

# **CHAPTER-I**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 General Background**

In our days, we have come to know a lot more about language in a specialized sort of way. Language is the most effective means of human communication. It is common to only human beings. It is the most unique gift that sets them distinct from the rest of other living beings, i.e. animals. Over the past century or more, language has come to be studied exclusively, and different points of view have arisen from which it can be observed. As Gleason says, 'language has so many inter-relationships with various aspects of human life that it can be studied from numerous points of view. All are valid and useful, as well as interesting in themselves' (Cited in Rajimwale 2001: 2).

This states that language is linked with a number of disciplines like literature, culture, psychology, information technology, science, anthropology, linguistics, and language teaching and many more. Moreover, 'language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols which permit all people in a given culture; or other people who have learned the system of that culture, to communicate or to interact' (Widdowson, 1988:3). Therefore, language is used as a vehicle to transmit ideas from person to person and generation-to-generation helping society to march forward. The supreme importance of language is in its use as a tool- a vehicle of expression, 'a means through which interaction between human beings takes place.'

People in the world speak a number of languages. English is the one among them and spoken all over the world. English is the majority first language in twenty-three countries (quoted in OEG: 2006). Further, it is an official language or a joint official language in about fifty other countries. English is also used as a second language, though without official status, in countries like Bangladesh, Malaysia, Bhutan and so on. To some extent, English is used extensively as a foreign language for international communication. The coverage of the English language has been increasing rapidly at present. We know that English is much used as the second language in former British colonies such as India and Nigeria. Not only this, the countries like Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh use English as a second language where it is used in a variety of function; in foreign affairs, in broadcasting, in the press, in IT, in researches, and broadly in education and many more.

Among the various languages spoken in the world, English occupies the principal roles for international communication though there are some other international languages such as French, Russian, Arabic and so on. English is accepted as a lingua-franca all over the world. It has become the gateway to the world body of knowledge in every field. Its popularity and emergence can be guessed from the fact that one in every seven human beings can speak English, more than half of the world books have been published in English and the powerhouses of the world such as the USA and the UK use English as their mother tongue- (MT). To conclude, we can say that teaching English has been the cry of the day as there is no other language, easy to learn for us internationally accepted as lingua-franca.

### **1.1.1 The History of English Language Teaching in Nepal : A Brief Account**

Considering the undeniable fact that English occupies the greater coverage in the world's linguistic arena, Nepal is at present also spending a lot of time, money and efforts to teach this language to its people. Different speculations have been made to find out when English Language teaching (ELT) was actually started in Nepal. It is said to have been spoken for the first time during the Prime Ministership of 'Bhimsen Thapa'. British Government opened "Gorkha Bharti Kendra" (Gorkha Recruitment Center) during his Prime Ministership. Nepalese people, during that period, were attracted with high salary and standard lives of British soldiers. Thus, they were instrumentally motivated towards English.

In the context of Nepal, by establishing 'Durbar High School' in 1953 (1910 BS), Janga Bahadur Rana sowed the seeds of the English Language. Since then, teaching and learning of English started formally. This very first English medium school was established immediately after PM Janga Bahadur Rana returned from Britain to give formal education to his children and to the children of other ruling class Rana families. The learning of English was only confined only to the children of Ranacracy, not for the children of common people at that time. The Rana put that school under their own grip as their treasure for about thirty years. Then the school was shifted in 'Ranipokhari' from 'Dakhchowk'. Then after, the children of other high class families also got opportunity to study there. Gradually, the doors were opened for the common

people to learn English there. Only then, no social class was confined to that school. Therefore, the sole credit goes to Janga Bahadur Rana as he was the founder of that school in Nepal.

After the democratic movement of 2007, the door of education opened for all common people. In higher education, English language teaching was started formally with the establishment of Trichandra College (1919). But after the democratic movement of 2007, Nepal also became the member of regional (SAARC) and international (UNO, UNICEF) organizations which ultimately forced the government to understand the growing need of English. Nepal was also known as one of the major tourist centers for the people of the world. Due to these, the demand of the English Language mounted slowly and gradually. Realizing this Nepalese government laid some more focus on ELT in Nepal.

In Nepal, ELT was systematically started in Nepal only after the implementation of National Education System Plan (NESP) in 2028 B.S. NESP brought a great change in the English Curriculum. The curriculum allotted 100 full marks for English subject at the school level from grade four onwards. There was also the provision of optional English at secondary schools. English was also included as compulsory and optional subjects in different levels of the university education later on.

In recent years, English is given a great importance in the education system of Nepal. At present, it is thought as a compulsory subject from Grade 1 to Bachelor's level in government aided schools and colleges. On the other hand, English is found to be broadly used and taught from Nursery to Bachelor's level in private schools and colleges in our country. The English language is taught informally all over the country in various private language institutes. Similarly,

British Council provides the students the opportunity to test their English Language proficiency offering internationally accepted testing measures such as IELTS. Therefore, there is no doubt that the English language has gained an important place in both governmental and non-governmental institutes in Nepal.

### **1.1.2 The Evaluation System of ELT in Nepal**

In the context of evaluation almost all national education commission reports and educational plans of Nepal have stressed the need for comprehensive and regular assessment of students' learning. The first and most comprehensive report on education "Education in Nepal, 2011 B.S." has stated that evaluation must cover all aspects of student learning and to do so it must be regular. Similarly, the second report on education i.e. All Round National Education Committee (ARNEC) Report (2018 B.S.) stated that there must be evaluation of all aspects of students' learning and evaluation must be done every month regularly. Furthermore, the 'NESP 2018-032 B.S.' developed a comprehensive and continuous scheme for primary school students by the use of a variety of evaluation tools. But this scheme could be materialized only for a short period of time.

It was again in 2049 B.S. that Education Commission Report (2049 B.S.) stressed the need to introduce a comprehensive and regular evaluation scheme for proper judgment of student learning and for quality improvement in education. But it did not get materialized. Six years later the High Level National Education Commission (HLNEC 2055 B.S.) blamed the existing examination system of creating the serious educational wastage in Nepal. According to the Commission the present examination system is defective and it further states that "The main reason for students' dropouts and class repetition

has been the annual examination system." Accordingly, both the Ninth (1997-2002) and the Tenth (2002-2007) Five Years Plans suggested to introduce continuous evaluation system at the primary level. The Ninth Plan stated to gradually implement continuous evaluation system for students.

Though all the educational commissions and reports have stressed the need of formative evaluation system and its implementation in the schools, external examinations are still popular in Nepal. External examination system also has some strength and is important mainly because of two reasons; it can provide information that can be used to judge whether a learner has achieved the major objectives of a course after it has been completed; it is also used for certification at certain school leaving points. Though the final examinations can not help the learners to promote their learning due to the lack of feedback during the instruction, it can equally be used by the teachers and students to guide the following year's teaching and learning. Apart from these strengths of external examination system, it can also be used to compare the results of the students across classes, schools, regions and nations. This comparability is provided by examinations because all the learners take the same examination. In almost all government schools as well as in many private schools they still depend on annual examination system. They conduct terminal and final examinations although these examinations measure only a small sample of the behaviour pattern of the examinees. Score is given high priority in the society and the people also think that public examination system as being the most effective screening device to reward the abler individuals and marginalize the less able ones.

