# CHAPTER ONE
# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 General Background

Language is a means of communication. Though human beings and animals can exchange their ideas, emotions and thought among the member of the same species through other means like tactile, gustatory, olfactory system of communication, these means of communication are less discussed in comparison to oral-aural communication.

Language has been studied from the time immemorial. It had been a subject of study to Plato and Aristotle. But language had been studied unscientifically for centuries. Saussure, the father of modern linguistics, set up a foundation to study language scientifically after his posthumous publication of "Course De Linguistique Generale". The whole of the recent history of linguistics can be described in terms of successive discoveries to view language. Language is the unique property of human beings. It is the system communication, which consists of the composite form of different units such as sounds, morphemes, words, phrases, sentences and so on, which are related to each other in a systematic way. Language is the means of communication, which enables us to establish relationship with different people in different situations.

Language is the most effective means of human communication. It is common to only human beings. It is the most unique gift that sets them distinct from the rest of other living beings, i.e. animals. Over the past century or more, language has come to be studied exclusively, and different points of view have arisen from which it can be observed. As Gleason says, "language has so many inter-relationships with various aspects of human life that it can be studied from numerous points of view. All are valid and useful, as well as interesting in themselves" (cited in Rajimwale 2001, p2).

This states that language is linked with a number of disciplines like literature, culture, psychology, information technology, science, anthropology, linguistics, and language teaching and many more. Moreover, "language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols which permit all people in a given culture; or other people who have learned the system of that culture, to communicate or to interact" (Widdowson, 1988, p3). Therefore, language is used as a vehicle to transmit ideas from person to person and generation-to-generation helping society to march forward. The supreme importance of language is in its use as a tool- a vehicle of expression, 'a means through which interaction between human beings takes place.'

English is the most vital means for any person to become successful in local, national and international communication. As the world is getting more and more complex day by day, because of the invention of science and technology, the importance of English is crucial. Undoubtedly, English is the means of international communication and major world language. Thus, we are in such a stage that we must know English if we want to know the world.

### 1.1.1 Language and Communication

Language is a means of communication. Thus, the function of language is to communicate. Language is used in a community for various communicative needs. It is through the magic of language humans are able to establish relationship with people from various backgrounds and in different circumstances.

For a long period in the history of language, there had been a very strong interest in the field analysis of formal properties of language. In the 1950s and 1960s, the structural linguists like Hockett, Sapir and transformation linguists made their studies emphasizing on discovering some of the abstract principles that lie at the very core of language. But sociolinguists' main attempt was to

describe the linguistic properties in relation to social factors like social status, class, educational level, age, sex and geographical situation of language users. Hymes and very few others would include the detailed study of interpersonal communication.

Every thing changes in course of time. In the same way, the primitive system of human face-to-face communication has changed into a very complex system viz. electronic communication, i.e. radio, television, films, etc and print devices, i.e. books, manuals, newspapers, magazines, brochures, banners, etc.

Pragmatics, one of the branches of linguistics, has emerged as a new insight in the field of language teaching/learning. This has added a milestone to the wall of the language teaching and learning process. Language cannot be used isolating it from the context or the situation where it is being used. Teaching or learning of a language is one of the functional or the communicative activities rather than a routined–activity that can be studied, memorized and recited or said.

 Therefore, this research has tried to find out the use of appropriateness of English for communicative functions and their relation to the context they are being used in the process of teaching and learning, especially by language instructors in different private and commercial language institutes in the Kathmandu valley.

### 1.1.2 History of English Language Teaching in Nepal

Considering the undeniable fact that English occupies the greatest coverage in the world's linguistic arena, Nepal is at present also spending a lot of time, money and efforts to teach this language to its people. Different speculations have been made to find out when English Language teaching (ELT) was actually started in Nepal. It is said to have been spoken for the first time during

the Prime Ministership of 'Bhimsen Thapa'. British Government opened "Gorkha Bharti Kendra" (Gorkha Recruitment Center) during his Prime Ministership. Nepalese people, during that period, were attracted by the high salary and living standard of the British soldiers. Thus, they were instrumentally motivated towards English.

In the context of Nepal, by establishing 'Durbar High School' in 1954 (1910 BS), Janga Bahadur Rana sowed the seeds of the English Language. Since then, teaching and learning of English started formally. This very first English medium school was established immediately after PM Janga Bahadur Rana returned from Britain to give formal education to his children and to the children of other ruling class Rana families. The learning of English was confined only to the children of Rana, not for the children of common people at that time. The Rana put that school under their own grip as their treasure for about thirty years. Then the school was shifted to 'Ranipokhari' from 'Dakhchowk'. Then, the children of other high class families also got opportunity to study there. Gradually, the door was opened for the common people to learn English there. Only then, no social class was confined to that school. Therefore, the sole credit for introducing English in Nepal goes to Janga Bahadur Rana as he was the founder of that school in Nepal.

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

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

In recent years, English is given a great importance in the education system of Nepal. At present, it is thought as a compulsory subject from Grade 1 to Bachelor's level in government aided schools and colleges. On the other hand, English is found to be broadly used and taught from Nursery to Bachelor's level in private schools and colleges in our country. The English language is taught informally all over the country in various private language institutes. Similarly, British Council provides the students the opportunity to test their English Language proficiency offering internationally accepted testing measures, such as, IELTS. Therefore, there is no doubt that the English language has gained an important place in both governmental and non-governmental institutes in Nepal.

### 1.1.3 Introduction to Communicative Functions

The new insight concerning what makes the communicative competence of a language learner provided the basis for what is now called communicative as well as functional approach to language teaching. It is also known as the communicative methodology. This organizes language-teaching syllabus by reference to language function. The syllabus contents are arranged in term of functions of speech act together with the exponents needed for them.

A function in language refers to the purpose to which an utterance or unit of language is based. Such functions are often described as category of behaviour.

For example, requesting, apologizing, complaining, offering, greeting, etc. The functional use of language cannot be attained simply by studying the grammatical structures of sentences. It also requires the awareness of the purposes for which the sentences are used. For example, a sentence in imperative form may perform a variety of different functions. The same form may function in different ways. For example:

1   Give me that pen. (Order)
2   Pass me that salt please. (Request)
3   Turn right at the corner. (Instruction)
4   Try the fried potatoes. (Suggestion)
5   Come round on Saturday. (Invitation)

Malinoswki asserts that language is dependent on the society where it is used. Therefore, it is not a self-content system. Moreover, it is involved to meet the demands of any given society. And its use in that society is entirely depended on the context. The meaning comes, as he says, not from a passive contemplation of the word but from analysis of its function with reference to the culture.

Although the tradition to look at language from functional point of view dates back to the period of Malinoswki, it continued in the time of J. R. Firth and MAK Halliday later on. It is only recently that a lot of emphasis has been given on communicative functions of language. Many writers and materials producers have suggested that they should form a basis for language learning syllabus rather than the traditional grammatical items. It has been suggested that traditional syllabuses and materials failed to teach the use of language: what they seemed to be doing was teaching grammar of the language without giving students the knowledge of its practical use, what we call its communicative function.

Different writers have analyzed communicative function into different sets of categories. Halliday, for example, presents the following three broad categories.

1. The ideational function,
2. Interpersonal function,
3. The textual function,

Likewise, Wilkins (1973) lists the following eight functions:

1. Modality,
2. Moral discipline and evaluation,
3. Suasion,
4. Argument,
5. Relational inquiry and exposition,
6. Personal emotions,
7. Emotional relations,
8. Interpersonal relations

Similarly, Van Ek (1975) distinguishes six main functions of communication as follows:

1. Imparting and seeking factual information,
2. Expressing and finding out intellectual attitude,
3. Expressing and finding out emotional attitude,
4. Expressing and finding out moral attitude,
5. Getting things done,
6. Socializing

In the same way Finochiaro (1983) groups communicative functions into the following five broad categories.

