



IMPACT OF MENTORING IN LEARNING GRAMMAR AT STANDARD VI

KULDEEP SABARWAL

Research Scholar, Dept of Educational Technology, Bharathiar University,

&

DR.G.SINGARAVELU

Professor & Head

Dept of Education, Bharathiar University,

Coimbatore-641 046.

ABSTRACT

The present study highlights the effectiveness of Mentoring to enhance English grammar among the learners of sixth standard. Grammar has unique place in development of English language or any other languages. Teachers are facing problems in teaching grammar at standard VI. Due to the parents of the learners are busy with work load, learners can learn only in the class room.. Mentoring programs can help the mentees or novice teachers in finding solutions to the challenges which they face particularly in the EFL classes, and they are also helpful to deal with the cultural differences, logistical issues, unfamiliar structural and organizational arrangements, different understanding of assessment, communication gaps and problems with teacher and student relations.. Present study may be useful to ameliorate the learners through Mentoring. **Hypotheses of the study:** 1. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of control group and post test of First- Experimental group. 2. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of First- Experimental group and post test of First Experimental group. 3. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of Second- Experimental group and post test of Second- Experimental group. 4. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of First- Experimental group

and post test of Second- Experimental group. **Methodology:** Experimental method was adopted in the study. One control group and Two Experimental groups design was adopted in the study. **Sample:** Ninety students studying in standard six at Airforce school were considered as sample for the study. Thirty learners were considered as Control group and another sixty students were taken as Two Experimental groups in the study. **Tool:** Researcher's self-made achievement test was employed as tool for the study. **Procedure of the study:** 1. Measuring the hurdles of the learners in English Grammar. 2. Preparation of Mentoring activities. 3. Treatment . Pre- test to Control group and two-Experimental groups and Post- test to Control group and two- Experimental groups. **Findings:** Mentoring is more effective than conventional methods in learning grammar in English at rural area. **Educational implications:** It may be helpful to eliminate the problems in learning English grammar at other levels.

Key words Mentoring, Educational courseware, multiple course wares

Introduction

Grammar has unique place in development of English language or any other languages .Teachers are facing problems in teaching grammar at standard VI .Due to the parents of the learners are work busy, learners have opportunity to get the experience of the language learning in home. Traditional methods of teaching English are not lucrative to the learners. Conventional methods of teaching is psychologically affected the interest of the learners. Mentoring ensures the effective individual leaning in limited time for all sorts of learners including slow learners also. The Mentoring strategies have gained an increasing amount of attention in the field of education. Chief motto of the researcher was the problems of the young learners of upper primary in learning grammar should be eliminated. Hence the researcher identified Mentoring for eliminating the hard spot of the learners in learning English grammar effectively.

Review related study

O'Hara, Susan; Bookmyer, Joanne; Pritchard, Robert; Martin, Robin (2020) examine the foundational knowledge and instructional methods needed for academic language teaching of English language learners (ELLs). It also examines how mentoring practices can build secondary content-based novice teachers' instructional capacity in this area. The study uses synthesized data from two independent studies to contextualize findings on essential instructional practices within the process of mentoring new teachers. Three themes emerged: novices need the foundational, theoretical and practical knowledge underlying essential practices for academic language development; essential practices must be articulated in detail for

enactment by teachers; and balancing explicit and immersive academic language instruction is a major paradigm shift for novices. Implications for mentor and teacher professional development are discussed, as mentors are key to supporting the uptake of dynamic instructional methods needed to enact essential practices. While mentoring is a common strategy for supporting new teachers, few models exist for how mentors can support new teachers with building the academic language development of ELLs. Further, few studies examine mentoring exchanges that can promote teachers' understanding and practices to support ELL students' academic language development. Limitations of the study include sample size and use of varied respondent data sets.

Objectives of the study

1. To find out whether there is any significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of control group and post test of First- Experimental group.
2. To find out whether there is any significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of First- Experimental group and post test of First Experimental group
- . 3. To find out whether there is any significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of Second- Experimental group and post test of Second- Experimental group.
4. To find out whether there is any significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of control group and post test of Second- Experimental group.

Hypotheses of the study

1. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of Control group and post test of First- Experimental group.
2. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of First- Experimental group and post test of First Experimental group
- . 3. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of Second- Experimental group and post test of Second- Experimental group.
4. There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of Control group and post test of Second- Experimental group.

Methodology:

Experimental method was adopted in the study. One control group and Two Experimental groups design was adopted in the study. Two groups Experimental method and one group control group were adopted for the study. Post test was administered for the control group. Pre test-Treatment and Post-test were

administered to the two Experimental groups. At the beginning, traditional methods of teaching to thirty students (control group) were given and their performances were tested by administering Post test only and its score was tabulated. Secondly, 60 students from another school were divided into two Experimental groups who were involved for the pre-test in the existing conventional method and after the treatment of using a Multimedia course ware for the both groups, the Post test was administered for the both experimental groups in achieving grammatical competency in English. The same tool was used for the Pre test and the Post test. Hence the experimental method, qualitative and quantitative approaches were adopted for the study.

Sample:

Ninety students studying in standard six at Airforce school, Indoor were considered as sample for the study. Thirty learners were considered as Control group and another sixty students were taken as Two Experimental groups in the study.

Tool:

Researcher's self-made achievement test was employed as tool for the study.

Description of instrumentation

Twenty five objective types of questions were prepared by the researcher. Each question carries one mark.

Fill up -5marks

Choose the best answer-5marks

True or False-5marks

Match the following-5marks

One word substitute-5marks

Reliability of the tool

Test- retest method was used for the study. The co-efficient correlation was found 0.78 in the tool through test-retest method.

