

Difference In Teaching English Between Teachers With Qualification In English Literature And Teachers With Non-English Literature Qualification

Dr. Shano ji

Assistant professor (contractual) Srinagar degree college zakura, Batpora

Abstract

The present study was conducted to find out the difficulties of teachers teaching English as a second language to the elementary students. The method adopted for this research was descriptive method and the sample comprised of 144 teachers and 288 students. It was found that 76.9% English teachers (**with English Literature background**) agreed that they teach English phonetics. 76.9% English teachers mentioned that they always follow a lesson plan whereas only 52.6% non-English literature respondents agreed that they always follow a lesson plan while teaching English. It was found that 61.5% English literature teachers frequently update themselves with reference to the subject language whereas 45.8% non-English literature teachers mentioned that they frequently update themselves with reference to the subject language. It was found that 61.5% English literature respondents mentioned that they follow direct method of teaching English whereas only 6.8% non-English literature admitted that they follow direct method.

Key words

Elementary students, language, phonetics, pronunciation,

Introduction

Language is a familiar feature of our daily life. It is a human and social activity without which human beings cannot function in the society. It is one of the basic needs. One has to learn it. It is not something optional. We just cannot avoid it. We regard it as both simple and natural. It is an essential element in the culture of a society. It is the flesh and blood of our culture. According to Leonard Bloomfield, (1935), "Each Community is formed by the activity of language." Without language, human life would exist, but there shall be no standard and no transmission of all, that is best in human tradition and civilization from one

generation to another. It plays a prominent role in our daily life and compels us to study it. With the advent of the concept of globalization, people all over the globe communicate with each other and exchange ideas. Though technological advances have served as a medium for communication, we cannot deny the role played by language. In India, elementary schools provide education from Class 1 to Class 8. The children in these classes are generally aged between 6 to 14 years. It is the next stage after kindergarten (Pre-Nursery, Nursery, Prep or Lower Kindergarten and Upper Kindergarten). The next stage after primary education is Middle School (Class 6th to 8th). In most schools in North India,

children in Classes 1st to 3rd are taught English, Hindi, Mathematics, Environmental Science, and General Knowledge. However some schools may introduce this concept in Class 3 itself. Some schools may also introduce a third language in Class 5th or even in Class 4th. At some places, primary education is labeled as the education of Class 3rd to Class 5th and up to class 2nd as pre-primary education. This is because many new concepts are introduced in this class. The NCERT provides support and technical assistance to a number of schools in India and oversees many aspects of enforcement of education policies.

Review of related literature

Sobia, B. et al. (2015) found that the teachers described their difficulties related to grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary; linguistic devices i.e. rhyme scheme, alliteration, assonance, consonants, syllable, diphthong, digraph, etc. **Wong, M. L (2010)** revealed that Pre-service teachers recognized the existence of foreign language aptitude and placed strong emphasis on excellent pronunciation, vocabulary acquisition, the benefits of practice and an immersion approach to language. Most of the teachers reported of being highly motivated to learn English and were positive about their ability to master the language. **Enamul, H. (2008)** found that the major problems in English language teaching and learning at the Alim level lie with the textbook materials, syllabus, uninteresting lessons, method of teaching, avoidance of practicing listening and speaking, poor quality of teachers, lack of physical facilities of the classroom, very poor quality teaching

aids and equipment, etc. **Mishra, K.C. (2005)** revealed that the trainees exhibited positive attitude towards errors during the course period and 93 percent of teachers under the present course had changed their methods of correction. **Chidambaram, K (2004)** revealed that the medium of instruction has direct impact on the achievement of second language Skills.

Objective of the study

To find out difference in teaching English between teachers with qualification in English literature and teachers with non-English literature qualification

Method and Design

The present study has been completed through the descriptive method of research.

Sample

The sample for the study has been drawn from both rural and urban elementary schools of

Kashmir division. List of all these elementary schools was obtained from the Directorate of School Education, Kashmir division. There are 10 districts in Kashmir division, out of which only four districts were selected. Out of which, two districts fall in urban areas viz, Anantnag and Srinagar and two districts fall in rural areas viz, Bandipora and Budgam. The investigator took one educational zone from each district. The sample comprised of 48 elementary schools, 12 schools were taken alphabetically from each zone. The sample included 24 lower primary and 24 upper primary schools.

