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The role of course material is vital in terms of its normal day-to-day use in the teaching and learning of English. Therefore it is crucial to choose the best possible fit or develop good course materials for the context in question. This process often needs careful consideration of many factors, most crucial of all being that ‘the course materials’ must meet the ‘needs’ and capture the ‘interests’ of its learners (Rubdy, 2003) and at the same time provide opportunities for learning (Tomlinson, 2008). However, most material developers do this by incorporating ‘their’ own generalised notion of students’ needs (Tomlinson, 2008). At no point are students consulted during the design and/or selection or the evaluation/feedback process of a coursebook, although the coursebooks are primarily designed to serve ‘students’.

This research study aimed to discover children’s perceptions and experiences regarding their course materials as a foundation for learner involvement in development, selection and evaluation of learner-centred course materials. The prominent issues that emerged from the analysis are ‘overemphasis on writing skill in the coursebook’, ‘overemphasis on linguistic exercises’, ‘coursebook catering to limited learning styles’ and ‘disconnect between the word and the world of the students’. This study aims to help curriculum developers, publishers, authors, teachers and officials in making informed decisions regarding revision, selection and evaluation of coursebooks based on the needs and interests of children.

1. Background of the study

Although the coursebook is primarily designed to serve students, they play no role in any aspect of coursebook development or selection. This is reiterated in Tomlinson’s findings (2008:7) in a survey conducted in 12 countries across the world where he found that the administrators were responsible for 85 per cent of ELT textbook selection, teachers 15 per cent and learners 0 per cent. There is also very little reference to the students’ voice in explicit terms in popular frameworks designed by major figures in material development such as Littlejohn (1992) and Gray (2006).

Although this gap was identified by researchers such as Wright (1987) and Clarke (1989) and reiterated later on by Swales (1992), Saraceni (2003) and Tomlinson and Masuhara (2010), who advocate the inclusion of learners in the process of material selection and adaptation, research that has successfully explored this gap in depth is relatively scarce.
McGrath (2006) and Tomlinson (2003) are among the few who focus on learners in their material studies. McGrath’s study (ibid) compares Hong Kong teachers’ and students’ metaphors and similes about secondary school coursebooks. He uses a quantitative approach in order to reveal subconscious beliefs and attitudes of secondary school students towards coursebooks. In Tomlinson’s (2003) study, a localised generalised textbook project in Namibia, secondary school students, teachers and administrators were consulted before, during and after the materials writing process.

The reason for the neglect of students’ voices is primarily due to the attitudes and beliefs of writers and educators who believe they know more than the students about ‘how they learn’ and ‘what they need to learn’ (Cook-Sather, 2002), thus resulting in coursebooks being designed or selected based on the adult notion of how materials should be conceptualised and practised. Tomlinson (2008) explains that these generalised needs at times can contradict the real needs of learners (as they are based on adult perspectives) in which case the coursebook can contribute to the failure of the learners to acquire competence in English as learners only learn what they really need or want to learn.

These beliefs and attitudes are most often products of social constructs. Most societies, even today, continue to value children for their future potential and in the process often devalue their present perspectives and experiences (Greene and Hogan, 2006:3). In this research we view children as social actors in their own right as they ‘act, take part in, change and become changed by the social and cultural world they live in’ rather than as being in the process of becoming an adult (Christensen and Prout, 2002: 481). This research perspective builds on the ‘UN Convention on the Rights of the Child’ (General Assembly, 1989) recommendation, that children should be informed, involved and consulted about all activities that affect their lives. Some argue that ‘there is no device for inquisiting the child, which can tell us what the child thinks’ (Stainton-Rogers and Stainton-Rogers, 1992:17) and Greene and Hill state that ‘our understanding will always be partial and imperfect’ (2006:18). Nevertheless, it is crucial that we listen to children’s voices as ‘social actors’ in their ‘own right’ as we have for too long taken them for granted and assumed we know what is good for them and how events impact them.

2. Research objectives and questions

Dendrinos (1992:142) states that learner centeredness promotes ‘conditions for learning’ rather than focusing on the content to be taught. Therefore, the research specifically aims to answer the following questions:

1. What do children perceive to be challenging, interesting, limiting and /or essential in their coursebook?
2. What ‘conditions of learning’ can facilitate effective English language learning (ELL)?

3. Methodological approaches with children

Listening to students’ voices in order to explore their perspectives and needs requires careful methodological consideration. Davie (1993:252) states that ‘the child should be asked and consulted in a way and at a level which is commensurate with their conceptual ability and development’. For instance, the language used in the research should not impose any linguistic demands on the child participant. Also, issues such as power relations, consent and ethics should be given utmost consideration while researching with children.

3.1. Context

Thirty seventh grade students (14 boys and 16 girls) of a school in Karnataka (India) took part in this study. The majority of the students in this class are first generation learners. The students are 12 years old and have been learning English from first grade onwards.

3.2. Quantitative methods

Questionnaires can prove to be a good way of finding out about children’s attitudes, and furthermore they can be designed to cover
exactly the areas the researcher is interested in (Greig, Taylor and MacKay, 2007:125). Thus, a questionnaire seemed appropriate to start investigating the area of my interest i.e. ‘What do children perceive to be challenging, interesting, limiting and/or essential in their coursebook?’ The questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was designed to yield what students think, their attitudes, opinion, beliefs, interests and values regarding their coursebook. The questions were mostly attitudinal questions (Dörnyei, 2007).

The language in the questionnaire was carefully drafted so as to not impose any linguistic demands on the students. It is often seen that children answer oddly formed questions, however baffling (Hughes and Greive, 1980, Blades and Spencer, 2001) therefore skewing the data. Loaded questions were hence avoided and/or framed in a simple manner from the children’s point of view. Care was taken not to readily reveal any expected answers while framing the questions as it is seen that children often provide responses to please adults, especially when they do not understand the activity (Pinter, 2006).

The entire questionnaire used visual elements in an attempt to make it more children friendly. Visual elements often clarify meaning and at the same time can reduce the pressure of reading and writing (Pinter, 2006:215). The questionnaire was printed in colour to make the information more visually attractive for the students. Drawings of children dressed in their school uniforms were used to contextualize and personalise the questionnaire. The standard ‘Likert scale’ commonly used in research with adults to measure attitudes was simplified by using smiley face expressions to probe for students feelings about their course book.

In addition to questions that used an attitudinal scale, different types of questions that required the students to rank, colour and write were also used in order to break the monotony of the type of questions and capture students’ interests as it is seen that children dislike repetitive tasks and have shorter concentration spans (Kellett and Ding, 2004). The questionnaire was designed to take no longer than thirty minutes to complete and contained a total of twenty questions (see Appendix 1). Because of the students’ limited language to express themselves clearly through writing, the dominant type of question was closed. The closed questions were particularly used to elicit students’ attitudes towards their coursebook, whereas open ended questions were used to allow students to express themselves freely about what they liked and disliked in their coursebook as well as how they wished their dream textbook to be like.

3.2.1 Format of the questionnaire

*First page:* A brief about the Children’s Act (Flutter and Rudduck, 2004). As Westcott and Littleton remind us: ‘It is easy to forget that children may rarely be spoken to, or seriously listened to, unless they have done something wrong’ (2006:141). Therefore, this section was used to make students aware of their rights and also convey that what they had to say would be taken seriously.

This was followed by two questions to elicit how many students were aware of the Children’s Act and the next question to find out if they have been consulted previously in matters that affect them directly.

*Second page:* The second page contained the opening greetings with my photograph and described the purpose of the study. A photograph was used again to emphasise the questionnaire. In the opening greeting I introduced myself as follows:

‘*I am trying to learn more about how textbooks should be.*’

Here I was trying to break the power imbalance by introducing myself as a researcher doing an academic project at a school. Then a hypothetical situation was used in order to explore the research question i.e. ‘What do children perceive to be challenging, interesting, limiting and/or essential in their coursebook?’

Students were asked to imagine that the people who make the textbooks wanted to change their English textbook as they have realised that it
is important to know ‘what students want their
English textbook to be like’ and that I was their
messenger.

This was done to contextualize the whole
questionnaire and empower the students.

