

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 General Background

Language is a means of communication. We need communication to run our life effectively. We face many problems in the absence of effective communication. We learn a language through speech and writing. The Encyclopedia Britannica (2005) defines language as "a system of conventional, spoken or written symbols by means of which human beings as members of social group and participants in its culture communicate"(vol.6, p.14). Language is based on religion, culture, custom and the status of the society, education and so on. In this regard, it is a means of inter-culture communication as well as social control.

Language is a special gift for the human beings. It is the most highly developed and most frequently used means of communication. The use of a language involves transmission of information from a sender to a receiver. In the process of communication, one perceives the clear picture of the whole world through language, it is a means, which helps us to think, interpret, perceive and express about the real world. On the other hand, language is the composition of sound. So, words, phrases and sentences with which thoughts, feelings, emotions etc are shared among human beings.

English is popular all over the world. It is not only spoken in Britain and America but also in every corner of the world. Thus, it is an international language. It is widely accepted as the language of international communication as it is used by the UNO and SAARC countries. It is used to get world wide knowledge in various fields like literature, academics, science and technology.

The interest on the English Language has been increased day by day. It is a principal language for international communication and gateway to the world body of knowledge. In view of these facts the English language is given great importance in the education system of Nepal. It is taught as a compulsory subject right from grade I to the Bachelor's degree. In addition, it is used as an access language to libraries and as a means of instruction and evaluation at the higher levels of education. Initially grammar aspect of language was highly prescribed on the assumption that until and unless grammar is learnt, language learning is not complete. At that time reading and writing were given higher priority where as other skills such as listening and speaking were ignored. Grammar translation method was assumed to be the best way of teaching a second language. Both Grammar and translation were taught deductively. Memorization was thought to be the best way of learning vocabulary.

Later on, other methods were introduced in the field of language teaching such as Direct Method, Audio-Lingual Method, Communicative Approach, etc. Today Communicative Approach dominates the other approaches and it emphasizes that the goal of language learning is to develop communicative competence. This approach was developed as a reaction against Audio-Lingual Method by British applied linguists. Adherents of the Communicative Approach acknowledge that structures and vocabulary are important. However, they feel that preparation for communication will be inadequate if only these are taught. Students may know the rules or language usage, but will be unable to use the language.

When we communicate, we use language to accomplish some functions, such as arguing, persuading, or promising. Moreover, we carry out these functions within a social context. A speaker will choose a particular way to express his/her argument not only based upon his/her intent and his/her level of emotion, but also on whom s/he is addressing to and what his/her relationship with that person is.

For example, s/he may be more direct in arguing with his/her friend than with his/her employer.

Furthermore, since communication is a process, it is insufficient for students to simply have knowledge of the target language forms, meanings, and functions. Students must be able to apply this knowledge in negotiating meaning. It is through the interaction between speaker and listener (or reader and writer) that meaning becomes clear. The listener gives the speaker feedback as to whether or not he/she understands what the speaker has said. In this way, the speaker can revise what s/he has said and try to communicate his/her intended meaning again, if necessary.

According to this approach, a language teacher's job is not to teach his/her students about the language but to teach the language itself. Not what students will know about language but what they will be able to do after learning should be the aim of language teaching. So, Communicative Approach should aim at developing the communicative abilities in students.

In communicative approach, the goal of teachers is to make one's students become communicatively competent. While this has been the stated goal of many of the other methods, in the Communicative Approach the notion of what it takes to be communicatively competent is much expanded.

Communicative competence involves being able to use the language appropriately in a given social context. To do this, students need knowledge of the linguistic forms, meanings, and functions. They need to know that many different forms can be used to perform a function and also that a single form can often serve a variety of functions. They must be able to choose from among these the most appropriate

form, given in the social context and the roles of the interlocutors. They must be able to manage the process of negotiation meaning with their interlocutors.

The role of the teacher and the students is very crucial in this approach. The teacher is a facilitator of his/her students' learning. As such s/he has many responsibilities to fulfill and many roles to play. S/he is a manager of classroom activities. In this role, one of his/her major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communication. During the activities s/he acts as an advisor, answering students' questions and monitoring their performance. At other times s/he might be a "co-communicator" engaging in the communicative activity along with the students.

Students are, above all, communicators. They are actively engaged in negotiating meaning in trying to make themselves understood - even when their knowledge of the target language is incomplete. They learn to communicate by communicating. Also, since the teachers' role is less dominant than in a teacher centered method, students are seen as more responsible managers of their own learning.

The most obvious characteristic of the Communicative Approach is that almost everything that is done is done with a communicative intent. Students use the language a great deal through communicative activities such as games, role - plays, and problem solving tasks.

In the context of Nepal, as the Nepali language cannot fulfill our needs of the scientific and technical knowledge of the world, Nepal needs English language for the acquisition and transmission of the scientific and technological knowledge for tourism and business and for higher education.

The English language seems to have entered Nepal during the establishment of Gorkha Bharti Kendra in the time of late Bhimsen Thapa. However, it was included into educational field with the establishment of Durbar High School in 1854. Then in 1919, it was included in higher education with the establishment of Tri-Chandra College. In course of time the School Leaving Certificate (SLC) Examination Board (1933) and Tribhuvan University (1956) were established. Since then, English has occupied a vital position in the education field.

Although the teaching of English in Nepal began in the time of the Rana regime. The ELT situation in Nepal is very poor due to innumerable problems. Due to the high rate of illiteracy most of people do not know the importance of the English Language. Of course, there is a shortage of trained and qualified teachers, necessary teaching materials and reference books. The present comparative study is focused on comparing the writing proficiency in the English language of the students of four faculties. English is prescribed as compulsory subject in all the stream and as a subject of specialization in faculty of Humanities and social science and faculty of education. Nepal Government has also prescribed English as compulsory English from class one to ten. So, we can imagine the importance of the English language in Nepal as the fast-growing language of the world.

### **1.1.1 English in Nepal**

Before the unification of the country by the late king Prithivi Narayan Shah in 1825, education in Nepal was highly influenced by two religions: Hinduism and Buddhism. The emphasis given by Hinduism is the education based on the Sanskrit and Gurukul Education system where as Buddhism gave emphasis on the education based on the Gumba. Before the unification of Nepal Sanskrit and Gumba School existed with the Gurukul education system. The existence of English education was hard to be traced in those periods.

Late king Prithivi Narayan Shah and his successors Pratap Singh Shah, Bahadur Shah and Rajendra Laxmi Devi Shah Stressed on the establishment of industrial and vocational education but much attention could not be paid to it as their main concern was to involve in internal and external struggles. Within a few years of the unification, the country came under the influence of the Rana Family. In the outset of Rana Regime, the founder, Junga Bahadur Kunwar, later known as Junga Bahadur Rana , became the Prime minister of Nepal in 1846. During that period the king was made nominal head of the state and education system was totally suppressed. However, Ranas could not avoid diplomatic relations with the British as India was influenced by British government. For the sake of proper diplomatic relationship with Britain and the help to be got by her, Ranas adopted the English education in the country. Hence, Jang Bahadur Rana decided to give his children an English education rather than the traditional religiously oriented training. In 1854 Jang Bahadur engaged an English tutor to hold classes for his children in the Rana palace. This act tipped the balance in favor of English education and established its supremacy over the traditional type of Sanskrit-based education. Even English education during Rana regime could not flourish in Nepal, though Dev Shamsheer had tried to spread education to all the people beyond the Rana's palace. With Batukrishna Maitreya, Dev Shamsheer had the discussion with regard the medium of the education and the former suggested that English should be the medium of the Education.(Sharma, 2003 Cited in KC 2006:p.3). This evidence shows that people had a great respect to the English Education in that period.

The Ranas were over thrown and the king came in the power in 1951 when there was a great public revolt under the leadership of King Tribhuwan Bir Bikram Shah Deva against the Rana Regime. The Ministry of Education was set up in 1951. Numerous primary, secondary schools and college were established after the

establishment of the democratic regime. In 1956, the first five year education plan was scheduled for the overall development of the country. English Education in Nepal, prior to the New Education System Plan (NESP) 1971, was in shadow. According to the NESP plan, English was taught from grade four. In accordance with the present education system in Nepal, English is taught and learnt as a compulsory as well as an optional subject which shows the significance and popularity of it.

### **1.1.2 Definition of Approach and Method**

It was the American applied linguist Edward M. Anthony who first made an effort to provide a useful set of definition of the term approach and 'Method.'

According to Anthony (1963), an approach to language teaching is a model or theory that describes the nature of the subject matter to be taught and of how it is learnt. It is a set of correlative assumption dealing with the nature of language, language learning and language teaching. An approach states a point of view, a philosophy, or a article of faith, which we believe, but cannot, or do not necessarily prove. For this reason, an approach is axiomatic in nature. It is often unarguable except in terms of the effectiveness of the methods that row out of it. In other words, we can't judge whether an approach is effective or not unless we see how effective the method or methods grown out of it have been. As more than one method can grow out of an approach, it is broader than a method.

