

**CONTENT VALIDITY OF GENERAL LINGUISTICS COURSE OF GRADE  
ELEVEN**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education  
in Partial Fulfilment for the Master of Education in English**

**Submitted by**

**Man Bahadur Karki**

**Faculty of Education**

**Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur**

**Kathmandu, Nepal**

**2010**

**CONTENT VALIDITY OF GENERAL LINGUISTICS COURSE OF GRADE  
ELEVEN**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education  
in Partial Fulfilment for the Master of Education in English**

**Submitted by**

**Man Bahadur Karki**

**Faculty of Education**

**Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur**

**Kathmandu , Nepal**

**2010**

**T.U. Regd. No.:9-1-57-413-99**

**Date of Approval of the**

**Second Year Examination**

**Thesis Proposal: 2066-07-26**

**Roll No: 280394/065**

**Date of Submission: 2066-11-14**

## RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Man Bahadur Karki** has prepared this thesis entitled "**Content Validity of General Linguistics Course of Grade Eleven**" under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend this thesis for acceptance.

Date: 2066-11-14

.....

**Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya (Guide)**

Professor

Department of English Education

Faculty of Education,

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

## RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation from the following

### **Research Guidance Committee.**

Signature

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

.....

Professor and Head

Chairperson

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

**Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya (Guide)**

.....

Professor

Member

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

**Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**

.....

Reader

Member

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

Date: 2066-11-20

## EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

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

Signature

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

.....

Professor and Head

Chairperson

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

**Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**

.....

Professor

Member

Department of English Education

Chairperson

English and Other Foreign Languages

Education Subject Committee

T.U., Kirtipur

**Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya (Guide)**

.....

Professor

Member

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur

Date: 2066-11-27

## 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: 2066-11-13

.....

Man Bahadur Karki

# **DEDICATION**

**Dedicated**

**to**

**My mother and late father who spent their  
entire life to make me what i am today.**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my respected Guru as well as my thesis supervisor **Prof. Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya** for his invaluable suggestions for completing this study. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**, Head of the Department of English Education, Faculty of Education, T.U., Kirtipur, for his encouragement.

I am highly indebted to **Dr. Anjana Bhattarai**, Reader, Department of English Education, Faculty of Education for providing me with first hand theoretical and practical knowledge in research methodology as well as for her perennial guidance to complete this thesis.

I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to **Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**, Professor and Chairperson of English and Other Foreign Languages Education Subject Committee for encouraging me by providing valuable suggestions.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Shanti Basnyat, Prof. Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai, Prof. Dr. Anju Giri, Mr. Vishnu Singh Rai, Mrs. Tapasi Bhattacharya, Dr. Laxmi Bahadur Maharjan, Dr. Balmukunda Bhandari, Mrs. Madhu Neupane, Mrs. Saraswati Dawadi, Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak, Mr. Bhesh Raj Pokhrel, Mrs. Hima Rawal** for their suggestions, for completing this thesis.

I will not miss this opportunity to thank **Mrs. Madhavi Khanal**, the Librarian, the Department of English Education for helping me by providing me with necessary books and theses. In the same way, I would also like to thank my mother, My brother **Ghanashyam**, Sisters **Mina** and **Pabirta** who created the proper environment and support. I am equally thankful to my friend and Relatives who directly or indirectly helped me during the study.

Last but not the least, I also thank **Miss Dibya Chhetri** of Creative Computer for her computer work.

Man Bahadur Karki



## ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to measure the content validity of the general linguistics paper I through the tests administered in the annual and supplementary examinations at grade eleven .To accomplish this task the test papers administered in annual and supplementary examinations during 2065to2066 were selected for the collection of data and analyzed in terms of content coverage and content weighting to see if the administered test items were the representative sample of the course contents and if the weighting of the test contents were proportional to the scheduled weighting specified by evaluation scheme chart in the syllabus. The findings are that in terms of content coverage the tests have high content validity (71.56%) but in terms of content weighting the tests have poor content validity.

This research report consists of four chapters where the first chapter deals with the brief introduction of the area of study along with the objectives of the study. The second chapter deals with the methodology the researcher had followed during the study in order to achieve the objectives specified which includes among other things the sources of data. The third chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the raw data obtained for the purpose of measuring content validity of the tests in terms of content coverage and weighting. For the purpose of measuring content coverage, the researcher matched the test contents (language items) with course contents (language item) and found that 71.56 percent of the language items were covered by the tests during two years. For the purposes of measuring content weighting, the researcher matched the four test papers against with the evaluation scheme specified by the syllabus. The researcher also looked into the content validity in terms of content coverage and weighting. The final chapter deals with the findings and recommendation the researcher made after analyzing the data.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Declaration</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Recommendation for Acceptance</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Recommendation for Evaluation</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Evaluation and Approval</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Dedication</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>List of Symbols and Abbreviations</b>	<b>xiii</b>

### CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background	1
1.1.1 Linguistics: An Introduction	2
1.1.2 Language Teaching and Language Testing	4
1.1.2.1 Test: A Brief Introduction	8
1.1.3 Basic Characteristics of a Test	9
1.1.3.1 Reliability	10

1.1.3.2 Practicality	10
1.1.3.3 Validity	11
1.1.3.4 Types of Validity	12
1.1.4 Content Representativeness	17
1.1.5 Content Weightage	18
1.1.6 General Linguistics Paper I at HSEB Curriculum	18
1.1.6.1 Course Objectives	19
1.1.6.2 Specific Objectives	19
1.1.6.3 Evaluation Scheme	20
1.1.6.4 Measuring Content Validity of on Exam: General Linguistics Paper I	22
1.2 Review of Related Literature	23
1.3 Objectives of the Study	25
1.4 Significance of the Study	26
1.5 Definition of the Specific Terms	26
<b>CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY</b>	
2.1 Sources of Data	28
2.1.1 Secondary Sources of Data	28
2.2 Sampling Procedure	28
2.3 Tools for Data Collection	28

2.4 Process of Data Collection	29
2.5 Limitations of the Study	29
<b>CHAPTER THREE: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>	
3.1 Representative Sample / Content Coverage	30
3.1.1 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit One	31
3.1.2 Examining Content Representativeness in Unit Two	34
3.1.3 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Three	36
3.1.4 Examining Content Representation in Unit Four	39
3.1.5 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Five	41
3.1.6 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Six	44
3.1.7 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Seven	47
3.1.8 Examining Content Validity of the Question Papers the whole in Terms of Representativeness	49
3.1.9 Unit wise Comparison of the Four Question Papers in Terms of Content Representativeness	50
3.2 Contents Weighting	50
3.2.1 Examining the Content Validity of the Question Papers in Terms of Weighting as a Whole	51
3.3 Comparison Between Course Converge in Terms of Course Weightage	56

## **CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

4.1 Findings	57
4.1.1 General Findings	57
4.1.1 Specific Findings	57
4.2 Recommendations	60

### **References**

### **Appendices**

#### **Appendix I Check List**

#### **Appendix II Question Papers**



## LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

%	-	Percentage
&	-	Ampersand
A.D.	-	Anno Domini
CUP	-	Cambridge University Press
EFL	-	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	-	English Language Teaching
i.e.	-	that is
M. A.	-	Master of Arts
M. Ed.	-	Master of Education
NELTA	-	Nepal English Language Teachers' Association
No.	-	Number
P	-	Partial Question
L	-	Long Question
S	-	Short Question
SN	-	Short Note
2066s	-`	Supplementary Exam 2066
HSEB	-	Higher Secondary Education Board
SLC	-	School Leaving Certificate
PCL	-	Proficiency Certificate Level

OUP - Oxford University Press  
Vol. - Volume  
T.U. - Tribhuvan University



# CHAPTER- ONE

## INTRODUCTION

This study is about the content validity of grade XI examination based on General Linguistics Paper I. This chapter consists of general background, language teaching and testing, test introduction, characteristics of test, introduction of general linguistics paper, measuring content validity of general linguistics, literature review, objectives of the study, significance of the study.

### 1.1 General Background

There are different kinds of means of communication. Among them language is very common for human beings. Wherever there is human society, there is language. We use language not only for communication but also for sharing ideas, emotions, feelings etc. Without language, the expression of all these aspects of human beings is impossible. So, it is impossible to exaggerate and define what actually language is. However, several attempts have been made regarding the definitions of language. Some of the definitions are given here:

According to Crystal (1941), "a language is the concrete act of speaking writing or singing in a given situation. The notion of parole or performance . . . a particular variety or level of speech, writing may also be referred as languages (p. 25).

For Sapir, "language is a primarily human and non- instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of system of voluntarily produced symbols" (1921, p. 8).

Various scholars have tried to define language from one angle to another but none of the definitions are complete in themselves. However, various definitions given by various scholars share some common characteristics. On

the basis of these common characteristics, language can be viewed as the voluntary vocal system of human communication. From the functional point of view it is a means of communication. According to the communicative approach, the main concern of present time on languages study is functional rather than formal. Functional ability is to interpret a language properly and an ability to use it appropriately in a given context or situation. It also covers common sense of the speaker. This change of the view of languages brought about change in language teaching as well.

The English language is taken as one of the richest languages in the world because of its richest vocabulary in comparison to other languages. Most of the distinguished books are written in English so, it has gained the status of being the most dominant language in almost all areas like trade, commerce and mass media, international diplomacy, politics science and technology, marketing and so on. English is serving as an important vehicle for the transmission of civilization and culture from the western world to the eastern world and vice-versa. Due to this reason, English is being taught as a compulsory subject from Grade I to Bachelor Level.

### **1.1.1 Linguistics: An introduction**

The word linguistics is derived from Latin word 'lingua ' meaning tongue and 'istics ' meaning science or study. So, linguistics is the scientific study of language. de Saussure (1983) "Linguistics is only one branch of this general science the laws which semiology will discover will be law applicable in linguistics" . . . (as cited in Pokhrel, 2004, p. 2). That is to say linguistics as a part of semiology there is a historical link between semiotics and linguistics. Linguistics is the scientific study of languages for the moment, it will be sufficient to say that by the scientific study of languages is meant its investigation by means of empirically verifiable observations and with references to some general theory of structures. Linguistics follows the

methods and principles that a science does. It is a branch of knowledge, which studies human natural languages. Thus linguistics is a scientific study of languages, scientific study of a phenomenon comprises the following features.

- a. A well defined subject matter.
- b. Scientific spirit
- c. Scientific method and procedure
- d. Scientific principles

A linguist, while studying a language, observes language use, formulates hypotheses, tests these hypotheses, refines them on the basis of data detected and finally arrives at a theory construction. In other words, like a scientist, a linguist, in the course of studying language, passes through different stages. They are observations of linguistic facts or events, formulation of hypotheses, testing of hypotheses by further observations and construction of theory. Being scientific means maintaining scientific spirit, scientific methods and principles. Scientific spirit refers to the spirit of a person who does not take anything for granted. Scientific method includes observation of events prior to the setting up of a hypotheses, which then systematically investigated via experimentation and theory is developed. Linguistics being a scientific subject follows these principles. There are principles of objectivity, economy, systematicness, exhaustiveness and completeness. As mentioned above, linguistics is scientific study of languages. It is also multidisciplinary subject. It observes all human natural languages. Its scope has become so wide-ranging that it is extremely difficult to squeeze and present here. It has two types of scope (Retrieved Nov. 10, 2009, from Wikipedia, The free encyclopedia) micro linguistics: It includes phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Macro-linguistics includes sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, stylistics,

discourse analysis, computational linguistics, cognitive linguistics and applied linguistics.

### **1.1.2 Language Teaching and language testing**

Language teaching and testing are closely related. It is virtually impossible to work in either field without being constantly involved with other. Any good means of evaluation or checking should not lead separation of language education and testing. Teaching and testing are like two sides of a coin. Testing is as important as teaching; they are taken as inseparable phenomena.

Testing in a broad sense has always been an inherent part of teaching. Assessment of learning is as old as education itself. From the time when teaching began, the teacher has always been keen to know the extent to which his teaching has been effective in making the learner understand what has been taught. Testing is used as a process of scrutinizing how far learners have learned what the teacher wishes them to learn (Khaniya, 2005, p. 1).

In order to ensure that the teaching is effective, and if not put more efforts to make it effective, testing is used in the classroom or after the classroom teaching. In many classroom situations, thus, teaching and testing are hardly separated. "Language testing in the past was considered as a separated entity from teaching. But both testing and teaching are so closely interrelated that it is virtually impossible to work in either field without being constantly concerned with each other" (Heaton, 1975, p.1).

Language teaching and testing function like the combination of a pick and shovel to dig deep into the language education. Language testing plays a very important role in language teaching. It will help to locate the precise areas of

difficulty encountered by the class or by the individual student. Unless the teacher is able to identify and analyze the errors a student makes in handling the target language he or she will be in no position to render any help at all though appropriated anticipation remedial work and additional practice.

Although the history of language testing goes back to the history of language teaching, it was not taken as a separate discipline in the past. There were different factors influencing in language teaching and testing. The emphasis on what is to be tested has been changing through different stages over the years. However, it has been emphasized differently over time can be discussed as different approaches to language testing.

The pre-discrete point approach to language testing was based on the assumption that no special expertise as required for testing, i.e. any teacher could do it. Language testing was viewed as entirely subjective in the sense that the total assessment was based on the subjective judgement of the examiner. Aspects of language to be tested are the abilities to translate and write open ended essays.

