

**EFFECTIVENESS OF DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE
METHODS IN TEACHING CAUSATIVE VERBS**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master's Degree in English Education**

**Submitted by
Dipak Kumar K.C.**

**Faculty of Education
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet
2009**

**EFFECTIVENESS OF DEDUCTIVE AND INDUCTIVE
METHODS IN TEACHING CAUSATIVE VERBS**

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master's Degree in English Education
(Specialization in English Education)

Submitted by
Dipak Kumar K.C.
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet
2009

T.U. Regd. No. : 9-2-57-580-2002
2nd Year Exam Roll No. : 570143
Campus Roll No. : 194/2063-064

Date of Approval of
Thesis Proposal : 2066 / /

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that to the best of my knowledge this thesis is original, no part of it was earlier submitted for the candidature of research degree to any university.

Date: 2066/08/20



.....
Dipak Kumar K.C.

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Dipak Kumar K.C.** has prepared the thesis entitled **Effectiveness of Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Causative Verbs** under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend this thesis for acceptance.

Date : 2066/08/22



Mr. Lal Bahadur Rana

(Guide)

Teaching Assistant

Department of English Education

Surkhet Campus (Education)

Surkhet



RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation by the following Research Guidance Committee.

Mr. Nem Bahadur Shahi
Head
Department of English Education
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet

Signature

.....
Chairman

Mr. Lal Bahadur Rana
Teaching Assistant
Department of English Education
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet

.....
Guide

Mr. Vasu Dev Karki
Teaching Assistant
Department of English Education
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet

.....
Member

Date : 2066/02.. / 23..



EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following Thesis Evaluation and Approval Committee.

Mr. Nem Bahadur Shahi
Head
Department of English Education
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet *

Signature

Chairman

Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi
Professor / Chairperson
English and Other Foreign Languages
Education Subject Committee
Tribhuvan University

Expert

Mr. Lal Bahadur Rana
Teaching Assistant
Department of English Education
Surkhet Campus (Education)
Birendranagar, Surkhet

Guide

Date : 2066 / 02 / 26

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my
Grandparents and Parents
who spent their entire life and took
all the pains to make me what I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my guide **Mr. Lal Bahadur Rana**, the Teaching Assistant of Surkhet Campus Education, for his continuous encouragement, guidance and invaluable suggestions. I am deeply indebted for his rigorous help during my research from the beginning to the end. Truly speaking, this work would have been incomplete and worthless without his encouragement and co-operation.

I would like to express my profound gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**, Chairperson of English and Other Foreign Languages Education Subject Committee TU, Kirtipur for providing me invaluable suggestions and ideas for this study.

I am extremely grateful to **Mr. Nem Bahdur Shahi**, the head of the Department of English Education, for his invaluable suggestions and academic support that led me to undertake this research work.

I am also grateful to **Mr. Vasu Dev Karki**, the Teaching Assistant of Surkhet Campus (Education), **Mr. Uttam Gaulee**, Teaching Assistant of Surkhet Campus (Education), **Mr. Balaram Khadka**, the Campus Chief of Surkhet Campus (Education), who provided me constructive comments and ideas.

I would like to thank **Mr. Chitra Bahadur Thapa**, the Head Teacher of Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab -7, Dailekh for scheduling my time from the busy school schedule, all the staff and the students of grade ten of the same school who fully supported me during my practical work directly and

indirectly. I can not remain silent without remembering the continuous encouragement and support from my dearest friend **Puspa Raj Baral**.

Similarly, my thanks go to my sisters **Bal Kumari K.C.**, **Jagat Kumari K.C.** and my brothers **Bhupendra K.C.** and **Bhim Bahadur K.C.** for their kind support and regular inspiration to write this thesis.

Last but not the least, I would like to express my special thanks to my wife, **Gita Acharya**, and my son, **Ridesh K.C.** for their uninterrupted support and encouragement for completing the thesis work.

Date : 2066 / /

Dipak Kumar K.C.

ABSTRACT

The present research entitled 'Effectiveness of Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Causative Verbs' aims to find out the effectiveness of deductive and inductive methods in teaching causative verbs. The analysis was done in the government aided school of Dailekh district. The sample population of the study consisted of forty students of grade ten studying at Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab – 7, Dailekh. The researcher himself was involved in the practical teaching for the purpose of carrying out the research. The tests (Pre and Post) were the major tools for data elicitation. The pre-test was administered before actual classroom teaching and the post-test was also administered after teaching the students for one month. The different sets of test items were used in the pre-test and the post-test. The test items were used for written test. There were also two types of questions for both tests i.e. multiple choice item and fill in the blank. The items were of forty and sixty marks respectively and contained forty questions each. On the basis of the result of the pre-test the students were ranked according to their individual scores then they were divided into two groups i.e. Group 'A' and Group 'B' on the basis of odd and even number in their pre-test rank. Group 'A' was taught inductively whereas Group 'B' was taught deductively. Both groups were taught the same grammatical items, i.e. causative verbs using the same teaching materials which were prepared before actual classroom teaching. Each group was taught for one month, 6 days a week, one period a day and each period was of 45 minutes. After teaching causative verbs for one month, the post-test was administered. The results of the pre-test and the post-test were tabulated and analyzed group wise from different angles, i.e. comparison in general, item wise comparison, sex wise comparison, group wise comparison of boys and girls in different test items, content wise comparison in general and content

wise comparison of boys and girls separately to achieve the objectives of the study. This study reveals that inductive method is more effective and more meaningful than deductive one in teaching causative verbs in English. Therefore, it is recommended that inductive method should be applied by the teachers to teach causative verbs in English in general.

This thesis is divided into four chapters. The first chapter introduces the study in terms of general background, importance of the English language, a brief account of ELT in Nepal, importance of grammar, teaching grammar, causative verbs, review of the related literature, objectives of the study, significance of the study and definition of the specific terms. The second chapter deals with the methodology adopted to carry out this research. It contains primary and secondary sources of data, sample population of the study, sampling procedure, tools for data collection, process of data collection and limitations of the study. The third chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data. This chapter includes the analysis of the data. This chapter includes the analysis of the data in comparison of the performance of the students on the basis of different variables i.e. item wise, sex wise and content wise to find out the relative effectiveness of inductive or deductive method. The final chapter presents the findings and recommendations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
DECLARATION	I
RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE	II
RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION	III
EVALUATION AND APPROVAL	IV
DEDICATION	V
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VI
ABSTRACT	VIII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	X
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	XIV
CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 General background	1
1.2 Importance of English language	3
1.3 A brief account of ELT in Nepal	4
1.4 Importance of grammar	6
1.5 Teaching grammar	9
1.5.1 Views on teaching grammar	10
1.5.1.1 Grammar should not be taught	10
1.5.1.2 Grammar should be taught	12
1.5.2 Methods of teaching grammar	13
1.5.2.1 Deductive method	14
1.5.2.2 Inductive method	16
1.5.2.3 Differences between deductive and inductive methods	20

1.6 Causative Verb	21
1.6.1 Basic causative structures	23
1.6.2 The active causative structure	23
1.6.2.1 Causative Verb 'get'	23
1.6.2.2 Causative verb 'make'	23
1.6.2.3 Causative verb 'have'	24
1.6.3 The passive causative structure	24
1.6.3.1 Causative Verb 'get'	24
1.6.3.2 Causative verb 'make'	25
1.6.3.3 Causative verb 'have'	25
1.7 Review of the related literature	25
1.8 Objectives of the study	28
1.9 Significance of the study	28
1.10 Definition of the specific terms	29

CHAPTER TWO : METHODOLOGY

2.1 Sources of Data	31
2.1.1 Primary sources of data	31
2.1.2 Secondary sources of data	31
2.2 Sample Population of the Study	32
2.3 Sampling procedure	32
2.4 Tools for data collection	33
2.5 Process of data collection	33
2.6 Limitations of the study	35

CHAPTER THREE : ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

3.1 Comparison of the total performance in general	37
3.2 Item wise comparison of the performance of both groups	38

3.2.1 Multiple choice item	38
3.2.2 Fill in the blank item	39
3.3 Sex wise comparison of both the groups	40
3.3.1 Boys	40
3.3.2 Girls	41
3.4 Performance of boys in different test items as a whole	42
3.4.1 Performance of boys in multiple choice item	42
3.4.2 Performance of boys in fill in the blank item	43
3.5 Performance of girls in different test items as a whole	43
3.5.1 Performance of girls in multiple choice item	43
3.5.2 Performance of girls in fill in the blank item	44
3.6 Content wise comparison in general	45
3.7 Content wise comparison of the performance of boys	46
3.8 Content wise comparison of the performance of girls	47

CHAPTER FOUR : FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Findings	49
4.2 Recommendations	52

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
1.	Comparison in general	37
2.	Performance in multiple choice item	38
3.	Performance in fill in the blank item	39
4.	Performance of the boys	40
5.	Performance of the girls	41
6.	Performance of boys in multiple choice item	42
7.	Performance of boys in fill in the blank item	43
8.	Performance of girls in multiple choice item	43
9.	Performance of girls in fill in the blank item	44
10.	Content wise comparison in general	45
11.	Content wise performance of boys	46
12.	Content wise performance of girls	47

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

ALM	Audio Lingual Method
GTM	Grammar Translation Method
Avg.	Average
CA	Communicative Approach
BSS	Bhanu Secondary School
NESP	New Education System Plan
EOP	English for Occupational Purpose
USA	United States of America
EAP	English for Academic Purpose
EST	English for Science and Technology
UK	United Kingdom
i.e.	(From Latin 'id est') that is
RN	Rank Number
&	And
etc.	etcetera (= and so on)
ELT	English Language Teaching
e.g.	(From Latin 'Exempli gratia') For example
D	Difference
D%	Difference in Percentage
P1	Pre-test
P2	Post-test
Viz.	namely
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
FM	Full Marks
M	Minute

UN	United Nations
OALD	Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary
P	Page
T.U.	Tribhuvan University
ibid	(From Latin 'ibidem') in the same book or piece of writing

CHAPTER : ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study is about 'Effectiveness of Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Causative Verbs'. It is a practical study. This chapter consists of general background, importance of the English language, a brief account of ELT in Nepal, importance of grammar, teaching grammar, causative verbs, review of the related literature, objectives of the study, significance of the study and definition of the specific terms.

1.1 General Background

Generally, language is a means of communication among human beings by using speech sounds. The term 'language' has been derived from the Latin word 'lingua' which means tongue. So, language is called a tongue e.g. mother tongue or first language .Language is an extremely complex, highly versatile and open system that allows human beings to communicate their thoughts, feelings desires, emotions, ideas etc. It is species' specificity, as no other beings have been found with language .The researches carried out during 1950s and 60s have proved that non-human beings can imitate some rudimentary features of language but they did not seem to have abilities to acquire any language . It is inevitable in the sense that every normal child acquires at least one language in his /her babyhood .The innate capacity that helps human beings to acquire and learn language makes him/ her superior to all the living organisms in the world.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1996, p.662) defines language as "the system of sounds and words used by human to express their thoughts and

feelings". Chomsky (1957, p. 13) says, "Language is a set of (finite or infinite) sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements". Similarly, Wardhaugh (1972, p.3) says, " Language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication".

Gimson (1976,p.3) defines language as " a system of conventions signals used for communication by whole community .The pattern of convention covers a system of significant sound units (the phonemes) the inflexion and arrangement of 'words' and the association of meaning with words".

Similarly, Sapir (1978,p.8 cited in Khatiwada 2007,p.1) says,"Language is a primarily human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, feelings and desires by means of a structured system of voluntarily produced symbols."

To sum up the whole ideas Sthapit (class notes) puts his words as "Language is a voluntarily vocal system of human communication."

There are many languages in the world .Among them, English is the most widely used language because it has gained the status of international language. English is often called lingua franca since it is used to communicate with the people whose native languages are different. So, the sound knowledge of the English language is basic need in the present days. Most of the books related to different fields of knowledge such as technology, science, education, commerce, arts, etc. are written in English. All these facts denote that English is widely used means of communication.

1.2 Importance of the English Language

English is the most important language in the world today. The importance of learning and teaching English is well expressed in the following paragraph:

The importance of the English language in the present day world need not be over-emphasized. It is a principal language for international communication and a gate way to the world body of knowledge. In view of these facts the English language is given great importance in the education system of Nepal. It is taught as a compulsory subject right from grade IV to Bachelor Level (Sthapit et. al. 1994, Introduction).

The teaching and learning of English has great significance for various reasons in Nepal. English has been prescribed in the curricula of primary to university levels. The students have to study it whether they like or not. It is important for the technical development of the country since most of the sophisticated technical research works are published in English .Many books, magazines, journals etc. are printed in English and circulated around the world. Likewise, the advertisements, the name of commercial goods and medicines are also written in English. Most of the books of different subjects at higher levels are available in English.

So far as the question of English for specific purpose is concerned, English has its own role and field. The air traffic controllers need English primarily to guide air craft through the sky .Business executives need English for international trade. Waiter may also need it to serve their customers. These

needs have been referred to as English for occupational purpose (EOP). The students who are going to study at universities in the USA, the U.K., Canada, Australia etc. need English so that they can communicate effectively, write report or essay and take part in seminars. This is called English for Academic purpose (EAP). Students of medicine and sciences need to be able to read articles and textbooks about those studies in English. This is called English for Science and Technology (EST). For these purposes English plays vital role.

Showing the importance of English in the world, French (1963, p.1 cited in Gotame 2007, p.3) says, “Any one who can read English can keep in touch with the whole world without leaving his own home.” He further says that “a young person starting a career with the knowledge of English holds a key which will open many doors including easier access to a good job. So, English can also be viewed a way to get a better job or improve social standing or to solve economic problems” (ibid).