The breakup of the sample is given as under:

	District		Boys School	Girls School	Total Boys & Girls Schools	Total No. of Schools
Urban	Anantnag	Lower Primary	3	3	6	12
		Upper Primary	3	3	6	
	Srinagar	Lower Primary	3	3	6	12
		Upper Primary	3	3	6	
Rural	Bandipora	Lower Primary	3	3	6	12
		Upper Primary	3	3	6	
	Budgam	Lower Primary	3	3	6	12
		Upper Primary	3	3	6	
Total						48

Description of the tools

As the researcher planned a descriptive study, keeping in mind the objective of the study therefore, the data for the present study was collected with the help of the self-constructed questionnaire

Statistical treatment:

In order to accomplish the objective of the present study, the data collected through various data gathering devices was analyzed by applying the percentage statistics

Analysis and interpretation

Showing the difference in teaching of English between teachers with qualification in English Literature and teachers with non-English literature qualification

Statements	Response	Non-English literature Teachers		English literature teachers	
Methods of teaching English		N	%age	N	%age

	Translation	78	59.5	1	7.6
	Discussion	39	29.7	4	30.7
	Direct	3	6.8	8	61.5
	Any other	11	8.3	0	0
	Total	131	100	13	100
Teach English phonetics	No	86	65.6	3	23.1
	Yes	45	34.4	10	76.9
	Total	131	100	13	100
Teaching material according to level of students	<1/3	22	16.7	0	0
	1/3 rd	29	22.1	3	23.1
	2/3 rd	57	43.5	8	61.5
	100	23	17.5	2	15.3
	Total	131	100	13	100

The table shows difference in teaching of English between teachers with qualification in English literature (**with English Literature background**) and teachers with non-English literature qualification. A perusal of the table revealed that out of 131 non-English literature respondents teachers, 78(59.5%) mentioned that they follow translation method of teaching, 39(29.7%) added that they follow discussion method of teaching in the class, 3(6.8%) mentioned that they follow direct method of teaching English, 11(8.3%) reported that they follow other methods of teaching English whereas out of 13 English literature respondents, 8(61.5%) added that they follow direct method of teaching, 1(7.6%) admitted that they follow translation method of teaching in the class, 4(30.7%) mentioned that they follow discussion method of teaching. Out

of 131 nonEnglish literature respondents teachers, 86(65.6%) admitted that they do not tried to study the English phonetics whereas 45(34.4%) mentioned that they always tried to study English phonetics whereas out of 13 English literature teachers, 3(23.1%) admitted that they do not study English phonetics, 10(76.9%) mentioned that they tried to study English phonetics. Out of 131 non-English literature respondents teachers 22(16.7%) mentioned that less than 1/3rd teaching material is according to level of students, 29(22.1%) mentioned that 1/3rd teaching material is according to level of students, 57(43.5%) admitted that 2/3rd teaching material is according to level of students, 23 (17.5%) reported that 100% teaching material is according to level of students while as out of 13 English literature

teachers, 3(23.1%) mentioned that 1/3rd teaching material is according to level of students, 8(61.5%) admitted that 2/3rd teaching material is according to level of

students, 2(15.3%) reported that 100% teaching material is according to level of students.

Showing the difference in teaching of English between teachers with qualification in English Literature and teachers with non-English literature qualification

Statements	Response	Non-English literature teachers		English literature teachers	
		N	%age	N	%age
Lesson plan	Always	69	52.6	10	76.9
	Often	31	23.6	3	23.1
	Some time	31	23.6	0	0
	Rarely	0	0	0	0
	Total	131	100	13	100
Update reference material	Frequently	60	45.8	8	61.5
	Often	35	26.7	4	30.7
	Sometimes	34	25.9	1	7.6
	Never	2	1.5	0	0
	Total	131	100	13	100
Important skills of English	Speaking	45	34.3	5	38.4
	Reading	38	29.0	4	30.7
	Writing	30	22.9	2	15.3
	Listening	18	13.7	2	15.3
	Total	131	100	13	100