The discrete point approach to language testing came into existence since the pre- discrete point test was severely criticized for not being reliable and valid. This approach is based upon the assumption that "Knowledge of the elements of a language is equivalent to knowledge of the language". It is due to the influence of structuralism in language testing. Language was considered as a set of habits. Language was taken to consist of different levels- phonology, morphology, syntax and lexis, etc. So what is to be tested, following discrete point testing, is the ability to use aspects of language. Phonology, lexicon, grammar and syntax- in a mechanistic way. The format of the test is composed of short answer and multiple choice items. The major contributions of this phase of language testing were the concern with reliability and the construction of objectives type tests. This approach has been criticized on the

ground that language is not merely an arrangement of element which can be tested in terms of yes- no answer. This approach does not represent how people perceive language, many things are left out. It was said that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. This approach does not provide adequate characterization of language. Language is something more than what this approach seems to believe.

The integrative approach to testing emerged when discrete point test was followed by its short coming. The emergence of integrative approach to language testing is based on the assumption that " knowledge of a language is more than just the sum of a set of discrete parts, and also on the belief that it is only the integrative test that gives a true measure of language ability" (Spolsky, 1978 b: viii). It was said that language elements interact with each other for meaning, and if language is broken into pieces as in discrete points testing crucial properties of language are lost. Therefore, it is argued that testing language elements is different from testing language itself. Although different approaches to language testing overlap in terms of time, it has been confined till 1970s as a decade of this approach. Oller (1979) and some other come up with unitary competence hypothesis of language testing. This hypothesis asserts that language ability can not be divided into discrete items. The sum of discrete elements never equals or the language as a whole. So, this is a holistic approach to language testing. Oller (1979) argues that language elements interact with each other for meaning. Therefore, close tests and dictation were exercised during the period. The notion of language as a single competence thus appeared as a prominent idea which has contributed to the development of learning materials pedagogically useful and a useful framework for course designing. Cloze, dictation and oral interview emerged as the major integrative tests. However, the integrative approach also could not avoid criticisms for its weaknesses.

When close tests and dictation were criticized for not being communicative because language from a psycholinguistic point of view, finds it a dynamic, creative, functional system. Any single linguistic unit is indispensable for communication. Looking at language from a sociolinguistic point of view, Read (1981) studied communicative competence is the most important aspect which covers not only knowledge of rules of forming grammatical sentences but also rules for using those sentences appropriately with different people in different contexts (as cited in Weir, 1990, p. 10). After that the functional approach to testing was emerged. It was argued that the nature of language knowledge is best captured by detailing the various uses to which the language can be put. The functional approach to testing is based on the assumption that knowledge of language should be seen in terms of language related functions, not in terms of underlying grammatical structures. This approach places importance on performance rather than on the linguistics ability of the examinee. The advocates of this approach see language as being composed of a series of functions that the learner should acquire in order for him to be able to perform different speech acts in various contexts and situations. It appears that performance is the demonstration of competence which only measures competence. However, this approach could not satisfy the thrust for determining what is to be tested. Experts involved in this field further explored the possibility of determining what it is that we need to test while testing language. Experts have argued that this approach to language testing also could not offer a complete account of what is to be tested in language, and consequently another approach, i.e. communicative approach come into existence.

The communicative approach views language as communication and language learning as developing communicative competence, which is essential for enabling learners to use language in the multiple functions it serves in the real life. Language test should evaluate not only the learner's knowledge of the

elements and skills but also their ability to comprehend and produce utterances that are both situationally and contextually appropriate. The first communicative model was developed by Hymes (1972), which consisted of both linguistic and sociolinguistic elements. The second model was developed by Canale and Swain (1980) which included three competencies: grammatical competence, socio-linguistic competence and strategic competence. Bachman's (1990) model of communicative competence is the third model that deals with three components: language competence, strategic competence and psycho- physiological mechanisms.

The Sthapit (2000) model, the fourth model of communicative competence, broadly involves the components of the extended linguistic competence, the extra-linguistic competence, and the pragmatic competence or language sensitivity. Therefore, the implication of the theory of communicative competence for language testing is that communicative testing must focus not only on what the learner knows about the second language and about how to use it but also to what extent the learner is able to actually demonstrate this knowledge in a meaningful way.

#### **1.1.2.1 Test: A Brief Introduction**

Generally, test and exam are taken synonymously in the testing literature:

Test may be defined as an activity the main purpose of which is to convey (usually to the tester) how well the testee know or can do something. This is contrast to practice, the main purpose of which is shared learning. Any procedure for measuring ability, knowledge performance is called test (Davies, 1977, p. 49).

According to Harrison (1983), "it is a natural extension of the classroom work providing teaching, teacher and students that can serve as a basis for improvement". A test is designed to provide an accurate standardized



measurement of certain abilities or skill without influencing teaching or student and without creating any tension in the students.

Test is meant to measure the learner's knowledge. A test is a device for providing the learner into showing what he knows. It is a set of questions or problems for determining a person's knowledge or ability. It is an attempt to see whether the things taught have been learned. Test measures and evaluates a course or group of students. It usually grades or puts them on a certain scale. Test should be conceived as teaching devices and therefore as a natural step in the educational process. It serves as a two fold purpose, acting as a guide to the students and a guide to the teacher. It is a measuring instrument and it is applied to the learners not to teaching materials or teacher. It is designed to measure the learner's knowledge or competence in the language at a particular moment in his course. A test, in plain ordinary words, is a method of measuring a person's ability or knowledge in a given area. A test samples performance but infers certain competence. A language test samples language behaviour and infers general ability in language. A test of reading comprehension may consist of some questions following one or two paragraphs, tiny samples of second language learner's total reading behaviour. From the result of that test, the examiner infers a certain level of general reading ability of the learners

### **1.1.3 Basic characteristics of a test**

Tests are administered for some purpose. To fulfill the purposes for which they are conducted, they must have some good qualities. The quality of a test is evaluated on the basis of its usefulness. A test is used to get information for making a decision on the testees, and the formation elicited through the test should be good to make a valid decision. Therefore, while designing a test the usefulness of the test must be taken into consideration.

Any test, to be a good test should have some common characteristics. Although the characteristics of test differ from author to author, some common characteristics of good tests are mentioned below. These characteristics should be taken into consideration while writing the test otherwise it becomes " . . . just as it is impossible to play chess without knowing how a knight moves across the board, so it is pointless to write test without a basic understanding of the principles behind them" ( Harrison, 1991, p. 10). So, what are the qualities of test? Various scholars on language testing have mentioned different points as fundamental features of a good test. Validity, reliability and practicality are the features of a good test. Here the researcher's concern is validity. So, validity is dealt with grater emphasis.

#### **1.1.3.1 Reliability**

Reliability is defined as consistency of measurement. "The reliability of a test is its consistency" (Harrison, 1991, p. 10) . It is "the extent to which a test is internally consistent and consistent over time" (Van ELS et al. 1984, p. 321) . A test is unreliable if it provides very different results when administered to two different groups of equal ability. It is necessary characteristics of any good test for it to be valid at all. A test must first be reliable as a measuring instrument. So, it is concerned with examining consistency in the performance of the examinee. In order to establish the reliability of an examination, it is necessary to answer the question: how consistent would the examinee's performance be if we asked him to take the same exam at different time. The degree of consistency of measurement is determined by carrying out some statistical analysis. For that purpose, two set of scores are obtained from the performance of the same sample of examinees. A correlation coefficient of the two set of scores is said to be the correlation coefficient of the examination, which is interpreted as the coefficient reliability of the exams. Other things being equal, the higher the reliability, the better the exam. There

are three aspects of reliability. The circumstance in which the test is taken, the way in which it is marked and the uniformity of the assessment it makes.

### **1.1.3.2 Practicality**

Practicality is different from other qualities of a test. Absence of this quality in a test will lead the test to be of no use. "The main questions of practicality are administrative" (Harrison 1991, p. 12). Explanation of practicality is that the exam must be fairly straight forward to administer. A test must be well organized in advance. In general, practicality involves the cost, and ease of administration and scoring. In order to achieve the practicality of the exam the test designer must keep a close look at the situation which the exam is supposed to fit into. Otherwise, the current literature based on sophisticated situation may lead the designer to be highly ambitious, and to forget the practical problems which are likely to occur at the time of implementation. It also involves the time allocated for scoring and analyzing.

### **1.1.3.3 Validity**

Validity is concerned with relevance, that is , whether or not the test actually test what it is intended to test. A measure is valid if it does what it is intended to test " A measure is valid if it does what it is intended to do " ( Davies et al 1999, p. 27). Similarly, "the validity of a test is the extent to which it measures what it is supposed to measure and nothingness " (Heaton 1975, p. 153). Further explanation is that the validity of test is measured on the basis of how far the information it provides is accurate concrete and representative in light of the purpose for which it is administered. In order to achieve this goal, the test objectives should be clearly stated breaking them down in the skills and abilities and define them in separate item and assess them in situation which are closely related to the real life situation in which they will be used.

The test must aim to provide a true measure of the particular skill, which it is intended to measure to the extent that it measures external knowledge and other skills at the same time, it will not be a valid test. For example, the following test item is invalid if we wish solely to measure writing ability is photography an art or a science? Discuss. It is likely to be invalid simply because it demands some knowledge of photography and will consequently favour certain students (Heaton, 1975, p. 153).

There are different factors that validity is dependent on. Validity in language test depends on the linguistic contents of the test and on the situation or technique used to test this content. A test that uses a perfectly valid conversational situation but does not test the elements of the language is not valid. On the other hand, a test that tests the elements of the language but does it by lists or rules or technical names rather than in use in essentially communicative situation is not valid test either.

Validity can be achieved and verified indirectly by correcting the scores on a test with those of another test or criterion, which is valid. If the two set of scores correlate highly, that is, if students who make high scores on the valid criterion test also score high on the experimental test and if those who score low on one also score low on the other, we say that the test is valid. Thus, it is related with consistency (accuracy) with which the score measures a particular cognitive ability of interest. There are two aspects of validity what it is measured and how consistently it is measured.

#### **1.1.3.4 Types of validity**

The concept of validity can be approached from a number of perspectives. The common classification is presented as follows:

- a. Construct validity

- b. face validity
- c. Criterion related validity
- d. wash back validity
- e. content validity

#### **a. Construct Validity**

If a test has construct validity, it is capable of measuring certain specific characteristics in accordance with a theory of language behaviour and learning. This type of validity assumes the existence of certain learning theories or constructs underlying the acquisition of abilities and skills. Here, the ability refers to theoretical construct or the theoretical explanation or proposition of a trait. Anastasi (1982) concludes that content criterion related validity and construct validity do not correspond to distinct or logically coordinate categories. A test is said to have construct validity if it can be demonstrated that it measures just the ability which is supposed to measure (as cited in Weir, 1990, p. 22). The concept of construct validity is thus associated with the validation procedures based on systematic examination of the abilities we want to measure, and evidence of their measurement. Thus, any domain of knowledge, any skill, or ability can be called construct. So, examination is designed to measure the quality which the individual is supposed to possess is called construct.

#### **b. Face validity**

If a test item looks right to the other testers, teachers, moderator and testees, it can be described as having face validity. In other words what it appears superficially to measure. According to Anastasi (1982), face validity is not validity in the technical sense. It refers not to what the test actually measure but to what it appears superficially to measure. Face validity pertains

to whether the test looks valid to the examinees who take it. Fundamentally, the question of face validity concerns rapport and public relations (as cited in Weir, 1990, p.23). If a test does not have face validity, then it may not be acceptable to the students taking it or the teacher and receiving institutions who may make use of it. So, the question is unless the learner genuinely accepts a test as a real test how can their performance be genuine? In the testing literature, face validity is often considered fake or pseudo- validity. However, it is believed that if the examinee does not consider an exam valid one, the information collected from it may not be genuine. The concept of face validity is far from new in language testing but the emphasis now placed on, it is relatively new. In the past many test writers regarded face validity simply as public relation exercise. Today however, most designers of communicative tests regard face validity as the most important of all types of test validity. Indeed, many argue that a test must look valid even as far as the production of the materials itself is concerned. Thus, a test of reading comprehension using such an authentic task as reading and skimming newspapers must contain actual newspaper or at least, articles printed in exactly the same way as they appeared in the news paper from which they are taken.

### **c. Criterion related Validity**

Criterion- related validity can be established by giving the students an established test with similar nature which has proved to valid. The test can be administered at the same time or in a short gap ensuring that no additional learning opportunity is given. Criterion related procedures determine the efficacy of an examination in predicting the examinee's future performances in a pre- specified situation. Criterion related validity divides into two types. i.e. concurrent validity and predictive validity. In concurrent validity, the test scores are correlated with another measure of performance usually an older

established test. In predictive validity the test scores are correlated with some future criterion of performance.

#### **d. Wash-back Validity**

The effect of testing on teaching is known as backwash. It can be harmful or beneficial (Hughes, 1959, p. 1). "Wash-back is an inherent quality of exam" (Khaniya, 2005, p. 113). Morrow (1986) terms the positive influence on teaching as 'wash-back validity' and considers this the most important criterion for a good test. It can be argued that if any language exams are made to measure the ability of students, the students may learn the intended language. Such exam can be good exams and can have positive wash back effects on students. This is how wash-back validity is emerging as an essential element for a good exam - such exam can be used as instruments for educational change. Thus, wash-back validity can be very powerful tool to reform in the language curriculum. Therefore, wash-back validation proceeds from the test to the classroom. Sometimes a test may have negative influence on teaching and learning which is called backwash effect. We should be grateful to be the criterion referenced testing movement for highlighting this point. The question for those who use large scale public imposed tests is whether wash-back validity is simply a luxury which we can think about after the tests have been conventionally validated, or whether it should become an essential part of every test.

