CHAPTER VI

THE POST SESSION AND THE POST INVESTIGATION TESTS

6.1 Introductory

This chapter attempts in the first place to account for learners' performance at the Post-Session tests. This performance is gauged in relation to uptake. The chapter also discusses the Post-Investigation tests in relation to uptake. Next, the Post-Investigation test results are discussed in relation to each word to see if words that were uptaken were retained over time. The factors which possibly facilitated long term retention are identified and evidence from the data supporting these factors is presented. Next, the researcher speculates on the likely reasons why some words were not retained.

6.2 The Post-Session Tests

The procedure for conducting the Post-Session tests (hereafter PS tests) and the purpose of the tests have already been presented (See chapter III). This chapter attempts to account for the performance of the testees. It also seeks to ascertain whether each PS test served to reinforce the uptake that had been recorded by the learners before the test was attempted. How far did the test items correspond
with or differ from learners' uptake? Did the tests help to consolidate uptake and aid its retention and so its recall at the Post-Investigation tests which were taken after the completion of the course?

Analysis of learners' uptake lists and PS test performance reveals

1) that between 50 and 70 per cent of the words listed in the total uptake of learners are words included in the PS tests set by the researcher. In other words a large number of words were regarded as salient in common by the learners and the researcher.

2) About 30 to 40 per cent of the words included in the tests were not uptaken by any learner. Quite often these are words that were not introduced in the discourse even though they are in the text-book. As learners generally did not look into their books, these words went unnoticed by them. Interview data provides evidence on this point.

R ............... Virbala ............... you answer well in class. You speak too. But when you write you don't do so well. Why, why is that so? There must be some reason. Do you feel afraid?

Virbala Shall I tell you the truth?
Yes?

When teacher explains the lesson, we listen to her, our attention is focused on the teacher. We don't look into our books. We like to listen. It is the narrative or story element that holds our attention.

This is true of all subjects.

(See interview following Lesson 2, lines 172-183).

3) About 10 to 15 words (per lesson) which the researcher had not included in the test, because they seemed either difficult conceptually or because they did not appear significant enough to worry about or seemed likely to be familiar, were listed in the uptake list of one or the other learner after each teaching session. The total uptake list of some sessions is therefore rather long. This suggests that some learners are not able to discriminate between the more useful and the less useful words. However as learners were asked to recall all words, it is, perhaps, unfair to blame them.

Sometimes learners confessed at the interview sessions that they had included a couple of familiar words to extend their individual uptake lists.

From the above analysis it appears that the PS tests may have helped to reinforce about half of the total uptake.
6.2.1 **Learners' performance at the PS tests**

It appears that the test format of matching a word in column A with its meaning in column B did not present much of a challenge to the learners, perhaps, because it entails merely an ability to recognise. Listing of uptake, on the other hand, is far more demanding because the learner has to recall the word with the correct spelling and write it down. Further, she was required in this research, (whenever possible) to assign the meaning to the recalled word. It is a difficult task to express the meaning even if one seems to know it. As the PS tests entailed an easier task and followed the difficult one of listing uptake, learners enjoyed the tests and seemed to find them fairly easy. They showed a great deal of enthusiasm and were keen on obtaining immediate feedback.

An element of challenge could have been added to the PS tests by including an extra number of meanings in column B as against the number of words in column A. This was, however, not attempted as the researcher had to prepare the test during the teaching session in order to be able to include words that figured prominently in the interaction. In addition to this task, she had to observe the class activity and keep track of the names of learners who contributed to the discourse, so as to be able to assign the
contribution to the right speaker on the tape. Owing to this multiplicity of tasks, the researcher was obliged to overlook the need to devise ways of making the tests a little more difficult. Therefore it may be that the equal number of meanings in the corresponding columns, afforded some learners an opportunity to take advantage, to a small extent, of the principle of elimination to secure all-correct responses.

An interesting and surprising aspect of performance was the fact that occasionally a learner who had listed a word in the uptake list and assigned it a meaning, failed to match the same word with its meaning in the PS test. This was a rare phenomenon for which no explanation could be obtained at the interviews.

6.2.2 Additional test format introduced in Lesson 6

In Lesson 6, an additional test format was introduced in the PS tests. Along with the usual format of matching a word with its meaning, the investigator gave 7 sentences with slots. The slots had to be filled in with appropriate words from among the 7 words listed separately on the blackboard. This test task was introduced in order to see if learners could use the words appropriately in a given context. The task was more challenging as it involved understanding the meaning of the sentence, in order to fill in the slot with the appropriate word.
6.2.2.1 Highly unsatisfactory performance

As usual the performance in the earlier format (matching words with meanings) was quite satisfactory, but the testees failed to fill in the slots in the sentences with appropriate words from the given list of words. Apparently they did not try to understand the meanings of the sentences. Some of the sample responses are:

1) The luxury idea of the lesson - (in place of the principal idea ...... )

2) She is detour happier - (instead of considerably happier)

3) He made a slight considerable to avoid the traffic - (instead of slight detour .... )

4) Sleeping in a warm bed was a amenities for the poor man - (instead of a luxury ...... )

The last example is even more distressing as it shows that the learner does not have the basic knowledge of article use and singular/plural concord. The absurdity of these responses was brought home to the learners at the interview sessions following Lesson 6. (See for example, lines 563-566 - interview with Kusum and others; lines 50-58 - interview with Asha and Anjou).
The investigator had sincerely hoped to remedy the situation by continuing with the new format in lessons 7, 8, 9, and 10 in order to provide sufficient training before the format was used in the Post-Investigation tests. Unfortunately due to extraneous factors such as extra-curricular activities, the Diwali festival and holidays, interest in the course waned and attendance numbers dwindled and fluctuated at such a rate that only a couple of learners who attended lessons 7 and 8 may have benefited from the training in the new format. In lessons 9 and 10 only the earlier format was used and so learners received little or no training in handling context-based sentences with slots. A continuous passage with slots was never used at any stage in the PS tests. This is an extremely important point to take note of because the Post Investigation tests include contextualised passages with slots.

