CHAPTER 5

5.1. THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING SITUATION AT THE PRE UNIVERSITY LEVEL IN KARNATAKA.

5.1.1. Statistical Information of Students performance in the II PUC English Examination from 1987 to 1993

NOTE: The following statistics pertain to public examination results prevailing prior to moderation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER APPEARED</th>
<th>NUMBER PASSED</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF PASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>April 1987</td>
<td>111802</td>
<td>42026</td>
<td>37.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>April 1988</td>
<td>185840</td>
<td>61979</td>
<td>28.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>April 1989</td>
<td>212500</td>
<td>90542</td>
<td>42.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>April 1990</td>
<td>265071</td>
<td>123196</td>
<td>46.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>April 1991</td>
<td>244765</td>
<td>134873</td>
<td>55.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>April 1992</td>
<td>282460</td>
<td>105289</td>
<td>37.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>April 1993</td>
<td>304412</td>
<td>142194</td>
<td>46.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Courtesy: PU Board, Government of Karnataka

5.1.2. The Questionnaire:

An analysis was attempted of the English language teaching and learning situation at the PU level in Karnataka via a questionnaire distributed to 125 lecturers teaching students at the +2 stage. The objectives of the questionnaire were to find out the teachers' attitudes to English language teaching at the +2 stage, their aims and objectives, the teaching strategies/methodologies employed by them and other relevant information. The questionnaire took into consideration the following factors:
a) The importance of teaching and learning English.
b) The present PUC syllabus and curriculum.
c) The present PUC textbook.
d) ELT methodology (old and new).
e) The PU Student.
f) The PUC classroom situation.
g) The present evaluation pattern.
h) Teacher's suggestions for bringing about an improvement in the English language teaching and learning situation at the PU level.

While distributing the questionnaires the need for a heterogeneous representation was borne in mind. Questionnaires were posted to select rural independent junior/composite colleges. Some of the questionnaires were distributed at the time of the PUC valuation, preference being given to lecturers from rural colleges. Lecturers in colleges in and around Bangalore were approached personally and requested to fill out the questionnaires. Some of the questionnaires were returned incomplete. Collecting the filled in questionnaires entailed repeated visits to several city colleges and ultimately only 40 filled in questionnaires were returned. These have been processed and analysed. A sample of the questionnaire has been included under appendix 3.

5.1.3. Teachers' Work experience and Training:

The first six questions elicited factual information about the teachers' experience, the type of college they were working in and the training program/course(s) (if any) attended by them.
No. of lecturers who responded

- No. of lecturers teaching in rural college: 16 (40%)
- No. of lecturers teaching in urban colleges: 24 (60%)
- Average teaching experience at the PU level: 17 Years
- Average teaching experience at the PU level: 11-12 years
- % of lecturers who attended training/orientation Program(s)/Course(s): 37.5%
- Rural trained: 22.5%
- Urban trained: 15%
- % of lecturers who had not attended any kind of training/orientation Program(s)/course(s): 62.5%

The average teaching experience of the teachers at the PU level being 11-12 years, their views and opinions can be taken to be fairly insightful. A disconcerting fact to be noted is that a large percentage of lecturers have not been exposed to any kind of systematic training in the teaching of English. Those teaching in rural colleges seem to take a keener interest in various reorientation courses in comparison with their urban counterparts. Perhaps this is due to the greater difficulties faced by the rural teacher in the teaching of English in view of the very poor standards of the rural student.

5.1.4. Training/Orientation program/courses for PUC Teachers

Question Nos 7 & 8.

These two questions attempted to find out about the various training courses/programs attended by the lecturers and their duration. The following courses were specified:

a) Orientation courses held periodically by the PUC Board.

b) English language teaching courses offered by the Regional Institute of English at Bangalore and Mysore.

c) Postgraduate diploma and certificate courses in the teaching of English, Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad.
The duration of these courses ranged from 3 days to 2 years.

1.5. The Postgraduate (MA) English syllabus in relation to the Teaching of English.

Question No. 9 relates to English language teaching papers at the M.A. level, i.e., does the post graduate syllabus make provisions for instructing students in the teaching of English to learners at the post-school levels. It is a logical surmise that most of the post graduate English students are likely to take up teaching posts in independent junior/composite/first grade colleges. Only 42.5% of the lecturers had English language teaching papers at the M.A. level. The rest (57.5%) had no English language teaching papers at the M.A. level. This seems a serious omission and it is hoped that syllabus framers will take notice of this fact and rectify the situation.

5.1.6. How Satisfied are Teachers with the ELT situation:

Question Nos 10 & 11 focus on the level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction expressed by teachers with the English language teaching situation at the +2 stage and the reasons for their satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Not responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The response to this question evidently points to the overwhelming dissatisfaction prevalent among teachers with the present teaching/learning trends at the PU level.

**Reasons given for Satisfaction:**

a) The PUC texts are comprehensive, dealing with all aspects of the language.

b) The standard of the PUC English texts is appropriate as it has kept in mind the average student.

c) The syllabus/textbooks are interesting as it covers a good deal of varied topics.

d) The short answer comprehension questions give students a chance to think independently.

The area of satisfaction seems to be solely the textbook. But a vital aspect of the question, i.e., the overall teaching/learning situation, has not been a source of satisfaction at all.

**Reasons given for dissatisfaction:**

a) The English syllabi is alien to student with a rural background.

b) The present English teaching methodology is defective.

c) Rural students, having too poor a command over English, cannot follow the lecturer.

d) The time allotted for completion of the syllabus is insufficient.

e) Classes are overcrowded, the result being that:
   - it prevents effective teaching of English.
   - it prevents teachers from giving appropriate attention to weak students.
- it prevents teachers from getting feedback from students.
- the scope for teacher-student interaction is severely curtailed.

f) A single syllabus/set of textbooks cannot cater to the varied language competencies/needs of all students.

g) The textbook is defective.

h) Students do not bring the prescribed textbooks.

i) Students do not attend classes regularly.

j) There is no linguistic oriented teaching.

k) Students are not motivated to do well in English.

l) There is the inhibition of the mother tongue.

s) Present classroom teaching do not enable students to speak the language nor does it meet their language needs out of the class.

