Chapter - 4

CLASSIFICATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The chapter IV includes classification, analysis and interpretation of the data collected through the questionnaires from the teachers and observation of their lessons. It also consists of the views of the headmasters and the renowned persons in the field of teaching English. Data was classified, analyzed, interpreted and conclusions are drawn.

4.2 DATA COLLECTED BY VARIOUS TOOLS

By using different research tools, the researcher has collected following types of data for the present study, which is shown with the help of following diagram.

Figure No. 4.1 : Tools for Collecting Data
4.3 PRESENTATION OF DATA COLLECTED FROM TEACHERS THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES

In total, 507 questionnaires were sent to the teachers teaching English in the selected schools with prior permission of the headmasters. Some of them were sent the questionnaires by post. Some teachers were personally given the questionnaires and all of them were asked to return them within 15 days. But even after one month, the researcher could collect only 200 questionnaires. The researcher also reminded and requested the teachers on telephone to return the questionnaires. In spite of having continuous follow-up, the researcher could collect only 325 questionnaires from the teachers.

As the researcher could collect more than half of the questionnaires i.e. 325, the figure is adequate to make conclusions. It is shown with the help of following table -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of ques. Sent</th>
<th>Total No. of questionnaires received</th>
<th>Percentage of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERPRETATION

Total 64% questionnaires were received by the researcher.

CONCLUSION

64% is a quantity which is sufficient to be drawn conclusions.

The questionnaire consists of two important parts –

i) Part I – General information of the teacher.

ii) Part II – Classroom teaching.
i) **Part I – General Information of the teacher**

This part includes following points –

(a) Name and educational qualifications
(b) Degrees and their methods
(c) Experience of teaching English.
(d) Classes which the teacher teaches.

ii) **Part II – Classroom Teaching**

This part includes following points.

(a) Use of teaching methods (traditional)
(b) Use of Communicative Approach for teaching English.
(c) Teachers' readiness to use this approach for teaching English.
(d) Communicative activities used by teachers.
(e) Use of Communicative Approach to develop skills and ideas suggested by the teachers to develop listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.
(f) Pre-service and in-service training.
(g) Views about text-books.
(h) Choice of dictionaries.
(i) Instructional material.
(j) Difficulties faced by the teachers while using Communicative Approach for teaching English.
(k) Remedies suggested by the teachers.
(l) Attributes of the Communicative Approach.
(m) Teachers' suggestions to improve pre-service and in-service training programmers, text-books and actual class teaching.
4.3.1 PART I : ANALYSIS, INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

Table No. 4.2 : Qualifications of the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A., B. Ed.</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A., B. Ed.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S.C., D. Ed.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A., D. Ed.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A., M. Ed.</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>325</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The table shows following important characteristics about teachers' qualifications.

(i) Qualified teachers are found in the sample selected, i.e. 65% teachers are having B.A., B. Ed. as their qualification.

(ii) A very few teachers i.e. only 1% have master’s degrees in education.

(iii) 26% teachers have M. A., B. Ed. as their qualification.

It is clear that there are 92% teachers having B. Ed. degree. Only 8% teachers have completed Diploma in education. 97% teachers are graduate teachers

Conclusion

Most of (i.e. 92%) teachers teaching English at higher primary level have professional graduate degree in education.
Table No. 4.3: Teachers having English as their principal method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

Most of the teachers i.e. 94% teachers have English as their principal method for B. Ed. degree.

Only 6% teachers have other methods i.e. Marathi, History, Geography etc. as their principal methods.

**Conclusion**

Having ‘English’ as a principal method, it seems that the teachers have basic knowledge of this subject and teaching of the subject.
Table No. 4.4. : Teachers' teaching experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

65% teachers have 6 years experience of teaching English. 39% teachers are teaching English since more than 10 years. Only 35% teachers have less than 5 years experience to teach English. It shows that most of the teachers are experienced teachers in the field.

**Conclusion**

65% teachers are experienced one. But in those days Communicative Approach in teaching English was not introduced. Therefore, inspite of their vast experience they face many difficulties while teaching English with Communicative Approach.
Table No. 4.5: Teachers’ standardwise experience of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI and VII</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI, VII, VIII</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

The table shows that most of (i.e. 71%) teachers teach to all the three standards i.e. VI, VII and VIII.

