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5.0 Introduction

The detailed report of the present investigation has been given in the previous chapters. This chapter comprises summary, findings of the study and implications based on the findings. It also presents further recommendations for the future study in the field of English as second/foreign language.

5.1 Summary of the Study

The main objective of the present study is to measure the effectiveness of communicative approach, structural approach and conventional method of ELT at secondary level. To achieve the objective of the study null hypotheses were formulated and tested. For the present study, Std. VIII students studying during the year 2012-13 in Gujarati Medium schools of Gujarat state Education Board of Visnagar town comprises the population. There are twenty two primary schools in Visnagar town. The researcher decided to carry out the experiment in Sardar Patel Vidyalaya, Gurukul Primary School and G.D. High School where he was permitted. The researcher had done the draw and decided Sardar Patel Vidyalaya as experimental group-1 (Communicative Approach) and Gurukul Primary as Experimental Group-2 (Structural Approach) and G.D. High school as Control group-1 (Conventional Method). All the three groups were selected purposively as these schools permitted the researcher to conduct the experiment. Total final 157 students were taken as the sample for the present study comprising 55 students from Sardar Patel Vidyalaya, 48 from Gurukul Primary School and 54 from G.D. High School. The researcher had developed the design of the programme selecting six teaching
units from std. VIII text book of English on communicative approach, structural approach and conventional method. With the help of the experts, post test of 100 marks was constructed by the researcher on the basis of the objectives, analysis of the contents and three dimensional table. The teacher made test comprised 25 marks for Listening skill, 25 for Speaking skill, 25 for Reading skill and 25 for Writing skill.

The investigation was experimental in nature. The study being Quasi-experimental in nature, post test only 3×2 factorial design was selected. Two experimental groups and one control group were made equal by the students' previous years' final examination marks in English and Verbal non verbal intelligent test. The researcher himself taught to all the three groups. Sardar Patel Vidyalaya, Gurukul Primary School and G. D. High School were taught through communicative approach, structural approach and conventional method respectively. The experiment was conducted for total 34 days in which 30 days for teaching and 4 days for implementation of post test. Listening, Reading and Writing test was given 1-30 hours time and speaking test was taken for three days. The students' achievement scores were taken group wise and skill wise. The collected data were analysed using SPSS software. ANOVA was calculated for the testing of hypotheses and t-test was computed to analyze the data and for drawing out the findings of the study.

5.2 Findings of the Study

5.2.1 Effects of Treatment and Sex and Their Interactions

As the data is divided in multiple cells, ANOVA WAS calculated and findings are as under:

$H_{0,1}$ The F-value for treatment is 8.9 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of language skill on achievement in
As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between:

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

$Ho_{t,1.1}$ The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 0.73 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of language skills on achievement in English.

$Ho_{t,1.2}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 6.38 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of language skills.

$Ho_{t,1.3}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and Conventional method was 3.51 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of language skills.

$Ho_{t,2}$ The F value for sex is 1.83 which is not significant. Sex did not effect on achievement in English of language skills.

$Ho_{t,3}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 2.75 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and sex did not effect on achievement in English of language skills.
Listening:

$H_{01,1L}$ The F-value for treatment is 3.85 which is significant at 0.05 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected on achievement in English. As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value.

$H_{01,1L}$ The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 1.88 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of listening skill on achievement in English.

$H_{01,2L}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 2.30 which was significant at 0.05 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of listening skill.

$H_{01,3L}$ The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and conventional method was 0.42 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of listening skill on achievement in English.

$H_{01,2L}$ The F value for sex is 4.65 which is significant at 0.05 level. Sex effected on achievement in English of listening skill. Boys are found superior to girls of listening skill in terms of achievement in English.

$H_{01,3L}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 0.76 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and sex did not effect on achievement in English of listening skill.
**Speaking:**

\( H_{0.18} \) The F-value for treatment is 7.05 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of listening skill on achievement in English. As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between

1. Communicative - Structural  
2. Structural - Conventional  
3. Communicative - Conventional

\( H_{0.1.18} \) The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 1.63 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of speaking skill on achievement in English.