5.1.7. **The need to teach English:**

Question Nos. 12, 13 & 14 emphasised the relevancy of teaching English at the PU level.

Question No.12 asked teachers if they thought the teaching and learning of English was necessary and relevant for PU students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers are unanimous about the necessity of teaching and learning English at the PU level. But a very small percentage of
Teachers felt that it was not necessary for all the students as
evaded by the response to question no.13 below, though the
majority did put forth the view that all students need to study
English.

Question No.13: English is necessary and relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For all students in urban and rural</th>
<th>Only for those students whose basic command over the language is below average</th>
<th>Only for those students intending to study further</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No.14 dealt with the need to learn English in India.
Teachers were given the option of choosing between two
alternatives as well as stating any other reasons that they
might think of. The two alternatives were:
1) It is a link language within India as well as an international Language.
2) It will enable students to do better in their optional subjects by reading and comprehending books containing specialized information which is not available at present in Indian languages.
3) Any other reason.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>a and b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other reasons forwarded were:

a) It widens students' job opportunities.
b) It widens students' outlook.

An analysis of the above response reveals that the need to study English was felt at two major levels:
- for the purpose of communication.
- for academic purposes.

Most of the lecturers feel the need to stress both aspects—communicative as well as academic.

5.1.8. The PUC English Syllabus:

Question Nos. 15, 16, 17 & 18 pertain to the PUC English syllabus.

5.1.8.1. The Syllabus apropos to Differential Student Needs:

Question 15: Would you like a more flexible PUC English syllabus which gives you the freedom to choose teaching materials to suit the needs of your students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No. 16: Do you think the PUC English syllabus, textbooks and language teaching at the PU level meet the varied language needs of PU students who are likely to join various professional and academic courses or even take up a variety of jobs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The response to Question No.15 clearly indicated a strong inclination towards a more flexible syllabus but paradoxically 30% of the lecturers who had answered 'yes' to question No.15 had also answered 'yes' to question No.16. They want a more flexible syllabus to cater to the different language needs of students. This implies that they feel the present syllabus is too rigid and does not cater to relevant student needs. At the same time they think that the present English syllabus and textbook do meet the various language needs of students. So in answering question No.16 they contradict what they have said in question 15. But we do observe that the response to question 16 indicates the general discontent prevalent among teachers with regard to the English syllabus and textbooks.

Question 17 asked teachers what other items they wanted included as part of the PUC English syllabus and they responded as follows:

a) Drafting and composition/essays.
b) Spoken English/dialogue practice.
c) comprehension paragraphs on similar lines as given in the question paper.
d) language games.
e) Increase in the grammar exercises/work books.
f) Phonetics and linguistics.
g) Precis writing and paraphrasing.
h) More stories/poems with an Indian setting.
1) Correction of errors.
2) Abridged Shakespearean plays.
3) Easily readable interesting stories.

5.1.8.2. Enabling Students to think/work independently:
Question No.18 asked teacher whether they wanted the PUC English syllabus to provide a greater scope for the student to think and work independently with minimal guidance from the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently teachers do want students to develop the ability to think and work independently. At present there is too much of 'spoonfeeding' with teachers doing all the work and students sitting passively.

5.1.9. The PUC Syllabus vis-a-vis the language needs of the Students.

Question Nos. 19 & 20 were related to the language needs of the PU STUDENTS.

Question 19: Do you think the English needs of PU Arts, Commerce and Science students are the same?
Q uestion 20: If you think language needs differ would you suggest different syllabi and texts appropriate to their needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though 60% of the teachers agreed that language needs of PU arts, commerce and science students differed, only 52.5% felt that this problem of varied language needs could be solved by opting for different syllabi and texts.

5.1.10 The Teachers' Aims and Objectives:

Question Nos. 21, 22, 23, 24 & 25 were related to the time allotted for English language teaching, the teachers' aims and objectives and the time spent on pre-lesson planning. English language teaching is generally categorised into two broad groups—language, i.e., the teaching of structures, vocabulary, etc. and literature. At the post-school levels the tendency is to have more of literature and less of language work.
Question No.21 drew teachers' attention to these two aspects of English language teaching.

Question No.21: At the PU level the emphasis should be on the teaching of:
(a) Language (b) literature (c) both language and literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though a small percentage of teachers do feel that the emphasis should be solely on language work, the majority agree that the teaching of both language and literature should be given due attention.

Question No.22: Are the four hours allotted per week adequate for the effective and meaningful teaching and learning of English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response to the above question clearly reveals that the four hours allotted per week for English was found to be inadequate by most teachers for the effective teaching of English.

Question No.23: According to you the teacher should aim at:
(a) the effective and meaningful teaching of English even though this might result in the syllabus not being completed.
b) the completion of the syllabus and preparing the student for the examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a healthy predilection among teachers to concentrate on the effective and meaningful teaching of English rather than merely on the completion of the syllabus.

Question No.24: asked teachers if they kept specific objectives in mind per lesson and tried to achieve these objectives during the one hour at their disposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No.25 asked teachers how much time they spent on pre-lesson planning. The time spent ranged from 15 minutes to 4 hours. Many of them had also written that the time spent on pre-lesson planning depended upon the class/content/teaching experience.

5.1.11. The PUC English Textbooks:

Question Nos 26 to 34 focused on the PUC English textbooks in
- effective teaching of English,
- inculcation of the habit of individual work and independent thinking.
5.1.11.1. The Effective Teaching of English via the Textbook

Question No.26: Do the present detailed and non-detailed textbooks enable you to teach English effectively?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large percentage of lecturers opined that the textbooks do not enable the effective teaching of English as evidenced by the above response.