1. Personal,
2. Interpersonal,
3. Directive,
4. Referential,
5. Imaginative,

In the 1970s a new approach to study the meaning of linguistic forms appeared. The pragmatic approach to study language accounts all the social factors that are involved along with the real utterances produced. Pragmatics, as a newly emerged branch of linguistics, is the study of actual use of language to express meaning. The actual use of language can be seen when two or more people are interacting with each other. The language they use conveys the message intended and the linguistic expression they involve.

**1.1.4 Common Forms and Functions of Language**

There can be different kinds of language forms and those forms represent different language functions

**I.** Three Basic Functions are generally noted: there is perhaps nothing more subtle than language is, and nothing has as many different uses.

**A.** Without a doubt, identifying just these three basic functions is an oversimplification, but an awareness of these functions is a good introduction to the complexity of language.

**B.** The **Functions of Language** (*i.e.,* its purpose; what it does; its uses)

i. **Informative language function:** essentially, the communication of information.

   a. The informative function affirms or denies propositions, as in science or the statement of a fact.

   b. This function is used to describe the world or reason about it (*e.g*.., whether a state of affairs has occurred or not or what might have led to it).

c. These sentences have a truth value; that is, the sentences are either true or false   (recognizing, of course, that we might not know what that truth value is).  Hence, they are important for logic.

ii. **Expressive language function:** reports feelings or attitudes of the writer (or speaker), or of the subject, or evokes feelings in the reader (or listener).

a. Poetry and literature are among the best examples, but much of, perhaps most of, ordinary language discourse is the expression of emotions, feelings or attitudes.

b. Two main aspects of this function are generally noted: (1) evoking certain feelings and (2) expressing feelings.

c. Expressive discourse is best regarded as neither true nor false. E.g., Shakespeare's King Lear's lament, "Ripeness is all!" or Dickens' "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom; it was the age of foolishness…" Even so, the "logic" of "fictional statements" is an interesting area of inquiry.

iii. **Directive language function:** language used for the purpose of causing (or preventing) overt action.

a. The directive function is most commonly found in commands and requests.

b. Directive language is not normally considered true or false (although various logics of commands have been developed).

c. Example of this function: "Close the windows."  The sentence "You're smoking in a nonsmoking area,"  although declarative, can be used to mean "Do not smoke in this area."

**II.** It is rare for discourse just to serve only one function; even in a scientific treatise, discursive (logical) clarity is required, but, at the same time, ease of expression often demands some presentation of attitude or feeling—otherwise the work might be dull.

**A.** Most ordinary kinds of discourse is mixed. Consider the following example. Suppose you want your listeners to contribute to the Multiple Sclerosis Society.

**B. There are several possible approaches**

1. Explain the recent breakthroughs in the scientist's understanding of the disease (informative) and then ask for a contribution (directive).

2. Make a moving appeal (expressive) and then ask for a contribution (directive).

3. Command it (directive).

4. Explain the good results (informative), make a moving appeal (expressive), and then ask (directive).

5. Generally speaking, step 3 (specifically stating that which is desired as outcome) is the least effective means. Usually, just making a moving appeal is the most effective for the general population; explaining the recent research is the most effective for an educated audience. Asking for the contribution is often not necessary, since the prospective contributor surmises this step.

**C**. Several other uses of language deserve mention.

1. The **ceremonial**--(also ritual language use) probably something quite different from simply mixing the expressive and directive language functions

because performative aspects are included as well. Example: "Dearly beloved, we are gathered here together to witness the holy matrimony of …."

2. **Performative utterances**: language which performs the action it reports. For example, "I do" in the marriage ceremony and the use of performative verbs such as "accept," "apologize," "congratulate," and "promise." These words denote an action which is performed by using the verb in the first person—nothing more need be done to accomplish the action.

3. **Phatic** language: "Elevator talk" and street-corner conversations accomplishing a social task.  Note the subtle transition from vocal behavior to body language from saying for example, "Hi" or "How are your?" to a nod or a wave of the hand.

4. Most of the examples we have been talking about are not merely of academic interest, even though we cannot take time out to trace the far reaching consequences. (*E.g.*,  in law, when a speaker is charged "with inciting to riot," the prosecution must maintain he was using the directive language function, while the defense will probably argue that the speaker was only expressing his feelings. Also, performative utterances are not normally subject to hearsay rules since they imply an action taken.)

**III**. The **Forms of Language** (types of sentences) and the dangers of identifying form with function in the use of language.

A. Much discourse serves all three functions--one cannot always identify the form with the function. Consider this chart for the following possibilities. But note that context often determines the purpose of an utterance.  "The room is cool" might be used in different contexts as informative (an observation), expressive (how one feels at the moment), or directive (to turn on the heat).

| Sentence Type | Informative | Expressive | Directive |
|---|---|---|---|
| assertion / *declarative* | The room is cool. | I had a nice time. | I would like some coffee. |
| question / *interrogative* | But isn't this room 222A? | Isn't that great? | Don't you want to help me? |
| command / *imperative* / | Read pages 1-10 for the test. | Have a nice day. | Shut the windows. |
| exclamation / *exclamatory* | The universe is bounded! | I'm really glad! | It's late! |

B. The importance of the differentiation of functions is shown by recognizing that the correct evaluation of a passage requires knowledge of the functions relevant to the situational context.

1. A person who says to the waiter, "I would like a cup of coffee," is not just reporting a psychological state of affairs. *I.e.*, it would be inappropriate for the waiter to respond with, "Speaking of things one would like, I'd rather have a BMW."

2. Other things being equal, a biology text is predominately informative, a novel is predominately expressive, but a logic or mathematics text is mostly directive.

### 1.1.5 Communicative Competence

The term communicative competence was coined by an American sociolinguist Hymes (1972, in Khaniya, 2005, p25), who defined "communicative competence" as "the intuitive mastery that the native speaker possesses to use and interpret language appropriately in the process of interaction and in relation to social context."

Hyme's "communicative competence" is different from chomsky's "Linguistic Competence" which is confined to internalized rules of syntax. Chomsky's notion of linguistic competence does not include social rules of language use,

which is very crucial in Hyme's notion of communicative competence. It should be noted that both the notions give adequate importance to linguistic competence but Hymes gives sufficient focus on the social and cultural meanings that are associated with utterances. The argument is that without being able to appreciate the social and cultural meanings of an utterance, effective communication cannot take place, no matter how competent some one is in terms of linguistic competence.

"Communicative Competence" was later developed by Canale and Swain (1980) and revised by Canale (1983), which distinguishes communicative competence from communicative performance, which is the realization of these competencies and their interaction in the actual production and comprehension of utterances. This model was highly accepted. The Canale and Swain (1980 and 1983) model includes following four competencies:

**Grammatical Competence:** It is concerned with the knowledge of formal system of language, which involves the knowledge of lexical items and rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar, semantics and phonology.

**Sociolinguistic Competence**: It is concerned with the knowledge of appropriateness of utterances within the sociolinguistic context.

**Discourage Competence**: It is concerned with the knowledge of processing language beyond sentence level in different modes. It is generally related with cohesion and coherence.

**Strategic Competence**: It is concerned with verbal-nonverbal strategies for effective communication.

Sthapit's (2000) model of "Communicative Competence" broadly involves the following three components:

**The Extended Linguistic Competence**: It involves both linguistic competence and discourse competence.

**The extra-linguistic Competence**: It captures the non-verbal behaviour system that is used as an integral part of communication, i.e., haptics, aculesics, proxemics, kinesics, olfacties, chronemics etc.

**Pragmatic Competence/Language Sensitivity**: It involves the ability to use language appropriately in a given situation. It is the language user's ability to assess the context of communication as a whole, which includes sensitivity and knowledge of the environment.

