



A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language

Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary

Stage in Manipur

M. Gunamani Singh

Ph.D. Scholar

ABSTRACT

Several methodologies and approaches were offered in NCF-2005. These were expected to be adopted in the schools but these were found only partially implemented at the Elementary stage in Manipur. Probably this could be one of the main reasons that the problem of low achievement persisted in some schools and English language learners did not attain the proficiency of Speaking skill required at the end of the Elementary stage in Manipur. Therefore, there is need to address this issue because it may not help future careers of the children. After the identification of this problem, ten schools (5 Private English medium schools and 5 Government schools) were selected for our study. Among these 5 Private schools, 2 of them were convent schools. Of the 5 Government schools, one is a model school where relatively more facility has been created by the Government. In order to carry out the investigation, language ability tests of Speaking skill were conducted. Questionnaires were administered to the teachers of English, who are working in these ten schools and their responses were analyzed. In addition, the Heads/Principals were also consulted by the investigator in relation to teaching/learning process, evaluation systems and their administration. We found some discrepancies in methods, approaches and techniques.

Keywords: *NCF-2005, Elementary school, Speaking skill, teaching methodology, English learning*

I. INTRODUCTION

Nisha (1995) has investigated the areas of hindrance in acquiring communicative competence and the areas of incompatibility between the language syllabus, language teaching and linguistic performance of the first year degree students in English who had Tamil as medium of Instruction. She has identified some of the communication strategies followed by the learners when they had encountered problem in the process of communication. Further, her study reveals that the socio - economic factors play less role and parental education, situational and psychological factors play a crucial role in the advancement of the communicative competence of the learners.

Chandran (1999) has investigated the communicative ability in speaking English of the higher secondary first year students. He has identified, in his study, the phonological, lexical and grammatical errors, and also he has proved that the communicative ability of speaking of the students with English as their medium of instruction is better than that of the students of Tamil medium. Further, he recommended that the syllabus designers and material producers may give top most priority for the communicative activities in the syllabus so that the learners would develop the acquired knowledge.



Jayanthi (2002) has observed the classroom interaction of the graduate students. This study revealed that the factors like smartness of the students, shyness, evaluative, capacity, commitment, psychological conditions, observation of world knowledge, time factor, interactional awareness, interaction with text, etc., play some role over the effective and efficient interaction of the students. Further, she has said shyness of the students' psychological conditions of the students especially past failures, etc. lead to the avoidance of the interactive performance and other above said factors enhance the interaction of the students in English literature Teaching classes.

Several studies had been conducted to find out the teaching/learning process of English in Manipur. Singh (2002) explored the problem, prospect and status of English in Manipur in his research "A Critical Scrutiny of the Position, Problems and Prospects of English in Manipur". Devi (2006) explored the difference between the sentence structures in English and Manipuri language in her research "Sentence structure in English and Manipuri Language". A contrastive study. Sujeta Beishamayum (2010) explored linguistic problems in learning English language in her research "communication and linguistic problems faced by Meiteiron speakers in learning English language." However, there is no study available with regard to the study of low achievement of Speaking skill in Manipur. The paper is an attempt to see whether the Speaking skill of the students is really low or not.

a. Recommendations in NCF 2005

Several methodologies and approaches in the teaching/learning process of English were recommended in NCF 2005. Since we have not seen much improvement in learning English in schools in Manipur, we will make an attempt to examine the probable factors that lead to low achievement of English learners.

One of the probable reasons for this low achievement could be that teachers have not fully understood or they were not aware of the methods and approaches recommended in NCF-2005, even though Government imparted training to Government school teachers through SSA, School Education Department and SCERT, Government of Manipur. It was also found that there were no teachers specifically for English in the Primary and Upper Primary Government schools (Elementary schools). For example, teachers of Mathematics and Science were teaching English in the Government schools. Third, it was also found that head teachers/Principals deputed the teachers of Mathematics and Science to attend the training programmes in English.