Question No.27: Do the present PUC textbooks provide scope for individual work and independent thinking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses reveal that according to most teachers the present English textbooks do enable students to think and work independently. The responses to question number 26 and 27 seem contradictory. It leads one to conclude that merely making students think and work independently does not constitute effective teaching of English.

5.11.2. The Standard and Appropriateness of the Detailed Texts

Question No.28: The standard of the detailed textbooks is:
a) too low (b) appropriate (c) too high for the average PU student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard of the PUC English detailed textbooks was felt to be appropriate by a large section of the teaching population.

Question No.29 asked teachers which lessons they found inappropriate in the 1st and IIInd PUC detailed texts. The following were mentioned:

I PUC:

Prose Lessons:

His First Flight
Exploring Space
War
Shooting an Elephant

Liam O'Flaherty
Navin Sullavín
Luigi Pirandello
George Orwell
Poems:
In London Town
Vachanas
On Killing a Tree

Mary E. Coleridge
Basavanna (translated: Ramanujam)
Gieve Patel

II PUC:

Prose Lessons:
Death of a Hero
The Last March
In the News
Social Responsibilities of
Scientists
The Hour of Truth

Jai Nimbkar
Extract from Scott's diary
Extract from 'The Statesman'
Bertrand Russel
Percival Wilde

Poems:
Bankers are Just like Anybody Else
The Death of a Bird

Ogden Nash
A.D. Hope

Question No.30 asked lecturers why they found the lessons inappropriate.
The following reasons were forwarded:

I PUC
a) His First Flight:
- difficult for students to understand
- uninspiring theme
- the lesson has no specific objectives
- uninteresting
b) Exploring Space:
- obsolete and outdated
- uninteresting/dull/monotonous
- more cerebral than literary
c. War
- uninteresting
- vague
- content and subject matter is dry

d. Shooting an Elephant
- too lengthy
- the language/vocabulary is too difficult for the average student
- uninteresting

e. In London Town:
- a repetition of the Xth standard syllabus
- childish

f. Vachanas
- bad translation
- childish

g. On Killing a Tree
- vague
- students may misunderstand the inner meaning of the poem.

II PUC

a. Death of a Hero
- it influences children to violence
- encourages indecent student behaviour, especially with teachers
- students may misunderstand the inner meaning of the lesson
- It creates the idea that students can get away with any kind of prank.

b. The Last March
- uninteresting
- diary writing could be included under grammar
- students do not respond to this lesson.
c. In the News:
- uninteresting

d. Social Responsibilities of Scientists
- uninteresting
- though highly instructive it is too difficult for the average PUC student

e. The Hour of Truth
- too lengthy
- does not suit the tastes of rural students
- above the standard of the average student

f. Bankers are Just Like Anybody Else
- students whose language is not good are presented with colloquial, ungrammatical language.

g. The Death of a Bird
- vague
- subjective
- difficult to comprehend
- uninteresting

5.1.11.3. Students' Response to the Detailed Texts:
Question No.31 concerns itself with students' response to the lessons in the detailed texts: Which lessons in the detailed texts did your students enjoy and respond to most?

I PUC Text:
Almost all the lessons in the I PUC text—both prose and poetry—seemed to have evoked some kind of response from certain sections of students with the exception of the lesson 'Exploring
The prose lessons that were repeatedly singled out as potentially enjoyable were:

- An Astrologers Day
- Meet the Bennets
- Chameleon
- Playing the English Gentleman
- Further Progress in Specialization

**II PUC Text**

Most of the lessons evoked response from students, the exceptions being:

- The Last March, In the News, and The Death of a Bird

A few lessons were pointed out as being more enjoyable. These were:

- The Death of a Hero
- The Story Teller
- The Pie and the Tart
- Drought
- Pepe
- Ajanil and the Tigers

Question No.32 asked teachers the possible reasons as to why students enjoyed and responded to these lessons. The reasons given were:

a) Language is simple/content and theme is simple/easily comprehended by the students.
b) Indian setting and theme
c) Topic suitable to students' age and interest.
d) Enjoyable short stories
e) Easy to teach especially in heterogeneous classes
f) Humourous and fun to read/teach
h) We are given life-like sketches of human behaviour

i) They espouse contemporary contradictions

5.1.11.4. Deletion of Lessons in the Detailed Texts:

Question No.33: Which lessons in the detailed texts do you delete?

First an analysis was made of the percentage of teachers who deleted lessons and those who completed the entire text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers who deleted lessons</th>
<th>Teachers who did not delete any of the lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lessons generally deleted were:

I PUC Text:

Prose

His First Flight
Exploring Space
Shooting an Elephant

Poems:

In London Town
Vachanas

II PUC Text

Prose

The Death of a Hero
The Last March
In the News

Social Responsibilities of Scientists
The Hour of Truth
The Death of a Bird

Question No. 34 asked teachers to state their reasons for deleting these lessons. Many lecturers complained that question No. 30 and question No. 34 overlapped. But the intention here was to find out whether they deleted these lessons merely because they found them inappropriate or because of other reasons such as lack of time, etc. The reasons stated for deletions were the following:

a) Same reasons as those mentioned in Question No. 30
b) Lack of time.
c) For students whose language is poor too many lessons prove to be a burden.

5.1.12. ELT in the Classroom:

Question Nos. 35 to 53 covered a broad spectrum of areas related to classroom teaching:

- the teachers' familiarity with different methodologies, especially the latest.
- specific areas of difficulty encountered by the teacher.
- the language used by both teacher and students in the classroom.
- the additional instructional materials used by the teachers.
- the teachers' individual methodology.
- the teaching of grammar.
- the teaching aids used.
- home assignments given (if any).
- the compatibility of the classroom situation with language games.
5.1.12.1. The Methodology:

Question No.35: What are the different English language teaching methodologies you are familiar with?