Validity of the tool

Content validity was established for the test through expert suggestions.

Hence reliability and validity were properly established for the study.

Statistical Technique

Percentage, mean, SD and t test were adopted in the study for analyzing the tabulated data.

Activities of the study:

- Listening Actively. Active listening is the most basic mentoring. ...
- Building Trust. ...
- Encouraging.
- Identifying Goals and Current.
- Instructing/Developing Capabilities. ...
- Providing Corrective Feedback. ...
- Inspiring. ...
- Opening Doors

Data collection:

The researcher administered pretest to the students with the help of the teachers. Diagnostic test was used to identify the problems of the learners in learning English grammar. The causes of low achievement by unsuitable methods were found out. Multimedia courseware was practiced in the classroom for the two Experimental groups. The posttest was administered towards the two Experimental groups and the effectiveness of the Multimedia courseware was found out.

Hypothesis testing**Null Hypothesis-1**

There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of Control group and post test of First- Experimental group.

Table-1

| Stages | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t- value | Result |
|------------------------------------|----|-------|------|----|----------|-------------|
| Posttest control group | 30 | 10.62 | 3.13 | 58 | 4.433 | significant |
| Post test First Experimental group | 30 | 14.22 | 3.16 | | | |

Achievement mean scores between post test of control group and posttest of First Experimental group.

The calculated t value is (4.433) greater than table value (2.00). Hence null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 levels. Hence there is significant difference between the post test of control group and post test of First Experimental group in achievement mean scores of the learners in learning English grammar.

Null Hypothesis-2

There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of First- Experimental group and post test of First Experimental group

Table-2.

| Stages | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t- value | Level of significance |
|---|----|-------|------|----|----------|-----------------------|
| Pretest First Experimental group | 30 | 10.70 | 3.24 | 58 | 7.65 | P>0.05 |
| Post test First Experimental group | 30 | 14.22 | 3.16 | | | |

Achievement mean scores between pretest of First experimental group and posttest of First Experimental group.

The calculated t value is (7.65) greater than table value (2.00). Hence null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 levels. Hence there is significant difference between the pre test of First- Experimental group and post test of First Experimental group in achievement mean scores of the learners in learning English grammar.

Null Hypothesis-3

There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of Second- Experimental group and post test of Second- Experimental group.

Table-3.

| Stages | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t- value | Level of significance |
|--|----|-------|------|----|----------|-----------------------|
| Pretest Second Experimental group | 30 | 10.60 | 3.14 | 58 | 7.54 | P>0.05 |
| Post test SecondExpe | 30 | 16.64 | 3.22 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Experimental group | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Achievement mean scores between pretest of Second experimental group and posttest of Second Experimental group.

The calculated t value is (7.54) greater than table value (2.00). Hence null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 levels. Hence there is significant difference between the pre test of Second- Experimental group and post test of Second Experimental group in achievement mean scores of the learners in learning English grammar.

Null Hypothesis-4

There is no significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of Control group and post test of Second- Experimental group.

Table-4

| Stages | N | Mean | S.D. | df | t- value | Result |
|-------------------------------------|----|-------|------|----|----------|-------------|
| Posttest control group | 30 | 10.70 | 3.13 | 58 | 7.34 | significant |
| Post test Second Experimental group | 30 | 16.64 | 3.22 | | | |

Achievement mean scores between post test of control group and posttest of Second Experimental group.

The calculated t value is(7.34) greater than table value (2.00). Hence null hypothesis is rejected at 0.05 levels. Hence there is significant difference between the post test of control group and post test of Second experimental group in achievement mean scores of the learners in learning English grammar.

Findings

1.Traditional method is ineffective but Mentoring assists-learners to score more marks in learning English grammar. Post test mean score of control group is (10.62) less than post test of First Experimental group 14.22 and post test of SecondExperimental group 16.64.

2. There is significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of Control group and post test of First- Experimental group.
3. There is significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of First- Experimental group and post test of First Experimental group
4. There is significant differences in achievement mean score between the pre test of Second- Experimental group and post test of Second- Experimental group.
5. There is significant differences in achievement mean score between the post test of Control group and post test of Second- Experimental group.

Educational Implications:

1. Mentoring can be extended to primary level.
2. It can be encouraged to implement to other subjects.
3. It may be implemented in Higher education
4. It may be implemented in school education also.
5. It can be implemented in all the Universities.
6. It may be more supportive to promote teacher Education.
7. It may adjust the learners' interest.
8. It may ensure the quality language education.

Conclusion

The study highlights the problems faced by the learners in acquiring grammatical competency in English by using traditional approaches. Mentoring is more effective in acquiring grammatical competency in English. Hence it will be more supportive to promote the competency of the learners in grammar. Like the effective methods of using Mentoring attract the young learners in learning English grammar.

References

- Bjerkholt, E. (2017), Professional Mentoring: From Practice to a Theoretical Field, Cappan Damm Akademisk, Oslo.
- Blackwell, J.E. (1989), "Mentoring: an action strategy for increasing minority faculty", *cademe*, Vol. 75 No. 5, pp. 8-14.
- Caroline Daly, Emmajane Milton, (2017) "External mentoring for new teachers: mentor learning for a change agenda", *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, Vol. 6 Issue: 3, pp.178-195, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2017-0021>

Singaravelu, G.(2007) *Educational Technology:A confidence Builder and Problem Solver in Learning English at Standard I, i-manager's Journal on School Educational Technology, Volume 2.no 4.*