

**“Developing Writing Competency Of Gujarati Speaking Students In English Through Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Approach”****Dr. Praveen Kumar Jain**

---

**ABSTRACT**

*The presents study is intended to highlight the the effectiveness of communicative language teaching and traditional language teaching. 100 teachers and 120 students of 10<sup>th</sup> class were selected randomly. The obtained data was analyzed with the help of statistical treatment the analysis of variance. The major findings of the study were- it may be tested that students who were taught by the CLT and TLT approaches did score significantly higher than the students who were not given any special treatment therefore, it can be concluded that the CLT and TLT approach involved in the experiment led to significance performance of the EG1 and EG2 respectively.*

**INTRODUCTION:**

We know that language is medium of communication. It is not primary need of students to get theoretical knowledge or analytical knowledge of target language but to have an ability to understand and to be understood in that language within the context and constraints of peculiar language using circumstances. Nowadays most people actually do very little writing in day to day life, and a great deal of what we do write is quite short – brief notes to friends, answers on question forms, diary entries, postcards and etc. Despite this, there may still be a number of good reasons why it is useful to include work on writing in our English lessons. Our students have specific needs to take notes, copy resumes, and describe processes. Writing involves a different kind of mental process. There is more time to think, to reflect, to prepare, to find alternative and better solutions. Writing should be as communicative, or functional, as possible. That is, it should be seen to fulfill the sort of normal communicative purposes, or functions it is used (for) in every day life. Although written English should certainly support and be integrated with grammar and vocabulary learning. The teaching of writing should be recognized as a special part of language teaching with its own aims and techniques.

The present concept of the communicative language teaching has brought about a revolution of thoughts and ideas and it has, infect, become a challenging task for our linguists to understand it in the right perspective. Some of our linguists have tried to prove that all over past efforts of teaching language have been failures just because of ours inadequate understanding or rather misunderstanding the notion as well as the function of language. They argue that much emphasis on the structures and lexical items have not yielded desirable results.

**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES**

1. To develop writing competency of students in English.
2. To find out writing needs of students in social context which motivate them to write in English?
3. To find out teaching strategies of teachers which they use in the classroom teaching for developing writing competency of students in English.
4. To study comparative efficacy of two teaching approaches, Traditional Language Teaching and Communicative Language Teaching for developing writing competency of students in English.

### **RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS**

1. There is no significance difference in the attainment scores on communicative test (C.T.C.C.) between the Scholars exposed to three different types of learning situations.
2. There is no significance difference in the efficacy of traditional Language Teaching (TLT) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the five areas of test [RTLAC, PTLAC, RTLAP, PTLAP, and CTCC].

### **SELECTION OF SAMPLE**

Investigator followed three steps to select sample.

1. At first stage 100 students of 10<sup>th</sup> class of Senior Secondary Schools, Bhiloda were selected randomly. During the second stage of the sample selection 100 English teachers of secondary school of Sabarkantha District at Gujarat were selected. The third stage and final stage was random selection of 120 students of class 10<sup>th</sup> of senior secondary school of Bhiloda District SabarKantha (Gujarat). The experiment was conducted with these 120 students. These 120 students were classified into three groups of 40- 40 students' randomly throwing coin First group of 40 students was taught by investigator through CLT Approach

*Note: 100 students were be selected randomly from 120 students who were be selected for experimental treatment.*

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

Investigator used experimental method and normative survey method to collect data from sample in present study.

### **TOOLS AND TECHNIQUE:-**

The investigator used standard tools in the study.

Diagnostic tests

Pre and post test for secondary school learners (Communicative Test).

#### **1. Diagnostic tests**

- A questionnaire for school level students to find out present and future writing need of students in social context.
- A questionnaire for Secondary School teachers of English to find out present and future writing needs of students in social context. .
- A structured interview schedule for secondary school teachers to find out their teaching strategies which they use in the classroom.

## **2. Pre and post test for secondary school learners (Communicative Test)**

**In the study investigator applied following statistical treatment.**

1. Mean, F Test (ANOVA)
2. Percentage, Standard Deviation.
3. T. Test, Percentage, Correlation.

**FINDINGS** - The summary of the results of the present study is given under the following heads:

- (i) Development of writing competence in written English.
- (ii) Comparative efficacy of two approaches (CLT & TLT)
- (iii) Testing of Hypothesis.

At first learners' writing needs were spelt out. On the basis of needs the teaching materials were prepared. Secondly the teaching strategies of teachers were spelt out. On the basis of it the teaching techniques and methodology was used in traditional language teaching.

### **Development of Communicative Competence in Written English (Main Findings)**

All the three groups of learner were given pre and post test of communicative competency. The data were analyzed by t test and ANOVA. The following are main findings.