#### **e. Content Validity**

Content validity depends on a careful analysis of the language being tested and of the particular course objectives (Heaton, 1975, p. 160). The test should be so constructed as to contain a representative sample of the course, the relationship between the test items and the course objectives always being apparent. It is defined as "whether the items composing the test do, in fact,

constitute a representative sample of the content domain of concern” (Brown, 1983, p.185). In order to judge whether a test has content validity, test constructor need a specification for making a principled selection of elements for inclusion in the test. According to Hughes (1995), a test is said to have content validity if it includes a proper sample of the relevant content or if the content constitutes a representative sample of the language skill structures etc with which it is meant to be learned. (ibid) said that “content validity is the extent to which a test measures a representative sample of the subject matter content”. Similarly, according to Richard et al. (1999) content validity is a form of validity which is based on the degree to which a test adequately and sufficiently measures the particular skills or behavior it sets out to measure. For instance, a case of pronunciation in language would have low content validity if it tests only some of the skills which required for accurate pronunciation.

Content validity is concerned with what goes into the test. The content of a test should be decided by considering the purposes of the assessment, and then drawn up as a list known as a content specification. The content specification is important because it ensures as far as possible that the test reflects all the areas to be assessed in suitable proportions and also because it represents a balanced sample, without bias towards the kinds of items which are easiest to write or towards the test materials which happens to be available (Harrison, 1983, p. 11) .

Therefore, in a final achievement test, the emphasis will be mainly on the coverage of the subject matter. It means that the test designer must specify what skills the exam is designed to cover clearly. Thus, content validity is a measure of the adequacy of a sampling. Moreover, to have good content validity a test must reflect not only the content of the course but also



demonstrate the balance of test items in terms of weightage given to each unit or area. When embarking on the construction of a test, the test writer should first draw up a table of test specifications, describing in very clear and precise terms the particular language skill and areas to be included in the test.

In addition to coverage, content validity of an exam is examined also in relation to its relevance to the given course of study. What it means is whether or not the test tasks included in an exam are relevant to the language activities that are expected to be exercised under the given course.

Content validity is considered especially important for achieving this purpose as it is principally concerned with the extent to which the selection of test tasks is representative of the larger universe of tasks of which the test is assumed to be a sample. Content validity is important from a wash back point of view. An exam can not avoid influencing teaching and learning and if an exam demands the examinee to demonstrate the ability envisaged in the course objectives, the wash back effect of the examination can be beneficial. An exam based on communicative tasks will encourage the students to use language by providing learning opportunities as well. An exam of this type can be used for educational change. Anastasi says (1982, p. 131) Content validity as: 'essentially the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behaviour domain to be measured' (as cited in Weir, 1998, p.25) . She provides a set of useful guide lines for establishing content validity.

1. The behaviour domain to be tested must be systematically analysed to make certain that all major aspects are covered by the test items, and in the correct proportion.
2. The domain under consideration should be fully described in advance, rather than being defined after the test has been prepared.

3. Content validity depends on the relevance of the individuals' test responses to the behaviour area under consideration rather than on the apparent relevance of item content.

The construction of an examination is usually preceded by through examination of the relevant course contents, and instructional objectives. Doing this provides a basis for test specifications on the basis of which test task are designed. The discussion of the test specification should show the instructional objectives or process to be tested, and the relative importance of individual topics and process will enhance the content validity of the test.

We can conclude that the test must reflect not only the content of the course but also demonstrate the balance of test items in terms of weightage given to each unit or area. In other words, what we should be doing, to make an exam educationally beneficial, as is discussed to make the exam mirror of the course objectives in order to make the people concerned understand what is expected of them. Moreover, a test is examined in relation to relevance to the given course of the study. So it is necessary to analyze two aspects, viz., content coverage and content weightage.

#### **1.1.4 Content Representativeness (Coverage)**

The tasks required in the test adequately represent the behavioural domain in the question to the extent. Hughes (1989) views that content validity depends up on how many of the functions are tested in the components and how representative they are of the complete set of functions included in the objectives. Similarly, Heaton (1998) claims that content validity is established in a test by considering the representative sample of the course. Above 60 percent of the coverage of the course contents in the test items, it is believed that the question paper is nearer to content validity. Content coverage means the degree to which the tasks required in the test adequately represent the

behavioural domain in question. Harrison (1991) claims that content validity is established by considering the purpose of the assessment and then drawing up a content list. It is the fact that no test can be fully valid and fully invalid. It is impossible for a test to obtain 100 percent validity.

#### **1.1.5 Content Weightage**

The investigation of content relevance requires the specification of the behavioural domain in question and the attendant specification of the task or test domain. In order to find out the content validity on the basis of content weighting of the test is the comparison between the course content weighting and the test content weighting. Weighting is the distribution of marks according to the specified contents. In the syllabus the unit wise weighting of course is specified. The more the unit wise weighting, the more focus it gets in teaching and learning; and the more test items are constructed from that unit. If the content weighting is over representative or under representative the test has less content validity and such a test may have harmful wash back effect too. Therefore, any deviation in the test content weighting lessens the content validity of the test. A test should therefore, strictly follow the weighting scheme of the course contents in the test contents to get content validity and good wash back effect.

#### **1.1.6 General Linguistics Paper I at HSEB Curriculum**

Higher secondary education should be taken as the first step towards specialization. Its main aim should be to produce middle level main power. There are altogether forty one specialization paper at class eleven. Out of them one paper is general linguistics. The course entitled as general linguistics designed for the students of class eleven who have taken 'general linguistics' as major subject at higher secondary school level since 2007. This paper carries 100 full marks and subject code is 180. This course is designed to

provide students with understanding and knowledge of the fundamental principles of general linguistics. The course comprises seven units. The first unit deals with language and linguistics. Second unit deals with the phonetics and phonology. Third unit discusses the structures of the words. Fourth unit provides the structures of sentences. Fifth unit includes semantics and pragmatics. Sixth and seventh unit introduces historical linguistics and history of linguistics respectively. Twenty marks question can be asked from each unit but fifteen marks question can be asked from unit five according to prescribed evaluation scheme of higher secondary education board curriculum. Therefore, students are asked seven questions but are required to attempt five questions. The course is designed for one academic session which should be taught at least 150 periods in a year. Long questions, short questions and short notes are administered in the examination.

#### **1.1.6.1 Course Objectives**

General objectives: On completion of this course, the students will be able to understand the structures of language at various levels; phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatics as well as the historical aspects of language.

#### **1.1.6.2 Specific Objectives**

Upon completion of this course, the students will be able to :

- a. express the nature and structure of languages;
- b. discuss the aims and scope of linguistics;
- c. describe the sound structures of language;
- d. analyze how words are formed;
- e. explain the organization of words in sentences;

- f. analyze the role of linguistics and extra linguistics factors interpreting meaning of language;
- g. describe and explain language change, and
- h. discuss the development of linguistics as a discipline.

**Table no. 1**

**Course scheme**

Unit	Course Topics	Teaching hours
1	Language and linguistics	15
2	Phonetics and phonology	25
3	Morphology	25
4	Syntax	25
5	Semantics and pragmatics	25
6	Historical linguistics	15
7	History of linguistics	20

The total time allocated to complete this course is 150 hours.

**1.1.6.3 Evaluation Scheme**

There will be question paper carrying 100 marks for three hours duration to evaluate the knowledge of the students.

**Table No. 2**

**Evaluation scheme charts**

Unit No.	Teaching Hours	Topics	Long questions 20	Short question 10	Short notes 5
1	15	Language and linguistics	1	1	1
2	25	Phonetics and phonology	1	1	1
3	25	Morphology	1	1	1
4	25	Syntax	1	1	1
5	25	Semantics and pragmatics	1	1	1
6	15	Historical linguistics	1	1	1
7	20	History of linguistics	1	1	1

- a. Long answer to 4 questions
- b. Short answer to 2 out of 3 questions
- c. short notes to 4 out of 6 question and

- d. question number 7 is compulsory students are required to attempt other 4 questions.

#### **1.1.6.4 Measuring Content Validity of on Exam: General Linguistics Paper I**

An examination specification grid reflects the assessment and evaluation part of the curriculum. It not only shows the marks allocated to different areas and skills to be measured as mentioned in the curriculum but also shows how the marks are divided according to the question. It clearly mentions the types and number of questions to be asked in the examination. It also includes the materials and equipment needed for the examinations. Objectives to be measured and usually followed by sample question with a marking scheme.

In a three hour test one cannot use all the contents form the syllabus or course. Therefore, the selection of tasks to be included in the test is indispensable. The basic question is therefore, whether the test items that compose an exam constitute an appropriate sample of behaviour domain under consideration. It is important that a test covers the content according to the course contents and course objectives or not. It is also important that whether or not test tasks included in an exam are relevant to the language activities that are expected to be exercised under a given course. The more test items are constructed, the more content validity the test paper has.

Anastasi (1982) states that "content validity involves essentially the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behaviour domain to be measured" ( as cited in Khaniya, 2005, p. 104). By this definition, we can conclude that content validity is one of the types of validity and it covers two things content coverage (representativeness) and content weighting. Moreover, test item should be prepared according to the specialization chart. So, the researcher wants to research in the topic. To find out the content validity of a course of study :general linguistics of grade XI, whether the test contains a

representative sample of the course or not, the relationship between the test items and the course objectives has or has not and the test contents cover the course content or not. Weighting is the distribution of marks according to specified evaluation scheme chart. Therefore, test content weightage is compared with specification chart to find out the weightage is relevant or not. Question papers asked in the years from 2065 to 2066 exam of general linguistics and match with checklist, which is prepared according to course contents and evaluation scheme specification chart prescribed by H.S.E.B. exam. A test should strictly follow the weightage scheme of the course contents in the test contents to get content validity. Students are asked seven questions. They required to give answers only to five questions. The questions are of equal value i.e. 20 marks. Students can choose two questions among three questions in case of short questions where there are three choices. In case of short notes, there are six choices. Students required to give answer only four questions, each short note carries 5 mark value.

In conclusion, most of the experts in the field of testing agree that if the question papers have 50 percent of the coverage of contents it is believed to have average content validity. If it is above fifty to sixty percent it is supposed to have nearer to content validity. If more than sixty percent course contents are covered in a test then it is supposed to have high content validity. Furthermore, the weightage of the questions and its types have to be strictly followed according to evaluation scheme chart in syllabus.

## **1.2 Review of Related Literature**

A number of studies have been carried out on the content validity in the department of English education. Some researches which have been carried out on the topic are as follows:



Khaniya (1990, p. 245) conducted a research on "Examination as Instrument for Educational change Investing the Washback effect of Nepalese Exam " and come to the conclusion that SLC exam fails to assess the language skills that the SLC exam course intends to develop the students because of its test book and previous exam paper oriented nature, it does not encourage students and teachers to focus of language skills entailed in objectives. Finally he has concluded that wash back is an inherent quality; ingredients of exam determine whether the wash back is negative or positive and teaching final exam is inheritable.

Ojha (2005) studied on "Content validity of ELT theories and methods Exam at B. Ed. Level" . The objective of his research work was to examine the content validity of ELT Theories and methods' question papers at B. Ed. Second year in terms of content coverage and content weightage. To fulfill the objectives, he analyzed the question papers administered in the annual examination from 2057 to 2061. His study showed that the ELT theories and methods tests had high content validity in terms of coverage but low content validity in terms of weighting.

Bhattarai (2005) studied on "The content validity of compulsory English textbook for grade eight" the objectives of his research work was to examine the content validity of English textbook for grade eight. She has found that the text book has less content validity in terms of interest and level, listening text or objectives, speaking, reading, writing exercise and communicative function of language.

Nepal (2006) carried out the research on "Content validity of examination: A case of fundamentals of language and linguistics at B. Ed. level". To accomplish this task the question papers administered in the annual examination during 2057 to 2062 were selected for the collection of data and analyzed in terms of content coverage and content weighting to see if the

administered test items were the representative sample of the course objectives or contents and if the weighting of the test contents were proportional to the scheduled weighting specified in the syllabus. He found that in terms of content coverage the tests have high content validity (80:28%) but in terms of content weighting the test have low content validity.

Subedi (2006) carried out a research on "content validity of B. Ed. questions. A case of English sounds and structures (302)". To accomplish the specified objectives, a set of questionnaire was prepared for the purpose of collecting the teacher's responses. The sample population consisted of 20 teachers: 15 from Kathmandu, 2 from Bhaktapur, 2 from Kavre and 1 from Lalitpur district. The result of the study indicated that the question papers of the written examination of the course are not as valid and objectives oriented as they should be they do not seem to follow the evaluation scheme of the syllabus properly.

Timilsina (2006) conducted a research on "Testing the test investigating the content validity of language testing test at M.Ed. level" . He analyzed five years question papers from 2058 to 2062 B.S. of the language testing papers. The major findings of his research is that the language testing tests have low content validity in terms of converge or representativeness principle. It is because out of 95 language item in totality of the course, the test item have represented 42 language items i.e . 44.21 percent during five years (from 2058 to 2062) on the other hand, according to the weighting principle, the language testing tests have low content validity. It was not following any norm or tendency in the distribution of marks in the question papers what it was given in the weighting schedule of the syllabus.

