

CHAPTER- ONE

INTRODUCTION

This study is about the “Effectiveness of Cooperative Language Learning in Teaching Language Functions.” This chapter consists of the general background, review of the related literature, objectives of the study and significance of the study.

1.1 General Background

Study and research in English Language Teaching (ELT) motivated researchers and educators to develop effective and reliable teaching learning process involving students’ participation in classroom with emphasis on group learning. Cooperative language learning was developed as the student centered teaching method emphasizing on social nature of learning. Richards and Rodgers (2001, p.192) mention, “The early twentieth century educator John Dewey is usually credited with promoting the idea of building cooperation in learning into regular class-rooms on a regular and systematic basis.” It is an old concept employed in education since a long time and goes back hundreds of years and longer. Similarly, Kessler (1992) says, “The application of cooperative learning to classroom teaching finds its root in the 1970s when Israel and the United States began to design and study cooperative learning models for classroom context” (as cited in Liang, 2002, p.1). There is a long history of cooperative learning on research and application in academic field to find out its effectiveness and relevance in teaching learning process. It has been established as an effective learner centered teaching method due to its productive nature and outstanding features. Therefore, it is applied in almost all academic fields including school level to university context and claimed to be an effective teaching method in foreign and second language education by scholars.

In traditional classroom teaching learning, teachers are superior and tend to impose the subject matter in one way direction which lacks the development of language skills as well as social skills needed on part of learners. Learners are accustomed to develop the sense of competition rather than cooperation. So, Richards and Rodgers

(2001, p.192) say, “Minority groups fall behind higher-achieving students.” Therefore, to overcome these problems cooperative language learning came into existence in the field of ELT.

Cooperative language learning is a teaching method involving small teams of students to maximize their learning performance. Each team and students are responsible for their task accomplishment to achieve the shared goals of learning. Each team is formulated in a number of four to six students with mixture of heterogeneous students: gender, ethnicity and learning ability. Therefore, they develop the sense of mutual help along with development of habit of learning together where students achieve social behaviors and academic learning. It is generally asserted that cooperative learning is the best option for all students because it emphasizes active interaction between students of diverse abilities and backgrounds and demonstrates more positive outcome in academic achievement, social behaviour and affective development.

1.1.1 Cooperative Language Learning

Cooperative Language learning refers to a teaching method whereby small groups of students with different levels of performance work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning to accomplish shared learning goal. It is an instructional method involving small groups of heterogeneous students working together to boost the overall goal of the group. According to Johnson et al.(1993, p.9), “Cooperative learning is the instructional use of small groups so that students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning” (as cited in McCafferty et al. 2006, p.3). Similarly, Richards and Rodgers (1986, p.192) define cooperative learning as an approach to teaching that makes maximum use of cooperative activities involving pairs and small groups of learners in the classroom. In this regard, Olsen and Kagan (1992, p.2) state:

Cooperative learning is group activity organized so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information between learners in groups and in which each learner is held accountable for his or her own learning and

is motivated to increase the learning of others (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.192).

In the same way, Johnson and Johnson (1998) say, “Cooperative learning is grouping students together to accomplish shared learning goals. Students work in small groups of three or four to get the most out of their learning and each other’s learning” (as cited in Seng 2006, p.27). Therefore, co-operative learning involves small heterogeneous groups usually of two to six students working together to accomplish assigned task in which each member is individually accountable for the outcome of an individual and whole group. It promotes efficacy on learners’ achievement by developing the sense of mutual cooperation among team members. Furthermore, it is beneficial on the development of social skills and psychological health among students in achieving the academic success and objectives specified in the classroom.

It creates cooperative and supportive environment among students in the classroom which results better performance on learning task assigned to individual and group ensuring less anxiety and psychological inhibition. It fosters democratic learning environment in the classroom where student to student interaction occurs to develop the social skills through learning environment. It is essential to include cooperative learning experience in our classroom because students no longer come to school with an established caring and cooperative orientation. Therefore, we need cooperative learning to preserve democracy in learning. Kagan (1994, p.2) says, “Exclusive use of autocratic and teacher-dominated classroom structures leave students unprepared for participation in a democratic society. Democracy is not nurtured by a system which models autocratic decision-making and expects passive obedience among pupils.” It deserves the democratic nature in teaching involving students’ active participation on completion of assigned task.

Cooperative learning is an instructional method in which heterogeneous group of students work together to ensure the success of individual and group as a whole. Students are highly motivated to learn and cooperate in group because each

individuals are responsible to make their friends understandable by sharing their learning experiences where higher level students help lower level students in improving the subject matter being taught. Therefore, social skill of learning is developed due to the responsibility of each member in helping teammates to learn for the overall success of the whole group. There is active participation on behalf of students in the classroom emphasizing on communicative aspect. Therefore, it is asserted as communicative language teaching method in nature.

It is a type of structured peer interaction emphasizing positive human relationship, collaboration between peers and active learning towards academic achievement with equal participation. It promotes higher achievement, more positive relationship among students and healthier psychological adjustment than do competitive or individualistic experiences. It is widely researched and adopted teaching strategy. On the importance of cooperative learning, it is assumed that if there is any educational technique that has firm empirical support, it is cooperative learning. Thus, cooperative learning ensures to achieve many social and academic benefits in the classroom where students work together to accomplish significant cooperative tasks. Students attain higher level of achievement to increase cross-ethnic friendship, to experience enhanced self-esteem, to build life-long interaction and communication skill and as a productive member of the society.

1.1.2 Theories Underlying Cooperative Language Learning

The theories related to cooperative language learning came from different theories and perspectives developed by prominent scholars: Vygotsky from Russia, Piaget from France and Albert Bandura from the USA. Advocates of cooperative language learning assume that theories regarding cooperative learning have bases on: The Vygotskian Perspective, The Piagetian Perspective and Bandura's Social Learning Theory.

1.1.2.1 The Vygotskian Perspective

The Vygotskian perspective to cooperative learning assumes that many cooperative

group activities deserve a very definite role to be played by actively directed learning, both in the cognitive development of individual human being and in the human culture. According to this perspective, cooperative learning is based mainly on the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which is defined by Vygotsky as the discrepancy between the student's actual developmental level (i.e. independent achievement) and his/her potential level (achievement with help from more competent partner). Thus, learning is more accelerated through social interdependence. Furthermore, Vygotsky (1978) states:

The essential feature of learning is that it awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when the child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his/her peers being the part of an environment (as cited in Liang, 2002, p.26-27).

It is found that two students were able to complete a particular task when working together. Therefore, this perspective believes that peers can help each other in developing learning very much with social interaction, cooperation, positive and social interdependence.

1.1.2.2 The Piagetian Perspective

The Piagetian perspective assumes that learning is geared only when the learners deserve the ability to learn cognitive content with respect to their stage of intellectual development which leads to learning with the participation among learners. This perspective assumes that knowledge is not merely transmitted verbally. It needs to be constructed and reconstructed by the learners in social interaction. Piaget asserted that a child starts to perceive the knowledge involving in different actions and experiences. Readiness approach in developmental psychology emphasizes that children can not learn something until maturation gives them certain prerequisite. Teaching learning should be oriented keeping in mind the competence and performance level of students in cooperative learning classroom. Instruction should be individualized as much as possible and students should have enough opportunities to communicate with one

another ensuring the learning environment to discover new learning. In this regard, Richards and Rodgers (1986, p.194) say, “Learners develop communicative competence in pedagogically structured situations.” Cognitive development is basically enhanced by the prerequisite learning environment by creating scaffolding for individuals in social cooperation and interaction. It is assumed that working together promotes socio-cognitive conflict and creates cognitive disequilibrium which in turn stimulates perspective-taking ability and cognitive development of learners.

1.1.2.3 Bandura’s Social Learning Theory

Social learning theory of Bandura emphasizes the importance of observing and modeling the behaviours, attitudes, emotional reactions of others from society and culture. Social learning theory assumes human behaviour in terms of continuous reciprocal interaction between cognitive, behavioural and environmental influences. This perspective believes that learning emerges with behavioural perspective, i.e. imitation and repetition from learning environment based on reward and punishment. This theory emphasizes the fact that most of the information comes from our interactions with other people. Humanist psychologists also support this perspective with the view that the cooperative learning focuses on affective benefits of cooperative learning and it contributes to increase self-esteem and improve ethnic relations. Social learning theory encompasses attention, memory and motivation. It covers cognitive and behavioural framework of learning.

1.1.3 Elements of Cooperative Language Learning

Cooperative learning is an outcome of joint effort of different ingredients to orient learning for success of shared goal. These elements are to be organized and structured in a way to determine the learning activities towards social interaction and interdependence. Elements of cooperative language learning are also known as principles of cooperative language learning. There are five elements of cooperative learning which are as follows:

- a. Positive interdependence,
- b. Individual accountability,

- c. Face to face interaction,
- d. Social skills and
- e. Team reflection.

Similarly, Kagan (1994) puts forward the five basic principles of cooperative learning as positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, simultaneous interaction and group processing (as cited in Baral 2006, p.5).

1.1.3.1 Positive Interdependence

Positive interdependence is the most essential element and heart of cooperative learning. It assumes that students must believe that they have to ‘sink or swim together.’ It is a sense of working together for a common goal and caring about each others’ learning. When students work in cooperative team with essence of ‘all work for one and one works for all’ which ensures the students learn valuable interpersonal skills that are socially, academically and vocationally beneficial to them.

Within cooperative learning situations, students have two responsibilities: 1) learn the assigned materials and 2) ensure that all members of the group will learn the assigned materials. The technical term for that dual responsibility is ‘Positive Interdependence’ (Sharan 1980). When positive interdependence is clearly understandable, it establishes:

- I) Each group member’s effort as an indispensable for group success (no ‘free-riders’).
- II) A unique contribution of each group member to make the joint effort on task responsibilities (Johnson and Johnson, 1994).

Students perceive that they need cooperation of each other in order to complete group task. It enhances the sense of helping each other for success of their team. Thus, students work in cooperative team with the essence of ‘we sink or swim together’ to promote teambuilding activities and other tasks that deal explicitly with the development of social skills needed for effective teamwork.