Though examination is taken as an unfair means of assessment, we still have terminal and final examinations in each subject area, and decide the final result of our evaluation according to the marks they have secured in different terms. In the case of English, though, there is the system of listening and speaking test which carries certain percentage of marks in some grades, the teachers have not taken it seriously because it has remained there as a formality only. It is because the teachers are compelled to make the students pass because of so many reasons. So, the total progress of the students during the entire period of instruction is assessed through a few hours' written examination. Because of such kind of unfair means of assessment, students show different kinds of unusual behaviours during or around the examination. Many of the students, as well as we all are familiar with, suffer from heavy stress and strain during the examination. Some of them develop serious psychological problems. The examinees during the exam show dishonest behaviours to the invigilators, bribe the examiners and practice mass copying and other unfair means.

Because of the total dependence in examination our whole system of education has become examination-oriented. The entire educational value system has been distorted and teaching has become subordinated to examination. To make many students pass in the exams, teachers practise to selective teaching and students to selective study. Eventually, the students who ought to be familiar with all the contents of a given syllabus are failed in the exam due to the examination-oriented teaching and learning.

One of the criticized aspects of examination is that even the talented students can be failed in the exam either because of their illness or some other problems which is not accounted for in this system. Not only in the case of SLC but also

in other examinations where the examinees do not get the expected marks or divisions, most of them drop the school; some of them run away from home and a few of them even commit suicide. We can read about these cases in the newspapers sometimes. So, by all these incidents, we can conclude that both the traditional tests and (standardized) external examinations can not assess the total aspect of the students. So they do not help the students learn better. A supporting view in this context by Chauhan (1993:131) states that "End-product of learning which is evaluated by written examination tells what the learner has memorized. It does not tell how the examinee achieved a particular score. It is due to genuine learning or to cheating the examination or to any other fair or foul means. There is no indication of whether the examinee had actually learnt. This points to the need of some kind of monitoring of learning during the course of instruction."

To assess the total aspects of the students' learning and to provide feedback even on the teacher as well as students during the instruction, assessment is a good tool which can promote the meaningful involvement of the students with material that is central to the teaching objectives of a given course which can not be expected from examinations. So, assessment goes far beyond than examination. To quote the words of Genesee and Upsher (1996:40), a similar view about final examinations is that, "They do not provide useful assessment information for students. When the course is over, it is too late for students to take steps to improve learning. Final exams may provide an incentive to study and may reward students to study hard with high grades. They may even provide teachers with useful information about student advancement for revising the instruction for the next term, but they don't help student learn better." From the above statement it becomes clear that final examination can

not provide feedback to the students during the instruction and it directly affects in students' learning.

Examinations do not have the nature of providing feedback during the instruction. So, to get the necessary information about the teaching-learning progress and the level of the achievement achieved by the students, many private schools and a few government aided schools as well conduct different tests in the schools nowadays. They have tests like-unit test, weekly test, monthly test, oral/written tests and the like. Such kinds of tests are very useful to promote the students' learning and provide feedback in their difficult areas. As stressed by the Ninth (1997-2002) and the Tenth (2002-2007) Five Year Plans plan to gradually implement the continuous evaluation system for the students in the schools, though it is not yet implemented; the programmes run by these schools can be regarded as a good beginning which would be able to establish continuous assessment system in the schools all over Nepal and the students will be more benefited through this system in time.

### **1.1.3 Distinction among Measurement, Testing and Assessment**

The terms assessment, test, and measurement are easily confused because all may be involved in a single process (Linn and Gronlund 2000 : 31). All these being means of educational inquiry are confused with each other. When we speak of measuring pupils' progress in any education system, we often are entangled with the terms assessment, test and measurement. So, the distinction among these terms would be important here.

The term measurement is limited to quantitative description of the students; that is, the results of the measurement are always expressed in numbers (Ibid, 2000). From this definition we can say that measurement is limited to quantitative description of pupil's behaviour. It is a descriptive process and it often includes the assignment of a number to express in quantitative terms the degree to which a pupil possesses given characteristics. For instance, we measure a student's ability to communicate, and then we record that she/he earned 50 of 100 points on a scoring sheet. It does not imply judgments concerning the worth or value of the behavior being measured.

Tests have been a valued part of instructional programmes throughout the world for a long time. They are used to see if students are learning what they are supposed to be learning. Teachers, administrators and other decision - makers always need the type of evidence to make judgments about the instructional process. In language teaching, tests are viewed as feedback for language learners concerning their progress. "A test is particular type of assessment that typically of a set of questions administered during a fixed period of time under reasonably comparable conditions for all students" (Linn and Gronlund 2000 : 31). From the above definition we know that a test is a set of questions which is administered in a fixed period of time and the result is compared descriptively. A test, according to the dictionary of education edited by Good (1959 : 426) is 'a group of questions or tasks to which a student is to respond, the purpose being to produce a quantitative representation of the pupil trait that it is designed to measure.'

The term assessment refers to gathering and interpreting information about students' achievement. In practice, students' achievement is generally assessed

through tests, classroom and take-home assignments, and assigned projects. Strictly speaking, assessment refers to assignments, and tasks that provide information for making decision. In course of day-to-day learning the students gain a wide range of knowledge, skills and abilities and attitudes. It means what a student knows is always changing. The teachers through observation or standardized test can assess this type of knowledge. Therefore, the way the assessment is conducted may affect decision about grades, advancement, placement, instructional needs, and curriculum. The knowledge of students keeps changing and, therefore, student achievement can be judged through comparison over a period of time.

We sometimes speak of testing and assessment together even though tests are a specific type of assessment. When used in this way an assessment emphasizes the broader array of performances and projects that might not be called to mind by the word testing. According to Linn and Gronlund (2000 : 1) assessment is a much more comprehensive and inclusive term than measurement or testing. It may include both quantitative description (measurement) and qualitative descriptions (non measurement) of students. In addition, assessment always includes value judgments concerning the desirability of the results. Assessment may or may not be based on measurement; when it is, it goes beyond simple quantitative descriptions.

#### **1.1.4 Types of Assessment and Functions**

Tests and other assessment procedures can also be classified in terms of their functional role in classroom instruction. One such classification system follows the sequence in which assessment procedures are likely to be used in the

classroom (Airasian and Madaus, 1972 in Linn and Gronlund 2000 : 40). Different assessment types classify the assessment of students' performance in different ways. Although a single instrument may sometimes be useful for more than one purpose (e.g. both form formative and summative assessment purposes), each of the following types of classroom assessment which is based on Linn and Gronlund (2000) typically requires instrument specifically designed for the intended use.

### **A) Placement Assessment**

Placement assessment is concerned with the student's entry performance and typically focuses on questions such as: (1) Does the student possess the knowledge and skills needed to begin the planned instruction? For example, is a student's reading comprehension at a level that allows him to do the expected independent reading for the next unit? (2) To what extent has the student already developed the understanding and skills that are the goals of the planned instruction? If the learner has sufficient knowledge and skills that might indicate the desirability of skipping certain units or of being placed in a more advanced course. (3) To what extent do the student's interests, work habits, and personality characteristics indicate that one mode of instruction might be better than another (e.g. group instruction versus independent study)? Answers to questions like these require the use of a variety of techniques: record of past achievement, pre-tests on course objectives, observational techniques and so on. The goal of placement assessment is to determine for each student the position in the instructional sequence and the mode of instruction that is most beneficial.