6.2.3 About PS charts

The PS charts given below present the learners' performance at the PS tests of Lessons 1 to 6. PS chart (i) presents numerical counts of success in each lesson and the averages. It also records the classroom treatment of words that were tested. PS chart (ii) presents each learner's success and adjusts the averages in terms of the lessons attended.
PS CHART (i)

POST SESSION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Averages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of words tested</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners present</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of successes (Matched meanings)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>98.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>77.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three learners left before the test.
### PS CHART (ii)
#### POST-SESSION TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Total per learner</th>
<th>Average per lesson attended and (percentage of correct answers over lessons attended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anju</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virbala</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirmala</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnima</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raakhi</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekha</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumitra</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamleshwari</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeru</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neelkamal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asha</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lata</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilpa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of Matched Mgs. reported</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff.Mgs. tests</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In Lesson 6, two test formats were used.
Format 1) 8 words to be matched with their meanings.
Format 2) 7 sentences with slots to be filled in with appropriate words from a given list.
6.2.4 Conclusions: PS tests

PS test performance of learners on the matching of word and meaning exercises appears quite satisfactory.

It was noticed that while learners could do well on the matching exercise, they could not fill in slots in sentences with appropriate meanings from a given list. This suggests that they could do well on a mechanical exercise but failed when the exercise demanded the reading and understanding of a given context. This lapse is parallel to other lapses noted in learners' work such as not looking closely at words and their spelling. Learners need to be trained in study skills and in exercises which require thinking.

6.3 Post Investigation Tests

The reader has already been introduced (see Chapter III) to the purpose of the Post-Investigation tests (hereafter PI tests) including the rationale for selecting particular words from learners' uptake, for testing, the rationale for the format of the tests and for the administration of the PI tests. Therefore, as far as possible, repetition of the above will be avoided.

The aim of this section is to discuss the results of the PI tests in relation to learners' uptake. To view the
test results in a proper perspective it is pertinent and essential to consider two factors that significantly affected the testees' performance.

6.3.1 Factors which affected test performance

6.3.1.1 Absenteeism during the teaching sessions

The chart entitled 'Word Recall' (see below) while it presents uptake figures of each learner, makes the absentees stand out clearly and adjusts the average recall of each learner in relation to the number of lessons attended. The rate of absence is appalling. The Word-Recall chart makes clear the attendance from Lessons 1 to 6. From Lessons 7 to 10, attendance figures registered a further fall. If test results are to be gauged in relation to uptake, then the students' presence or otherwise across lessons has to be taken into account. It is possible that a learner may not have been present when some of the 32 items of the tests figured in the classroom discourse or even if present, she may have failed to uptake some of them. Hence success on the PI tests has to be carefully considered in relation to the uptake recorded by each learner. This would be the count showing the relation between uptake and retention. If it is found that learners who had been absent or had notuptaken a word, get the test item correct, it may be reckoned under a separate count. It is possible that such
WORD RECALL (i.e. UPTAKE) CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Total per learner</th>
<th>Average per lesson attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anju</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virbala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalpana</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirmala</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purnima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raakhi</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rekha</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumitra</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamleshwari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeru</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neelkamal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lata</td>
<td>abs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shilpa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. words recalled</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The above chart has been repeated from an earlier chapter. Its purpose this time is to indicate the large number of absentees.
learners may have uptaken the item but failed to record it in the uptake list. The absent ones may have learnt it over time. Alternatively both categories of learners may have known the word already before it came up in the class session. The separate count therefore seems necessary. (Hence PI chart (i) and PI chart (ii) which follow).

6.3.1.2 **Unfamiliarity with the major format used in the tests**

Apparently, the testees were hardly at all used to the format of tests A, B, D, E which required understanding the context of the passage and filling in words appropriate to the context in the slots provided. That a simpler version (using sentences not passages) of this format had been introduced in the PS test of Lesson 6, that learners had exhibited conspicuous lack of skill in handling it, and the absurd responses they had presented have already been discussed above. The new format was however used in designing the PI tests because it was expected that learners would continue to attend classes and get trained in the use of the contextualized passage format. The necessary training could not, however, be given on account of the fall in attendance. Further, the uncertainty of being able to continue at all obliged the researcher to design the PI tests soon after Lesson 6. It was feared that the learners might not be available for these tests if much time was allowed to
lapse after the teaching. As pointed out earlier (see Chapter III) the contextualised passage format (Tests A, B, D, E) was used along with the isolated words format (Tests C and F) because the 2 formats were together expected to indicate a learners' grasp of the word. Success was to be measured in terms of the CI pairs a testee got right. (That is, if the words had been appropriately filled in the slots in the contextualised passage and if the isolated words were correctly matched with their meanings).

However, in view of the fact that the testees could not be trained before the test in the use of the new format (the context based passage) and were quite familiar with the matching of isolated words with their meanings, it would be hardly fair to insist on CI pairs as the measure of success at the PI tests as planned earlier. It would be only fair to see how far they succeeded on the matching of isolated words and meanings that is Tests C and F alone, and how far their performance on these tests related with uptake.

6.3.2 Explaining PI chart (i)

The following chart PI(i) called 'Performance at PI Tests in Relation to Words Claimed as Uptake', first states the number of words each learner claimed as uptake. (See A). Hence, Anjou 19, Virbala 5, Kalpana 16 and so on. Next,
'B' states the number of claimed words the learner was able to get right both in context and in the individual word list. Next, in 'C' are stated the number of claimed words which the learner got right on the individual word list. 'D' then gives the total number of each learner's correct CI and I (because CI includes the I of the individual word-list) responses. This is the actual total number of correct responses in relation to uptake. Hence Anjou 15, Virbala 4, Kalpana 4. 'E' then shows the number of words each learner failed to retain over time. Percentages are worked out to facilitate interpretation. Finally 'F' and 'G' present the number of words (out of the 32) for which the learner was absent and present respectively at the teaching sessions 1 to 10. (The earlier word recall chart had indicated absentees over lessons 1 to 6 only). 'F' and 'G' are crucial in making clear the overall picture which will be discussed later.