1.1.3.2 Individual Accountability

Individual accountability refers that all students are actively involved and responsible for their own learning. It assumes the essence of ‘we each do our fair share of work.’ In cooperative learning classroom, each learner is personally responsible for his/her own learning process and its outcome. In small group learning individual accountability means each pupil makes sure that he/she learns what he/she is supposed to learn and his/her teammates also achieve their individual goal. Each team member feels in charge of their own and their teammates’ learning and makes an active contribution to the group. Therefore, there is no ‘hitchhiking’ or ‘freeloading’ for anyone in a team. As Richards and Rodgers (1986, p.197) say, “Individual accountability involves both group and individual performance.” Hence, each individual student’s performance is assessed and the result is assigned back to the individual and group to make each member a stronger individual in his or her right. Individual accountability is a necessary requirement for cooperative learning to occur emphasizing learning as a core process of cooperative group task. Thus, each member of the team is regarded important and is accountable for contributing his/her share of classroom task.

1.1.3.3 Face to Face Interaction

Cooperative learning is fundamentally a simultaneous approach, i.e. both discussions and activities take place at once. This element assumes the essence of ‘lets talk about it together.’ Face to face interaction refers to the physical set up of the group where students need to be clustered together in a tight group, facing each other, in order to share the ideas to accomplish the task. There should be small groups to work together to develop their skills. Therefore, for successful interaction, classroom environment should be stimulating and cooperative that each and every student has to promote each other’s learning by helping, sharing and encouraging team members for effective learning. Face to face interaction refers to the physical set up of the team where students need to be placed together in a small group in order to share the ideas to accomplish the task.

1.1.3.4 Social Skills

Cooperative learning should aim to develop small group skills and social skills of each individual. Students should be taught the social skills for high quality cooperation and be motivated to use them. It is essential for students to have sufficient social skills, involving an explicit teaching of appropriate leadership, communication, trust and conflict skills so that they can cooperate effectively. In this regard, Johnson and Johnson (1990, p.26) state, “If group members lack the interpersonal and small group skills to cooperate effectively, cooperative learning would not be productive.” Thus, for successful cooperative learning, social skills should be explicitly taught to the students so that students can work among themselves in terms of cooperation without the teacher’s authority.

1.1.3.5 Team Reflection

In cooperative learning there should be critical review of each individual and their group’s behaviour related to psychological, social and academic phenomena. It assumes the essence of ‘we need to monitor and process our experiences.’ There should be reflection of individual student’s behaviour and thinking as the core of team reflection. Team members set up group goal and assess what they are doing well as a team. Thus, overall performance of each and every team member and group has to demonstrate their learning as a team reflection for effective group learning.

In a nutshell, elements of cooperative learning are appropriately considered to stimulate and support their teammate’s learning which develop social and academic skills in students. Therefore, cooperative learning is fruitful in promoting language acquisition by providing comprehensible input in developmentally appropriate ways and in a supportive and motivating environment (Kagan 1995). It is dependent upon and motivated by the focus on the reward or goal structure under which students operate to perform the assigned task.

1.1.4 Cooperative Language Learning and Second Language Acquisition

Cooperative language learning and second language acquisition are considered to be

incorporated in teaching learning process. It is proclaimed as an effective instructional method to promote cognitive and linguistic development on ESL or EFL learners. In this regard, Kryszewska, (2007) says, “Learners can naturally feel relaxed and free and enjoy themselves in the language acquisition process” (as cited in Bhattarai, 2010, p.5). Similarly, Kagan (1995, p.1) says, “Language acquisition is determined by a number of critical input, output, and context variables. An examination of these critical variables reveals cooperative learning has a dramatic positive impact on almost all of the variables critical to language acquisition.” Therefore, cooperative learning consolidates the scaffolding of second language acquisition process by critical variables which are as follows:

a. Input

Language acquisition is fostered by input that is comprehensible (Krashen, 1985), developmentally appropriate, redundant and accurate (Kagan, 1995). In cooperative learning students need to understand the language input so that they can naturally and contextually adjust the input to make it more comprehensible. Therefore, language acquisition takes place naturally in an effective way. For successful input, according to Kagan (1995, p.2), “Natural source of redundant communication” is essential from various sources. Students get frequent opportunities for great chance of developing language acquisition in comparison to formal accurate input provided by the teacher. According to Kagan (1995, p.1), “Cooperative groups focused input in the Zone of Proximal Development, stimulating development to the next stage of language development.” Thus, cooperative learning enhances second language acquisition with accurate, comprehensible and developmentally appropriate language input from team members.

b. Output

Language acquisition is fostered by output that is functional and communicative (Swain, 1985) frequent, redundant and constant with the identity of the speaker (Kagan, 1995, p.3). Second language acquisition is best acquired when it is used in a way that is meaningful to the students. Cooperative learning provides the ideal

situation for communicative interaction and output. Similarly, students in small group setting are supposed to have greater opportunities for language use. As Nunan (1989) says, “The more opportunities for the students to employ the target language to negotiate meaning, the more they are expected to acquire communicative competence” (as cited in Liang, 2002, p.24). Furthermore, with regard to language output, cooperative learning provides frequent language use and less formal language use which is closer to the identity of many students to consolidate the second language acquisition process in a greater range. Therefore, output of second language acquisition is highly developed in cooperative learning situation.

c. Context

Language acquisition is fostered if it occurs in a context that is supportive and motivating, communicative and referential, developmentally appropriate and feedback with correction (Kagan, 1995, p.4). He further argues that students are far from supportive, communicative and learning environment in traditional classroom. In contrast, cooperative learning provides communicative situations in a meaningful way because the situations are real and contextual where students speak about real events and objects negotiating meaning with context to accomplish the task. Furthermore, students feel much easier to talk to a peer in a small group with more opportunities to communicate at the level of developmentally appropriate for them. In the same way, Kagan (1995, p.4) says, “Students talk to each other, providing immediate feedback and correction opportunities in the process of communication.” Therefore, second language acquisition is fostered in a greater range in cooperative learning classroom with more opportunities of using language in real and contextual situation. Thus, it is obvious that cooperative learning provides opportunities for a better learning environment for second language acquisition.

In a nutshell, students give immediate feedback to one another to support easier language acquisition. Therefore, cooperative learning provides opportunities to develop and improve second language acquisition. Cooperative learning transfers input, output and context variables in the direction of facilitating language acquisition

with communicative goal of language teaching. Thus, as Kagan (1995, p.5) says, “Cooperative learning and communicative teaching deserve natural marriage.”

1.1.5 Cooperative Learning and Traditional Teaching

Cooperative learning and traditional teaching differ in respect of different aspects.

Cooperative learning, compared with traditional instruction, tends to promote productivity and achievement providing more opportunities for communication.

According to Johnson and Johnson (2000), “Cooperative learning deserves higher level reasoning, more frequent generation of new ideas and solutions, greater transfer of what is learned within one situation to another than do competitive or individualistic learning and traditional teaching” (as cited in Zhang , 2010, p.82).

Cooperative learning and traditional teaching are different in the following respect:

1. In traditional language teaching, the role of a teacher is supposed to be a controller and director of teaching, judge of students’ right or wrong, source of assistance and centre of the classroom. In cooperative language learning, the role of a teacher is supposed to be an organizer and counselor of group work, facilitator of the classroom task and intervener to teach collaborative skills.
2. In traditional language teaching, the role of a learner is supposed to a passive receiver and performer in classroom activity. In cooperative language learning, the role of a learner is supposed to be an active participator and autonomous learner in classroom activity.
3. In traditional language teaching, there is complete set of same materials for each and every student of the whole class. In cooperative language learning, materials are managed according to purpose of lesson and one group shares a complete set of materials. There may be variation in materials according to group.
4. In traditional language teaching, classroom activities are oriented towards recall and review of knowledge. Activities regarding pattern practice, role play, listening and translation are emphasized. In cooperative language learning, classroom activities are oriented towards group work involving learners in communication, interaction, information sharing and negotiation of meaning.

5. In traditional language teaching, there is rare interaction among students. There is mainly teacher-student interaction in classroom. In cooperative language learning, there is intense interaction among students in groups.
6. In traditional language teaching, there is no group structure of students. Students are placed in whole class-structure in desk. In cooperative language learning, there is group structure. Students are placed in small and collaborative teams.
7. In traditional language teaching, the teacher is senior and the students are junior in terms of teacher-student relationship. In cooperative language learning, the teacher is cooperative and equal in terms of teacher-student relationship.
8. In traditional language teaching, there is no equal contribution of each student for success of whole class in teaching learning process. In cooperative language learning, there is equal contribution of each student for the success of team and whole class.
9. In traditional language teaching, there is 'none or negative' interdependence among learners. In cooperative language learning, there is positive interdependence among learners.

1.1.6 Cooperative Learning and Group Learning

Generally, cooperative learning and group learning seem to be alike in teaching learning process. Cooperative learning, in contrast to group learning, promotes social skills and positive interdependence which is not concerned in group learning. There is difference between cooperative learning and group learning in respect of social skill, group structure and procedure which are as follows:

Cooperative Learning		Group Learning
1.	There is positive interdependence among students with structured team and goal.	There is no positive interdependence among students with structured team and goal.
2.	There is clear individual accountability for share of the group work through role assignment and	There is no clear individual accountability for share of the group work through role assignment and

	regular rotation of the assigned role.	regular rotation of the assigned role.
3.	It has heterogeneous group of students.	It has homogeneous group of students.
4.	There is role of leadership in sharing team experience.	There is rare role of leadership being appointed or put in charge of the group.
5.	There is sharing of the appointed learning task(s) of each member.	There is no sharing of each learner' learning task in learning.
6.	It aims to maximize each member's learning.	It aims on accomplishing the assignments.
7.	It maintains good working relationship towards process-oriented learning.	It has frequent negligence of good working relationship and it is product oriented learning.
8.	It focuses in teaching of collaborative skills.	It assumes that students already have the required skills.
9.	Teacher's role is of observation of students' interaction in classroom activity.	Teacher's role is of rare observation of students' interaction in classroom activity.
10.	There is pre-determined structuring of procedure and time for the processing of classroom activities.	There is rare pre-determined structuring of procedure and time for the processing of classroom activities.

Source: (Johnson and Johnson 1986c, as cited in Liang 2002, p.18.)

