CHAPTER: V
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.0. Introduction

The present study aims at exploration and description of a complex phenomenon of development of soft skills under cooperative learning methods based tasks. This chapter mainly consists of the analysis and interpretation of the data as per the objectives and research questions formulated for the present study. The context and entry - exit of the phenomena is dependent on richness of data. The data was collected till the last teaching day of the second semester which was exactly a day before the starting of internal examination of the college.

As the essence of the present study is the description of the phenomena, fourth chapter was devoted exclusively for description of the complex phenomena. This fifth chapter is meant for the description the analysis and interpretation of the data. The data that were collected using various tools were systematically organized and analyzed qualitatively using appropriate techniques.

The nature of the collected data was descriptive. Therefore the techniques used for the analysis of qualitative data were also qualitative in nature. There were about 14 participants who engaged themselves in academic learning during two phases-i.e. practice teaching phase and CLM based Instructional Plan. The investigator expected to collect rich data from the participants but there were certain difficulties and problems encountered by the researcher such as all the participants were also engaged in learning other subjects, they were engaged in a tough daily schedule with lot of academic co-curricular activities, hence the researcher could not get proper response from the participants in a few sessions. Some of them were irregular in attending sessions, submitting artifacts-documents.

5.0.1. Data Analysis:

The investigator could collect rich data for the study and they are analyzed using appropriate techniques. Analysis of data have been presented under four main sections viz.

➢ **Section: I:** It includes data analysis of tools collected during both Pre-field work and first stage of field work phase. This section included analysis of data for student-teacher's profile and tools collected during CLM based Practice teaching Plan**.**

➢ **Section: II** It includes data analysis of tools collected during Field work phase. This phase includes Analysis of data for Prior Performance Tests and Understanding process of development of soft skills during Field work in CLM based tasks. Basically, this section consists of data collected while Implementing CLM based strategy.

➢ **Section: III.** It includes data analysis and interpretation of tools collected during Post- field work phase. This phase includes analysis and interpretation of data collected through Posterior Performance Tests on select soft skills and collection of documents and artifacts; Cooperative learning Self-Assessment Scale; Opinionnaire on Cooperative Learning Method Instructional Plan.

➢ **Section: IV.** This includes establishment of trustworthiness of the findings of the research work.

The details of the above sections are described in the following passages.

5.1. **Section: I:** This section includes student-teacher's profile and tools collected during CLM based Practice teaching Plan.

5.1.1. **Part: I. Analysis of the Profile of the student-teachers**

The investigator could receive fully filled in profiles from 14 participants. More information of these participants was obtained from database of the affiliated university. The following passage depicted the analysis and interpretation of data on Student-teacher's Profile.

Analysis of student-teachers' profile reveals that all participants were female and their age ranges was 22 to 33 with an average age of 26.All of the 14 participants had English method either as first or second method course. As far as their mother tongue is concerned, two participants had Sindhi, six had Hindi, four had Gujarati and one each had Maithili, Malayalam. Out of these fourteen participants, nine had English literature as a subject during graduation, four had commerce and one had science. All the participants had Gujarat as their place of birth but they were native of different states of India.

5.1.2. **Part: II. Data analysis of Practice teaching phase.** It focuses on experiences of participants using CLM in practice teaching phase. This part includes analysis of mainly four tools i.e. Participant's Self Evaluation sheet on CLM based lessons delivered during practice teaching; Participant's Peer Evaluation sheet on CLM based lessons delivered during practice teaching;

Lesson Plan Transcripts on CLM lessons and Self-assessment of participants on self –evaluative rubrics on four soft skills.

[**Note:** Table of data analysis of Student's Profile and database of students of English method course are attached in the appendices.]

5.1.2.1. Participant's Self Evaluation sheet on CLM based lessons delivered during practice teaching

The investigator could receive 28 self-evaluation sheets duly filled in by 14 participants. This was an open ended reflective questionnaire on CLM based lessons delivered during practice teaching phase in real schools. The following themes emerge in analysis and interpretation of data received.

While analyzing self-evaluation sheet on CLM based lesson teaching, it is noticed that most of the participants were clear about CLM based activity and lesson plan format. Most participants prepared the lesson plan by properly following steps of CLM activity selected by themselves. Most participants learnt to use simple language for the interaction with school students. Most participants gave correct instructions during their lesson. All participants learnt how to make group heterogeneously. Most of the participants enjoyed their teaching due to use of CLM. All participants developed confidence and got inspired to learn more. On the contrary, it is found that most of the participants hardly could devise a new lesson format with CLM. All participants had incorporated CLM into their own lesson plan format devised by the college. Apart from these, it is observed that most of the participants were not able to devote adequate time for the CLM based task and some of them were not able to monitor the class properly.

Regarding skills developed during teaching through CLM in practicing lesson, most participants mentioned that they had developed written communication skill. Most of the participants found difficulties with management of time. A few provided reasons that the CLM activities required more time to operate and process in classrooms. Most participants confessed that their soft skills got developed. Especially they found that their oral communication, grammar and teaching skills got developed. Based on the ideas mentioned in the form of description in self- evaluation sheet, it is observed that most participants found the use of CLM in their lessons helpful to develop their skills like communication, thinking, speaking, understanding, understood child differences better, developed confidence, helped improve grammar,

learnt ways of assessment and task preparation. Most of them had opined that they could not improve time management skill.

[Note: Table of analysis on Self Evaluation sheet on CLM based lessons is attached in the appendix for further reference.]

5.1.2.2. Analysis of Participant's Peer Evaluation sheet on CLM based lessons delivered during practice teaching:

The investigator had collected 28 Peer- evaluation sheets duly filled in by 14 participants. This was an open ended, flexible, reflective questionnaire on how their group mates delivered their CLM based lessons during the practice teaching phase in cooperating schools. Since the participants were allotted by the college to a particular practicing school (as per the permission given by respective principal of the practice teaching schools), there were students of different subject background in a group. Therefore the selected participants were scattered in different schools. This was sole reason why all the selected participants could not observe all CLM based lessons delivered by the participants.

However, analysis of the peer evaluation sheets reveals the view that their pursuance in preparing CLM lessons was quiet well. The objectives were clear to their peer. All participants reflected that that their peer teachers used simple language during CLM task. Most of them introduced lesson trough variety of devices. Most of the participants had organized the content well. All participants viewed that the lesson was properly executed. All participants found that the school students enjoyed learning activities.

It is noticed that most of the student-teachers evaluated performance of peer teacher trainee on communication skills and writing skill. Most participants reflected that many among them needed improvement in time management as they could not complete their task in time limit.

[Note: Table of analysis on Peer Evaluation sheet on CLM based lessons is attached in the appendix for further reference.]

5.1.2.3. Analysis of Participant's Lesson Plan Transcripts:

All fourteen participants could get the opportunity to deliver at least one lesson incorporating any one CLM of their choice during two phases of practice teaching. Some participants delivered their lessons during stray teaching programme conducted in first semester and a few could deliver CLM based lesson during Block teaching in second semester. The researcher could receive 14 lesson transcripts from

all participants. The themes emerged from the analysis of the transcripts reveals the following.

All participants had followed traditional lesson plan format but they could incorporate at least one CLM in their plans after the presentation part got over. Thus the CLM was used to provide a group activity taking the content under discussion. Most of them had prepared the task with the help of content based questions as per steps of CLM. All participants were clear about steps of CLM, lesson plan format, framing of objectives, listing method and materials. In all participant's lesson plans, the language was simple but some errors were noticed regarding syntax and spellings. None had attempted to prepare a new lesson plan exclusively on any one CLM since all of them followed the lesson plan format that their college had given them.

5.1.2.4. Self-assessment of participants on self –evaluative rubrics on four soft skills:

The participants were given Self- Evaluative rubrics to rate themselves at Entry level during the practice teaching phase in order to determine and know where they stand in terms of four soft skills. Thus, the participants were asked to fill up the rubrics based assessment sheets in the beginning of practice teaching before delivering a CLM task based lesson. The researcher guided the participants to fill up the self-assessment sheets at the Terminal level i.e. after the completion of practice teaching. The participants were expected to determine the terminal status on four soft skills having delivered the last CLM lesson in the second phase of practice teaching programme.

Table: 5.1: Participant's Self-assessment of select soft skills at Entry level during the practice teaching phase

Participants' Codes	Grading assigned on Codes of select four Soft skills			
	RCS1	**CTS1**	**WCS1**	**TMS1**
P1	B	C	C	B
P2	B	C	C	B
P3	C	C	C	C
P4	C	C	C	D
P5	B	C	B	B
P6	C	D	C	C
P7	C	C	C	C
P8	B	C	C	B
P9	B	C	C	B
P10	C	D	D	C
P11	C	C	C	B
P12	B	C	D	C
P13	C	C	C	C
P14	B	D	C	C

Note: RCS1, CTS1, WCS1 and TMS1 stand for entry level performance on selected four soft skills. Letters of grades are O, A, B, C, D, E and F.

A perusal of the table no: 5.1 reveals that on **RCS**, P1, P2, P5, P8, P9, P12 and P14 self-assessed themselves at B grade i.e. level of Good whereas rest assumed their abilities at C grade i.e. Satisfactory level. On **CTS**, P6, P10 and P14 rated themselves on D grade i.e. level of Mediocre or Satisfactory whereas the rest of the participants assessed them on C grade i.e. Satisfactory level. On **WCS**, only P5 rated herself on B grade denoting level of Good; P10 and P12 rated D grade i.e. on level of Mediocre or Below Satisfactory whereas rest of the other rated themselves on level of Satisfactory with C grade. It is noticed that majority of participants confessed the inadequate competence in writing skills. On **TMS** only P4 rated herself on Mediocre level whereas P1, P2, P5, P8, P9, P11 self-assessed at level of Good and the rest of the other assessed themselves at level of Satisfactory.

From the self-assessment of select soft skills, during practice teaching phase, overall it is found that four participants- P2, P5, P8, P9 assessed themselves at Good level on RCS and TMS whereas the same participants assumed C grade that denote Satisfactory level on CTS and WCS. However, P1, P3, P7, P11, P12 assessed themselves at satisfactory level on RCS, CTS and WCS whereas they assessed them at Good or above average level on TMS. The rest of the participants P4, P6, P10 assessed themselves at Mediocre level in all four skills.

Table: 5.2.: Participant's Self-assessment of select soft skills at

Terminal level at exit of CLM tasks based lessons

Participants' codes	Grading assigned on Codes of select four Soft skills			
	RCS2	CTS2	WCS2	TMS2
P1	A	B	B	A
P2	A	B	B	A
P3	B	C	C	A
P4	C	D	C	B
P5	A	B	B	A
P6	D	D	D	C
P7	C	C	C	B
P8	A	B	B	A
P9	A	B	B	A
P10	D	D	D	C
P11	C	D	C	B
P12	B	C	C	A
P13	C	D	C	C
P14	C	C	C	C

Note: RCS2, CTS2, WCS2 and TMS2 stand for Terminal level performance on selected four soft skills. Letters of grades are O, A, B, C, D, E and F during second practice teaching phase.

From the self-assessment of select soft skills after the second practice teaching phase ended, overall it is found that four participants- P2, P5, P8, P9 assessed themselves at A grade that denote Very Good level on RCS and TMS whereas B grade denoting level of Good on CTS and WCS. P1, P3, P7, P11, P12 assessed themselves at Satisfactory level on RCS, CTS and WCS whereas they self-assessed them at Good or above average level on TMS. The rest of the participants P4, P6, P10 assessed themselves at Mediocre level in all four skills.

Self- assessment rubrics on four soft skills present a comprehensive output of all participants on rubrics on four soft skills on seven point grading system adopted for participants. It is noticed that most participants over-rated themselves.

Thus the first part of the section: I of Data Analysis contains analysis of Student-teacher's Profile, analysis of Practice teaching lesson Peer observation schedule through Peer Evaluation sheet and Self- assessment of CLM lessons through Self Evaluation sheet. During practice teaching the student-teachers rated themselves in terms of soft skills selected through Self- Assessment Rubrics of four soft skills. The self- assessment of soft skills would help not only the investigator to consolidate

his observations and assessment of participants on four soft skills but also help in corroboration through data triangulation.

5.2. Section: II:

Data analysis and interpretation on understanding process of development of select four soft skills:

This section focuses on the analysis of the data collected during Field work phase. It presents analysis of the understanding the process of development of selected four soft skills among the participants. This section is categorized into three parts, viz., data analysis of worksheets collected during CLM tasks; observation and evaluation of participants on components of four selected soft skills and last part deals with analysis of video transcripts of CLM task based sessions and self-reflective reports of the participants.

5.2.1. Part: I. Data analysis of the artefacts collected during process of understanding the development of select soft skills during CLMIP:

Artefacts that were collected during CLMIP, mainly contains task based worksheets, self-reflective reports in terms of individual and group reports and researcher's on the site performance observation and evaluation of the participants on the basis of evaluation rubrics of four soft skills and field notes. Artefacts thus help in understanding the process how selected soft skills got developed among participants. The first among the artefact is worksheets, comprises of answers to the content based questions written by the participants in each CLM task.

5.2.1.1. Linguistic analysis of Worksheets:

In CLMIP, there were twelve tasks and every task was different with different CLM and content. Hence worksheets on the subject matter given for discussion during main task were prepared with a set of questions based on the topic selected. The answers of the worksheets were also used to reconfirm the observation of participants' performance on RCS, WRC and CTS made by the researcher at the main task during CLMIP. The same worksheets were analysed using linguistic analysis in order to know whether they reveal any other significant things or not. Linguistic analysis was done using error analysis, comprehension competency, language ability, grammar skills, spellings and punctuations.

It may be mentioned here that so far whatever analysis presented under section-I was related to the understanding of CLM, its preparation and execution. With this now the participants were ready to perform task related activities pertaining to the related 12 CLM. In order to comprehend how participants have performed task-wise, a linguistic analysis of worksheets was carried out in the following table.

Table: 5.3: Linguistics Analysis of Task Based Worksheets from individual participant

Participants Code	Observations and key concepts on consolidated 12 sessions based Worksheets of each participant						
	Evaluation/Assessment Criteria of the worksheets						
	Use of language & linguistics skill	**Correctness of Grammar**	**Content knowledge**	**Comprehension skill**	**Expression skill**	**Errors analysed**	**Reflections/thinking level**
P1	Used Simple language; Use of active vocabulary Narrative-descriptive style	Flaws in some Sentence structures – Errors in tense usage in most sentences Subject-verb disagreement in a few sentence	Has Content clarity	High understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely, using one's own language, could convey message, described processes, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In a few worksheets error of omission and selection, in some worksheets error of addition and error of order	Has mediocre level of reflection or critical thinking
P2	Typical oral form based language used mostly active vocabulary, no passive vocabulary used, poor passive repertoire, Good at Narrative-style	Had Flaws in some Sentence structures – Errors in tense usage in most sentences In a few sentence,	Had somewhat clarity of Content	Mediocre understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely in writing, using one's own language, could convey message, described processes, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In some worksheets error of omission and selection, in some worksheets error of addition and error of order	Reflection or critical thinking was of mediocre level

		errors of prepositions used and clauses					
P3	Had used Refined language Both active and passive vocabulary used Good at all styles- Narrative-descriptive and argumentative Writings reflected analytical-synthesis ability	No Flaws in Sentence structures Very less Errors in tense usage Somewhat confused for use of content words- adjectives and verb	High clarity of Content	High understanding of subject matter	Very good at expressing oneself freely in writing, using one's own language, could convey message, Aware about purpose of language, could describe processes, could explain reasons in own language, Has used creative expressions	Only a few error of selection,	Has outstanding level of reflection or critical thinking
P4	Simple language user Use of active vocabulary only, Strong at descriptive style	Flaws in some Sentence structures – Errors in tense usage in most sentences Correct Use of punctuations Less spelling	Has Content clarity	Good understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely in writing, using one's own language, could convey message, lacked creative expressions	In few worksheets error of omission and selection, in some worksheets error of addition and error of order	Has bit above than Average but not above average level of reflection or critical thinking

132

		errors					
P5	Full of erroneous language used Language of lower level use of active vocabulary descriptive style	Many flaws in most Sentence structures Errors in tense usage in most sentences Errors in spelling, order of words, Subject-verb disagreement in most sentences	Little clarity of Content	Lower understanding of subject matter	Could not express oneself freely, Used one's own language but of , could convey message, described processes, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In all worksheets errors of omission and selection, addition and error of order	Has unsatisfactory level of reflection or critical thinking
P6	Simple but erroneous language used Conversational language used use of active vocabulary Dominating descriptive style	Weak in Syntax Errors in tense usage in most sentences Spelling errors in sentences Has left many of questions undone	Very less clarity of Content	Lower understanding of subject matter	Could not express oneself freely, used erroneous one's own language, could not convey message, Poor at description of processes, satisfactory level to explain reasons in own language, Totally lacked creative expressions	Almost all worksheets have errors of omission, selection, error of addition and error of order	Has below/lower average level of reflection or critical thinking

P7	Conversational-communicative language use of active vocabulary descriptive style dominated	Flawless Sentence structures Few Errors in tense usage in sentences	Good clarity of Content	Had very good understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely in writing, Used one's own simple language, could convey message as per goal, Had described processes, Had explained reasons in own language, very few use of creative expression	most worksheets had error of selection, in some worksheets error of addition	Has average level of reflection or critical thinking
P8	Flawless lucid and Simple language used used of active vocabulary and some passive also Strong at descriptive style and argumentative	Very few spelling errors Correct Sentence structures Less Errors in tense usage in few sentences	Outstanding concept and subject matter	High understanding of subject matter	Could express herself freely in writing, Could use one's own language for explanation, could convey message, Had described processes, Had explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In few worksheets error of selection,	Has excellent level of reflection or critical thinking
P9	Had Simple language used active vocabulary descriptive style preferred	Flaws in some Sentence structures mostly in elaboration	Good Content clarity	Satisfactory level understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely, using one's own language, could convey message, lacked creative expressions	In most worksheets error of omission and addition	Has average level of reflection or critical thinking

		Errors in tense usage in most sentences					
P10	Simple language use of active vocabulary descriptive style	Somewhat erroneous Sentence structures Had Errors in tense usage in most sentences Subject-verb disagreement in a few sentence	Content clarity,	High understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely, using one's own language, could convey message, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In most worksheets error of selection and order	Has average level of reflection or critical thinking
P11	Lucid and Simple language use of active vocabulary Good at Narrative and descriptive style	Flaws in some Sentence	Content clarity,	High understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself own language, could convey message, described processes, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In most worksheets error of omission and selection, in some worksheets error of addition and error of order	Has above average level of reflection or critical thinking
P12	Simple but smooth language use of active vocabulary Good at both	some Sentence structures had flaws Errors in	Gradually developed Content	High understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely, using one's own language, could convey message, language lacked	In most worksheets error of addition and error of order	Has mediocre level of reflection or critical thinking

	Narrative-descriptive style	tense usage in most sentences Subject-verb disagreement in a few sentence	clarity,		creative expressions		
P13	Simple but erroneous language used Mostly used of active vocabulary, no passive vocabulary used Narrative-descriptive style	Spelling errors and punctuation errors , had flaws in some Sentence structures – Errors in tense usage in most sentences	Content clarity,	High understanding of subject matter	Could express oneself freely, using one's own language, could convey message, described processes, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions	In most worksheets error of omission and selection, in some worksheets error of addition and error of order	Has below average level of reflection or critical thinking
P14	Used Simple language Has used more of active vocabulary Strong at descriptive style	Occasional Flaws in some Sentence structures Errors in use of tense usage in some sentences	Has Content clarity	Good at understanding of subject matter	Could express one's self freely in writing, using one's own language, could convey message, explained reasons in own language, lacked creative expressions in language use	Some worksheets had error of sequence,	Has mediocre level of reflection or critical thinking

It is observed from the above table of analysis that most of the participants had not got complete comprehension of content. Most participants made moderate errors in writing especially half of them made errors in spellings and syntax. Most of the participants developed their comprehension competency at Average level. All participants had improved their language ability, although in most cases, little improvement was found in general on grammar. Almost all participants had difficulties in writing correct spellings and most of them had made errors of improper usage of punctuations.

This first part of first section of data analysis is on process of enhancing soft skills under CLMIP phase. Worksheets are written record of how learning take place during tasks. Though the worksheets might reveal many aspects of personality traits and abilities of participants, they were mainly supportive in consolidating performance on reading comprehension and writing communication skills. In conclusion, it is found that participants had improved in comprehension but lacked satisfactory improvement in writing skills.

5.2.1.2. Analysis of Video Transcripts of the sessions conducted during Cooperative Learning Methods based Instructional Plan [CLMIP]:

The researcher has so far analysed the data collected during CLMIP using rubrics and other tools. The following passages describe the process of development of soft skills reveals in video sessions of all 12 CLM tasks. The qualitative data offer significant revelations with regard to selected soft skills enhancement.

CLM based Tasks are conducted under CLMIP during phase-II of data collection at the main site of the present study. There are twelve activity sessions exclusively based on twelve different CLM. Each time the content is of different nature. First two sessions are treated as team building. All of these tasks are video graphed. From the description of these tasks, the investigator has selected some of the most significant excerpts from the video transcript of all 14 sessions. The purpose of selecting the direct quotes is that these quotes reveal many direct and hidden messages of what speakers say with what intension, motives, and emotions. These dialogues are selected because they come from the participant's mouth that reveal the genuine concern and opinions of the participants.

The analysis of the video sessions are based on the aspects of the present study. Most of the participants have reflected almost on all aspects that are part of the

present study, i.e. selected four soft skills, CL methods selected, content selected, task designed, ambience created, team formation, norms observed etc. Although the language used at many instances has been erroneous but the message conveyed is loud and clear. Feedback on aspects, other than the research objectives and scope of the present study, are not taken into consideration as a few participants have also opined about the communication skills, their English proficiency, and their experience of learning and have also commented about the co-learners.

Participants have presented their frank opinions and feedback on the **aspect of selected soft skills,** from various CLM sessions. The following passages describe the selected quotes as they are found significant by the investigator from aspect of development of soft skills.

P1: we read the text silently, individually and then we discussed the main points, so this was to understand or develop thinking, other pairs have different points and views. **[CIRC]**

P2: being part of this activity, it enhanced the writing skill by discussing with the different partners; I could enhance my writing skills and thinking skills. Like I could express myself more clearly and the content was very interesting. Because there were various moods of happiness, sadness in the story. **[WPS]**

P7: through this activity, we came to know, we have partners who are thinking alike. All the answers were correct. But when we switched, we came to know different writers, or poets, what my next partner was thinking about title of the poem and answers were also different. I and my partner think in same way, but the new partner mentioned different. **[WPS]**

P2: While we discussed, we found many of our thoughts were very same.……... And through this Think-Pair-Share activity, we found that our writing, speaking skills increased. **[TPS]**

P4: from this activity, we developed thinking that we can think different ways than the others. And through pair work, we have discussed our partner. But after switching another pair, we saw different thinking of different people. **[WPS]**

P8: the poem is very beautiful one. Though it looks very simple. It needs lot of thinking when we read a poem. **[J-I]**

P1: we have generated more questions. **[RTR]**

P5: Reading skill developed. **[RTR]**

P4: P3 has written the keywords, ……..general questions, and myself had given the clarification and …..standard questions. ….**[RTR]**

P11: we found all very good in reading. **[RTR]**

P9 : the common goals were to understand the text properly, to read the text properly, reading aloud was done with different members, and based on observation proper feedback for every member was given…, we could improve our reading skills. We had discussed meanings of different words namely. ……..**[RTR]**.

P7: So, it enhances our listening skills and not only the listening skills but also the speaking skills. We were able to quickly remember the points. Whatever our partner said and we were sharing it with other members of the activity. So, it was a wonderful activity. **[AYN]**

P14: This activity developed listening as well as speaking skill. **[AYN]**

P2: ….We have developed a very good reading skill and each of us had read the text and through this next partner or group member, who is listening, tells us what were the areas we did wrong, pronunciation or how we did read it. And the central theme of the activity was discussed and doubts were clarified and we discussed different questions among ourselves and keywords were also discussed. **[RTR]**

P8: in this. Group work was more important than pair work. So, all of us have contributed well. Everybody had different roles - … tried to find out meaning of words. Then all of us together discussed questions which were a bit tough for us. But we cleared and found ….It was the responsibility of each member, person of the group to have the clarity. Through this, we discussed various questions and that made ability in us more active. And there were various skills, reading silently, and probing questions and knowledge with fun. **[AYN]**

P5: so far as the activity is concerned, it enhances our writing skills, we came across different ideas and opinions and our content was enhanced and enriched. It also motivated us to work in groups**. [PW]**

P7: I feel that ideas about my writing were, I could get that from others to. They helped me a lot which helped with enhancing my writing in bringing out the best so that people can understand what my writing belongs to. **[PW]**

P1 in this activity – pair writing, as there were different topics. We had selected, so first of all, we came to know about various (topics), as we went to different

partners, and talking to people, we not only discussed about our own topic but we discussed with other topic also. So, we came to know about lot many things apart from what we were writing. And it was sure that we were working in a group, different ideas were given to others and we could enhance our writing more nicely with more ideas and more topics. **[PW]**

P12: That technical thing we learnt about from this activity. **[PW]**

P13 – today's activity; we understood that we are quite weak in grammar. It was quite difficult for us to remember things because we were getting confused with words like for and for – used in different ways. So, we have developed grammar by this – prepositions. **[STAD]**

P9: I got different ideas from others and we can express our own ideas about poems, literature. [J-I]

P1: we learnt to express our views about poem and whatever content you have given. [J-I]

P1: And whatever content you have taken, I can analyze that imagination power has variety of meanings. [J-I]

P4: I found interpretation interesting. [J-I]

It is observed that most participants have positive opinion for development of many soft skills. In most of the CLM tasks sessions, participants confessed that they could develop reading comprehension, silent reading, analysis of text, interpretation, questioning, writing skills, grammar, thinking skills, probing skills and speaking skills.