Chart PI (i) ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANJU</th>
<th>VIRBALA</th>
<th>KALPANA</th>
<th>KUSUMALATA</th>
<th>NIRMALA</th>
<th>PURNIMA</th>
<th>RAAKHI</th>
<th>REKHA</th>
<th>SUMITA</th>
<th>KAMLESHWARI</th>
<th>NEERU</th>
<th>NEERIKAMAL</th>
<th>ASHA</th>
<th>MANTA</th>
<th>LATA</th>
<th>SHILPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A'</strong> Number of words uptaken by learner out of 32 in the PI test.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B' Correct CI pairs ofuptaken words</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C' Correct Is (i.e. isolated words matched with meanings) of uptaken words</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANJU</td>
<td>VIRBALA</td>
<td>KALPANA</td>
<td>KUSUMALATA</td>
<td>NIRMAI</td>
<td>PURNIMA</td>
<td>RAAKHI</td>
<td>REKHA</td>
<td>SUMITRA</td>
<td>KAMLESHWARI</td>
<td>NERRU</td>
<td>NERLKAMAL</td>
<td>ASHA</td>
<td>MANTA</td>
<td>LATA</td>
<td>SHILPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'D'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Cls+Is (i.e. total No. of uptake n words retained over time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage retained</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'E'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words lost over time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart contd....
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMU</th>
<th>VIRBALA</th>
<th>KALPANA</th>
<th>KUSUMALATA</th>
<th>NIRMALA</th>
<th>PURNIMA</th>
<th>RAKHI</th>
<th>REKHA</th>
<th>SUMITA</th>
<th>KAMLMSEWARI</th>
<th>NERU</th>
<th>NILKAMAL</th>
<th>ASHA</th>
<th>MANA</th>
<th>LATA</th>
<th>SHILPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.3 Explaining PI chart (ii)

The next chart (PI ii) 'Performance at PI tests in relation to unclaimed words' presents the test performance of learners who either did not uptake word(s) at the teaching session or were absent at the teaching session when the word was presented.

'A' states the number of times a learner 'got' an unclaimed word right both in context and in the individual word-list (that is a CI pair).

'B' states the number of times a learner got an unclaimed word right in the individual word list (that is I).

'C' presents the total of CI (which includes I) and I that is the number of times the learner got the word right even though she had not claimed it as uptake. Chart PI (ii) complements PI(i) and the two need to be considered together to arrive at a proper picture of test results in terms of loss and gain. Interpretation of PI (ii) will be presented below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANJU</th>
<th>VIRBALA</th>
<th>KALPANA</th>
<th>KUSUMALATA</th>
<th>NIRMALA</th>
<th>PURNIMA</th>
<th>RAJAKHI</th>
<th>REKHA</th>
<th>SUMITRA</th>
<th>KAMLESHWARI</th>
<th>NERJU</th>
<th>NERKANAL</th>
<th>ASHA</th>
<th>MANTA</th>
<th>LATA</th>
<th>SHILPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'C'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.4 Explaining PI chart (iii)

The next chart PI (iii) presents the test results in relation to uptake but this time in terms of each word to see if words that were successful on the uptake count were correspondingly high on the retention measure (the PI tests C and F).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Learners who claimed the word as uptake</th>
<th>No. of uptakers who got the word right both in context and individual list (i.e. got CI)</th>
<th>No. of uptakers who got the word right on the individual list i.e. (I)</th>
<th>No. of uptakers with CI+1 (i.e. total No. of Is right)</th>
<th>No. of uptakers who failed to retain the word</th>
<th>No. of non-uptakers who recalled the word in PI test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insignificant</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 - 55.6</td>
<td>8 - 88.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 - 16.7</td>
<td>4 - 33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 - 14.3</td>
<td>1 - 14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 - 50.0</td>
<td>6 - 60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 - 44.4</td>
<td>4 - 44.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorb</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 - 20.0</td>
<td>4 - 40.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 - 50.0</td>
<td>4 - 66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 - 33.3</td>
<td>4 - 66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 - 0</td>
<td>5 - 83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0 - 0</td>
<td>2 - 66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 - 22.2</td>
<td>5 - 55.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 - 60.0</td>
<td>4 - 80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking in</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 - 25.0</td>
<td>2 - 25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 - 50.0</td>
<td>5 - 83.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3 - 37.5</td>
<td>7 - 87.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 - 33.3</td>
<td>7 - 77.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart contd...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Learners who claimed the word as uptake</th>
<th>No. of uptakers who got the word right both in context and individual list (i.e. got Cl)</th>
<th>No. of uptakers who got the word right on the individual list i.e. (I)</th>
<th>No. of uptakers with Cl+1 (i.e. total No. of Is right)</th>
<th>No. of uptakers who failed to retain the word</th>
<th>No. of non-uptakers who recalled the word in PI test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosperous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 - 66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 - 16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - 33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 - 66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disservice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 - 60.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 - 70.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owing to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 - 75.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 - 80.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 - 80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 - 14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 - 42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 - 42.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 - 57.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 - 50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconceivable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 - 28.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 - 57.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In succession</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 - 11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 - 33.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomparable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 - 25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 - 100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declare</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 - 0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 - 57.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 - 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 - 28.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 - 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 - 33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>68 - 32.3%</td>
<td>56 26.5%</td>
<td>124 - 59.04%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.5 Interpreting Chart PI (i) (Performance at Post Investigation Tests in Relation to Words Claimed as Uptake)

An attempt will be made first to get an overall picture of learners' performance and then to look at individual cases. Later it will be necessary to look at chart PI (ii) as well, to arrive at the complete picture.

Chart PI (i): A look at D shows that 8 out of the 16 learners have retained 50 per cent or more of the uptaken words. There is one case of 100 per cent retention, 5 instances of over 75 per cent retention. Of the 8 learners whose scores are below 50 per cent, 3 have scored over 40 per cent. There are only 5 learners who have scored below 40, the lowest being 25 per cent retention. Apparently this is quite satisfactory performance.

