CHAPTER ELEVEN

TEACHERS' EQUIPMENT

"It seems ... that most of the obstacles to the acquirement of a second language will be removed if we can provide the perfect teacher."

- E.V. Gatenby

A successful teaching of English depends on a number of factors. Syllabuses and students are two of the factors. A third factor is teachers. Syllabuses may be appropriately designed, students may be motivated and competent enough to learn the subject, and yet the teaching might remain ineffective if it is not done by competent teachers.

The competence of the teachers of English cannot, for a number of reasons, be taken for granted. The subject to be taught is a foreign language, and it was formally studied by the relatively younger teachers of the subject themselves for only four years at school. The younger teachers studied English in unfavourable circumstances in many other respects. They were not exposed to the right type of environment as most of their elder colleagues in the field were owing to
historical and national circumstances (British teachers at one time and, then, English as the medium of instruction). The appointment of a teacher by itself does not conclusively prove that he is competent enough to teach the subject. Appointments of the teachers of English often depend on the supply of the personnel. In the present context, a thorough knowledge of English language and literature is not all that matters. The method plays a special role in the teaching of English today. It becomes necessary, therefore, to measure the competence of the teachers of English.

DIFFICULTIES IN MEASURING TEACHERS' COMPETENCE

Though necessary, it is not easy to measure teachers' competence partly because most of them would be reluctant to submit themselves to such an inquiry. Also, the complex nature of the competence to be examined makes the proposed inquiry difficult. The competence of a teacher of English depends on the teacher's proficiency in the language skills, his ability to teach them, his training in teaching English as a language, his awareness of the problems of teaching English in India and the possible solutions to them, etc. Designing standardized competence tests for English teachers could be a subject for a major research. Considering that
the competence of English teachers was but one of the several parts of the central problem being probed, the investigator could not afford to devote considerable time to designing such competence tests.

QUESTIONNAIRE

In view of the difficulties and limitations mentioned above and the like, a questionnaire was designed for the limited purpose of having only a glimpse of the equipment of the teachers of English. The questionnaire sought to know whether and, if yes, to what extent the teachers of English were live to the problem they faced in effectively teaching their subject, whether they used to think of possible solutions to the problems, and the method they generally adopted in the class to teach English. Incidentally, the responses provided short specimens of their written English and clarity of approach.

The Design:

The questionnaire (Appendix I) consists of five questions. Q.1 and Q.2 are made up of three sub-questions each. At three places where the responses could be YES or NO, and at one place where the response could be one of the four grades suggested, the questions are close-end. The rest are open-end questions, because in those cases,
the responses anticipate statements of personal views and a description of the method of teaching.

The Sample:

It was decided to seek immediate responses in order to avoid getting studied and manufactured ones. Depending on approachability in person, therefore, a few local teachers of English in commerce and science colleges were given the questionnaire for completion. The number of those who completed them is twenty five.

No respondent has over fifteen years of teaching experience. The investigator thought it was rather distasteful to presume to measure the equipment of very senior colleagues in the field, some of whom were once his reversed teachers and/or are today members of the Board of Studies.

There is relevance in getting the questionnaire responded to only by comparatively younger teachers of English, in the light of the fact that sooner than later the elder colleagues in the field who have done their job would call it a day and the teaching of English, its course-designs etc. would be shaped by the younger colleagues. This thesis, too, has relevance to days yet to come in that, if at all, its recommendations would be adopted, they would be adopted in future when the onus of teaching English meaningfully would be on the younger colleagues of today.
All the teachers who answered the questionnaire are from the commerce and science colleges in Ahmedabad, affiliated to the Gujarat University. Thus they are from only one area whose colleges are affiliated to one and the same university. The number of the respondents is also small, not only in relation to the total number of English teachers in the universities covered by this investigation, but also in relation to the number of English teachers in the Gujarat University. The sample is thus not fairly proportionate and, in addition, it is purely accidental.

Even so, the sample can be considered representative of the population of the English Teachers in the Commerce and Science faculties of all the Universities in Gujarat. The teachers of English all over Gujarat studied in uniform circumstances and now teach English in uniform circumstances. There is no known attempt in any of these universities to specially train the teachers of English in Commerce and Science colleges. Of late, summer Institutes are being organized by these universities. A few of the teachers of English have also been trained by the CIEFL.