Third page: This page contained the instructions
and the questionnaire items. The instructions did
emphasise that there were no right and wrong
answers to the questions.

Exploring perceptions and views with students,
especially using a questionnaire, has limitations,
as it can reduce complex constructs to a set
of measurable activities or events (Harrison,
2010:150). Therefore, it is very difficult to gain
comprehensive data about a participant’s
perspective by using questionnaires alone
(Dörnyei, 2007).

3.3 Qualitative methods

With a commitment to gaining a clearer
understanding of the perceptions and social
constructions of children and young people,
the use of participatory techniques falls within
qualitative/interpretive methods of research (Hart
and Tyrer, 2006). A core principle of participatory
research is to facilitate the process of ‘knowledge
production’ and to involve the participants in the
interpretation and analysis of that knowledge, as
opposed to ‘knowledge gathering’ as is the case
with methods such as surveys and checklists
(Veale, 2006), in the process overcoming the
limitation of reductionism that quantitative
research methods often impose.

Participatory techniques were chosen for their
data of communication, as they do not heavily
rely on literacy skills like reading and writing but
place a greater emphasis on the power of visual
representation of ideas (O’Kane, 2008:129). In
addition, conversations, as O’Kane states, are
one of the means for acquiring good data as a
basis for policy oriented work (2008:122), which
was the case in this research i.e. designing a
coursebook as per learners’ needs.

Creative and flexible methods such as storytelling,
child led discussions, photography (Clark and
Moss, 2001), drama, drawings and completing
charts are used to serve as constructivist tools in
participatory research (Veale, 2006). Qualitative
approaches involving focus groups interviews
and participatory tools that included charts,
photography and child-led discussions were used
to obtain in depth and rich descriptions.

3.3.1 Participatory activity 1: ‘Put in on a Post-
it’
The aim of this activity was to stimulate rich
discussions and get in-depth answers to questions
11 and 12, i.e. what students liked and disliked
in their coursebook and why. At the same time,
this approach allowed for consensual, dissenting
and conflicting perspectives to emerge regarding
their likes and dislikes. Coloured post-it notes
were used in this activity to explore students’ likes
and dislikes about the coursebook. Conforming
to the principles of participatory research, the
choice of how and with whom they wanted to
do the activity was open to the students. This
was one of the steps to break down the power
imbalance between the student participants and
me i.e. the adult researcher (O’Kane, 2008). The
students chose to work in two groups, boys and
girls. Each group was asked to pick a chart sheet
and post-its to write and/or draw about what
they liked and disliked about their coursebook
respectively. Coloured post-it notes were written on post-its by me and given to
respective groups. Students were asked to come
together round the sheets to look at everybody’s
responses, leading to a discussion.

3.3.2 Participatory activity 2: ‘Mosaic approach
using camera and post-its’
It was evident from students’ responses in
the questionnaire and discussions in the ‘put
it on a post-it’ activity that their coursebooks
did not quite cater to their needs or learning
styles. However, these methods did not reveal
what exactly students wanted their dream
textbook to be like (except for question 20 in
the questionnaire). Therefore, a combination of a
‘Mosaic approach’ and post-it activity was used
to explore what students wanted their dream
coursebook to contain and look like. The Mosaic approach (Clark and Moss, 2011) is an integrated approach which combines visual data (here we use photographs) with verbal input. Not all students are good at expressing their thoughts by speech alone. Taking this into consideration, this approach was chosen as it does not heavily rely on their speaking skills.

There are two stages in the Mosaic approach:

**Stage one: Children and adults gathering the documentation.**
Photographs clicked by children were chosen for the recording process as cameras are a medium which appeal to children and can provide a form of communication that is fun (Clark and Moss, 2011:23). Students were provided with three different well-known global and local coursebooks and storybooks in order for them to experience what other coursebooks are like. These books were mainly picked as they contained authentic texts, attractive layouts, and interactive activities. The purpose was to give students a snapshot of how other coursebooks were structured and not to model better coursebooks. For the ‘documentation’ process students were asked to take turns and capture photographs of pages that interested them in the materials given. Each group spent a considerable amount of time discussing what they wanted to adopt from the coursebooks.

**Stage two: piecing together information for dialogue, reflection and interpretation.**
In the second stage, the ‘put it on a post-it activity’ was used again for constructing meaning and interpreting the photographs. Each group explained their photographs and summarised what they wanted in their dream coursebook using five post-its each (see Appendix 2). At the end of the activity, all the post-its were stuck on one chart and this summarised what students wanted in their new ‘dream coursebook’.

All the activities provided a source of data in themselves generating discussion through which students’ experiences, needs and definitions could be explored (O’Kane, 2008; Hill, 2006).

4. Results and discussion

The dialogues around the participatory activities (which were transcribed) and the participatory materials generated from the activities (charts and photos), were carefully analysed for patterns and classified under themes. These themes were predominantly derived from the data generated from the participatory activities as opposed to data from the questionnaire in an attempt to avoid investigator’s bias. The questionnaire data was inserted into Microsoft Office Excel 2007 and coded according to the objectives of each question. The results of the questionnaire are interwoven with data from participatory activities to get a better understanding of the issue being analysed.

Table 1: Session outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outline of the session:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• students arrived at the library (the place was negotiated beforehand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ice breaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• setting positive ground rules – these rules were co-constructed by negotiation to ensure a smooth session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• obtaining recording permission from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activity 1: Put it on a Post-it: Likes and Dislikes activity; to explore what students liked and disliked about their coursebook followed by discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activity 2: a combination post-it activity and mosaic approach (capturing photos of pages in the coursebooks provided) was used to explore what students wanted their dream coursebook to contain and look like followed by a discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Activity versus exercises

In this section, data from the questionnaire (questions 4 and 20), transcripts of dialogues during participatory activities 1 and 2 and the pictures taken are combined for analysis. Question 4 aimed to find if the student’s coursebook contained what students like doing in their English class. Eight out of 21 checked ‘never’, two checked ‘rarely’, six of them checked ‘sometimes’, two checked ‘I can’t decide’ and three checked ‘yes’ (Figure 1).

**During Activity 1 []:** indicates utterances that overlapped.

**Girls**
Deepika: Nothings is mentioned about what children should do. All teachers are deciding no?
Tanuja: Hmm.
Sujatha: Hey no activities.
Tanuja: Yes no pair work or group work.
Deepika: That only I told no nothing is mentioned in that.
Tanuja: And ..aah this book contains no games like which we can find out as Imystery
Deepika: [like crossword and all Akka.
Me: They don’t have?

**Boys**
Puneeth: In the lessons there must be activities.
Vineeth: Exercise should be less and activities more.
Me: What is the difference?
Rahul: Activity means a group Akka, they will make a group. They will ask one person what is that, why does he feel like this.

**Akka** translates to older sister in south Indian languages.

When asked ‘What’s the difference between activity and exercise?’ the girls responded as follows:

Deepika: Activity which makes us [play
Sujatha: [Like playing Akka like games it is.
Sujatha: Exercises means writing, choose the correct answer, correct the following, something like that.
Me: Can we mix activities and exercises?
Tanuja: Yes Akka.
Me: How?
Deepika: Like ahh riddle like questions.

**Figure 1:** Activity versus exercises: Q 4: Does the English textbook have activities that you like doing?
Students felt their coursebook featured far more ‘language practice exercises’ than ‘language use activities’ (that had pair or group work). The emphasis was mainly on ‘questions and answers’ and ‘grammar exercises’. Students wanted activities as opposed to language practice exercises. Tomlinson (2008:5) states that ‘practice activities which have been designed to give the learner frequent opportunities to get something right, make very little contribution to language acquisition because they don’t add anything new nor make any contribution to language development’. This, he explains, is because such exercises often focus on accurate outputs rather than successful outcomes. Tomlinson goes on to say that these forms of exercises often create an illusion of language learning by using the Presentation/Practice/Production (PPP) approach, which is true in the case of their textbook where linguistic items are presented followed by exercises to facilitate practice and production of those items.

