

CHAPTER-ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study is about “**Strategies Adopted in Teaching Language Functions at Secondary Level**”. This section includes general background of teaching English language, review of the related literature, objectives and significance of the study.

1.1 General Background

The aim of English language teaching in Nepal is to enable the learners to interact with others fluently and correctly in the English language. Teaching English means teaching different levels, skills and aspects of the English language. English language teaching (ELT) has crossed many developments to reach this day. To give a comprehensible picture of theoretical foundation of language teaching and learning is a challenging task in language pedagogy i.e. it is a tough task to bridge gaps between theory and practice. Brown (1994, p. 15) writes that there are no instant recipes. No quick and easy method is guaranteed to provide success. Every learner is unique. Every teacher is unique. And every learner-teacher relationship is unique. The application of strategies employed by different teachers in teaching English language functions in different types of schools.

The traditional concept of teaching is different from modern one. Traditionally, teachers were taken as the sources of knowledge and the students as the creature having an empty mind, where the teachers would feel in things whatever s/he wanted to put. Traditional methods of teaching did not include communicative activities in the classroom. Pupils were not provided chance to interact each other. Still there is influence of teacher-centered techniques such as lecture, illustration and explanation in teaching learning process. Different investigations were done to make classes learner-centered. Unfortunately, the concerned institutes or people do not follow learner-centered techniques in

actual teaching. Teachers are not using simulation, dramatization, discovery, individual work; group work and role play techniques while teaching English.

But in the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) over the last few decades a gradual but significant shift has taken place, resulting in less emphasis on teachers and great stress on learners and learning. Teaching is not as easy as it seems to be. Teaching is not the task of imposing one's ideas upon the students rather cultivating students' potentialities. Teachers should adopt effective strategies to create an appropriate environment for students to learn. Teacher should be a facilitator and mediator for students to learn. Teaching is an art and teacher as an artist. A teacher should be able to mould his/her material (student) according to his/her ideas (i.e. objective) in his/her studio (i.e. classroom). Whether students are interested to learn or not is determined by the strategies that teachers have been adopting.

As we know that the result from the private school does not match with the result from the community school. To happen so there are various causative variables such as strategies, environment and so on. Among of them strategy plays vital role. Therefore, the researcher is exploring the strategies adopted in teaching language functions at secondary level in private and community schools.

1.1.2 Teaching Strategy

Each and every activity done in the classroom by the teacher in the language classroom to obtain predetermined objectives is regarded as the teaching strategy. It refers to activity for achieving a major goal. Teaching strategy is a means to achieve objective. The strategies are the tools for active self-directed improvement needed for developing L2 communicative ability. Teaching strategy is a pattern of teaching acts that serves to attain certain outcomes and to guard against others. Strategy is an art which enables the teacher to create new thoughts, feelings, and ideas and transmit them to their learners so, it is

completely creative activity. It promotes creative skills, subject specific skills and ability to explore ideas and use the imagination.

Other terms frequently found to have been used to clarify the meaning of strategy are a long term plan, activities, ways, techniques or methods or approaches, plan of action, operations, course of actions and group of activities in which the students are taken into actions and the means by which they will explore the dramatic focus. Teaching strategies must be matched to the objectives so that the most efficient and effective one is selected. Teaching strategies are the core part of effective teaching; classroom management, structuring task and grouping are the main instructions for the teaching strategies.

On the basis of the specific principles and methods, a teacher applies certain strategies in the classroom. The effectiveness of the teaching learning process depends on the sorts of strategy that are used in the classroom. In this regard Brown (1994, p. 15) states:

You cannot teach effectively without understanding varied theoretical positions. This understanding forms principled basis upon which you can choose particular methods and strategies for teaching a foreign language and unless that primary basis is your own carefully and thoughtfully divided theory; you become a slave to one theory of thinking, a puppet without self control. Your task is the formulation of an integrated understanding of the principle of language learning and teaching is to find those points of compromise or tension between two poles of possibilities that will best fit a global theory of second language acquisition.

To acquire second language means learning of listening, speaking, reading and writing in that language. Teachers can use their idiosyncratic strategies to teach those different skills and other many aspects of language for the achievement of selected measurable objectives.

Some of the prominent strategies adopted in teaching language functions in the Nepalese context are as follows:

Lecture:

It is a kind of pedagogical device in which the teacher gives lecture on the subject to be taught. This is suitable when all or most of the students need content and if it is supported with handouts and is a must if the class is of large size.

Group and pair work :

It is a learner centered technique of language teaching it is a learning activity which involves a small group of learners working together.

Project work:

The project work is an activity which centers on the completion of a task, and usually requires an extended amount of independent work either by an individual students or group of students.

Role Play

Role play is a classroom activity which gives the students as opportunity to practice the language, the aspects of role behaviour, and the actual roles they may need outside the classroom.

Discovery technique:

It is a technique where students are given examples of language and are told to find out how they work to discover the grammar rules rather than be told them.

Problem Solving

In problem solving, the learner is given a situation and problem and must work out a solution. Such activities are said to require higher order thinking.

Illustrations

It refers to use of materials to help to make the content interesting, understandable and clear to children. Illustration illuminates what is presented or taught to children.

1.1.2.1 Child Centered Approach of Language Teaching

Child centered education has been emphasized in the aim of secondary education of Nepal. The qualities of classroom learning experiences need to develop further away from treating the students in class as homogeneous unit and away from rote learning. The focus of teaching learning methodology should be on student centered active learning with awareness of teacher to help each students at all time through using wide range of formal and informal techniques. Other terms synonymously used for child centered teaching are student centered, child focus and joyful learning. Some of the principles of child centered approach of teaching are as follows:

- All children are equal and should be treated with love and respect.
- Put children first by responding to their needs and building on their knowledge.
- Children are unique individual with different needs, abilities and interests.
- Children come to school already knowing many things.
- Children learn at different rates, they have their own pace.

- Children are various and inquisitive.
- Children learn best through concrete hands on experiences.
- The learning environment should stimulate children' development.
- Different children learn in different ways and a variety of strategies are necessary to cater for the needs and interest of individual children in interesting ways

1.1.3 Language Functions

A function of language refers to the purposes for which an utterance or unit of language is used. Such functions are often described as categories of behaviour, e.g., requests, apologies, complaints, offers, compliments, etc. The functional use o language can not be determined simply by studying the grammatical structures of sentences but also the purposes for which they are use.

Language functions can be broadly classified as; Grammatical functions and Communicative functions. Grammatical functions deal with the relationship that a constituent in a sentence has with another constituents. For example, in a sentence, ‘Madhab killed a snake’. Madhab is the subject of the verb ‘killed’ is verb and ‘snake’ functions as a object. The scope of the present study does not cover grammatical functions. It mainly concerns with communicative functions but for our purpose, language functions mean communicative functions of language. Communicative functions of language refer to the communicative goal for which a language is used in a community. For example, greeting, requesting, inviting, denying, promising, and so on are the functions of the language. The detail of the communicative functions is given in the following sections.

1.1.3.1 Communicative Functions

The ultimate aim of language teaching is to make student able to use language in communication. Students need to develop listening, speaking, reading and

writing skills to use language in communication. Knowing English, therefore, means to know how to communicate in English. This involves not only producing language correctly but also using language for particular purposes. For example, being able to advise in English, make prediction and describe people. If learners are able not only to produce and understand structure of language but also use it to express the ideas and feelings, they are said to be communicatively competent. Obviously, students need to learn how to express these functions in English. Recognizing the importance of functions, the emphasis should be on making students aware of why they are practicing particular structure to use language in social context.

Hymes (1972, p. 281) opines that a person who acquires communicative competence acquires both knowledge and ability for language use with respect to:

- a. Whether (and to what degree) something is formally possible.
- b. Whether (and to what degree) something is feasible in virtue of the means of implementation.
- c. Whether (and to what degree) something is appropriate in related to the context in which it is used and evaluated.
- d. Whether (and to what degree) something is in fact done actually performed and what it is doing entails.

This makes us clear that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) means little more than integration of functional and grammatical teaching. Standing on the same ground Littlewood (1981, p. 1) states, “one of the most characteristic features of communicative language teaching is that it pays systematic attention to functional as well as structural aspect of language”.

The word ‘Function’ is a key term in CLT, just as ‘Structure’ is the central concern in structural approach. Functions denote what is done with language. They refer to communicative properties of sentences to accomplish through language. What language does or what we do through the use of language is its

function. A language is used to communicate something. So, communication is the global function of language.

A sentence can be said to have at least three facets. The three facets of 'what is your name' can be described as:

- Substance: sentence.
- Form: what is your name?
- Function: asking

Similarly, a language can be said to have following facets:

- Substance: sounds/letters and punctuation marks.
- Form: Patterns of sounds/letters/words and phrases.
- Function: communicating message.