Of the twenty five respondents, 5 are professors, 15 lecturers and 5 more are tutors. Nine of these teachers of English have the teaching experience of between 1 and 5 years, ten of them have the experience between 6 and 10 years, and six between 11 and 15 years.
The Responses:

In response to Q.4, all the 25 respondents said they joined the profession by choice. In other words, these teachers have the aptitude to teach English. Meaningful responses can, therefore, be expected from these teachers.

Objective of Teaching English: Q.1(a) seeks to know the respondent's views on the objective of teaching English in India today. Q.1(b) is designed to know whether the present syllabuses and text-books meet the objective stated by him in answer to Q.1(a).

The responses to Q.1(a) and Q.1(b) were studied from the viewpoint of the emphasis they directly or indirectly put on developing either active skills or passive skills. Writing and speaking, which involve constructing sentences, are considered active skills. Reading and listening, which involve only understanding the constructed sentences, are considered passive skills.

Q.1(a) being open-end, all the responses to it do not directly spell out the respondent's preference for either active skills or passive skills or for both. Where the response is, for example, "to make students understand the language", the preference is obviously for passive skills.
Where the response is "to make students speak, write and understand English" or "to make students read, write and understand written and spoken English", the preference is not entirely for active skills or passive skills. However, it is clear that while in the former, the emphasis is on developing active skills, in the latter, it is on developing passive skills. In some cases, the responses are even more general. One such response, for example, is "To have for them a powerful media (sic) through which they can 'move ahead' in life with necessary assurance." Such responses are interpreted as ones emphasizing active skills.

Q.1 (b) being close-end with YES/NO as the responses to choose from, all except two responses are specific. The two exceptional responses are YES with "partly" added to it. These have been treated as NO responses.

Responses to Q.1(a) and Q.1 (b) have been classified in Table 11.1. Out of those who favour the teaching of active skills or passive skills as the objective, there are a few who think the objective is met by the syllabuses and text-books prescribed, and others who think the objective is not met by them. The table classifies all these responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of the Respondents who think the Syllabuses &amp; Text-books meet the Objective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of the Respondents who think the Syllabuses &amp; Text-Books DO NOT meet the Objective</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 of the 25 respondents believe that the objective of teaching English in India today should be to develop active language skills, and of these 13, only 1 respondent is of the opinion that the present syllabuses and text-books meet the objective. The number of those who believe that the objective should be to develop passive skills is 12; of them, one is of the view that this objective is met by the present syllabuses and text-books.

Those who have favoured developing passive skills as the objective of teaching English, certainly reflect an awareness of the changed situation in which English
is being taught in India, and of the desirable shift in the emphasis in teaching English in this situation. These respondents can be said to be sensitive to the problem basic to the teaching of English.

Do those who favour active skills happen to register an honest difference of opinion or do they reflect their ignorance of the changed situation and the shift in the emphasis? Probably the latter is true. The teachers of English, especially in Gujarat, should know well the condition in which English is being taught. They should know, too, practically where and in what ways English could be useful to average students - to those of Commerce and Science in particular. If they do, they would not think of developing active skills as the objective of teaching English.

It must be noted that of the 12 respondents who favour active skills, 3 have stated basic language skills - viz. speaking, writing, reading and listening. The rest have referred to such ambitious goals as sharpening sensibility, cultivating a sense of appreciation, placing students in contact with the world, and developing the conversational skill.
An honest disagreement with a view which is very largely accepted would normally be so worded that the consciousness of disagreement would be reflected. Hardly any respondent reflects this consciousness either in response to Q. 1 or any other. This further strengthens the assumption that the responses in favour of active skills are bred by ignorance of the changed situation and the shift in the emphasis in teaching English.

**Syllabuses and the Objective:**

Q. 1 (c) was meant to be answered by those respondents who thought that the present syllabuses and text-books did not meet what they considered to be the objective of teaching English. This open-end question expected the respondents to offer suggestions to make the syllabuses and text-books meet the objective.