In the light of the above background, we will investigate the root causes of low achievement of English language learners in the Speaking skill at the elementary stage in Manipur. The identification of this problem not only helps the learners to develop better Speaking skill, but it also could be of use to teachers. The findings of this study may be useful to teachers and teacher educators in choosing relevant methods and approaches at the lower and upper Primary stages in Manipur.

b. The Structure of the Paper

In section 1.1, we will discuss the methodology adopted in the study while section 1.2 deals with the analysis of language ability tests. In the next section 1.3, responses of questionnaire from the teachers are examined. This is followed by section 1.4, where we discuss the findings of the study conducted. In the section 1.5, we conclude with some of remedial measures in order to enhance the proficiency of the students in Speaking skill.



II. METHODOLOGY

For this research, we initially planned to take up 400 students of VIII standard, taking 40 students from each school for collection of data. But we could not get the number of students we had stipulated earlier for our study since there was less number of enrollments in some Government schools. It was surprisingly found while collecting data that out of the 5 Government schools we approached, only one school in the serial number 10 has got more than 40 students. This school is a model school to which more attention is given by the Government to create facilities, etc. The total number of students we could finally get as a sample of our study was only 290.

First, the students will be given a language ability test consisting of 6 Speaking skill test items. These test items did not cover Phonetic aspect of Speaking skill. The proficiency of the students is assessed on the four grade points. If the school attains 85% to 100% the school is rated as “Excelent”, while the school secures 75% to 84% it is graded “ Very good”. It is followed by next grade ie “Good” if the school attains 60% to 74%. Finally the school which have 40% to 59% is rated as ‘Weak’.

Secondly, the questionnaires consisting of 100 questions were administered to the teachers who were teaching English subjects in the respective schools. The responses of the teachers were analyzed. Among 100 questions in the questionnaires, we focused only on 30 main teaching points.

Serial numbers 1 - 5 are Private English medium schools.

Number of students in the serial numbers in 1- 5 = 200

Serial numbers 6 -10 are Government schools.

Number of students in the serial numbers in 6-10 = 90

Sl. No.	Name of the schools	Medium of instruction	Number of the students selected	
			Boys	Girls
1.	Nirmalabas High school (Imphal West)	English		40
2.	St. George High Schoo (Imphal East)	English	20	20
3.	IPS (Imphal West)	English	20	20
4.	Ever Green High School (Thoual district)	English	20	20
5.	Paradise High School (Thoual district)	English	20	20
6.	Ngasi Rastrapili Girl High School (Imphal West)	Manipuri		10
7.	Kwakeithel Girls High School (Imphal West)	Manipuri		16
8.	Thangmeiban Lilasingkhongnangkhong High School (Imphal East)	Manipuri		14
9.	Meitei Mayek high School (Imphal West)	Manipuri		10
10.	Wangkhei High School (Imphal East)	English		40
	Total no. of students		80	210

Grand total = 80+210 = 290

Test items of Speaking skill and test patterns given in table 1:

For the assessment of Speaking skill, we will be employing the following test items: Colouring boxes, Family Tree, and Road Mapping, Dialogue, Story telling and Answer questions. The proficiency of the students will be assessed on the four grade points as mentioned above.



Table 1.

Sl. No.	Test Items	Purpose
1.	Colouring boxes	Inferring the speech based information.
2.	Family tree	Inferring the Family Tree based information
3.	Road Mapping	Inferring the Road mapping based information
4.	Dialogue	Inferring the dialogue based information
5.	Story telling	Inferring the story telling based information
6.	Answer questions	Inferring Answer Question based information

II. RESULT OF SPEAKING SKILL TESTS DISPLAYED IN THE FOLLOWING TABLES (2 TO 7).

In the first test item of Speaking skill, “Colouring boxes” as shown in the table 2 below, 40% to 55% of Private English medium school students responded correctly and 45% to 60 % of Private school students gave incorrect responses. All the students have not fared well scoring only weak grade. Even the reputed school in 1st serial could score only 55% of the students correct. Similar result have been obtained by Wangkhei High school serial in 10th serial number in the table, followed by St. George school High school securing 50% the school correct and the lowest being the school in 6th serial number while the remaining schools are in between the scores of 20% and 40% . Here in this test surprisingly the performance is very low as none of schools could secure even a good grade.