### **B) Formative Assessment**

Formative assessment is used to monitor learning progress during instruction. Its purpose is to provide continuous feedback to both student and teacher concerning learning successes and failures. Feedback to students provides reinforcement of successful learning and identifies the specific learning errors and misconceptions that need correction. Feedback to the teacher provides information for modifying instruction and for prescribing group and individual work. Formative assessment depends heavily on specially prepared tests and assessment for each segment of instruction (e.g., unit, chapter). In short, formative assessment is directed toward improving learning and instruction, the results typically are not used for assigning course grades.

### **C) Diagnostic Assessment**

Diagnostic assessment is highly specialized procedure. It is concerned with persistent or recurring learning difficulties that are left unresolved by the standard corrective prescription of formative assessment. If a student continues to experience failure in reading, writing and other works then a more detailed diagnosis is indicated. To use medical analogy, formative assessment provides first-aid treatment for simple learning problems and diagnostic assessment searches for the underlying causes of problems that do not respond to first-aid treatment. Thus, diagnostic assessment is much more comprehensive and detailed. To sum up, the aim of diagnostic assessment is to determine the causes of persistent learning problems and to formulate a plan for remedial action.

### **D) Summative Assessment**

Summative assessment generally comes at the end of a course or unit of instruction. It is designed to determine the extent to which the instructional goals have been achieved and is used primarily of assigning course grades or for certifying student mastery of the intended learning outcomes. The techniques used in summative assessment are determined by the instructional goals, but they typically include teacher made achievement tests, ratings, and various types of performance (e.g. laboratory, oral report), and assessment of products (e.g., themes, drawings). These various sources of information can be systematically collected into a portfolio of work and can be used to summarize the student's accomplishment and progress. Although the main purpose of summative assessment is grading, or the certification of student achievement, it

also provides information for judging the appropriateness of the course objectives and effectiveness of the instruction.

### **1.1.5 The Meaning and Purpose of Formative Assessment**

The history of educational assessment is as old as education itself. If we see its etymological meaning the word 'assessment' is from the Latin word '*assidere*' which means 'to sit beside'. Sitting beside children suggests a close relationship and sharing of experience. The meaning of assessment nowadays, is not limited as its etymological meaning. Assessment in contrast to that includes the full range of information teachers gather about their pupils, instruction and classroom climate. It also includes the full range of methods that the teachers use to gather that information. It includes interpreting and synthesizing the information to help teachers understand their pupils, plan and monitor instruction and establish a viable classroom culture.

Assessment can be considered as an interactive process that engages both the teacher and the students in monitoring the student's performance and progress. Since assessment is a part of the process of learning, it must provide multiple opportunities for the measurement of process and yield data that a teacher can use to develop a course grade. In short, we can say that assessment is an interactive process where both the teacher and the students are engaged in monitoring the students' performance and progress. Assessment is directed towards learners' performance with the aim of bringing about improvements; the type of evaluation involved here is called 'formative', since its main purpose is to 'form' : not conclude a progress.

There are many purposes of conducting language assessment in the classroom. One of the primary reasons for conducting assessment in the classroom is to promote the meaningful involvement of students with materials that is central to the teaching objectives of a given course. Students face different kinds of problems in the class. Hence, the teachers have to find out who are having learning, emotional, or social problems in the classroom and diagnose them correctly. So, to diagnose the students' problems is another purpose of assessment.

Another main reason for collecting assessment information is to provide feedback and incentives to motivate pupils. Assessment information is also useful for making decision about the placement of pupils in their class. Whenever a teacher divides pupils into sub-group assessment for placement purpose is being carried out. Assessment helps not only the students but also the teacher to plan and conduct the instruction programme in a new way in the classroom.

A final, often overlooked purpose for assessment is to establish and maintain the social equilibrium of the classroom. Classrooms are complex social setting where people interact with one another in a multitude of ways. For classrooms to become positive social and leaning environments, order, discipline and co-operation must be present. So, the teacher's decisions should be concerned with establishing and maintaining the classroom as a viable and stable social setting.

In short, assessment serves many purposes in the classroom. Some of these include decision about the academic progress or placement of pupils; others are

concerned with carrying out instruction, to establish and help maintain the classroom as a stable, productive social setting.

### **1.1.6 Literature Review**

The role of assessment has always been an integral part of language education. Assessment of language teaching is as old as the educational process itself. Assessment in language teaching plays a significant role in bringing effective outcomes in it. Mainly, assessment is used as a process of scrutinizing how far learners have learnt and how much effective the teaching has been as well. Mainly, formative assessment is carried out to gear up the process of teaching and learning a language. The students get feedback on how well they perform various tasks after they are administered formative assessment. Therefore, formative assessment encourages the pupils to learn better knowing their own proficiency. This kind of assessment can be a good means to reduce the number of failures and drop-outs in higher education in the context of our country Nepal.

English language teaching has been a challenging profession in government aided secondary and higher secondary schools in Nepal. The students are reluctant towards learning English because of its limited exposure. Therefore, many researchers as well as teachers have been studying and discussing the factors responsible for its declining standard and trying to suggest for the

betterment of ELT. Most of the researchers are confined to the effectiveness of the teaching materials, language games, group works, and so on. But, not a single research has been carried out on the effectiveness of formative assessment in ELT of class eleven students.

A few researches carried out in the area of language testing are reviewed here.

Khanal (1997) made an experimental research on the effectiveness of cloze test over conventional subjective test in testing reading comprehension in English. The study shows that the cloze test was far more better than traditional subjective test in testing reading comprehension.

Chappagain (1999) carried out a research to find out the impact of teaching materials in language teaching. It was concluded that the use of teaching materials helped for better learning.

Similarly, Sharma (2001) carried out a practical study to find out the effectiveness of the role play technique in teaching communicative functions. The study showed that students assigned to play roles inside the classroom could do better in communicative functions than those who were not assigned to.

Dahal (2002) carried out a practical study to find out the effectiveness of group work on oral performances. The findings showed that the group work technique proved to be relatively more effective than the conventional one on the student's oral performances.

Chapagain (2005) made an experimental research on the effectiveness of continuous assessment system in enhancing class-six students' achievement.

The findings revealed that the continuous assessment system in English Language learning was relatively more effective and successful than the usual of teaching.

So many research works and books written by different scholars have directly or indirectly shown the importance of assessment system in ELT. Apart from these, no practical study has been carried out on the broad topic English Language Testing. However, Chapagain (2005) attempted to find out the effectiveness of continuous assessment system in enhancing pupil's (class-6) achievement in English. But, the concrete and clear impact in Teaching English language with the implementation of formative assessment tools is not clearly mentioned anywhere. Therefore, this study is going to be conducted to find out the effectiveness of this system in English language teaching of grade eleven students.

### **1.1.7 Objectives of the Study**

The objective of this study were as follows :

To find out the effectiveness of formative assessment in English Language teaching.

To suggest some pedagogical implications.

### **1.1.8 Significance of the Study**

Since it is the study on the effectiveness of formative assessment system in ELT, both the teachers as well as students will be benefited. As this research is limited only to class eleven students, the concerned teachers and students will be benefited from it and the findings are applied in the classrooms. The teachers will be able to assess their students and promote them through formative

assessment. Moreover, the teachers will be able to make decisions about their instruction, remedial or additional instruction for the betterment of teaching and learning process.

Apart from the teachers and students, textbook writers, syllabus designers, educationists and language planners will also be benefited from the study. The study provides some insights into the improvement of the existing evaluation system. Similarly, this study will be important for the higher secondary schools, formal and informal educational institutes and those who are directly and indirectly involved in teaching and learning English as a foreign or second language in Nepal. And finally, it will be important for the researchers for further study since it is the very important field in language teaching.