Masuhara and Tomlinson (2008) also note that exercises that follow the PPP approach often have little or no creative input on the part of the learners and do little to facilitate authentic language skills. Tomlinson (2008:3) states that ‘ELT materials currently make a significant contribution to the failure of many learners of English by focusing on the teaching of linguistic items rather than on the provision of opportunities for acquisition and development.’ Therefore, what the coursebook ought to do is provide opportunities for the learners to use language in the form of interesting and fun activities to achieve intentions rather than focusing on linguistic exercises.

4.2 Overemphasis on the writing skill

In this section, data from the questionnaire (questions 2 and 12) and transcripts of dialogues during participatory activities 1 and 2 are combined for analysis. Question 2 was set to examine if all the four skills reading, writing, listening and speaking were dealt equally in the course book. Although nine out of 21 reported ‘all skills were deal equally’, seven of them reported the course book focused mainly on ‘writing skill’. Three checked ‘reading skill’ and the rest of them reported they were unable to decide as there was no clear demarcation of the skill being focused on at any point in the coursebook. However, the skill area that drew most comments from the students in the questionnaire (open ended questions) as well as in the participatory activities was writing. Students reported that the coursebook overemphasised the writing skill.

Rahul: More writing.
Me: You dislike more writing?
Rahul: Yes Akka.
Me: Do you think there is more writing?
Puneeth: [Yes Akka
Rahul: [Yes Akka full hand will pain Akka.
Vineeth: There is no listening activities.
Me: There are no listening activities?
Sujatha: In our textbook it’s not there Akka.
When asked ‘Why there was no or very little speaking or listening activities?’ the students’ response was as follows:
Vineeth: Because there is more of writing Akka.
Me: Why do you think there is more writing?
Vineeth: It will be in the record no Akka, that’s why.
Me: Ahhh, it’s going to be in record so teachers can see what you are. Speaking and listening teachers cannot see?
Vineeth: Yes Akka.
Me: Can you give me a solution as to how teachers can know that your speaking and listening

[also..]
Deepika: [Like one recorder Akka.
Deepika: If Akka asks a question, Akka can on the recorder and if we need to tell one answer she can record everyone’s.
Me: May be recorder will be a good thing?
Deepika: Yes she can show it to Akka or any principal.

One of the students reported the reason writing was stressed over listening or speaking was because writing could be recorded (a record in the form of notes that teachers can produce to the concerned authorities) whereas speaking and listening activities often went unnoticed. Students suggested using a recorder to record speaking and listening sessions in the class as a possible solution. The discussion here raises the question of accountability. As Hutchinson and Torres (1994) state: ‘Although only teachers, learners, and material may actively participate in the classroom, they are not the only parties to the interactions’. They explain that there are other stakeholders involved like education authorities, school owners and parents, who may not only want to know what is being done in the class but may also influence what is taught in the classroom in terms of content and methodology. This is reiterated by

### Table 1: Things I ‘Dislike in my textbook’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number given to identify each questionnaire</th>
<th>Dislikes (written by students)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Writing is the main thing I dislike in my textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Question and answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The lesson with too many writing exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>More writing exercises and no activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I dislike the writing exercises of the textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The stories should be small and brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>In the textbook the stories are very long and it’s boring. It should be short, understandable and more attracting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>More of writing activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There many writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>More question answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Many big question answers and more exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have more writing work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poems are written by adults all the time. Students can also write better poems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don’t like there a long story which make me sleep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Long stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Too many words that I cannot understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Too much grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I dislike some poems in my textbook</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tomlinson who explains that books often focus on teaching linguistic items rather than on provision of opportunities for acquisition and development because that is what teachers are expected or required to do by administrators, by parents and by publishers (Tomlinson, 2008). Therefore, we have two conflicting views here i.e. students’ perspectives and those of adults.

Question 12 was an open ended question, where students were asked to write about anything that they disliked about their textbook. Table 2 lists the responses of all 21 students.

It is clear from their responses that most of them ‘disliked’ the textbook for its ‘overemphasis on writing exercises.’

**4.3 Preferred learning style**

In this section data from the questionnaire (questions 5 and 6) and transcripts of dialogues during participatory activities 1 and 2 as well as pictures are put together for analysis. Question 5 was aimed at exploring students’ learning styles.

Students could choose more than one activity type/learning method. Each type of activity/learning method was carefully matched (see Table 3) to a learning style (Tomlinson, 2003). Different learners learn in different ways and as Tomlinson states (ibid) the ideal materials should aim to provide all these ways of acquiring a language for the learners to experience and sometimes select from. Learning styles include:

- thinking mathematically: Logical
- looking at pictures and colours: Visual/spatial
- studying things in their natural world: Naturalistic
- being with others: Interpersonal
- playing and doing sports: Kinaesthetic
- listening to and telling stories: Linguistic/verbal
- listening to music: Musical/rhythmical
- having time to be alone and think: Intrapersonal

**Figure 2:** Learning Styles: Q 5: I like learning by ...
The majority of the students preferred ‘Naturalistic’, ‘Kinaesthetic’ and ‘Auditory’ learning styles (see Figure 2). Reid (1987) conducted a similar survey of 1388 students, aimed at identifying preferred sensory learning styles and found that most ESL learners have strong kinaesthetic learning style preferences. However, an analysis of any major coursebook series shows that although the auditory and visual sides of learners are catered for, there is rarely any opportunity for learners to receive kinaesthetic input (Tomlinson, 2003:90). Reid’s findings (ibid) are in line with the findings in Question 5, where one of the most preferred learning styles was kinaesthetic. The textbook however catered mostly to the auditory learners and did little for the kinaesthetic and naturalistic learners. These observations justify students’ responses in Question 6, which investigated if the coursebook catered to students’ preferred learning style. Nine out of 21 (see Figure 3) checked ‘never’ (the majority), three said ‘rarely’ and six said ‘sometimes’.

Rahul: Nothing about sports in this Akka.

Tanuja: We want to go out like a picnic.

Sujatha: Like museum Akka.

Me: So you want to .......

Sujatha: Like they should give us to research Akka like in Google.

Deepika: Like project work Akka.

Me: Ok.

Rahul: They should have more about sports Akka.

Vineeth: Yes Akka.

Materials ideally should take into account that learners differ in learning styles’ (Oxford and Anderson, 1995). It is also true that no ‘one’ coursebook can cater to all the individualistic learning styles every time. However, a single, centralised and highly structured textbook can be dangerous, as it may lead to the de-skilling of teachers (Littlejohn, 1992), where the teacher becomes little more than a follower of a prepared script.

A possible solution is that the coursebook writers should be looking at developing materials that allow local input to be added (Kuo, 1993) as and when needed, thus helping teachers in facilitating

![Figure 3: Learning styles: Q 6: Does the textbook allow you to learn in the way you like and/or wish to learn?](image-url)
the most appropriate learning styles of their students. A teacher in a local situation is in a better position to cater to her learners’ needs than a global textbook writer, who may never meet the local teacher’s class, and can only make a guess at the needs of the learners’ (Dendrinos, 1992).

4.4 Connecting the word with the world
Students also felt that they could not connect the learning from the texts in the classroom to their own life outside the classroom. For this reason students preferred personalised activities that facilitate opportunities for self-expression and connect their world with the word. Students also strongly felt that the coursebook should contain ‘real’/’authentic’ photographs of events that have occurred instead of using ‘illustrations’.

During the participatory activity 1 (dislikes chart) the girls’ group had the following discussion while I was with the boys’ group.

Sujatha: Hey the moral ya.
Deepika: There are no morals only...
Sujatha: There are!
Deepika: Where?
Sujatha: Messages.
Deepika: Messages are there...
Tanuja: It is messages related to the stories, I want messages related to real life. What is happening in real life?
Sujatha: Like solving problems?
Tanuja: Like telling stop child labour, like street performance.
Sujatha: Hey they had no, we had in...
Tanuja: Which?
Sujatha: Anitha Akka’s class... (In Grade 6)
Tanuja: Ok.
Sujatha: The women carrying water (referring to a poem).
Tanuja: Only one in the whole textbook, I want more...