Number of teachers teaching to either one or two standards is comparatively very less.

**Conclusion**

As most of the teachers are teaching to all the standards of higher primary level, the level of sample seems to be adequate. It shows their equal experience to teach English to all the standards.
4.3.2 PART II - CLASSROOM TEACHING - TABULATION, INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The information collected from the teachers about the classroom teaching is given as under –

Q.1. Which methods do you use to teach English?

Table No. 4.6 : Methods used by the teachers while teaching English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar translation Method</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Method</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. West’s new Method</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Approach</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative Approach</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Each teacher has given more than one response, hence the total is more than hundred.

**Interpretation**

Most of the teachers i.e. 79% teachers use Communicative Approach for teaching English in the class at higher primary level. Very few (8%) teachers use Dr. West’s New Method.

More than 50% weightage is given to Grammar-translation Method.

Some of the teachers using Communicative Approach for teaching English were asked about the other methods which they use for teaching in rural area.
Conclusion

Teachers also use Grammar translation Method along with Communicative Approach for teaching English.

The information given by the teachers has found contradictory to the information collected through the observation of classroom lessons of the teachers. Hence, it is clear that teachers though, having the impression that they use Communicative Approach for teaching English, don’t know all the aspects and proper procedure of using Communicative Approach.

Q.2 a) Do you use Communicative Approach to teach English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. response</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

According to teachers' response, it is observed that 93% teachers use Communicative Approach for teaching English. But it is not equal to the % of the teachers using Communicative Approach in table no. 4.6. Hence, the researcher made an inquiry by contacting them on the phone and by engaging personal meetings with them and found their views.

Conclusion

Teachers only say that they use Communicative Approach for teaching English but the fact is that they are not much aware of it and have very vague and limited knowledge about Communicative Approach.
Q.2 b) Answer given to the question i.e. ‘if yes, for how many years?’ is as follows –

**Table No. 4.8 : Teachers' experience is using Communicative Approach for teaching English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(302 teachers response is ‘yes’)

**Interpretation**

Frequency of 1 to 3 years is very high and 4 to 6 stands after this. Frequency of 7 to 10 years is very low.

**Conclusion**

Most of the teachers have very less experience of using Communicative Approach for teaching English.
Q.3 Do you think that you are adequately prepared for using Communicative Approach for teaching English?

Table No. 4.9: Adequate preparation of the teachers to use CLT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>055</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The table shows that only 50% teachers feel that they are adequately prepared to use Communicative Approach for teaching English. 33% teachers have not given response to this question.

Conclusion

Still, 50% teachers cannot use Communicative Approach because they are not aware of it and don’t have adequate knowledge about it.
Q. 4 Which activities do you undertake in the class for teaching English by Communicative Approach?

(a) Pair work
(b) Group work
(c) Dialogue
(d) Discussion
(e) Role play
(f) Dramatization

Table No. 4.10: Communicative activities undertaken by the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair work</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatization</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each teacher has given more than one response.

**Interpretation**

Most of the teachers i.e. 75% teachers are using pair work as a Communicative activity. Group work is also used by 66% teachers. More than 50% weightage is given to role play, dialogue and discussion. Only 42% teachers are using dramatization.

**Conclusion**

All the teachers do not use Communicative activities. Except ‘pair work’ teachers have very less knowledge about these activities.
Q. 5 (a) Do you get good response from the pupils for the above mentioned activities?

Table No. 4.11 : Students response to Communicative Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The table shows that 96% teachers get response to Communicative teaching in the classroom. Only 4% teachers are not getting response in the classroom.

Q. 5 (b) If ‘yes’, how much ?

Table No. 4.12 : Degree of response by the students for CLT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely not good</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(312 teachers' response is 'yes')

Interpretation

Only 3% teachers are getting the best response for CLT. 17% teachers get very good response. 44% teachers get good response. 29% teachers get fair response. It means 64% students gave good or more than good response.

Conclusion

Teachers face problem in getting best response for Communicative Language Teaching.
Q. 6  Do you think that Communicative Approach is useful for developing following skills –

(1)  Listening
(2)  Speaking
(3)  Reading
(4)  writing
(5)  Talking (Interacting)

Table No. 4.13 : Usefulness of Communicative Approach for developing skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note : Each teacher has given response to more than one skill.

