CHAPTER – ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background

Language is the most powerful, convenient and permanent means of communication. In general, language, being a voluntary vocal system of human communication, is the global medium for conveying facts including complex thoughts, emotions and feelings of every day life. Human beings differ from the other species on this earth only because they have got a unique faculty of speech. They express their personality through language. It is also the manifestation of the abstract feelings, sentiments and emotions through the concrete medium. Language differs with regard to geographical, social, educational, economic, tribal, political, ethnical, familial and historical boundaries. It helps human being to establish relation with other members in the society, and at the same time it also helps to break the relation with the means of abusing remarks. In that sense it can be called a social phenomenon, too. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English defines language as the system of communication in speech and writing that is used by people of a particular country or area (2005, p. 862). According to Sapir (1978), "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions, feelings and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols" (p.8). Likewise, Wardhaugh (1972) defines language as "a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used for human communication" (p.3). From the above mentioned definitions and descriptions of language, it has become apparent that language is purely a vehicle of communication for human being. In the sense that inhuman animals do not have such language acquisition device.

So that, there are many modes of communication, viz. aural, visual, olfactory, tactile and gustatory. However, linguistics involves only aural and visual modes of communication. Olfactory, tactile and gustatory modes of communication are the subjects of semiotics but not linguistics.

1.1.1 Linguistic Scenario of Nepal

Nepal is a multilingual, multicultural and multiethnic country where people speak varieties of languages and dialects with respect to their geographical variation. According to the Census 2001, one hundred and two ethnic groups and more than ninety two languages existed in Nepal. Among these languages, most of them do not have written scripts. So, it is obvious that Nepal is a land of ethnic diversity and linguistic plurality. The language and their innumerable dialects spoken in Nepal have genetic affiliation to at least four language families, namely: Indo-Aryan (17 languages), Tibeto-Burman (about 56 languages), Austro-Asiatic (only one language) and Dravidian (only one language) together with one controversial language isolate/Kusunda.

The list of above mentioned four language groups can be further detailed as follows:

The Indo-Aryan group includes the following languages:

Nepali	Magahi	Hindu-Urban
Maithili	Marawadi	Chureti
Bhojpuri	Kumal	Bengali
Awadhi	Darai	Bajjika
Tharu	Majhi	Danuwar
Rajbanshi	Bote	

The Tibeto-Burman group includes the following languages:

Limbu	Chamling	Gurung	Sangpany
Thakali	Chepang	Sunwar	Huyu(Bayll)
Ghale	Newar	Kaike	Bahing (Ramdali) etc.

According to the Census 2001, Jhangad is the only language of the Dravidian family, which is spoken around the Koshi River in the eastern region of Nepal.

Moreover, only one language comes under this Austro-Asiatic group i.e. Sattar (Santhali) which is spoken in Jhapa district of the eastern part of Nepal. This group has two other branches, namely: Mon-Khmer and Manda.

1.1.2 An Introduction to the English Language

English is grouped under "West Germanic" origin as one of the sub-branches of the Germanic branch of the Indo-European family. It is the most dominant language in the world. It serves today as a lingua franca in many parts of the world; for some speakers, it is a native language: for others a second language; for still others a foreign language. As the world has shrunk into a global family due to the latest scientific discoveries and development in the field of communication, the importance of English as an international language has increased all the more. Most of the books are written in English. Therefore, the English language has become as indispensable source of knowledge for all.

The English language has changed the World Scenario. One in five of the world's population speaks English. Approximately 375 million people speak English as their first language. Over 375 million people speak English as their second language. It is the main international language of business, pop music, sports, advertising, academic conferences, travel, airports, diplomacy, science and technology. It is estimated that English is the language of over 50 percent

of the information shared in the world's computers and 85 percent of internet home pages. It is the language of 68 percent web users.

The development of the English language in Nepal is closely connected with the rise of the Prime Minister Jung Bahadur Rana. After his visit to England, he established Durbar High School in 1854. It was the first School to teach the English language in Nepal (English in Nepalese Education-3). Since then English has been included in the curriculum right from Grade four up to the Master's level. This language is compulsorily taught in almost all the educational institutions of Nepal from the primary to the higher secondary levels. In some disciplines, English has been one of the subjects right up to the Bachelor's level.