Khatri (2007) carried out a research on "Content validity of semantics and pragmatics M.Ed. level". He analyzed the five year question papers from 2058 to 2066. His major findings was in terms of converge the content validity of

semantics and pragmatics was in average (neither low nor high) but in terms of weightage it has poor content validity.

Although, the studies mentioned above are related to content validity, the present study is a new endeavor and different from other studies in the sense that it is concerned with the 'content validity of a course of study :general linguistics a case of grade eleven'.

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- i. To examine the content validity of general linguistics paper exam of grade XI in terms of :
  - a. content coverage and
  - b. content weighting
- ii. To suggest some pedagogical implications for the betterment of the test in future.

### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

The present study provides information on the content validity of general linguistics exam of grade XI. It will provide insights to the teachers, testers, and those who are directly involved in the business of teaching and testing. It will equally be important for the policy makers and curriculum designers. No doubt, it will be helpful for the students of applied linguistics. Particularly, it will be valuable for the test authority of the higher secondary board. Furthermore, this research work will be significant to other researchers who want to carryout research works in this field.

### **1.5 Definition of the specific terms**

Validity is the degree to which the test measures what it is supposed to measure, or can be used successfully for the purposes for which it is intended.

**Content validity**

Content validity is a form of validity, which is based on the degree to which a test adequately and sufficiently measure the particular skills or behaviour it sets out to measure.

**Wash back effect**

Wash back effect is the effect of testing on teaching and learning.

**Content coverage**

Content coverage is the degree to which the task required in the test adequately represents the behaviour domain in question.

**Weightage**

The marks contained by the question.

**Item**

An individual question

**Partial question (s)**

A single test item covering two or more different language items form the contents of the syllable.

**Reliability**

Reliability is a measure of the degree to which a test gives consistent results.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

The researcher has adopted the following methodology during the study in order to achieve the objectives specified.

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

The researcher has used only secondary sources of data for the purposed study.

##### **2.1.1 Secondary Sources of Data**

For this study the researcher used the question papers of General Linguistics Paper I of grade XI from the years 2065 to 2066 (annual and supplementary). Apart from this, he consulted the syllabus of higher secondary level education, various books, articles, journals and research reports such as Heaton (1995), Weir (1990), Richards (1993), Hughes (1989), Lado (1991), Khaniya (2005) and so on.

#### **2.2 Sampling Procedure**

The question papers of general linguistics from the years 2065 to 2066 of grade XI (annual and supplementary) prepared by the higher secondary examination board were selected through purposive sampling.

#### **2.3 Tools for Data Collection**

The researcher prepared the checklist for data collection. In that checklist, he prepared the areas of contents on the basis of specification chart and syllabus of the given course. Four question papers of the course used previously were analyzed.

## **2.4 Process of Data Collection**

The researcher collected question papers administered in the annual and supplementary examination of the subject general linguistics from 2065 to 2066 and the syllabus. Then, he categorized all the test items unit wise based on the course contents given in the syllable and prepared a checklist. To find out content coverage of the course, he compared the test items with the course contents in the checklist and listed the instance of represented in the question papers and not represented in the question papers and he counted them. Finally, to find out content weighting, he prepared the checklist according to specified evaluation scheme chart and match it. Then he observed test weightage and evaluation scheme chart to find out weightage.

## **2.5 Limitations of the Study**

The study had the following limitations:

- a. The study was confined only to the content validity of general linguistics question papers of grade XI.
- b. The study was limited to the question papers from the years 2065 to 2066 (annual and supplementary) asked in the higher secondary examinations.
- c. The study was based on only secondary sources.
- d. Only tables and percentage were used as the statistical tools for data analysis.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter is the central part of the study since it is concerned with the analysis and interpretation of the raw data obtained from the information to examine the content validity of 'general linguistics course of grade eleven'. For this purpose, this chapter has been divided into two parts. The first part deals with the analysis of the content validity of "general linguistics" question papers in terms of coverage and the second part deals with the content validity of the same question papers in terms of weighting.

The question papers of "General linguistics" of grade XI which were administered in H.S.E.B. examination from 2065 to 2066 (annual and supplementary) are analyzed in terms of their coverage. The researcher attempted to examine whether the question papers had content validity or not.

There are seven units in this course. It is a theory course that carries 100 marks and the pass marks is 35. Course contents and teaching hours are clearly specified in the syllabus. Evaluation scheme chart is also given. Table no 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 show the representation of units, 1,2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 respectively in the examination from 2065 to 2066 ( annual and supplementary).

The researcher has mainly analyzed the question papers of above mentioned academic years. The question papers of those two years are given in appendix- II.

### 3.1 Representative Sample / Content Coverage

For the purpose of examining content validity of the course in questions from 2065 to 2066 (annual and supplementary), the researcher has compared the test contents in relation to course contents. If the question papers have fifty percent of the coverage of contents it is believed to have average content validity. If it is above fifty to sixty percent it is supposed to have nearer to content validity. If more than sixty percent course contents are covered in a test then it is supposed to have high content validity.

Here, the researcher has tried to examine whether the question papers have represented the course contents or not in the four question papers which are presented below. The researcher has used only descriptive and tabulation method to analyze the data.

#### 3.1.1 Examining course Representativeness in Unit One

**Table No. 3**

#### **Representation of test contents in terms of course contents in unit one**

Unit	Course contents	Test contents			
	Course items	Test Items Represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2066s
1	Language and linguistics				
1.1	Why study language ?	L1P			
1.2	Definition of language	L1P	L1P		
1.3	Characteristics of human language		L1P		



	and animal communication				
1.4	Levels of language: phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic				L1
1.5	Definition of linguistics : the scientific study of language				
1.6	Branches of linguistics				
1.6.1	Theoretical linguistics			S6A	
1.6.2	Applied linguistics		SN7A		
1.6.3	Synchronic and diachronic linguistics				S6A
1.6.4	Psycholinguistics	SN7A	S6A		
1.6.5	Sociolinguistics	S6A			SN7A
1.7	Basic assumption about language and modern linguistics			L1	
1.7.1	All languages have a grammar			√	
1.7.2	All languages and grammars are equal			√	
1.7.3	Grammars are alike in basic ways			√	
1.7.4	Speech is primary and writing secondary			√	
1.7.5	Linguistics is descriptive, not prescriptive			√	

1.7	Change is natural for a language			v	
	<b>Total no. of asked question sin unit 1</b>	1L,1S N,1S	1L, 1S 1S N	1L, 1S	1L, 1S N 1S

**Note:** 2066s = 2066 supplementary

L1= long question, question No. 1

S6A= Short question: question no. 6 A

SN7A- Short notes: question no. 7 A

L1P = Long partial question no. 1

v = Covered the language contents by test contents

The given table shows that in unit one, there are eighteen language items, which are spread from 1 to 1.7. If we see diachronically the most representative language items were 'definition of language', 'applied linguistics', 'psycholinguistics' and 'sociolinguistics' which were the contents of the test in two examinations. 1.1 (why study language) was represented in one examination out of four examination. Similarly, 1.4 , 1.6.1, 1.6.3 and 1.7 ( levels of language, theoretical linguistics, synchronic and diachronic linguistics and basic assumption about language and linguistics which is super ordinate term) were represented in one year question paper out of four question papers from 2065 to 2066 ( annual and supplementary).

If we see synchronically, one question (one long question) was asked from this unit in 2065. The long question L1P was asked from 1.1 and 1.2(why study language and definition of language). Similarly, one question (one short question) was asked from this unit in 2065. Short question (S6A) was asked

from 6.5 (sociolinguistics). And one short note was asked from this unit in this year. The short note (SN7A) was asked from 6.4 (psycholinguistics).

In 2065 supplementary one question (one long question) was asked from unit 1.2 and 1.3. One short question was asked from 'sociolinguistics' and one short note was asked from 'psycholinguistics'.

In 2066, two questions (one long and one short question) were asked. Long question was asked from the language item 'basic assumption about language' and 'modern linguistics' and short question was asked from the language item 'theoretical linguistics'. Similarly, in 2066 supplementary, three questions were asked from this unit. One long question was asked from the language item 'levels of language'. One short question was asked from the language item 'synchronic and diachronic linguistics'. And, one short note was asked from the unit 6.5 (sociolinguistics). In four question papers, the repeated language items were three. The language item i.e. 'definition of language' was repeated in two times. Similarly, the language item 'psycholinguistics' was asked as short note in 2065 and as a short question in 2065 supplementary. Finally, the language item 'sociolinguistics' was asked as a short question in 2065 and as a short note in 2066 supplementary.

In conclusion, on the basis of the table and above description, there are eighteen language items according to the course contents, but the representation of the test items is sixteen language items. Two language items were neglected while designing test items. It means the coverage of course contents in test contents in unit one is 88 percent. But 11.12 percent of course contents were not covered in the question papers. To sum up, the unit one has high content validity because it (question papers) covers 88.88 percent, course contents.

### 3.1.2 Examining Content Representativeness in Unit Two

**Table No. 4**

#### **Representation of Test Contents in Terms of Course Contents in Unit 2**

Unit	Course contents	Test Contents			
	Course items	Test items represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2066s
2	Phonetic and phonology				
2.1	Definition of phonetics				
2.2	Branches of linguistics				
2.2.1	Articulator phonetics				
2.2.2	Auditory phonetics				
2.2.3	Acoustic phonetic				
2.3	Production of speech.			L2	
2.4	description and classification of sounds: vowel, consonants, semi vowels and diphthongs.		SN7B		SN7B
2.5	Syllable and syllable structures	S6B			
2.6	Stress		S6B	SN7A	
2.7	Tone and intonation				
2.8	Definition of phonology, phonology versus phonetics		L3P		S6B

2.9	Phones , phonemes and allophones	L3	SN7C L3P		
2.10	General introduction to 7PA chart	SN7B			
Total no. of asked questions		1L, 1S,1SN	1L, 1S,1SN	1L, 1SN	1S,1SN

The above table shows that in unit two there are altogether thirteen language items from 2 to 2.10. If we see diachronically among these 13 language items, 2.4, 2.6 and 2.8 (description and classification of sound; vowel consonants, semivowels and diphthongs, stress, definition of phonology, phonology verses phonetics) were more representative language items repeating in two question papers out of four question papers. The language items 2.9 were partially represented in two question papers. The language item 2.3 (production of speech) 2.5 (syllable and syllable structures) and 2.10 (definition of phonology, phonology verse phonetics) have been represented only in one question papers. Besides them, other language items, which are mentioned in the above table, have not been represented in any years' examination.

If we see synchronically, three questions (one long question one short question and one short note) were asked from this unit in 2065. In case of long question, L3 was form 2.9 (phones, phonemes allophones). In case of short question, short question (S6B) was asked from 2.5 (syllable and syllable structure). In case of short note, the one short note (SN7B) was asked from 2.10 (general introduction to IPA charts).

In 2065 supplementary, one long question (L3P) was asked from 2.8 and 2.9 (definition of phonology, phonology vs. phonetics and phones phonemes and

allophones). One short question (S6B) was asked from 2.6 (stress). Similarly, two short notes were asked in this year.

In 2066, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit. In case of long question, L2 was asked from 2.3 (production of speech) and short note (SN7A) was asked from 2.6 (stress).

In 2066 supplementary, two questions (one short question and one short note) were asked from this unit. In case of short question, S6B was asked from 2.8 (definition of phonology, phonology verses phonetics). And short note (SN7B) was asked from 2.4 (description and classification of sounds: vowels, consonants, semi- vowels and diphthongs). In four question papers the repeated language items were three. The test item 'what is stress' was asked in 2065 supplementary and the same stress was asked in 2066 supplementary as a short note. Similarly, the SN7B in 2065 supplementary and SN7B in 2066 were partially similar. The long questions I3 in 2065 and L3P in 2065 supplementary were partially similar.

In conclusion, from the above table and description the researcher found that there are thirteen language items according to the course contents but the representation of the test items is only seven language items. Six language items were ignored while designing test items. Therefore, the coverage of the course contents in the test contents in unit two is 53.84 percent but 46.16 percent course contents were not covered in the question papers. To sum up, this unit has nearer to content validity because it (question papers) covers 53.84 percent course contents.

### 3.1.3 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Three

Table No 5

#### Representation of Test Contents in Terms of Course Contents in Unit Three

Unit	Course contents	Test contents			
	Course items	Test items represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2065s
3	Morphology				
3.1	Definition of word				
3.2	Morphology? The study of word				
3.3	Word structures: root stem, and affix				
3.4	Morphs, morphemes and allomorph		SN7C	SN7C	
3.5	Types of morpheme: free and bound	SN7C			SN7C
3.6	Types of affix: (a) prefix in fix, suffix and supra-fix				
3.7	Types of affix: (b) inflectional and deviational	S6C			
3.8	Major process of word formation		L4	L3	L2
a	Affixation		✓	✓	✓
B	Reduplication		✓	✓	✓
C	Compounding		✓	✓	✓
d	Shortening		✓	✓	✓

e	Blending		v	v	v
f	Borrowing			v	
g	Acronym			v	
H	Coinage			v	
i	Back formation			v	
3.9	Major morphophonemic process				
	Total no. of asked questions	1S, 1SN	1L,1S N	1L, 1S N	1L, 1S N

The above table shows that in unit three there are eighteen language items from 3 to 3.9. If we see diachronically among these eighteen language items, 3.8 (major process of word formation) has been represented in three question papers. The language items 3.4 (morphs, morpheme, allomorphs), 3.5 (types of morphemes: free and bound) 3.7 types of affix: (b inflectional and derivation) have been represented in one year or one paper out of four question papers. Besides them, the language items, which are mentioned in the table have not been represented in any question papers.