Based on the categories that are introduced by different scholars, which are discussed above, this study will be based on the model of Van Ek (1975) with the six main functions of communication because:

1 It keeps the learning load as short as possible. The forms, which serve more than one purposes (i.e. which can be used for more than one language functions) are selected,

2 The total sets of exponents selected become as coherent and balanced as possible. This applies to the coverage of semantic fields by the lexical items as well as consistently of the total grammatical context,

3 The instructor will be expected to play the more neutral, social and psychological roles. This means the exponents selected are to be socially and psychologically unmarked exponents of informality, formality must be avoided,

4 The instructor will have to be able to understand more than they can produce.

### 1.1.6 Introduction to Language Institutes

Generally the term language institutes refer to the educational institutes where different languages are taught. Language institutes can be categorized in two types: The one is formal institute where university has provided its approval and the learners, along with the communicative skills in the language in question, are provided with the globally accepted degrees of different levels like, Diploma, Masters and so.

There is another category of language institutes, which are registered in the office of company registrar, under the rules and regulations of the Company Act. As they are also a kind of educational institutes, their registration in the concerned DEO of their area is made obligatory by the Ministry of Education of Nepal Government. Specially, those language institutes are opened with the aim of assisting people for developing functional or communicative skill of a particular language. But in a general sense they are developing as commercial language institutes for the purpose of profit making. Students under such institutes are classified under different categories like elementary, intermediate and advance, by administering appropriate tests. They are given courses developed for different levels.

This research work will focus on the 2nd type of language institutes as mentioned above, which are in the Kathmandu Valley.

### 1.1.7 Language Instructors

Language instructors, in this research work, are the teachers with different levels of study from any recognized universities (e.g. Intermediate, Bachelor's, Master's and so on), who have studied The English language and developed their competency in the same.
They are selected by the principal of the concerned language institute on the basis of their academic qualification, experience, performance in an interview

and a written test. The instructors are responsible for developing expected communicative skills in their learners remaining within the periphery of the time determined and developed in advance.

So far as the course of the language instruction is concerned, it is either copied or down-loaded from the English language learning web sites, developed by some experts of the concerned language or simply developed by the English language instructor of the concerned commercial language institute.

## 1.2 Review of Related Literature

A very few studies have been carried out on language related to language institutes. It is quite a new field of study in our context. Some works and researchers related to this topic in some ways are reviewed here.

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

Sharma (2006) on "Mother Tongue Use in English Classroom" concludes that limited and judicious use of the mother tongue in the English classroom does not reduce students' exposure to English, but rather can assist in the teaching and learning processes. But it should be noted that excessive and more frequent use of mother tongue is counter-productive…the use of mother tongue should be less encouraged. Total prohibition of mother tongue in an English classroom will certainly deprive the students of certain opportunities to learn more and better.

Dahal (2007) has made an attempt to analyze errors carrying out a study on "Analysis of Errors in Tense Used by the Basic Learners in Language Institutes"

with the finding that most of the basic learners use simple present tense more frequently with major mistakes in subject- verb agreement.

Khanal (2008) on the Effectiveness of Communicative Method in Teaching Vocabulary emphasized the contextual use of language and vocabulary. Similarly Paudel (2008) on his study "Teaching of Communicative Functions: An Analysis of Classroom Activities " emphasized on improving teaching communicative skills in classroom to make the learning more fruitful and productive.

A comparative study on Language Functions for Seeking Information and Confirmation in English and Nepali (Adhikari, 2007) identifies the utterances and their functions of both languages.

The researchers have tried to study the use of language in a different field, but no further studies on language instructors have been carried out yet, particularly on language instructors related to private and commercial language institutes.

## 1.3 Objectives of the study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1 To identify the use of communicative functions performed by language instructors in English language classes,

2 To classify them under different categories in terms of the classification of Van Ek(1975)  as follow:

   i.Imparting and seeking factual information,

   ii.Expressing and finding out intellectual attitude,

   iii.Expressing and finding out emotional attitude,

   iv.Expressing and finding out moral attitude,

   v.Getting things done,

   vi.Socializing, and

3 To suggest some pedagogical implications.

## 1.4 Significance of the study

The findings of the study will be beneficial to the students, teachers, syllabus designers and the critical mass that are involved in teaching and learning language. Specifically, this study will be directly or indirectly useful to the persons who are interested in teaching or learning the use of communicative functions.

# CHAPTER TWO
# METHODOLOGY

The researcher adopted the following methodological framework to accomplish the objectives of the study.

## 2.1 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data have been used to carry out the research work.

## 2.1.1Primary Sources of Data

The primary data for this study have been collected through the direct class observations, recorded on checklists, and the spoken discourse is recorded by the tape recorder. For that, the researcher visited different private and commercial language institutes of the Kathmandu valley and observed the language classes, recorded all the teaching learning activities including communicative functions used by the instructors. The teachers were also given short questionnaires for required information.

## 2.1.2Secondary Source of Data

Related published materials e.g. articles, books, journals, seminar papers and related and useful websites have been taken as secondary sources of data.

## 2.2 Sample of the Study and Sampling Procedure

The sample of the study consists of 20 language instructors from ten different commercial language institutes of the Katmandu valley. Ten Language institutes were selected randomly. Some of the Language Institutes, where the study was carried out were as follows.

Career Training Foundation, Bagbazar, etc.

Educational Training Institutes, Bagbazar,

Oxford.edu, New Baneshor,

Quick Language Center, Bagbazar,

Xavier Institute, Bagbazar,

## 2.3 Tools for Data Collection

The researcher visited the different above-mentioned types of language institutes and collected the required data through direct class observation, using sets of questionnaire, recorder and checklist.

## 2.4 Process of Data Collection

After preparing the questionnaires and checklist the researcher visited the selected institutes, established the rapport with the institutes- owner, and clarified the purpose of visiting to them. Then the researcher met the English Language Instructors and handed over the questionnaires to them. After that he developed the rapport with the purpose and randomly selected the required number of instructors. The researcher distributed questionnaires, explained briefly what they were supposed to do. Then he collected the questionnaire, thanked the respondents, and left the classes. For the purpose of observation, the researcher went to the selected institutes and observed the classes. He observed six classes of instructors without informing the instructors in advance so that he could find the regular classroom environment and could collect the authentic data. But as soon as the instructors got noticed of the researcher's presence they became aware.

## 2.5 Limitations of the Study

The Study had the following limitations:

1. The study was limited to 10 institutes in the Kathmandu valley only.
2. The population of the study comprised 20 English instructors only,
3. The study focused only on the English Language,
4. The study was limited to identifying communicative functions used only.
5. The study was limited to only on the use of communicative functions of English language.

# CHAPTER THREE

# ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with different aspects of teaching techniques and methods regarding language teaching at language institutes. First it presents the data in a tabular form and interprets the data. It includes the information related to language teachers' education, their experiences, training, and types of exponents they used during classroom teaching. Data received from both questionnaires and observation forms are presented in the following sections.

## 3.1 Status of instructors in terms of experience and education

The following table presents the academic status of the instructors who were involved in language teaching. For the very purpose of data collection the researcher made direct visit to different institutions.

Table no. 1

**Status of Instructor**

| S.N | Academic Qualification | | Total | Experience | | Total | Specialization | | Total |
|-----|------------------------|-------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|-------|----------------|--------------|-------|
| | Bachelor (+) | Bachelor (-) | | Less than 2yrs | more than 2yrs | | Eng | Non-Eng | |
| 1 | 13 | 7 | 20 | 9 | 11 | 20 | 14 | 6 | 20 |

The above table shows the status of the instructors. Total numbers of instructors were 20. Among them 13 were with the academic qualification of Bachelor (+) degree whereas 7 had not passed bachelor degree. Likewise, 9 instructors had less than 2 years experience and 11 had more than 2 years experience. Among 2o instructors, 14 were found specialized in English and 6 in non-English. Language teachers /instructors' performance regarding the use of language was observed for six days.