Tanuja was looking for the coursebook to provide content that she could connect to. She also insists that the messages in the text should be applicable to real life i.e. authentic texts. She mentioned that the messages in the coursebook were applicable to stories and had little relevance to ‘real life’ situations. This finding was in agreement with one of the many theories Tomlinson states on ‘learning and teaching’ that ‘the most important thing that learning materials have to do is to help the learner to connect the learning experience in the classroom to their own life outside the course’ (2003:18). Delpit (2010) states that if children (of the minority) are to effect the change which will allow them to truly progress we must insist on ‘skills’ within the context of critical and creative thinking that are meaningful.

However, one should be aware that no one coursebook can possibly relate directly to each learner’s life considering diversity in experiences, events and environment outside school. This is when, as McGrath notes, the process of adaption and the teachers’ competence in managing that process becomes highly essential (2002). ‘Adaption’ as McDonough and Shaw put it: ‘Is to maximise the appropriacy of teaching materials in context, by changing some of the internal characteristics of a coursebook to better suit particular circumstances’ (1993: 85).

5. Findings
A summary of key findings is presented below.

- Students felt their coursebook material should facilitate opportunities for them to use the language in the form of interesting and fun activities rather than focusing on ‘linguistic exercises’.
- Students reported that their coursebook overemphasised writing as compared to listening and speaking.
- The present coursebook did not cater to learners’ varied learning styles.
- There is a disconnect between the word and the world of the students.
6. Overall learning and limitation

This study has left me convinced that children are not passive consumers. They actively think about materials and can voice their perspectives if the appropriate language and methods are used. In this study I have focused on learners that were accessible to me. I am aware that the input of these participants alone cannot wholly capture the story of the coursebook. The views of teachers, curriculum developers, publishers, authors remain unexamined and will result in a whole new journey.

7. Recommendations

As Lansdown (2001:5) states ‘most countries of the world share in common a concern, to raise standards and improve educational opportunities for children and yet few take the trouble to find out from children what works in terms of developing their strategies for learning and positive behaviour’. Teachers and curriculum developers need to find ways to engage in regular, systematic, school-based research with learners regarding their coursebooks. These ways can help both learners and adult stakeholders (teachers, curriculum developers, publishers and authors) negotiate and co-construct meaning together that will result in a more inclusive coursebook. Also, giving learners a more contributory role can serve to make existing materials more relevant and motivating for the learners.

There is a need for coursebook developers to be sensitive to and cater for differences in learning styles of students. This may be achieved by providing opportunities for adaptation in the coursebook by the teachers and hence not assuming that all learners can benefit from the same approaches, content or learning styles.
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1. Introduction

In a long-term endeavour such as learning a language, motivation needs to be sustained over many years and effort expended outside the classroom as well as inside. For many successful learners, the source of that motivation, at least initially, is an inspiring teacher they had at school; for others, the lack of such a teacher may be one of the primary reasons for their failure. Teacher Educators, therefore, need to know what kind of pedagogic behaviour can inspire learners in this way and one way of finding out is to ask learners to reflect on their past experience and, if possible, to recall and describe a teacher who inspired them in their English studies. By analysing and categorising the learner responses, it becomes possible to identify the characteristics which are associated with inspiring English teaching.

The research reported here builds on a previous British Council-funded project which targeted inspiring English teachers in the state school systems of China and Indonesia (Lamb, 2013, Lamb and Wedell, 2013). This project found that inspiring language teaching seemed to have common elements in the two countries, but that there were also significant differences which reflected features of their national and educational cultures. The aim of this project therefore was to see whether inspiring teachers of English in parts of India exhibit similar or different characteristics to those in China and Indonesia.

2. Context

English is taught from Class I in the schools of Chandigarh, Punjab and Haryana. English teachers are selected through a written entrance test and interview. They all need to have a teaching degree such as a BEd. However, according to various reports, standards of English are particularly low in this area of India. While infrastructure is generally of a good quality, the Chandigarh Union Territory ranks lower in English language ability compared to the national average (National Achievement Survey Class 5). One of the reasons is that the primary teachers are generally Social Studies teachers not specifically trained to teach English, though in the BEd courses they would have taken English as one of their teaching subjects. Furthermore, even if they are familiar with methods of teaching English to some extent, this skill is not implemented in their day to day classes. That there is need for change is universally accepted; however, there has not been much improvement in the teaching/learning scene.

In the experience of the first author, one of the redeeming features of the Indian education system is the English teacher. It is often seen...
that if an English teacher has the qualities of an inspiring teacher, the learners learn the language better. In fact, they move forward towards overall excellence in their school, and life in general. While some of the impact of teachers on pupils will always be personal and idiosyncratic, we may be able to identify particular behaviours or features of personality which have a positive impact on learner motivation, and this motivated our research here. We hope that by sharing the results with teachers or teacher training institutes, they will be able to perform better in the classroom and bring some positive change.

3. Literature review

As Lamb (2016) suggests, the study of second language (L2) motivation can be divided into two broad types: that which focuses on what the individual learner brings to class, and that which focuses on what happens inside the classroom. It is fair to say that the majority of empirical research has been about the former; that is, trying to understand the nature of learners’ own motivation (for a recent review, see Boo, Ryan and Dörnyei, 2015). Much less attention has traditionally been given to the impact of the classroom on the learner’s motivation, and in particular what role is played by the teacher and their methodology, and this has probably limited the impact of L2 motivation research on pedagogy (Ushioda, 2013). Fortunately, there are signs that this is changing, and a recent review article (Lamb, in press) cites over 200 articles dedicated to exploring the effects of teaching on language learner motivation, most of them published since the turn of the century. What follows is a brief description of this research and the knowledge base that it is building.

3.1. Motivational teaching strategies

A central strand of this research is that on motivational strategies. These are defined as teaching techniques used ‘to consciously generate and enhance student motivation, as well as maintain ongoing motivated behaviour and protect it from distracting and/or competing action tendencies’ (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011: 103). Dörnyei’s (2001) taxonomy of 35 macro-strategies and 108 micro-strategies was organised on a temporal basis, on the premise that teachers needed first to create the basic motivational conditions (e.g. by appearing knowledgeable, and developing good relations with them), then generate initial classroom motivation in learners (e.g. by setting appropriate goals and discussing course content with them), then to maintain and protect the motivation in class (e.g. by giving interesting tasks, or adding humour to lessons), and finally to encourage positive retrospective self-evaluation (e.g. by making appropriate assessments and giving useful feedback).

Several research studies have set out to validate this list of strategies, by investigating whether they are recognised as useful by teachers and learners in different contexts (e.g. Cheng and Dörnyei, 2007, Ruesch, Bown and Dewey, 2012), and whether they actually promote learner motivation in practice (Guilloteaux and Dörnyei, 2008; Papi and Abdollahzadeh, 2012; Wong, 2014). Results suggest that there are many motivational strategies with universal applicability. For example, learners and teachers in all contexts recognise the motivational value of the teacher ‘setting a good example’ with their personal behaviour, promoting healthy teacher-student relations and providing interesting lessons, though the way this should be done will differ from context to context. Other strategies have been found to be more valued in some contexts than others; for instance, ‘offering rewards’ was found to be highly rated by Chinese school teachers (Wong, 2014), but has not been identified as motivationally important in other educational contexts. In the most ambitious research to date, Alrabai (2016) trained Saudi Arabian teachers in a set of motivational strategies, observed their classes over a ten-week course and measured their impact on learner motivation and achievement. He found that the strategies did have a beneficial effect on the learners’ classroom behaviour and that this lead to gains in L2 competence compared to learners in a control group.

3.2. Theoretically-inspired interventions

Other research into motivational teaching has been conducted through the lens of a particular theory. To take two prominent examples, self-determination theory (Ryan and Deci, 2000)
posits that teachers who adopt an ‘autonomous’ teaching style will motivate learners more effectively than those adopt a ‘controlling’ style. An autonomous style implies recognising learners’ innate psychological need to feel competent at the subject, to feel related to other people, and to feel that they are doing it for themselves (i.e. feel autonomous). A handful of empirical studies have shown that teachers who incorporate these values in their teaching do successfully motivate their learners (Noels, 2001; Pae and Shin, 2011). Most recently, Dörnyei’s (2009) L2 motivational selfsystem has inspired researchers to investigate whether teachers can motivate learners through building their ‘ideal L2 selves’ – that is, their vision of themselves using the language in the future, with the assumption being that the more detailed and salient the future images and the more they are accompanied by action plans, the more likely it is that learners will put concerted effort into learning the L2 inside and outside the classroom (see Hadfield and Dörnyei, 2013). Studies suggest that this is indeed an important motivational tool for teachers (Magid and Chan, 2012; Sampson, 2012).