The objective of this question was to find out how many lecturers were aware of the latest teaching methodology/techniques, i.e., CLT. The number turned out to be only five (12.5%). Of these five only three (7.5%) had specifically mentioned 'communicative teaching' or CLT. The other two had written 'Activity/Discussion Method' and 'Discourse Method'. How far this can be taken to imply CLT cannot be surmised.

A number of other old/traditional methods had been mentioned:
- Structural/situational approach (S/SA)
- Lecture Method (LM)
- Direct Method (DM)
- Grammar Translation Method (GTM)
- Bilingual Method (BM)

Question No.36: Which methodology would you advocate as being most suitable for the effective teaching and learning of English at the +2 stage? Why? This question attempted to find out whether teachers followed/wanted to follow any specific methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers who advocated a specific methodology</th>
<th>Those who stated general teaching methods</th>
<th>Not responded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general teaching methods stated were:

a) Explanation in Kannada/vernacular

b) Group work/discussion/interaction
c) Different methods for different lessons/classes

The specific methods stated were as follows:

- **Direct Method** 12.5%
- **Bilingual Method** 10%
- **Communicative Language Teaching** 2.5%
- **Grammar Translation Method** 5%
- **Structural/Situational Approach** 2.5%
- **Discourse Method** 5%
- **Lecture Method** 7.5%
- **Eclectic Approach** 2.5%

We find that there is no unanimity among teachers as to the most appropriate methodology. Perhaps this is to be expected because as one lecturer put it "every teacher has to discover his own effective method", in keeping with the standard of the students and the teaching situation.

The advantages of the above mentioned methods were enumerated by teachers as follows:

- **Direct Method**: enables large scale exposure to target language in the classroom.
- **Bilingual Method**: eases the teaching/learning process.
- **CLT/Discourse Method**: enables students communicate/use the language out of the class.
- **Grammar Translation Method**: felt to be suitable in rural areas where students have a very poor command over English.
- **Structural/Situational Approach**: enables students gain mastery over language structures.
Lecture Method: suitable for large/heterogeneous classes and facilities comprehension of texts by students.

5.1.12.2.: The Teaching of the Prose Lessons:

Both the I and II PUC detailed texts contain a short note to the teacher explaining the methodology that the teacher is expected to follow. "While dealing with the literary components of the texts it would be profitable to encourage a close study of the pieces through pointed questions and directions leading on to an interaction (where ever possible) instead of giving conventional lectures". (1st and IIInd PUC detailed English texts, 1986, Oxford University Press) The 1st PUC detailed text (Pg:xii) further states: "Students should be encouraged to read the prose passages on their own even if comprehension is only partial at this stage... the passage should be 'taught' as far as possible not through explanations, but through the use of the questions and exercises attached to the passage. This is best done through classroom discussion, and other student activities like written work. At this stage these questions and exercises should be used to help the student understand the passage by making him go back to the relevant portions of the text".

Question No.37 was aimed at ascertaining whether teachers kept to the above mentioned guidelines or not. The question had five alternatives.

Question No.37: The detailed texts are taught by you:

a) by giving a detailed explanation of the contents and making students answer questions:

b) by making the students read the contents silently/aloud and answer questions.

c) by reading the contents without explaining and making students answer questions.
d) by discussing the contents with the students and making them answer questions.

e) by picking out certain language items in the lesson, making the students use these language items in practical terms, then either reading the contents yourself or making the students read the contents and answer questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We notice that most lecturers resort to giving a detailed explanation of the prose lessons in contravention of the expectations/assumptions of the textbook designers. The low standard of English of the average PU student, especially in the rural and semi-urban areas compell teachers to explain the contents in detail.

5.1.12.3. The Teaching of Grammar:

With regard to the teaching of grammar the 1st PUC detailed text (pg xi) has this to say: "A textbook at this level has to start with the assumption that the necessary components of English grammar have already been taught to the students before they enter the pre-university course. All the same, at the end of the prose lessons some language exercises have been included for student practice and consolidation. Apart from these
exercises some areas of grammar have been explicitly dealt with. These are areas where our students are found to commit many errors. This 'grammar work' may be seen as being remedial in nature. What is important, however, is that even this grammar work should be used for practical language work rather than for any theoretical treatment of grammar... . Every lesson has a note on grammar wherein a specific point regarding its description and use is discussed in detail. Contextualised exercise materials are given for further practice. Students should be encouraged to work these exercises, along with the other language work mentioned, to help them familiarise themselves with some of the functional aspects of grammar. It would be useful to set further tasks based on the situations in the passages on similar lines”.

An analysis of question number 38 will enlighten us as to whether the above guidelines have been followed by lecturers. The question had four alternatives.

**Question No.38: You teach grammar:**

a) independent of the text, using other instructional material.
b) by putting the language in the text to grammatical and practical use.
c) by doing only those grammatical items and exercises given in the text.
d) simultaneously along with the prose lessons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A point to be noted is that most of the teachers who had marked (b) had also marked (d). Perhaps this was because they assumed that (b) and (d) had more or less similar implications. But (b) implies completion of the lesson and then picking out the structures and grammatical items from the prose lessons that the teacher feels should be taught and practised in detail. (d) implies integrating the teaching of grammar with the teaching of the contents of the prose lesson as has been attempted in the experimental lesson units designed and discussed in Chapter 6.

The response to question No.38 unmistakably points to the fact that generally is taught independent of the prose text, using other grammar textbooks, thus bellying the expectations of the textbook framers.

5.1.12.4. The Difficulties Encountered by the Teacher:

Question Nos.39 and 40 elicited information regarding the specific areas of difficulty faced by the teacher while teaching various aspects of the syllabus.