## **CHAPTER-II**

### **METHODOLOGY**

In this chapter, source of data, definition of population, sample population and sampling procedures, tools and process of data collection, procedure of analyzing the data, design of the experiment and limitations of the study are presented in detail.

#### **2.1 Sources of Data Collection**

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used for the collection of data.

##### **2.1.1 Primary Source of Data**

The primary sources of data were the Grade-Eleven students of Shree Bhanudaya Higher Secondary School in Nawalparasi. They were administered pre-test and post-test and their answer sheets were checked and the data was considered as the primary source of this study. The same set of test items was used for the both tests. The pre-test was administered before the real teaching started and post-test was administered after it. The researcher himself was involved in teaching the students for a month.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

Various books, journals, articles, magazines, workshop papers, thesis, internet related to the research topic were consulted as the secondary sources of data.

## 2.2 Sample Population

The population of this study was all the class-eleven students who were studying in Shree Bhanudaya Higher Secondary School in Nawalparasi. The sample population of this study consisted of all sixty students of class-eleven.

## 2.3 Sampling Procedures

The total sample population was divided into two halves in terms of odd and even number according to the rank obtained in the pre-test. Then, the experimental and control groups were determined by tossing a coin. Thus, there were 30 students in each group.

## 2.4 Tools for Data Collection

To collect the data for this study, a set of test items was prepared. The test items consisted of seven different items including both subjective and objective type of questions from Link English course of class eleven (See Appendix-A). The test items and the weightage they carried are given below.

TABLE 1 : Test Items Types

<b>S.N.</b>	<b>Types of Test Items</b>	<b>Marks Allocated</b>
1	Put in alphabetical order	10
2	Find the dictionary quarter	5
3	Reading comprehension	15
4	Put the verbs in correct tense	5
5	Rearrange the words to make sentences	5

6	Fill in the gaps/Choose the best answer	5
7	Free writing	5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>

## 2.5 Process of Data Collection

The researcher followed the following processes while collecting data: First of all, suitable test items were prepared on the basis of the textbook 'Link English' of class eleven. (Appendix-A)

The pre-test was administered and on the basis of the result of the pre-test, the researcher split the students into two equal proficiency level groups. The students were split into groups, on the basis of odd-even ranking of the individual scores (See Appendix-B). Then, the scores of both groups were tabulated. Their mean and variance were calculated. Then, the mean difference of two groups was compared to check whether two groups formed were statistically homogeneous or not. Then, the students were assigned experimental group (EG) and control group (CG) by tossing a coin to avoid partialism.

Then, both the groups were taught by the researcher himself. They were taught six days a week, one period a day, and each period lasted for forty-five minutes. It took a month to complete all the contents from where the test items were prepared.

During the experimental period, the researcher himself was involved in teaching both the groups. Homework was assigned to them both but only the homework done by the students of experimental groups was checked and they were given feedback after correction. Similarly, four informal weekly tests were administered to the experimental group. The students were given feedback after the tests. They were made familiar with mistakes and helped in difficulties. But, the students of control groups did not get any kind of treatment during this

period. After a month's teaching, both groups were administered the same test as post-test which was administered in pre-test.

The average scores of both groups of the post-tests were computed and tabulated as the data.

Finally, the gathered data were compared to determine the effectiveness of formative assessment system in ELT.

## 2.6 Design of the Study

The pre-test/post-test equivalent group design was adopted for the purpose of the study. The design was as follows :

TABLE 2: The Design of the Study

<b>Equivalent Groups</b>	<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Post-test</b>
Experimental Group (EG)	O <sub>1</sub>	X	O <sub>2</sub>
Control Group (CG)	O <sub>3</sub>	-	O <sub>4</sub>

Where,      O<sub>1</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>      = Pre-tests  
                  O<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>4</sub>      = Post-tests  
                  'X'            = Treatment

For this study, two groups were made as nearly equal as possible on the basis of pre-test result before the treatment was given. After the formation of two equivalent groups EG and CG in this design, one group EG received the experimental treatment 'X' but other groups CG received usual treatment. The data was gathered after the administration of the post-tests of both the groups.

## **2.7 Limitations of the Study**

These were the limitations of the study :

This study was confined to a government aided +2 school in Nawalparasi district.

Only 60 students of class eleven of the concerned study were included as the sample population of the study.

The primary data of this study was collected only from the written test.

Only the effectiveness of formative assessment system was observed in this study.

The test items were selected only from the "Link English" excluding other two text book; Meaning into Words and The Magic of Words.

## **CHAPTER-III**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

#### **3. Introduction**

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data. The collected data are analysed under the following headings. The further analysis of the data leads to the interpretation of the effectiveness of formative assessment in ELT.

Holistic Comparison

Item-wise Comparison

The researcher in the beginning established two equivalent groups of the students on the basis of pre-test results. It was urgency for the researcher to make two groups equivalent (i.e. balanced in the abilities in English) in order to find out the effect of treatment 'X' which was used during the experimental period. If both groups were not equivalent, then it was difficult to conclude that the difference between the experimental group and control group on the post-test was due to the influence of experimental treatment 'X'. The researcher calculated the mean scores of the pre-tests of both the groups and found no significant difference between them (CG=21 and /EG=20.8). Therefore, both the groups were uniform in their abilities.

Then the sources obtained by the students in both pre- and post-tests were tabulated under the item-wise headings (Appendix-C). Then after, the average scores were computed out of the individual scores tabulated. The average scores of the pre-test were subtracted from the average scores of the post-test to find out the differences and the differences were converted into percentage. If it is

higher than zero, it shows the progress of the students. If the average scores and difference percentage of EG in the post-test are higher than CG, it shows that the treatment that was provided to the experimental group, i.e. formative assessment system is significant. If not the system is not significant.

Throughout this study, EG refers to 'Experimental Group' which was taught applying formative assessment system and CG refers to 'Controlled Group' which was taught in a conventional way, without daily tests, class test, weekly test, regular feedback and so on.

The analysis and interpretation of collected data is given below.

### 3.1 Analysis of Pre-test Result

The pre-test raw scores of students of both the groups are presented in Appendix-'B'. The summary statistics on the mean achievement of the experimental group and control group on the pre-test is presented in the table 3 below.

Table-3 : Holistic Comparison of the Pre-test Result

<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D %</b>
CG	30	21.0	0.2	0.4
EG	30	20.8		

The above table shows that the experimental and control group were balanced in their abilities in English (i.e. equivalent) because there is not significant difference between the means of the two groups. The above table shows that

Group 'E' has the average score of 20.8 and Group 'C' has the average scores of 21.0 in the pre-test. It shows that both the groups were equivalent in their abilities.

### 3.2 Holistic Comparison

The raw scores of the students of both the groups in both tests are presented in Appendix C. For holistic analysis, the total average marks of both groups in both tests were computed and tabulated in the following table :

Table-4 : Holistic Comparison between Pre-test and Post-test Result

<b>Group</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>AV score in Pre-test</b>	<b>AV score in Post-test</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>D%</b>
CG	30	21.0	27.6	6.6	31.42
EG	30	20.8	30.7	9.2	44.23

The above table shows that the control group has the average scores of 21.0 and 27.6 in the pre and post-tests, respectively. This group has increased its average scores by 6.6 or 31.42 percent. On the other hand, the experimental group has the average scores of 20.8 and 30.7 in the pre- and post-tests, respectively. This group has increased its average scores by 9.2 or 44.23%.