Table 2.

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			22	18	55%	45%
2	St. George High School, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			14	26	35%	65%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			14	26	35%	65%
6	Ngasi Rastrapili High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl’s High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			3	7	30%	70%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhang High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			16	24	50%	50%



In the 2nd test item of Speaking skill, **“Family Tree” in the Table 3** of tracing

relationship it is observed that the correct responses given by the students of the Private schools ranged from 35% to 50 while 15% to 50% of the Private schools gave their incorrect response The performance of Government schools except the one in the serial number 10 has struct extremely low ranging from 20% to 29%. What we can see from the test of tracing relationship is, even though some individual students have performed well however, the overall performance of the school is very poor and categorized in the weak grade as the maximum performance given by the serial number 1 is only 55% achievement with regard to this list. The Government school in the serial number 10, though it comes under the weak grade, has followed the school in the serial number 1.

Table 3

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of question ing (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			18	10	45%	55%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			16	24	40%	60%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			14	26	35%	65%
6	Ngasi Rastrapili High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl’s High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			20	20	50%	50%



The Test item 3 “Road Mapping” as shown in the **table 4** indicates the same poor performance as in the Family Tree for the Private schools ranging from 30% to 55% correct while Government schools ranging from 20% to 50% correct. When we considers individual performance some of the Private schools had good performance but overall performance of the schools is very low as 45% to 80% of the students responded incorrect. Even the reputed school in the serial number 1 could score 55% correct.

Table 4

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			22	18	55%	45%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			14	10	35%	65%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			12	28	30%	70%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
6	Ngasi Rastrapili High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl’s High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal East	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			20	20	50%	50%

In this fourth Test item“**Dialogue**” as shown in the **table 5**above, 30 to 50% of Private school students responded correctly while 50 to 70 % of Private school students responded incorrect. In this test, the performance of all the schools are extremely poor, and rated in the weak grade, for Private schools ranging from 20% to 50% correct and Government schools ranging from 30% to 50% correct.



Table 5

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			14	10	35%	65%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			12	28	30%	70%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
6	Ngasi Rastrapili High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl’s High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			20	20	50%	50%

In the fifth test item “**Story Telling**” as shown in the table 6, 28 to 50% of Private school students told the story nicely and 50 to 72 % of Private school students could not tell the story. Though Nirmalabas High School in the serial number 1 secured the highest number of correct responses among ten schools, that is, 50% , 50% of students of this school could not tell the story. Next to Nirmalabas High School, there comes Wangkhei High School securing 45% of correct answers. St. George High School securing 40% correct answers is closer to Wangkhei High school. Ngasi Rastralipi High School and Meitei Mayak High School hit the bottom securing 20% correct response.it is to note that overall performance of all the ten schools are in the weak grade.



Table 6

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage i)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of students who could tell the story nicely	No of students who could not tell the story properly	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Could tell the story	Could not tell the story
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			12	28	30%	70%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			11	29	28%	72%
6	Ngasi Rastrapili High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			18	22	45%	55%

The result of Test item 6 “Answer questions test” in the table 7 shows that 30% to 50% of Private school students are willing to talk with the researcher while 50 to 70 % of Private school are not willing to talk with the researcher. 50% of students from Nirmalabas High School in the serial number 1 are willing to talk and 40% of students from St. George and Wangkhei High School are willing to talk. Thus these two schools come to the next of Nirmalabas High School in the serial number 1.