Interpretation

Most of the teachers (more than 90%) say that Communicative Approach is useful for developing listening and speaking skills. 85% teachers opine that it is useful for developing talking skill. Less than 50% teachers say that it is useful for writing skill.

Conclusion

Communicative Approach is most useful for developing listening, speaking and talking skills.
Q. 7 What are your ideas to develop above mentioned skills?

**Interpretation and Conclusions**

Following ideas are suggested by the teachers to develop the skills—
(The suggestion are given in the order of frequency i.e. from maximum to minimum)

1. Teacher should use more English in the class.
2. Teacher should use simple and easy English.
3. Students should be given practice of speaking English.
4. More conversational practice should be given to the class.
5. Teachers should use tape, cassettes and various teaching aids while teaching English.
6. English language fobia should be removed from the students' mind.
7. Use of Communicative Approach should be extensive.
8. Extra coaching for poor students should be given.
9. Vocabulary and reading should be increased.
10. English should be used in real life situations.

**Conclusion**

Ample of practice for all the skills is required.

Teachers gave many suggestions to develop skills. It means teachers are thinking about various ways for developing skills.
Q.8 Did you get pre-service training to use Communicative Approach?

Table No. 4.14: Percentage of teachers having pre-service training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

Only 27% teachers got pre-service training. 71% teachers do not have such training. 02% teachers have not given response to this question.

**Conclusion**

Pre-service training to use Communicative Approach is not given to most of the teachers because it was not introduced before in training colleges or training schools.
Q.9  a) Was pre-service training adequate?

Table No. 4.15: Adequacy of pre-service training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(89 teachers responded that there was pre-service training programme.)

**Interpretation**

34% teachers have got adequate pre-service training. 56% teachers did not get adequate pre-service training. 10% teachers have not given response to this question.

**Conclusion**

Adequate pre-service training is not given to the English teachers.
Q. 9  b) If ‘No’, please mention your suggestions?

Though there are 50 teachers giving ‘no’ response, no one out of them could explain the reasons of inadequacy of pre-service training programme. It shows that teachers did not think carefully about the programme.

Q. 10  a) Did you get adequate in-service training for using this approach?

Table No. 4.16: Adequacy of in-service training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

The percentage of teachers getting adequate in-service training and not getting it, is almost same. 14% teachers have not given response to this question.

Conclusion

Only 44% teachers got adequate in-service training. Other 56% teachers are away from adequate in-service training programme. There is no sufficient arrangement for providing in-service training to the teachers.
Q. 10 b) If ‘Yes’ who arranged it?

The Institutions from which the teachers got in-service training are given in descending order.
(i) Extension Service Centre, college of Education, Nashik.
(ii) Maharashtra State Council of Educational Research and Training (MSCERT)
(iii) Zilla Parishad (Education Department)
(iv) State Institute of English, Aurangabad.
(v) Schools.

Conclusion

Extension Service Centre, MSCERT and Education Department of Zilla Parishad had organized in-service training programmes for the teachers.

There is no sufficient arrangement for in-service training.

Q. 11 a) Do you think that in-service training given to you was adequate?

Table No. 4.17 : Number of teachers showing their view about adequacy of in-service training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

61% teachers say that in-service training was adequate and 39% say that it was not adequate.

Conclusion

Most of teachers are satisfactory about the in-service training. But in practice it is not observed. Hence the responses are given casually.
Q. 11 b) If 'yes' record its level of effectiveness.

**Table No. 4.18 : Level of effectiveness of in-service training programme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of effectiveness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 100%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 80%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 60%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40%</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>61%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Only 199 teachers have said ‘yes’)

**Interpretation**

Frequency of 60 to 80% effectiveness is very high, whereas 80 to 100% comes after that. According to 61% teachers the effectiveness of in-service training programme is more than 60%.

**Conclusion**

Most of the teachers apparently seem to be satisfied about in-service training programme. But it is not observed in practice. Hence, the responses are given casually.
Q.11  c) If ‘No’, please give your suggestions to increase effectiveness of in-service training programme.

**Interpretation**

As per table no. 4.17, 39% teachers have given following suggestions in descending order.

(i) Resource persons for in-service training should be expert in teaching English.

(ii) Duration of in-service programme should be more.

(iii) There should be provision of extra in-service training for the teachers in rural area.

(iv) It should be given from time to time and should be up-to-date.