1.1.7 Cooperative Group and Typical Classroom Group

Drawbacks of whole-class teaching motivated language teachers and researchers to involve students in learning small groups. Similarly, to enhance teaching learning process they tend to implement cooperative learning due to its team structure and individual accountability where each member of a team supports for shared goal which is lacked in typical classroom groups. Therefore, according to Johnson and Johnson (1983, as cited in Chafe 1998) cooperative group differs from typical classroom group in the following ways:

1. In typical group, one leader is chosen by the teacher. In cooperative group, leadership is shared so that students are responsible for completion of the task and all group members are included.
2. In typical group, group is homogeneous in nature. In cooperative group, members are selected by the teacher on the basis of gender, ability, interests and behaviour.
3. In typical group, members create their own product, have their own materials and have rewards based on individual accomplishment. In cooperative group, the group creates one product and shares materials and has a group reward based on the success as a group.
4. In typical group, students are told to 'cooperate' with no attempt to teach social skills. In cooperative group, social skills are defined, discussed, observed and processed.
5. In typical group, the teacher interrupts group work to solve problems, warn students and remind them. In cooperative group, the teacher encourages group problem solving as an interactor rather than an intervener.
6. In typical group, the top priority is to accomplish the task and get the job done. In cooperative group, the top priority is to accomplish the task and to include every member through each person's use of social skills.

Cooperative learning compared to competitive or individualistic learning promotes greater achievement, more intrinsic motivation and more persistence in completing the task with level of motivation. It enhances more positive attitude towards subject matter and learning with higher level of self-esteem, healthier processes for deriving conclusions about one's self-worth and greater psychological health.

1.1.8 Cooperative Learning Task

Effective cooperative learning is possible when the classroom task is designed to be accomplished with equal contribution of each team members. The teacher needs to monitor the class in a way to maximize participation, interaction and achievement in classroom activities. Therefore, cooperative learning task includes two phases. The

first phase 'Teambuilding' refers to the process of building cooperative groups of students into working teams. Second phase 'In-class activities' refers to the real involvement of teams in classroom learning activities regarding presentation, participation, assignment and discussion of teaching items. These two phases are shortly mentioned below.

Phase One: Teambuilding: Teambuilding refers to the process of building teams including students from different background and experiences into cooperative and caring team. Cooperative team plays a vital role in learning activities. Therefore, it is essential to create cooperative team which includes:

a. Heterogeneous grouping: Heterogeneous grouping refers to the process of grouping students from different background. In heterogeneous group, students are selected from various backgrounds to form cooperative team. It includes students from academic achievement, ethnicity and gender to form heterogeneous group.

b. Commitments and commandments: There should be sense of strong devotion and commitment in learning for effective cooperative classroom. Commitment refers to one's commitment to the whole class. It ensures effective learning with what to do in class to enhance overall success of the whole class. It is based on the principle of positive interdependence. Commandment refers to one's engagement to his/her own group. It is usually expressed in the form of 'I will not +'. It enhances the favourable attitude towards own group.

Phase Two: In-class Activities: In this phase, teacher presents teaching items in cooperative classroom situation. Classroom activities vary according to method and techniques. There are various methods and activities in English Language Teaching (ELT) to be adopted and among them appropriate and suitable activities should be selected. In cooperative learning following in-class activities are adopted:

a. Three step interview: It is one of the classroom activity employed in cooperative learning classroom. Students play active role in this activity. In three step interview, students play the role of interviewer and interviewee and they reverse their role. In this activity, student A would interview student B for specified number. As the response student B answers the question of student A and they reverse their role. It is useful in developing competence in language skills of listening, speaking and summarizing.

b. Learning together: It is also one of the classroom activity conducted in cooperative learning classroom. It was investigated by Duetsch (1949). It assumes to promote interdependence among students. Generally it occurs in the form of group summary. Teacher presents the teaching item and activity then teacher asks the students to recall what they learnt in their group. Students are encouraged to learn sharing in groups. Students are actively involved in activity and it ensures the effective comprehension and retention of the materials learnt in classroom.

c. Chalkboard share: It is used in presenting the idea of a group on board. In this activity, first of all teacher presents teaching item and he/she provides the task for each group. Students work together and discuss the assigned task. Then one member from each group is asked to write the group's response on the board. Members from other group provide praise and discussion. In this way, subject matter to be learnt can be effectively perceived by the students.

d. Talk pair: Talk pair is classroom activity which involves active participation of two students. Students are divided into pairs and either topic or role is assigned to them. Each pair plays the role as per the assigned topic. It is useful in developing speaking skills and promoting presentation skills of students. Teacher may suggest if students commit error or problem. Therefore, it provides maximum input to enhance listening and speaking skills.

1.1.9 The Roles of Teachers and Learners

In cooperative learning classroom roles of teachers and learners are supposed to promote teaching learning process in an effective way. Learning takes place in communicative way with joint effort of all the team members. The role of teachers and students is to facilitate learning of student and to help each other in learning respectively.

1.1.9.1 The Teacher's Roles

The role of a teacher, in cooperative language learning, differs considerably from the role of a teacher in traditional teacher-fronted classroom. The teacher is supposed to be helpful source of guidance who is there to make them successful, rather than a judge who hands out grades and marks paper with red ink. Furthermore, teacher monitors each group, intervenes when needed to improve task work and team work. In this regard, Johnson et al.(1994) say, “The teacher has to create highly structured and well-organized learning environment in the classroom, setting goals, planning and structuring tasks, establishing the physical arrangement of the classroom, assigning students to group and roles and selecting materials and time” (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.199).

Therefore, the role of a teacher, according to Richards and Rodgers (1986, p.199) is that of facilitator of learning and the teacher must move around the class helping students and groups as needs arise. Teachers are supposed to have the task of restructuring lessons so that students can work on them cooperatively. According to Harel (1992, p.169), “The role of teacher is to prepare students for the tasks they will carry out, to assist students with the learning tasks and to give few commands imposing less disciplinary control” (as cited in Richards and Rodgers, 1986, p.199). Thus, the roles of a teacher in cooperative language learning is as a facilitator of learning, supporter to the students, manager of the classroom environment and guide to the students in problem solving activities.

1.1.9.2 The Learner's Roles

The learner's role is essentially important in cooperative language learning to accomplish the shared goals where learners are supposed as a member of group who must work collaboratively on tasks with other group members. Learners have to learn team work skills to ensure the effective individual and group learning. Due to the stimulating and social environment students become directors and instruct one another to boost the overall performance of the whole team as the current instructional achievement. Therefore, Richards and Rodgers (2001, p.199) say, "Learning is something that requires students' direct and active involvement and participation." Thus, learners are supposed as an active and autonomous participant in learning task because each learner is responsible for their learning with the sense of individual accountability.

1.1.10 Language Functions

Language functions refer to the purpose for which an utterance or unit of language is used. Language function is generally classified as grammatical function and communicative function. As Richards et al. (1985) say, "Grammatical functions deal with the relationship that a constituent in a sentence has with other constituents" (as cited in Sharma and Phyak, 2004, p.180). For example, in the sentence, 'John reads a book.' 'John' has the function of subject of verb, 'reads' whereas 'a book' has the function of object of the verb, 'reads'. In the same way, Lyons (1974) mentions three grammatical functions: subject, predicate and adjunct. Subject and predicate are obligatory constituents whereas adjunct is optional constituent in a sentence.

Language functions refer to the communicative goal for which an utterance is used in a community. Thus, communicative function refers to purpose of an utterance used for communicative need in a community.

1.1.10.1 Communicative Functions

Communicative functions refer to the communicative goal for which a unit of a language is used in community to accomplish a certain purpose. According to Ur (2001, p.92), "A function is some kind of communicative act: it is the use of language

to achieve a purpose, usually involving interaction between at least two people.” Similarly, Richards et al. (1999, p.148) put forward their views on communicative function of a language as the purpose for which an utterance or unit of a language is used. In language teaching, language functions are often described as categories of behaviour, for example, request, apologies and compliments. Sthapit (2000, p.9) further elaborates the communicative function as a thing having at least three facets: substance, form and function. Here, function refers to the communicative goal to accomplish a certain purpose. Language serves the purpose of describing people or stating events. Therefore, describing and stating people and events respectively is one of the functions of language. In the same way we communicate through the use of language for the sake of communication with several functions of language. For example, request, command, order, advice and instruct. Thus, communicative functions of language are employed to accomplish certain goal with several functions in a community.

1.1.10.2 Classification of the Communicative Functions

Communicative functions of language are broadly classified into different types by various scholars and linguists. They do not seem to follow consistent system of classification of communicative functions of language and assert that the system of classification is the only accurate and appropriate for the complex system of language functions as employed in a community. In this regard, Sthapit (2000, p.10) says, “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 how narrow a given classification is.” Therefore, linguists provide narrow to broad classification of communicative functions of language. Some of them are as follows:

Corder (1973, p.44) classifies communicative functions as follows:

1. Personal: This function refers to the use of language towards speakers to reveal his/her attitudes towards their speaking. It is addressor focused function of language.

2. Directive: It refers to the use of language towards hearer. It directs addressee to do something.
3. Referential: This function is used for describing states or events then we have referential function of language.
4. Phatic: It refers to establish relations, promote feelings of goodwill and social solidarity. It is used for beginning, continuation and termination of attention of listeners.
5. Metalinguistic: This function refers to the use of code to describe language itself.
6. Imaginative: When the focus is on expression of speaker's feelings and emotions then it is said to have imaginative function.

Halliday (1973, as cited in Brown 1994, p.232-233) presents the seven types of classification of communicative functions of language as follows:

1. The instrumental function: This function serves to manipulate the environment, to cause certain events to happen. It acts to bring about a particular condition. For example, "This court finds you guilty." "On your mark, get set, go!"
2. The regulatory function: This function refers to the control of events. It seems to be similar with the instrumental function. But it seems to be less unpleasing than instrumental function. The regulation of encounters among people, approval, disapproval, behaviour control, setting laws and rules come under regulatory function. For example, "Upon good behaviour, you will be eligible for parole in five months."
3. The representational function: It refers to the use of language to convey facts and knowledge, to report the factual reality and statement. For example, 'The Sun is hot.' 'The Earth is round.'
4. The interactional function: It serves to maintain social rapport between and among people and to keep channels of communication open. It requires knowledge of slang, jargon, jokes, cultural mores, politeness and formality expectations for successful interactional communication in social relationship.