If we see synchronically, two questions (one short question and one short note) were asked in 2065. In case of short question, S6C was asked from 3.7 (types of affix (b) inflectional and derivational). In case of short note, one short note (SN7C) was asked from 3.9 (types of morpheme free and bound).

In the year 2065 supplementary, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit. The long question (L4) was asked from 3.8 (major process of word formation). In case of short note, one short note (SN7C) was asked from 3.4 (morphs, morphemes and allomorph).



In the year 2066, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit. In case of long question, one long question (L3) was asked from 3.8 (major process of words formation). In case of short note, one short note (SN7C) was asked from 3.4 (morphs, morpheme and allomorph).

Two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit in 2066 supplementary examination. The long question (L2) was asked from 3.8 (major process of word formation). In case of short note, one short note (SN7C) was asked from 3.5 (types of morphemes; free and bound) In case of repeated language items , the researcher has found that from unit three within four question papers (2065, 2065s, 2066, 2066s), no short question and no short note were recreated. But in case of long question, the test item L4 and L2 which were from unit 3.8 (major process of word formation) were exactly the same. There is not any difference between 2065s and 2066 L2. Similarly, the test item, which was asked in 2066 as a long question (L3) was more than seventy percent similar with the question paper which was asked in 2065S and 2066S. All these 3 long questions (L4, L3 and L2) were from same language items (i.e. major process of word formation).

To some up, the above presented table and description, there are altogether eighteen language items in unit 3 from 3.1 to 3.9 according to the course contents but the representation of test contents is only thirteen language items. Five language items were ignored while constructing the test items. Therefore, the coverage of course contents in test contents in unit three is 72.22 percent but 27.78 percent course contents were not covered in the question papers. The unit three has high content validity because It (question papers) covers 72.22 percent course content.

### 3.1.3 Examining Content Representation in Unit Four

Table No. 6

#### Representation of Test Contents in Terms of Course Contents in Unit Four

Unit	Course Contents	Test Contents			
	Course Items	Test Items Represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2066s
4	Syntax				
4.1	Syntax: The study of sentences structures				
4.2	Syntactic categories				
4.2.1	Criteria for identifying syntactic categories: meaning, inflection and distribution				
4.2.2	Types of syntactic categories			L4	
i	Word level categories such as lexical categories noun verb, adjective, adposition, adverb and non-lexical categories such as determiner, degree word , qualifier, auxiliary and conjunction		S6C	v	
ii	Phrase -level categories: noun phrase, verb phrase adjective phrase, adpositional phrase, adverbial phrase			v	
4.3	Basic sentence patterns and transformations (question, passive negation)	L4			L3
4.4	Subordinating and transformations ( complementation				SN7D

	relativization, adverbial clause)				
4.5	Coordination			SN7C	
4.6	Grammatical functions: subject object ( direct and indirect), Complement , adjunct (manner time , place )	SN7D			
	Total no. of asked question in unit 4	1S, ISN	1S	1L, 1S N	1L, 1SN

The above presented table shows that in unit four there are altogether ten language items from 4.1 to 4.6.

If we see diachronically among these ten language items, 4.3 (basic sentence patterns and transformation-question, passive, negation) has been represented in two question papers (2065, 2066s). The language items 4.2.2 (i) ( types of syntactic categories), 4.2.2 (i) (world level categories lexical categories such as noun , verb, adjective adposition adverb and non- lexical categories such as determiner, degree word, qualifier, auxiliary and conjunction), 4.4 (subordination and transformation complementation, relativization, adverbial clause), 4.5 ( coordination) , 4.6 ( grammatical functions subject, object -direct and indirect, complements adjunct i.e. manner, time and place) have been represented in one question paper out of four time question papers.

If we see synchronically, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked in 2065. In case of long question, it (L4) was asked from 4.3 (basic sentence patterns and transformation question passive, negations). Short note (SN7D) was asked from 4.6 (grammatical function subject, object i.e. direct and indirect, complement, adjunct-manner, time, place).

One short question was asked in the year 2065 supplementary from this unit. The short question (S6C) was asked from 4.2.2 (i) (word level categories such as lexical categories-noun, verb, adjective, adposition adverb and non-lexical categories such as determiner, degree word, qualifier, auxiliary and conjunctions).

In the year 2066, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit. The long question (L4) was asked from 4.2.2 (types of syntactic categories). It is the superordinate terms of 4.2.2 (i) and 4.2.2 (ii). In case of short note, the short note (SN7C) was asked from 4.5 (coordination). Two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit in 2066 supplementary examination. The long question (L3) was asked from 4.3 (basic sentence patterns and transformation-question, passive, negation). The short note (SN7D) was asked from 4.4 (subordination and transformations –complementation, realization, adverbial clauses). In case of repeated items, 4.3 (basic sentence patterns and transformations-question, passive negation) was partially similar in two year question papers (in 2065 annual and in 2066 supplementary) Other language items were not repeated what researcher has found in his observation according to this above table.

To sum up, there are altogether ten language items in unit four from 4 to 4.6 according to the course contents but the representation of the test items is only seven language items. Three language items were ignored while designing test items. Therefore, the coverage of course contents in test contents in unit four is 70 percent. Thirty percent course contents were not covered in the question papers. So that, the unit four has high content validity because it (question papers) covers seventy percent course contents.

### 3.1.5 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Five

**Table No.7**

#### **Representation of Test Contents in Terms of Course Contents in Unit Five**

Unit	Course Contents	Test Contents			
	Course Items	Test Items Represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2066s
5	Semantics and pragmatics				
5.1	Definition of semantics				
5.2	Semantic relations among words	L5	L5		
5.2.1	Synonymy	√	√		
5.2.2	Antonymy	√	√	S6B	
5.2.3	Hyponymy	√	√		
5.2.4.	Homonymy, homography and homophony	√	√		
5.2.5	Polysemy	√	√	SN7D	
5.3	Semantic relation involving Sentences				
5.3.1	Paraphrase				
5.3.2	Entailment				
5.3.3	Contradiction				SN7E

5.4	Type of meaning				
5.4.1	Lexical				
5.4.2	Grammatical				
5.4.3	Contextual	SN7E			
5.5	Thematic roles: agent, instrument, experience, source, location, possessor, patient/ object, benefactive				
5.6	Pragmatics: the study of meaning in context				S6C
5.7	Presupposition				
5.8	Context			SN7E	
5.8.1	Setting (physical context )			v	
5.8.2	Discourse		SN7E	S6C	
a	Old and new information			vV	
b	Topic and comment			vV	
5.9	Meaning and discourse			v	
5.9.1	Cohesion			v	
5.9.2	Coherence			v	
5.9.3	Discourse strategies			v	

	Total no. of asked question in unit five	1L1SN	1L1SN	2S,2SN	1S,1SN
--	--	-------	-------	--------	--------

The above table shows that in unit five there are twenty seven language items. If we see diachronically among these twenty seven language items, 5.2.2, 5.2.5 ( antonymy, ploysemy) have been represented in three question papers (2065, 2065s 2066). 5.2 (semantic relations among words) and 5.8.2 (discourse) have been represented in two question papers. Similarly, 5.3.3 (contradiction), 5.4.3 (contextual), 5.6 (pragmatics the study of meaning in context) and 5.8 (context) have been represented in one year question papers. Besides them, the language items, which are mentioned in the table, have not been represented in any years' examination.

If we see synchronically, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked in 2065 annual examination. In case of long question, it (I5) was asked from 5.2 (semantic relations among words) it was also super ordinate term for (5.2.1 to 5.2.5) and short note (SN7E) was asked from 5.4.3 (contextual meaning).

Two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked in the year 2065 supplementary examination. In case of long questions, the long question (L5) was asked from 5.2 (semantic relations among words). In case of short note, it (SN7E) was asked from 5.8.2 (discourse).

In 2066 four questions (two short questions and two short notes) were asked from this unit. The first short question (S6B) was asked from 5.2.2 (antonymy) and, the next short question (S6C) was asked from 5.8.2 (discourse). In case of short notes, the first short note (SN7D) was asked from 5.2.5 (Polysemy), and the next short note (SN7E) was asked from 5.8 (context). Similarly, two questions (one short question and one short note) were asked in the year 2066 supplementary examination. In case of short question, the short

question (S6C) was asked form 5.6 (pragmatics: the study of meaning in context), in case of short note, it (SN7E) was asked from 5.3.3 (contradiction). The researcher has found from unit five within four question papers (2065, 2065s, 2066, 2066s), some items were repeated. The researcher has found that the long question in 2065 as same as asked in 2065 supplementary examination from 2.5.2 (Semantic relation involving sentences). Likewise, the test items which were asked in 2065 2065s and 2066 form 5.2.2 (Antonym) were partially similar. The test item (SN7D) asked in 2066 as a short note which was asked in previous question paper as a subordinate term or items. The researcher has found that in 2065s, SN7E was exactly the same as 2066 (S6C). Only difference is SN7E was asked as a short note and (S6C) was asked as a short question. In 2066 question papers, SN7E 'context' was asked as a short note but its subordinate term (S6C) discourse was asked as a short question. Therefore, within one year exam paper two terms were repeated. Superordinate item asked as a short note but its subordinate item was asked as short question.

To sum up, there are altogether twenty seven language items in unit five from 5.1 to 5.9.3 according to the course contents but the representation of the test items is only eighteen language item. Nine language items were ignored while designing the test items. Therefore, the coverage of course contents in test contents in unit five is 66.66 percent but 33.34 percent course contents were not covered in the question papers. The unit five has high content validity because it (question papers) covers more than sixty percent course contents.

### **3.1.5 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Six**

#### **Table No.8**

#### **Representation of Test Contents in Terms of Course Contents in Unit Six**



Unit	Course contents	Test Contents			
	Course item	Test items represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2066s
6	Historical linguistics: the study of language change				
6.1	Historical linguistics: the study of language change				
6.2	The nature of language change				
6.3	Different types of language change			L5	L4
6.3.1	Sound change		SN7F	√	√
6.3.2	Morphological change		√	√	√
6.3.3	Syntactic change		√	√	√
6.3.4	Lexical and semantic change			√	√
6.4	Introduction to the classification of language	L2			
6.4.1	Genetic classification	√			
6.4.2	Typological classification	√			
6.4.3	Areal classification	√			
	Total no. of asked question in Unit 6	1L	1SN	1L	1L

The above table shows that in unit six there are eleven language items from 6.1 to 6.4.3. If we see diachronically among these eleven language items, 6.3 (different type of language change) has been represented in two years exam papers. 6.3.1 (sound change) and 6.4 (introduction to the classification of language) have been represented in one question papers out of four question papers. Besides them, the language items, which are mentioned in the table, have not been represented in any years' examination.

If we see synchronically, one long question was asked in 2065. The long question (L2) was asked from 6.4 (introduction to the classification of language) it is the super-ordinate language item which represented 6.4.1, 6.4.2., 6.4.3 (genetic classification, typological classification, areal classification) respectively.

One short note was asked in 2065 supplementary. The short note (SN7F) was asked from 6.3.1 (sound change). Similarly, one long question was asked in 2066. The long question (L5) was asked from 6.3 (different types of language change) It is the super ordinate term of 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 (sound change, morphological change, syntactic change, lexical and semantic change) respectively.

One long question was asked in 2066 supplementary examination from this unit. The long question (L4) was asked from 6.3 (different types of language change) which includes 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, 6.3.4 (sound change, morphological change, syntactic change, lexical and semantic change) respectively. These are the subordinate term of 6.3 (different type of language change). The researcher has found from unit six within four question papers, no short question and short note were repeated. In case of long question, the researcher has found that in 2066, L5 was exactly the same as L4 in 2066 supplementary. They were from 6.3 (different types of language change) which was the super ordinate language item of 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.4 (sound

change, morphological change, syntactic change, lexical and semantic change).

To sum up, the above presented table and description, there are altogether eleven language items in unit six from 6.1 to 6.4.3 according to the course contents but the representation of test items is only nine language items. Two language items were neglected while constructing the test items. It means that the coverage of course contents in test contents in unit six is 81.81 percent. But 18.19 percent course contents were not covered in the test contents. The unit six has high content validity because it (question papers) covers 81.81 percent course contents.

### 3.1.7 Examining Course Representativeness in Unit Seven

**Table No. 9**

#### **Representation of Test Contents in Terms of Course Contents in Unit Seven**

Unit	Course contents	Test Contents			
		Test Items Represented			
		2065	2065s	2066	2066s
7	History of linguistics				
7.1	Sanskrit tradition and contribution of Sanskrita Grammar , Pratishakhya, Yaska, Panini, and Bhartrihari				SN7F
7.2	Contribution of geeks and Romans				
7.3	19 <sup>th</sup> century historical comparative linguistics			L5	

7.4	Modern linguistics: contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, Halliday, Chomsky	SN7F	L2	SN7F	
7.5	Development of linguistics in Nepal contribution of native and foreign and linguistics.				
	Total no. of asked question in unit seven	1SN	1L	1L1SN	ISN

The above table shows that in unit seven there are five language items from 7.1 to 7.3. If we see diachronically among these five language items, 7.4 (modern linguistics: contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, Halliday, Chomsky) was the most representative language items repeating three years question papers. The language item 7.1 (Sanskrit tradition and contribution of Sanskrit Grammar Pratishakhya , Yasaka, Panini and Bhartrihari) has been represented in one question paper. Similarly, 7.3 (19<sup>th</sup> century historical comparative linguistics) has been represented in one question paper.