On the aspect of **CL methods selected,** all participants have given positive feedback that the CLM selected were loaded with fun and learning. The following quotes selected from oral feedback given by participants.

P4: through this activity, we can share our opinions or any problem. We are facing. We can easily share with our friends. If any text is not clear than our friends can explain us. [CIRC]

P5: As far as this activity is concerned, we truly enjoyed this activity. And we came to know about the others' point of view of poem. ….we know about others' point of view and others' thinking what they think about life…. **[TPS]**

P3: In our group, we contributed, first we read silently and then we discussed on the theme, and central idea etc. and one person write the report. Others helped them. In short, we enjoyed this activity. **[NHT]**

P2: through this activity, not only questions and answers were exchanged but views of our partner were also exchanged. **[QAP]**

P5: the activity – paired writing helped us to understand each other's view by giving our opinions, creativity and the pair came to limelight, enhancing our writing skill along with brainstorming helped us a lot. **[PW]**

A perusal of the above excerpts reveal that all the participants like each selected CLM tasks. Most participants found that CLM tasks helped them make friends and developed many skills. It is noticed that most participants accepted that they enjoyed the tasks and there was learning with fun.

On the aspect of **content selected,** from various sessions, the succeeding exerts are selected.

P8: **I** never like poetry. Being a literature student, but I never liked poetry, now I like it. Yes but today I enjoyed it. **[J-I]**

P9: as far as the content is concerned, it was quite interesting and new to us. The group discussion also brought out the new ideas from people. Especially, we had not similar thinking. **[WPS]**

P8: the selection of the story was very good and heart touching…And by this activity, we did come across reading aloud and reading silently. So our skills of reading have been developed a lot …. **[RTR]**

P7: so far as the content was concerned, it was very interesting and great. It teaches us that we should be kind, humble and should possess quality of being honest... **[AYN]**

P1: as far as the content is concerned, it was very interesting …. **[AYN]**

P8: when we had given answer, we were getting similar answer, but when we see dissimilarity on that basis we can say that ennumber of interpretation can be made. And we got that, we understood that by doing this kind of activity. **[QAP]**

P3: I asked my partner, what is theme of story? and she replied that the theme of the story, the actual treasure of a person is not like in gold, or silver or some special elements, it is just his honesty and sharing to others' sorrow, pain etc. this is the main theme of the story. **[AYN]**

P5: so far the content is concerned, I think it was very interesting one. And so far activity is concerned, first of all, we learnt to frame questions and then we gave

answers and then vice-versa. And we can answer our partner's questions also. So, it was a good experience. **[QAP]**

P7: when we were given worksheet individually and we started filling up, it was, we really found it difficult. **[STAD]**

P14: and we were in impression that preposition is very easy and there is nothing in it to learn. But after reading this material, we came to know that there is so much to know and now we really find it more interesting so, while completing these worksheets. Because we have worked a lot in group and team. **[STAD]**

A close look at the above mentioned quotes, it is observed that most participants have positive opinion for selection of subject matter. The participants mostly praised the selection of stories, poems and grammar topics. Participants commented positively on genres selected for the study. Most often the content was chosen from classics of English literature either prescribed in the textbooks or found in anthology for a general bachelors programme. Most participants liked all grammar topics very much as they confessed that the grammar topics were of intermediate level, and they had knowledge at superficial level but through CLM tasks, they got opportunity to learn them at deeper levels . Although selected topics were known to them, they learnt many new rules about the grammar topics with fun which they were unaware of earlier.

Pairing and grouping are considered as foundation and basic strategy of CL. Team building is very necessary for creating cooperative skills among students. From various CLM sessions, the succeeding exerts have been selected on the aspect of **task designed, team formation and group/pair work.**

P8: through this activity, we can share our opinions and any problem. We can easily share with our friends. If any text is not clear than our friends can explain us. **[CIRC]**

P9: we had common goal as every member should be able to understand and interpret the reading, silent reading, aloud reading, we found out the meaning. … **[RTR]**

P6: our group, we got, different ideas, we get…. **[CIRC]**

P11: This activity developed our listening skill and our pair respected each other's ideas. We could develop individual ability and understanding of the content. We both were interdependent on each other. Because when I ask question, at the same time she used to note down answer and vice-versa. **[AYN]**

P4: when we had given answer, we were getting similar answer, but when we see dissimilarity on that basis we can say that end number of interpretation can be made. And we got that, we understood that by doing this kind of activity. **[QAP]**

P7: I was not able to understand the story while answering the questions, with the help of my partner, I was able to understand story easily and clear my doubts also. **[QAP]**

P7: my grammar is very weak. From this, I understood which words are used before framing some words like besides and besides, all that I have got true words. **[STAD]**

P5 : pair work helps us in understanding the text better way and through this we can develop our own understanding that love has more power. **[CIRC]**

P5: And then about the pair activity, again it was individual thinking and pair work, though some of the points there were similarities, there were some differences also. Group leaders presented, we could get differences of everybody…. **[TPS]**

P3: …..when we start interacting with pair, group or partner, it gives us more confidence so we try to listen to our partner… **[AYN]**

P8: whenever I started reading the poetry or prose, I found very difficulty, I would leave it, because it was difficult then I switch to guide, and came to know about the story. But here whenever I was difficulty, a thing or name, characters were confusing, so we discussed among each others. **[AYN]**

P12: what I found was that most of the questions were similar. In two questions only our ideas were different. In those questions only we compared with each other. As I was not same in that. **[QAP]**

P7: – she made me correct answer. I totally wrote the wrong answer. **[QAP]**

It is observed that most participants have positive remarks for grouping, team building, pairing and grouping during CLM tasks. The decision of the selection of CLM tasks for study of process of the development of some soft skills was a bit risky since each CLM require particular content as well as a group of participants having similar learning capabilities. Tasks designed for each CLM have interesting steps and group formation is based on heterogeneity, therefore participants enjoyed learning.

It is observed in the process of analysis of the qualitative data that most participants were happy with decision to join and stay with CLM programme. Although a few participants were irregular in attending the sessions due to their

personal and family problems, all participants could adjust themselves quickly in the task and the pairing and grouping formed in each task was appropriate. Most participants could develop select soft skills.

5.2.1.3. Self -reflective report at Individual level and Group level on CLM based task:

There were 14 participants who remained punctual in attending the sessions. Most participants could attend more than half of sessions from total 12 CLM task sessions, hence the investigator received a total of 168 individual reports. About 48 group reports were collected from the participants who actively engaged in the CLMIP tasks as group leaders in one or the other tasks. There were a few who had never been group leaders. Based on the analysis of the Self-reflective reports, the investigator has identified some quotes from the participants' own words that focuses on various aspects of the present study. The following excerpts showed how and what the participants perceive about CLMIP task and task related aspects.

During the main task, the investigator observed that only some of the participants were active in terms of making presentation orally. A few avoided to come forward to reflect what they thought, felt, perceived about aspects of the study when they were asked during feedback at the end of each task. Hence all participants were asked to reflect on paper by writing what they felt, thought of the task.

CLM tasks helped students in many ways in their learning. One of the participants wrote: "We learn individually as well as in groups". [J-I]

The content selected was appropriate as one of participants stated, "The content was interesting". [CIRC]

Participants could develop components of soft skills. As one of the participants stated, "This activity helped to analyze the text". [RTR]

Participants confessed that they could enhance a few soft skills, as one participant wrote "It also helped to think fast and give answer fluently". [AYN] Another participant said, "It has enhanced our listening skills and different aspects of each other's views. [AYN]

The principles of CL were also got place in reflection. One of them said, "We respect each other's ideas". [NHT]

Group work helped participants. As a participant mentioned, "Together in coordination all the members helped in the activity and found out the answers". [QAP]

'Sharing' being one of the elements of cooperation skill, has strengthened the bonding and learning both among participants. One of the participants said "In this way each of us shares our views and this enable us to understand the text". [WPS]

CLM helped students to comprehend text. As one participant wrote, "This gave us a better and different understanding of the given text". [TPS]

One of the participants stated, "By answering on behalf of the group or pair, a feeling of confidence was achieved."

As a participant mentioned, "It is an interesting way of learning in pair". [QAP]

One of the participants stated, "There was interaction between us which developed listening skills and respecting our views". [STAD]

As a participant mentioned, "It developed concentration power as we tried to remember each other's answers". [NHT]

One of the participants stated," "Development of memory power and discouraging rote memorization". [AYN]

One of the participants opined, "Through this activity, we come to know about our partner's thoughts and views about the story. Doubts were clarified. Our reading, listening, speaking writing skills were enhanced". [CIRC]

One of the participants stated," "It was enthusiastic to work with the partner and share both or our answers to each other. The content got clarified with this". [GI]

All of these excerpts are significant in the context of the objectives of research of the present study. These excerpts express important revelations for CLMIP, content selected, participants' experiences, development of soft skills and principles of CL. It is noted while analysing and interpreting the qualitative data that all participants got new learning experiences through CLM tasks. Most Participants come to know about other's thoughts and views. Most Participants could develop reading, listening, speaking, writing skills. The CLM task created curiosity, made participants more enthusiastic and sharing was best of the thing. There was interaction between participants that helped them develop listening skills Participants started respecting other's views. CLM developed concentration and memory power as they tried to remember each other's answers. Different understanding of the given text was shared. CLM activity helped to analyze the text. CLM also helped to think fast and give answer fluently. Confidence was developed. The content was interesting. Participants got their doubts cleared in the content. CLM is an interesting way of learning in pair.

5.2.2. Part: II: Data analysis and interpretation of participants' performance assessment through observations of components of four selected soft skills on rubrics:

This section depicts the analysis and interpretation of data collected at the main site i.e. Dr. H. R. Gajwani College of Education, Adipur during CLM tasks while Cooperative Learning Methods based Instruction Plan [CLMIP] was implemented. The observation of performance had been made by the investigator. The researcher has kept records of observation of assessment of participants' performance on four soft skills in field notes and Researcher's observation cum reflective diary.

Four soft skills are assessed at Entry level, Terminal behaviour tests and performance during the CLM tasks. All four soft skills are coded as RCS, CTS having six components each and WCS and TMS having five components each. A component of 'overall impression' of performance is added in WCS and TMS to make number of components equally six in each skill , as per the expert's suggestion when they were asked to provide their comments on validity of evaluative rubrics of the soft skills. All of these soft skills have sub-criteria and sub-categories viz., whether leaners able to do the task or unable to perform and they are assessed at seven point scale. The assessment is made using grading system, starting from letter grade 'O' being the highest, decoded as 'Excellent' performance whereas 'F' being at the lowest position, decoded as Insignificant or Absent during task. Other letter grades included 'E' as Very Poor or Very Weak performance, 'D' as Below Satisfactory or mediocre, 'C' as Average or Satisfactory, 'B' as Good or Above Average/Above Satisfactory , 'A' as Very Good. The following table depicts Grading system adapted and used for Participants' performance assessment during CLMIP.

Table: 5.4: Description of Grading system of seven point scale

Letter grades	Point on scale	Range of values	Description/Value Judgement	Code assigned to grades
O	6	5.50 – 6.00	Outstanding/Excellent/Extraordinary/Advanced	O
A	5	4.50 – 5.49	Very Good/Above standards	VG
B	4	3.50 – 4.49	Good/Above Satisfactory/Standard	G
C	3	2.50 – 3.49	Satisfactory/Moderate/Average/Expected Standard	S
D	2	1.50 – 2.49	Mediocre/Below Satisfactory	M
E	1	1.00 – 1.49	Very Poor/Very weak	VP
F	0	0.00 - 0.99	Absent/Insignificant/Fail/Not Applicable	I

5.2.2.1. Data analysis of Participants' performances during Entry Behaviour Tests based on individual cases:

First soft skill is RCS. Reading comprehension skill has six components namely, comprehension, analysis, interpretation, Relation to text, Understanding genre and using reading strategies, and lastly Critical Reading. First component of Comprehension includes ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words. Second component of Analysis has ability to break the text and differentiate details. Third component of Interpretation includes ability to identify purpose of the reading. Fourth component is Relation to Text which is an ability to make meaning in the context of the given text. Fifth component of Genre recognition and Use of Reading Strategies include ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies like proper posture of reading, avoiding vocalisation, sub-vocalization, regression or moving back while reading and using fingers to read. Sixth component is Critical Reading that includes the ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

Table: 5.5. Entry behaviour Performance on Soft Skill: 1- Reading Comprehension Skill [RCS]

Participant's Codes / Letter Grades	Comprehension							Analysis							Interpretation							Relating Text to the Context							Understanding Genre & Using reading strategies							Critical Reading							AGP
	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√								√								√						√							√								√				D
P2				√						√								√							√						√								√				C
P3		√								√							√							√							√							√					D
P4	√							√									√					√									√							√					E
P5				√							√							√							√						√								√				C
P6	√							√									√					√								√								√				E
P7	√									√							√							√								√						√					D
P8		√								√							√							√						√								√				D
P9				√						√							√							√								√						√					C
P10	√							√									√							√						√								√				E
P11		√								√							√							√						√								√				D
P12		√								√							√								√							√						√				D
P13	√							√									√							√						√						√						D
P14		√						√									√							√						√								√				D

Notes : Codes P1 to P14 indicate codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands for grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants. Each letter grade is assigned a digit 0 to 6 that indicate point value which is used to get AGP. AGP stands for Average Grade Point obtained by a participant cutting across all components of the skill.

Based on the components of RCS, a perusal of the table no.5.5 reveals the following observations. On first component of RCS **Comprehension,**   P4, P6, P7, P10, P13 could get Very Poor level whereas P1,P3,P8,P11,P12,P14 could attain Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level and the rest of the participants P2, P5, P9 secured Satisfactory level.

On second component **Analysis,** P4, P6, P10, P13, P14 could get Very Poor level whereas P1, P2, P3, P7, P8, P9, P11, P12 could attain Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level and P5 secured Satisfactory level.

On third component **Interpretation,** P5, P6, P10, P13 could achieve Very Poor level whereas P1, P2, P5 could reach at Satisfactory level. The rest of the participants P3, P4, P8, P9, P11, P12, P13, and P14 could attain Mediocre level.

On **fourth** component **Relation to Text,** P4 and P6, could get Very Poor level whereas P1, P3, P7, P8, P10, P11, P13, P14 could attain Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level and the rest of the participants P2, P5, P9 achieved Satisfactory level.

On **fifth** component **Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies,** P6, P10, could attain Very Poor level and P5, P7, P9, P12 could get Satisfactory level whereas the rest of the participants could reach at Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level.

On sixth component **Critical Reading,** it is found that P3, P4, P6, P10 could get Very Poor level whereas the rest of the participants reached at   Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level.

Overall, a perusal of the table no.5.5. reveals that P2,P5,P9 were able to score at C grade denoting Satisfactory or Average level across all components whereas P6 and P10 achieved lower levels i.e. D or E grades that denotes Mediocre and Very Weak levels respectively. The rest of other participants attained D i.e. Mediocre levels.

Second skill is CTS. **Critical Thinking skill** has six components namely, Interpreting, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation and Self-regulation. The no. sub categories of each components varied. The first component of Interpreting includes ability to categorize, ability to decode or make meaning, ability to understand significance, and ability to clarify meaning. The second component Explanation has ability to examine ideas, ability to detect arguments, ability to analysing arguments. Third component Analysis consists of ability to assess claims, and ability to assess arguments. Fourth component comprises of Inference that includes ability to query evidences, ability to conjecturing alternatives, ability to draw conclusions. Fifth

component is Evaluation which includes ability to state results, ability to justify procedures, ability to present arguments. The last component is Self-regulation which is composed of ability of self- explanation and ability of self-correction.

All of the above sub-skills contain the following elements as sub categories. 1.1. Ability to formulate Categories for describing information 1.2. Ability to detect and describe the informational content and purposes and intentions or social significance 1.3. Ability to make explicit, contextual and conventional meanings of words, ideas, concepts, statements and remove ambiguity 2.1. Ability to compare and contrast ideas, concepts, statements and identify issues, to define terms and to determine the role various expressions play 2.2. Ability to determine whether or not the set of statements/descriptions express a reason in support of claim, 2.3. Ability to identify and differentiate the intended main conclusion and reasons intended to support the main conclusion or premises 3.1. Ability to recognize the factors to assess source of information; to assess the contextual relevance of information; to assess the acceptability of truth 3.2. Ability to judge the expressed conclusion of the argument and to determine if an argument relies on false assumptions 4.1.Ability to recognize premises that require support and to formulate a strategy to seek information as support and to judge relative merit of the alternative 4.2. Ability to formulate multiple Alternatives for resolving a problem and to develop a variety of plans to achieve the goal 4.3. Ability to apply appropriate modes of inference on what position one should take on given issue 5.1. Ability to produce accurate statements, descriptions of the results of one's reasoning activity 5.2. Ability to present the evidential considerations that was used in interpretations or inferences 5.3 Ability to give reasons for accepting some claim and to meet objections to evidence or judgement 6.1. Ability to reflect on one's own reasoning and verify results produced 6.2. Ability to design reasonable procedure to remedy or correct errors or deficiencies.

Table: 5.6. Entry behaviour Performance on Soft Skill: 2- Critical Thinking Skill [CTS]

Participant's Codes / Letter Grades	Interpretation							Analysis							Evaluation							Inference							Explanation							Self-Regulation							A GP
	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√								√							√						√								√							√					D
P2				√						√							√							√								√						√					D
P3			√							√							√						√								√							√					D
P4			√							√							√						√								√							√					D
P5				√						√							√							√								√								√			C
P6			√							√						√								√						√							√						E
P7		√								√						√								√							√						√						E
P8		√								√							√						√								√							√					D
P9				√						√							√							√							√							√					D
P10			√							√						√								√						√							√						E
P11		√								√						√								√							√							√					D
P12		√									√					√								√							√							√					D
P13			√							√						√								√							√						√						E
P14		√								√						√								√							√							√					D

Notes : Codes P1 to P14 indicate codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands for grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants.

While observing component wise performance of participants, on first component of CTS, **Interpreting,** it is noticed that P3, P4, P6, P10, P13 could achieve only E grade i.e. Very Poor level whereas P1, P7, P8, P11, P12, P14 could attain D grade i.e. Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level and the rest of the participants P2, P5, P9 secured C grade i.e. Satisfactory level.

On second component **Analysis,** P3, P4, P6, P7, P10, P11,P13, P14 could secure Very Poor level whereas the rest of the participants P1, P2, P5, P8, P9, P12 could reach Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level. None could reach above level than D grade.

On third component **Evaluation,** P6, P7, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14 could secure Very Poor level whereas the rest of the participants P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P8, P9 could reach Mediocre level.

On fourth component **Inference,** P2, P5 and P9 could secure Mediocre level whereas the rest of the participants P1, P3, P4,P6, P7, P8, P10, P11, P12, P13 and P14 could reach Very Poor level.

On fifth component **Explanation,** P6 and P10 could get Very Poor level. P1, P3, P4, P7, P11, P12, P13, P14 could reach Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level.P2, P5, P8, P9 could get Satisfactory level.

On second component **Self-regulation,** only one participant P5 secured Satisfactory level. P6, P7, P10, P13 could secure Very Poor level whereas the rest of the participants P1, P2, P3, P4, P8, P9,P11, P12 and P14 could reach Mediocre level.

On overall observation of the table no.5.6 reveals that P2, P5, P9 were able to score at C grade denoting Satisfactory or Average level across all components whereas P6 and P10 achieved Very Weak level. The rest of other participants attained D i.e. Mediocre levels.

Third soft skill is WCS. Written Communication skills has six components namely, structuring, Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and overall Impression of piece of writing. This skill has always been considered the most difficult one among all four skills of learning language and it requires consistent practice to achieve excellence. Moreover, when one gets mastery over rest of the language skills like listening, speaking, reading, grammar and thinking skills etc., one can reach at an advanced level in writing skills. The first component of the skill is structuring that comprises of three abilities viz., ability to clarify the purpose of writing, ability to address the audience for whom the writing meant as well as able to have familiarity

with genre or form of writing that one selected to write, ability to organise one's text, able to make paragraphs and able to transit paragraphs smoothly. The second component of Content consists of three abilities viz., ability of making relevant selection of subject matter and sources for one's writing; ability or organising ideas, make use of coherence and smooth transition of ideas; ability of making use of vocabulary in variety. The third component is Style which includes two abilities i.e. ability to write with a specific style and ability to make use of language appropriately. Fourth component is Grammar which comprises of correctness syntax and varied types of sentences. Fifth component is Mechanics that consists of correct usage of punctuations and following the general rules of writing. The last component is overall impression of the piece of writing.

Table: 5.7. Entry behaviour Performance on Soft Skill: 3- Written Communication Skill [WCS]

Participant's Codes	Structuring							Content							Style							Grammar							Mechanics							Overall impression of piece of writing							AGP
Letter Grades	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1			√							√						√								√						√								√					D
P2			√							√								√						√						√								√					D
P3			√							√						√								√						√							√						E
P4		√								√						√								√						√							√						E
P5				√							√					√									√					√							√						C
P6		√							√							√							√							√							√						E
P7		√								√						√							√							√							√						E
P8			√							√						√								√						√							√						D
P9			√							√								√						√						√								√					D
P10		√							√							√							√							√							√						E
P11		√								√						√							√							√							√						E
P12			√							√						√							√							√							√						E
P13			√							√						√							√							√							√						E
P14			√							√						√								√						√							√						D

Notes : Codes P1 to P14 indicate codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands for grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants.

154

While observing component-wise performance of participants, on first component of WCS, **Structuring,** only one participant- P5 could achieve Satisfactory level. P4, P6, P7, P10 and P11could get Very Poor level whereas P1, P2, P3, P8, P9, P12, P13, P14 could attain D grade i.e. Mediocre level.

On second component **Content,** it is observed that P5 could achieve Satisfactory level. P6 and P10 could get Very Poor level whereas the rest of the participants P1, P2, P3, P4, P7,P8, P9, P11, P12, P13, P14 could attain Mediocre level.

On third component **Style,** P2, P5 and P9 could receive Satisfactory level whereas the rest of all participants secured Very Poor level.

On fourth component **Grammar,** only one participant i.e. P5 could achieve Satisfactory level. P1, P2, P8, P9, and P14 could attain D grade i.e. Mediocre level. P3, P4, P6, P7, P10, P11, P12, P13 could attain Very Poor level.

On fifth component **Mechanics,** it was only P5 that could achieve Mediocre level whereas the rest of all 13 participants secured Very Poor level.

On last sixth component **Overall Impression of piece of writing,** P**1,** P2, P5 and P9 could reach to Mediocre level whereas the rest of the participants i.e. P3, P4, P6, P7,P8, P10, P11, P12, P13,P14 secured Very Poor level.

Overall, table no.5.7. reveals that P5 could get C grade denoting Satisfactory or average level across all components whereas P3, P6 and P10 achieved lower levels i.e. D or E grades- Mediocre and Very Weak levels respectively. The rest of other participants attained D i.e. Mediocre levels across all components.

Fourth soft skill is **Time Management Skill.** TMS can be observed at two levels viz., at individual level and the group task. It has six components namely, Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided, Punctuality and Getting Task organised and overall Impact. The first component is how the participant use given time. The second component is getting things done by the deadlines. The third component is how the participant made adjustment due to procrastination of either one's own slowness of others delay. Fourth component is Quality of work within time slot which includes ability to provide a qualitative work in given time limit and the ability to create positive impact on quality of work. Fifth component is Punctuality and getting Task organized that includes able to be punctual in each task assigned and able to do well organised task. The last component is overall impression of how successfully managed the time allotted for the task.

Table: 5.8. Entry behaviour Performance on Soft Skill: 4- Time Management Skill [TMS]

Participant's Codes	Way of using Time							Get things done & Meeting Deadlines							Adjustment due to procrastination							Quality of work provided							Punctuality in attending Task							Getting groups organised							AGP
Letter Grades	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√									√							√						√								√							√				C
P2		√								√								√							√							√							√				C
P3		√								√									√					√								√						√					C
P4	√									√									√			√									√							√					D
P5				√						√								√						√							√							√					C
P6	√									√							√					√									√						√						D
P7	√									√									√					√							√							√					D
P8		√								√								√						√							√							√					C
P9				√						√								√						√								√						√					C
P10	√									√							√					√									√						√						D
P11		√								√									√					√						√								√					D
P12		√								√								√						√						√								√					C
P13		√								√								√						√							√							√					C
P14				√						√								√						√							√							√					C

Notes : Codes P1 to P14 indicate codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands for grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants.

