

CHAPTER : V

SUMMARY

AND

SUGGESTIONS

CHAPTER : V

SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS

	Page No.
	256 - 317
5.1 Introduction	256
5.2 Statement of the problem	256
5.3 Objectives of the study	256
5.4 Hypotheses	257
5.5 Delimitation of the Study	259
5.6 Methodology	259
5.6.1 Population	259
5.6.2 Sample	259
5.6.3 Tools	261
5.6.3.1 Opinionnaire for Teachers	261
5.6.3.2 Interview Schedule for Experts	262
5.6.3.3 Questionnaire for Teachers	263
5.6.3.4 Classroom Observation Schedule	263
5.6.3.5 Common Errors Identification Test for students	264
5.6.3.6 Information Schedule for Achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati	265
5.6.4 Data Collection	265
5.6.5 Data Analysis	266
5.7 Major Findings	267

5.7.1 Findings based on clarity of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of teachers	267
5.7.2 Findings based on problems faced by teachers of Standard V, VI and VII in teaching Gujarati	271
5.7.3 Findings based on teaching of poetry lessons of Standard V, VI and VII	273
5.7.4 Findings based on grammar lessons of Standard V, VI and VII	281
5.7.5 Findings based on teaching of prose lessons of Standard V, VI and VII	283
5.7.6 Findings based on Experts opinion regarding teaching of Gujarati	289
5.7.7 Findings based on Achievement score of students of Standard V, VI and VII in the subject of Gujarati	291
5.7.8 Findings based on Weakness score of students of Standard V, VI and VII in the subject of Gujarati	292
5.7.9 Findings based on Errors Committed by students of Standard V in the writing of Gujarati	297
5.7.10 Findings based on Errors Committed by students of Standard VI in the writing of Gujarati	299
5.7.11 Findings based on Errors Committed by students of Standard VII in writing of Gujarati	300
5.8 Conclusion	302
5.9 Discussions	307
5.10 Suggestions and Implications	313
5.11 Suggestion for further researches	316

CHAPTER : V

SUMMARY AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The quality of education depends upon various factors operating upon and within it. One of the important factors is teaching. In the light of this view, the investigator intends to review work done and discussed in previous chapter. In this chapter, investigator includes summary, findings, conclusions, discussion, implication and suggestion.

5.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF GUJARATI LANGUAGE TEACHING IN UPPER PRIMARY SCHOOLS OF BARODA CITY

5.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study has been carried out with the following objectives :

- (1) To study the clarity of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of teachers.
- (2) To study the teaching procedure followed by the teachers in teaching of Gujarati with respect to ;
 - a) Various skills of Gujarati teaching.
 - b) Various methods and techniques of teaching Gujarati.
 - c) Use of audio Visual aids.
- (3) To study the problem faced by teacher in teaching Gujarati.
- (4) To study the achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati.
- (5) To study the weakness of the students in the subject of Gujarati.

- (6) To identify common errors committed by students in writing Gujarati.
- (7) To study the opinions of teachers about teaching Gujarati.
- (8) To study the relationship between achievement score and weakness score of students in the subject of Gujarati of Standard V, VI, and VII

5.4 HYPOTHESES

On the basis of above objectives, the following null hypotheses were formulated.

1. There will be no significant difference in mean achievement of boys and girls in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
2. There will be no significant difference in mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
3. There will be no interaction between caste category and sex in the achievement in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
4. There will be no significant difference in the mean achievement of boys and girls in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VI.
5. There will be no significant difference in the mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VI.
6. There will be no interaction between caste category and sex in the achievement in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VI.
7. There will be no significant difference in the mean achievement of boys and girls in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.
8. There will be no significant difference in the mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.
9. There will be no interaction between caste category and sex in the achievement in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.

10. There will be no significant difference in the mean weakness score of boys and girls in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
11. There will be no significant difference in the mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
12. There will be no interaction between caste category and sex in the weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
13. There will be no significant difference in mean weakness score of boys and girls in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VI.
14. There will be no significant difference in the mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and general category of students in the subject of Gujarati Standard VI.
15. There will be no interaction between caste category and sex in the weakness in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VI.
16. There will be no significant difference in the mean weakness score of boys and girls in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.
17. There will be no significant difference in the mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.
18. There will be no interaction between caste category and sex in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.
19. There will be no significant relationship between achievement score and weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for Standard V.
20. There will be no significant relationship between achievement score and weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VI.
21. There will be no significant relationship between achievement score and weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for Standard VII.

5.5 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The study was delimited to Municipal schools run by Municipal school Board, Vadodara. The study was also delimited to Municipal schools which provide instruction through Gujarati language.

5.6 METHODOLOGY

After formulation of the research problem theoretically, the next task is to find out empirically dependable and valid answers to research questions.

This requires deciding about the research methodology to be used for data collection and analysis and interpretation of results. Methodology of the study involves population, sample, tools to be used, procedures for data collection and statistical techniques to be used for data analysis. The methodological been details have been presented in the pages to follow.

5.6.1 POPULATION

Population of the present study comprises of 108 Gujarati Medium Primary Schools, 550 teachers of upper primary schools and all the students of the Standard V, VI, VII of schools managed by Municipal School Board, Vadodara.

5.6.2 SAMPLE

Sample for the presented study was drawn from:

- (a) Schools,
- (b) Teachers,
- (c) Students,
- (d) Experts.

Further Details are given below:

(a) Schools:

There are 138 schools providing primary education through different medium of instruction. There are 108 primary schools of Gujarati medium, from which twelve schools were selected randomly for observation of teaching procedure followed by the teachers of these schools.

(b) Teachers:

From the office records of Nagar Prathmik Shikshan Samiti (1994-95) , it was found that total number of teachers teaching from Standard I to VII was 1625 and the teachers teaching in upper primary level were 550. Of which 400 teachers were selected randomly by using random number table of Kendall and Smith. As seventy two teachers did not complete the given questionnaire and opinionnaire, they were dropped. The investigator was finally able to collect data from 328 teachers.

(c) Students:

For drawing the sample of students, cluster sampling technique was adopted. From the official records of the schools, it was found that there were 1218 students available in standard V, VI, VII of the sample of schools selected for the present study.

(d) Experts :

To study opinion about the teaching of Gujarati , twenty experts were selected using judgment sampling. These experts were from primary and secondary school teachers and teachers from teaching institution of Baroda. The experts were selected on the basis of their long standing experience (at least 10 years) in teaching the subject, their contribution to Gujarati literature and in investigator's perception about these experts.

5.6.3 TOOLS

The following tools were constructed for the present study.

1. To study the clarity of objectives of teaching of Gujarati, opinionnaire was constructed.
2. To study the problems faced by the teachers while teaching Gujarati, questionnaire was constructed.
3. To observe the teaching procedure following by the teachers class room observation schedule was constructed.
4. To study the opinions of teachers and experts regarding the teaching of Gujarati, interview schedule was constructed.
5. To identify common errors committed by the students in writing Gujarati, a common errors identification test was developed.
6. To study the achievement of students, scores obtained by students on the final examination of Gujarati in the year 1994-95 were collected from the respective schools.

The details of the above mentioned tools have been given under separate captions.

5.6.3.1 OPINIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

To decide about the aspects for constructing opinionnaire, the following criteria were kept in mind while formulating and selecting the statements.

- The statement might be expression of behaviour and not of the statement of facts.
- The statement might be expressed in clear, concise and straight forward language.
- Ambiguity in the meaning of statement or vague words to be avoided.
- Each statement should have single idea.

On the basis of the above criteria and keeping in view the four basic skills of language teaching viz., listening, speaking, reading and writing, the investigator constructed

an opinionnaire consisting of 45 statements in the final draft of thus constructed opinionnaire. Each statement had five categories viz., always, often, sometimes, seldom and never.

For the scoring of the tool, for each item frequency was computed and the same has been converted in to percentages.

5.6.3.2 INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR EXPERTS

For construction of interview schedule the following criteria were kept in mind.

- The statements might be expression of behaviour and not of statements of facts.
- The statements might be expressed in clear, concise and strait forward language.
- Ambiguity in meaning of statements or vague words to be avoided.
- Statement should have single idea.

In addition to this, the interview schedule focused on the following five areas.

- Language skills
- In-service training,
- Pre- service training,
- Improving standards of Gujarati teaching,
- Modes of evaluating language skills.

On the basis of the above criteria and keeping in view the aspects mentioned above, the investigator constructed an interview schedule and the final draft of which consisted of nine structured items.

For the scoring of each item frequency was computed and the same has been converted into percentages.

5.6.3.3 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS

As stated earlier, in order to study the problem faced by the teachers in teaching Gujarati, a questionnaire was constructed by keeping in mind the following criteria:

- The questionnaire should deal with a significant topic.
- The information might be available, should not ask to write in the questionnaire.
- The question should be short and clear.
- The question should seek for one idea at a time and should be arranged in logical sequence.