A function is the purpose for which language is used. The purpose of using language is to communicate something. Human beings use very sophisticated form of language to communicate their feelings, intentions, desire and so on. They use language to greet others, to bid farewell, to express gratitude, to ask for permission, to request for something, to get things done and so on. By the same token, language serves the purpose of describing people. So, describing people is one of the functions of language.

How many types of function does language have? Regarding this question Sthapit (2000, p. 10) says:

This question can not be answered definitely, partly because the complex nature of language and society and their relationship defines any such enumeration and partly because there is nothing like the only right or proper way of classifying language depends on how broad or narrow a given classification is. So, one can claim that his/her system of classification is the only way or only right way of doing the job of

classifying the complex system of functions. However, a writer or a pedagogue has to follow one or the other system so as to make his description consistent and complete.

This states that the linguists are not at one regarding the classification of language functions i.e. linguists do not seem to follow a consistent system of classifying communicative functions. It is, thus, important to have a look at some linguists' classification of communicative language functions which are given below:

Corder (1973, p. 44) classifies communicative functions on the basis of the factors of a speech event, which are as follows:

- a. Personal: if the orientation is towards the speakers we have the personal function of language. Through this function the speaker reveals his/her attitude towards what he/she is speaking about.
- b. Directive: if the orientation is towards the hearer we have the directive function of language. It is the function of controlling the behaviour of the participant.
- c. Phatic: if the focus is on the content between the participants we have the phatic function of language which establishes relations, maintains them, and promotes feelings of goodwill and fellowship or social solidarity.
- d. Referential: if the focus is on the topic we have referential function of language.
- e. Meta-linguistic: this function is associated with the code. When language is used to talk about language itself, it is the meta-linguistic function of language.

- f. Imaginative: when the focus is on message, we have imaginative function of language.

Similarly, Finocchiaro (1986, p. 1) classifies communicative functions in the following categories:

- a. Personal: this function helps to express ones emotion, needs, thoughts, desires, attitudes etc.
- b. Impersonal: this function helps to maintain good social relation with individuals and groups. For example, expression of praise, sympathy, joy at other's success etc.
- c. Directive: this function helps to control the behaviour of others through advice, warning, request, permission, and discussion.
- d. Referential: it talks about objects of events in the immediate setting or environments or on the culture.
- e. Meta-linguistic: it talks about language itself.
- f. Imaginative: it is the use of language creatively in rhyming, composing poetry etc.

Likewise, Van Ek (1975) provides following six communicative functions:

- a. Imparting the factual information (identifying, reporting, correcting, asking etc.)

For examples What is your name?, he is our sir. , no, he has not said in this way. etc

- b. Expressing and finding out intellectual attitude(expressing and inquiring about agreement and disagreement, accepting or declining an offer or invitation etc)

For examples yes, I agree. , I think so, too. , certainly, no deal, I don't think so, can I help you? etc

- c. Expressing and finding out emotional attitude (pleasure and displeasure, surprise, hope, intention etc)
For examples oh, how nice! That is a good idea! I don't like this. etc
- d. Expressing and finding out moral attitudes (apologizing, expressing approval and disapproval etc.
For examples Sorry, you are great, you have done it, excuse me etc.
- e. Getting things done (suggestion, advising, warning, ordering etc.)
For examples you should do it, how about visiting doctor?, don't play cards. etc
- f. Socializing (greeting and leaving people, attracting attention, proposing a toast, etc)
For examples Can I have your attention please?, good morning, bye, cheers. etc

There is no common ground in the classification of the language functions. Different scholars have classified from their individual perspectives. However, the purpose of classifying language functions is to group the similar one in a category. The same thing can be seen different from different perspectives and can be placed in several groups depending on the way it is looked on. Hence, it is all but natural for different linguists to have different system of classification. Even though the terminologies given by several linguists are different, the classification is more or less same.

Linguists have introduced various functions of language. However, out of various functions, curriculum designers select appropriate functions for the level of students. Various communicative functions have been mentioned in grade nine and ten 'Our English Textbook'. Some of the communicative functions mentioned in these textbooks are giving suggestions, refusing, describing person/place/event/thing, advising, greeting, apologizing, agreeing and accepting and so on.

Students of class nine and ten are regarded as communicatively competent in English language because they have been teaching English from their starting class i.e. class one. To make communicatively competent different communicative items have been included in the course (textbook and curriculum). But only including in the curriculum is not sufficient, success of it depends on the environment of the implemented area (school, quality of the teachers, activeness of the teacher etc.).

1.2 Review of Related Literature

Since teaching strategy is a broad area of study, many researchers have been carried out in this field of language functions and different strategies used to teach them being specific over the effectiveness of these techniques against other. Furthermore, numbers of comparatives study have been carried out in the Department of English Education. Some instances of the latest research work are reviewed as follows:

Devkota (2003) has carried out a research on “Learning Strategies: An attitudinal study”. His objective was to find out the techniques and strategies employed to learn literature. He has used questionnaire to collect data from students and structured interview to obtain information form the teachers. He has found that one of the causes of the students’ failure is due lack of writing practice.

Similarly, Rai (2006) has conducted a research on “Learning Strategies Used by Maithili Learners of English at Secondary Level”. The objectives of his study were to find out the strategies used by Maithili learners to learn English at secondary level and suggest some pedagogical implications. He found that the learners have used few techniques to learn English language. He concluded that teachers and learners have not used communicative approach in the classroom. They have practised English language by using of traditional methods, i.e. GT method.

In the same way, Bista (2008) has carried out a research on “Reading Strategies Employed by Ninth Graders”. The objective of her study was to find out the reading strategies used by the government aided school's students. She has used test items and interview schedule as research tools. She has found out that all students have used guessing strategies, asked questions to them while reading, read determining the important points and made notes for exam.

Similarly, Chaudhary (2009) has carried out a research on “Learning Strategies Used by The Class Toppers”. Her objective was to find out the learning strategies used by the class toppers of Higher Education to learn the English language. She has used a set of questionnaire as a tool for data collection. She has found out that meta-cognitive (rehearsal) strategies were used by the class toppers of higher education to a great extent. She has concluded that the class toppers had the strong desire to communicate and were willing to guess meaning when they were not sure.

Although some researches have been conducted in the area of learning strategies, no research has been carried out to explore the strategies used in teaching language functions in private and community school. So, I claim my purposed study is new in the department.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- a. To explore the teaching strategies used by the private schools' English language teachers in teaching language functions at secondary level.
- b. To compare those strategies with that of community schools' English language teachers.
- c. To recommend some pedagogical implications.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The outcomes of this study will be directly useful for the teachers, who are teaching at secondary level. It will also be significant for the teacher trainer and curriculum experts to identify the teaching strategies that are being used by the teachers who are teaching in this level. This study will also help both the departments and faculty members to identify the effectiveness of their course. Similarly; curriculum designers, textbook writers, programme evaluators, policy makers and for all directly or indirectly involved will also find it valuable since it provides valuable information about strategies used in teaching language functions. It will also help the novice researchers to gain an insight into the area who want to hold their researches in this field ahead. Finally, it will also be beneficial for all those who are directly or indirectly involved and interested to know more about teaching strategies used in the private school in comparison to the community school in comparative framework.

CHAPTER-TWO

METHODOLOGY

This section deals with the methodology the researcher adopted during the study. The researcher adopted the following methodology to fulfil the objectives of the study.

2.1 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used for the collection of the required data. The primary sources were used to collect the data whereas secondary sources were used in forming the theoretical part of the research.

2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data

The English language teachers teaching at secondary level in Pyuthan district were the primary sources of data for this study. The data from them were collected using questionnaire and observation checklist (see Appendix I).

2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data

The secondary sources of data were collected from different books, journals, previous theses, dictionaries, articles and other books as well as internet websites related to teaching strategies, language functions such as: Corder (1973), Finocchiaro (1986), Richards and Rodgers (1986), Brown (1994), Harmer (2001) and many more.

2.2 Population of the Study

Secondary level English teachers of Pyuthan district were the population of this study.

2.3 Sampling Procedure

The researcher selected six schools (three private and three community schools) and secondary English language teachers of these schools of Pyuthan district by using non-random sampling procedure. Due to the restricted numbers of private secondary schools in the district, the researcher selected only three private schools.

2.4 Tools for Data Collection

Questionnaires and the observation checklists were the major research tools for data collection (see appendix: I and II). The questionnaires were used to collect the required data from the teachers teaching at secondary level. Both closed-ended and open-ended questions were included in questionnaire.

Likewise, the observation checklist i.e. developed on the basis of model of peer-observation form of Faculty of Education, TU. was used while observing the classes of selected teachers.

2.5 Process of Data Collection

To collect the required data the following steps were adopted.