Question No.39: Which aspects of the prescribed syllabus do you have most difficulty in teaching?
(a) prose lessons (b) poems (c) non-detailed texts (d) grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>NIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No.40: Which grammar items do you find the most difficult to teach?
(a) articles (b) prepositions (c) tenses (d) changing the voice
of the verb (e) change from direct to indirect speech (f) idioms (g) question framing (h) assertive, interrogative and exclamatory sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>NOT RESPONDED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response to the above two questions directly indicate that many teachers have difficulties in teaching the grammar portions of the syllabus. In grammar the specific items which seem to pose problems are: prepositions, tenses, direct to indirect speech and idioms.

Question No. 41 asked teachers how many hours they required to complete one prose lesson. The time taken ranged from two to six hours and depended on both the teacher as well as the students in the classroom.

Question No. 42: The contents of the textbooks are explained by you:
(a) only in English (b) only in Kannada (c) in both English and Kannada.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urban
Rural

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As evident from the above most teachers resort to the bilingual method - using both Kannada as well as English. This is done not only by teachers in rural colleges but also by those in Urban colleges.

**Question No.43:** You: (a) permit your students to speak and answer in Kannada in English classes. (b) insist that students speak and answer in English only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though teachers often use the vernacular to ease the process of comprehension, most of them do not permit students to use the same in the class. This is a healthy trend, because if both teacher and student regress back to communicating in Kannada in English classes it is to be feared that very little English will be learnt by the student.

**Question No.44** focussed upon the development of writing skills - an area of vital importance from the perspective of the Indian student.

**Question No.44:** Your students are made to write:

a) in every English class (b) in most English Classes (c) only in grammar classes.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately teachers do not insist that students should be made to write in each and every English class. It seems that due attention
is not being paid to the development of the writing skills in students. It is not surprising that the students' ability to write in English has deteriorated over the years.

5.1.12.6. The Use of Extra Instructional Materials:

Question Nos 45 & 46 were aimed at finding out whether teachers depended solely on the textbook or whether they made use of extra instructional materials.

Question No.45: You: (a) depend only on the text book (b) take extra instructional material to class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No.46 asked teachers to specify the extra teaching materials used by them. The following were mentioned:

a) Translation of poems
b) Articles from newspapers and magazines
c) Additional passages
d) Different poems or stories of the authors prescribed
e) exercises on grammar from other books/sources. The following were mentioned:

-- A Practical English Grammar by A.J.Thomas and A.V.Martinet
-- Phonetics (OUP)
-- Strengthen your English by Bhaskaran and Horsburgh
-- The advanced Learners Dictionary of English by A.S.Hornby and others.
5.1.12.7. The Teaching Aids Used

Question No. 47 asked teachers what teaching aids they used in the teaching of English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers who used aids</th>
<th>Teachers who used only chalk and board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most teachers do not use any kind of teaching aids. Those who did mentioned the following:

a) Pictures/cartoons/photographs/rough illustrations
b) Pictorial essay charts
c) Paper cuttings
d) Grammar/structure charts
e) Flannel board and structure cards
f) Cassettes
g) Articles from newspapers/magazines related to a particular lesson.

5.1.12.8. The Use of the Chalkboard:

The chalkboard can be a very useful teaching aid if used effectively. In the Indian context, where financial constraints forbid the use of more expensive aids, it is absolutely vital that the chalkboard be used in the proper way. Difficult words, idioms, phrases, structures should necessarily be written on the chalkboard. Important points are easily remembered if students see the same written on the chalkboard. The board should be used extensively in each and every English Class. The purpose of question number 48 was to find out whether teachers put the chalkboard to purposeful use or not.
**Question No.48:** You make extensive use of the chalkboard:

a) in teaching prose (b) in teaching poetry (c) in teaching the non-detailed text (d) in teaching grammar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response indicates that the chalk board is used extensively only in the teaching of grammar and to some extent in the teaching of the prose lessons.

5.1.12.9. **Home Assignments:**

Question Nos 49, 50 & 51 sought to glean information about whether students were given assignments to complete at home.

**Question No.49:** Do you give home assignments to your students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question No.50:** What percentage of your students do the given homework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 50%</th>
<th>50% to 75%</th>
<th>Above 75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question No.51:** You check the homework:

a) always  b) sometimes  c) rarely.
Though most teachers did give home assignments, the students do not seem very enthusiastic about it. 75% of the teachers have stated that less than 50% of the students did these assignments. Many teachers also do not take the trouble to check these assignments regularly.

5.1.12.10. ELT and Language Games:

Is the present English teaching situation conducive for conducting language games? The responses to question numbers 52 & 53 gives us the answer.

Question No.52: Do you think English language teaching and learning could be made more interesting and effective through language games?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No.53 asked teachers if the classroom situation was suitable for the playing of language games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Though most teachers were of the view that English teaching could be made more interesting through language games, they are skeptical of its feasibility in the present classroom situation, overcrowded classes being the main deterrent.

5.1.13. The Pre University Student:

Question Nos. 54 to 62 were related to the PU student and covered the following points:
- the students' previous knowledge of English.
- the language skills students were weakest in
- the students' aptitude for and responsiveness to English.
- students' attendance.
- the individual attention required by students.

5.1.13.1. Knowledge of English at the Entry Level:

Question Nos 54, 55 & 56 were aimed at gauging the PU students' knowledge of English at the entry level.

Question No. 54: Most of your students have:

a) a good command over the English language (b) a tolerable command over the English language (c) a poor command over the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No. 55: According to you the average PU student:

(a) has no knowledge of the forms and grammatical structures of the English language.
has some knowledge of certain language forms but very little mastery of grammatical structures.

(c) has mastered the basic forms and grammatical structures of the English language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident, according to most teachers the average PU student has a very poor command over the English language, with very little knowledge of either language forms or structures.

Question No.56: In which of the following English language skills are your students weakest:
(a) in speaking (b) in comprehending spoken English (c) in comprehending written English (d) in reading (e) in writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of speaking and writing skills definitely needs to be given greater emphasis as seen by the above response.