(v) Emphasis on the use of new techniques and practical work should be there.

Q.12 a) Are the textbooks properly designed to fulfil the objectives of Communicative Language Teaching?

**Table No. 4.19 : Number of teachers giving their views about textbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q.12 b) If 'yes' how much?

Table No. 4.20 : Teachers' opinion about CLT objectives fulfilled through textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of fulfilling objectives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 100%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 80%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 60%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40%</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20%</td>
<td>00%</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation**

Table 4.19 and 4.20 show that most of the teachers (i.e. 97%) feel that text-books are designed properly. Out of these 97% teachers, only 3% teachers say that text-books fulfil 100% objectives of CLT. 25% teachers says that this proportion is 80 to 100 %, whereas 42% say that it is 60 to 80 %. 27% teachers says that only 40 to 60% objectives of CLT are fulfilled by textbooks. Only 3% teachers are of the opinion that the text-books fulfil 20 to 40% objectives of CLT.

**Conclusion**

According to more than 70% teachers, the text-books fulfil more than 70% objectives of CLT. Hence, according to teachers text-books are adequate to fulfil the objectives of teaching English by Communicative Approach.
Q. 13) Which dictionaries do you use? From where do you get them?

Table No. 4.21: Use of dictionaries by the teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Dictionary</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navneet</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohoni</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virkar</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other dictionary</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Each teacher has given more than one response.

Interpretation

About 50% teachers use Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. 31% teachers use Virkar dictionary, 29% teachers use dictionary by S. V. Sohoni, whereas only 10% teachers use Navneet dictionary. Other dictionaries used by 3% teachers include dictionaries by the authors i.e. Deshmukh, Saraf and Ranade.

Conclusion

Descending order of popularity of the dictionaries among the teachers is Oxford, Virkar and Sohoni. Teachers are using dictionaries. Teachers mostly (50%) use Oxford dictionary.
Q. 14) Does your school have sufficient instructional material to use Communicate Language Teaching? a) tape recorder b) O.H.P c) charts d) pictures e) V C P .

### Table No. 4.22: Instructional Material in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional material</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape-recorder</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.H.P.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charts</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pictures</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video-player</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Each teacher has given more than one response.)

**Interpretation**

More than 80% schools have pictures and charts for teaching English. 68% schools have tape recorder. The percentages of the schools having O.H.P. and video player are 10 and 7 respectively. No school is having language laboratory or LCD projectors.

**Conclusion**

The schools don’t have any other teaching material than pictures, charts and tape recorders to teach English.
Q. 15 a) Is it more time consuming to teach English with Communicative Approach than traditional methods?

Table No. 4.23: Teachers' opinion about using Communicative Approach - if time consuming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>29 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>07 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

Maximum teachers i.e. 64 % teachers say that teaching English with Communicative Approach is time consuming. 29 % teachers say that it is not time consuming. 07 % teachers have not given response to this question.

Conclusion

According to the teachers teaching English with Communicative Approach is more time consuming. It may be one of the reasons that the teachers don't feel like using Communicative Approach for teaching English.
Q. 15  b) If ‘yes’ mention the reasons-

**Interpretation**

The teachers were asked to give reasons it they are of the opinion that teaching English with Communicative Approach is more time consuming than traditional methods. They have given following reasons.

1. Number of students is more in the class, so it requires more time to engage activities and situations.
2. Students can’t express their ideas, can’t talk properly. Naturally it takes time for response and the whole process.
3. It requires more time to undertake communicative activities.
4. Student performance of speaking English is poor due to uneducated family background.
5. Shy students in rural area find it difficult to participate.
6. In the schools from rural and tribal area, it is very difficult to get response from the students, so it becomes time consuming.
7. Students’ vocabulary is very poor and no practice of reading.
8. Marathi medium students are habituated to translate each and every sentence. Due to this habit it becomes time consuming.
9. Students have fear in their mind for speaking English so it requires more time to motivate and encourage them.
Q.16 a) Do you like to teach English with Communicative Approach?

Table No. 4.24: Teachers' interest in teaching English by Communicative Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation

Most of the teachers (95%) like to teach English by Communicative Approach. Only 04% teachers don’t like to use Communicative Approach for teaching English.