1.3 A Brief Account of ELT in Nepal

Before the unification of the country by the late king Prithivi Narayan Shah in 1825, education in Nepal was highly influenced by two religions: Hinduism and Buddhism. The emphasis given by Hinduism is the education based on the Sanskrit and Gurukul education system, whereas Buddhism gave focus on the education based on the Gumba. Before the unification of Nepal, Sanskrit and Gumba schools existed in association with the Gurukul education system, the English education and its existence were hard to be traced in those periods. Late king Prithivi Narayan Shah and his successors Partap Singh Shah, Bhadur Shah and Rajendra Laxmi Devi Shah stressed on the establishment of industrial and vocational education but much attention could not be paid to it as they

themselves were involved in internal and external struggles. Within a few years of the unification, the country came under the influence of the Rana family in the outset of Rana Regime. Janga Bhahdur Rana became the first defacto Rana prime-minister of Nepal in 1846 .During his period, the education system was entirely suppressed. For the sake of proper diplomatic relationship with Britain and the help to be got from Britain, the Ranas adopted the English Education rather than traditional religion -oriented training .In 1854, Janga Bahadur engaged an English tutor to hold classes for his children in the Rana palace. This act tripped the balance in favor of English education. Even English education during Rana Regime could not flourish in Nepal, though Dev Samsheer had tried to spread education to all the people beyond the Ranas' palace. With Batu Krishana Maitery, Dev Samsheer had a discussion regarding the medium of the instruction in the classroom and the former had suggested that English should be the medium of the instruction (Sharma 2003, p.9 cited in Khatiwada 2007p.3) This evidence shows that people had a great respect to the English education in that period. The king, Tribhubvan Bir Bikram Shah Dev came in power in 1951. The ministry of education was set up in the same year. Numerous primary schools, secondary schools and colleges were established after the establishment of the democratic regime. In 1956, the first five year plan was scheduled for the overall development of the country. English education in Nepal, prior to the New Education System Plan (NESP) 1971 had been overshadowed. It was NESP that defined English as one of the UN (United Nations) languages and thus put it in to the curriculum. According to the NESP, English was taught from grade four. In accordance with the present education system in Nepal, English is taught and learnt as a compulsory as well as an optional subject which reveals the significance and its popularity.

Regarding to the English language teaching (ELT) methods in Nepal, before the implementation of the New Education System Plan-1971, the Grammar

Translation Method was widely used .It mainly focused on grammar and translation. The grammatical rules were taught deductively. The medium of instruction was Nepali .The students taught through this method could recite the rules of target language but generally failed to apply them in actual communication.

Because of a worldwide influence of Audio-Lingual Method, New Education System Plan (1971) adopted this method for teaching English in our country too. It was also a revolt against GT method. Audio-Lingual Method emphasized on the spoken form of language and grammar teaching inductively. At present, the new syllabus for school has been designed on the basis of communicative approach in which grammar is supposed to be taught inductively.

1.4 Importance of Grammar

In a general sense, grammar is defined as the connection of words and word groups in an acceptable structure. In other words, the body of rules which underlie a language is called its grammar. This grammar includes rules which govern the structure of words (suffixes and prefixes) and rules which govern the structure of words to form clauses and sentences that are acceptable to educated native speakers. Traditional descriptions of English grammar developed from the grammars of classical Greek and Latin. Grammar is one of the aspects of language that should be taught and learnt. Grammar has been defined variously. Some of the definitions are given below:

According to Richards et. al. (1985), “Grammar is a description of the structure of language and the way in which linguistic of language such as words and phrases are combined to produce sentences in the language” (p.125).

Similarly Cowan (2009) defines grammar as "the set of rules that describes how words and groups of words can be arranged to form sentences in a particular language" (p.3).

Likewise, OALD (1996, p.517) defines grammar as "the rules in a language for changing the form of words and combining them into sentences. Grammar helps in the production of indefinite numbers of new sentences. To get mastery over any language one needs to know its underlying grammar and its production." But, Lado (1977, p.144) cited in Khatiwada 2007, p.4) has defined grammar using other terms as “a grammatical pattern is more than any single utterance since it is the mould from which countless utterances can be produced”.

Similarly, Chomsky, (1957, p.15) writes

any grammar of a language will project the finite and somewhat accidental corpus of observed utterances to a set (presumably infinite) of grammatical utterances. In this respect, a grammar mirrors the behaviors of the speaker who on the basis of finite and accidental experience with language can produce or understand an indefinite number of new utterances.

The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (cited in Harmer, 1987) defines grammar as "The study and practice of the rules by which words change their forms and are combined in to sentences” (p.1).

Similarly Aarts (1997) says that

Grammar plays the pivotal role in the language to be well structured.

Language ,either it is the form of spoken or written, has the same specific structure and that is not a hotchpotch of randomly distributed elements

.Instead ,the linguistics ingredients that language is made up of are arranged in accordance with the set of rules. This set of rules we call the ‘grammar’ of the language (p.3).

To summarize the definitions given above, grammar is a description of the structures of language and the way in which linguistic units such as words, phrases and clauses are combined or arranged to produce an indefinite number of novel sentences in a particular language. In other words, grammar is a key from which learners formulate and understand an infinite number of sentences. It can be said that the definitions of grammar seem to be academic in their nature.

Similarly, grammar is the connection of words and word groups in an acceptable arrangement. It is the basis for the production of any grammatical correct utterances which make the language meaningful. It enables learners to use the language accurately and appropriately in the meaningful language background. Each language has its own grammar. Hence, grammar is the core of each language from which language is made most appropriate. So, grammar is taught for:

1. Developing accuracy.
2. Systematic analysis of language forms.

3. Rules in order to generate all and only grammatical sentences.
4. Showing the relationship of vocabulary with grammar and the inverse.
5. Developing communicative efficiency.

1.5 Teaching Grammar

Teaching of grammar has always been a controversy in foreign language teaching context. People also make arguments on the way they can best teach the grammar of a particular language. During the heyday of the Grammar Translation Method, grammar was the core of a foreign language course. In those days, teaching grammar was used to concern about the teaching of grammatical concepts and categories. During the days of Direct Method and Audio-Lingual Method, grammar was still the core of the subject matter to be taught in the classroom. But with the advent of the communicative Approach in the 1970s the teaching of grammar becomes unfashionable in foreign language teaching (cited in Basnet 2005, p. 261) Foreign language teachers seemed to have the common belief now and then that teaching grammatical rule may not help learners to speak fluently and appropriately. However, grammar helps us to make the correct utterances in meaningful language background. Thus, grammar is supposed to be taught within a meaningful context that helps us to acquire language naturally.

1.5.1 Views on Teaching Grammar

In fact, the ability to arrange the words of a second language into meaningful sentences is absolutely basic to communicating in that language. Given this fact, it would seem that adult learners need grammar instruction if they are ever

to develop the ability to communicate effectively in an L2. However, this raises an important question: what if adult learners have the ability to learn an L2 grammar without being taught its grammar? In other words, what if adults can learn the grammar of an L2 in the same way that small children learn the grammar of their native language (L1) - by simply being exposed to the speech of native speakers?

The questions mentioned above highlight a long standing debate within the language teaching community over whether adult language learners need grammar instruction or not. So, there are two types of views on teaching grammar. They are mentioned below:

1.5.1.1 Grammar Should not be Taught

Beginning in the 1970s, Stephen Krashen developed a theory of L2 learning that rejected the value of teaching grammar. Krashen's theory, in monitor model and subsequently elaborated as the Input Hypothesis, holds that there are two processes by which adults obtain knowledge about language. The first is *acquisition*, which is a sub-conscious process identical in all important ways to the process that children utilize in acquiring their native language. The second is *learning*, a conscious process that results in knowing about a language. According to Krashen, knowledge obtained by these two types of processes never interacts, and only acquired knowledge can be used in spontaneous conversation in the L2. This theory implies that all facets of grammar teaching are pointless. That is to say, they are peripheral and fragile since they lead to the accumulation of learned knowledge, which can not be converted into acquired knowledge.

Krashen eventually developed a classroom approach to teaching an L2, known as the natural approach. This approach involves no instruction about how L2 grammar rules work; rather it aims at supplying students with opportunities to receive comprehensible input-L2 language samples that students can use to figure out the rules of grammar on their own.

But, many L2 researches have criticized Krashen's theory. One of the most devastating and detailed critiques came from McLaughlin (1987). He pointed that the empirical evidence used is of questionable validity and the terms that are the cornerstone of Krashen's theory-acquisition and learning-are not clearly defined. He noted that it is not possible to tell which process is operating in a particular case. In addition to this, McLaughlin also pointed out numerous examples of internal weaknesses and inconsistencies in the theory such as Krashen's Input Hypothesis makes no clear predictions that can be proven or rejected. McLaughlin also pointed out to some disturbing tendencies in Krashen's writings, such as a tendency to ignore empirical research that contradicts his claims. One example is Krashen's statements that a grammar instruction has no effect on a learner's acquisition of an L2. Instead, the only way for learners to acquire an L2 is to provide them with more comprehensible input (cited in Cowan, 2009, p.29).

1.5.1.2 Grammar Should be Taught

Over the past decade, a number of empirical evidences has shown that classroom instruction in grammar actually results in substantial gains in L2 proficiency. The evidences of many researches that have been done in controlled environment i.e. in classrooms have shown that the grammar of a language is supposed to be taught. To support on the same, Master (1994) has shown that grammar teaching can effectively improve English learner's accuracy in the use of articles, which is notoriously difficult for many learners of English. Likewise, Cadierno (1995) and Doughty (1991) have demonstrated that explicit instruction can increase students' accuracy in the production of past tense forms and relative clauses. The studies of Carroll and Swain (1993), Fotos (1993), Lightbown (1991), Lightbown and Spada (1990), and Nassaji and Swain (2000) have also shown the evidence that instruction (teaching) which focuses students' attention on grammatical forms promote the attainment of high level of accuracy (cited in Cowan 2009, p.30).

In addition to the above studies, there is an extensive body of research on language learning in French immersion programs that argues for the value of grammatical instruction. Immersion programs provide precisely the type of environment where the students are given large amounts of meaningful input and have to focus simultaneously on understanding the new language and determining its grammar without any help from the teacher. In other words, the studies of different researchers imply that attaining high levels of grammatical accuracy requires some grammar instruction (ibid).

At present, although there are two views on teaching grammar in existence, the view for teaching grammar seems to be more plausible since the evidences described earlier clearly demonstrate the significance of grammar teaching for

these learners. However, the notion that L2 learners do not need grammar instruction resonates strongly with many kindergartens through grade six teachers, for instance, who have noted that their students do seem to learn without formal grammar instruction (teaching).

In a nutshell, it is recommended that the debate should be on the question of how grammar is to be taught, rather than on the question of whether learning or teaching grammar is important or not. That is to say, there should be a debate on the ways of teaching grammar; not on importance of teaching grammar.

1.5.2 Methods of Teaching Grammar

Some teachers see no need to teach and practice grammar at all. Some even regard structure practice and other forms of grammar teaching as harmful. Their view is that learners will pick up the regularities intuitively, provided they meet enough samples of natural languages. The teacher's role, as they see it, is to provide a language rich environment in which the learners meet comprehensible language as they engage in activities of various kinds.

“In the history of foreign and second language pedagogy, the twentieth century is noted for numerous experiments and investigations which provide teachers with new insights into formal grammar teaching” (Bhattarai 2000, p.29).

In present era, there are two important methods of teaching grammar in existence which are popularly known as deductive and inductive methods.

1.5.2.1 Deductive Method

The deductive method of teaching grammar is the academic and scholarly one which was devised in order to teach Latin and Greek. This approach is very simple. First, the teacher writes an example on the board or draws attention to example in the text book. The underlying rule is explained, nearly always in the mother tongue and using the meta language of grammar. Finally, the students practice applying the same. Special attention is paid to the areas of conflict between the grammar of the mother tongue and that of the target language. The whole approach is cognitive. The little attention is paid to the value of the message.

Those steps are used by teachers who follow a grammar translation method and by those who are working with a text book which has a traditional grammar syllabus rather than a structural one.

Deductive method for teaching grammar has been defined variously. The definitions of the deductive method (cited in Sharma and Phyak 2006, p.166-167) are:

Thornbury (1999) defines deductive method as “an approach starts with the presentation of a rule and is followed by examples in which the rule is applied.

Similarly, Richards et al. (1985) say:

Deductive method is an approach to language teaching in which learners are taught rules and given specific information about a language. They then apply these rules when they use the language. Language teaching methods which emphasize the study of the grammatical rules of a language

(grammar translation method) make use of the principles of deductive reasoning (p.73).

But, Brown (1994) defines deductive method using the different words as “a movement from generalization to specific instances: specific subsumed facts are inferred or deduced from a general principle.”

Going through the above mentioned definitions, we can simply define the deductive method as a rule- driven method. This method starts with presentation of grammatical rules and then those rules are followed by examples and explanation. The teacher can also translate L₂ into students' L₁ while using deductive method

Steps of Deductive Method

Sharma and Phyak (2006, p. 167) have given the following steps of deductive method:

- a) Presentation of rules.
- b) Description and explanation of rules.
- c) Providing some examples.
- d) Explaining underlying rules mostly by using mother tongue.
- e) Asking students to practice the rule orally or in writing.
- f) Contrasting the areas of difference between mother tongue and target language.

Features of Deductive Method

- a) The teaching moves from abstract rules to concrete examples.
- b) The teaching proceeds from general to specific.
- c) This method follows the theoretical science. The deductive theorist:
 - i) Perceives a pattern.
 - ii) Constructs a theoretical mode.
 - iii) Tests to see how much can be deduced from it.
- d) This method is cognitive. It is cognitive in the sense that learners are attracted more by the rules and wording of the rules than that of the communicative value of word \ the message.

