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ABSTRACT
First and foremost, the goal of this research is to determine the level of English proficiency among primary school students. Secondly, this study looked into the professionalism of the teacher. Thirdly, this study looks into the factors that may have a negative impact on the standard of English among primary school students. Fourthly, it examines the teacher’s ability to teach English to primary school children in the pursuit of quality education.

To ensure efficient and effective data collection, this study relied solely on the non-experimental design-descriptive survey method with a quantitative approach. Pre-testing of survey questionnaires was carried out to ensure consistency and reliability. This study was based on researcher classroom experiences. The research was mostly carried out in Bhutan under the auspices of the Department of School Education. The research began on the 18th of December, 2020, and ended on the 18th of May, 2021.

The findings, recommendations, and limitations of the study were totally based on the 60 sample collections. The researcher used SPSS and the Microsoft Excel sheet for tabulations and interpretation of data. For the data analysis the researcher used the SAS software and Microsoft Excel.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: tsheringdorjik@education.gov.bt;
Keywords: Standard; professionalism; research; quality; competency; curriculum; hypothesis, sampling.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the context of Bhutan's high school English curriculum, this research examines concerns regarding the preservation and promotion of culture. Bhutanese languages have a long and varied legacy of oral literature, but these genres, as well as the cultural values they represent, may be lost if they are not maintained.

Schools are an active cultural preservation site in Bhutan. Because of this, and because English is the language of most school curricula, we felt that studying folk literature in the English curriculum would be one of the ways in which Bhutan's many cultures might be acknowledged and revitalized. We have two questions for you: (1) "How do secondary English instructors see Bhutanese folk literature's long-term relevance in the English curriculum as a source of cultural knowledge?" (2) "After three months of learning about Bhutanese folk literature in the secondary English curriculum, what knowledge and attitude do secondary students demonstrate?" To answer the first question, a purpose-built questionnaire was completed by 38 percent of all secondary English teachers (n=181), followed by in-depth interviews with six (expert) instructors. Action research was used to answer the second study question, which was done with twenty-four Class 11 science students over the course of a year.

Today’s young people live in an environment which is very different from the one in which their parent’s generation grew up. This paper focuses on, amongst many socio-economic changes, changes in the role of education.

1.1 Conceptual Background

Since Bhutan started its development activities in 1961, the country has experienced (and continues to experience) considerable changes in its social, (and people’s perception of it) in the society and its relationship to students’ future careers, and aims to understand the relationship among three different components of Bhutan’s human resource development, namely: the education system, the government grading system of civil service (which is the largest employer of the country), and changes in young people’s preferences in terms of their career, which appears to be changing following socio-economic changes of the country [1-3].

In the current scenario, there are three kinds of education in Bhutan, namely English medium of education, Dzongkha (Bhutan’s national language) medium education and monastic education. All three different kinds of education systems which are currently prevail in the country for the development of the society as a whole [4-7].

Modern English medium education is the dominant mode of education today and encompasses the largest number of schools and students of the three types of system [8-11]. Formal secular education, according to Driem, was introduced into Bhutan by the first king, Ugyen Wangchuck (1862-1926; regn. 1907-1926), with the opening of two schools. This number was expanded to five schools during the reign of the second king, Jigme Wangchuck (1905-1952, regn. 1926-1952). In the English medium schools therefore can be seen as the dominant view among young people in Bhutan. In modern English education students are taught science, mathematics, English and social studies in English [12-17]. The structure of English medium education at the time of my fieldwork consists of one year pre-primary, six years of primary education, four years of secondary education (two years in junior high school level and two years in high school level), two years of the junior college programme and three years in the under-graduate programme [18,19]. Courses in training institutes are available for students who have passed various levels of education, however most courses are for those who have passed Class 10. English medium education is seen as the mainstream mode of education in Bhutan not only because of the number of students enrolled in the system but also in terms of the social attention given to it.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The Progress being made to enhance education is hindered by the increasing population. The difficult mountainous terrain, climate, lack of transport system and a scattered settlement pattern are the hurdles for accessing primary education. The success of expanding primary education is now placing pressure on the secondary and post secondary levels with an ever increasing number of students moving up the education ladder. The current scenario,
Bhutan has much to do with the outcome of our education system. With the implementation of the Education system, the language policy and advancement of modern technology has had a greater impact on the standard of English. Though English language is the second language of the Bhutanese people and also English is the international language, the government has given the paramount importance to the education for the improvement of Standard English.

From my teaching experiences of the 18th year in remote parts of schools, I came to understand and observed that the standard of English in primary school children is comparatively poor as compared to rural and city children. With this very problem, I want to study the standard of English in primary school children.