It shows that EG has made better improvement than CG. The increase of difference of EG over CG is by 2.6 or 12.81%.

### 3.3 Analysis of the Post-test Results

The post-test raw scores of students of the control group and the experimental group have been presented in Appendix-'C' and the summary of statistical calculation of the experimental group and control group is given below in table 5.

Table-5 : Holistic Comparison of Post-test Results

Group	N	Mean	D	Remarks
CG	30	27.6	3.1	30.7>27.6
EG	30	30.7		

The above table shows that there is a significance difference between two mean scores. The result of significant difference between two means was due to the treatment 'X' provided to the experimental group against control group because both the groups were statistically homogeneous before the introduction of the treatment-X. Therefore, the investigator concluded that the administration of formative assessment tools with informal tests, feedback and continuous assessment caused better achievement in English language learning than without such kind of tools.

### 3.4 Item-wise Comparison

For the process of data collection a set of seven different test items was administered and the average scores obtained by the students in both tests were tabulated. For item-wise comparison, the mean scores of both groups of pre-

and post-tests were calculated to find out the effectiveness of formative assessment system in ELT.

### 3.4.1 Alphabetical Order

In this item, there were ten words which were to be put in alphabetical order (See Appendix 'A'). The raw scores of both the tests of both groups have been presented in Appendix-'C'. The summary of statistical calculation of both groups is given below in Table-6.

Table-6 : Comparison of Pre- and Post-test Result of Item no-I

Group	N	Av Pre-test Score	Av Post-test Scores	D	ID%
CG	30	5.9	7.3	1.4	23.72
EG	30	5.3	8.03	2.73	51.50

This table shows that group 'C' has the average of 5.9 and 7.3 in pre- and post-test, respectively whereas group 'E' has the average scores of 5.3 and 8.03 in pre- and post-test, respectively.

It shows that Group 'E' has made better improvement than Group 'C'. Group 'C' has increased its average marks by 1.4 or 23.72 percent while Group 'E' has increased its average marks by 2.73 or 51.50 percent.

### 3.4.2 Find-out the Quarter of the Dictionary

There were only five words in this item which were to be put in the right dictionary quarter (See Appendix-'A'). The summary of the average mark

differences and differences in percentages have been presented below in Table no 7.

Table-7 : Comparison of Pre- and Post-test Result of Item no-II

Group	N	Av Score in Pre-test	Av Score in Post-test	D	D%
CG	30	2.3	2.9	0.6	26.08
EG	30	2.3	3.2	0.9	39.13

The above table shows that group 'C' has the average scores of 2.3 and 2.9 in Pre- and post-test, respectively whereas group 'E' has the average scores of 2.3 and 3.2 in pre- and post-test, respectively.

It reveals that Group 'C' has increased its average marks by 0.6 or 26.08 percent while Group 'E' has increased its average marks by 0.9 or 39.13 percent. It shows that Group 'E' has made better improvement than Group 'C'.

### 3.4.3 Reading Comprehension

In this item, there was a reading passage (See Appendix-'A') and there were 4 True/False items, 4 subjective questions and 3 fill-in-the gaps. They carried 15 marks altogether. The pre- and post-test raw scores of both the groups are presented in Appendix-'C'. The summary of statistical calculation of both groups is given in table no 8 below.

Table-8 : Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Results of Item no-III

Group	N	Av Score in Pre-test	Av Score in Post-test	D	D%
CG	30	6.4	8.8	2.4	37.5
EG	30	6.5	9.6	3.1	47.7

According to the table, the mean scores of pre and post-test of Experimental Group is 6.5 and 9.6, respectively and Control Group has the average score of 6.4 and 8.8 in pre- and post-test, respectively.

It shows that Group 'C' has increased its average scores by 2.4 or 37.5 percent while Group 'E' has increased its average scores by 3.1 or 47.7 percent. The fact shows that there is significant difference between the achievements of both the groups in this item but Experimental group is better than another.

#### 3.4.4 Put the Verbs in the Correct Tense

There were five items and it carried five marks (See Appendix-'A'). The average mark differences and differences in percentage of pre-test and post-test of both the groups are given below in Table no-9.

Table-9 : Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Result of Item no-IV

Group	N	Av Score in Pre-test	Av Score in Post-test	D	D%
CG	30	1.7	2.7	1.0	58.82

EG	30	2.03	2.8	0.77	37.93
----	----	------	-----	------	-------

The above table shows that there are 30 students in each group (EG and CG). The mean achievement score of CG is 1.7 and 2.7 in pre- and post-test, respectively. While the EG has the mean achievement score 2.03 and 2.8 in pre- and post-test respectively. The summary shows that there is not significant difference between the achievements of both the groups. The mean achievement of EG is greater than CG but the increased percent of CG in post-test over pre-test seems much better than EG.

### 3.4.5 Arrange the Words

In this item, there were five questions. Each question carried one mark. In each question, there were some words in wrong order. The students were asked to make appropriate sentences out of them. The raw scores obtained by the students in both the tests are given in Appendix-'C'. The summary of statistical calculation of both groups is given in Table 10 below.

Table-10 : Comparison of the Pre-test and Post-test Result of Item no-V

Group	N	Av Score in Pre-test	Av Score in Post-test	D	D%
CG	30	1.6	2.4	0.8	50
EG	30	1.7	2.7	1	58.82

According to the table, Group 'C' has the average scores of 1.6 and 2.4 in the pre- and post-test, respectively. Whereas Group 'E' has the average scores of 1.7 and 2.7 in the pre- and post-test, respectively. Group 'C' has increased its marks by 0.8 or 50% while group 'E' has increased its average marks by 1 or 58.82%. It concludes that group 'E' made better progress than group 'C' in this item.

### 3.4.6 Fill in the Blank

In this question, there were five items (See Appendix 'A'). The students had to choose the best answer from the brackets in the gaps. The summary of the statistical calculation is given below in Table 11.

Table-11 : Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Results of Item no-VI

Group	N	Av Score in Pre-test	Av Score in Post-test	D	D%
CG	30	1.7	2.1	0.4	23.52
EG	30	1.7	2.4	0.7	41.17

This table shows that group 'C' has the average scores of 1.7 and 2.1 in pre- and post-test, respectively whereas group 'E' has the average scores of 1.7 and 2.4 in pre- and post-test, respectively. Group 'C' showed the increment in its average marks by 0.4 or 23.52 percent whereas Group 'E' has increased its average marks by 0.7 or 41.17 percent. It shows that Group 'E' made better progress than group 'C' in this item.

### 3.4.7 Free Writing

In this item, there was only one question which carried 5 marks (See Appendix-A). Students had to write a couple of paragraph about their own classroom. The raw scores obtained in both tests by both the groups is given in Appendix-'C'. The average marks and increased percentage in the post-test are tabulated below in Table 12.

Table-12 : Comparison of Pre-test and Post-test Result of Item no-VII

Group	N	Av Score in Pre-test	Av Score in Post-test	D	D%
CG	30	1.2	1.5	0.3	25.0
EG	30	1.4	1.9	0.5	35.71

This table shows that the group 'C' has the average scores of 1.2 and 1.5 in the pre- and post-test, respectively whereas group 'E' has the average score of 1.4 and 1.9 in pre- and post-test, respectively.

Group 'E' has increased its average marks by 0.5 or 35.71% while group 'C' has increased its average marks by 0.3 or 25%. It shows that group 'E' made better improvement than group 'C' in this item.