5.1.13.2. Interest and Response of Students:

Question No.57 asked teachers if they thought the average PU student was interested in learning English.
Most teachers seem to think that the average PU student does not evince interest in learning English.

Question No.58: Your students are more responsive when you teach:
(a) prose  (b) poetry  (c) grammar  (d) non-detailed texts

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prose and poetry portions of the syllabus evoked greater student response than the non-detailed texts or grammar. A personal observation of mine is that as we progress through the non-detailed texts students tend to forget the earlier chapters. They are unable to relate a former incident with a latter one. For example, in 'Huckleberry Finn' the dead body on the houseboat in Chapter 3 with Huck's father in the last chapter.

5.1.13.3. Students' Attendance in Class:
The next question elicited information about how regularly students attended the English classes.

Question No.59: What percentage of your students attend classes regularly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below 50%</th>
<th>50% to 75%</th>
<th>Above 75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I PUC</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II PUC</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is to be observed that there is a 10% fall in attendance in the second year. This may be due to the fact that students prefer to concentrate on the vital core subjects.

5.1.13.4. Do Students bother to purchase the Textbook?

Question No.60: What percentage of your students bring the textbooks to class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 50%</th>
<th>50-75%</th>
<th>Above 75%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I PUC</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II PUC</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with attendance, so with the purchase of the textbooks, we notice that the first year students seem more diligent than the second year students. But here it cannot be put down to mere disinterest. Other factors may also be responsible such as:
- non-availability of texts especially in rural areas.
- financial constraints preventing the purchase of books, especially by poor rural students.
- dependence on guides.

5.1.13.5. The Need for Individual Attention:

Question No.61 asked teachers if some of their students required individual attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The response is unanimously positive.

Question No.62 had to be analysed at two levels:
whether it is possible to give individual attention.

the reasons for being able/not being able to give individual attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible to give individual attention</th>
<th>Not possible to give individual attention</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not possible to give individual attention for the following reasons:
- large classes
- lack of time
- students are too inhibited to discuss their problems
- teachers tend to concentrate on completion of the syllabus
- the rest of the class becomes restless and noisy.

5.1.13.6. Individual and independent work by students:

Question No.63: do you think your students are capable of doing individual and independent work without expecting any kind of spoonfeeding from the teacher?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most teachers are skeptical about their students' capacity to work by themselves. Two factors may account for this:

- students have become accustomed to 'spoonfeeding' and may be unwilling to work independently.
the poor language competency of Kannada medium/rural students may come in the way of independent work.
The response to this question is in total contrast to the response to question No.18 where teachers exhibited a keen interest in developing the students' ability to think and work independently.

5.1.14. Interaction in the Classroom:
Question Nos 64 to 69 dealt with teacher-student and student-interaction in the classroom.

5.1.14.1. Teacher-student Interaction:
Question No.64: The present classroom situation permits:
(a) ample teacher-student interaction (b) limited teacher-student interaction (c) no teacher-student interaction.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As obvious, proper teacher-student interaction is not possible under present circumstances.

Question No.65 asked teachers the reasons as to why effective teacher-student interaction was not possible. The following were stated:
- Disinterested/indifferent/apathetic students
- Poor educational background/English of the students
- Large/overcrowded classes
- Insistence on the completion of the syllabus
students are hesitant to interact with the teacher
- Lack of time
- Heterogeneous classes
- Many students come without textbooks
- Students are not motivated to interact

5.1.14.2. Student-student Interaction:

Question No. 66 asked teachers if student-student interaction was necessary for the effective teaching and learning of English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No. 67: Do you permit student-student interaction in the class such as discussions, group-work, etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question No. 68: Does the classroom situation permit student-student interaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is near unanimity among teachers about the need to facilitate student-student interaction in the class. But the responses to the next two questions are at variance. Though most teachers did encourage/permit student-student interaction it was opined that the classroom situation does not permit effective student-student interaction.

Question No. 69 asked teachers to state factors which inhibited effective student-student interaction. The following were stated:

- students' poor command over the language.
- heterogeneous classes
- only bright students evince interest
- the less bright/lazy student lapses into inactivity
- the constraints of time imposed by limited number of periods and the pressure of completing the portions.
- overcrowded classes
- student indiscipline/noise in the class
- students language abilities differ

A handful of teachers were of the view that student-student interaction would be possible provided;

- an extra hour is allotted for it in the timetable
- there was additional space in the classroom
- classroom atmosphere is conducive
- students are given some definite purposeful work
- the number of students in the class is limited
- students are allowed to express/exchange their views and opinions without hesitation.
5.1.15. Internal Assessments/Assignments

Question No.70 touched upon the very important aspect of internal assessment which can play a vital role in motivating students to pay attention to English language studies and thereby improve their language skills.

Question No.70: Do you think a certain percentage of the total marks should be allotted for Internal Assessment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a strong inclination in favour of Internal Assessment among teachers.

5.1.16. The PUC English Question Paper:

Question Nos 71, 72 and 73 pertaining to the present English question paper pattern served to highlight its merits and drawbacks.

Question No.71 asked teachers if they were satisfied with the present question paper pattern.
Interestingly the balance is levelled in favour and against the present question paper pattern.

5.1.16.1. The Merits and Demerits of the Present Question Paper Pattern:

Question No.72: What, according to you are the merits and demerits of the present question paper pattern?