While observing component-wise performance of participants, on first component of TMS, **Time Utilization,** P5 and P9 could achieve C grade i.e. Satisfactory level. P1, P2, P3, P8, P11, P12, P13 could attain D grade i.e. Mediocre level. P4, P6, P7 and P10 could get E grade i.e. Very Poor level.

On second component **Observing deadlines,** it is observed that P1 could achieve Satisfactory level. On the contrary, P4, P6 and P10 could get Very Poor level. The rest of the participants P2, P3, P5, P7, P8, P9, P11, P12, P13, and P14 could attain Mediocre level.

On third component **Adjustment due to procrastination,** P6 and P10 could attain Mediocre level. P3, P4,P7,P11 could reach at Satisfactory level while the rest of the participants P1, P2, P5,P8, P9, P12, P13, P14 could achieve the level of Good.

On fourth component **Quality of work provided,** P2, P5, P8, P9, P12, P13, P14 could achieve level of Satisfactory. P1, P3, P7, P11 could get level of Mediocre. P4, P6, P10 could attain the level of Very Poor.

On fifth component **Punctuality,** only one participant P1 attained A grade i.e. the level of Very Good. P2, P3, P7, P8 could reach at B grade i.e. the level of Good. P4, P5, P6, P9, P10 could achieve Satisfactory level. P11, P12, P13, P14 could attain Mediocre level.

On sixth component **Getting Task organised,** P1, P2 and P5 could achieve C grade i.e. Satisfactory level. P3, P4, P7, P8, P9, P11, P12, P13 P14 could attain Mediocre level. P6 and P10 could get level of Very Poor.

It is noticed from observation of table no.5.8. that most participants scored between D grade to E grades, were able to score at C grade denoting Satisfactory or average level across all components. Mostly P4, P6 and P10 achieved lower levels i.e. D or E grades- Mediocre and Very Weak levels respectively. The rest of other participants attained D i.e. Mediocre levels.

So far the above passages describe the entry level performance of the participants on selected four soft skills. The succeeding passages describe actual process of development of soft skills. This process is explored with the help of investigator's assessment of performance of participants on select soft skills using rubrics and observations. An attempt is made to look at the process phenomena from different perspectives hence the same process is analysed, interpreted and understood through CLM task based assessment and participant based assessment.

5.2.2.2. Data Analysis of Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM Tasks on four Soft skills:

The following passages describe participant's Comprehensive Performance Evaluated on four soft skills during Cooperative Learning Methods based tasks viz., CLMPI. The performance of each participant was marked using evaluative rubric and observations were made on the field notes. Apart from the observation, the performance on some of the specific components of RCS and WCS was evaluated using worksheets provided during each task. The worksheets consisted of set of questions which were specially prepared to check various abilities of RCS, CTS and WCS. The performance on TMS was task based.

Each soft skill was assessed based on the components of the target skill but there was limitation of the assessment of the skill. Each of the four soft skill selected in the present study have six components. As per the nature of the subject matter, select soft skills were assessed.

CLM Task 1 - Jigsaw-I:

Performance on seven point scale on four Soft skills during CL task 1 to 12.

Table: 5.9 Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-1- Jigsaw Basic

Participants Codes	SS code L.G.	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1				√						√								√								√				
P2		√							√							√							√							A
P3				√						√								√								√				
P4				√						√								√							√					
P5					√						√								√							√				
P6		√								√							√							√						
P7		√							√							√							√							A
P8				√							√							√								√				
P9		√							√							√							√							A
P10			√							√							√							√						
P11		√							√							√							√							A
P12				√							√							√								√				
P13				√						√							√								√					
P14				√							√							√								√				

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

159

Reading Comprehension Skill [RCS] has six components namely Comprehension, Analysis, Interpretation, Relation to text, Understanding genre and Using Reading Strategy, Critical Reading. A perusal of the table: 5.9 reveals that P5 was the only participant who could reach to Satisfactory level; whereas most participants i.e. seven namely P1, P3, P4, P8, P12, P13 and P14 attained Mediocre level. P10 was the only participant who secured Very Poor level. P6 was only participant who failed to meet the standard expected and attained Insignificant level. The rest of the other participants P2, P7, P9, and P11 attained Insignificant level during the first CLM session.

Critical Thinking Skill [CTS] has six components namely Interpretation, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. A close observation of the table: 5.9 reveals that none of the participants could reach even at Satisfactory level on CTS in the first session. It is found that P5, P8, P12 and P14 could attain Mediocre level whereas P1, P3, P4, P6, P10 and P13 got Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P2, P7, P9, and P11 attained Insignificant level during the first CLM session.

Written Communication Skill [WCS] has six components namely Structuring, Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of piece of writing. A close study of the table 5.9 discloses that P5 gained Satisfactory level whereas as many as six participants viz. P1, P3, P4, P8, P12, P14 received Mediocre level. P6, P10, P13 attained Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P2, P7, P9, and P11 attained Insignificant level during the first CLM session.

Time Management Skill [TMS] has six components namely. Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A perusal of the table: 5.9 reveals that most participants showed below expectations level on TMS. P1, P5 and P8 could get Satisfactory level. Four students i.e. P3, P12, P13, and P14 could attain Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. P4, P6 and P10 could reach only at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P2, P7, P9, and P11 attained Insignificant level during the first CLM session.

Overall in the first CLM based activity ten participants remained present whereas as many as four participants i.e.P2, P7, P9 and P11 remained absent during the first session on Jigsaw-I.

Table: 5.10. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-2: CIRC

Participants Codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks:
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1					√						√							√								√				
P2					√						√								√							√				
P3				√							√							√								√				
P4				√							√							√							√					
P5		√							√							√							√							A
P6		√							√							√							√							A
P7				√							√							√							√					
P8					√						√								√							√				
P9					√						√							√							√					
P10			√							√							√							√						
P11				√							√							√							√					
P12					√						√								√							√				
P13				√						√								√							√					
P14					√						√								√							√				

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

A perusal of first part of the table on Reading Comprehension skill in the table 5.10, an overall performance of all participants reveals that none of the participant could reach to level of Good; whereas most participants i.e. six, namely P1, P2, P8, P9, P12, P14 attained Satisfactory level. P3, P4, P7, P11, P13 secured Mediocre level whereas P10 was the only one who recorded Very Poor level. P5 and P6 failed to meet expected standard and attained Insignificant level.

A close observation of second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.10 reveals that none of the participants could reach even at Satisfactory level. It is observed that P1, P2, P3, P4, P7, P8, P9, P11, P12 and P14 could attain Mediocre level whereas P10 and P13 reached Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P5 and P6 attained Insignificant level.

A close study of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.10 discloses that P2,P8, P12, P14 gained Satisfactory level whereas as many as seven participants viz. P1, P3, P4, P7,P9, P11, P13 received Mediocre level. P10 was the only one who remained at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P5 and P6 attained Insignificant level.

A close look at the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.10, reveals that most participants performed at expected level but could not go beyond Satisfactory level to reach at Good level. P1, P2, P3, P8, P9 and P12 could reach at Satisfactory level. P4, P7, P11, P13 and P14 could attain Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It was only P10 who leg behind and could attain only Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P5 and P6 attained Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **twelve** participants remained present whereas **two** participants i.e.P5 and P6 remained absent during the second CLM session.

Table: 5.11. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-3: WPS

Participants codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks:
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1					√						√								√							√				
P2						√						√							√								√			
P3					√						√								√								√			
P4				√						√								√									√			
P5		√							√							√							√							A
P6			√						√								√									√				
P7					√						√							√									√			
P8						√						√							√								√			
P9						√						√							√								√			
P10		√							√							√							√							A
P11					√						√							√									√			
P12		√							√							√							√							A
P13		√							√							√							√							A
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

CLM Task 3 - WPS:

A perusal of first part of the table on Reading Comprehension Skill in the table 5.11, an overall performance of all participants reveals that three participants P2, P8 and P9 could reach to the level of Good whereas P1,P3,P7 and P11 could reach to Satisfactory level. P4 was in Mediocre level and P6 was the only participant who secured Very Poor level. P5, P10, P12, P13, P14 got failed to meet the expected and gained Insignificant level.

A closer study of second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.11 reveals that none of the participants could reach even at level of Good but Satisfactory level was attained by P2 and P8 and P9. It is found that P1, P3, P7 and P11 could secure Mediocre level whereas P4 and P6 stayed at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P5, P10, P12, P13, and P14 attained Insignificant level.

An observation of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.11 discloses that P1, P2, P3, P8, P9 attained Satisfactory level whereas as less as three participants viz. P4, P7, P11 reached Mediocre level. P6 was only one that attained Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P5, P10, P12, P13, P14 attained Insignificant level.

A closer look at the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.11, reveals that most participants had progress much. P2, P3, P8, P9 reached at the level of Good whereas P1, P4, P7 and P11 could gain Satisfactory level. Only one student i.e. P6 could attain Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be recorded at Very Poor level while the rest of the other participants P5, P10, P12, P13, P14 attained Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **nine** participants remained present whereas as many as **five** participants i.e. P5, P10, P12, P13, P14 remained absent.

Table: 5.12. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-4- TPS

Participants codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1					√							√							√								√			
P2						√						√							√								√			
P3					√						√								√								√			
P4					√						√								√									√		
P5						√						√							√								√			
P6			√								√							√									√			
P7					√							√							√								√			
P8						√						√								√							√			
P9						√								√						√							√			
P10		√							√							√							√							A
P11						√						√							√								√			
P12						√						√							√								√			
P13				√							√								√								√			
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

CLM Task 4 - TPS:

A perusal of first part of the table on Reading Comprehension skill in the table 5.12, an overall performance of all participants reveal that P2, P5, P8, P9, P11, P12 attained of Good and P1, P3, P4, P7 could reach to Satisfactory level. Only two participants i.e. P6 and P13 gained Mediocre level. No participant who found at Very Poor level. P10 and P14 attained Insignificant level as they failed to meet the standard expected.

A closer look at second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.12 disclosed that only one participant could reach at level of Good. As many as six participants i.e. P1, P2, P5, P7, P8, and P12 gained Satisfactory level. It is found that P3, P4, P11 and P13 could attain Mediocre level whereas P6 could not make any progress and stuck at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P10 and P14 stayed at Insignificant level.

A closer observation of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.12 reveals that P2, P5, P8, P9 attained Good level and P1, P3, P4, P7, P11 and P12 could reach to Satisfactory level. P6 and P13 got Mediocre level. It is noted that none gained Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P10 and P14 stayed at Insignificant level.

A careful closer study of the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.12, reveals that most participants had made great performance show and exceeded expectation level. A great number of participants i.e. eight, coded as P1, P2, P3, P5, P7, P8, P9 and P12 could reach the level of Good or Above Satisfactory level. P4, P11 and P13 got Satisfactory level. P6 could attain Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. None was found at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P10 and P14 stayed at Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **twelve** participants remained present whereas **two** participants i.e.P2, P7, P9 and P11 remained absent.

Table: 5.13. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-5 RTR

Participants codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1					√							√							√								√			
P2						√						√							√								√			
P3					√							√							√							√				
P4					√						√								√								√			
P5						√							√						√								√			
P6				√						√										√						√				
P7		√							√							√							√							A
P8						√							√						√								√			
P9		√							√							√							√							A
P10				√							√							√							√				
P11					√							√							√							√				
P12						√						√							√								√			
P13		√							√							√							√							A
P14						√						√							√							√				

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

CLM Task 5 - RTR:

A perusal of first part of the table on Reading Comprehension skill in the table 5.13, an overall performance of all participants reveals that P2, P5, P8, P12, P14 attained level of Good and P1, P3, P4, P11 could reach to Satisfactory level. Only two participants i.e. P6 and P10 scored at Mediocre level. No participant was found at Very Poor level. P7, P9 and P13 attained Insignificant level.

A closer observation at second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.13 discloses that only two participants i.e. P5 and P8 could reach at level of Good. As many as six participants i.e. P1, P2, P3, P11, P12, P14 gained level of Satisfactory. It is found that P4, P10 could attain Mediocre level whereas P6 could not make any progress and stuck at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P7, P9 and P13 stayed at Insignificant level.

A view from closer quarters of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.13 reveals that as many as six participants coded as P1,P2, P3, P5, P8, P12 had reached a level of Good and P4, P11 and P14 could go further to Satisfactory level. P6 had progressed at Mediocre level. P10 was only who got Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P7, P9 and P13 remained at Insignificant level.

When a careful study made of the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.13, it reveals that highest no. of participants i.e. five had made given great performance. P1, P2, P5, P8 and P12 could reach the level of Good or Above Satisfactory level. P3, P4, P11 and P14 attained Satisfactory level. P6 and P10 could attain Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. No participant was found at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P7, P9 and P13 stayed on Insignificant level due to their absence during the session.

Thus, overall in this CLM task a total of **eleven** participants remained present whereas **three** participants i.e.P7, P9 and P13 remained absent.

Table: 5.14. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-6 AYN

Participants Codes	SS code L.G.	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1						√						√							√								√			
P2						√							√						√									√		
P3						√						√							√									√		
P4					√							√							√								√			
P5						√							√								√							√		
P6				√								√							√							√				
P7		√							√							√							√							A
P8						√							√							√								√		
P9						√							√								√							√		
P10				√						√							√									√				
P11					√							√							√									√		
P12						√							√							√								√		
P13		√							√							√							√							A
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

CLM Task 6 - AYN:

.A perusal of first part of the table on Reading Comprehension Skill in the table 5.14, an overall performance of all participants   reveals that as many as seven participants coded as P1, P2, P3, P5,P8, P9,and P12 could reach to the level of Good whereas P4 and P11 went further at Satisfactory level. P6 and P10 secured Mediocre level and no participant was found on Very Poor level. Contrarily, P7, P13, P14 got failed to meet the expected level and retained at Insignificant level.

A closer observation of second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.14 reveals that none of the participants could reach even at level of Very Good even after five sessions. It is noteworthy that five participants could gain level of Good including P2, P5, P8, P9, and P12 reached at level of Good. P1 and P3 gained Satisfactory level. It is found that P4, P6 and P11 secured Mediocre level whereas P10 stayed at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P7, P13, P14 could stick to level of Insignificant.

A serious study of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.14 discloses that P5 and P9 had made great progress to reach at Very Good level. P1, P2, P3 and P8 maintained themselves at level of Good. P4, P11, P12 attained Satisfactory level whereas only one participant i.e. P6 reached Mediocre level. P10 was only one that remained at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P7, P13, P14 attained Insignificant level.

A closer look at the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.14, reveals that most participants recorded good progress. P2, P5, P9, P12 achieved Very Good level. P1, P3, P8 and P11 reached at the level of Good whereas P4 gained Satisfactory level. It was only P6 and P10 that attained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Very Poor level while the rest of the other participants P7, P13, P14 stayed at Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **eleven** participants remained present whereas as many as **three** participants i.e. P5, P10, P12, P13, P14 remained absent.

Table: 5.15. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-7- NHT

Participants codes	SS code L.G.	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1						√						√							√									√		
P2							√						√						√									√		
P3						√							√						√							√				
P4						√						√						√								√				
P5							√						√					√										√		
P6				√						√							√								√				
P7					√					√									√									√		
P8							√						√						√									√		
P9		√							√							√							√							A
P10				√						√							√								√					
P11		√							√							√							√							A
P12		√							√							√							√							A
P13					√							√						√								√				
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

CLM Task 7- NHT:

A perusal of first part of the table on Reading Comprehension skill in the table 5.15, an overall performance of all participants reveal that only three participants i.e. P2, P5 and P8 was able to reach the Very Good level. P1, P3 and P4 maintained at level of Good whereas P7 and P13 reached to Satisfactory level. P6 and P10 attained Mediocre level. Not a single participant was found at Very Poor level. More no. of participants i.e. P9, P11, P12 and P14 failed to meet the standard expected and attained Insignificant level.

A close observation of second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.15 reveals that none of the participants could reach at Very Good level. It is observed that P2, P3, P5 and P8 achieved level of Good. P1 and P4 were at Satisfactory level. P7 and P13 could attain Mediocre level whereas P6, P10 got stuck to Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P9, P11, P12 and P14 attained Insignificant level.

A close study of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.15 reveals that P5 made greatest progress to attain a Very Good level. P1, P2, P3 and P8 secured the level of Good. P4, P7, P13 gained Satisfactory level whereas P6 and P10 reached till Mediocre level. None was found at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P9, P11, P12 and P14 attained Insignificant level.

A closer look at the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.15, reveals that most participants recorded good progress. P1, P2, P5, P8 achieved Very Good level. P3, P7 reached at the level of Good whereas P4, P10 and P13 gained Satisfactory level. It was only P6 that attained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Very Poor level while the rest of the other participants P9, P11, P12 and P14 remained on level of Insignificant. Overall in this CLM task a total of **ten** participants remained present whereas as many as **four** participants i.e. P9, P11, P12 and P14 remained absent.

Table: 5.16. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-8 –QA

Participants codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1						√						√								√							√			
P2							√						√							√								√		
P3						√						√								√							√			
P4					√							√							√								√			
P5							√						√								√							√		
P6				√						√							√									√				
P7					√						√								√								√			
P8						√							√								√							√		
P9						√							√								√							√		
P10				√						√							√									√				
P11						√					√								√								√			
P12						√						√							√								√			
P13					√						√							√								√				
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Note: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

CLM Task 8 - QA:

A perusal of first part on Reading Comprehension Skill in the table 5.16, an overall performance of all participants reveal that as many as four participants coded as P2, P5,P8, P9 could reach to the level of Very Good. P1, P3, P11 and P12 achieved level of Good. P4, P7 and P13 progressed further at Satisfactory level. P6 and P10 remained at Mediocre level and no participant was found on Very Poor level. It is found that P14 got failed to meet the expected level and retained at Insignificant level.

A closer study of second part of the table on Critical Thinking skill in the table: 5.16 reveals that none of the participants could reach at level of Very Good even after seven sessions especially for this skill. It is noteworthy that four participants could achieve level of Good. They were P2, P5, P8, and P9. P1, P3 and P12 gained Satisfactory level. It is found that P4, P7, P11 and P13 attained Mediocre level whereas P6 and P10 stuck to Very Poor level. P14 could remain at Insignificant level. A close observation of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.16 discloses that P5, P8 and P9 had made extensive progress to reach at Very Good level. P1, P2, P3 and P12 secured the level of Good. P4, P7, P11 gained Satisfactory level whereas only one participant i.e. P13 reached at Mediocre level. P6 and P10 were at Very Poor level. P14 could remain at Insignificant level.

A closer study of the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.16, reveals that most participants recorded nice progress. P2, P5, P8, P9 achieved Very Good level. P1, P3, P4, P7, P11 and P12 reached at the level of Good whereas P13 gained Satisfactory level. It was only P6 and P10 that attained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Very Poor level while P14 was only one who remained at Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **thirteen** participants remained present whereas only one participant i.e. P14 remained absent.

Table: 5.17. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-9- PW [Free composition]

Participants codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS							SS4-TMS							
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√							√										√								√			
P2		√							√											√								√		
P3		√							√											√								√		
P4		√							√										√							√				
P5		√							√											√								√		
P6		√							√									√								√				
P7		√							√										√							√				
P8		√							√											√								√		
P9		√							√											√								√		
P10		√							√									√								√				
P11		√							√										√							√				
P12		√							√							√							√							A
P13		√							√									√								√				
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Notes:

1. The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

2: The CLM task is exclusively on free writing hence no RCS and CTS assessed as all criteria of these two skills are not applicable.

CLM Task 9: PW:

As the task in this session was exclusively meant for Writing skill, most of the components of Reading Comprehension Skill and Critical Thinking skill were not at all applicable. Hence, all participants in the table: 5.17 on both soft skills i.e. RCS and CTS were noted at Insignificant level.

An observation of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.17 discloses that P2, P5, P8 and P9 had superb progress and they could reach at Very Good level in writing skill. P1 and P3 attained the level of Good. P4, P7 and P11 gained Satisfactory level. P6, P10 and P13 had reached at Mediocre level. None was found at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P12 and P14 attained Insignificant level.

A closer study at the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.17, reveals that most participants recorded good progress. P2, P5, P8, P9 achieved Very Good level. P1, P3 reached at the level of Good; whereas P4, P7, P11 and P13 gained Satisfactory level. It was only P6 and P10 who attained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Very Poor level in writing skill while the rest of the other participants P12, P14 stayed at Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **twelve** participants remained present whereas only two participants i.e. P12, P14 remained absent.

Table: 5.18. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-10- Jigsaw II [Degrees of Comparison]

Participants codes	SS code L.G.	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS/GS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√							√										√									√		
P2		√							√											√								√		
P3		√							√										√								√			
P4		√							√										√							√				
P5		√							√												√							√		
P6		√							√							√							√							A
P7		√							√										√								√			
P8		√							√											√								√		
P9		√							√												√							√		
P10		√							√								√							√						
P11		√							√										√								√			
P12		√							√							√							√							A
P13		√							√									√								√				
P14		√							√									√								√			

Note:

1. The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

2: The CLM task is exclusively on free writing hence no RCS and CTS assessed as all criteria of these two skills are not applicable

CLM Task 10: Jigsaw-II:

As the task in this session was exclusively meant for Grammar skill on the topic of 'Degrees of Comparison in English', most of the components of Reading Comprehension Skill and Critical Thinking skill were not applicable. Thus the participants were not assessed at these two skills. Hence, all participants in the table: 5.18 on both soft skills i.e. RCS and CTS were noted at Insignificant level.

A perusal of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.18 reveals that P5 and P9 could achieve Very Good level. P2 and P8 attained the level of Good. Maximum no. of participants i.e. five, coded as P1, P3, P4, P7 and P11 gained Satisfactory level. P13 and P14 reached at Mediocre level. P10 was found at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P6 and P12 attained Insignificant level.

A close observation of the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.18, reveals that most participants recorded noteworthy progress. P1, P2, P5, P8, P9 achieved Very Good level. P3, P7, P11, and P14 reached at the level of Good; whereas P4 and P13 gained Satisfactory level. It was only P10 that attained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Very Poor level; while the rest of the other participants P6 and P12 remained at Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **twelve** participants remained present whereas only two participants i.e. P6, P12 remained absent.

Table: 5.19. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-11- STAD [Prepositions]

Participants Codes	SS code L.G.	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCS/GS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√							√											√								√		
P2		√							√												√							√		
P3		√							√										√								√			
P4		√							√							√							√							A
P5		√							√												√								√	
P6		√							√									√								√				
P7		√							√										√								√			
P8		√							√											√								√		
P9		√							√											√									√	
P10		√							√									√								√				
P11		√							√										√									√		
P12		√							√							√							√							A
P13		√							√							√							√							A
P14		√							√							√							√							A

Notes:

1: The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

2: The CLM task is exclusively on free writing hence no RCS and CTS assessed as all criteria of these two skills are not applicable.

179

CLM Task 11 - STAD:

As the task in this session was exclusively meant for Grammar skill on the topic of 'Prepositions in English', most of the components of Reading Comprehension Skill and Critical Thinking skill were not applicable. Thus the participants were not assessed at these two skills. Hence, all participants in the table: 5.19 on both soft skills i.e. RCS and CTS were noted at Insignificant level.

A perusal of the third part of the table on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.19 reveals that most of the participants could make marvelous progress. P5 was the only participant that could achieve O letter grade i.e. Outstanding level. Whereas P2, P8 and P9 could achieve Very Good level. P1 and P3 gained the level of Good. P7 and P11 reached Satisfactory level. P6 and P10 could go at Mediocre level. None of the participant was found at Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P4 and P12, P13, P14 attained Insignificant level.

A close observation of the fourth part of the table on the Time Management skill in the table 5.19, reveals that most participants recorded remarkable progress. P5 and P9 achieved Outstanding level whereas P1, P2, P8, P11 achieved Very Good level. P3, P7 reached at the level of Good; while P6 and P10 gained Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level and Very Poor level. The rest of the other participants P4 and P12, P13, P14 remained at Insignificant level.

Overall in this CLM task a total of **ten** participants remained present whereas as many as four participants i.e. P4 and P12, P13, P14 remained absent.

Table: 5.20. Comprehensive Performance Assessment of Participants during CLM-12 –GI [Reported speech]

Participants Codes	SS code	SS1- RCS							SS2-CTS							SS3-WCSGS							SS4-TMS							Remarks
	L.G.	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√							√										√								√			
P2		√							√										√									√		
P3		√							√										√								√			
P4		√							√									√								√				
P5		√							√											√								√		
P6		√							√								√									√				
P7		√							√									√								√				
P8		√							√										√									√		
P9		√							√											√								√		
P10		√							√								√									√				
P11		√							√									√									√			
P12		√							√										√									√		
P13		√							√									√								√				
P14		√							√									√								√				

Note: 1.The codes in the table S.S. Code indicates soft skill code, L.G. indicates Letter Grade and each letter grade from "O" to "F" in given components indicates Performance Descriptors. Remarks indicate absentees of the participants during the CLM task session.

2: The CLM task is exclusively on free writing hence no RCS and CTS assessed as all criteria of these two skills are not applicable.

