CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1.0 INTRODUCTION

Chapter III elaborates the methodology used in the present study. It is intended to give an insight into the experimentation, tools used to collect the data and the type of data collected in this study. Data was collected during the present research so that one can deduce meaning out of it. Raw data collected during the experimentation however, does not provide any information without analysis. Utility is attached to raw data only when it is analyzed and interpretation is made. Interpretation of data is the process of deriving sense out of the collected and analyzed data. Analysis and interpretation of data not only helps to achieve the objectives of the study but also gives a direction to the researcher for testing the hypothesis of the study. This facilitates the researcher to reach to a conclusion, thereby deriving generalization to a larger population. Therefore, the process of data analysis is very crucial to any research. Utmost care needs to be taken to use appropriate statistical techniques for data analysis pertaining to the nature and design of the study.

Present study is experimental in nature following a quasi-experimental design. The data were collected to compare the achievement score in English, of the control group and the experimental group at the end of the experiment. Data were collected by the investigator through two tools namely achievement test and reaction scale. The achievement test was administered by the researcher at the beginning of the experiment as the pre-test for equating the groups. The students in the experimental group were taught English through activities related to LSRW skill for each unit of English Literature Reader whereas, students in the control group were taught English through the traditional method. The same achievement test was administered on both the experimental and control groups at the end of the experiment to know the effectiveness of the package. This test assessed students' achievement in LSRW skills in English language through 14 different activities. Reactions of the students on the

implementation of the package were measured through a Likert type reaction scale. Quantitative analysis of the data was done for the present study.

This chapter is an attempt to present the analysis and interpretation of the data. To achieve objective 3 of the present study i.e. "to study the effectiveness of the developed package in terms of improvement in LSRW skills in English among secondary CBSE students" and to test the five null hypothesis, a comparison of the post test scores in listening, speaking, reading and writing of the students of control group and experimental group was made. The investigator used the statistical techniques such as Mean, SD, SE and Mann-Whitney U-test to achieve this objective. As the selection of the sample was done purposively, the assumption of parametric statistic did not match for the present data. As a result, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test was used which is considered equivalent of t-test of the parametric family. The comprehensive analysis to achieve objective 3 is detailed through tables 4.1 to 4.10

To achieve objective 4 of the present study i.e. "To study the reaction of secondary CBSE students towards the developed package for enhancing LSRW skills" data collected through a Likert type five point reaction scale were analyzed using percentage and intensity index (II) . The detailed analysis related to this objective is given in table 4.11.

4.2.0 COMPARISON OF THE POSTTEST SCORES OF LISTENING SKILL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 gives the summary of the results arrived at after applying statistical analysis on the scores obtained by the control and experimental groups in the posttests to achieve the objective 3 i.e. "to study the effectiveness of the developed package in terms of improvement in LSRW skills in English among secondary CBSE students" and to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of listening skill of experimental and control groups secondary students".

Table 4.1: Distribution of Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error of Mean (SE) of Listening Skill in English Language of Experimental Group and Control Group

Groups	N	Mean	SD	SE
Experimental Group	33	21.92	2.47	0.43
Control Group	33	20.67	3.08	0.54

From table 4.1, it was found that the mean score of listening skill in English of the experimental group taught English through the developed package was 21.92 out of the total score of 25. The standard deviation from the mean for listening skill was found to be 2.47 with standard error of mean of 0.43. From the same table it was also found that the mean score of listening skill in English of control group taught English through traditional method was 20.67. Standard deviation from the mean for control group was found to be 3.08 with standard error of mean of 0.54.

Comparing the mean scores of listening skill in English of the experimental group and control group, it was found that the mean score of the experimental group was higher than the mean score of the control group. From the standard deviation of the control group and the experimental group it was found that the experimental group was more homogenous in comparison to the control group. More mean score of the experiment group in the listening skill and the less standard deviation could be due to the effect of the experiment. Standard error was also found to be quite less in both the groups.