\( H_{0.1.28} \) The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 8.70 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of speaking skill on achievement in English.

\( H_{0.1.38} \) The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and conventional method was 3.99 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected of speaking skill on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to conventional method on speaking skill.

\( H_{0.28} \) The F value for sex is 2.77 which is not significant. Sex did not effect on achievement in English of speaking skill.
The F-value for interactions among treatment and sex is 2.59 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and sex did not affect achievement in English speaking skill.

**Reading:**

The F-value for treatment is 1.22 which is not significant. So it is interpreted that treatment did not affect reading skill on achievement in English.

The F value for sex is 4.88 which is significant at 0.05 level. Sex affected achievement in English reading skill. Boys are found superior to girls in terms of achievement in English.

The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 2.89 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and sex did not affect achievement in English reading skill.

**Writing:**

The F-value for treatment is 30.78 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment affected writing skill on achievement in English.

As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between:

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 3.64 which was significant. Treatment affected writing skill on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to structural approach of writing skill.
The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 3.65 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of writing skill.

The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 7.82 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of writing skill.

The F value for sex is 2.41 which is not significant. Sex did not effect on achievement in English of writing skill.

The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 2.61 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and sex did not effect on achievement in English of writing skill.

5.2.2 Effects of Treatment and IQ and Their Interactions

Language:

The F-value for treatment is 5.9 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of language skill on achievement in English. As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional
The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 0.73 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of language skills on achievement in English.

The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 2.76 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of language skills.

The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 3.51 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of language skills.

The F value for IQ is 17.71 which is significant at 0.01 level. IQ effected on achievement in English of language skills. High IQ are found superior to low IQ of language skills in terms of achievement in English.

The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 0.88 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and IQ did not effect on achievement in English of language skill.

Listening:

The F-value for treatment is 3.78 which is significant at 0.05 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of listening skill on achievement in English. As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between
1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

**H02.1.1.** The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 1.88 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of listening skill on achievement in English.

**H02.1.2.** The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 2.30 which was significant at 0.05 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method on listening skill.

**H02.1.3.** The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 0.42 which was significant. Treatment did not effect on achievement in English of listening skill.

**H02.2.** The F value for IQ is 13.09 which is significant at 0.01 level. IQ effected on achievement in English of listening skill. High IQ are found superior to low IQ of listening skill in terms of achievement in English.

**H02.3.** The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 1.23 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and IQ did not effect on achievement in English of listening skill.

**Speaking:**

**H02.1S.** The F-value for treatment is 6.07 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of speaking skill on achievement in English.
As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

$H_{02.1.1S}$ The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 1.63 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of speaking skill on achievement in English.

$H_{02.1.2S}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 1.87 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect on achievement in English of speaking skill.

$H_{02.1.3S}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Communicative approach and Conventional method was 3.99 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of speaking skill.

$H_{02.2S}$ The F value for IQ is 12.13 which is significant at 0.01 level. IQ effected on achievement in English of speaking skill. High IQ students are found superior to low IQ of speaking skill in terms of achievement in English.

$H_{02.3S}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 0.15 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and IQ did not effect on achievement in English of speaking skill.
Reading:

$H_{0.1R}$: The F-value for treatment is 0.8 which is not significant. So it is interpreted that treatment did not effect of reading skill on achievement in English.

$H_{0.2R}$ The F value for IQ is 9.18 which is significant at 0.01 level. IQ effected on achievement in English of reading skill. High IQ students are found superior to low IQ of reading skill in terms of achievement in English.

$H_{0.3R}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and sex is 1.75 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and IQ did not effect on achievement in English of reading skill.

Writing:

$H_{0.1W}$ The F-value for treatment is 27.23 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of writing skill on achievement in English.

As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

$H_{0.1W}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 3.63 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to structural approach of writing skill.