3.3. Demotivating teaching

While research is demonstrating that teachers can deliberately enhance their pupils’ motivation, it has also found that the reverse is true: they can damage their pupils’ motivation, sometimes irreparably. Many learners of English actually begin studying in school with high hopes – they do recognise the value of English for their future lives – but then find their motivation gradually eroded by what happens in their English lessons (Lamb, 2007). In developing countries, there are often structural features of the education system, such as very large class sizes, poor resources and low teacher pay, which impact negatively on both teacher and learner motivation (Bennell and Akyeampong, 2007). But in other well-resourced education systems, it is often aspects of teaching methodology that undermine learner motivation, such as boring and monotonous classes based on a knowledge-oriented approach to learning, which do not take learners’ own interests or identities into account (Falout et al., 2009).

3.4. Recognising complexity

Valuable as this research is, much of it adopts a somewhat simplistic view of the teaching-learning process, where ‘motivation is the product in a chain of cause and effect’ (Ushioda, 2007:23). While it is no doubt beneficial for novice teachers to be made aware of potential strategies for motivating learners, it should never be assumed that the deployment of a particular strategy or technique will generate motivation to learn. Rather, individual or group motivation will tend to emerge over time, through the dynamic interaction of teachers and learners and multiple other contextual factors, and this process is not always predictable. In particular, we need to recognise that there is a critical difference between “motivating students” and “developing their motivation” (Dörnyei and Ushioda, 2011:136); in other words, between the short-term aim of persuading learners to do what we want them to do in class, and the longer-term aim of encouraging them to learn the language of their own volition, in their own time and after the particular course we are teaching has finished. We might term this the distinction between ‘motivating’ and ‘inspiring’. Bowman, (2011) points out that in contemporary education systems, detailed national curricula, accountability criteria and frequent assessment points tend to encourage teachers to think short-term, and so their focus is on motivation, using whatever rewards or punishments are at hand, rather than on inspiring learners to dedicate themselves to learning the subject long-term.

The research reported in this paper follows that of Lamb and Wedell, (2015) in exploring the longer-term impact of teaching on language learners’ motivation. Lamb and Wedell’s aim was to identify and describe the characteristics of school teachers in China and Indonesia who their learners reported had inspired them to learn English over subsequent years. It was expected that this might produce slightly different results to the research reported above, which largely focuses on the immediate motivational effects of teaching strategies. In this Indian project, we aimed to replicate this study in the Punjab/ Haryana region. It addresses these research questions:
RQ1. What are the qualities of English teachers that learners in northern India regard as ‘inspiring’?

RQ2. How do these qualities differ from those reported by learners in China and Indonesia?

4. Methodology

4.1. Data generation

Our intention was to replicate the first part of the methodology employed in the China/Indonesia study. An online survey was designed for learners aged 14-22, inviting them to nominate and describe an inspiring state school English teacher they had had in the past, that is, a teacher who had changed their feelings about the language and persuaded them to put more effort into learning it. After some trialling of the Hindi translation, the final version of the questionnaire was posted on the University of Leeds website (https://leeds.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/inspiringteacherindia), and advertised among local schools with the help of the Director of School Education in Chandigarh. The British Council also agreed to promote the survey on their website and through their newsletters.

Unfortunately only 34 responses were received through the online questionnaire. The researchers therefore decided to revert to a printed and slightly revised version of the questionnaire (see Appendix 1). The survey was distributed in nine schools in Chandigarh – chosen to include at least one model school, one normal school and one periphery school to ensure there was a broad range of institutions. Approximately 300 completed responses were received. The data was entered by a research assistant into an Excel spreadsheet and has been analysed.

4.2. Data analysis

Because our intention was to compare the survey data directly to that obtained in China and Indonesia, data analysis followed the exact same procedure. With the help of a research assistant, data was first entered into an Excel spreadsheet with a row for each completed survey. Responses which were considered invalid were then removed – this includes those where the statements were incomprehensible, or where they mimicked another response indicating that it had been completed in partnership with a peer (or even, possibly, a teacher); regrettably over half the responses fell into this category. The responses in each of the three open items were then coded using the same analytic categories as had been used in Lamb and Wedell, (2013). It should be pointed out that item responses often contained several distinct ‘idea units’ and these were given different codes. Occasionally the ideas related more closely to other questions asked, and were then given the appropriate code i.e. a comment about teacher quality in an answer to question #3 would be coded accordingly and added to the data for question #1.

5. Results

A total of 94 valid surveys were analysed: 34 from the online survey, 60 from the paper survey. As in China and Indonesia, a slight majority of responses (54:40) came from female learners. The average age of the respondent was 19.0, and the average age at which they were inspired was 14.6 – this makes them slightly older than the Chinese and Indonesian respondents, where the average age was 16.7 and age at which they were inspired was 13.7. A total of 74 different teachers were nominated, and over 75 per cent of these were female. However this simply reflects the gender ratio in the teaching profession.

The following sections present the results for each of the three open items in the survey. In each case, we compare the India results with those obtained in China and Indonesia. The tables can be found in Appendix 2.

5.1. Qualities of the inspiring teacher

Table 1 shows the responses to the survey question: ‘What was it about the teacher that inspired you?’ The comments fell into three broad categories in similar proportions to the Indonesian and Chinese responses: 54 per cent related to the methodology used by the teacher, 39 per cent were about the personality of the teacher, and the remaining seven per cent concerned the relationship between teacher and learners. Of
the comments about methodology, a significantly higher proportion of the Indian comments were general, along the lines of this one: ‘The thing which inspired me the most about her was the methodology used by her to teach us.’ Where the Indian respondents did specify particular pedagogic actions, they were more similar to the Chinese learners than the Indonesian learners in emphasising the need for classes to be ‘interesting’ rather than ‘fun’, but shared the Indonesian learners’ concern for clarity of explanations. In terms of the teacher’s personal/professional qualities, one statistic stands out – 16 per cent of the Indian respondents commented on the English competence of their inspiring teacher. ‘She was so fluent in English that none can compete with her. She uses British and American words in her conversation’ said one pupil. Another commented that her teacher ‘speaks English with very easy pronunciation, nicely and very confidently.’ The personal quality most highly valued was kindness, though a range of idiosyncratic references were made here, for instance to the teacher being ‘well-groomed’, to another being ‘beautiful’, and another having ‘a smile that did wonders’.

5.2. Teacher’s effect on the learner

Table 2 shows the responses to the survey question ‘How did your thoughts or feelings about English change?’. Like the Chinese and Indonesian learners, Indian learners mention a range of different impacts from the inspiring teacher. However, two related impacts are notably higher than the other nationalities: in being made to feel that English was easy, and feeling greater confidence. This suggests that low self-esteem may be a more prevalent problem among English learners in India than in the other two countries. They were similar to the Indonesian learners, but not the Chinese, in valuing teachers who made English seem important in their lives. Finally, five per cent of Indian respondents introduced a new category of response: that the inspiring teacher improved their image or self-respect. ‘When I understand the lecture of my English teacher and know the respect in life, my thoughts were changed. Without English no-one gives respect to you’, wrote one learner. Another commented that the teacher was inspiring for ‘helping us rise above our social and personal barriers’.

5.3. Actions taken by the learner

Table 3 shows the responses to the survey question: ‘What did the teacher inspire you to do? That is, what extra effort do you make to learn English (now or in the past)?’. Only 1.5 per cent of Indian respondents claimed that the teacher had inspired them to change their class-related behaviour, compared to 7.3 per cent of Indonesians and 10.4 per cent of Chinese; this indicates that their focus is more on learning English at home, in private institutes or in the environment. Like the Indonesians, many of them began to watch more English language films or TV programmes, though music and songs were not popular. The most striking contrast in responses to this question is in the skills which the Indian learners say that the teacher inspired them to practise: unlike the Chinese and Indonesians, who favoured developing their speaking, nearly a quarter of the Indian respondents mentioned that they read more in English, while another ten percent said they wrote more. This suggests their use of English is more literacy-based than in the other two contexts. Finally, a new category in the Indian data was improving pronunciation, mentioned by three per cent of respondents. This perhaps links to the comments about improving image and self-respect, as pronunciation is said to be the aspect of language competence most closely related to identity (Jenkins, 2006).