1.5.2.2 Inductive Method

Teachers following the inductive approach induce the learners to realize grammar rules without any forms of prior explanation. These teachers believe that the rules will become evident of learners are given enough appropriate examples. When teaching a grammar points, the first step is to demonstrate the meaning to the class. For example, they will hold up a book, saying-*This is a book*. They will do the same showing other objects. Then they will hold up several books and say-*These are books*. After giving several examples of the plural form they will contrast the two forms.

The next step is to get the students to produce the two grammatical forms, working with the same set of objects. The teacher says nothing through this stage except to correct if necessary.

The grammar point is shown on the board only after extensive practice. Explanations are not always made, though they may be elicited from the students themselves. In such cases, the mother tongue might as well be used. The model is copied and the class may be required to write some sentences from the model.

Inductive method has also been defined variously. Some of the definitions (cited in Sharma and Phyak 2006, p.169-170) are given below: Thornbury (1999) defines inductive method as “an approach starts with some examples from which a rule is inferred.”

Similarly, Richards et al. (1985) say, “In inductive learning learners are not taught grammatical or other type of rules directly but are left to discover or induce rule from their experience of using the language” (p.73).

Brown (1994) says the same thing a bit differently as, “In the case of inductive reasoning, one store a number of specific instances and induces a general law or rule of conclusion that governs or subsumes the specific instances.”

To sum up the whole idea, inductive method is rule-discovery method. In the inductive method, the teacher first gives his/her students examples of the grammatical structure or rule to be learned. After the examples have been presented, the students are guided in forming a generalization about the grammatical rule guided in forming a generalization about the grammatical rule underlying the example sentences. Thus, students feel ease and free in learning grammatical rules by inductive method because they have to generalize the rules from the rules from the example they have practiced before.

Steps of Inductive Method

Sharma and Phayak (2006, p.170) have given the following steps of inductive method:

- a) Presentation of examples.
- b) Analysis of examples.
- c) Rule formation.
- d) Generalization of rules that grow out of the previous activity.
- e) Written and oral practice.

Features of Inductive Method

- a) The teaching moves from concrete examples to abstract rules.
- b) The teaching proceeds from specific to general.
- c) It advocates that rules become meaningful to the learners when they are made by observation working with the language.
- d) The method is based on 'Science of observation. So, it claims that valid statements are only arrived by:
 - i) Observing linguistic facts.
 - ii) Classifying them.
 - iii) Making generalization on what is observed and classified.

But, Cowan (2009) has defined deductive and inductive methods differently. He has used the terms-explicit and implicit instead of the terms deductive and inductive methods respectively. He puts his own words as

in explicit grammar teaching, the rules are explained to learners, or the learners are directed to find the rules by looking at linguistic examples, that is, sentences that embody the rules. Implicit teaching, on the other hand, makes no overt references to rules or forms (p.31).

Until recently, arguments in favor of one or the other approach were not supported by evidence. But, careful examination of Norris and Ortega's (2000) analysis of 49 studies have shown that explicit teaching (inductive teaching) produces better and longer-lasting learning than implicit teaching (inductive teaching). Most English and foreign language textbooks use a style of explicit grammar teaching called deductive instruction. However, implicit grammar teaching is only useful in teaching intermediate and advanced students only (ibid).

It is now generally accepted that either ways of teaching grammar is better than no grammar teaching at all. Thus, any method of teaching grammar can be used in accordance with the different contexts and level of the students.

1.5.1.3 Differences between Deductive and Inductive Methods

Gotame (2007, p.10) has given the fundamental differences between deductive and inductive methods, which are given below:

S.N	Deductive Method	S.N.	Inductive Method
1	The goal of deductive method is linguistic competence. It emphasizes on the knowledge about the language.	1	The goal of inductive method is also linguistic competence but it emphasizes on the knowledge of language or on the use of language.
2	The theory of this method is as follows: A model is presented than explanation of the intuitive notion of the structure of the language is made. Much intellectual practices are preferred.	2	The theory of this method is as follows: Only variable facts have scientific validity. The facts of language are verifiable by the sense. Here much meaningful practices are preferred.
3	The procedure of deductive method is: - Statement of rules -Explanation of rules -Application of rules	3	The procedure of inductive method is: -Observation -Classification -Generalization of rules
4	This method is based on prescriptive approach.	4	This method is based on descriptive approach.
5	It is based on theoretical science.	5	It is based on science of observation.

6	In this method, learners seem to be active in applying the rules.	6	In this method, learners are active for making the rules.
7	In this method, application is applied.	7	In this method, understanding is applied.
8	In this method, teaching moves from abstract rules to concrete examples.	8	In this method, teaching moves from concrete examples to abstract rules.
9	In this method, teaching proceeds from general to specific	9	In this method, teaching proceeds from specific to general.

1.6 Causative Verb

Crystal (1980, p.67) defines causative as “a term used in GRAMMARTICL description to refer to the causal relationship between alternative version of a sentence.” In the pair of sentences, a word can be a causative version of another word. For example, in the following sentences, the transitive 'kill' can be seen as a causative version of the intransitive 'die', viz. cause to die.

The cat killed the mouse.

The mouse died.

Similarly, some affixes have a causative, for example-ize, as in domesticize (cause to become domestic). This type of system is particularly found in Japanese and Turkish language

Richards et.al. (1985) define causative verb as "a verb which shows that someone or something brings about or causes an action or a state". For

example, in *'Peter killed the rabbit.'*, 'killed' is a causative verb; but in *'The rabbit died,* 'died' is not. Causative verbs are always TRANSITIVE (p.36).

Generally, causative verbs are the verbs which help to perform an action by using other agent. The causative is a common structure in English. We use the causative verbs when we do not carryout an action ourselves, but are responsible for the action being performed. In another words, a verb which causes someone\somebody to do something is a causative verb. In case of causative verb, the subject does not do the work. Instead, it causes somebody\something to do something. Verbs like- 'get', 'make' and 'have' in English are known as causative verbs.

"There is a certain category of verbs whose function is to signal that someone has caused someone\something to do something." These constructions of the verbs are said as causative construction by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Free Man (1983, p. 480).

Murphy (1994, p.90) says that the causative verb 'have' as, "We use 'have something done' to say that we arrange for somebody else to do something for us."

Examples:

Jill repaired the roof (she repaired it herself).

Jill had the roof repaired (she arranged for somebody else to repair it).

Similarly, commenting on the use of 'get' Murphy (1994, p.90) says, " We can also say 'get something done' 'instead of 'have something done' (mainly in informal spoken English)."

Examples:

When are you going to get the roof repaired? (Have the roof repaired)

I think you should get your hair cut.

1.6.1 Basic Causative Structures

There are two basic causative structures. One is like an active, and the other is like passive. These examples use the causative verb 'have'.

I had John fix the car. (I arranged for the car to be fixed by John-I caused him to fix it).

I had the car fixed. (I arranged for the car to be fixed by someone .We do not know who, so this is like a passive).

1.6.2 The Active Causative Structure

1.6.2.1 Causative verb 'Get'

Structure: Get +person +to+ verb

Use: This structure generally means 'to convince to do something' or 'to trick someone in to doing something'.

Examples:

Susie got her son to take the medicine even though it tasted terrible.

Srijana gets her son to bring Sandwich.

1.6.2.2 Causative verb 'Make'

I) Structure: Make +person + verb

Use: This construction usually means 'to force someone to do something'.

'Make' in active takes the bare infinitive. (Thomson & Martinet, 1990, p.220)

Examples:

My teacher made me apologize for what I had said.

She made her children do their work.

II) Structure: Make +Obj+V³+self pronoun (subject)

Example:-

I made the paragraph understood myself. (=I managed to understand the paragraph myself).

1.6.2.3 Causative Verb 'Have'

Structure: Have +Person +verb

Use: This construction means 'to give someone responsibility to do something'.

Examples:

I had the mechanic check the brakes.

Dr. Smith had his nurse take the patient's temperature.

.

1.6.3 The Passive Causative Structure

1.6.3.1 Causative Verb 'Get'

Structure: Get + obj + Past participle

Examples:

Susie got the medicine taken even though it tasted terrible.

Shrijana gets a sandwich brought.

1.6.3.2 Causative Verb 'Make'

Structure: be –verb + past participle (made) + to infinitive

Examples:

I was made to apologize for what I had said.

Her children were made to do their work.

1.6.3.3 Causative Verb 'Have'

Structure: Have + object +past participle

Examples:

I had the breaks checked.

Dr. Smith had the temperature taken (of his patient).

1.7 Review of the Related Literature

To find out the effectiveness of one particular method over another, different researches have been carried out in different contexts. Regarding this, Richards and Rodgers (1987, p.165) write "since the 1950s a number of ambitious attempt have been made at testing the comparative effectiveness of methods. Most often, researches have been unable to demonstrate the effectiveness of specific methods. For example, a major large scale investigation of the audio lingual method, like other studies before it, failed to demonstrate that the audio lingual method had any significant impact on improvement of language learning."

In the context of Nepal, a few researches have been done on "Teaching Grammatical Items: Deductively and Inductively at the Department of English Education, Trivbhuvan University. They are as follows:

Sitaula (1999) undertook a research entitled "Teaching passivization in English using Inductive and Deductive Methods". It was a comparative study. He compared the effectiveness of both methods in teaching passivization in

English. His study showed that the inductive method is more effective than deductive method in teaching passivization in the context of Nepal.

Karki (1999) carried out a research on “Teaching Subject-Verb Agreement Inductively and Deductively”. It was a practical study. He elicited data from the thirty students studying in Araniko English Boarding School, Tulsipur, Dang .The students of the study were of grade nine. He collected data using written test only. He concluded his research with the finding that the group taught through inductive method is found to perform better in most of the cases in teaching subject verb agreement in English. The inductive method was relatively more effective than deductive for teaching subject-verb agreement in general.

Sharma (2000) undertook a research on "Teaching Reported Speech in English Deductively and Inductively." It was a practical study. The population of the study was all the eighth graders studying in the boarding school of Parbat district for his study. He selected the subjects of the study using random sampling procedure. He taught twenty lessons and administered the post - test .He wanted to find out the relative effectiveness between deductive and inductive method in teaching reported speech. He, comparatively, found that the group taught through deductive method performed slightly better in most of the cases than the group taught through inductive method.

Similarly, **Ghimire (2000)** carried out a research entitled “Teaching Tag Questions in English Deductively and Inductively”. It was a practical study .He selected fifty-six students of grade -‘X’ studying at Janajyoti Secondary School of Chitawan for his study. However, only forty students were presented in the pre-test and the post-test. He taught the lesson for four weeks. He used both oral test and written test. He wanted to find out that the group taught

inductively found perform better in most of the cases than deductively taught group. He writes, " The inductive method is more effective than deductive one in teaching tag questions in English".

Gotame (2007) undertook a research on “Teaching Conditionals in English Inductively and Deductively”. It was a comparative study. She elicited data from thirty-eight students of grade VIII studying in Manohar Secondary School of Kathmandu district. She selected the school using random sampling procedure. She taught the lesson for two weeks and administered written test only. She wanted to find out the relative effectiveness between deductive and inductive method. She concluded her research maintaining that deductive method is more effective than inductive one to teach conditionals in English in general.

Khatiwada (2007) carried out a research on “Proficiency of Grade Ten Students in Using Causative Verbs”. The primary sources of data were the fifty students of grade X studying in Nobel Academy and Ratna Rajya Secondary School of Kathmandu district. He collected the data purposely using written test only. Comparing the data, he found that the students of private school were found far better than that of the government school students in using causative verbs .The total proficiency of the grade ten students in using causative verbs was found to be quite satisfactory. The students secured 67.12 percent out of the total marks which was above 50 percent.

The present research is basically different from that of the above reviewed researches in the sense that no research has ever been done on "Effectiveness of Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Causative Verbs". So, in this study, the researcher attempts to find out the relative effectiveness of two methods in this area.

1.8 Objectives of the study

The objectives of my study were as follows:

1. To measure the development of proficiency in the use of causative verbs on the part of the learners.
2. To find out which method (inductive or deductive) is more effective for teaching causative verbs in English.
3. To suggest some pedagogical implications based on the findings of the study.

1.9 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study will be as follows:

This research will be the first research on “Effectiveness of Deductive and Inductive Methods in Teaching Causative Verbs” at the department of English Education. This will be invaluable for the department itself because the department will advise the researchers to carryout research on different grammatical items using deductive and inductive method in teaching English grammar. This study will also give insight on teaching causative verbs in English. The study will be significant for syllabus designers and textbook writers. They will get some ideas of teaching causative verbs in English using any method (deductive or inductive). By analyzing important things of this research and will include some hints in the context of preparing syllabus and textbooks. This will be helpful for teachers and students since they will understand the method of teaching causative verbs in English. They will teach and read taking it as a reference material. This study will be equally important

for the prospective researchers. They will research on different grammatical items by taking it as an important source.

1.10 Definition of the Specific Terms

Causative verbs: Causative verbs are the verbs which help to perform an action by using other agent. We use it when we do not carry out an action ourselves, but are responsible for the action being performed.

Test Items: Test items, here, refers to a set of questions prepared to find out the relative effectiveness of any method (deductive and inductive) in teaching causative verbs.

Teachers: All the teachers including the researcher himself who have been teaching at Bhanu Secondary School.

Students: The students who are studying in grade ten at B.S.S.

Proficiency: Here, proficiency refers to the ability of the students of grade ten to supply the correct causative verbs.