6.3.5.1 Scores in terms of percentages

This impression of a satisfactory amount of retention of uptake, however, appears illusory when one looks at the overall uptake figures in A and the absenteeism displayed in F. For example, compare the overall retention (shown in D) of Virbala - 80 per cent and Anjou 78.9 per cent. The figures of the two learners come pretty close to each other in D, but while Anjou initially uptook 19 of the 32 words and retained 15 of them, Virbala uptook only 5 of
the 32 words and retained 4 of them. Anjou is therefore a far better learner. The scores in terms of percentages tend to obscure individual gains and perhaps even create an illusion of glorious successes. Another example worth looking into is the scores of Kalpana and of Rekha. Each of them comes pretty close to Anjou at the uptaking stage. Each uptakes 16 out of 32 words but retains only a miserable few. (Kalpana 4 and Rekha 5 out of 32). Later a close analysis of various data may reveal why learners such as Kalpana, Rekha, Neeru, Kamleshwari and even Purnima and Neelkamal failed to retain a substantial amount of what they had claimed as uptake. The next interesting case is that of Sumitra, who was present only at Lesson 4, uptook among other words 4 of those selected for the PI test and retained 2 of them. In terms of percentages (ironically enough) this is 50 per cent retention which is above the retention scores of Lata and of Shilpa who were present for most of the teaching sessions and interview sessions as well.

1 & 2 Rekha and Neelkamal had been absent for Lessons 3 and 4 out of 6 respectively.

3 The possible factors that hindered uptake itself of specific words have already been analysed and discussed (See Chapter V) and will be referred to here only if necessary.
Comparing Lata/Shilpa with Raakhi, one finds that though
Raakhi's uptake score is lower than either Lata's or
Shilpa's, she is able to retain more than them. Short term
recall cannot be expected to equal Long-term retention.

Lastly comparing Kusum and Nirmala's performance,
while Kusum gets 17 CI pairs correct, Nirmala has only 6 CI
pairs right. But as Nirmala has 12 Is correct (see column C)
the difference between their scores on I is only 2, that is,
Kusum 20 and Nirmala 18 (see column D). This would obscure
the difference between the ability of the two learners.
Obviously Kusum who scores high on CI pairs is a learner of
a better calibre than Nirmala.

6.3.6 Conclusion

In terms of percentages, a satisfactory amount of
uptake is retained over time. However, these figures
appear illusory when considered in relation to overall
uptake which is very little in the case of some students.

Lastly the scores of CI and I taken together also
obscure the differences in real learning.

6.3.7 Interpreting Chart PI (ii)

To get a proper insight into the PI test performance,
it is necessary to also take into account Chart PI (ii)
which presents learners' performance in relation to
unclaimed words. A look at this chart shows, for example, the outstanding performance of Kusum. While she retained all the 20 claimed words, she also retained the remaining 12 unclaimed ones. Her score is therefore 100 per cent considering both claimed and unclaimed words. What is more remarkable is that Kusum gets 27 (out of the 32) words right in the contextualised passages (that is 27 CI pairs) which is substantial evidence of her grasp of each of these words. Mamta's performance needs to be viewed in relation to both charts too (PI (i) and PI (ii)). She is the only learner who attended Lessons 1 - 6 (not missing any). She uptook 9 words and retained 8 (getting all 8 correct in the context passages). Of the 24 unclaimed words, she retained 19 (getting 18 correct in the context passages). Thus she had 26 CI pairs (which includes claimed and unclaimed words). Kusum as discussed above had 27 CI pairs. But while Kusum's claimed figure was 20 (retention also 20) Mamta's claimed total was 9 (retention 8). The researcher strongly suspects that Mamta is the kind of learner who paid attention and absorbed the maximum but could not recall it right away in the uptake list. She needed, perhaps, what Prabhu calls an "incubation period" (Prabhu 1980). To recognise only that aspect of Mamta's performance which relates to uptake and ignore the rest is rather unfair. If there were more learners like Mamta (and perhaps there are a few), then the
very usefulness of 'uptake' as a research instrument would be subject to doubt. If 'uptake' is (as defined earlier) what a learner claims she has learned, Mamta may have in her heart of hearts felt that she had learned more than she was able to record immediately. There may also have been a few words she already knew and so did not deliberately record. Her classroom behaviour however suggests that she did not know most words. She paid attention and absorbed them during class time and is likely to have learned them between the teaching and the PI test through sheer application and reinforcement. Chart PI (ii) shows the gains (words not claimed as uptake but nevertheless stamped on the unconscious mind, retained and brought to the surface at the PI tests). One is unfortunately not sure how far these are real gains because it cannot be established whether the learner knew the words before the teaching sessions.

Another interesting aspect worth looking into is how mere presence at a teaching session can be almost meaningless, in the case of some learners. For example, Kamleshwari was present at the teaching sessions when 30 words out of the 32 (in the tests) figured in the discourse. She was able to uptake 13 but retained only 5. As against this Sumitra was present in only 1 lesson (Lesson 4) where 11 of the 32 words were presented. Of these 11, she could uptake 4 and retained 2. (Thus, Kamleshwari 5 out of 32, Sumitra 2 out of 32).
the final analysis however, Sumitra's score when seen in relation to uptake is higher. (Sumitra 50 per cent and Kamleshwari 38.5 per cent). Similarly Sumitra has a higher percentage on unclaimed words than Kamleshwari (Sumitra 31.3 per cent; Kamleshwari 6.3 per cent). Thus, a learner present in only one lesson has scored higher than the one who was absent in only one\textsuperscript{4} lesson.

6.3.8 Interpreting Chart PI (iii)

Finally, chart PI (iii) presents the PI test results in relation to uptake but this time in terms of each word in order to see

1) why individual words that had been uptaken by individual learners could not be retained over time.

2) if words that ranked high on the uptake count (that is were uptaken by a larger number of learners) were correspondingly ranked high on the retention measure (the PI tests).

6.4 Uptake: Assignment of Meaning: Retention

Studying the uptake lists of individual learners in relation to their performance at the PI tests the following counts are noted.

\textsuperscript{4} Figures here relate to only lessons 1-6.
(i) Ninety five uptaken words which had been assigned meanings at the uptake stage were retained (matched correctly with their meanings) at the PI test.

(ii) As against this, only 29 words that had been recalled without a meaning being assigned to them were retained and matched correctly at the PI test.

This clearly suggests that an uptaken word has a far better chance of being retained over time, if the learner has been able to understand its meaning and express it at the uptake stage.