To find whether the difference in the mean scores was significant or by chance and to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of listening skill of experimental and control group secondary students", Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Table 4.2 gives the details of the result of the Mann-Whitney U-test followed by the analysis.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Sum of the Ranks (SR), U-Value (U), Z-Value (Z) and Indicator of Significance of the Experimental Group and Control Group in Listening Skill in English language

Groups	N	SR	U	Z	Significance Level
Experimental Group	33	1238	412	-1.70	0.044
Control Group	33	991			

From Table 4.2, it was found that the sum of the ranks of the groups taught listening skill in English through the package and the group taught listening skill in English through traditional method were 1238 and 991 respectively with 33 students in both the groups. The U-value and Z- value were found to be 412 and -1.70. The Z-value of -1.70 was found to be significant at 0.044 level of significance which was found to be less than the decided significant level (α) i.e. 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of listening skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was rejected and it could be believed that the group taught English through the package and the group taught English through traditional method, differed significantly in terms of the mean scores of listening skill. Thus it can be concluded that the package was found to be significantly effective in terms of enhancing listening skills in English among secondary CBSE students.

4.3.0 COMPARISON OF THE POSTTEST SCORES OF SPEAKING SKILL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of speaking skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was tested to achieve the third objective i.e. "to study the effectiveness of the developed package in terms of improvement in LSRW skills in English among secondary CBSE students". Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 gives the summary of the results arrived at after applying statistical analysis on the scores obtained by the control and experimental group in the posttest for speaking.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error of Mean (SE) of Experimental Group and Control Group in Speaking Skill in English language

Groups	N	Mean	SD	SE
Experimental Group	33	17.94	2.11	0.37
Control Group	33	14.86	4.26	0.74

From table 4.3, it was found that the mean score of speaking skill in English of the experimental group taught English through the developed package was 17.94 out of

the total score of 25. The standard deviation from the mean for speaking skill was found to be 2.11 with standard error of mean of 0.37. The mean score of speaking skill in English of control group taught English through traditional method was found to be 14.86. Standard deviation from the mean for control group was found to be 4.26 with standard error of mean of 0.74.

Comparing the mean scores of listening skill in English of the experimental group and control group, it was found that the mean score of the experimental group which was taught English through the package was significantly higher than the mean score of the control group which was taught English through traditional method. From the standard deviation of the control group and the experimental group it was found that the experimental group was more homogenous whereas, the control group was heterogeneous. This could be due to the effect of the experiment. Standard error was also found to be quite less in both the groups.

To find whether the difference in the mean scores was significant or by chance and to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of speaking skill of experimental and control group secondary students", Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Table 4.4 gives the details of the result of the Mann-Whitney U-test followed by the analysis.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Sum of the Ranks (SR), U-Value (U), Z-Value (Z) and Indicator of Significance of the Experimental Group and Control Group in Speaking Skill in English language

Groups	N	SR	U	Z	Significance Level
Experimental Group	33	1370			
Control Group	33	840	279.5	-3.40	0.001

From Table 4.4, it was found that the sum of the ranks of the groups taught listening skill through the package and the group taught English/speaking skill through traditional method were 1370 and 840 respectively with 33 students in each group. The U value and Z value were found to be 279.5 and -3.40. The Z-value of -3.40 was

found to be significant at 0.001 level of significance which was found to be less than the decided significant level (α) i.e. 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of speaking skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was rejected and it could be believed that the group taught English through the package and the group taught English through traditional method, differed significantly in terms of the mean scores of speaking skill. Thus it can be concluded that the package was found to be significantly effective in terms of enhancing speaking skills in English among secondary CBSE students.

