Chapter 4

Data Analysis

4.0 Introduction

The previous chapter had presented a detailed description of the methodology adopted for the research. It presented a detailed description of the sample and population, research framework, tools used for the study and their administration. A detailed analysis of the preliminary study which was helpful in planning the main study has also been presented. The research methodology was presented in the form of a flow chart showing all the stages of the study.

This chapter mainly focuses on describing and analysing the data gathered with the help of different tools. Here, the analysis of the data is presented in different ways depending upon the nature of the data gathered. Each section of the research tools used for data collection is interpreted separately and a final discussion is presented at the end of the interpretation. The final sections present a discussion on data analysis in order to arrive at a more meaningful conclusions. In the next paragraph the data description is presented.

4.1 Data description

Based on the tools used for data collection, data description is presented in five categories for discussion. In this chapter, data is analysed based on the information gathered from questionnaires (questionnaire-I and questionnaire-II), classroom observations, interviews (teacher interviews and learner interviews), teacher manuals evaluation and the analysis of test scripts (question papers and answer sheets). The data obtained from all the tools is presented quantitatively and qualitatively depending
on the nature of the data. Quotes from the respondents are provided as recorded wherever necessary. Graphs charts and table were used to make the data available in the most comprehensive way possible. The data gathered through each instrument is presented separately along with its analysis and interpretation. Analysis and interpretation of data is done according to the information obtained from the respondents who were teachers and learners, along with the information obtained from teacher manuals and test scripts.

4.2 Description, analysis and interpretation of questionnaires

In Section 3.6.2.3 a detailed discussion on the construction of questionnaire-I and questionnaire-II was provided. In this section, the description, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through these questionnaires are presented.

4.2.1 Questionnaire-I

As mentioned earlier, questionnaire-I was mainly intended to gather basic information about schools and teachers that were chosen for the study after the inception of CCE. This was done in order to fine-tune the research questions and to make further plans for the main study. Questionnaire-I was administered to six teachers of Kendriya Vidyalayas in Hyderabad. The description, analysis, interpretation and discussion on the data gathered through questionnaire-I is presented in the following sections. While this section presents an overall description of questionnaire-I, the next sub-sections present the data gathered through questionnaire-I. Discussions on each sub-section are presented along with the data and a comprehensive discussion on the data gathered through questionnaire-I is made in the last section.
Questionnaire-I was divided into three sections. Section-I had seven items that tried to seek information about the teacher. Section-II had three types of questions which included a) a set of questions which were intended to know about the general practices of the regular classrooms and assessment procedures; b) a table intended to collect information about teacher beliefs on CCE; and c) three open-ended questions that aimed to examine the teacher’s opinion on the implementation of CCE and teacher manuals. Section-III had 5 questions. While the first two questions sought the details of the training on CCE, the next three questions which were open-ended in nature, tried to obtain further details of the training on CCE. The questions in Section-II, where the respondents were asked to tick their option under ‘agree’, ‘not sure’ and ‘disagree’ along with Section-III, where the respondents were asked to tick on one option (smiley), were treated as quantitative in nature. On the other hand, the questions that were intended to capture open-ended responses, where the respondents were expected to give opinions/information in their own words were considered as qualitative data. The quantitative responses are presented in the form of tables, charts and graphs and the same are subsequently analysed and interpreted. The qualitative responses are presented descriptively in the form of tables and quotes/excerpts. The responses are presented as they were gathered by the researcher with regard to opinion, grammar, and vocabulary and so on. The responses are later analysed and interpreted.

To administer questionnaire-I, four different Kendriya Vidyalaya schools were visited by the researcher and six teachers were approached for their responses. All the six teachers responded to questionnaire-I. However, the number of respondents for all the questions was not the same.
In the following section, the description, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered through questionnaire-I is presented.

4.2.1.1 Section-I

This section had seven items which included the name of the teacher, date, name of the school (branch), educational qualification, the number of years of teaching experience, classes taught and in-service training attended.

The analysis and interpretation of these items are presented in the sections mentioned hereunder.

4.2.1.1.1 School

Item 1 of Section-I provided space for the teacher to mention their names. The names of the respondents are not disclosed in the interpretation in order to maintain confidentiality. All six teachers are represented as T1, T2, T3….T6 respectively. Item 2 gathered information on the date on which the teacher had responded to the questionnaire, which was solely done to keep track of the period of conducting the preliminary study. Item 3 was intended to seek information on the schools that the teachers were currently teaching at. The information from the questionnaires showed that all the teachers were teachers of English at the Kendriya Vidyalaya schools.

4.2.1.1.2 Educational qualification

Item 4 was aimed at collecting information about the teacher’s educational qualification. The following table presents the data gathered from questionnaire-I.
Table 4.1 Teacher’s Qualification

Table 4.1 shows that all six teachers had a minimum degree of Master of Arts in English Literature and a Bachelor’s degree in Education. Furthermore, one teacher was pursuing Masters in education, two teachers had done their Masters in Education and one teacher had done her Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching English (PGCTE). Therefore, from the data, it was clearly seen that all the teachers had the minimum qualification required to teach English at the secondary level and a few others were also equipped with additional qualifications which was presumed to be helpful in aiding for their professional development.

4.2.1.1.3 Teaching experience (1)

Item 5 sought information on the number of years of teaching experience. The following table represents the number of years of teaching experience.
Table 4.2 Teaching Experience (1)

Table 4.2 clearly shows the teacher’s teaching experience. It presents the different number of years of teaching experience of the teachers approached for the preliminary study with questionnaire-I ranged from a maximum of twenty-two years to a minimum of eight years.

4.2.1.4 Classes taught

Item 6 was aimed at gathering information about the classes taught by the teacher in the current school. The following chart presents that information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Classes Taught
Table 4.3 presents the data of the classes taught by the six teachers who were approached for the preliminary study. The chart clearly shows that all the teachers commonly taught classes VI to VIII whereas two teachers also taught classes IV and V. Moreover, two other teachers were seen teaching classes IX and X also.

### 4.2.1.5 In-service training attended

Item 7 sought information on the number of in-service training programmes attended by the teacher. The following table presents the data obtained.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Number of years of in-service training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 In-service Training

Table 4.4 clearly shows that one teacher had a minimum of one year of in-service training, four other teachers had two years of in-service training and one teacher had three years of in-service training.

Based on the data gathered from this section it could be said that the sample selected for the preliminary study comprised of teachers of English from the Kendriya Vidyalaya schools. From the data obtained it was evident that the teachers not only possessed the minimum qualification required for teaching English but also had other additional qualifications in the same area. It was also evident that all the teachers were well experienced with a minimum of eight years and a maximum of twenty-two years of teaching experience.
4.2.1.2 Section-II

This section is divided into three parts. Each part used different formats of questions to gather different information from the teachers. Data, collected in all the parts, is presented in the following sections.

4.2.1.2.1 Information on teaching and testing of English

The first part of the section was a set of six items that intended to get information about the number of days allotted for teaching English, duration of each period, average number of learners in each class, number of formative assessments conducted per term, importance given to scholastic and co-scholastic aspects in terms of percentage and the number of periods per week allotted for co-curricular activities. The data gathered through the first part, i.e. from the above six items, is presented descriptively below.

The data obtained from the questionnaire- II clearly showed that the number of days allotted for teaching English varied between twenty-five to thirty days. Also it implied that the duration of each period was thirty-five to forty minutes. It was also found from the data that the average number of learners in a class varied from 40-45 on a regular day. The number of formative assessments per term was two. Moreover, all the teachers had stated that the ratio given for scholastic and co-scholastic aspects in terms of percentage was ten (i.e., 90% : 10%) and the number of periods per week for co-curricular activities was a minimum of one or a maximum of two.
Therefore, it was found that the average classroom and classes allotted for teaching or testing English had not changed much after the implementation of CCE. However, though very less, there was a clear indication of a change in terms of co-scholastic and co-curricular activities.

4.2.1.2.2 Statements on CCE

The second part of Section-II was a table where thirteen statements related to CCE were listed down and the respondent was asked to indicate the degree of agreement against each statement by checking against the columns ‘agree’, ‘not sure’ and ‘disagree’.

The second part, i.e. the table consisted of the following thirteen statements:

i) There is a need to break the stereotypical beliefs on evaluation.

ii) Implementation of CCE is an innovation in evaluation in schools and it aims at learner autonomy.

iii) CCE helps in improving a learner’s performance by identifying his/her learning difficulties at regular time intervals.

iv) Since formative assessment focuses more on the number of midterm or unit examinations, there is less scope for the learner to reflect and improve.

v) Formative Assessment is nothing but achievement testing which is only useful to understand how much learning of content has happened.

vi) Formative Assessment must be diagnostic in nature so that suitable remedial measures are taken to ensure improvement.
vii) Identifying learning progress of learners at regular time intervals and employing suitable remedial measures can enhance learner’s learning performance.

viii) Diagnostic tests are difficult to administer in the classroom because of the diversity among learners.

ix) By using remedial measures, most of the problems that learners face while learning a language can be rectified.

x) Focusing on excellence in academics alone undoubtedly results in the lop-sided development of personality.

xi) This form of evaluation offers flexibility to the schools to plan their own academic schedules as per specified guidelines.

xii) Numerical scores are considered to be better than grading system as it clearly specifies the learning outcomes.

xiii) Learners and parents should also be given proper awareness on CCE

The data, along with its interpretation is presented quantitatively in the form of a chart below.

![Figure 4.1 Statements on CCE](image-url)
Figure 4.1 clearly shows that all the teachers ‘agreed’ to the statements - one, two and three. From this it can be interpreted that all the teachers do believe that there was a need to break the stereotypical beliefs on evaluation. They were also of the view that implementation of CCE was an innovation in evaluation in schools that aimed at learner autonomy. Further, teachers also agreed that CCE was useful in identifying learner difficulties at regular intervals and thus in improving learner’s performance.

It was also clear (from Figure 4.1) that all the teachers had unanimously disagreed with statement four which states that since formative assessment focused more on the number of midterm or unit examinations, there was less scope for the learner to reflect and improve.

However, Figure 4.1 also shows that for statement five, while one teacher had agreed that formative assessment was nothing but achievement testing which was only useful to understand how much learning had happened, three teachers had stated that they were not sure of this statement. On the other hand, two teachers had disagreed with the same statement.

As shown in Figure 4.1, all the teachers had agreed with statement six and seven, which stated that formative assessment must be diagnostic in nature so that suitable remedial measures could to be taken to ensure improvement in learning, to identify learning progress at regular time intervals and to employ suitable remedial measures which could enhance learner’s learning performance. Similarly, all of the teachers had disagreed to statement eight which stated that diagnostic tests were difficult to administer in the classroom because of learner diversity. Moreover, all teachers had agreed to statements nine, ten and eleven which stated that by using remedial measures most of the problems that learners faced could be rectified. This implies
that CCE provided scope for the teachers to plan their own academic schedule where evaluation could be used to help the learner overcome their learning difficulties and the focus was on the learner progress rather than on excellence in academics.

Finally, Figure 4.1 also shows that all the teachers disagreed with the statement that numerical scores were considered to be better than grading system as it clearly specified the learning outcomes and similarly, all the teachers had agreed that learners and parents must be made aware and updated on the new innovation in evaluation i.e. CCE.

From the responses that were gathered, it can be said that the teacher’s opinion on CCE seemed to be positive. According to most of the responses to the statements, teachers had shown a positive approach towards the new method of evaluation. Therefore, it can be said that teachers had an understanding of the positive outcomes of CCE and also had a positive approach towards adopting new method.

4.2.1.2.3 Teacher’s opinion on introduction of CCE

The third part was aimed at gathering information regarding the teacher’s opinion on CCE. The questions were a list of three open ended questions of which question three had two subparts ‘a’ and ‘b’. While question 1 asked the teachers to state their opinion on the introduction of CCE in India, question 2 tried to find out about the usefulness of teacher manuals provided on CCE. Question 3 investigated that, in the given Indian education scenario, whether teachers believed that CCE could be administered effectively and whether CCE could be academically effective. The data gathered from the third part, i.e. from the three questions, is presented qualitatively in the form of a table listing the responses provided by the teachers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Provides stress free learning environment along with motivation for learning and generates curiosity to develop questioning ability in the students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes, but student strength should be kept low for more effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Very useful for learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-explanatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>CCE gave the students scope for their overall all round development in scholastic and non-scholastic areas of the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very useful and very clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>New and innovative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-explanatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes, provided sufficient training and awareness is given to the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Focusses on continuous assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) With constant efforts and regular monitoring, it is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>A very good method that helps the learner in a number of ways to emerge as a confident and proficient user of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Yes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Teacher’s Opinion on Introduction of CCE
Table 4.5 presents the responses to the questions that were intended to know about the teacher’s opinion on the introduction of CCE. From the responses, it can be seen that all the teachers had shown a positive opinion on the introduction of CCE. Besides, it can also be stated that all the teachers had found the teacher manuals provided by NCERT as very useful. In fact, during the informal discussions with the teachers, one of the teachers had mentioned that the new teacher manuals were like a ‘Teacher’s Bible’. Furthermore, it can also be seen from Table 4.5 that all the teachers believed that given the Indian education scenario, CCE could be administered effectively with the help of sufficient training, regular monitoring, and constant efforts and so on. Finally, the teachers also believed that CCE could be academically effective if proper measures were taken.

Data from this section clearly indicated that the teacher-learner ratio in a regular classroom was 1:40 to 1:45 on average. The average number of classes allotted for teaching or testing, after the introduction of CCE, were the same as before the introduction of CCE. It was also clear that the teachers were not only positive about the introduction of CCE but also felt that it was necessary. It can also be clearly perceived that the teachers had an understanding of learner problems and were in favour of using diagnosis and remedial instruction to help the learners overcome their problems. Furthermore, it was evident from the teacher responses that teachers believed that CCE could be useful in helping the teachers in understanding the learner better, provided certain measures such as sufficient training, monitoring and constant efforts are taken care of.
4.2.1.3 Section-III

This section had a total of five questions which were aimed at gathering information on training on CCE. The format of the questions varied from being yes/no questions, to multiple questions and open-ended questions. The data obtained from all six teachers is presented below. Interpretation and discussion on the data are presented after each question presented.

Question 1: Have you been officially trained to implement CCE? If yes, please mention the number of days and state if it was effective in terms of clarifying your doubts related to CCE.

The first question was presented in the form of a yes/no question and the respondents were provided with space to give reasons for their choice of the answer if required. The data gathered from this question is presented below in the form of a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, but had a few unofficial sessions.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>02 days.</td>
<td>Two days was offered but only outline was given to me.</td>
<td>Two days.</td>
<td>Yes, 2 days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Training on CCE-1

It can be seen from Table 4.6 that five out of six teachers had attended a two-day training programme which focused only on the outlines, while one teacher had not attended any training programme on CCE but attended a few unofficial sessions.
Question 2: Please respond to the questions based on the training provided on CCE.

The second question was presented in the form of multiple questions where teachers were asked to select one of the three expressions among a set of questions under one main item. The data obtained from this question is presented below in the form of a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>😊</th>
<th>😊</th>
<th>😊</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The training objectives were clear.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training procedures supported the course objectives.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of reading you were asked to do was appropriate.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of writing or other work asked to do was sufficient.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kind of material provided was useful to a great extent.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of days allotted for the training were sufficient.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Training on CCE-2

Table 4.7 clearly presents the data gathered from teachers about the training provided on CCE. It was found that all the teachers had mentioned that the training objectives were clearly presented and the training procedures supported the course objectives. It was also seen that all the teachers stated that the amount of reading and writing they were asked to do was appropriate and sufficient. The materials provided in the training were useful to a great extent for the teachers. Interestingly, all teachers had also stated that the number of days allotted for the training was not sufficient.
However, one teacher who did not attend any training programme officially had also given information based on the unofficial sessions that were attended.

Question 3: Did you face any difficulties with the training provided on CCE?

The third question was presented in the form of an open-ended question where the teachers were expected to give their desired response. The data gathered from this question clearly shows that none of the teachers had faced any difficulty with the training provided on CCE.

Question 4: How useful was the training in helping you implement CCE in your classroom?

The fourth question was given in the form of an open-ended question where space was given to the teachers to respond freely. However, two teachers did not provide any information which is why only four responses are presented below in the form of a table. The data gathered from this question is presented qualitatively in the form of a table.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Guidelines were clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>To clearly understand the strategies that can be used/implemented for the betterment of the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Could assess the pupils effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Useful to a good extent as we were clear about the objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8 Training on CCE-3
Table 4.8 shows that all the teachers, who had given their responses, stated that the training was very helpful in implementing CCE in their classrooms. Also, teachers stated that the training was useful in understanding the strategies that can be used for learner progress, in assessing the learners effectively and in understanding the objectives of CCE.

Question 5: Any other information you would like to share about the training?

The last question in this section was given as an open-ended question. However, only two teachers had given their responses to this question of which T4 stressed on the need for more such formal training at regular intervals and T6 stated that training programmes are necessary to get updated information.

From the data obtained from this section, it was observed that most of the teachers had received training on CCE and were satisfied with the content provided in the training. The teachers had found the training useful in implementing CCE in their classrooms. Teachers had also mentioned that the training was not sufficient and more such training was needed in the future. However, with regard to the training, it was also important to notice that during informal discussions with teachers it was learned that due to academic and administrative reasons, all the teachers did not attend the training programme on CCE. The training was attended by few of the teachers from each school and then the contents of the training were further passed on to the other teachers who did not attend the training programme.
4.2.1.4 Conclusion

An overall discussion on questionnaire-I is presented in this section. To sum it all, from questionnaire-I, it was observed that all the teachers were English teachers of classes VII to IX and had possessed the required qualifications and in-service training for teaching English at the secondary level and all the teachers had a positive outlook towards the implementation of CCE. Moreover, the teachers had the awareness of using evaluation for other purposes such as diagnosis and remediation other than just measuring learning. They were affirmative about the use of CCE to understand the learner better and to help the learner overcome learner difficulties. It was evident from the data gathered through questionnaire-I that teacher’s beliefs about implementation of CCE in Indian classrooms was a positive one and the teacher manual on CCE seemed to be of great use. However, there seemed to be some irregularities in terms of the training provided on CCE. The training though was officially given to all teachers, there had been an instance of one teacher not receiving any such training. During the informal discussions with the teachers, it was also found that due to administrative constraints, all teachers did not get the opportunity to attend the training provided on CCE, but arrangements were made to have a few sessions on CCE for those who missed on the training. Nonetheless, the problem here lies in the fact that the two-day training that most teachers attended was not administered directly by professionals in the area but was provided by other teachers who had attended the official training. Here the issue of training quality getting diluted arose as the teachers who passed the information to other teachers did not have any experience in training. So, there was a less chance of providing uniformity in terms of training and that seems challenging.
4.2.2 Questionnaire-II

The previous section presented a description, analysis, interpretation and discussion on the data gathered for preliminary study through questionnaire-I. This section now presents the description, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered for the main study through questionnaire-II.