Conclusion

Teachers are very much interested in teaching English with Communicative Approach.
Q.16  b) If ‘Yes’ mention the reasons

**Interpretation**

The teachers were asked to mention the reasons for their interest to teach English by Communicative Approach.

1. Communicative Approach can make average student speak English.
2. It helps to develop listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.
3. Class is very active and lively.
4. It is useful for increasing interactions in the class and outside the class also.
5. It is activity oriented teaching.
6. As language learning by this approach is enjoyable, more pupils participate in it.
7. Students become confident while using English as the fear in their mind to use English is lessened.
8. It gives a lot of scope for the teachers to use various ideas and new techniques for classroom teaching.
9. Teaching English by Communicative Approach is real life oriented and need based teaching.
10. Old methods and approaches are not sufficient now a days, to teach English so, teachers like to use Communicative Approach to teach English.
11. In the era of globalization and communication, it is necessary to teach English by Communicative Approach.
12. It creates congenial atmosphere for language learning.
13. Communicative language teaching has a practical base.
Communication skills are well developed by using Communicative Approach for teaching English.

Conclusion

(i) Because of the growing importance of communication in English and the demand of the time, the teachers like to teach English by Communicative Approach.

(ii) The teachers like to teach English with Communicative Approach because it is interesting, enjoyable, child-centred, activity-oriented and need-based.

(iii) As Communicative Approach is very important to develop communication skills, fluency in speaking and developing confidence among the students; teachers like to use it.

Q.17 a) Which difficulties do you face while teaching English by Communicative Approach?

The teachers have mentioned following difficulties which they face while teaching English by Communicative Approach.

(1) Students have less intellectual capacity, poor and uneducated family background, poor vocabulary and therefore very less participation is in the class.

(2) In rural area students are very shy and afraid of speaking English.

(3) Students get no exposure to listen to English.

(4) Teachers sometimes find it practically difficult to engage the activities.

(5) As this is a new, time consuming approach, teachers cannot complete the vast syllabus in given time.
(6) Students' mother tongue impact on learning English matters a lot.
(7) Teachers have to use translation method very often.
(8) Number of students is very large in the class. So, teachers have the problem of class control while undertaking group work, pair work etc.
(9) Sometimes teachers are not interested in using Communicative Approach and they follow traditional way of teaching.
(10) The schools don’t provide teaching aids.
(11) The teachers are not innovative enough to prepare their own teaching aids.
(12) Teachers' non-educational works affect their capacity and interest in teaching.
(13) In tribal area, the students even cannot use their mother tongue properly as they have their own tribal dialect. Therefore understanding and using English language is difficult for them.
(14) According to many teachers basic English teaching of primary level is ignored so, they have to start from the beginning. Therefore, such students remain poor in English at higher primary stage.
(15) Examination is not based on communicative competence or oral work.
(16) Some teachers say that in heterogeneous classes, this Communicative Approach is useful for only clever and sharp students. Below avarage students find it difficult to cope up with it.
(17) A very few teachers don’t have much difficulties to use this approach.
Q.17 b) What are the remedies to overcome these difficulties?

The teachers were asked to write their suggestions to overcome the difficulties faced by them while teaching English by Communicative Approach. The teachers have suggested following remedies.

(1) Number of students per class should be less.

(2) Sufficient time i.e. at least 9 to 10 periods per week should be allotted to teach English.

(3) Trained English teachers should be there for primary section.

(4) Teachers should speak maximum English in the class.

(5) Teachers should make teaching English interesting and lively.

(6) Extra efforts should be taken to improve students' vocabulary, pronunciation, reading, listening and speaking.

(7) Teachers should have proper in-service and pre-service training to use Communicative Approach for classroom teaching.

(8) Content in the syllabus should be less.

(9) Teachers should remove fear from the students' mind about speaking English and motivate them.

(10) Try to neglect pupils' mistakes and encourage them to speak English.

(11) 30% to 50% marks should be for oral examination so that the students will practice speaking compulsorily.

(12) Some teachers have said that there should be separate textbooks of English for rural area.

(13) Maximum teaching aids as well as T.V., tape, radio should be used for teaching English.

(14) Teachers should be innovative and creative.
(15) Orientation to the parents should be given regarding encouraging their children to listen to the English news, to read good English books, observing English T.V. programmes and English conversation in the family.

(16) Impact of mother tongue should be lessened.

(17) English language should be taught for practical purpose.