4.4.0 COMPARISON OF THE POSTTEST SCORES OF READING SKILL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of reading skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was tested to achieve the third objective i.e. "to study the effectiveness of the developed package in terms of improvement in LSRW skills in English among secondary CBSE students". Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 gives the summary of the results arrived at after applying statistical analysis on the scores obtained by the control and experimental group in the posttest.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error of Mean (SE) of Experimental Group and Control Group in Reading Skill in English language

Groups	N	Mean	SD	SE
Experimental Group	33	18.18	3.14	0.55
Control Group	33	15.52	4.65	0.81

From table 4.5, it was found that the mean score of reading skill in English of the experimental group taught English through the developed package was 18.18 out of the total score of 25. The standard deviation from the mean for reading skill was found to be 3.14 with standard error of mean of 0.55. The mean score of reading skill in English of control group taught English through traditional method was found to be

15.52. Standard deviation from the mean for control group was found to be 4.65 with standard error of mean of 0.81.

Comparing the mean scores of listening skill in English of the experimental group and control group, it was found that the mean score of the experimental group which was taught English through the package was higher than the mean score of the control group which was taught English through traditional method. From the standard deviation of the control group and the experimental group it was found that the experimental group was more homogenous whereas, the control group was heterogeneous. This could be due to the effect of the experiment. Standard error was also found to be quite less in both the groups.

To find whether the difference in the mean scores was significant or by chance and to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of reading skill of experimental and control group secondary students", Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Table 4.7 gives the details of the result of the Mann-Whitney U-test followed by the analysis.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Sum of the Ranks (SR), U-Value (U), Z-Value (Z) and Indicator of Significance of the Experimental Group and Control Group in Reading Skill in English language

Groups	N	SR	U	Z	Significance Level
Experimental Group	33	1276	374	-2.19	0. 029
Control Group	33	935			

From Table 4.6, it was found that the sum of the ranks of the groups taught listening skill through the package and the group taught English/reading skill through traditional method were 1276 and 935 respectively with 33 students in each group. The U value and Z value were found to be 374 and -2.19. The Z-value of -2.19 was found to be significant at 0.029 level of significance which was found to be less than the decided significant level (α) i.e. 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There will

be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of reading skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was rejected and it could be believed that the group taught English through the package and the group taught English through traditional method, differed significantly in terms of the mean scores of reading skill. Thus it can be concluded that the package was found to be significantly effective in terms of enhancing reading skills in English among secondary CBSE students.

4.5.0 COMPARISON OF THE POSTTEST SCORES OF WRITING SKILL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of writing skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was tested to achieve the third objective i.e. "to study the effectiveness of the developed package in terms of improvement in LSRW skills in English among secondary CBSE students". Table 4.7 and Table 4.8 gives the summary of the results arrived at after applying statistical analysis on the scores obtained by the control and experimental group in the posttest.

Table 4.7: Distribution of Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error of Mean (SE) of Experimental Group and Control Group in Writing Skill in English language

Groups	N	Mean	SD	SE
Experimental Group	33	16.70	4.65	0.81
Control Group	33	12.44	5.07	0.88

From table 4.7, it was found that the mean score of writing skill in English of the experimental group taught English through the developed package was 16.70 out of the total score of 25. The standard deviation from the mean for writing skill was found to be 4.65 with standard error of mean of 0.81. The mean score of writing skill in English of control group taught English through traditional method was found to be 12.44 out of the total score of 25. Standard deviation from the mean for control group was found to be 5.07 with standard error of mean of 0.88.

Comparing the mean scores of writing skill in English of the experimental group and control group, it was found that the mean score of the experimental group which was taught English through the package was higher than the mean score of the control group which was taught English through traditional method. From the standard deviation of the control group and the experimental group it was found that the experimental group was more homogenous whereas, the control group was heterogeneous. This could be due to the effect of the experiment. Standard error also was found to be quite less in both the groups.

To find whether the difference in the mean scores was significant or by chance and to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of writing skill of experimental and control group secondary students", Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Table 4.8 gives the details of the result of the Mann-Whitney U-test followed by the analysis.