1.3 The Objectives of the Study

The following are the objectives that have to be achieved from this particular research. The objectives which are mentioned below are based on the type of sample collection and the objectives are achievable and specified.

1. To find out the strength and weakness which hinders the standard of English?
2. To identify the teaching competency (teacher competency)
3. To find out resource constraint or defect in teaching and learning process
4. To identify the relevancy and constraint that hinders the implementation of curriculum
5. To find out the teacher’s professionalism (work ethics).

1.4 Research Questions

1. What are the detrimental factors affecting the standard of English in primary children?
2. What are the perceptions of primary school teachers with special reference to the teaching of English?
3. What are the perspectives in regard to their professionalism?
4. What are the strategies of the ministry of education to improve the standard of English in primary school children?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

English has been introduced as the medium of instruction in the Bhutanese schools as it is the lingua franca of the world (El-Dakhs, & Mitchell, 2011; Sherab, 2013). Bhutanese children start learning all the subjects in English right from their first year (age 6) in school except Dzongkha (the national language) and Environmental Studies (Sherab, 2013). Therefore, it is important that children become proficient in the English language which includes four basic skills: reading, speaking, listening, and writing. According to El-Dakhs and Mitchell (2011, p. 2), “an essential component of this proficiency is improving one’s ability to communicate via writing since it is crucial to effective communication and essential to employment in today’s world.” Communication skills represent a kind of individual one is. Language is the most essential medium to communicate one’s thoughts, needs, desires, and feelings. Cook (2003, p. 3) rightly argues that “Language is at the heart of human life. Without it, many of our most important activities are inconceivable.” In Bhutan, the English language is not only used as a medium of instruction in schools and universities but also widely used as an official language across the nation and for everyday communication (both verbally and in written form). Despite all these facts, the standard of English has been always a concern for the education stakeholders (CERD, 2002; MoE, 2014; REC, 2009). A recent evaluation of the entire school English curriculum recommended a major review of the existing English curriculum (Sherab, Dorji, Lhendup, Tshering, Zangmo, & Tshering, 2017). This is an indication that there are issues related to the English curriculum and the standard of English in the Bhutanese schools. Some of the pertinent issues identified were issues related to grammar teaching, choice of texts, assessment, teacher preparation and size of the curriculum amongst others [20-23]. While there is no research conducted in the Bhutanese context, anecdotal evidence indicates that writing in general and spelling errors in particular are a common problem amongst Bhutanese students.

2.1. Teachers’ Beliefs about Teaching Grammar: According to Ward (2012), the earliest influence on language teaching in the West was the formal study of Latin and Greek in the sixteenth and seventeen centuries. It started with introduction of the grammar rules of the written language, which were learnt off by heart.
This traditional method of language teaching, known as Grammar-Translation Method became the basis for language teaching throughout the world as European empires grew and their education system developed on their colonies (Richards and Rogers, 1986 cited in Ward, 2012).