6. Discussion and implications

We must acknowledge the limitations of this research. Firstly, the dataset is small – only 94 questionnaire responses were included, and although these come from different school types, they were predominantly from central Chandigarh; the data therefore represents a more metropolitan viewpoint. Secondly we cannot state with any confidence how common inspiring English teaching is. The China/Indonesia data (see Lamb and Wedell, 2015) indicated that it was rare (less than 20 per cent of trainee English teachers in Jakarta could think of a teacher who had inspired them) and the poor response to the online questionnaire might suggest the same for
India; on the other hand, it could simply suggest that young Indians are not easily persuaded to complete online surveys.

Nevertheless, there are some unequivocal messages in the data for those who are preparing English teachers in similar contexts. As in China and Indonesia, methodology matters. Those teachers who are remembered as being inspiring tended to teach in a way that was memorable, either because it was felt to be particularly effective, because it was interesting or enjoyable, or because it was intellectually satisfying. Given that learners differ in their preferred learning style (Williams et al., 2015), there is no one teaching method which could satisfy all learners anyway; what is important is that the teacher thinks about how they teach and takes into account the likes and dislikes of different learners in their class. When learners see that their teacher is varying their lesson structure and trying out new activities, it shows them that they care – and this in turn reinforces the importance of the subject. Although our data does not offer any evidence in this regard, we might surmise that teachers who consult directly with learners about their preferences, and adjust their teaching accordingly, will leave a very positive impression.

Teachers’ personal and professional qualities are important too, and two results stand out. Indian learners appear to value ‘kind’ teachers, though possibly this reflects the higher proportion of female teachers nominated in the survey. The other notable result is the higher value that Indian learners (compared to Chinese and Indonesians) place on the teacher’s own standard of English. Sometimes these comments relate to aesthetic qualities (e.g. ‘her speaking English was very lyrical’), at other times they simply refer to the teacher’s deep knowledge or general command of the language. In these cases it seems that the teacher is acting as a role model for the learners, and has perhaps invoked or reinforced an ‘ideal L2 self’ (Dörnyei, 2009). It is important to note here that qualities are relative – the teacher does not need total mastery of the language, only sufficient competence to inspire the learners to believe that they too could achieve it.

Related to this, the pattern of responses in Table 2 suggests that enhancing Indian pupils’ self-confidence is particularly important for inspiring them to learn the language. Perhaps because of the status of English within Indian society, or at least urban society, the language is not just a school subject but is potentially a mark of personal sophistication, both cultural and academic. As Ushioda, (2013) argues, too many school classrooms around the world are oriented towards helping learners pass exams, meaning that learners ‘perceive English and learning English to mean little more than the business of mastering grammar and vocabulary and taking tests’ (p11). By contrast, the really inspiring teachers are aware that mastering English can be personally transformative, and deliberately work to enable learners to develop their own L2-mediated identity (Block, 2007). There are many ways to do this, for instance through encouraging learners from an early stage to use the language to express their own ideas, through developing local communities or networks (actual or virtual) for learners which use English as a medium of communication, and fostering learner autonomy through giving learners a say in how the course is run.

Our results are encouraging in that they reassure us that teachers can play an important role in motivating and inspiring learners of English. While there is always an element of chance to the process of inspiration – the right teacher encountering the right learner at just the right time in their development – with more effective pre-service and in-service training of English teachers, we can make this life-changing pedagogy occur more often.
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## Appendix 1: Results

### Table 1: Qualities of the inspiring teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main categories</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 What the teacher does</td>
<td>General methodology – good/effective teaching</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>METHODOLOGY</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of novel methods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective use of traditional methods</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fun/humorous/lively classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interesting classes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strict/firm/serious classes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensible lessons/clear explanations</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paid attention to learner strengths/weaknesses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gave advice on learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gave advice on life generally</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraged learners to take particular actions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 What the teacher is like</td>
<td>Nice/kind</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL QUALITIES</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humorous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart (i.e. intelligent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (e.g. easy-going, young, assertive)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. QUALITIES</td>
<td>Dedicated to job/hard-worker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treated work and students in an ethical way</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showed passion for English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had a good knowledge or skill in English</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had good cultural knowledge/understanding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Teacher’s relationship with learners</td>
<td>Good relationship with class as a whole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had a personally close relationship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offered reassurance, praise, encouragement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Effect of the teacher on the learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main category</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>INDONESIA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Felt greater confidence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Became more aware of importance of English</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Made English seem easy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developed interest in English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Enjoyed learning more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Changed aspirations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gained a sense of progress</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Improved image or self-respect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Changed as a person</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Motivation/ambition becoming internalised</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Became more aware of language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>133</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>210</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Actions taken by the learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main categories</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL EFFORT</td>
<td>Generally studying more/making more effort</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CLASS-RELATED LEARNING STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Revise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reciting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 INDEPENDENT LEARNING STRATEGIES</td>
<td>General change in learning strategies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using English more, in general</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-media resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Film or TV</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music or songs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer games, chatting, social networks etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills/knowledge</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammar work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving pronunciation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking a private course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anxiety as a barrier in English language learning: a case study of BSc III students from Maharashtra
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1. Introduction: English in India

With the advent of globalisation and privatisation, the world has become a global village and English is the language of this village. Moreover, it has become the language of survival. In this scenario, it is not only necessary to learn but to master the English language. Second/foreign language learning is a demanding task for learners. Researchers agree that one of the factors that hinder the process of language learning is the existence of anxiety.

In India, English performs social roles relevant to educational and educational contexts and legitimises cultural behaviour. As Gupta points out:

*India is the third largest English book producing country after United States and the U.K. in the world and the largest number of books published in India is in English. Not only this, we are the second largest English-speaking nation in the world. At the moment, there are about 300 universities excluding deemed universities in our country and over 20,000 colleges and more than three lakh high schools where English is being taught either in the form of English medium or English as language and literature.* (Gupta: 2)

In Maharashtra, English is seen as being very popular. Parents often choose English medium or convent schools to obtain what they see as the best quality education for their children. In government schools, English is introduced in the curriculum from the first standard. However, many students face very significant challenges in writing, speaking and reading English. English is often seen as ‘a subject of failure’, with students realising the importance of English for job interviews but nevertheless being very reluctant to speak in class. In colleges, English is taught through Marathi and the majority of teachers make use of bilingual or translation methods to teach English. Students often reject a teacher who uses a high level of English in class. A detailed study on second language acquisition and language learning anxiety is needed in Maharashtra. It is necessary to study the factors affecting language learning to make our students globally competent. This study is an attempt to find out the factors responsible for language learning anxiety, level of anxiety among male and female students and the impact of socioeconomic factors and demographic variables on language learning anxiety.

2. Literature review

The role of anxiety and its effect on learning a second language has been a concern for many researchers over the last three decades. Researchers have studied the role of anxiety in
language learning, factors responsible for anxiety, learners’ self-reported anxiety in relation to second language achievements and performance and other related areas. However, as pointed out by Gardner and MacIntyre (1993) and Scovel (1978), results of research conducted in the 1970s were difficult to interpret and contradictory. Anxiety can be described in the following way:

one of those topics on which significant differences of opinion can be found. Some people believe that anxiety is a minor inconvenience for a language student, perhaps an excuse for not participating in class or a guise to hide a lack of study. Others seem to feel that anxiety may be the linchpin of the entire affective reaction to language learning (MacIntyre, 1999: 24)

It would appear that there are three types of anxiety:

- **trait anxiety** – a personality trait
- **state anxiety** – apprehension experienced at a particular moment in time
- **situational anxiety** – anxiety experienced in a well-defined situation.