5. The personal function: It refers to the permission for a speaker to express feelings, emotions and personality reactions. Every person's individuality is usually characterized by his/her use of the personal function of communication where personal nature of language , cognition, affect and culture interact in ways that have not yet been explored.
6. The heuristic function: It refers to the involvement of language use to acquire knowledge, to learn about the environment. It is usually expressed in the form of question for inquiry purpose. It is used to elicit representations of reality from others.
7. The imaginative function: This function refers to the use of language for the sake of creation of imaginary ideas. Furthermore, it is the use of language to express the aesthetic pleasure through imagination to have sheer pleasure using language. For example, telling fairy tales, poetry, puns and tongue twisters. It sometimes goes beyond the real world to soar the heights of beauty of language itself to create impossible dreams too.

Halliday (1991, as cited in Sharma and Phyak 2004, p.184-185) further classifies the above mentioned communicative language functions into macro categories which are as follows:

1. The ideational function: This function refers to the use of language used to organize experience and ideas of speakers and writers regarding real or imaginary world.
2. The interpersonal function: This function refers to the indication and establishment of social relationship between and among people. It covers forms of address, function and modality.
3. The textual function: It is the use of language to create written and spoken texts to fit the particular situation in which they are used.

Van Ek and Alexander (1977, p.19-21) classify language functions into the following six types:

1. Imparting and seeking factual information: It includes identifying, reporting, and asking.
2. Expressing and finding out intellectual information: expressing agreement/disagreement, declining and accepting an offer/invitation, expressing capability and incapability.
3. Expressing and finding out emotional attitudes: expressing pleasure, like, dislike, surprise and satisfaction/dissatisfaction.
4. Expressing and finding out moral attitudes: expressing regret, approval/disapproval, apologizing and granting forgiveness.
5. Getting things done: suggesting others, advising people, warning, instruct/direct others to do something.
6. Socializing: greeting and leaving people, introducing people, toasting, congratulating and beginning a meal.

Finocchiaro (1986, p.1) classifies communicative functions into the following division:

1. Personal: This communicative function of language refers to the clarifying one's ideas and expressing thoughts, feelings and needs like love, joy, pleasure and happiness.
2. Interpersonal: It helps to build and maintain social rapport between and among people. For example, greeting and taking leaves, introducing people to others.
3. Directives: This function refers to the attempt to influence or control the actions of others, accepting or refusing direction. For example, refusing to accept a suggestion or a request.
4. Referential: It talks/reports about things, actions, events in the environment of past and future.
5. Imaginative: It is the use of language creativity for artistic and aesthetic purpose. For example, creating poetry, stories, discussing music.

To make teaching learning language functions easy and systematic, different linguists tried to group similar language functions into different categories. Same language

functions are classified with different perspectives depending on the way they made. Though there is variation, the classification seems to be more or less the same.

1.2 Review of the Related Literature

The use of cooperative language learning in English learning classroom has been widely researched and appraised by many researchers and educationists for academic and social development. There are various research works carried out on the effectiveness of group work area and few research works carried out on cooperative language learning area in the Department of English Education, Tribhuwan University.

A research by Johnson, Johnson and Stanne (2000) showed that cooperative learning is essential for maximizing learning and ensuring healthy cognitive and social development as well as many other important instructional outcomes. Hundreds of research studies demonstrated that cooperative learning result in higher individual achievement than competitive or individualistic learning. Cooperative learning is used throughout the world by educators. The combination of theory, research and practice had made cooperative learning one of the most outstanding of all instructional practices.

Ghaith (2002) carried out an experimental research on “Effects of the learning together model of cooperative learning on English as a foreign language for reading achievement, academic self-esteem and feelings of school alienation” in High School in Lebanese context for ten weeks. Objectives of the study were to find out the effectiveness of learning together model of cooperative learning in promoting reading achievement, academic self-esteem and in decreasing the feelings of school alienation of multilingual Lebanese EFL learners. The researcher used both primary and secondary sources for data collection. The main tool for data collection was test items, i.e. pre-test and post-test. Twenty eight students out of fifty six students were selected for experimental group and divided into seven teams including four students in each team. The researcher found out that learning together model of cooperative learning

increased 7.69% higher result in promoting reading achievement and academic self-esteem. It is also found that it heavily decreases the learning anxiety and feeling of school alienation in multilingual society.

Liang (2002) carried out an experimental research on “Implementing cooperative language learning in EFL teaching: process and effects” in Junior High School in Taiwan context. The objectives were to find out the effects on learners’ language learning in terms of oral performance and learners’ motivation in a heterogeneous class. He selected 35 students for experimental and control group. The researcher used primary and secondary sources of data collection. The main tool for data collection was test items, i.e. pre-test and post-test. Test items were limited for every language aspects. The study found out that the cooperative learning has relatively better achievement in learning English and social skills in comparison to usual way of teaching.

Regmi (2004) carried out an experimental research on “The effectiveness of group work technique in teaching English tenses.” The aim of research study was to find out the effectiveness of group work technique in teaching English tenses. He used both primary and secondary sources for data collection and selected a public school of Chitawan as the population of the study. The researcher used pre-test and post-test for primary data collection by dividing the students into two groups i.e. experimental and controlled group. It was found that the students who were taught using group work progressed relatively better than the students who were taught using explanation. He suggests to use group work technique and it provides an insight to implement group work technique more effectively in teaching learning process.

Rimal (2004) carried out an experimental research on “A study on the effectiveness of group work on learning writing skills.” The objective of the study was to find out the effectiveness of group work on learning writing skills. The researcher used a simple random sampling procedure and used both primary and secondary sources of data collection. The main tool for data collection was test items, i.e. pre-test and post-test.

Sixty students were selected for control and experimental group. This study was limited to grade nine of government aided school of Lamjung district. Researcher found out that group work learning has relatively better achievement and performance in every task and test items. He suggests to apply group work technique in the classroom to ensure the motivation and learning curiosity in students.

Baral (2006) carried out an experimental research on “Effectiveness of cooperative learning on the lower secondary students’ achievement in English.” Objectives of the study were to find out the effectiveness of cooperative learning in comparison to usual teaching methods with respect to achievement of eighth graders in four language skills. The researcher followed a non-random sampling procedure for sampling population. He selected 40 students for experimental group and 40 students for control group. The researcher used both primary and secondary sources for data collection. He conducted the research in Surkhet district. He used test items, i.e. pre-test and post-test as the tool for data collection. He found out that cooperative learning is more effective instructional method in comparison to usual method of ELT. Cooperative learning has relatively higher achievement on the performance in four language skills. It has developed the better social skills on part of learners.

Seng (2006) carried out an experimental research on “Cooperative learning and achievement in English language acquisition in a literature class in a Secondary school” in Malaysian context. Objective of the study was to find out whether cooperative learning can improve the students’ English language acquisition in a literature class. The researcher used both primary and secondary sources for data collection. Students were selected through judgmental non-random sampling procedure. The main tool for data collection was test items, i.e. pre-test and post-test. The researcher found out that cooperative learning developed 24.44% increment in post-test result. It was also found that 94% of the students favoured the cooperative learning experiences in promoting higher academic achievement and greater motivation with less anxiety in classroom.

Adhikari (2010) carried out a survey research on “Collaborative learning for teachers’ professional development” in Nepalese context. Objectives of the study were to identify the attitudes of English language teachers towards collaborative learning and to find out the environment available for the teachers in learning and practising collaboratively. The researcher followed non-random judgmental sampling procedure for sampling population. She selected 20 High School English teachers from Kathmandu valley and 20 High School English teachers from Pokhara valley. She used both primary and secondary sources for data collection. She used questionnaire as the tool for data collection. She found out that almost all 97.5% teachers had positive attitudes and 70% teachers had favourable environment for collaborative learning within their institutions.

Bhattarai (2010) carried out a research on “Co-operative learning in developing vocabulary.” The objective of the study was to find out the effectiveness of cooperative learning in developing vocabulary in secondary level. Researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data collection. Students were selected through judgmental non-random sampling procedure. The tool for data collection was test items, i.e. pre-test and post-test. Forty students from grade nine were selected from Kathmandu district for the research. The study was limited to vocabulary aspects only. The study revealed that cooperative learning deserves better achievement in learning vocabulary in a wider concept formation and development.

There are a few researches carried out in cooperative language learning in the Department of English Education. The present research is different from other researches because there is no research carried out on the effectiveness of cooperative language learning in teaching language functions. This research will present the effectiveness of cooperative language learning in teaching language functions for secondary level in Nepalese context.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the present study were as follows:

- a. To find out the effectiveness of cooperative language learning in teaching language functions.
- b. To suggest some pedagogical implications.

1.4 Significance of the Study

As all language teachers undeniably accepted that appropriate method ensures the effective teaching learning process go smoothly and successfully. This study aimed at revealing the effectiveness of cooperative language learning in teaching language functions. This study will be significant for the prospective researchers, language teachers who tend to implement heterogeneous group teaching, subject experts and language trainers in particular. This will help English teachers to effectively implement the curriculum by bringing elements of cooperative learning into the real classroom practice to consolidate the overall learning on students with respect to academic development and social skills. Textbook writers will equally be benefited while devising activities in teaching learning for communicative language functions. It will be useful to the researchers who are interested to conduct further research on cooperative language learning. Therefore, it will be useful to stockholders and right holders who are directly or indirectly related in the field of ELT in general.

CHAPTER - TWO

METHODOLOGY

The process involved through the whole work ensures the research result and findings. Research needs systematic study following proper methodology to achieve the predetermined objectives. To quote, Kothari (1990, p.9), “Research methodology is a sequential procedure and methods to be adopted in a systematic study.” In this research study, I adopted the research methodology as given below:

2.1 Sources of Data

For this study, I used both primary and secondary sources of data for accomplishment of research. Primary sources were used for collecting the data and secondary sources were used to facilitate the researcher in providing theoretical knowledge and concept.

2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data

The primary sources of data for this study were Grade IX students of Mahendra Secondary School, Koltadi-9, Pandaun, Kailali.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data

Regarding the secondary sources of data various books especially, Finocchiaro (1986), Richards & Rodgers (1986), Johnson et al. (1991), Edge (1992), Brown (1994), Kagan (1995), Freeman (2000), Harmer (2001), McCafferty et al. (2006) etc. were consulted.