The study of individual uptake in relation to test results further provides the following figures.

(iii) Fifty four reporters who had assigned meanings to words claimed as uptake were able to get them right on the contextualised passage as well as on the isolated word list. (That is CI pairs).

(iv) As against this only 14 reporters who had not assigned meanings to recalled words could get CI pairs right.

This is further evidence to suggest that if a learner uptakes a word along with its meaning, then retention over time is facilitated.
It appears, therefore, that lexical uptake without uptake of meaning is likely to be of little value.

It is therefore significant that recall of the meaning (where possible) of uptaken items was a part of the design of this research study which was not the case in the earlier study on uptake, namely (Slimani 1987).

6.4.1 Possible reasons for failing to retain uptaken lexical items

Each of the 32 uptaken words which formed the test content may now be examined to understand the possible reasons why individual learners failed to retain them over time.

Insignificant (Retained by 88.9 per cent uptakers)

From among 9 learners who uptook the word, 8 were able to retain it over time. Asha alone failed to do so. It is difficult to say why she failed. However, it is encouraging to note that "insignificant" had a high rate of success both at the uptake stage and at the PI test. (See discussion on relation between treatment and uptake in Chapter V).

---

5 The words are sequenced in the same order in which they were arranged in the PI tests.
**Retain** (Retained by 33.3 per cent learners who claimed it as uptake)

Out of the 12 learners who uptook this word only 4 were able to retain it. The 8 who failed have all been able to match the word with its meaning in the PS test. They have also assigned a meaning to the uptaken word in the uptake list. Their failure therefore needs to be studied in relation to classroom interaction. (See Chapter V (i)).

It is clear that the learners latched on to the teacher's response ('keep it') to Lata's question "Retain means 'keep it'?" Perhaps they made a mental note of it and did not listen to the teacher's efforts to correct her own hasty response. Hence as pointed out earlier, they wrote: 'retain' - 'keep it'.

The error was taken up at the interview session and the researcher attempted to show them how 'keep it' just could not be substituted for 'retain' in the given sentence. (See Interview with students following Lesson 4, lines 196–223).

It was perhaps a rude shock to some, such as Mamta, to have made such a mistake. They were probably a little upset and unanimously blamed the teacher. (See lines 208–210).
In later interviews the researcher has attempted to drive home the need to listen to all that the teacher says instead of just the first few words.

The instance discussed above points to the learners' poor grasp of syntax. It also points to the need to teach them learning strategies and study skills.

What is significant is that it is just possible that the state of psychological upset resulting from the realisation of the nature of the error committed, may have wiped off the word from the learners' minds.

If this be so, then the probing done at the interview session, though it served to make learners aware of the nature of the error perhaps proved detrimental in the long run.

*Regard* (Retained by 14.3 per cent learners who claimed it as uptake)

Only 1 learner was able to retain 'regard'. One of the possible reasons why 6 learners who uptook the word failed to retain it may be the fact that 'regard' was not included in the PS test. Thus the reinforcement which is likely to be provided by the matching (word with meaning) task in the PS test was missing.

Another reason may be that 2 of the 6 learners who failed to retain the word had not assigned it a meaning in the uptake list. It has already been pointed out how the
ability to express the meaning of a word at the uptake stage, facilitates retention of uptake. As the 2 learners were not able to assign a meaning to the word 'regard' it may be that the word had not registered well enough with them for recognition in the future.

Yet another point to take account of is the fact that it was primarily the context meaning 'to think of' (regarded - thought of) which had been focussed on during the teaching session. (See Lesson 1, lines 613-637) and it was this meaning that is likely to have been uptaken along with the word. In the PI test C however, the general meaning of 'regard' 'look at' is listed and the context meaning is omitted. This may have puzzled learners and posed a problem in matching the word with its meaning.

**Concentration** (Retained by 60 per cent of the learners who claimed it as uptake)

Six out of 10 learners who uptook the word 'concentration' were able to retain it. Among the 4 who failed to retain it, 2 learners, namely Kalpana and Lata had neither been able to assign it a meaning, nor did they match the word with its meaning in the PS test. Thus the word had not registered well enough for long term retention. Both learners had not grasped the meaning sufficiently well. This perhaps explains why they were merely able to uptake
the word following the large amount of treatment it received and the learning opportunities created by classroom interaction. Purnima, the third learner who failed to retain the word over time, had also failed to assign it a meaning at the uptake stage. She had however matched it correctly in the PS test. The fourth learner, Neeru who failed on long term retention had actually assigned the word its meaning and had matched it correctly on the PS test. It is difficult to explain why she failed to retain it over time.

Thus, inability to assign meaning to the uptaken word may be one of the reasons for the absence of long term retention as in the case of the 3 out of 4 learners discussed above.

**Rapid** (Retained by 44.4 per cent learners who claimed it as uptake)

Four out of 9 who uptook the word retained it until the PI test. Surprisingly all the 5 who failed had recalled the word with its meaning and also matched it correctly in the PS test. It is therefore difficult to say why they failed at long term retention.

Three learners who failed, (Kalpana, Neeru and Lata) had also failed to retain 'concentration'. The same 3 learners had failed at the retention of 'retain' and the next word 'absorb' to be discussed below. It may therefore be that some learners do not process input at a deeper level (See 8.5.2.3) and so fail to retain it.
**Absorb** (40 per cent learners who claimed it as uptake retained it)

Four uptakers succeeded, 6 failed at the PI test to match 'absorb' with its meaning. Of the 6 who failed, Kalpana and Purnima had not been able to assign a meaning to the word at the uptake stage. This, to some extent, explains their failure at the PI test.

A look at the tapescript shows that at the moment the teacher was trying to put across the meaning of 'absorb', Purnima was sidetracked by the word 'verse' and successfully drew the teacher's attention to her query. Apparently, Purnima was not paying attention to the teacher's treatment of the word 'absorb'. As a result, she could neither assign the meaning to it at the uptake stage nor could she match it correctly at the PI test. (See Lesson 3, lines 341-42).

Secondly, the given meaning 'take in' is a phrasal verb and therefore difficult to grasp.

Thirdly, Neeru, Kalpana, Lata (as pointed out above) and Kamleshwari as her performance on several words at the PI test shows, appear basically unable to retain items.