It has been observed that students hesitated to speak or talk with the researcher in English. Reasons for the hesitance are that the learners do not want to show their weakness in the English language to others. So, to conceal their weakness, the learners hesitated to talk. Further, the anxiety, language shock and culture shock are yet another factors which lead them to their hesitance. The students didn't want to talk in a complete sentence. Upon questioning, the students have given one or two word answer instead of giving complete answers

Table 7

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (conversation)	Mode of questioning (questioning and seeking answer)	No of students who are willing to talk	No of students who hesitated to talk	Performance in pc	
							Willing to talk	Hesitate to talk
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			14	26	35%	65%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
6	The Ngashi Rastrapili High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			3	11	21%	79%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			16	34	40%	60%

III. ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRES ADMINISTERED TO TEACHERS”

The questionnaires containing 100 questions were administered to teachers of ten schools in order to find out whether they were following and implementing the guidelines of NCF 2005 and MLL based teaching in the respective schools. Among these 100 questions , we focused only 30 important teaching points in view of NCF 2005 and MLL based teaching in the ten schools. The data collected were used to notice which items were



followed by the teachers in the class-room transaction. Based on these 30 teaching point, schools were grouped into three categories: A, B and C; the schools following 10 teaching points mentioned in the Table 9 as A (Fully implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching) , the schools following 10 teaching points mentioned in the Table 10 as B (Partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching and the schools following 10 teaching points mentioned in the Table 11 as C (Non implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching .

Table 8

10 questions in relation to core teaching of NCF-2005 and MLL in the class-room transaction.

1. Interactive activities
2. Higher level of questioning.
3. Constructivist approach to teaching
4. Teaching reading skill through Innovative techniques.
5. Students explore to learn reading skill through skimming, scanning and review
6. Objective of teaching
7. Minimum level of learning.
8. Skill based teaching
9. Problem solving method.
10. CCE (Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation.

Table 9.

10 questions in relation to partial teaching of NCF-2005 and MLL in the class-room transaction

1. Activity based teaching.
2. Question design
3. Higher level of Questioning.
4. Teaching reading skill through written tests.
5. Reading aloud and asking questions.
6. School based test and assessment.
7. Objective of teaching
8. Question design
9. Blue print
10. CCE (Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation



Table 10

10 questions in relation to traditional methods implemented in the class-room transaction

1. Introduction
2. Teaching aids
3. Remedial teaching
4. Lower level of questioning
5. School based evaluation
6. Explanation
7. Content based teaching
8. Lecturer method
9. Grammar teaching
10. Vocabulary teaching

Based on the 10 questions each in relation to teaching points in Table 8, 9 and 10, ten schools were categorized into three group A (**Fully implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching**), B (**Partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching**) and C (**Not implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching**) as shown in **Table 11**.

6 schools were in group B (**Partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching**) and 4 schools were in the **group C (Not implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching)**. Not a single school was in the group A (Fully implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching). The Private schools in the serial numbers 1-5 were found partially implementing NCF-2005 and the MLL based teaching in the schools. Whereas Government schools in the serial numbers 6 to 9 were in the group C (Non implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching). Only one Government school in the serial number 10 was partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching in the school and it had better performance than the rest of Government schools in the serial numbers 6-9.

3 Categories of Schools Based on the 30 Teaching Points in NCF-2005 and Implementation of MLL in Teaching

Group A= Fully Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching schools

Group B= Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching schools

Group C = Not Implementing NCF and MLL Based Teaching schools



Table 11

Sl. no	Name of the schools	Group A	Group B	Group C
1	Nirmalabas High School, Imphal West		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
2	St. George High School Impal East		Partially Implementing NCF and MLL Based Teaching school	
3	IPS Imphal West		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
4	Ever Green Flower High School, Thoubal		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
7	Kwakeithel Girls' High School, Imphal West			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal East			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
10	Wangkhei Girl High School, Imphal East.		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	

IV. DISCUSSION

According to the results displayed in the Tables 2 to 7, performances of students varied from individual to individual and from school to school in different test items. None of the schools could get ‘Excellent’ ‘Very Good’ and ‘Good’. The performance of all the schools is extremely low and could be rated in the ‘Weak’ grade. Even the reputed school in the serial number 1 had low performance.