A method, as Anthony says, is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language materials. It is a set of procedures, a coherent system that spells out exactly how to teach a language. A method is based on a selected approach and is consistent with the approach. It is consistent within itself, too, as no part of it contradicts with any other part or parts it is narrower than an approach, but

broader than a technique. Where as an approach is axiomatic, a method is procedural.

There can be more than one method based on one approach as there are several other factors that influence the orderly presentation of language for instructional purpose. The nature of the students' native language as compared to the target language, the age level of students, their cultural background, their previous experience with the target language, the experience, the goal of the language course, the place of the target language in the curriculum, the time available for the language course, etc. are such other factors that shape a method.

Anthony's proposal (1963) is insufficient to account for the nature of a method itself. It says nothing about the roles of teachers, learners, and instructional materials and about the form that instructional materials are expected to take in a method. It also fails to show exactly how an approach is realized in a method. So, to fill this gap, Richards and Rodgers (1986) have revised and extended Anthony's original model. The revised version provides, as they claim, a more comprehensive model of the discussion of approaches and methods.

Richards and Rodgers (1986) see a method as consisting of three elements: an approach, a design and a set of procedures. An approach according to them, provides the theoretical under pinning to a method; a design determines the objective of the method, contents to be taught and their order of presentation and specifies the roles of teachers, learners and instructional materials assumed in the method; and procedure implements the method in actual classroom. Thus, a method is theoretically related to an approach, organizationally determined by a design and practically realized in procedure.

Richards and Rodgers (1986) assert that all language teaching methods can be described in terms of the elements identified here at the level of approach, design and procedure.

Various writers on language teaching methodology have their own ways of conceptualizing and describing methods. Larsen-Freeman (1986) describes a method in many terms. Her descriptive framework seems less systematic and less comprehensive than that proposed by Richards and Rodgers(1986). Although Larsen – Freeman recognizes that a method comprises theoretical principles and behavioral manifestations of those principles in the form of techniques and although his questions include many of the elements that are to be dealt with at the three different levels - approach, design and procedure – her model does not make a systematic categorization of the issues at the three different levels.

Above description, we can make distinguish between approach and method. In short, an approach is a set of correlative assumptions dealing with the nature of language teaching and learning. An approach is axiomatic. It describes the nature of the subject matter to be taught whereas a method is an overall plan for the orderly presentation of language material, no part of which contradicts, and all of which is based upon the selected approach. An approach is axiomatic, a method is procedural. Anthony's (1963) definition 'approach' is broader than method.

### **1.1.3 Some Major Methods and Approaches**

Language teaching has a century long history. Throughout the history, efforts have been constantly made to improve the quality of the job. This has been particularly so over the last hundred years. Language educators have attempted to solve the problems of language teaching by focusing their attention on methods. During this period several new methods have been developed and used with dramatic claims. But each of these has failed to achieve as much success as expected and has given

way to the emergence of another. These changes in methods, have been caused sometimes by the failure of the previously used method to teach certain aspect or aspects of language proficiency (e.g. the Grammar - Translation Method failed to develop learner's oral proficiency and gave way to the Direct Method) and other times as a result of a change in the theories of the nature of language and language learning (e.g. the Audio Lingual Method developed as a result of the structural linguistic theory and the behaviorist learning theory). There are nearly a dozen of methods and approaches developed and used in the 20th century alone with different degrees of influence and popularity. In the section that follows we will consider five of such various methods and approaches that have been highly influential at different times and, thus, represent the major trends in language teaching in the nineteenth and the twentieth century.

### **1.1.3.1 The Grammar Translation Method**

There is no full and carefully documented history of the Grammar Translation Method (GTM). However, it is generally agreed that it is the oldest of all second or foreign language teaching methods used by language teachers in the world so far. This method was used to teach the classical languages, Greek and Latin, in many part of the ancient world, particularly in the Western world. For this reason, it was also called the Classical Method at one time. The Classical Method focused on the teaching of grammatical rules, memorization of vocabulary, translation of texts and doing written exercises. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, when modern languages began to enter the curriculum of European educational institutions, the Classical Method was adopted as the standard procedure for teaching those languages. In the nineteenth century the Classical Method came to be known as the Grammar Translation Method, and this name was appropriate in view of its focus on grammatical rules as the basis for translating from and into the foreign language. The GTM then became the principal method of teaching modern languages in schools and colleges.

In the final decades of the nineteenth century the GTM was attacked as a cold and lifeless approach to language teaching. It was blamed for the failure of foreign language teaching. The majority of the reforms made in language teaching in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century were in opposition to the GTM.

In spite of these attacks, the GTM is still used today as a valid procedure to teach foreign languages in several educational institutions (Brown 1994;p.16). However, it is now used as a contributory strategy in conjunction with other strategies rather than as a self-contained method.

In Nepal, the GTM was the most widely used method prior to the introduction of the National Education System Plan (NESP), 1971. The foreign language (English) curriculum under NESP, incorporated in it the Oral Structural Situational Approach as the standard method of language teaching, and recently it has given way to what is known as the Communicative Approach. In spite of the introduction of these modern approaches to teaching English, some teachers still stress heavily on teaching the rules of grammar explicitly and making use of translation as a teaching technique.

### **1.1.3.2 The Direct Method**

The failure of the GTM to teach oral communication skills caused language educationists to look for better ways of teaching a second or foreign language in the later part of the nineteenth century. Francois Gouin and Charles Berlitz are the two most outstanding figures of the reform movement. Gouin developed an approach to foreign language teaching based on the observation of the acquisition and use of the first language by children. Although this approach did not take hold immediately, it was later established as a credible approach through the efforts of applied linguists, largely through those of Charles Berlitz. This new approach of

Gouin and Berlitz came to be known as the Direct Method (DM). The DM, therefore, is a method that simulates the natural way in which children acquire their first language.

The DM, thus, became established toward the end of the nineteenth century and reached the height of its influence in the first quarter of the twentieth century. Initially it was also called Berlitz method after the name of Charles Berlitz. The DM enjoyed considerable popularity in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century. It was widely used in France, Germany and the United States in commercial language schools.

Although the DM was widely accepted in private language schools where students were highly motivated and where native-speaking teachers could be employed, it did not take well in public education. In public schools the constraints of budget, class size, time and teachers' background made it difficult to use this method. The method was also criticized for its weak theoretical foundations. So further improvements were required, and the applied linguists like Harold Palmer and A.S Hornby, in the 1920s and the 1930s, attempted to develop a more scientific foundation for an oral approach to foreign language teaching than was evidenced in the DM. This paved way for the development of what come to be known as the Oral Structural Situational Approach to language teaching.

### **1.1.3.3The Audio-lingual Method**

Since the DM was unable to gain popularity in the United States as it could in Europe, American foreign language specialists conducted a study on what might be the best approach to teach foreign languages. The report of the study, often known as the Coleman Report, was published in 1929. The report persuaded foreign language teaches in America that it was impractical to teach oral skills and that a more reasonable goal of a foreign language course would be a reading

knowledge of the foreign language which could be a reading knowledge of the foreign language which could be achieved through the gradual introduction of words and grammatical structures in simple reading texts. Thus, American schools and colleges adopted a reading approach, often known as the Reading method, in the 1930s. The Reading Method, then, became the standard method of foreign language teaching in the USA until the outbreak of the World War II.

When the world war II broke out, the USA was thrust into a worldwide conflict and it needed personnel who were orally proficient in the languages of both their allies and enemies. To cater for this need a foreign language teaching program called the Army Specialized Training Programs (ASTP) was established in 1942. The main characteristics of the army training course was a great deal of oral activity - pronunciation, pattern drills and conversation practice - the fundamental characteristic of the discarded DM. The success of the ASTP - more colloquially the 'Army Method' - stimulated schools and other educational institutions in America to adopt this new approach. The Army Method, with some variations and adaptations, came to be known as the Audio-lingual Method (ALM) in the 1950s.

Thus, the ALM in origin is mainly American. But this method gained a worldwide popularity in the 1950s. In Nepal the syllabuses and text books introduced with the introduction of the National Education System Plan (NESP) in 1971 (2028 B.S.) reflected the main principles of the ALM such as the focus on the oral skills and on accuracy through drills and practice of the basic structures and sentence patterns of the target language as these were similar to the principles of the recommended Oral Structural Situational Approach. With the advent of the Communicative Approach (CA) in the 1970s, the influence of the ALM in the foreign language teaching arena of the world has decreased. In Nepal, too, English language syllabuses and text books have been changed recently, and the new

syllabuses and text books have incorporated the principles of the Communicative Approach.