## 3.2 Language functions performed by instructors

### 3.2.1 Imparting and Seeking Factual Information

During the period of collecting data I found the instructors making use of Imparting and Seeking Factual Information on the following ways:

Table no. 2

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Identifying | 9 | 27 | 21 |
| 2. | Reporting | 8 | 16 | 13 |
| 3. | Including | 10 | 20 | 16 |
| 4. | Describing | 20 | 100 | 83 |
| 5. | Narrating | 6 | 12 | 10 |
| 6. | Correcting | 4 | 16 | 13 |
| 7. | Asking | 19 | 76 | 63 |
| | **Total/Average** | ----- | ----- | 31.2% |

1. I will describe a person and you will have to identify who that person is.
2. One of you needs to report me the daily tasks you performed.
3. Write a few sentences about yourself including your early child hood.
4. We need to describe that house, its interior and its exterior.
5. I heard them narrating on the topic we discussed yesterday.
6. Did you finish the task I gave you?

The survey of 20 instructors for 6 days on **Imparting and Seeking Factual Information** is shown in the above data. Among all, the most used language function was found to be *describing* which was used by all 20 instructors for 5 days i.e. (83%), the second most used was found as *asking* that is 19 instructors

used it for 4 days i.e. (63%) and the least used language function was found to be *narrating* used by 6 instructors for 2 days i.e. (10%), *Reporting and correcting* was also not used a lot. R*eporting* was used by 8 instructors for 2 days and *correcting* was used by 4 instructors for 4 days i.e. (13%), *including* was used by 10 instructors for 2 days i.e.(16%) and *identifying* was used by 9 instructors for 3 days i.e.(21%). In the average imparting and seeking factual information showed 31.2 % result.

### 3.2.2 Expressing and Finding out Intellectual Attitude

Similar to the Imparting and Seeking Factual Information instructors even used Expressing and Finding out Intellectual Attitude on the following ways;

Table no. 3

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Agreement | 4 | 16 | 13 |
| 2. | Disagreement | 8 | 16 | 13 |
| 3. | Capability | 6 | 12 | 10 |
| 4. | Incapability | 10 | 20 | 16 |
| 5. | Denying | 12 | 36 | 30 |
| 6. | Inquiring | 14 | 42 | 35 |
| 7. | Offering | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | **Total/Average** | --------- | ------- | 16.8% |

1 You all should sign an agreement paper before starting your job.

2 He showed disagreement to the things I proposed.

3 All people have their own capability of doing work. Like wise, you too have your own.

4   It is not that it is his incapability; he is feeling lazy.

5   Some people have the habit of denying the things others say.

The survey on **Expressing and Finding out Intellectual Attitude** is shown in the above data. Among all the above language functions, the most used language function was found to be *Inquiring,* which was used by 14 instructors for 3 days i.e. (35%), the second most used was found to be *denying* that is 12 instructors used it for 3 days i.e. (30%) and the least used language function was found to be *offering* used by 2 instructors for 1 day i.e. (1%). *Agreement and disagreement* was also not used a lot. *Agreement* was used by 4 instructors for 4 days and *disagreement* was used by 8 instructors for 2 days i.e. (13%), *capability* was used by 6 Instructors for 2 days i.e. (10%) and *incapability* was used by 10 instructors for 2 days i.e. (16%). In the average *expressing and finding out intellectual attitude* showed 16.8% result.

### 3.2.3 Expressing and Finding out Emotional Attitude

The table below shows the frequencies of instructors using language functions of Expressing and Finding out Emotional Attitude. They used the language function as;

Table no. 4

| S.N. | Language guy | No of Instructors | Frequency | percentage |
|------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Expressing and inquiring about pleasure | 3 | 9 | 7.5 |
| 2. | Expressing and inquiring about liking | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 3. | Expressing and inquiring about surprise | 1 | 2 | 1 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Expressing and inquiring about hope | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 5. | Expressing and inquiring about satisfaction | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| 6. | Expressing and inquiring about disappointment | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 7. | Expressing and inquiring about fear | ------ | -------- | --------- |
| 8. | Expressing and inquiring about worry | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 9. | Expressing and inquiring about preference | 4 | 16 | 13 |
| 10. | Expressing and inquiring about want/desire | 13 | 39 | 32.5 |
| | **Total/Average** | --------- | -------- | 5.9% |

1  I am very happy to see you all passing the exams with good grades.
2  I am surprised to hear that Ram, the smallest guy in the class, is already married.
3  Don't you guys want to go for picnic?

The survey on Expressing and Finding out Emotional Attitude is shown in the above data. Among all the above language functions, expressing and inquiring about want/desire was done most, that is, 13 instructors did it for 3 days i.e. (32.5%), the second most done was expressing and inquiring about preference i.e. 4 instructors did it for 4 days i.e. (13%). expressing and inquiring about pleasure was done by 3 instructors for 3 days i.e. (7.5%), expressing and inquiring about liking was done by 4 Instructors for 1 day i.e. (2%) and expressing and inquiring about worry was done by 2 instructors for 4 days i.e.

(2%). expressing and inquiring about hope & expressing and inquiring about disappointment was done by 1 instructor for 1 days i.e. (0.5%) each. And expressing and inquiring about satisfaction & expressing and inquiring about fear was not done by any of the instructors. In average, expressing and finding out emotional attitude showed 5.9% result.

### 3.2.4 Expressing and Finding out Moral Attitude

The instructors expressed and found out the moral attitude as shown in the table. And the ways of using them were as follow;

1   I am sorry for the delay on the timetable.
2   I feel bad for calling you soon and not arriving on time.

The observed data on expressing and finding moral attitudes are tabulated as given

Table no. 5

| S.N. | Language Function | No of instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Apologizing | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| 2. | Granting forgiveness | 9 | 9 | 9.5 |
| 3. | Expressing approval and disapproval | 2 | 8 | 9 |
| 4. | Expressing appreciation | 4 | 12 | 10 |
| 5. | Expressing regret | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| | **Total/Average** | ------- | --------- | 7.4% |

The survey on **Expressing and Finding out Moral Attitude** is shown in the above data. Among all the above language functions, the most used language

function was found to be expressing appreciation which was used by 4 instructors for 3 days i.e. (10%), the second most used was found to be granting forgiveness that is 9 instructors using it for 1 day i.e. (9.5%) and the least used language function was found to be expressing regret used by 1 instructor for 1 day i.e. (0.5%). Expressing approval and disapproval was used by 2 instructors for 4 days i.e. (9%) and apologizing was used by 5 instructors for 2 days i.e. (8%). In the average expressing and finding out moral attitude showed 7.4% result.

### 3.2.5 Getting things done

The exponents used by the instructors were, for examples, as given.

1   Sir, could you please pass me that hand book?
2   Why don't you go to the store yourself?
3   I am warning you not to go out of this compound until the class ends.

Table no. 6

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Suggesting a course of action | 12 | 48 | 40 |
| 2. | Requesting | 17 | 68 | 56 |
| 3. | Inviting | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 4. | Advising other | 3 | 12 | 10 |
| 5. | Warning | 8 | 24 | 20 |
| | **Total/Average** | --------- | ------- | 24% |

The survey on **getting things done** is shown in the above data. Among all the above language functions, the most used language function was found to be *requesting* which was used by 17 instructors for 4 days i.e. (56%), second most

used was found to be *suggesting a course of action* that is 12 instructors used it for 4 days i.e. (40%) and least used language function was found to be *inviting* which was  used by 2 instructors for 2 days i.e. (2%). W*arning* was used by 8 instructors for 3 days i.e. (20%) and *advising other* was used by 3 instructors for 4 days i.e. (10%). In the average getting things done showed 24% result.

**3.2.6 Socializing**

Examples of sentences used:-

Good morning sir, long time no see.

I am leaving now, I will see you tomorrow.