Group A: It, here, refers to the group of the students that the researcher has taught inductively .

Group B: It refers to the group of the students of grade ten that the researcher has taught deductively.

CHAPTER : TWO

METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the methodology which the researcher adopted during the study in order to find out the relative effectiveness of the two methods. The chapter comprises with the sources of data, sample population of the study, sampling procedure, and tools for data collection, process of data collection and limitations of the study. The researcher has adopted the following methodology during the study.

2.1 Sources of Data

In order to undertake the research, both primary and secondary sources of data were used. However, the research has been grounded on primary data.

2.1.1 Primary Source of Data

The primary sources of data for this study were the students of grade X studying in Shree Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab -7 Dailekh.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources of data

Different related theses, related books, journals reports and articles related to the English language teaching, particularly causative verbs in English were mainly consulted for designing the tests and classroom teaching materials. They are : Chomsky (1957), Harmer (1987), Cross (1992), Kumar (1996), Sitaula (1999), Sharma (2000), Ghimire (2000), Bhattarai (2001), Gotame (2007), Cowan (2009), etc.

2.2 Sample population of the study

The sample population for the study consisted of forty students of grade ten studying at Shree Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab – 7, Dailekh.

2.3 Sampling Procedure

The researcher selected Shree Bhanu Secondary School Kalbhairab-7, Dailekh purposively and after that class ten was selected randomly and the same was the process in selecting the number of students. The selected population of the study was divided into two groups based on pre test raw marks - group 'A' and Group 'B' on the basis of odd and even number. The students who had equal score in the pre-test were placed in a particular position by drawing a lottery.

The ranking procedure and group division were as follows:

Pre-test rank	Group 'A'	Group 'B'
1-10	odd	even
11-20	even	odd
21-30	odd	even
31-40	even	odd

2.4 Tools for Data Collection

The major tool for data collection was a set of test items which was used to assess the students' proficiency. It consisted of two different types of test items

which altogether carried 100 marks. It was prepared before actual classroom teaching. The different sets of test items having the same difficult level were used for the pre-test and the post-test. The test items were developed from a specific area of grammar viz. causative verbs. The following types of questions were used for the collection of data:

- a. Multiple choice items.
- b. Fill in the blanks.

2.5 Process of Data Collection

The stepwise process to collect the primary data was as follows:

- a. At first, the researcher went to the selected school and established the rapport with the authority for their permission to carryout the study. The researcher explained the purpose of his study and assured the students/subjects' confidentiality.
- b. The researcher prepared a set of test items based on various types of causative verbs- 'have' , 'make' and 'get'.
- c. Having prepared a set of tests, the researcher administered a written pre-test to determine the actual performance of the students in causative verbs. Moreover, the score obtained from the pre-test was also used in order to group the students in to Group 'A' and Group 'B'.
- d. On the basis of the result of the pre-test, the students were ranked as per their raw mark list.

- e. The students were divided into two groups on the basis of odd-even ranking procedure and the group division was as follows :

Pre- test rank	Group ‘A’	Group ‘B’
1-10	odd	even
11-20	even	odd
21-30	odd	even
31-40	even	odd

- f. The researcher prepared the same teaching materials for both the groups before classroom teaching. Teaching items were same for both groups. However, the teaching methods were different i.e. Group ‘A’ was taught inductively and Group ‘B’ was deductively. The medium of instruction was entirely English.
- g. Each group was taught for one month, six days a week, one period of a day and each period ended for forty-five minutes.
- h. After real teaching for one month, a written post –test was administered using a set of test items having the same difficulty with the pre-test. Finally the results of both tests (pre-test and post-test) were evaluated and compared in order to determine the students' proficiency and to find out the effectiveness.

2.6 Limitations of the Study

The study was carried out under the following limitations:

- a. The total population of the study was limited to forty students of grade ten studying in only one government aided school of Dailekh district.
- b. The total population was confined only to two groups e.g. Group 'A' and Group 'B' on the basis of odd and even number of pre-test raw mark list.
- c. The primary data for the study was collected from the written test only.
- d. The sets of questions contained only two different types:
 - I. Multiple choice items
 - II. Fill in the blank
- e. The questions were limited to causative verbs only.
- f. The research study was limited to only one level of school i.e. secondary level.
- g. The research study was confined to teaching English language only.

CHAPTER: THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of data. After collecting the tests papers from both groups of informants, the responses were marked systematically and the marks obtained by them were tabulated. Comparison was made on the basis of the different variables like test items, sex and content. The analysis of information was done by using the statistical tools of average and percentage. The analysis leads to the interpretation of their performance and effectiveness of methods.

The analysis and interpretation of data was carried out under the following different headings:

- 1) Comparison of total performance in general
- 2) Item wise comparison of performance of both the groups
- 3) Sex wise comparison of performance of both the groups
- 4) Group wise comparison of the performance of boys in different test items as a whole
- 5) Group wise comparison of the performance of girls in different test items as a whole
- 6) Content wise comparison in general
- 7) Content wise comparison of the performance of boys
- 8) Content wise comparison of the performance of girls

The analysis has been done in the following ways:

The individual score of both tests (pre-test and post test) of each heading was taken and tabulated group wise. The marks of each student in the pre-test were subtracted from the marks of the post test of their performance. The results were converted into percentage. Then, the increased percentage of each group was determined by converting the average increased score into percentage. Thus, the relative effectiveness of the two methods was determined.

3.1) Comparison of the Total Performance in General

The tests were divided into two items, i.e. multiple choice items and fill in the blank items. Each item consisted of forty questions. The multiple choice item carried forty marks whereas, the completion item sixty marks. The set of tests was of one hundred marks.

Table No.1
Comparison in general

Group	Avg. score in Pre-test	Avg. score in Post-test	D	D %
A	31.55	57.15	25.7	81.14
B	31.45	48	17.55	52.62

This table shows the average scores of both the groups. It reveals the fact that the average score obtained by Group 'A' was 31.55 marks in the pretest and 57.15 in the post-test. Their mark was increased by 25.7. So, the increased percentage was 81.14. On the other hand, the average marks obtained by Group 'B' was 31.45 in the pre-test and 48 in the post-test . The mark was increased by 17.55. So, the increased percentage was 52.72.

The difference between the percentage of both Groups clearly shows that the Group A's performance was better than Group B's in the post-test. Therefore, it is concluded that inductive method has been found to be more effective than deductive method in teaching causative verbs in English.

3.2) Item wise Comparison of the Performance of both the Groups

The test was divided into two items, i.e. multiple choice item and fill in the blank items. Each items consisted of forty questions. The multiple choice items were of forty marks and the fill in the blanks of sixty marks.

3.2.1) Multiple Choice Item

In this item, the students were required to choose the best answer from the given three alternatives and tick it. This test item consisted of forty questions which carried forty marks.

Table No. 2
Performance in multiple choice items

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	17.40	26.40	8.50	48.85
B	17.30	22.40	5.10	29.47

The above table shows that the average score of Group 'A' was 17.40 marks in the pre-test and 26.40 in the post-test. Their mark was increased by 8.50. The increased percentage was 48.85. On the other hand, the average score of Group 'B' was 17.30 marks in the pre-test and 22.40 in the post-test. Their mark was increased by 5.10. The increased percentage was 29.47.

The difference between the percentages of the two groups proves that Group 'A' is comparatively better than Group 'B' in their performance in the post-test. Therefore, it can be concluded that inductive method is more effective than deductive method to teach causative verbs.

3.2.2) Fill in the Blank Item

In this item, the students were required to supply the appropriate answer. The item consisted of forty questions which carried sixty marks.

Table No. 3
Performance in fill in the blank

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	14.20	30.75	16.60	116.90
B	14.15	25.60	11.45	80.91

The above table reveals that the average score of Group 'A' was 14.20 in the pre-test and 30.75 in the post-test in their performance. Their mark was increased by 16.60 and the increased percentage was 116.90. On the other hand, the average score of Group 'B' was 14.15 in the pre-test and 25.60 in the post-test. Their mark was increased by 11.45. The increased percentage was 80.91.

The difference between the percentages of the two groups proves that Group 'A' is comparatively better than Group 'B' in their performance in the post-test. That is to say, inductive method is better than deductive method in this item of teaching causative verbs.

3.3) Sex wise Comparison of both the Groups

According to sex, the whole population of the study was divided into two variables, i.e. boys and girls. Then, the increased percentage, in each group of boys and girls, in their performance in the pre-test and post-test was determined separately and compared to find out the relative effectiveness of the two methods to teach English causative verbs.

3.3.1) Boys

The population of boys involved in both tests (pre and post) was twenty. Out of them, ten students were in Group 'A' and ten in Group 'B'. The questions, containing all two items, were of one hundred full marks.

Table No. 4
Performance of the boys

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	34.90	57.50	22.60	64.75
B	34.00	48.00	14.00	41.17

This table reveals the fact that the average score of Group 'A' was 34.90 marks in the pre-test and 57.50 in the post-test. Their mark was increased by 22.60. The increased percentage was 64.75. Whereas the average score of Group 'B' was 34.00 marks in the pre test and 48.00 in the post test in their performance. Their mark was increased by 14.00. The increased percentage was 41.17.

The difference between the percentages of two groups denotes that Group 'A' is comparatively better than Group 'B' in their performance in the post-test.

Therefore, it is concluded that inductive method is better than deductive method to teach causative verbs.

3.3.2) Girls

The population of girls involved in both tests (pre and post) was twenty. Out of them, ten students were in Group 'A' and ten in Group 'B'. The questions containing two test items were of one hundred full marks.

Table No. 5
Performance of the girls

Group	Avg. score in pre- test	Avg. score in post- test	D	D%
A	28.20	56.80	28.60	101.41
B	28.90	48.00	19.10	66.08

This above mentioned table shows that the average scores of Group 'A' was 28.20 marks in the pre-test and 56.80 marks in the post test. Their mark was increased by 28.60. The increased percentage was 101.41. Whereas the average scores of Group B was 28.90 marks in the pre-test and 48.00 marks in the post-test. Their mark was increased by 19.10. The increased percentage was 66.08.

The difference between the percentages of two groups portrays that Group 'A' did much better in their performance in the post-test in comparison with Group 'B'. Therefore, it is clear that inductive method is much better than deductive method to teach causative verbs.

3.4 Performance of Boys in Different Test Items as a Whole

All the test items (multiple choice and fill in the blank items) were included to find out the performance of the boys and the girls. The multiple choice items consisted of forty questions of forty marks and the latter one consisted of forty questions of sixty marks.

3.4.1 Performance of Boys in Multiple Choice Items

Table No. 6

Performance of boys in multiple choice items

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	17.00	25.70	8.70	51.17
B	17.10	21.00	3.90	22.80

The above table reveals that the average score of Group 'A' (boys) was 17.00 marks in the pre-test and 25.70 in the post-test. The mark was increased by 8.70 and the increased percentage was 51.17. On the other hand, the average score of Group 'B' (Boys) was 17.10 and 21.00 in the pre-test and in the post-test respectively. The mark was increased by 3.90. The increased percentage was 22.80.

3.4.2 Performance of Boys in Fill in the Blank Item

Table No. 7

Performance of boys in fill in the blank items

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	18.00	31.80	13.80	76.66
B	16.90	27.00	10.10	59.76

The table above reveals that the average score of boys of Group 'A' in fill in the blanks item was 18.00 marks in the pre-test and 31.80 in the post test. The mark was increased by 13.80. The increased percentage was 76.66. On the other hand, the average score of boys of Group 'B' in this item was 16.90 in the pre-test and 27.00 in the post-test. The mark was increased by 10.10. The increased percentage was 59.76.

This difference between the performances of two groups proves that the former Group that was taught inductively benefits more than the latter that was taught deductively.

3.5 Performance of Girls in Different Test-Items as a whole

3.5.1 Performance of Girls in Multiple Choice Items

Table No. 8

Performance of girls in multiple choice items

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	17.80	27.10	9.30	52.24
B	17.50	23.80	6.30	36.00

According to the table mentioned above, the average score of Group 'A' girls in multiple choice items was 17.80 marks in the pre- test and 27.10 in the post test. Their mark was increased by 9.30. The increased percentage was 52.24. Whereas the average scores of girls of Group 'B' in the same item were 17.50 and 23.80 in the pre-test and the post-test respectively. The Mark was increased by 6.30. The increased percentage was 36.00.

The table shows that the percentage of the performance of Group A is better than Group B. Thus, the researcher comes to the conclusion that inductive method is more effective than deductive one to teach causative verbs.

3.5.2 Performance of Girls in Fill in the Blank Item

Table No. 9
Performance of girls in fill in the blank item

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	10.40	29.70	19.30	185.57
B	11.40	24.20	12.80	112.28

The above table denotes that the average scores of Group A were 10.40 and 29.70 marks in the pre-test and post-test respectively. Their marks were increased by 19.30. The increased percentage was 185.57. On the other hand, the average score of Group B was 11.40 marks in the pre-test and 24.20 marks in the post-test. Their marks were increased by 12.80. The increased percentage was 112.28.

Comparing the performance of both the Groups 'A' and 'B', the researcher comes to the finding that the effectiveness seems to be better in inductive method than deductive one.

3.6 Content wise Comparison in General

The tests were divided into two items i.e. multiple choices item and fill in the blank item. Each item consisted of forty questions. The multiple choices item carried forty marks. Whereas fill in the blank item was of sixty marks. The test

altogether was of one hundred marks. Among eighty questions, 28 were from Causative verbs 'Have', twenty six each were respectively from 'Make' and 'Get'. The questions were of 35.50 marks, 32.50 marks and 32 from 'Have', 'Make' and 'Get' respectively.