In addition to this, the questionnaire focused on the following areas:

- Problems related to speech defect faced by the teachers.
- Difficulties faced by teachers in teaching prose, poetry, grammar lessons.
- Facilities available in the school for teaching Gujarati subject.
- Problems related to implementation of textbook knowledge.

On the basis of above criteria and keeping in view. The aspects mentioned above the final draft of questionnaire consisting of 26 items was constructed. For scoring of the questionnaire, frequencies were computed and the same were converted into percentages wherever possible.

5.6.3.4 CLASS ROOM OBSERVATION SCHEDULE

For construction of observation schedule the following criteria were kept in mind.

- Selecting the aspects to be observed.
- Defining the aspects to be observed.
- Training the observer.
- Quantifying the observations.
- Developing the recording procedure.

In addition to this, the observation schedule focused on the following five dimensions.

1. Introduction on the content.
2. Model reading.
3. Discussion points which include methods, techniques, and skills adopted by teachers.
4. Evaluation done by the teachers.
5. Black board work of the teachers.
6. Home work given by teachers.

On the basis of above criteria and keeping in view the aspects mentioned above the final draft of observation schedule consisting of 73 items was developed. For the scoring of each items, frequencies were computed and the same has been converted into percentages.

5.6.3.5 COMMON ERRORS IDENTIFICATION TEST FOR STUDENTS

In order to identify the areas where students were generally committing errors, the investigator explored two major sources from the twelve sampled schools. The sources were (1) Teachers teaching Gujarati subject in standard V, VI, VII, and (2) Home work, class work not book and composition book of Standards of standard V, VI, VII. Exploring these sources, nine areas like nasal sound, spellings, punctuation mark, syntax, comma, in to inverted comma, full stop, logical sequence of thoughts, effect of dialect in writing were identified.

On the basis of above areas, the separate test for standard V, VI, VII were developed by the investigator. The test were given to twenty five students of each standard V, VI, VII to ensure the time limit and comprehensibility of language. Total forty marks test were developed and maximum possible score was forty.

5.6.3.6 INFORMATION SCHEDULE FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS

IN THE SUBJECT OF GUJARATI

An information Schedule was developed to collect the information regarding achievement of students of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of boys & girls students in the subject of Gujarati, in the Annual examination conducted by Municipal school Board, Vadodara during the year April 1995.

5.6.4 DATA COLLECTION

For collecting the data from Municipal School Board, Vadodara investigator took the permission letter from administrative officer of Nagar Prathmik Shikshan Samiti Vadodara.

Questionnaire and opinionnaire were prepared with forwarding letters addressed to Municipal School teachers by giving an assurance of keeping respondents' view confidential.

The filling up questionnaire, opinionnaire, and test to identify common errors and achievement of students of standard V, VI, VII examination and for the observation of instructional process investigator requested school principals and teachers for their co-operation.

During the data collection investigator had taken care of clarifying their doubts and checked that none of the responses were left incomplete. This was done to avoid loss in the obtained data for the selected schools. The data pertaining to experts opinions regarding teaching of Gujarati were collected personally by the investigator through personal interview. The experts were consulted earlier and interviews were carried out according to their convenience and without any constraints of time.

The data pertaining to achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati was collected from their respective schools. Details of schedule of data collection given in the Table: 5.1

Table 5.1

SCHEDULE OF DATA COLLECTION

TYPE OF TOOL	DURATION	SAMPLE DISTRIBUTED	RESPONDED
QUESTIONNAIRE	December 1996 to February 1997	550 teachers of Standard V, VI, VII	326 teachers of standard V, VI, VII
OPINIONNAIRE	December 1996 to February 1997	550 teachers of Standard V, VI, VII	326 teachers of standard V, VI, VII
OBSERVATION SCHEDULE	October 1995 to February 1996	Teachers of twelve schools	Whole
COMMON ERRORS TEST	April 1996	Standard V 420 Standard VI 400 Standard VII 400	Standard V 419 Standard VI 399 Standard VII 400
INFORMATION SCHEDULE	May 1996	Standard V 420 Standard VI 400 Standard VII 400	Standard V 419 Standard VI 399 Standard VII 400
INTERVIEW	December 1996 to February 1997	20 experts	20 experts

5.6.5 DATA ANALYSIS

Data pertaining to objectives 1,2,3,6, and 7 viz., clarity of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of teachers, classroom observation, problems faced by the teachers , opinion of experts on teaching Gujarati, and common errors committed by students frequencies were computed and were converted into percentages and whenever possible content analysis was done.

The data pertaining to Objectives 4 and 5 viz., achievement score and weakness score of students of Standard V, VI and VII were analyzed quantitatively by using the technique of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Data pertaining to objective 8, viz., relationship between achievement score and weakness score of students, coefficient of correlation was computed using Product Moment Method.

The entire Programme of present piece of research, presented in chapter provides a clear cut direction for the work and thus the sets the stage for analysis. In other words , how is language teaching carried out by primary school teachers of municipal school board can be seen in the data analysis.

5.7 MAJOR FINDINGS

Major findings of the study are presented in eleven parts.

5.7.1 FINDINGS BASED ON CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES OF TEACHING

GUJARATI ON THE PART OF TEACHERS

1. Majority of the teachers (73.61 per cent) have not read the objective of teaching Gujarati language.
2. Majority of teachers (69.02 per cent) mentioned that objectives do included all the information which is required to be expected from the students towards the completion of language teaching.
3. Majority of the teachers (62.66 per cent) found that objectives do take in to consideration the appreciation of literary piece.
4. Majority of the teachers (66.25 per cent) found that objective do not take in to consideration the neatness in writing process.
5. Majority of the teachers (64.72 per cent) agreed that objectives which have prescribed in Gujarat State School Text Book Board, Gandhinagar do not take in to consideration for independent assessment of details.
6. Majority of the teachers (63.80 per cent) found that objectives do take in to consideration to create rapport with narrator.

7. Majority of the teachers (63.48 per cent) found that objectives do not take in to consideration to inspire the students for free and open discussion in the class.
8. Majority of the teachers (64.72 per cent) found that the objectives do take in to consideration to motivate students for supplementary reading.
9. One third of teachers could often give opportunity to the students for listening the content in the class.
10. One third of teachers could rarely organise activities where students get opportunity to listen dialogue in the class.
11. One third of teachers could rarely organise activities like one student narrates his own experiences and rest of the class listen to it.
12. Only few teachers (08.90 per cent) always could do model reading of unknown prose lessons in the classroom.
13. One third of teachers could frequently do recitation of poem in the class.
14. Almost all the teachers could not arrange the listening of radio talk in the class.
15. Few teachers (06.75 per cent) could not arrange activities like story telling to be carried out by the students.
16. Almost half of the teachers could not impart knowledge about award winner poets or authors in the class.
17. Almost half of the teachers could rarely arrange activities like drama play in the class.
18. Few teachers (08.59 per cent) could not allow students to crack jokes in the class.
19. Almost half of teachers could arrange the poet meeting (Kavi Samelana) in the school.
20. Few teachers (06.13 per cent) could encourage students to deliver speech during celebration of national festivals.

21. One fourth of teachers could always organise language antakshari in the school.
22. Majority of the teachers (61.35 per cent) could not arrange debate competition for the students.
23. One third of teachers could arrange the activities like thought of the day to be carried out in the assembly.
24. One fourth of teachers could make students to read the stories in the class.
25. Few teachers (10.43 per cent) could rarely make students to read the audio plays.
26. Few teachers (09.20 per cent) could not make students to sing a song in chorus.
27. One third of teachers could organise recitation of poem in the class.
28. One third of teachers could ask students few oral reading in the class.
29. One third of teachers could ask students for silent reading in the class.
30. One fourth of teachers could not give preference to free reading in the period of non textual reading.
31. One fourth of teachers could try to make students to read good essay in the classroom.
32. Majority of the teachers (60.74 per cent) could not provide references to read for the self study for the development of reading skills.
33. Almost half of the teachers could make students to read national and international head lines.
34. Cent percent of teachers could not organize good recorded reading.
35. One third of teachers agreed that in order to read, a student should be made to copy and consolidate it.
36. One third of teachers could arrange the activities like reading of good thoughts in assembly.
37. Majority of the teachers (60.74 per cent) could make provision to read the content and could ask the questions based on main theme.

38. Few teachers (06.13 per cent) could not give the students the supplementary material of the content to read.
39. One third of teachers could arrange reading of non textual lesson and ask students to justify the title orally.
40. Very few teachers (03.07 per cent) could not spare time for essay writing.
41. One third of teachers could spare one period a week for copy writing.
42. Majority of the teachers (70.78 per cent) could spare one period a week for dictation.
43. Majority of the teachers (72.61 per cent) were able to put before students, the example of good hand writing to the students.
44. Majority of the teachers (64.84 per cent) could not arrange activities like thought expansion.
45. Majority of the teachers (69.72 per cent) could spare time for letter writing.
46. Only few teachers (07.36 per cent) could not check that students maintain the chronological order during writing.
47. Majority of the teachers (66.52 per cent) could arrange writing of golden sentences (Soneri Vakyo) or other writing on the board to improve students writing.
48. Cent percent teachers could not encourage students to prepare hand written periodicals and magazines. (Hasta Likhit Samayika)
49. Almost half of the teachers could not guide students for independent writing.