The responses to Q. 1 (c) have been classified in Table 11.2. There are two sections in the table. Section One contains suggestions related to practice in one or more language skills. Section Two consists of suggestions other than those related to practice in language skills.
### TABLE 11.2: TEACHERS’ SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE SYLLABUSES AND TEXT-BOOKS OF ENGLISH SO AS TO MAKE THEM EFFICIENT ENOUGH TO MEET THE OBJECTIVE OF TEACHING ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of suggestions</th>
<th>Language Teaching</th>
<th>Text-Books Teachers</th>
<th>Suggestions Related to Practice in Skills</th>
<th>All Skills</th>
<th>Writing &amp; Speaking</th>
<th>Only Writing</th>
<th>Only Speaking</th>
<th>Only Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION TWO:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of suggestions</th>
<th>Language Teaching</th>
<th>Text-Books Teachers</th>
<th>Suggestions Other Than Those Related to Practice in Skills</th>
<th>Vague</th>
<th>Blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11 out of the 25 respondents have suggested that language teaching should be given a more prominent place in the syllabuses. Eight respondents are not satisfied with the text-books prescribed by the university. Of the other suggestions, none is made by over 8% of the total number of the respondents. Suggestions to emphasize both the writing and the speaking skill, together and speaking skill alone in the syllabuses have been made by two respondents each. Seven more suggestions have been made one each by seven respondents. It is rather disturbing that out of 25 respondents only 11 see the need to give weight to language teaching in the syllabuses. Equally disturbing is a single response for practice in reading skill.

Three respondents only say - very innocently - that courses should be changed to make them meet the objective of teaching English. Incidentally, 4 respondents have left this question blank. Of them, 2 think that the present syllabuses and text-books meet what they think is the objective of teaching English and another two think that the present syllabuses and text-books only partly meet it.

Students' Language Behaviour : Diagnosis and Causes :

Q.2 is made up of three sub-questions, each of which is intended to serve an independent purpose.
Q. 2 (a) is meant to verify the hypothesis on which Q. 2 (b), which puts to test the respondent's knowledge of the problems related to the teaching of his subject, is based. While Q. 2 (c) tactfully tries to know how many fall prey to an educationally unsound method of 'teaching' English - resorting to dictation of notes.

Q. 2 (a) is a close-end question on "average students' performance in English." The responses offered for choice are five - ranging between Very Poor and Very Good. The responses have been classified in Table 11.3.

TABLE 11.3: TEACHERS' RATING OF AVERAGE STUDENTS' PERFORMANCE IN ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Performance</th>
<th>Very Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigator's hypothesis that average students' performance is not good stands verified by the 25 respondents. No respondent rates average students' performance in English 'Very Good' or 'Good'. 9 of the respondents
appear to be showing rater's generosity to the students in saying that average students' performance is 'Fair'. Sixteen respondents call a spade a spade - 13 of them regard average students' performance poor and 3 consider it 'Very Poor'. The respondents' verdict is based on their experience of directly dealing with them, so the investigator respects the verdict. The responses to Q. 2 (a) cannot be considered just personal views.

Q. 2 (b), which is an open-end question, is designed to know what, according to the respondents, are the factors causing the type of performance mentioned by them in response to Q. 2 (a). Responses to Q. 2 (b) have been classified in Table 11.4.

TABLE 11.4 : TEACHERS' VIEWS REGARDING FACTORS CAUSING VERY POOR TO POOR PERFORMANCES OF AVERAGE COLLEGE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No.</th>
<th>Factors Mentioned by Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Learners' indifference</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Learners' Poor Equipment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Untrained Teachers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Official Policy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Defective Courses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Defective Examination System</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

==============================================
As many as 20 responses (factors 1 and 2) imply that college students are themselves responsible for their disappointing performance in English. It is suggested that average college students are indifferent to the teaching of English and/or have a poor language proficiency. The responses are ambiguous. Instead of indicating a 'cause' for the unsatisfactory performance, some respondents have only further diagnosed the 'debility'. Is that a hesitant way of passing the buck to schools?

One of the 3 miscellaneous responses, indeed, categorically blames 'untrained teachers at school'. While there is refreshing introspection behind the 7 responses considering Untrained Teachers at college responsible, there is the necessary objectivity reflected in the 8 responses seeing the Official Policy of teaching English responsible and in the 5 responses pinning the responsibility on the Defective Examination System.

Responses to question 2 (c) have been discussed later in the chapter under the title "The Respondents and Note-dictation."

What the Teachers Teach:

Q.3 asked respondents to give an outline of the method they adopt to teach English in the class. The
objective of this question was not that of knowing a particular method followed by any teacher. It was rather to know the 'teaching items' included in the methods followed by the teachers. That is, it was expected that the question would reveal whether the teachers generally concentrated on teaching grammar or text contents or a particular skill, and so on.

The responses were studied from the view-point of the teaching items stressed by the methods described. The teaching items have been classified in Table 11.5.