Teaching grammar following this method is, however, still prevalent in EFL classrooms. It is taught deductively (Widodo, 2006, p.123). This approach was challenged in the 1950s with the growing influence of behaviorism on language teaching methodology, which was thought to be based on sound scientific principles. Language was seen as a set of patterns that had to be turned into habits. The habit development was through drills that were focused on the spoken language (Larsen Freeman, 1998, cited in Ward 2012). According to Larsen Freeman in “Teaching Grammar” in traditional grammar teaching, it is a form-based approach, which uses structural syllabus and lessons composed of three phases: Presentation, Practice, and Production (or communication), often referred to as the PPP approach. Le Van Canh (2012) in his qualitative case study on “Vietnamese secondary school teachers’ beliefs and practices regarding grammar instruction” states that “the place of grammar instruction remains controversial in the field of second-language teaching, as consensus has not yet been reached regarding whether grammar instruction helps learners gain proficiency in a second language” (p.90). Marton (1988) also points some common faults in teaching grammar, which he calls obvious pedagogical mistakes. Firstly; it is with introduction of new grammatical rules without proper planning. Secondly, teachers do not take enough trouble to ensure that the learners fully and clearly understand the metalinguistic concepts and terms necessary for understanding the verbalization of a given principle. Thirdly, which Marton considers as a serious fault is, mismatch of techniques in terms of providing pedagogically justifiable sequences of exercises. There is lack of pedagogical efficiency in assigning exercises, which is a haphazard combination. Finally, there is a lack of knowledge and skill transfer from the grammar lesson, in production of spontaneous reconstructive tasks. Teachers believe that once a given grammatical rule has been presented and some exercises performed, their business of teaching grammar is finished. There was a reaction against a particular approach to teaching grammar rather than against grammar such as, making to follow prescriptive rules of rote learning, without any consideration for the communicative functions of language (Hung, 2003, p.41). According to Shoemaker (1991), Krashen’s theory on second language acquisition has influenced the Move Analysis of Senior High School Research Abstracts in a Philippine University International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies 86 concept of language teaching and has suggested new ideas for communicative techniques and simulation as opportunities to interact and learn language. This approach to grammar teaching, according to Widodo (2006), can make learners apply grammar in writing and speaking. Leng (1997, cited in Kaewsanchai, 2012) considers CLT as “one of the most competent language teaching methods available today” (p.206). Conversely, communicative language teaching (CLT), though it is gaining popularity, it seems there has been some misunderstanding among teachers and curriculum developers (Kaewsanchai, 2012, p.203). Rivers and Temperley (1978) mention that “at some stage students must learn the grammar of the language. The learning may be approached deductively (students are given a grammatical rule with examples before they practice the use of a particular structure) or inductively (students see a number of examples of the rule in operation in discourse; practice its use, and then evolve a rule from these examples with the help of the teacher; or they see a number of examples, evolve a rule from these examples with the help of the teacher, and then practice using the structure” (p.110). Likewise, Widodo (2006) also proposes five-step procedures for teaching grammar, which among these are deductive and inductive approaches. This approach started in the 1960s as a reaction to behaviourism (Larsen Freeman, 1998 cited in Ward 2012). Celce-Murcia (2001) gives the development of different approaches to language teaching as reactions to particular approaches. According to her, the order of sequence is, Grammar-translation approach, Direct approach, Reading approach, Audio-lingual and Oral situational approach and four other discernable approaches such as Cognitive approach, Affective-humanistic approach, Comprehension-based and Communicative approach. CelceMurcia suggests EFL/ESL teachers to learn about the various approaches and methods available with and find out which practices have proved successful. The Literature covers the oldest to the newest approaches to teaching grammar, though each of the subsequent approaches is a reaction to the previous, all are
attributed with advantages and disadvantages and no particular approach has been considered as the best and most successful. Different approaches have been initiated since the start of language teaching in the history.

2.2. Teachers’ Beliefs about Teaching English Grammar in Bhutan: Teaching grammar in Bhutan has been considered central to the teaching and learning of languages since the inception of western education. According to Gajmeer and Maxwell (2009), English grammar was taught based on an Indian curriculum, and Bhutan was completely dependent on India for materials and teachers. The textbooks were of high standard and grammar was taught rigorously from Classes III to VIII. The general standard of English was understood to be good. Though it mentioned that the grammar teaching was very intensive, nothing had been mentioned on the approaches to teaching grammar at that time, being followed by the Indian teachers. Gajmeer and Maxwell (2009) mention that, by the late 1980s, with the establishment of Bhutan’s own Curriculum and Textbook Development Division, the English curriculum contained only selected structures up to class VIII and there was no grammar textbook. By 2000, an open concern regarding the standard of English had been raised and the formal grammar teaching started with prescribed textbooks from class VI onwards (Gajmeer & Maxwell 2009, p.29). The concern at that time was not on pedagogy in teaching grammar but was on having a prescribed grammar textbook. The action research on “Improving the Use of Articles, Prepositions and Tenses” of trainee teachers at Samtse College of Education, found answers to how was grammar being taught to students from class VI till XII. According to the report, grammar was taught in bits and pieces using manuals, sight words, pictures, flashcards, drawings and real objects to teach grammatical items till class VI. From class VI till VIII, grammar was never taught separately, but in integration with English and other subjects. A few examples from the texts would be selected and sketchy explanation would be provided. From class IX to XII, Volume 1, Issue 2, 2020 International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies 87 grammar teaching further deteriorated, without any grammar textbooks (Gajmeer & Maxwell, 2009, p.29). If I recall how I was taught grammar, I can’t get any vivid picture of a grammar lesson being taught. The English lessons were based on explanation of text, focussed on comprehension of text rather than teaching grammatical items. If I was taught grammar, it was in preparation for examination, Reflections and Insights from the Classroom” by CERD (2009), it is stated that, a prescribed grammar for class XI and XII has not been developed leaving the learners lost and searching for subject materials. This section states that there was no particular approach to teaching grammar, followed by the Bhutanese English teachers and most approaches were flawed and varied. The teachers never taught grammar making to learn answers by heart. Similarly, the Curriculum Education and Research Division (2009) found that, there is no clear cut instruction given for grammar activities, and grammar is taught much less often in the higher classes, leaving vast areas uncovered. In “Teacher’s Perception about the new Curriculum: systematically, paying lesser attention to grammar. One of the drawbacks could have been due to inexperienced curriculum developers and unavailability of materials which had caused grammar to be neglected in the curriculum.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The researcher used the questionnaire tool of closed form that was administered to my fellow teachers of some schools in three Districts of Bhutan because the researcher thought that teachers would be in a better position to provide the views on the standard of English with the special reference to the teacher profession. Teachers are the stakeholders of the school education system in the country.