5.7.2 FINDINGS BASED ON PROBLEM FACED BY TEACHERS OF STANDARD V, VI & VII IN TEACHING GUJARATI

1. Majority of the teachers (95.05 per cent) did not experience any speech defect which hampers in teaching process.
2. Majority of the teachers (65.95 per cent) found difficulties in pronouncing words and letters appropriately due to their family background and dialect.
3. Majority of the teachers (35.28 per cent) could use Gamathi dialect during teaching of Gujarati.
4. Majority of the teachers (63.80 per cent) could not find difficulties in expression during teaching.
5. Cent percent teachers found difficulties in teaching owing to the students problem in writing.
6. Majority of the teachers (70.24 per cent) found difficulties in teaching due to the lack of cooperation by the students during reading and dialect used by students.
7. All the teachers perceived students difficulties in punctuation mark and logically presentation of thoughts during letter writing.
8. Cent percent teachers observed students difficulties in logically presentation of thoughts, ideas, writing correct spellings, hand writing and punctuation mark in essay writing.
9. Very few teachers (08.58 per cent) perceived students difficulties in giving significance of moral of the story.
10. Cent percent teachers perceived students difficulties in application of General knowledge linking with poem or sentences, spellings punctuation mark during thought expansion.
11. Majority of the teachers (72.68 per cent) found difficulties in explaining rules of punctuation marks during teaching of Grammar.

12. Very few teachers (38.65 per cent) found difficulties in explaining syntax during teaching of Grammar.
13. None of teachers found difficulties in reading, writing and language aspects during the teaching of prose.
14. Majority of the teachers (36.80 per cent) found difficulties in giving proverbs and using specific words during explaining linguistic beauty.(Bhasha Saundrya)
15. Majority of the teachers (66.25 per cent)found difficulties in teaching of essay form of prose lesson.
16. Majority of the teachers (65.28 per cent) found difficulties in explaining appreciation of poem.
17. All the teachers found difficulties in literary play and projects during organization of literary activities in the class.
18. Majority of teachers (65.64 per cent) found interest in teaching poetry form of Gujarati as compared to prose and grammar.
19. Majority of the teachers (64.41 per cent) of Standard V and VII found that syllabi were coherent with the content of the textbooks.
20. All the teachers agreed that content of textbook of Standard V, VI and VII were comprehensible.
21. Majority of the teachers (64.41 per cent) found textbook of Standard VII as an excellent.
22. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII unanimously opined content do give opportunity for self learning.
23. Almost all the teachers (17.77 per cent) were in favour of that pictures of text books adds clarity.
24. Majority of the teachers were in favour of that poetry lessons were not recitable and arouse interest of students for Standard V, VI and VII.

25. Majority of the teachers found that library books could not use by the students.
26. Majority of the teachers found that black board, postures, charts, maps were available in the school.
27. Majority of the teachers could use teaching aid for Standard V, VI and VII.
28. All the teachers of standard V, VI, VII found that questions given in exercise takes consideration of language skills.
29. All the teachers found that text books of standard V, VI, VII give students an opportunity for self learning.

5.7.3 FINDINGS BASED ON TEACHING OF POETRY LESSONS OF STANDARD V, VI AND VII

1. Very few teachers of Standard V and VII gave introduction related to the content to be taught while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not give introduction related to the content to be taught.
2. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not retain interest in the students.
3. Majority of the teachers of Standard VII could not relate previous knowledge with present knowledge during introduction where as one third of teachers of Standard VI could not relate previous knowledge during introduction and majority of the teachers of Standard V could rarely relate previous knowledge with present knowledge during introduction.
4. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII could not initiate students to teach something new during introduction where as half of the teachers of Standard VI could initiate students to teach something new during introduction.
5. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could ask knowledge level questions during introduction.

6. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could ask understanding level questions during introduction.
7. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not ask application level questions.
8. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not express poets view to the students.
9. Majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not introduce with keeping in mind mental level of students while teachers of Standard V could rarely do it.
10. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not introduce by citing examples.
11. Majority of teachers of Standard V could introduce by explanation while most of the teachers of Standard VII could scarcely and are third of teachers of Standard VI could not introduce by explanation.
12. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not introduce by story telling while majority of the teachers of Standard VII could introduce by story telling.
13. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and VII could not introduce by drama presentation.
14. Cent percent of teachers of Standard V could not introduce by historical background few teachers of Standard VI and most of the teachers of Standard VII could introduce by historical background.
15. Cent percent teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use audio visual aid during introduction.
16. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V could rarely do recitation of poem with proper expression while few teachers of Standard VI and most of the teachers of Standard VII could do recitation of poem with proper expression.

17. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V could not use pauses at right time during recitation of poem where as half of the teachers of Standard VI and majority of the teachers of Standard VII could use pauses at right time during recitation of poem.
18. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could rarely finish recitation of poem during model reading.
19. One third of teachers from Standard V could read poetry with proper intonation, variation of tone and clear pronunciation while half of the teachers from Standard VI and majority of the teachers from Standard VII could not do read of poetry with proper intonation, variation of tone and clear pronunciation.
20. Most of the teachers of Standard V could rarely maintain silence in the class during model reading while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not maintain silence in the class during model reading.
21. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not keep eye contact on students during model reading while one third of teachers of Standard VI and VII could rarely keep eye contact on students during reading.
22. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not start discussion with the help of students.
23. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not initiate discussion by asking questions to the students.
24. Most of the teachers of Standard V and VII could not initiate discussion by explanation. While one third of teachers of Standard VI could not initiate discussion by explanation.
25. Half of the teachers of Standard V could not cite examples during discussion where as majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could cite examples during discussion.

26. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could do discussion by explaining each and every line of the poem while half of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could do discussion by explaining each and every line.
27. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not clarify theme of the poem with the reference sentence.
28. Majority of the teachers of standard V, VI and VII could not create an lively atmosphere during discussion.
29. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V provided sweetness, knowledge and style of language of the poem during discussion while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not provide sweetness knowledge and style of the poem during discussion majority of the teachers of Standard VII could able to provide it.
30. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not ask logically sequenced questions.
31. One third of teachers of Standard V could provide knowledge about the structure of poem. While majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not provide knowledge about the structure of poem.
32. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not provide knowledge about the style of the poem.
33. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not provide the change mood of the poem. (Bhavaplato)
34. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII could not keep in mind the poet's message during discussion while half of the teachers of Standard VI could keep in mind the poet's message during discussion.
35. Most of the teachers of Standard V could discuss the important lines which supports the theme of poem by recitation. One third of teachers of Standard VI and

- VII could rarely discuss the important line which supports and half of the them of poem.
36. Most of the teachers of Standard V could discuss the humor presented in the content while one third of teachers of Standard VI and VII could discuss the humour presented in the content.
 37. Most of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not discuss the active presented in the content and one third of teachers of Standard VII could do it.
 38. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not discuss major issues related to the society, nation or world presented in the content.
 39. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could rarely introduce the new words of the content whereas half of the teachers of Standard VII could not introduce the new words of the content.
 40. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not use idioms presented in the content while most of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could use idioms presented in the content.
 41. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not develop listening skill among students through story telling and recitation of poem while one third teachers of Standard VI and majority teachers of Standard VII could develop listening skill among students through story telling.
 42. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could use local language instead of recognised language.
 43. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII could not inspire students to speak perfect pronunciation while one third of teachers of Standard VI could tell students to speak perfect pronunciation.
 44. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not encourage students who have lack of confidence during reading while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and

- Standard VII could rarely encourage students who have lack of confidence during reading.
45. Half of the teachers of Standard V could motivate students to explain incidents and condition for the development of speaking skill. While one third teachers of Standard VI could motivate students to explain incidents and condition for the development of speaking skill and majority of the teachers of Standard VII could motivate students to explain incidents and condition for the development of speaking skill.
 46. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and Standard VI could not lead students for model reading whereas most of the teachers of Standard VII could rarely lead students for model reading.
 47. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V could frequently encourage students to read sentences and pronounce the word perfectly while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not encourage students to read sentences and pronounce the word perfectly while half of the teachers of Standard VII could rarely encourage students to read sentences and pronounce the word perfectly.
 48. Very few teachers of Standard V could motivate students to read word perfectly with proper pronunciation while more than half of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not motivate students to write word perfectly with proper pronunciation.
 49. Most of the teachers of Standard V and VI could give proper attention when students write spellings and majority of the teachers of Standard VII could not give proper attention.
 50. Very few teachers of Standard V could motivate students to improve their hand writing while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not motivate students to improve their hand writing.

51. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not ask questions and also not waited for students response.
52. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not reinforce responses of the students with encouraging words while half of the teachers of Standard VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not reinforce responses of the students with encourage words.
53. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could develop negative reinforcement for the students while half of the teachers of Standard VI and most of the teachers of Standard VII could rarely develop negative reinforcement for the students.
54. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not encourage students to assess one's own responses.
55. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not guide students to collect information and data form different sources.
56. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use charts for explanatory sketch to the contents.
57. All the teachers of Standard V could not use charts for comparative study while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could use charts for comparative study.
58. Few teachers of Standard V could use charts for teaching rules of spellings while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not use charts for teaching rules of spellings.
59. All the teachers of Standard V and majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not use flesh cards for revision of grammar while majority of the teachers Standard VII could use flash cards for revision of grammar.
60. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use film strips to orient students about folk dance and songs.

61. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use models for introducing new words.
62. Few teachers of Standard V could not evaluate students by asking questions while majority of the students of Standard VI and VII could not evaluate students by asking questions.
63. All the teachers of Standard V could not evaluate students by recitation of poem while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not evaluation it.
64. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could evaluate students to write moral (Bodha) of the story.
65. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could give students to write character sketch during home work.
66. One third of teachers of Standard V could not give students writing work form the chapters while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not give students chapter based writing and half of the teachers of Standard VII could give students chapter based writing.
67. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could give students to write moral of the story.
68. All the teachers of Standard V could not give students for comprehensive writing while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and one third of teachers of Standard VII could not give students comprehensive writing in home work.
69. All the teachers of Standard V could not give students the task of extra reading while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not give students the task of extra reading.
70. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could write with neat and legible hand writing on the black board.

71. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could do spelling mistakes on the black board while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not do spelling mistakes on the black board and one third of teachers of Standard VII could do spelling mistakes on the black board.

5.7.4 FINDINGS BASED ON TEACHING OF GRAMMAR LESSONS OF STANDARD V, VI AND VII

1. Most of the teachers of Standard V could use sentences or paragraph from the learnt chapters for introducing the grammar content while half of the Standard VI and majority of the teachers of Standard VII could rarely use sentences or paragraph from the learnt chapters for introducing the grammar content.
2. Majority of the teachers Standard V, VI and VII could relate previous knowledge with present knowledge during introducing the grammar point.
3. Majority of the teachers of Standard VI, VII and half of the teachers of Standard V could initiate discussion by asking questions related to previous knowledge.
4. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII could not use and half of the teachers of Standard VI rarely used illustration technique during teaching of grammar.
5. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII and half of the teachers of Standard VI could use explanation technique during teaching of grammar.
6. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and half of the teachers of Standard VII could use questioning technique during introduction of grammar points while most of the teachers of Standard VI could not use questioning technique during introduction of grammar points.

7. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and half of the teachers of Standard VII could teach learnt paragraph or sentences from the text for teaching of new concept on the black board.
8. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could use inductive approach for teaching of grammar while cent percent of teachers of Standard VI and majority of the teachers of Standard VII could not use inductive approach for teaching of grammar.
9. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not use deductive approach for teaching of grammar while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and half of the teachers of Standard VII could rarely use deductive approach for teaching of grammar.
10. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could frequently use charts for teaching of grammar while all the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not use charts for teaching of grammar.
11. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use flash cards for teaching of grammar.
12. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use tape recorder for teaching of grammar.
13. All the teachers of Standard V and majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not note down sentences or paragraph from the text for repetition of the concept.
14. All the teachers of Standard V could not do evaluation with the help of students while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and half of the teachers of Standard VII could do evaluation with the help of students.
15. All the teachers of Standard V and VI and majority of the teachers of Standard VII could give home work based on topic taught earlier.

5.7.5 FINDINGS BASED ON TEACHING OF PROSE LESSONS OF STANDARD V, VI AND VII

1. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could give introduction related to the content and one third of teachers of Standard VII could not give introduction related to the content to be taught.
2. Half of the teachers of Standard V and one third teachers of Standard VII could not retain interest of the students during introduction while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could retain interest of the students during introduction.
3. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third of teachers of Standard VII could not relate previous knowledge with present knowledge.
4. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and half of the teachers of Standard VI could initiate students during introduction while majority of the teachers of Standard VII could not initiate it.
5. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and half of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could ask knowledge level questions during introduction.
6. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI could not ask understanding level questions during introduction while majority of the teachers of Standard VII could ask understanding level questions during introduction.
7. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not ask application level questions during introduction.
8. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not express author's views to the students during introduction and one third of teachers of Standard VII could express author's views to the students during introduction.
9. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not introduce the content with keeping in mind mental level of the students while one fourth of teachers of

Standard VII could introduce the content with keeping in mind the mental level of the students.

10. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and one third teachers of Standard VII could not introduce with citing examples while half of the teachers of Standard VI could introduce with citing examples.
11. Majority the teachers of Standard V, almost half of the teachers of Standard VI and one third of teachers of Standard VII could introduce by giving explanation.
12. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and few teachers of Standard VII could not introduce through story telling.
13. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and all the teachers of Standard VI could not introduce through drama presentation and most of the teachers of Standard VII could introduce through drama presentation.
14. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not introduce through historical back ground and important events.
15. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and one third teachers of Standard VII could use audio visual aids during introduction while majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not use audio visual aids during introduction.
16. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not read prose lesson with proper expression and natural way while one third teachers of Standard VII could read prose lesson with proper expression and natural way.
17. One third teachers of Standard V, most of the teachers of Standard VI could not do model reading with proper pause at right time and one third teachers of Standard VII could do model reading with proper pause at right time.
18. Majority of the teachers of the Standard V and half of the teachers of the Standard VI could not finish reading of prose at proper speed while one third teachers of Standard VII could finish reading of prose at proper speed.

19. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could finish model reading with proper intonation, variation of tone and clear pronunciation.
20. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and very few teachers of Standard VI could maintain silence in the class and very few teachers of Standard VII could not maintain it.
21. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could frequently keep an eye contact on the students during reading.
22. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not discuss with the help of students.
23. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not initiate discussion by asking questions to the students.
24. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and one fourth teachers of Standard VII could not initiate discussion through explanation while most of the teachers of Standard VI could initiate discussion through explanation.
25. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not cite examples during discussion.
26. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not discuss by explaining each and every sentence of the prose while majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII could discuss through explaining each and every sentence of the prose.
27. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and few teachers of Standard VI and VII could not clarify the theme of prose with the help of reference sentence during discussion.
28. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and one third teachers of Standard VI and VII could create lively atmosphere during discussion.

29. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not ask logically sequenced questions.
30. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII and one third teachers of Standard VI could provide language sweetness, language style to the students.
31. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and very few teachers of Standard VI and VII could not discuss humor presented in the content.
32. Almost half of the teachers of Standard V and majority of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could not express satire presented in the content.
33. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and half of the teachers of Standard VII could not discuss major issues related to the society, national and world presented in the content.
34. Half of the teachers of Standard V, very few teachers of Standard VII could not introduce new words of the content while few teachers of Standard VII could introduce new words of the content.
35. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and few teachers of Standard VII could not use idioms at the time of discussion.
36. Very few teachers of Standard V, VII and majority of the teachers of Standard VI could not develop listening skill.
37. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, one third teachers of Standard VI and VII could not develop listening skill through reminding oral information.
38. One third teachers of Standard V, VII and most of the teachers of Standard VI could not use recognised language.
39. Half of the teachers of Standard V could not tell students to speak perfect pronunciation instead of wrong use of it while one third teachers of Standard VI

- and VII could rarely tell students to speak perfect pronunciation instead of wrong use of it.
40. One third teachers of Standard V and VII could not encourage students who have lack of confidence during reading time while one third teachers of Standard VII could encourage students who have lack of confidence during reading time.
 41. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not motivate students to explain incidents and different conditions for the development of speaking skill.
 42. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and very few teachers of Standard VII could not lead students to model reading for the development of reading skill.
 43. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, one third teachers of Standard VI and VII could not encourage students to read sentences and pronounce the word perfectly.
 44. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VII could not motivate students to write words perfectly with proper space in the sentences while one third teachers of Standard VI could motivate students to write words perfectly with proper space in the sentences.
 45. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could give proper attention when students write spellings while most of the teachers of Standard VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could not give proper attention when students write spellings.
 46. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and very few teachers of Standard VII could motivate students to improve their hand writing.
 47. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not ask questions to the students and waited for students response.
 48. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could reinforce ;on responses of students with encouraging words.

49. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could encourage students to assess ones own response while half of the teachers could not encourage students to assess ones own response.
50. Almost all the teachers of Standard V could not guide students to collect information and data from different sources while majority of the teachers of Standard VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could guide students to collect information and data from different sources.
51. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not use charts for explanatory sketch related to the content while most of the teachers of Standard VII could use charts for explanatory sketch.
52. Majority of the teachers of Standard V could not use charts for comparative study while one third of teachers of Standard VI and VII could use charts for comparative study.
53. Most of the teachers of Standard V and VI could not use charts for teaching of rules of spellings and one third of teachers of Standard VII could use charts for teaching of rules of spellings.
54. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI could use flash cards for revision of grammar point while one third teachers of Standard VII could not use flash cards for revision of grammar points.
55. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use film strips to orient students about talk dances and songs.
56. All the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could not use models to orient students about new words of the content.
57. Most of the teachers of Standard V could not evaluate students by asking questions while most of the teachers of Standard VI and VII could evaluate students by asking questions during discussion.