Since the mid-1980s, researchers have aimed to develop a firm theoretical basis to understand the construct of language learning, its development and maintenance and its dimensions. L2-related anxiety has become one of the major, most highly examined psychological variables in second language research, documented in learners of diverse target languages (TL) in various instructional settings. Many of these researchers have adopted a situation-specific approach to second language anxiety and theorised it as a distinct form of anxiety expressed in response to second language learning rather than a manifestation of other more general types of anxiety (Horwitz et al., 1986; MacIntyre and Gardner, 1991). Horwitz et al. define anxiety as:

> the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system. Just as anxiety prevents some people from performing successfully in science or mathematics, many people find foreign

Factors responsible for language learning anxiety include:

- **communication apprehension (CA):** an ‘individual level of fear or anxiety associated with real or anticipated communication with another person or persons’ (McCroskey, 1997, cited in Mosaddaq Yahya, 2013)
- **test anxiety:** an apprehension towards academic evaluation and a fear of failing in tests or examination.
- **fear of negative evaluation:** an apprehension about others’ evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations and the anticipation that others will evaluate oneself negatively (Watson and Friend, 1969 as cited in Mosaddaq Yahya, 2013).

Horwitz et al. also emphasise that one key type of anxiety is test-anxiety, ‘a type of performance anxiety stemming from a fear of failure’ (Horwitz: 127). This study will use this identification, along with the same writers’ classification of classroom anxiety as a situational anxiety including factors related to beliefs and behaviours and speaking anxiety (sometimes referred to as communication apprehension). Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986) were also the first researchers to develop research instruments specifically focused on the learner’s experience of anxiety inside the foreign language classroom and this study will draw on this research.

Many studies have shown a negative correlation of second language anxiety with second language achievement and performance. One typical study is that undertaken by Cheng (2004) which this study draws on for some aspects of its research methodology.

Rezaeia and Jafarib examined the levels of anxiety of Iranian students specifically as regards the skill of writing. A number of factors resulting in anxiety were identified including a fear of negative comments from the teacher and a lack of self-confidence (Rezaeia and Jafarib: 1549). The
writers suggest that a less judgmental approach by the teacher will serve to reduce this anxiety. A 1994 study by Aida of Japanese learners shows a clear negative correlation between language anxiety and student performance also examined the effects of anxiety on foreign language performance.

Many of the studies conducted on language anxiety referred to above were general in nature and very few examined domains related to foreign or second language anxiety. Researchers have also focused on negative as well as positive impact of anxiety. Some studies have pointed out the teacher, friends, parents, fear of evaluation, worry, types of activities and lack of preparation may increase students’ anxiety. Little or no similar research has been conducted in Maharashtra on this subject and this emphasises the vital need to conduct such studies in the state. This study aims therefore to study the relationship between some aspects of learners’ socioeconomic background, demographic variables, caste, religion and the level of language learning anxiety they experience.

3. Research question
The purpose of this study is to study the factors responsible for anxiety in English language learning and the level of anxiety among the BSc Part III students. It aims to study the relationship between the socioeconomic background and level of parental education and language learning anxiety. Based on the purpose of the study following the research questions have been formulated:

- What are the factors responsible for language learning anxiety among BSc III students?
- What relationship is there between the socioeconomic background of these students and their level of anxiety?
- What relationship is there between the level of education of these students’ parents and students’ level of anxiety?

4. Research methodology
4.1 Participants
Participants for the present study were selected at random from BSc Part III classes in three districts of Maharashtra: Pune, Satara and Kolhapur. A total of 104 students participated in the study. English is a compulsory subject for BSc Part III students from Satara and Kolhapur region and, for Pune region, it is compulsory at Part II level. BSc Part III students are selected as the medium of instruction is English. The terms rural, semi-urban and urban are used in the study to distinguish their background. The national Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) defines ‘rural’ as ‘an area with a population density up to 400 per square kilometer with clear surveyed boundaries but no municipal board and a minimum of seventy five per cent of the population involved in agriculture and related activities. Full details of participant profiles are presented in Appendix 1.

4.2 Research methodology
The study used a closed questionnaire with a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, strongly disagree, disagree). The questionnaire had four sections which asked for personal information and included a foreign language test anxiety scale and foreign language speaking anxiety scale. Numerical values (strongly agree, agree, neutral, strongly disagree, disagree) were assigned to each response. These were used to facilitate data entry. We utilised the MS-Excel 2013, Libreoffice5.0 and SPSS (version 17) for windows to carry out data analysis to answer for the research question. We employed the ANOVA test to study the level of significance between three types of anxieties: classroom anxiety, test anxiety and speaking anxiety. We used descriptive statistics to find mean and standard deviation for the types of anxieties for the various backgrounds of the students. This allows us to understand the level of student’s anxiety compared to different backgrounds.

The questionnaire consisted of four domains: personal information, foreign language classroom anxiety, test anxiety and speaking anxiety. Items are presented in Tables 1 and 2 below.
Table 1: Test design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal information</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language classroom anxiety</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test anxiety</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking anxiety</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample of 104 students were also asked to respond to a set of questions on how they saw English medium schools, their preferences on English as a school subject and which precise areas of English might be the most significant sources of anxiety. Key test items included:

Table 2: Test design

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I don’t worry about making mistakes in my language class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>During my language class, I find myself thinking about things that I have nothing to do with the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I worry about the consequences of failing my English class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I get upset when I don’t understand what the teacher is correcting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The more I study for a language test, the more confused I get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The language class moves so quickly that I worry about getting left behind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than other classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results and discussion

The levels of all three types of anxiety experienced by students were compared to their backgrounds, classified as a) urban, semi-urban, rural educated b) level of education of parents. While there were a few neutral responses to some questions, in general, the results presented in this section help us to identify a range of sources of anxiety and factors affecting the English language learning.

5.1 Analysis of the ANOVA test

The results of the ANOVA test are presented in Appendix 3. The comparison of F values of classroom anxiety (F=5.718), test anxiety (F=8.564) and speaking anxiety (F=4.139) at p <0.05 shows that there is significant difference between three types of anxieties. The overall mean and standard deviations of individual anxieties are listed in Table 2. This shows that speaking anxiety (M=2.894) is comparable with the classroom anxiety (M=2.855) which itself is more significant than test anxiety (M=2.640). However, the difference between them means each type of anxiety appears less significant. The main reason for this is that a small number of the 104 participants registered their reply as neutral. In our questionnaire, we use Likert scale (SA=4, A=3, D=2, SD=1) and we modified this for neutral as N=0 and this is affecting the mean by some small value. However, the data is sufficiently useful when we compare the means of student’s anxieties against their background as recorded in Appendix 3, Table 3.
5.2 Influence of students’ background

Detailed means and standard deviations of the all types of anxieties against these conditions are presented in Appendix 1 Table 2. It is observed that mean values of anxiety against different backgrounds exhibit no significant difference except for urban background. This apparently tells us that there is no specific impact of students’ background on overall English language learning anxiety. However, a figure of SA=4 on the Likert scale shows the highest level of anxiety. Overall mean anxiety in our analysis falls approximately at 2.800 and this indicated that our students have significant level of anxiety in learning English as a foreign language.

Results show that students whose parents have a very limited level of education have a higher level of anxiety (M=2.147) than those with parents with a higher level of education. The second highest level of anxiety is experienced by students who have a rural background (M=2.131). Students whose parents are educated and urban students have lower levels of anxiety, the third (M=2.035) and fourth (M=2.018) levels respectively experienced. The lowest levels of anxiety were experienced by students from a semi-urban background (M=1.912).

5.3 Student responses

Student responses on a range of issues were also collated and analysed. Results (see Appendix 4) showed a striking preference for being taught through an English medium, with almost 79 per cent of respondents stating that they ‘would have performed better if they had studied in an English medium school’. This perhaps reflects the prioritisation across India by non-teaching professionals including parents and learners of this specific medium. However, for almost 60 per cent of students, English is not a favourite subject at school (reflecting, perhaps, the level of anxiety connected to the subject). Use of English on a daily basis is also rare with 78 per cent of students stating that they do not use English daily with friends/teachers/parents.

Students were also asked to ascribe reasons to any possible anxiety they felt about learning English (the term ‘sources of fear’ was used as it was felt it would be more familiar to students). Some students selected specific options such as the grammar of English (19 per cent) vocabulary (9.6 per cent) and less than 10 per cent selecting mixed options. The majority of students (51 per cent) stated that all the options presented to them were causes of anxiety.

