The focus of this research study was to highlight the need for quantification of language being learnt with reference to syntactic aspects. Hence, the analysis was directed towards the understanding of this focus point. Quantification requires segmentation and specification of the object (being taken up for this purpose) in terms of its structure and nature. Here, the object is ‘the language being learnt’. Hence, it is the language which needs to be segmented and specified so that their numerical counts could become the quantified value.

It was in view of this reason, the main and sub components that constitute the syntactic part of language and the dimensions associated with them were identified and listed. These details comprising the syntactic aspects as well as the dimensions associated with them together with the examples of operating contexts, were proposed as learning points (in chapter-3). The points so proposed were taken up for analysis for determining the viability of their teaching, learning, and assessment. For this purpose, a four point criteria viz., Self Introspection, Quality of Tools used, their Impact on the Learners, and Opinion of the Teachers / Researchers of L₂ was adopted. The details are given below.

5.1 Self Introspection

The first point in the criteria is the researcher’s own assessment of the rationale behind the essence of the whole study. The need was felt for examining the researcher’s own thoughts on the procedures, steps, etc., followed at every stage of this study:
• Identified, defined, and demarcated the major, minor, and sub-components that constitute the syntactic part of Tamil language, after analysing the views of various scholars, on historical perspectives.

• Subsequently, identified and listed the problems being encountered by the learners while learning syntactic aspects of Tamil language as L	extsubscript{2}.

• The factors that were causing the problems (listed in chapter-2) were identified and classified under the broad category of five dimensions.

• The details of the syntactic components and dimensions associated with them along with their operating contexts (as examples), were considered as the learning points. Accordingly, around 280 learning points were identified.

• For the purpose of determining the compatibility of their learning, a set of tools viz., questionnaires for written and oral responses, was formulated by adopting an appropriate table of specifications. They were designed in such a way that the responses provided by the learners would become easily quantifiable. The principles, and other parameters required for item writing were strictly adhered to. The clarity and adoptability were also ensured through a pilot study.

• Having administered the above questionnaires, to the L	extsubscript{2} learners of SRLC, etc., (5 batches as specified in chapter-4), the responses were obtained, recorded, and quantified to establish the extent (%) of their compatibility of learning syntactic aspects (for each components in terms of dimensions). The five tables showing (one each for 5 batches) the compatibility in % are provided in appendix-5.

\[38\] The supporting evidences viz., a set of tables consisting of all the details of responses along with procedures followed for this purpose, including the details worked out, are provided in the appendices.
• This fact was later cross validated from the opinions obtained from the teachers / researchers of L2 through an opinionnaire, a specially designed tool comprising the learning points.

On being analysed the reasoning behind all the procedures / steps adopted at every stage of the study, the researcher has got satisfied on the rationale behind the whole approach which included the principle of simple to complex, known to unknown, etc., for resolving the issues. The causal factors were arrived at based on a sizable number of examples; their relevance and interrelatedness among the constituent parts were identified and continuity maintained all through the study. Thus, adequate amount of thoughts have gone into the whole process and thereby ensured establishing the validity of the approach adopted for the whole study.

5.2 Quality of Tools

Another criteria adopted for analysis is the quality of the tools used; ‘Quality’ is something that can be noticed as part of an object or a thing; an essential character or nature or property. It is obtained based on the tool’s capability of attracting the attention of more people to attend to it. Here, the tools refer to the questionnaires meant for collecting written as well as oral responses. They consist of a number of individual questions, thus making it an integral whole. According to established norms, the quality of the whole is nothing but the reflection of the totality of the qualities of all its components / constituents; accordingly, the quality of the questionnaire, is assumed as the totality of the qualities of the individual questions that constitute the questionnaire.

Hence, the choice index (C.I) which is one of the indicators of a question quality, was worked out to each question included in the questionnaire (which was formulated by accommodating the problems
pertaining to each of the learning points listed in chapter-3). The details of the C.I. so worked out are shown in the tables (table-1 to 25 provided in the appendix-6). These tables are supplemented with a consolidated one, as given below. The rows of the table indicate the syntactic components; columns indicate dimensional factors (here, refer to as segments); the percentage indicates actual number of examinees who attempted the questions (in otherwords, attracted by these questions).

It may be seen that questions covering all the syntactic components (phrase, clause, and sentence) with reference to form dimension have attracted 95%, boundary dimension 96%, structure dimension 95%, function dimension 94%, and meaning dimension 90%.