If we see synchronically, one short note was asked in the year 2066. The short note (SN7F) was asked from 7.4 (Modern linguistics: contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, Halliday and Chomsky). One long question was asked in 2065 supplementary. The long question (L2) was asked from 7.4 (modern linguistics: contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, Halliday and Chomsky).

In 2066, two questions (one long question and one short note) were asked from this unit. In case of long question, the long question (L5) was asked from 7.3 (19<sup>th</sup> century historical, comparative linguistics) . In case of sort note, the short note (SN7F) was asked from 7.4 (modern linguistics: Contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, Halliday and Chomsky).

One short note was asked from this unit in 2066 supplementary examination. The short note (SN7F) was asked from 7.1 (Sanskrit tradition and contribution

of Sanskrit grammar, Prastishakhya, Yaska, Panini and Bhartrihari). The researcher has found that no short question was asked from this unit out of four question papers. No language items were repeated from this unit during four time question paper. Language item 7.4 was repeated in three question papers but test items were not exactly same, they are different test items from same language items in three time question paper.

In conclusion, there are altogether five language items in unit seven from 7.1 to 7.5 according to the course contents but the representation of the test items is only three language items. Two language items were neglected while designing the test items. It means that the coverage of course contents in test contents in unit seven is sixty percent. Forty percent course contents were not covered in the test contents. The unit seven has high content validity because it (question papers) covers sixty percent course contents.

### **3.1.8 Examining Content Validity of the Question Papers the whole in Terms of Representativeness**

**Table No. 10**

#### **Examining Content Validity of the Question Papers the whole in Terms of Representativeness**

S.N.	Units	Course contents language items	Test contents language items	Ignore items	Test coverage percentage
1	1	18	16	2	88.88
2	2	13	7	6	53.84
3	3	18	13	5	72.22

4	4	10	7	3	70
5	5	27	18	9	66.66
6	6	11	9	2	81.81
7	7	5	3	2	60
Total		102	73	29	71.56

The above table shows that on the whole in the seven units, there are altogether 102 language items in the whole general linguistics course at grade eleven. Out of 102 language items, the representative of the test content language items are seventy three. Twenty nine language items were neglected while designing the test items. It means that coverage of contents in the whole units is 71.56 percent but 28.44 percent contents were not covered in the question papers.

To sum up, the content validity of the question papers as a whole is high i.e. 71.56 percent. It covers 71.56 percent course. All the units except unit two, have been represented the course contents and really tested what they were supposed to test in the question papers. Therefore, general linguistics test papers have high content validity in terms of coverage.

### **3.1.9 Unit wise Comparison of the Four Question Papers in Terms of Content Representativeness**

The unit wise comparison of content representativeness shows that the most representative unit is unit one which represents 88.88 percent of the course contents. The second place is occupied by unit sixth in the hierarchy of comparison from most to least representation, which represented 81.81 percent of the course contents. The third unit occupies the third place in the

hierarchy because it covers 72.22 percent of the course contents. Similarly, unit four occupies the fourth place in the hierarchy because it covers 70 percent of the course contents. The fifth unit occupies the fifth place in the hierarchy because it covers 66.66 percent of the course contents. Unit seven occupies the sixth place in the hierarchy because it covers 60 percent of the course contents. Finally unit two comes in the last position of the hierarchy since it covers only 53.84 percent of the course contents.

### **3.2 Contents Weighting**

Comparison between weightage of the course contents and weightage of the test contents is as follows:

This is the second part of this chapter, which deals with an analysis of the proportionality of weighting of the general linguistics question papers. That is to say, the researcher examined whether or not the marks weighting evaluation scheme specified chart according to the syllable is proportional with the weighting of the test contents for the purpose of examining content validity of the general linguistics. It is believed that if test contents strictly follow the evaluation scheme chart it (question papers) has high content validity in terms of weightage. Therefore, the researcher examined the general linguistics four question papers as whole.

### 3.2.1 Examining the Content Validity of the Question Papers in Terms of Weightage as a Whole

**Table No. 11 (a) Evaluation Scheme Chart**

Units	Long Question 20	Short Question (10)	Short Note (5)
1	1	1	1
2	1	1	1
3	1	1	1
4	1	1	1
5		1	1
6	1	1	1
7	1	1	1

This table is based on the evaluation scheme chart of prescribed syllable.

Note: Long question 20 means: One long question has twenty marks.

**Table No. 11 (B) Evaluation Scheme Chart**

Units	Weighting of the Question Papers			
	2065	2065s	2066	2066s
1	20+10+5	20+10+5	20+10	20+10+5
2	20+10+5	20+10+5+5	20+5	10+5



3	20+5	20+5	20+5	20+5
4	20+5	10	20+5	20+5
5	20+5	20+5	10+5+10+5	10+5
6	20	5	20	20
7	5	20	20+5	5

Note: 20 means one long question contains 20 marks

10 means: one short question contains 10 marks

5 means: one short note contains 5 marks.

There are altogether seven questions in each year but students are required to attempt only five question.

5 long questions are asked

3 short questions are asked but required to attempt only two

6 short notes are asked but required to attempt only four.

The above tables (a and b) show that out of 100 full marks of the whole 'general linguistics' course at grade eleven, from unit one 3 question can be asked according to evaluation scheme chart. Researcher compared the weighting of the question papers with the weighting of the evaluation scheme chart and found that, though from unit one, three question can be asked but it is not found to be followed in question paper in different year. In 2065, the weightage of the question paper from this unit was 35 marks. The weightage of the question paper was exact according to the evaluation scheme chart. The question designer has kept in mind, the weightage of the unit while

constructing question paper in this year. Similarly, in 2065s, the weightage of the question paper from this unit was 35 (1 long 1 short and 1 short note). In this time the weightage of the question paper was exact according to the evaluation scheme chart. In 2066, the weightage of the question papers from this unit was 30 (20 for long question and 10 for short questions). In this year, it does not follow the evaluation scheme chart. In 2066, supplementary, the weightage of the question paper was 35 (20 for long question, 10 for short question and 5 for short note). The weightage of the question paper was exact according to the syllabus. On the whole, in unit one, the researcher found out that the weightage of the question papers seem rather satisfactory. On the whole, in unit one , the researcher found out that in almost all four question papers' marks weighting in the question papers were not proportional to the weighting of its evaluation scheme chart. One test item is left to ask. This indicates that the 'general linguistic' question papers lack content validity.

Three questions can be asked from unit two according to evaluation scheme chart. Three questions carry 35 marks weightage but question papers have carried different weightage in 2065. The weightatge of the question paper from this unit was 35 ( 20 marks for one long question, 10 marks for short question and five marks for short notes) which is exact according to evaluation scheme chart. In 2065 supplementary the weightage of the question paper was 40 marks (20 marks for long question, 10 marks for one short question and 10 marks for 2 short notes). 5 marks was over weightage for this unit in the question papers. Similarly, in 2066, the weightage of the question paper was 25 (20 marks for long question and 5 marks for short notes) It shows that 25 marks is under weightage in terms of syllabus marking. In the year 2065s, the weightage of the question paper was 25 marks (20 marks for long question 5 marks for short notes). It shows that 25 marks is under wieghtage in terms of syllabus marking. On the whole, in unit two, the

researcher found out that in most of the question papers, the weighting of the question papers were not proportional to the weightage of its evaluation scheme chart because of its over and under weightage in question papers. Therefore, this indicates that 'general linguistics' question papers lack content validity.

The unit three carried 35 marks weightage according to the evaluation scheme chart. However, the question papers carried various weightage in different years. In the year 2065, 15 marks was carried in the question papers. It seems that in this year the weightage of the question paper is unsatisfactory. In 2065s the weightage of the question was 25 marks. It seems that in this year the weightage of the question paper is not satisfactory. In the year 2066, the question papers carried 25 marks weightage, 25 marks was under weightage according to syllabus. In 2066s, the weightage of the question paper was 25 marks. Thus, in summary, the researcher found that all the question papers marks weighting was not proportional to the weighting of its evaluation scheme chart because of its under weighting in each year in the question paper this indicates that 'general linguistics' course lacks content validity.

Unit four carried 35 marks according to evaluation scheme chart but the question papers have been carried different weightage as follows. In the year 2065, 25 marks was asked which was not proportionate to the weighting of the evaluation scheme chart. In the year 2065s, 10 marks was asked. It carried 25 less marks then the scheduled of the syllabus. In the year 2066, the weightage of the question papers was 25 marks. It was 10 less marks then scheduled of the syllabus. Similarly, the weightage of the question papers was 25 marks in the year 2066 supplementary. Thus, as a whole in unit 4, in most of the question papers marks weightage was not proportional to the

weightage of evaluation scheme chart. This result shows that 'general linguistic' question papers lack content validity.

The unit five also carried 15 marks according to syllabus. However, the question paper has carried various weightage in different years. In 2065, the weightage of the question papers was 25 marks. It seems unsatisfactory. In the year 2065s, the weightage of the question papers was 25.30 marks was the weightage of the question papers in the year 2066. It was 15 marks over than the scheduled of the syllabus. The weightage of the question paper was 15 in the year 2066 supplementary. It was exact according to evaluation scheme chart. Thus, in summary, the researcher found out that there is not any norm in the design of question papers and distribution of marks in question papers because in some question papers have over wieghtage, this indicates that 'general linguistics' question papers lack content validity.

The unit six carried 35 marks according to the evaluation scheme chart. However, the question papers have carried various weightage in different years. In 2065, the weightage of the question papers was 20 marks. 15 marks was under weightage for this unit in the question papers. In the year 2065s the question papers carried only 5 marks weightage. In 2066, the weightage of the question was 20 marks. In the year 2066 s, the weightage of the question papers was 20 marks. As a whole, the researcher found that all the question papers marks weightage was not proportional to the weightage of evaluation scheme chart because of its under weighting in each question papers. Thus, this indicates that 'general linguistics' question papers lack content validity.

As far as the unit seven is concerned, it also carried 35 marks according to evaluation scheme chart. However, the question papers have carried various weightage in different years. In the year 2065, 5 marks was carried in the question paper. In the year 2065s, 20 marks was carried in the question

papers. It carried 15 less marks than the scheduled of the syllabus. Similarly, 25 marks was the weightage of the question paper in 2066. It carried 10 less marks than the shelled of the syllabus. Finally, 5 marks was the weightage of the question paper in 2066 supplementary. On the whole, the researcher has found out that all the years the marks weighting in the question papers were not proportional to the weighting of its evaluation scheme chart because of its under weighting in question papers. Therefore, this indicates that 'general linguistic' question papers lack content validity. Moreover, an examination specification grid reflects the assessment and evaluation part of the curriculum it has to show how the marks are allocated according to the question to be asked in the examination. Though it is given in the syllabus, the test setters would not find strictly follow the specification chart. It shows testing seems to be guided by 'what is easy to test and construct rather than what is important to test' because such over weightage and under weightage is not a good sign for achieving the fulfill objectives. By the result, such test have harmful wash back effect because the units or language items which are given less weighting in the question paper used in the examination. The testees read and prepare the language item according to specification chart as they do not know less number of questions or no question will be asked from that unit or language item then how they can score good marks. By the result, the course objectives are not fulfilled.

### **3.3 Comparison Between Course Converge in Terms of Course Weightage**

There are altogether 102 language items in the whole general linguistics course at grade eleven. Out of 102 language items the representative test content language item is 73. Twenty nine language items were ignored while designing the test. It is believed that if more than 60 percent course contents are covered by test contents it is supposed to have high content validity. Therefore, general linguistics question papers have high content validity in

terms of coverage it means the test items have tested what they ought to test.

On the other hand, in terms of contents weighting, some question papers have over weighting and some question papers have under weighting, there is not any norm followed in the distribution of marks in the question paper. Therefore, general linguistic question papers lack content validity.

The above description shows that a valid test from one perspective may not necessarily be valid from another perspective. Here, the question papers have high content validity in terms of content coverage have low content validity in terms of content weighting and vice versa.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This is the final chapter of this research, which deals with the findings and recommendations made by the researcher after analyzing the data. This chapter has been divided into two parts where the first part deals with the findings made by the researcher after analyzing the data and the second part deals with the recommendations made on the basis of the collected and analyzed data and the findings made in the first part of this chapter.

#### 4.1 Findings

##### 4.1.1 General findings

According to the coverage or representativeness principle, 'general linguistic' question papers have high content validity. It is because out of 102 language items in totality of the course, the test items have represented 73 language items, i.e. 71.56 percent by four exams.

It has also been found that the given question papers have low content validity in terms of content weighting. Though it is not given mark distribution of each unit in the syllabus, evaluation scheme chart is given but it was not duly followed by the question setter. No any standard procedure was followed while allocating marks to the test items. In 2066 supplementary, from unit seven, it carried 5 marks in the question papers whereas 35 marks question can be asked according to the evaluation scheme chart.