#### **1.1.3.4 The Oral Structural Situational Approach**

As the Direct Method was criticized for its weak theoretical foundation, Harold Palmer and A.S. Hornby, two of the most prominent figures in British twentieth century language teaching, made efforts to develop a more scientific foundation for an oral approach to teaching English. Their work, along with that of other British applied linguists, from the 1920s onwards, developed an approach to language teaching that involved systematic selection, gradation and presentation of language items. In other words, the approach they developed consisted of the procedures by which lexical and grammatical content was chosen, the principles by which the organizations and sequencing of content were determined and the techniques that were used for the presentations and practice of items in a course. The general principles they set forth were referred to as the 'Oral Approach', which was different from the Direct Method in that the latter lacked a systematic basis in applied linguistic theory and practice.

The Oral Approach (OA) was the accepted British approach to English language teaching by the 1950s. George Pittman (1960s), it is described in the standard methodology textbooks written in that period. In the 1960s George Pittman, one of the outstanding Australian textbook writers, seemed to be an active supporter of OA. Pittman and his colleagues, including Gloria Tate, prepared an influential set of teaching materials based on the OA, which attempted to teach language points situationally and which were widely used in Australia, New Guinea and the Pacific territories. Pittman also developed situationally based materials to be used in the English programs for immigrants in Australia on behalf of the Commonwealth Office in Sydney, Australia. These materials were published for worldwide use in 1965 as the series Situational English. Meanwhile, leading

British textbook writers including L.G. Alexander also developed materials that reflected the principles of situational language teaching. Because of this focus on situation, the term 'situational' was used increasingly in referring to the OA in the 1960s. In fact, Hornby had already used the term 'The Situational Approach' in the title of a series of three articles published in the journal 'English Language Teaching' in 1950. The Situational Approach (SA) attempted to teach language structures orally and situationally. This is evident in Pittman's remark: 'Our principal classroom activity in the teaching of English structure will be the oral practice of structures. This oral practice of controlled sentence patterns should be given in situations designed to give the greatest amount of practice in English speech to the pupil' (Pittman 1963:p.179, quoted in Richards and Rodgers 1986:p.35). So later, the terms 'Structural Situational Approach' and 'Situational Language Teaching' came into common usage to refer to the OA that has evolved over more than three decades. Thus, the approach that was originally known as the OA took these new names to acknowledge that language structures and situational presentation and practice were considered as two other key elements of this approach. Many language teachers in the late 1960s and the 1970s used the term 'Oral Structural Situational Approach' to include the Structural Situational and the Oral approaches. Thus, the oral Structural Situational (OSS) Approach is the combination of the three approaches - Oral, Structural and Situational - that developed in Britain and Australia over the decades from the 1920s to the 1960s. Or it is the extended and more developed form of what was initially known as the Oral Approach. The essence of this approach is the oral presentation and practice of language structure in a meaningful situation.

In the context of Nepal this approach was introduced together with the introduction of the National Education System Plan in 1971 and remained as the recommended approach to the teaching of English as a foreign language until recently.

The OSS approach aims at providing the learner with a practical command of the four basic skills of language, the goal it shares with the DM. But here the skills are approached through the teaching of structures that are carefully selected and graded. Automatic control of basic structures and sentence patterns is the objective, which is achieved through speech work in a meaningful situation.

#### **1.1.4 The Communicative Approach**

When Noam Chomsky's classic book *Syntactic Structures* 1957 demonstrated that the then current structural linguistic theory was incapable of accounting for the fundamental characteristic of language, viz. the creativity and uniqueness of individual sentences, American and British applied linguists began to call into question the effectiveness of the ALM and the OSS Approach, for which structural linguistic theory had provided the basis. In addition to Chomsky's attack on structuralism, British applied linguists, towards the late 1960s, emphasized another fundamental aspect of language – the functional and communicative potential – that was not adequately addressed in the structural language teaching at that time. They felt the need to focus on communicative proficiency rather than on the mastery of language structures alone. As a result, there appeared a change in British language teaching tradition from the late 1960s with the emergence of a new approach known as the 'Communicative Approach (CA),' or 'Communicative Language Teaching (CTL)'. In 1972 D.A. Wilkins, a British applied linguist proposed a functional or communicative definition of language and analysed the communicative meanings that a language learner needs to understand and express. Wilkins (1972) described two types of meanings: notional categories (Such as time, sequence, quality, frequency, location, etc.) and functional categories (such as requesting, denying, complaining, inviting, defining, describing, socializing, etc.). Later, in 1976, he revised and expanded his 1972 document into a book

called 'Notional Syllabus'. The Council of Europe, a religion organization for cultural and educational co-operation among European countries, used Wilkins's work to produce a set of specifications for a first level communicative language syllabus for adult learners. These threshold level specifications formed a basis for the design of communicative language programs and text books in Europe.

Applied linguists such as Christopher Candlin, Hanry G. Wiuddowson, J.A. Van Ek, Chrisopher Brumfit, Keith Johnson, Keith Morrow and several others have written widely on the theoretical basis for the Communicative Approach drawing on the work of British functional linguists (e.g. John Firth, M.A.K. Halliday, etc), the work of American sociolinguists (e.g. Dell Hymes, John Gumperz) and the work of philosophers such as John Austin and John Searle. Their writings were quickly accepted and applied by British textbook writers, language teaching specialists, curriculum development centers and by the government. Thus, originally the CA was a largely British innovation, but since the mid 1970s it has expanded widely outside Britain. In Nepal this approach has been incorporated in English language curriculums and textbooks only recently.

#### **1.1.4.1 Goal/objective of the Approach**

The Communicative Approach aims at making communicative competence the goal of language teaching. Its main objective is to make learners communicatively competent, i.e. to enable them to use the target language appropriately in a social context. To develop this ability, students need to know linguistic forms, meanings and functions; know the relationship between forms and functions: choose the most appropriate form for a given social context; and manage the process of negotiating meaning with their interlocutors.

#### **1.1.4.2 Theoretical assumptions**

The Communicative Approach to language teaching starts from a theory of language as communication, particularly, the theory of communicative competence as propounded by an American linguist named Dell Hymes. Hymes (1972) views of that communicative competence state that a person who acquires communicative competence acquires not only the knowledge and ability to see whether an utterance is formally (grammatically) possible, but also the knowledge and ability to see whether it is practically feasible, situationally or contextually appropriate and ever actually produced. Thus, Hymes's theory of what constitutes the knowledge of language is much broader than Chomsky's view of linguistic competence, which consists of merely the abstract grammatical knowledge of the language concerned. Another linguistic theory underlying the Communicative Approach is Halliday's functional account of language use. Halliday (1970:145) asserts, "Linguistics ... is concerned... with the description of speech acts or texts, since only through the study of language in use are all the functions of language, and therefore all components of meaning, brought into focus." Thus, he emphasizes the importance of context to understand language functions and language use. In addition, Widdowson (1978) presented a view of the relationship between linguistic systems and their communicative values in text and discourse. Widdowson has made a number of terminological distinctions such as 'signification' and 'value', 'usage' and 'use', 'proposition' and 'illocution', 'cohesion' and 'coherence' etc. to refer to the formal and fictional aspects of language. Besides, Canale and Swain (1980) have identified four components of communicative competence: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. These components refer to grammatical and lexical knowledge; an understanding of the social context in which the language is used, including role relationships, shared knowledge and the purpose of communication; interpretation of the meanings of individual sentences in the context of text and discourse; and coping strategies that

communicators employ to initiate, terminate, maintain, repair and redirect communication respectively.

As regards learning theory, the Communicative Approach does not seem to have been based on any explicit learning theory although certain underlying theoretical principles can be discerned in CLT practices. In particular, the following three principles can be inferred (Canale and Swain, 1980):

- i) Communication principle: Activities that involve real communication promote learning.
- ii) Task principle: Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning.
- iii) Meaningfulness principle: Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process.

These principles state the conditions needed to promote second language learning rather than the processes of learning. So learning activities are selected according to how well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use (rather than merely mechanical practice of language patterns). Proponents of the CA believe that language learning comes about through using language communicatively, rather than through mechanical practice of language structures or through formal explanation.

Communicative Approach of language teaching is widely accepted approach in English Language Teaching. Its characteristics are mentioned as follows (Finocchiaro and Brumfit, 1983):

- Meaning in Communicative Approach is paramount.
- Contextualization is a basic premise in CA.
- Language learning is aimed for communication.

- It seeks for effective communication.
- It encourages the communication from the very beginning of Language Learning.
- The target Linguistics system will be learnt best through the process of struggling to communicate.
- Linguistic variation is a central concept in materials and methodology.
- Language is created by the individual, often through trial and error.
- Fluency and acceptable language is the primary goal: Accuracy is judged not in the abstract but in context.
- Students in Communicative Approach are expected to interact with other people, either in the flesh, through pair & group work, or in their writings.

The word function is a key term in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), just as the 'structure' is the central concern in the structural approach. Functions denote what is done with the language. They refer to communicative properties of sentences to accomplish through language. What language does or what we do through the use of language is its function. A language is used to communicate something. So, communication is the overall global function of language.