Table No. 10
Content wise comparison in general

Group	Avg. Score in Pre-test			Avg. Score in Post-test			D			D%		
	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get
A	10.85	10.10	10.60	18.9	18	20.25	8.05	7.90	9.65	74.19	78.21	91.03
B	12.70	8.80	10.15	15.4	12.55	20.05	2.70	3.55	9.90	21.25	40.34	97.53

This table shows the average scores of both the groups. It reveals that the average scores obtained by Group A were 10.85, 10.10 and 10.60 in causative verbs – Have, Make and Get respectively in the pre-test and 18.90, 18.00 and 20.25 respectively in the post-test. Their marks were increased by 8.05 (Have), 7.90 (Make) and 9.65 (Get). So, the increased percentages were 74.19 (Have), 78.21 (Make) and 91.03 (Get). On the other hand, the average marks obtained by Group B were 12.70, 8.80 and 10.15 in causative verbs – Have, Make, and Get respectively in the pre-test, and 15.40, 12.55 and 20.05 respectively in the post-test. Their marks were increased by 2.70 (Have), 3.55 (Make) and 9.90 (Get). So, the increased percentages were 21.25 (Have), 40.34 (Make) and 97.53 (Get).

The difference between the percentages of two groups clearly depicts that Group A's marks are greater than Group B's in their performance in the post-test. Thus, it is concluded that inductive method has been found to be more effective than deductive method in teaching causative verbs in English. But,

deductive method is seen to be slightly effective than inductive method for teaching the causative verb 'Get' only in general.

3.7 Content wise Comparison of the Performance of Boys

Table No. 11
Content wise performance of boys

Group	Avg. Score in Pre-test			Avg. Score in Post-test			D			D%		
	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get
A	11.20	11.30	12.40	19.70	17.90	19.90	8.50	6.60	7.50	75.89	58.40	60.48
B	13.90	9.10	11.30	15.40	11.90	20.70	1.50	2.80	9.40	10.79	30.76	83.18

This table above shows that the average scores obtained by the boys of Group 'A' were 11.20, 11.30 and 12.40 in Causative verbs 'Have' 'Make' and 'Get' respectively in the pre-test and 19.70, 17.90 and 19.90 respectively in the post-test. Their marks were increased by 8.50, 6.60 and 7.50 respectively in 'Have', 'Make' and 'Get'. The increased percentage were 75.89 (Have), 58.40 (Make) and 60.48 (Get).

On the other hand, the average scores obtained by the boys of Group 'B' were 13.90, 9.10 and 11.30 respectively in causative verbs - 'Have', 'Make' and 'Get' in the pre-test and 15.40, 11.9 and 20.7 marks respectively in the post test. Their marks increased by 1.50 (Have), 2.80 (Make) and 9.40 (Get). The increased percentage were 10.79 (have), 30.76 (Make) and 83.18 (Get).

This analysis helps the researcher to conclude that the performance of boys of Group 'A' was seen better than boys of Group 'B' in different causative verbs in totality. However, in Group 'B' (boys) did better than Group 'A' (boys) in

causative verb-(Get). In totality, inductive method seems more effective than deductive method. But, deductive method is more effective than inductive one for teaching causative verb ‘Get’ for boys only.

3.8. Content wise Comparison of the Performance of Girls

Table No. 12
Content wise performance of girls

Group	Avg. Score in Pre-test			Avg. Score in Post-test			D			D%		
	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get	Have	Make	Get
A	10.50	8.90	8.80	18.10	18.10	20.60	7.60	9.20	11.80	72.38	103.38	134.09
B	11.50	8.50	9.00	15.40	13.20	19.40	3.90	4.30	10.40	33.91	50.58	115.55

The table given above reveals that the average scores obtained by the girls of Group A were 10.50 (Have), 8.90 (Make) and 8.80 (Get) in the pre-test and 18.10, 18.10 and 20.60 respectively in the post-test. Their marks were increased by 7.60 (Have), 9.20 (Make) and 11.80 (Get). The increased percentages were 72.38 (Have), 103.37 (Make) and 134.09 (Get).

On the other hand, the average scores obtained by the girls of Group B were 11.5, 8.5 and 9 in causative verbs- Have, Make and Get respectively in the pre-test and 15.4, 13.2 and 19.4 respectively in the post-test. Their marks were increased by 3.9 (Have), 4.3 (Make) and 10.4 (Get). Their increased percentages were 33.91 (Have), 50.58 (Make) and 115.55 (Get).

This analysis helps the researcher to conclude that the performance of the girls of Group A seems to be better than the girls of Group B in causative verbs- have, make and get. Thus, inductive method seems to be more effective than deductive method in totality for girls.

To sum up through the table nos.10, 11 and 12 the researcher comes to the conclusion that inductive method is more effective than deductive one in totality. However, deductive method is more effective only for teaching causative verb-'get'.

CHAPTER : FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Findings

In order to assess the effectiveness of inductive and deductive methods regarding teaching causative verbs in English in the context of Nepal, a practical study was done. The findings of the study have been derived from analysis and interpretation of data. The data were analyzed by using simple statistical tools like average and percentage. The findings are presented here on the basis of the 'Group' rather than responses of the individual student. The major findings are summarized as follows:

- a. The students of Group 'A' increased their marks by 81.14 percentage and the students of Group 'B' increased their marks by 52.62 percentages in their performance in the post test. The difference between the increased percentages of each Group proves that inductive method is more effective than deductive one to teach causative verbs in English in general.

- b. The item wise analysis shows that in multiple choice test items and fill in the blank test item inductive method is found better than deductive method. Group 'A' has increased its average marks by 48.85 percentage and 116.90 percentage respectively in multiple choice test item and fill in the blank test item, whereas Group 'B' has increased its average marks by 29.47 percentage and 80.91 percentage respectively in multiple choice test item and fill in the blank test items (see Table Nos. 2 and 3).

- c. The sex wise analysis shows that the boys of Group 'A' increased their marks by 64.75 percentage and the boys of Group 'B' increased their marks by 41.17 percentage. The difference between increased percentages proves that inductive method is more effective than deductive one to teach causative verbs (see Table No. 4). On the other hand, the girls of Group 'A' increased their marks by 101.41 percentage and the girls of Group 'B' increased their marks by 66.08 percentage. Group 'A' obtained greater marks than Group 'B'. Thus, inductive method is more effective than deductive method (see Table No. 5).
- d. In Group wise analysis of the performance of boys in different test items, the analysis shows that in both test items, inductive method was found more effective in comparison with deductive one. The students of Groups 'A' have increased their average marks by 51.17 and 76.66 percentages in multiple choice item and fill in the blank items respectively. Whereas Group 'B' increased marks by 22.80 and 59.76 percentages respectively in multiple choice item and fill in the blank items (see Table No. 6 and 7).
- e. In Group wise analysis of the performance of girls in different test items, it shows that Group 'A' has done much better in all test items than Group 'B' in the post test. Groups 'A' has increased its average marks by 52.24 and 185.57 percentages in multiple choices item and fill in the blank item respectively. On the other hand, Group 'B' has increased its average marks by 36 and 112.28 percentages in multiple choice items and fill in the blank items respectively (see Table Nos. 8 and 9). From the above evidence, it is obvious that inductive method is more effective than deductive method to teach causative verbs in English.

- f. In content wise comparison of both the groups as a whole, the analysis shows that Group 'A' has done better in causative verbs than Group 'B'; except in 'Get'. Group 'A' has increased its average marks by 74.19, 78.21 and 91.03 percentages in causative verb – Have, Make and Get respectively. On the other hand, Group 'B' has increased its average marks by 21.25, 40.34 and 97.53 percentages in causative verbs – Have, Make and Get in the post-test respectively.

From the above analysis, it is clear that inductive method is more effective than deductive one for teaching causative verbs –Have and Make. But, deductive method has been found to be more effective for teaching causative verb –Get only (see Table No. 10).

- g. In Content wise analysis of the performance of boys in different causative verbs, the analysis shows that Group 'A' has done better in different causative verbs i.e. 'Have', 'Make' and 'Get'. Group 'A' has increased its average marks by 75.89, 58.40 and 60.48percentages in causative verbs 'Have', 'Make' and 'Get' respectively. On the other hand, Group 'B' (boys) has increased its average marks by 10.79, 30.76 and 83.18 percentages in 'Have', 'Make' and 'Get' respectively.

From the above evidence, it is quite clear that inductive method is more effective than deductive method to teach causative verbs 'Have' and 'Make'. But for teaching causative verb 'Get', deductive method is more effective in comparison with inductive method of grammar teaching (see Table No. 11).

- h. In content wise comparison of the performance of girls in different causative verbs (Have, Make and Get), it shows that the girls of Group

'A' increased their average marks by 72.38, 103.37 and 134.09 percentages in – Have, Make and Get respectively. Whereas the girls of Group 'B' have increased their average marks by 33.91 (Have), 50.58 (Make) and 115.55 percentages (Get). The difference between increased percentages proves that inductive method is more effective than deductive one to teach causative verbs (see Table No. 12).

On the basis of these findings, it is concluded that inductive method is more effective and more meaningful than deductive one to teach causative verbs in English in the context of Nepal. However, causative verb- 'Get' is supposed to be taught deductively.

4.2. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of the research, the researcher has made the following recommendations for pedagogical implications:

1. Inductive method has been found to be better than deductive one in general. Group 'A', which was taught inductively, did better in their performance in the post-test in comparison with Group 'B', which was taught deductively. Therefore, inductive method should be applied in teaching causative verbs in general.
2. Inductive method has been found to be more effective than deductive one in all types of comparison i.e. item wise, sex wise and content wise. Thus, inductive method should be applied in teaching causative verbs.

3. In order to make students more active in the classroom, inductive method should be applied in teaching causative verbs since ample practices rather than recitation of rules make them active in the classroom. In the study, the students of Group 'A', who were taught inductively, were found more active in the classroom while teaching causative verbs in comparison with the students of Group 'B', who were taught deductively. Therefore, inductive method should be used to make the students more active in the classroom than deductive one.
4. The syllabus designers and the textbook writers should be encouraged in the use of inductive method of teaching while designing syllabuses and writing textbooks. However, it does not mean that deductive method should be given no place at all in the syllabuses and textbooks.
5. The size of class and the number of students should be appropriate so that the teacher can go around the students and check performance individually. If the size of class and the number of students are large enough, it will be too difficult to handle the class by applying inductive method. In the research study, the number of students in Group 'A', which was taught inductively, was no more than twenty. The researcher himself could go around the students and check their performance individually. If the number of students in Group 'A' was large enough, the researcher could not be able to go around the students and check their performance. Thus, it is recommended that the size of class and the number of students should be appropriate while using inductive method.
6. Inductive method requires much time. So, the teacher should devote much time according to the language item while using inductive method. Therefore, it is suggested that much time should be devoted while using

inductive method.

7. While writing textbooks, rules should not be prescribed directly but ample practices and some examples should be given to students so that the teacher can make the students engage in practice and help them to deduce the underlying rule.
8. It is recommended that inductive method should be applied by the teachers to teach causative verbs because this study reveals that inductive method is more effective and meaningful than deductive one in teaching causative verbs in English.
9. According to the content wise comparison of the performance of girls, inductive method has been found to be more effective for teaching causative verb- Get. However, there is more effectiveness of deductive method in teaching causative verb-Get for boys only. So, it is suggested that girls should be taught causative verb- Get inductively and boys deductively.
10. Inductive method has been found to be more effective than deductive one in content wise comparison. However, as analysis shows, deductive method is seen more effective than inductive one for teaching causative verbs 'Get' only. Thus, inductive method should be applied in teaching causative verb 'Have' and 'Make'. However, deductive method should be used in teaching causative verb 'Get' only.
11. This study was conducted in one government aided school of Dailekh district. It is limited to only forty students. Thus, it can not be claimed that the inductive method is applicable in all schools and all the students

of Nepal in teaching causative verbs. It is suggested that several other experiments of this type should be carried out with more number of students in different schools throughout the country to make the findings of the study reliable and valid.

REFERENCES

- Aarts, B. (1997). *English syntax and argumentation*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Bhattari, A. (2000). *Current trends of teaching grammar and vocabulary*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Bhattarai, G.R. (2001). *A thematic analysis of research reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book for ESL \EFL teachers*. Heinle and Heinle: Newbury House.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Cowan, R. (2009). *The teacher's grammar of English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cross, D (1992). *A Practical handbook of language teaching*, London: Prentice Hall.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. New York: Black Well Publication.
- Ghimire, S.P. (2000). *Teaching tag questions in English inductively and deductively*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Gimson, A.C. (1976). *An introduction to the pronunciation of English*. England: ELBS.
- Gotame, A. (2007). *Teaching conditionals in English inductively and deductively*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Kathmandu. T.U.
- Harmer, J. (1987). *Teaching and learning grammar*. London: Longman .
- Hart, C. (2003). *Doing your masters dissertation*. New Delhi: Vistaar Publication
- Heaton, J.B. (1988). *Writing English language tests*. London: Longman.

- Hornby, A.S. (1996). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karki, P.B. (1999). *Teaching subject verb agreement inductively and deductively*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Khatriwada, K.P. (2007). *Proficiency of grade 10 students in using causative verbs*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Murphy, R. (2003 Reprint). *Intermediate English grammar*. New Delhi: Cambridge University Press.
- Pakharin, R. (2008). *Proficiency of the SLC graduates in the use of grammatical items*. An unpublished and methods in language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharma, B.K. & Phyak, P.B. (2006). *Teaching English language*. Kathmandu: Sunlight Publication.
- Sharma, B.R. (2000). *Teaching reported speech in English deductively and inductively*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Subhechchu, G. (2006). *Educational research methodology*. Nepal: New Hira Books Enterprises.
- Sitaula, P.P. (1999). *Teaching passivization in English using inductive and deductive methods*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu. T.U.
- Sthapit et. al. (1994). *A Course in general English*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press
- Tamang, B.L (2065). *SLC English practice book*. Kathmandu: Asia Publication.
- Thomson, A.J. & Martinet, A.V. (1990). *A practical English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1972). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. New York : Basil Black Well.