Merits:

a) The objective type questions enable students to score more/easily.

b) Short answer questions emphasise knowledge of the texts rather than dependence on the guide.

c) The larger number of questions cover a large amount of portions studied.

d) It enables weak students to get a minimum for passing.

e) Sufficient importance has been given to reading comprehension.

f) Ample and varied grammar exercises are covered.
Demerits:

a) It is far below the standard of the Urban English medium student.

b) There are too many objective type questions.

c) Unseen passage is time consuming/disadvantageous to the rural student whose language is very poor.

d) There is wide scope for malpractice especially where objective questions are concerned—mass copying/dictation.

e) Some of the objective type questions are vague.

f) Competent students can pass without attending classes or even reading the contents of the textbook. They bank upon the unseen passage and grammar items.

g) Answering questions in a word or phrase does not provide opportunities to learn the language.

h) It does not in any way encourage students to speak or write better.

i) The question paper is too long for the rural student.

j) Spoken English and listening comprehension are not tested.

5.1.16.2. Suggestions for improving the question paper pattern

Question No.73: What are your suggestions for improving the methods of evaluation and question paper pattern?

Teachers put forward the following suggestions:

a) Testing should be more skill based and less memory based.

b) Evaluation could be made more precise by specifying clearly, the different aspects to be taken into consideration.

c) 40% internal assessment and 60% exam marks would be ideal.
d) The writing of essays, applications and letters should be included.

e) Some of the rural college teachers have called for:
- more textual questions as against the unseen passage.
- separate texts for rural students.
- separate question papers for rural students.

f) Limiting the questions on comprehension.

g) Reintroduction of annotations.

h) Increasing paragraph answers so the pupils' language skills, especially writing skills, improve. There should be more scope for writing in a sustained manner.

i) Allotment of 75% marks for comprehension and expression and 25% marks for testing spoken English and reading skills would be suitable.

j) Limiting the number of objective type questions.

k) Reducing the marks for the unseen passage.

5.1.17. The Success of ELT at the PU level:

Question No.24: According to you English language teaching and learning at the +2 stage has been: (a) successful (b) unsuccessful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above response reflects the dismal feeling among most teachers that ELT at the PU level has not been very successful.
5.1.18. Reorientation Programmes

Question No.75 asked teachers if regular reorientation programmes are necessary for English teachers at the +2 stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidently the need for regular reorientation is clearly denoted by the above response.

Question No.76 asked teachers to state reasons as to why reorientation programmes were thought to be necessary/not necessary.

Only one teacher felt that reorientation programmes were not necessary for the following reason:

a) Ultimately teachers have to fall back on their own classroom techniques to get the best out of their students, be they English medium/Kannada medium/urban or rural students.

Reorientation programmes were felt to be necessary for the following reasons:

a) To familiarize teachers with new methods/techniques/innovations.

b) To share and exchange views/opinions/ideas with other teachers.

c) To improve the ability of teachers especially since most of them are untrained and to prevent academic stagnation.

d) Because syllabuses keep changing.

e) There is no compulsory syllabus oriented/English language teaching paper at the M.A. level in most universities.
f) Rural teachers are cut off from the reach of fellow teachers and reorientation programmes provides an opportunity for discussing mutual problems and to interact with urban counterparts.

g) To understand/cater to/ solve changing problems/ needs/ requirements.

h) To ensure that some sort of common standard is maintained among students.

i) To ensure that there is uniformity in teaching and evaluation.

j) To evolve a consensus on the methods to be adopted to help students better learn English.

k) The pattern of question paper to be adopted can be discussed.

Question No.77 asked teachers if attendance at reorientation programmes should be made compulsory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT RESPONDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above response manifests teachers' willingness to attend these reorientation programmes.

5.1.19. Suggestions for Improving ELT at the PU Level.

The last question in the questionnaire elicited teachers' suggestions for bringing about an overall improvement in the teaching and learning of English at the +2 stage. The suggestions forwarded were:
a) Suitable textbooks should be framed keeping in mind the classroom situation, the standard of the student, as well as the students' present and future language needs.
b) Allotment of at least two more hours per week for the teaching of English.
c) Ample opportunities for lecturers to undergo regular reorientation programme.
d) Lessening the portions to be taught.
e) Inclusion of some kind of practical work.
f) Language should not be taught solely from the examination point of view.
g) The textbook should contain interesting lessons.
h) Limiting the number of students per class.
i) More emphasis should be placed on the teaching and evaluation of spoken English.
j) Appropriate workbooks should be designed.
k) Examinations should be split into two semesters instead of the year end exam.
l) The pass marks in English should be raised to 40.
m) Marks scored in English should be given due weightage when applying for other undergraduate courses.

n) Most of the lessons must be from an Indian context.
o) Periodic assignments should be made compulsory through the allotment of marks.
p) Conducting interesting co-curricular activities in English such as quiz competitions, debates, dramatization of a lesson, guest lecturers, etc.
q) Use of interesting audiovisual teaching aids.

r) Providing interesting books for supplementary reading—simple interesting stories.

s) Emphasis on the development of writing skills through ample writing related activities.

t) Bringing textbooks to class should be made compulsory.

u) Conducting bridge courses, starting from the elementary levels.

v) Graded syllabi and textbooks to cater to differential student competencies.

w) Both teachers and students should evince sincerity and interest in the teaching/learning process.

x) Constant interaction between teachers in rural colleges and urban colleges.

5.2. Observations:

The analysis of the data provided via the questionnaire has thrown light on the major shortcomings of English language teaching at the pre-university level. The glaring drawbacks have been enumerated below.

a) Most teachers teaching at the +2 stage have not been trained in the techniques of teaching English.

b) Most universities do not make provisions for the inclusion of a language teaching paper at the M.A. (English) level despite being aware of the fact that a major portion of their candidates are likely to take up the teaching profession.
c) The syllabus is too rigid and incapable of meeting the varied language needs of students.
d) The textbooks do not provide sufficient scope for students to work independently nor facilitate the effective teaching of English.
e) Overcrowded/heterogeneous classes prevent teachers from giving proper attention to students, particularly those who are very weak in the language.
   - effective teacher-student and student-student interaction.
   - the effective and meaningful teaching of English.
f) The four hours allotted per week is insufficient for effective language teaching.
g) Most teachers are ignorant of the latest teaching methodology/technique. One notices a kind of professional and academic stagnation.
h) Most teachers do not follow the methodology advocated by the textbook framers in the teaching of the prose lessons and grammar.
i) Very few teachers take the trouble to use teaching aids.
j) The full potential of the chalkboard is not being utilised by teachers to facilitate teaching.
k) The development of writing skills is grossly neglected. Students are not made to write in every English class with the result that writing skills have steadily deteriorated over the years.
l) The PU students' command over English at the entry level is
very poor and it is futile pointing fingers at the school
teacher. This will not help us rectify the situation.