## **CHAPTER-IV**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

The investigator carried out this practical study just to identify, analyze and interpret the effectiveness of formative assessment system in ELT. It was just limited to class 11 students of a government aided +2 school in Nawalparasi district. Therefore, this was carried out to answer the question whether formative assessment system plays any significant role in English Language learning or not.

A pre-test/post-test Equivalent Group Design was adopted for the purpose of this study. Two equivalent groups i.e. Experimental and Control groups were established on the basis of pre-test results (See Appendix 'B'). Both groups were taught by the researcher himself on the selected units/course. But, the experimental group was taught with the application of class tests, weekly tests, homework checking and continuous feedback and regular encouragement to the students. On the other hand, such kind of attention was not provided to the students of control group. They were taught with the usual way. The researcher administered a post-test after a month's teaching to both the groups. The result of both groups in the form of raw scores were computed and tabulated. The obtained data, thus, were used for the analysis and interpretation.

The statistical analysis of the data indicated that the experimental group achieved more than control group. Therefore, it is concluded that formative assessment system with different formative tests and regular feedback caused better achievement than the usual teaching i.e. without formative means. So on

the basis of the findings, the following conclusions are drawn and some recommendations are given.

## **4.2 Findings**

On the basis of the pre-test result the experimental group's mean score was 20.8 and the mean achievement score of the control group was 21.0. The mean scores showed that the both groups i.e. experimental and control were equivalent in their abilities before the experiment.

The holistic comparison between pre-test and post-test is shown in Table 4, in which the control group has increased its average score by 6.6 or 31.42% in the post-test whereas experimental group has increased its average score by 9.2 or 44.23%. It shows that experimental group showed better performance than control group.

The summary of item based comparison of pre- and post-test results between experimental and control group has been shown in the tables from Table no 6 to 12. The formative assessment system is found to be significant in six items, out of seven. Only, in 'Put the Verbs in the Correct Tense' item, it is found to be insignificant, though both the groups have increased their average scores.

The findings of this study were concluded on the basis of groups rather than individual responses of the students. Both groups were taught the same content for the equal length of time. Only the difference was in the provision of extra attention during the experiment. The result of post-test shows that both groups were benefited.

On the whole, the formative assessment system in English Language learning/teaching was relatively more effective and successful than the usual way of teaching.

### **4.3 Recommendations**

From the result of experimental study, the researcher suggests the following recommendations for pedagogical implications.

Formative assessment system should be applied in ELT in Higher Secondary Level to enhance the students' achievement in English.

It is strongly suggested to carry out in the classrooms in the form of a regular feedback, encouragement, assignments, periodic tests, classroom observation and other practical works.

The number of students should not be large. Proper ratio of teacher and students should be maintained. If it is too large, it is impossible to pay attention to individual students and evaluate them continuously.

Guardians, students and the concerned should be made aware of this system. It helps them to know the position of their children, their progress and level of performance.

This system solely depends on the teachers' efforts and commitments. So, all the teachers should be more skilled and responsible even in higher secondary level. Even the teachers should be provided with some extra perks, if possible. There should be the monitoring of teachers' jobs as well.

The physical and managerial aspects of the schools should also be good for the effective implementation of formative assessment system.

The Curriculum Development Center (CDC), HSEB, Textbook writers and educationists should develop the supplementary materials which can be fruitful in this system.

The government aided higher secondary schools should also develop their own academic calendars mentioning the schedule for the implementation of such formative system.

Apart from this, all the language teachers are suggested to apply formative assessment tools for the betterment of their students' achievement.

This study was only limited to sixty students of a government aided higher secondary school in Nawalparasi district. It was confined to only one experimental group of 30 students and one control group of 30 students. Thus, it can not be said that the findings of this research are applicable in all conditions in all schools of Nepal. It is, therefore, very essential to carry out further more experiments in this area with the involvement of more and more number of students and hence the validity of the findings of this study can be tested.

## REFERENCES

- Abbot, G. et al. (1981). *The Teaching of English as an International Language: A Practical Guide*. London: Collins ELT.
- Airasian, P. (1991). *Classroom Assessment*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Alausa, Y.A. (2005). *Continuous Assessment in Our Schools: Advantages and Problems*.
- Best, J.W. and J.V. Kahn (1993). *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall.
- Bhattarai, G.R. (2001). *A Thematic Analysis of Research Reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Brown, H. Douglas (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Carrol, J.B. and S.M. Spon (1958). *Modern Language Aptitude Test*. New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Chapagain, D.R. (2005). *The Effectiveness of CA in Enhancing Pupil's Achievement: An Unpublished M. Ed Thesis*. T.U.: Kathmandu.
- Chauhan, C.P.S. (1993). *Emerging Trends in Educational Evaluation*. New Delhi: Common-Wealth.
- Cross, D. (1992). *A Practical Handbook of Language Teaching*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International (U.K.) Ltd.
- Curriculum Development Center (CDC), (2000). *Nirantar Bidhyarthi Mulyankan: Teachers' Guide*. Bhaktapur: Curriculum Development Center.
- Dahal, ..... (2002). *The Effectiveness of Group Work on Oral Performances*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu : Tribhuvan University.
- Doff, A. (1988). *Teach English : A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.

- Ganese, F. and I.A. Upshur (1996). *Classroom-based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gautam, R.B. (2005). *Research Methodology in Language Education*. Sunlight Publication: Kathmandu.
- Good, H.G. (1959). *The Dictionary of Education*. .....
- .....
- Heaton, J.B. (1975). *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman.
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teachers*. New York. CUP.
- Husen, T. and T.N. Postlethwaite (eds.), (1994). *The International Encyclopedia of Education*. London: Pergamon.
- Kansakar, C.B. (1979). 'Teaching of English in Nepal: Some Suggestions'. *Educational Quarterly*. Vol 24. Kathmandu: College of Education.
- Khanal, ..... (1997). *The Effectiveness of Cloze Test Over Conventional Subjective Test in Reading Comprehension in English*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu : Tribhuvan University.
- Kumar R. (1996). *Research Methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Linn, R.L. and N.E. Gronlund. (2000). *Measurement and Assessment in Teaching*. New Delhi: Pearson Education.
- Macintosh, H.G. (1976). *Assessment and the Secondary School Teacher*. London: Rand K Paul Ltd.
- National Institute for Educational Development (NIED), (1996). *Towards Improving Continuous Assessment in Schools : A Policy and Information Guide*. Namibia: NIED.
- Neupane, NRP. (2005). *Testing Listening Comprehension : A Case of Secondary Level Students*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu: T.U.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Regmi, C.R. (2004). *Effectiveness of Group Work Technique in Teaching English Tenses*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.

Richards, et al. (1999). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Salvia, J. and J.E. Yesseldyke. (1978). *Assessment in Special and Remedial Education*. London: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Satterly, D. (1981). *Assessment in Schools*. England: Basil Blackwell Publisher.

Sharma, ..... (2001). *The Effectiveness of Role Play Technique in Teaching Communicative Functions*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu : Tribhuvan University.

Srivastava, A.P. (1994). *Scoring High in Examinations : Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: The Learning Laboratory.