For this research the researcher have used the Descriptive Survey Method used for my present study.

3.1 Sampling Method

To fulfill the above mentioned objectives, the researcher will be using the more specifically a simple random sampling method which is more convenient for me to collect the information very effectively. For gathering the data or information basically, researcher will be focusing on the teachers who are teaching in primary school and Lower Secondary Schools three primary schools both rural and urban across the country. I will be collecting the data at the minimum of sixty teachers irrespective of genders and type of schools.

3.2 Statistical Techniques

Researchers used the simple percentage method. Simple percentage is calculated based
on the data collected from the respondents. Although it is said that use of percentage may lead to wrong conclusions, it is quite a simple and commonly used method.

3.3 Data Processing

The data collected during research has to be processed and analyzed as laid down in the research plan. The processing of data primarily means editing, coding, classification and tabulation of data, so that they are agreeable and open to discussion.

3.4 Part A: Analysis and Interpretation of Planning

1. 100% of the respondents agreed that it is really necessary to prepare yearly, block and weekly plans for effective teaching.
2. About 53.30% of the respondents said that it is necessary that a good teacher must teach according to a planned plan. About 46.70% of the respondents disagreed that a good teacher must not teach according to a planned plan.
3. Almost 95% of the respondents agreed that time constraints hinder your preparation of a teaching plan. Only 5% disagreed that the time constraints do not hinder the preparation of the teaching plan.
4. About 38.30% of the respondents think that a teacher can teach effectively without a teaching plan. Nearly 61.70% of the respondents disagreed that a teacher cannot teach effectively without a teaching plan.
5. About 73.30% of the respondents agreed that, teaching plan is of any help for their actual teaching.26.7% of the respondents disagreed that the teaching plan is not helpful for actual teaching.
6. Barely 13.30% responded that planning is not important in primary school. But, almost 70% of the respondents disagreed that planning is important in primary school.
7. About 26.70% agreed that they never prepared the plan, because my principal does not insist on it. Around 73.30% of the respondents responded that they prepared the plan as the principal insisted on them.
8. Only 28.30% of the respondents agreed that they always use yellow notes for teaching and learning.71.70% of the respondents do not use yellow notes for teaching and learning.
9. About 73.30% agreed that planning enhances comprehensive understanding of the lesson. Only 26.7% disagreed that planning does not enhance comprehensive understanding of the lesson.
10. Merely 20% of the respondents agreed that specific lesson objectives and learning activities need not be given much importance in lesson plan writing. About 80% of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

Table 1. Comparison of percentage scored by each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreee</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>86.70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 1. Represents the percentage comparison on planning

3.5 Part-B: Interpretation of Implementation on Teaching Methodology

Table 2. Comparison of percentage scored by each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 2. Represents the percentage comparison on teaching methodology
1. The 50% of the respondents agreed that in the rural school, teachers make best use of a teacher centred approach. The 50% of the respondents disagreed about the statement.

2. About 75% of the respondents agreed that remote teachers do have the ideas of a child centred approach. Only 25% of the respondents disagreed that remote teachers do have the ideas of a child centred approach.

3. Absolutely 100% of the respondents agreed that they prefer diverse methodologies in teaching the lesson?

4. Only 10% of the respondents agreed that they feel the method given in the textbook is best for teaching. Almost 90% of the respondents disagreed that they feel the method given in the textbook is best for teaching.

5. About 61.70% of respondents agreed that, multigrade teaching hinders the quality of learning. Another 38.30% of the respondents disagreed that multigrade teaching hinders the quality of learning.

6. About 55% of respondents responded that they always use deductive and inductive approaches in my teaching. About 45% of the respondents responded that they do not use deductive and inductive approaches in my teaching. About 45% of the respondents responded that, they do not use deductive and inductive approach in my teaching.

7. Only 25% of the respondents responded that, the methodologies which are given in the textbook are irrelevant to the children. About 75% responded that the methodologies which are given in the textbook are irrelevant to the children.