**TABLE 11.5: TEACHING ITEMS HIGHLIGHTED BY THE TEACHERS' TEACHING METHODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Teaching Items</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Text-book Contents Only</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Text-book Contents &amp; Language</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Text-book Contents with Discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Text-book Contents with Digressions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Language &amp; Text-book Contents with Discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Language &amp; Speaking Skill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Vague Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As many as 10 respondents concentrate on only the text-book...
contents while teaching English. Whatever may be the reasons shaping this method, it is undesirable because it does not conform to the necessity of combining language teaching with the teaching of text-book contents. The method of 4 other respondents strikes that combination. The teaching of text-book contents with discussion is also a good combination - in fact, discussions can help one grasp grammar points even better than a formal language teaching. It must be noted, however, that in all these, text-book contents have been given prominence. Other items are subsidiary parts of these methods.

There is an interesting revelation in the method combining text-book teaching with digressions on 'current topics'. The method is too eloquent to need further comments.

In 3 other methods described by the teachers, language teaching has been given first priority.

Six respondents have been vague in answering the question. Since the vague responses reflect on the respondents' equipment, they have been reproduced below verbatim:

(i) To strengthen English language from school level so that students may have scope to have intensive and extensive reading in order to develop their mental faculties and to enjoy charms of language and literature.
(ii) Free discussion should be done in the tutorial class, seminars should be held. Writing work should be done and their work should be properly assessed. Their mistakes should be pointed out.

(iii) Discussion

(iv) The real method of teaching English is through English only. But most of the teachers are compelled to speak in the mother tongue which is very harmful to the students. If the students know that the teacher will speak only through English in an English classroom I feel that the students will be more responsive in what the teacher is telling. Instead of giving notes, students must be encouraged to write papers themselves and they must be encouraged to conduct seminars, and group discussions. Special marks must be given for their performance.

(v) 1. More aids

2. The change of structure method at school level also.

(vi) Taking much pain to make it interesting to attract students.

The Respondents and Note-dictation:

Note-dictation is not teaching. The investigator was afraid the practice of dictating notes in English classes was widespread. A direct question like "Do you dictate notes?" would have had ethical overtones preventing the respondent from giving a natural response. Q.2 (c) - "In view of their performance do you think note-dictation can be of use?" - is designed to discover how many of the teachers probably resort to note-dictation in
'teaching' English. Giving a note on a difficult aspect of a subject, once in a while, is understandable, but resorting to note-dictation as a rule does not speak well of the teacher's teaching ability. Does not a YES to Q. 2 (c) imply resorting to note-dictation as a rule?

Q. 2 (c) was a close-end question with YES and NO as the possible responses. Two respondents, however, have added 'partly' and 'to some extent' to their YES responses. These two have also been considered YES responses.

Fourteen out of the 25 respondents are of the opinion that in view of average students' performance in English (which, responses to Q. 2 (a) indicate, is Very Poor, Poor, or, at best, Fair), note-dictation could be of use. It is within probability that all or most of the 14 respondents who favour note-dictation do resort to it. For whatever reason, if they do, English is not TAUGHT during the time of note-dictation. Besides, ready answers dictated by no other person than the revered teacher himself induce students to learn them by heart rather than 'waste' time in learning 'small' rules of grammar or studying the text-book minutely.

Incidentally, 8 of the 14 respondents who consider note-dictation useful, and 2 of the 11 respondents who do not consider it useful, have included it in the method of teaching English they have described in response to Q. 3.
Responses to the questionnaire were studied from the view-point of correctness of the language used by the respondents. A questionnaire completed by a teacher was an index of his language equipment. The language equipment of the teachers was rated on a three-point scale. The three points of the scale were GOOD, FAIR and POOR.

The language errors taken into account were related to grammar, usage, spelling and the choice of appropriate words. A stray occurrence of an error was considered only a slip and the questionnaires having only a slip were rated GOOD. Questionnaires with two, three or four errors were rated FAIR and those with five or more errors were rated POOR. In some cases, the responses were not in full sentences - thus reducing the chances of language errors to the minimum. In those cases, the investigator preferred to err on the side of generosity and rated the responses only on the basis of the number of errors, if any.

The classification of the responses, in accordance with the rating, has been given in Table 11.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Equipment</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of the teachers whose language equipment is rated GOOD is only 40%. Another 40% deserved FAIR. 20% of the respondents showed POOR language equipment.

Three typical specimen responses have been reproduced below - one each from the three categories.

1. **GOOD**: The aspect of comprehension is more important than any other as English is the most important among 'Library Languages'. Emphasis should be on the receptive ability, but English is also a link language and some ability of reproduction is necessary.