1.1.3 Introduction to the Nepali Language

The Nepali language, spoken as the mother tongue of 50.3 percent of the total population of Nepal (CBS, 1990), and is also recognized as the national language. It has been known by various scholars as being the developed form of the old language. Sinjali, which came into existence in Sinja in the eleventh century. The development of the Nepali language can be attributed to the role of Sinjali kings, who spread it, giving up their own Tibeto-Burman language. The role of various ethnic groups such as: Magars, Gurungs, Newar, Tamangs, Rais, and Limbus in bringing up this language into the modern form can never be forgotten (ibid). These days, Nepali has been established as the medium of administatration, education, mass media and public affairs. Besides, it is also spoken in the district of Darjeeling of West Bengal and in the state of Sikkim in India. A large number of Nepali speaking population is dispersed over many parts of eastern India, Bhutan, Burma and Malaysia. Recently, it has been included in the eighth schedule of the Indian constitution.

Like English, Nepali belongs to Indo-European group. Nepali has much in common with other members of the Indo-Aryan family viz. Maithili, Hindi, Gujarati, Rajasthani, Malwai, Nimadi, Kumauni and Garhwali. It has been becoming flexible enough to borrow words from other languages like: Hindi, Urdu, Awadhi and even English as well, and has piled up thousands of books in this language. It has increased its importance both from pedagogical and linguistic perspectives. Nepali is related with English both genetically and through contact. In Nepalese context, the chief media for instruction in English and Nepali, as a result of which we find much similarity between those two languages.

1.1.4 Communicative Functions and their Classification

Languages are learned for different purposes. The most important purpose of learning a language is communication. It is a process in which two or more people exchange ideas, facts, feelings or impressions by speaking, orating or using other signal. The word communication is derived from the Latin word 'communis' which means to share that is sharing of ideas, concepts, feelings and emotions. It also means the willing to talk and give information to other people. So, effective communication depends on use of language functions. A function in language refers to the purpose for which an utterance or a unit or language is used. Such functions are often described as categories of behaviors, such as: asking, requesting, narrating, apologizing, etc. the functional use of language cannot be determined simply by studying the grammatical structures of sentences but also the purposes for which they are used. So, communicative function refers to the ways in which a language is used in community. Language functions involve grammatical forms or structures as well as communicative purpose. Communicative grammar is not a theory of grammar. It is a model of applied grammar based on the communicative approach to

language teaching developed by British applied linguists during the 1990s. Its aim is to teach the functional types of a language which refers to a variety of functions. Those learners require in their real communication which focuses communicative processes about how grammatical structures of a language are used appropriately in different situations. So, the communicative grammar is to develop the learner's communicative competence. The functions are used in real situation according to the context. Therefore, the main purpose of communicative language is to enable to speak the learners easily in the society with each other while talking. It is thought to be the vehicle of culture and service in the society. So, the language function has been defined as the role played by language in the social situation how it is used to express attitudes, communicative feelings etc. Some of the classifications of the language functions (as cited in Bhandari and Adhikari, 2065, pp. 7-10), are:

Crystal, (1987) classifies language functions as follows:

    i.   Communicating ideas among the persons

   ii.   Emotional Expression

  iii.   Social interaction

  iv.   Enjoyment with sound

   v.   Controlling the reality

  vi.   Recording the facts

 vii.   Instrument of thought

viii.   Expressing identity

Malinowski (1942) maintains that language is dependent on the society in two senses,

1. a language involves in responses to the specific demands of the society in which, it is used.

2. its use is entirely context-dependent because utterance and situation are bund up inextricability with each other and the context of situation is indispensable the understanding of the worlds.

He distinguishes the immediate context of utterance from a general and generalizable context of situation and urges that we must study meaning with reference to an analysis of the functions of language in any culture. As such, he classifies language functions into the following three categories.

a) The pragmatic function: Language as a form of action.

b) The magical function: Language as means of control over the environment.

c) The narrative function: Language as a store-house filled with useful and necessary information preserving historical accounts.

Halliday (1964) has classified the language functions into three categories. They are:

a) the ideational function,

b) the textual function, and

c) the interpersonal function

In Jacobson's (1960) view, a speech event has six components each of which determines a different function of language. They include: emotive function, connective function, referential function, phatic function, meta-lingual function and poetic function.