$H_{0.2W}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 3.65 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on
achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of writing skill.

$H_{02.1\text{W}}$ The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Communicative approach and Conventional method was 7.82 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of writing skill.

$H_{02.2\text{W}}$ The F value for IQ is 13.04 which is significant at 0.01 level. IQ effected on achievement in English of listening skill. High IQ students are found superior to low IQ of writing skill in terms of achievement in English.

$H_{02.3\text{W}}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and IQ is 0.4 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and IQ did not effect on achievement in English of writing skill.

5.2.3 Effects of Treatment and Achievement in English and Their Interactions

Language:

$H_{03.1}$: The F-value for treatment is 6.64 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that achievement in English effected of language skills on achievement in English. As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

$H_{03.11}$ The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 0.73
which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of language skills on achievement in English.

\( H_{03.1.2} \) The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 2.39 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of language skills.

\( H_{03.1.3} \) The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Communicative approach and Conventional method was 3.51 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of language skills.

\( H_{03.2} \) The F value for achievement in English is 22.55 which is significant at 0.01 level. Achievement in English effected on achievement in English of language skills. Above average students are found superior to below average of language skills in terms of achievement in English.

\( H_{03.3} \) The F value for interactions among treatment and achievement in English is 0.78 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and achievement in English did not effect on achievement in English of language skills.

**Listening:**

\( H_{03.1L} \) The F-value for treatment is 0.8 which is not significant. So it is interpreted that treatment did not effect of listening skill on achievement in English.

\( H_{03.2L} \) The F value for achievement in English is 6.31 which is significant at 0.01 level. Achievement in English effected on achievement in English of listening
Above average students are found superior to below average on listening skill in terms of achievement in English.

\( H_{03.1} \) The F value for interactions among treatment and achievement in English is 1.05 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and achievement in English did not effect on achievement in English of listening skill.

**Speaking:**

\( H_{03.1S} \): The F-value for treatment is 9.04 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of speaking skill on achievement in English. As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between

1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

\( H_{03.1S} \) The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 1.63 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect of speaking skill on achievement in English.

\( H_{03.2S} \) The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 1.87 which was not significant. Treatment did not effect on achievement in English.

\( H_{03.3S} \) The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Communicative approach and Conventional method was 3.98 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on
achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of speaking skill.

$H_{0.25}$ The F value for achievement in English is 28.26 which is significant at 0.01 level. Achievement in English effected on achievement in English of speaking skill. Above average students are found superior to below average of speaking skill in terms of achievement in English.

$H_{0.38}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and achievement in English is 0.3 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and achievement in English did not effect on achievement in English of speaking skill.

Reading:

$H_{0.1R}$: The F-value for treatment is 0.06 which is not significant. So it is interpreted that achievement in English did not effect of reading skill on achievement in English.

$H_{0.2R}$ The F value for achievement in English is 8.79 which is significant at 0.01 level. Achievement in English effected on achievement in English of reading skill. Above average students are found superior to below average of reading skill in terms of achievement in English.

$H_{0.3R}$ The F value for interactions among treatment and achievement in English is 1.8 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and achievement in English did not effect on achievement in English of reading skill.

Writing:

$H_{0.1W}$ The F-value for treatment is 32.34 which is significant at 0.01 level. So it is interpreted that treatment effected of writing skill on achievement in English.

As there are three levels of treatment, it is obligatory to find out t-value between
1. Communicative - Structural
2. Structural - Conventional
3. Communicative - Conventional

**H₀₃.1.₁W** The t-value calculated for pairs of the group which studied through the communicative approach and structural approach was 3.64 which is significant. Treatment effected of writing skill on achievement in English. Communicative approach is found superior to structural approach of writing skill on achievement in English.

**H₀₃.₁.₂W** The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Structural approach and Conventional method was 3.65 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Structural approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of writing skill.

**H₀₃.₁.₃W** The t-value calculated for the pairs of the group which studied through the Communicative approach and Conventional method was 7.82 which was significant at 0.01 level. Treatment effected on achievement in English. Communicative approach is significantly superior to Conventional method of writing skill.