2.2 Sampling Procedure

Mahendra Secondary School, Koltadi-9, Pandaun of Kailali district was selected through purposive non-random sampling procedure and thirty students of grade nine were selected as sample for control group and experimental group.

2.3 Tools for Data Collection

The main tool for data collection was test item. The test items were constructed based

on 'Our English Grade Nine' text book prescribed for Grade IX. It consisted of objective and subjective items carrying 27 and 23 full marks respectively. Numbers of items with mark in each language functions were as follows:

Table No. 1
Functions of Language

S. N.	Types of functions	No. of items	Marks
1	Introducing	5	5
2	Greetings and farewell	4	4
3	Seeking information	3	3
4	Requesting	7	7
5	Making suggestion/advising	6	6
6	Expressing ability to do something	3	3
7	Thanking	1	1
8	Making offer	3	3
9	Expressing the degree of probability	2	2
10	Expressing sympathy	2	2
11	Seeking confirmation	3	3
12	Giving direction	3	3
13	Giving instruction	2	2
14	Asking for permission	3	3
15	Apology	3	3
Total question items		Total=50	Total=50

2.4 Process of Data Collection

The process of data collection from primary sources involved the following procedure:

1. First of all, I consulted the relevant literature, curriculum and textbook of Grade IX. A set of test items was developed as a tool for administering pre-test and post-test.

2. Then I went to the concerned school and built rapport with concerned people including Head teacher and subject teacher. I informed them about my research and requested for permission.
3. Then, I explained to the respondents about the purpose and administered a pre-test for determining the actual proficiency level of the students.
4. I ranked the students on the basis of their level of proficiency in communicating language functions based on pre-test. I divided the students in two groups: experimental and controlled on the basis of odd and even rank order of pre-test result to create equal proficient group.
5. Students were selected on the basis of academic achievement, gender and ethnicity to create a heterogeneous team including four students. In each group high achiever, low achiever and girl were selected. Three teams were created including four students and one team was created including three students.
6. Experimental group was taught by using various classroom activities like talk pair, learning together, numbered heads together, three step interview and chalkboard share.
7. Experimental group was taught using cooperative language learning method and controlled group was taught using usual teaching method.
8. At the end of my study, a post-test was administered and the result of pre-test and post-test was compared and processed for analysis and interpretation.

2.5 Limitations of the Study

This study was confined with the following limitations:

1. It was limited to Grade IX students of a government aided school of Kailali district.
2. The study was limited to the sample size of 30 students.
3. It was limited to cooperative language learning method in teaching 15 language functions.
4. It was limited to classroom situation only but not to natural situation.

CHAPTER- THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter consists of analysis and interpretation of data computed and analyzed under the following headings:

1. Holistic comparison
2. Function based comparison

3.1 Holistic Comparison

The holistic comparison refers to functional category and item category. It further refers to the summary of the analysis and interpretation of the data on the basis of the average scores of the pre-test and post-test of experimental and control group in terms of language functions and test items. Comparative table of average percentage of group A and group B is as given below:

Table No. 2
Holistic comparison

Category	Group A in %		Group B in %		D % in Post-test
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	
Functional category	35.73	62.4	37.2	55.87	6.53
Item category	37.51	71.21	36.99	54.18	17.03

The table shows that the average score of group A was 35.73 percentage in pre-test and 62.4 percentage in post-test in terms of functional category. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 26.67 percentage. Similarly, the average score of group B was 37.2 percentage in pre-test and 55.87 percentage in post-test in terms of functional category. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 18.67 percentage. The difference in percentage between post-test score of group A and post-test score of group B was of 6.53 percentage. Thus, group A learnt this functional category more effectively than group B.

In the same way, the average score of group A was 37.51 percentage in pre-test and 71.21 percentage in post-test in terms of item category. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 33.7 percentage. Likewise, the average score of group B was 36.99 percentage in pre-test and 54.18 percentage in post-test in terms of item category. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 17.19 percentage. Thus, the difference percentage between post test score of group A and group B was of 17.03. In this category, group A performed better than group B.

3.2 Function Based Comparison

Function based comparison refers to the average performance of experimental group and control group with their difference in terms of language functions. The average increment percentage of experimental group (i.e. Group A) and control group (i.e. Group B) is given below:

a. Introducing

This functional category consisted of 5 items carrying 5 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as presented in the following table:

Table No. 3
Average score in introducing

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	2.63	4.6	1.97	74.90
B	3.7	4.7	1	27.02

The table shows that the average score of group A was 2.63 in pre-test and 4.6 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 1.97. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was of 74.90 percentage. Similarly, the average score of group B was 3.7 in pre-test and 4.7 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 1. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was of 27.02 percentage. Thus, it indicates that group A learnt this language function more effectively than group B.

b. Greetings and Farewell

This functional category consisted 4 items of 4 full marks. The average score of experimental group and control group is as presented in the following table:

Table No. 4

Average score in greetings and farewell

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	1.83	2.93	1.1	60.10
B	1.66	3	1.44	86.74

The average score of group A was 1.83 in pre-test and 2.93 in post-test. It means it was increased by 1.1. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 60.10 percentage. In the same way, the average score of group B was 1.66 in pre-test and 3 in post-test. This means average score was increased by 1.44. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 86.74 percentage. Thus, it shows that group B learnt this language function more effectively than group A.

c. Seeking Information

This functional category consisted of 3 items of 3 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is presented in the following table:

Table No. 5

Average score in seeking information

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.6	1.13	0.53	88.33
B	0.46	0.8	0.34	73.91

The table shows that group A scored the average score 0.6 in pre-test and 1.13 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 1.1. So, the difference between two tests was of 0.53 percentage. In the same way, group B scored the average score 0.46 in pre-test and 0.8 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 0.34. So, the difference between two tests was of 73.91 percentage. It indicates that group A learnt this language function more effectively than group B.

d. Requesting

This functional category consisted of 7 items of 7 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is presented in the following table:

Table No. 6

Average score in requesting

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	3	5.6	2.6	86.67
B	2.94	4.52	1.58	53.74

The table shows that the average score of group A was 3 in pre-test and 5.6 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 2.6. So the difference between two tests was of 86.67 percentage. Similarly, the average score of group B was 2.94 in pre-test and 4.52 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 1.58. So, the difference between two tests was of 53.74 percentage. It shows that group A learnt this functional category better than group B.

e. Making Suggestions/Advising

This functional category consisted 6 items carrying 6 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as given below:

Table No. 7

Average score in making suggestions/advising

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	3.2	5.03	1.83	57.18
B	2.83	4.5	1.67	59.01

Average score of group A was 3.2 in pre-test and 5.03 in post-test. This means it was increased by 1.83. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 57.18 percentage. In the same way, average score of group B was 2.83 in pre-test and 4.5 in post-test. This means it was increased by 1.67. Therefore, the difference between two tests was 59.01 percentage. In this category, group B performed better than group A.

f. Expressing Ability to Do Something

This functional category consisted 3 items carrying 3 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as presented in the following table:

Table No. 8
Average score in expressing ability to do something

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.33	0.6	0.27	81.81
B	0.33	0.5	0.17	51.51

Average score of group A was 0.33 in pre-test and 0.6 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.27. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was of 81.81 percentage. Likewise, average score of group B was 0.33 in pre-test and 0.5 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.17. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 51.51 percentage. In this language function, group A progressed better than group B.

g. Thanking

This functional category consisted 1 item of 1 full mark. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is given below.

Table No. 9
Result of average score of thanking

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.63	0.86	0.23	36.50
B	0.53	0.6	0.07	13.20

The table shows that the average score of group A was 0.63 in pre-test and 0.86 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.23. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was of 36.50 percentage. Similarly, the average score of group B was 0.53 in pre-test and 0.6 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.07.

Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 13.20 percentage. Thus, it indicates that group A learnt this language function better than group B.

h. Making Offer

This functional category consisted of 3 items of 3 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as presented in the following table:

Table No. 10
Average score in making offer

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.6	1.06	0.46	76.66
B	0.6	0.93	0.33	55

The average score of group A was 0.6 in pre-test and 1.06 in post-test. It means it was increased by 0.46. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 76.66 percentage. In the same way, the average score of group B was 0.6 in pre-test and 0.93 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.33. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 55 percentage. In this category group A performed better than group B.

i. Expressing the Degree of Probability

This functional category consisted of 2 items of 2 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is given in the following table:

Table No. 11
Average score in expressing the degree of probability

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.46	0.86	0.4	86.95
B	0.6	0.73	0.13	21.66

The table shows that the average score of group A was 0.46 in pre-test and 0.86 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.4. So, the difference between two tests was

of 86.95 percentage. In the same way, the average of group B was 0.6 in pre-test and 0.73 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.13. So, the difference between two tests was of 21.66 percentage. In this function, group A progressed better than group B.

j. Expressing Sympathy

This functional category consisted 2 items of 2 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as given below:

Table No. 12

Average score in expressing sympathy

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.46	0.8	0.34	73.91
B	0.53	0.83	0.3	56.60

The table shows that the average score of group A was 0.46 in pre-test and 0.8 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.34. So, the difference between two tests was of 73.91 percentage. Similarly, the average score of group B was 0.53 in pre-test and 0.83 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.3. So, the difference between two tests was of 56.60 percentage. Thus, group A learnt this language function more effectively than group B.

k. Seeking Confirmation

This functional category consisted of 3 items of 3 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as presented in the following table:

Table No. 13

Average score in seeking confirmation

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.53	0.96	0.43	81.13
B	0.33	0.5	0.17	51.51

Average score of group A was 0.53 in pre-test and 0.96 in post-test. It means that it was increased by 0.43. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 81.13 percentage. In the same way, average score of group B was 0.33 in pre-test and 0.5 in post-test. This means that it was increased by 0.17. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 51.51 percentage. Thus, it shows that group A learnt this language function more effectively than group B.

l. Giving Direction

This category consisted 3 items of 3 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as given in the following table:

Table No. 14

Average score in giving direction

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.9	1.63	0.73	81.11
B	1.32	2.26	0.94	71.21