CLM Task 12- GI:

As this was last task and this session was exclusively meant for Grammar skill on the topic of 'Reported Speech in English', most of the components of Reading Comprehension Skill and Critical Thinking skill were not applicable. Thus the participants were not assessed at these two skills. Hence, all participants in the table: 5.20 describes participants, performance on both soft skills i.e. RCS and CTS were noted at Insignificant level.

A perusal of the third part on Witten Communication skill in the table 5.20 reveals that P5 and P9 could achieve Very Good level. None could attain the level of Good during this session. Maximum no. of participants i.e. five, coded as P1, P2, P3, P8 and P12 reached Satisfactory or average level. P4, P7, P11, P13 and P14 got Mediocre level. P6 and P10 stayed at Very Poor level. No participant attained Insignificant level.

A close observation of the fourth part on the Time Management skill in the table 5.20, reveals that most participants recorded noteworthy progress, yet none could get outstanding level. P2, P5, P8, P9 and P12 could achieve Very Good level. P1, P3, P11 reached at the level of Good. The rest of the other participants included P4, P6, P7, P10, P13 and P14 attained Satisfactory level. It is noted that none could be found at Mediocre level, Very Poor level or even Insignificant level. Overall in this CLM task all selected participants remained present.

The investigator not only has tried to analyze the observations and assessment of performance of participants on four soft skills in terms of tasks but also has analysed the individual participants' performances on selected four soft skills based on components, described in detail in the following passages.

The previous passages described the data analysis on task based performance on four select soft skills. However it remains inadequate to look at the process of development of soft skills from single aspect only. Therefore an attempt is made to understand the process through analysis of individual participant's performance on each component of select four soft skills.

5.2.2.3. Data analysis & Interpretation of Performance Profile of participants on four soft skill during CLM tasks conducted in CLMIP:

This second part of data analysis comprises of data collected at main site during the field work that focuses on the exploration and understanding of the process of development of soft skills. It describes comprehensive component-wise performance assessment of participants based on seven point scale grading system. The assessment done at CLMPI phase by the investigator is based on components of each selected four soft skill viz., RCS, CTS, WCS, TMS. The assessment was made based on observation of participants during the select CLM task in the form of Profile of Participant. This performances on four select soft skills were assessed using evaluative rubrics of soft skills. The following passages describe the progressive performance of individual participants during all twelve CLM tasks done by the investigator.

Performance Profile of P1:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending all sessions including all orientations and two teambuilding sessions .She was the most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. She remained with the investigator when CLM strategy started implemented, from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day when terminal test implemented.

She was a mediocre, average student but had the greatest enthusiasm and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close quarters that she had made quite outstanding progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with her grammar skills and cooperative skill.

Table: 5.21: Performance Profile of P1

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task Codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	C	C	C	C	C	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	D	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	D	C	C	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	E	D	D	D	D	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	C	C	C	C	B	B	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	E	E	D	D	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	E	D	D	C	C	C	C	C				
	CTSC4	E	E	D	D	D	D	C	C				
	CTSC5	E	E	E	D	D	D	C	C				
	CTSC6	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		E	D	D	C	C	C	C	B	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	E	D	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_
	WCSC2	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC3	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC4	D	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	C	B	B
	WCSC5	E	D	D	D	B	C	C	B	B	B	B	B
	WCSC6	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	C	C	B
GPA-->		D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	D	E	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	B	B	A	A	B
	TMS2	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	B	B	A	A	A
	TMS3	D	C	C	C	B	B	A	B	B	A	A	B
	TMS4	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	C	B	B	B
	TMS5	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
	TMS6	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	B
GPA-->		C	C	C	B	B	B	A	B	B	A	A	B

Note: Soft Skills are coded as SS1 to SS4 along with short names of each soft skills. Components of Soft Skills are coded with shorter names of soft skills. GPA stands for Grade Point Average. This average letter grades are obtained through median of seven points. Letters of alphabets viz., O, A, B, C, D, E, F indicate obtained grades by individual participants on specific components of four soft skills. All twelve CLM tasks are coded with shorter names.

Soft skills' component-wise performance analysis based on evaluative rubric:

Each select four soft skills have six components and each components have sub-criterion to describe the ability form Very Poor level as lowest to Outstanding as the highest level on seven point scale. Reading Comprehension Skill has six

components namely Comprehension, Analysis, Interpretation, Relation to Text, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. Critical Thinking Skill [CTS] has six components namely Interpretation, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. Written Communication Skill [WCS] has six components namely Structuring, Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. Time Management Skill [TMS] has six components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact.

A close observation of the table: 5.21 reveals that P1 remained present during all orientation sessions and all CLM tasks. On **RCS**, in the beginning of the first task, while analysing the performance component-wise in RCS in first activity, she was on Satisfactory or average level on first component i.e. comprehension. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on second to fifth components namely, analysis, interpretation, Relation to Text, Understanding Genre and use of reading strategies and on last component i.e. Critical Reading, she was on Very Poor level. In the last task –eighth component-wise P1 attained level of Good on sixth component whereas she gained Very Good level on first to fifth components of SS1. Comparing the performances given during first to last tasks, it is observed that P1 started on Average Grade Point with Mediocre level in first task for RCS then P1 achieved Satisfactory or Average level from second till fifth session and in sixth and seventh sessions she got Good level whereas she attained level of Very Good on AGP at the end of eighth and the last task for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS level from Mediocre to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P1 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.21 on P1 component-wise performance reveals that in the first task, P1 was at Mediocre level on second component i.e. Explanation whereas she attained a Very poor level on rest other components namely, Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. In the last eighth task she could reach at the level of Good on first, second and sixth components, viz. Interpretation, Explanation, and Self-regulation whereas she gained Satisfactory or Average level on third to fifth components namely Analysis, Inference, and Evaluation. Comparing the average performances from first to last tasks, a closer observation of the performances of P1 reveals that she achieved Very Poor level on AGP in first and second tasks,

Satisfactory level from fourth to seventh tasks and then afterwards she progressed till the level of Good at the end of the last session. Thus she could enhance her CTS.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P1 had moderate abilities. A closer observation of the table: 5.21, the component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that in first task, P1 was at Very Poor level on first and fifth components- structuring and Mechanics; at Mediocre level on third, fourth and sixth components i.e. Style, Grammar, Overall impression of piece of writing whereas she attained a Satisfactory or average level on second component namely, Content. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good on Structuring, but remained at the level of Good, on the last task, on components like Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close study of P1 performance in terms of AGP, reveals that P1 in her first and second task achieved Mediocre level on AGP, Satisfactory level in third and fourth tasks then afterwards progressed from fifth task till last task on the level of Good. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre to level of Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P1 gave above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.21 on target skill's component-wise performances reveals that P1 in the first task, was at Mediocre level on first, third, and sixth components i.e. Time utilization, Adjustment due to procrastination, Overall Impact. She attained Satisfactory or average level on second, fourth and fifth components. In the last task she could reach at the level of Very Good on second component i.e. Observing Deadlines, but she was able to achieve the level of Good on other components viz. Time utilization, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close study of performance in terms of AGP, reveals that P1 achieved Satisfactory level in her first , second and third task , afterwards progressed at Good level in fourth to sixth task, Very Good in seventh task and the level of Good at the end of the last fourteenth session. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Satisfactory to level of Good.

Performance Profile of P2:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending eleven CLM tasks though she could not attend the initial first session on teambuilding; she was the most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents, worksheets, lesson plan transcripts etc. She remained with the investigator when CLM strategy started implemented, from the second session till last day of terminal test implemented. She was an average student especially in language capabilities but her greatest quality was her eagerness, zest and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close look that she had made quite extraordinary progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement. Though she had no literature background at her graduation as she was a science graduate, she made extensive progress in linguistics and academic skills.

Table: 5.22: Performance assessment of P2

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	F	C	B	B	A	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	F	D	C	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	F	C	B	B	A	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	F	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	F	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	F	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	F	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	F	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	F	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	F	D	C	C	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	F	E	D	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	F	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	F	D	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_
	WCSC2	F	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	A	_	_	_
	WCSC3	F	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_
	WCSC4	F	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	B	B
	WCSC5	F	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	B	B
	WCSC6	F	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	B
GPA-->		F	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	C	D	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	F	C	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	TMS2	F	B	B	B	A	B	A	A	A	A	A	A
	TMS3	F	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A
	TMS4	F	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	B	A	C	C
	TMS5	F	C	B	B	B	A	B	A	A	B	B	B
	TMS6	F	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A
GPA-->		F	C	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A	A

A close observation of the table: 5.22 reveals that P2 remained present in eleven CLM tasks. On **RCS** analysis of the performance Component-wise, P2 in her first activity was on Good level on fourth component-Relation to Text. She was on Satisfactory or average level on first, third and fifth component i.e. Comprehension, Interpretation, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on second and sixth components namely Analysis; Critical Reading. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on sixth component Critical Reading whereas she got the level of Very Good on first to fifth components of RCS viz. Comprehension, Analysis, Interpretation, Relation to Text, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. Comparing the performances of P2 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the second CLM task, P2 started on AGP with Satisfactory or average level. During second to sixth tasks, P2 achieved Good level and in seventh task, she got Very Good level whereas in the last session she attained Very Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Satisfactory to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P2 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.22 reveals that P2 in the second task, attained a Very poor level on fifth component namely, Evaluation. She got Mediocre level on first, third, fourth and sixth components i.e. Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Self-regulation whereas she was at Satisfactory level on second component i.e. Explanation. In the last task, she could reach at Very Good level on second component i.e. Explanation and attained the level of Good on first, and third to sixth components, viz. Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. A very serious look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P2 in her first task achieved Mediocre level, Satisfactory level from third to fifth tasks, then afterwards she progressed from the level of Good from sixth to last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Good.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P2 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.22 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P2 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on first, fourth and fifth components i.e. Structuring, Grammar and Mechanics; whereas she attained a Satisfactory level on second, three and sixth component namely, Content, Style, Overall Impression. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, second, third, fifth components viz., Structuring, Content, Style, Mechanics, and she attained the level of Good on fourth

and sixth components like Grammar and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P2 in her first task achieved Satisfactory level and carried to level of Good from third to eighth tasks, then afterwards she progressed and achieved the level of Very Good in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Satisfactory level to level of Very Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P2 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.22 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill's reveals that in the second task, P2 was at Satisfactory level on first, third, fifth and sixth components i.e. Time utilization, Adjustment due to procrastination, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact; and attained level of Good or Above Satisfactory level on second and fourth component i.e. Observing Deadlines, Quality of work within time limit. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Very Good on first, second, third and sixth component namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination and Overall Impact whereas level of Good on fifth i.e. Punctuality & Getting Task organized and satisfactory level on fourth component i.e. Quality of work within time limit. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P2 in her first task achieved Satisfactory level and carried to level of Good from third to fifth tasks, then afterwards she progressed from sixth task having got Very Good level till the last task with Very Good level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Satisfactory level to level of Very Good.

Performance Profile of P3:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending twelve CLM tasks, though she could not attend the initial two sessions on teambuilding. She was the most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents, lesson plans, task-sheets etc. She remained with the investigator when CLM strategy was started implemented, though she was not able to attend the orientation sessions, she was present from the first task and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was an average student but she had qualities of eagerness, zest and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close quarters that she had made quite extraordinary progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with her grammar skills and cooperative

skill. Though she had no literature background at her graduation as she was a commerce graduate, she made extensive progress in language skills.

Table: 5.23: Performance assessment of P3

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	E	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	E	E	D	D	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	E	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	E	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	E	E	D	D	D	D	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	E	E	E	D	D	D	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		E	D	D	D	C	C	B	B	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	E	D	C	C	C	B	B	A	A	_	_	_
	WCSC2	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC3	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC4	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	C	A	B
	WCSC5	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	B	B	C	A	B
	WCSC6	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	C	A	B
GPA-->		D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	D	C	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
	TMS2	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	A
	TMS3	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
	TMS4	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	C	B	C	C
	TMS5	D	B	B	B	D	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
	TMS6	D	C	C	B	D	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
GPA-->		D	C	B	B	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B

An observation of the table: 5.23 reveals that P3 remained present in twelve CLM tasks. On **RCS**, component-wise analysis of the performance, P3 in her first

activity was on Satisfactory or average level on first component i.e. Comprehension. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on third and fourth components namely Interpretation, Relation to Text. She was at Very Poor level on second, fifth and sixth components Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on second, fifth and sixth components namely, Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading whereas she gained the level of Very Good on first, third and fourth components of RCS viz. Comprehension, Interpretation and Relation to text. Comparing the performances of P3 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first and second CLM task, P3 started on AGP with Mediocre level. During third and fourth tasks, P3 achieved Satisfactory level and from fifth to seventh task, she got Good level whereas in the last session she attained Very Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P3 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.23 reveals that P3 in the first task, achieved Mediocre level on second component i.e. Explanation; whereas she attained a Very poor level on first to sixth components namely, Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. In the last task, she could reach at Very Good level on second component i.e. Explanation and attained the level of Good on first, and sixth component, viz. Interpretation, and Self-regulation. She was at Satisfactory level on third, fourth and fifth components viz. Analysis, Inference, Evaluation. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P3 in her first task achieved Very Poor level, Mediocre level from second to fourth tasks, then afterwards she progressed from the level of Satisfactory in fifth and sixth tasks; Good level from seventh to last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Very Poor to level of Good.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P3 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.23 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P3 in her first task, was at Very Poor level on Structuring, Style, Mechanics; whereas she got Mediocre level on fourth and sixth components i.e. Grammar and Overall Impact. She attained a Satisfactory level on second component Content. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, component i.e. Structuring, whereas she attained the level of Good on second to sixth components like Content, Style,

Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P3 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and progressed to level of Good from fifth to ninth tasks. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to level of Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P3 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.23 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that P3 in the first task, was at Mediocre level from third to sixth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. She attained Satisfactory level on first and second components namely, Time utilization, Observing Deadlines. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Good from first, to third and fifth to sixth components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact and satisfactory level on fourth component i.e. Quality of work within time limit. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P3 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and level of Good in the last task. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Mediocre level to level of Good.

Performance Profile of P4:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation cum Reflective diary:

This participant was very regular in attending CLM tasks, as she could remain present in eleven tasks and second session on Teambuilding. She was the most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents, lesson plans, task-sheets etc. She remained with the investigator as she was present from the first task and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was a below average student but she had qualities of enthusiasm and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close quarters that she had made quite good progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with her grammar skills and cooperative skill. Though she had no literature background at her graduation as she was a commerce graduate, she made noteworthy progress in soft skills.

Table: 5.24. : Performance assessment of P4

Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
RCSC1	D	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
RCSC2	E	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
RCSC3	D	C	C	C	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
RCSC4	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
RCSC5	E	E	D	D	C	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
RCSC6	E	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
	D	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	F	F	F	F
CTSC1	D	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
CTSC2	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
CTSC3	E	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
CTSC4	E	E	D	D	D	D	C	C	_	_	_	_
CTSC5	E	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
CTSC6	E	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	F	F	F	F
WCSC1	D	D	D	D	C	B	C	B	B	_	_	_
WCSC2	D	D	C	C	C	B	C	B	B	_	_	_
WCSC3	D	D	D	C	C	D	C	D	C	_	_	_
WCSC4	E	D	D	C	C	D	C	C	C	C	F	B
WCSC5	E	D	D	D	D	E	C	D	C	C	F	C
WCSC6	E	D	D	C	C	C	C	B	C	C	F	B
	D	D	D	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	F	D
TMS1	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	C	A	F	B
TMS2	E	D	C	C	D	B	B	B	C	B	F	B
TMS3	E	C	C	C	C	D	B	B	C	C	F	D
TMS4	E	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	D	F	C
TMS5	D	D	C	B	C	C	C	C	C	D	F	C
TMS6	E	D	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	F	B
	E	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	C	C	F	C

An observation of the table: 5.24 reveals that P4 remained present in eleven CLM tasks. On **RCS**, component-wise analysis of the performance, P4 in her first activity was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Comprehension, Interpretation, and Relation to Text. She was at Very Poor level on Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. In the last task,

in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on Comprehension, Analysis, Interpretation, and Relation to Text whereas she gained the level of Satisfactory level on Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. Comparing the performances of P4 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P3 started on AGP with Mediocre level whereas in the last eighth session she attained level of Good for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre to Good level.

On **CTS**, P4 had lower abilities. A perusal of the table: 5.24 reveals that P4 in the first task, achieved Mediocre level on Interpretation and Explanation components; whereas she attained a Very poor level on components such as Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on Explanation and Self-regulation. She was at Satisfactory level on components viz. Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P4 in her first task achieved Very Poor level, till she achieved the level of Satisfactory at last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Very Poor to level of Satisfactory.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P4 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.24 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P4 in her first task, was at Very Poor level on Grammar, Mechanics and overall impression; whereas she gained Mediocre level on Structuring, Content and Style components. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Good level on components such as Structuring, Content and Overall impression of piece of writing. She attained the level of Satisfactory on Grammar, and Mediocre level on components like Style and Mechanics. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P4 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and progressed to level of Satisfactory in the ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to level of Satisfactory or average level.

On **TMS** it is found that P3 exhibited nice performance. A perusal of the table: 5.24 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that P4 in the first task, was at Very Poor level on component i.e. Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit and Overall Impact. She attained Mediocre level on Time utilization, Punctuality & Getting Task organized. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Mediocre on Adjustment due to procrastination, on Satisfactory level on components namely

Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and the level of Good on components like Time utilization, Observing Deadline and Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, it is seen that P4 in her first task achieved Very Poor level and progressed at level of Good in the last task. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Very Poor level to level of Good.

Performance Profile of P5:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending ten CLM tasks, though she could not attend the initial first session on teambuilding. She was the most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents, lesson plans, task-sheets etc. She remained with the investigator when CLM strategy was started implemented, from the first day and she stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was a bright and hardworking student. Moreover, she had qualities of eagerness, zest and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close quarters that she had made exemplary progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with her grammar skills and cooperative skill. Although she had English literature background at her graduation; she made extensive progress in language skills.

Table: 5.25: Performance assessment of P5

Codes of Components of soft skills	CLM based Sessions											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
RCSC1	C	F	F	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
RCSC2	C	F	F	C	C	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
RCSC3	C	F	F	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
RCSC4	C	F	F	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
RCSC5	D	F	F	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
RCSC6	D	F	F	D	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
	C	F	F	C	B	B	A	A	F	F	F	F
CTSC1	D	F	F	C	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
CTSC2	D	F	F	C	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
CTSC3	D	F	F	D	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
CTSC4	E	F	F	D	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
CTSC5	D	F	F	D	C	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
CTSC6	D	F	F	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	D	F	F	C	B	B	B	B	F	F	F	F
WCSC1	C	F	F	B	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_
WCSC2	B	F	F	B	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_
WCSC3	C	F	F	C	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_
WCSC4	C	F	F	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A
WCSC5	C	F	F	D	C	C	C	B	B	A	A	A
WCSC6	C	F	F	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A
	C	F	F	C	B	B	A	A	A	C	C	C
TMS1	C	F	F	B	B	A	B	A	B	A	A	A
TMS2	C	F	F	B	B	A	A	A	A	B	B	A
TMS3	B	F	F	C	B	A	B	A	A	A	A	A
TMS4	C	F	F	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A
TMS5	D	F	F	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
TMS6	C	F	F	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	B
	C	F	F	B	B	A	B	A	A	A	A	A

An observation of the table: 5.25 reveals that P5 remained present in twelve CLM tasks. On **RCS**, component-wise analysis of the performance, P5 in her first activity was on Mediocre level on fifth and sixth component i.e. Understanding Genre

and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. She was on Satisfactory level on first to fourth components namely Comprehension, Analysis, Interpretation, and Relation to Text. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on fifth and sixth components namely, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading whereas she gained the level of Very Good on first to fourth components of RCS viz. Comprehension, Analysis, Interpretation, Relation to Text. Comparing the performances of P5 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first and fourth CLM task, P5 started on AGP with Satisfactory level. During fifth and sixth tasks, P5 achieved Good level and from seventh to last task, she attained Very Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Satisfactory or average level to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P5 was moderate compared to the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.25 reveals that P5 in the first task, achieved a Very poor level on fourth component i.e. Inference; whereas on rest of other five components namely, Interpretation, Explanation, Analysis, Evaluation, Self-regulation. In the last task, she could reach at Very Good level on first and second component i.e. Interpretation and Explanation and attained the level of Good on third to sixth component, viz. Analysis, Inference, Evaluation and Self-regulation. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P5 in her first task achieved Mediocre level then afterwards she progressed from the level of Below Satisfactory to last eighth task at level of Good. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre level to level of Good.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P5 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.25 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P5 in her first task, was Satisfactory or average level on Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She got level of Good on Content. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, second, and fourth components i.e. Structuring, Content, Grammar whereas she attained the level of Good on third ,fifth and sixth components like style, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P5 in her first task achieved Satisfactory level and progressed to level of Very Good from seventh to ninth tasks. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Satisfactory level to level of Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P5 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.25 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that P5 in the first task, was at Good level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She attained Satisfactory level on first, second, fourth and sixth components namely, Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Quality of work within time limit and Overall Impact. She gained Mediocre level on fifth component i.e. Punctuality & Getting Task organized. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Very Good from first to fourth components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, and Quality of work within time limit. She attained level of Good on fifth and sixth components i.e. Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P5 in her first task achieved Satisfactory or average level till level of Very Good in the last task. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Satisfactory level to level of Very Good.

Performance Profile of P6

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending ten CLM tasks though she could remain present in first session's teambuilding activity. She was rather most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. she was not hardworking much. She remained with the investigator from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was a below average student. She wanted to learn new things. It is observed from the close quarters that she had made marginal progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with cooperative skill. Though she had literature background at her graduation, she could make very little progress soft skills.

Table: 5.26: Performance assessment of P6

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	D	F	D	D	D	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	D	F	C	C	C	C	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	F	F	E	D	D	D	D	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	F	F	E	D	D	D	D	C	_	_	_	_
GPA☐		E	F	D	D	D	D	C	C	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	E	F	D	D	D	D	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	E	F	D	D	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	E	F	E	E	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	E	F	E	E	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	E	F	E	E	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	E	F	D	E	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
GPA☐		E	F	D	E	D	D	D	D	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	D	D	_	_	_
	WCSC2	D	F	D	C	D	D	D	D	C	_	_	_
	WCSC3	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	E	E	_	_	_
	WCSC4	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	E	D	F	D	D
	WCSC5	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	E	D	F	D	D
	WCSC6	E	F	E	D	D	D	D	E	D	F	D	D
GPA☐		E	F	E	D	D	D	D	E	D	F	E	E
SS4-TMS	TMS1	D	F	D	E	C	C	C	B	C	F	C	C
	TMS2	D	F	D	D	C	D	C	B	C	F	C	C
	TMS3	E	F	D	D	C	D	C	D	D	F	C	C
	TMS4	E	F	D	D	C	D	C	D	D	F	C	C
	TMS5	E	F	C	B	B	D	B	D	D	F	C	C
	TMS6	E	F	D	C	C	D	C	D	D	F	E	C
GPA☐		E	F	D	D	C	D	C	C	D	F	C	C

A close observation of the table: 5.26 reveals that P6 remained present in eleven CLM tasks. On **RCS** analysis of the performance Component-wise, P6 in her first activity was on level of Insignificant on fifth and sixth components, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. She secured Very Poor level on Analysis and Interpretation. She was on Mediocre or Below

Satisfactory level on first and fourth components namely Comprehension and Relation to Text. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on Relation to Text whereas she got the level of Satisfactory level on components viz. Comprehension, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. She achieved Mediocre level on Analysis, Interpretation. Comparing the performances of P6 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P6 started on AGP with Very Poor level. In the last session she attained Satisfactory level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Very Poor to Satisfactory level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P6 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.26 reveals that P6 in the first task, attained a Very Poor level on all six components. In the last task, she could reach at Mediocre level on all components viz., Interpretation, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. A very close look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P6 in her first task achieved Very Poor level, till last eighth task with Mediocre level. Thus she make very little enhancement her CTS from Very Poor to Mediocre level.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P6 had lower abilities. A close study of the table: 5.26 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P6 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on Content whereas attained Very Poor level on rest other components viz. Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Poor level on Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall impact. She attained the Mediocre level on Structuring and content. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P6 in her first task achieved Very Poor level and carried to level of Moderate in eighth task but achieved the level of Very Poor again in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Very Poor level to level of Very Poor level.

On **TMS** it is found that P6 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.26 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill's reveals that in the first task, P6 was on Moderate level on first and second components i.e. Time utilization, Observing Deadlines whereas she could get Very Poor level on Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Satisfactory on all components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close

observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P6 in her first task achieved Very Poor level then afterwards she progressed from Mediocre level till the last task with Satisfactory level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Very Poor level to Satisfactory level.

Performance Profile of P7:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending nine CLM tasks and both sessions on teambuilding activities. She was somewhat sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. She remained with the investigator from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was a mediocre, average student but she was eager to learn new things and had positive outlook. It is observed that she had made quite good progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with her grammar skills and cooperative skill. Though she had literature background at her graduation, she was at mediocre level in use of language. At the end of all tasks she could make noteworthy progress in language skills.