4.2.2.1 Description, analysis and interpretation of questionnaire-II

Questionnaire-II was mainly designed to examine better the classroom pedagogy after the implementation of CCE. Details pertaining to the teacher, the learner, methodology used by the teachers, the materials used in the classroom, and evaluation were obtained with the help of questionnaire-II. This was mainly done to explore the teaching practices adopted by the teachers, learning and evaluation, teacher’s understanding of learners and learner problems, their conception of CCE, and the extent to which teachers use evaluation in helping learners overcome learning problems to aid learner progress. The questionnaire–II was administered in six branches of Kendriya Vidyalaya schools to twelve teachers but only eight teachers have responded and returned the questionnaires back to the researcher.

Questionnaire-II was divided into five sections namely personal information; learners; methodology; textbooks, teacher manuals and other materials; and evaluation.

The first section had nine items (questions 1-9) and was mainly intended to obtain information about the teacher’s background.

The second section mainly focused on the learner and was aimed at understanding the learner from the teacher’s point of view. Three questions (question 10-12) were
designed for this purpose of which one was a set of multiple questions and the other two were open ended questions.

The third section intended to investigate the methodology adopted by the teacher in the classroom ranging from lesson plans to classroom techniques and error correction. A total of fifteen questions (questions 13-27), ranging from yes/no questions to multiple choice questions were used to gather information in this regard.

The fourth section was a section on materials used by the teacher. This section enquired into the role of textbooks and teacher manuals in the classroom. This was done with the help of four questions (questions 28-31) that had yes/no, multiple choice and open ended questions.

The last section i.e. the fifth section was on evaluation and attempted to gather information on various aspects such as internal assessment, the usefulness of CCE in the classroom, using evaluation for multiple purposes, using evaluation to identify learner problems, remedial instruction, feedback and so on. This section included a total of thirteen questions (questions 32-44) that constituted open ended questions, Likert scale and a multiple choice question.

In the next section, data obtained through questionnaire-II is presented in both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantified data is presented in the form of charts and the qualitative data is presented in descriptive and table formats where the teacher’s responses were quoted in the manner they were obtained. No changes had been made with the language, grammar, spelling or any other aspect with regard to teacher responses.
As mentioned earlier, though questionnaire-II was given to fourteen teachers, only eight teachers had responded to the questions and returned the questionnaires back to the researcher. However, in some cases, of these eight questionnaires, a few questions were left out without any response. Hence, for some questions, where the number of responses are less than eight, the actual number of responses are duly mentioned.

The next section presents the data gathered through questionnaire-II, followed by a discussion, analysis and interpretation of the data of each question.

4.2.2.2 Section-I: Personal information

The present section, on personal information, included nine items (1-9) which were intended to gather information about the name of the teacher, name of the school, educational qualification, teaching experience, teaching experience in the current school, email id, contact number, grades teaching currently, and training on CCE attended by the teacher. The data gathered on personal information from questionnaire-II is presented in the form of tables and graphs. Personal information pertaining to the name of the teacher, email id and contact number are not discussed here as the researcher had assured confidentiality in terms of keeping personal details anonymous. Other details such as educational qualification, teaching experience, training etc. are discussed in this section. Since all the eight teachers provided their responses for all the eight items in this section, the information gathered from the teachers is represented individually as that of T1 T2, T3…..T8 respectively.

Avoiding personal details such as name of the teacher, email id and contact number, for reasons of convenience, items two and seven i.e. name of the school and grades teaching currently in that school are discussed in one table. Items four and five i.e.
teaching experience in general and teaching experience in the present school are discussed in another table. However, item three i.e. educational qualification, item eight i.e. training on CCE attended by the teacher and item nine i.e. details of the training attended are discussed separately.

4.2.2.1 Distribution of teachers and classes taught

As mentioned earlier a total of eight teachers responded to the questionnaire-II and they belonged to six branches of Kendriya Vidyalaya. The eight teachers are randomly represented as T1 – T8 respectively and the schools are randomly represented as KV1- KV6. The school-wise distribution of teachers and current grades teaching is presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>KV1</td>
<td>KV3</td>
<td>KV3</td>
<td>KV2</td>
<td>KV4</td>
<td>KV5</td>
<td>KV6</td>
<td>KV4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes taught</td>
<td>VI- IX</td>
<td>IV- IX</td>
<td>VI- IX</td>
<td>VI-X</td>
<td>VI-X</td>
<td>VI- IX</td>
<td>VI- IX</td>
<td>VI- IX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 Information about Teachers

From Table 4.9, it can be inferred that out of eight teachers the distribution in terms of schools is as follows. Two teachers each had participated from two schools and one teacher each had participated from four schools. Besides, it can be clearly seen that all the teachers handled classes from VI to IX whereas, one teacher i.e. T2 handled class IV and V as well and two teachers i.e. T4 and T5 also handled class X.
4.2.2.2.2 Educational background (2)

Question 3 was mainly aimed at collecting information on the educational background of the teachers. The following table presents details of the educational qualifications of all the eight teachers who were part of the main study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educational Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education, PGDTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education, Masters in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education, Bachelor of sciences, Masters in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education, Master of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Master of Arts, Bachelor’s degree in Education, PGCTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Educational Background

It can be seen from Table 4.10, that the minimum level of educational qualification that every teacher had was a Masters in Arts along with a Bachelor’s Degree in Education. Besides, a few teachers also possessed additional educational qualifications such as Post Graduate Diploma in the Teaching of English (PGDTE) in the case of T3, Bachelor of Sciences (B.Sc.) and Masters in Education (M.Ed.) in the case of T5, Master of Philosophy (M.Phil.) in the case of T6, and Post Graduate Certificate in the Teaching of English (PGCTE) in the case of T8.
4.2.2.2.3 Teaching experience (2)

Total teaching experience and teaching experience in the present school was the information sought through the questions in this section. The following chart presents the details in this matter.

Figure 4.2 Teaching Experience (2)

As seen in Figure 4.2, it was found that all teachers approached for the main study with questionnaire-II had a minimum of eighteen years and a maximum of thirty four years of teaching experience. In addition to that, 50% of the teachers had a teaching experience of more than twenty-two years and 12.5% of the teachers had thirty-four years of teaching experience. However, the number of years of teaching experience in the current school varied between one to four years where 50% of the teachers had four years of experience in the current school, 37.5% of teachers had two years of teaching experience in the current school and 12.5 % of teachers had one year of teaching experience in the current school.
4.2.2.2.4 Teacher training programmes on CCE

As part of gathering information, teachers were asked about the training programmes attended on CCE since its inception. The following chart provides information about the training on CCE.

Figure 4.3 Teacher Training

As seen in Figure 4.3, 37.5% of teachers did not attend any training on CCE. However, 50% of the teachers had attended a two-day programme on CCE and 12.5% of the teachers had attended a five-day programme on CCE.

To procure additional information on the training programme attended by the teachers on CCE, item nine focused to investigate if the training programme was satisfactory in terms of its objectives, the training procedures, the materials provided and its usefulness. Though no details were provided by the 37.5% teachers who had not attended any training programme on CCE the rest of the 62.5% of teachers had answered positively with a ‘yes’ in the space provided. However, most of the teachers had not provided any details about the training programme, three teachers T2, T4 and T5 had given details on how satisfactory the training programme was. The following are the remarks presented by the three teachers on the training programme:
Yes. The programme was directly in connect to the CBSE syllabus so it was very useful (T2).

It provided an outline. Helped us with procedures or the process to be used. Provided us with opportunities to discuss, raise issues, come up with formats, tables etc. also understood the focus of the people who would monitor (T4).

Children can be evaluated at all levels. It is easy to know the different standards of different children. It is also easy to know in which area the child is good and where their problems are. This is what I learnt (T5).

From the above statements, it can be deduced that the training programme on CCE had provided the teachers an understanding of the processes involved in pedagogy. It not only was helpful in brainstorming the teachers on the different opportunities, issues and formats but also was helpful in sensitising the teacher of the diversities among learners and learner problems.

4.2.2.3 Section-II: Learners

This section was mainly intended to gather information about the teacher’s learners. Details pertaining to learner’s abilities, learner problems and remedies adopted by the teacher to help overcome the problems are extracted in this section. This section had a total of three questions (Q10, Q11 and Q12) of which question 10 had a set of eight items under which the teachers were asked to describe their learners and two questions were open-ended. The data gathered from this section is presented in the form of tables and charts depending on their nature. Quantitative data is presented in the form of charts and tables and qualitative data is presented in the form of tables and is descriptive in nature.
### Learner details

Question 10 (on learners) sought to gather information about the learner from a teacher’s perspective and captured information about the age of the learner, learner’s level of competence, learner diversity, ability to speak, write and read and any other information. The information obtained from questionnaire-II is presented below in the form of a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Level of competence</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Ability to speak</th>
<th>Ability to write</th>
<th>Ability to read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Needs to be improved</td>
<td>Different background</td>
<td>Need more practice</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Need practice</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>Up to the mark</td>
<td>Linguistically diverse</td>
<td>Not satisfactory</td>
<td>Able to write on familiar topics</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Very diverse</td>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Diverse</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 Learners
It is evident from Table 4.11 that most of the teachers mentioned that their learners belonged to the age group 11-15. In terms of the level of competence, 86.5% of teachers had provided similar answers such as ‘good’, ‘satisfactory’, ‘sufficient’, ‘up to the mark’. However, 12.5% of the teachers had mentioned that the competence level of the learners needed to be improved. In terms of diversity, all the responses were similar. Since the schools were Central Government schools run for the children of Indian Defence Services personnel, the learners were from various parts of the country with varying social backgrounds and different linguistic skills. In terms of ability to speak, 62.5% of teachers used the words such as ‘good’ ‘satisfactory and ‘above average’, whereas 25% mentioned that the learners ‘need more practice’ and 12.5% stated ‘not satisfactory’. Regarding the ability to write, while 75% of the teachers mentioned ‘good’ and ‘satisfactory’, 12.5% mentioned that the learners were ‘able to write on familiar topics’ and 12.5% stated that the learner’s writing ability was ‘average’. With regard to reading, 87.5% of teachers mentioned that the learner’s ability to read was ‘good’, ‘satisfactory, and ‘above average’ and 12.5% of the teachers mentioned as ‘average’.

However, only two teachers had responded in the space provided for any other information about the learner that the teacher wanted to share. The two responses that were obtained are presented hereunder:

My learners had a positive attitude to learning and they participate in all activities without inhibitions (T4).

They want to learn more but there is less time to do more (T5).
Keeping in view the teacher’s responses about their learners, it can be stated that the learners belonged to the age group of 11-15 and were from different backgrounds. It can also be said that their ability to speak, write and read and their knowledge of words was on the whole satisfactory, however, they needed more attention in these areas. It can be said that the learners had a positive attitude towards learning and the teachers were aware of the learner’s abilities and needs.

4.2.2.3.2 Learner problems

Question 11 was intended to enquire about the major problems faced by the learners in the classroom. This question was presented in the form of an open-ended question hoping that the teacher finds enough space to respond in their desired manner. The data obtained on learner problems is presented below in the form of a table by quoting the teacher’s unaltered responses.

| T1   | Problems in writing what is required. |
| T2   | Read about alien concepts/unfamiliar topics. |
| T3   | Problems in communication. |
| T4   | Appropriate use of tense. |
| T5   | Improper pronunciation. |
| T6   | Grammatical errors, tenses were not correct. |
| T7   | Ridicule by peer group at any attempt to speak in English. |
| T8   | Some children will not understand the concept and keep quite in the class. This we will know when we conduct a class test. Some others will understand the concept but cannot answer in the class. |

Table 4.12 Learner Problems
Table 4.12 clearly indicates that learners faced many problems in the classroom ranging from restricted attempt to speak for fear of ridicule from peers to grammatical and language problems. It is evident that the learners faced problems in many ways, such as, their inability to understand the concept which came to the teacher’s notice only either when a class test was conducted or in the case where the learner understood the concept but was found unable to answer in the class. Other problems included inappropriate use of tense, grammatical errors, inability to read fluently about alien topics or unfamiliar topics, improper pronunciation, problems in communication and problems in providing adequate answers.

4.2.2.3.3 Diagnosing learner problems

The next question, i.e. question 12 was an extension of the previous question which looked at learner problems. This question was intended to get information on what, according to the teacher, can be done to help the learners overcome their problems. The data obtained from the questionnaire–II is presented below in a descriptive manner with the teacher’s unaltered responses.

Proper exposure and opportunities to use language can help the learner overcome their problems (T1).

Students who are not open in the class about their problems with language can share their ideas with their peer. This should happen in the remedial classes that are conducted after one term as the teacher should also be aware of the problems (T2).

Students should be encouraged to use their mother tongue whenever they had difficulty to express in English (T3).
Continuous assessments can be useful for the teacher to understand learner problem and continuous practice can be useful for the learner to overcome that problem. The problem can be identified based on the student’s performance in class tests and then it can be tackled in the classroom itself (T4).

Teachers should be sensitive enough to understand the learner’s problems in all four skills. As one skill is dependent on the other, a comprehensive assessment can be helpful to analyse where the problem lies. It should be a conscious effort from the teacher and the student (T5).

These formative assessments can be like tools that can be used to build the students levels and help them do better for the summative assessments. It depends on how you use the information and how you build (T6).

Identifying the problem is what needs to be done to tackle the problem. It is like half job done (T7).

Learner problems should be categorised and remedial instruction is one way of helping the learners (T8).

From the above statements, it is clear that a number of problems were stated in the questionnaires where teachers expressed the need to identify learner problems and to help the learner either through remedial instruction or by making conscious efforts. It is also evident that teachers viewed assessment as a way of understanding the learner and their learning problems and as a means of devising strategies that can help the learner overcome their problems. Though other methods such as exposure, language awareness and usage of the first language had also been suggested by the teachers, it is apparent from their responses that identifying learner problems was what was
required to help overcome them. This, as some of the teachers had clearly stated, can be achieved through observed assessment, where learner problems can be identified, categorised and addressed.

4.2.2.4 Section-III: Methodology

This section had fifteen questions (questions 13-27). Questions 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 were yes/no questions which were aimed to gather information about teacher’s lesson plans, maintaining teacher diaries, reflection, and new techniques employed in the classroom. Question 18 had seven items and tried to gather information on how teachers taught a lesson. Question 19 was an open-ended question that enquired about classroom techniques/procedures. Question 20 and 21 were also yes/no questions where teachers were provided space to give reasons for their choice of answer. These questions focused on gathering information on the use of activities or tasks as part of classroom techniques, and about the technique that teachers used to encourage the learners. Question 22 was again a yes/no question on usage of tasks/ activities which were not included in the textbook. The teacher was provided with five options to tick depending on where the tasks were adapted from. Questions 23 was an open-ended question where teachers were asked to respond to any one activity they had used in the classroom. Question 24 was also an open-ended question that tried to explore teacher’s concept of learner errors. Question 25 had two items which were aimed at understanding the objectives behind using activities in the classroom. Question 26, on the other hand, gathered information on how the teacher responds to learner errors by listing six options to choose from. Finally, question 27 was another yes/no question where the teacher was asked to provide details based on their choice of answer. It attempted to extract information about the use of pair or group work. The data
gathered from these questions is analysed in both quantitative and qualitative ways and is presented in the form of tables and charts in the sub-sections that follow.

4.2.2.4.1 Methodology of the teacher

Questions 13-17 were yes/no questions that enquired the teachers on their lesson plans. Details pertaining to preparing lesson plans, discussing of lesson plans with colleagues, reflecting on lesson plans after the class, maintaining a diary or a journal and trying new techniques in the classroom as part of reflection were the aspects that were included in this question. From the data obtained from this question, it was evident that all the teachers not only planned their lessons but also discussed their lesson plans with their colleagues. They also stated that they reflected on their lesson plans after the class. They mentioned that they maintained a diary or a journal and liked to reflect and try new techniques in the classroom.

4.2.2.4.2 Lesson planning

Question 18 asked the teachers to present a sample of their method of beginning, progressing and ending a lesson. Furthermore, details on how teachers give feedback, the activities used in the classroom, explanation and learner’s role were also queried as part of this question. However, only five teachers i.e. 62.5% of the teachers responded to this question and data obtained from this question i.e. on the methodology of the teacher is descriptively discussed below.

In terms of beginning a lesson, T1, T3 and T4 had mentioned about brainstorming the learner’s schema towards a topic by using different methods. T5 had stated about using teacher manuals to design lesson plans and T7 had mentioned about using questions to introduce the topic.
With regard to progress, T1, T3, T4 and T5 stated that they used techniques such as explaining the lesson with examples from day to day context, discussing new vocabulary and asking questions. T7, on the other hand, talked about reading aloud and using discussions for comprehension. Similarly, as far as ending a lesson was concerned, T1 mentioned about asking exploratory questions, T3 and T4 talked about note making, while T5 stressed on posing comprehension questions in the classroom, T7 mentioned about paragraph writing to check the understanding of the learners.

However, T1, T3, T4, T5 had mentioned that providing feedback was done either by eliciting feelings about the topic or by answering doubts or asking questions. However, it was not made clear as to how giving feedback was actually dealt. On the other hand, in the questionnaire-II, a variety of responses were furnished to the question on various activities used in the classroom. Activities, such as writing a diary entry, letter writing, paragraph writing, story writing, roleplay, skit, group discussions, debating and conducting quiz were listed as part of the responses. Moreover, on explanation, teachers had listed only two methods that included read aloud and question and answer method.

Finally, about learner’s role, words such as read, write, discuss, and pair discussion were the terms mentioned without any further clarification.

4.2.2.4.3 Classroom techniques and procedures

Question 19, an open-ended question, sought information on the classroom techniques/procedures that teachers used in the class which proved useful for the learners in developing their language skills. The question was presented in an open-ended format with the intention of providing enough space for the teacher to answer
as desired. The data that was gathered with the help of the questionnaire-II in this regard presented the different techniques/procedures followed by teachers for developing language skills among learners that were listed out by the teachers. The techniques/procedures that teachers listed included using the first language, using task based/ activity based teaching to facilitate reconstruction of knowledge, conducting group discussions and seminars, conducting quiz, using role play and using question and answer methods. This list not only showed the different approaches that teachers used in the classroom but also articulated the efforts made by teachers to help their learners learn effectively.