8. About 70% of the respondents agreed that, methodology is not important but how you disseminate the concept is important. Another 30% disagreed that, methodology is not important but how you disseminate the concept is important.

9. Almost 90% of the respondents agreed that, they always workout on arriving at the best method to teach my students in easy and understandable way. Only 10% is disagreed about the statement.

10. About 38.30% of the respondents agreed that, the traditional method of teaching is much better than present approaches and only 61% of the respondents disagreed.

3.6 Part C: Interpretation on Teaching Learning Materials

Table 3. Comparison of the percentage scored by each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>91.70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Only 6.70% responded that they strongly agreed that they do not prepare teaching-learning materials due to heavy teaching load. About 11.70% agree, 46.70% strongly disagree and 35% of the teachers disagree.

2. About 38.30% of the respondents strongly agreed that they hardly use teaching-learning materials which are available in the school. Only 13.30% agreed, only 10% strongly disagreed and 38.30% disagreed TLMs do not bring any impact on children’s learning.

3. About 83.30% of the teachers strongly disagreed and 16.79% disagreed that TLMs do not bring any impact on children’s learning.

4. Sometimes, 50% of the teachers prepare teaching-learning materials as when the topic demands and only 10% of teachers do not prepare teaching learning materials.
5. About 75% of the teachers agreed that they should never improvise TLM in the school due to the dearth of materials, 15% strongly agreed, 5% strongly disagree, and 5% of the teachers disagreed.

6. About 50% of the teachers disagreed that learning objective can be achieved only incorporating TLMs in the lesson plan, 43% strongly disagreed, and only 6.70% agreed.

7. About 33.30% of the teachers strongly agreed that, TLMs makes the lesson interesting, enjoyable and worthwhile learning. Only 30% disagreed and only 3.70% agreed.

8. About 91.70% of the teachers said that, using TLMs helps in achieving observational learning, conceptual learning and perceptual learning and only 8.30% agreed.

9. About 80% of the teachers strongly agreed that using teaching learning materials for my effective teaching. Only 20% of the teachers also agreed.

10. Nearly 78.70% of the respondents strongly agreed that lesson without the TLMs no impact in children’s learning. 20% of the teachers agreed and only 1.70 disagreed.

Line Graph 3. Represents the percentage of teaching learning materials

3.7 Part D: Interpretation and Analysis on Assessment

Table 4. Comparison of percentage scored by each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>48.</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P( %)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. About 73.30% of the respondents said that they always evaluate children’s tasks like homework, class work, and projects for grading. But only 26.6% said they do sometimes.

2. About 48.30% of the teachers always conduct unit tests, weekly tests, and block tests to see the comprehensive understanding of the topic. 50% teachers do sometimes, and only 1.7% do rarely.

3. About 48.30% of the teachers always evaluate their papers and follow up the remedial classes. But 50% of the teachers do sometimes and only 1.70% teachers never do.

4. About 76.70% of the teachers always check their notebook and give them constructive feedback for improvement. Only 26.70% do sometimes.
5. About 55% of the teachers always emphasise more on reading and writing. On the other hand only 28.30% do sometimes and only 6.70% rarely.
6. About 43.30% of the teachers always maintain portfolio for overall improvement of children’s performance. About 48.30% of the teachers does sometimes, and only 1.70% never does.
7. About 66.70% of the teachers always orient on question patterns and procedures before carrying out any type assessment for better performance. On the other hand, only 33.30% does sometimes.
8. About 65% of the teachers always ensure that, the child performance made to be transparent to their parents for future improvement. About 28.30% does sometimes and only 6.70% do rarely.
9. Almost 90% of the teachers always maintained all the assessment records of individual child for the future reference to update. Only 8.30% does sometimes and merely 1.70% does rarely.
10. About 80% of the teachers always do the result analysis are done for all the subjects for the future enhancement. But about 16.70% does sometimes and 1.70% in rarely and 1.70% never.

Graph 4. Comparison of percentage scored by each statement

3.8 Part E: Interpretation and Analysis on Curriculum Implementation

Table 5. Comparison of percentage scored by each statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage%</td>
<td>78.30</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73.30</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree%</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>31.70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage%</td>
<td>38.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. About 78.30% of the teachers agreed that, the present English curriculum was designed top-down based and of high standard. Only 21.70% of teachers disagreed.
2. About 68.30% of the teachers agreed that, it consists of numerous activities to be converyed which are not at all important for the children. Only 31.70% teachers disagreed.
3. About 60% of the teachers agreed that, the curriculum is not designed as per the need of the children and not relevant to the children. Only 40% teachers disagreed.
4. About 73.30% of the teachers agreed that the percentage English curriculum demands the specialist teacher. Only 26.70% of the teachers disagreed with statement.
5. About 48.30% of the teachers agreed that, the implementation of curriculum is on the basis of trial and error method. On the other hand, 51.70% disagreed with the statement.
6. About 75% of the teachers agreed that, the syllabus of the subject is lengthy and unimportant, whereby teacher has to speed up to cover the syllabus as mandate. But only 25% of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

7. About 61.70% of the teachers agreed that, it requires techniques and skills to teach the subjects which is not possible in the remote schools. About 38.30% of the teachers disagreed.