##### 4.1.1 Specific Findings

1. In terms of content coverage and representativeness

In unit one, the coverage of the course contents is 88.88 percent. In unit two the coverage of course content is 53.84 percent. In unit three, the coverage of course content is 72.22 percent. In unit four, five, six and seven, the coverage of course contents is 70, 66.66, 81.81, 60 percent respectively. It shows that unit two and seven are nearer to content validity and other units have high content validity.

## 2. In terms of content weightage

Though course content weightage is not given in the syllabus, test content weightage is compared with evaluation scheme chart weightage. In case of marks allocation, there is not followed any standard procedure so that it was found the weightage of the question papers is not proportional to the weightage of its evaluation scheme chart because of over and under weighting in the question papers. For example, in 2066 supplementary, 35 marks question can be asked but in practicality only 5 marks question was asked. It showed that evaluation scheme chart was not followed by the question setter in any year question papers in any unit. This indicates that the 'general linguistics' question papers lack content validity according to the evaluation scheme chart.

3. It has been found that the 'general linguistics' question papers have high content validity in terms of the coverage or representativeness of the course contents and low content validity in terms of evaluation scheme chart in the syllabus.

4. According to the representation of the course contents it can be argued that the 'general linguistics' question papers have measured what they have been supposed to measure in the testees because it represented 71.56 percent course items.



5. In terms of content coverage, no test contents represent all the course contents. Some questions cover more language items some questions cover less language items.
6. The researcher has also found some repeated items during two years in four question papers for e.g. 'What is stress' in 2065 supplementary was same as 2066 supplementary to some extent in marks. Such repetition of the same test item encourage guessing, reduces content converge and such test items exert harmful washback effect, and reduce content validity.
7. The researcher has found that some test items are guided by the principle of testing; what the testees do not know rather than what the testees know. For example, the test item "Describe the major word formation process" was repeated in three question papers exactly. Repetition of such ready made test items time and again terrorizes the students on the one hand and encourages guessing and learning by heart on the other.
8. According to the weightage of the evaluation scheme charts, this course has not tested what has been supposed to measure in the testees because it is not strictly followed the procedure if it is follow it will not be beneficial because there are many options in the sense that many questions can be asked but not asked in real sense. It gives dilemma to the students then how can they prepare the language items and score good marks.
9. The researcher has found that in some units more marks is allocated but in some unit less marks is allocated, for example in 2066 supplementary from unit one 35 marks and unit seven only 5 marks. After that, such norm or trend can not cover all the language items and some items were left in the question paper. Therefore, that trend reduces content validity and it gets harmful washback effect.

10 The researcher has found that there is not given exact weightage for each unit, the priority is same for all units but in question papers some units have over weightage (i.e. 35 marks in one question paper) but some units have under weightage ( i.e. 5 marks in one question paper) in the same paper .

11. The researcher has found that there are many choices items, students prepare some units and do not prepare other what they think it will easy, then there is not obligation to prepare all units to achieve all objectives which are expected to fulfill after examination.

## **4.2 Recommendations**

The researcher has made some recommendations on the basis of the data analyzed and the findings of the research work listed in the previous sub-chapter as below.

1. The researcher has found that the content representativeness of general linguistics question papers is 71.56 percent. Some items are left out. Therefore, to get high content validity, the question paper designers should ensure more than 90 percent content representation as far as possible.
2. It has been found that the general linguistics question papers have not followed the evaluation scheme chart specified in the syllabus. Therefore, the weightage scheme of the course can not maintain 100 percent. The test designers should take it into consideration.
3. It has been found that some units and language items were neglected and some others were over emphasized while designing the question papers. Therefore, the test constructors should give equal emphasis on all the units and language items.

4. Many test items were repeated in four question papers. Such repetition encourages guessing and reduces content validity. Therefore, repetition of the same items time and again should not be made.
5. Though there should be fixed criteria about how many and what types of test items to be asked but in practically it is not followed therefore, the test designer should follow the evaluation scheme chart exactly.
6. There is necessary to give fix weightage to each unit only then it can be beneficial for question setters.
7. If possible, choice should not be given to the testees in answering the test items if it is to be given, less number of choices should be given and more importantly the given choices should be prepared from the same unit.
8. The test item should be moderated before administering to the targeted testees.
9. If feasible, test items should be piloted and individual items should be analyzed in terms of problems in administration and scoring.
10. There are given five long questions, three short questions and six short notes. They may not be sufficient to represent the course objectives. So, if possible, more items should be included in the test, reducing the weighting of long questions to ten marks, short questions to six or seven and short notes three to four marks.
11. If possible, objective questions should be prepared for the sake of content coverage.

12. To get a test high content validity, the question designers have to have minute study the course objectives, course contents and evaluation scheme chart before constructing the question papers. Trained and highly experienced teachers have to be assigned to construct the question papers.
13. The higher secondary examination board, HSEB has sole authority in conducting examination. It should play a significant role in improving tests by providing training to the question designers.

## References

- Bachman, L.F. (1990). *Fundamental of languages testing*. London: OUP.
- Batala K.B. (2004). *Validation of the S.L.C English examination question paper*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal .
- Bhattarai , A. (2001) Writing a research proposal. *Journal of NELTA*, 6, 45-51.
- Bhattarai, G.R. (2000). *A Thematic Analysis of Research Reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Bhattarai, J. (2005) *The content validity of compulsory English textbook for grade Eight*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis , Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal .
- Brown, D. (1994) . *Principle of language learning and teaching*. London: Longman.
- C.D.C, H.S.E.B. New Syllabus. (2007). Bhaktapur.
- Crystal, D (1971). *Linguistics*. Harmond Sworth: Penguin.
- Davies, A (1990) *Principle of languages testing*. Oxford. Basic Blackwell.
- Davies, A. (1968) *Language testing symposium: a psycholinguistics approach*. London: OUP.
- Hamal, R. (2007). *Content validity of general English test items of B. Ed. level : A Case of reading and writing*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis , Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal .
- Harris , P.D. (1969). *Testing English as a second language*. New Delhi: McGraw Hill publishing company Ltd. India offset press.
- Harrison, A. (1991). *A languages Testing handbook*. Longman: ELTS.

Heaton, J.B. (1975). *Writing English languages tests*. London: Longman Group limited.

<http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/thinkknowledge/wiki/contentvalidity>

<http://www.britannica.com/ebechecked/topic134762contentvalidity>

<http://www.burns.com/webcontentvalidity.htm>

Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teacher*. Cambridge: CUP.

Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. London: Penguin.

Khaniya, T.R. (2000). Washback. Emerging validity. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol. 5, p. 31-35.

Khaniya, T.R. (2005). *Examination for enhanced learning*. Lalitpur: Millennium Publication.

Khatri, R. (2007), *Content validity of translation : Theory and practice*. Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. Delhi: Pearson Education.

Lado, R. (1961). *Language testing: The construction and use of foreign languages tests*. London: Longman.

Nepal, P. (2006) *Content validity of example examinant: A case of fundamental of languages and linguistics and B. Ed. level*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Neupane J. (2005). *The content validity of English textbook for Grade seven*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in language learning*. Cambridge: CUP

- Ojha, D.R. (2005). *Content validity of ELT Theories and methods exam at B. Ed. Level*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal .
- Oller, J.W.JR (1979), *Language tests at school: A pragmatic Approach*, London: long man.
- Richards, J. et.al (1999). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex: Longman.
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York: Harcourt.
- Subedi, R. (2006) *Content validity of B. Ed. Question: A case of English sounds and structures (302)*. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal .
- Van, EK J. (1975). *The threshold level*. London: Council of Europe.
- Weir , C. (1998) . *Communicative languages testing*. UK: Prentice Hall.
- Yadava, Y.P. (2000). *Linguistics: A basic course*. Kiritpur: New Hira books

## APPENDIX I

### Check List

#### Course Content Representation

Unit	Course contents	Test contents			
		2065	2065 Supplementary	2066	2066 Supplementary
<b>Unit 1</b>	Language and Linguistics				
1.1	Why study language?				
1.2	Definition of language				
1.3	characteristics of human language and animal communication				
<b>1.4</b>	Levels of language: phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic				
1.5	Definition of linguistics: the				



	Scientific study of language				
1.6	Branches of linguistics				
1.6.1	Theoretical linguistics				
1.6.2	Applied linguistics				
<b>1.6.3</b>	Synchronic and diachronic linguistics				
<b>1.6.4</b>	Psycholinguistics				
<b>1.6.5</b>	Socio linguistics				
<b>1.7</b>	Basic assumptions about language and modern linguistics				
<b>1.7.1</b>	All languages have a grammar				
<b>1.7.2</b>	All languages and grammars are equal				
<b>1.7.3</b>	Grammars are alike in basic ways				

<b>1.7.4</b>	Speech is primary and writing secondary				
<b>1.7.5</b>	Linguistics is descriptive, not prescriptive				
<b>1.7.6</b>	change is natural for a language				
<b>Unit 2</b>	Phonetics and Phonology				
<b>2.1</b>	Definition of phonetics				
<b>2.2</b>	Branches of phonetics				
<b>2.2.1</b>	Articulator phonetics				
<b>2.2.2</b>	Auditory phonetics				
<b>2.2.3</b>	Acoustic phonetics				
<b>2.3</b>	production of speech				
<b>2.4</b>	Description and classification of				

	sounds: vowels, consonants , semi- vowels and diphthongs				
<b>2.5</b>	Syllable and syllable structure				
<b>2.6</b>	Stress				
<b>2.7</b>	Tone and intonation				
<b>2.8</b>	Definition of phonology, phonology versus phonetics				
<b>2.9</b>	Phones, phonemes and allophones				
<b>2.10</b>	General introduction to IPA Chart				
<b>3</b>	<b>Morphology</b>				
<b>3.1</b>	Morphology: the study of word				
<b>3.2</b>	Definition of word				
<b>3.3</b>	word structure:				

	root, stem and affix				
<b>3.4</b>	Morphs, morpheme and allomorph				
<b>3.5</b>	Types of morphemes: free and bond				
<b>3.6</b>	Types of affix: (a) prefix, infix, suffix and superafix				
<b>3.7</b>	Types of affix : (b) inflectional and derivational				
<b>3.8</b>	Major processes of word formation : (a) Affixation (b) reduplication (c) compounding (d) shortening (e) Blending (f) Borrowing (g) Acronym				

	(h) coinage  ( i) Back formation				
<b>3.9</b>	Major morphophonemic process				
<b>4</b>	<b>syntax</b>				
<b>4.1</b>	Syntax: the study of sentence structure				
<b>4.2</b>	Syntactic categories				
<b>4.2.1</b>	Criteria for identifying syntactic categories: meaning, inflection and distribution				
<b>4.2.2</b>	Types of syntactic categories				
<b>I</b>	Word level categories such as lexical categories; noun, verb,				

	adjective, adposition, adverb and non-lexical categories such as determiner, degree words, qualifier, auxiliary and conjunction.				
<b>II</b>	Phrase-level categories: noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase, appositional phrase, adverbial phrase				
<b>4.3</b>	Basic sentence patterns and transformations (question, passive, negation)				
<b>4.4</b>	subordination and transformations (complementation, gelatinization adverbial clauses)				
<b>4.5</b>	Coordination				

<b>4.6</b>	Grammatical functions: subject, object (direct and indirect) complement, adjunct (manner, time, place)				
<b>5</b>	<b>Semantics and pragmatics</b>				
<b>5.1</b>	Definition of semantics				
<b>5.2</b>	Semantic relations among words				
<b>5.2.1</b>	Synonymy				
<b>5.2.2</b>	Antonym				
<b>5.2.3</b>	Hyponymy				
<b>5.2.4</b>	Homonymy, homography and homophony				
<b>5.2.5</b>	Polysemy				
<b>5.3</b>	Semantic relation involving sentences				

<b>5.3.1</b>	Paraphrase				
<b>5.3.2</b>	Entailment				
<b>5.3.3</b>	Contradiction				
<b>5.4</b>	types of meaning				
<b>5.4.1</b>	Lexical				
<b>5.4.2</b>	Grammatical				
<b>5.4.3</b>	contextual				
<b>5.5</b>	thematic roles; agent, instrument, experience, source, location possessor, patient/ object, benefactive				
<b>5.6</b>	pragmatics: the study of meaning in context				
<b>5.7</b>	presupposition				
<b>5.8</b>	Context				
<b>5.8.1</b>	Setting ( physical context)				
<b>5.8.2</b>	Discourse				



<b>a</b>	old and new information				
<b>b</b>	topic and comment				
<b>5.9</b>	meaning and discourse				
<b>5.9.1</b>	Cohesion				
<b>5.9.2</b>	Coherence				
<b>5.9.3</b>	Discourse strategies				
<b>6</b>	<b>Historical linguistics</b>				
<b>6.1.</b>	Historical linguistics: the study of language change				
<b>6.2</b>	The nature of language change				
<b>6.3</b>	different types of language change				
<b>6.3.1</b>	Sound change				
<b>6.3.2</b>	Morphological change				

<b>6.3.3</b>	Syntactic change				
<b>6.3.4</b>	Lexical and semantic change				
<b>6.4</b>	introduction to the classification of languages				
<b>6.4.1</b>	Genetic classification				
<b>6.4.2</b>	Typological classification				
<b>6.4.3</b>	Areal classification				
<b>7</b>	<b>History of linguistics</b>				
<b>7.1</b>	Sanskrit tradition and contribution of Sanskrit Gramamr Pratishakhya, Yaska, Panini, and Bhartrihari				
<b>7.2</b>	Contribution of Greek and Romans				

<b>7.3</b>	19 <sup>th</sup> century historical comparative linguistics				
<b>7.4</b>	Modern linguistics: contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, Halliday Chomsky				
<b>7.5</b>	Development of linguistics in Nepal: Contribution of native and foreign linguistics				

## **APPENDIX III**

### **Linguistics**

#### **Grade XI**

##### **Paper I: General linguistics**

**Full Marks 100**

**Teaching hours 150**

#### **1. Introduction**

This course is designed to provide students with understanding and knowledge the fundamental principles of general linguistics . It deals with the sound structures morphological structure, sentence structure, semantic structure, pragmatic structures as well ass the evolution of language.