**Neglect** (66.7 per cent learners retained this word)

Out of 6 learners who uptake the word, 4 were able to retain it, 2 learners failed to do so. Both of them had
assigned the word its meaning in the uptake list and both had matched it correctly in the PS test. The two who failed are Raakhi and Rekha. What is surprising is that Raakhi had asked the teacher for the meaning of 'neglect' which the teacher then elicited from Kusum. Though Kusum said 'Not have care for', and the teacher repeated it, Raakhi heard 'not have careful'. This is evident from the meaning assigned to the uptaken word by Raakhi. As Raakhi did not come for the interview after Lesson 4, she could not get feedback on her error in listening. It may be recalled (See Chapter V) that several learners' uptake of this word had to be rejected as they had spelled the word incorrectly. Even though 6 learners had been able to uptake it, the spelling difficulty may have hindered long-term retention.

Obtain (66.7 per cent learners retained the word)

Again 4 out of 6 learners who uptook the word, retained it. Of the 2 learners who failed to retain it, one had not attempted the PS test and so did not avail of the reinforcement it may have provided. The other learner is Neeru, who (as already pointed out) failed several times at long term retention. (See 8.5.2.3 in this connection).
Selfless (83.34 per cent learners retained this word)

Five learners were able to retain the uptaken word 'selfless'. One learner, namely, Kalpana failed. She had however assigned a meaning to it in the uptake list. As the word was not included in the PS test, the opportunity of reinforcement which the PS test might have provided was missing. Whether the reinforcement would have helped retention is however difficult to say with certainty. As pointed out earlier Kalpana has failed to retain several of the uptaken words. At any rate, the fact that 83.34 per cent learners retained the word over time is encouraging. The very composition of the word may have aided retention.

Principles (Retention 100 per cent)

Only 2 learners had uptaken the word 'principles'. Both retained it.

Adult (55.6 per cent learners retained the word)

Five learners retained the uptaken word, 4 failed - Kamleshwari, Shilpa, Purnima and Rekha. The first two had earlier failed to assign a meaning to the uptaken word. The third could not match it correctly in the PS test. These factors may have been responsible for the failure of specific learners.
Lacking in (25 per cent of the learners were able to retain 'lacking in')

Six learners failed to retain the expression. Only 2 succeeded. The 6 who failed at long-term retention had assigned the word a meaning at the uptake stage. This was the first meaning given by the teacher in class, namely, 'be without'. Later the teacher had also said 'do not have'. They also matched the expression correctly in the PS test. The given expression at the PS test was 'lack in' and the meaning to be matched was 'be without, not have'. It is very likely that the learners did not take note of 'not have' but merely recorded 'be without' in their minds. In the PI test, the meaning that learners were expected to match with 'lacking in' was 'not having'. Learners faulty study strategies discussed earlier (for example, here, latching on to the first meaning given by the teacher) may be a crucial, if not the only factor, responsible for the inability to absorb the word. To be retained over time, a word has necessarily to be better grasped and its meaning processed at a deeper level.

Prosperous (100 per cent retention).

Alter (33.3 per cent learners retained 'alter').

Two learners succeeded while 4 failed to retain this word. The 4 learners who failed are Neeru, Lata, Shilpa and Mamta.
One of the reasons for their failure may be the fact that the word 'alter' was not included in the PS test and so the reinforcement opportunity was missing.

While the names of the first 3 learners often figure among those who fail at the PI test, Mamta's has appeared for the first time and therefore it may be advisable to scan both lessons tapescript data and interview data to see if anything may have hindered retention.

From the interview with learners after Lesson 2, it appears that the example of a dress which needs to be 'altered' had helped learners to remember the word 'alter', but the mother tongue meaning which the learners processed from it was not appropriate. This was brought to light not in the uptake sheets where learners wrote 'change' as the meaning, but in the interviews where they uttered the mother tongue expression अद्धली करना. Unfortunately the erroneous meaning did not register on the researcher while interviewing the learners on account of her preoccupation with several contributions that were being made simultaneously. It was after the interview that the researcher recalled how learners had equated 'alter' with अद्धली करना. Thereupon it was decided to take up the issue at a later interview. (See interview following Lesson 4, lines 261-288). Here, some students equated 'alter' 'to change' with अद्धली करना, which
is nearer 'exchange'. Others said, सुधारना which is 'to improve'. It must be observed that it was the context of the example given by the teacher, namely, altering a dress which is tight/loose that brought the above meanings to the learners' minds. The researcher attempted to explain that बदलना was 'to exchange' rather than 'to alter', and that 'change' and 'exchange were different words. Mamta herself had said बदलना. Perhaps, 'to alter', 'to change' and बदलना/बदलना may be acceptable as equivalents in some other context but not in the context of the example given and hence the difficulty of resolving the issue satisfactorily.

The interaction at the interview session around these words in English and Hindi was therefore rather unsatisfactory and it may be that learners' realisation of having wrongly processed the meaning may have led to some amount of psychological frustration and consequently a loss of their earlier hold on the word at the uptaking stage.

**Amenities** (100 per cent retention).

**Owing to** (100 per cent retention).

This word was retained by all the 4 learners who had earlier claimed it as uptake. (See discussion on poor uptake in Chapter V (vi).)
Exhilaration and Expensive (100 per cent retention)

1 and 2 learners respectively uptook each word and retained it until the PI test.

Inconceivable (57.1 per cent learners retained this word)

Four learners retained the word they had earlier listed as uptake. Three failed to retain it. Of these three, 2 had failed to assign a meaning to their uptake which suggests a weak grasp of the word and perhaps explains absence of retention.

Further the meaning of this word was given in the form of a rather unsatisfactory paraphrase - 'a thing you cannot think of'. The examples that followed may have helped to drive the meaning home and so led to uptake of the word. But the unsatisfactory paraphrase probably failed to aid long-term retention. Moreover, in the PI test the meaning given was 'something you cannot imagine'. The word 'imagine' may be unfamiliar to learners. Further the context of the test passage in which the word appeared may also have been unfamiliar. It has already been pointed out that 3 of the test passages employed familiar context while the context of the fourth passage may have been unfamiliar to the learners.
In succession (33.3 per cent learners retained this word).