Table: 5.27: Performance assessment of P7

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	F	B	B	B	F	F	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	F	D	D	C	F	F	C	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	F	D	C	C	F	F	C	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	F	D	B	B	F	F	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	F	D	D	C	F	F	C	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	F	D	D	D	F	F	D	D	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	D	C	C	F	F	C	B	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	F	E	D	D	F	F	D	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	F	C	B	B	F	F	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	F	D	D	D	F	F	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	F	E	E	D	F	F	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	F	E	E	D	F	F	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	F	D	D	C	F	F	D	D	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	D	D	C	F	F	C	C	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	F	D	C	C	F	F	C	C	C	_	_	_
	WCSC2	F	C	C	B	F	F	B	B	A	_	_	_
	WCSC3	F	D	D	D	F	F	D	D	C	_	_	_
	WCSC4	F	C	C	C	F	F	C	B	B	C	B	B
	WCSC5	F	D	D	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	B	B
	WCSC6	F	D	C	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	C	B
GPA-->		F	D	C	C	F	F	C	C	C	D	D	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	F	D	C	B	F	F	B	B	B	B	B	A
	TMS2	F	B	B	B	F	F	B	B	B	B	B	B
	TMS3	F	D	C	B	F	F	C	C	C	B	B	B
	TMS4	F	D	C	C	F	F	B	B	C	B	B	C
	TMS5	F	D	C	C	F	F	C	C	C	B	B	D
	TMS6	F	D	C	C	F	F	C	C	C	B	B	D
GPA-->		F	D	C	B	F	F	B	B	C	B	B	C

A close observation of the table: 5.27 reveals that P7 remained present in eleven CLM tasks. On **RCS** analysis of the performance Component-wise, P7 in her first activity i.e. second CLM task was on Good level on first component-

Comprehension. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on second to sixth components namely Analysis, Interpretation, and Relation to Text, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. In the last task, in eighth CLM task. She achieved the level of Very Good on Relation to Text, she gained level of Good on Comprehension and Interpretation whereas she got Satisfactory level on Analysis and Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. She was at mediocre level on Critical Reading. Comparing the performances of P7 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the second CLM task, P7 attained Mediocre or Below Average level whereas in the last session she attained Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre or Below Average level to Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P7 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.27 reveals that P7 in the second task, attained a Very poor level on Interpretation, Inference, and Evaluation. She got Mediocre level on Analysis, Self-regulation whereas she was at Satisfactory level on second component i.e. Explanation. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on second component i.e. Explanation and attained the level of Satisfactory or average level on Interpretation, Analysis. She reached at Mediocre level on Inference, Evaluation, and Self-regulation. A very serious look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P7 in her first task achieved Mediocre level, then afterwards she progressed from the level of Mediocre to Satisfactory level in last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Satisfactory.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P7 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.27 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P7 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on Structuring, style, Mechanics and Overall Impression; whereas she attained a Satisfactory level on Content, Grammar. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on second component viz., Content and she attained the level of Good on fourth component- Grammar whereas she received Satisfactory level on Structuring, Style, Grammar and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P7 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and reached the level of Satisfactory in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to Satisfactory level.

On **TMS** it is found that P7 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.27 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the second task, P7 was at Mediocre level on Time utilization, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact; and attained   level of Good or Above Satisfactory level   on second component i.e. Observing Deadlines. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Very Good on first, component namely Time utilization, whereas level of Good on Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination and satisfactory level on fourth component i.e. Quality of work within time limit and Mediocre level on Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P7 in her first task achieved Mediocre level   and then afterwards she progressed to level of Satisfactory in the last fourteenth task, in addition she could get level of Good in ninth task. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Mediocre level to Satisfactory level.

Performance Profile of P8:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending twelve CLM tasks and first teambuilding session. She was most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. She remained with the investigator when CLM strategy started implemented, from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was an average student but her greatest quality was her honesty, eagerness, zest and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close quarters that she had made quite extraordinary progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with her grammar skills and cooperative skill. Though she had literature background at her graduation, and her schooling from Hindi medium, she worked hard to make extensive progress in language   skills.

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	E	D	C	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	D	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	D	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	D	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	E	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	E	E	D	D	D	D	C	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	D	C	C	B	B	B	A	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	D	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_
	WCSC2	B	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	_	_	_
	WCSC3	D	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC4	D	B	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A
	WCSC5	D	D	C	C	C	C	B	B	B	A	A	A
	WCSC6	D	C	C	B	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A
GPA-->		D	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	C	C	C
SS4-TMS	TMS1	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	A	A	A	A
	TMS2	D	B	B	B	B	B	A	B	A	A	A	A
	TMS3	D	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A
	TMS4	D	C	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A
	TMS5	C	C	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A
	TMS6	C	B	B	B	C	B	B	B	A	A	A	A
GPA-->		C	B	B	B	B	B	A	A	A	A	A	A

A close observation of the table: 5.28 reveals that P8 remained present in twelve CLM tasks. On **RCS** analysis of the performance Component-wise, P8 in her first activity was on Very Poor level on second component i.e. Analysis. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Interpretation, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. She was on Satisfactory or Average level on Comprehension, Relation to Text. In the last task i.e. eighth CLM task, she achieved level of Good on second component Analysis whereas she attained level of Very Good on rest of the other components viz. Comprehension, Interpretation,

Relation to Text, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. Comparing the performances of P8 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P8 started with Mediocre level. During second task she gained Satisfactory level, then she achieved Good level from third to sixth task and in seventh and last task, she got Very Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P8 was average than the rest of the other skills. A perusal of the table: 5.28 reveals that P8 in the first task, attained a Very poor level on third and fourth component namely, Analysis, Inference. She got Mediocre level on first, fifth and sixth components i.e. Interpretation, Evaluation, Self-regulation whereas she was at Satisfactory level on second component i.e. Explanation. Comparatively she improved her grades in last few sessions. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on second component i.e. Explanation whereas she could reach at the level of Very Good on all other five components, viz. Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. A very serious look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P8 in her first two tasks achieved Mediocre level, from third and fourth tasks had Satisfactory level, then afterwards she progressed from the level of Good from fifth to seventh and got Very Good level in last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Very Good.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P8 had above average abilities. A close study of the table: 5.28 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P8 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics; Overall Impression; whereas she attained a Good level on second component namely, Content. Overall Impression. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, second, fourth components viz., Structuring, Content, Grammar whereas she attained the level of Good on third, fifth and sixth components like Style, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P8 in her first task achieved Mediocre, then afterwards she progressed and achieved the level of Very Good in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to level of Very Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P8 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.28 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the first task, P8 was at Satisfactory level on first, fifth and sixth

components i.e. Time utilization, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact; and she could attain level of Mediocre on second to fourth component i.e. Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Very Good on all six components of the skill. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P8 in her first task achieved Satisfactory level till the last task with Very Good level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Satisfactory level to level of Very Good.

Performance Profile of P9:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending nine CLM tasks, though she missed to join in first session on Teambuilding, she could remain present in second session. She was the most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. She faithfully stayed with the investigator from the very first day of the data collection till last day when terminal test was administered. She was a bright student and she had qualities like friendliness, frankness, eagerness, zest, honesty, sincerity and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed from the close corners that she had made quite wonderful progress in enhancement of almost all four soft skills, improving her grammar skills and cooperative skill too. Though she had no literature background at her graduation as she was a commerce graduate, she made extensive progress in attaining language and study skills.

Table: 5.29: Performance assessment of P9

Codes of Soft Skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	F	C	B	B	F	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	F	D	C	B	F	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	F	C	B	B	F	B	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	F	B	B	B	F	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	F	C	C	B	F	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	F	D	C	C	F	C	F	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	C	B	B	F	B	F	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	F	D	C	B	F	B	F	A	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	F	C	B	B	F	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	F	D	C	C	F	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	F	D	C	C	F	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	F	D	C	C	F	C	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	F	C	C	B	F	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	D	C	B	F	B	F	A	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	F	C	B	A	F	B	F	A	A	_	_	_
	WCSC2	F	C	B	A	F	A	F	A	A	_	_	_
	WCSC3	F	D	C	B	F	B	F	B	A	_	_	_
	WCSC4	F	D	C	B	F	B	F	B	B	A	A	A
	WCSC5	F	D	C	B	F	C	F	B	B	A	A	A
	WCSC6	F	D	C	B	F	B	F	B	B	A	A	A
GPA-->		F	D	C	B	F	B	F	B	A	C	C	C
SS4-TMS	TMS1	F	C	B	A	F	A	F	A	A	A	A	O
	TMS2	F	C	B	B	F	A	F	A	A	A	A	O
	TMS3	F	C	B	B	F	B	F	A	B	B	A	A
	TMS4	F	C	C	C	F	B	F	B	B	B	A	A
	TMS5	F	C	B	B	F	C	F	B	A	A	A	A
	TMS6	F	C	B	B	F	B	F	B	B	B	B	B
GPA-->		F	C	B	B	F	B	F	A	A	A	A	A

A close observation of the table: 5.29 reveals that P9 remained present in nine CLM tasks. On **RCS**, Component-wise analysis of the performance of P9 in second task was on Good level on fourth component-Relation to Text. She was on Satisfactory or average level on first, third and fifth component i.e. Comprehension,

Interpretation, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on second and sixth components namely Analysis; Critical Reading. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on second, fifth and sixth component Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading whereas she got the level of Very Good on first, third and fourth components of RCS viz. Comprehension, Interpretation, Relation to Text. While comparing the performances of P9 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the second CLM task, P9 achieved satisfactory or average level, whereas in the last session she attained Very Good level on RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Satisfactory to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P9 was medium level than the rest of the other soft skills. A perusal of the table: 5.29 reveals that P9 in the second task, attained Mediocre level on first, third, fourth and fifth components i.e. Interpretation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation whereas she was at Satisfactory level on second and sixth component i.e. Explanation and Self-Regulation. In the last task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, second and sixth component i.e. Interpretation, Explanation and Self-Regulation whereas she attained the level of Good on third to fifth components, viz. Analysis, Inference, Evaluation. A very close look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, reveals that P9 in her first task achieved Mediocre level but then afterwards she progressed to level of Very Good in last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Very Good.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P9 had above average abilities. A close observation of the table: 5.29 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P9 in second task, was at Mediocre level on Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall impression; whereas she attained a Satisfactory level on first and second, components namely, Structuring, Content. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, second, third, components viz., Structuring, Content, Style and she attained the level of Good on third to sixth components like Grammar, Mechanics, and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P9 in her first task achieved Mediocre level, then afterwards she progressed and achieved the level of Very Good in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to level of Very Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P9 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.29 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the second task, P9 was at Satisfactory level on all six components. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Outstanding or Excellent level

on first two components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines; whereas she got level of Very Good on third to fifth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized. She got level of Good on Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P9 in second task achieved Satisfactory level and improved till the last task with Very Good level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Satisfactory level to level of Very Good.

Performance Profile of P10:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending ten CLM tasks though she could remain present in first session's teambuilding activity and missed the second session on Teambuilding activities. She was rather most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. she was hardworking but she couldn't get productive results. She remained with the investigator from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was a below average student. She wanted to learn new things but did not try hard to improve by reading or writing much. It is observed from the close contacts and daily encounters with her that she had made marginal progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with grammar skill except cooperative skill. Though she had literature background at her graduation, and schooling with Tamil medium, she could make very little progress in English language and soft skills.

Table: 5.30 Performance assessment of P10

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	E	D	F	F	D	C	C	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	E	E	F	F	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	D	F	F	C	C	B	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	D	C	F	F	B	B	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	E	D	F	F	D	D	C	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	E	D	F	F	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		E	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	D	D	F	F	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	C	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	E	E	F	F	C	C	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	E	E	F	F	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	E	E	F	F	D	D	D	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	F	E	F	F	D	D	E	D	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		E	E	F	F	D	D	D	D	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	E	D	F	F	D	C	C	C	C	_	_	_
	WCSC2	C	C	F	F	D	D	C	C	C	_	_	_
	WCSC3	D	D	F	F	D	D	D	D	E	_	_	_
	WCSC4	D	D	F	F	C	D	D	D	C	C	B	B
	WCSC5	E	D	F	F	D	D	D	D	E	C	C	D
	WCSC6	D	C	F	F	E	D	D	D	C	C	C	D
GPA-->		D	D	F	F	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	E
SS4-TMS	TMS1	D	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
	TMS2	E	D	F	F	D	C	C	C	C	C	C	C
	TMS3	E	D	F	F	D	C	C	C	D	C	C	C
	TMS4	E	E	F	F	D	D	D	C	D	C	C	C
	TMS5	E	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	D	C	C	C
	TMS6	D	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	D	C	C	C
GPA-->		E	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	D	C	C	C

A close observation of the table: 5.30 reveals that P10 remained present in ten CLM tasks. On **RCS,** Component-wise analysis of the performance, P10 in her first activity was on level of Very Poor level on Comprehension, Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. She was on Mediocre or

Below Satisfactory level on Interpretation and Relation to Text. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Mediocre on Analysis and Critical Reading, whereas she scored on Satisfactory level on components viz. Interpretation and Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. She achieved Good level on Comprehension and Relation to Text. Comparing the performances of P10 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P10 started with Very Poor level. In the last session she attained Satisfactory level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Very Poor to Satisfactory level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P10 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.30 reveals that P10 in the first task, attained Insignificant level on Self-Regulation; and got Very Poor level on third to fifth components viz. Analysis, Inference, Evaluation. She achieved Mediocre level on Interpretation whereas gained Satisfactory level on Explanation. In the last task, she could reach at Mediocre level on Interpretation, Inference, Evaluation, and Self-regulation. On Explanation, Analysis components she secured Satisfactory level. A very close study on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P10 in her first task achieved Very Poor level, till last eighth task with Satisfactory level. Thus she could make some enhancement on her CTS from Very Poor to Satisfactory level.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P10 had very lower abilities and had not improved much till last session. A close study of the table: 5.30 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P10 in her first task, attained Very Poor level on Structuring, Mechanics, whereas she was at Mediocre level on Style, Grammar, and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She secured Satisfactory level on Content. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Poor level on Style and Mechanics, whereas she could attain Satisfactory level on Structuring, content, Grammar, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P10 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and again stuck to Mediocre level in last ninth task. Thus she could not enhance her WCS.

On **TMS** it is found that P10 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.30 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the first task, P10 was on Moderate level on first and sixth components i.e. Time utilization and Overall Impact; whereas she could get Very Poor level on Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time

213

limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Satisfactory on all components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P10 in her first task achieved Very Poor level then afterwards she progressed from Mediocre level till the last task with Satisfactory level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Very Poor level to Satisfactory level.

Performance Profile of P11:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most regular in attending ten CLM tasks and could join in second session of team building activities. She was also one of the most sincere and punctual students who submitted all reports and artefacts, documents etc. in time. She remained with the investigator from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was an above average student. She had good qualities of patience, eagerness, zest and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed that she had made quite noteworthy progress in almost all four soft skills enhancement along with improvement in her grammar skills and cooperative skill. Though she had no literature background at her graduation as she was a Commerce graduate, she made extensive progress in language and soft skills.

Table: 5.31 Performance assessment of P11

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	F	C	B	B	B	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	F	C	B	B	B	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	F	C	C	B	B	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	F	D	C	C	B	C	F	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	F	D	D	C	C	C	F	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	D	C	B	B	B	F	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	F	E	D	D	C	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	F	D	C	B	B	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	F	D	D	D	C	C	F	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	F	E	E	D	D	C	F	D	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	F	E	E	D	D	C	F	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	F	D	D	C	C	C	F	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		F	D	D	C	C	C	F	C	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC2	F	C	C	B	B	B	F	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC3	F	E	D	C	B	B	F	C	C	_	_	_
	WCSC4	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	B	B	B	C
	WCSC5	F	D	D	D	C	C	F	B	B	B	B	C
	WCSC6	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	B	B	B	C
GPA-->		F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	B	D	D	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	F	C	C	B	B	B	F	B	A	A	A	A
	TMS2	F	C	B	B	B	B	F	B	B	A	A	A
	TMS3	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	B	A	A	B
	TMS4	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	A	B	B	B
	TMS5	F	D	C	B	B	B	F	B	B	B	B	B
	TMS6	F	D	C	C	B	B	F	B	B	B	B	B
GPA-->		F	D	C	B	B	B	F	B	B	A	A	B

A close observation of the table: 5.31 reveals that P11 remained present in ten CLM tasks. On **RCS,** component-wise Analysis of the performance, P11 in her first activity i.e. second CLM task was on Satisfactory level on Comprehension, Interpretation, Relation to Text. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. In the

215

last task, in eighth CLM task. She achieved the level of Very Good on Comprehension, Interpretation , and Relation to Text. She gained level of Good on Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. Comparing the performances of P11 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the second CLM task, P11 attained Mediocre or Below Average level whereas in the last session she attained Very Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre or Below Average level to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P11 was moderate. A perusal of the table: 5.31 reveals that P11 in the second task, attained a Very poor level on Interpretation, Inference, Evaluation. She got Mediocre level on Explanation Analysis, Self-regulation. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on Interpretation, Explanation and Self-regulation. She attained the level of Satisfactory or average level on Analysis and Evaluation. She reached at Mediocre level on Inference. A close look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P11 in second task achieved Mediocre level, then afterwards she progressed from the level of Mediocre to reach Satisfactory level in last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Satisfactory.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P11 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.31 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P11 in second CLM task, was at Mediocre level on Structuring, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression; whereas she attained a Satisfactory level on Content. She remained at level of Very Poor on Style. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Satisfactory level on Style, She could achieve Good level on Structuring, Content, Grammar, Mechanics, and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P11 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and reached the level of Good in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to Good level.

On **TMS** it is found that P11 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.11 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the second task, P11 was at Mediocre level on Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact; whereas attained   level of Satisfactory level Time utilization, Observing Deadlines. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Very Good on first and second component namely Time utilization and

Observing Deadlines; whereas level of Good gained on, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P11 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and then afterwards she progressed to level of Satisfactory between four to six tasks in the last fourteenth task. She could get level of Good in ninth task. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Mediocre level to level of Good.

Performance Profile of P12:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant attended seven CLM tasks along with first teambuilding session. She was little less punctual and sincere in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. She also remained with the investigator when CLM strategy started implemented, from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day when terminal test was administered. She was an average student. She was good at expression and had qualities like eagerness and positive outlook to learn new things. It is observed that she had made remarkable   progress in enhancement of almost all four soft skills along with improving her grammar skills and cooperative skill. She had English literature background at her graduation, she made extensive progress in language skills.

Table: 5.32 Performance assessment of P12

Codes of Soft skills	Codes of Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	C	B	F	C	B	B	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	E	D	F	C	C	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	C	F	B	B	B	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	C	B	F	B	B	A	F	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	C	B	F	B	B	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	D	D	F	C	C	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	C	F	B	B	B	F	A	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	C	C	F	C	C	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	C	C	F	B	B	B	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	D	D	F	D	C	C	F	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	D	D	F	D	C	C	F	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	D	C	F	C	C	C	F	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	D	D	F	C	C	B	F	C	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	C	F	C	C	B	F	B	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	D	C	F	B	B	B	F	A	F	F	F	_
	WCSC2	C	B	F	B	A	A	F	A	F	F	F	_
	WCSC3	D	D	F	C	C	B	F	B	F	F	F	_
	WCSC4	D	C	F	C	C	B	F	B	F	F	F	B
	WCSC5	D	C	F	C	B	B	F	A	F	F	F	B
	WCSC6	D	C	F	C	B	B	F	B	F	F	F	B
GPA-->		D	C	F	C	B	B	F	A	F	F	F	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	C	C	F	B	B	A	F	A	F	F	F	A
	TMS2	C	B	F	B	B	A	F	B	F	F	F	A
	TMS3	D	B	F	C	B	A	F	A	F	F	F	B
	TMS4	D	B	F	B	B	B	F	B	F	F	F	A
	TMS5	D	B	F	B	B	B	F	A	F	F	F	B
	TMS6	D	B	F	B	B	B	F	B	F	F	F	B
GPA-->		D	B	F	B	B	A	F	A	F	F	F	A

A close observation of the table: 5.32 reveals that P12 remained present in seven CLM tasks. On **RCS** component-wise analysis of the performance, P12 in her first activity was on Satisfactory or Average level on Comprehension, Relation to

Text, and Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. She was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Interpretation, Critical Reading. She secured Very poor level on second component- Analysis. In the last task, in eighth CLM task she achieved level of Good on Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies; whereas she got the level of Very Good on Comprehension, Interpretation, and Relation to Text, Critical Reading. Comparing the performances of P12 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P12 started with Mediocre or Below average level, whereas in the last session she attained Very Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre level to Very Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P12 was lower than the rest of the other soft skills. A perusal of the table: 5.32 reveals that P12 in the second task, attained Mediocre level on Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation; whereas she was at Satisfactory level on first and second components i.e. Interpretation, Explanation. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on Interpretation, Explanation, and Analysis. She attained the level of Satisfactory on Inference, Evaluation, and Self-regulation. A close study of the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P12 in her first task achieved Mediocre level, then afterwards she progressed till the level of Good in the last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Good.

It is found on **WCS**, that P12 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.32 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P12 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression. Whereas she attained a Satisfactory level on second component namely, Content. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Very Good level on first, second components viz., Structuring, Content, Mechanics whereas she attained the level of Good on components like Style, Grammar and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P12 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and gradually achieved the level of Good in last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Mediocre level to level of Good.

On **TMS** it is observed that P12 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.32 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the first task, P12 was at Mediocre level on Adjustment due to

procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact; and attained level of Satisfactory level on Time utilization, Observing Deadlines. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Very Good on first, second and fourth components namely Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Quality of work within time limit; whereas she secured level of Good on Adjustment due to procrastination, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P12 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and afterwards she progressed till finished the last task with Very Good level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Mediocre level to level of Very Good.

Performance Profile of P13:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was not regular in attending CLM tasks as she could attend first teambuilding session and eight CLM tasks. She wasn't much serious and sincere in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. Although she could remain with the investigator till last day of terminal test implemented. She was a mediocre, below average student. Her quality was her attempting and not giving up as she fumbled with English she kept on learning correct use in speaking and writing English. It is observed that she had made quite noteworthy progress in enhancement of almost all four soft skills along with her grammar skills and cooperative skill. Though she had literature background at her graduation, her schooling background was Gujarati medium though she made some progress in soft skills.

Table: 5.33 Performance assessment of P13

Codes of soft skills	Codes of components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	D	D	F	C	F	F	C	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	E	E	F	D	F	F	D	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	C	F	D	F	F	B	B	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	C	C	F	B	F	F	B	A	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	E	D	F	D	F	F	C	C	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	E	D	F	D	F	F	D	D	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	D	F	C	F	F	C	B	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	D	D	F	D	F	F	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	C	D	F	C	F	F	B	B	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	E	E	F	D	F	F	D	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	E	E	F	D	F	F	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	E	E	F	D	F	F	C	C	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	F	E	F	E	F	F	D	C	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		E	E	F	D	F	F	C	C	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	D	D	F	D	F	F	C	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC2	E	C	F	C	F	F	B	B	B	_	_	_
	WCSC3	E	D	F	D	F	F	C	C	C	_	_	_
	WCSC4	D	D	F	D	F	F	D	C	C	B	F	A
	WCSC5	E	D	F	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	B
	WCSC6	E	C	F	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	B
GPA-->		E	D	F	D	F	F	C	C	C	D	F	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	D	D	F	C	F	F	C	B	B	B	F	C
	TMS2	D	D	F	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	C
	TMS3	D	D	F	D	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	C
	TMS4	E	D	F	D	F	F	D	D	C	C	F	C
	TMS5	C	C	F	B	F	F	C	C	B	B	F	C
	TMS6	D	C	F	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	C
GPA-->		D	D	F	C	F	F	C	C	C	C	F	C

A close observation of the table: 5.33 reveals that P13 remained present in eight CLM tasks. On **RCS,** component-wise analysis of the performance, P13 in her first activity was on Satisfactory level on fourth component-Relation to Text. She was

on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on first, third components i.e. Comprehension, Interpretation. She was on Very Poor level on second and fifth, sixth components namely Analysis; Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. In the last task, in eighth CLM task, she achieved level of Very Good on Relation to Text; whereas she got the level of Good on Comprehension, Interpretation. She gained Satisfactory level on Analysis, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies whereas on Critical Reading she scored Mediocre level. Comparing the performances of P13 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P13 secured Mediocre level; whereas in the last session she attained level of Good for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre to Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P13 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.33 reveals that P13 in the first task, attained level of Insignificant on Self-regulation whereas she achieved a Very poor level on Analysis, Inference, and Evaluation. She got Mediocre level on first component i.e. Interpretation and got Satisfactory level on Explanation. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on first and second component i.e. Interpretation, Explanation and attained the level of Satisfactory on Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, Self-regulation. A very serious look on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, reveals that P13 in her first task achieved Very Poor level, which she could improve in further sessions and finally scored Satisfactory level in last eighth task. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Very Poor to level of Satisfactory.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P13 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.33 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P13 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on first, fourth components i.e. Structuring, Grammar; whereas she attained a Very Poor level on Content, Style, Mechanics, Overall Impression. In the last ninth task, she could reach at Good level on Structuring, Content, and she attained the level of Satisfactory on Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P13 in her first task achieved Very Poor level then afterwards she progressed and achieved the level of Satisfactory in last ninth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Very Poor level to Satisfactory level.