Van, Ek (1975) has classified the function of language into six different categories that are given below:

1. Imparting and speaking factual information (identifying, reporting, correcting, asking)

2. Expressing and finding out intellectual attitudes (expressing and inquiring about agreement and disagreement, acceptation and declining and offer or disapproving)

3. Getting things done, (suasion) (suggesting a course of action, advising, warning)

4. Socializing (getting and learning people, attracting attention, proposing a toast)

5. Expressing and finding out emotional attitude (apologizing, expressing approval and disapproval)

6. Expressing and finding out moral attitude (apologizing, expressing approval and disapproval)

With the analysis of the above classification of language functions, we can say that there are various language functions. Among them, the study will be concerned with making, accepting and rejecting offers.

1.1.5 Making Offers: An Introduction

Making offers is a language function; we extend an offer to somebody on different situation. It may be acceptable or refusal. For instance, we may offer for tea, to have lunch or dinner, to attend a party, to see your house/garden, to carry your bag, etc.

a. Functions of Making Offers

Matreyek (1983, pp. 14-15) states the following exponents of making, accepting and rejecting offers:

1. Exponents Used in Making Offers

- Shall I bring a chair for you?
- Would you like to go to the cinema?
- I will make some coffee if you like?
- Here, take some sugar.
- Let me carry your bag.
- Here, have a seat.
- How about some more rice?
- Do you want me to help you?
- Can I get you some milk?
- Please have a piece of candy?
- Would you like a cigarette?
- Come on and join us.
- Come on.
- May I have the pleasure of this dance?
- How about going with us?
- Can you go to the park?

2. Accepting Offers

- Yes.
- Thank you.
- Yes, please. Thank you.
- Would you mind?
- If it is no trouble for you.

- That's very kind of you.

- Please.

- Sure.

- Thank you very much.

- I accept your invitation.

- I'd come

3. **Rejecting Offers**

- No, thank you.

- That's no necessary.

- Thanks but it's ok.

- Thanks, but no thanks.

- I'm sorry.

- I'm sorry, I am already booked.

- No, I can't come. I……………

- Well, that's very kind of you.

- But, I'm afraid. I have already promised to …..

1.1.6 Competence and its Classification

Competence is the ability to do well. The main purpose of learning a language is to be able to use the language independently. The learners can use the language independently. They can communicate their feelings and thoughts to others. The language users use their language independently in the appropriate situation. They are said to have competence. Communicative competence means the ability not only to apply the grammatical rules of a language in order to form grammatically correct sentences but also to know when and where to

use sentences and to whom. It also includes the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, rules of speaking, responding different types of speech acts and appropriate use of language.

Generally, competence refers to the mental ability underlying in the human mind. In the regard, Richards et al. (1985) state that competence is a person's internalized grammar of language. This means a person's ability to form and understand sentence, including sentences they have never heard before. Thus, competence can be defined as the speakers' internalized knowledge of their language system which consists of the rules that speakers have mastered. So they are able to produce and understand an infinite number of sentences. There are four competencies viz. linguistic competence, communicative competence, pragmatic competence and strategic competence. They can be described briefly as follows:

i. The overall formal or grammatical knowledge of a language is referred to a grammatical competence. It includes phonetics, phonology, system and semantics. The speaker must be able to pronounce the sound of the language in the acceptable pattern and the pattern of larger units like phrases, clause, and sentences must be grammatical giving the clear meaning to the listeners or the readers. This knowledge of speakers in known as linguistic competence.

ii. The ability that enables the speakers to convey and interpret a message and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within a specific context is known as communicative competence. Defining communicative competence, Richards et al. (1985) says that communicative competence is the ability not only to apply the grammatical rules of a language in order to form grammatically correct sentences but also to know when and where to use these sentences and to whom.

iii.   According to Sthapit (2000) the pragmatic competence or language sensitivity refers to an ability to interpret language properly and an ability use it appropriately in a given context or situation. The pragmatic competence, thus, can be described as the knowledge of language, which includes contextually and culturally implied aspects of language, which are not clearly stated in the structures of the language.

iv.   Strategic competence generally refers to the ability to know when and how to take the floor, how to keep a conversation and how to close a conversation. Thus, the ability to select an effective means of performing a communicative act is the strategic competence.

A course in spoken English must include the contexts, i.e. 'what to say' and 'how to say'. The former is usually focused on English conversation and the latter on English pronunciation. The former aims to teach how to express communicative functions, such as asking question, making requests, getting things done, or expressing greetings, farewells, regrets, thanks, etc. The latter, on the other hand, aims at teaching the pronunciation of words, phrases and sentences. Here, this research focuses on making, accepting and rejecting offers in the English and Nepali languages.