Appendix: A

School's Name: Shree Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab-7, Dailekh

Student's Name:

F.M.:100

Class: X

Time: 1.30 hrs

Subject: English

Sex:

Test: Pre-test

Attempt all the questions

A. Tick (✓) the best answer

1×40=40

1 My father makeshis shoes.

a. to shine b. shine c. shone

2. Have you had your garden.....?

a. plant b. to plant c. planted

3) Don't get himuneasy.

a. feel b. felt c. to feel

4) Parmila isUma pronounce the word.

a. getting b. making c. made

5) When had my motherus finish all the household works?

a. had b. got c. makes

6) How can we get his carin two days?

a. repaired b. to repair c. repair

7) Who weretheir village cleaned yesterday?

a. having b. making c. made

8) Who shall have my food?

a. cook b. to cook c. cooked

9) Sabitraher dress washed yesterday.

a. got b. made c. have

- 10) My son had made mechocolate.
a. to buy b. bought c. buy
- 11) The filmme feel happy.
a. got b. gets c. made
- 12)your building made.
a. Have b. Make c. Makes
- 13) She has her childrenhomework.
a. do b. to do c. done
- 14) Whothe black pants brought?
a. makes b. gets c. is making
- 15) Where did he get his hat.....?
a. to blow off b. blown off c. blow off
- 16) Anna will us sing a pop song.
a. make b. get c. makes
- 17) Why do you always make methe piano?
a. to play b. play c. played
- 18)them to solve the puzzle.
a. Get b. Make c. Have
- 19) I get my brothera poem.
a. read b. read (past) c. to read
- 20) Jillthe roof repaired.
a. made b. got c. makes
- 21) The teacher had been having the students
a. danced b. to dance c. dance
- 22) Was sheit painted?
a. getting b. making c. made
- 23) She will be getting Mr. Bhattarai.....the letter.
a. read b. read\red c. to read

24) Don't.....herself weep.

- a. make b. get c. got

25) The boys were made the work.

- a. submit b. submitted c. to submit

26) Will they beyou do it?

- a. getting b. having c. to get

27) You will have your camera.....

- a. repair b. repaired c. to repair

28) Why have you made her.....?

- a. dance b. danced c. to dance

29) Madhav Nepal will havethe secretaries work honestly.

- a. get b. got c. made

30) When do you your brotherin the campus?

- a. admitted b. to admit c. admit

31) The teacher wasShyam to bring a glass of water.

- a. making b. getting c. having

32) Rima.....her sister to wake up in the morning.

- a. will make b. will get c. will have

33) Sheher shoes cleaned.

- a. will have been having b. will have been making c. will have been made

34) Who is having his work?

- a. to complete b. completed c. complete

35) Do childrentheir tiffin prepared?

- a. gets b. make c. have

36) Don't have youit.

- a. do b. to do c. done

37) He was thinking to make a new person.....his works.

- a. do b. done c. to do

38) Shall wethe children to disturb us?

a. have got b. have made c. have had

39) Was sheto write to him?

a. made b. got c. had

40) Does she make her childrenthe hard work?

a. do b. done c. to do

B. Fill in the blanks with appropriate answer:

1.5 ×40=60

1) Whose death is making ussorry? (Feel)

Ans :.....

2) Theyrecently me think deeply. (Make)

Ans:.....

3) We will be having your passport..... (Steal)

Ans:.....

4) Who will be getting his son? (Fight)

Ans:.....

5) The contractorthe workmen to build bridge. (Get)

Ans:.....

6) We arethe house painted at the moment. (Get)

Ans:.....

7) Will they have been getting their house? (Build)

Ans:.....

8) They havethat coat cleaned. (Get)

Ans :.....

9) Bill is having his hair (Cut)

Ans :.....

10) Theythe servants sweep the room. (Have)

Ans :.....

11) I have been having the proposal (Write)

Ans :.....

12) George will have had his nose in a fight. (Break)

Ans :.....

13) Who will his son brings his girl friend home? (Make)

Ans :.....

14) I have been making Ramesh up. (Stand)

Ans :.....

15) Will they have been newspapers delivered . (Have)

Ans :.....

16) Uma was having my Photograph (Take)

Ans :.....

17) Who will be his son to fight. (Get)

Ans :.....

18) Why is Sita getting her brother his books? (Cover)

Ans :.....

19) Where have you been having your research? (Print)

Ans :.....

20) Who had got her passportaway. (Take)

Ans :.....

21) Had they been the film developed? (Get)

Ans :.....

22) Have you ever your passport stolen ? (Have)

Ans :.....

23) Where will have you had your hair? (Cut)

Ans :.....

24) We shall bethe workmen dig the garden. (Make)

Ans :.....

25) She will have been making her aunt.....her. (Help)

Ans :.....

26) Why did youher sing? (Make)

Ans :.....

27) Will Barsha be making me.....this matter? (Type)

Ans :.....

28) They have.....me think deeply. (Make)

Ans :.....

29) Who have been making my brothermy Clothes? (Clean)

Ans :.....

30) Had you.....your wife wear a red sari? (Make)

Ans :.....

31) When had they been Making their students.....away? (Run)

Ans :.....

32) By who had been having my dress.....? (Clean)

Ans :.....

33)I say something please. (Have)

Ans :.....

34) My aunt had had the cousin.....the lesson. (Read)

Ans :.....

35) Why will I have been making herme? (Follow)

Ans :.....

36) The English teacher has beenthe blackboard cleaned. (Get)

Ans :.....

37) She has been getting her hair..... (Color)

Ans :.....

38) She had the mechanic.....the brakes. (Check)

Ans :.....

39) Sapanaa sandwich brought. (Get)

Ans :.....

40) Dr. Awasthi had the temperature..... (Take)

Ans :.....

Thank you

.....

Test Items

School's Name: Shree Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab-7, Dailekh

Student's Name:

F.M.:100

Class: X

Time: 1.30hrs

Subject: English

Sex:

Test: Post – test

Attempt all the questions

A. Tick (✓) the best answer

1×40=40

1. My father makes me a letter.
a. write b. to write c. written
2. Have you had your field?
a. dig b. to dig c. dug
3. Don't get her the puzzle.
a. to solve b. solved c. solve
4. The teacher isRamesh read the story.
a. getting b. making c. made
5. When had the factory man the workers finish all the factory works?
a. had b. makes c. got
6. How can they get her motorcycle.....in a week?
a. repair b. to repair c. repaired
7. Who was his house painted yesterday ?
a. making b. having c. make
8. Uma..... her dress washed yesterday.
a. got b. made c. have
9. Who will have my food?
a. to cook b. cook c. cooked

10. My mother had made memy homework.
 a. to do b. done c. do
11. The film 'Bandhaki'her feel unhappy.
 a. gets b. got c. made
12.his building made.
 a. Have b. Make c. Gets
13. Gore Dai has his sons homework.
 a. to do b. do c. done
14. Who the red shirt bought?
 a. makes b. gets c. is making
15. Where did he get his cap.....?
 a. to blow off b. blown off c. blow off
16. Rajani willthem sing a pop song.
 a. get b. makes c. make
17. Why does he always make me.....the guitar?
 a. played b. play c. to play
18. the students to solve the problems .
 a. Get b. Make c. Have
19. Hari gets his sister a story .
 a. to read b. read c. read \ red
20. Johnthe house painted.
 a. sing b. make c. got
21. The Guruma had been having the students pop songs .
 a. sing b. sung c. to sing
22. Was Hariit colored?
 a. getting b. making c. made
23. The prime minister will be getting Mr. Pandey..... budget.
 a. read b. to read c. read \ red

37. Uma was thinking to make Parkashher works.

- a. do b. done c. to do

38. Will theythe kids to interrupt them?

- a. have got b. have made c. have had

39. Was he to read the novel ?

- a. made b. got c. had

40. Do they make their childrenhomework?

- a. do b. done c. to do

B. Fill in the blanks with appropriate answer:

40×1.5=60

1. Whose marriage party is making ushappy? (Feel)

Ans.....

2. He has recentlyher think deeply. (Make)

Ans ,.....

3. We will be having our shirts..... (Iron)

Ans

4. Who will be getting his friend? (Help)

Ans:.....

5. Ramesh.....the workmen to build house. (Get)

Ans

6. They arethe car repaired at the moment. (Get)

Ans

7. Will she have been getting her home?(Build)

Ans

8. We havethat coat cleaned. (Get)

Ans

9. John is having his hair..... (Cut)

Ans

10. We the workers work in the factory. (Have)

Ans :.....

11. She has been having the report (Write)

Ans :.....

12. George will have his leg in fight. (Break)

Ans :.....

13. Who willher daughter bring his boy friend home? (Make)

Ans :.....

14. They have been making Nita.....up (wake)

Ans :.....

15. Will they have beennewspapers delivered? (Have)

Ans :.....

16. Juni was having her photograph (Take)

Ans :.....

17. Who will bethe boys to fight? (Get)

Ans :.....

18. Why is Gita getting her sisterher copies? (Cover)

Ans :.....

19. Where have you been having your report ? (Computerize)

Ans :.....

20 Who had got her bag? (Steal)

Ans :.....

21. Had Prema been the field dug? (Get)

Ans :.....

22 Have you ever your cap bought? (Have)

Ans :.....

23. Where will you have had your paint? (Iron)

Ans :.....

24. We shall be the peasants work in the garden. (Make)

Ans :.....

25. He will have been making his unclehim. (Help)

Ans :.....

26. Why did youhim dance? (Make)

Ans :.....

27. Will Rekha be making Harithis letter? (Type)

Ans :.....

28. Hari and Geeta haveme think twice. (Make)

Ans :.....

29. Who have been making Rajesh my shoes? (shine)

Ans :.....

30. Had you your wife wear a red sari? (Make)

Ans :.....

31. When had the teacher been making their students in group ? (Play)

Ans :.....

32. By whom had been having my dress? (Cut)

Ans :.....

33.I say something please. (Have)

Ans :.....

34. The Guruma had the children the lesson (write)

Ans :.....

35. Why shall we have been making themus? (Follow)

Ans :.....

36 . The science teacher has beenthe white board cleaned. (Get)

Ans :.....

37. Pemba has been getting the camera (Repair)

Ans :.....

38. He had the mechanic the mobile. (Check)

Ans :.....

39. Madhuri a noodle bought. (Get)

Ans :.....

40. Bishnu had his shoes (Polish)

Ans :.....

Thank you

.....

Appendix :B
Marking Scheme
(Pre- test)

A. Tick (✓) the best answer :

1×40=40

Question No.	Answer	Question No.	Answer
1	b	21	c
2	c	22	a
3	c	23	c
4	b	24	a
5	a	25	c
6	a	26	b
7	a	27	b
8	c	28	a
9	a	29	c
10	c	30	b
11	c	31	b
12	a	32	b
13	a	33	a
14	b	34	b
15	b	35	c
16	a	36	a
17	b	37	a
18	a	38	a
19	c	39	a
20	b	40	a

B. Fill in the blanks with appropriate answer :**1.5×40=60**

Question No.	Answer	Question No.	Answer
1	feel	21	getting
2	have made	22	had
3	stolen	23	cut
4	to fight	24	making
5	gets	25	help
6	getting	26	make
7	built	27	type
8	got	28	made
9	cut	29	clean
10	have	30	made
11	written	31	run
12	broken	32	cleaned
13	Make	33	Have
14	stand	34	read
15	having	35	follow
16	taken	36	getting
17	getting	37	colored
18	to cover	38	check
19	printed	39	gets
20	taken	40	taken

Marking Scheme

(Post-test)

A. Tick (✓) the best answer :

1×40=40

Question No.	Answer	Question No.	Answer
1	a	21	a
2	c	22	a
3	a	23	b
4	b	24	a
5	a	25	b
6	c	26	b
7	b	27	a
8	a	28	c
9	c	29	c
10	c	30	b
11	c	31	b
12	a	32	c
13	b	33	b
14	b	34	b
15	b	35	c
16	c	36	a
17	b	37	a
18	a	38	a
19	a	39	a
20	c	40	a

B. Fill in the blanks with appropriate answer :**1.5×40=60**

Question No.	Answer	Question No.	Answer
1	feel	21	getting
2	made	22	had
3	ironed	23	ironed
4	to help	24	making
5	gets	25	help
6	getting	26	make
7	built	27	type
8	got	28	made
9	cut	29	shine
10	have	30	made
11	written	31	play
12	broken	32	cut
13	make	33	Have
14	wake	34	write
15	having	35	follow
16	taken	36	getting
17	getting	37	repaired
18	to cover	38	check
19	computerized	39	Gets
20	stolen	40	polished

Appendix :C

Lesson Plan No. 1

School's Name: Shree Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab -7, Dailekh

Class: X

Date: 2066-02-18

Subject: English

Time: 45 minute

No. of Students: 20

Topic: Introduction to Causative Verbs

1. Specific Objectives

On completion of this lesson, the students will be enabled to

- Find out the doer of action in causative verbs used sentences.
- Tell the types of causative verbs.

2. Teaching Materials:

- Daily used materials.
- Flannel board.
- Sentence chart.

Group: A

3. Teaching Learning Activities

- i. The teacher will write the following sentences on the white board based on the actions done contextually.

) The English teacher has got Sangita to write a sentence on the white board.