Question 20 was a yes/no question intended to know about familiarising the learners with task/activity objectives. The teacher was also asked to provide details to support their choice of answer. However, only 75% of the teachers provided responses to this question. This question gathered various answers which were similar in terms of their purpose.

T3, T4, T5 and T6 stated that they discuss the purpose of using an activity with their learners to create a situation for understanding the usefulness of the activity. The following were the responses provided in the questionnaire-II.

Yes, because they can further implement in their language use (T3).

Sharing the objective/purpose of an activity helps the learners to be focused (T4).

Use of PPT/a situation for introducing the lesson can be done (T5).
I ask them how the activity would be of use to them in their opinion. Then draw them into discussion with my questioning (T7).

Nevertheless, T2 provided a positive response by opting for ‘yes’ but no further reasoning was provided for the question.

4.2.2.4.4 Teaching strategies

Question 21 was again a yes/no question that enquired into the ways in which teacher techniques helped learners develop/use strategies of language learning. However, only three teachers had provided reasons for their answer. The responses furnished by the teachers are presented below and the details given by the three teachers are presented descriptively along with the analysis, interpretation and discussion that is presented subsequently.

It was evident from the responses that all teachers had unanimously given a positive answer but only three teachers had given their reasons which are as follows.

Learners are able to compare their agendas of language learning with the objectives of the activities. This ensures better learning (T3).

It’s a kind of practice which helps the student to develop their language learning (T5).

For predicting what happens next; for enhancing vocabulary, speaking skills; to identify and suggest solutions by writing reports (T7).
The information gathered shows that teachers had been using different techniques consciously for multiple purposes with the intention of developing learning strategies among their learners.

### 4.2.2.4.5 Teaching resources

Question 22 was yet another yes/no question where five options were provided for the teachers to choose from the sources on which teachers rely for a variety of tasks/activities in an attempt to go beyond the textbook. The following table presents the data followed by a discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
<th>T3</th>
<th>T4</th>
<th>T5</th>
<th>T6</th>
<th>T7</th>
<th>T8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource books</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web base</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-developed</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 Resources for Other Activities

Responses in Table 4.13 show that all the teachers used activities that were not included in the textbook. It also shows that while 50% of the teachers availed the help of colleagues, 62.5% of the teachers used resource books for using tasks/activities that were not included in the textbook. Moreover, only 25% of the teachers used web base and 75% of the teachers relied on self-developed tasks/activities. However, only
12.5% of the teachers responded to the option ‘any other’ and talked about ‘tasks suggested by learners but designed by self’ were also used. These responses show that teachers used different tasks/activities from different sources to help the learner learn better.

4.2.2.4.6 Activities from other sources

Question 23 was an open-ended question and it was intended to know more about the tasks/activities used by teachers that were adopted from other sources. The data gathered is presented descriptively along with discussion and analysis.

In response to the question on tasks/activities used by teachers, a variety of example tasks/activities had been presented. Activities such as debate, group presentations on real life social issues, group activities for the encouragement of ‘weak learners’ (as said by the teachers), projects and presentations were listed as examples. This implied that teachers used a variety of additional tasks/activities to ensure learner participation and learner progress.

4.2.2.4.7 Learner errors

Question 24 was an open-ended question and it tried to elicit the teacher’s understanding of learner errors and asked the teachers to give examples of those errors. The data gathered from this question is presented as a table and a discussion is presented below.
Errors in spellings and articles.

They just write the articles directly translated from their mother tongue.

Errors in spelling and tenses.

Careless attitude results in errors.

Using apostrophe for plurals.

Translating sentences directly from mother tongue.

Low level of concentration and focus are reasons for errors.

Tenses will not be correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Errors in spellings and articles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>They just write the articles directly translated from their mother tongue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Errors in spelling and tenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Careless attitude results in errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Using apostrophe for plurals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Translating sentences directly from mother tongue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Low level of concentration and focus are reasons for errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Tenses will not be correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14 Learner Errors

As seen in Table 4.14, teachers associated learner errors with temporary mistakes done by learners which were a result of either carelessness or lower levels of concentration. Many examples of errors were provided which included translating sentences directly from mother tongue, using an apostrophe for plurals, using wrong tenses, spelling errors, and errors in the usage of articles and so on.

4.2.2.4.8 Teaching objectives

Question 25 had two parts. The first part tried to find out the teacher’s objective behind using an activity and was provided with three options to choose from. The second part asked the teacher to elaborate on the reasons behind their focus. Though all the teachers provided responses to the first part of the question, only two teachers provided reasons for their choice of answer in the second part. The data obtained is
presented in the form of a chart for the first part and a detailed description of the data obtained for the second part is presented below followed by analysis.

Figure 4.4 Objectives of Using Activity

Figure 4.4 clearly shows that 25% of the teachers had opted accuracy, 37.5% of the teachers had opted for fluency whereas 37.5% of the teachers had opted for successful completion of the task. This data shows that there was a difference in the focus of the teacher in using activities in the classroom. The data collected on the second part of this question had only two responses which are presented below. Interestingly the two teachers who chose to respond to part two of the question had presented a similar option in part one. Their option in part one was fluency and their responses were as follows:

If the students are clear with the concept then there will be a certain level of fluency from their side. If they can clearly express their views, even with small errors, the objective behind a task is obviously met (T5).
Though I strive at all three options, I would focus more on the fluency aspect as that is what my activity would aim at (T7).

These responses show that these two teachers, though had put it differently, focus on achieving fluency rather than accuracy and completing the task successfully.

**4.2.2.4.9 Feedback on learner errors**

Question 26 was another multiple choice question which was asked to know about the teacher responses to learner errors. The question presented six different options from which they could choose from. The data gathered from the question is presented in the form of a chart and is discussed below.

![Figure 4.5 Feedback on Learner’s Errors](image)

Figure 4.5 Feedback on Learner’s Errors

Figure 4.5 shows that only 12.5% of the teachers had opted for ‘simply correct the errors orally’, 37.5% opted for ‘underlying the errors’, 12.5% of the teachers had opted for ‘explain in the written form on a paper’, 87.5% of the teachers had opted for ‘explain personally when and why the learner is wrong’, and 50% of the teachers had
opted for ‘provide the correct alternative form’. As part of response to the question on any other technique used, teachers responded in one or two words only without any further explanation. While T1 had mentioned ‘drilling’, T3 had mentioned ‘providing correct spelling’, T4 and T5 had mentioned ‘providing examples’.

4.2.2.4.10 Pair and group work

The final question of this section i.e. question 27 was a yes/no question and sought information about encouraging pair or group work among learners. The responses are presented below in the form of a table along with the reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Yes, yes it enhances speaking skills and self-confidence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Yes, group activity for role play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Yes, with activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Yes, pair work for exchanging and sharing any answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Yes, it encourages sharing information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Yes, pair/group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Yes, for collective learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Yes, through writing script, writing a report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 Interaction
Table 4.15 shows that all the teachers used pair and group work to encourage interaction between learners. Alongside, teachers had also provided the reasons for doing so, which ranged from ‘It encourages sharing information’ to ‘It enhances speaking skills and self-confidence’ and ‘For collective learning’. This information shows that the teachers not only brought in different methods of teaching to enhance learning but also strived towards collaborative learning.

4.2.2.5 Section-IV: Textbooks, teacher manuals and other materials

This section sought information on textbooks, teacher manuals and other materials used by the teachers. It had four questions of which two (questions 28 - 29) were yes/no questions. It also provided space for the teachers to give reasons for their choice of answer. One question (question 30) was a multiple choice question where multiple options were provided from which the teacher could tick the desired option and another question was a yes/no questions, which sought further information on the teacher manuals. Quantified data is presented in the form of tables and charts and qualitative data is presented in the form of tables and in the descriptive form. The data gathered is then discussed, interpreted and analysed.

4.2.2.5.1 Textbooks

Question 28 was a yes/no question which sought information on the appropriateness of the topics in the textbook to the level of the learners. Teachers were also provided with space to give their reasons. The data obtained is presented below in the form of a table along with discussion, analysis and interpretation.
Table 4.16 Textbook-1

As shown in Table 4.16, 87.5% of the teachers had agreed that the topics from the textbook were appropriate to the level of the learners. However, 12.5% of the teachers had mentioned that not all the topics were appropriate to the level of the learners. It is also evident from the above table that only 50% of the teachers had stated reasons for their choice of answer. From their responses, it can be inferred that teachers felt that many things were mixed and the idea/message could be presented through beautiful stories and vice-versa. In addition to this, it was also mentioned that the topics could be slightly more challenging to make the learners take them seriously. Furthermore, the teachers had also mentioned that different topics such as working with the language, activity based grammar could be included.
4.2.2.5.2 Textbook usage

Question 29 was again a yes/no question that asked the teachers about the possibility of teaching the textbook fully within the time allotted (i.e. within the academic year). As far as the case of negative responses is concerned, the question further enquired into what can be done to overcome such circumstances.

The data gathered through the question is presented in the form of a chart followed by a discussion on the responses which is provided later on.

Figure 4.6 Textbook

The data in Figure 4.6 indicates that while 75% of the teachers felt that the textbook could be fully taught within the allotted time, 25% of the teachers felt that it could be possible by reducing the complexity or by dividing the topics so that the learner can achieve the desired goal. It is interesting to see that the 75% of the teachers who answered ‘yes’ to this question had not provided any reasons or further details for their choice of answer.
4.2.2.5.3 Additional materials used

Question 30, a multiple choice question, investigated the use of the additional material in the classroom and provided nine options for the teacher to choose from. The data is presented in the form of a chart and a discussion, analysis and interpretation are made based on the chart.

As shown in Figure 4.7, all teachers used additional material in the classroom. It is evident from the data presented that none (0%) of the teachers preferred using guides and photographs in the class, 25% preferred using grammar books and songs, 87.5% preferred using a dictionary, newspaper and pictures and 50% preferred using question papers. Moreover, teachers had mentioned the use of learner brought materials, practice books, PPTs and videos as additional material in the classroom.
4.2.2.5.4 Teacher manuals

Question 31 attempted to gather information on the teacher manuals provided on CCE and formative assessment and asked the teacher to mention three important things that were emphasised in it. However, only four teachers provided responses to this question. The data obtained is presented in the form of a table and is analysed further.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>FA can be instrumental in catering to the learner needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Child-centered education, strategy building, assessing student activities and activity method of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>FA can act as a tool to plan lessons. They are a holistic approach of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>FAs are informal tests that can help students overcome learning problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Teaching and Testing are to be taken repeatedly till the students clear with the concept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 Teacher Manuals

Table 4.17 clearly shows that all the teachers were familiar with the teacher manuals provided on CCE, but only 62.5% of teachers had listed down the three important things emphasised in it. Based on their response, it can be said that the teacher manuals clearly presented the importance of continuous assessment and its role in helping the learners overcome learning problems. It also discussed about using formative assessment, as a tool while planning lessons, to cater to the learner’s needs. Further, it also mentioned that repeated testing and repeated teaching can help the learners understand concepts better.
Besides, teachers had also mentioned about holistic approach to teaching, child-centered education, strategy building, assessing learner activities, activity method of teaching, informal assessments and so on. The responses presented in this section not only clearly show that the teacher manuals, to a great extent, tried to inform the teacher about the role of evaluation in the teaching-learning process but also tried to emphasise its usefulness in fostering learner progress.

4.2.2.6 Section-V: Evaluation

This section was mainly aimed at gathering information on the evaluation procedures and their implications for teaching and learning. This section had a total of thirteen questions (questions 32-44). Different questioning techniques such as open-ended, Likert scale, yes/no questions and multiple choice questions, had been used to gather different types of information to examine the relationship between the teacher, evaluation, CCE, feedback, learner problems and remedial measures.

4.2.2.6.1 Assessment and language learning

Question 32 was an open ended question and enquired about the relationship between assessment and learner’s language learning. The responses obtained from this question are presented in the table below along with its analysis and interpretation.
The responses in Table 4.18 shows that according to the teachers, assessment played a major role in understanding the learning abilities and could be instrumental to rectify/modify learner errors. It is also evident that assessment alongside measuring language learning could be useful in providing information about the learner in many ways which in turn could be useful for the teachers in planning remedial instruction. It was clearly observed that teachers believed that through assessment there could be better scope to enhance learner’s language learning.

4.2.2.6.2 Internal assessments

Question 33 was also an open ended question that was intended to find out about the different kinds of internal assessments schedules adopted in the classrooms. However, teachers had listed a number of ways that they had adopted in their classrooms which
include ‘conducting class tests chapter wise’, ‘informal assessment’, ‘asking questions as soon as the topic is completed’, ‘as prescribed by the organization’, ‘using activities’, ‘writing tasks’, ‘discussions’, ‘reading comprehension’, ‘listening comprehension’, ‘slip tests’, and ‘role play’. These methods suggest that the teachers adopted different ways of assessment techniques to recognise the learning patterns of the learners and to help them learn better.

4.2.2.6.3 Usefulness of CCE

Question 34 presented a Likert scale for the teachers to gather information on the usefulness of CCE for the teacher and the learner. Seven statements were devised and teachers were asked to mark their responses on a five point scale where five indicated ‘strongly agree’, four indicated ‘agree’, three indicated ‘partially agree’, two indicated ‘disagree’ and one indicated ‘strongly disagree’. The data gathered is presented in the form of a table and is later interpreted and analysed.

Since all the teachers had responded to this question, all the responses for each of the categories are added together to get the total of each response and are mentioned in the options (five item scale) that were provided for marking. Finally, a quantitative discussion is presented based on the total number of responses for each category. The teacher preferences are presented below.
Table 4.19 Usefulness of CCE-1

Table 4.19 shows that 25% ‘strongly agreed’, 50% ‘agreed’ and 25% ‘partially agreed’ that evaluation could de-emphasise memorisation. Similarly, 12.5% ‘strongly agreed’, 27.5% ‘agreed’ and 50% ‘partially agreed’ that it helped in organising effective teaching strategies. Also, 62.5% ‘strongly agreed’, 12.5% ‘agreed’ and 25% ‘partially agreed’ with the statement that assessment could be useful in motivating learners. However, only 12.5% ‘strongly agreed’, 25% ‘agreed’, 25% ‘partially agreed’ and 37.5% ‘disagreed’ with the statement that evaluation could serve as a quality control device to maintain desired standards. Furthermore, 62.5% ‘strongly agreed’, 12.5% ‘agreed’, 25% ‘partially agreed’ with the statement that CCE provided immediate feedback to the teacher to plan for remedial instruction. On the other hand,
only 12.5% ‘strongly agreed’, 75% ‘agreed’ and 12.5 % ‘partially agreed’ that evaluation could be used for improving learner achievement. Finally, 25% ‘strongly agreed’, 25% ‘agreed’, 25% ‘partially agreed’ and 25% ‘disagreed’ that evaluation could be used as a quality control device.

From teacher responses, it was evident that evaluation could be seen to be instrumental in organising effective teaching strategies, providing feedback, improving learner achievements and diagnosing learner problems.

4.2.2.6.4 Uses of CCE

Question 35 was an open-ended question which sought information on the way teachers viewed CCE with regard to its usefulness for multiple purposes. The teacher responses are presented in the form of a table followed by discussion, analysis and interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Yes. Behaviour attitudes are known.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Yes, children can be assessed in different areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Chance for improvement for slow learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>The personality of the student is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Yes, there is scope to widen the horizons of the learners’ world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>To diagnose learner problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Yes, evaluate teaching and assessment strategies as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>To understand the learner better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20 Usefulness of CCE-2
From the teacher responses, it is obvious that CCE could be useful for multiple purposes and it could be helpful not only in assessing learners in different areas, developing assessment strategies, widening the horizons of the learner’s world, knowing learner behaviors and attitudes but also for helping slow learners overcome learning difficulties.

4.2.2.6.5 Formative assessments

Question 36 was an open-ended question and gathered information on using formative assessment to identify learner problems. While all the teachers had agreed that it could be useful in understanding learner problems, only three teachers comprising 37.5% of the teachers had listed reasons for their opinion. The following is a discussion, analysis and interpretation of the information gathered from this question.

From the teacher responses, it can be observed that teachers believed that learner problems could be identified using formative assessment. However, three teachers had given the reasons to justify their beliefs which are as follows.

Formative assessment is useful in assessing all skills equally (T3).

Yes, the teacher gets an insight into the level of understanding of the students through formative assessments (T5).

Yes, the teacher knows the areas in which the children understood and which areas children could not understand (T7).
These responses provided insights into the ways in which formative assessment could be useful for the teacher to identify learner problems.

4.2.2.6.6 Remedial instruction

Question 37 was also an open ended question and it talked about using remedial instruction. The data obtained is presented in the form of a table along with its discussion, analysis and interpretation. Though all teachers had agreed on devising remedial instruction based on diagnosis, only three teachers i.e. 37.5% of the teachers had provided details which are furnished below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>Yes, for reinforcing the teaching-learning process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Remedial teaching will be of comprehensive help for the learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Revamping the methodology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 Remedial Instruction

The responses from the teachers to this question show that teachers were aware of learner problems and were able to devise remedial instruction. It was evident that teachers used diagnosis to modify their instruction to help learners overcome their difficulties.

4.2.2.6.7 Employing remedial measures

Question 38 was an open-ended question which conversed about employing suitable remedial measures to enhance learner’s learning performance. Though all the teachers
had responded to this question only four i.e. 50% of the teachers had provided details which are furnished below. The information gathered from this question is presented as a table along with the discussion, analysis and interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Remedial Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Yes, continuous drilling oral as well as written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Yes, regular testing will help them perform better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Yes, enhances learning performance to a great extent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Yes, repetition clears doubts, strengthens learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22 Remedial Measures

Table 4.22 clearly shows that teachers believed that employing suitable remedial measures could enhance learner’s learning performance. Furthermore, it can be seen that these remedial measures could be used to strengthen learning and help the learner perform better.

4.2.2.6.8 Criteria used for conducting formative assessments

Question 39 had three sub-questions on formative assessment. It tried to elicit information on the question paper used for assessment and criteria used for devising the question paper. From the teacher responses, it was evident that the question papers used for formative assessment were set by the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) and the criteria used for evaluating was also provided by CBSE in the form of an answer key. However, through informal discussion with the teachers, it was
learned that the teachers had the liberty of adding their choice of test items, if desired, along with the question paper forwarded from CBSE, but none of them seemed to do so.