#### **1.1.4.3 Theory of Language**

This theory of what knowing a language entails offers a much more comprehensive view than Chomsky's view of competence, which deals primarily with abstract grammatical knowledge. Another linguistic theory of communication favored in CLT is Halliday's functional account of language use. Linguistics .... is concerned .... with the description of speech acts or texts, since only through the study of language in use are all speech acts or texts, since only through the study of language in use are all the functions of language, and therefore all components of meaning, brought into focus (Halliday 1970: 145). In a number of influential books and papers, Halliday has elaborated a powerful theory of the functions of

language, which complements Hymen's view of communicative competence for many writers on CLT (e.g., Brumfit and Johnson 1979; Savignon 1983). Halliday described (1975; p.11-17) seven basic functions that language performs for children learning their first language.

1. the instrumental function: using language to get things
2. the regulatory function: using language to control the behavior of others
3. the interactional function: using language to create interaction with others
4. the personal function: using language to express personal feeling and meanings.
5. the heuristic function: using language to learn and to discover
6. the imaginative function: using language to create a world of the imagination
7. the representational function: using language to communicate information

Learning a second language was similarly viewed by proponents of Communicative Language Teaching as acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions.

#### **1.1.4.4 Theory of Learning**

In contrast to the amount that has been written in Communicative Language Teaching literature about communicative dimensions of languages, little has been written about learning theory. Neither Brumfit and Johnson (1979) nor Littlewood (1981), for example, offers any discussion of learning theory. Elements of an underlying learning theory can be discerned in some CLT practices, however. One such element might be described as the communication principle: Activities that involve real communication promote learning. A second element is the task principle: Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning (Johnson 1982). A third element is the meaningfulness principle:

Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process. Learning activities are consequently selected according to how well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use (rather than merely mechanical practice of language patterns). These principles, we suggest, can be inferred from CLT practices (e.g., Littlewood 1981; Johnson 1982). They address the conditions needed to promote second language learning, rather than the processes of languages acquisition.

Other accounts of Communicative Languages Teaching, however, have attempted to describe theories of language learning processes that are compatible with the communicative Approach. Savignon (1983) surveys second language acquisition research as a source for learning theories and considers the role of linguistic, social, cognitive, and individual variables in language acquisition. (Cited in Sharma and Phyak, p. 121) Other theorists (e.g., Stephen Krashen, who is not directly associated with Communicative Language Teaching) have developed theories cited as compatible with the principles of CLT. Krashen sees acquisition as the basic process involved in developing language proficiency and distinguishes this process from learning. Acquisition refers to the unconscious development of the target language system as a result of using the language for real communication. Learning is the conscious representations of grammatical knowledge that has resulted in from instruction, and it cannot lead to acquisition. It is the acquired system that we call upon to create utterances during spontaneous language use. The learned system can serve only as a monitor of the output of the acquired system. Krashen and other second language acquisition theorists typically stress that language learning comes about through using language communicatively, rather than through practicing language skills.

#### **1.1.4.5 The syllabus**

Discussions of the nature of the syllabus have been central in Communicative Language Teaching. We have seen that one of the first syllabus models to be proposed was described as a notional syllabus (Wilkins 1976), which specified the semantic grammatical categories (e.g., frequency, motion, location) and the categories of communicative function that learners need to express. The Council of Europe expanded and developed this into a syllabus that included descriptions of the objectives of foreign language courses for European adults, the situations in which they might typically need to use a foreign language (e.g., travel, business), the topics they might need to talk about (e.g., personal identifications, educations, shopping), the functions they needed language for (e.g., describing something, requesting information, expressing agreement and disagreement), the notions made use of in communication (e.g., time, frequency, duration), as well as the vocabulary and grammar needed. The result was published as *Threshold Level English* (van Ek and Alexander 1980) and was an attempt to specify what was needed in order to be able to achieve a reasonable degree of communicative proficiency in a foreign language, including the language items needed to realize this "threshold level."

Discussion of syllabus theory and syllabus models in Communicative Language Teaching has been expensive. Wilkins's original notional syllabus model was soon criticized by British applied linguists as merely replacing one kind of list (e.g., a list of grammar items) with another (a list of notions and functions). It specified products, rather than communicative processes. Widdowson (1979) argued that notional functional categories provide only a very partial and imprecise description of certain semantic and pragmatic rules which are used for reference when people interact. They tell us nothing about the procedures people employ in the applications of these rules when they are actually engaged in communicative activity. If we are to adopt a Communicative Approach to teaching which takes as its primary purpose the development of the ability to do things with language, then

it is discourse which must be at the center of our attention. (Widdowson 1979;p. 254)

There are several proposals and models for what a syllabus might look like in Communicative Language Teaching. Yalden (1983) describes the major current communicative syllabus types. We summarize below a modified version of Yalden's classification of communicative syllabus types, with reference sources to each model:

Type	Reference
1. structures plus functions	Wilkins (1976)
2. Functional spiral around a structural core	Brumfit (1980)
3. structural, functional, instrumental	Allen (1980)
4. functional	Jupp and Hodlin (1975)
5. notional	Wilkins (1976)
6. interactional	Widdowson (1979)
7. task-based	Prabhu (1983)
8. learner-generated	Candlin (1976), Henner-Stanchina and Riley (1978)

(Cited in Sharma and Phyak, p. 124)

There is extensive documentation of attempts to create syllabus and proto-syllabus designs of Types 1 - 5, Descriptions of interactional strategies have been given, for example, for interactions of teacher and student (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975) and doctor and patient (Candlin, Bruton, and Leather 1974). (Cited in Sharma and Phyak, p. 124). Although interesting, these descriptions have exist reasonably rigid and acknowledged super ordinate-to-subordinate role relationships.

#### **1.1.4.6 Types of learning and teaching activities**

The range of exercise types and activities compatible with a Communicative Approach is unlimited, provided that such exercises enable learners to attain the communicative objectives of the curriculum, engage learners in communication, and require the use of such communicative processes as information sharing, negotiation of meaning, and interaction. Classroom activities are often designed to focus on completing tasks that are mediated through language or involve negotiation of information and information sharing.

These attempts take many forms. Wright (1976) achieves it by showing out-of-focus slides which the students attempt to identify. Byrne (1978) provides incomplete plans and diagrams which students have to complete by asking for information. Allwright (1977) places a screen between students and gets one to place objects in a certain pattern: this pattern is then communicated to students behind the screen. (Cited in Sharma and Phyak, p. 125). Geddes and Sturtridge (1979) (Cited in Sharma and Phyak, p. 125) develop "jigsaw" listening in which students listen to different taped materials and then communicate their content to others in the class. Most of these techniques operate by providing information to some and withholding it from others (Johnson 1982;p.151).

Littlewood (1981) distinguishes between "functional communication activities" and "social interaction activities" as major activity types in Communicative Language Teaching. Functional communication activities include such tasks as learners comparing sets of pictures and events in a set of pictures; discovering missing features in a map or picture; one learner communicating behind a screen to another learner and giving instructions on how to draw a picture or shape, or how to complete a map; following directions; and solving problems from shared clues. Social interaction activities include conversation and discussion sessions, dialogues and role plays, simulations, skits, improvisations, and debates.

#### **1.1.4.7 Learner's roles**

The emphasis in Communicative Language Teaching on the processes of communication, rather than mastery of language forms, leads to different roles for learners from those found in more traditional second language classrooms. Breen and Candlin describe the learner's role within CLT in the following terms:

The role of learner as negotiator - between the self, the learning process, and the object of learning - emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way. (1980;p. 110)

There is thus an acknowledgment, in some accounts of CLT, that learners bring preconceptions of what teaching and learning should be like. These constitute a "set" for learning, which when unrealized can lead to learner confusion and resentment (Henner-Stanchina and Riley 1978). (Cited in Sharma and Phyak, p. 126). Often there is no text, grammar rules are not presented, classroom arrangement is nonstandard, students are expected to interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher, and correction of errors may be absent or infrequent. The cooperative (rather than individualistic) approach to learning stressed in CLT may likewise be unfamiliar to learners. CLT methodologists consequently recommend that learners learn to see that failed communication is a joint responsibility and not the fault of speaker or listener. Similarly, successful communication is an accomplishment jointly achieved and acknowledged.

#### **1.1.4.8 Teacher's roles**

Several roles are assumed for teachers in Communicative Language Teaching, the importance of particular roles being determined by the view of CLT adopted. Breen and Candlin(1980;p. 99). describe teacher roles in the following terms:

“The teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants in the classroom, and between these participants and the various activities and texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning teaching group. The latter role is closely related to the objectives of the first role and arises from it. These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teacher; first, as an organizer of resources and as a resource himself, second as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities .... A third role for the teacher is that of researcher and learner, with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experience of the nature of learning and organizational capacities.” Other roles assumed for teachers are needs analyst, counselor, and group process manager.