1.2 Review of the Related Literature

Every research needs observing the fundamental background of the related subject and the past achievements. Theoretical background of the study is given in the general background as well. "Communicative Approach" is the new aspect in the present curriculum and textbook. The researcher reviewed the literature from the plenty of fields. In the Department of English Education, some studies have been carried out on the analysis of textbook and some on vocabulary achievement some of the studies which are more or less related to this study can be observed as follows:

Giri (1982) has carried out a research on "English and Nepali Kinship Terms: A Comparative Study". In her research, the kinship relations (in English) were addressed by name while they were addressed (in Nepali) by kinship terms. Her study also concluded that English kinship terms were less in number in comparison to Nepali kinship terms.

Pandey (1997) studied "A Comparative Study of Apologies Between English and Nepali Languages". The purpose of this study was to list different forms of apology and to compare them between native English and Nepali speaker. He concluded that English people are more apologetic compared to Nepali speakers.

Kafle (2000) has studied the relationship between acquired formal and functional competence of graduate level students. He found that all respondents become self-initiative and eager to write the answers but the researcher had to convince and request to make them speak. This shows that the students have more difficulties in speaking than writing. The students should be able to speak before they are able to write, but the study showed just the opposite condition. The students were able to write but not able to speak as effectively as they could write.

Pokhrel (2000) has studied on "Teaching Communicative Functions Inductively and Deductively". The findings of his study were determined done on the basis of the results of a group not of an individual. The results showed that both groups were benefited in most of the cases. Both groups were taught the some subject matter using the some medium and materials only the methods were different. Group B was taught inductively whereas group A was taught deductively. He concluded that inductive method was better than deductive to teach communicative function.

Prasai (2002) has studied formal and functional competence acquired by ninth graders. She found that all the students took part actively and performed better

in written test whereas the students comparatively felt shy and hesitated in their spoken performance.

Chapagain (2002) has carried out a research work on "Request Forms in the English and Nepali Language, A Comparative Study". Her research shows that English native speakers were more polite than Nepali native speakers.

Basnet (2006) carried out a research on "Term of Greeting and Taking Leave Used in English and Nepali". He has found that English native speakers use the greeting terms 'good morning/night' when they greet in a formal situation whereas Nepali native speakers used 'Namaste' or 'Abhibadan' etc. Further, his study says that English people were habituated in saying first names, kinship terms to greet family member either they were seniors or juniors, where as Nepali people used more formal exponents to greet their senior.

Tembe (2007) has a research on "A Comparative Study of Apologies Between English and Limbu". The purpose of his study was to identify the different forms of apologies in English and Limbu. He also concluded that native English speakers were more apologetic in comparison to native Nepali Speakers.

The present study is different from the others as it seeks to make a comparative study on the language functions of making, accepting and rejecting offers in English and Nepali. The stated function of language is not so far done.

1.3   Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were:

i. To list different forms of making, accepting and rejecting offers used by the native speakers of English and Nepali.

ii. To compare the language functions used in making, accepting and rejecting offers by the native speakers of English and Nepali.

iii. To provide some pedagogical implications.

1.4   Significance of the Study

No any research has yet been carried out on the language functions of making, accepting and rejecting offers in Nepali and English in the Department of English Education. So, this study is expected to be significant to all those who are engaged in the pursuit of teaching and learning language functions.

Hence, the study will be significant to the textbook writers, subject experts, curriculum designers, language teachers, lecturer, language trainers and students and all those who are directly and indirectly involved to studying in language function.

CHAPTER – TWO
METHODOLOGY

The second chapter deals with the methodology. This chapter comprises the sources of data, tools and process of data collection and limitations of the study.

2.1   Sources of Data

The study made use of both primary and secondary sources of data.

2.1.1 Primary Source of Data

The study was based on primary sources of data i.e. responses given by the English and Nepali language speakers using questionnaires for collecting their responses.

2.1.2 Secondary Source of Data

The related literature such as books, journals, reports, dictionaries, web sites and unpublished thesis were used as the secondary sources of data. The main sources of secondary data were: Van Ek (1975), Matreyak (1983), Heaton (1988), Corder (1993), Pokharel (2005)

2.2   The Sampling Procedure

 Eighty students of M.Ed. 1st year of the University Campus, Kirtipur and Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal (twenty from each and forty native English speakers) were selected using judgmental sampling procedure. The researcher contacted only those people who he thought could supply the required information to achieve the objectives of the study. The process of sample selection continued until the expected informants were met to provide the required information.