**Appendix-A**  
**Questionnaire**

Name :

FM : 50

Roll no :

Time : 1.5 hr

School's Name :

Class :

**Attempt all the questions.**

1. Put the followings words in alphabetical order : 10

- |            |         |
|------------|---------|
| a. Phone   | a. .... |
| b. Picture | b. .... |
| c. Piece   | c. .... |
| d. Picnic  | d. .... |
| e. Phrase  | e. .... |
| f. Pirate  | f. .... |
| g. Photo   | g. .... |
| h. Phase   | h. .... |
| i. Pirates | i. .... |
| j. Pimple  | j. .... |

2. In which quarter of the dictionary will you find the following words. 5

- |             |       |
|-------------|-------|
| a. Paint    | ..... |
| b. Cheerful | ..... |
| c. Yawn     | ..... |
| d. Loud     | ..... |
| e. Swear    | ..... |

3. Read the following passage and answer the given questions.

Several hundred years ago, in the small town of Pisa in Italy, there lived an unusual man. His name was Galileo. Galileo was a professor of mathematics. He always dressed in strange clothes and used to walk around the town talking to himself. The people of Pisa were never quite sure whether Galileo was totally crazy or an amazing genius. He certainly had some very peculiar ideas.

One day Galileo gathered together some people from the town and asked them, "What do you think will happen if I take one heavy ball and one much lighter ball and drop them at the same time from the top of the Leaning Tower of Pisa ? Which ball do you think will hit the ground first ?" Everyone thought this was a very odd question. The answer was obvious. Every sensible person knew that the heavy ball would land first. When Galileo said that they would arrive at the same time, the people were sure that he was out of his mind. He dropped the two balls and they came down exactly together.

Next, Galileo made a powerful telescope and started to study the sky. It was then that he came up with the craziest idea of all.

A. Indicate whether the statements are 'true' or 'false'. 4

- a. Galileo was a mathematics student.
- b. Galileo loved fashionable clothes.
- c. People were doubtful about him if he was crazy or an amazing genius.
- d. The heavy ball arrived on the earth first.

B. Answer the following question. 4 × 2 = 8

- a. Who was Galileo ?

- .....
- b. Was he really mad ? Why did people think that he was crazy ?  
.....
- c. What happened when he dropped the two balls together ?  
.....
- d. How did he walk around the town ?  
.....

C. Fill in the blank spaces with appropriate words. 3

- a. Galileo was a..... of mathematics.
- b. Galileo made a ..... to study the sky.
- c. He had some ..... ideas.

4. Put the verbs in brackets in the correct tense.

5

- a. I ..... this yesterday. (buy)
- b. They ..... out yet. (not go)
- c. Everyday, Hari ..... (go) home by bus.
- d. The earth ..... (go) round the sun.
- e. I ..... her last Friday. (see)

5. Put the following words into the correct order and make suitable sentences.

5

- a. years/ she/ English / four/ was/ compulsory/ studying/ for.  
.....
- b. official/ he/ a/ to/ wanted/ government/ become.  
.....

- c. a/ she/ hospital/ hoped/ in/ doctor/ become/ to/ a.  
.....
- d. the/ must/ bus/ he/ have/ caught.  
.....
- e. him/ made/ captain/ we.  
.....

- 6. Fill in the gaps with the appropriate words. 5
  - a. Asmi runs a ..... shop. (stationery/stationary)
  - b. There were a few ..... sheets for papers. (loose/lose)
  - c. The students are ..... the HSEB exam. (taking/giving)
  - d. We must be ..... of our country. (pride/proud)
  - e. I offered her a cup of tea, but she ..... (accepted/refused)

- 7. Write a description of your classroom in about 60 words. 5  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

***Thank You for Your Cooperation !***

## Appendix - 'B'

### Table - I

**Students Rank Table According to the Pretest.**

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Obtained Marks</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Obtained Marks</b>
1	Asmita Shrestha	27	31	Bimala Pudel	22
2	Shova Bhandari	27	32	Laxmi Kutal	22
3	Ummaya Rana	26	33	Shava Subedi	22
4	Bhim Ku. Thapa	26	34	Kamala Bhandari	21
5	Krishna Adhikari	26	35	Dil Bdr. Gurung	21
6	Ridaya Bhatta	26	36	Nanda Ku. Gurung	20
7	Namsu Mastangi	25	37	Sarita Bhusal	20
8	Balram Pokhrel	25	38	Bishnu Bhattarai	20
9	Shambhu Gurung	25	39	Bed Psd. Bhattarai	20
10	Nisha Subedi	24	40	Munnidevi Thapa	20
11	Shova Gurung	24	41	Durga Bdr. Thapa	19
12	Ram Psd. Poudel	24	42	Bishnu Kanchha	19
13	Balkrishna Pandey	24	43	Navin Pariyar	19
14	Sita Thapa Chhetri	24	44	Divya Neupane	19
15	Sanju Shrestha	24	45	Lamaya Phagami	18
16	Upendra Subedi	23	46	Om Brd. Rana	18
17	Binu Ku. Ale	23	47	Durga Brd. B.K.	18
18	Hemchandra Amgai	23	48	Sapana Dhakal	18
19	Chandrakala Karki	23	49	Shantimaya Rana	17
20	Manju Chhetri	23	50	Sunita Neupane	17
21	Govinda Poudel	23	51	Pavitra Dhenga	16
22	Barsha Poudel	23	52	Durgadevi Adhikari	16
23	Bishnu Timilsena	23	53	Pramila Lama	16
24	Tul Bdr. Rai	23	54	Man Ku. B.K.	16
25	Sagar Pudel	22	55	Samjhana Tamang	15
26	Ganga Thapa	22	56	Anusha Shrestha	15
27	Navin Pokhrel	22	57	Priswas Pariyar	14
28	Kabita Amgai	22	58	Prithvi Bdr. Khamcha	14
29	Mohan Batha	22	59	Kamala Rimal	13
30	Tanka Maya Gurung	22	60	Sanjana Tamang	12

## Table - II

### Table of Group Division

**Group Division According to the Odd-Even Ranking Process of the Pretest.**

Rank	Name	Obtained Marks	Rank	Name	Obtained Marks
1	Asmita Shrestha	27	2	Shova Bhandari	27
3	Ummaya Rana	26	4	Bhim Ku. Thapa	26
5	Krishna Adhikari	26	6	Ridaya Bhatta	26
7	Namsu Mastangi	25	8	Balram Pokhrel	25
9	Shambhu Gurung	25	10	Nisha Subedi	24
11	Shova Gurung	24	12	Ram Psd. Poudel	24
13	Balkrishna Pandey	24	14	Sita Thapa Chhetri	24
15	Sanju Shrestha	24	16	Upendra Subedi	23
17	Binu Ku. Ale	23	18	Hemchandra Amgai	23
19	Chandrakala Karki	23	20	Manju Chhetri	23
21	Govinda Poudel	23	22	Barsha Poudel	23
23	Bishnu Timilsena	23	24	Tul Bdr. Rai	23
25	Sagar Pudel	22	26	Ganga Thapa	22
27	Navin Pokhrel	22	28	Kabita Amgai	22
29	Mohan Batha	22	30	Tanka Maya Gurung	22
31	Bimal Pudel	22	32	Laxmi Kutal	22
33	Shava Subedi	22	34	Kamala Bhandari	21
35	Dil Bdr. Gurung	21	36	Nanda Ku. Gurung	20
37	Sarita Bhusal	20	38	Bishnu Bhattarai	20
39	Bed Psd. Bhattarai	20	40	Munnidevi Thapa	20
41	Durga Bdr. Thapa	19	42	Bishnu Kanchha	19
43	Navin Pariyar	19	44	Divya Neupane	19
45	Lamaya Phagami	18	46	Om Brd. Rana	18
47	Durga Brd. B.K.	18	48	Sapana Dhakal	18
49	Shantimaya Rana	17	50	Sunita Neupane	17
51	Pavitra Dhenga	16	52	Durgadevi Adhikari	16
53	Pramila Lama	16	54	Man Ku. B.K.	16
55	Samjhana Tamang	15	56	Anusha Shrestha	15
57	Priswas Pariyar	14	58	Prithvi Bdr. Khamcha	14
59	Kamala Rimal	13	60	Sanjana Tamang	12