4.2.2.6.9 Testing of listening and speaking skills

Question 40 was also an open-ended question which enquired the teacher about the testing of speaking and listening. The responses from the teachers clearly showed that though listening and speaking were tested, it was done once in a month and it was needed to be worked upon.

4.2.2.6.10 Feedback

Question 41 had two parts, where the first part was a multiple choice question that tried to elicit information about feedback. It provided four options to the teachers to choose from. However, none of the teachers opted for the option which mentioned that feedback should be given to learners who performed well in the assessments. The second part asked the teacher to elaborate on the choices made in part one. However, only three i.e. 37.5% of the teachers had responded to the second part of the question. The data gathered in part one is presented in the form of a chart along with discussion, analysis and interpretation. The data obtained from this section is presented descriptively with the analysis. The data gathered in part one of question 41 is presented below:
Figure 4.8 Feedback

Figure 4.8 shows that 62.5% of the teachers believed that feedback should be given to all learners, 12.5% thought that feedback should be given to learners who are unable to perform well in the assessment and 25% of the teachers believed that feedback should be given to learners who had problems.

However, the following are a few other responses from the teachers with regard to the second part of the question on feedback:

Each student is an individual with his own issues that need handling (T3).

Feedback can be for all. For good learners – what more they had to read to enhance knowledge. For students who are unable to perform well - it is necessary to explain the ways for improvement and for students who had problems – suggestions by suggesting exercises to solve problems in learning (T4).

Students should be shown their answer sheets so that they will know where they had gone wrong – which area they lost their marks and why (T5).
4.2.2.6.11 Different methods of giving feedback

Question 42 was an open-ended question and was intended to gather the different ways in which the teacher provided feedback to the learners. The data obtained shows that teachers adopted different ways to provide feedback to their learners ranging from - providing the learners the answer key, giving specific comments, making positive comments, mentioning their mistakes, telling expected answer, providing details on how to improve their language skills to the oral discussion on errors. In addition to these responses, T4 further stated the following:

The correct answers after every test will be given to the children after the exam is conducted and they write the correct answers in their H/W book (T4).

4.2.2.6.12 Learner scores

Question 43 was also an open-ended question that aimed at understanding teacher’s concept of learner scores in relation to their learning ability/performance. However, only four teachers i.e. 50% of the teachers had provided responses to this question which are presented below in the form of a table along with its analysis and interpretation.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Not much. Scores do not tell ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Not at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Tests can inform of learners’ problems but not represent their abilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>To no extent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23 Scores
Table 4.23 clearly shows that teachers did not consider their learner scores as a representation of their abilities or performances. It is evident that teachers had an understanding that though tests can inform a teacher about learner’s learning ability and learner problems, the test scores are not a mere representation of their levels.

4.2.2.6.13 Any other information

Question 44 which was an open-ended question was devised to provide space for the teacher to furnish any other information they would like to share. However, only three i.e. 37.5% of the teachers had made the effort of providing with the extra information. The table below presents their responses and an analysis is made after the table.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>CCE is for overall development of the student. But only a few students are sincere to reap the benefits. It is the teacher who needs to step in even when burdened with many factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>The time constraints, demands of large classes robs CCE of its spirit. Hence steps must be taken to ease out these problems for effective results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Following CCE is difficult for a large class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24 Other Information

Of the three responses, two of them (T4 and T5) specifically mentioned that the large classrooms were one of the major constraints for the teacher to focus on the various possibilities available for remediation. The response of T3 presented not only the teacher’s awareness and efforts in helping the learners overcome their problems but had also shed light on the constraints that the teachers face in the classroom.
4.2.2.7 Conclusion

The above sections presented, analysed and interpreted the data that was collected through questionnaire-II. Each section was presented separately and each question from the sections was described individually. The data obtained was presented in the form of tables, charts and in a descriptive manner. The following is a section-wise comprehensive description of the data collected through questionnaire-II.

Section-I: Personal information

This section gathered information on the details pertaining to the teachers and presented information about the educational qualification, teaching experience and training on CCE. In this section, it was found that all the teachers possessed the minimum qualifications required to teach English at the secondary level and also possessed other additional qualifications in the same area. Alongside this, information on training on CCE was also mentioned which ranged from two to five days and as well as no training in case of a few teachers.

Section-II: Learners

All the required information about the learner’s age, abilities in terms of skills, the level of competence, diversity and problems faced by the learner are discussed in this section. From this section, it was found that the learners belonged to the age group of 11-15 and they possessed the minimum required level of competence. It was also found that since the schools were basically military schools, the learners belonged to diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In addition to this, the learners possessed good abilities to speak, write and read and had some common areas where they faced problems such as tenses, spellings, and difficulty in reading with unfamiliar topics and
so on. It was also found that teachers used a number of strategies to help the learners overcome these problems. To name a few, pair work, group work, group discussion, exposure to language use are some of them that were discussed in this section.

**Section-III: Methodology**

It was found that most of the teachers were aware of the different ways of handling a classroom. This section was helpful in realising the fact that most of the teachers planned their lessons in advance and they reflected on their methodology in order to make necessary changes depending on the requirements of the learners. Teachers had presented samples on ways they teach a lesson by discussing on how they begin, progress and end a lesson. Other information on providing feedback, activities used, explanation and learners role in the classroom were also discussed as part of this section. Moreover, discussions on classroom techniques, learner errors, pair work and group work were also made in this section. It was found that most of the teachers used brainstorming techniques while beginning a lesson. A variety of activities used during the lesson were also presented which included diary entry, role-play, discussions, debating, and paragraph writing and so on. Classroom techniques such as task based teaching, activity based teaching, group discussions, use of L1 in the classroom and so on were mentioned as part of techniques used for developing language skills. Moreover, it was also found that teachers viewed problems with spelling, tenses, articles as learners’ errors and used techniques such as underlining the errors, explaining personally when and why the learner was wrong, providing the correct answer and so on. The measures were listed out as useful ways of responding to learner errors. Finally, teachers were seen using pair work and group work to encourage interaction among learners.
Section-IV: Textbook, teacher manuals and other materials

This section mainly focuses on gathering information about the textbook, teacher manuals and the use of other materials in the classroom. From this section, it was found that the textbooks used for classes VI to IX are appropriate to the level of the learners. It was also found that teachers used additional materials such as dictionaries, newspapers, pictures, question papers, grammar books and so on to provide additional support for language learning. Information pertaining to familiarity with the teacher manuals provided on CCE and formative assessment were discussed along with the items emphasised in the manuals. Certain items such as holistic approach towards teaching, continuous teaching and testing to help learners overcome learner problems and use of formative assessment for diagnosing learner problems to devise remedial teaching were a few that were mentioned.

Section-V: Evaluation

This section mainly focuses on eliciting required information about assessment, use of assessment, CCE, identifying learner problems, the scope for formative assessment, employing remedial measures, feedback and so on. It was found through this section that teachers viewed assessment as a helpful means of understanding learner abilities as well as learner problems. It was evident from the responses that assessment and development of learners’ language learning go hand in hand. Different kinds of internal assessments such as writing tasks, reading comprehension, slip tests, group discussions etc. were discussed as part of informal assessment adopted in the classroom. The usefulness of CCE in organising effective teaching strategies, de-emphasising memorization, providing feedback to the learner and much more were looked at in this section. It was also stressed that CCE encourages teachers to further
use evaluation for multiple purposes other than measuring learning. It was also found that teachers viewed assessment as a means of identifying learner problems and use suitable remedial measures to help learners overcome their problems, to enhance learners’ learning performance and to provide appropriate feedback to the learner.

Eventually, it can be said that questionnaire-II was instrumental in understanding the teacher, learner, methodology, materials used and evaluation at a deeper level.

4.3 Description, analysis and interpretation of Classroom Observation Schedule (COS)

4.3.1 Introduction

Classroom observation schedule was carried out in five schools out of the six schools approached for the study. One teacher (hereafter referred as T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5) from each school (hereafter referred as KV1, KV2, KV3, KV4 and KV5) had agreed to conduct classroom observations. A total of five classes were observed without interrupting the normal classroom procedure. Classroom observations of classes VIII and IX were conducted after formative assessment 1 and formative assessment 3. The main intention of observing classes after formative assessments (FA1 and FA3) was to know more about the classroom after the implementation of CCE and to observe how teachers modified their classroom instruction based on their diagnosis of learner problems. Though, the observations were intended to be recorded in all schools, all the teachers were not very comfortable with video recording as they felt that it would disrupt the natural classroom set-up. So, a few of the classroom observations were audio recorded.
As mentioned earlier, classroom observations were mainly done to observe the actual classroom proceedings after the implementation of CCE and also to examine more about the use of diagnosis, washback and remediation in the classroom to help the learners overcome their difficulties. A checklist was devised to capture the important points that would be useful in making implications on classroom practices. The data from the checklist contained information regarding the physical details of the class, description of the process observed in the class, preparation and presentation of the topic in the class, execution of methodology in the class, personal characteristics of the teacher, teacher-learner interaction and reflection. The summary of the observations made in the classrooms is presented in the form of a table and a discussion on the analysis and interpretation is also presented along with the table.

At the end of each section in the checklist, additional space to fit in any kind of data under the heading ‘other information’ was also included. The points that were written in these areas were also presented in the form of a table titled ‘other information’ along with the analysis and interpretation. The data was collected on five point Likert scale where four points were given numerical values and one point was given ‘NA’ meaning ‘Not Applicable’ or ‘Not used’. Here, 4 indicated ‘excellent’, 3 indicated ‘above average’, 2 indicated ‘average’, 1 indicated ‘unsatisfactory’ and NA indicated ‘not applicable/used’.

4.3.2 Analysis and interpretation of data collected through COS

The following tables present the entire data collected through all five classroom observations in all the five schools followed by a table on other information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>T1 KV 1</th>
<th>T2 KV 2</th>
<th>T3 KV 3</th>
<th>T4 KV 4</th>
<th>T5 KV 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>i) Grade</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom details</td>
<td>ii)Learners present</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)Skill taught in the class</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>i)Teacher was well prepared and organised for the class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)Lesson plan made in advance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)Teaching objectives and goals were clear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv)Extra tasks were prepared</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>i)Teacher gave proper instructions to the learners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)Teacher stated objectives at the beginning of the lesson</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)Method was appropriate to learner level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Teacher was aware when learners faced difficulty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Teacher was able to hold learner’s interests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Teacher asked questions while teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Teacher used a variety of learner centric activities/tasks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Teacher planned and paced the materials properly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Teaching technique was appealing to the learners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Purpose of the technique was made clear to the learner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Activities were related to academic needs of the learner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Teacher moved around in the class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii) Teacher used authentic material in the class</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii) Teacher used audio/video aids in the class</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix) Examples and illustrations were used effectively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x) Instructional aids was used effectively</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi)</td>
<td>x) Instructional aids was used effectively</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xi) Tasks were reasonably challenging for the learners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xii) Learner errors were corrected with care</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiii) Teacher obtained feedback from learners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>xiv) Lesson plan was well timed and sequenced properly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Teacher’s appearance and classroom presence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Teacher was aware of learner needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Teacher was patient in answering learner’s doubts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Teacher was effective in eliciting responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) Teacher’s speech was clear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Teacher presented the topic in an interesting way</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i) Teacher encouraged the learner to speak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Teacher-learner interaction</td>
<td>i) Teacher encouraged the learner to ask questions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Teacher encouraged full learner participation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Learners felt free to disagree with the teacher</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v) Learners felt free to express their own ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Interaction among learners was encouraged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vii) Teacher talk was less than learner talk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Reflection</td>
<td>i) Teacher used strategies intentionally to help learners based on previous knowledge about learner problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Teacher mentioned a few points/tips for learners to focus on to help learners overcome certain problems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Teacher gave extra work for learners which focused on improving learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 Classroom Observations

The Table 4.25 on classroom observations provided a lot of details on what goes into a regular classroom. Data from Section-I in the checklist i.e. classroom details presents the details of the classes, learners present and skills taught in the class. As
seen in the table, classes of five teachers from five Kendriya Vidyalaya schools were observed of which four teachers dealt with class VIII and one teacher dealt with class IX. The number of learners present in the class ranged from thirty-nine to forty-seven and the skills taught during observation were reading and writing.

Section-II, which looked into the preparation of the teacher for the class, tried to record details on how well the teacher was prepared for the class, whether the lesson plan was prepared in advance, were the objectives and goals clear and were any extra tasks prepared for the class. From the table, it is evident that with respect to being prepared for the class, making lesson plans in advance and having a clarity of teaching objectives, all five teachers were either excellent or above average. However, only two teachers (T3 and T4) had prepared extra tasks for the class.

Similarly Section-III, which enquired into the presentation aspect of the teacher by focusing on whether the teacher gave proper instructions to the learners, if the objectives were stated at the beginning of the lesson, appropriateness of the method to the learner level, awareness of learner difficulty, keeping the learner interest intact and questions asked while teaching. From the data obtained, it is clearly evident that the teachers gave proper instructions to the learners. Apart from teacher 2, all other teachers stated the objectives at the beginning of the lesson. Moreover, all the teachers were either ‘excellent’ or ‘above average’ with respect to the method adopted, having awareness of learner difficulties and asking questions. Though teacher 5 was ‘average’ with grasping the interests of the learners, the rest of the teachers seemed to have no problems in this regard.

Coming to Section-IV, which investigated into the execution or methods used by the teacher in the classroom, several aspects were highlighted to explore more about the
methodology adopted by the teacher. Details pertaining to whether the teacher used a variety of activities, whether the materials used paced properly, were teaching techniques appealing for the learners, was there a clarity of the purpose of the technique, whether the activities served the needs of the learner were a few of the aspects that were considered. In addition to these, other details such as movement of the teacher around the class, use of authentic materials, use of audio or video aids, use of examples and illustrations, use of instructional aids, use of challenging tasks, handling learner errors, taking feedback from learners, timing of lesson plans were among the other aspects that were investigated. The data, that was collected from the classrooms clearly showed that all the teachers were either ‘excellent’ or ‘above average’ with respect to using a variety of activities, pacing materials properly, using appealing teaching techniques, clarifying the learner about the purpose of the techniques and using activities that catered to the learner’s academic needs. However, it was ‘average’ or ‘unsatisfactory’ while considering the movement of the teacher in the class. From the data, it was also clear that only teacher 3 and teacher 4 had used authentic material in the class and none of the teachers had used any audio or video aids in the class. In addition to that, while all teachers were ‘excellent’ with use of examples and illustrations effectively, teacher 2, and teacher 5 did not use instructional aids. Also, from the data, it can be stated that all the teachers were ‘excellent’ and ‘above average’ with tasks being reasonably challenging and correcting learner errors with care. On the other hand, it was either ‘unsatisfactory’ or ‘average’ with respect to teachers obtaining feedback from learners. All the teachers were found ‘excellent’ with the timing and sequencing of lesson plans.
The next section i.e. Section-V of the checklist, which gathered inputs on the personal characters of the teacher namely, teacher appearance and classroom presence, awareness of learner needs, answering learner doubts, effectiveness in eliciting responses, clarity of speech and presenting topics in an interesting way, all teachers were mostly ‘excellent’ and in very few cases above average.

Section-VI of the checklist focused on enquiring about the teacher – learner interaction. The main points that were observed were the extent to which the teacher encouraged the learner to speak, to ask questions, to participate in the class, to disagree with the teacher, to feel free to express ideas, to interact with peers and learner talk. Almost all the teachers were either ‘excellent’ or ‘above average’ in all these aspects. It was only teacher 4, who was ‘average’ with letting learners interact among themselves and learner talk was not much. However, this can be said to be because teacher 4 had focused on writing in that class and had discussed paragraph and diary writing.

The last section of the checklist, i.e. Section-VII focused on reflection procedures adopted by the teachers. It had looked into details where teachers had employed strategies used intentionally to help the learners based on their previous knowledge of learner problems. It was found that all teachers, were marked ‘excellent’ for their use of strategies to help the learner. Similarly, this section also focused on knowing if the teachers provided tips to the learners to help them overcome certain problems. Similarly, all teachers were marked ‘excellent’ with regard to mentioning of tips to the learner to overcome learner problems. Finally, this section also looked into the extra work given by the teachers for improving learning and it was found that all
teachers were found to be ‘excellent’ with regard to giving extra work which focused on improving learning.

From classroom observations and checklists it can be interpreted that:

a) Classroom observations were conducted in classes VIII and IX where the learner population was between thirty-nine and forty-seven and the skills taught were reading and writing.

b) Teachers, who were well prepared and organised with lesson plans made in advance, had a clarity of teaching objectives and goals. They had given proper instructions to the learners and had stated the objectives at the beginning of the lesson. Teachers were seen using appropriate methods for the learner’s level and they were aware of the learner difficulties. They were fairly able to hold the learner’s interest and frequently asked questions while teaching.

c) Reasonably challenging learner centric activities that catered to the academic needs of the learner were used and were properly paced accordingly. The teaching techniques were appealing to the learners and the purpose was made clear to the learners as well. Though the teacher was not seen moving around much in the classroom, proper examples and feedback from the learners were not obtained. In most cases illustrations were used effectively along with the fair use of instructional aids. Authentic materials were used by only two teachers with proper timing and sequencing of the lesson plan. Learner errors were corrected with care.
d) Teachers were seen to have clarity of speech and excellent classroom presence along with being patient towards the learners’ doubts. They were not only aware of learner needs but also were effective in eliciting learner responses in presenting the topic in an interesting way.

e) Teachers encouraged the learners to speak in the class and also to ask questions, which eventually promoted learner participation. Learners were given the freedom to disagree with the teacher and also to express their own ideas. Learners were also encouraged to interact with each other and in most cases, teacher talk was less than learner talk.

f) Reflection was seen to have prominently present in all classes and teachers were seen to have intentionally used strategies based on their previous knowledge about the learner problems. All teachers provided tips for learners to help them overcome their learning problems and also gave extra work which focused on improving learning.

Details pertaining to the other information recorded in the checklists are presented without any changes. This is mainly done to give an insight into the methods and approaches adopted by the teachers and also to make conclusions on certain aspects such as the different techniques and activities used by teachers to help the learners overcome their learning problems and to help them learn better.
| **T1** | Teacher divided learners into groups of 5 each; teacher gave instructions on writing skits; teacher listed four topics on the board around which the learners based their skits; 15 minutes time was given to complete the task.