58. Majority of the teachers of Standard V and VI and one third teachers of Standard VII could evaluate students by reading of prose lessons.
59. Very few teachers of Standard V could not give students to write moral of the story and one third teachers of Standard VI and VII could rarely give students to write moral of the story.
60. Most of the teachers of Standard V, very few teachers of Standard VI could not give students to write character sketch in home work while most of the teachers of Standard VII could give students to write character sketch.
61. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could give students chapter based writing.
62. Most of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could write with neat and legible hand writing on the black board.
63. Majority of the teachers of Standard V, VI and VII could make spellings mistakes on the black board.
64. Majority of the Standard V and VI could use black board for comparative study and half of the teachers of Standard VII could not use black board for comparative study.

5.7.6 FINDINGS BASED ON EXPERTS OPINION REGARDING TEACHING OF GUJARATI

1. Cent percent experts opined that students did not have perfection of Gujarati language.
2. One fourth of experts opined that text book should provide complete information of teaching grammar moral clearly, effectively and simpler manner to the students which can improve the Standard of Gujarati.

3. 35 percent of experts opined that students should be given moral education.
4. 45 percent of experts opined that to improve the language the child should aware of different linguistic words and meaning.
5. 75 percent of experts suggested activities like identification of alphabets, competition in writing, action song competition charts for correct spellings should be take in to consideration for raising the Standard of language.
6. 70 percent of experts opined that apart from listening various programmes on radio, T. V. by the students, teachers should develop listening skills through story telling, recitation of poem, good thoughts of the day in the class.
7. 65 percent of experts opined that teachers should organise activities like action song competition, news reading, antakshari, talk of the day.
8. Almost half of the respondents opined that teachers should give students to read paragraph from the books, news papers, essay reading and thought of the day in the class.
9. Cent percent respondents opined that more and more writing exercises related to short sentences, copy writing and dictation should be given at primary level.
10. Cent percent experts favour of continuous and comprehensive evaluation and skills should be evaluated by daily progress of the child at primary level.
11. 85 percent of the experts opined that agenda for pre-service training programme should not be carried out in traditional manner, there is no innovative approach adopted for training pre-service teachers so far. Respondents further opined that pre-service training programme is just waste of time, energy and money.
12. 90 percent of experts opined that instead of calling experts for delivering lectures, it is good if the training is given by experienced school teachers of the field and in-service training programme is not at all a practical, more emphasis should be given to difficulties faced by teachers in teaching learning process.

13. Cent percent experts opined that government should provide adequate equipment and teachers should be motivated and directed to prepare low cost of teaching aids.
14. 80 percent experts opined that along with teaching of language, grammar should be taught, syllabus should include Indian cultural values at all levels and selection of prose, poetry stories should be life oriented scientific out look should be developed through language lessons and lessons propagates superstitious beliefs should be avoided.
15. 20 percent experts opined that emphasis should be given for quality of lessons rather than quantity.

5.7.7 FINDINGS BASED ON ACHIEVEMENT SCORE OF STUDENTS OF STANDARD V, VI AND VII IN THE SUBJECT OF GUJARATI

1. There was no significant difference between mean achievement of boys and girls of standard V. This indicated that the mean achievement of boys and girls were equal in their achievement in subject of Gujarati.
2. There was no significant difference between mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General Categories of students in the subject of Gujarati of standard V. This indicated that the mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard V were equal in their achievement of Gujarati subject.
3. The Sex and Caste do not affect jointly in the mean achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati of standard V. This indicated that sex and caste were equal in their achievement in the subject of Gujarati.
4. Their was significant difference between mean achievement of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that mean achievement of girls were higher than boys.

5. There was no significant difference between mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General Categories of the students of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VI were equal in the subject of Gujarati.
6. The sex and caste do not affect jointly in the mean achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati of standard VI. This indicated that mean achievement of sex and caste were equal.
7. There was no significant difference between mean achievement of students of standard VII in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated the mean achievement of girls and boys were equal in the subject of Gujarati.
8. There was no significant difference between mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VII in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and general categories of students of standard VII were equal in the subject of Gujarati.
9. The sex and caste do not affect jointly in the mean achievement of students of standard VII in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that mean achievement of sex and caste were equal in the subject of Gujarati.

5.7.8 FINDINGS BASED ON WEAKNESS SCORE OF STUDENTS OF STANDARD V, VI & VII IN THE SUBJECT OF GUJARATI

1. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of boys and girls of standard V. This indicated that the mean weakness score of boys and girls were equal in the subject of Gujarati.

2. There was a significant difference between mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard V the subject of Gujarati. This indicated the mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students differ significantly.
3. The sex and caste differ significantly in the weakness score of students of standard V in the Gujarati subject. This indicated that sex and caste differ significantly.
4. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC boys and ST boys of standard V. This indicates that they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
5. There was significant difference between mean of SEBC boys and SC boys for standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicates that weakness score SEBC boys was higher than that of SC boys for standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
6. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC boys and general category boys of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
7. There was significant difference between mean of SC girls and SC boys at standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that the weakness score of SC girls was higher than SC boys for standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
8. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC boys and ST girls for standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
9. There was significant different between mean weakness score of SEBC girls and SC boys in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that the weakness score of SEBC girls was higher than SC boys in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.

10. There was no significant different between mean weakness score of ST boys and general girls in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that weakness score of ST boys and general girls was equal in the subject of Gujarati.
11. There was no significant different between mean weakness score of ST boys and general boys in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that the weakness score ST boys and general boys was equal in the subject of Gujarati.
12. There was no significant different between mean weakness score of ST boys and SC girls of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that weakness score of ST boys and SC girls was equal in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
13. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of ST boys and ST girls of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that weakness score of ST boys and ST girls was equal in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
14. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of ST boys and SEBC girls of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
15. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score ST boys and girls of general category of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
16. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SEBC boys and boys of General category in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
17. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SEBC boys and SC girls in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.

18. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SEBC girls and SEBC boys in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
19. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SEBC boys and girls of General category of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated they were equal in their weakness score of standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
20. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score boys of general category and SC girls in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
21. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of boys of General category and ST girls in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
22. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of boys of general category and SEBC girls in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
23. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of boys of general category and girls of general category in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
24. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC girls and ST girls of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.

25. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC girls and SEBC girls of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
26. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC girls and girls of general category of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
27. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score ST girls and SEBC girls of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati for standard V.
28. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of ST girls and girls of general category in the subject of Gujarati for standard V. This indicated they were equal in their weakness score for standard V in the subject of Gujarati.
29. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score SEBC girls and girls of general category of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated they were equal in their weakness score in the subject of Gujarati of standard V.
30. There was significant difference between mean weakness score of boys and girls of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that weakness score of girls was higher than that of boys of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati.
31. There was no significant difference between average weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VI were equal in their weakness score of Gujarati subject.
32. There was no interaction between sex and caste on the weakness score of students of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati. This indicated that sex and caste jointly do not affect the weakness score of standard VI in the subject of Gujarati.

33. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of boys and girls of standard VII. This indicated that boys and girls were equal in their weakness score of standard VII in the subject of Gujarati.
34. There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VII. This indicated that SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VII were equal in the weakness score of Gujarati subject.
35. There was no interaction between sex and caste on the weakness score of students for standard VII. This indicated that sex and caste jointly do not affect the weakness score of Gujarati.

5.7.9 FINDINGS BASED ON ERRORS COMMITTED BY STUDENTS OF STANDARD V IN THE WRITING OF GUJARATI

1. SC girls (76 percent) committed more errors in marking of Avataran Chinh in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 60 per cent of students committed errors in marking of Avataran China.
2. SC girls (79 per cent) committed more errors in marking of full stop in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 71 per cent of students committed errors in marking of full stop in the sentences. (Purnaviram)

3. SC girls (76 per cent) committed more errors in exclamatory mark in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 60 per cent of the students committed errors in exclamatory mark. (Ashcharya Chinha)
4. SC girls (81 per cent) committed more errors in marking of comma in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 63 per cent of students committed errors in marking of comma. (Alpa Viram)
5. ST girls (85 per cent) and SC girls (87 per cent) committed more errors in writing spelling in syntax as compared to rest of the student and on an average 77 per cent of the students committed errors in writing spellings in syntax. (Vakya Rachana ma Jodani ni Bhulo)
6. ST girls (92 per cent) committed more errors in introduction of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing as compared rest of the students and on an average 82 per cent of the students committed errors in introduction of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing.
7. ST boys (86 per cent) and SC girls (85 per cent) committal more errors in syntax as compared to rest of the students and on an average 80 per cent of the students committed more errors in syntax.
8. SC boys and SEBC boys (86 per cent) committed errors in Anushwar as compared to rest of the students on an average 76 per cent of the students committed errors in Anushwara. (Nasal sound)
9. SEBC boys (91 per cent) committed more errors in effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing as compared to rest of the students on an average 81 per cent students committed errors in effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing.
10. SC girls (95 per cent) committed more errors of writing title of the story as compared to rest of the students and on an average 76 per cent of students committed errors of writing title of the story.