Table no. 7

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Greeting | 12 | 48 | 40 |
| 2. | Meeting people | 8 | 32 | 26 |
| 3. | Leave taking | 6 | 24 | 20 |
| | **Total/Average** | ------------- | ---------- | 28.6% |

The survey on **Socializing** is shown in the above data. Among all the above Language functions the most used language function was found to be *greeting* which was used by 12 instructors for 4 days i.e. (40%), the second most used was found to be *meeting people* that is 8 instructors used it for 4 days i.e. (26%) and the least used language function was found to be *leave taking* which was *used* by 6 instructors for 4 days i.e. (20%). In the average socializing showed 28.6% result.

### 3.3 Situational use of Language Function

Situational use of language function, hence, in this study, tries to identify whether the expression produced by the instructors were contextualized or not. Using the language functions, i.e. communicative activities, as given the role stranger/stranger or communicative activities between, for example, patient/doctor, etc are well observed and the collected data are tabulated as below.

### 3. 3.1 Social Roles

Table no. 8

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | stranger/stranger | ------------- | ----------- | ------------- |
| 2. | friend/friend | 16 | 80 | 66 |
| 3. | private person/official | 8 | 24 | 20 |
| 4. | patient/doctor | ---------- | ------ | -------- |
| | **Total/Average** | ------- | --------- | 21.5% |

The survey on **Situational use of Language Functions** is shown in the above data on **Social Roles**. From the above data it was found that situational use of language function was done mostly in between *friend/friend* by 16 instructors in 5 days i.e. (66%), secondly it was done in between private *person/official* by 8 instructors in 3 days i.e. (20%). Language function was not found to have been used in between patient/doctor and stranger/stranger. In average, social roles showed 21.5% result.

## 3. 3.2 Psychological Roles

Table no. 9

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Neutrality | 10 | 30 | 25 |
| 2. | Equality | 15 | 75 | 62 |
| 3. | Sympathy | 9 | 27 | 21 |
| 4. | Antipathy | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| 5. | Caring | 3 | 9 | 7.5 |
| 6. | Insulting | 7 | 28 | 21.5 |
| 7. | Helping | 12 | 36 | 30 |
| | **Total/Average** | ------- | --------- | 23.9% |

The survey on 'Situational Use of Language Function' is shown in the above data on **Psychological Roles**. From the above data, it was found that most played role was of equality that was played by 15 instructors for 5 days i.e. (62%), helping was the second mostly played role that is it was played by 12 instructors for 3 days i.e. (30%), 10 instructors in 3 days i.e. (25%) played the role of neutrality, insulting was done by 7 instructors in 4 days i.e. (21.5%), 9 instructors in 3 days i.e. (21%) showed sympathy, 3 instructors in 3 days i.e. (7.5%) showed care and antipathy was not done by any of the instructors. In the average psychological roles showed 23.9% result.

### 3. 3.3 Indoor Setting

Table no. 10

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Room | 5 | 10 | 8 |
| 2. | Kitchen | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| 3. | Library | 6 | 24 | 20 |
| 4. | Class | 13 | 52 | 43 |
| 5. | Corridor | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| | **Total/Average** | ------- | --------- | 14.2% |

The survey on **Situational use of Language Function** is shown in the above data on **Indoor Setting**. From the above data it was found that situational use of language function was done most in *class* by 13 instructors in 4 days i.e. (43%), secondly it was done in *library* by 6 instructors in 4 days i.e. (20%). Language function was used in a *room* by 5 instructors for 2 days i.e. (8%). Language function was found not to be used in *kitchen* and *corridor*. In average the indoor setting showed 14.2% result.

### 3. 3.4 Surroundings/ Outdoor Setting

Table no. 11

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Human | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| 2. | Family | 5 | 30 | 25 |
| 3. | Friends | 9 | 45 | 37.5 |

| S.N. | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Acquaintances | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| 5. | Stranger | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| 6. | Park | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 7. | Street | 4 | 8 | 6 |
| 8. | Seaside | ------ | ------- | ------- |
| | **Total/Average** | ------- | --------- | 8.9% |

From the above data it was found that situational use of language function on the surrounding /out door was found to be very low i.e. 8.9%. 9 instructors used situational functions for 5 days among their friends, which seemed to be the highest rate i.e. 37.5%. 5 Instructors used it for 6 days among their family i.e. 25%. Language function was used in the street by 4 instructors for 2 days i.e. 6%. Like wise, 2 instructors used it for 2 days in the park i.e. 3%. Situational language function was supposed to be used in other places too but it was not used.

**3. 3.5 Workplace**

Table no. 12

| S.N. | Language Function | No          of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Office | 14 | 56 | 46 |
| 2. | Field | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 3. | Road | 4 | 12 | 10 |
| 4. | Worksite | 10 | 30 | 25 |
| | **Total/Average** | ------- | --------- | 21% |

The survey on **Situational use of Language Function** is shown in the above data on **Work Place.** From the above data it was found that situational use of

language function was done most in *office* by 14 instructors in 4 days i.e. (46%), secondly it was done in *worksite by 10 instruc*tors in 3 days i.e. (25%). Language function was used in a *room* by 4 instructors for 3 days i.e. (8%). Language function was found to be the least used in the field by 2 instructors for 2 days i.e. (3%). In the average indoor setting showed 21% result.

### 3.3.6 Mood/Emotions

Table no. 13

| S.N. | Language Function | No of Instructors | Frequency | Percentage |
|------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1. | Peace | 9 | 27 | 25.5 |
| 2. | Moderate | 13 | 52 | 43 |
| 3. | Horrified | 6 | 12 | 10 |
| 4. | Normal place | 12 | 60 | 50 |
| | **Total/Average** | ------ | ------- | 23.9% |

In different places, in different mood and in different emotions people use different languages. From the above data obtained from the survey it was found that situational language function was used most in the *normal place,* that is, 12 instructors used it for 5 days, which is the maximum rate i.e. 50%. Secondly, it was used in *moderate* place by 13 instructors for 4 days i.e. 43%. In *peace* places, it was used by 9 instructors for 3 days i.e. 25.5%, in *horrified* place it was least used by 6 instructors for 2 days i.e. 10%. In average, situational use of language function depending upon the mood and emotion showed 23.9% result.

## 3.4 Summary of the data of Language function

Table no. 14

| S.N | Language Function | Percentage | S.N | Situational use/ Roles | Percentage |
|-----|-------------------|------------|-----|------------------------|------------|
| 1. | Imparting and Seeking Factual Information | 31.2% | 1. | Social role | 21.5% |
| 2. | Expressing and Finding out Intellectual Attitude | 16.8% | 2. | Psychological roles | 23.9% |
| 3. | Expressing and Finding out Emotional Attitude | 5.9% | 3. | Indoor setting | 14.2% |
| 4. | Expressing and Finding out Moral Attitude | 7.4% | 4. | Surroundings/ Outdoor Setting | 8.3% |
| 5. | Getting things done | 24% | 5. | Workplace | 21% |
| 6. | Socializing | 29% | 6. | Mood/Emotions | 23.9% |
| | Average | 19.05% | | Average | 18.8% |

Table no. 14 shows the average percentage of the Instructors using different language functions and number of instructors making situational use of language functions. The survey was done for 6 days with 20 instructors. From the observation, the above data was obtained. Most used language function was found to be imparting and seeking factual information which is a quite a positive result but not as much as it should be. The factual information is the must for learning or teaching. We should have the fact information on the things we are dealing with. Socializing showed the second result, which is also not so satisfactory. Humans are the social animals. They should learn to be social and should interact in a society. But now-a-days, people are being selfish. They only think of themselves; instructors also did the same. Getting things done showed

the third result, which is not satisfactory. A few instructors used the language function of expressing and finding out factual information for a few days. Like wise, expressing and finding out moral attitude also showed low result. The poorest result was found to be of expressing and finding out moral attitude. The people do not show their emotional attitude towards any one, so the result might have come poor.

Similarly, the situational use of language function also showed the poor result. The situational use of language function was maximum according to the mood/emotion but according to the psychological roles it can not be said so well. Anyway, it is satisfactory. Situational use of language function was done in social role and work place in the average level. Indoor setting also showed poor result. The instructors did not use the language function much in indoor setting. In the surroundings/ outdoor setting the language function was not used much, instructors must have used the situational language function in outdoor and surrounding but they did not do so.