Table 4.8: Distribution of Sum of the Ranks (SR), U-Value (U), Z-Value (Z) and Indicator of Significance of the Experimental Group and Control Group in Writing Skill in English language

Groups	N	SR	U	Z	Significance Level
Experimental Group	33	1355	295	3.20	0. 001
Control Group	33	856			

From Table 4.8, it was found that the sum of the ranks of the groups taught writing skill through the package and the group taught English/writing skill through traditional method were 1355 and 856 respectively with 33 students in each group. The U value and Z value were found to be 295 and 3.20. The Z-value of 3.20 was found to be significant at 0. 001 level of significance which was found to be less than the decided significant level (α) i.e. 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of writing skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was rejected and it could be believed that the group taught English through the package and the group taught

English through traditional method, differed significantly in terms of the mean scores of writing skill. Thus it can be concluded that the package was found to be significantly effective in terms of enhancing writing skills in English among secondary CBSE students.

4.6.0 COMPARISON OF THE POSTTEST SCORES OF COMMUNICATION SKILL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The objective 3 of the present study was "to study the effectiveness of the developed package in terms of improvement in LSRW skills in English among secondary CBSE students". The researcher also intended to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of English communication skill of experimental and control group secondary students".

Table 4.9: Distribution of Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and Standard Error of Mean (SE) of Experimental Group and Control Group in Communication skill in English language

Groups	N	Mean	SD	SE
Experimental Group	33	74.10	10.28	1.79
Control Group	33	62.92	13.71	2.39

From table 4.9, it was found that the mean score of communication skill in English of the experimental group taught English through the developed package was 74.10 out of the total score of 100. The standard deviation from the mean for communication skill was found to be 10.28 with standard error of mean of 1.79. The mean score of communication skill in English of control group taught English through traditional method was found to be 62.92 out of the total score of 100. Standard deviation from the mean for control group was found to be 13.71 with standard error of mean of 2.39.

Comparing the mean scores of communication skill in English of the experimental group and control group, it was found that the mean score of the experimental group which was taught English through the package was higher than the mean score of the control group which was taught English through traditional method. From the

standard deviation of the control group and the experimental group it was found that the experimental group was more homogenous whereas, the control group was heterogeneous. This could be due to the effect of the experiment. Standard error was found to be quite less in both the groups.

To find whether the difference in the mean scores was significant or by chance and to test the null hypothesis i.e. "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of listening skill of experimental and control group secondary students", Mann-Whitney U-test was used. Table 4.10 gives the details of the result of the Mann-Whitney U-test followed by the analysis.

Table 4.10: Distribution of Sum of the Ranks (SR), U-Value (U), Z-Value (Z) and Indicator of Significance of the Experimental Group and Control Group in Communication skill in English language

Groups	N	SR	U	Z	Significance Level
Experimental Group	33	1365	285	-3.33	0.001
Control Group	33	846			

From Table 4.10, it was found that the sum of the ranks of the groups taught communication skill through the package and the group taught English/communication skill through traditional method were 1365 and 846 respectively with 33 students in each group. The U value and Z value were found to be 285 and -3.33. The Z-value of -3.33 was found to be significant at 0.001 level of significance which was found to be less than the decided significant level (α) i.e. 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There will be no significant difference between the mean achievement score of communication skill of experimental and control group secondary students" was rejected and it could be believed that the group taught English through the package and the group taught English through traditional method, differed significantly in terms of the mean scores of communication skill. Thus it can be concluded that the package was found to be significantly effective in terms of enhancing communication skills in English among secondary CBSE students.