11. SEBC boys (85 per cent) committed more errors in the item of spellings as compared to rest of the students on an average 80 per cent students committed errors in spellings item.

5.7.10 FINDINGS BASED ON ERRORS COMMITTED BY STUDENTS OF STANDARD VI IN THE WRITING OF GUJARATI

1. General category boys (74 per cent) committed more errors in marking of Avataran China in the sentences as compared to rest of the students on an average 67 per cent of students committed errors in marking of Avataran China in the sentences.
2. ST girls (82 per cent) committed errors in marking full stop in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 72 per cent students committed errors of Full stop.
3. SEBC girls (80 per cent) committed more errors in marking of interrogation mark in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 68 per cent of students committed errors of interrogation mark.
4. General category of boys (86 per cent) committed errors of exclamatory marks in writing sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 60 per cent of students committed errors of exclamatory marks in writing sentences.
5. ST girls (93 per cent) committed errors of anushwara in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 76 per cent of students committed errors of Anushwara.
6. ST girls (82 per cent) committed errors of comma in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 67 per cent of students committed errors of comma in the sentences.

7. ST girls (92 per cent) committed more errors of spellings as compared to rest of the students and on an average 80 per cent of students committed errors of spellings.
8. ST girls (91 per cent) committed more errors of introduction of essay, story and letter writing as compared to rest of the students and on an average 82 per cent of students committed errors of introduction of essay, story and letter writing.
9. ST girls (97 per cent) committed more errors of logical sequence of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing as compared to rest of the students and on an average 82 per cent of students committed more errors of logical sequence of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing.
10. SC girls (86 per cent) committed more errors in syntax as compared to rest of the students and on an average 81 per cent of students committed errors in syntax.
11. ST girls (92 per cent) committed more errors in effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing as compared to rest of the students and on average 79 per cent of students committed errors in effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing.
12. SEBC girls (92 per cent) committed more errors on writing title of the story as compared to rest of the students and on an average 83 per cent of students committed errors on writing title of the story.

5.7.11 FINDINGS BASED ON ERRORS COMMITTED BY STUDENTS OF STANDARD VII IN WRITING GUJARATI

1. ST girls (78 per cent) and SEBC (78 per cent) girls committed more errors of Anushwara as compared to rest of the students and on an average 72 per cent of students committed errors of Anushwara.

2. General category of girls (84 per cent) committed more errors of Avtaran China as compared to rest of the students and on an average 61 per cent of students committed errors of Avtaran China.
3. General category of girls (74 per cent) committed more errors of marking exclamatory marks as compared to rest of the students and on an average 62 per cent of students committed errors of marking exclamatory marks.
4. General category of girls (77 per cent) committed more errors of full stop as compared to rest of the students and on an average 67 per cent of students committed errors of full stop.
5. ST girls (83 per cent) committed errors of spellings as compared to rest of the students and on an average 75 per cent of students committed errors of spellings.
6. General category of boys (75 per cent) committed more errors of comma as compared to rest of the students and on average 60 per cent of students committed errors of comma.
7. General category of boys (85 per cent) committed errors of interrogation mark in the sentences as compared to rest of the students and on an average 62 per cent of students committed errors of interrogation mark in the sentences.
8. ST boys (88 per cent) committed more errors in introducing essay, story and letter writing and on average 80 per cent of students committed errors in introducing essay, story and letter writing.
9. ST girls (88 per cent) committed more errors of logical sequence of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing and on an average 81 per cent of students committed errors in logical sequence of thoughts.
10. SC boys (89 per cent) committed more errors in syntax as compared to rest of the students and on an average 77 per cent of students committed errors in syntax.

11. SC boys (89 per cent) and ST girls (89 per cent) committed errors of writing title of the story and on an average 76 per cent students committed errors of writing the title of the story.
12. ST girls (79 per cent) committed errors in effect of dialect on story, letter and essay writing and on an average 75 per cent of students committed errors in effect of dialect on story, letter and essay writing.

5.8 CONCLUSIONS

The study dealt with Gujarati language teaching at upper primary level. The study stressed on the clarity of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of teachers, teaching procedure followed by the teachers, achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati, weakness of students in the subject of Gujarati, errors committed by students in writing Gujarati, relationship between achievement and weakness score of students in the subject of Gujarati of standard V, VI and VII.

With respect to clarity of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of teachers, it can be concluded that majority of the teachers were not aware of the objectives of teaching Gujarati enlisted by the Gujarati state Board of school text books, Gandhinagar. But after the reading the objectives from the appendix given along with the opinionnaire it was concluded that majority of the teachers were making efforts to develop various language skills viz.; listening, speaking, reading and writing.

The efforts to develop language skills were not adequate for writing and reading skills. The teachers even could not encourage students for independent writing, writing for magazines and periodicals (Hastalikhit Samaika). Similarly, for the development of reading skills, teachers could not provide reference books and other related literature for self study.

In the area of problem faced by teachers in teaching Gujarati, the study revealed that teachers themselves faced difficulties in pronouncing appropriate certain words and letters due to their family back ground and dialect which is not the same as that of students. The teachers found it difficult to make students write essay and letter writing especially in logical presentation of thoughts and appropriate punctuation marks. The teachers also found it difficult to make students apply knowledge related to thought expansion. However, teachers did not face difficulties in reading, writing and language aspects during the teaching of prose lesson. But they faced difficulties in teaching essay form of prose. As compare to grammar lessons and prose lessons, the teachers found it easy to teach poetry lessons. The teachers found that the content of text books of standard V, VI and VII was comprehensible for students, the poetry lessons were not recitable and hence could not arouse the interest of students. The teachers and students had to heavily depend upon textbooks for teaching and learning of Gujarati as the reference books and other related literature were not available in the schools.

With respect to teaching procedure followed by teachers while teaching Gujarati, it can be concluded that the teachers did not follow the systematic procedure of teaching, hence it means that they did not follow teaching methodology of language teaching. The teachers could not introduce the topic by citing appropriate illustration, not even introduced related to content to be taught. Even teachers could not introduce with keeping in mind the mental level of the students and they were also not able to retain interest during introduction of poetry and prose lessons. The model reading of prose lessons and recitation of poem lessons presented by teachers was not satisfactory. The teachers could not discuss the content with students and neither could initiate the discussion. As a result of this, the climate in the class was not lively. The teachers could ask only knowledge and understanding level questions but could not ask application level questions and hence the teachers could not provoke the thinking process in the mind of students. With respect to

poetry lessons, the teachers could not clarify the theme of poem and nor could they present the change mood of the poem. So, the students could not appreciate the beauty of poem. The home work given by teachers was a mere of repetition of class work, it was not creative and hence was not enjoyable by the students. This just added to their burden. However, with respect to teaching of Grammar lessons the teachers could use charts and flash cards which was interesting for students. The teacher used local language during their interaction with students. Though this approach is desirable, especially for teaching of languages it is always expected that teachers should make use of grammatically correct language.

When experts were asked to opine about the teaching of Gujarati, they expressed that the teaching of Gujarati is not carried in the expected manner. May be as a result of this, the students have not achieved the competence in Gujarati language. The experts revealed that the curriculum should take care of cultural value. According to experts the selection of prose and poetry lessons should be made in such manner that it would help students to develop scientific out look. While preparing text book, care should be taken to included simple and relevant information about teaching methodology to be adopted by teacher for different types of lessons. The experts also opined that an integrated approach should be adopted by teacher for different types of lessons. To develop in students various language skills and ultimately to raise the standard of language, the experts opined to organise the activities like: listening of various educational programmes on Radio/T.V., Story telling, Recitation of poem, thought of the day, news reading in school assembly, Action song competition, story, essay and letter writing, language antakshari, preparation of charts for identification of alphabets and correct spellings.

With respect to students evaluation in language, the experts emphasized that it has to be a continuous and comprehensive evaluation which focusing on evaluating the acquisition of language skills. The experts also opined to bring about necessary

modifications in the pre-service and in-service training programmes for the preparation of teachers as it was found traditional in nature.

With respect to achievement of students of standard V and standard VII, it can be concluded that mean achievement of boys and girls of standard V and VII was not significantly differ in the subject of Gujarati. So boys and girls were equal in mean achievement in subject of Gujarati. However, mean achievement of boys and girls of standard VI differ significantly in the subject of Gujarati so it can be concluded that mean achievement of girls was higher than their counter parts.

The Mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard V, VI, VII was not differ significantly in the subject of Gujarati. It can be concluded that SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students of standard V, VI and VII were equal in mean achievement of Gujarati subject.

The sex and caste do not affect jointly in mean achievement of students of standard V, VI and VII. It can be concluded that SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students were equal in their mean achievement in the subject of Gujarati.

With respect to weakness some of students of standard V and VII, mean weakness score of boys and girls was not differ significantly, So it can be concluded that mean weakness score of boys and girls were equal in the subject of Gujarati. However mean weakness score of students of standard VI differ significantly in the subject of Gujarati. So it can be concluded that weakness score of girls was higher than boys in the subject of Gujarati.

There was no significant difference between mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard VI and VII but mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard V differ significantly in the subject of Gujarati. So it can be concluded that mean weakness score of SEBC boys was higher than SC boys of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. Similarly mean weakness

score of SC girls of standard V and SEBC girls of standard V was higher than SC boys of standard V.

The sex and caste do not differ significantly in the mean weakness score of students of standard V, VI and VII. So, it can be concluded that mean weakness score of sex and caste was equal in the subject of Gujarati.

With respect to errors committed by students of standard V, VI and VII it can be concluded that majority of SC girls of standard V committed more errors in Avataran chinha, Purnaviram, astray chinha and Alpaviram in the subject of Gujarati. However, majority of ST girls of standard V committed more errors in comma, spellings, logical presentation of thoughts in story, essay and letter writing where as majority of ST boys and SC girls of standard V committed more errors in comma, spellings, logical presentation of thoughts in story essay and letter writing in the subject of Gujarati. While majority of ST boys and SC girls committed more errors in syntax and SC boys and SEBC girls committed more errors in anushwara for standard V. SEBC boys committed more errors in effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing, and in spellings. SC girls committed more errors in spelling items in the subject of Gujarati.

With regard to General categories of boys of standard VI committed more errors in Avataran chinha, exclamatory marks. While ST girls of standard VI committed more errors in the full stop, anushwara, comma, spellings, logical presentation of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing and thought expansion. Where as SC girls of standard VI committed more errors in syntax, ST girls of standard VI committed more errors in effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing. SEBC girls of standard VI committed more errors in title of the story in the subject of Gujarati.

With regarding to ST girls of standard VII committed more errors in anushwara, spellings, logical presentation of thoughts and effect of dialect on essay, story and letter writing in the subject of Gujarati. While General category of girls committed more errors

of Avtaran china, exclamatory marks and Full stop. General category of boys of standard VII committed more errors in comma, interrogative marks. Where as SC boys of standard VII committed more errors in syntax, writing of the title of the story and effect of dialect on story, essay and letter writing.

5.9 DISCUSSION

Language is the foundation of the curriculum, because the subject of curriculum are taught through the medium of language only. In classroom situation also it is only language which is the medium of instruction between teacher and taught. Language is taught as a subject and as a language. Hence it is concluded that language plays an important role in education. Therefore, language has been recognised as a compulsory subject right from the elementary stage.

Place of mother tongue is very important in the elementary stage. Most of the students learn other subject through medium of mother tongue. Four basic skills of language viz. listening, speaking, reading and writing influence the education of child. Teaching of Gujarati as a mother tongue starts from Grade I. In the lower primary stage (i.e. Grade I to Grade IV) emphasis is on development of four basic skills. These skills have to be further developed in upper primary (i.e. Grade V to Grade VII) here emphasis is not only on comprehension through reading and listening but also develop interest for reading. At upper primary stage students must be able to write essay, letter, stories prescribed in syllabus. It is also expected that through co-curricular activities, teachers must try to develop all four skills of mother tongue. Here activities such as debate, dictation, role-play, story telling and writing, listening to radio, television. are emphasised. At upper primary stage they are expected to learn and apply grammar in depth.

With respect to clarity of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of teachers who were teaching Gujarati subject, it has been found from the present study that the

teachers were not aware of the objectives of teaching Gujarati at the upper primary level as enlisted by Gujarat State School Textbook Board, Gandhinagar. Bhattacharjee (1984), arrived at a similar type of finding which reported that teachers were not clear about the objectives of teaching English language. This situation might have arisen due to the following reasons: inadequate pre-service and/or in-service training to the teachers, to abreast the knowledge and skills of teaching, non availability of syllabus documents which contains specification of objectives of teaching different school subjects, lack of interest on the part of teachers to acquire the update the available knowledge. It may be mentioned here that such a situation is never desirable as the lack of awareness of the objectives of teaching subject may lead to situation in which the teaching procedure and evaluation techniques adopted by teachers also may not be appropriate. It is an established fact that teaching procedure and evaluation technique are based on the objectives of teaching. So, it is most essential on the part of the teachers to have adequate knowledge regarding objectives of teaching, teaching procedure to be adopted for different objectives and the evaluation techniques. This can be ensured by taking proper care at the time of providing pre-service education to teachers. But many a times pre-service education programme can not fulfill all the requirements due to a variety of reasons. So, in-service education programme may be organized at a regular intervals and the teachers should be encouraged to attend such programmes, Along with this, workshops may be organized to give the teachers a training in objectives of teaching, teaching procedure and evaluation technique.

With respect to teaching procedure followed by teachers while teaching Gujarati subject, it was found that majority of the teachers of standard V could discuss prose and poetry lessons by explaining each and every line and half of the teachers of standard VI and VII could discuss by explaining each and every line of prose and poetry lessons. Many a times, teaching of language lessons by following such teaching procedures do not lead the students in understanding the theme of the lesson. The present study also revealed that

majority of the teachers of standard V, VI and VII could not provide knowledge about the style of poem, could not provide change mood of the poem, and majority of the teachers of standard V, VI and VII could not appropriately use skills of reading the prose lessons and reciting the poetry lessons. Majority of the teachers did not use audio visual aids at different stages of the lessons. This indicates that majority of the teachers of standard V, VI and VII may not follow proper teaching procedures. The studies of Sharma (1986), Khalique (1995), and Mishra (1969), also reported the similar type of findings. Sharma (1986), reported that teachers adopted faulty teaching method, Khalique (1995), also found that only translation method of teaching was employed by a majority of teachers. Khalique (1995), specifically found that seventy per cent of teachers employed translation method, twelve percent of teachers employed direct method while only eighteen percent of teachers employed structural approach for teaching of English language. Mishra (1969), found that more seventy five percent teachers used only translation method. This may be due to lack of knowledge adopting method for teaching language forms. It may also differs for prose lessons, poetry lessons, grammar lessons and composition lessons i.e. prose, poetry, or any other, the approach should differ for different kinds of lessons. For instance Urmi Kavya and Akhyana Kavya, two different kinds of poetry lesson may be taught different approaches. Similarly, Hashya pradhan Patha and Natika, two different kinds of prose lessons, may not be taught in similar way.. Bhattacharya (1970), stated that, "as such there is no clear cut method musical pattern of lines, appeal to young minds." Similarly Patel et al. (1992-93), observed that, "most of the teachers believe that teaching poetry is explaining poetry and in doing so the teacher converts the poetry into a prose."(Gadyanvaya) The present study also revealed that majority of the teachers of V, VI and VII did not use charts for explanation, models for new words and films strips for folk dances. Similarly, Bhattachajee (1984), and Khalique (1995), have found that though on the

one hand teachers appreciate the importance of teaching aids, on the other hand they did not use it. This may be due to lack of motivation on the part of teachers, lack of training in use of such teaching aids, non availability of the resources in the schools, if such teaching aids are available they may not be in operating condition. However, the use of teaching aids may always lead to better understanding of the instruction. Carderio (1995), supported this by stating, "teaching of poetry with new materials, techniques and strategies had been effective in control group." Keeping in mind the importance of use of teaching aids, they should be use optimally and in best possible way. Where ever such teaching aids are not available, the school administrator and the teachers may make efforts to prepare low cost teaching aids. For this the resources available in the community may be identified and utilised.

With respect to problems faced by the teachers, the present study revealed that majority of the teachers found difficulties in pronouncing words and letters appropriately due to their family background and dialect, all the teachers found difficulties in teaching owing to the students problems in writing, majority of the teachers found difficulties in explaining rules of punctuation marks during teaching of grammar, majority of the teachers found it difficult to make students write essay and letter writing especially in logical presentation of thoughts and appropriate punctuation mark. When the poetry lessons of the teachers were observed by the investigator, it was found that the teachers could not teach the poetry lessons in the expected manner. However, when the teachers were asked to opine about their ease of teaching among the three types of lessons viz., prose, poetry and grammar; they opined that poetry lessons were easy to teach as compared to prose and grammar lessons. It is supported by Mishra (1969), that teachers inability to teach either prose, poetry, grammar or composition lesson; teachers inability to inspire the students to speak correct pronunciations; teachers inability to inspire the students for general reading were some of the major factors responsible for the deterioration of the standards of Hindi,

English and Sanskrit languages. The problems faced by the teachers were either related to inability of teachers with regard to appropriate use of teaching procedure or inability of inability of teachers with regard to proper use of language or in ability of teachers to understand their students. As a result of such problems faced by the teachers, ultimately the standards of language teaching may be affected.