Average score of group A was 0.9 in pre-test and 2.26 in post-test. This indicates that it was increased by 0.73. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was 81.11 percentage. .Likewise, average score of group B was 1.32 in pre-test and 2.26 in post-test. This indicates that it was increased by 0.94. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 71.21 percentage. In this function, group A performed better than group B.

m. Giving Instruction

This functional category consisted of 2 items of 2 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is as given below:

Table No. 15

Average score in giving instruction

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.4	0.76	0.36	90
B	0.53	0.98	0.52	98.11

The table shows that average score of group A was 0.4 in pre-test and 0.76 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 0.36. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was of 90 percentage. Similarly, average score of group B was 0.53 in pre-test and 0.98 in post-test. This means, it was increased by 0.52. Therefore, the difference between pre-test and post-test was of 98.11 percentage. Thus, it indicates that group B learnt this language more effectively than group A.

n. Asking for Permission

This functional category consisted of 3 items of 3 full marks. The average score of the students of experimental group and control group is presented in the following table:

Table No. 16

Average score in asking for permission

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	0.93	1.8	0.87	93.54
B	0.73	1.4	0.67	91.78

The average score of group A was 0.93 in pre-test and 1.8 in post-test. It means that it was increased by 0.87. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 93.54 percentage. In the same way, the average score of group B was 0.73 in pre-test and 1.4 in post-test. It means that it was increased by 0.67. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 91.54 percentage. Thus, it shows that group A learnt this language function a bit better than group B.

o. Apology

This functional category consisted of 3 items of 3 full marks. The average score of the

students of experimental group and control group is as follows:

Table No. 17

Average score in apology

Group	Avg. score in pre-test	Avg. score in post-test	D	D%
A	1.06	2	0.94	88.67
B	0.8	1.4	0.6	75

The table shows that the average score of group A was 1.06 in pre-test and 2 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.94. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 88.67 percentage. Similarly, the average score of group B was 0.8 in pre-test and 1.4 in post-test. This means it was increased by 0.6. Therefore, the difference between two tests was of 75 percentage. In this functional category, group A performed better than group B.

CHAPTER-FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Findings

In this chapter findings of the study are presented in the light of statistical analysis and recommendations are derived on the basis of findings for further research. Findings of the present research are as follows:

- I. Cooperative language learning was found more effective as a teaching learning method in comparison to usual method of teaching the English language.
- II. The experimental group progressed by 6.53 percentage than the control group in terms of functional categories in total performance. Similarly, the experimental group progressed by 17.03 percentage than the control group in terms of item category in total performance.
- III. It is found that experimental group excelled the control group in terms of functional categories such as introducing (47.78%), seeking information (14.42%), requesting (32.93%), expressing ability to do something (30.3%), thanking (23.3%), making offer (21.66%), expressing the degree of probability (65.29%), expressing sympathy (17.31%), seeking confirmation (29.62%), giving direction (9.9%), asking for permission (1.76%) and apology (13.67%).
- IV. The control group performed better than the experimental group on functional categories such as greetings and farewell (26.64%), making suggestion or advising (1.83%) and giving instruction (8.11%).

4.2 Recommendations

The recommendations derived on the basis of research findings are as follows:

- a. It was found that cooperative language learning is an effective method of teaching language functions. Therefore, cooperative language learning should be used in teaching language functions.
- b. This study was limited to 15 language functions only. Other researches can be carried out in other areas of language functions, language aspects and language skills.
- c. The experimental study was limited to 30 students of secondary level of government school. Further researches can be carried out in teaching large class from primary level to college level.
- d. This study was limited to the academic achievement of the students in English language. So, further researches can be carried out to find out the effectiveness of cooperative language learning regarding academic motivation, social skills and group relation.
- e. Teachers need to be trained for effective implementation of cooperative learning in developing academic achievement of the students.

References

- Adhikari, K. (2010). *Collaborative learning for teachers' professional development*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Department of English Education, T. U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Arzu, H. (2005). Cooperative Learning. Retrieved May 20, 2010 from <http://www.yde.yildiz.edu.tr/uddo/belgeler/inca-hicyilmaz-cooplearn.htm>
- Baral, L. N. (2006). *Effectiveness of cooperative learning on achievement of lower secondary studies in English*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Department of English Education, T. U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Bhandari, S. B. (2005). *The effectiveness of pair work and group work technique in teaching communicative functions*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Department of English Education, T. U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Bhattarai, J. (2010). *Cooperative learning in developing vocabulary*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Department of English Education, T. U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Eaglewood Cliff. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Chafe, A. (1998). *Cooperative learning and the second language classroom*. Retrieved May 25, 2010 from <http://www.cdli.ca/~achafe/cooplang.html>
- Corder, S. Pit. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ghaith, G. (2002). Effects of the learning together model of cooperative learning on English as a foreign language reading achievement, academic self-esteem and feelings of school alienation. *Bilingual Research Journal*, Vol.27, No.3, 2002.
- Finocchiaro, M. (1986). *English as a second /foreign language: From theory to practice*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.

- Johnson, D. & Johnson, R. (1990). Impact of group processing on achievement in cooperative groups. *Journal of social psychology*, Vol.130, p.507-516.
- (1994). *Learning together and alone: cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Johnson et al. (1991). *Basic elements of cooperative learning*. Interaction Book Company: Edina.
- (1998). *Cooperation in the classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kagan, S. (1990). The structural approach to cooperative learning. *Journal of educational leadership*, Vol.47, No.4, p.12-15.
- (1994). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente: California.
- (1995). *We can talk: cooperative learning in the Elementary ESL classroom*. DC. (<http://www.ericdigests.org>)
- (1999). *Cooperative learning: seventeen pros and seventeen cons plus ten tips for success*. (Kagan online Magazine, Winter 1999).
- Kochhar, S. K. (1990). *Methods and techniques of teaching*. India: Sterling Pvt. Ltd.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Liang, T. (2002). *Implementing cooperative learning in EFL teaching: process and effects*. An Unpublished Thesis of Ph. D. in The Graduate Institute of English, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: an introduction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- McCafferty et al. (2006). *Cooperative learning and second language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Collaborative language learning and teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning and interaction: three communicative strands in the language classroom. *Modern language Journal*, Vol.81, p.443-456.

- Piaget, J. (1965). *The language and thought of the child*. New York: World Publishing Co.
- Regmi, C. R. (2004). *A study of the effectiveness of group work technique in teaching English tenses*. An Unpublished M. Ed. Thesis. Department of English Education, T. U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Rimal, L. N. (2004). *A study on the effectiveness of group work on learning writing skills in English*. An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Department of English Education, T. U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Rodgers, T. (1988). Cooperative language learning: What's new? *PASSA: A Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, Vol.18, No.2, p.12-23.
- Rodger, T. & Johnson D. W. (1994). *Creativity and collaborative learning*. Brookers Press: Baltimore.
- Seng, T. H. (2006). *Cooperative learning in achievement in English language acquisition in a literature class in a secondary school*. An unpublished Thesis of Master's Degree, The Department of Modern languages, University Technology Malaysia.
- Sharan, S. (1980). Cooperative learning in small groups: recent methods and effects on achievement, attitudes and ethnic relations. *Review of educational research*, Vol.50, p.241-272.
- Sharma, B. K. & Phyak, P. B. (2004). *ELT theories and practices*. Kirtipur: Sunlight Publication.
- Sthapit, S. K. (2000). Teaching language for communication. *Journal of NELTA*, Vol.5, No.1, p1-17.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching practice and theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- (2001). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Van Ek, J. A & Alexander, L. G. (1977). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative learning and foreign language learning and teaching.
Journal of language teaching and research, Vol.1, No.1, p.81-83. January
2010.

APPENDIX-I

Test Items

Name: F.M.: 50
Grade: Nine P.M.: 20
Subject: Com. English (Language functions) Time: 1:30 hrs.
School: Mahendra Secondary School Pandaun 9, Kailali. Date:

Attempt all the questions

1. Tick the best answer. (10x1=10)

- I. Which of the following serves the language function of 'requesting'?
- a. Could you lend me your book, please? b. I want your help.
c. You should dance in the party. d. Why don't you go to library?
- II. 'I am sorry to hear about your uncle's car accident' serves the language function of:
- a. bad news b. expressing sympathy
c. making offer d. suggesting
- III. 'Where do you live?' represents the function of:
- a. asking question b. seeking information
c. seeking confirmation d. expressing want
- IV. The exponent 'May I use your towel?' refers to the language function of:
- a. asking for permission b. expressing ability
c. requesting d. suggesting
- V. Which of the following exponent serves the language function of 'suggesting'?
- a. Listen! Go to the office. b. See you again.
c. You'd better to visit a doctor. d. May you go to the Heaven!
- VI. The statement 'First light the stove and then put the pan on it.' has the function of:
- a. making order b. describing the action
c. making suggestion d. giving instruction
- VII. 'First of all, turn your left and go straight.' has the language function of:
- a. commanding b. requesting
c. giving direction d. telling about road

VIII. 'May I serve a glass of water?' is an example of:

- a. asking for permission
- b. making offer
- c. going to future
- d. criticizing

IX. 'I am extremely sorry for making noise.' serves the language function of:

- a. expressing congratulation
- b. expressing happiness
- c. apologizing
- d. thanking

X. Which of the following exponent serves the language function of 'expressing probability'?

- a. He writes a letter.
- b. He is very fast in running.
- c. He'll probably come.
- D. He doesn't know what to do.

2. Fill in the gaps with appropriate language function and exponent. (8x1=8)

a) 'You are welcome to this beautiful city!' serves the language function of:

.....

b) 'Are you student of Grade nine?' is an exponent of the language function of:

.....

c) "....." is an example of requesting.

d) 'I am sorry for late.' represents the language function of:

e) 'If I were you I'd join the tuition class.' serves the language function of:

.....

f) 'Hi! I am Kedareshwor from Dadeldhura.' refers the language function of :

.....

g) 'I am sorry, I can't have the meal right now.' shows the language function of:

.....

h) 'Sujal can not carry the load.' represents the language function of:

.....