) The Monitor always makes three students bring water.

) The Head Teacher always has the peon sweep the office room.

After that, the teacher will ask the students to find out the doer of actions in the given three sentences e.g. has the English teacher written a sentence on the white board or Sangita? The teacher will also facilitate the students in finding out the same.

ii. Secondly, the teacher will show the following sentence chart on the flannel board:

-) The teacher gets Ramesh to do his home work
-) .My father made me write a letter.
-) I have my students solve the problems.
-) She got her husband bring her ornaments.
-) The Head Teacher always makes us come at 9:30 AM.
-) Dr. Awasthi had his nurse take the patients' temperature.

Then, the students will be asked to find out the causative verbs that are used in the given sentences. If they feel difficulty in causative verbs types, he will also facilitate them, and finally, the teacher will write the types of causative verbs on the white board.

4. Evaluation

- a. Who is the doer of action in the following sentences?
 - I. Uma always makes her brother do his home work.
 - II. My father has got Hari to sweep his house.
 - III. She had Prem sing a pop song.
- b. What are the types of causative verbs?

5. Home Work

Write the types of causative verbs.

Group: B

3. Teaching Learning Activities

- a) First of all, the teacher will write the following sentence on the white board: When the subject of a sentence does not carry out the action oneself but causes some one (agent) to do it, we use causative verbs. e.g.

) The English teacher has got Sangita to write a sentence on the white board.

) The Monitor always makes three students bring water.

) The Head Teacher always has the peon sweep the office room.

The teacher will further clarify about the doer of action - in the first sentence, the subject does not carry out the action instead, Sangita has done the action due to the subject.

- b) Secondly , the teacher will tell the following rule :

There are three types of causative verb in English. They are – ‘Have’, ‘Get’ and ‘Make’.

After that, the teacher will show the sentence chart on the flannel board for further clarification.

) The teacher gets Ramesh to do his home work.

) My father made me write a letter.

) I have my students solve the problems.

) She got her husband bring her ornaments.

) The Head Teacher always makes us come at 9:30 AM.

) Dr. Awasthi had his nurse take the patients’ temperature.

4. Evaluation

- a. Who is the doer of action in the following sentences?
- i. Uma always makes her brother do his home work.
 - ii. My father has got Hari to sweep his house.
 - iii. She had Prem sing a pop song.

b. What are the types of causative verbs?

5. Home Work

Write the types of causative verbs.

Lesson Plan No. 2

School's Name: Shree Bhanu Secondary School, Kalbhairab -7, Dailekh

Class: X

Date: 2066-02-19

Subject: English

Time: 45 minute

No. of Students: 20

Topic: Causative verb – Get, Make and Have

1. Specific Objectives

On completion of this lesson, the students will be enabled to

-) Tell the situations where causative verbs – get, make and have are used appropriately.

2. Teaching Materials:

- Daily used materials.
- Flannel board.
- Sentence chart.

Group: A

3. Teaching Learning Activities:

- i) At first, the teacher will revise the previous lesson in short.

After that, the teacher will write the following sentences on the white board based on the contextual used. for example ,

-) I get my wife to clean my room.
-) They have got the workers to work in the factory before 10 AM.
-) The English teacher makes the students recite word meanings.
-) My wife made me buy her ornament.
-) She had Ramesh reach at school.
-) Secondly, the students will be asked to find out the structures where causative verbs- get, make and have are used respectively and the

situations where they are used .The teacher will also facilitate the students while generalizing rules and structures from the given examples . Finally, the teacher will also stick the rule chart on the flannel board. for example ,

) Sub + get + person + to + v¹

This structure is generally used to convince someone to do something.

) Sub + make +person + v¹

This construction is used to force someone to do something.

) Sub + have +person +v¹

This construction is used to give someone the responsibility to do something.

4. Evaluation

Fill in the blank with an appropriate answer:

- a. Ramesh got me a song. (sing)
- b. Parmila always the boys write a love letter. (get)
- c. I make my wife food. (cook)
- d. She will have Nita home work. (write)

5. Home work

- a. Make one sentence using each of the following structure :
 - Sub + get + person +to + v¹.....
 - Sub + make + person + v¹.....
- b. In which situations these structures are used?

Group: B

3. Teaching Learning Activities:

- i. At first, the teacher will revise the previous lesson in short.
After that, the teacher will stick these rules on the flannel board and will explain them with examples.

a. Sub + get + person + to + v¹

b. Sub + make + person + v¹

c. Sub + have + person + v¹

The first structure is used to convince someone to do something. e.g.

I get my wife to clean my room.

They have got the workers to work in the factory before 10 AM.

The second structure is used to force someone to do something. eg.

The English teacher makes the students recite word meanings.

My wife made me buy her ornaments.

The final structure is used to give someone the responsibility to do something. eg.

The Head Teacher always has the peon sweep school office.

She had Ramesh reach at school.

4. Evaluation

Fill in the blank with an appropriate answer:

a. Ramesh got me a song. (sing)

b. Parmila always the boys write a love letter. (get)

c. I make my wife food. (cook)

d. She will have Nita home work. (write)

5. Home work

a. Make one sentence using each of the following structure:

Ñ Sub + get + person + to + v¹

Ñ Sub + make + person + v¹

b. In which situations these structures are used?

Appendix 'D'

a) Marks obtained by the students in pre-test

Rank	Name of the students	Obtained marks
1	Saroj Kumar Shahi	51
2	Ram Bahadur Bhandari	49
3	Min Bahadur Thapa	45
4	Mausham Shahi	44
5	Kushal Thapa Magar	43
6	Rita Thapa Magar	41
7	Dev Kumari Thapa	39
8	Tarka Bahadur Sunar	38
9	Ramesh Bahadur Bhandari	37
10	Sandip Kumar Shahi	36
11	Binaya K.C.	36
12	Dipak Prakash Thapa	34
13	Gita Kumari Dhakal	34
14	Binita Bhandari	33
15	Yamuna K.C.	32
16	Lalita Bhandari	32
17	Binod Kumar B.K.	32
18	Tulsi Kumari Thapa	31
19	Sumitra Malla	31
20	Gita Kumari Bhandari	31
21	Bakhat Bahadur Thapa	31
22	Shanti Thapa	30
23	Mahesh K.C.	30
24	Khima Thapa	30
25	Yam Raj Soni	29

26	Prakash K.C.	29
27	Bablu B.K.	29
28	Namsara Kumari Thapa	28
29	Babita Shahi	28
30	Kalam Bhandari	27
31	Jagat Bahadur Rana	26
32	Gita Kumari Sunar	25
33	Karishma Shahi	24
34	Parbati Kumari Thapa	24
35	Amar K.C.	23
36	Madhuri Katuwal	23
37	Sharmila K.C.	22
38	Hem Raj Khadka	20
39	Shyam Kumari Bhandari	17
40	Sangita Malla	16

b) Ranking Procedure and Group Division

Ranking Procedure

Pre -test Rank	Group 'A'	Group 'B'
1-10	odd	even
11-20	even	odd
21-30	odd	even
31-40	even	odd

Group Division

Group 'A'

Rank No.	Name of the Students	Obtained Marks
1	Saroj Kumar Shahi	51
3	Min Bahadur Thapa	45
5	Kushal Thapa Magar	43
7	Dev Kumari Thapa	39
9	Ramesh Bahadur Bhandari	37
12	Dipak Prakash Thapa	34
14	Binita Bhandari	33
16	Lalita Bhandari	32
18	Tulsi Kumari Thapa	31
20	Gita Kumari Bhandari	31
21	Bakhat Bahadur Thapa	31
23	Mahesh K.C.	30
25	Yam Raj Soni	29
27	Bablu B.K.	29
29	Babita Shahi	28
32	Gita Kumari Sunar	25
34	Parbati Kumari Thapa	24
36	Madhuri Katuwal	23
38	Hem Raj Khadka	20
40	Sangita Malla	16

Group 'B'

Rank	Name of the students	Obtained marks
2	Ram Bahadur Bhandari	49
4	Mausham Shahi	44
6	Rita Thapa Magar	41
8	Tarka Bahadur Sunar	38
10	Sandip Kumar Shahi	36
11	Binaya K.C.	36
13	Gita Kumari Dhakal	34
15	Yamuna K.C.	32
17	Binod Kumar B.K.	32
19	Sumitra Malla	31
22	Shanti Thapa	30
24	Khima Thapa	30
26	Prakash K.C.	29
28	Namsara Kumari Thapa	28
30	Kalam Bhandari	27
31	Jagat Bahadur Rana	26
33	Karishma Shahi	24
35	Amar K.C.	23
37	Sharmila K.C.	22
39	Shyam Kumari Bhandari	17

c) Pre-test and Post-test result of Group 'A' (Inductive)

Rank No.	Name of the Students	Obtained Marks in the Pre-test	Obtained Marks in the Post-test
1	Saroj Kumar Shahi	51	60
3	Min Bahadur Thapa	45	84
5	Kushal Thapa Magar	43	64
7	Dev Kumari Thapa	39	65
9	Ramesh Bahadur Bhandari	37	46
12	Dipak Prakash Thapa	34	55
14	Binita Bhandari	33	65
16	Lalita Bhandari	32	62
18	Tulsi Kumari Thapa	31	52
20	Gita Kumari Bhandari	31	54
21	Bakhat Bahadur Thapa	31	54
23	Mahesh K.C.	30	55
25	Yam Raj Soni	29	59
27	Bablu B.K.	29	51
29	Babita Shahi	28	66
32	Gita Kumari Sunar	25	46
34	Parbati Kumari Thapa	24	66
36	Madhuri Katuwal	23	54
38	Hem Raj Khadka	20	47
40	Sangita Malla	16	38

d) Pre-test and Post-test result of Group 'B'(Deductive)

Rank	Name of the students	Obtained Marks in the Pre-test	Obtained Marks in the Post-test
2	Ram Bahadur Bhandari	49	77
4	Mausham Shahi	44	59
6	Rita Thapa Magar	41	56
8	Tarka Bahadur Sunar	38	43
10	Sandip Kumar Shahi	36	36
11	Binaya K.C.	36	37
13	Gita Kumari Dhakal	34	41
15	Yamuna K.C.	32	53
17	Binod Kumar B.K.	32	39
19	Sumitra Malla	31	57
22	Shanti Thapa	30	51
24	Khima Thapa	30	52
26	Prakash K.C.	29	30
28	Namsara Kumari Thapa	28	42
30	Kalam Bhandari	27	69
31	Jagat Bahadur Rana	26	39
33	Karishma Shahi	24	69
35	Amar K.C.	23	51
37	Sharmila K.C.	22	28
39	Shyam Kumari Bhandari	17	31

Appendix : E

**Table No. 1
Comparison in General**

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P1	P2	D	D%	R.N.	P1	P2	D	D%
1	51	60	9	17.64	2	49	77	28	57.14
3	45	84	39	86.66	4	44	59	15	34.09
5	43	64	21	48.83	6	41	56	15	36.58
7	39	65	26	66.66	8	38	43	5	13.15
9	37	46	9	24.32	10	36	36	0	0
12	34	55	21	61.76	11	36	37	1	2.77
14	33	65	32	96.96	13	34	41	7	20.58
16	32	62	30	93.75	15	32	53	21	65.62
18	31	52	21	67.74	17	32	39	7	21.87
20	31	54	23	74.19	19	31	57	26	83.87
21	31	54	23	74.19	22	30	51	21	70
23	30	55	25	83.33	24	30	52	22	73.33
25	29	59	30	103.44	26	29	30	1	3.44
27	29	51	22	75.86	28	28	42	14	50
29	28	66	38	135.71	30	27	69	42	155.55
32	25	46	21	84	31	26	39	13	50
34	24	66	42	175	33	24	69	45	187.5
36	23	54	31	134.78	35	23	51	28	121.73
38	20	47	27	135	37	22	28	6	27.27
40	16	38	22	137.5	39	17	31	14	82.35
Total	631	1143	512		Total	629	960	331	
Avg Score	31.55	57.15	25.6	81.14	Avg Score	31.45	48	16.55	52.62

Table No.2
Performance in multiple choice items

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
1	20	22	2	10	2	17	30	13	76.47
3	19	30	11	57.89	4	18	27	9	50
5	20	25	5	25	6	24	29	5	20.83
7	23	31	8	34.78	8	14	23	9	64.28
9	13	23	10	76.92	10	18	16	-2	-11.11
12	19	23	4	21.05	11	22	10	-12	-54.54
14	22	32	10	45.45	13	19	23	4	21.05
16	20	23	3	15	15	20	30	10	50
18	18	28	10	55.55	17	11	15	4	36.36
20	17	25	8	47.05	19	19	25	6	31.57
21	20	30	10	50	22	17	28	11	64.70
23	17	26	9	52.94	24	18	28	10	55.55
25	11	29	8	72.72	26	16	15	-1	-6.25
27	17	22	5	29.41	28	14	24	10	71.42
29	17	32	15	88.23	30	22	29	7	31.81
32	15	23	8	53.33	31	19	18	-1	-5.26
34	15	27	12	80	33	17	29	12	70.58
36	19	27	8	42.10	35	14	27	13	92.85
38	14	27	13	92.85	37	14	11	-3	-21.42
40	12	23	11	91.66	39	13	11	-2	-15.38
Total	348	528	170		Total	346	448	102	
Avg. score	17.4	26.4	8.5	48.85	Avg. Score	17.3	22.4	5.1	29.47