The learners exchanged their skits with other groups.

Each group had to provide a summary of the skit written by another group; one learner from each group had to read out the summary in front of the class. |
| **KV1** |  |

| **T2** | Teacher distributed FA1 answer sheets; gave group feedback; talked about common mistakes done by learners.

Feedback and instructions on how they can improve was given in the first half of the class; in the second half of the class was a lesson where the teacher read from textbook and explained from text; asked frequent comprehension questions; group answers were provided by learners and the teacher asked one learner from each group to clearly state the answers.

The last five minutes was again allotted to discuss about answer sheets; learners were permitted to clarify their doubts regarding their performance; learners were allowed to discuss among themselves while checking answers with their peers.

Since many students committed spelling errors, the teacher announced that the next class would be a spelling test where they have to produce their own sentences. The next day the teacher got an audio visual of riddles and poems that had homonyms and homophones. The teacher listed the words on the board and asked students to make sentences using the words. |
<p>| <strong>KV2</strong> |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3</th>
<th>The teacher brought pictures of sportsmen and asked others to write few points about that picture; teacher listed a few sample sentences on the board.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| KV3| The teacher instructed learners to use different vocabulary while describing the pictures. The teacher had mentioned that she found many students had problems with using appropriate vocabulary.  
In the end, teacher elicited all the descriptive words from the learners and listed them on the board; teacher gave an alternative and new vocabulary for some words. |
| T4 | The teacher introduced writing and talked about essay writing, paragraph writing and diary entry; instructions on how to write essays, paragraphs and diary entries were listed on the board. The teacher gave guidelines of essay writing and the criteria used for evaluating essays. The teacher asked the learners to write an essay keeping in mind the guidelines and evaluation criteria. The teacher had brought samples of essays and circulated them in the class.  
The teacher had asked the learners to make a diary entry of their choice and submit it in the next class. |
| KV4|                                                                                                                                 |
| T5 | The teacher made the students read the text one by one randomly  
The teacher started the lesson by asking students if they had pets at home; how they take care of pets; encouraged the learners to tell more about their pet; asked if anyone saw a snake around  
Asked how many watch Discovery Channel; how many have watched Anaconda movie; teacher gathered extra information on snakes; talked about personal experience with snakes. |
| KV5|                                                                                                                                 |
The teacher asked learners about their personal experience with snakes; let one student narrate her experience.

The lesson was totally interactive and most students participated in the discussion; almost 15 to 20 minutes went into brainstorming towards the lesson; teacher also read from the text and explained where necessary.

The teacher asked questions in the end to check understanding; asked if the students had any doubts. The teacher also gave tips on how to improve comprehension.

Asked meanings of difficult words, listed difficult vocabulary, gave example sentences with these words.

Table 4.26 Other Information Recorded in Checklist

From the data listed out in the above table, it is evident that based on the knowledge of the learner levels, teachers used different techniques, innovative methods and interesting activities in the class to cater to the learner’s needs for the learner to progress. They used authentic material and provided sufficient help to the learner to perform a task. Teachers also gave many examples and were very interactive while teaching. Learners were encouraged to speak in the class and they were also given ample scope to nurture their creativity. Based on what was known about the learner through formative assessments, teachers focused on providing practice in areas they needed to improve.

4.3.3 Conclusion

Classroom observations were helpful in realising that teachers were following communicative approach and that the classes were more learner centered. Learners
were provided with ample opportunities to participate in the classroom and care was taken to understand the learner and learner problems. Classroom observations also revealed that the teachers made efforts to cater to the learner’s needs and were more inclined towards providing the learner sufficient help to overcome their learning difficulties. It was also apparent that teachers based their classroom instruction on the learner’s performance in formative assessment and had incorporated a remedial approach in their teaching. Moreover, most techniques and methods used by teachers clearly indicated that teachers were making efforts to provide with more opportunities to the learners to progress. In conclusion it can be said that the teacher now, from these observations, was completely aware of all that was required from them and was capable of incorporating the curricular objectives into their teaching objectives and thus aiding towards learner progress.

4.4 Description analysis and interpretation of interviews

4.4.1 Introduction

As mentioned earlier, teacher and learner interviews were planned to supplement the data that was gathered through questionnaires for this study. The interviews were developed, and all the interviews were first audio recorded and later transcribed. The questions in the interview for the teachers mainly focused not only to understand the teacher’s opinion on the introduction of CCE but also about how teachers viewed evaluation and its various advantages. The questions in the interview for the learners mainly aimed at examining their understanding of the shift in pedagogy after implementation of CCE.
Apart from these interviews, on a few occasions, informal discussions were also made with the teachers. During these informal discussions, notes were taken down wherever felt necessary. After the discussion on teacher interviews, the information gathered through informal discussions is also presented.

This section is divided into two parts based on the sources of the data i.e. teachers and learners. The data gathered from teacher interviews and learner interviews is interpreted and analysed and presented in the next sections.

4.4.2 Teacher interviews

A total of six teachers (hereafter referred as T1, T2, …T6), who were teachers of English in Kendriya Vidyalaya schools for the classes VII, VIII and IX were approached for the interviews. Teachers whose classes were observed and who were approached with teacher questionnaire-II were part of this sample. To provide a comprehensive analysis of the data obtained from teacher interviews, direct responses are presented without altering the language, grammar or any response in any manner. A question-wise summary of the responses from teachers is presented in the following sections along with its analysis and interpretation.

4.4.2.1 Comments on introduction of CCE

Q1: What do you feel about the introduction of CCE into the Indian Education System?

First of all the teachers were asked to share their opinion on introducing CCE into the Indian education system. The first and immediate answers that were provided show that the teachers had varied opinions ranging from CCE being a very positive and a developmental approach, to CCE being implemented in haste. From a response, such
as the one where the teacher talks about CCE coming to the rescue for some learners who were good in other areas, it was evident that CCE was viewed in a positive sense and that CCE promoted the learners to move forward. Similarly, a few other teachers, who considered CCE as a good initiative, had problems with the teacher-learner ratio, which made implementing CCE difficult. It was also evident that teachers had concerns with the way it was being implemented. The following are the responses gathered from all six teachers:

CCE is a very good initiative taken by the Indian government because we all teachers also felt that the learners are at different levels of their learning, especially in KVs, after failing the second time the child used to be removed from the class, and uuh which other schools could take such a failure? We used to feel very bad, neither we could pass a child without any substance nor we could keep them. So this came as a respite to such children who were very good otherwise, like they were good in other areas, they were good in certain subjects. Most of us could hope and looked for it (T1).

CCE is very good but the teacher ratio, student ratio it’s not proper. In a large class like that you have seen now, where 1:47 is the ratio that is not at all a proper ratio. So it’s like a flop with that kind of class you know where the strength is more (T2).

I thought it was introduced in haste, without doing much work on it. They did not study the way. It is to be experimented, the effect is to be studied, the effect expected on children is to be looked at. That they have not looked at. The objectives that are set by CCE are very effective and propose a very good learning environment. They have not even experimented anywhere. They
straight away implemented without any planning. So, if these aspects were
looked upon it would have made a lot of difference (T3).

The concept of CCE is good but the implementation has been like a half-baked
cake. It could not achieve the goals envisioned due to many reasons like
crowded classrooms, teachers not fully aware of the system and so on. Else the
initiative was a very good one (T4).

Very happy about implementation part but it is lacking behind because of
many reasons like we have large classrooms. There is also a problem with the
mind-set of the parents. Clarity of the very concept is to be major thing that
needs more attention (T5).

It is a very good initiative. No doubt about it but how many teachers can really
understand the actual essence of implementing it is one major concern I have.
It is in the hands of the teacher to use CCE to its full potential and benefit the
child without which all of this will make no difference (T6).

From the above responses, it is clear that almost all teachers had a positive response
towards the implementation of CCE into the Indian education system. However, some
teachers gave responses which meant that CCE was introduced without proper
planning for them in the Indian scenario where the teacher – learner ratio was too
high, it was really difficult to administer CCE. Nevertheless, the overall response of
the teachers was that CCE was a good initiative, but certain aspects needed attention
for its successful execution.
4.4.2.2 Comments on usefulness in realising teaching objectives

Q2: To what extent do you think it is useful for you in realising your teaching objectives/goals?

Next, teachers were asked about the usefulness of CCE in realising their teaching objectives/goals. The responses indicated that teachers viewed CCE as both being helpful in setting new teaching objectives/goals as well as in realising their teaching objectives/goals and also in having a different approach towards the learner. However, one teacher (T3) mentioned that CCE had not proved to be of any use in this aspect. Following are the responses of the teachers on the usefulness of CCE in realising their teaching objectives/goals:

Somehow as a person I feel that it is helping me a lot in realizing my goals because I never thought that all children would prefer one project, one criteria, one kind of thing. Whereas earlier we had to go by one particular uuh uniformity in everything. Now we have a chance to vary our work according to the learner’s interest, but there is, the thing is when it comes to really substantiating their lessons, sometimes it becomes difficult to substantiate, to justify and then there are other perspectives as well (T1).

Once again I will have to repeat myself, you know. If the audience is small and you are able to reach out to them, it works. CCE works out very well. But we have a very heterogeneous group, all will not be able to follow what we are trying to say. So we have to go down to their level. So whatever we plan, whatever objects (objectives) we have in our mind, you will not be able
to reach out to the children. The purpose is being lost, so, such kind of a set up, you know, where the strength is more is not at all O.K. (T2).

I don’t think it has helped me to realise any of my objectives, because through CCE, they have realised the fact that there is no need to study to pass. That is so. LSRW skills have deteriorated. CCE has done more harm than use (T3).

It is not much of a difference in terms of achieving goals but yes there is a difference in the teaching goals I have set for myself when it comes to a class. I have more focus on understanding learner problems, ways to help them and also I tend to focus more on using different strategies to help the child to understand the concept easily (T4).

To some extent it is useful in fine-tuning my teaching objectives. My focus is more on learner progress than on achieving good grades (T5).

I cannot mention one way that it has proved useful but I can say that my approach towards learners and their learning has changed to a great extent. My understanding of the learner is a lot different than what it was earlier. May be I am more open to understand the learner better now (T6).

As seen from the responses, majority of the teachers mentioned that CCE had helped them in setting new goals such as understanding the learner problems in a better way, fine-tuning their teaching objectives and in understanding the learner better. Therefore, it could be said that teachers were viewing teaching with a purpose and also were more sensitive towards the learner and learner’s needs after the implementation of CCE. However, a quote by T3 also indicated that there are a few loopholes in the system which could be harmful if not reasonably handled.
4.4.2.3 Comments on difference in the teacher before and after CCE

The next question posed to the teacher enquired about the difference in the teacher before and after implementation of CCE. The responses from the teachers clearly showed that there have been many changes that could be observed from the teacher’s point of view. The teachers mentioned that they had more freedom than before in terms of planning their lessons and activities. It was evident that the teacher was more sensitive to the needs of the learner and their learning problems and that the classrooms had become more interactive.

Q3: Could you tell me the major difference between the teacher now and the teacher before CCE?

I still feel because there is a monitoring tool with us, basically the teacher earlier was guided too much, then there was a fixed system. There is a little bit more of freedom given to the teacher now but when it comes to recording I think we still have a hazard. Otherwise we have a lot of freedom to conduct the activities and give the children what they need (T1).

Introduction of CCE aimed at the holistic development of the child, that is a fact that we have to accept, but then, in the process of trying to go through the all-round development of the child, the main purpose of teaching in the class is being lost. We are concentrating on other activities rather than concentrating on the content. So the basic idea of CCE is not realised over here, because we are more organised towards content teaching. That transaction is being lost. You have observed in the class also, because there are so many diverse answers and every child is to be concentrated upon. You cannot stop a child
saying this answer is wrong. So in that process, there are digressions that are going on. So the main purpose with which we go into the class may not be realised. It’s a long process, no doubt about it, but CCE, if implemented properly, it can bring a lot of important changes (T2).

I have become a lot more liberal. I ask easy questions. I forgive many of their mistakes. I used to be a lot more rigid. CCE asks me to be very liberal. But somehow may be this has let some of the students open up to me with questions and I do find there is a lot more interaction in the class than earlier (T3).

There is a lot of difference, positive and negative. I will first mention the negatives. There is too much of documentation work, no assistance for the teacher, too much pressure for the teacher from the administration, parents and students. The teacher is overburdened. Now coming to positives, there is a systematic record of learner problems and the teacher can easily identify with learner progress. There is scope for the teacher to use different methods that are promising in bringing the best of the learner. Provided teachers are given more time and lesser children in the classroom there can be more scope for improvement (T4).

No doubt we are more burdened with paper work and are made more responsible towards everything but still we are more free to give the children what they need and we are given more freedom than earlier, to devise our own method of teaching (T5).
I have changed in many ways. Be it being more empathetic towards the child or being more observatory towards learner needs (T6).

The data gathered from teachers showed that there had been a major shift in the way teachers viewed their learners. They seemed to be more inclined towards catering to the learner needs and also had more liberty than before in terms of making changes to their lesson plans. However, they also mentioned that there was a lot of burden on the teacher after the introduction of CCE and teachers were made more responsible for the learner’s progress. This indicated that teachers had a bigger role to play than before by managing the overload of work as well as catering to the learner needs.

4.4.2.4 Comments on difference in the learner before and after CCE

The teachers were also asked about the changes in the learner after the implementation of CCE. From the responses, it was possible to infer that there was an immense change in the learner. The first thing that needs to be highlighted is that there seemed to be a lesser burden on the learner now than earlier. The learner from the teacher’s point of view could be seen to have equal opportunity in many ways. However, there were instances where teachers had given contradictory responses. While a few teachers had mentioned that the learner was seen to have misinterpreted CCE by aiming at better grades than better learning, a few others had also mentioned that the learners were seen to get into the depths of the concepts and were more independent in their learning. The following are the responses provided by the teachers regarding their learners:
Q4: Could you tell me the major difference between the learner now and the learner before CCE?

The learner then used to be more scared of the teacher, now the learner is free, and uuh I don’t know but not all of them are so goal oriented and they understand the kind of freedom they get. Then somehow there are some who have misinterpreted CCE, they think that it is a teachers job, when we are after them trying to ask them to improve on their earlier drafts and give feedback and ask them to redo it and say it does not matter it is a formative test you can do it and if you do this and meet the criteria I am going to grade you up, but that is seen as it is a teachers interest in giving good grades so it is seen as pouring in grades which is not true not all the time and that is also there with parents, they have stopped pestering to do well that is a good thing, when it comes to pressure, the pressure is less but it shouldn’t come to the level where they don’t ask their children to do anything. That is again the problem (T1).

The learner is less burdened now. There is equal opportunity to all children in spite of their different abilities. All children are given equal opportunity to prove themselves worthy. At the same time they are also given too much lenience with the concept of all pass (T2).

Not any difference in the learner. In the sense that the depth of knowledge that they used to have once upon a time is no longer the same. Children are more or less like walkie talkies. The reaction that they exhibit is not as deep as it used to be. This can be credited to the fact that there is no notion of fail anymore (T3).
The best thing about the learner is that they enjoy learning and have developed interest in knowing things on their own (T4).

The learner is seen as an independent learner and in this process the learner is trying to be independent of the teacher (T5).

There is a lot of difference in the learner. With the syllabus divided into two parts it is easy for them to get into details of certain concepts and they also have the liberty to enjoy the learning process (T6).

This data substantiates the fact that every system has both the positive and the negative side to it. It was evident that the learners were less burdened with the quantity of syllabus and were provided more opportunities to project their skills. They were also given ample support from the teacher to contemplate more into their learning. Similarly, there was also a possibility of misguiding the learner with the extent of giving equal opportunities for all, where the learners were pushed into the next grade at any cost.

4.4.2.5 Comments on using evaluation to understand the learner

A majority of the teachers had given positive responses when enquired about the usefulness of evaluation in understanding the learner in a better way. Their responses suggested that evaluation was viewed as a very useful tool to understand the learner. Almost all the teachers had stated the many uses of evaluation and talked about evaluation providing a chance for washback. Evaluation was also seen to provide information about learner problems and as a means of planning the next lesson more effectively so that the needs of the learner in overcoming learning problems and to
improve learning were taken care of. The following are the teacher responses on using evaluation to understand the learner better.

Q5: Do you agree that evaluation can help the teacher understand the learner in a better way? Could you give reasons for your agreement/disagreement?

It does, evaluation does help, actually without it it’s difficult and there is what you call uuh washback also, there is a chance for waskback and because of this understanding, like difference in understanding like our aims and what the learners have seen CCE as, there is a problem. There is a problem and so there is washback. It is very difficult to get what I mean is, when there is scope for washback there is hope that we can reflect and go and improve again, help them improve. That is seen as a weakness and there is a time. CCE is, it is taking into consideration the other co-curricular activities and other things, then in KVs we have too many because of its inter-regional inter-cultural, a very mixed culture probably we need time to let the learners to reflect and then do and then reason it without any pressure. That is also a problem. Those who want to do very well meticulously and therefore best is there are the ones who are there in other activities too. So that is it. Ok (T1).

It is very important if the children are also able to understand the problem that he has, so that he could improvise and evaluation does that. It not only informs the teacher but also helps the child realise his faults (T2).

Very much. Evaluation is a very useful tool in understanding the child. When I read the answers, I come to know whether the child’s thinking is on the right line or not. I come to know the command over the language. I come to know
the general knowledge of the environment that lives in. I know what sort of person the child is—meticulous, planning, organised, careless, I come to know a lot of things (T3).

Of course yes. It’s the best way to know the child (T4).

Evaluation is not only for checking how effective our teaching was or how much did the learner understand. It is also for knowing the hurdles that students have in their path of learning (T5).

Yes. In fact evaluation documents all the areas that the student needs to focus. It tells us what is acquired and what needs attention (T6).

These teacher responses clearly indicated that evaluation played a major role in understanding the learner and their learning difficulties. It was clearly seen that teachers believed that evaluation informed them about the learner’s language learning abilities and about the areas that needed more attention. Moreover, according to a few other teachers, evaluation also informed the learners on the areas that needed attention.

4.4.2.6 Comments on importance of continuous assessment

Similar to the previous question, this question enquired about the importance of continuous assessment in understanding the learner. The data that was gathered from this question substantiate the data obtained earlier and further elaborated on the different ways in which continuous assessment could be used to know about the learner. As mentioned by T1, continuous assessment was a useful tool that could be helpful for the teacher in modifying instruction. It was with the information provided
by continuous assessment that teachers learned about the language learning abilities learners and their learning difficulties.