Only 3 learners succeeded while 6 failed to retain this word. Of these 6, 3 had not been able to match the word with its meaning in the PS test, 2 others had failed to assign a meaning to the word in the uptake list. Hence 5 out of 6 cases had apparently a weaker grasp of the word than those who retained it.

Incomparable (100 per cent retention)

All 4 learners who uptook the word also retained it. (See Chapter V for discussion on poor uptake of the word).

Declare (57.1 per cent learners retained this word).

From among those who had claimed 'declare' as uptake 4 learners retained this word, 3 failed to do so. These 3 have assigned the word a meaning in the uptake list and have also matched it correctly in the PS test. Therefore the possible reasons for their failure need to be studied.

Perhaps it is necessary to recall the classroom interaction while the word was presented and the attempts that were made by learners to negotiate its meaning. (See Chapter V). The meaning given by the teacher was 'say' and later 'say in public'. At no stage had the teacher offered the meaning 'state' or given examples of how the word is used in day to day situations. As most learners had been
familiar with what the word connotes in cricket and not sure whether the word had another meaning, they had a genuine problem which the teacher was in too much haste to resolve satisfactorily. This is apparent from the learners' complaints at the interview sessions too. First, they could not fit the cricket meaning in the context of the lesson. Second, as the teacher gave the meaning 'said in public', and as 'declare in cricket too is in public', learners remained uncertain whether there were 2 different words or different meanings of the same word in different contexts. Left unresolved, the learning opportunity did not register well enough to lead to long-term recall. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that the word and its more general meaning 'state' had hardly registered so as to be retained over time.

It has already been pointed out (see Chapter V) that 7 learners were able to uptake the word because the meaning given by the teacher, namely, 'say' is an easily statable and graspable word. Further the associations of 'declare' with cricket may also have facilitated short-term recall.

Note (28.6 per cent learners retained this word)

Only 2 learners succeeded in retaining this word; 5 failed. Though, they had all assigned a meaning to the uptaken word, the fact that it was not included in the PS test meant a reinforcement opportunity lost and hence perhaps a weaker hold on the word.
Furthermore, it appears that although the interaction on this word made it salient for immediate recall, the confused presentation of the meaning caused failure of long-term retention. The following excerpt from the tapescript shows that the teacher is thinking on her feet.

T To see. We must remember, we must see. 'Note' is to see. 'Note' is to keep in mind. Remember, yes, but we must also realise, we must know, we must know that is take great care to see properly. We must know. hm?

Kusum To keep in mind.

T To keep in mind. We must see. First, we must see and then keep in mind, both. See and remember.

The meaning finally given is 'see and remember' and this was the meaning given in the PI test for matching. However, the rambling fashion in which it was arrived at in the classroom deprived it of the focus that might have aided long-term recall.

The inherent difficulty of giving a meaning equivalent to certain words must however be remembered. Apparently, it was this difficulty that the teacher had to face.
Effort (33.3 per cent learners retained this word).

Again 2 learners succeeded while 4 failed to retain the word. This word too was not included in the PS test and hence a special form of reinforcement was absent. Kalpana, one of the 4 who failed to retain the word, had in addition failed earlier to assign a meaning to the uptaken word, which is some evidence of the fact that the word had not registered fully with her.

Further at the uptake stage too the word had posed a problem (see discussion in Chapter V) probably because a single noun equivalent is not available.

To avoid repetition, the retention or otherwise of some words is not discussed. These are instances where failure of some learners to retain a word may be attributable to (1) absence of reinforcement through the PS test (2) meaning not being assigned to the word at the uptake stage and (3) the possibility that some learners do not process input at a deeper level and hence fail to retain it over time. The words not discussed are:

Illiterate, principal, literate, compassion, disservice, anti-social, exhibit, co-operative.

6.5 Conclusions
(a) (i) Only 4 learners have below average retention (that is below 35 per cent).
Four learners have retention scores between 40 and 50 per cent.

The remaining 8 learners (that is half the total number) have very high retention scores (that is between 60 and 100 per cent).

(ii) Similarly, 7 words were retained by less than 35 per cent of the claimants. Eight words were retained by between 40 and 60 per cent learners who had claimed them as uptake. The remaining 17 words (that is more than half) were retained by 60 per cent or more of the claimants.

(b) But scores in terms of percentages tend to obscure individual gains and even create an illusion of glorious successes. (See discussion in 6.3.5.1). Moreover CI is very different from I.

(c) A more realistic picture emerges when individual cases are compared keeping in mind the amount of uptake of each learner on the number of lessons attended.

(d) Those who have high uptake scores do not necessarily retain more claimed items over time. In other words, short and long term recall cannot be equated.
(e) Some learners may have uptaken certain words subconsciously and may not have been able to claim them as uptake (which is necessarily conscious recall). Such learners may be able to identify words after a lapse of time, that is at the PI test. It must be remembered that the PI test tasks required the skill of identification of word and meaning not expression of meaning as was expected earlier in the uptake list.

(though as an additional task).

(f) If it is accepted that learning requires a period of incubation and some of the learners (at least one in the present study) have during such a period of time been able to assimilate certain lexical items (which they could not earlier claim as uptake), then their gain needs recognition. The notion of 'uptake' may not be of much value for such learners. It may on the other hand be useful for others whom conscious recall helps towards long-term retention.

(g) It is difficult to say whether an item not listed as uptake but successfully identified on the PI test was known to the learner before the teaching session
or was encountered for the first time during the teaching period and brought up to the conscious memory after lying in the subconscious for some time.

(h) It is hardly fair to compare the test performance of a learner regularly absent with that of a learner regularly present for the teaching sessions. Data in these cases is too scanty for drawing conclusions.

(i) A word claimed as uptake has a far better chance of being retained over time if the learner has been able to assign it a meaning. Lexical uptake without uptake of meaning is of little value.

(j) If an item claimed as uptake is also included in the PS test, it gets reinforced when the learner successfully matches it with its meaning. The possibility of retaining such an item is thus greater.

(k) Items claimed as uptake that were not included in the PS test had a lesser chance of being retained.