Table No. 3
Performance in fill in the blank items

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
1	31	38	7	22.58	2	32	47	15	46.87
3	26	54	28	107.69	4	26	32	6	23.07
5	23	39	16	69.56	6	17	27	10	58.82
7	16	34	18	112.5	8	24	20	-4	-16.66
9	24	23	-1	-4.16	10	18	20	2	11.11
12	15	32	17	113.33	11	14	27	13	92.85
14	11	33	22	200	13	15	18	3	20
16	12	39	27	225	15	12	23	11	91.66
18	13	24	11	84.61	17	21	24	3	14.28
20	14	29	15	107.14	19	12	32	20	166.66
21	11	24	13	118.18	22	13	23	10	76.92
23	13	29	16	123.07	24	12	24	12	100
25	19	30	11	57.89	26	13	15	2	15.38
27	12	29	17	141.66	28	14	18	4	28.57
29	11	34	23	209.09	30	5	40	35	700
32	10	23	13	130	31	7	21	14	200
34	9	39	30	333.33	33	7	40	33	471.42
36	4	27	23	575	35	9	24	15	166.66
38	6	20	14	233.33	37	8	17	9	112.5
40	4	15	11	275	39	4	20	16	400
Total	284	615	332		Total	283	512	229	
Avg. score	14.2	30.75	16.6	116.90	Avg. Score	14.15	25.6	11.45	80.91

Table No.4
Performance of the boys

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
1	51	60	9	17.64	2	49	77	28	57.14
3	45	84	39	86.66	4	44	59	15	34.09
5	43	64	21	48.83	8	38	43	5	13.15
9	37	46	9	24.32	10	36	36	0	0
12	34	55	21	61.76	11	36	37	1	2.77
21	31	54	23	74.19	17	32	39	7	21.87
23	30	55	25	83.33	26	29	30	1	3.44
25	29	59	30	103.44	30	27	69	42	155.55
27	29	51	22	75.86	31	26	39	13	50
38	20	47	27	135	35	23	51	28	121.73
Total	349	575	226		Total	340	480	140	
Avg. score	34.9	57.5	22.6	64.75	Avg. score	34	48	14	41.17

Table No.5
Performance of the girls

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
7	39	65	26	66.66	6	41	56	15	36.58
14	33	65	32	96.96	13	34	41	7	20.58
16	32	62	30	93.75	15	32	53	21	65.62
18	31	52	21	67.74	19	31	57	26	83.87
20	31	54	23	74.19	22	30	51	21	70
29	28	66	38	135.71	24	30	52	22	73.33
32	25	46	21	84	28	28	42	14	50
34	24	66	42	175	33	24	69	45	187.5
36	23	54	31	134.78	37	22	28	6	27.27
40	16	38	22	137.5	39	17	31	14	82.35
Total	282	568	286		Total	289	480	191	
Avg. score	28.2	56.8	28.6	101.41	Avg. score	28.9	48	19.1	66.08

Table No.6

Performance of boys in multiple choice items

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
1	20	22	2	10	2	17	30	13	76.47
3	19	30	11	57.89	4	18	27	9	50
5	20	25	5	25	8	14	23	9	64.28
9	13	23	10	76.92	10	18	16	-2	-11.11
12	19	23	4	21.05	11	22	10	-12	-54.54
21	20	30	10	50	17	11	15	4	36.36
23	17	26	9	52.94	26	16	15	-1	-6.25
25	11	29	18	72.72	30	22	29	7	31.81
27	17	22	5	29.41	31	19	18	-1	-5.26
38	14	27	13	92.85	35	14	27	13	92.85
Total	170	257	87		Total	171	210	39	
Avg. score	17	25.7	8.7	51.17	Avg. score	17.1	21	3.9	22.80

Table No.7
Performance of boys in fill in the blank item

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
1	31	38	7	22.58	2	32	47	15	46.87
3	26	54	28	107.69	4	26	32	6	23.07
5	23	39	16	69.56	8	24	20	-4	-16.66
9	24	23	-1	-4.16	10	18	20	2	11.11
12	15	32	17	113.33	11	14	27	13	92.85
21	11	24	13	118.18	17	21	24	3	14.28
23	13	29	16	123.07	26	13	15	2	15.38
25	19	30	11	57.89	30	5	40	35	700
27	12	29	17	141.66	31	7	21	14	200
38	6	20	14	233.33	35	9	24	15	166.66
Total	180	318	138		Total	169	270	101	
Avg. score	18	31.8	13.8	76.66	Avg. score	16.9	27	10.1	59.76

Table No. 8
Performance of girls in multiple choice item

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
7	23	31	8	34.78	6	24	29	5	20.83
14	22	32	10	45.45	13	19	23	4	21.05
16	20	23	3	15	15	20	30	10	50
18	18	28	10	55.55	19	19	25	6	31.57
20	17	25	8	47.05	22	17	28	11	64.70
29	17	32	15	88.23	24	18	28	10	55.55
32	15	23	8	53.33	28	14	24	10	71.42
34	15	27	12	80	33	17	29	12	70.58
36	19	27	8	42.10	37	14	11	-3	-21.42
40	12	23	11	91.66	39	13	11	-2	-15.38
Total	178	271	93		Total	175	238	63	
Avg. score	17.8	27.1	9.3	52.24	Avg. score	17.5	23.8	6.3	36

Table No. 9
Performance of girls in fill in the blank item

GROUP									
'A'					'B'				
R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	R.N.	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
7	16	34	18	112.5	6	17	27	10	58.82
14	11	33	22	200	13	15	18	3	20
16	12	39	27	225	15	12	23	11	91.66
18	13	24	11	84.61	19	12	32	20	166.66
20	14	29	15	107.14	22	13	23	10	76.92
29	11	34	23	209.09	24	12	24	12	100
32	10	23	13	130	28	14	18	4	28.57
34	9	39	30	333.33	33	7	40	33	471.42
36	4	27	23	575	37	8	17	9	112.5
40	4	15	11	275	39	4	20	16	400
Total	104	297	193		Total	114	242	128	
Avg. score	10.4	29.7	19.3	185.57	Avg. score	11.4	24.2	12.8	112.28

Table No. 10
Content wise comparison in general

GROUP																										
A														B												
RN	Have				Make				Get				RN	Have				Make				Get				
	P1	P2	D	D%	P1	P2	D	D%	P1	P2	D	D%		P1	P2	D	D%	P1	P2	D	D%	P1	P2	D	D%	
1	19	19	0	0	14	18	4	28.57	18	23	5	27.77	2	17	29	12	70.58	14	21	7	50	18	27	9	50	
3	18	32	14	77.77	9	29	20	22.22	18	23	5	27.77	4	18	12	-6	-33.33	11	17	6	54.34	15	30	15	100	
5	12	24	12	100	11	21	10	90.90	20	19	-1	-5	6	18	16	-2	-11.11	11	18	7	63.63	12	22	10	83.33	
7	12	17	5	41.66	10	26	16	160	17	22	5	29.41	8	18	14	-4	-22.22	11	10	-1	-9.09	12	19	7	58.33	
9	8	13	5	62.5	13	13	0	0	16	20	4	25	10	14	14	0	0	10	10	0	0	12	12	0	0	
12	12	19	7	58.33	6	15	9	150	16	21	5	31.25	11	13	11	-2	-15.38	9	6	-3	-	14	20	6	42.85	
14	7	24	17	242.85	10	20	10	100	16	21	5	31.25	13	16	13	-3	-18.75	8	11	3	37.50	10	17	7	70	
16	15	21	6	40	8	19	11	137.50	9	22	13	144.44	15	16	18	2	12.5	8	13	5	62.50	8	22	14	175	
18	12	11	-1	-8.33	9	16	7	77.77	10	25	15	150	17	19	11	-8	-42.10	6	7	1	16.16	7	21	14	200	
20	13	15	2	15.38	9	14	5	55.55	9	25	16	177.77	19	11	15	4	36.36	10	15	5	50	11	27	16	145.45	
21	11	16	5	45.45	9	16	7	77.77	11	22	11	100	22	10	17	7	70	7	13	6	85.71	13	21	8	61.53	
23	14	17	3	21.42	13	19	6	46.15	3	19	16	533.33	24	9	21	12	133.33	10	15	5	50	11	16	5	45.45	
25	4	22	18	450	15	18	3	20	10	19	9	90	26	10	6	-4	-40	8	7	-1	-12.5	11	17	6	54.54	
27	7	19	12	171.42	13	13	0	0	9	19	10	111.11	28	11	14	3	27.27	7	12	5	71.42	10	16	6	60	
29	10	21	11	110	10	23	13	130	8	22	14	175	30	11	25	14	127.27	8	18	10	125	8	26	18	225	
32	12	13	1	8.33	11	17	6	54.54	2	16	14	700	31	9	14	5	55.55	7	7	0	0	10	18	8	80	
34	9	25	16	117.77	9	15	6	66.66	6	26	20	333.33	33	11	20	9	81.81	9	22	13	144.44	4	27	23	575	
36	10	23	13	130	6	18	12	200	7	13	6	85.71	35	10	18	8	80	7	16	9	128.57	6	17	11	183.33	
38	7	16	9	128.57	10	17	7	70	3	14	11	366.66	37	7	9	2	28.57	7	6	-1	-	8	13	5	62.5	
40	5	11	6	120	7	13	6	85.71	4	14	10	250	39	6	11	5	83.33	8	7	-1	-12.5	3	13	10	33.33	
Total	217	378	161	74.19	202	360	158	78.21	212	405	193	91.03	Total	254	308	54	21.25	176	251	71	40.34	203	401	198	97.53	
Avg. Score	10.85	18.90	8.05	74.19	10.10	18	7.90	78.21	10.60	20.25	9.65	91.03	Avg. Score	12.70	15.40	2.70	21.25	8.80	12.55	3.55	40.34	10.15	20.05	9.90	97.53	

Table No. 11

Content wise performance of boys

GROUP																									
'A'												'B'													
R.N.	Have				Make				Get				R.N.	Have				Make				Get			
	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%		P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%
1	19	19	0	0	14	18	4	28.57	18	23	5	27.77	2	17	29	12	70.58	14	21	7	50	18	27	9	50
3	18	32	14	77.77	9	29	20	222.22	18	23	5	27.77	4	18	12	-6	-33.33	11	17	6	54.34	15	30	15	100
5	12	24	12	100	11	21	10	90.90	20	19	-1	-5	8	18	14	-4	-22.22	11	10	-1	-9.09	12	19	7	58.33
9	8	13	5	62.5	13	13	0	0	16	20	4	25	10	14	14	0	0	10	10	0	0	12	12	0	0
12	12	19	7	58.33	6	15	9	150	16	21	5	31.25	11	13	11	-2	-15.38	9	6	-3	-33.33	14	20	6	42.85
21	11	16	5	45.45	9	16	7	77.77	11	22	11	100	17	19	11	-8	-42.10	6	7	1	16.16	7	21	14	200
23	14	17	3	21.42	13	19	6	46.15	3	19	16	533.33	26	10	6	-4	-40	8	7	-1	-12.5	11	17	6	54.54
25	4	22	18	450	15	18	3	20	10	19	9	90	30	11	25	14	127.27	8	18	10	125	8	26	18	225
27	7	19	12	171.42	13	13	0	0	9	19	10	111.11	31	9	14	5	55.55	7	7	0	0	10	18	8	80
38	7	16	9	128.57	10	17	7	70	3	14	11	366.66	35	10	18	8	80	7	16	9	128.	6	17	11	183.33
Total	112	197	85		113	179	66		124	199	75		Total	139	154	15		91	119	28		113	207	94	
Avg. score	11.2	19.7	8.5	75.89	11.3	17.9	6.6	58.40	12.4	19.9	7.5	60.48	Avg. score	13.9	15.4	1.5	10.79	9.1	11.9	2.8	30.76	11.3	20.7	9.4	83.18

Table No. 12

Content wise performance of girls

GROUP																										
'A'														'B'												
R.N.	Have				Make				Get				R.N.	Have				Make				Get				
	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%		P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	P ₁	P ₂	D	D%	
7	12	17	5	41.66	10	26	16	160	17	22	5	29.41	6	18	16	-2	-11.11	11	18	7	63.63	12	22	10	83.33	
14	7	24	17	242.85	10	20	10	100	16	21	5	31.25	13	16	13	-3	-18.75	8	11	3	37.5	10	17	7	70	
16	15	21	6	40	8	19	11	137.5	9	22	13	144.44	15	16	18	2	12.5	8	13	5	62.5	8	22	14	175	
18	12	11	-1	-8.33	9	16	7	77.77	10	25	15	150	19	11	15	4	36.36	10	15	5	50	11	27	16	145.45	
20	13	15	2	15.38	9	14	5	55.55	9	25	16	177.77	22	10	17	7	70	7	13	6	85.71	13	21	8	61.53	
29	10	21	11	110	10	23	13	130	8	22	14	175	24	9	21	12	133.33	10	15	5	50	11	16	5	45.45	
32	12	13	1	8.33	11	17	6	54.54	2	16	14	700	28	11	14	3	27.27	7	12	5	71.42	10	16	6	60	
34	9	25	16	117.77	9	15	6	66.66	6	26	20	333.33	33	11	20	9	81.81	9	22	13	144.44	4	27	23	575	
36	10	23	13	130	6	18	12	200	7	13	6	85.71	37	7	9	2	28.57	7	6	-1	-14.28	8	13	5	62.5	
40	5	11	6	120	7	13	6	85.71	4	14	10	250	39	6	11	5	83.33	8	7	-1	-12.5	3	13	10	333.33	
Total	105	181	76		89	181	92		88	206	118		Total	115	154	39		85	132	43		90	194	104		
Avg. score	10.5	18.1	7.6	72.38	8.9	18.1	9.2	103.37	8.8	20.6	11.8	134.09	Avg. score	11.5	15.4	3.9	33.91	8.5	13.2	4.3	50.58	9	19.4	10.4	115.55	