3. Write the correct exponent in the following context. (15x1=15)

- a) Your friend is getting headache, how would you advise him/her for medical treatment?
- b) You feel very thirst in your exam hall. How would you request to bring a glass of water?
- c) Your teacher says, "Thank you!" to you. Write an appropriate reply to it
- d) You are student of grade nine and it is your first day in your school, how would you introduce yourself?
- e) Five students are transferred to your section. Write the correct exponent you use to welcome them
- f) You heard that your friend is injured in bus accident how do you express your sympathy?
- g) You are in the classroom and you need a pen. Aask for permission to use pen.
- h) You are feeling hot in the classroom. Request your friend to open the windows.
- i) You think that your brother has not finished his homework. Confirm it by asking him.
- j) You need 50 rupees for farewell programme. Request your mother for the money.
- k) A tourist wants to visit Bus Park. How do you give directions to him?
- l) Your sister wants to prepare coffee. How would you give instructions to her?
- m) You don't know the family members of your friend. How would you ask him/her?
- n) You know that your grandmother can't read anymore. Write an appropriate exponent for this situation.....
- o) Your sister says 'Good bye!' to you. Write your reply.

4. Match the appropriate language function and exponent.

(9x1=9)

- A. Making request () Good bye!
- B. Seeking information () Turn your right and go straight for 10 minutes.
- C. Asking for permission () Please, give me your pen.
- D. Making offer () May I use your pen?
- E. Giving direction () You'd better to visit a dentist.
- F. Advising () Would you like to have a cup of tea?
- G. Introducing () Hello! She is Justina from Biratnagar.
- H. Taking leave () I'm sure he will win the game.
- I. Expressing probability () how many members do you have in your family?

5 Write T for True and F for False.

(8x1=8)

- a. "I can't thank you enough." is an example of 'Making suggestions.' ()
- b. "Have a good day ahead." is an example of introducing. ()
- c. "May I use your book?" is an example of asking for permission. ()
- d. The example of 'Introducing' is "Hi! My name is John from Canada." ()
- e. "Sunita is not a nurse, is she?" is an example of 'seeking confirmation.' ()
- f. "You would better to join tuition class." is an exponent of advising. ()
- g. "I am sorry for interruption." serves the language function of making apologizing. ()
- h. "I would like to serve with Chinese food." serves the language function of making offer." ()

GOOD LUCK!

APPENDIX-II

Lesson Plan No.1

Class: Nine

No. of students: 15

Subject: Com. English

Time: 45 minutes

School: Mahendra Secondary School Koltadi-9, Kailali.

Date: 2067-03-32

Teaching Items: Advising

Objectives: On completion of the lesson, the students will be able to:

1. tell the exponents of advising.
2. use the exponents appropriately.

Materials: Picture and sentence cards

Group A

Activities:

- i. The teacher will show the picture of a patient and will ask the students to guess the problems.
- ii. The teacher will explain about the picture and provide advice.
- iii. The class will be divided into teams of four.
- iv. Then, another picture will be shown to the students and all the teams will discuss the picture and write down the advice.
- v. One pairs of each team will be transferred to another team and they will discuss and share in a new team.
- vi. Pairs will go back to the original team and share the activities and experiences.
- vii. One member from a team will present the answers of the questions.
- viii. Teacher provides corrective feedback if necessary.

Evaluation: What are the exponents of advising?

Homework: Ask your family members about their problem and write your advice to them.

Group B

Activities:

- i. The teacher will show the picture of a patient and will ask the students to guess the problems.
- ii. Students will be asked to tell the exponents of advising for the problem.
- iii. The teacher will explain the picture and provide exponents of advising.
- iv. Students will be practised with more examples of advising with the help of context.
- v. The teacher will make the students clear with more examples with explanation and discussion method and will summarize the lesson.

Evaluation: What are the exponents of advising?

Your friend is getting weak in study. What is your advice to him/her?

Homework: Ask your family members about their problem and write your advice to them.

APPENDIX-III
Sample Teaching Aids
Lesson Plan No. 12

Exponents:

Congratulations to.....

I would like to congratulate you

Bundle of congratulations to you.

Congratulations on your victory.



APPENDIX-IV
Pre-Test Rank Order

Rank Order	Name Of the students	Pre-test score
1	Kamal Gaharti Magar	33
2	Laxmi Devkota	32.5
3	Krishna Bahadur Giri	32
4	Lalit Devkota	31
5	Tilak Bhatta	29
6	Bandu Khanal	28
7	Bhima Upadhyaya	27
8	Bharat Bhatta	26
9	Dev Bahadur Gautam	25.5
10	Kabita Binadi	25
11	Ganesh Subedi	19.2
12	Yam Paudel	19
13	Pushpa Bantola	18.5
14	Chayan Paudel	18
15	Krishna Jaishi	17
16	Bandana Binadi	16
17	Bhim Bahadur Khadka	15.5
18	Bandu Pokhrel	15
19	Krishna Hamal	14.5
20	Manisha Pun Magar	14
21	Dan Bahadur Thapa	13
22	Bal Bahadur B. K.	12
23	Kabita Puri	11.5
24	Amit Khatri	11
25	Sushmita Malla	10
26	Ram Bahadur Oli	9
27	Nanda Singh Shahi	8
28	Reshma Bhandari	7
29	Mahima Pandey	5.3
30	Sukhram Nepali	4.5

APPENDIX –V

Group-based table for Pre-Test and Post-Test Results

1. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test of Group A

R.N.	Name of the student	Pre-test score	Post-test score
2	Laxmi Devkota	32.5	48
4	Lalit Devkota	31	43
6	Bandu Kanal	28	35
8	Bharat Bhatta	26	43
10	Kabita Binadi	25	45
12	Yam Paudel	19	32
14	Chayan Paudel	18	35
16	Bandana Binadi	16	36.5
18	Bandu Pokhrel	15	29.5
20	Manisha Pun Magar	14	23
22	Bal Bahadur B. k.	12	27
24	Amit Khatri	11	21
26	Ram Bahadur Oli	9	19
28	Reshma Bhandari	7	14
30	Sukhram Nepali	4.5	7
Total score		268	468

2. The Result of Pre-test and Post-test of Group B

R.N.	Name of the student	Pre-test score	Post-test score
1	Kamal Gharti Magar	33	43
3	Krishna Bahadur Giri	32	38
5	Tilak Bhatta	29	39
7	Bhima Upadhyaya	27	42
9	Dev Bahadur Gautam	25.5	35
11	Ganesh Subedi	19.2	32
13	Pushpa Bantola	18.5	31
15	Krishna Jaishi	17	29
17	Bhim Bhadur Khadka	15.5	30
19	Krishna Hamal	14.5	17
21	Dan Bahadur Thapa	13	15
23	Kabita Puri	11.5	22
25	Sushmita Malla	10	18
27	Nanda Singh Shahi	8	13
29	Mahima Pandye	5.3	15
Total score		279	419

APPENDIX –VI

Function-Based Table for Pre-Test and Post-Test Results

I. The result in Introducing

Total items: 5

Total Marks: 5

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	4	5			1	4	5		
4	4	5			3	5	5		
6	3	5			5	5	5		
8	3	5			7	3	5		
10	3	5			9	5	5		
12	3	5			11	5	5		
14	4	5			13	4	5		
16	3	5			15	3.5	4.5		
18	1.5	5			17	5	5		
20	2	4			19	3	4		
22	2	4			21	3	4		
24	2	4			23	2	4		
26	3	5			25	3	5		
28	1	5			27	4	5		
30	1	2			29	1	4		
Total	39.5	69				55.5	70.5		
Average	2.63	4.6	1.97	74.90		3.7	4.7	1	27.02

II. The result in Greetings and farewell

Total items: 4

Total Marks: 4

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	3	4			1	3	4		
4	3	4			3	3	4		
6	3	3.5			5	4	4		
8	2.5	4			7	3	4		
10	3	4			9	3	4		
12	3	3			11	1	2.5		
14	1.5	2.5			13	1	3.5		
16	1.5	3.5			15	1	4		
18	1.5	3			17	1	3		
20	1	3			19	1	1		
22	1	3			21	1	1		
24	1	2.5			23	1	4		
26	1	3			25	0	2		
28	1	0			27	1	2		
30	0.5	1			29	1	2		
Total	27.5	44				25	45		
Average	1.83	2.93	1.1	60.10		1.66	3	1.44	86.74

III. The result in Seeking Information

Total items: 3

Total Marks: 3

Group-A	Group-B
----------------	----------------

R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	0	3			1	0.5	1.5		
4	1	2			3	1	1		
6	2	1			5	1.5	1.5		
8	1	3			7	0	1		
10	0	3			9	1	2		
12	1	1			11	0	0		
14	2	2			13	1	1		
16	2	1			15	0	1		
18	0	1			17	0	1		
20	0	0			19	1	1		
22	0	0			21	0	0		
24	0	0			23	0	0		
26	0	0			25	0	0		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	1	1		
Total	9	17				7	12		
Average	0.6	1.13	0.53	88.33		0.46	0.8	0.34	73.91

IV. The result in Requesting

Total items: 7

Total Marks: 7

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	6.5	7			1	5	7		
4	5	7			3	3	6		
6	6	7			5	6	6		
8	4.5	7			7	3	5.5		
10	4	7			9	3.5	5.5		
12	1	6			11	3.8	4.6		
14	2	7			13	2.5	5		
16	3	7			15	2	3.5		
18	3	6.5			17	4	5		
20	3	6			19	4	4.5		
22	2	5.5			21	1	4		
24	2	5.5			23	2.5	3.5		
26	0	4			25	1.5	3		
28	2	1.5			27	2	2		
30	1	0			29	0.3	2.7		
Total	45	84				44.1	67.8		
Average	3	5.6	2.6	86.67		2.94	4.52	1.58	53.74

V. The result in Making Suggestions/Advising

Total items: 6

Total Marks: 6

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	6	6			1	6	6		
4	6	6			3	6	6		
6	4	5			5	4	5		
8	4	5			7	4.5	6		
10	3	6			9	1	5		
12	2	6			11	2	4		
14	3	5			13	2	4.5		
16	3	6			15	4	5		
18	4	5			17	1	6		
20	3	4.5			19	4	4		
22	3	4.5			21	4	4		
24	4	4.5			23	1	2		
26	2	5			25	2	3		
28	1	4			27	1	3		
30	1	3			29	0	3		
Total	48	75.5				42.5	67.5		
Average	3.2	5.03	1.83	57.18		2.83	4.5	1.67	59.01