4.7.0 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PACKAGE IN TERMS OF THE REACTIONS OF THE STUDENTS

To achieve objective 4 of the present study i.e. "To study the reaction of secondary CBSE students towards the developed package for enhancing LSRW skills" data were collected from the sample of experimental group which was taught English through the package. Data were collected through a Likert type five point reaction scale. Collected data were analyzed using percentage and intensity index (II) which is given and analyzed in table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Summary of the Reactions of the Students towards the Statements related to the Developed Package to Enhance LSRW Skills in English in terms of Percentage Response and Intensity Index (II)

No.	Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	II
1.	The package provided a wide range of LSRW activities.	56	44	0	0	0	4.6
2.	The LSRW activities were thematically related to the units of English Literature Reader.	51	49	0	0	0	4.5
3.	The activities in the package motivated me to develop communicative competence in English.	56	38	5	0	0	4.5
4.	I developed knowledge of LSRW skills in English.	41	56	3	0	0	4.4
5.	The language used in the LSRW activities was according to my standard.	46	41	10	3	0	4.3
6.	The instructions for each LSRW activity were clear to me.	59	33	5	3	0	4.5
7.	The LSRW activities gave me practise to develop communicative competence in English language.	56	38	5	0	0	4.5
8.	The LSRW activities encouraged me to participate during the teaching learning process.	33	54	10	3	0	4.2
9.	It created an English language learning environment for skill practise.	36	54	10	0	0	4.3
10.	The feedback provided by the teacher after each activity helped to enhance my language skills.	44	56	0	0	0	4.4

No.	Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	II
11.	I am now able to understand better while I listen to English.	62	33	0	3	3	4.5
12.	I am now able to interpret better while I listen to English.	46	41	10	0	3	4.3
13.	The listening activities helped me to enhance my listening skills.	44	56	0	0	0	4.4
14.	The speaking activities helped to reduce stage fear in me.	49	44	8	0	0	4.4
15.	I have developed confidence to use English language for conversation.	31	54	13	3	0	4.1
16.	The speaking activities helped me to enhance my speaking skills.	54	46	0	0	0	4.5
17.	The reading activities helped me to enhance my reading skills.	36	64	0	0	0	4.4
18.	The reading activities developed my interest towards reading.	31	41	15	8	5	3.8
19.	The writing activities provided intense writing practise.	54	38	5	3	0	4.4
No.	Statement	SA	A	U	D	SD	II
20.	Varied writing activities exposed me to various formats of writing.	54	36	8	3	0	4.4
21.	The writing activities helped me to enhance my writing skill.	36	62	3	0	0	4.3
22.	The content of the LSRW activities were related to real life.	54	38	8	0	0	4.5
23.	The LSRW activities have instilled enough confidence in me to use the English language.	31	59	10	0	0	4.2
24.	I liked integration of LSRW activities with regular teaching of English.	54	33	13	0	0	4.4
25.	I had adequate time to complete each LSRW activity.	36	36	15	13	0	3.9
26.	Enough time was provided for practicing speaking activities wherein prior preparation was required.	59	18	18	3	3	4.3
27.	Implementation of LSRW activities at regular interval helped me to improve LSRW skills at a consistent rate.	46	49	5	0	0	4.4
28.	I liked the discussion of assessment criteria before implementation of each activity.	56	38	5	0	0	4.5
29.	English teachers should use these types of LSRW activities while teaching the subject.	74	21	5	0	0	4.7
30.	I liked the package through which LSRW activities were conducted in the classroom.	72	23	5	0	0	4.7
Over all Reactions							4.38

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 1 i.e. "The package provided a wide range of LSRW activities", 56 percentage and 44 percentage of them reacted as strongly agree and agree respectively. The intensity index of 4.6 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students stating that the developed package had a wide range of LSRW activities for learners.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 2 i.e. "The LSRW activities were related to the units of English Literature Reader", 51 percentage and 49 percentage of them reacted strongly agree and agree respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students towards the activities in the developed package asserting that each activity of the package was thematically based on the units of English literature reader.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 3 i.e. "The activities in the package motivated me to develop communicative competence in English", 56 percentage, 38 percentage and 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction towards the package in terms of motivating the students to develop their communicative competence in English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 4 i.e. "I developed knowledge of LSRW skills in English", 41 percentage, 56 percentage and 3 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reactions of the students towards the package stating that they developed the knowledge basic skills of English.