Q6: How important according to you is continuous assessment in understanding the learner?

It is undoubtedly important as we come to know many things through evaluation. It not only tells us about how effective our teaching was, it also helps us in modifying our next instruction. It tells us about the student weaknesses and our weaknesses too. We know more about the each student and about the whole class at the same time (T1).

It is very important. We will be able to understand a learner in a better way because, we can find out what are the lacking here that he is having, whether it is grammar or spelling. O.K. We test the children on fluency, accuracy, aaaa, content. O.K. If it goes properly, then the child would have written a proper answer, but most of the times, it so happens, the child is having lot of information, but because of lack of expression, he is not able to write. So, if you go through his test papers, we will be able to find out what are the general flaws that the children are suffering from and concentrate more. We learn about their errors. It does help a lot (T2).

Continuous assessment which is nothing but formative assessment is a continuous process and needs to be linked with teaching and learning. It cannot be isolated from these two. We can know what to do in the next class based on one evaluation. This is because we know the learner after one assessment. We know where they need attention (T3).
Continuous assessment is a good idea if it is done objectively. It helps identify academic emotional levels of the child and development of the child. It also helps in assessing aptitudes (T4).

As mentioned earlier, we can understand the hurdles in the learner’s path in a better way through continuous assessment. This is where we can in fact help the learner in coming up with ways through which these hurdles can be tackled (T5).

Teachers can use continuous assessment as a tool to know their learners. Then they can use the information to plan their next step, like if they need to discuss any topic again or if they need to repeat anything for clarification and so on (T6).

As pointed out in the above responses, continuous assessment played a major role in understanding the learner. From teacher responses, it could be said that continuous assessment was useful in not only diagnosing learner problems but also in planning on what can be done. It was useful in knowing about the areas that need more attention and take remedial action. Furthermore, it was also helpful to the learner to understand the obstacles and come up with ways to tackle them.

4.4.2.7 Comments on role of diagnosis

Diagnosis was seen as a very effective way of finding out about the learning problems faced by the learners. To examine better the ways of helping the learner, teachers were asked to share their views on how diagnosis can help the learner overcome their learning problems. The responses clearly indicated that all the teachers had a positive approach towards diagnosis and believed that it can be very helpful in knowing the
learner and their learning difficulties. The following were the responses provided by the teachers when enquired about diagnosis:

Q7: What role do you feel diagnosing learner problems play in helping learners progress?

It plays a very important role I think. If there is proper diagnosis in the right time, teachers can help the learner overcome the problem and help them to progress (T1).

Diagnosis is very important. It helps us know about learner problems better (T2).

I feel diagnosis is a very important tool. If used in the right way, many positive changes can be made for the learner to come out of their difficulties (T3).

Diagnosing helps teachers in helping their learners to overcome learning disabilities and helps them to bridge the gaps in basic learning during formative years (T4).

It enables teachers to take corrective steps to help the learner overcome grey areas (T5).

It is very essential that every teacher understands diagnosis properly. It should be a conscious effort from the teacher to understand the problems children face with learning. If done successfully diagnosis can actually be used to help learners learn better (T6).
As stated by the teacher T6, diagnosis was seen as a useful tool that could be helpful for the learner to learn better. Diagnosis, when done consciously, could be useful in bridging the gaps in learning. Based on what was diagnosed, positive changes could be made in the instruction by the teacher and it could be used to cater to the needs of the learner. Learners could overcome grey areas in their learning while teaching could be more focused.

4.4.2.8 Comments on use of remedial teaching for learners

It was already noted in the above discussions that evaluation provided scope to understand the learner and to diagnose learner problems to a great extent. Through this diagnosis, teachers planned their instruction to cater to the learner’s needs. It was also noted that by planning remedial instruction, these problems could be addressed properly. Hence, teachers were further asked about the way in which remedial teaching could be useful for learners in realising their learning objectives. The responses that were obtained clearly indicated that teachers believed that remedial teaching could be of great use as it gave them the chance to interact with the learner on a one on one basis. However, teachers had also mentioned that there seemed to be lesser scope for organising such remedial classes in the academic session. The following are the responses that the teachers provided in this context:

Q8: In what way do you think remedial teaching can be useful in helping learners meet their learning objectives?

    What I have seen over a period of time is this remediation to the point is not the thing, like when it comes to grammar learners have a problem with using appropriate tense, then, if it were only spelling then there are some mechanics
you can always use. So now our focus is mainly on communication, if they are able to communicate, we just try to help them, where the communication is missing, like what part of it, though we are focusing on content it is not on content but the focus is mainly on the meaning, So, that kind of remediation which we used to visualise earlier is not very easily possible now. May be we can help them with functions, to some extent organization yes. Because it all about whole two parts and when it comes to one part your focus is still not clear. The level where I have seen the learners it is not possible within the tangibility of time. Here time is also one constraint and they need in-depth analysis. In schools what they do is they do not conduct remediation programmes throughout the year, it is soon after the test or once just before the session ending examination say somewhere in January and the focus is again on some question answers. It is more exam oriented and somehow it doesn’t help according to me (T1).

It will be able to help out because in a remedial class, we have lesser number of children and one to one contact is more over here. Whereas in a general class, most of the time, those who do very well, they would like to dominate the show, so these children will be neglected. Remedial classes do happen sometimes (T2).

My remedial teaching. It modifies my entire perception a lot to the way I teach in the regular class because I address all those needs which I learn from the evaluation. I address all their needs and remedial teaching is more to the point, more focused and of course, that will be helping in learner progress. It
will not only help me to learn their progress, it will also help me to work on the child’s progress (T3).

I think if they analyse themselves, then maybe they can correct their own mistakes. My analysing will not help them, their own analysis will help them (T4).

Remedial teaching will reinforce and cement the gap of previous learning. Once the concept learners clear, the learner would progress. It is like clearing a mental block. This will also remove the hidden phobia in the learner regarding a subject or a chapter (T5).

Remedial teaching does help the learner a lot as the attention we pay on individual learners is more and the focus is also on the problems they have. It is a very important way to look into problem areas and a chance to rectify them. Unfortunately teachers don’t have time for it in the academic schedule. It does not happen often. Time is one big constraint here. I personally try to make it happen in the regular classroom but it is not very fruitful (T6).

From the above responses, it was clearly evident that teachers were aware of the potential of remedial teaching and the benefits it could reap. They certainly believed that remedial teaching not only modified their perception but also provided space to address the needs of the learners in a more focused way. Also, it was seen as helpful in cementing the gap of the previous learning with the current one. But quote by T6 also indicated that teachers did not get the time to do so. Though remedial teaching provided scope for rectifying the learner’s problem areas, due to time constraints, it did not happen often.
In addition to this, during the period of data collection, the researcher observed that in all the six schools that were chosen for the study, remedial classes for the learners who needed it were not initiated either by the teachers or by the administration in the entire academic year, even when felt necessary.

4.4.2.9 Comments on use of remedial teaching to help learners develop learning strategies

Similar to question eight, teachers were asked about remedial teaching being useful for the learners in developing learning strategies. Almost all the teachers gave a positive response to this saying that remedial teaching was helpful for the learners in identifying their own flaws and that this provided them the scope to come up with ways of overcoming those flaws. From the teacher responses, it was evident that remedial teaching also helped the learners in devising new strategies for learning. Following are the responses provided by the teachers:

Q9: In what way do you think this can encourage the learners more to develop or use effective strategies of learning?

I feel it would help the learner identify with his own mistakes and also help them develop a strategy to overcome their problem areas. It gives them proper scope to look into their learning styles and can be useful in coming up with some strategy that can be of use to them (T1).

They will be able to understand, you know, we have to their level, we may have to change the language also, you know, I for myself follow three language policy. If they are not able to follow English, then either Hindi or Telugu, these are the languages I know. So, I try to reach out to the child, if
the child is able to understand what you are saying, my job is half done. That’s what I tell (T2).

Whenever we conduct remedial teaching it does help the student identify with the areas that he needs to work on. We do provide them inputs, with ways on how to cope up with those areas. Most students so work it out. They try different ways to come out of their problem areas (T3).

Yes to some extent they do come up with strategies for learning. If remedial instruction can be made a regular thing there can be good scope for the learners to come up with these strategies (T4).

In many ways I think. Once they are aware that something needs to be done they are very quick to come up with different ways, ways even which we are not aware of. They just need that little help from us to work on their skills (T5).

It will surely encourage students to do many things. But as I mentioned it is not seen as mandatory. So my point is, we need to have it built into our system first then talk about its benefits (T6).

As seen above in the teacher responses, teachers agreed that remedial instruction could be useful for the learners in helping them overcome their learning problems. According to the teachers, remedial instruction would not only help them look into their own mistakes but also helped them to come up with strategies that could be useful to them. This also gave the teachers a chance to provide inputs and gave ways to the learners to cope with their difficulties. Remedial teaching was also seen as a
place where individual attention could be made available to the learners thus help them progress.

4.4.2.10 Comments on recommendations and suggestions

The final question in the interview was about the suggestions or recommendations by teachers to refine the current stage i.e. with reference to post implementation of CCE. Multiple recommendations and suggestions were made by the teachers where some of them had referred to a few common areas such a crowded classroom, insufficient training and so on. The following are the recommendations and suggestions made by teachers:

Q10: What are your recommendations or suggestions to refine the current stage?

The recommendation I would like to pose which is to allow the teachers to loosen, I understand that for monitoring sake there are certain things required but that is all making it very clerical and very recording documentary in nature. I think more of autonomy, not on paper but in real sense is what should be. This should be understood by the people around. We have inspections and they are bitter, but what I feel is the concept, the change is not just in CCE, the change is also in the way people look at, more democratic, more stake holder oriented, but when it comes to teachers, like we are in the middle, so we neither get that, we give freedom to our learners but we are not given that freedom, so it looks like we are not stake holders, for us it top down and small differences come when your principal is good so it differs from institution to institution. Hence to get more clarity we need more training as well (T1).
Parents are ignorant of the system. No cooperation and they think promoting the student to the next level or higher class is the teacher’s responsibility. They also need to attend a few workshops or training programmes if possible (T2).

Scrap CCE. Take away completely or immediately reduce the strength of class. Also, first remove the clause of ‘all pass’ (T3).

Parents too should be made aware of their responsibilities and made stakeholders and partners in the teaching learning process. There is a problem, with informal assessment. With FA2 and FA 4 projects are given to the students and we find parents and artists getting their hands into the projects so that their child gets the desired grade. It is lost the sanctity of a learner’s original work. Sometimes, even the best of students indulge in this practice (T4).

Learning by doing is a great concept but it has become a passport to getting an A+. Parents and students go all out to present the project. They want perfection in their child’s project, to get the best grade possible. So parents are also required to be a part of CCE and they need to be informed about its guidelines and objectives in the right way (T5).

CCE cannot be put into its best use with overcrowded classrooms. Also teachers need to understand diagnosis and remedial instruction are very important for the learners to progress. Teachers need more training to understand it’s potential. Also make remedial instruction a part of the system (T6).
As seen from the teacher responses, most of the teachers had mentioned that with crowded classrooms, where the teacher-learner ratio was more than 1:40, there was less scope to focus on successfully administering CCE and its implications. Teachers were also seen to be asking for less burden in terms of documentation so that they could focus more on the learner and learner progress. Teachers also seemed to emphasise the point where parents were to be educated about the objectives of CCE and were to be made part of the teaching and learning process so that they understood what went into the process. The clause of ‘all pass’ had also been mentioned as it gave the learners the liberty to take learning not seriously due to which the quality of education was at stake. Also, more teacher training was another aspect that was recommended by a few teachers for everyone to have a better vision of the reason behind introducing CCE.

4.2.2.11 Analysis and interpretation of data from teacher interviews

The entire discussion on the responses of all the six teachers on all the ten questions asked in the interview protocol has helped to reach to the following inferences:

a. The introduction of CCE was viewed as a positive one but a few teachers also felt that it was introduced without proper planning. The problems that were raised with regard to CCE were with the ratio of teacher and learner. This was a concern for many teachers as they had mentioned that CCE could not be successfully administered in crowded classrooms as it was not possible in large classrooms to attend to the learner’s individual needs. Furthermore, it was stated by a few teachers that CCE also promoted diagnosis and remediation and hence promoted the learners to move forward. All in all, CCE was a good initiative, but certain areas needed immediate attention.
b. Almost all the teachers believed that CCE was helpful for them in realising their teaching objectives/goals and that it had also helped the teachers have a different approach towards the learner. Teachers were more sensitive towards learners and learner needs. They had more freedom than before in planning their classes and there was more interaction between the teachers and the learners than before. However, the teachers were also seen burdened a lot with all the documentation work that was assigned to them.

c. Teachers strongly believed that, since CCE focuses on the holistic development of the child, the learner, was less burdened and had equal opportunity in all areas. In some instances teachers had mentioned that learners had become more lenient and careless because CCE promotes the ‘all pass' clause. It was also evident from their responses, where teachers mentioned about learners being more interactive than before, that learners were also more involved in the process of teaching and learning. Hence it could be said that CCE promotes the learners to progress.

d. Evaluation and continuous assessment were viewed as useful tools to understand the learners better and were also seen useful in planning the next step. Continuous assessment played a major role in knowing about learner problems and provided scope for modification. It also helped the learner understand their own learning patterns.

e. Diagnosing learner’s problem could be useful in providing the learners with the correct input and help them in the process. Through diagnosis, positive changes could be made and this could help the learner progress.
f. Remedial instruction modified the teacher’s perception of the learner and provided space to address the learner’s needs in a more focused way. Remedial instruction could bridge the gap of what was learned and what was to be learned. Remedial teaching could also help the learner to look into their own mistakes and to devise new strategies for learning.

g. With regard to teacher recommendations and suggestions, most teachers had mentioned that teachers needed more training to be sensitive towards the use of diagnosis and remediation and that remedial instruction should be conducted whenever required. Besides, parents were also to be sensitised about the true potential of CCE and were to be involved into pedagogy.

This section presented an inside look at the teacher’s responses provided during the interview protocols conducted as part of data collection. The next section presents details of the information obtained from teachers through informal discussion on several occasions.

4.4.3 Informal discussions with teachers

On a few occasions, during FA1, FA3 and Classroom observations, informal discussions with teachers were made where the teacher responses were either taken note of in the researcher’s diary or recorded over the phone. These discussions were not planned and were part of the normal conversations that were between the researcher and the teachers, and hence they were not made with all the teachers approached for the study. The responses in a way presented a few more details about assessment, learners, teachers, teaching and learning. Therefore, they are presented in this section as they are also a part of the data gathered and have a lot of relevance to
the topic under discussion. Since they were felt no less important than the data
gathered through teacher interviews, along with the teacher responses, a discussion on
the analysis and interpretation of the informal discussions with teachers is presented
in the following sections.

4.4.3.1 Comments on formative assessment

An informal discussion with a few teachers on formative assessments revealed a lot of
information regarding the setting of the question papers, formal and informal
assessments and so on. Following are the responses that were obtained from the
teachers on formative assessments.

We have four formative assessments out of which two are pen and paper based
and two we give either projects or assignments. Question paper from Regional
Office only. Guidelines say we can change according to our class, but no one
does. FA1 and FA3 are more organised and we assess the students based on
their performance. FA2 and FA4 we have no control, but they give the child to
be more creative and innovative (T1).

We get our question papers from the regional office. And yes we use them as
they are. We don’t make any changes unless required. Most cases they do
cover all aspects required for assessment. FA1 and FA3 are formal so we get
for these two assessments. We get to know a lot about the learners through
these exams. The concept of diagnosing problems and all that we spoke of
earlier, I think this is where the scope for such a thing is. FA2, FA4 are also
very helpful. If we had more time and if we had more control over students, it
would be helpful as FA2 and FA4 give a lot of scope to exploring their
creative abilities and unfortunately we are so time bound and stressed, overloaded that we do not get the time to exploit this facility to its maximum level (T3).

Students in the higher grade perform better in exams as they have more understanding over the language. They try to go beyond, go out of the box thinking is there. FA2 and FA4 are informal. We give them projects either individual or group. They do exceptionally well with FA2 and FA4. They get a chance to exhibit their potential (T6).

From the above responses, it is evident that of the four formative assessments, formative assessment 1 and 3 were formal ‘pen and paper’ assessments and the question papers for these two assessments were provided by Kendriya Vidyalaya Regional Office and in most cases teachers did not alter the questions even when they have the choice to do so. FA2 and FA4 were informal assessments and the learners were given either individual or group projects or assignments. While formative assessment 1 and 3 were mostly achievement testing, they were seen as providing scope for diagnosis and remediation. On the other hand, formative assessment 2 and 4 were considered as more helpful in tapping the creativity levels of the learners as the learners were given space to explore beyond the text and were provided space to present their creative abilities.

4.4.3.2 Comments on general problems and mistakes learners face with assessment

During informal discussions on the general problems or mistakes that learners faced or committed with regard to assessment, few teachers had mentioned that learners
made mistakes because of either not clearly understanding the concepts or not focusing on instructions. Following are the responses that were given by the teachers:

One child in particular was not able to understand the concept of what needs to be done in the class e.g., he learnt one lesson’s question answers. So throughout the paper where it is the comprehension or a writing task, he only wrote the answers of the lesson that he had learnt. So I have to reach out to that child now. In the entire class I cannot pin point the child. So I have to bring him out and work separately and ask him what is his problem whether he is unable to follow what is being told or is it the language problem or he is not putting any effort that we will be able to realise only outside the class (T1).

Children do mistakes by not looking at the instructions properly. If they give little time to look into what is asked, they would not loose marks. Like for instance they read only half the instruction and assume they have to summarise or provide answers when the instructions either ask for comprehension or one word answers (T3).

A few of the children, they don’t want to read the question and answer. So they prefer to leave the literature section very conveniently they will leave the space and they concentrate only on what is there in the comprehension or in the writing activity or grammar part because for that they need not learn anything. So they are trying to score marks based on this only. They are very lazy (T4).
May not be in FA1 or that, but there was once it so happened that – this was a question based on a visual clue. The children had read the word notice when the point was what are the changes you notice and they wrote a notice of it only. So the problem is even if the children don’t read the rubrics very well they do not understand what is their only with one word they try to answer that and then that goes away. Afterwards, when you explain to them, they say oh, we didn’t think about it (T5).