2. **FAIR**: It can be said very frankly that the present syllabuses are very ambiguous and found to be not so useful as it should. Phrases, idioms and some rapid reading books should be prepared. A language-oriented paper should be separately introduced at all levels in college.

3. **POOR**: We try to follow the syllabuses but there is no much scope in it. So we have to switch over to extra-class activities; Talking about the current topics, films and sports, so they be forced to take interest in English by associating them with these (illegible).

**CLARITY OF RESPONDENTS' APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM AS REFLECTED IN THEIR RESPONSES**

Responses to the questionnaire were studied also from the viewpoint of the clarity of the teachers' approach to the problem of teaching English they reflected. The clarity of their approach, too, was rated on a three-point scale. The three points of the scale were: GOOD, FAIR and POOR.
Two factors were considered relevant in rating the clarity of the teachers' approach to the problem: (i) the respondents' basic understanding of the problem, and (ii) consistency in the responses given. Where an approach was not found deficient in either respect, it was rated GOOD; where it was found deficient at only one place in either, but not both, of the factors, it was rated FAIR; where it was found deficient at more than one place either in the same respect or two different respects, it was rated POOR.

The following, which is a response to 4.1 (a), is an illustration of the respondent's lack of proper understanding of the problem:

To refer books (sic) in every field, to have better understanding with (sic) other countries, to cultivate sense of appreciation and power of expression and thinking and imagination.

Apart from the language errors, the respondent seems to be emphasizing wrong aims. In the light of the conditions in which English is being taught in India today, how compatible is the idea of teaching English for a better understanding of other countries or for the purpose of cultivating a 'sense of appreciation' or the power of expression? And, to think of cultivating thinking and imagination as an objective of teaching
English! The respondent, it seems, is fascinated by catch words.

The following excerpts, which are a teacher's responses to Q.1 (a) and Q.2 (b), respectively, are an illustration of inconsistency:

(i) To make the students read, write, speak and understand English plus think in English.

(ii) Lack of discipline on part (sic) of the learner and also no desire to learn a new language. Besides, there is no atmosphere in which they are encouraged to use new language (sic) and lack of audio-visual equipments (sic).

If there is no desire on the part of the learner to learn English, and at the same time no suitable environment for its learning, is it not impractical to consider the teaching of all language skills so well as to make the learner 'think in English'?

Even where a response is not in agreement with the question asked, it is considered inconsistent. The following is an example:

Q.3: Give an outline of the method you adopt or are forced to adopt by the existing circumstances to teach English in a regular class.

The Response: Free discussion should be done in the tutorial class, seminars should be held. Writing work should be done and their work should be properly assessed. Their mistakes should be pointed out.
Whereas the question expects the respondent to give an outline of the method he adopts in a class to teach English, the respondent, in his response, talks about the ideal that should be followed in teaching English.

On the basis of the three-point scale discussed, the responses have been classified in Table 11.7 so as to rate the clarity of the teachers' approach to the problem of teaching English in the present Indian conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of Approach</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>FAIR</th>
<th>POOR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absence of a clear approach to the problem of teaching English in India is too conspicuous to be denied. Of all those who are concerned, let alone those who presume they too are concerned, with the problem, it is the teachers of English who must have a clear approach to it in order to be able to do their job efficiently. It is sad, however, that only a paltry 12% of the sample appear
to have the desirable clarity of approach worth the rating GOOD. No fewer than 24% of the respondents have scored POOR rating in relation to the clarity of their approach. The only consolation is that a large number of the respondents - 64% in all - show a sign of hope in that if the clarity of their approach is not GOOD, it is not POOR either.

CONCLUSION

As stated earlier, the sample of the respondents to the questionnaire is very limited. At the same time, the respondents are teachers of English in the Commerce and Science colleges affiliated to only the Gujarat University. All the teachers of English in the Commerce and Science colleges in Gujarat, save in exceptional cases, can, however, be assumed to have the same background - the policy of teaching English being the same in Gujarat, they studied English for the same number of years as did the respondents, and teach the students having the same background. A special training can affect the teachers' language equipment as well as clarity of approach to teaching it. But none of the five universities is known to have arranged for the training of a large number of the teachers of English.
If Summer Institutes, Refresher Courses etc. are organized by the Gujarat University, they are organized also by the other universities. It can be concluded on the basis of the findings of the study of the questionnaire responses, therefore, that a large number of the teachers of English in the Commerce and Science colleges of Universities in Gujarat do not have an adequate language equipment and the desirable clarity of approach to the problem of teaching English in the present circumstances.