#### **Main Findings Based On ANOVA (C.T.C.C.)-**

The one way ANOVA technique was used in this study in order find out the level of performance of the 3 groups of learners EG1-EG2, and CG on the areas included writing description, instruction, greeting and good wishes, direction, telegram, invitation and letter. The following table contains the main findings. Table

**F value calculated for 7 items of CTCC**

| S.N. | Area of writing          | Calculated F value | Significant/ not significant | Level of Significant |
|------|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1.   | Description              | 56.64              | S                            | .05=3.07             |
| 2.   | Greeting and Good wishes | 50.00              | S                            | .01=4.70             |

|    |             |       |   |  |
|----|-------------|-------|---|--|
| 3. | Instruction | 49.00 | S |  |
| 4. | Invitation  | 54.23 | S |  |
| 5. | Letter      | 47.34 | S |  |
| 6. | Direction   | 57.81 | S |  |
| 7. | Telegram    | 63.89 | S |  |

**Main finding based on the critical difference and post test means difference (C.T.C.C.)**

The critical difference and post test means differences were calculated in order to find out the groups which performed best in the 7 areas of the CTCC.

Table 2  
Post test means difference between the three group

| S.No. | Post test mean difference |              |          |          | Critical Difference |      |
|-------|---------------------------|--------------|----------|----------|---------------------|------|
|       | Areas                     | EG1 & EG2    | EG1 & CG | EG2 & CG | .05                 | .01  |
| 1.    | Description               | 4.01         | 6.15     | 2.14     | 1.17                | 1.54 |
| 2.    | Greeting                  | .20 NS       | 1.11     | .91      | .24                 | .31  |
| 3.    | Instruction               | 1.19         | 1.93     | 0.74     | .40                 | .52  |
| 4.    | Invitation                | 0.47         | 1.28     | 0.81     | .24                 | .31  |
| 5.    | Letters                   | .95(NS)(.01) | 3.52     | 2.57     | .72                 | .96  |
| 6.    | Direction                 | 1.42         | 2.14     | 0.72     | .40                 | .52  |
| 7.    | Telegram                  | 1.40         | 2.07     | 0.67     | .38                 | .50  |

NS=Non significance  
NS (.01) on .0

Table 3  
Post test means (CTCC) of the 3 Groups

| S.N. | AREAS       | GROUPS POST TEST MEANS |      |      |
|------|-------------|------------------------|------|------|
|      |             | EG1                    | EG2  | CG   |
| 1.   | Description | 11.55                  | 7.54 | 5.40 |
| 2.   | Greeting    | 1.64                   | 1.44 | 0.53 |
| 3.   | Instruction | 2.63                   | 1.44 | 0.70 |
| 4.   | Invitation  | 1.64                   | 1.17 | 0.36 |
| 5.   | Letters     | 4.80                   | 3.85 | 1.28 |
| 6.   | Direction   | 3.04                   | 1.83 | 0.90 |
| 7.   | Telegram    | 2.81                   | 1.41 | 0.74 |

**Finding based on the ANOVA (Pre and Post Test)**

The following table presents the Fx (pre test scores) and Fy (Post test scores) found out through the ANOVA.

Table No. 4

| S.NO. | Test         | Pre Test Fx | Post Fy | Table vale F         |
|-------|--------------|-------------|---------|----------------------|
| 1     | RTLAC        | 0.01        | 19.67   | .01=4.79<br>.05=3.07 |
| 2     | PTLAC        | 0.02        | 17.68   |                      |
| 3     | RTLAP        | 0.08        | 28.14   |                      |
| 4     | PTLAP        | 1.04        | 84.78   |                      |
| 5     | CTCC         | 0.20        | 100.19  |                      |
| 6     | TOTAL SCORES | 0.10        | 77.06   |                      |

Table No. 5

Post test means difference between the three groups.

| Test       | Post test mean difference |          |          | Level of Significant critical difference |      |
|------------|---------------------------|----------|----------|------------------------------------------|------|
|            | EG1 & EG2                 | EG1 & CG | EG2 & CG | .01                                      | .05  |
| RTLAC      | 1.35                      | 6.78     | 8.13     | 1.70                                     | 1.30 |
| PTLAC      | 3.50                      | 7.50     | 4.00     | 1.62                                     | 1.23 |
| RTLAP      | 7.25                      | 10.38    | 3.13     | 1.02                                     | 0.80 |
| PTLAP      | 5.75                      | 8.95     | 3.20     | 1.32                                     | 0.95 |
| CTCC       | 10.75                     | 18.75    | 7.07     | 2.07                                     | 1.60 |
| TOTAL SCO. | 26.05                     | 52.96    | 26.50    | 3.98                                     | 3.00 |

**Main Finding Based On The Post Test Means Of The Groups.**

The following table presented the post test means of the three groups.

Table No. 6

Post test mean of the three groups.

| S. No. | Test         | Post Test Means |       |       |
|--------|--------------|-----------------|-------|-------|
|        |              | EG1             | EG2   | CG    |
| 1      | RTLAC        | 23.65           | 25.00 | 16.87 |
| 2      | PTLAC        | 20.00           | 16.50 | 12.50 |
| 3      | RTLAP        | 16.25           | 9.00  | 5.87  |
| 4      | PTLAP        | 15.00           | 9.25  | 6.05  |
| 5      | CTCC         | 28.75           | 18.00 | 10.00 |
| 6      | TOTAL SCORES | 104.25          | 77.75 | 51.29 |

On the basis of the above findings. “The hypothesis that there is no significance difference in the efficacy of the CLT and TLT approaches in developing writing

competency in English is summarily rejected thus it may be concluded that there is a significant difference in the efficacy of the CLT and TLT approaches in developing writing competency in English in social context.