8. About 46.70% of the teachers favoured that, a frequent change in the curriculum has no impact on children’s learning. About 53% of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

9. About 60% of the teachers agreed that, the present English curriculum for class PP-VI, cannot be implemented in the multigrade situation. (because realignment of topics is not done and teachers are incompatible to teach). And only 40% of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

10. About 61.70% of the teachers agreed that, the present curriculum is designed on the basis of simple to complex, age wise and level wise pattern. Only 38.30% teachers disagreed with the statement.

Graph 5. Represents the percentage comparison on curriculum implementation

3.9 Part F: Interpretation and Analysis on Teacher Competency

Table 6. Comparison of percentage scored represents to teaching competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage %</td>
<td>96.70</td>
<td>56.70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage%</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Almost 96.70% of the teachers agreed that, in remote schools, language is caught by NCT or CBT due to shortage of teachers. Only 3.30% of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

2. About 56.70% of the teachers agreed that teachers are confident and competent enough to teach English. But about 43.30% of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

3. About 70% of the teachers agreed that they have full confidence to teach English cl.PP-VI. Only 30% of the teachers disagreed with it.

4. 100% of the teachers agreed that, in remote schools, two or three grades are handled by a single teacher.

5. About 65% of the teachers agreed that training, refresher courses, orientation programmes and seminars gave more priority to the urban teachers. Only 35% of the teachers disagreed with it.
6. About 95% of the teachers agreed that they update their profession by doing research, reading, and writing. Only 5% of the teachers disagreed with it.
7. Only 30% of the teachers agreed that they do not like the teaching profession because it is a tiring job. About 70% of the teachers disagreed.
8. About 80% of the teachers agreed that teachers are responsible for the success or failure of the student. Only 20% of the teachers disagreed with the statement.

Graph 6. Part F: Represents the percentage comparison on teacher competency

3.10 Hypothesis With Respect To Gender

(H0): There is no significant difference in the opinion of male and female teachers on standard of English in primary children.

To study the above hypothesis the following calculations were done the result were tabulated as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that the ‘t’ value 2.45 is greater than the table 1.03 at 0.05 level of significant. There is no significant difference between male and female teachers on standard of English in primary school children. Here Null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

3.11 Hypothesis with Respect to Type of Schools

(H0): There is no significant difference in the opinion of LSS and PS teachers on standard of English in primary children.

To study the above hypothesis the following calculations were done the result were tabulated as shown below:
Table 8. Comparison of scores with respect to LSS and PS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51.17</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49.02</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 0.05 level

The above table indicates that the ‘t’ value 3.19 is greater than the table value 2.15 at 0.05 level of significance. There is no significant difference between LSS and PS teachers on standard of English in primary school children. Here the Null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is accepted.

3.12 Hypothesis with Respect to Location

(H0): There is no significant difference in the opinion of Rural and Urban teachers on standard of English in primary children. To study the above hypothesis the following calculations were done the result were tabulated as shown below.

Table 9. Comparison of scores with respect to Rural and Urban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>3.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.62</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at 0.05 level

The above table indicates that the ‘t’ value 3.16 is greater than the table value 2.19 at 0.05 level of significant. There is no significant difference between Rural and Urban teachers on standard of English in primary schools children. Hence, Null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

3.13 Hypothesis with Respect to Professional Qualification

(H0): There is no significant difference in the opinion of PTC and B.Ed teachers on standard of English in primary children. To study the above hypothesis the following calculations were done the result were tabulated as shown below:

Table 10. Comparison of scores with respect to PTC and B.Ed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47.17</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ed</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.24</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at 0.05 level

The above table indicates that the ‘t’ value 2.89 is greater than the table value 3.07 at 0.05 level of significance. There is no significant difference between PTC and B.Ed teachers on standard of English in primary school children. Here the Null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is accepted.

3.14 Hypothesis with Respect to Teaching Experience

(H0): There is no significant difference in the opinion of children below 10 years and above 10 years on standard of English in primary children.