I have come to know that children actually don’t understand or make any effort to understand the questions. They simply look for similar answers within the passage and write when it is reading comprehension and if it is literature, they completely ignore the question. They only need to identify the lesson and they write down whatever they know. They don’t bother what the question is trying to ask them. They write whatever they know and they expect the teacher to pick out the right answer from the entire summary that they have written. The problem with children is that there is no patience. They just want to finish the exam and go (T6).

From the above information provided by the teachers, it can be inferred that the mistakes made by the learners which were noticed during assessments occurred not only due to the lack of competency or comprehension but also occurred due to lack of understanding of the concepts or due to the inattentiveness of the learner. They either misunderstood or misinterpreted what was asked of them or they did not pay attention to details because of which they committed mistakes.
4.4.3.3 Comments on strategies used by teachers to help the learners

During discussions with teachers on the different methods or strategies they used to help the learners, it was observed that teachers made use of different strategies to help the learner. Following are a few of those strategies discussed with respect to rectifying learner problems.

The next instruction what we have to do is, we have to concentrate more on the writing task because, children are not familiar with the formats, they just write down paragraphs for any question or every question that is asked. For example, if it is a diary writing, there has to be a format and they have to follow that. They do not have that. I don’t know because we do all this teaching in the class, but when it comes to writing in the exams, they don’t follow these instructions, so I think we have to concentrate more on these instructions now (T1).

Actually, I am happy I just mentioned this because earlier I was talking to the students and I asked the students about FA1 and most of them scored well but a few of them who did not score well actually said that they know the answers but they had a problem with writing it down. I want to give them more writing tasks this time, O.K. of course they have to listen to what is being told and then write. Next assignment will be based on what we have observed now. We have to take a few remedial measures and we have to see that all the children will be able to rise up to their expectations (T3).
I make changes my lesson plans much depending on each class. I modify what I have may be add a few things (T6).

From the above responses, it is evident that the teachers had put in a lot of effort to help the learner overcome their difficulties. The teachers also made note of the mistakes and modified their classroom instruction accordingly. They made sure that they clarified to the learner about where they had gone wrong. It was also seen that teachers planned to re-teach certain aspects or provided more details for the learner to acquire certain concepts. This process of modifying instruction, which is referred as washback, seems to be a method adopted by the teachers to help the learners overcome their problems.

4.4.3.4 Analysis and interpretation of informal discussions with teachers

The informal discussion with teachers provided scope for discussion regarding three areas. First, the how and what of formative assessments, which revealed that two of them (FA1 and FA3) were formal and structured and they provided information on learner abilities and learner difficulties. It was with these formal assessments that learner problems were diagnosed. Teachers with the help of this diagnosis made changes to their instruction aiming at the learner’s needs. Similarly, it was also seen that the other two assessments (FA2 and FA4) were informal and it was here that the learners were provided space to exhibit their creative abilities.

Second, the mistakes that the learners made in formative assessments were also discussed with teachers which revealed that learners made mistakes not only due to low levels of competence but also due to their lack of understanding of the
instructions or concepts. It was also for these reasons that a few learners made mistakes and performed low in assessments.

Third, the strategies used by teachers unveiled the fact that teachers used the information about learner problems from formative assessment and modified their instruction. Based on diagnosis and what was required by the learner, teachers planned their instructions and tailored these modifications into the regular classrooms.

The information that was obtained through the informal discussion had revealed the fact that formative assessments were the main sources of diagnosing learner problems based on which remediation was planned. This had formed a basis for a continuity in assessment and provided scope for the teacher to monitor learner progress. These formative assessments not only carried information about learner problems and learner progress but also formed a link between assessment and instruction thus taking assessment further from ‘assessment of learning’ to ‘assessment for learning’.

4.4.4 Learner interviews

Learner interviews were conducted informally with four groups of learners from four different schools. Each group consisted of thirty-five to forty-five learners from classes VIII and IX. Interviews were conducted inside the classroom in the absence of the teacher. All the learners were asked questions related to three aspects - implementation of CCE, formative assessment and the teacher. Questions were addressed to the entire class where everyone was allowed to answer the questions freely. The questions used to gather information on the three aspects mentioned above were not fixed for all groups. However, the questions were framed accordingly taking into consideration the level of the learners, the responses, their level of
participation and above all the objectives behind conducting the interviews. Also, the questions were simplified and rephrased whenever felt necessary. This was done mainly to make the learners feel free to answer at their own convenience and to make the interviews as interactive as possible so that learners gave their immediate and natural responses to the questions. A total of one hundred fifty-five learners were approached for learner interviews and the learner interviewees are hereafter referred to as S1, S2, S3…S155, where, for example, S1 are used to refer to learner one. The following sections present the responses of the learners on the implementation of CCE, formative assessments and the teacher along with a discussion on the analysis and interpretation of the responses.

4.4.1 Comments on classroom before and after implementation of CCE

During the interview protocol with the learners, learners were asked about the difference they observed in the classroom before and after the implementation of CCE. They were asked to give their responses based on the differences they observed after CCE was implemented. Surprisingly, learners expressed a lot of things regarding the classrooms after CCE. They were not only able to identify with the question but also related it to their previous experience of learning English and made comparisons with the present context. The responses provided by the learners are listed below followed by a discussion on the analysis and interpretation of learner responses:

After CCE there are lot of changes. Earlier we used to study a lot for better marks but now, if we understand the concepts, we can score marks. Also, instead of focusing on the written part like FA1 and FA3, we are more focusing on FA2 and FA4 and getting marks (S5).
But it is advantageous because the children who used to do little study they can excel themself in FA2 activities, sports and other activities. Like two students with different levels are put at same level (S13).

We are finally understanding concepts are important. There is less burden on us because when it was half-yearly for example we used to have like at least more than half of the book for the exam. Now, as we are having FA1, FA2, SA1 and then FA3, FA4 and SA2, the chapters are divided. Now, we can focus on the topics rather than trying to cover the syllabus for the exams. Now the focus is on the important points (S45).

We are not feeling discriminated, for what I mean is, earlier some used to feel that there is a separate class for people who are toppers and they had separate sections. For those who were too low in studying, they also have separate sections. But now it is not like that because of the grading system, many feel the same. Average students feel they are doing better but same time the toppers are also discouraged to work extra hard because 49 is also A and 42 is also A. We feel anyway I am in A1, so I don’t know need to work more as I will be in A1 only then also (S52).

Studying now is becoming kind of easy (S55).

Earlier the exams were like quarterly, half-yearly and finals. But now, it is divided into four exams. It is easy this way. And two more were informal. FA1, FA3, SA1, SA2 are formal, FA2, FA4 are informal (S58).
Earlier we used to by heart the answer and go and write. No need to understand, now we don’t have any answer for many lessons. We have to think and write. It is more easy as don’t have to mug up but we have to understand and write correctly. It is more work but easy work. It is good work (105).

Ma’am I have something to say like, now, actually half part of CCE is good and half part is bad like below average students, they try to get some marks like by doing projects and all and not study harder (S110).

The above responses show that learners felt less burdened after the implementation of CCE because of the division of the syllabus into two semesters and also because of less number of formal assessments than before. Discrimination of learners into toppers and failures was also non-existent currently as learners with different skills were placed at the same level. Also according to the learners, they were focusing more on content rather than on syllabus completion because of which they had a clarity of topics. In addition to this, learners also mentioned that they were encouraged to write their own answers rather than reproducing the answers provided by the teachers like before. However, some learners also mentioned about how they focused more on informal assessment and tried to get better grades which seemed to be a disadvantage as the focus was more on getting grades than on learning.

4.4.4.2 Comments on formative assessment

The second aspect that was raised for discussion was on formative assessments. This was mainly done to know about the usefulness of formative assessments in comparison to summative assessments and also to know about the usefulness of
formative assessments, both formal and informal. A number of responses were recorded from the learners which led to understanding the advantages of conducting formative assessment. The following were the responses provided by the learners:

We prefer Formative Assessment over Summative Assessment because time is short, paper is easy, portion is small, we improve for Summative Assessment from Formative Assessment and we know our weaknesses. Formative Assessment is for 40 marks. After the exam, we can discuss our answers with our friends as it is not a holiday (S8).

Formative Assessment is easier and correction is done by our teacher. A teacher corrects them not that she shows partiality she is strict but she knows where we went wrong or where we lost our marks (S16).

In Formative Assessment, whatever mistakes we do, like we can correct and overcome it for the Summative Assessment. But in Summative Assessment, the term ends and we don’t get the chance to again work on it (S20).

We are sometimes given feedback on paper like, improve your spelling mistakes, I got (S31).

Me, she said improve on my sentence formation. She said be more attentive. This is in formative assessment. In summative we don’t get any feedback as it is semester end exam. It is better if we get feedback on our exam papers but they should not be shown in the parent teacher meetings (S38).
Paper is not lengthy, we can manage time well. In Formative Assessment, fewer chapters are there and in Summative Assessment, more portion is there. The teacher knows our weaknesses and strengths. We can improve and change for the next one (S45).

Formative Assessment 3 was easier then FA1 because we know more about the assessment, subject and teacher (S50).

We can understand the lesson and write on our own now. We are encouraged to write on our own. I think actually, CCE is testing that. We are given answers also and also we make our own answers. Like sometimes, we are given answer and sometimes no (S52).

In FA3 all questions were easy. Even the unseen passage was easy. By FA3, we are used to this syllabus (S63).

We had an idea what was asked. Mam familiarised with everything. FA3 was easy. We had a lot of discussion on story writing, so it was easy (S68).

FA3 was easy as compared to FA1 and SA1. But I lost marks in spelling and handwriting (S74).

After doing with FA1, FA3 and SA1, we are more confident that SA2 will be exciting. It’s like whatever mistakes happened in the first time, it is already corrected in the second also. So, now we know we had enough practice (S80).
FA3 was easy because first FA1 we don’t know the syllabus. Teacher didn’t
know us. Now exam is familiar. Even teachers guide us a lot. So FA 3 is
easy (S103).

It is also easy because it is cut semester wise. Per year only four exams and
two projects. Earlier it was exams all the time. With CCE we are making
different projects, are physically fit, these things are happening. Question
papers are easy. FA1 was difficult but FA3 is very easy (S106).

But there is no focus on lesson and more focus on projects and we know more
while doing projects. The problem is some focus more on decoration than on
content. Appearance is important, they use colours, stickers, flowers, sketch
pens to make it attractive. Especially girls use them. Sometimes we also copy
paste (S111).

FA1 was only two lessons. But it was tough. But FA3 is much easy even if
we have more lessons (S112).

While discussing formative assessment, it was found that most of the learners
preferred formative assessments over summative assessments for a number of
reasons. Reasons such as the question paper being not very long; assessment being
familiar to the learner; topics being familiar to the learner; topics being easy to the
learner; portion being less and so on were listed out by the learners. From the
responses, it was also clear that learners found it beneficial to get immediate feedback
from the teacher with regard to formative assessment as they were keen on knowing
their mistakes and problem areas. Learners preferred formative assessment also for
the reason that they could discuss their performances with their peers after the exams as they did not have a vacation as in the case of summative assessment.

Moreover, learners also mentioned about informal assessment (FA2 and FA4) to be useful as they get to explore more into the topic and go beyond the text. They also mentioned that though some learners who were concerned about grades tend to take advantage either by taking help from others or by just copying from the internet and doing projects was seen as more of learning independently and being more creative.

4.4.4.3 Comments on the teacher before and after implementation of CCE

Finally, learners were asked about how different the teacher was after the implementation of CCE. Though many of the answers were similar, the responses from the learners provided valuable inputs on the changing face of the teacher. The following are the responses from the learners on their teachers:

Nowadays, the teachers are very interactive. They use PPT presentation also. It is more clear (S23).

Earlier, we had to by heart our answers. Now we have to understand it, the lesson, we have to understand completely and learn it. Earlier, we followed only class notes. Now we go to the text books (S36).

Question answers were given and we used to by heart them, but now, I mean they are trying to check our ability to apply. I think they are trying to do that. You can feel it actually (S45).
They are giving more practice to tackle the language instead of read the language like we had formulas v1, v2. It’s not mathematics anymore (S76).

We now have PPT, we have smart classrooms, like we do role play in the class, we make charts. It helps us to understand the concepts easier (S96).

There is more interaction between the teacher and the student than before, like, discussions are made now (S99).

Earlier, only the teacher was talking and we were listening and now we are also talking more (S110).

From the above responses, it can be indicated that there were changes in the methodology and in teacher attitudes to a great extent. Learners not only found the classrooms to be more interactive than earlier, they also distinctly indicated that teachers encouraged and appreciated the learners to make their own answers based on their understanding of the lesson. Moreover, teachers were also seen to use more innovative practices where they tend towards the use of Power Point Presentations, role-plays and also charts to aid the learning process.

4.4.4.4 Analysis and interpretation of interviews with learners

From the learner interview protocol, many informative aspects of teaching, learning and assessment were gathered which are summarised as follows:

a. After the implementation of CCE, the learners felt less burdened with the syllabus and felt more comfortable with the contents being divided semester-wise with lesser number of formal and informal assessments.
b. Discrimination of learners into toppers and failures was no longer felt by the learners as all the learners were provided with equal opportunities to exhibit their abilities in different areas.

c. Focus on the content was more rather than on syllabus completion due to informal assessments which provided scope for the learners to explore more.

d. Learners were encouraged to come up with their own answers rather than reproducing answers provided by the teachers.

e. Learners preferred formative assessments over summative assessments as they were short, familiar, and easy.

f. Learners found formative assessments beneficial as they provided immediate feedback and their problems were addressed sooner.

g. Teachers interacted more with the learners and used different methods of teaching.

4.4.5 Conclusion

Interview protocols provided very valuable insights about teachers, learners, assessment and CCE. Interviews with teachers were helpful in understanding that though teachers felt that CCE could have been introduced with little more planning, they viewed the introduction of CCE to be a positive step. The problems that were raised were concerned with facing more burden of documentation, overcrowded classrooms and insufficient training. Apart from this, teachers also felt that there was a need to familiarise the parents about the objective behind introducing CCE. Another
problem that teachers had with CCE was the clause ‘all pass’, which according to them, was the reason in the lowering quality of learning.

However, with respect to the positive aspects of introducing CCE, most teachers felt that the burden on the shoulders of the learner was lesser than before due to the lesser number of assessments and division of syllabus into semesters. While discussing the benefits of CCE it was also found that teachers were more sensitive towards learner problems and through formative assessments, teachers had found the opportunities to diagnose these learner problems. Teachers were also seen modifying their classroom instruction based on their diagnosis to cater to the learner needs. Moreover, teachers also believed that, with the help of remedial teaching, learner’s problems could be addressed individually and thus help the learner progress. It was clear from these discussions that teachers were not only aware of these procedures but also were applying them to help the learners overcome their difficulties. Teachers also believed that with CCE it was possible for them to realise their teaching objectives. Also, different strategies were used by teachers to help the learner meet their learning goals.

Moreover, interviews with learners also provided additional information about the teacher and assessment after the implementation of CCE. Learners were seen to feel less burdened with syllabus completion and more focused on the understanding of concepts. With CCE providing equal opportunities to all learners with different abilities, learners felt less discriminated. Besides, learners felt they were encouraged to write on their own rather than rely on answers prepared by the teachers. They believed that their creative abilities were appreciated more after the implementation of CCE. Moreover, learners also found formative assessment beneficial as their mistakes and difficulties in learning were addressed immediately. Finally, they also believed
that the interaction between the teacher and the learners had increased to a great extent and that teachers used new and innovative methods of teaching after the introduction of CCE.

4.5 Description, analysis and interpretation of teacher manuals

4.5.1 Introduction

Teacher manuals provide the teachers with methodological guidance required to teach the textbook/course books. They, in addition, provide help to the teachers on steps or procedures to be followed in the classroom. They provide a valuable in-service role, as they try to update and refresh teachers’ knowledge of pedagogical content and techniques.

CBSE introduced teacher manuals on CCE and formative assessment so that they can be instrumental for teachers in understanding the objectives of CCE. These manuals also provided the information required for the teachers to plan their lessons and help the teachers in understanding the objectives of CCE.

The information in the manuals was arranged in the following format:

- A foreword, addressed to the teacher, stating the rationale behind the course
- The principles and objectives of the course
- The syllabus and materials; background information and teaching procedures
- Organization and planning and the teaching strategies
- The design of question papers, evaluation scheme and guidance to teachers in testing.
In addition to this, the manuals include detailed information about the scheme of CCE, fundamentals of assessment in scholastic and co-scholastic areas, essential dimensions of school based assessment, tools and techniques of evaluation in scholastic and co-scholastic domains, the proposed school based assessment report book and detailed guidelines for effective implementation of the scheme in schools.

Teacher manuals of classes VII, VIII and IX provided by the CBSE were analysed as part of data analysis. The teacher manuals were analysed to evaluate their effectiveness in providing guidance to the teacher in meeting the objectives of the curriculum alongside the objectives of CCE.

This was done mainly to analyse if these manuals were helpful for the teachers in understanding CCE, planning their lessons, assessing the learner, diagnosing learner problems, planning for washback i.e. modifying classroom instruction, providing remedial instruction, promoting learner progress and so on. Teacher manuals for each class (classes VI to X) included two documents, namely, a manual on CCE and manual on formative assessment for teachers. The manuals were downloaded for the purpose of evaluation from the official website of CBSE (www.cbse.ac.in).

A checklist consisting of two sections was used to analyse the teacher manuals. The first section i.e. ‘global evaluation’ and the second section i.e. ‘detailed evaluation’ together constituted twenty-six items in the checklist. The checklist was adapted from Hemsley’s (1997) teacher guide evaluation checklist. Though the checklist provided by Hemsley (1997) was designed to evaluate teacher guides, a few necessary changes were made to suit the checklist for analysing teacher manuals in the current context. A description of the checklist adopted is provided in the next paragraph.
Section-I, titled ‘global evaluation’ consisted of a total of nine items (1-9) and mainly focused on gathering information regarding the design aspects of the teacher manual such as its availability, advice given, assumptions presented and so on. Similarly, Section-II, titled ‘detailed evaluation’ consisted of a total of seventeen items (10-26) and mainly focused on gathering detailed information regarding the application aspects of the teacher manuals such as its usage, clarity of objectives, appropriateness in terms of content, suggesting appropriate ways of teaching, helpful notes, procedures of planning, preparing and conducting lessons, alternative routes, adequate guidance etc. The responses to these items were marked on a three point scale that is, ‘Yes’ (Y), ‘Not Sure’ (NS), ‘No’ (N). The next section presents a qualitative analysis of the information obtained from the checklist on the teacher manuals designed for classes VII, VIII and IX.