Table of consolidation of Choice Index values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.</th>
<th>Batch No.</th>
<th>Dimension covered</th>
<th>C.I. of Phrase</th>
<th>C.I. of Clause</th>
<th>C.I. of Sentence</th>
<th>C.I. Average</th>
<th>segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39 The supporting evidences viz., a set of tables consisting of all the details of responses along with procedures followed for this purpose, including the details worked out, are provided in the appendices.
An average of 90 to 96% of the learners/examinees are found to have been attracted by the questionnaire as a whole; obviously, this indicates the questions are considered as valid to the extent of 90%. That means, the questionnaire as a whole could be considered as reasonably good in view of its value having statistical significance; it is also evident from the value of the measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) noticed.

### 5.3 Impact on the Learners

The focus of the analysis here is on the impact caused by the learning points on the L₂ learners, particularly those at the Southern Regional Language Centre who constitute the core experimental group. This factor is considered very significant in deciding the viability of the learning points proposed. The term ‘impact’ refers to powerful effect or influence caused by one thing on the other. Here, it refers to the learning points duly embedded in a series of question items constituting the questionnaire. The learners on whom
the questionnaire was administered were asked to provide their oral and written responses after grasping the content of the questionnaire. The responses so provided by them were duly recorded in a specially designed recording sheet and the same provided in the chapter-4.

The quantum of impact (the manifestation of which considered as reflecting in the response) is derived on the basis of the percentage of those who volunteered to adopt the learning points for their usage especially while providing their oral response under a non-compelling situation. This is evident from the percentage of correct responses provided in the last columnn in each of the tables (table-1 to 15 provided in the appendix-7) meant for oral response.

The percentage of impact obtained on oral response was also compared with that of written response in order to find out their consistency and results so obtained, are provided in the following consolidated table:

The columnn 1 of the table provides ‘table number’, col. 2 ‘batch no.’, col. 3 ‘dimensions covered’, col.4 ‘% of impact (phrase)’, col.5 ‘% of impact (clause)’, col.6 ‘% of impact (sentence)’, col.7 average. The last column (total) indicates the quantum of impact caused by the learning points on the examinees of all the 3 batches.

**Table of consolidation showing % of impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.</th>
<th>Batch No.</th>
<th>Dimension covered</th>
<th>% w.r.t Phrase</th>
<th>% w.r.t Clause</th>
<th>% w.r.t Sentence</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76% 89%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.</th>
<th>Batch No.</th>
<th>Dimension covered</th>
<th>% w.r.t Phrase</th>
<th>% w.r.t Clause</th>
<th>% w.r.t Sentence</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident from the above details, the percentage of those who provided oral response works out to more than 50% against the total number of examinees; among them, more than 75% provided the responses correctly. This shows the impact caused on to the learners is quite significant. With all probability, the percentage arrived at could be interpreted as highly positive, and hence the learning points proposed considered viable, though there is a scope for improvement.

### 5.4 Opinion of the Teachers / Researchers of L₂

This part of the analysis is concerned with the opinion of the teachers and researchers of L₂ who are the actual practitioners playing a vital role in the process of teaching and evaluation. Their opinion forms a strong basis in deciding the viability of the learning points. Viability includes the practical feasibility and relevance for teaching by eliminating the problems frequently faced by the learners while learning syntactic part of Tamil as L₂. The teachers from whom opinions are sought include those having prior knowledge and experience in the area of pedagogy. In order to obtain their valuable opinions, a specially designed tool called ‘opinionnaire’ was used (ref. appendix-8).
Accordingly, their views (consisting a set of three faceted opinions viz., points concurred, points negated, and new points suggested for improvement) were collected from a small group of identified teachers and researchers. All the views obtained from them in the form of opinions are reflected in the five tables – representing the form, boundary, structure, function, and meaning dimensions, each of which is associated with all the syntactic components viz., phrase, clause, and sentence (ref. appendix-9). The consolidated opinions are reflected in the following table.

**Table of Consolidated opinions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.</th>
<th>Dimension covered</th>
<th>Syntactic aspects covered</th>
<th>No. of points concurred</th>
<th>No. of points negated</th>
<th>No. of points Suggested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Boundary</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand total w.r.t. all the dimensions of syntactic components</strong></td>
<td><strong>275</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the above details, more than 95% of the learning points proposed are retained as it is; a few of them in the list are deleted; new points to the extent of about 10% have been incorporated under certain dimensional categories mainly under the form, and also the structure. The additions as well as the deletions are reflected in the concluding part of the study.