To study the above hypothesis the following calculations were done the result were tabulated as shown below:
Table 11. Comparison of scores with respect to below 10 years and above 10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>MD</th>
<th>‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.12</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 0.05 level

The above table indicates that the ‘t’ value 2.89 is greater than the table value 3.19 at 0.05 level of significance. There is no significant difference between PTC and B.Ed teachers on standard of English in primary school children. Here the Null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is accepted.

4. FINDINGS, RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Introduction

In the preceding chapter the researcher has done a painstaking study by analyzing and interpreting the results which were made through statistical methods. This chapter tries to deal with the generalization to arrive at a favorable conclusion to the problems of the preceding chapter.

In this particular chapter the researcher needs to work out with vigilance in formulating conclusions and arriving at any generalizations in order to avoid the entire energy, time and resources into fruitless conclusion. The researcher has to interpret the results of the findings and recommendations for future improvement.

The findings and recommendations are entirely based on six areas such as planning, implementation on teaching methodologies, teaching-learning materials, assessment, curriculum implementation, and teacher competency to teach English.

4.2 Finding Pertaining to the Planning

Cent percent of teachers expressed their views that it is necessary to prepare yearly, block and weekly plans for effective teaching. About 53.30% of the teachers viewed that it is necessary that a good teacher must teach according to the planned plan but 95% of the teachers confessed that the time constraints really hinder their preparation of teaching plans.

The majority of teachers said that a teacher cannot teach effectively without having the teaching plan and about 73.30% of the teachers admit that, teaching plan is helpful for their actual implementation of the lesson.

Maximum teachers feel that planning is very important in the primary school and they prepare the plan as they are instructed by the principal.

About 71.70% of the teachers never use the yellow notes for teaching and learning purposes as the planning enhances the comprehensive understanding of the lesson. Moreover, the specific objectives and learning activities need to be given paramount importance and incorporated in the lesson plan writing.

4.3 Finding Pertaining to the Implementation of Teaching Methodology

About 50% of the teachers in the rural schools make the best use of the teacher centre approach whereas, another 50% of the teachers prefer to use the child centred approach. The greatest number of teachers confessed that remote teachers do not have the ideas of a child centred approach.

100% of the teachers are preferable to use diverse methodologies (such as deductive and inductive approach) in teaching and learning process. Even considering the methods which are given in the textbooks are relevant or appropriate to the children and good at teaching the lesson.

About 61.70% of the teachers feel that multigrade teaching in the remote parts of the country hinder their standard of language (English). About 70% of the teachers viewed that methodologies are not important but how you disseminate the concept is important.

Almost 90% of the teachers’ workout on arrival is the best method to teach their children in an easy and understandable way. The maximum number of teachers prefer to use the present methods of teaching rather than going for the traditional method.
4.4 Finding Pertaining to the Teaching Learning Materials

The majority of teachers sense that integrating the TLMs in the lesson makes the lesson enjoyable, interesting, worthwhile, and effective in achieving the learning objectives. Nevertheless, it helps in achieving observational, conceptual, and perceptual learning.

4.5 Finding Pertaining to the Students Assessment

Almost all the teachers always assess their children's assignments such as homework, classwork, and project work for promotion to higher grades. Besides, they also conduct unit tests, weekly tests, and block tests to see the comprehensive understanding of the topic and give constructive feedback, and conduct the remedial classes for the low performers.

To enhance the standard of English, the majority of teachers focus on the reading and writing activities. To ensure transparency, most of the teachers maintain the individual's portfolios and assessment records.

Before the examination, about 90% of the teachers orient on question patterns and procedures to ensure better performance at the same time after the examination, result analysis done for the subjects for the future enhancement of teachers as well as for children.

Almost all the teachers prepare their teaching-learning materials for the effective deliberation of the lesson in spite of having heavy teaching loads. Most of the teachers hardy use teaching-learning materials which are available in the school.

When the topic demands, teachers improvise and do prepare their teaching-learning in spite of having the dearth of materials owing to the fact that it brings greater impact on children's understanding or learning.

4.6 Finding Pertaining to the Curriculum Implementation

About 60% of the teachers feel that, English curriculum is not designed as per the needs of the children and it really demands specialist teachers.

About 51.71% of the teachers confessed that the implementation of curriculum is not the basis of trial and error method but 75% of the teachers expressed that the syllabus is lengthy and unimportant and they face tough time to cover up the syllabus. 61.70% of the teachers favored that the English curriculum requires techniques and skills to teach which is not possible in the remote schools where English is taught by untrained teachers (CBT/NCT).

The majority of teachers feel that, the frequent changes in the curriculum brings the impact on children learning.