#### **1.1.4.9 Procedure**

Because communicative principles can be applied to the teaching of any skill, at any level, and because of the wide variety of classroom activities and exercise types discussed in the literature on Communicative Language Teaching, description of typical classroom procedures used in a lesson based on CLT principles is not feasible. Savignon (1983) discusses techniques and classroom management procedures associated with a number of CLT classroom procedures (e.g., group activities, language games, role plays), but neither these activities nor the ways in which they are used are exclusive to CLT classrooms. Finocchiaro and Brumfit (1983) offer a lesson outline for teaching the function "making a suggestion" for learners in the beginning level of a secondary school program that suggests that CLT procedures are evolutionary rather than revolutionary.

1. Presentation of a brief dialog or several mini-dialogs, preceded by a motivation (relating the dialog situation(s) to the learners' probable community experiences) and a discussion of the function and situation - people, roles, setting, topic, and the informality or formality of the language which the function and situation demand. (At beginning levels, where all

- the learners understand the same native language, the motivation can well be given in their native tongue.)
2. Oral practice of each utterance of the dialog segment to be presented that day (entire class repetition, half-class, groups, individuals) generally preceded by your model. If mini-dialogs are used, engage in similar practice.
  3. Questions and answer based on the dialog topic(s) and situation itself. (Inverted *wh* or *or* questions.)
  4. Questions and answers related to the students' personal experiences but centered around the dialog theme.
  5. Study one of the basic communicative expressions in the dialog or one of the structures which exemplify the function. You will wish to give several additional examples of the communicative use of the expression or structure with familiar vocabulary in unambiguous utterances or mini-dialogs (using pictures, simple real objects, or dramatization) to clarify the meaning of the expression or structure ....
  6. Learner discovery of generalizations or rules underlying the functional expression or structure. This should include at least four points: its oral and written forms (the elements of which it is composed, e.g., "How about + verb + ing?"); its position in the utterance; its formality or informality in the utterance; and in the case of a structure, its grammatical function and meaning.
  7. Oral recognition, interpretative activities (two to five depending on the learning level, the language knowledge of the students, and related factors).
  8. Oral production activities - proceeding from guided to freer communication activities.
  9. Copying of the dialogs or mini-dialogs or modules if they are not in the class text.
  10. Sampling of the written homework assignment, if given.

11. Evaluation of learning (oral only), e.g., "How would you ask your friend to \_\_\_\_\_? And how would you ask me to \_\_\_\_\_?"

## **1.2 Review of Related Literature**

A number of research studies related to perception and communicative language teaching methods have been carried and some of them are as follows:

Pokhrel (2000) has carried a study entitled **Teaching Communicative Functions Inductively and Deductively**. The results showed that both group were benefited in most of the cases. Both groups were taught the same subject matter using the same medium and materials. Only the methods were different. There were two groups – Group A and Group B. Group B was taught inductively. It responded the questionnaire better than group A. It implied that Group B learned the selected communicative functions of English better.

Kafle's (2000) research entitled **The Relationship Between Acquired Formal and Functional Competence of Graduate Level English Students** found that all the respondents were self-initiated and eager to write the answers rather than speak but the researcher had to convince and request them to speak. This shows that students find more difficulty in speaking than writing.

Ghimire (2001) has carried out his thesis on the topic of "**A comparative study on the effectiveness of the Grammar Translation method and Communicative Approach in a lower secondary school**". He was interested in finding out the outcomes of two methods in selected schools of Lamjung district. This research was an experimental research. He taught for a month in a school by using the two methods and found that teaching through Communicative Approach is more effective than that of teaching through Translation Method. He collected the

required data by administering a set of questionnaire and the primary data were the seventy-six students studying at Gyanodaya Secondary School.

Prasai (2001) has carried out a research entitled "**A Study on Formal and Communicative, Competence Acquired by the Ninth Grade Students**" of Makawanpur. Her objective was to find out the students' formal and functional competence and the correlation between the two. She concluded that the students were weaker at using the particular language forms and functions in appropriate situations. She collected the required data by administering a set of questionnaire and primary source of data were the 97 students studying at five different secondary schools of Hatauda.

Pant (2009) has carried out a research entitled "**Perception of Communicative Language Teaching by Secondary Level English Teachers.**" He found out that different teachers perceive CLT differently depending upon their contexts. The secondary level English teachers were found deprived of the opportunity to involve in the experimental learning cycle to sharpen their skills in CLT. He found that the secondary level teachers perceive examination as a facilitator and the textbook as a cause of interference in the implementation of CLT.

Till now no research has been done regarding problems in applying Communicative Approach in secondary level. This research shows the problems in applying Communicative Approach and ways to overcome them.

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

The objectives of the study were as follows:

1. to trace out the use of communicative approach.
2. to find out areas of difficulties in using communicative approach.

3. to suggest some pedagogical implications.

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

This study emphasized the major problems applying Communicative Approach. This study also focuses on the Communicative Approach. The finding out of this study is helpful for the learners, teachers, trainers, syllabus designers, textbook writers, researchers, methodologists and all the concerned involved in this field. This study focuses on the pedagogical issues.

## **CHAPTER TWO METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Source of Data**

In order to fulfill the set objectives of this research, the researcher has used both primary and secondary sources of data

#### **2.1.1 Primary Sources**

The primary sources of data for the study were the secondary level English teachers of Nuwakot District. (who were teaching in both government aided schools and private schools) The researcher also observed the classes of informants who were teaching English at secondary and lower secondary level.

#### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources**

The researcher has used the secondary sources of data as well. In order to carry out this research, the researcher studied the books, theses, articles, journals etc. related to work in order to facilitate the study. Some of them were as follows:

Breen, M and Candline, C (1980), Larsen-Freeman, D (1983), Sthapit, S. K. (2000)

### **2.2 Population of the Study**

The population of the study consisted of teachers teaching at (government aided and private, trained and untrained teachers) secondary and lower secondary schools of Nuwakot District.

### **2.3 Sample Population**

The sample population of this study consisted of fifty teachers teaching at twenty five different government schools and private schools of Nuwakot District.

Trained teachers are those teachers who took Bachelor Degree or Master's Degree from education faculty and got teachers' training from authorized institutions as well but untrained teachers are those teachers who took their Bachelor Degree or Master Degree from Humanities and Social Science and not participated in any teachers training organized by authorized institutions.

#### **2.4 Tools for Data Collection**

For collecting primary data, the researcher used objective and subjective questionnaires (models given in the appendix -3) and he observed their classes with the help of class observation form to collect data and confirmed what the teachers responded and what they did.

#### **2.5 Process of Data Collection**

The primary data was collected from objective and subjective questionnaires, and observation of class on secondary and lower secondary English teachers. At first, the researcher went to the concerning schools and talked to the authority to get permission for carrying out the research explained him the purpose and process of it and met and discussed with secondary level English teachers of government and private school. Then he distributed both objective and subjective questionnaire to them for collecting data. Then he visited the same schools to collect the given questionnaires. After that he collected questionnaires and observed one class each of the respondents.

#### **2.6 Limitation of Study**

The research had the following limitations to make the study systematic and objective:

- The Study was limited to Nuwakot district only.
- The study population consisted only 50 teachers teaching at different government aided schools and private school of Nuwakot district, applying random sampling procedures.
- The study was limited to only Teaching English through Communicative Approach and Methods, and to suggest ways to overcome those problems.
- The primary data for this study was collected only from objective and subjective questionnaires and observing fifty classes of secondary English teachers.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

#### **3.1 Analysis and Interpretation of the Data**

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. To analyze all the data, at first the researcher classifies all the data on the basis of the objective questions and then tabulated them. Comparison was made on the basis of the different variables like trained and untrained teachers, Nepali medium and English medium, large class and small class.

##### **3.1.1 Role of teachers inside the classroom**

The role of the teacher inside the classroom as in the form of authority refers that the teacher controls overall classroom activities. All the activities are guided by the teacher and students do not have opportunities to explore themselves. The authoritative teachers dominate the teaching learning environment in the classroom.

Facilitator: The role of the teacher as in the form of facilitator implies the meaning that the teacher facilitates the learning environment. Providing clues, enhancing learning environment, pursuing students to explore their abilities in the area of difficulties, guiding them in communication, enhancing their personalities by themselves arise the role that the teachers play in it.

Model for Language Learning: The teacher is the model in the classroom. He plays the central role and students are guided by his modality. A good model in the classroom is supposed to be copied by the students. So, a teacher should be a good model in communication, presenting ideas, pronunciation, discussion, facilitation

and so on, which the students are likely to be imitating and they will enhance this quality in the class.

The role of the teacher in the form of tutor that helps students in their area of difficulties. He just presents the lesson and students are supposed to be covered it. The teacher just plays the role of tutoring them in their need.

The role of the teachers inside the classroom is categorized as authority, facilitator, model for language learning, tutor. The questions were asked to the teachers of government aided and private schools and the respondents' responses are tabulated under the following table.