On **TMS,** it is found that P13 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.33 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the first task, P13 was at Satisfactory level on Punctuality & Getting Task organized whereas attained level of Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Time utilization, Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Overall Impact; and on fourth component on Quality of work within time limit, she gained Very Poor level.. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at the level of Satisfactory level on all six components. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P13 in her first task achieved Mediocre level to the last task with Satisfactory level. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Mediocre level to level of Satisfactory.

Performance Profile of P14:

Investigator's Observations and Inferences from Observation and Reflective diary:

This participant was most irregular in attending CLM tasks as she could attend only five CLM tasks and first session on Team-building; but she was most sincere and punctual in submitting all reports and artefacts, documents etc. She could remain with CLM strategy from the very first day of the data collection and stayed till last day of terminal test implemented. She was an Above average student and her greatest quality was her eagerness, zest to learn new things. It is observed that she had made good progress in enhancement of almost all four soft skills along with improving her grammar skills and cooperative skill. She had literature background at her graduation but Hindi medium at schooling, she made extensive progress in soft skills.

Table: 5.34 Performance assessment of P14

Codes of Soft skills	Components of soft skills	Task codes of CLM based sessions											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
		J-I	CIRC	WPS	TPS	RTR	AYN	NHT	QAP	PW	J-II	STAD	GI
SS1-RCS	RCSC1	C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	RCSC2	C	D	F	F	C	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	RCSC3	D	C	F	F	B	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	RCSC4	D	B	F	F	A	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	RCSC5	D	B	F	F	A	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	RCSC6	D	C	F	F	C	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	C	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
SS2-CTS	CTSC1	D	C	F	F	B	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	CTSC2	C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	CTSC3	D	C	F	F	C	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	CTSC4	E	D	F	F	C	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	CTSC5	D	C	F	F	C	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
	CTSC6	C	C	F	F	C	F	F	F	_	_	_	_
GPA-->		D	C	F	F	C	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
SS3-WCS	WCSC1	D	C	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	_	_	_
	WCSC2	B	B	F	F	A	F	F	F	F	_	_	_
	WCSC3	C	C	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	_	_	_
	WCSC4	C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	C	F	B
	WCSC5	C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	B	F	C
	WCSC6	C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	C	F	B
GPA-->		C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	D	F	D
SS4-TMS	TMS1	C	B	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	B	F	B
	TMS2	D	C	F	F	B	F	F	F	F	A	F	C
	TMS3	D	B	F	F	C	F	F	F	F	B	F	D
	TMS4	D	B	F	F	C	F	F	F	F	B	F	D
	TMS5	D	B	F	F	C	F	F	F	F	C	F	D
	TMS6	D	B	F	F	C	F	F	F	F	B	F	C
GPA-->		D	B	F	F	C	F	F	F	F	B	F	C

A close observation of the table: 5.34 reveals that P14 remained present in five CLM tasks. On **RCS,** Component-wise analysis of the performance, P14 in her first activity was on Satisfactory level on Comprehension, Analysis. She achieved Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Interpretation, Relation to Text,

Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies, Critical Reading. In the last task, in fifth CLM task she achieved level of Satisfactory on Analysis and Critical Reading whereas she got the level of Good on Comprehension, Interpretation whereas she attained Very Good level on Relation to Text, Understanding Genre and Using Reading Strategies. Comparing the performances of P14 in terms of AGP throughout all CLM tasks, in the beginning of the first CLM task, P14 was on Mediocre level but she could achieve in the fifth session Good level for RCS. Thus she could enhance her RCS from Mediocre level to Good level.

On **CTS**, the performance of P14 was lower than the rest of the skills. A perusal of the table: 5.34 reveals that P14 in the first task, attained a Very poor level on fourth component namely, Inference. She got Mediocre level on first, third, and fifth components i.e. Interpretation, Analysis, Evaluation whereas she was at Satisfactory level on second and sixth component i.e. Explanation, Self-regulation. In the last task, she could reach at Good level on Interpretation, Explanation and attained the level of Satisfactory on Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, and Self-regulation. A perusal on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P14 in her first task achieved Mediocre level and progressed to Satisfactory level on fifth task; then afterwards she could not remain present till tenth session. Thus she could enhance her CTS from Mediocre to level of Satisfactory.

On **WCS**, it is observed that P14 had moderate abilities. A close study of the table: 5.34 on component-wise performances on the target skill reveals that P14 in her first task, was at Mediocre level on first component i.e. Structuring; whereas she attained a Satisfactory level on Style, Grammar, Mechanics, Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She secured level of Good on Content. In the fifth task, she could reach at Very Good level on second component viz., Content; and she attained the level of Good on Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, P14 in her first task achieved Satisfactory level till she achieved the level of Good in fifth task. Thus she could enhance her WCS from Satisfactory level to level of Good.

On **TMS** it is found that P14 exhibited above expected performance. A perusal of the table: 5.34 on component-wise comprehensive performances on target skill reveals that in the first task, P14 was at Mediocre level on Observing Deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized and Overall Impact whereas she attained level of Satisfactory or Average level on Time utilization. In the last fourteenth task she could reach at

the level of Good on first component namely Time utilization, whereas Satisfactory level on Observing Deadlines, Critical Reading. She scored level of Mediocre on Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work within time limit, Punctuality & Getting Task organized. A close observation on the performances throughout all CLM tasks in terms of AGP, reveals that P14 in her first task achieved Mediocre level then afterwards she progressed to Satisfactory level in the last task. Thus she could enhance her TMS from Mediocre level to Satisfactory level.

The investigator has made an attempt to explore and describe the process of development of soft skills during CLMIP. This process is so far understood with the help of researcher's assessment and observation of performance of participants on select soft skills using rubrics. The process is further understood through video transcripts and self-reflective reports in the succeeding passages.

5.2.2.4. Data analysis and interpretation of participants' performances during Terminal Behaviour Tests:

The following passages describe the performance of participants by comparing and contrasting individual performance on four soft skills selected. The tables on four soft skills describe letter grades obtained in terminal behaviour tests. The performances are analysed simultaneously comparing terminal behaviour test with that of entry behaviour test on selected four soft skills. The differences are observed in terms of progress achieved at Terminal behaviour test. The regularity of the participants during sessions was also crucial for continuous performance.

As far as attending the sessions regularly is concerned, out of total fourteen participants under study, P1 remained present in all sessions whereas P8, P3, P4, P2 remained present in almost all sessions except one or two sessions.P14, P12, P13 remained absent in more sessions compared to others.

Performance on Reading Comprehension Skill during both Entry and Terminal Behaviour tests:

Table: 5.35. Terminal Behaviour Test [TBT] Performance on Soft Skill: 1- Reading Comprehension Skill [RCS]

Participant's Codes	Comprehension							Analysis							Interpretation							Relating Text to the Context							Understanding Genre & Using reading strategies							Critical Reading							AGP[TBT]
Letter Grades	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1		√			√				√			√					√	√					√		√					√		√					√			√			A
P2			√		√				√			√					√	√						√	√					√				√			√			√			A
P3		√		√					√	√							√	√					√		√					√		√					√		√				B
P4		√		√					√	√							√	√					√		√					√	√						√		√				C
P5			√		√						√	√								√							√			√		√					√					√	A
P6		√		√						√√						√√							√		√					√							√√						D
P7		√			√				√	√						√		√					√	√							√√							√	√			C
P8		√			√				√		√					√		√					√		√					√		√					√		√				A
P9			√		√				√		√					√			√							√				√		√					√		√				A
P10		√		√						√√						√√							√	√						√	√						√√						D
P11		√		√					√	√						√	√						√		√				√		√						√		√	√			B
P12		√		√					√	√						√	√								√					√	√					√	√		√	√			B
P13		√		√					√	√						√√							√	√						√	√					√	√		√				C
P14		√		√					√	√						√	√						√	√						√	√					√	√		√	√			C

Notes: Codes P1 – P14 indicate codes given to Participants; Letters of alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands for standards of performance obtained by participants Tick marks √ **indicates Entry behaviour test performance whereas** √ **indicates Terminal Behaviour test score attained by the participants.**

227

A perusal of table.5.35 reveals the following observations and comparison of all participants' performances at the Entry level and that of Terminal level.

P1   performed at mediocre or below satisfactory level on five components except on third component at satisfactory level during Entry Test. She was able to identify the purpose of the reading text by correctly interpreting but less able to comprehend, analyse, establishing relation with text, identifying genre or form and using reading strategies and critical reading ability.

During the terminal behaviour test she could make good progress at the end of all sessions and achieved Good or above average level on analysis, interpretation, and critical reading abilities whereas she had gone further by achieving at very good level on comprehension, relating text and Understanding genre and using reading strategies.

P2   exhibited a mediocre or below satisfactory level on three components viz., C2, C5, C6 during Entry Test. She was able less able to analyse, identifying genre or form and using reading strategies and critical reading ability. She was at average and above satisfactory level to identify the purpose of the reading text by correctly comprehending text, interpreting relating the text with its context.

During the terminal behaviour test she had made good progress at the end of all sessions and achieved Very Good level on C1, C4, and C5. She had improved in ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; at ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; and at ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She was on Good on C2 i.e. ability to break the text and differentiate details; C3 i.e. ability to identify purpose of the reading; and C6 i.e. Ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P3   performed at mediocre or below satisfactory level on first five components during Entry Test. She was able to comprehend, analyse, identify the purpose of the reading text by correctly interpreting at below satisfactory level and was less able to establish relation with text, identifying genre or form and using reading strategies. She was at very poor level on critical reading ability.

During the terminal behaviour test she had made good progress at the end of all sessions and achieved Very Good level on ability to make meaning in the context of the given text. She was at Good level in ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words and ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She was on average or satisfactory level on three components that included ability to break

the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P4 was at very poor level on C1, C2, C4, C6 components during Entry Test. She was not able to comprehend literal meaning, explain message and summarize text, analyse, establishing relation with text, and critical reading ability. She was at mediocre level at identifying the purpose of the reading text by correctly interpreting and identifying genre or form and using reading strategies.

During the terminal behaviour test she had made a progress at the end of all sessions and achieved Good level at first component i.e. ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words. She was at mediocre level at ability to break the text and differentiate details. She reached at Satisfactory level in rest other four components including ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P5 performed at average or above satisfactory level on first five components. She was of able to comprehension text through literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words and was able to analyse by breaking the text and differentiate details. She had ability to identify purpose of the reading, she had an ability to make meaning in the context of the given text. She could recognition genre and use of Reading Strategies. She was at Below satisfactory level on sixth component of Critical Reading that included the ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

During the terminal behaviour test she had made greatest progress at the end of all sessions and achieved Excellence level at C4 i.e. ability to make meaning in the context of the given text. She reached at Very Good level on C1, C3, C5, C6 i.e. the participant performed extremely well on showing ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text. She reached at Good or above average level on C2 i.e. ability to break the text and differentiate details;

P6   was at very poor or weak level in all six components of the skill. She was not able to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words, not able to break the text and differentiate details, not able to identify purpose of the reading, not able to make meaning in the context of the given text, not able to understand form of the text and unable to use reading strategies and not at all able to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

During the terminal behaviour test she could make a satisfactory level progress at the end of all sessions and achieved average level on ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies;

At Very Poor level on ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P7   was at very poor level on ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words and very weak at identifying the purpose of the reading. She was at below satisfactory level at breaking the text and differentiate details, ability to make meaning in the context of the given text, ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text. She was at average or satisfactory level on ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies.

During the terminal behaviour test she had made some progress at the end of all sessions in target skills and achieved Good or above average level on C1 i.e. Ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; whereas she reached to satisfactory level on the rest of the components of the target skill. She could break the text and differentiate details; identify purpose of the reading; make meaning in the context of the given text; understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies; read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text at average level.

P8   performed at below satisfactory level on all components. She exhibited a mediocre level ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; at ability to break the text and differentiate details; at ability to identify purpose of the reading; at ability to make meaning in the context of the given text, at ability to understand form of the text and ability to use

reading strategies; at ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

During the terminal behaviour test she had made great progress at the end of all sessions on target skill and achieved Good or above satisfactory or above average level on ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text; whereas she had gone further by achieving at Very Good level on comprehension i.e. ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; Relating text - ability to make meaning in the context of the given text, and Understanding genre and using reading strategies i.e. ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies;

P9   exhibited mediocre or below satisfactory level on ability to break the text and differentiate details, ability to identify purpose of the reading, and ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text. She was at satisfactory or average level on ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to make meaning in the context of the given text, and ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies.

During the terminal behaviour test she was had made excellent progress at the end of all sessions on the target skill and reached at Excellent or Outstanding level on fourth component Relation to Text that was an ability to make meaning in the context of the given text. She could reach at Very good level on ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to identify purpose of the reading; and ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She achieved Good or above average level on ability to break the text and differentiate details; and ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P10   was at very poor level on ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading and she was also very weak to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text. She was at below satisfactory level in ability to make meaning in the context of the given text and at ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies.

During the terminal behaviour test she made very little and almost negligible progress at the end of all sessions on the target skill. She achieved Satisfactory or average level on first component having ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; fourth component showing ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; fifth component indicating ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She couldn't make any progress and remained at Very Poor level on ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; and ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P11 was very poor at C5 i.e. ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. Comparatively, she was at mediocre or below satisfactory level on C1, C2, C3, C4, and C6. She had mediocre ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words and ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

During the terminal behaviour test she performed at Good or above average level on ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; and ability to make meaning in the context of the given text. She could reach at Satisfactory level on ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P12 was at below satisfactory level having ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading and able to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text. She was at average or satisfactory level having ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; and was able to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies.

At the end of all sessions, during the terminal behaviour test she made noteworthy progress and achieved level of Good or above average on comprehension ability including how to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; fourth component having ability to make meaning in the context of the given text, fifth component showing

ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She could reach at Satisfactory level in terms of ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P13   showed a very poor level on C1, C2 and C6. She was very poor at ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text. She remained at below satisfactory level on C3, C4, and C5.She was not able to identify purpose of the reading; not able to make meaning in the context of the given text; not able to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies.

The participant could not make significant progress at the end of all sessions in the target skill although she could reach up to Satisfactory level on first, fourth and fifth components. She could develop ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; ability to make meaning in the context of the given text, ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She achieved Mediocre level on second, third and sixth components. She could develop below average ability to break the text and differentiate details; ability to identify purpose of the reading; and ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

P14   performed at mediocre or below satisfactory level on C1, C3, C4, C5 components whereas she was very poor at C2 and C6. She had below satisfactory ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words; and was unable to identify purpose of the reading; unable to make meaning in the context of the given text; below ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She was very poor on ability to break the text and differentiate details; and ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

During the terminal behaviour test she was at level of Above average or Good in terms of ability to make literal meaning, explain message or summarise in own words. She achieved satisfactory level on ability to identify purpose of the reading; ability to make meaning in the context of the given text; and ability to understand form of the text and ability to use reading strategies. She reached at Below satisfactory or mediocre level on ability to break the text and

differentiate details; ability to read critically by examining text deeply, reinterpreting and reconstructing the text.

Performance on Critical Thinking Skill during both Entry and Terminal Behaviour tests:

Table: 5.36. Terminal behaviour Performance on Soft Skill: 2- Critical Thinking Skill [CTS]

Participant's Codes	Letter Grades	Interpretation							Analysis							Evaluation							Inference							Explanation							Self-Regulation							AGP
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1			√		√					√			√						√					√		√							√	√				√	√					B
P2				√		√				√			√						√					√	√								√		√			√				√		B
P3			√		√					√		√							√					√	√								√	√				√	√				C
P4			√		√					√	√								√					√	√								√	√				√	√				C
P5				√		√				√			√							√				√		√							√	√						√	√		B
P6			√		√					√ √							√ √							√ √								√ √					√ √					D
P7				√	√					√	√							√	√					√	√								√	√				√	√				C
P8				√		√				√			√						√					√		√							√	√				√	√				B
P9					√		√													√				√		√							√	√				√	√				B
P10			√	√						√ √							√ √							√ √								√ √					√	√				D
P11				√	√					√	√							√	√					√	√								√	√				√	√				C
P12				√		√				√	√							√	√					√		√							√	√				√	√				C
P13			√		√					√	√							√	√					√	√								√	√				√	√				D
P14				√		√				√	√							√	√					√	√								√		√				√ √				C

Notes: P1 – P14 indicates codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants. Tick marks √ **indicates Entry behaviour test performance whereas** √ **indicates Terminal Behaviour test score attained by the participants.**

P1   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated a poor performance at the target skill-CTS. She was unable to perform as per standard at many components of the target skill at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on fourth component 'Inference' comprising abilities of - Ability to recognize premises that require support and to formulate a strategy to seek information as support and to judge relative merit of the alternative; Ability to formulate multiple Alternatives for resolving a problem and to develop a variety of plans to achieve the goal; Ability to apply appropriate modes of inference on what position one should take on given issue. She achieved Below satisfactory or Mediocre level on rest other components like C1, C2, C3, C5, C6.

This participant could make significant improvement and performed at Good or Above Satisfactory level on first, second and fifth components. She made great progress in C1-Interpreting component that comprised of Ability to formulate Categories for describing information, Ability to detect and describe the informational content and purposes and intentions or social significance, Ability to make explicit, contextual and conventional meanings of words, ideas, concepts, statements and remove ambiguity; in C2 component i.e. Explanation that consisted of Ability to compare and contrast ideas, concepts, statements and identify issues, to define terms and to determine the role various expressions play, Ability to determine whether or not the set of statements/descriptions express a reason in support of claim, Ability to identify and differentiate the intended main conclusion and reasons intended to support the main conclusion or premises; on C5- Evaluation component which included Ability to produce accurate statements, descriptions of the results of one's reasoning activity, Ability to present the evidential considerations that was used in interpretations or inferences, Ability to give reasons for accepting some claim and to meet objections to evidence or judgement. She enhanced a little less on C3, C4 and C6. She achieved Satisfactory or Average level on C3 Analysis having Ability to recognize the factors to assess source of information; to assess the contextual relevance of information; to assess the acceptability of truth; Ability to judge the expressed conclusion of the argument and to determine if an argument relies on false assumptions and on C4 Inference comprising abilities of - Ability to recognize premises that

require support and to formulate a strategy to seek information as support and to judge relative merit of the alternative; Ability to formulate multiple Alternatives for resolving a problem and to develop a variety of plans to achieve the goal; Ability to apply appropriate modes of inference on what position one should take on given issue. On C6 Self-regulation component, she developed at average level on Ability to reflect on one's own reasoning and verify results produced Ability to design reasonable procedure to remedy or correct errors or deficiencies

P2   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated overall an average performance at the target skill-CTS. She was unable at many components like C2, C3, C4, and C6 at Entry level test. She performed at Satisfactory or average level on componentC1 and C5. These comprised abilities of Interpreting and Evaluation respectively. She was at Mediocre on Below Satisfactory level on components such as Explanation; Analysis, Inference, Self-regulation

The participant could make great improvement and performed at Very Good level on C1and C5 i.e. Interpreting and Evaluation components. She gained Good level on C2 and C6. She attained Satisfactory level on C3 Analysis and C4 Inference components.

P3   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated a poor performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was unable to reach at average level at many components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C1, C2, C4 components comprising Interpreting, Explanation and Inference. She was at Mediocre level on C3 – Analysis; C5 – Evaluation; C6- Self-regulation components.

The participant could make some improvement and performed at Good level on C1-Interpreting and C5- Evaluation. Her performance got deteriorate and got Satisfactory level on second, third, fourth and sixth components.

P4   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated a poor performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was unable to reach at average level at many components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C1, C2, C4 components comprising Interpreting, Explanation and Inference respectively. She was at Mediocre level on C3, C5, C6 i.e. Analysis; Evaluation; Self-regulation components respectively.

The participant had leg behind in progress and performed at above satisfactory level on C5 component and it is observed that little improvement was made. She performed at Satisfactory level on C1, C3 and C6 components. She scored lower and got Below satisfactory on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory levels on C2 and C4.

P5 At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated an average performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was able to reach at average level at some components at Entry level test. She performed at Satisfactory level on C1, C5, C6 components comprising Interpreting, Evaluation, and Self-regulation respectively. She was at Below Satisfactory or Mediocre level on C2 Explanation C3 Analysis C4 Inference components.

The participant could make marvelous progress at terminal level test and performed at C1 and C5 components whereas she recorded her achievement on Good or Above Satisfactory level on C2, C3, C4, C6 components. Earlier she was at mediocre level but at terminal test she could improve her scores.

P6 At the entry level test, this participant consistently demonstrated a Very poor performance on all components at the target skill-CTS at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on Interpreting, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation, and Self-regulation.

The participant could not make any significant improvement at terminal level test. She struggled to attain grades from Very poor level to Average levels. It is observed that she could perform well at C1 i.e. interpreting component only; whereas she could get Below satisfactory level on C5 -Evaluation component. She remain stable and made no progress on C2, C3, C4 and C6 components. She gained Very poor level on component on Explanation, Analysis; Inference and Self-regulation.

P7 At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated a poor performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was unable to reach at even expected level at many components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C2, C3, C4, C6 components comprising Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Self –regulation components respectively. She was at Mediocre level on C1- Interpreting and C5 – Evaluation components.

The participant could improve at terminal level test and performed at various levels on different components. She gained Good level on C5 Evaluation

component and she attained Satisfactory level on C1 Interpreting. On rest of the components, C2 Explanation, C3 Analysis, C4 Inference, and C6 Self-regulation she achieved Below Satisfactory levels.

P8   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated nearly an average performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was able to reach at Satisfactory or average level at one component i.e. C5 at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C4 component comprising component of Inference. Whereas she was at Mediocre level on C1, C2, C3, C6 namely Interpreting, Explanation, Analysis and Self-regulation components.

The participant had made significant improvement at terminal level test while comparing with the earlier performance on Entry level test. She performed at Very Good level on C5 Evaluation and achieved Good or Above Average level on C1 Interpreting and C2-Explanation component .She could reach up to Satisfactory level on C3 -Analysis, C4-Inference, C6 -Self-regulation.

P9   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated an average level performance in general on all components of the target skill-CTS. She was able to reach at satisfactory level at many components at Entry level test. She performed at Satisfactory level on C1, C5 components comprising Interpreting and Evaluation. She was at Mediocre level on Explanation, Analysis, Inference and Self-regulation components.

This participant had gradually outshined others and left remarkable impact in the Terminal test from her past performance. She had improved a great at terminal level test. She performed at Very Good level on Interpretation component and she could reach at Above Satisfactory or Good level on Explanation, Analysis, and Evaluation components .She achieved Satisfactory level on Inference, Interpreting, and Self-regulation components.

P10   At the entry level test, she demonstrated a very weak performance in general on all components of the target skill-CTS. She was unable to reach at an expected level at all components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C1,C2,C3,C4,C5, and C6 components comprising Interpreting, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation; Self-regulation components.

This participant remained weak at most components of the target skill. She could make very little improvement at terminal level test. She performed at Satisfactory level on C5 Evaluation and Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level

on C1 Interpreting, C6 Self-regulation whereas she was at Very Poor level on C2 Explanation, C3 Analysis, C4 Inference components.

P11   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated a somewhat mixed performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was unable to reach at average level at all components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C2, C3, C4 components comprising Explanation, Analysis and Inference respectively. She was at Mediocre level on C1- Interpreting; C5 – Evaluation; C6- Self-regulation components.

The participant could make some improvement at terminal level test on most components of the target skill. She was on Above Average or Satisfactory level on Evaluation component. She performed on Satisfactory level on first component, i.e. Interpreting. She could reach at Mediocre level on Explanation, Analysis, and Inference components. Lastly she remained Very Poor on Self-regulation.

P12   At the entry level test, this participant demonstrated a poor performance in general at the target skill-CTS at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C3, C4 components consisting Analysis and Inference. She was at Mediocre level on C1, C2, C5 and C6 namely Interpreting, Explanation, Evaluation; Self-regulation components respectively.

The participant was comparatively average on target skill components at terminal level test. She surpassed with Above Average or Good level on C1- Interpreting and C5 –Evaluation. She had attained at Satisfactory level on C2, C4 and C6 components. On C3 she could gain Mediocre level.

P13   At the entry level test, she demonstrated a very weak performance in general on all components of the target skill-CTS. She was unable to reach at an expected level at all components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C1,C2,C3,C4,C5, and C6 components consisting Interpreting, Explanation, Analysis, Inference, Evaluation; Self-regulation components respectively.

The participant couldn't make much improvement at terminal level test .She performed at satisfactory level on C1- Interpreting and C5- Evaluation. She could reach level of Mediocre component with C2 Explanation, C3 Analysis, C4 Inference, and C6 Self-regulation.

P14   At the entry level test, this participant could demonstrate a poor performance in general at the target skill-CTS. She was not able to reach at average level at most components at Entry level test. She performed at Very Poor level on C2, C3, C4 components comprising Explanation Analysis and Inference components respectively. She was at Mediocre level on C1-Interpreting, C5 – Evaluation; C6- Self-regulation components.