- a. At first, the researcher went to selected schools and talked to the concerned authority explaining them the process and purpose of research. The researcher also asked them to grant permission to consult their English language teachers.
- b. After getting permission from the authority, the researcher built rapport with the concerned teachers explaining them about the purpose and process of his study.
- c. The researcher observed the classes of those selected teachers of each school by using prepared checklist for four days.

- d. Then, the researcher requested them to help him by responding to the questionnaire.
- e. The researcher collected the distributed questionnaire and thanked the teachers and authority.

2.6 Limitations of the Study

No study is without limitation because all the people, places and areas in a field cannot be included in a small scale research like this. This research also had some limitations which are as follows:

- i. The study included only six schools out of which three were private and three were community schools in Pyuthan district.
- ii. The study was limited to secondary level.
- iii. It was limited to the strategies used in teaching language functions.
- iv. The study was limited only in four classes of class ten of each school.
- v. The study was limited to two types of research tools i.e. questionnaire and checklist.

CHAPTER-THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter presents analysis and interpretation of data which the researcher collected from the selected schools.

3.1 Analysis and Interpretation of Data Collected from Checklist

In order to analyze the collected data from the checklists, the researcher used statistical tool of percentage. In course of collecting data two types of scale were used. The actual strategies or techniques used have been compared on the basis of their frequency of occurrence while teaching like frequently, sometimes and seldom whereas in order to make comparison over sample of lesson presentation and indirectly related aspects the researcher used a scale like excellent, good, average and poor which have been mathematically represented as 4,3,2 and 1 respectively. The researcher had categorized the teachers presentation into excellent if the teacher had entered the classroom with prepared lesson plan, self confidence in the content to be taught, clarity and fluency in expression, engaged students into the classroom actively, facilitated his or her presentation with teaching materials and related motivated his students appropriately. Similarity, 'good' has categorized if other things being equal to excellent but he lacked prepared lesson and related teaching materials. Likewise, 'average' if other things being equal to good but he lacked lesson plan, teaching materials and self confidentiality and 'poor' if he lacked even clarity in his expression and motivating power including things included under average.

Collected data was compared both holistically and in detailed version. In order to bring clarity and uniformity in the presentation table (a) and table (b) have been presented which stand for the position of private school and of community schools respectively. Both analysis and interpretation and findings have been presented in consonance with the objectives taken.

3.1.1 Teaching Strategies Used in Private Schools

There are many strategies of teaching language functions. Here, strategy has been used synonymously with techniques or methods or activities. Some have had their heydays and have fallen into relative obscurity; other are widely used now; still others have a small following, but contribute insights that may be observed into the generally accepted mix. After having checklists of class observation of PS English teachers, the researcher has found for the major part of the instructional time the following strategies were used which have been captured under holistic and detailed comparison. This does not mean that other strategies were not used but these were the ones which were heavily used by the teachers.

3.1.2 Holistic Analysis of Strategies and Techniques

This is the holistic comparison made between the performance of the English Teachers (CS and PS) of two schools over the strategies or techniques they had used in course of teaching language functions. This is the analysis of techniques or strategies used which was derived on the basis of classroom observation captured in appendix I.

Table No. 1 Holistic Comparison of Strategies and Techniques

Name of the strategy used	Frequently %		Sometimes %		Seldom %	
	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
Audio video	0	0	35	0	65	100
Co-operative	65	0	35	65	0	35
Deductive	0	35	100	65	0	0
Demonstration	35	0	65	100	0	0
Drill	100	100	0	0	0	0
Experimental	0	0	0	65	100	35
Games	0	0	100	100	0	0
Group Work	35	0	65	100	0	0
Inductive	100	100	0	0	0	0
Inquiry and discovery	0	0	0	0	100	100
Lecture	65	65	35	35	0	0
Non verbal Communication	0	0	35	65	65	3
Pair work	0	0	100	65	0	3
Question Answer	65	65	35	35	0	0
Role play and Simulation	0	0	100	65	0	35
TPR	0	0	65	35	35	65

Being this holistic comparison, the researcher has compared the teacher's performance in general. Among the strategies listed above the teachers of Private school (PS) were to have frequently used inductive, question answer, cooperative learning, drill and lecture whereas the strategies like experimental and discovery were not found to have used. Other remaining strategies were used sometimes. On the other hand frequently used strategies on the part of CS teachers were drill, inductive, lecture, and question and answer. Similarly, strategies like audio- video, inquiry and discovery were not used.

3.1.3. Detailed Comparison of Activities and Techniques Used

a. Audio-video

Audio-video strategy refers to the use of some devices which make appeal to more than one sense. For example the use of television, computer and power point in language teaching and learning. It is a teaching techniques in which items to be taught are shown in visual form and student get chance to listen as well. By hearing and seeing students get clear concept about the topic.

Table No. 1.1 Audio-video technique

Table No. 1 (a)%	Table No. 1 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 35	Sometimes: 0
Seldom: 65	Seldom: 100

Table no.1 (a) shows that the use of audio-video technique found better than table no.1 (b). It shows that, audio-video technique was proportionally used more in the class of PS teachers than in CS. As shown in the above table no. 1 (a) the use of audio-video technique in private school was 35% sometimes and 65% seldom whereas in CS was 100% seldom.

b. Co-operative Learning

Co-operative learning is a systematic pedagogical strategy that encourages small group of students work together for the achievement of common goal. In this strategy students are given chance to work co-operatively. By sharing owns' idea they reach at the conclusion.

Table No. 1.2 Co-operative learning

Table No. 2 (a)%	Table No. 2 (b)%
Frequently: 65	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 35	Sometimes: 65
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 35

As shown in table no. 2 (a) and (b) co-operative learning strategy used by the English teacher of PS was 65% frequently and 35% sometimes whereas by the English teacher of CS was 65% sometime and 35% seldom. It was result of the fact that in private school they focus on learning from work. Students have to work one hour co-operatively each day, which was not only the physical task but also psychological or mental work.

C. Deductive

Here, deductive strategy refers to rule providing phenomenon from the very beginning of the presentation

Table No. 1.3 Deductive

Table No. 1 (a)%	Table No. 1 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 35
Sometimes: 100	Sometimes: 65
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

Table no. 3 (a) shows that deductive strategy was comparatively less used by PS teachers than CS English teachers. As shown in the table no. 3 (a) deductive strategy was used 100% sometimes by PS English teachers whereas by the teacher of CS used 35% frequently, 65% sometimes and 0% seldom.

d. Demonstration

Demonstration implies the presentation of pre-arranged series of events or equipment to a group of students for their observation accompanied by explanatory remarks. Demonstration depends upon needs, ideas, materials, procedures.

Table No. 1.4 Demonstration

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Frequently: 35	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 65	Sometimes: 100
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

Comparison between table no. 4 (a) and (b) show that demonstration strategy has been used frequently by the English teachers of PS than the English teachers of CS. The researcher has found here that majority of the English teachers of PS were instructed by the administration strongly.

e. Drill

It is a teaching strategy in which students follow the idea given by the teacher or in the course. Students may repeat without any changes or sometimes they can reform as well.

Table No. 1.5 Drill

Table No. 5 (a)%	Table No. 5 (b)%
Frequently: 100	Frequently: 100
Sometimes: 0	Sometimes: 0
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

Table no. 5 (a) and (b) have shown that drill strategy was found to have been used frequently by the English teachers of both PS and PS. Though curriculum of both types of schools have not recommended to use drill techniques while teaching language functions in the secondary level, this strategy has been used in the classroom. Both types of schools are equal in applying drill strategy.

f. Experimental

Table No. 1.6 Experimental strategy

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 0	Sometimes: 65
Seldom: 100	Seldom: 35

Comparison between table no. 6 (a) and (b) show that experimental strategy was found frequent in the practice of CS English teachers than of PS English teachers. As the table shows teachers in CS used 65% sometime and 35% seldom but teachers of Private school teachers never used this strategy. The researcher has found that non user groups were not sure about the position of experimental strategy as one of the student centered technique.

g. Games

It is a kind of strategy used in the language classroom in which students learn many things by engaging in games. In the classroom different types of games can be done.

Table No. 1.7 Games

Table No. 7 (a)%	Table No. 7(b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 100	Sometimes: 100
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

This comparison shows that same result in the use of games while teaching language functions. When, the researcher observed the classes of both types of teachers; the researcher found that they were using simple games like guessing, Simon say, predicting game, look and say, read and say etc. These activities or games were not only used for the practice of the taught materials but also for the sake of motivation and inspiration. As the table has shown both types of English teachers used 100% sometime.

h. Group Work

It is a learner centered technique of language teaching it is a learning activity which involves a small group of learners working together.