**H₀₃.₂W** The F value for achievement in English is 24.03 which is significant at 0.01 level. Achievement in English effected on achievement in English of writing skill. Above achievement students are found superior to below achievement of writing skill in terms of achievement in English.
The F value for interactions among treatment and achievement in English is 1.07 which is not significant. Interactions among treatment and achievement in English did not effect of writing skill.

5.3 Comparison with the Findings of the Related Studies

In the present study, communicative approach and structural approach are found effective than conventional method and no difference is found between communicative approach and structural approach. And as per the finding of the previous studies, communicative approach was found effective than structural approach and traditional method in most of the studies. But in one study conventional method was found effective than communicative approach and structural approach.

5.4 Implications of the Study

Language education is handicapped in crowded classrooms and mere repetition and cramming lexical items does not help the cognitive development or language development of the learners. It is necessary to look over the strategies that can develop the communicative competence of the students.

On the basis of the findings, the following implications have been made.

The findings related to the comparison of the three groups, two experimental and one control group, emphasized that students who has been taught by communicative approach and structural approach were found effective than conventional method. The result shows that if we want to make our children better in English, communicative approach should be implemented in the school education in Gujarati Medium schools. In communicative approach life like teaching is given importance and all skills Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing are taught simultaneously and children are found active learners whereas in structural approach mechanical and situational drilling practice of structures is emphasized whereas in
conventional method Listening and Speaking are omitted and only reading and writing are given importance using mother tongue Gujarati. If we look at the psychology of language learning all skills work simultaneously.

The above discussion led the investigator to the fact that the present teaching learning process doesn’t bring effective result and present method of teaching English needs to be improved. Students’ role in the classroom should be increased. Equal importance to the listening, speaking, reading and writing should be given.

The researcher has been serving in B.Ed. as a teacher trainer and he had also served in higher secondary school for three years and had remained as resource person in communicative language teaching training programme at different places like GS&HSEB, Gandhinagar, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, Diu and Diet, Mehsana.

Researcher’s suggestions for working out CLT are as under:

1. Students must be given as much as time to speak in the classroom and in the family and in the social environment.
2. The prescribed books should be based on the principles of communicative approach.
3. Students should be assessed on the basis of four language skills as Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing.
4. Language laboratory should be provided to each schools and colleges.
5. English language teaching programme should be learner centered.
6. Teachers’ knowledge regarding latest methods and techniques should be updated.
7. The present teaching in the classroom is focused mostly on Conventional method. So teachers should be motivated and get acquainted with CLT.
8. Classroom communication should be in English.
English language teaching should be made life like and usable.

As Allen Maley says, “Language is not purely an intellectual matter.” It is a social affair, hence follows the ever-altering rules of the specific social milieu. Just as there are no fixed rules about what is considered acceptable or socially correct. Just as fashions in dress codes change, fashions in language too change. (Sulabha Natraj)

5.5 Recommendations for the Future Study

There are many relevant unanswered questions which potentially serve as the basis for future study. The researcher recommends for the following studies that should be undertaken in future based on the findings of the present study.

1. A Study of teachers’ preparedness for Communicative Language Teaching at primary, secondary, higher secondary and college level may be undertaken.

2. There are different communicative activities. So A Comparative study of effectiveness of communicative activities can be taken.


5. In the present study, the design of the programme using communicative approach, structural approach, and conventional method was prepared for few lessons prescribed for standard VIII. This may be done for more topics and on other subjects also.
5.6 Conclusion

The findings and implications of the present study may create an awareness among the teachers and experts of English Language Teaching as how English language teaching in classroom should be implemented and how to work out communicative language teaching in classroom using the text book of English to get effective result in Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. Thus the problems of speaking in English of Gujarati students can be minimized. Lastly, it could be stated that communicative approach and structural approach is helpful and useful in developing communicative competence of students.
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