Table No.1  
Role of the teachers inside the classroom

	Authority	Facilitator	Model for Lg. Learning	Tutor
Total Respondents	5	30	10	5
Percentage	10%	60%	20%	10%

Out of the total 50 respondents of all the groups (private school, government aided schools, trained teachers and untrained teachers), Majority of the teachers i.e. 60% of the respondents come to the conclusion that the teachers should have the role of facilitator in the class room. Similarly, 20% respondents felt that the teachers role is to be the model for language learning, 10% felt the authority and 10% tutor.

### 3.1.2 Preventing factor of applying communicative approach

Communicative Approach needs a special focus on the different materials available in the teaching learning activity. The classroom size, facilities, instructional aids are very much essential for the some. The researcher has kept, lack of facilities, large size classroom, lack of sound knowledge on Communicative Approach and lack of sufficient training on ELT are the preventing factor of applying Communicative Approach.

Table No. 2  
Preventing factor of applying Communicative Approach

	Lack of facilities	Large size of the classroom	Lack of sound knowledge on CA	Lack of sufficient training on ELT
No. of Respondents	6	14	13	17
Percentage	12%	28%	26%	34%

The above table shows the responses on the preventing factor of applying Communicative Approach. The slightly higher respondents i.e. 34% of them said that lack of sufficient training on English Language Teaching is the preventing factor to apply Communicative Approach, similarly, large size classroom, lack of knowledge on Communicative Approach and lack of facilities are the other preventing factors respectively which got the 28%, 26% and 12% responses respectively.

### 3.1.3 Frequency of playing cassette for listening skills

Playing cassette for listening skills is a must for the development of better listening capabilities and ear training. It is the very basic component for the Communicative Approach as well. So, the researcher observed how many times to the teachers use cassette or listening skills while applying Communicative Approach.

Table No. 3  
Frequency of playing cassette on listening skills

	Always	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
No. of Respondents	11	22	11	6
Percentage	22%	44%	22%	12%

Though playing cassette is essential for the enhancement of ear training and Communicative Approach, only 22% of the respondent teachers used it always, 44% teachers used it sometimes and 22% teacher rarely used it. Where as 12% teachers are found not using cassette in listening skills.

### **3.1.4 The role of students in the class**

The students' role in the class describes the effectiveness in the teaching learning process in the classroom. For the same the researcher asked the respondents teachers that they are likely to have the students role in the classroom. The table shows the responses.

Table No. 4

### The role of the student in class

	Follower of the teacher	active participants	passive listener	Discipline learner
No. of Respondents	17	22	4	7
Percentage	34%	44%	8%	14%

The above table shows the preferred role of the students in the classroom by the total 50 respondents . Among them, less then half, though majority, i.e. 44% preferred the role of active participants, 34% preferred follower of the teachers’, 14% believed the students to be disciplined learner and 8% agreed that students role is just to listen to the teachers passively or become passive listener.

### 3.1.5 The preferable activities under communicative approach

The preferable activities under Communicative Approach are categorized as Drilling, Translation, Rule presentation and Interaction. The respondent teachers of all the variables have given the following responds on it.

Table No.5

The preferable activities under Communicative Approach

	Drilling	Translation	Rule Presentation	Interaction
No. of Respondents	17	4	2	27
Percentage	34%	8%	4%	54%

The above table shows the preference given to the different activities on Communicative Approach. Among the preferences the majority, more than half

i.e. 54% respondents preferred that interaction must be the preferred activity and 34% believed that drilling is the preferred activities, while, translation and rule presentation got 8% and 4% preferences respectively.

### 3.1.6 Effective communication through choice

Communication is effective of given choices born on the fact, the researcher took the respondents view, as to how they feel giving choice. The table below shows the effectiveness communication through choice.

Table No. 6  
Effective communication through choice

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
No. of Respondents	16	34	0	0
Percentage	32%	68%	0%	0%

The above table shows that among the respondents 32% showed their strong agreement on the fact that choices of production helps learners to communicate effectively and 68% showed their basic agreement on the choices. Where as none of the respondents disagree on it.

### 3.1.7 Language learning for communication

Language is a means of communication. It is primarily done for the same purpose and language is learning by communicating. This statement is proved under the following table.

Table No.7  
Language learning for communication

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
No. of Respondents	13	37	0	0
Percentage	26%	74%	0%	0%

The above table shows that majority of the respondents i.e. 74% agreed on the basic principles that language is for communication and 26% show their strong agreement. Where as none of the respondent disagree on it.

### 3.1.8 Emphasized area for communicative competence

This section deals with the area emphasized for communicative competence through communicative approach. The table below shows the emphasis given on writing, grammar, translation and communicative function.

Table No. 8  
Emphasized area for communicative competence

	Writing Practice	Grammatical Rules	Translation Activities	Communicative Function
No. of Respondents	8	8	6	28
Percentage	16%	16%	12%	56%

The above table shows that majority of the respondents i.e. 56% emphasized communicative functions to enhance the communicative competence whereas 16% of each emphasized on writing practice and grammatical rules to develop communicative competence.

### 3.1.9 View on teaching grammar implicitly

In explicit way of teaching grammar, rules are presented vividly in detail and explanation is done on the basis of it whereas in the implicit way of teaching the things are not presented clearly but are to be derived from the given clues and examples whether the language is to be taught implicitly or explicitly, this view is researched by the researcher and the following outcome can be seen through the respondents.

Table No. 9  
View on teaching grammar implicitly

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
No. of Respondents	14	23	13	0
Percentage	28%	46%	26%	0%

The above table shows that 46% of the total respondent teachers agreed the fact that grammar should be taught implicitly and 28% showed their strong agreement on it where as 26% disagree on this thought saying it should be taught explicitly.

### **3.1.10 Application of correction type**

Correction types and technique is crucial for the teaching learning activity. In Communicative Approach what technique or type of correction is preferred by the respondents teachers are viewed in the following table.

Table No. 10  
Application of correction type

	Self correction	Peer correction	Teacher correction	No correction
No. of Respondents	12	19	19	0
Percentage	24%	38%	38%	0%

The above table shows the application of correction types preferred by the respondents as a whole. Among the total respondents 38% preferred the teacher's correction, 38% preferred the peer correction and 24% preferred the self-correction whereas no respondent was motivated towards no correction.

### **3.1.11 Effectiveness of teacher centered approach**

The teacher-centered method is dominated by the teacher. He is the active participant in the classroom whereas the students are mere receivers. Students play a receptive role in it. He is like an orchestra leader, directing and controlling the language behaviour of his students. He models the language for the teachers to imitate, controls the direction and pace of learning, corrects errors in the learner performance, choose relevant situations to practice structures and keeps the learners attentive by varying drills and other learning activities.

The researcher looked for the effectiveness of teacher centered approach over student centered approach from the research. The following table shows its outcome.

Table No. 11  
Effectiveness of teacher centered approach

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
No. of Respondents	5	19	21	5
Percentage	10%	38%	42%	10%

The above table shows effectiveness of teacher centered approach over the students centered. Ten percent respondents show their strong agreement and 38% show their basic agreement whereas 42% respondents show their basic disagreement to it and 10% show their strong disagreement on it.

### 3.1.12 Difficulties in using communicative approach

Communicative Approach has some difficulties areas while using it. The variables felt varieties of difficulties while using communicative approach.

Table No.12

#### Difficulties in using communicative approach

	Hesitate to speak	Lack of sufficient vocabulary	Noisy Classroom	All of the above
No. of Respondents	24	12	7	7
Percentage	48%	24%	14%	14%

The above table shows difficulties in using communicative approach. Among all the respondents 48% felt that the problem is hesitation to speak, 24% showed the lack of sufficient vocabulary, 14% showed that noisy classroom poses difficulties whereas 14% showed that all the above mentioned difficulties.

### 3.1.13 Correction of the students' errors

In response to whether the students' errors are to be corrected in communicative approach or not the respondents gave the following opinions.

Table No. 13  
Correction of the students' errors

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
No. of Respondents	8	14	18	10
Percentage	16%	28%	36%	20%

The above table shows the correction of the students' errors. Most of the respondents were seen that students' errors must not be corrected. They showed their slight disagreement on it, i.e. 36% respondents were on this view. Similarly, 20% of the respondents strongly disagree on it. Sixteen percent of the respondents strongly agree on the fact that students' errors must be corrected and 28% respondents slightly agreed on it.

### 3.1.14 Role of Inductive method for learners' communicative competence

In the deductive method first the rules, patterns of generalizations are presented to the student, and then the students is given opportunity to practice those new features of grammar. Usually the approach follows this three step procedure: i)

statement of the new rule or pattern by the teacher, ii) sample sentences that illustrate the rule or pattern for the students to repeat, and iii) ample opportunity for the students to practice the rule or pattern.