## 3.5 Instructors' teaching activities and their language competence

Out of 20 language instructors 13 were found graduate and the remaining 7 were under graduate. Among them 11 were found to have more than 2 years of experience whereas a few of them had recently started language teaching or had less than 2 years experience. On the basis of their academic qualification and professional experience the competence and performance upon the use of language teaching activities and preparation, i.e. Use of role play, focus on content, text selection, language testing, prioritizing language skills, etc (See appendix-3) were compared and examined in the study. The following table indicates the performance of the teachers during their teaching activities as per given.

Table no. 15

| 1. | Instructors' teaching activities and competence according to qualification | | | | | | | | |
|----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| S.N | Questions | Bachelors (+)/13 | | | | Bachelors (-)/7 | | | |
| | | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d |
| 1. | Use of role play | 31 | 15 | 7 | 46 | 28 | 14 | 28 | 28 |
| 2. | Focus on contents | 15 | 46 | 7 | 31 | 14 | 28 | 28 | 14 |
| 3. | Curriculum/ Text selection/ development | 46 | 15 | 31 | 23 | 14 | 14 | 28 | 43 |
| 4. | Testing student's performance | 38 | 15 | 23 | 23 | 43 | 14 | 14 | 28 |
| 5. | Classifying the lesson | 7 | 38 | 31 | 23 | 14 | 28 | 14 | 43 |
| 6. | Prioritizing language skills | 7 | 31 | 38 | 23 | 28 | 14 | 3 | 14 |
| 7. | Determining lessons | 46 | 15 | 38 | 15 | 43 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 8. | Following Curriculum | 46 | 7 | 31 | 15 | 71 | -- | 28 | -- |

*Note: The given numbers and alternatives represent the answer and performance of the teachers during their classroom observation, (See appendix-3), were coded as given.*

**1.**
**a)** daily/ very frequently
**b)** Once/ twice a week
**c)** Sometimes
**d)** never
**2.**
**a)** Vocabulary
**b)** Grammatical items
**c)** Structures
**d)** Communicative activities
**3.**
Directors
a) Instructors/ teachers
b) Students and teachers
**c)** Ready made textbook recommendation
**4.**
a) Writing exam
**b)** Speaking
c) Role playing

**d)** Through assignment

**5.**
a) Language function
b) Grammar based
c) Vocabulary based
d) Essay topic based

**6.**
**a)** Listening
**b)** Speaking
**c)** Reading
**d)** Writing

**7.**
a) With the help of book
**b)** Speaking
**c)** Reading
**d)** Writing

**8.**
a) Yes
**b)** No
c) Sometimes
**d)** Never

From the above table no 15, it was found that more instructors were there with Bachelors (+) degree. There details are given below.

Thirty one percent of them used role-play frequently, 15% of them used it once or twice a week and 14% sometimes or never used the role-play in language teaching.

Similarly, 15% of them focused on vocabulary of the content, 46% on grammatical item, 7% on structures and 31% of them focused on the communicative activities in language teaching.

Here, it was found that 38% tested the students through written exam, 15% by speaking, 23 % by the way of role playing and through assignment. Seven percent classified the lesson according to language function, 38% based on grammar, 31% based on vocabulary and 23% based on the essay topic. Seven percent prioritized listening, 31% speaking, 38% reading and 23% focused on

writing. Forty six percent determined the lesson with the help of book, 15% through speaking, 38% through reading and 15% through writing. Forty six per cent followed the curriculum regularly, 7% did not follow the curriculum, 31% sometimes followed the curriculum and 15% never followed the curriculum. Like wise, from the above table we can also see that 7 of the instructors had bachelor (-) degree, whose details are given below.

Twenty eight percent of them used role-play frequently, 14% of them used it once or twice a week and 28% sometimes or never used the role-play in language teaching. Similarly, 14% of them focused on vocabulary of the content, 28% on grammatical item and on structure and 14% of them focused on the communicative activities of the language teaching. Likewise, 14% followed the instruction of the director to give rise to the curriculum/text selection/development, 14% followed the instructions of teachers, 28% developed it with the help of interaction between students and teachers and 43% followed the ready made text book.

Here 43% tested the students through written exam, 14% by speaking and by the way of role-playing and 28%through assignment. Fourteen percent classified the lesson according to language function and based on vocabulary, 28% based on grammar, and 43% classified it based on the essay topic. Twenty eight percent preferred listening, 14% speaking and writing, 43% prioritized reading. Forty three percent determined the lesson with the help of book, 14% through speaking, reading and through writing. Seventy one percent followed the curriculum regularly, 28% sometimes followed the curriculum, and rest of them never followed the curriculum.

Table no. 16

| 2. | Instructors' teaching activities and competence according to experience | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S.N | Questions | Less than 2yrs/9 | | | | More than 2yrs/11 | | | |
| | | a | b | c | d | a | b | c | d |
| 1. | Use of role play | 22 | 11 | 44 | 11 | 27 | 22 | 36 | 22 |
| 2. | Focus on contents | 33 | 33 | 22 | 11 | 22 | 36 | 22 | 27 |
| 3. | Curriculum/ Text selection/ development | 33 | 22 | 33 | 11 | 22 | 22 | 45 | 22 |
| 4. | Testing student's performance | 44 | 22 | 11 | 22 | 27 | 36 | 22 | 22 |
| 5. | Classifying the lesson | 22 | 44 | 11 | 22 | 36 | 22 | 27 | 22 |
| 6. | Prioritizing language skills | 22 | 33 | 33 | 11 | 27 | 36 | 22 | 22 |
| 7. | Determining lessons | 33 | 11 | 44 | 11 | 45 | 22 | 27 | 9 |
| 8. | Following Curriculum | 66 | 11 | 22 | -- | 64 | 14 | 22 | -- |

*Note: The given numbers in table no. 16 are presented in percentage.*

From the above table no 16 it was found that there were 9 instructors with less than 2 years experience. There details are given below.

Twenty two percent of them used role-play frequently, 11% of them used it once or twice a week or never used the role-play and 44% sometimes used it in language teaching. Similarly, 33% of them focused on vocabulary of the content and grammatical item, 22% on structure and 11% of them focused on the communicative activities of the language teaching.

Likewise, 33% followed the instruction of the director to give rise to the curriculum/text selection/development, 22% followed the instruction of teachers, 33% developed it with the help of interaction between students and teachers and 11% followed the ready-made textbook.

Here, 44% tested the students through written exam, 22% by speaking, 11% by the way of role playing and 22% through assignment.     Twenty two percent classified the lesson according to language function, 44% based on grammar, 11% based on vocabulary and 22% based on the essay topic. Twenty two percent prioritized listening, 33% speaking, 44% reading and 11% focused on writing. Thirty three percent determined the lesson with the help of book, 11% through speaking, 44% through reading and 11% through writing. Sixty six percent followed the curriculum regularly, 11% did not follow the curriculum, 22% sometimes followed the curriculum and none of the rest of them ever followed the curriculum.

From the above table it was also found that there were 11 instructors with more than 2 years experience. Their details are given below.

Twenty seven percent of them used role-play frequently, 22% of them used it once or twice a week or never used the role-play and 36% sometimes used the same in language teaching. Similarly; 22% of them focused on vocabulary of the content and 36% on grammatical item, 22% focused on structure and 27% of them focused on the communicative activities of the language teaching. Like wise, 22% followed the instruction of the director to give rise to the curriculum/text selection/development, 22% followed the instruction of teachers, 45% developed it with the help of interaction between students and teachers and 22% followed the ready made text book.