m) The absence of Internal Assessments has contributed to the
intellectual teaching and falling standards of English.

n) Teachers are aware of the stalemate inherent in the ELT
situation at the PU level and yet seem unable to do anything
about it.

o) Regular and compulsory reorientation programmes are very
necessary to spruce up teachers' knowledge and professional
vitality.

p) Members of the textbook/syllabus committee are predominantly
from urban colleges. These teachers, though perhaps aware of
the problems faced by rural college teachers and students, have
never experienced the same at first hand. Thus they are not in
a position to comprehend the language needs and learning
difficulties of the rural students. So we have the unsavoury
situation wherein an urban elite lays down educational
conditions for the rural students. The questionnaire revealed
the lacunae inherent in this. A number of rural college
lecturers complained that many of the prose lessons were from a
totally alien cultural setting and rural students had
difficulty in comprehending these lessons. Quite a few teachers
had called for more lessons with an Indian setting. Another
significant point to be noted is that rural college teachers
expressed the view that the standard of the textbooks was too
high.

5.3. A Hopeful Solution:

Much has been heard, said and written about the inherent
defects of the Indian educational system. But prospects of
finding a practical and proper solution in the near future are quite dim. The teaching of English is but part of the whole erroneous and outmoded system. It is pointless crying out against the large, overcrowded, heterogeneous classes or the lack of other infrastructural facilities. These are the outcome of our socio-economic environment and they are bound to persist for a long time to come. At present these unpleasant facts cannot be altered and any solution should be within the purview of these adverse educational conditions. Agitating for smaller, homogeneous classes would be both futile and to some extent quixotic in the face of the awareness that its implementation is near impossible. Interestingly B. Naidu et al (1991) have remarked that "Heterogeneity is a challenged to be faced, not a problem to be wished away". Constraints of time could be amended by allotting two more hours per week, especially in rural colleges, for the teaching of English. It is to no avail blaming school teachers for not having done their jobs properly. The tirade against the lack of proper attention paid to the teaching of English at the primary/secondary school levels will continue. The focus of attention should be on appropriately designed textbooks and practical classroom procedures which take all existing realities into consideration. Textbooks should be designed so as to ensure that:
- students, particularly in rural areas, are taught the basic structures of English, i.e., literally from scratch.
- effective teaching is possible even in large and heterogeneous classes.
- students are kept actively engaged from the beginning of the lesson to the end.
- students are made to work independently to a great extent, with teachers not 'spoonfeeding' but guiding.
- Wrong language habits of students are eradicated.
- there is ample scope for the development of the language skills, especially reading and writing.
- the language taught in the classroom can be made use of by students for their own use and purposes out of the class.
- the teaching and learning of English is made as interesting and invigorating as possible.

5.4. The Compatibility of CLT with the ELT situation at the pre-university level in Karnataka.

The success of CLT rests on the fulfilment of certain pre-requisites:
- limiting the number of students in the class.
- a lot of teacher-student and student-student interaction.
- sufficient time for the act of communication to be completed, i.e. a flexible curriculum.
- sufficient exposure to the target language, i.e., increase in allotment of periods per week.
- suitable teaching/learning materials designed on CLT principles.
- Suitable instructional aids such as tapes, audio and video recorders, language laboratories, etc. all of which are clearly beyond the reach of the average Indian teacher.
- the use of genuine and authentic materials from real-world contexts within the classroom.
- motivation, interest and aptitude to learn on the part of the student.
- regular student attendance.
- bringing textbooks/learning materials regularly to class.
- teachers trained in CLT methods.
- periodic (once a week or fortnightly) evaluation for regular and effective feedback.
- the capacity to work hard on the part of both teachers and students.
- catering to individual/differential student needs and competencies.
- homogeneous classes.
- suitable evaluation procedures.

A glance at existing conditions of English language teaching and learning at the plus two stage in Karnataka (which may as well apply to all other states also) gives rise to a very pertinent question— is CLT compatible with the situation? It is quite obvious that the inviolate version of CLT is certainly not going to work under these adverse circumstances. What is required is an eclectic approach which draws on several methods especially structural/situational approach and CLT. Fortunately, CLT has the advantage of adapting itself to traditional methodologies. Overcrowded, heterogeneous classes are grim realities that will have to be contended with. B. Naidu et al (1991) refer to "the mixed cultural milieu of our students, the largely apathetic attitudes of teachers and learners, the differences we perceived in teaching 'general'
English to Science versus Arts students, and the widespread lack of motivation among our students. Large scale group work, informal interaction between teacher-student and student-student, task-based procedures as envisaged by CLT, cannot be contemplated in view of related discipline and infrastructural problems. Neither can errors be left unchecked. In pre-university students we have the prevalence of 'fossilised' errors which have to be weeded out. "We function in a multilingual milieu and no single approach to ELT at home can be a panacea for the deplorable deterioration in standards of English". (Rangacharya, S.K. 1988).

The next chapter examines the possibility of a synthesis between the structural approach and CLT. The focus was on designing lesson units of one hour duration which would enable fairly effective teaching and learning of English in large, heterogeneous, ill-equipped classes of intermediate students who are not very highly motivated to learn the target language. It was also necessary to ensure that at the level of organization and implementation the method proves functional within the confines of the regular college/institutional curriculum.