Table No. 1.8 Group work

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Frequently: 35	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 65	Sometimes: 100
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

Group work falls between whole class grouping and pair work. It promotes learners autonomy by allowing students to make their decision in the group without being told what to do by the teacher. Moreover, it encourages broader skills of co-operation and negotiation than pair work. This group work strategy, as table no. 8 (a) and (b) have shown, was found more frequent in private school teachers' practice than of the teachers of CS. As the table shows, it has been used 35% frequently and 65% sometimes in PS whereas 100% sometimes in CS. The researcher found that despite practicing this strategy, students were not independent all the time since they could not possess the entire requirement for successful group work.

i. Inductive

Inductive strategy refers to examples providing phenomenon from the very beginning and deriving the rules by analyzing the examples given.

Table No. 1.9 Inductive

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Frequently: 100	Frequently: 100
Sometimes: 0	Sometimes: 0
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

When researcher observed the classes of both types of schools' teacher specifically in course of teaching language functions, they were found to have used this strategy regularly. As the table shows, the researcher found it's equal application. Furthermore, the researcher found that both types of schools' teachers were not aware of the rule generalizations. It could be because of the nature of the topic they were dealing with made them unable to do so.

j. Inquiry and Discovery

It is a technique in which students are asked about new topic and students are given problems and students try to find out the solution

Table No. 1.10 Inquiry and Discovery

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 0	Sometimes: 0
Seldom: 100	Seldom: 100

These two strategies inquiry and discovery were kept in the checklist made by the researcher expecting slight use of it. But when the researcher went to the real field both types of schools' teachers had not implemented these strategies. As the table no. 10 (a) and (b) show these strategies were seldom used by the teachers of both types of schools.

k. Lecture

It is a kind of pedagogical device in which the teacher gives lecture on the subject to be taught. This is suitable when all or most of the students need content and if it is supported with handouts and is a must if the class is of large size.

Table No 1.11 Lecture

Table No. 11 (a)%	Table No. 11 (b)%
Frequently:65	Frequently: 65
Sometimes: 35	Sometimes: 35
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

Lecture is ever green strategy used in the field of language teaching despite it's disadvantages. As table no. 11 shows, it has been found to have been used equally 65% frequently and 35% sometime by the English teachers of both types of schools. It is paradoxical in the statement and the real practice of Private Education Curriculum. They have promised not to use this traditional outdated method in their curriculum but were using in the real field.

I. Non-Verbal Communication

It is a strategy which is similar to demonstration where information is disseminated in non-verbal form. It includes performing actions using gestures and facial expression silently (without uttering any noise).

Table No. 1.12 Non-verbal communication

Table No. 12 (a)%	Table No. 12 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 35	Sometimes: 65
Seldom: 65	Seldom: 35

Table no. 12 (a) and (b) have shown that it was less frequently used in private school than in community school. This table clearly shows that PS English teachers used it 35% sometime and 65% seldom but the CS teachers have used 65% sometime and 35% seldom.

m. Pair Work

In this technique two students are given a task that should be solved by both students by working collaboratively

Table No. 1.13 Pair work

Table No. 13 (a)%	Table No. 13 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 100	Sometimes: 65
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 35

As the table no. 13 shows, pair work strategy was found more frequent in the class of PS English teachers than of CS English teachers. It was used 100% sometime by PS teachers whereas 65% sometime and 35% seldom by CS teachers.

n. Question Answer

Questioning is another strategy used in teaching at all levels. The most frequent use of questioning was to lead the students to discover patterns, put items into categories and find labels for the categories. It is used for the purpose of developing thinking process for concept formation.

Table No. 1.14 Question Answer

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Frequently: 35	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 65	Sometimes: 100
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 0

The researcher's work found this strategy was frequently used by PS teachers than of CS teachers. As the table no. 14 (a) shows PS teachers used 65% frequently and 35% sometime whereas table no. 14 (b) shows CS teachers used 35% frequently and 65% sometime.

o. Role Play and Simulation

Role play and simulation are both communicative and learner-based strategies having some common properties. They are distinct in the nature of environment. Simulation of real life events creates realness in the language class. Here, participations are supposed to feel that they are involved in performing a task/role in the context similar to real-life situation. But in role play situation is brought from the real life into the classroom.

Table No. 1.15 Role Play and Simulation

Table No. 15 (a)%	Table No. 15 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 100	Sometimes: 65
Seldom: 0	Seldom: 35

Their use in the classroom made by teachers showed that, these strategies were more frequent in the presentation of PS teachers than that of CS teachers which was related by the table no. 15 (a) and (b). It shows that role play and simulation were used 100% sometime by PS teachers than CS teachers who used 65% sometime and 35% seldom.

p. TPR (Total Physical Response)

TPR is one teaching strategy where it is expected to organize physical actions in the classroom.

Table No. 1.16 Total Physical Response

Table No. 16 (a)%	Table No. 16 (b)%
Frequently: 0	Frequently: 0
Sometimes: 65	Sometimes: 35
Seldom: 35	Seldom: 65

The researcher's work found that it was comparatively more frequent in PS teachers' classrooms than those of CS teachers' classroom which has been shown in the table no.16 (a) and (b). One of the reasons behind this practice was the result of strong rule and regulation of administration to be followed where students were accustomed to obey the command or order physically as well in necessary area.

3.2 Holistic Analysis of Sample Lesson Presentation

i. Warming up Activities

The teachers' performances are not only judged on the basis of how s/he presents the subject matter but also from how s/he motivates his or her students towards the subject matter to be taught and towards himself/ herself. Success of teaching highly depends on those activities which are conducted for inoperative purposes. It includes objectives specification, telling jokes and story to bring humour inside relating presented lesson to the previous one and other ways of motivation.

Table No. 2
Warming Up Activities

	Excellent%		Good%		Average%		Poor%	
	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
Students' motivation to the subject matter	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
Students' motivation to the teacher	0	0	65	0	35	100	0	0
Objective specification	0	0	33	35	33	0	33	65
Related to the previous lesson	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0

Among the aspects used for warming up activities PS were better than in students' motivation towards the subject matter and students' motivation towards the teacher than the CS teachers. But teachers of both of the schools were found equal in relating present lesson with the previous one. On the other hand, CS teachers were found slightly better in the specification of the objectives than PS teachers.

ii. Presentation

It is an actual phase of teaching lesson where the teacher uses his or her ways and means in order to make his presentation effective and meaningful. It

includes various gestures, demonstration, use of appropriate teaching materials and appropriate illustration to support his or her presentation. Fulfilment of objectives highly depends on the teacher' presentation.

Table No. 3

Presentation

	Excellent%		Good%		Average%		Poor%	
	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
Was the presentation interesting?	0	0	35	0	65	100	0	0
Relevant to the students' level and interest	0	0	35	35	65	65	0	0
Language functions presented in dialogue form	0	0	35	35	65	65	0	0
Language functions presented in the classroom context	0	0	35	35	65	65	0	0
Command over subject matter	0	0	33	0	33	100	33	0
Was subject matter logical and psychological?	0	0	65	0	35	100	0	0
Use of teaching materials	0	0	65	35	35	65	0	0
Appropriate illustrations	0	0	35	65	65	35	0	0

Out of eight aspects included under presentation, teachers of PS have been found better in interesting presentation, command over subject matter, psychological and logical presentation and use of teaching materials whereas in appropriate illustration they have been found poor in comparison. But in other aspects like relevant to the students' level and interest, language functions presentation in dialogue form and language functions in the classroom context they have been found equal.

iii. Practice Techniques

Table No. 4 Practice Techniques

	Excellent%		Good%		Average%		Poor%	
	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
Students' Question on Practice	0	0	0	0	35	65	65	35
Relation of presentation and practice	0	0	100	65	0	35	0	0
Attention to linguistic form	0	0	0	35	100	65	0	0
Mechanical transformation exercise	0	0	0	65	100	35	0	0
Recognition and identification activities	0	0	33	0	33	35	33	65
Information transfer activities	0	0	0	35	100	65	0	0
Meaningful drill	0	0	65	35	35	65	0	0
Students' participation on practice	0	0	65	35	35	65	0	0

Among the aspects kept under practice stage PS teachers were found better over relation of presentation and practice, recognition and identification activities, meaningful language drill and students' participation on practice CS teachers were found better in other remaining aspects like students' question on practice, attention to linguistic form, mechanical transformation exercise and information transfer activities.

iv. Communicative Activities

Table No. 5
Communicative Activities

	Excellent%		Good%		Average%		Poor%	
	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
Information exchange	0	0	35	0	65	100	0	0
Free interview	0	0	35	0	65	65	0	35
Opinion gap task	0	0	0	65	0	35	100	0
Role play/simulation	0	0	0	0	100	35	0	65
Real life activity	0	0	65	35	35	65	0	0

Under this stage five different aspects were included, among them PS students were found better in information exchange, free interview, role play/simulation and real life activity than CS students, on the other hand in opinion gap task PS students were better.

v. Evaluation

All teaching and learning activities are guided by certain destination. It is an evaluation stage which determines the accomplishment and un-accomplishments of the objectives.