2.3   Tools for Data Collection

The set of questionnaire was the main tool for data collection. Informants were given a list of different situations of making, accepting and rejecting offers in both the English and Nepali languages and were asked to supply suitable and natural utterances they used in such a context.

2.4   Process of Data Collection

The M.Ed. I year students of the University Campus, Kirtipur and Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal were selected by adopting judgmental sampling procedure. After establishing rapport with the students of selected campus, they were distributed questionnaires; especially, in order to find out exponents used in making, accepting and rejecting offers in the English and Nepali languages. Lastly, the collected items were tabulated and analyzed and interpreted descriptively. This analysis was done being based on the utterances used by the respondents in different situations for making, accepting and rejecting offers.

2.5   Limitations of the Study

The present study was carried out under the following limitations:

i.   Only the students of M.Ed. first year were selected from the T.U. Campus, Kirtipur and the Mahendra Ratna Campus, Tahachal for the sample of study.

ii. This study was only focused on the making, accepting and rejecting offers.

iii. The study, particularly, is based on the linguistic practice in Kathmandu. So, it cannot be taken as totally complete or universal one.

iv. The study was further limited to the analysis of the responses obtained from the respondents only.

CHAPTER – THREE
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of collected information. The responses in the English and Nepali languages were analyzed, compared and contrasted in terms of making, accepting and rejecting offers used by the respondents in different situations. Then the responses were also tabulated in terms of formal, quite formal and informal forms of making offers.

The collected data were interpreted in terms of different variables. The researcher compared and contrasted the offers of the English and Nepali languages in gender and age wise among friends, customers and shopkeepers and relatives.

3.1 Total Forms of Making, Accepting and Rejecting Offers (MARO)

Making offers is a language function which we put forward to be accepted or refused. While analyzing the collected data, the researcher found different forms of exponents for making offers in English and Nepali as presented in the table below:

Table No. 1

Total Responses of MARO

Language	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
English	197	30.31	285	43.85	168	25.85
Nepali	158	27.24	316	54.48	106	18.28

The table given above shows that the native English speakers have used formal forms of MARO in greater number in comparison to the Nepali speakers while making offers. Out of 650 responses in English 30.31% native English speakers used formal forms and out of 580 responses in Nepali 27.24% Nepali speakers used formal forms of MARO.

Some examples from both languages are as follows:

a) I'll bring some drink if you like.

b) Would you like me to bring water?

c) Botalma pani chha kripaya khanuhos.

d) Kripaya bhitri palnuhos.

Similarly, the researcher found 43.85% and 54.48% responses under the quite formal forms in English and Nepali of MARO respectively. These responses are neither highly formal nor informal but they are temperately used.

For example,

a) Do you want me to bring water?

b) I requested you to stay at my home today.

c) Kehi chiso khauki?

d) Aaja ta ho sinema herna jana sakchaun?

Likewise, 25.85% in English and 18.28% in Nepali exponents were informal forms of MARO. That is to say that the English speakers responded more formally than Nepali speakers in MARO.

Some of the examples are:

a) Have some drink.

b) Here, take water.

c) Ekaichin aaram gara.

d) Hinda jaun chiya piuna.

3.1.1 Total Forms of MARO Among Friends Circle

The researcher collected information from different respondents asking in how they made offers to their friends. The responses from the respondents are presented in the table below:

Table No. 2

Total Forms of MARO Among Friends Circle

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	1,7,21, 24	24	26.37	59	64.84	8	8.79
Nepali	1,7,9,11,15,20,21	20	25	42	52.5	18	22.5

The table given above shows that English speakers used formal forms of MARO more than that of Nepali speakers. Out of 91 responses in English 26.37% were formal forms of MARO. Whereas out of 80 responses in Nepali 25% the Nepali speakers used formal forms of MARO while making offers.

Some examples from both languages are as follows:

a) Would you like me to bring water?

b) How about going in my car?

c) Sathi sarbat lyaidiyeko chhu piunuhos.

d) Kripaya malai eak patak herna dinuhos.

In the same way, there were some other exponents where the respondents expressed a very close intimacy with their friends while making offers. The table shows that out of 80 responses in Nepali, 52.5% responses were

expressed and out of 91 responses in English 64.84% were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO.