The results of Speaking skill tests displayed in the Tables 2 to 7 show that (Nirmalabas High School) in the serial number 1 is the best performing school while the school (Ngasi Rasralipi High School) in the serial



number 6 is the weakest school securing 20% in all the tests among ten schools. In these tests of speaking skill, it is surprisingly found that none of schools secured 'Excellent', 'Very good' and 'Good' grade. It was also learnt from the principals and teachers of English that these ten schools never conducted tests for assessing the speaking skill of the students. This may be one of the reasons for low achievement of the students in the speaking skill.. One of the reasons for low achievement for speaking skill may be that these schools used the old traditional methods of teaching and evaluation system. It can be concluded that traditional methods, improper assessment, weak administration and medium of instruction have impact on low achievement of the English language learners in the Speaking skill. The school in the serial number 10 (Wangkhei High school) secured 50% and this model school is at par with the private schools in terms of language proficiency. It is recently established model school wherein the Government pays more attention and take care of the schools. The schools in the serial number 6 and 8 secured the lowest number of correct responses i.e. 20% among ten schools. None of schools secured "Excellent" "Very good" and "Good" grade.

V. CONCLUSION

Knowing all these facts, some remedial measures may be taken up to improve the proficiency of students in the Speaking skill. To enhance the speaking proficiency of the students in the English language, the following remedies will be helpful and suggested. Different types of conversational discourse of L2 may be taught, and the students may be given enough time for the development of conversational discourse in the school hours. The conversational discourse training will eliminate language shock and cultural shock. Further, that will help to develop communicative competence of the students. Different types of conversational discourse may be taught, and the students should be given enough time for the development of conversational discourse in the school hours. The conversational discourse training will eliminate language shock and cultural shock. Further, that will help to develop communicative competence of the students. While teaching vocabulary of English, the grammatical functions and linguistic features of words should be taught. Further, the semantic value of words should be distinguished. The similarities and differences between L1 and L2 should be taught especially while teaching syntax which will eliminate the habits of literal translation from L1 to L2.

Role play is perhaps the liveliest form to get the class involved in speaking. Role play brings situations from real life into the classroom. Students imagine and assume roles. They create a pretend situation, and they pretend to be some different persons. Once they assume a role the students are forced to improvise and to produce words and sentences appropriate to the situation as well as to the roles they have assumed. Teachers should select the roles beforehand so that the roles to be assumed are familiar and are within the linguistic competence attained until then by the students. Roles such as friends, brothers, sisters, parents, teachers, shopkeepers, police officers, characters from the textbook and popular television programs have been suggested to enhance the speaking skill.

As Doff (1988) points out, role play increases motivation. Always talking about real life can become very dull, and the chance to imagine different situations adds interest to a lesson. In addition, role play gives a chance to use language in new contexts and for new topics. Everyday life situations such as shopping, holidays, camps, local journeys, fables and folktales, etc., have been found very useful. Interviews are yet another excellent situation for role play. Students may have difficulty composing their thoughts in English or expressing them coherently, using appropriate grammatical structures and words. Teachers should give prompts wherever



necessary, which would encourage students to guess and produce utterances appropriately. Role plays help reduce the common reluctance found among the second language learners in using English because of fear of committing errors in English. Teachers can improve structure practice by encouraging students to give a variety of responses, rather than the usual set responses a situation and a role may demand. The focus of practice should be on producing a text of related sentences suitable for the role and the situation, rather than on the production and practice of single sentences. Role-play involves several students at once and holds the attention of the class, even as it enables students to be original and produce utterances often on their own. Begin first with the contexts of familiar stories. Go to local contexts including market situations, and then to contexts that may be peculiar to the native English speakers. This activity is recommended for all classes. Role-play for every lesson should be done whenever we teach.