(18) Ample practice of group work, pair work and other communicative activities should be undertaken.

(19) Extra coaching classes for teaching English with Communicative Approach be made available.

(20) Individual attention should be given and counselling should be there as per that students' weaknesses in using English.

Q. 17 c) Considering the level of importance, arrange the attributes of CLT.

The teachers were asked to write the attributes as per their importance. Teachers have given different number of order. They are arranged in descending order in the following way.

(1) Emphasis on language in action.

(2) An active class.

(3) Skill oriented teaching.

(4) Pupil centred Approach.

(5) Fourfold skills are developed properly.

(6) Use different situations for language learning.

(7) Teachers' role is skilful in the class.

(8) CLT makes all the pupils think at a time.

(9) Functional aspect of language is considered.

(10) Students' mistakes are tolerated.

(11) Monotonous class.
Q.18) Give your suggestions for improving pre service training, in service training, textbooks and actual teaching in the class?

The teachers were asked to give their suggestions to improve pre-service and in-service training, textbooks and actual teaching in the class. They have given following suggestions.

(a) Pre-service training

(1) Some of the teachers say that they got pre-service training for using Communicative Approach.
(2) Concept of CLT must be made clear in pre-service training.
(3) It should be more effective.
(4) Duration should be more.
(5) Emphasis should be on Communicative language teaching.
(6) A special book on CLT should be there.
(7) Special lesson using CLT should be demonstrated.
(8) A training for pronunciation should be there.
(9) Trainee teachers’ mindset should be changed from traditional methods to Communicative Approach.
(10) Seminars and workshops on CLT should be arranged.
(11) New techniques and communicative activities should be demonstrated.
(12) Emphasis on practical work should be there like language projects, activity, situations, conversational practice, oral work etc.
(13) Emphasis on developing skills should be there.
(14) Practice of speaking English should be there.
(b) **In-service training**

(1) Majority of the teachers have suggested that there should be experienced, expert and skilled resource persons.

(2) In-service training should enhance the quality of teaching English.

(3) Every year, this training should be compulsory for English teachers.

(4) Duration should be more for such programme.

(5) Teachers' problems regarding teaching English should be considered, discussed and solved in in-service training.

(6) New ideas and techniques to teach English should be taught.

(7) Model lessons with Communicative Approach should be demonstrated.

(8) In-service training should be given at taluka place also.

(9) Remedies should be suggested to the problems faced by the teachers in rural area.

(10) Emphasis should be on English communication.

(11) In-service training should be there according to the standards to which the teachers teach.

(c) **Textbooks**

Some of the teachers have said that the textbooks are good, well-prepared, but many teachers have given following suggestions.

(1) Text-books should be based on Communicative Approach.

(2) They should be more attractive.

(3) Separate text-books should be there for rural area.

(4) Interesting stories should be included in the text-books for lower classes like V and VI.
They are better than the textbooks in the past.

Difficult to understand for the students in rural area.

Content in the textbook should be less and activities should be more.

Books are skill based.

Names, examples, illustrations should be related to Indian surrounding.

There should be more pictures in the textbooks.

(d) Actual Classroom teaching

Maximum English should be spoken by the teacher in the class and avoid translation.

Teachers have to complete the syllabus within the time limit so, CLT is not followed properly.

Lifelike situations should be created and various communicative activities should be undertaken by the teachers.

Spoon feeding should be avoided.

Motivation and individual guidance should be there in the classroom.

More use of functional English and emphasis on practical purpose should be there.

Teacher should be competent enough to perform the role of an actor, director, and guide and should make CLT interesting.

Sometimes students' response is very less in the class.

Innovative and skilled teachers should be there.

Maximum pupils' participation should be taken in the class.

Classroom teaching should be child-centred and need-based.

Necessary, attractive, new teaching aids and supplementary material handbook should be used by the teacher for actual class teaching.
(13) Practice of skills should be given.

(14) In rural and tribal area teachers face many problems in classroom teaching.

(15) For effective classroom teaching, teachers should be well-versed with English.

(16) Simple commands, requests, orders should be taught through actual practice.

(17) Along with classroom teaching there should be a language laboratory for improving listening and speaking skills.

(18) Use of Marathi is more than English for actual class teaching than English in rural and tribal area.

(19) Teachers should make clever students guide the dull ones for improving speaking skill.