For statement 5 i.e. "The language used in the LSRW activities was according to my standard", 46 percentage, 41 percentage, 10 percentage and 3 percentage of students reacted as strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree. The intensity index of 4.3 showed favourable reaction of the students regarding the lucid language used in the package making it grade appropriate.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 6 i.e. "The instructions for each LSRW activity were clear to me", 59 percentage, 33 percentage, 5 percentage and 3 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction of the

students towards the clarity in instructions given for each LSRW activity of the package.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 7 i.e. "The LSRW activities gave me practice to develop communicative competence in English language", 56 percentage, 38 percentage, 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package asserting that they provided enough opportunity to develop communicative competence.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 8 i.e. "The LSRW activities encouraged me to participate during the teaching learning process", 33 percentage, 54 percentage, 10 percentage, 3 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.2 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package stating that the package encouraged active participation of students in the teaching learning process

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 9 i.e. "It created an English language learning environment for skill practise", 36 percentage, 54 percentage, 10 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.3 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the package affirming that implementation of the package created an input rich environment in in the classroom which was conducive for English language skill practice.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 10 i.e. "The feedback provided by the teacher after each activity helped to enhance my language skills", 44 percentage and 56 percentage of them reacted strongly agree and agree respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the feedback provided by the teacher at the end of each activity asserting that teacher's feedback helped them to enhance language skills.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 11 i.e. "I am now able to understand better while I listen to English", 62 percentage, 33 percentage, 3 percentage and 3 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable

reaction of the students regarding the feelings of the students that the package helped them to comprehend better while listening to English making it easier to respond.

For statement 12 i.e. "I am now able to interpret better while I listen to English", 46 percentage, 41 percentage, 10 percentage and3 percentage of students reacted as strongly agree, agree, can't say and strongly disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.3 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the package in terms of it helping them to develop their interest in listening to English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 13 i.e. "The listening activities helped me to enhance my listening skills", 44 percentage and 56 percentage of them reacted strongly agree and agree respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students affirming that the listening activities in the package facilitated them to enhance their listening skill in English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 14 i.e. "The speaking activities helped to reduce stage fear in me", 49 percentage, 44 percentage and 8 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students asserting that the components of the package emphasizing speaking were useful in reducing stage fear in them.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 15 i.e. "I have developed confidence to use English language for conversation", 31 percentage, 54 percentage, 13 percentage and 3 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.1 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the package as they felt that the developed package benefitted them in building confidence while conversing in English.

For statement 16 i.e. "The speaking activities helped me to enhance my speaking skills", 54 percentage and 46 percentage of students reacted as strongly agree and agree respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package which focused on speaking skill stating that the package aided them to enhance speaking skills in English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 17 i.e. "The reading activities helped me to enhance my reading skills", 36 percentage and 64 percentage of them reacted strongly agree and agree respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the reading activities in the package regarding the assistance provided by these activities in improving their reading skills in English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 18 i.e. "The reading activities developed my interest towards reading", 31 percentage, 41 percentage, 15 percentage, 8 percentage and 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, can't say, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. The intensity index of 3.8 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the reading activities in the package affirming that the reading activities helped them to develop their interest towards reading in English.

For statement 19 i.e. "The writing activities provided intense writing practise", 54 percentage, 38 percentage, 5 percentage and3 percentage of students reacted as strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package focusing on writing skill stating that these activities provided them with intense writing practice in English.