The participant could not improve remarkable at terminal level test. She performed on Good level on C1 and C5.She could attained and performed at Mediocre level on C2, C3, C4 and C6 components.

Performance on Written Communication Skill during both Entry and Terminal Behaviour tests:

Table: 5.37. Terminal behavior Performance on Soft Skill: 3- Written Communication Skill [WCS]

Participant's Codes	Letter Grades	Structuring F	E	D	C	B	A	O	Content F	E	D	C	B	A	O	Style F	E	D	C	B	A	O	Grammar F	E	D	C	B	A	O	Mechanics F	E	D	C	B	A	O	Overall impression F	E	D	C	B	A	O	AGP
P1				√		√					√		√				√		√						√	√						√		√						√		√		B
P2				√		√					√			√			√		√						√	√						√		√						√		√		B
P3				√	√						√		√				√	√						√	√						√	√						√	√				C
P4			√		√						√	√					√	√						√	√						√	√						√	√				C
P5				√		√						√		√				√	√						√	√						√	√						√		√		B
P6			√	√						√√							√√							√√							√√							√√						D
P7			√		√						√	√					√	√						√	√						√	√						√	√				C
P8				√		√					√		√				√		√						√	√						√		√						√	√			B
P9				√		√					√		√					√		√					√	√						√		√						√		√		B
P10			√	√						√	√						√	√						√√							√√							√√						D
P11			√		√						√	√					√	√						√	√						√	√						√	√				C
P12				√	√						√		√				√	√						√	√						√	√						√			√		C
P13				√	√						√	√					√	√						√	√						√	√						√		√			C
P14				√		√					√	√					√	√						√√						√	√						√			√		C

Notes:P1 – P14 indicates codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants

Tick marks √ **indicates Entry behaviour test performance whereas** √ **indicates Terminal Behaviour test score attained by the participants.**

P1   At Entry level Test, this participant performed at moderate level on Witten Communication skill. She was at Very Poor level on third component of the target skill namely 'Style' and fifth component 'Mechanics' of the target skill- WCS. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on first, second fourth and sixth components namely Interpreting, Content, Grammar and Overall Impact of the piece of writing respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made remarkable progress after getting through CLMIP and performed very well. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on first component i.e. Structuring, second component i.e. Content, fifth component i.e. Mechanics and sixth component. I.e. Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She gained Satisfactory level on third and fourth components like Style, Grammar respectively. Thus she could gradually improve her skill of writing.

P2   This participant performed at moderate level at Entry level Test. She was at Very Poor level on Mechanics –fifth component of the target skill. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on rest of five components i.e. Structuring, Content, Style, Grammar and Overall Impact of the piece of writing.

This participant made remarkable progress at Terminal behaviour test. She achieved the level of Very Good on second component i.e. Content; and she attained Good or Above Satisfactory level on first, fifth and sixth components namely Structuring, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She gained Satisfactory or average level on component like Style, Grammar.

P3   At Entry level Test this participant performed very weakly. She was at Very Poor level on last four components of the target skill i.e. Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impact of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on components of Structuring and Content.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made noteworthy progress. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on second component of Content and she gained Satisfactory level on first, fifth and sixth components like Structuring, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She

achieved Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on third and fourth components Style, Grammar respectively.

P4 This participant performed poorly at Entry level Test. She was at Very Poor level on five components like Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on components of second component Content of the target skill.

This participant made quite well progress after getting through CLMIP and performed satisfactorily at Terminal behaviour Test. She achieved Satisfactory level on Structuring, Content, and Overall Impression of the piece of writing components. She gained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on components like Style, Grammar and Mechanics.

P5 This participant performed nicely at Entry level Test. She was at Satisfactory or Average level on Structuring, Content, and Grammar components of the target skill. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on third, fifth and sixth components namely Style, Mechanics and Overall Impact of the piece of writing respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test having got through CLMIP, this participant performed Extremely Good. She made remarkable progress and achieved Very Good level on first, second components i.e. Structuring, Content respectively. She attained Good or Above Satisfactory level from third to sixth components like Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing respectively.

P6 At Entry level Test this participant performed extremely weak. She was at Very Poor level on all components of the target skill namely Structuring, Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She couldn't make any impact in writing on given topic.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made negligible progress. She could achieve Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Structuring whereas, on rest of the components she made no improvement on Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing of the target skill.

P7 This participant performed poorly on average at Entry level Test. She was at Very Poor level on five components viz. Structuring, Style, Grammar,

Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on second component i.e. Content of the target skill.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Satisfactory level on first, second and fifth components i.e. Structuring, Content, Mechanics. She gained Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on third, fourth and sixth components like Style, Grammar and Overall Impression of the piece of writing respectively.

P8 At Entry level Test this participant performed moderately on the target skill. She was at Very Poor level on third, fifth and sixth components namely Style, Mechanics, and Overall Impact of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on first, second and fourth components of Structuring, Content, Grammar respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made extensively remarkable progress. She achieved Very Good level on first component i.e. structuring and could reach to Good or Above Satisfactory level on second and fifth components Content, Mechanics. She gained Satisfactory level on third, fourth and sixth components of Style, Grammar and Overall Impression of the piece of writing.

P9 At Entry level Test this participant performed moderately on most components of the target skill. She was at Very Poor level only on fifth component i.e. Mechanics; whereas she was on Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on rest of five components i.e. Structuring, Content, style, Grammar and Overall Impact of the piece of writing.

This participant made outshining progress at Terminal behaviour test. She achieved a Very Good level on first component namely Structuring whereas she achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on rest other five components i.e. Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing respectively as in sequence.

P10 This participant performed extremely weak on all components of the target skill at Entry level Test. She was at Very Poor level namely Structuring, Content, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She was not able to make any impact in writing on given topic.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made insignificant progress. She achieved Mediocre or Below Satisfactory level on Structuring, Content, and style. She remained stable on fourth to sixth components on Very poor level on Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing.

P11 This participant performed poorly on comparing all components on average at Entry level Test. She was at Very Poor level on five components viz. Structuring, Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on second component i.e. Content of the target skill.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made remarkable progress. She achieved Satisfactory or Average level on Structuring, Content, and Style. She could reach at Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on last three components i.e. Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing as per order of components of the target skill.

P12 At Entry level Test this participant performed very weakly. She was at Very Poor level on last four components of the target skill i.e. Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impact of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on components of Structuring and Content.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made remarkable progress. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on Structuring, Content and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She gained Satisfactory level on component like Style, Mechanics whereas she got Mediocre level on Grammar.

P13 This participant performed poorly on average at Entry level Test. She was at Very Poor level on last four components of the target skill i.e. Style, Grammar, Mechanics and Overall Impact of the piece of writing. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on components of Structuring and Content.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Mediocre level on only one component i.e. fourth, named Grammar whereas she reached at level of satisfactory level on rest of five components viz. Structuring, Content, Style, Mechanics and Overall Impression of the piece of writing.

P14   At Entry level Test this participant performed very weakly. She was at Very Poor level on Style, Mechanics Overall Impact of the piece of writing components of the target skill. Whereas she was on Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on components of Structuring, Content, Grammar.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant could make somewhat well progress. She achieved Good level on Structuring and Overall Impression of the piece of writing. She attained Satisfactory level on component like Content, Style, Mechanics and she could reach at Mediocre level on fourth component Grammar.

Performance on Time Management Skill during both Entry and Terminal Behaviour tests:

Table: 5.38. Terminal behaviour Performance on Soft Skill: 4- Time Management Skill [TMS]

Participant's Codes	Letter Grades	Way of using Time							Get things done & Meeting Deadlines							Adjustment due to procrastination							Quality of work provided							Punctuality in attending Task							Getting groups organised							AGP
		F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	F	E	D	C	B	A	O	
P1				√				√				√			√					√	√						√		√					√	√					√		√		A
P2				√				√		√					√					√	√				√		√					√	√						√	√			A
P3				√		√				√			√					√	√					√		√					√	√						√		√			A
P4		√			√				√			√					√	√					√			√					√	√						√	√				B
P5				√			√			√					√					√	√				√		√				√	√						√			√		A
P6		√		√					√			√					√		√				√		√					√	√				√	√		√					C
P7		√			√				√			√					√	√					√		√					√	√						√	√				B
P8				√			√		√					√					√	√				√		√					√	√					√			√		A
P9				√		√			√					√					√	√				√		√				√	√						√				√	A
P10	√	√						√			√				√	√						√			√					√	√				√	√						C
P11				√	√				√			√				√	√					√			√					√	√						√	√				B
P12				√		√			√				√				√	√				√			√				√	√						√		√				B
P13			√		√				√		√					√	√							√					√	√						√						C
P14				√		√			√		√					√	√						√	√					√	√						√						C

Notes: P1 – P14 indicates codes given to Participants; Letters of Alphabets 'O' to 'F' stands grades showing standards of performance obtained by participants.

Tick marks **√ indicates Entry behaviour test performance whereas √ indicates Terminal Behaviour test score attained by the participants.**

248

P1   This participant performed moderately at Entry level Test on the target skill of Time management. She achieved A grade with Very Good level on fifth component namely Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She gained B grade denoted as level of Above Satisfactory or Good at third component Adjustment due to procrastination of others. She attained C grade on second and sixth component i.e. observing deadlines and overall Impact. She received D grade on First and fourth components comprised of Time Utilization and Quality of work provided.

This participant made quite excellent progress after getting through CLMIP and performed amazingly at Terminal behaviour Test. She gained O grade on first and second components of the target skill i.e. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. On rest of the other components. She could achieve Excellent i.e. A grades with components from third to six components. It is observed that she that remained present in earlier all sessions conducted from orientations till Terminal level test at the end of the CLMIP.

P2   This participant performed poorly on comparing all components on average at Entry level Test. She achieved Good or Above satisfactory level on third and fifth components viz. Adjustment due to procrastination and Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Satisfactory or average level on fourth and sixth components i.e. Quality of work provided and overall Impact. She could reach till the level of Mediocre or Below satisfactory on first and second components Time Utilization, Observing deadlines respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Excellent level on first and second components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. She attained Very Good level on third, fourth and fifth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided and punctuality and Getting Task organised. She could reach till the level of Good or Above Satisfactory on sixth component i.e. overall Impact.

P3   This participant performed moderately well on comparing all components of the target skill at Entry level Test. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on fifth component i.e. Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Satisfactory or Average level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She could reach till the level of Mediocre or Below

satisfactory on rest other components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Quality of work provided and overall Impact.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made good progress. She achieved Very Good level on first, second and fifth components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines and Punctuality and Getting Task organised respectively. She attained Good level on third, fourth and sixth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided and Overall Impact.

P4   At Entry level Test, this participant performed weakly on all components on the target skill. She could attain Satisfactory or Average level on third and fifth components viz. Adjustment due to procrastination and Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She got Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on sixth component i.e. overall Impact. She could reach at the level of Very Poor level on first, second and fourth components Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Quality of work provided respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made noticeable progress. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on first five components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided, Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She could reach to the level of Satisfactory or Average on last and sixth component i.e. overall Impact.

P5   This participant performed moderately on all components at Entry level Test. She achieved Good or Above satisfactory level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She attained Satisfactory or average level on first, fourth, fifth and sixth components viz. Time Utilization, Quality of work provided Punctuality and Getting Task organised and overall Impact. She could reach till the level of Mediocre or Below satisfactory on second component i.e. Observing deadlines.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made outstanding progress. She achieved Excellent level on first and second components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. She attained Very Good level on third, fourth, fifth and sixth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided and punctuality, Getting Task organised, and overall Impact.

P6 At Entry level Test, this participant performed weakly on all components on the target skill. She could attain Satisfactory or Average level on fifth component i.e. Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She reached at Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She remained at the level of Very Poor level on first, second, fourth and sixth components Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Quality of work provided and overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Very Good level on fifth component i.e. Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Good level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She could reach till the level of Satisfactory on first, second and fourth components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Quality of work provided whereas she gained Mediocre level on last i.e. sixth component- overall Impact.

P7 This participant performed at mixed level as she could gain different grades on all components on average at Entry level Test. She achieved Good level on fifth component Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She gained Satisfactory level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. On Second, fourth and Sixth components, whereas she gained Very Poor level on Time Utilization component.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Very Good level on third and fifth   components viz. Adjustment due to procrastination, Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Good or Above Satisfactory level on first and second components i.e. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. She could attain the level of Satisfactory or Average on fourth and sixth component i.e. Quality of work provided and overall Impact.

P8 At Entry level Test, this participant performed moderately well on all components on the target skill. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on third and fifth components viz. Adjustment due to procrastination and Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Satisfactory or average level on fourth component i.e. Quality of work provided. She could reach at the level of Mediocre or Below satisfactory on first, second and sixth components Time Utilization, Observing deadlines and overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made extensive progress. She achieved Excellent level on first and second components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. She attained Very Good level on third, fourth and fifth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided and punctuality and Getting Task organised. She could gain the level of Good or Above Satisfactory on sixth component i.e. overall Impact.

P9   This participant performed moderately at all components on the Entry level Test. She achieved Good or Above satisfactory level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She attained Satisfactory or average level on first, fourth and fifth components i.e. Time Utilization, Quality of work provided and Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She gained the level of Mediocre or Below satisfactory on second and sixth components namely Observing deadlines and overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made outstanding progress. She achieved Excellent level on first and second components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. She attained Very Good level on the rest four components i.e. third, fourth, fifth and sixth components namely Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided and punctuality, Getting Task organised, and overall Impact respectively.

P10   At Entry level Test, this participant performed very weakly on all components on the target skill. She could attain Satisfactory or Average level on fifth component i.e. Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She reached at Mediocre or Below satisfactory level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. She remained at the level of Very Poor level on first, second, fourth and sixth components Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Quality of work provided and overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made marginal progress. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on fifth component. I.e. Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Satisfactory or average level on second, third, fourth components i.e. Observing deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided. She reached at the level of Mediocre or Below Satisfactory on first and sixth component i.e. Time Utilization, overall Impact.

P11   This participant performed lower moderately while comparing all components of the skill at Entry level Test. She could attain Satisfactory or Average level on third component i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination. On rest of the components from first to sixth components namely Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Quality of work provided, Punctuality and Getting Task organised and overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made somewhat progress. She achieved level Good or Above Satisfactory on first to fifth components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided, Punctuality and Getting Task organised. She attained Satisfactory level on sixth component i.e. overall Impact.

P12   At Entry level Test, this participant performed moderately well on all components on the target skill. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on third component viz. Adjustment due to procrastination She attained Satisfactory or average level on fourth component i.e. Quality of work provided. She could reach at the level of Mediocre or Below Satisfactory on first, second, fifth and sixth components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Punctuality and Getting Task organised and Overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Very Good level on first to four components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided. She attained Good or Above Average level on fifth and sixth components i.e. Punctuality and Getting Task organised and overall Impact.

P13   This participant performed quiet lower on all components of the skill at Entry level Test. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on third component viz. Adjustment due to procrastination She gained Satisfactory or average level on fourth component i.e. Quality of work provided. She reached at the level of Mediocre or Below satisfactory on first, second, fifth and sixth components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines, Punctuality and Getting Task organised and Overall Impact respectively.

At Terminal behaviour Test, this participant made little progress. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on first and second components viz. Time Utilization, Observing deadlines. She attained Satisfactory or average level on

third, fourth and fifth components i.e. Adjustment due to procrastination, Quality of work provided and punctuality and Getting Task organised. She had reached at the level of Mediocre on sixth component i.e. overall Impact.

P14 At Entry level Test, this participant performed moderately well on all components of the target skill. She achieved Good or Above Satisfactory level on third component viz. Adjustment due to procrastination. She attained Satisfactory or average level on first and fourth component i.e. Time Utilization, Quality of work provided. She could reach at the level of Mediocre or Below satisfactory on second, fifth and sixth components viz. Observing deadlines, Punctuality and Getting Task organised and Overall Impact respectively.

At the terminal level test this participant could make remarkable improvement form her earlier performance. She achieved level of Very Good on first component- Time Utilization, and Good level on second - Observing deadlines, and fourth component- Quality of work provided whereas she scored on Satisfactory level on third component- Adjustment due to procrastination, and had retained Mediocre level on fifth and sixth components- Punctuality and Getting Task organised and Overall Impact.

In conclusion, so far the investigator has tried to present the analysis and interpretation of the data collected during Field work phase. This phase includes Analysis of data for Prior Performance Tests and Understanding process of development of soft skills during Field work in CLM based tasks. Basically, this section consists of data collected while Implementing CLM based strategy. An attempt is made to analyze and interpret data for understanding the process of enhancement of select four soft skills, through tripolar process i.e. three aspects - CLM task wise, soft skills components wise and individual participants' Profile wise. This manner of analysis of same data has helped the researcher in comparing and contrasting the performances of participants and get helped on crosscheck of performances of participants on select soft skills individually.

5.3. Section: III. Data Analysis of tools collected during Post-field phase:

As per the fifth focused research objective, this third section presents data analysis in order to know the perception of participants towards their learning experiences from CLM strategy. It includes data analysis and interpretation of tools collected during Post- field work phase. This phase includes analysis and

interpretation of data collected through Posterior Performance Tests on select four soft skills and collection of documents and artifacts; Cooperative learning Self-Assessment Scale; Opinionnaire on Cooperative Learning Method Instructional Plan.

5.3.1. Analysis of data on Cooperative learning Self-assessment Rating Scale:

The data collected on this tool have been analyzed using holistic method. Major data analysis technique used here is Descriptive statistics using percentage. There were total no. of 14 respondents. Their responses have been converted in to tallies, and frequencies and finally presented in percentage.

[**Note:** For detailed information of statements refer to the tool- **Cooperative skill Self-Assessment Rating Scale** attached in the appendix.]

Table: 5.39: Data analysis of Cooperative skill Self-Assessment Rating Scale

Item code No.	Fully Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Fully Disagree
1	50	50	0	0	0
2	28.57	71.42	0	0	0
3	28.57	71.42	0	0	0
4	50	28.57	14.28	07.14	0
5	64.28	28.57	07.14	0	0
6	50	42.85	07.14	0	0
7	0	0	0	35.71	64.28
8	0	21.42	0	35.71	42.85
9	42.85	35.71	21.42	0	0
10	50	28.57	21.42	0	0
11	21.42	21.42	14.28	42.85	0
12	07.14	14.28	0	57.14	21.42
13	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
14	71.42	28.57	0	0	0
15	71.42	28.57	0	0	0
16	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
17	57.14	42.85	0	0	0
18	64.28	21.42	14.28	0	0
19	42.85	21.42	21.42	07.14	07.14
20	71.42	28.57	0	0	0
21	07.14	07.14	0	57.14	28.57
22	50	50	0	0	0
23	71.42	14.28	07.14	07.14	0
24	50	50	0	0	0
25	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
26	50	42.85	07.14	0	0
27	64.28	14.28	14.28	0	07.14
28	14.28	14.28	0	35.71	35.71
29	42.85	57.14	0	0	0

Item code No.	Fully Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Fully Disagree
30	85.71	14.28	0	0	0
31	71.42	28.57	0	0	0
32	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
33	35.71	50	14.28	0	0
34	42.85	50	07.14	0	0
35	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
36	0	28.57	57.14	14.28	0
37	42.85	57.14	0	0	0
38	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
39	57.14	42.85	0	0	0
40	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
41	78.57	21.42	0	0	0
42	57.14	42.85	0	0	0
43	57.14	42.85	0	0	0
44	0	07.14	21.42	14.28	57.14
45	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
46	28.57	28.57	28.57	07.14	07.14
47	42.85	42.85	14.28	0	0
48	57.14	35.71	0	0	0
49	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
50	42.85	50	07.14	0	0
51	07.14	28.57	21.42	14.28	28.57
52	21.42	35.71	35.71	07.14	0
53	71.42	28.57	0	0	0

[Notes: Digits at each item in each cell on five points indicate percentage of the responses.]

Interpretations are based on set criteria that included-ratings for positive points-strongly agree and agree have been merged for all Statements with positive polarity and vice versa for negative polarity. Point values get reversed for statements with negative polarity. The following interpretation and inferences have been drawn from the analyzed data.

All of the participants i.e. 100 % could learn building on each other's ideas. All of the participants i.e. 14 liked to take turns, which means no one liked to withdraw or dominate. All of them shared responsibility through equal opportunity. All of the participants agreed that they listened to all before reaching any conclusion. About 78 % participants believed that a benefit for one group member is a benefit for another. About 92 % participants agreed that Collaboration is an essential value needed. About 92 % participants agreed that one person alone isn't sufficient for task. All participants shown disagreement for the statement with negative polarity. This

means all participants liked to help their group mates. About 78 % participants shown disagreement on disliking to depend on their group mates to complete group task. This means 78 % participants liked to depend on their group-mates to complete the task which is a positive sign and scope for cooperation among participants. About 78 % participants agreed that they felt comfortable to work together. About 78 % participants believed in the motto "all for one and one for all." Almost half of the participant's i.e.6 which means 43 % participants confessed to depend on teammates. The statement being on negative polarity had disagreement of about 78 % participants that do not see their group members as resource for sharing a common goal. This means that 78% participants saw their group members as resource for sharing a common goal. All participants agreed that each group member has unique resource to share for the group to succeed. All participants agreed that Celebration/reward encouraged them to do the task in best way. All participants enjoyed jigsaw method very much. All participants accepted and carried out their role assigned to them responsibly. All participants agreed that they helped teammates to complete the assigned task. About 85 % participants liked to participate in every stage of activity willingly. About 64 % participants avoided hitchhiking (getting help from others) while working on given task. All participants believed that each participant was responsible for contributing to learning and success of the group. About 85 % participants disagreed that they were not responsible to contribute, to demonstrate competence publicly. This means that 85 % participants actually understood their responsibility and wanted to contribute their competence publicly. All participants agreed that Public performance has allowed them to learn more from their teammates. About 85% participants liked to share ideas freely with others. All participants felt great being part in the group product i.e. completion of task. All participants always tried to justify and do their best to the role assigned to them. It meant that they tried to carry their role responsibly. About almost 93 % participants agreed that CL methods have helped them to have mastery over the contents. About 78 % participants had taken care to criticize ideas without criticizing people. About 71 % participants disagreed with the view that they disliked to keep patience to listen others. This meant that 71% participants actually liked to listen others. All participants confessed that they gave opportunity to others to speak. All participants listened to others while they spoke as they did not interfere when others were presenting their views. All participants agreed that Supportive learning environment had promoted their

competence. All participants opined that they got help from their group mates to try out new ideas. About 85% participants liked to provide constructive feedback to others. About 92 % participants believed that more interaction among team mates has resulted in more competence and confidence build up. All participants accepted that putting ideas into words helped them to develop their expression skills. Surprisingly 57 % participants had taken neutral stand and only 14 % said that they disliked sequential interaction in the class room. The number was not much significant. All participants agreed that reporting had helped to develop communication. All participants supported that Class building and teambuilding activities helped them to develop communication skills. All participants knew "how to work with others" as an essential life skill. All participants have understood the need for the collaborative skill. All participants tried their best to justify the assigned roles. All participants opined that they helped others to do their role. They all helped others to perform their roles. All participants have been actively listening to others. About 71 % participants shown disagreement that they had not encouraged others at all. This meant that 71 % participants actually encouraged others. All participants agreed that they have respected others. About 57 % participants accepted that they disagree politely. About 85 % participants had learnt to solve conflict in positive way. All participants agreed that Collaborative skills have helped to develop thinking skills. All participants shown agreement that they had set their group's goals by consensus among all group members. About 92 % participants confessed that they had frequently assessed our team's progress. Almost equal no. of participants responded for both positive and negative stands with regard to this statement, 'We did never think of changes to be made in future for our group.' This meant that about 42 % participants really agreed that they had thought of changes in group formations in future. About 57 % participants believed "Autonomy" means having power over one's own fate. This show that half of them understood what is autonomy. All participants agreed that Group work encouraged their democratic spirit.

From the data analysis and interpretation it is observed as a whole that all participants liked to help their group mates, thus they became more collaborative with their teammates. Nearly half of them understood what autonomy is. They all helped others to perform their roles. About 78 % participants liked to depend on their group-mates to complete the task. About 78 % participants agreed that they felt comfortable to work together. All of the participants have learnt building on each other's ideas. All

participants have been actively listening to others. All participants liked each CLM activities. About 85 % participants actually understood their responsibility and wanted to contribute their competence publicly. About 85 % participants liked to participate in every stage of activity willingly. All participants agreed that Collaborative skills have helped to develop thinking skills.

5.3.2. **Analysis of data on Opinionnaire on overall reactions towards Cooperative Learning Methods based strategy:**

Reaction Scale or Opinionnaire (Likert type) was given to the participants in order to explore the opinions and the tacit knowledge and experiences of the participants about learning through Cooperative Learning Methods or CLM Task based strategy. There were 14 respondents. The data collected through this instrument was analyzed using descriptive statistics i.e. percentage.

[**Note:** For detail about the statements refer to Opinionnaire attached in the appendix.]