VI The result in Expressing Ability to do Something

Total items: 5

Total Marks: 5

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%

2	1	1			1	2	2		
4	1	1			3	2	0		
6	1	1.5			5	0.5	1.5		
8	0	1			7	0.5	1		
10	1	0			9	0	1		
12	0	1			11	0	1		
14	1	1.5			13	0	0		
16	0	1			15	0	0		
18	0	1			17	0	0		
20	0	1			19	0	0		
22	0	0			21	0	0		
24	0	0			23	0	0		
26	0	0			25	0	0		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	5	9				5	7.5		
Average	0.33	0.6	0.27	81.81		0.33	0.5	0.17	51.51

VII. The result in Thanking

Total items: 1

Total Marks: 1

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	1	1			1	1	1		
4	1	1			3	1	1		
6	1	1			5	1	1		

8	0.5	1			7	1	1		
10	1	1			9	1	1		
12	0	1			11	1	1		
14	0.5	1			13	1	1		
16	0	1			15	0	0		
18	1	1			17	0	1		
20	1	0.5			19	0	0		
22	1	1			21	0	0		
24	0	1			23	0	0		
26	0	1			25	0	0		
28	1	0.5			27	0	0		
30	0.5	0			29	1	1		
Total	9.5	13				8	9		
Average	0.63	0.86	0.23	36.50		0.53	0.6	0.07	13.20

VIII. The result in Making Offer

Total items: 3

Total Marks: 3

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	1	3			1	2	3		
4	1	2			3	0	2		
6	2	2			5	0	1		

8	2	3			7	2	3		
10	1	3			9	2	2		
12	1	1			11	1	1		
14	0	1			13	0	0		
16	0	1			15	1	1		
18	1	0			17	0	0		
20	0	0			19	0	0		
22	0	0			21	0	0		
24	0	0			23	1	1		
26	0	0			25	0	0		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	9	16				9	14		
Average	0.6	1.06	0.44	76.66		0.6	0.93	0.33	55

IX. The result in Expressing the Degree of Probability

Total items: 2

Total Marks: 2

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	1	2			1	2	2		
4	2	2			3	1	1		

6	0	1			5	1	2		
8	1	2			7	2	2		
10	1	2			9	0	0		
12	0	0			11	1	1		
14	0	0			13	1	1		
16	0	0			15	0	1		
18	1	0			17	0	0		
20	1	1			19	0	0		
22	0	1			21	0	0		
24	0	1			23	0	0		
26	0	0			25	1	1		
28	0	1			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	7	13				9	11		
Average	0.46	0.86	0.4	86.95		0.6	0.73	0.13	21.66

X. The result in Expressing Sympathy

Total items: 2

Total Marks: 2

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	2	2			1	1	1		

4	0	2			3	1	1		
6	1	1			5	1	1		
8	1	2			7	1	1		
10	0	2			9	1	1		
12	1	0			11	0	1		
14	0	1			13	1	1		
16	1	1			15	0	1.5		
18	1	0			17	1	1		
20	0	0			19	0	0		
22	0	1			21	0	0		
24	0	0			23	1	1		
26	0	0			25	0	1		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	7	12				8	12.5		
Average	0.46	0.8	0.34	73.91		0.53	0.83	0.3	56.60

XI. The result in Seeking Confirmation

Total items: 3

Total Marks: 3

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%

2	0	3			1	1	1		
4	1	3			3	1	1		
6	0	1			5	1	2		
8	2	2			7	1	2		
10	1	2			9	0	0		
12	0	1			11	1	1.5		
14	0	1			13	0	0		
16	0	1			15	0	0		
18	0	0			17	0	0		
20	2	0			19	0	0		
22	1	0.5			21	0	0		
24	1	0			23	0	0		
26	0	0			25	0	0		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	8	14.5				5	7.5		
Average	0.53	0.96	0.43	81.13		0.33	0.5	0.17	51.51

XII. The result in Giving Direction

Total items: 3

Total Marks: 3

Group-A	Group-B
----------------	----------------

R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	2	3			1	1.5	2.5		
4	1	2			3	2.5	2.5		
6	1	1.5			5	1.5	2.5		
8	0	2			7	0	2.5		
10	2	3			9	3	3		
12	0	2			11	1.4	2.4		
14	1	1.5			13	2	2.5		
16	0.5	2.5			15	1	2		
18	0	1			17	1.5	1.5		
20	1	1			19	1.5	2.5		
22	1	1.5			21	1	1		
24	1	1			23	0.5	2.5		
26	1	1			25	2.5	2.5		
28	1	1.5			27	0	2		
30	0	0			29	0	1		
Total	13.5	24.5				19.9	33.9		
Average	0.9	1.63	0.73	81.11		1.32	2.26	0.94	71.21

XIII. The result in Giving Instruction

Total items: 2

Total Marks: 2

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	1	2			1	2	2		
4	1	1			3	0.5	1.5		
6	1	0.5			5	0.5	1.5		
8	0	1			7	1	1		
10	1	2			9	1	1.5		
12	0	1			11	0	1.2		
14	1	1.5			13	1	1		
16	0	1.5			15	0	1		
18	1	1			17	0	1.5		
20	0	0			19	0	0		
22	0	0			21	1	1		
24	0	0			23	1	1.5		
26	0	0			25	0	0		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	6	11.5				8	14.7		
Average	0.4	0.76	0.36	90		0.53	0.98	0.52	98.11

XIV. The result in Asking for Permission

Total items: 3

Total Marks: 3

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	2	3			1	0	2		
4	2	3			3	3	3		
6	1	2			5	1	3		
8	2	3			7	1	3		
10	0	3			9	2	2		
12	2	2			11	0	2		
14	2	2			13	1	2		
16	1.5	3			15	1	1		
18	1	2			17	1	2		
20	0	1			19	0	0		
22	0	2			21	1	1		
24	0	0			23	0	0		
26	0	0			25	0	0		
28	0	0			27	0	0		
30	0.5	1			29	0	0		
Total	14	27				11	21		
Average	0.93	1.8	0.87	93.54		0.73	0.4	0.67	91.78

XV. The result in Apology

Total items: 3

Total Marks: 3

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	2	3			1	2	2		
4	2	3			3	2	3		
6	1	1			5	2	3		
8	3	3			7	2	3		
10	2	3			9	1	2		
12	1	3			11	0	2		
14	2	2			13	1	3		
16	2	2			15	1	1		
18	1	3			17	1	2		
20	0	2			19	0	0		
22		2			21	0	0		
24	0	1			23	0	0		
26	0	1			25	0	0		
28	0	1			27	0	0		
30	0	0			29	0	0		
Total	16	30				12	21		
Average	1.06	2	0.94	88.67		0.8	1.4	0.6	75

APPENDIX-VII

Item based table for pre-test and post-test results

I. The result in Multiple Choice

Total items: 10

Total Marks: 10

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	7	10			1	10	1		
4	7	9			3	7	8		
6	5	7			5	7	9		
8	5	9			7	7	10		
10	5	8			9	65	3		
12	5	7			11	6	9		
14	3	7			13	6	9		
16	6	7			15	4	7		
18	4	6			17	3	7		
20	3	5			19	3	4		
22	3	7			21	3	4		
24	2	4			23	3	5		
26	2	3			25	3	3		
28	2	3			27	2	3		
30	1	2			29	1	3		
Total	60	94				70	94		
Average	4	6.26	2.26	56.5		4.66	6.26	1.6	34.33

II. The result in Fill in the gaps

Total items: 8

Total Marks: 8

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	5	7			1	3	3		
4	5	7			3	3	5		
6	5	6			5	3	7		
8	5	7			7	3	6		
10	3	5			9	4	6		
12	0	6			11	3	7		
14	4	5			13	4	6		
16	4	7			15	3	4		
18	2	6			17	2	5		
20	2	4			19	1	2		
22	3	5			21	2	2		
24	2	4			23	1	3		
26	1	3			25	1	2		
28	1	3			27	0	1		
30	1	1			29	0	2		
Total	43	76				33	61		
Average	2.86	5.06	2.2	76.92		2.2	4.06	1.86	84.54

III. The result in Short answer

Total items: 15

Total Marks: 15

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	10.5	14			1	10	12		
4	7	13			3	9	1		
6	9	12			5	10	10		
8	5	12			7	7	10		
10	7	14			9	6.5	8.5		
12	3	8			11	5.5	8.5		
14	3	12			13	3.5	6.5		
16	3	10.5			15	2	4.5		
18	3.9	7.5			17	4.5	7		
20	4	5			19	5.5	6		
22	4	3			21	3	3		
24	3	5			23	3.5	7		
26	3	3			25	2	4		
28	3	4			27	3	3		
30	1.5	0			29	2.3	5		
Total	69.9	123				76.8	105		
Average	4.66	8.2	3.54	75.96		5.12	7	1.88	36.71

IV.The result in Matching

Total items: 9

Total Marks: 9

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	5	9			1	6	7		
4	6	7			3	6	7		
6	5	5			5	5	7		
8	6	9			7	5	8		
10	5	9			9	5	5		
12	5	6			11	4	5		
14	5	6			13	3	5		
16	5	6			15	5	7		
18	5	5			17	3	5		
20	3	4			19	3	3		
22	0	4			21	3	3		
24	2	3			23	2	3		
26	2	4			25	2	3		
28	1	3			27	2	3		
30	1	2			29	2	2		
Total	56	82				54	73		
Average	3.73	5.46	1.73	46.38		3.6	4.86	1.26	35

V. The result in True or false

Total items: 8

Total Marks: 8

Group-A					Group-B				
R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%	R.N.	Pre-test	Post-test	D	D%
2	5	8			1	3	5		
4	6	7			3	6	7		
6	4	5			5	5	7		
8	5	6			7	5	7		
10	5	8			9	4	6		
12	5	6			11	3	4		
14	3	5			13	2	5		
16	6	6			15	2	4		
18	1	5			17	3	5		
20	2	4			19	2	2		
22	2	4			21	2	3		
24	2	3			23	2	4		
26	1	4			25	2	3		
28	0	3			27	2	3		
30	0	2			29	1	3		
Total	47	74				44	68		
Average	3.13	4.93	1.8	57.50		2.93	4.53	1.6	54.60