For statement 20 i.e. "Varied writing activities exposed me to various formats of writing", 54 percentage, 36 percentage, 8 percentage and 3 percentage of students reacted as strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students regarding the components of the package focusing on writing activities asserting that these activities provided with enough exposure to diverse formats of writing.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 21 i.e. "The writing activities helped me to enhance my writing skill", 36 percentage, 62 percentage and 3 percentage of the students reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.3 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package emphasizing on writing activities stating that these activities helped them to enhance their writing skills in English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 22 i.e. "The content of the LSRW activities were related to real life", 54 percentage, 38 percentage and 8 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package regarding their relevance and relatedness to the real life situations.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 23 i.e. "The LSRW activities have instilled enough confidence in me to use the English language", 31 percentage, 59 percentage and10 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.2 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the components of the package stating that the activities in the package infused in them the confidence to use the English language for listening, speaking, reading and writing.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 24 i.e. "I liked integration of LSRW activities with regular teaching of English", 54 percentage, 33 percentage and13 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the implementation of the package affirming their liking regarding the implementation of the package along with regular teaching of English.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 25 i.e. "I had adequate time to complete each LSRW activity", 36 percentage, 36 percentage, 15 percentage and 13 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, can't say and disagree respectively. The intensity index of 3.9 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the time allotted for execution of the activities in the package stating that appropriate time was allotted to complete each activity.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 26 i.e. "Enough time was provided for practicing speaking activities wherein prior preparation was required", 59 percentage, 18 percentage,18 percentage, 3 percentage and 3 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree, can't say, disagree and strongly disagree respectively. The intensity index of 4.3 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the execution of the speaking activities in the package wherein pre-speaking preparation

was required asserting that the time allotted for preparation of such speaking activities was adequate.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 27 i.e. "Implementation of LSRW activities at regular interval helped me to improve LSRW skills at a consistent rate", 46 percentage, 49 percentage and 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.4 showed favourable reaction of the students towards the implementation of the package in as continuous practice throughout the year helped them in improving LSRW activities constantly.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 28 i.e. "I liked the discussion of assessment criteria before implementation of each activity", 56 percentage, 38 percentage and 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.5 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students towards the implementation of the package in terms of discussion of the criteria of assessment before each activity.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 29 i.e. "English teachers should use these types of LSRW activities while teaching the subject", 74 percentage, 21 percentage and 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.7 showed strongly favourable reaction of the students towards the package in terms of their positive inclination towards the LSRW activities in future. Students felt positive towards teachers taking up the practice of teaching LSRW skills through activities focusing on each skill.

In terms of the reaction of the students towards statement 30 i.e. "I liked the package through which LSRW activities were conducted in the classroom", 72 percentage, 23 percentage and 5 percentage of them reacted strongly agree, agree and can't say respectively. The intensity index of 4.7 showed strong favourable reaction of the students towards the package with respect to their liking towards the execution of each LSRW activity in the package.

Out of the 30 statements the reaction was found strongly favourable for 11 statements and the reaction was found positively favourable for rest of the statements. It indicates the positive favourable reaction of the students towards the package. Further, the overall intensity index of 4.38 indicates a positive reaction of the students towards the

developed package and its implementation. It indicates that the students liked the components of the package aiming at each language skill (LSRW). They reacted positive towards the appropriateness of each LSRW activity in the package. They felt positive towards the implementation of the package and the adequate time allotted for each activity. The students also reacted positively towards the influence the package had on their enhanced LSRW skills in English.

4.8.0 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data gathered in the present study following findings were drawn.

1. The developed package was found to be significantly effective in enhancing the listening skill of secondary CBSE students.

2. The developed package was found to be significantly effective in enhancing the speaking skill of secondary CBSE students.

3. The developed package was found to be significantly effective in enhancing the reading skill of secondary CBSE students.

4. The developed package was found to be significantly effective in enhancing the writing skill of secondary CBSE students.

5. The developed package was found to be significantly effective in enhancing the overall communication (LSRW) skill of secondary CBSE students.

6. The developed package was found to be effective in terms of the overall favourable reactions of the secondary CBSE students.

7. Students' reactions were found strongly positive towards the developed package through which LSRW skills were conducted in the classroom.

8. Most of the students felt positive and favourable regarding the grade appropriateness of the package, its implementation and adequate time allocation for each activity.

9. Most of the students also reacted favorably towards the activities in the package asserting that the package helped them to enhance their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills in English. They also felt strongly favourable towards the activities in the package stating that the package motivated them to develop communicative competence in English.