Table: 5.40: Data Analysis of Opinionnaire on Cooperative Learning strategy:

Code	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	78.57	21.42	0	0	0
2.	78.57	14.28	0	07.14	0
3.	71.42	28.57	0	0	0
4.	57.14	35.71	07.14	0	0
5.	78.57	21.42	0	0	0
6.	50	42.85	0	07.14	0
7.	64.28	35.71	0	07.14	0
8.	57.14	42.85	0	0	0
9.	07.14	07.14	07.14	57.14	21.42
10	14.28	21.42	28.57	21.42	14.28
11	42.85	50	07.14	0	0
12	57.14	35.71	07.14	0	0
13	0	07.14	07.14	50	35.71
14	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
15	14.28	21.42	07.14	50	28.57
16	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
17	64.28	35.71	0	0	0

Code	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18	28.57	50	14.28	07.14	00
19	42.85	57.14	0	0	0
20	42.85	35.71	21.42	0	0
21	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
22	64.28	28.57	07.14	0	0
23	07.14	21.42	0	57.14	14.28
24	50	50	0	0	0
25	71.42	21.42	07.14	0	0
26	78.57	14.28	07.14	0	0
27	14.28	07.14	42.85	35.71	0
28	64.28	21.42	14.28	0	0
29	85.71	14.28	0	0	0
30	0	07.14	0	50	42.85
31	50	42.85	07.14	0	0
32	71.42	21.42	07.14	0	0
33	64.28	35.71	0	0	0
34	07.14	07.14	14.28	50	21.42
35	0	28.57	21.42	42.85	07.14
36	50	50	0	0	0
37	07.14	0	0	64.28	28.57
38	71.42	21.42	0	0	0
39	57.14	35.71	0	07.14	0
40	50	50	0	0	0
41	35.71	42.85	07.14	07.14	07.14
42	0	07.14	0	71.42	21.42
43	78.57	14.28	07.14	0	0
44	14.28	07.14	0	35.71	42.85
45	14.28	07.14	14.28	57.14	07.14
46	07.14	28.57	14.28	35.71	14.28
47	07.14	07.14	07.14	64.28	14.28
48	71.42	28.57	0	0	0

Code	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49	0	14.28	0	50	42.85
50	42.85	57.14	0	0	0
51	07.14	14.28	0	50	28.57
52	14.28	0	0	50	35.71
53	50	42.85	0	07.14	0
54	07.14	0	0	42.85	50
55	57.14	42.85	0	0	0
56	71.42	28.57	0	0	0
57	0	07.14	21.42	50	21.42
58	50	42.85	07.14	0	0
59	0	14.28	0	64.28	21.42
60.	50	35.71	14.28	0	0
61.	21.42	71.42	0	07.14	0
62.	57.14	42.85	00	00	00
63.	50	50	00	00	00
64.	00	00	07.14	78.57	14.28
65.	07.14	00	00	85.71	07.14
66.	07.14	28.57	50	14.28	00
67.	14.28	57.14	21.42	07.14	00
68.	35.71	64.28	0	0	0
69.	35.71	57.14	07.14	07.14	0
70.	35.71	57.14	07.14	0	0

Note: The digits on each statement indicate percentages of responses.

The terminology used in this instrument was intended for participants hence common expressions were used instead of technical terms and jargons. The term' programme' had been used loosely in laymen's language so that students understand them in better way. For the purpose of data interpretation, the two positive extremes and negative extremes are merged together at specific instant. Interpretations were based on the reversal of negative polarity into positive statement and vice versa.

Most of the participants i.e. 78.57 % found that the Cooperative Learning programme was helpful in the development of their overall personality. About 78 % participants opined that the programme helped them in the development of overall

command over English language. About 10 out of14 participants i.e. 71 % participants agreed that the programme had been most useful in the development of my oral communication skills. Only 57.14 participants strongly agreed that the programme had helped them to enrich their knowledge of English grammar. This indicates that Cooperative Learning methods had not helped in improving English grammar. About 78.57 % participants supported strongly that the programme helped participants develop overall thinking skills. Half of the participants strongly agreed for development of critical thinking skills through CLM. About 64.28 % participants got confidence and developed positive self-esteem through CLMIP. The entire participants 100% opined that their vocabulary had enriched and increased. Although the statement was on negative polarity, the participants had understood and responded accordingly. About more than 78% participants were disagreed and responded that they had not preferred to work in group or teams. This means 78 % of participants positively agreed that they actually preferred to work in groups or teams. Further it is understood that the participants experienced that they learnt better in teams than learning individually. About 28 .57 % participants had not understood the statement hence opined neutrally i.e. undecided .On both positive and negative polarity the responses were equal i.e. I have always disliked to be dependent on others. This means only 35.7 % participants opined to be interdependent. The statement has contradictory opinion from above statement where 78 % agreed to have liking for working in groups or teams. About 92.85 % agreed that they had cooperated with others in order to do a project work. This programme had helped more than 92.85 % personally to develop their quality of cooperation. Being on negative polarity the statement had 85.71 % disagreement for feeling uncomfortable to adjust in team or group. This means that more than 85% participants were comfortable to adjust in team. All participants supported that Team building activities for cooperative learning has been most joyful. Only 25 % participants accepted that Team building strategies have helped in learning. The rest 78.57% were of the opinion that team building activities had no role in learning. All participants admitted that their academic skills have developed. All participants were clear and had understanding what cooperative learning was. About 78 % were confident to have developed skills to prepare cooperative learning lesson plans on their own. All had enjoyed teaching through CLM hence they liked to teach through cooperative learning lessons in the real school classrooms. More than 78 % participants preferred to work in team instead of working

individually. All participants had enjoyed every role or task assigned to them in group. About 13 out of 14 participants opined that their leadership quality has been developed. Responding on statement with negative polarity, that more than 71 % were disagree for not satisfied with their performance in cooperative group. This means that 71 % participants were satisfied with their performance in CLMIP. All had learnt to take responsibility for their learning. About 92 % participants supported that the classroom management techniques used in the programme had been effective. About 13 out of 14 participant got a lot of opportunity to express their ideas freely. Surprisingly this item had highest neutral response having 42.85 %.Only 21% participants supported that remaining in only one group for entire programme has not helped much. And 35.71% participants disagreed with it which means they had opportunity to change their groups occasionally. About more than 85% i.e. 12 participants had experienced a change in their role and so agreed that this change helped them develop their skills better. Absolutely all participants believed that the classroom environment and ambience for learning had been conducive, motivating, and enthusiastic. About 92 % participants disagreed that they had not understood the instructions properly during activities. This simply means in positive terms that whatever the instructions given by the investigator were clear, correct and in simple language. All participants opined that their teammates or group mates had mostly encouraged and supported them in learning. More than 92 % participants agreed on view that the subject matter selected was interesting. The principle of positive interdependence has helped 100% participants. 71 % participants had shown disagreement that they could not assesses their individual performance properly which means only 21% participants could understand the processes of self-assessment. Sadly this item had received some contradictory results. This might be misunderstood. Somewhat half number of participants from total responded negatively. They disagreed that they had found difficulty to be accountable for my group members' (responsible) learning. This means that almost half of them had found no difficulty for being responsible for own learning.

All participants agreed that the principle of simultaneous interaction helped them to develop their oral communication skills. Only one participant felt being devoid of equal opportunity. The rest 92 % participants disagreed with view that they had not got equal opportunity for the participation in the group work. All participants agreed their collaborative skills got developed. About 92 % participants viewed that

the changes in their group have helped them develop their skills better. The results on this item consolidated the results of item no.27 where 35 % were disagree and 42 % were neutral in saying remaining in only one group for entire programme gad not helped them much. This was interpreted as there was frequent change in grouping. Thus both results get consolidated instead of contradicting with each other. Every participant had shown positive view to become team member. All participants would now like to work as a team or group member. About 78 % participants agreed with the statement that the assessment of their performance in group had been just. For negative statement, about 92 % shown disagreement that they had not appreciated other's quality of personality. This can be interpreted in positive context that more than 90% participants had appreciated others personality. More than 92 % had agreed that the tasks or activities given had been interesting and joyful. About 78 % participants understood the statement correctly and responded negatively for a statement of negative polarity so 78% participants found that various cooperative tasks had helped them develop their higher-order thinking ability. About 64 % have found difficult to write reports on each activity. These shows the participants have disliking for writing or they find themselves poor at writing skills. About 49 % participants found worksheets writing a tedious task. This result consolidated results of above item no.45. About 78 % disagreed on item- Time limit given on each task has not been sufficient. Converting double negatives into positives, this showed that most of the participants had sufficient time to complete the task. All participants agreed that they have learnt to respect other's views. About 92 % participants found the Study material provided to them in group task have not been much supportive. This means 92 % positively agreed that the study materials were quiet helpful. All participants have enjoyed to present reports being leader of the group. About 78 % participants disliked to work alone rather than in team or group. Converting the same statement into positive indicated that 78% participants like to work in groups as they found that they learnt more in groups rather than learning alone. About 85 % participants disagreed that the content selected for the activities was not in variety. This means that the content was in variety. About 92 % opined that general guidelines on cooperative learning have helped them in learning. About 92 % participants disagreed with the statement that the CLMPI has not been helpful to develop Listening skill. It means that the programme had been helpful in developing listing skills. All participants said that by joining this Programme voluntarily they have

developed speaking ability in English. All participants agreed that they enriched reading comprehension skill in English. About 71 %participants disagreed that their writing in English have not improved in this programme which means they had actually improved in writing skill. About 92 % participants felt that they had learnt to take responsibility for learning of others in group. About 85% participants had shown disagreement that they disliked presenting orally the reports of our group work. This means that 85% actually liked to make oral presentation of their reports. About 85% participants agreed that the Steps of the C. L. lesson of every activity were appropriate and they had followed them well. Most of them found the steps-procedure very easy to follow. Here it was inferred that the participants did not require the instructions to carry out the task. About 92 % i.e. 13 participants from total of 14, had become aware of the videography during every activity. All participants have developed self-esteem through CL activities. All participants have learnt to explain in their own words what they understood. About 92 % participants agreed that the Analysis of the text was still difficult for them. About 92% participants were disagree that they have not developed much skill of interpretation of text or any literary piece of works. This means they had actually developed such skills. Surprisingly about 50% participants were neutral and only 14 % shown disagreement to this statement. About 35 % really bothered about the shooting in each activity. This result contradicted with item no. 61 where 92% said they become aware of video shooting. About 71% participants can reorganize and synthesize the subject matter of any literary text. All 14 i.e.100% participants have learnt self- regulation. About 92 % participants have developed the habit of asking questions and search of truth to find answer. About 92% participants have started understanding grammar and literary texts.

In conclusion, this third section of analysis and interpretation of data present a holistic view on what perceptions participants have about their learning through CLM. Their reflections and opinions were captured through rating scale and Opinionnaire on CL. Overall, the participants have positive view on CLM and it is also observed that the participants had given their frank and honest responses. It is found that CLMIP helped them develop their four select soft skills. On the whole their cooperative skill has been improved.

5.4. Section: IV: Strategies adopted for trustworthiness of the findings of the study:

This includes what strategies are used for the establishment of trustworthiness of the results of the research work.

5.4.1. Triangulation of data and method (based on analysis of data) for establishing trustworthiness and arriving at reliable findings in the present qualitative study:

Any qualitative research need to establish validity-trustworthiness of the results. Therefore, the investigator has made an attempt here to consolidate results and their validity and trustworthiness through corroboration and triangulation of data and methods of inquiry. In this regard it is worthy to take a bird's eye view of ideas suggested by the authorities in the field of qualitative research. Creswell (2007) suggested following four criteria for checking the validity-trustworthiness of the results: Credibility, Transferability, Dependability and Confirmability.

5.4.2. Strategies employed for establishing trustworthiness of the present study:

The present study has fulfilled the most of the criteria as suggested by Creswell in order to establish trustworthiness of results. Out of these strategies more than four strategies were used here in the present study. Since the present study is a case study of a phenomenon of how student-teachers develop soft skills under Cooperative Learning Approach, qualitative methodology was adopted. Keeping in view the complexity of the problem, first measure undertaken was **analysis of cases/participants** (i.e. multiple case study) wherever possible. Second measure was **Data Triangulation**. Data was triangulated collected from various instruments and forms like field notes, artifacts, reflective diary, cases. The third measure was **Method triangulation**. Here in the present study the investigator employed content analysis and data reduction-inductive approach with descriptive statistics based on results from Reaction sheet and self-reflective sheet; Content Analysis on the basis of searching key phrases, words or/and concepts, and finding similarities/dissimilarities. Fourth measure was to **check similarity** in results/themes emerged from participants or cases. Fifth attempt was to study Negative **case/s analysis** and cross check if required. Sixth measure was Researcher's reflective diary of personal accounts and experiences analyzed. Some of the **other measures that were used included**

coded or fictitious names of cases in the present study in description of the events so that the participants' identity could never be disclosed. In the beginning of the study, Consent forms were filled up by participants.

Another important feature of qualitative study is that it employs **triangulation approach** in collecting the data because it "draws on multiple methods of inquiry" (Denzin, 1994). Olsen (2004) defines triangulation as "the mixing of data or methods so that diverse viewpoints or standpoints can light upon a topic" (p. 3). However, it is usually used to describe data verification of data, and considered as a method for "…checking for the most common or the most insidious biases that can steal into the process of drawing conclusions."(Hoepfl, Marie C.1997).

Thus the present study has fulfilled most criteria for the trustworthiness. The measures employed in the study have consolidated the internal and external validity and reliability of the study. A detailed description of   strategies employed are given below:

Table: 5.41: Strategy: 1: Triangulation of Data with Multiple cases

Type of data collection through major instruments	Diverse viewpoints of data verification-similarity-confirmation/rejection and checking researcher's bias				
	Participants' standpoint		Investigator's viewpoint		Conclusions drawn on commonality features - confirmation/rejection
	CLM	Selected Soft skills	CLM	Selected Soft skills	
Student-Teachers' Profile	No information	Want to learn English to improve communications skills, grammar skills	Not applicable	Most participants are of Intermediate level in terms of English proficiency, Very few Participants at below level	Results confirmed as all regular participants aspired to learn English, wanted to learn innovative methods of teaching English subject
Student-teacher's Portfolio	Most participants opined to have developed understanding for CLM	Positive improvement in participants in terms of RCS. Somewhat significant improvement for WCS, TMS, and CTS.	All of the participants developed understanding for CLM	Positive improvement in participants in terms of RCS. Insignificant improvement for WCS, TMS. Negligible development of CTS.	Consolidated results that Participants had developed full understanding for CLM but have imbalanced development of soft skills
Self-Evaluation Sheet For Assessing One's Own Practice Teaching Lesson	All participants understood steps and also executed plan easily,	Positive improvement in participants in terms of RCS, WCS, TMS, and CTS.	Not applicable	No data available on researcher's observation of lessons	Results get fixed as Participants developed CLM understanding and also developed soft skills
Peer Observation Schedule for Performance	Participants evaluated peer ,found them successful in	Most peer observation revealed poor performance on time	Mutual consensus about understanding of CLM among	Peer group mates over rated others on WCS, CTS.	Results are skeptical and hence not fully acceptable, although not to be rejected at all

Type of data collection through major instruments	Diverse viewpoints of data verification-similarity-confirmation/rejection and checking researcher's bias				
	Participants' standpoint		Investigator's viewpoint		Conclusions drawn on commonality features - confirmation/rejection
	CLM	Selected Soft skills	CLM	Selected Soft skills	
Evaluation	implementation of CL lesson with steps correctly	management during CL lessons; other skills like WCS, CTS,RCS developed equally among all participants	students found	No issues with peer rating for RCS ,TMS	
Evaluation Rubric on soft skills	Not applicable	Positive improvement in all participants in terms of development of RCS. Somewhat significant improvement for only a few participants for developing WCS, TMS, and CTS.	Not applicable	Positive improvement in participants in terms of RCS, TMS. Very little improvement for WCS, and CTS.	Results consistent in evaluation by both investigator and participants with regard to RCS ,TMS,WCS but contradictory for CTS development
Task based Individual Worksheet [content based writing task]	Not applicable	Participants showed positive development of RCS, and WCS Have developed content clarity	Not applicable	Developed RCS gradually, results due to largely group work on task; Most participants lag behind in WCS development as Linguistics analysis showed negative results-most common errors in writing included spellings, syntax and error of omission and	Results contradicted only in terms of WCS

269

Type of data collection through major instruments	Diverse viewpoints of data verification-similarity-confirmation/rejection and checking researcher's bias				
	Participants' standpoint		Investigator's viewpoint		Conclusions drawn on commonality features - confirmation/rejection
	CLM	Selected Soft skills	CLM	Selected Soft skills	
				selection	
Task based Individual & Group Report of the participants	Positive comments on CLM	Developed WCS,RCS, ,TMS	Developed CLM understanding	Developed WCS,RCS, TMS	No contradictions in results
Lesson Plan Transcripts	Clarity of basic rules and concepts of CLM, steps ; lacks variation brought in as per needs	Not Applicable for RCS, Positive scope for improving WCS	Limited usage of CLM, used at one stage in regular macro lesson format, Most participants developed understanding for CLM	Developed RCS, limited WCS	Results confirmed
Cooperative Learning Self-Assessment Scale	Participants developed CLM understanding based on principles of CL	Not Applicable	Participants developed CLM insights and learnt to apply principles of CL	Not Applicable	Both viewpoints confirm the results
Opinionnaire or Reaction Scale on cooperative learning instructional plan	Participants developed CLM insight	Participants developed RCS, WCS, TMS, Confessed general thinking skills development but not critical thinking skills	Participants developed understanding for CLM theory and practice	Participants developed RCS, TMS in theory and practice; little progress on WCS,CTS	Consolidated results
Transcripts of Video Sessions	Participants developed CLM insight	Participants developed RCS, WCS, TMS, Confessed general thinking skills	Participants developed understanding for CLM theory and	Participants developed RCS, TMS in theory and practice; little	Results are consolidated

Type of data collection through major instruments	Diverse viewpoints of data verification-similarity-confirmation/rejection and checking researcher's bias				
	Participants' standpoint		Investigator's viewpoint		Conclusions drawn on commonality features - confirmation/rejection
	CLM	Selected Soft skills	CLM	Selected Soft skills	
		development but not critical thinking skills	practice	progress on WCS,CTS	
Researcher's Observation cum Reflective Diary	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Participants developed understanding for CLM theory and practice	Participants developed RCS, TMS in theory and practice; little progress on WCS,CTS	Results are consolidated

Table: 5.42. Strategy: 2: Triangulation of Method of inquiry:

The following tabular information contained major Themes /codes and findings obtained from variety of instruments looking from the viewpoint of how the methods of research employed. In the data analyzed, various techniques are applied.

Viewpoints	Method of inquiry		Verify validity of data and check researcher's bias if any
	Data collected using Qualitative techniques- questionnaires, descriptive documents, Direct Observation, Participant observation, Peer Observation, Self-reflection, Self-Evaluation, Self-Assessment and transcription of video sessions	Data collected using Quantitative techniques-descriptive statistics for CLSAS & RSCLMIP	
Developing understanding of CLM and task proceedings	Results consolidated from various sources that most participants developed understanding for CLM and its steps, procedure, principles applied in tasks	Most Participants understood CLM	Most of the data on self-assessment, self-evaluation, peer assessment, self-reflective ,and oral communication in video consolidated the development of Cm based understanding; No biases by researcher as most data had self-evaluation type
Developing RCS	Positively consolidated results in Task sheets –developed RCS	Descriptive aspects in Task sheets contradict development of RCS for some participants	Hand written worksheets consolidated RCS development in most of participants

Developing WCS	consolidated results from reports, documents but less improvement in writing through linguistic analysis	Not applicable	Less improvement as per linguistics analysis of documents Possibility of researcher's bias
Developing CTS	Positively consolidated results in some sources but contradict with results in linguistic and content analysis of the lesson transcripts submitted, video sessions transcribed	Moderate progress of the development of CTS on scales	Researcher's diary contradict with results
Developing TMS	Positively consolidated results for development of TMS Initially poor performance but gradually improved by participants	Most students managed time during CLM sessions	As far as the CLM tasks concerned , TMS was developed
Perception of experiences in CLM	Joyful experience, learning with fun, new ways to read literary text and	Scales results positive, video sessions confirmed development of perception or experience of CLM	No deviations of results

Strategy: 3: Corroboration

The following passages present some significant quotes that are selected due to their significant revelations for the soft skills development. Especially, these excerpts show how the student-teachers planned, executed and reflected upon their performances. Most participants are found frank and honest in stating their experiences in oral as found in video sessions and also in written forms as evident in terms of artifacts submitted by the participants.

All the participants were female; among them the most were single i.e. 11 as far as marital status was concerned. Average age of the participants was 26 years, thus the focus group consisted of youngsters. More than 64 % participants had English literature as graduation background. Most of the participants had English as first language background. Most of the participants confessed in self-evaluation sheet for CLM based lesson that their area of improvement is time management while delivering lessons. When the statement compared with other instrument- 'Most of the participants found difficulties with management of time' as evident in peer observation sheet.

P1 in self-evaluation sheet for CL lessons said, 'It (the CLM activity) helped a lot so far my communication skills are concerned. It helped me to speak louder, I became confident and as the days pass, I made better performance."P5 while observing P1's lesson noted that she could management time in her class. Hence it was initially that the participants couldn't manage time well.

P1, P5, P2, P9 could comprehend the content as found in Individual worksheets in which they wrote answers and individual Main task sheets written during CLM tasks during CLMIP. The other participants did not show much improvement in reading comprehension skills while comparing and cross analyzing data from individual main task sheet, task worksheet, explanations given for content during video sessions.

As P5 said, others like P1, P12, P10, P7, P2, P9, P3, and P6 told, "It helped me to improve communication skills, by this activity speaking skill improved.

Other participants like P2, P12, P8, P4, P9, P1, P7, P11, felt the same as P3 said, **"**Up to some extent activity lesson have helped me to develop my communication skills and thinking skills".

The above statement have been supported in video sessions. Most participants said that they had developed oral communication skills. But critical thinking skills

were not developed as in evidences. On evaluative rubrics the participants showed development of oral communication skills.

Most participants lag behind in development of written communication and critical thinking skills as found in evaluative scoring rubrics, worksheets content analysis, composition written by them, group reports written.

All participants have shown development of cooperation skills and teamwork sills on all instruments relevant to this item.

Strategy no.4- Using Negative case analysis

1. **First Case: P6:** This participant from the beginning was under careful observation by the investigator. It is found that the participant wanted to learn English especially she was not at all confident for speaking and much worried about her grammar. She aspired and thought to learn a short cut to increase her proficiency in English. Hence joined the research project. She was punctual, almost regular in attending the sessions but late in submissions of rubrics and reports. By analyzing the content of this participant it is found that she had not put her best efforts and almost remained passive inn tasks. Her world view was limited due to rare reading acts during her studies. Spellings in the content written were below standard. Grammatical errors were a lot in number. She had tried to hide herself during CL tasks. Her performance was steadily bad and no or very little improve improvement observed. These inferences drawn are contrary to her statements in **Self -Evaluation sheet for practice teaching, P6 said, "**It **(CLM)** helped me to communicate well and able to think and understand independently." The CL methods and its tasks based on this were tried and tested as theory of learning but have very little impact. Although it is found that this participant considered CL methods a new fun filled and seemed to have enjoyed.

2. **Second Case: P10:** This participant from the beginning was under close observation by the investigator. It is found that the participant wanted to learn English especially she was not at all confident for speaking and much worried about her pronunciation. **In Self -Evaluation sheet for practice teaching, P10 said, "It (CLM)** helped a bit in developing speaking ability". She wanted to learn English. Hence joined the research project. She was punctual, almost regular in attending the sessions but late in submissions of rubrics and reports. By analyzing the content of this participant it is found that she had not put her

best efforts and almost copped copied from others. She has remained active in groups but her world view was limited due to rare reading acts during her studies. Spellings in the content written were below standard. Grammatical errors were great in number. She had tried to hide herself during CL tasks. Her performance show very little improvement. The CL methods had very little impact. Although it is found that this participant considered CL methods a new fun filled and seemed to have enjoyed.

As the study focused on exploration of a complex phenomenon that evolved in natural set up, the type of research adopted for the present study is Explorative Case study. The previous chapter gave a detailed account of this phenomenon. During different phases of the study, a variety of instruments were employed to capture and describe the phenomena. The present chapter describe what data have been collected through various self-designed instruments by investigator and how data are analyzed and interpreted. Through the above analysis and interpretation of data, the investigator aims to find answer to the questions raised by the study.

5.5. Concluding Note:

This fifth chapter presents a detailed description of analysis and interpretation of data collected through variety of tools. The data collected from variety of sources have been analyzed using qualitative techniques of data analysis. There are descriptive statistics and grading techniques used as being quantitative methods. In the present study the major sources of information are participants and the investigator himself. The aim of the study is achieved through an in-depth, thorough description of the phenomena. Although there were many instruments designed and used to capture the phenomena, it was video sessions that gave documentary evident, and proved to be the most useful data retrieval method. Data analysis have been carried out under four sections and all of these sections represent the research questions raised. Most of the data have been analyzed through techniques like content analysis, linguistics analysis of the documents, and hermeneutic analysis. The results of the analysis of the data are helpful in answering the research questions raised.