VI. ABBREVIATIONS

L1: First language.

L2: Second language.

LT: Language teaching

ELT: English language teaching.

LSRW: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing.

CBTL: Competency Based Teaching Learning.

MLL: Minimal level of learning.

NCERT: National council of Education and Research and Training.

MHRD: Ministry of Human Resource Development.

ELT: English language teaching.

NCF: National Curriculum Framework.

MHRD: Ministry of Human Resource Development.

CCE: Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation.

SSA: Sarva Shiksha Avhiyan

SCERT: State Council Of Educational Research and Training

REFERENCES

Beishamayum, S. 2010. *Communication and linguistic problems faced by Meiteiron speakers in learning English language* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Manipur University, Manipur.

Chandran, A 1999. A study of the productive skills with special reference to communicative ability in speaking English of the higher secondary first year students in Combatore District (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Bharathiar University. Coimbatore.

Devi, Aruna, Kh. 2006. *Sentence Structure in English and Manipuri Language: A contrastive study* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Manipur University, Manipur.

Doff, Adrian.1988. *Teach English - A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.



National Curriculum Frame Work, 2005.New Delhi: NCERT Publications.Report of the committee, MHRD,
Minimum level of learning at Primary stage, NCERT.

Singh, Rameshwar, M. 2002. *A critical scrutiny of the position, problems and prospects of English in Manipur*
(Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Manipur University, Manipur.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

SECTION –1

Bio-data of teacher

Name of the teacher:.....

Age.....

Sex:

Education Qualification:.....

Any Additional Qualification:

.Date and Place of Birth:.....

Monthly Income:.....

Caste/Community/Tribe/ :
.....

Religion:
.....

Mother Tongue:
.....

Name of School where working presently:.....

For how long you have been teaching English:

In what medium you have received your education:

- (a) Primary _____ (b) Middle _____
- (c) Secondary _____ (d) Collage _____
- (e) University _____ (f) Any other _____

15. Do you teach English only or other subject well?

English only.....(b) other subject as well.....

SECTION –2

16.Which portion of the English text do you teach ?

- (a) Prose----- (b) Poetry ----- (c) Grammar----- (d)Spoken English -----.....



17. Do you like teaching the portion assigned to you ?

- (a)Yes(b) No
.....(c) No option

18. Are the classrooms in which you teach sufficient and proper in terms of space?.....

Do you have sufficient space and furniture in your classroom?

.....
Is it possible for you to freely move around the class?

19. Do you actually move around the class among the students or do you teach by standing in front of them throughout the period?.....

.....
.....

20. Do you organize classroom activities like:

- a) Pair work..... b)Group work c) Role play d) Any other
..... Please describe in brief:

.....
.....
.....

If you do so, do you have necessary space, time and other requirements in the classroom? Please give some examples from your experience:

.....
.....
.....

21.How do you teach the lesson in the classroom? How do you begin the class?

.....
.....
.....

22.How do you teach the main body of the lesson? How do you conclude the class?

.....
.....

23.Do your students raise question in the classroom? If yes, please specify their manner and frequency?



.....
.....
.....

24. Do you encourage your students to raise question in the classroom?

If yes, how?

.....
.....
.....

If no, why?

.....
.....
.....

25. If so, how many types of question do you encourage them. Please name them and elaborate them.

.....
.....
.....

26. Does it create problems of discipline in your classroom?

.....
.....
.....

SECTION-3

27. Are the classrooms in which you teach sufficient and proper in terms of space?.....

Is it possible for you to freely move around the class?

.....

28. Do you organize classroom activities like:

- a) Pair work.....
- b) Group work
- c) Role play
- d) Any other

..... Please describe in brief:

.....
.....
.....
.....

29. If you do so you have necessary space, time and other requirements in the classroom? Please give some examples from your experience:

.....