4.4 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA COLLECTED THROUGH LESSON OBSERVATIONS

This part of the research comes under experimental research. In this part 30 teachers were selected randomly and their lessons of English subject were observed. This observation was done with prior information to the headmaster but without any intimation to the teachers before observation.

Through this observation, the researcher could understand the status of their teaching of English at higher primary level. This first observation was called as pre-observation.
Drawbacks in the teaching of English observed by the researcher in pre-observation.

(1) Teaching of English was totally teacher centred.
(2) Most of the teacher used translation method for teaching English.
(3) Many a times English was taught completely through Marathi.
(4) There were no interactions between teacher and students.
(5) Students were very passive.
(6) Teachers did not use Communicative Approach while teaching English.
(7) No communicative activities were undertaken by the teachers.
(8) Pupils' participation was very less.
(9) Teachers did not use teaching aids for teaching English.
(10) Teachers did not use realia to teach English.
(11) There was no rapport between students and teacher.
(12) Teachers did not motivate the students.

After observing all such drawbacks in teaching of English, the teachers were sent a package of CLT for their own study. After some days a training programme was undertaken for the teachers. (All these points are well discussed in the third chapter.) Then second observation was done by the researcher, but she could find very less improvement in their teaching. Again the researcher met the teachers personally, guided them about using Communicative Approach for teaching, discussed important points with them and made third observation of their lessons. This third observation was called as post observation. The observation was done with the help of rating scale. Each lesson was of 50 marks.

Data collected was in terms of marks. (Observation schedule with rating scale is already given in appendix no. A)

Through the third observation, the researcher could notice following points of improvement in the teachers' performance –

(1) A shift from teacher centred to child centred class was observed to some extent.
(2) Teachers started using more English in the class.
Communicative activities like group work, pair work, and role play were undertaken.  
Teachers started to motivate the students for their participation.  
Students started to participate in various activities.  
Teachers developed interest in teaching English.  
Use of teaching aids such as charts, pictures, tape recorder, models was observed.  
Teachers started using real objects like newspaper cuttings, advertisements in the classroom.  
Teachers could get good response from the students.  
Interactions in the class were increased and the class became active.  
Teachers could manage the class by becoming a guide, participant, motivator and manager.  

The data from pre-observation and post-observation is compared, analyzed and interpreted in the following way (Garrett, 1981, p. 227)

**Table No. 4.25 : Scores of Pre and Post observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>D = Y - X</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.367</td>
<td>1.867869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-2.367</td>
<td>5.601269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>11.33467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td>2.667669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>0.134469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.367</td>
<td>1.867869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-4.367</td>
<td>19.06807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-3.367</td>
<td>11.33467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>D = Y - X</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-7.3667</td>
<td>54.26827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.3667</td>
<td>1.867869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1.633</td>
<td>2.667669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-3.3667</td>
<td>11.33467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.401069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-3.3667</td>
<td>0.134469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6333</td>
<td>13.20087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6333</td>
<td>58.26727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-2.3667</td>
<td>5.601269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-2.3667</td>
<td>5.601269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.3667</td>
<td>1.867869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-3.3667</td>
<td>11.33467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.401069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.401069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.401069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>6.934269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.401069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>6.934269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.6333</td>
<td>21.46747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>6.934269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6333</td>
<td>6.934269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6333</td>
<td>31.73407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \Delta X = 426 \) \( \Delta Y = 805 \) \( \Delta D = 379 \) \( \Delta x^2 = 302.9667 \)
X = Scores of first lesson observation  i.e. Pre observations
Y = Scores of third lesson observation  i.e. Post observations

Mean of scores of pre-observation = (M₁)

\[ M₁ = \frac{\sum X}{N} \]

\[ = \frac{426}{30} \]

\[ = 14.2 \]

Mean of scores of pre-observation = (M₂)

\[ M₂ = \frac{\sum Y}{N} \]

\[ = \frac{805}{30} \]

\[ = 26.83 \]

Mean difference = \( M₂ - M₁ \)

\[ = 26.83 - 14.2 \]

\[ = 12.63 \]