They also support that, the present English curriculum for PP-VI cannot be implemented in the multigrade situation as topic realignment was not done though the curriculum is developed on the basis of simple to complex, age-wise and level-wise pattern.

4.7 Finding Pertaining to the Teacher Competency to Teach English

About 96.70% of the teachers support that, in the remote schools language is taught by NCT/CBT due to the teachers' shortage in the country. They have full confidence to teach English classes PP to VI.

100% of the teachers agreed that, in the remote schools, two or three grades are handled by a single teacher whereby the standard of English is poor. Moreover, they confessed that the training, refresher course, orientation programmes and seminars are given preferences to the urban teachers.

The majority of teachers love the teaching profession they update their profession by doing research, reading and writing and they are the responsible for the success or failure of the children.

4.8 Finding Pertaining to the Gender

There is no significant difference with respect to male and female teachers on standard of English. The mean value of male is 50.14 which is less than mean value of female which is 51.72.
4.9 Finding Pertaining to the Type of School

There is no significant difference with respect to LSS and PS teachers on standard of English. The mean value of male is 51.17 which is greater than mean value of female which is 49.2.

4.10 Finding Pertaining to the Location

There is no significant difference with respect to Rural and urban teachers on standard of English. The mean value of male is 49.81 which is greater than mean value of female which is 47.62.

4.11 Finding Pertaining to the Professional Qualification

There is no significant difference with respect to PTC and B.Ed teachers on standard of English. The mean value of male is 47.17 which is less than mean value of female which is 50.24.

4.12 Finding Pertaining to the Teaching Experience

There is no significant difference with respect to below 10 years and above 10 years teachers on standard of English. The mean value of male is 49.41 which is greater than mean value of female which is 47.12.

4.13 Recommendations Part-A: Planning

Time constraints the main factor that hinders the preparation of the teaching plan, so if the concern is the Ministry to study the school before deploying the teachers to the school.

4.14 Part-B: Interpretation Implementation of Teaching Methodolog

Remote teachers do not have the ideas of a child centred approach, if the agency could provide the opportunities to participate in a child centre approach orientation program or any related workshops, seminars, and refresher course.

The school Administrator or HOD should encourage the teachers to make best of use methods or strategies which are given in the textbooks.

The majority of teachers expressed their opinions that Multi-grade teaching hinders the standard of English so to uplift the standard of English, the Ministry must deploy the teachers according to the requirements of education policy or multi-grade teaching should be discontinued.

4.15 Part-C: Teaching Learning Materials

The school administrator should encourage the teachers to use the teaching-learning materials which are available in the school. At the same time the Ministry should provide materials for preparing teaching and learning aids.

4.16 Part-E: Curriculum Implementation

As the present English Curriculum was developed top-down based and of high standard whereby teachers are not able to teach well (untrained teachers and content is very high). As a result, the standard of English in primary children is not up to expectation. So to boost the curriculum designers should design the curriculum from low level to high level; and its content should be simple to complex.

The Ministry should also deploy at least one language teacher in the remote schools.

While framing the curriculum, the designers should also coordinate with the field workers so that pros and cons will be taken care of. (For instance; lengthy syllabus, irrelevant activities and numerous activities). If the present English Curriculum should be implemented in the multi-grade situation, the concerned agency should realign the curriculum.

4.17 Part-F: Teacher Competency to Teach English

It would be better if the Ministry could deploy at least one trained teacher in the remote school or encourage and provide some trainings, refresher courses.

Ministry should encourage teachers to serve in the remote schools to avoid teacher shortage.

4.18 Suggestions for Future Research

A similar study may be carried out more emphasizing on specific topics such as reading or writing. A study may be done on the same topic, with special reference to the children.

A study may be conducted with special reference to the curriculum designers. A Similar study can
be done taking large samples from different schools from different schools so as to validate the present result.

A similar study can be attempted on shortage of teachers with reference to standard of English. A study may be conducted in multi-grade schools or classes with reference to the standard of English.

Case studies of teacher deployment could be studied. In the present study only standard of English but other aspects may be included in the study.

5. CONCLUSION

Although it was found that the standard of English was affected by the following factors such as frequent changes in curriculum, acute shortage of teachers in the remote parts of schools, insufficient teaching-learning materials, multi-grade teaching, and untrained teacher

Conversely, the Ministry of Education (MoE) is taking greater steps to overcome all those problems for the further improve the standard of English in the primary children. Moreover, the government has established a seven member commission to carry out the review work of the education sector. It has taken several research works at the national levels as well as various universities which will bring the improvement standard of English. Nevertheless; this research work will also address the issue of standard of English in the country.
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