Here, 27% tested the students through written exam, 36% by speaking, 22% by the way of role playing and 22% through assignment. Thirty six percent classified the lesson according to language function, 22% based on grammar, 27% based on vocabulary and 22% based on the essay topic. Twenty seven percent preferred listening, 36% speaking, 22% reading and 22% writing. Forty five percent determined the lesson with the help of book, 22% through speaking, 27% through reading and 9% through writing. Out of 11 experienced

instructors, 64% followed the curriculum regularly. Twenty two percent in both groups did not follow the curriculum whereas rest of them never followed the curriculum.

Table no. 17

| 3 | Instructors' teaching activities and competence according to specialization | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S.N | Questions | Eng/(14) | | | | Non- Eng/(6) | | | |
| | | a | b | c | d | a | b | C | d |
| 1. | Use of role play | 28 | 36 | 14 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 3 | 16 |
| 2. | Focus on contents | 36 | 28 | 21 | 7 | 16 | 50 | 16 | 16 |
| 3. | Curriculum/ Text selection/ development | 14 | 14 | 43 | 28 | 33 | 33 | -- | 33 |
| 4. | Testing student's performance | 28 | 14 | 36 | 21 | 50 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 5. | Classifying the lesson | 28 | 21 | 28 | 21 | 16 | 33 | 33 | 16 |
| 6. | Prioritizing language skills | 28 | 28 | 28 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 33 | 33 |
| 7. | Determining lessons | 43 | 14 | 28 | 14 | 33 | 16 | 33 | 16 |
| 8. | Following Curriculum | 64 | -- | 36 | -- | 50 | -- | 50 | -- |

*Note: The given numbers in table no. 17 are presented in percentage.*

From the above table no.17, it was found that 14 instructors were specialized in English. Their details are given below.

Twenty eight percent of them used role-play frequently, 36% of them used it once or twice a week or never used the role-play and 14% sometimes used it in language teaching.

Similarly, 36% of them focused on vocabulary of the content and 28% on grammatical item, 28% focused on structure and 7% of them focused on the communicative activities of language teaching.

Like wise, 14% followed the instruction of the director to give rise to the curriculum/text selection/development, 14% followed the instruction of teachers, 43% developed it with the help of interaction between students and teachers and 28% followed the ready made text book.

Here, 28% tested the students through written exam, 14% by speaking, 36% by the way of role playing and 21% through assignment.

Twenty eight percent classified the lesson according to language function, 21% based on grammar, 28% based on vocabulary and 21% based on the essay topic. Twenty eight percent prioritized listening, 28% speaking, 28% reading and 14% writing. Forty three percent determined the lesson with the help of book, 14% through speaking, 28% through reading and 14% through writing. Sixty four percent followed the curriculum regularly, 36% of them were found to be following the same occasionally.

From the above table it was also found that there were 6 instructors specialized in non-English. Their details are given below.

Sixteen percent of them used role play frequently, 16% of them used it once or twice a week or never used the role play and 3% sometimes used the same in language teaching.

Similarly, 16% of them focused on vocabulary of the content and 50% on grammatical items whereas 16% focused on structure and 16% of them focused on the communicative activities of the language teaching. Likewise, 33% followed the instruction of the director to give rise to the curriculum/text selection/development, 33% followed the instruction of teachers, none of them developed it with the help of interaction between students and teachers and 33% followed the ready made text book.

Here, 50% of them tested the students through written exam, 16% by speaking, 16 % by the way of role playing and 16% through assignment. Sixteen percent classified the lesson according to language function, 33% based on grammar, 33% based on vocabulary and 16% based on the essay topic. Sixteen percent prioritized listening, 16% speaking, 33% reading and 33% of the instructors were found with the main focus on writing. 33% of them determined the lesson with the help of book, 16% through speaking, 33% through reading and 16% through writing. Fifty percent followed the curriculum regularly, 50% sometimes followed the curriculum and none of them ever neglected it.

# CHAPTER FOUR
## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1 Findings

The findings of this study are derived from analysis and interpretation. The findings are made on the basis of observation and the checklists and questionnaires.   The main findings of this research work can be summarized in the following points.

1   Language exponents that represent different language functions or different kind of communicative functions are found in use in the research. As language functions categorized by Van Ek (1975) it is found that 31.2% instructors used language function related to Imparting and Seeking Factual Information (e.g., Write a few sentences about yourself including your early child hood, One of you needs to report me the daily tasks you performed, Did you finish the task I gave you? etc). Similarly, 16.8% for Expressing and finding out Intellectual Attitude (e.g., You all should sign an agreement paper before starting your job, It is not that it is his incapability, He is feeling lazy, All people have their own capability of doing work. Like wise, you too have your own, etc), 5.09% for Expressing and Finding out Emotional Attitude (e.g., I am very happy to see you all passing the exams with good grades, Don't you guys want to go for picnic?, I am surprised to hear that Ram, the smallest guy in the class, is already married, etc), 7.4% for Expressing and Finding out Moral Attitude (e.g., I am sorry for the delay on the timetable, I feel bad for calling you soon and not arriving on time, etc.), 24% for Getting Things Done (e.g., Sir, could you please pass me that hand book?, Why don't you go to the store yourself?, I am warning you not to go out of this compound until the class ends, etc.) and 29% for Socializing (e.g., Good morning sir, long time no see, I am leaving now, I will see you tomorrow,

etc.) were found respective language exponents used during classroom language teaching process in the language institutes of the Kathmandu valley.

2   Language exponents that are used were not contextually used in most of the cases. Only 18.08% exponents used by instructors were contextually and appropriately used.

3   As per language functions performed by the language instructors in classroom teaching, out of different language functions and its categorical functions in average, 19.05% language functions, i.e. representative exponents performed in language teaching were found in the study.

4   Only 7% of the instructors focused on the communicative activities of language teaching.

5   Most of the language institutes arrange language instruction without syllabus, course books and proper classrooms. The condition suggests that very few of the institutes have knowledge about language teaching methodology.

6   Situational use of language function on the surrounding /out door was found to be very low i.e. 8.3%. Situational language function was supposed to be used in the other places too but it was not used.

7   Communicative functions of language are partly used by the instructors of the commercial language institutes of Kathmandu valley while instructing English language.  Among various communicative functions of the language these two 'socializing and imparting and seeking factual information' were more frequently used than the other communicative functions.

8   It is proven that most of errors have been committed due to inadequate knowledge and experience on the part of the language instructors. In the time of interview, most of them accepted their insufficient knowledge about the subject matter to be instructed.

9   Among all the language function of imparting and seeking factual information most used language function was found to be describing which was used by all 20 instructors for 5 days i.e. (83%), in the average imparting and seeking factual information showed 31.2 % result.

10  The most used language function on expressing and finding out intellectual attitude was found to be describing which was used by 14 instructors for 3 days i.e. (35%), least used language function was found to be offering used by 2 instructors for 1 days i.e. (1%). In the average expressing and finding out intellectual attitude showed 16.8% result.

11  Among all language functions of expressing and finding out emotional attitude expressing and inquiring about want/desire was performed most. In the average expressing and finding out emotional attitude showed 16.8% result.

12  The most used language function on getting things done was found to be requesting which was used   (56%).   In the average getting things done showed 24% result.

13  The survey on 'Socializing' showed that, among all the language function the most used language function was found to be greeting which was used i.e. (40%), and the least used language function was found to be leave taking . In the average socializing showed 28.6% result.

14  The survey on 'Situational use of Language Function' on Social Roles showed that the situational use of language function was done mostly in between friend/friend   (66%), social roles showed 28.6% result in the average.

15  The survey on 'Situational use of Language Function' on Work Place showed that the use of language function was done most in office by 46% of the instructors.

## 4.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations have been made on the basis of these findings. The findings of this study have the following pedagogical implications.

1. The language instructors need teacher-training programme on Language Teaching for the better transforming language skills and culture to the target group.

2. Curriculum, Syllabus, Course content and Text Books for the language learners, i.e. as per the target group, are required to set and designed to meet the need of the learners and maintain the global standard of language teaching.