MD = 12.63

(192)
Mean D = $\frac{\Delta D}{N}$

$= \frac{379}{30}$

$= 12.63333$

$SD_D = \sqrt{\frac{\sum \Delta^2}{N-1}}$

Where $N = \text{No. of cases} = 30$

$\text{\ N-1} = 30 - 1 = 29$

$= \sqrt{\frac{302.9667}{29}}$

$= \sqrt{10.4471}$

$= 3.2322$

$SE_{MD} = \frac{SD_D}{\sqrt{\frac{N}{\sum \Delta^2}}}$

$= \frac{3.2322}{\sqrt{\frac{30}{5.4772}}}$

$= 0.59$

Where $t = t \text{ ratio}$

(193)
\[ t = \frac{M_D - O}{SE_{MD}} \]

\[ = \frac{12.6333}{0.59} \]

\[ = 21.41 \]

\[ Df = 1 \]

\[ t \text{ at 0.01 level is 2.76 from the table of } t \]

\[ 21.41 > 2.76 \]

Hence the mean difference (12.63) is significant at 0.01 level.

From the above example, it is clear that the difference between pre observation and post observation is significant among 99% cases.

**TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS**

As the calculated ‘t’ value (21.41) is greater than table ‘t’ value at 0.01 level (2.76) the difference between the means is significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, the hypothesis framed for this study i.e. ‘A well designed programme arranged to teach English by Communicative Approach makes significant difference in teachers' performance’ is proved to be right and therefore, it is accepted.

**Conclusion**

A well planned programme implemented in in-service training to teach English by Communicative Approach makes a positive effect.
4.5 THE HEADMASTERS' VIEWS ABOUT CLT

The researcher has discussed about communicative language teaching with 15 headmasters of different schools. While discussing with the headmasters the researcher considered the points regarding CLT, their views about teachers teaching of English, Material that the schools provide for classroom teaching etc. (All these are clearly mentioned in the 3rd chapter.)

Followings views are expressed by the headmasters –

(1) Most of the headmasters said that English teachers follow traditional translation method and very few teachers know about Communicative Approach.

(2) The schools have limited teaching aids.

(3) The teachers should prepare some teaching material on their own.

(4) Teachers should go beyond the textbooks.

(5) They should be very well prepared.

(6) Teachers should not use Marathi while teaching English.

(7) Schools should provide training to the teachers.

(8) Some have said that teacher himself is a barrier in Communicative Language Teaching because teacher is not interested in it and doesn't want to change.

(9) Pupils' participation should be taken by the teachers.

(10) Teachers should be innovative and take efforts to teach English.

(11) The teachers should use CLT as it is the need of today’s world and globalizations.
4.6 RENOWNED PERSONS' VIEWS ABOUT CLT

The researcher has interviewed 10 renowned persons in the field of teaching English and experts in this field. The researcher also got a very good opportunity to interview a renowned person in CLT i.e. Mrs. Ann McAllen from America. She is presently working with American Education Centre, Mumbai. Her interview and demonstration of CLT was really helpful in this regard.

Following opinions about Communicative Language Teaching were collected through their interviews. (The interview schedule is given in appendix 'C')

(1) Teachers' role in CLT should not be only as a provider of knowledge but manager, planner, organizer, diagnostician.. Therefore teacher should accept this radical change in his role.

(2) CLT is process-oriented teaching so, it should be emphasized.

(3) Teachers are reluctant to increase pupils’ participation because they feel it as if inviting trouble to them.

(4) Learning with the help of activities is based on trial and error but doesn’t happen so in the class.

(5) Traditional classroom situation i.e. teacher centered class, one-way process is the main barrier in CLT.

(6) Pre-service training for the teachers should be redesigned.

(7) Proper machinery should be formed for in-service training programme.

(8) Teacher should develop own reference material.

(9) A number of students per class should not be more than 30.

(10) Limited time is also a barrier in using CLT.
(11) Due to many barriers teachers are reluctant to change.

(12) Schools should be a counselling cell for the teachers' training. Schools should arrange seminars and workshops.

(13) Pair work, group work, role playing should be emphasized to create confidence among the students.

(14) More exposure to speaking and listening English should be there.

(15) Conversational practice should be there.

(16) There is a wide gap between CLT theory and practice.

(17) In the beginning of in service training, teachers' pre-test should be taken and as per this test adequate practice and material should be provided.

4.7 SUMMARY

This chapter has mainly dealt with the data collected for the research, statistical analysis and interpretation and the headmasters' views as well as renowned persons' views about CLT.
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