## Appendix - C

### Table - I

**Pretest and Posttest Raw Scores Obtained by the Students of Experimental Group in Each Item.**

**Group 'A'**

S.N.	Name	Item-I		Item-II		Item-III		Item-IV		Item-V		Item-VI		Item-VII		Total	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
1.	Shova Bhandari	7	10	3	4	7	12	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	4	27	
2.	Bhim Ku. Thapa	7	10	3	5	6	11	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	26	
3.	Ridaya Bhatta	6	10	3	3	7	12	4	4	1	3	3	3	2	3	26	
4.	Balram Pokhrel	7	8	3	3	6	10	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	25	
5.	Nisha Subedi	7	10	2	3	8	10	3	3	2	4	1	3	1	2	24	
6.	Ram Psd. Poudel	5	10	3	4	7	12	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	24	
7.	Sita Thapa Chhetri	6	8	2	4	10	11	2	3	1	2	2	3	1	3	24	
8.	Upendra Subedi	7	10	4	5	8	14	1	4	2	4	0	3	1	3	23	
9.	Hemchandra Amgai	7	8	3	4	7	12	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	23	
10.	Manju Chhetri	5	8	2	3	10	12	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	23	
11.	Barsha Poudel	5	7	2	3	8	10	3	4	1	3	3	3	1	2	23	
12.	Tul Bdr. Rai	4	8	3	3	7	11	2	3	3	4	2	3	2	1	23	
13.	Ganga Thapa	8	8	3	4	3	8	3	3	2	3	1	2	2	2	22	
14.	Kabita Amgai	8	10	4	3	3	10	4	4	1	2	1	2	1	2	22	
15.	Tanka Maya Gurung	4	8	3	6	7	12	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	22	
16.	Laxmi Kutal	7	9	1	3	6	10	3	3	1	3	2	3	3	2	22	
17.	Kamala Bhandari	4	6	2	3	7	8	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	21	
18.	Nanda Ku. Gurung	5	7	2	3	7	8	1	3	2	3	2	3	1	2	20	
19.	Bishnu Bhattarai	5	8	1	2	6	9	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	20	
20.	Munnidevi Thapa	5	8	2	2	6	8	1	3	2	3	3	3	1	1	20	
21.	Bishnu Kanchha	5	6	1	3	5	6	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	2	19	
22.	Divya Neupane	6	8	1	2	5	8	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	19	
23.	Om Brd. Rana	3	10	3	4	7	10	2	3	1	2	1	3	1	1	18	
24.	Sapana Dhakal	5	7	2	3	4	3	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	2	18	

25.	Sunita Neupane	2	7	3	3	5	4	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	17
26.	Durgadevi Adhikari	3	8	2	3	8	10	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	16
27.	Man Ku. B.K.	3	6	2	3	8	12	1	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	16
28.	Anusha Shrestha	5	8	1	2	6	8	1	2	2	3	0	2	0	1	15
29.	Prithvi Bdr. Khamcha	4	6	2	2	5	10	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	14
30.	Sanjana Tamang	4	4	2	2	5	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	12
	<b>Total</b>	159	241	70	97	194	287	61	84	51	81	47	73	43	56	624
	<b>Mean</b>	5.3	8.03	2.3	3.2	6.5	9.6	2.03	2.8	1.7	2.7	1.7	2.4	1.4	1.9	20.8

**Table - II**

**Pretest and Posttest Raw Scores of Obtained by the Students of Control Group**

**Group 'B'**

S.N.	Name	Item-I		Item-II		Item-III		Item-IV		Item-V		Item-VI		Item-VII		Total	
		Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
1.	Asmita Shrestha	6	10	3	5	10	12	2	4	1	2	3	5	2	3	27	4
2.	Ummaya Rana	6	7	3	3	10	11	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	26	2
3.	Krishna Adhikari	7	8	3	3	8	10	3	2	3	3	1	1	1	2	26	2
4.	Namsu Mastangi	6	6	4	3	6	10	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	2	25	2
5.	Shambhu Gurung	7	6	2	3	6	7	4	3	3	2	2	3	0	2	25	2
6.	Shova Gurung	8	10	3	2	5	10	2	3	2	3	3	3	1	2	24	3
7.	Balkrishna Pandey	7	10	3	3	6	10	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	24	3
8.	Sanju Shrestha	5	8	3	2	8	10	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	25	2
9.	Binu Ku. Ale	7	8	2	3	8	10	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	1	23	3
10.	Chandrakala Karki	8	6	2	2	7	10	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	23	2
11.	Govinda Poudel	7	8	4	3	6	11	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	1	23	3
12.	Bishnu Timilsena	5	5	3	2	9	8	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	23	2
13.	Sagar Pudel	7	9	2	4	5	10	2	3	3	5	2	5	1	2	22	3
14.	Navin Pokhrel	4	10	2	3	8	12	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	1	22	3
15.	Mohan Batha	6	7	2	3	5	8	3	4	4	3	1	2	1	2	22	3
16.	Bimal Pudel	6	10	3	2	4	8	4	3	3	3	1	3	1	2	22	3
17.	Shava Subedi	8	6	2	3	8	8	0	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	22	2
18.	Dil Bdr.	6	7	1	2	7	8	3	3	2	2	1	2	1	2	21	2

	Gurung																	
19.	Sarita Bhusal	5	7	2	3	6	7	1	2	2	3	2	2	2	1	20		
20.	Bed Psd. Bhattarai	6	8	2	3	7	8	0	2	1	2	3	2	1	1	20		
21.	Durga Bdr. Thapa	4	8	3	5	7	10	1	4	1	1	1	0	2	2	19		
22.	Navin Pariyar	6	8	3	3	3	8	2	3	1	2	3	2	1	1	19		
23.	Lamaya Phagami	8	7	3	3	2	3	2	3	0	2	2	1	1	2	18		
24.	Durga Brd. B.K.	7	8	3	5	7	10	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	18		
25.	Shantimaya Rana	5	7	2	3	2	8	3	2	2	3	1	2	2	1	17		
26.	Pavitra Dhenga	5	6	1	2	5	6	1	2	0	2	2	2	1	1	16		
27.	Pramila Lama	4	5	1	2	7	7	0	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	16		
28.	Samjhana Tamang	4	5	1	3	7	10	1	2	0	3	1	2	1	2	15		
29.	Priswas Pariyar	5	5	0	2	5	8	2	2	0	2	1	1	1	1	14		
30.	Kamala Rimal	2	3	1	1	7	5	1	3	1	2	1	3	0	1	13		
	<b>Total</b>	177	218	70	86	191	263	52	80	49	73	52	63	37	46	630	8	
	<b>Mean</b>	5.9	7.3	2.3	2.9	6.4	8.8	1.7	2.7	1.6	2.4	1.7	2.1	1.2	1.5	21	2	