Table No. 6
Evaluation

	Excellent%		Good%		Average%		Poor%	
	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
Feedback given by teachers	0	0	35	65	65	35	0	0
Was evaluation technique good?	0	0	100	35	0	65	0	0

Among the two aspects included under evaluation, PS teachers were better in evaluation technique, on the other hand they were poor in providing feedback which was reverse in the case of CS teachers.

3.2.1 Detailed Comparison of Sample of Lesson Presentation

As it has been mentioned under the tools of data collection, there were three major concepts included within checklist, out of which this deals with the analysis of checklist second which has included the overall presentation of teaching items. This included pre-communicative stage, controlled communicative stage and free communicative stage with evaluation. The position of teachers of both types of schools has been analyzed including it within 29 sub-points.

3.2.1.1 Pre-Communicative Activities

i. Warming Up Activities

a. Students' Motivation to the Subject Matter

Table No. 2.1 Students' Motivation to the Subject Matter

Table No. 1 (a)%	Table No. 1 (b)%
Good:100	Good: 0
Average: 0	Average: 100
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Table no. 1 (a) shows that the student motivation in the subject matter was found better than table no. 1 (b). It shows that in the class of PS teachers' students had better motivations in subject- matter than CS teachers. As shown in the above table no. 1 (a) and (b), students' motivation was 100% good in the case of PS teachers whereas it was 100% average in CS teachers.

b. Students' Motivation to the Teacher

Table No. 2.2 Students' Motivation to the Teacher

Table No. 1 (a)%	Table No. 1 (b)%
Good:65	Good: 0
Average: 35	Average: 100
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Motivation refers to the internal drive that leads one to take certain course of action. Thus, without motivation one cannot get success in any action. This is one of the important factors for effective teaching and learning too. The success of teacher lies over the extent to which he/she can motivate to his or her students. Table no. 2 (a) shows that the students' motivation to the teacher was better than table no. 2 (b). As shown in the above table, students' motivation was 65% good and 35% average in the case of PS students whereas 100% average for CS students. The reason behind their better motivation was the result of better demonstration and style of teaching.

c. Objective Specification

Table No. 2.3. Objective Specification

Table No. 3 (a)%	Table No. 3 (b)%
Good: 33	Good: 35
Average: 33	Average: 0
Poor: 33	Poor: 65

Objectives are the guiding factors which lead to a certain direction. In the field of language teaching and learning objective specification is the final target to be met. As all other remaining activities are based on it which are conceived as epitome of whole process. The analysis of its position in the class conducted by

the teaching of PS and CS schools as shown in table no. 3 (a) and (b). Objective specification from the sight of PS teachers was 33% good, 33% average and 33% poor whereas in the case of CS teachers it was 35% good, 65% poor.

d. Related to Previous Lesson

Table No. 2.4 Related to Previous Lesson

Table No. 4 (a)%	Table No. 4 (b)%
Good: 100	Good: 100
Average: 0	Average: 0
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

The content can be learnt simultaneously which compels us to restrict and to follow certain chronological order in course of proceeding. It is the aspect where content gets certain order either horizontal or vertical. It's application in course of teaching into two types of schools has been presented on the above table. It shows that the lessons were properly knitted by both types of schools' (PS and CS) teachers who were 100% good.

ii. Presentation

a. Was Presentation Interesting?

Table No. 3.1 Was Presentation Interesting?

Table No. 5 (a)%	Table No. 5 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 0
Average: 65	Average: 100
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Above table no. 5 (a) and (b) have shown that the presentation was 35% good and 65% average in the case of PS teachers whereas 100% average in the case of CS teachers. Both PS and CS teachers wanted to do interesting presentation.

PS teachers have different techniques to create interesting environment in the classroom (especially by the use of demonstration) whereas CS teachers could not reach at the point of PS teachers. One main problem that the researcher found in CS teachers was that they only exposed the content to the students which lead them to feel monotonous but the PS teachers as their routine suggested had to provide interval regularity after two classes and include extra activities corresponding to the lesson.

b. Relevant to the Students' Level and Interest

Table No. 3.2 Relevant to the Students' Level and Interest

Table No. 6 (a)%	Table No. 6 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 35
Average: 65	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

It is widely accepted fact that teaching should be done as the level and interest of students because they are the main components in teaching. If one goes beyond the level and interest of the students, they may loss their interest in the study. Similarly if one can not meet their level and interest, their progressive wings will be cut off. So, it is important to maintain the level and interest. With the help of this research the researcher found that both types of teachers (PS and CS) were equally aware of meeting the students' level and interest in their lesson. As shown in the table no. 6 (a) and 6 (b) both schools' teachers were 35% good and 65% average in their presentation.

c. Language Function Presented in Dialogue Form

Table No. 3.3 Language Function Presented in Dialogue Form

Table No. 7 (a)%	Table No. 7 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 35
Average: 65	Average: 0
Poor: 0	Poor: 65

Among the various ways of presenting language functions, presentation in the dialogue form is regarded as a significant way where interlocutors share their ideas with the application of specific language functions. The position of the teachers' presentation as shown in the table no. 7 (a) and (b) it is seen that the teachers of PS were 35% good and 65% average whereas CS teachers' position was 35% good and 65% poor. It has proved that language functions were better presented in regular forms by PS teachers than CS teachers.

d. Language Function Presented in Classroom Context

Table No. 3.4 Language Function Presented in Classroom Context

Table No. 8 (a)%	Table No. 8 (b)%
Good : 35	Good : 35
Average : 65	Average : 65
Poor : 0	Poor : 0

It is another way of presenting language functions where classroom is simulated as the real context. This way of presentation as table no. 8 (a) and (b) have shown that teachers of both schools (PS and CS) were found equally applying contextual presentation, which was 35% good and 65% average.

e. Command Over Subject Matter

Table No. 3.5 Command over Subject Matter

Table No. 9 (a)%	Table No. 9 (b)%
Good : 33	Good : 0
Average : 33	Average : 100
Poor : 33	Poor : 0

How can a teacher teach without having command over the subject matter to be taught? It is the most important and indispensable requirement in teaching.

Teacher remains professionally unqualified if he has not good command over the content. The researcher in his research found PS teachers' status as 33% good, 33% average and 33% poor in the subject matter whereas 100% average in the case of CS teachers. Comparatively both PS and CS teachers were found similar in this point but little weakness of PS teachers was seen. It was 33% poor which was zero in the case of CS teachers despite the lack of certain percent over the criteria good.

f. Was Presentation Logical and Psychological?

Table No. 3.6 Was Presentation Logical and Psychological?

Table No. 10 (a)%	Table No. 10 (b)%
Good : 65	Good : 0
Average : 35	Average : 100
Poor : 0	Poor : 0

It is believed that if teachers teach lesson orderly that is called logical and if they teach as students' desire, level and psychology that is called psychological. Logical and psychological presentation is the backbone for successful presentation. The researcher in his research found that the status of PS teacher was 65% good and 35% average whereas the status of CS teachers was 100%

average as shown in the above table. It has shown that PS teachers had better status than CS teachers on logical and psychological presentation. Similarly, the researcher found that PS teachers were more aware with the psychological level of the students.

g. Use of Teaching Materials

Table No. 3.7 Use of Teaching Materials

Table No. 11 (a)%	Table No. 11 (b)%
Good: 65	Good: 35
Average: 35	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

This table no. 11 (a) and (b) have shown that in the use of teaching materials PS teachers were comparatively better than those of CS since it was 65% average on the part of PS teachers whereas it was 35% good and 65% average on the part of CS teachers.

h. Were Illustrations Appropriate?

Table No. 3.8 Were Illustrations Appropriate?

Table No. 12 (a)%	Table No. 12 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 65
Average: 65	Average: 35
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Illustration refers to the provision of additional examples in order to support certain statements. For the clarification of certain difficulty it functions as additional advantage. With the help of this research the researcher found that in the provision of appropriate illustrations CS teachers were better in comparison to PS teachers. As shown in the table no. 12 (a) and (b) the position of CS

teachers was 65% good and 35% average whereas it was 35% good and 65% average in the part of PS teachers.

i. Presentation Techniques

Table No. 3.9 Presentation Techniques

Table No. 13 (a)%	Table No. 13 (b)%
Inductive: 75	Inductive: 60
Deductive: 25	Deductive: 40

As the table no. 13 (a) and (b) have shown under the presentation technique only two techniques were used. Despite having slight differences in both types of schools' teachers were found using inductive techniques more frequently than deductive one. But inductive and deductive techniques were used 75% and 25% respectively by the teachers of PS whereas these were used 60% and 40% respectively by the teachers of CS schools. In the real experience of classroom observation the researcher found that both types of schools' teachers were aware of presenting the example first but were not aware in the generalization of rules.