Analysis of statistical range of data on EFL classroom anxiety in the case of rural and urban students reveals that there is no significant difference between the responses of rural and urban students in most of the statements except for the statements presented in Table 2. The discussion of these statements may be helpful to explore the reasons or sources of classroom anxiety. Statement number 2 says: ‘I don’t worry about making mistakes in English class.’ Figure 1 shows that rural students’ response for this statement is significantly higher than that of urban students which implies that they feel they worry less making mistakes in their English classes. Further study is required to identify the reason whether this lack of concern is the result of teaching methods, a passive teaching, class environment, etc. or simply a lack of care for accuracy as a result of the environment the students live in.

Furthermore, the statistical range analysis for classroom anxiety in case of students’ parents’ education is considered, the difference between average response of the students from educated parents and non-educated parents background for statement numbers 7, 31, 32 may be significant. For statement number 7, ‘I think my classmate’s English is better than mine’, students with educated background have a significantly higher value than less-educated/almost non-educated or illiterate students, implying that students with an educated background are more inclined to think in class that their classmates’ English is better than theirs and exhibit a confident more attitude.

For the remaining statements, the average responses of the students with educated parents’ background and students with non-educated parents’ background are similar.
5.4 Test anxiety

No significant differences were found for test anxiety between rural and semi-urban students but the difference between the average response of rural students (2.663) and that of urban students (2.356) may be significant. This difference was tested to check whether this difference was statistically significant or not. For this purpose, two sample t-test were used. So here \ null hypothesis (H₀) versus alternative hypothesis (H₁) was tested.

H₀: There is no significant difference between average response of rural students and urban students.

H₁: Average responses of rural students is greater than that of urban students.

For this test we consider alpha value=0.05 and we obtain p value = 0.49825 which is greater than alpha value and therefore we fail to reject the null hypothesis. Hence we conclude that there is no significant difference between average responses of rural students and urban students which was apparent from mean. However, the range analysis shows that for the statement numbers 2, 3, 4, 9 the difference between average responses for rural and urban students may be significant.

For statement number 2 (I think about what will happen if I fail), rural students respond significantly more (i.e. they disagree more with) this statement) urban students, implying that rural students worry less about failing tests.

5.5 Speaking anxiety

We found no significant difference between average responses of rural and semi-urban students as regards speaking anxiety. The difference between the average response of rural and urban students was tested for significance through two sample t-tests to test null hypothesis (H₀) verses alternative hypothesis (H₁). There was no significant difference between average response of rural students and urban students for speaking anxiety.

6. Conclusions

As outlined in the literary review, the majority of studies of learner anxiety have been undertaken in contexts outside India and there seem to have been few studies within India itself. This study has focused simply on the types of anxiety students may experience, possible links with student background and level of parental education and there are many other possible factors contributing to anxiety which deserve examination. The study is also limited to one context and there are many other contexts which could be investigated.

Results show that, with the overall average anxiety obtained for 104 students falling around 2.800 and for all kinds of anxieties a large F value when compared to the F critical value, there is a comparatively high level of anxiety experienced by students sampled. It was not found that there were very significant differences between levels of classroom, test and speaking anxiety – all three seem to be experienced by anxious learners although speaking anxiety was the most significant more dominant than classroom anxiety and test anxiety. English is not seen as a preferred subject and, for at least half the group, it was not specific features of the language but all of them which presented challenges. As regards student background, we found that there is no significant difference of average anxieties of all the three kinds between the students of rural and urban background and between the students of educated and non-educated family background. It is possible that this may be the result of the sample distribution. Only 8.65 per cent of participants came from an urban background and only two per cent of students came from a non-educated background and this may have skewed the final result. This study should be regarded as a pilot and further research is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn.

It would appear that students experience anxiety about English language learning due to many factors. Urban as well as rural students also face anxieties which will affect their performance in examinations in particular and life in general and
these challenges are likely to lead to students losing interest in their studies. One suggestion for professionals working with these students would be that lack of progress may not necessarily be because of low academic ability but because of anxiety impeding their performance and to identify ways that this anxiety can be reduced.

While further and more intensive research is required, it is hoped that this study has gone some way to illustrate that the range of types of anxiety which students experience needs to be addressed and taking into account in classroom teaching.
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Appendix 1: Participants profiles

Appendix 1: Table 1 – Participants descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium of education (school)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-English</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken at home</td>
<td>Marathi</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family’s educational background</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly educated</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1: Figure 1 – Participant demographic details (percentage)
## Appendix 2: Overall results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stmt</th>
<th>Average response</th>
<th>Region wise</th>
<th>Parents education wise</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>Less educated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Region wise</td>
<td>Parents education wise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sl. No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.066667</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>2.9897952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.933333</td>
<td>2.6122449</td>
<td>2.3333333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.866667</td>
<td>2.44444</td>
<td>2.91836735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.825</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>2.79591837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8875</td>
<td>2.933333</td>
<td>2.92857143</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>3.266667</td>
<td>2.222222</td>
<td>2.80612245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.733333</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>2.76530612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0875</td>
<td>2.733333</td>
<td>3.11111</td>
<td>3.03061224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>3.10204082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.33333</td>
<td>2.79591837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9125</td>
<td>2.933333</td>
<td>3.11111</td>
<td>2.93877551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.222222</td>
<td>2.51020408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.025</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.777778</td>
<td>2.92857143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>2.866667</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>3.01020408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8875</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.222222</td>
<td>2.79591837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0875</td>
<td>2.933333</td>
<td>2.55556</td>
<td>3.04081633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.33333</td>
<td>2.60204082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.266667</td>
<td>3.33333</td>
<td>3.15306122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33333</td>
<td>2.86734694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.9125</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.55556</td>
<td>2.85714286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7375</td>
<td>3.133333</td>
<td>2.33333</td>
<td>2.75510204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.866667</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>2.80612245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.933333</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.98979592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.933333</td>
<td>2.44444</td>
<td>2.93877551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.8375</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.222222</td>
<td>2.73469388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>2.333333</td>
<td>1.88889</td>
<td>2.46938776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.222222</td>
<td>2.73469388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.11111</td>
<td>2.94897959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.925</td>
<td>2.666667</td>
<td>2.88889</td>
<td>2.8877551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.733333</td>
<td>2.77778</td>
<td>2.93877551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.7875</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.55556</td>
<td>2.80612245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.866667</td>
<td>3.11111</td>
<td>2.91836735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.9375</td>
<td>2.785714</td>
<td>2.77778</td>
<td>2.89690722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Overall results
# Appendix 3: ANOVA results

## Table 1: ANOVA Test: Overall Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>F critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom anxiety</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>80.153</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>5.718</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1488.875</td>
<td>3397</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1569.028</td>
<td>3431.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test anxiety</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>64.921</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>4.637</td>
<td>8.564</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>836.615</td>
<td>1545.000</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>901.536</td>
<td>1559.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking anxiety</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>10.962</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.566</td>
<td>4.139</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>311.731</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322.692</td>
<td>831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 2: Overall Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Anxiety</td>
<td>2.855</td>
<td>0.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>2.640</td>
<td>0.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Anxiety</td>
<td>2.894</td>
<td>0.605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Background and Mean Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Anxiety</th>
<th>Mean (M)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>0.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>2.663</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2.972</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural mean total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.84</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>2.643</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>2.356</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2.694</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban mean total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.018</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>2.844</td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>2.707</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-urban mean total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.800</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>2.6404</td>
<td>0.73797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated mean total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.809</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-educated</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>2.828</td>
<td>0.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low educated mean total</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2.804</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Student responses

**Figure 3a:** Responses to selected statements, urban and rural students

**Figure 3b:** Student responses to individual cues: English medium study
English was not my favourite subject in school

![Bar chart showing interview responses regarding preferred subjects.](image)

**Figure 3c**: Interview responses: preferred subjects

---

I speak English daily with friends/teachers/parents

![Bar chart showing interview responses regarding daily English use.](image)

**Figure 3d**: Interview responses: preferred subjects
Figure 4: Interview responses: sources of anxiety