3. Instructors should have sufficient knowledge about the subject matters and teaching methodology.

4. Instructors should have reduced the level of errors, which occurred in using communicative function of language .For that he/she must have knowledge about different aspect of language and its proper use.

5. To use language functions contextually appropriate, instructors should have sufficient knowledge of language and linguistics.

6. It is advisable to maintain   well-designed syllabus and course books for language teaching. Similarly, the concerned authority of the government should make the policy to monitor the institutes regularly.

7. Instructors need to be aware of the language function being used or to be used, as per properly used in context.

# References

Abercrombie, D. (1973). *Paralinguistic communication*. In Allen, J.P.B. and Corder S.P.(eds). *The Edinburgh course in Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1.

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*.

Adhikari**, (2007).** *A comparative study on Language Functions for Seeking Information and Confirmation in English and Nepali* . An unpublished M. Ed. Thesis, TU.

Bhattari, G R (2001). *A Thematic Analysis of Research Reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.

Corder, S. P. (1993). *Introducing Applied Linguistics,* Penguin Books.

Dahal (2007) *"Analysis of Errors in Tense Used by the Basic Learners in Language Institutes"*

Dahal, K.R. (2005) A *Comparative Study on Vowels and Consonants used in Grade one English and Nepali Textbook,* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, TU Kirtipur, Kathmandu.

Dahal, S. (2007). *A short introduction to non-verbal communication.* http://stephan.dahl.at/non-verbal_communicationhtml.

Heaton, J.B. (1988). *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman.

Herluck. B. E. (1979). *Developmental Psychology. New Delhi:* Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company.

Hughes, A. (1995). *Testing for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D.H.C (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride, J.B. & Holmes. J (eds). Sociolinguistics. England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Khanal (2008) T*he Effectiveness of Communicative Method in Teaching Vocabulary.* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, TU Kirtipur, Kathmandu.

Khaniya , T. R (2005) *Examination For Enhanced Learning*, Lalitpur: Millenium Publication (p) Ltd.

Kumar, R. (1996). *Research Methodology.* London: Sage Publication.

Paudel (2008). "*Teaching of Communicative Functions: An Analysis of Classroom Activities".* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, TU Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Sharma (2001) A *Practical Study to find out the Effectiveness of the Role Play Technique in Teaching Communicative Functions.* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, TU Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Sharma (2006) on *"Mother Tongue Use in English Classroom*". An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, TU Kirtipur, Kathmandu

www.google.com/np

www.pearsonlongman.com/new_eng_par/teachers

# *Appendix 1: Check List*

## *Language function related to:*

| 1. | Imparting and Seeking Factual Information | |
|---|---|---|
| **S N** | **Function** | **Frequency** |
| 1. | Identifying | |
| 2. | Reporting | |
| 3. | Including | |
| 4. | Describing | |
| 5. | Narrating | |
| 6. | Correcting | |
| 7. | Asking | |
| **2.** | **Expressing and Finding out Intellectual Attitude** | |
| **S N** | **Function** | **Frequency** |
| 1. | Agreement | |
| 2. | Disagreement | |
| 3. | Capability | |
| 4. | Incapability | |
| 5. | Denying | |
| 6. | Inquiring | |
| 7. | Offering | |

| 3. | Expressing and Finding out Emotional Attitude | |
|---|---|---|
| **S N** | **Function** | **Frequency** |
| 1. | Expressing and inquiring about pleasure | |
| 2. | Expressing and inquiring about liking | |
| 3. | Expressing and inquiring about surprise | |
| 4. | Expressing and inquiring about hope | |
| 5. | Expressing and inquiring about satisfaction | |
| 6. | Expressing and inquiring about disappointment | |
| 7. | Expressing and inquiring about fear | |
| 8. | Expressing and inquiring about worry | |
| 9. | Expressing and inquiring about preference | |
| 10. | Expressing and inquiring about want | |
| 11. | Expressing and inquiring about desire | |

| 4. | Expressing and Finding out Moral Attitude | |
|---|---|---|
| S N | Function | Frequency |
| 1. | Apologizing | |
| 2. | Granting forgiveness | |
| 3. | Expressing approval and disapproval | |
| 4. | Expressing appreciation | |
| 5. | Expressing regret | |

| 5. | Getting things done | |
|---|---|---|
| S N | Function | Frequency |
| 1. | Suggesting a course of action | |
| 2. | Requesting | |
| 3. | Inviting | |
| 4. | Advising other | |
| 5. | Warning | |

| 6. | Socializing | |
|---|---|---|
| S N | Function | Frequency |
| 1. | Greeting | |
| 2. | Meeting people | |
| 3. | Leave taking | |

| 7. | Use of Situational Appropriateness | |
|---|---|---|
| S N | Function | Frequency |
| 1. | *Social role* | |
| | 1. stranger/stranger<br>2. friend/friend<br>3. private person/official<br>4. patient/doctor | |
| 2. | *Psychological roles* | |
| | 1. Neutrality<br>2. Equality<br>3. Sympathy<br>4. Antipathy<br>5. Caring<br>6. insulting<br>7. helping | |
| 3. | *Indoor Settings* | |
| | 1. Room<br>2. Kitchen<br>3. Library<br>4. class<br>5. corridor | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| *4.* | *Out door setting* | |
| | 1. Park<br>2. street<br>3. seaside | |
| *5.* | *Surroundings* | |
| | 1. Human<br>2. Family<br>3. Friends<br>4. Acquaintances<br>5. strangers | |
| *6.* | *Workplace* | |
| | 1. Office<br>2. field<br>3. road<br>4. worksite | |
| *7.* | *Mood/Emotions* | |
| | 1. Peace<br>2. Moderate<br>3. Horrified<br>4. normal pace | |

## *Appendix 2*
### Details of the Instructor

| Details of the Instructor | |
|---|---|
| **Name:** | |
| **Date of birth:** | |
| **Institute:** | |
| **Education:** | |
| **Experience:** | |
| **Major subject:** | |

## *Appendix 3*
## Question To The Instructors

Dear Sir/Madam,

I, Shanti Ram Timsina, a student of M. Ed., am carrying out a research work for the partial fulfillment of my course. So, I hereby request you, the English language instructor, to kindly cooperate me for the accomplishment of my study providing the below-given facts/information accurately as far as possible.

Thanking you for your cooperation

Shanti Ram Timsina

| Detail of the Instructor | |
| --- | --- |
| *Name:* | |
| *Date of birth:* | |
| *Institute:* | |
| *Education:* | |
| *Experience:* | |
| *Major subject:* | |

| Question to the Instructors | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| S N | Questionnaires | Options |
| 1. | Do you follow curriculum /syllabus? | 1. Yes<br>2. No<br>3. sometimes |
| 2. | How do you determine or plan the lesson? | 1. With the help of book<br>2. As you felt the need<br>3. On the basis of syllabus |

| 3. | Which of the language skill do you prioritize most? | 1. Listening<br>2. Speaking<br>3. Reading<br>4. Writing |
|---|---|---|
| 4. | Which of the following do you prioritize to classify/prepare the lesson? | 1. Base on language function<br>2. Grammar based<br>3. Vocabulary based<br>4. Essay topic based |
| 5. | Which of the following tools do you use most frequently to test the student's performance? | 1. Written exam<br>2. Speaking<br>3. Role playing<br>4. Through project assignment |
| 6. | Who is the most authorized person to prepare the curriculum and text? | 1. Director<br>2. Instructors/teacher<br>3. Students and teacher<br>4. Ready made textbook recommended |
| 7. | Which of the following language items do you focus most? | 1. Vocabulary<br>2. Grammatical items<br>3. Language structure<br>4. Communicative activities |
| 8. | How often do you let your students play different roles? | 1. Daily/ very frequently<br>2. Once/twice a week<br>3. Some times<br>4. Rarely |

9. How do you get helped while preparing the language syllabus/course/lesson?

(Please, write below the information required as the answer for question number.)

................................................................................................................................
....