3.2.1.2. Controlled Communicative Activities

i. Practice

a. Students' Question on Practice

Table No. 4.1 Students' Question on Practice

Table No. 14 (a)%	Table No. 14 (b)%
Good: 0	Good: 0
Average: 35	Average: 65
Poor: 65	Poor: 35

Students' activeness is primary in the classroom today so, it is the day of student centered teaching. But supremacy was still existed in the classroom CS teachers were found a bit more flexible than the PS teachers for this point as

given in table no. 14 (a) and (b) students' question on practice was 65% average and 35% poor on the part of CS whereas it was 35% average and 65% poor on the part of PS.

b. Relation of Presentation and Practices

Table No. 4.2 Relation of Presentation and Practices

Table No. 15 (a)%	Table No. 15 (b)%
Good: 100	Good: 65
Average: 0	Average: 35
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Presentation without practice remains lamb without support. So, presentation and practice must go on parallel way. As given in table no.15 (a) and (b) the correspondence between presentation and practice was 100% good in PS teachers whereas it was 65% good and 35% average for CS teachers. Comparatively PS teachers were found more balance in presentation and practices than CS teachers.

c. Attention to Linguistic Form

Table No. 4.3 Attention to Linguistic Form

Table No. 16 (a)%	Table No. 16 (b)%
Good: 100	Good: 35
Average: 0	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Simply linguistic form refers to the skeleton on which body gets stood. Similar to the language, there are restricted numbers of structure with the help of which infinite number of sentences can be generated. Thus, importance of linguistic form can not be underestimated in course of dealing with language function. The researcher in his research found that as shown in the table no. 16 above an

attention to linguistic form given by CS teachers was 35% good and 65% average whereas it was 100% average in the case of PS teachers.

d. Mechanical Transformation Exercise

Table No. 4.4 Mechanical Transformation Exercise

Table No. 17 (a)%	Table No. 17 (b)%
Good: 65	Good: 100
Average: 35	Average: 0
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

It is one type of drill where the students are encouraged to transfer the given ideas mechanically without getting its meaning. In course of language learning language learners have to be accustomed to repeat certain structure which is better resulted by the help of mechanical transformation exercise. It's use as the researcher found in his research was 100% average in the case of CS teachers whereas it was 65% good and 35% average in the case of PS teachers.

e. Recognition and Identification Activities

Table No. 4.5 Recognition and Identification Activities

Table No. 18 (a)%	Table No. 18 (b)%
Good: 33	Good: 0
Average: 33	Average: 35
Poor: 33	Poor: 65

This activity falls between mechanical transformation and free compositions. Here' students are even not fully getting independency but are indirectly directed. In the present research, recognition and identification activities were found more frequently used in PS teachers' class rather than CS teachers' class. As the table no. 18 (a) and (b) have shown that the use of this activity was 33%

good and 33% average and 33% poor in PS teachers' class whereas it was 35% average and 65% poor in CS teachers'.

f. Information Transfer Activities

It refers to the transformation of the information presented either in picture or table into prose form and vice-versa. It is regarded as one of the creative exercise.

Table No. 4.6 Information Transfer Activities

Table No. 19 (a)%	Table No. 19 (b)%
Good: 0	Good: 35
Average: 100	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

The position of this exercise in CS teachers' class was found better than in the class of PS teachers. As shown in the table no. 19 (a) and (b) the position of CS teachers was 35% good 65% average whereas it was 100% average in the case of PS teachers.

g. Meaningful Language Drill

It is one types of drill where without having the help of clue given the students response the correct reasons by the use of their knowledge accumulated.

Table No. 4.7 Meaningful Language Drill

Table No. 20 (a)%	Table No. 20 (b)%
Good: 65	Good: 35
Average: 35	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

In some previous aspects related to drill, CS schools' position was better than PS schools' but for the current one (meaningful language drill) reversely the position of PS teachers found better than CS teachers. As shown in the table no. 20 (a) and (b) the use of meaningful language drill was 65% good and 35% average by PS teachers whereas it was 35% good and 65% average in the case of CS teachers.

h. Students' Participation on Practice

Only good listener is not sufficient for language learning how much time students give actively on practice.

Table No. 4.8 Students' Participation on Practice

Table No. 21 (a)%	Table No. 21 (b)%
Good: 65	Good: 35
Average: 35	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

As given in the table no. 21 (a) and (b) students' participation on practice was 65% good and 35% average in the case of PS students' whereas it was 35% good 65% average in the case of CS students'. It has shown that students' participation on practice was found better in the case of PS than CS. One important aspect has been found here, is that it depends on the behaviours of the teachers. If he or she emphasizes on the practice there will be student participation. Thus, the teacher has a great role to create such environment in the classroom.

i. Practice Techniques

Table No. 4.9 Practice Techniques

Table No. 22 (a)%	Table No. 22 (b)%
Drill: 30	Drill: 50
Question Answer: 35	Question Answer: 30
Role Play: 20	Role Play: 10
Peer Work : 15	Peer Work : 10

Table no. 22 (a) and (b) have shown that drill, question answer, role play and peer work were the common techniques used in the practice of language functions by both types of schools' teachers. But the distinct lies to what extent they gave the priority to each technique. As mentioned in the above table no. 22(a) and (b) comparatively question answer, role play and peer work got much priority in the case of PS teachers whereas drill got more in the case of CS teacher. To put in mathematical form 45% questions answer, 25% role play, 15% peer work was used by PS teachers whereas it was 30% question answer, 10% role play and 10% peer work on the part of CS teachers. On the other hand 50% drill was used by CS teachers whereas 30% in the case of PS.

3.2.1.3. Communicative Activities

a. Information Exchange

It refers to ability where students have to be able to share information creatively.

Table No. 5.2 Information Exchange

Table No. 23 (a)%	Table No. 23 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 0
Average: 65	Average: 100
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

Since it does not resemble with the different types of drills, in his research work the researcher found that the information exchange activities was 35% good and 65% average in PS class whereas it's use in CS was 100% average. It showed that information exchange activities were more frequent in PS classes than CS classes.

b. Free Interview

It refers to a sort of interview in which interviewee has to response the question of the interviewer with his sport decision. But this activity has not been used in that sense since the students of secondary level can not engage them in that manner. Here, the researcher means the interview conducted over the topic taught which takes the shape of just simple question answer exchange.

Table No. 5.2 Free Interview

Table No. 24 (a)%	Table No. 24 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 0
Average: 65	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 35

The position of free interview (in general sense) in the case of PS was 35% average and 65% poor whereas it was 65% average and 35% poor in the case of CS. It showed that the position of PS was better than the position of CS.

c. Opinion Gap Task

Opinion gap task demands students' ability to express his or her ideas over certain matter. It tries to derive originality outside. Similar to the free interview activities it has been used in general sense.

Table No. 5.3 Opinion Gap Task

Table No. 25 (a)%	Table No. 25 (b)%
Good: 0	Good: 0
Average: 0	Average: 65
Poor: 100	Poor: 35

The analysis of collected data revealed out that the position of CS was better in comparison to PS. As the table no. 25 (a) and (b) have shown that it's use in CS was 65% average and 35% poor whereas 100% poor in the case of PS.

d. Role Play/Simulation

Both role play and simulation are students centered activities having certain similarity and differences. They mainly differ in the creation of environments whereas they are similar in the provision of role provided. These activities are more demanding on the part of teachers as well as students.

Table No. 5.4 Role Play/Simulation

Table No. 26 (a)%	Table No. 26 (b)%
Good: 0	Good: 0
Average: 100	Average: 35
Poor: 0	Poor: 65

The status of these activities was found poor in both types of schools (no position was found over the criteria good as well). Again in comparison the position of PS teachers was found slightly better than CS teachers. As it has been mentioned in table no. 26 (a) and (b) role play and simulation were used 100% average in PS teachers' classes whereas 35% average and 65% poor on the part of CS teachers.

e. Real Life Activity

Whenever the students try to apply whatever they have learnt in their day to day activities we talk about real life activities. Here, this activity has been restricted in course of learning language functions like greeting, requesting, welcoming and so on.

Table No. 5.5 Real Life Activity

Table No. 27 (a)%	Table No. 27 (b)%
Good: 65	Good: 35
Average: 35	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

The researcher found the students were practising the learnt materials while participating in different external activities comparatively students of PS have found to have applied it since they used to be together with all their classmates unlike in the case of CS students who get them together only six hours at school not beyond that. So, as the table no. 27 (a) and (b) have shown real life activities were used 65% good and 35% average in the case of PS teachers whereas they were 35% good and 65% average on the part of CS teachers.