(l) Lexical items which are not satisfactorily taught are less easily retained even if these are uptaken by a large number of learners. Classroom interaction may have highlighted them for uptake and short-term retention.
To be retained over time, a learner's grasp of the item has to be more thorough than for 'uptake' (which is immediate recall and perhaps short term retention). For this reason the assignment of meaning to the item (claimed as uptake) helps to consolidate it and success at the PS test (if the item is included there) helps to reinforce the item.

Reinforcement in some form seems essential for the retention of claimed items. Eight out of 11 words (from among those in the PI test) which had the category 'Deliberate Reinforcement' as one of the treatment categories used, were retained by a large majority (that is 60 or over 60 per cent learners).

 Failure in the PI tests may sometimes be due to the fact that the meaning equivalent was phrased differently in the PS and PI tests or differently phrased (in the PI) from the way the teacher phrased it during the class sessions.

As specific learners tend to do better on uptake than on long-term recall, it may be that 'uptake' is nearer Krashen's concept of 'learning' which according to Krashen (1980) is: "often fast and obvious" while acquisition is "slow and subtle".
Words with intangible equivalents, phrasal verb equivalents, for example, 'absorb' - 'take in' are, perhaps, difficult to retain.

The main reasons for learners not being able to get CI pairs right at the PI tests have already been pointed out. (See 6.3.1.2). It may be reiterated that contextualized passages were never set at PS tests. Further, hardly any practice could be given even in contextualised sentences with slots. The only occasion when most learners encountered this test format was after Lesson 6. Their absurd responses already discussed in Chapter III indicate how totally unprepared they were for such a task. This lack of training is therefore the main reason for failure to handle the contextualized test passages at the PI tests.

Three out of the four passages set at the PI test used familiar context while the context of the fourth may have been unfamiliar. What is disconcerting however is that apparently learners do not read a paragraph as a whole. They probably proceed sentence by sentence, perhaps from one slot to the next and fill in words at random. This is evident from the performance specially of those learners who got only Cs correct (that is they filled in the right words
occasionally in the slots but failed to match their meanings in the individual word list). It is for this reason that the discussion and the charts have excluded correct Cs.

6.6 Results of the Experimental and Non-experimental Groups Compared (See 5.6)

At the PI test, the average score of Is obtained by the experimental group was 16.87, while the average score of their classmates, the non-experimental group was 13.31. Thus it may be that training in conscious recall, the teaching and the interview sessions had made the experimental group score over their classmates who did not get any such training.

Learners' performance at the PS and PI tests has been discussed and interpreted in relation to uptake. Before moving on to the pedagogical implications which are presented in the next chapter, it may be appropriate to see if learners' test performance suggests any rating in terms of achievement groups and whether such groups have any characteristic patterns of interaction behaviour.

6.7 Rating Learners in Terms of Achievement

Learners' performance at the uptake stage, PS tests and finally the PI tests has made it possible to group them in terms of achievement. It is perhaps possible to group
these learners under average, above average and under-
average achievers in relation to each other.

Thus Kusum, Nirmala, Anjou and Mamta\textsuperscript{6} may be
regarded as above-average. Lata, Raakhi, Shilpa and
Virbala\textsuperscript{7} as average. Neeru, Kamleshwari, Purnima and
Kalpana as below-average. Rekha, Sumitra, Neelkamal and
Asha have been excluded from the grouping as their frequent
absence from classes makes it difficult to gauge their
performance.

6.7.1 Achievement groups and pattern of participation

According to Allwright (1988(a)) it is the average
achievers who ask the most questions. The under achievers
are afraid of ridicule while the above average fear that
others may think they are showing off.

How far is this true of the above groups? It is to
a great extent true of the under-achievers who hardly speak
except Purnima who may occasionally ask the meaning of a word.

\textsuperscript{6}Mamta's name has been included in this group taking
into account her retention scores in relation to both
claimed and unclaimed words.

\textsuperscript{7}Virbala has been put among the average achievers
even though her retention percentage is high. This is
because her uptake is very little.
The above-average group is fairly characteristic in the way they participate in the interaction. They generally respond to questions asked and in this way their contributions create learning opportunities. This is true especially of Kusum and Mamta. Anjou is however generally quiet. Nirmala, on the other hand, sometimes behaves as the average achievers do, checking, for example, on the pronunciation of 'quite' (Lesson 6, line 490) or urging the teacher to give an example which would help her process the meaning of 'consequently' (Lesson 6, line 472) or bluntly tells the teacher she does not understand the meaning of 'hand to mouth'.

All the learners grouped as average achievers, do ask questions. Lata, for example, asks

1) 'Retain means 'keep it'? (Lesson 4, line 238).
2) Whether 'declare' meant 'declare' as in cricket.
   (Lesson 5, lines 181-182).

Raakhi asks the meaning of words and has no inhibitions in repeating her query until she has succeeded in drawing the teacher's attention. For example,

1) the meaning of 'absorb' (Lesson 3, lines 330, 332).
2) the meaning of 'harvest' (Lesson 6, lines 278, 281).

Virbala speaks a great deal. Quite often she offers a mother tongue equivalent or checks on the mother tongue
meaning which she knows. At times her contribution is not quite relevant and she is even silenced by the teacher. Shilpa is relatively less vocal. This suggests that the participation characteristics discussed above are not strictly attributable to particular achievement groups but may be regarded as general tendencies of the groups.

The average achievers are also vocal at interview sessions. However as interview sessions were informal and learners were allowed to speak in Hindi, they generally contributed without inhibitions. Further, as interview groups were smaller and those who got on with one another generally kept together, they spoke much more freely than in the class sessions.

Next, the more vocal learners are not necessarily high achievers. The above discussion clearly suggests that the more vocal belong to the average group.

Further, even though for convenience both Kusum and Nirmala have been placed in the above-average group, they are learners of different calibre. Kusum scores high on CI pairs while Nirmala scores high only on I.

This chapter has discussed learners' test performance and drawn certain conclusions from it. In addition to this learners' classroom interaction behaviour has been discussed
in relation to their achievement in the PI test and their uptake. The next chapter presents the pedagogical implications drawn from the study.