The new rule or pattern is usually presented orally at first. When the students can handle the spoken form, they are introduced to its written form. However, for more complex patterns at higher levels, the teacher may present the written pattern first and allow for oral practice afterwards.

In the inductive method the teacher first gives his students examples of the grammatical structure or rule to be learned. After the examples have been presented, the students are guided in forming a generalization about the grammatical rule underlying the example sentences. This approach, too, follows a three step procedure that involves i) presentation of examples, ii) oral or written practice, and iii) generalization of the rule or pattern out of the examples and the practice activities. In the third step the teacher may state the rule, but preferably the students themselves formulate it under his guidance.

The key to success in this approach lies in the careful choice of examples. Often the use of paired sentences helps to make the grammatical point clear.

To make learners communicatively competent the role of inductive method is crucial or not. The table shows the following out put through choice.

Table No. 14

Role of Inductive method for learners' communicative competence

	Strongly	Agree	Disagree	Strongly
--	----------	-------	----------	----------

	agree			Disagree
No. of Respondents	18	30	2	0
Percentage	36%	60%	4%	0%

The above table shows respondents agreement and disagreement through choice on the role of inductive method for learners' communicative competence. Among these total respondents 60% show their basic agreement, 36% of the total respondents show the strong agreement on the role of inductive method for learners communicative competent and 4% disagree on it where as none of the respondents strongly disagree on it.

### **3.2 Teachers' Opinion**

Regarding the first question, 'what approach/method do you choose to teach language? and why?', most of the teachers chose Communicative Approach. Some of them chose Grammar Translation (GT) Method and Direct Method to teach. Because of the large size of classroom, lack of facilities, students' participation, they chose GT method. But they insisted that the best way is to teach English is through Communicative Approach.

The second question was related to whether they use Communicative Approach to teach English, and the frequency of using that. Majority of them used Communicative Approach. The number of using other methods like GT Method and Direct Method was not less as well. Because of the over population of the classroom, lack of facilities and furniture they prefer to use other methods rather than Communicative Approach. It seems that practical aspect of Communicative Approach is not properly used amongst all the teachers.

Regarding the third question most of the teachers chose to teach communicative function and composition through information gap activities. They use situational approach to teach grammar. Mostly private school teachers used information gap activities rather than others. Similarly, the trained teachers prefer to use the same aided for teaching function and composition whereas untrained and government school teachers still use GT method to get access over different teaching items.

Regarding the fourth question, majority of the teachers felt difficulties in using CA at first. But they felt ease when students get participated in it. Mostly government aided school teacher felt the problem in using it while teaching grammatical items and so the untrained teacher felt because of the large size class and inadequate training on it.

Reading the fifth question, majority of the teachers irrespective of which type of school they belong to and whether they are trained or untrained showed that they felt difficulties in using it while teaching grammar and reading. Most of the teachers were unknown about the solutions to these difficulties.

Regarding the sixth question, majority of the teacher choose to use Communicative Approach to teach but they responded that they were limited to theory only. Because of the nature of the course and compulsion to finish it with in time they use GT Method and Direct Method, practically they felt the difficulties in using CA in language classroom though they know that it is the best way to teach.

Regarding the seventh question, most of the teachers, irrespective of the types of school and training taken, listed out the following difficulties they have faced while applying Communicative Approach.

- Lack of knowledge about classroom management

- Lack of materials
- Lack of sound knowledge in English to the students part
- Lack of proper teaching environment
- Lack of sufficient vocabularies
- Hesitation to speak
- Lack of materials

Regarding the eighth question, all the respondents opined the objectives of foreign language in the same way. The objectives they have listed are as follows:

- to make them competent in foreign language
- to understand the target language and use it properly
- make the learners communicatively competent
- to read and understand the target language text without any problem
- to communicate with the target language users fluently.

Regarding the ninth question, all the respondents gave their view on advantages of the application of information gap activities in ELT classes. The advantages are as follows:

- students took part actively in the learning activities
- students knew the form and function of the language
- students got motivated towards learning
- students hesitation was reduced while talking openly in the class
- teacher had less time to talk and students exposure to teaching language was increased

Regarding the tenth question, most of the respondents believed that the best way of learning language was to know and be able to understand the TL appropriately in meaningful situation. To learn language, it is to be used and it should be given proper exposure in the school and out side as well.

Regarding the eleventh question, most of the respondents felt difficulties in integrating the four language skills because of the large size classroom, students ability to use language properly, noise, physical facilities and so on. Though they want these four skills to be integrated. The government aided school teachers stated that they faced many problems in integrating all the skills and avoid listening the most, they stated.

### **3.3 Analysis and Interpretation of Class Observation**

All the teachers, irrespective of the type of school they belonged to, tried their best to implement Communicative Approach in their class. Because of the large class size and lack of facilities, they could not implement Communicative Approach successfully. Government aided school teachers, did not use listening cassettes for listening texts because of lack of cassette player, electricity and batteries. Same was the case with private school teachers as well.

All the teachers were found confident in the subject matter they taught but their language proficiency was not found satisfactory. Government aided school teachers were not able to manage classroom and students whereas private school teachers were found better in this regard.

Regarding the students involvement in the learning activities, private school teachers managed time for students to take part in class. Students were participated in interaction whereas students of government aided schools were found, shy, hesitated, nervous while doing so. The classroom was found teacher centered rather than student centered.

Regarding teaching grammar, most of the teachers were found teaching explicitly and they were found using information gap activities appropriately but some teachers especially untrained ones showed the level of knowledge in doing so. Grammar was not taught inductively as well.

Regarding correction of students' errors and provision of immediate feedback, untrained teachers of both government aided and private schools were found not correcting the students errors and they did not provide immediate feedback whereas trained teachers of both types schools were effectively doing it.

Regarding the evaluation activities, the similar type of result was found. All the teachers of private schools were found doing evaluation partially whereas teachers of government aided schools were found not doing so even some of them are trained.

Regarding the teaching method lecture, discussion and demonstration methods were integrated in private schools where as it is not properly found in government aided school teachers and they were found to use lecture method only.

Regarding integration of all the four skills, all the teachers tried to include all four skills but remain unsuccessful. The medium of instruction in government aided school was mostly Nepali where as in private schools it was English.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.1 Findings**

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the data the following findings have been derived.

1. Majority of the teachers were found playing the role of the facilitator though they faced difficulties in applying communicative approach. Private school teachers and trained teachers were found applying the role of facilitator more.
2. Lack of sufficient training on ELT was found more serious problem amongst all the problems. Similarly, large size classroom was also found to be the problematic area in using communicative approach.
3. Teachers were found using cassette players sometimes, which may not be adequate for communicative approach.
4. Majority of the teachers preferred the role of students as an active participants and follower of the teachers.
5. Interaction was the most preferred role accepted by more than fifty percent of the respondent teachers.
6. Most of the teachers were found emphasizing communicative functions for the enhancement of communication.
7. Both peer correction and teacher correction were found to be used by majority of the teachers.
8. Most of the teachers agreed hesitation as one of the difficulties in using communicative approach.
9. Most of the teachers viewed that and agreed upon the fact that students' errors must be corrected.



## 4.2 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings from the analysis and interpretation of data, some recommendations have been made. They are as follows:

- i. Many teachers could not use communicative approach properly, so, they need training.
- ii. Most of the teachers faced the problems of large class. So appropriate number of the students should be kept in a room.
- iii. Four skills should be emphasized while teaching language but teachers were not found giving more attention to listening and speaking skills.
- iv. Students should be encouraged to use the English language.
- v. Due to lack of teaching materials, teachers are facing problem for applying communicative approach in the class room, so teachers should be trained to use the local resource as the teaching materials.
- vi. Teachers should be given orientation for applying the course in the classroom effectively.
- vii. Basic teaching materials like charts, maps, cassette players, reference books should be made available in the schools.
- viii. Seminar for English language teachers should be organized at least once a year so that they can use more techniques and methods for teaching English.
- ix. Untrained teachers should not be appointed to teach English.

## REFERENCES

- Anthony, E.M (1963). '*Approach Method and Technique*' in *English Language Teaching*.
- Asher, R.E. (Ed) (1994). *Communicating in English*. New York, Pergamon Press
- Allen, E.D. (1977). *Classroom Techniques: Foreign Language and English as a Second Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Bhattacharai, G.R. (2001). *A Thematic Analysis of Research Reports*. Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Bhattacharai, G.R. (2002). 'A Record of Research Activities in the Department of English Education. T.U.', *Journal of NELTA*, Vol. 7 No. 1 & 2.
- Breen, M. and Candlin C. (1980). '*The Essentials of a Communicative Curriculum in Language Teaching*' in *Applied Linguistics*. 1/2.
- Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson K. (eds.) (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Byrne D. (1978). *Teaching Writing Skills*. London.
- Canale, M. and Swain M. (1980). '*Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approach to Second Language Teaching and Testing*.
- Cater, R. (1993). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. London Penguin Books Ltd.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague Pans.
- Finocchiaro, M & Brumfit C.(1983). *The Functional-Notional Approach from Theory to Practice*. Oxford: OUP.
- Doft, Ardian (1988). *Teach English; A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge, CUP
- Encyclopedia Britannica (2005). Encyclopedia Britannica Pvt. Ltd., India
- Guragain, D.P. (2003). *A Study on the Learners Ability to use Colloquial Communicative Expressions*. An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, T.U.
- Halliday, M.A.K.. *Language Structure and Language Function*.