30. What teaching aids are available for your classroom use?

- a) Black board(b) Roller board(c)Cassette player
-(d) Television (e) VCP/VCR(f) Computer
-(g) Any other

31. Are there teaching aids conveniently supplied to you as and when you require them?

.....

.....

.....

32.Do you need any specific items like picture cards, overhead projectors etc.? Please specify:.....

.....

.....

33.Do you have a library in your school? : What kind of books, journals and other kinds of reading materials are there in the library?

.....

.....

.....

SECTION-4

34.How important do you think is English in Manipur?

- (a) Extremely Important(c) Very Important
- (c) Quite Important.....(d)Not so Important(e) Not so Important at all

35. In what particular areas is the use of English most important? Please list at least five items from your practical experience?

- 1)
-
- 2).....
-
- 3).....
-
- 4).....
-

36.Do you think that the students are aware of the reasons for learning English?



(1) Yes(2) No(3) I don't know

37. Why do you think that your students are interested in learning English? Please tick the right choice:

Because it is a compulsory subject

Because it is an important language

Because it is a necessary for getting jobs

Because it is a status symbols

38. What are your students' specific needs for learning English? Please specify.

.....
.....
.....
.....

39.What do you think are the objectives of teaching English in Manipur? If yes, what are they? Please list?

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....
- 4.....
- 5.....

40.Does the present syllabus specify the goal of teaching English in Manipur? Please list the most important ones below?

- 1).....
- 2).....
- 3).....

If no, can you make out the hidden goals and objectives?

1..... 2..... 3.....

.....

4..... 5.....

6.....

41.Do you focus more on:

- (a).Content based teaching.
- (b). Grammar based teaching.
- (c). Skill based teaching.
- (d). Functional grammar



42. Have you ever participated in course design either at your school level or at the State board level?

Please describe your experience?

.....
.....
.....

43. Do you think that all the teachers must participate in the process of setting question design?

.....
.....
.....

44. How do you think that teachers can contribute course design?

.....
.....
.....

45. Have you read “minimal levels of learning” the publications by NCERT, New Delhi?

a) YES b) NO

.....

46. If yes, what are the minimal level of English from class (I) to (VIII), Please write a few minimal level of learning in school?

.....
.....
.....

47. Do you know the competency base teaching learning based on this minimal level of learning?

(a) YES (B) NO

.....

48. Have you ever attended any short term or long term orientation programmes of English language teaching methodology organized by SCERT or any other agencies?

(a) YES (B) NO

.....

49. How do you teach listening, speaking, reading and writing skill in your school?

.....
.....
.....
.....



50. Do you take up any approaches and methods to develop these skills among the children and the students in the class?

(a) Yes (b) No

51. If yes, what are those approaches, methods and techniques you employ in the classroom?

52. How do you evaluate the students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills?

53. Do you have any pattern of evaluation from Standard I to Standard VIII? If so, what are the patterns from Standard I to Standard V and from Standard VI to VIII?

(A) Yes.....

(B) No.....

If yes, what are the patterns of evaluation for each class right from the beginning of Standard I to Standard VIII?

54. How do you evaluate for the whole syllabus of English?

55. How many marks do you set questions for the whole syllabus? (i) 100 (ii) 200.

If it is 100 marks, what are the components in the questions and tick these in the given components.

(i). Grammar (ii) listening skill (iii) Speaking skill (iv) Reading skill (v) Writing skill (vi) Functional grammar

How do you distribute marks?

56. If you are not satisfied with the achievement of the students in a period of 45 minutes, what do you do?



.....
.....
.....

57. How many minutes do you spare for evaluation in a class period?

.....
.....
.....

Suppose there are 90 students in a class. Are you able to evaluate all the 90 students within the time kept for evaluation? (A) YES(B) NO

.....

58. If yes, what techniques or strategies do you adopt? Please elaborate the techniques or strategies.

.....
.....

.....59. Do you motivate them sometime?

(A) YES(B) NO

If yes, how do you motivate them ?

.....
.....
.....