#### **2. General Objectives**

On completion on this course, the students will be able to understand the structure of language a t various levels: Phonological, Morphological, syntax semantic, pragmatic as well as the historical aspects of language.

#### **3. Specific objectives**

Upon completion of this course, the students will be able to:

- a. Express the nature ad structure of language
- b. discuss the aims and scope of linguistics;
- c. describe the sound structures of language:
- d. analyze how words are formed;

- e. explain the organization of words in sentence;
- f. analyze the role of linguistics and extra linguistics factors interpreting meaning language.
- g. Describe and explain language change; and
- h. Discuss the development of linguistics as a discipline.

#### **4.Course**

Unit	Course topics	Teaching hours
Unit 1	Language and linguistics	15
Unit 2	Phonetics and phonology	25
Unit 3	Morphology	25
Unit 4	Syntax	25
Unit 5	Semantics and pragmatics	25
Unit 6	Historical linguistics	15
Unit 7	History of linguistics	20
Total		150

#### **Course contents**

##### **Unit 1 : Language and linguistics (15 teaching hrs.)**

- 1.1 Why study language ?
- 1.2 Definition of language
- 1.3 characteristics of human language and animal communication
- 1.4 Levels of language: phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic
- 1.5 Definition of linguistics: the Scientific study of language
- 1.6 Branches of linguistics
  - 1.6.1 Theoretical linguistics
  - 1.6.2 Applied linguistics
  - 1.6.3 Synchronic and diachronic linguistics
  - 1.6.4 Psycholinguistics
  - 1.6.5 Socio linguistics
- 1.7 Basic assumptions about language and modern linguistics
  - 1.7.1 All languages have a grammar
  - 1.7.2 All languages and grammars are equal
  - 1.7.3 Grammas are alike in basic ways
  - 1.7.4 Speech is primary and writing secondary
  - 1.7.5 Linguistics is descriptive, not prescriptive
  - 1.7.6 change is natural for a language

## **Unit 2 : Phonetics and phonology (Teaching 25 hrs.)**

- 2.1 Definition of phonetics
- 2.2 Branches of phonetics
  - 2.2.1 Articulator phonetics
  - 2.2.2 Auditory phonetics
  - 2.2.3 Acoustic phonetics
- 2.3 production of speech
- 2.4 Description and classification of sounds: vowels, consonants , semi-vowels and diphthongs
- 2.5 Syllable and syllable structure
- 2.6 Stress
- 2.7 Tone and intonation
- 2.8 Definition of phonology, phonology versus phonetics
- 2.9 Phones, phonemes and allophones
- 2.10 General introduction to IPA Chart

## **Unit 3 : Morphology (25Teaching hrs.)**

- 3.1 Definition of word
- 3.2 Morphology: the study of word
- 3.3 word structure: root, stem and affix
- 3.4 Morphs, morpheme and allomorph

3.5 Types of morphemes: free and bond

3.6 Types of affix: (a) prefix, infix, suffix and superfix

3.7 Types of affix : (b) inflectional and derivational

3.8 Major processes of word formation : (a) Affixation (b) reduplication (c) compounding (d) shortening (e) Blending (f) Borrowing (g) Acronym (h) coinage (i) Back formation

3.9 Major morphophonemic process

#### **Unit 4 : syntax ( 25 teaching hrs)**

4.1 Syntax: the study of sentence structure

4.2 Syntactic categories

4.2.1 Criteria for identifying syntactic categories: meaning, inflection and distribution

4.2.2 Types of syntactic categories

i. Word level categories such as lexical categories; noun, verb, adjective, adposition, adverb and non-lexical categories such as determiner, degree words, qualifier, auxiliary and conjunction.

ii. Phrase- level categories: noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase, appositional phrase, adverbial phrase

4.3 Basic sentence patterns and transformations (question, passive, negation)

4.4 \ subordination and transformations ( complementation, gelatinization adverbial clauses)



4.5 Coordination

4.6 Grammatical functions: subject, object ( direct and indirect) complement, adjunct ( manner, time, place)

### **Unit 5 : Semantics and pragmatics (25 teaching hrs)**

5.1 Definition of semantics

5.2 Semantic relations among words

5.2.1 Synonymy

5.2.2 Antonym

5.2.3 Hyponymy

5.2.4 Homonymy, homography and homophony

5.2.5 Polysemy

5.3 Semantic relation involving sentences

5.3.1 Paraphrase

5.3.2 Entailment

5.3.3 Contradiction

5.4 types of meaning

5.4.1 Lexical

5.4.2 Grammatical

5.4.3 contextual

5.5 thematic roles; agent, instrument, experience, source, location possessor, patient/ object, benefactive

5.6 pragmatics: the study of meaning in context

5.7 presupposition

5.8 context

5.8.1 Setting ( physical context)

5.8.2 Discourse

a. old and new information

b. topic and comment

5.9 meaning and discourse

5.9.1 Cohesion

5.9.2 Coherence

5.9.3 Discourse strategies

## **Unit 6 : Historical linguistics (15 Teaching hrs)**

6.1 Historical linguistics: the study of language change

6.2 The nature of language change

6.3 different types of language change

6.3.1 Sound change

6.3.2 Morphological change

6.3.3 syntactic change

6.3.4 Lexical and semantic change

6.4 introduction to the classification of languages

6.4.1 Genetic classification

6.4.2 Typological classification

6.4.3 Areal classification

**Unit 7 : History of linguistics (20 teaching hrs)**

7.1 Sanskrit tradition and contribution of Sanskrit Gramamr Pratishakhya,  
Yaska, Panini, and Bhartrihari

7.2 Contribution of Greek and Romans

7.3 19<sup>th</sup> century historical comparative linguistics

7.4 Modern linguistics: contribution of Saussure, Bloomfield, holiday Chomsky

7.5 Development of linguistics in Nepal: Contribution of native foreign  
linguistics

6. Textbook ( TO be prepared by a team of linguistics)

## Reference Books

- Bandu, C.M. 2053 VS. Bhasha Vigyan, Kathamndu: Sajha Prakashan.
- Ransakar, T.R. 1998. A course in English Phonetics. Delhi: Macmillan .
- Pokharel, M.P. 2064 ( Nepali Dhoni Vynjana ra Nepal ko Bhasa ka Parichaya.  
Kathmandu: Bhuripuran Prakashan.
- Syal, P. & D.V. Jindal. 1998. An introduction to linguistics language Grammar  
and semantics. New Delhi: Prentice hall of India.
- Yadava, Y.P. 2000. Linguistics: A Basci Course. Kirtpur: New Hira Books
- Yadava, Y.P. and B.N. Regmi. 2004. Bhasha Vigyan. Kathmandu: New Hira  
books.
- Yule, G. 1996. The study of language. Cambridge University press .

## Evaluation scheme

8.1 There will be a questions paper carrying 100 marks for hours duration to evaluate the knowledge of the students.

8.2 Questions will be structured as follows:

### Checklist

- a. long answer to 4 questions;
- b. short answer to 2 out of 3 questions;
- c. short notes to 4 out of 6 questions; and
- d. Question number 7 is compulsory. Students are required to attempt other 4 questions

Question can be set from all the units of the course as follows

Unit No.	Teaching hours	Topics	Long questions (20)	Short Questions (10)	(Short Notes (5))
1	15	Language and linguistics	1	1	1
2	25	Phonetics and phonology	1	1	1
3	25	Morphology	1	1	1

4	25	Syntax	1	1	1
5	25	Semantics and pragmatics	-	1	1
6	15	Historical linguistics	1	1	1
7	20	History of linguistics	1	1	1

## Appendix-II

HSEB-GRAD XI

Sub. Code: 180

2065 (2008)

## Linguistics

विद्यार्थीहरूले सकेसम्म आफ्नै शब्दमा उत्तर दिनुपर्नेछ । दायाँ किनारामा दिइएको अङ्कले पूर्णाङ्क जनाउँदछ ।

Candidates are required to give their answer in their own words as far as practicable. The figure in the margin indicates full marks.

Full marks: 100

Time: 3 hrs. Pass Marks:35

कुनै पाँच प्रश्नको उत्तर दिनुहोस् । प्रश्न ६ र ७ अनिवार्य छन् । सबै प्रश्न समान अङ्कका छन् ।

Attempt any five questions, Questions 6 and 7 are compulsory. The questions are of equal value.

१. व्यवस्थाहरूको व्यवस्थाका रूपा भाषाको चर्चा गर्दै मानवीय सञ्चार प्रक्रियाको वर्णन गर्नुहोस् ।

Describe language as a system of systems and the human communication system.

२. भाषाहरूको वर्गीकरण के के हुन, सोदाहरण छलफल गर्नुहोस् ।

What are the classification of language ? explain with examples ?

३. वर्णहरूको निर्धारण कसरी गरिन्छ ? स्पष्ट गर्नुहोस्

How are phonemes identified ? Explain .

४. आधारभूत वाक्य भनाले के बुझिन्छ ? सोदाहरण छलफल गर्नुहोस् ।

What do you understand by the term basic sentences ? explain them with examples.

५. शब्दका अर्थगत सम्बन्ध बारे सोदाहरण वर्णन गर्नुहोस् ।

Describe the lexical relations with examples.

६. कुनै दुई प्रश्नको उत्तर दिनुहोस् । (Answer any two of the following questions)

(क) समाज भाषा विज्ञानको क्षेत्र के हो ?

what is the scope of sociolinguistics ?

contd...

(ख) अक्षर संरचना भनेको के हो ?

what is syllabus structures ?

(ग) व्युत्पादन र रूपायन प्रक्रिया भन्नाले के बुझिन्छ ?

what do you understand by inflectional and derivational processes ?

७. कुनै चार विषयमा संक्षिप्त टिप्पणी लेख्नुहोस् ।

Write short notes on any four

(क) मनोभाषाविज्ञान ( Psycholinguistics)

(ख) वार्णिक आलिखन ( Phonemic Transcription)

(ग) बद्धरूप ( Bound Morpheme )

(घ) व्याकरणिक कार्य ( Grammatical Function )

(ङ) सान्दर्भिक अर्थ (Contextual Meaning)

(च) चोमस्की (Chomsky)



HSEB-GRAD XI

Supplementary Examination

Sub. Code: 180

2065 (2008)

Linguistics

विद्यार्थीहरूले सकेसम्म आफ्नै शब्दमा उत्तर दिनुपर्नेछ । दायाँ किनारामा दिइएको अङ्कले पूर्णाङ्क जनाउँदछ ।

Candidates are required to give their answer in their own words as far as practicable. The figure in the margin indicate full marks.

Full marks: 100

Time: 3 hrs. Pass Marks:35

कुनै पाँच प्रश्नको उत्तर दिनुहोस् । सबै प्रश्न समान अङ्कका छन् ।

Attempt any five questions. Question 6 and 7 are compulsory. The questions are of equal value.

१. भाषाको परिभाषा दिई यसका कुनै पाँच विशेषतहरूको वर्णन गर्नुहो ।

Define language and describe any five of its characteristics.

२. आधुनिक भाषा विज्ञानका योगदानहरू के के हुन्

What are the contributions of modern linguistics ?

३. वर्ण भनेको के हो ? वर्णहरूको पहिचान गर्ने आधार के के हुन् ?

What is a phoneme ? what are the principles for identifying phonemes ?

४. शब्द निर्माणका विभिन्न प्रकारहरू के के हुन् ? सोदाहरण चर्चा गर्नुहोस् ।

What are the various ways of word formation? Discuss them with examples

५. अर्थ भनेको के हो ? यसका कति प्रकार हुन् ? प्रष्ट गर्नुहोस् ।

what is meaning ? what are different types of meaning ? explain them.

६. कुनै दुई प्रश्नको उत्तर दिनुहोस् । (Answer any two questions)

(कक) मनोभाषा विज्ञानको क्षेत्र के हो ?

what is the scope of psycholinguistics ?

(ख) बालघात भनेको के हो ?

contd...

what is stress ?

(ग) प्राथमिक र गौण व्याकरणिक कोटि कुन कुन हुन ?

what are the primary and secondary Grammatical categories ?

७. कुनै चार विषयमा संक्षिप्त टिप्पणी लेख्नुहोस् ।

Write short notes on any four

(क) प्रायोगिक भाषा विज्ञान ( applied linguistics)

(ख) स्वरध्वनि ( Vowel sound )

(ग) संरूप ( Allo-morphs)

(घ) समानार्थकता ( Synonymy)

(ङ) संकथन ( Discourse)

(च) ध्वनिपरिवर्तन (sounds change)