The table shows difference in teaching of English between teachers with qualification in English literature and teachers with non-English literature qualification. A perusal of

the table revealed that out of 131 non-English literature respondents teachers 69(52.6%) admitted that they always follow a lesson plan for teaching English,

31(23.6%) mentioned that they oftenly follow lesson plan for teaching English, 31(23.6%) reported that they sometimes follow a lesson plan for teaching English whereas out of 13 English literature teacher respondents, 10(76.9%) admitted that they always follow lesson plan for teaching English, 3(23.1%) admitted that they oftenly follow lesson plan for teaching English. Out of 131 non-English teachers, 60(45.8%) mentioned that they frequently update themselves with reference to the subject language, 35(26.7%) agreed that they oftenly update themselves with reference to the subject language, 34(24.9%) admitted that they sometimes update themselves with reference to the subject language, 2(1.5%) acceded that they never update themselves with reference to the subject language. Out of 13 English literature teachers 8(61.5%) mentioned that they frequently update themselves with reference to the subject language, 4(30.7%) admitted that they oftenly update themselves with reference to the subject language, 1(7.6%) agreed that they sometimes update themselves with reference to the subject language. From the analysis of non-literature teachers, 45(34.3%) mentioned that speaking skill is more important in teaching English, 38(29.0%) admitted that reading skill is more important while teaching English language, 30(22.9%) agreed that writing skill is important while teaching English, 18(13.7%) reported that listening is an important skill whereas out of 13 English-literature teachers, 4(30.7%) admitted that reading is more important skill while teaching English language, 2(15.3%) agreed that writing skill is important while teaching

English, 5(38.4%) mentioned that speaking skill is more important in teaching English, 2(15.3%) admitted that listening is an important skill.

Discussion

It was found that English literature teachers mostly focus on direct method while teaching English whereas non-English literature teachers mostly follow translation method. It was revealed that English literature teachers try to teach English phonetics while it could be seen less in non-English literature teachers. As per English literature teachers, they admitted that 2/3rd teaching material is according to the level of students, while as very few non English literature respondents agreed with it. From the analysis it was found that English literature teachers mostly follow lesson plan as compared to non-English literature teacher as it could be seen less among them. English teachers' oftenly update themselves with reference to the subject language as compared to non-English teachers. Non-English teachers sometimes updated themselves with reference to the subject language. Non-English literature teachers focus more on listening skills while teaching English.

References

- Ackoff Russel (1961) *Research Methods in social Relations*, New York: Dryden Halt Publishers.
- Aggarwal, J.C. (1983) *Landmarks in the History of Modern Indian Education*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House
- Bharathi, V.V (2012) Identification of problems in teaching-learning English

commerce college of the Kuchch district, *unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Baroda.*

Chidambaram, K. (2004) A Study on the learning process of English by highersecondary Students with special reference to Dharmapuri district, www.languageinindia.com p.1-4.

Enamul, H. (2008) English language teaching and learning at the Alim Level in the Madrashes in Bangladesh: problems and possible solutions, M.phil Dissertation, university of Bangladesh. www.asian-efl-journal.com

IramShafi (2012) Advent of English language in J&K, *An Educational Journal, Government College of Education*, M.A. Road, Srinagar.

Leonard Bloomfield (1935) *Language*, London: Allen &Unwin. American edition, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Mishra, K.C. (2005) Correction of Errors in English Training Course for the Teachers of English as a Second Language'. Sarup& Sons, New Delhi

Sobia, B. Shugufta, P. Nadeem, M. et al., (2015) Difficulties of teaching English at primary level in rural areas of Pakistan. *International Journal of Information Research and Review*. Vol. 2, Issue, 04, pp. (646-648).

Wong, M.L. (2010) 'Study of pre-service teachers' beliefs about learning English and the stability of these beliefs, R.E.L.C. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol.41, n.2, p.123-136, Aug.2010.