3.2.1.4. Evaluation

a. Feedback Given by Teacher

Table No. 6.1

Table No. 28 (a)%	Table No. 28 (b)%
Good: 35	Good: 0
Average: 65	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 35

The provision of feedback to the learner is an essential part in all stages of learning. Feedback can be provided in two ways; correcting by the teachers and giving chances to correct the students themselves. In this aspects as shown in table no. 28 (a) and (b) have shown that feedback given by PS teachers was 35% good and 65% average whereas it was 65% average and 35% poor by CS teachers. Comparatively PS teachers were found better in the use of immediate feedback than PS teachers.

b. Was Evaluation Technique Good?

Evaluation is one of the inevitable aspects in course of teaching and learning. It helps to identify, the position of students as well as success/unsuccess of teachers.

Table No. 6.2 Was Evaluation Technique Good?

Table No. 29 (a)%	Table No. 29 (b)%
Good: 100	Good: 35
Average: 0	Average: 65
Poor: 0	Poor: 0

The position of evaluation in PS schools was found comparatively better than CS. As shown in the table no. 29 (a) and (b) effectiveness of evaluation technique was 100% good in PS whereas it was 35% good and 65% average in CS.

3.3 Holistic Comparison of Indirectly Related Aspects

Table No. 7 Holistic Comparison of Indirectly Related Aspects

S · N ·	Name of Aspects	Excellent %		Good %		Average %		poor %	
		PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS	PS	CS
i.	Classroom Situation								
	Attendance	0	0	65	33	35	33	0	33
	Discipline	35	0	65	35	0	65	0	0
	Classroom size	0	0	0	0	100	35	0	65
	Arrangement	0	0	65	0	0	65	35	35
	Furniture	0	0	35	0	65	65	0	35
ii	Teachers								
	Attitude to the students	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0
	Self confidence	0	0	65	35	35	65	0	0
	Language	0	0	0	35	100	65	0	0
	Teachers' voice and fluency	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0
	Personality	0	0	100	65	0	35	0	0
ii i.	Students								
	Motivated	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0
	Answer teachers' question	0	0	65	35	35	65	0	0
	Participate in action	0	0	0	0	100	35	0	65
	Ask question relevantly	0	0	0	0	35	0	65	100
iv ·	Instructional Materials								
	Size and clarity	0	0	33	0	33	65	33	35
	Appropriateness to teaching	0	0	35	0	65	100	0	0
	Proper use	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0
	Use of chalkboard	0	0	65	65	35	35	0	0

i. Classroom Situation

This aspect has been measured on the basis of five sub-criteria which have been indicated with the use of 'a' 'b' 'c' 'd' and 'e' (attendance, discipline, classroom size, arrangement and furniture) respectively. Analysis of these aspects as in the table no. 7 (i) shows that the position of PS school was 65% good and 35% average in 'a', 35% excellent and 65% good in 'b', 100% average in 'c', 65% good and 35% poor in 'd' and 35% good and 65% average in 'e' whereas, the position of CS school was 33% in each good, average and poor in 'a', 35% good and 65% average in 'b', 35% average and 65% poor in 'c', 35% average and 65% poor in 'd' and 65% average and 35% poor in 'e'.

ii. Position of Teachers

This aspect has been measured on the basis of five headings which have been indicated by 'a', 'b', 'c', 'd' and 'e' respectively for attitude to the students, self confidence, language teacher's voice, fluency and personality. Analysis of these aspects as in the table no. 7 (ii) showed that the position of PS teachers was 100% good in 'a', 65% good and 35% average in 'b', 100% average in 'c', 65% average and 35% poor in 'd', and 100% good in 'e' whereas the position of CS teachers was 100% good in 'a', 35% good and 65% average in 'b', 35% average and 65% poor in 'c', 35% average and 65% poor in 'd' and 65% good and 35% average in 'e'. Thus, teacher's attitude towards the students was equal to language. Proficiency of PS teachers was poor in comparison of CS teachers but in other three aspects b, d and e PS teachers were better than CS teachers.

iii. Status of Students

As done in earlier aspects named classroom situation and teachers' position it has been evaluated being based on four sub-headings indicated by 'a' 'b' 'c' 'd' (motivated, answer teachers' question, participate in the activities and ask question relevantly) respectively. As the table no. 7 (iii) shows that the position of PS students was 100% good in 'a', 65% good and 35% average in 'b' 100%

average in 'c' and 35% average and 65% poor in 'd' whereas the position of CS students was 100% average in 'a', 35% good and 65% average in 'b', 35% average and 65% poor in 'c' and 100% poor in 'd'. This leads the researcher to conclude that over the position of students, the students of PS were found better than CS.

iv. Instructional Materials

Similar to the cases above, it has been evaluated on the basis of four criteria as indicated by the use of 'a', 'b', 'c' and 'd' size and clarity, appropriate to teaching, proper use and use of chalk board respectively. As table no. 7 (iv) shows the position of PS teacher was 33% good, average, and poor in each in 'a', 35% good and 65% average in 'b', 100% average in 'c', 65% good and 35% average in 'd' whereas 65% average and 35% poor in 'a', 100% average in 'b', 65% average and 35% poor in 'c', 65% good and 35% average in 'd' in the case of CS. This leads the researcher to conclude that except having equal position in 'd' both types of schools' teachers in all remaining aspects like 'a' 'b' 'c', position of PS teachers was better than CS teachers.

CHAPTER - FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to find out the teaching strategies used in teaching language functions in two different types of schools, PS and CS highlighting their similarities and differences. After the analysis of the collected data obtained from observation and questionnaire the researcher found that co-operative learning, audio-video, total physical response (TPR), questioning and group work were highly used by the PS teachers. Among them questioning, group work and TPR were slightly used by CS teachers. Comparison of overall presentation of two types of schools' teachers revealed out that in majority of the aspects of warming up, presentation, practice and evaluation PS teachers were found better and in limited aspects they were equal and in some aspects CS teachers' position were found better.

4.1 Findings

The teachers of PS were found to have entered into the classroom without having prepared lesson plan but started lesson with warming up activities which were followed by the presentation, practice and evaluation. On the way of going some teachers were found with some teaching materials in order to bring clarity in their presentation. Specifically, their position has been captured on the following points:

- a. Audio-video, deductive, games, lecture, non-verbal communication, pair-work, role play/simulation and TPR strategies were used sometimes by them.
- b. Experimental inquiry and discovery strategies were not found used while teaching language functions.
- c. The position of both PS and CS English teachers was found exactly similar in the use of games, inductive and lecture strategies. Similarly, both types of schools' teachers did not use inquiry and discovery activities.

- d. The techniques i.e. drill, inductive, lecture, question and answer were found frequently used in both types of schools' teachers' presentation.
- e. Audio-video, co-operative, group-work, question and answer were frequently used by PS teachers whereas deductive technique was found more frequent in CS teachers' presentation.
- f. Position of PS teachers' in the use of TPR, role play/simulation, pair-work and non-verbal communication was found better whereas position of CS teachers was found better in the use of deductive, drill and experimental strategies.
- g. Students were found highly motivated towards both types of schools' teachers and subject matter.
- h. Even in the specification of the objective PS teachers were found better than those of CS teachers.
- i. In relating present lesson to the previous on both types of schools' teachers were found equally aware having 100% good position.
- j. Interesting, logical and psychological presentation were found better done by PS teachers than of CS teachers.
- k. PS teachers were found to have better command over subject matter than CS teachers, similar the case within the use of teaching materials.
- l. Equal position was found in the relevance of presentation with the students' need and interest in the contextual presentation.
- m. In the provision of appropriate illustrations CS teachers were found comparatively better than PS teachers.
- n. Students' participation and their questions on practice were found more frequent in PS students than those of CS students.

- o. Presentation and practice were found parallel developed by PS teachers than those of CS teachers.
- p. In meaningful language drill, recognize and identification activities PS students were better than CS students whereas in mechanical transformational exercise and information transfer activities CS students were found better.
- q. Attention to linguistic form was found better given by CS teachers than of PS teachers.
- r. In communicative activities viz. information exchange, free interview, role play/simulation, real life activity PS students were better than CS students whereas in opinion gap task activity CS students were found better than PS students.
- s. Students' achievement over objective and feedback given by teachers were better on the part of PS.
- t. Even in the evaluation technique used by PS teachers were comparatively better than CS teachers.

4.1.2 Findings from Questionnaire

As it has mentioned under the tools of data collection it was not a major tool but additional one. As the appendix ii shows questionnaire was prepared around ten questions with two aims. The main aim behind it's preparation was to evaluate to what extent there was consonance in theoretical and practical aspect of the teachers of both types of schools. The other additional aim was to check their theoretical position taking it into comparative framework.