With respect to achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati, it has been found that achievement of the students in the subject of Gujarati was average. Similarly, Bhatt (1995), Kothari (1996), and Parmar (1998), also found that achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati was average. It may be noted here that, the average achievement of students in the subject of Gujarati may be due to lack of awareness of objectives of teaching Gujarati on the part of the teachers, the adoption of faulty methods of teaching, the problems faced by the teachers while teaching Gujarati especially in understanding the students and their difficulties. It may be also due to lack of facilities like library, audio visual aids, organisation of different co-curricular activities like Kavi sammelana, Language Quiz, Projects related to language and other Linguistic activities. Even in absence of such facilities, it is most essential on the part of teachers to have awareness of objectives of teaching Gujarati and adoption of proper teaching procedure as teachers teaching style has direct or indirect influence not only in the classroom but also on the achievement of the students.

With respect to identifying common errors committed by students in writing Gujarati, the present study revealed that majority of the girls committed more errors in Avataran Chinha, Purna viram, Alpaviram and majority of ST boys and SC girls committed errors in Syntax, Spellings and Logical presentation of thoughts. Similarly Nair (1966), Dave and Shah (1968), Joshi (1975), and Desai (1986), found that many students committed mistakes related to, correct spellings and punctuation marks other than Full stop

and Comma. Apart from these, Nair (1966), also found that the students faced many problems in written English with respect to verbs, punctuation, spellings and vocabulary. This might be due to ignorance of importance of language on the part of students, teachers, parents and the community at large. Nair (1966), and Dave and Shah (1968), found the following major causes of such errors: the lack of sufficient vocabulary, the ignorance of proper use of words in the sentences, the unsystematic teaching with regard to pronunciation, the non-availability of reading materials. The defective methods of instruction especially for teaching spellings, the poor reading habits of not only the students but the teachers too, the lack of awareness of the importance of the spelling, the wrong use of proposition and the use of irregular verbs. The close analysis of answer scripts, composition book, class work note book and homework note book by parents and teachers may help in reducing errors in writing Gujarati. On the other hand Mishra (1969), found that teachers faced difficulties in correcting the home work of students as teachers were over loaded with other activities of the school. In such a situation, it would be desirable on the part of teachers to concentrate more on the teaching learning process than the other activities. The school administrator should also insist more on the involvement of teachers and students in the curricular and co-curricular activities than the other activities. It may be due to teachers may not aware of punctuation marks, full stop, comma, anushwara. They may not get the practice of it in workshop.

The experts also revealed that teaching of Gujarati is not carried out in expected manner. So as a result of this, students have not achieved the competence in Gujarati language. Teachers might not be interested in developing language skills. In-service, pre-service education may be given in traditional manner.

With respect to weakness of students of standard V, VI and VII, it was revealed that mean weakness score of SEBC boys was higher than SC boys of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. Similarly, mean weakness score of SC boys of standard V and SEBC girls of

standard V was higher than SC boys of standard V. It may be due to SEBC boys, SEBC girls, SC girls were not being oriented for high weakness score in the subject of Gujarati. They may not be getting remedial programme in the school. While weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students of standard VI and standard VII were equal.

5.10 SUGGESTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

From the above findings and discussion, investigator would like to put forward few suggestions and implications.

Majority of the teachers were not familiar with objectives of teaching Gujarati at upper primary level. Hence it is suggested that Gujarat State Board of School Textbook should make the syllabus document containing the specification of objectives of teaching Gujarati at different levels of school education. It is also suggested that the text books which are prescribed by the Gujarat State Board Of School Textbook Board should also include the specification of objectives of teaching Gujarati at different levels of school education. It is suggested that the school principal should organize workshop to teaching Gujarati at different levels of school education.

Majority of the teachers could not introduce the topic related to the content to be taught, teachers could not cite examples not even express poet views, and teachers could not ask application level questions. Hence it is suggested that it should be made compulsory for the teachers to write the daily lesson plan and the school principal should ensure the execution of the planned lesson in a systematic manner. If require, the school principal may organized training programmes for the teachers of his/her school.

If was also observed by the investigator that majority of teachers could not use audio visual aids during prose lessons. So it suggested that school principal should make an arrangement to practical orientation for improvised audio visual aids and low cost teaching aids.

Over and above this, it is suggested that the education department of the state government should make it compulsory for all teachers to attend in service training programmes at regular interval (may be after every five year) which should be organized by DIET of respective district, while the DIET is organizing in-service programme for teachers, it should take care of including the topics like objectives of teaching different school subjects at different levels, recent trends in methodology in teaching different subjects, use of low cost and no cost teaching aids and appropriate techniques of evaluation.

With respect to common errors committed by students in writing Gujarati for standard V, VI, VII it was found that ST girls committed more errors in syntax, errors of comma, spellings, logical presentation of thoughts in essay, story and letter writing in the subject of Gujarati. ST boys, SEBC boys of standard V, VI, VII committed more errors on essay, story and letter writing due to their dialect. So it can be suggested that diagnostic and remedial approach should adopted which would help students in rectifying the errors. More and more composition writing may be given to students and this writing of students should be corrected regularly and accordingly the feed back should be provided to the students.

Majority of the experts commented that in-service programme was carried out in traditional way and not content based so it is suggested that activity based approach should be adopted in the programme. It is also suggested that while organizing such programmes a survey should be carried out for identification of the needs of participant teachers and the entire programme should focus on the identified needs. The such programme should also take care of making the programme interesting. For this, along with lectures by the eminent experts discussion, workshop, brainstorming, activity based session should be organized. The experts from among the teachers community should be identified and invited to share their expertise with the group.

It was opined by the experts that in the examination, weightage should be given to language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing skills at primary level and also workshop should be organised for development of language skills. It is also suggested that along with written examination, oral examination should also be given importance to take care of three of the four language skills listening, speaking, reading and writing.

With regard to achievement of students of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard V, VI and VII, it was found that the mean achievement of girls was higher than boys of standard VI but mean achievement of girls and boys was equal for standard V and VII while it was also found that mean achievement of SC, ST, SEBC and General categories of students of standard V, VI, VII was not significant. This may be due to lack of awareness about the methods of teaching and even use of inappropriate evaluation techniques. So, it is suggested that more orientation programmes needed for teachers for awareness of objectives of teaching Gujarati and teaching methodology aspects of Gujarati. As suggested earlier teachers should be made aware of objective, approaches for methodology to be adopted for different content area and use of appropriate techniques of evaluation through different programmes. Teachers should also be given training in setting better question papers. The reasons for low or average achievement of the students should be identified and discussed with the school principals and staff members and also should be reported to the parent. Appropriate strategy should be worked out by the students, teachers, school principals and the parents to raise the level of achievement of students.

With respect to weakness score of students of standard V, VI and VII in the subject of Gujarati, it was found that the mean weakness score of SEBC boys was higher than SC boys of standard V in the subject of Gujarati. Mean weakness score of SEBC boys was higher than SC boys and mean weakness score of SEBC girls was higher than SC boys of standard V. Mean weakness score of SC, ST, SEBC and General category of students of

standard VI and VII were equal in the subject of Gujarati. So, it is suggested the students of this group who have high weakness score should get remedial programme from the school.

It was also observed by the investigator that classes were found over crowded. With the informal talk with teachers it was also found that teachers have a very heavy work load and they are supposed to carry out other government duties, government task like census survey, election duties, national literacy camp. Hence it is suggested that government should ensure that primary school teachers should devote maximum time for instruction activities and should channelized all the efforts for the improvement of primary education. The Government should decide the upper limit regarding the number of students in a class and should ensure that this is strictly obeyed. The government should also taken care of proper and timely recruitment of teachers.

5.11 SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

On the basis of the present study, the investigator felt that more studies should be carried out in the area of not only Gujarati language teaching but also in the area of other languages. Some of the studies which could be undertaken and listed below:

- A study of Gujarati language teaching at different levels of school education.
- An investigation in to cause of negligence of Gujarati subject at higher secondary schools.
- A comparative study of teaching of mother tongue in upper primary schools of Gujarat state and other state.
- An analysis of Gujarati language textbooks of standard V, VI, VII.
- The study of achievement in language skills at primary level.
- Evolving a set of strategies techniques and materials to teach Gujarati poetry effectively at all level in Gujarati on the basis of try out and experimentation.

- An exploratory study of process of instruction in the languages carried out at all levels.
- A study of difficulties faced by students of standard V, VI and VII in learning of mother tongue and other subjects.
- A case study of students with low and high scholastic achievement in Gujarati at primary level.
- A study of factors affecting achievement in Gujarati.
- Construction and standardization of test to identify weakness of the students of different levels of school education in the subject of Gujarati.