In other words it may be conclusively stated that the students who were taught through the CLT and TLT approach did score significant higher than the student who were not given any special experiment treatment. It is concluded in summary that the significance performance of EG1 and EG2 might owe the CLT and TLT approaches respectively which were used for experimentation.

**EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**- The study may be termed as a significant attempt in the direction of the ELT in Gujarat in the sense that its results and findings would be quite useful for course-designers, teacher, learners, paper- setters, examiner, SIERT (State institute of Educational Research and Training) as well as the Board of Secondary Education, Gujarat. In the present study, an attempt was made to compare two language teaching approaches (CLT and TLT). The following are the educational implications derived from the main findings of the study.

1. With the help of diagnostic testing, teachers may find out learners writing needs in English in social context, and design courses accordingly.
2. The study has revealed the fact that spell out learners' writing needs and then providing instructions to the learners can help them (learners) maintain and increase their interest in learning English.
3. Both the TLT and CLT approaches help in bringing about significant changes in the achievement scores of the learners.
4. The study supports the theory of linguists that communicative competence involves linguistic competence. In this study the EG-1 which was not taught accuracy in the strict sense of the term, also performed significantly in comparison to the EG-II where focus was exclusively on grammatical accuracy.
5. The presentation of the language and its items in life like and social context helps the learner in learning linguistics appropriately.
6. A lot of exposure to the 'real' language (The language people generally use in real life) helps the learners to be linguistically accurate, socially appropriate and communicatively competent.
7. The study brings the fact to light that the TLT approach is more instrumental in developing in the learners the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences.
8. The study makes it crystal clear that the CLT is more effective in developing the skill of producing socially appropriate expressions in the learners.  
The learners are linguistically more receptive and responsive when their teacher also plays the role of a participant in the language learning tasks.
11. It is also brought out by the investigation that the use of role play group-work, group-discussion, basic-dialogues, and conversation helps the learners to develop

- communicative competence. Picture, charts, role-cards, cut-outs of magazines and newspapers stimulate the interest in learning to communicate.
12. The study proves that if teachers teach learners by the CLT approach helps the learners to learn written English in social contexts. (The learners who were not exposed to any kind of special experimental treatment did learn something either on their normal classroom, but this learning is not significant in comparison to the learners' achievement scores in the experimental treatment groups.
  13. Too much grammatical corrections hamper the pace of learning language and discourage the learners to come out with verbal expressing fluently.
  14. The study suggests that the pre and in service teachers should be orientated towards the CLT techniques and be encouraged to use to the language in social context.

**REFERENCES**

|     |                                                                                                                                                                              |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| ➤   | Good, C.V. Scates, D.E. & Barr, A.S. (1941) 'Methodology of Educational Research', New York, Appleton Century Crafts, 167-168.                                               |
| ➤   | Hymes, D. (1971) Competence and Performance in Linguistic Theory. In Huxley and Ingram (Eds.) Language acquisition: Models and methods. London: Academic Press Inc. page 12. |
| ➤   | Lado Robert (1971) Language Teaching. Longman page 5.                                                                                                                        |
| ➤   | Savignon, S.J. (1972) Communicative Competence : An Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching. Philadelphia: Centre for curriculum development Inc.                            |
| ➤   | Fox, David J. (1972), Research Process in Education, Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York.                                                                                    |
| ➤   | Leeson, Richards. (1975) Fluency and Language Teaching. London: Longman, page 136.                                                                                           |
| ➤ 1 | Widdowson, H.G.(1978). Teaching Language As Communication. Oxford : O.U.P., page 73.                                                                                         |
| ➤   | Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds.) (1979) Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. C.P.U. , page 52- 53                                                                |
| ➤   | Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds.) (1979). Communicative Approach to Language Teaching. C.U.P., page 187.                                                                  |
| ➤   | Breen M. and Candline C.N. (1980) The Essentials of Communicative                                                                                                            |

|   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|   | Curriculum in Language Teaching. Applied Linguistics 1(2). Longman , page 99.                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| ➤ | Carroll., B.J. (1980). Testing Communicative performance. Oxford: Pergamon press., page 7.                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| ➤ | Johson, k and Morrow, K. (Eds.) (1981). Communication in Classroom. London Group Ltd. , page 2.                                                                                                                                                                             |
| ➤ | Littlewood, T.W. (1981) Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction. C.P.U. , page 87                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| ➤ | Stevick, E.W. (1982) Teaching and Learning Languages: new York : C.P.U. , page 16                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| ➤ | Saraswati, V. (1982). Towards A Communicative Course Design in EOP: A Study in Applied Linguistics. Ph.D. Linguistic and Phonetics, C.I.E.F.L., Hyderabad. In M.B. Buch (Ed.) 4 <sup>th</sup> survey of Research in Education, 1983-88, Vol. 1 New Delhi: N.C.E.R.T., 1991. |