Questionnaire was analyzed on the basis of the answer of information. Generally, the answer of CS and PS English teachers were compared. The questionnaire itself was not very demanding on the part of teacher since it was

prepared for the English teacher of secondary level. The comparison of the answer sheets written by the teachers revealed out that despite having slight differences on theoretical level. The researcher could not find such striking differences between their theoretical knowledge. Collectively, the teachers of PS were found a bit more forward than the teachers of CS. But one common finding was that both schools teachers were not theoretically sound and applying theoretical knowledge into practical field (teaching) both types of schools' teachers were weak as well.

4.2. Recommendations

Teaching being a challenging task requires both ability to integrate science and art. As the child centered teaching being the demand of day, it requires higher level of knowledge and skills than the traditional teacher dominated teaching and learning. This study has come up with the following recommendation in the secondary level of both schools in bringing out improvement in teaching learning.

a. Bring Variety in Teaching

Both types of the schools' teachers were found restricted within certain strategies specially, inductive and drill. From which students were found feeling bored. So, they should be taught by using different techniques in different times.

b. Contextualize Their Presentation

Language functions require appropriate context. When this item is taught creating appropriate context, its effectiveness can be raised and predetermined objectives can be met. The more context in the classroom is created the more effective learning will be.

c. Motivate Students Appropriately

In both types of schools' teachers have used question and answer strategy to motivate their students towards the lesson frequently which is not good as well so, new and interesting techniques should be applied as a motivating strategy.

d. Develop Them Theoretically

- a. Despite their practice in real classroom they were not aware of the theoretical ground on which these techniques or strategies were standing. So, in order to bring better improvement they should be sound enough theoretically.
- b. The teachers should be more labourious in order to develop them theoretically which will require the study of various books and references materials.

e. Envisage Child Centered Strategies

It is essential to envisage child centered strategies in both secondary schools' classrooms (CS and PS) which will require.

- a. Creating conducive classroom environment such as appropriate class size, manageable teachers, work load, display, availability of require materials, setting, arrangements learning, corner, appropriate furniture.
- b. Preparing teachers to implement child centered strategies identifying skills and resources required for child centered education.

f. Provide Focused Training

Teachers need to be prepared to achieve predetermined objectives.

g. Rethink Minimal Qualification for Entry in the Teaching Profession

- a. Rethink what level of qualification and initial/pre-service training will be required for entry into teaching profession such as BEd with training in secondary level course.
- b. Set time line for gradual introduction of minimum qualification requirement by analyzing the ability of required human resources.

h. Understand Psychological Level, Need and Interest of the Students

- a. Specially, teachers of CS were not much aware of the fact that students come with something in their mind. They were found teaching for the fulfilment of their duty rather than to make students able over taught item.
- b. They should know child already had something in their mind; every child is unique to another child and should be treated accordingly.

i. Enter into the Class with Preparation

They should enter into the classroom with full preparation which can facilitate for effective teaching.

References

- Abbs, B. and Freebairn, I. (1977). *Starting strategies*. England: Longman publication.
- Bennett, W.A. (1969). *Aspects of language and language teaching*. London: Cambridge University press.
- Bhattarai, A. (2001). Writing a research proposal. *Journal of NELTA* Vol. 6, No 1.
- Bhattra, G.R. (2005). A sample of s proposal. *Young Voices in ELT*, Vol. 4, No.1.
- Bista, P. (2008). *Reading strategies employed by ninth grade students*. An unpublished thesis of M.Ed., T.U. Kathmandu.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. London: prentice Hall.
- Chaudhary, L (2009). *Learning strategies used by the class toppers*. An unpublished thesis of M.Ed., T.U. Kathmandu.
- Corder, S. Pit. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. London: Penguin Books.
- Crystal, D. (1990). *The English language*. London: Harmondsworth.
- Devkota, B. (2003). *Learning strategies: an attitudinal study*. An unpublished thesis of M.Ed., T.U. Kathmandu
- Finocchiaro, M. (1986). *English as a second/foreign language: From theory to practice*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.

- Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An Introduction*.
Cambridge: CUP.
- Martin, J. (2007). *Teaching strategies*. Retrieved 10 July 2011 from
<http://www.cmu.edu/facstaft/part-time/strategy.htm/>
- Rai, R.J. (2009). *Learning strategies used by Maithili learners of English at secondary level*. An unpublished thesis of M.Ed., T.U. Kathmandu
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Sthapit, S. K. (2003). *Teaching language for communication*. *A Journal of NELTA* Vol. 8, No. 1-2.
- Van, Ek. J.A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe

Appendix I
CHECKLIST FOR THE CLASS OBSERVATION

The researcher is going to research on the "**Strategies Adopted in Teaching Language Functions at Secondary Level**" under the supervision of **Mr. Raj Narayan Yadav**, Reader, Department of English Education, T.U. The researcher will observe the classes of select teachers by using the given checklist.

The checklist is based on the model of peer observation form of Faculty of Education, T.U.

The Researcher
Madhab K.C.

Name of the Teacher:

Date:

Name of the School:

Period:

Types of School:

No. of Students:

Observed Classes:

Class:

Teaching Item:

S.N.	Indirectly Related Aspects	Excellent	Good	Mediocre	Poor	Remarks
1	Classroom Situation					
	Attendance					
	Discipline					
	Classroom Size					
	Furniture					
	Arrangement					
2	Teacher					
	Attitude to the Students'					
	Self-confidence					
	Language					
	Teacher's Voice and Fluency					
	Personality					
3	Students					
	Motivated					
	Answer Teacher's Question					
	Ask Questions Relatively					
	Participate in Activities					
4	Instructional Materials					
	Size and Clarity					
	Appropriateness to the Teaching					
	Proper Use					
	Use of Chalkboard					

S.N.	Sample of Lesson Presentation	Performance of the Teacher				
		Excellent	Good	Mediocre	Poor	Remarks
1	Pre Communicative Activities					
I	Warm up Activities					
	Students motivation to the subject matter					
	Student motivation to the Teacher					
	Objective Specification					
	Related to the previous lesson					
II	Presentation					
	Related to the previous lesson					
	Is the presentation interesting?					
	Related to the students' level and interest					
	Language function presentation in classroom context					
	Language functions presented in classroom context					
	Teachers command over subject matters					
	Is presentation logical and psychological?					
	Use of Teaching learning materials					
	Are illustrations appropriate?					
	Presentation technique Deductive Inductive					
2	Controlled Communicative Activities					
I	Practice					
	Students question on practice					
	Relation of presentation and practice					
	Attention to linguistic form					
	Related of presentation and practice					
	Attention to linguistic form					
	Mechanical transformation exercise					
	Information transfer					
	Mechanical language drill					
	Recognition/Identification activities					
	Student's participation on practice					
	Practice technique Drill Question answer Role play Pair work					
3	Communicative Activities					
	Information exchange					
	Free interview					
	Role play/ Simulation					
	Real life activities					
4	Evaluation					
	Students achievements over objective					
	Feedback given by teachers					
	Are the evaluation techniques good?					

Strategies or Techniques Used	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Remarks
Audio-Video				
Co-operative Learning				
Deductive				
Demonstrative				
Drill				
Experimental				
Games				
Group Work				
Inductive				
Inquiry/Discovery				
Lecture				
Non-Verbal Communication				
Pair Work				
Question-Answer				
Role play/Simulation				
Total Physical Response [TRP]				
Others....				

Appendix: II

Questionnaire

Dear Sir/Madam

This questionnaire is a research tool for gathering information for my research entitled "**Strategies adopted in Teaching language Functions at Secondary Level**" under the supervision of **Mr. Raj Narayan Yadav**, Reader, Department of English Education, T.U., Kirtipur. The correct information provided by you will be the great help for completing my research. The information provided by will be kept highly confidential and used only for research purpose. I would appreciate your honest opinion assure you that your response will be completely anonymous.

Name:	Qualification:
Address:	Experiences:
School:	

Please answer the following questions.

1. How can we teach language function effectively?

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

2. Do you think teaching language function is difficult than teaching any other aspect? If yes why? If not why?

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

3. Do your students show curiousness while studying language function?

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

4. Which skills of language do you focus more while teaching language function in the classroom?

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

5. Teaching language functions is more difficult than teaching any other aspects.

- a. Strongly agree []
- b. Agree []
- c. Disagree []
- d. Strongly disagree []

6. Is teaching language function necessary for language learning? Why or why not?

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

7. What do you do in the following while teaching language functions?

a. Pre-communicative stage:

.....
.....

b. Presentation stage:

.....
.....

c. Practice stage:

.....
.....

d. Communicative stage:

.....
.....

8. What types of material are used while teaching language functions? List them.

- a.
- b.
- c.

d.

9. What are the techniques you commonly use while teaching language functions? List them.

a.

b.

c.

d.

10. How do you evaluate students' achievement over the topic taught?

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

Thank You for Your Assistance

.....

Madhab K.C

The Researcher

.....

Signature of Teacher