4.5.2 Analysis and interpretation of data on teacher manuals

This section presents a detailed analysis of the teacher manuals in two ways. First, a qualitative description of the manuals individually on CCE and on formative assessment is provided followed by a table of items that present the global and detailed evaluation of the consolidated teacher manuals (on CCE and on formative assessment).

The teacher manuals on CCE for classes VI – VIII and IX – X provided teachers with a conceptual introduction to CCE and held the information required to put into practice an evaluation that is continuous and comprehensive so that it could incorporate both, scholastic and co-scholastic components of learning. They contain six chapters and three annexures in total. Various features and parameters of CCE along with a gradual progression of CCE in all classes were also clearly stated in the
manuals. Details and techniques necessary for formative assessment, implications for schools and teachers were also covered in the teacher manuals. Teacher manuals, not only offered ways for the teachers to develop their professional competence but also tried to equip the teachers with an ability to deal with the changing evaluation practices and implement CCE as part of school based assessment. Details pertaining to methodology, tools and techniques of evaluation, fundamentals of assessment were also implicitly stated in the manuals.

The teacher manuals on formative assessment emphasised teacher-preparedness, planning and coordination. Since it was felt necessary to provide a holistic view of CCE to all its stakeholders, in particular, to the teachers, the teacher manual on CCE for all classes was designed, which gave detailed information about the scheme of CCE, the fundamentals of assessment, tools and techniques of evaluation and so on. Detailed guidelines for summative assessment were also provided in the manual on CCE.

Since formative assessment needed to be strengthened, a manual on formative assessment was also made accessible to all teachers on the CBSE website. The manual on formative assessment intended to clarify about formative assessment within the framework of CCE. It also provided a rich source of formative assessment tasks for units/lessons, so that teachers could generate further tasks on their own. It was designed to help the teachers with formative assessment in order to enhance teaching-learning process and thus enabled teachers to have a conceptual clarity of formative and summative assessments. The components of this manual contain language and literature, suggested annual planner, units 1-11 from the reader (e.g. Beehive) and units 1-10 from a supplementary reader (e.g. Moments).
This manual not only helped the teacher plan and manage time effectively, but also provided guidelines to record all assessments in a systematic manner. Further, it tried to initiate interaction between different stakeholders and provided scope for teacher development in assessment in order to make pedagogy enjoyable for both the teachers and the learners. This manual contained the overall framework of formative assessment with a time frame, user-friendly tasks for formative assessment, analysis, follow-up and feedback. The following is a sample of the reading task on Unit 3 of the supplementary reader (Class IX - Moments) from the ‘Teacher Manuals on formative assessment.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit 3: Formative Assessment- Iswaran- the Story teller</th>
<th>Skill: Writing</th>
<th>Time: 30 minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Procedure: Students will be asked to re-read the relevant portion of the lesson.

The teacher will ask them to write a newspaper report in about 150 words covering the incident at Iswaran’s school. The teacher may provide some help for the writing tasks on the following points-

Report:

- Format – Heading, date, place, first paragraph (what the news is about), second paragraph (details), third paragraph (interview of ISWARAN)
- Language – Use a mixture of active and passive voice and use simple past tense.
- Style – Formal, use quotes from people who witnessed the incident and a brief interview of ISWARAN.
- Criteria for Assessment:
- Content – relevant, appropriate details from the story (two marks)
- Language – Accurate, fluent and appropriate style (two marks).
- Originality: One mark.

- Follow-up:
  - Some of the written reports could be read out and edited.
  - This task may form a part of the portfolio.

- Feedback
  - Teacher could work with the class to edit some of the points.
  - The best report for the newspaper could be displayed.
  - If some students find it difficult, they can have a conversation with peers.

Figure 4.9 Sample Reading Task from Supplementary Reader


From the sample provided above, it can be observed that teachers were provided with reader friendly instructions along with the information on the time that can be allotted for the task, aim for using the task, procedure that can be adopted for the task, criteria that can be used for assessment, follow-up and feedback that can be used by the teachers with regard to the task.

As mentioned earlier, a checklist was used for the purpose of evaluating the teacher manuals. Both the manuals (on CCE and on formative assessment) for classes VII, VIII and IX were looked into for evaluation and a comprehensive evaluation (Global and Detailed) was made with the help of the checklist. The following is the checklist
used for evaluating teacher manuals and a discussion on the analysis and interpretation of data is presented after the checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Global Evaluation:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the TM readily available at an acceptable price, both to the school and to the learners?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the TM provide a viable rationale for the information and guidance it provides?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the TM make unreasonable assumptions about the users' knowledge and experience of language teaching?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the TM deepen users' understanding of language teaching principles as they develop their practical teaching skills?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the advice given on teaching procedures explicit enough?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is there enough cultural information to enable teachers to interpret appropriately the situations represented in the teaching materials?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Does the TM have helpful things to say about the language learning process which are also supported by modern theory and research?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Does the TM make explicit an awareness of different learning styles and strategies and suggest ways of using and developing them?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the TM consider a variety of roles for the teacher with reference to the nature of each learning activity?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Detailed Evaluation

10. Does the TM explicitly inform the teacher how it can best be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are the objectives of the course set out clearly and rationally?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the basic teacher-learner relationship implied in the TM, and the content and methods contained within it appropriate to the context of use?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the TM likely to help heighten and sustain learner motivation?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is use of the TM likely to result in lessons the learners will enjoy?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the design and content of the TM suggest ease of use?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the TM aim to maximise learners' opportunities?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the TM suggest appropriate ways for the teacher to evaluate each activity, lesson, and sequence of lessons?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the information about, and guidance on handling language items adequate, unambiguous and appropriate?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any helpful notes about potential problems which may arise regarding language items in this context?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the TM predict difficulties in understanding the cultural setting and background in the materials, and provide sufficient information about, and explanation of them?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the TM provide clear but adequately flexible guidance in selecting and sequencing units, planning them into a scheme of work and integrating them into the programme as a whole?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the TM suggest procedures for the planning, preparation and conduct of lessons in an appropriate manner and in sufficient detail?</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.27 Teacher Manuals Checklist

From the data obtained with the help of the checklist, firstly, with regard to the global evaluation of the manuals, it was found that the teacher manuals were readily available and provided a viable rationale in its information and guidance. No unreasonable assumptions about the users' knowledge and experience of language teaching were made by the manuals and the advice given on teaching procedures were explicit enough. The manuals also seemed to deepen the teacher’s understanding of language teaching principles with an explicit awareness of the different learning styles and learning strategies. However, it was not clearly found that there was enough cultural information to enable teachers to interpret appropriately the situations represented in the teaching materials, but the manuals had helpful things to say about the language learning process. Also, a variety of roles for the teacher with reference to the nature of each learning activity was clearly seen in the manuals.

Secondly, with regard to the detailed evaluation of the teacher manuals, it was visibly evident that the manuals were very user-friendly and the objectives were very clearly
and rationally presented. The context of use in the manuals was appropriate to the basic teacher-learner relationship and to the content and methods. The teacher manuals were not only likely to heighten and sustain learner motivation but also to make the learners enjoy the lesson. The manuals also aimed at maximising learners’ opportunities by suggesting appropriate ways for the teacher to evaluate each activity, lesson, and sequence of lessons. Information regarding the guidance on handling language items was adequate, unambiguous and appropriate to the level of the learner. Moreover, the manuals provided helpful notes to the teachers about potential problems which may arise in the classroom regarding language items.

Though difficulties in understanding the cultural setting and background in the materials were not clearly predicted in the manuals, procedures for planning, preparation and conduct of lessons in an appropriate manner were suggested with details. The manuals also provided a clear and flexible guidance in selecting, sequencing and planning units along with alternative routes through activities, lessons or units which could be helpful when things did not go according to the plan. In addition to this, the manuals advised the teachers about the ways to correct learners' language and provided adequate guidance for the checking of learning, both formally and informally. Finally, the manuals also provided clear and unambiguous answers to tasks under use.

4.5.3 Conclusion

The information gathered on teacher manuals and the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained through evaluation of the teacher manuals suggested that the information provided in the manuals was explicitly clear and elaborate with regard to the role of CCE and the role of formative assessment in the classroom. The manuals
not only educate the teacher about various aspects required for conducting classroom teaching and assessments, but also assist the teacher in bringing innovative methods by adapting to the various tasks provided in them. Furthermore, the manuals also provided a pool of sample tasks, ways of conducting the tasks, possible difficulties that may arise in the class to the follow-up and feedback that can be useful in helping the learner to learn better.

Apart from this, while downloading these manuals, it was observed that teacher manuals were easily accessible for all grades and also there were many other resources available for the teachers. It was also observed that there were other sites (e.g. www.meritnation.com), other than CBSE, that also provided access to resources such as text solutions, sample question papers, study materials, revision notes, chapter tests, textbook solutions, activities and so on. Hence, it can be said that there was a pool of information available online and that the teacher could access any material if required.

To conclude, teacher manuals, as a whole, promoted the concept of assessment for learning in place of assessment of learning thus promoted the concept of learning by doing.

4.6 Description, analysis and interpretation of test scripts

4.6.1 Introduction

Evaluation of text scripts which included evaluation of question papers and answer sheets was done to get information on the formative assessment procedure. This was done to know more about the process of assessment, evaluation, diagnosis, washback, and remediation and so on. Formative assessment 1 (FA1) and formative assessment 3
(FA3) were closely observed for this purpose. This was done because FA1 and FA3 were formal ‘pen and paper’ exams and hence, documentation of learner understanding and learner’s learning difficulties was possible.

CCE states that formative assessment is continuous and comprehensive in nature as it provides scope for teachers to know the learner and modify instruction to help the learner overcome learner problems. Evaluation of test scripts was done for two major reasons. The first reason was to check if teachers used assessment as a tool to understand the learner. The second reason was to examine if they made changes in classroom instruction based on what was diagnosed.

Only two teachers from two Kendriya Vidyalaya schools provided access to FA1 and FA3 respectively and the data gathered from test scripts evaluation had provided certain useful insights in knowing more about formative assessment and about evaluation.

Two checklists were prepared, of which, the first checklist was designed for analysing the question papers used for FA1 and FA2. This was done mainly to know the format of the test and the role of the teacher in the preparation of the question papers. The second checklist was designed for analysing answer sheets in order to understand the criteria used for evaluation, to check the type of feedback provided to the learners, and to identify learner difficulties, if any.

4.6.2 Analysis and interpretation of data from test scripts

As mentioned earlier, two checklists were used to analyse and interpret question papers and answer sheets of FA1 and FA3. The data obtained is presented in the tables along with its analysis and interpretation.
### 4.6.2.1 Analysis and interpretation of data from question papers

Following is the data extracted from FA1 and FA2 through the checklist designed to gather information on question papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checklist for analysing question papers of FA1 and FA3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class</strong></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td>KVUI</td>
<td>KVU2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test</strong></td>
<td>FA1</td>
<td>FA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidelines used for assessment</strong></td>
<td>Paper was set by Regional Office, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangatan and made available for all the teachers of English.</td>
<td>Paper was set by Regional Office, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangatan and made available for all the teachers of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total marks</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of sections in the question paper</strong></td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Division of marks per section**                      | Section-I (Reading)–10 marks  
Section-II (writing and grammar) - 15 marks  
Section-III (Literature)-15 marks | Section-I (Reading)–10 marks  
Section-II (writing and grammar) - 15 marks  
Section-III (Literature)-15 marks |
<p>| <strong>Time allotted for learners</strong>                         | 1 and ½ hours | 1 and ½ hours |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were the instructions clear?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the tasks used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) new to the learners</td>
<td>b) similar to tasks used while teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) similar to tasks used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) same tasks were used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the question paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) very short</td>
<td>c) Required</td>
<td>c) Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) too long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of tasks used</td>
<td>-Multiple choice questions</td>
<td>-Rearrange the jumbled words/phrases to form sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Rearrange the jumbled words/phrases to form sentences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Fill the blanks</td>
<td>-Fill the blanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Short answer questions</td>
<td>-Article writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Reading comprehension</td>
<td>-Complete the story using hints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Diary entry</td>
<td>-Short answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Letter writing</td>
<td>-Reading comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of questions used</td>
<td>-Wh-questions</td>
<td>Wh-questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Factual</td>
<td>-Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Inferential</td>
<td>-Inferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Exploratory</td>
<td>-Exploratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Open-ended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other information | None | None

Table 4.28 Checklist for Question Paper Evaluation

From the data presented in the table, it was evident that a question paper of FA1 from class VIII of Kendriya Vidyalaya, Uppal-1 and a question paper of FA3 from class IX of Kendriya Vidyalaya, Uppal-2 were analysed for the purpose of the study. With regard to the guidelines used for setting the question paper for FA1 for class VIII and FA3 of class IX, it was found that the teachers had no role in setting the question paper. When enquired with the teachers in this matter, it was found that all the question papers for formative assessments were provided to all the teachers of English by the Regional Office of the Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan. The test was conducted for a total of forty marks for FA1 for class VIII and FA3 for class IX.

Similarly, for FA1 for class VIII and FA3 for class IX, the test was divided into three sections namely reading comprehension, writing and grammar and literature respectively. While the first section on reading was for ten marks, sections on writing and grammar and literature were for fifteen marks each. The time allotted for both classes was the same for FA1 and FA3, which was one and half hours. The instructions were clearly stated in both the question papers, the tasks used for assessment were similar to the tasks used while teaching and the length of the question paper was appropriate according to the level of the learners.
While the type of tasks used in FA1 for class VIII was mostly multiple choice questions, rearrange the jumbled words/phrases to form sentences, fill the blanks, short answer questions, reading comprehension, diary entry and letter writing, the tasks used for FA3 for class IX were reading comprehension, rearrange the jumbled words/phrases to form sentences, fill the blanks, article writing, complete the story using hints and short answer questions. Moreover, the type of questions used in the question papers in FA1 for class VIII were mostly wh-questions that were factual, inferential and exploratory in nature and the type of questions asked in FA3 for class IX were mostly wh-questions that were factual, inferential, exploratory and open-ended in nature.

### 4.6.2.2 Analysis and interpretation of data from answer sheets

Following is the data obtained from FA1 and FA2 through the checklist designed to gather information on answer sheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checklist for analysing answer sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Criteria used for evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Criteria used for allotting marks for each section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Learning difficulties identified by the teacher(if any) | -Learner made grammatical errors.  
-Learner did not understand the reading passage and gave wrong answers.  
Learner made mistakes with format of letter writing.  
Learner wrote diary entry like formal letter. | -Learner gave only one line answers while the question required a short answer.  
-Learner misinterpreted the question and provided a wrong answer.  
-Learners made errors in using past tense. |
| 7. Type of feedback given | -Underlined errors.  
-Made comments such as ‘good’.  
-Mentioned areas that the learner needed to work on.  
-Mentioned areas where the learner needed to elaborate.  
-Gave suggestions in -Underlined errors.  
-Made comments such as ‘good’.  
-Mentioned areas that the learner needed to work on.  
-Mentioned areas where the learner needed to elaborate.  
-Gave suggestions in | -Made comments such as ‘good’.  
-Mentioned about giving example.  
-Mentioned about grammatical errors made by the learners.  
-Made suggestions about |
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Paper itself about errors made by the learner:
- Gave elaborate feedback on areas of error made by the learner
- Gave suggestions on what errors were made by the learner
- Gave suggestions on how to improve
- Gave information on why marks were deducted
- Provided extra information on how to rectify problem areas
- No feedback given

Grammatical errors were made:
- Mentioned to check spellings
- Made suggestions about handwriting
- Made suggestions about reading instructions properly

Using appropriate vocabulary:
- Made suggestions about improving writing

| 8. Any other information | None. | None. |

Table 4.29 Checklist for Answer Sheets Evaluation
Answer sheets of FA1 from class VIII of Kendriya Vidyalaya, Uppal-1 and the answer sheets of FA3 from class IX of Kendriya Vidyalaya, Uppal-2 were analysed for the purpose of the study. However, the criteria used for evaluation and for allotting marks for each section was provided by the Regional office, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan in the form of an answer key which was not accessible for discussion. With regard to learning difficulties identified by the teacher, though a very little information was stated in the answer sheets by the teachers, while discussing with the teachers, it was found that teachers identified that in FA1 for class VIII, learners had difficulties in understanding the reading passage and so gave wrong answers. Besides, a few grammatical errors were also found in the answer sheets of class VIII learners. Also, learners made mistakes with the formats of letter writing and diary entry. However, learners of class IX in FA3, not only misinterpreted a question and provided a wrong answer but also gave only one line answers while the question required a short answer. Moreover, class IX learners in FA3 also made errors in using past tense.

Contrary to teacher’s beliefs and attitudes that were formulated through questionnaires and teacher interviews, it was found that though the teachers had identified a few difficulties that the learners faced. Feedback provided to the learners in the written form was limited to highlighting the areas that needed attention. Feedback was limited to either underlying the errors or in most cases mentioned as ‘Good’ for learners who scored more than thirty-five marks out of the total forty marks or giving suggestions about the areas learners needed to focus. Indirect feedback was provided to learners in groups in the classroom and teachers had made changes in their instruction to accommodate remedial instruction into daily instruction.
4.6.3 Conclusion

An analysis of the data obtained from test scripts revealed that, in formative assessment, though the teacher had a better understanding of the levels of the learners, there was no involvement of the teacher in planning or preparing the question papers. The criteria required to assess learner performance was also handed down to the teachers from the Regional office, Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan. From the analysis of question papers, it was found that the time allotted for the learners was felt sufficient from the teacher’s and the learner’s point of view. There were a variety of test items and question types that had made the question paper interesting and challenging enough for the learners. Many aspects of language learning that included reading comprehension, letter writing, diary writing, report writing, grammar and so on were included in one place in the question paper.

From the answer sheets, it was obvious that the space provided for the learners to write their responses was not sufficient as it was found that some learners wrote beyond the space provided to them. Interestingly, learner difficulties with answering the question paper were identified by the teacher and feedback was provided to the learner either in the written form or orally in the classroom. Thus, the information from the test scripts, though not very detailed, have supplemented further details on the formative assessment procedures that are conducted as part of CCE.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter presented the data collected with the help of five tools and presented a discussion, analysis and interpretation of the data. The next chapter presents the finding, implications and limitations of this study based on which research-oriented suggestions are made.