- Harmondsworth, Penguin Books Ltd
- Hymes, D. (1971a). *On Communicative Competence*. Philadelphia PA.  
University of Pennsylvania Press
- Johnson, K. and K. Morrow (1981). '*Communication in The Classroom*' Essex.  
Longman
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*.  
Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative Language Teaching, Cambridge*.  
Cambridge University Press.
- Matreyek, W. (1983). *Communicating in English*. New York, Pergamon Press
- Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative Syllabus Design, Cambridge*. Cambridge  
University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*.  
Cambridge, CUP
- Pant, J.R.(2009). *Perception of Communicative Language Teaching by  
Secondary Level English Teachers*. Department of English Education,  
An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu, TU
- Pokharel, D. (2007). *Effectiveness of Interaction Techniques in Teaching  
Communicative Function: A Practical Study*. Department of English  
Education, An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Kathmandu, TU
- Pokharel, T.P. (2000). *Teaching Communicative Functions Inductively and  
Deductively*. Department of English Education, An Unpublished  
M.Ed. Thesis, TU
- Rai, M. (2004). *The Effect of Communicative Language Approach on English  
in Nepal*. Journal of NELTA Vol. 8, No. 1
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). '*Approaches and Methods in Language  
Teaching: A description and analysis*'. Cambridge University Press
- Sharma, B.K. & Phyak P.B.(2003) *A Course for ELT Methods and Practices*.  
Compiled.

- Sharma, Y. (2002). *Effectiveness of Role Play Techniques in Teaching Communicative Functions: A Practical Study*. Department of English Education, An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, TU
- Sthapit, S.K. (2000). *Teaching Language for Communication*. Journal of NELTA Vol. 5, No.1.
- Van Ek, J.A. and L.G. Alexander (1975). *Threshold, Level English*. Oxford: Pergamon Press
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: OUP
- Wilkins, D.A.(1976). *Notional Syllabuses*. London: OUP
- Wright A. (1976). *Visual Materials for the Language Teachers*. Longman.
- Yalden, J, (1983). *The Communicative Syllabus: Evaluation, Design and Implementation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

## Appendix 1

### LIST OF TEACHERS

1. Tara Prasad Shrestha
2. Bashu Dev Sapkota
3. Padam Koirala
4. Ganga Khadka
5. Ram Pyari Shrestha
6. Krishna Bdr. Rai
7. Peshal Sharma
8. Tej Bdr. Khadka
9. Manee Rai
10. Kedar Nath Pandey
11. Tul Dhoj Khatiwada
12. Keshav Khanal
13. Rajendra man Manandhar
14. Rita Khadka
15. Roshani Tamang
16. Amar Singh
17. Rashmi Tamang
18. Kumar Shrestha
19. Badri Badal
20. Madhav Lamichhane
21. Krishna Bdr. Thapa
22. Madhu Ghimire
23. Upendra Prd. Yadav
24. Pitamber Bhandari
25. Yadav prd. Lamichhane
26. Tika Kadel
27. Kumar Gautam
28. Ganga Bdr. K.C.
29. Susmita Shakya
30. Sushila Khadka Magar
31. Kaji Man Dangol
32. Raj Kumar Shreshta
33. Durga Man Dangol
34. Rajendra Panganee
35. Padam Jung Adhikari
36. Bishnu Prd. Parajulee
37. Nirmal Khadka
38. Rajendra Sapkota
39. Rambabu Yadav
40. Suresh Shakya
41. Sujan Bhajracharya
42. Anita Devi Bhattarai
43. Ram Kumar Khadka
44. Ajit Tamang
45. Shiva Prd. Adhikari
46. Sagar Bhattarai
47. Hari Chandra Nepal
48. Kamal Sapkota
49. Krishna Khatiwada
50. Jhuma Shrestha

## **Appendix 2**

### **LIST OF SCHOOLS**

1. Shree Gramsewa Higher Secondary School, Samari
2. Shree Vindu Keshav Secondary School, Samari
3. Shree Rukmani Lower Secondary School, Samuntratar
4. Shree Pragatiseel Secondary School, Khadga Bhanjang
5. Shree Saraswati Secondary School, Bungtang
6. Shree Sita Lower Secondary School, Bansuchet
7. Shree Dangsing Secondary School, Dangsing
8. Shree Mahendra Higher Secondary School, Chaturalee
9. Shree Bhumedevi Higher Secondary School, Deuralee
10. Shree Kundala Secondary School, Bhadrutar
11. Shree Bageshwori Higher Secondary School, Chogate
12. Shree Gyan Jyoti Secondary School, Phikuree
13. Shree Ajingare Secondary School, Ajingare
14. Shree Uttargaya Public English Secondary School,
15. Shree Chhetrapal Higher Secondary School,
16. Shree Narayan devi Secondary School, Khanigaun
17. Shree Dhaneshwori Lower Secondary School, Samari
18. Shree J.D. Boarding School
19. Shree Vinayak Secondary School, Fatate
20. Shree Kalyani Devi Secondary School, Jiling
21. Shree Chandi Secondary School, Budhasing
22. Shree Mahadev Higer Secondary School, Ratmate
23. Shree Saraswati Secondary School, Kumari
24. Shree Navajiban Secondary School, Madanpur
25. Shree Jalpa Devi Boarding School, Samari

### Appendix 3

#### QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Which one of the following roles do you want to play in your class?
  - a) an authority
  - b) a facilitator
  - c) a model for language learning
  - d) a tutor
  
2. Which one of the following factors mostly prevents you from applying communicative approach in your class?
  - a) lack of physical facilities
  - b) large size of the class
  - c) lack of sound knowledge on communicative approach
  - d) lack of sufficient training on ELT.
  
3. How often do you play cassettes on listening skill in your class?
  - a) always
  - b) sometimes
  - c) rarely
  - d) never
  
4. The role of the student in your class should be:
  - a) a follower of the teacher
  - b) an active participant in teaching learning process
  - c) a passive listener
  - d) disciplined learners
  
5. Which of the following activity do you regard as a communicative activities?
  - a) drilling
  - b) translation
  - c) rule presentation
  - d) interaction
  
6. "Whenever a learner has various choices for production they are likely to communicate effectively."
  - a) strongly agree
  - b) agree
  - c) disagree
  - d) strongly disagree
  
7. "Language is basically learnt through using language for communication".
  - a) strongly agree
  - b) agree
  - c) disagree
  - d) strongly disagree

8. To make the learners communicatively competent in target language which of the following areas has to be emphasized more?

- a) writing practice
- b) grammatical rules
- c) translation activity
- d) communicative functions

9. "Grammar should not be taught explicitly", Do you?

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

10. Which of the following correction type do you usually apply?

- a) self-correction
- b) peer correction
- c) teacher correction
- d) no correction

11. "Teacher-centered teaching approach will be more effective than student-centered teaching approach".

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

12. What difficulty do you face while using communicating approach?

- a) students hesitate to speak
- b) they don't have sufficient vocabulary to case
- c) the class room will be noisy and communication cannot be observed
- d) all of the above

13. Do you correct every error that the students make? Do you?

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

14. "Out of deductive and inductive methods, inductive method plays a vital role to make the learners communicative competent."

- a) strongly agree
- b) agree
- c) disagree
- d) strongly disagree

## SUBJECTIVE QUESTIONNAIRES

1. What approach/method do you choose to teach language? And why?

-----  
-----  
-----

2. Do you choose communicative approach/method to teach language? How often do you do so?

-----  
-----  
-----

3. What subject matter do you teach through information gap activities? Like grammar, vocal, composition, communicative function comprehension etc and more.

-----  
-----  
-----

4. Do you feel ease teaching through information gap? What area?

-----  
-----  
-----

5. What areas do you feel difficulties teaching language through communicative approach? How do you think can they be overcome?

-----  
-----  
-----

6. If you have to choose communicative approach or any other approaches which would you choose to teach language and why?

-----  
-----  
-----

7. Mention some of the difficulties that you have faced while using communicative approach.

-----  
-----  
-----

8. What is/are the objectives of foreign language teaching? Give your view.

-----  
-----  
-----

9. Mention some of the important advantages that you have achieved while applying information gap activities?

-----  
-----  
-----

10. Write your brief on the best way of learning language?

-----  
-----  
-----

11. How far do you integrate all the four skills of language teaching? What difficulties do you face in doing so?

-----  
-----  
-----

**Appendix 4**

**OBSERVATION FORM**