For example,

a) Can I get you some juice?

b) Shall I bring water for you?

c) Sathi halkhabar bataunuhos.

d) Bhitrai aayera basnuhos.

Likewise, a very few responses were informal forms of MARO in both languages. Out of 80 responses in Nepali 22.5% exponents were used and out of 91 responses in English 8.79% were categorized under informal forms of MARO.

Some examples of both languages are as follows:

a) Have some drink.

b) Take my bike.

c) Katabata ho bhitrai aau.

d) Sathi pani khau.

The above discussion shows the native English speakers used more formal exponents while making offers to their friends whereas Nepali speakers seemed less formal to their friends while making offers.

3.1.2 Total Forms of MARO Between a Customer and a Shopkeeper

The researcher collected information from different respondents about making offers between a customer and a shopkeeper have been tabulated in the following table:

Table No. 3

Total Forms of MARO Between a Customer and a Shopkeeper

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	12, 27	26	32.5	39	48.75	15	18.75
Nepali	12, 27	8	11.42	45	64.29	17	20.29

The table given above shows that out of 80 responses, 32.5% were formal forms of MARO in English whereas out of 70 responses in Nepali 11.42% responses were expressed formal forms of MARO. This reveals that the native English speakers used more formal forms than that of Nepali speakers while shopping.

For example,

   a) How about taking goods by taxi?

   b) Would you give me an ice from the freeze, please?

   c) Kripaya malai baraph upalabdha garauna saknuhunchha?

   d) Tapainko saman lana taxi khojidiunki?

Similarly, out of 80 responses, 48.75 % were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO in English whereas out of 70 responses in Nepali 64.29% were expressed under quite formal forms.

For example,

   a) How much does it cost?

   b) Do you want me to help you?

   c) K sahayog garaun?

   d) Malai baraph dinuhos.

Likewise, the Nepali speakers used 20.29% exponents informally whereas the native English speakers used 18.75% exponents informally.

Some of the examples are:

a) Provide me a piece of ice.

b) I want a piece of ice. Do you have?

c) Taxi bolai dinchu.

d) Kasto mahango hola.

The discussion above shows that both English and Nepali speakers used formal exponents more than that of formal and informal exponents of MARO while shopping. Nepali speakers used more informal variety than the native English speakers in making offers while shopping.

3.1.3 Total Forms of MARO Among Relatives

The information was collected from different respondents about making offers among relatives have been tabulated in the following table:

Table No. 4

Total Forms of MARO Among Relatives

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	2,3,4,5,8,25	64	54.24	29	24.58	25	21.18
Nepali	3,4,5,19,25	17	28.33	39	65	4	6.67

The table given above shows that out of 118 responses, 54.24% were categorized under formal forms of MARO in English whereas out of 60

responses 28.33% used by the Nepali speakers were formal forms of making offers. This reveals that English speakers used more formal forms of MARO with their relatives than that of Nepali speakers.

For example,

    a) Would you like to watch T.V.?

    b) Would you like to rest for a while?

    c) Kripaya ekaichin aram garnuhos.

    d) Ma tapainko saman bokidina sakchhuhola?

Similarly, English speakers extended 24.58% responses quite formally whereas 65% were used by the Nepali speakers to their relative in making offers.

Some examples are given below:

    a) Can I carry your suitcase?

    b) I'll carry your suitcase.

    c) Aram garnuhos.

    d) Ekaichhin chiso hawa khanuhos.

On the other hand, out of 118 responses in English 21.18% were expressed under informal forms whereas 6.67% were categorized informal forms of MARO in Nepali among relatives.

For example,

    a) Wait, I'll call a taxi.

    b) Don't worry. I'll help you to carry.

    c) Jau hatkutta dhoyera aau.

    d) Euta jhola lyau ma bokidinchhu.

The above discussion reveals that Nepali speakers used quite formal forms than that of English speakers in making offers to their relatives. But English speakers extended offers more informally than Nepali speakers while making offers to their relatives.

3.1.4 Total Forms of MARO Between Two Opposite Sexes

The researcher collected information from different respondents asking them as to how they made offers to their friends of opposite sex. The responses from the respondents are presented in the table below:

Table No. 5

Total Forms of MARO Between Two Opposite Sexes' Friends

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	10,17,28,30	10	8.85	66	58.41	37	32.74
Nepali	10,17,19,28,30	24	24	57	57	19	19

The table given above shows that out of 113 responses in English 8.85% were expressed under formal forms of MARO whereas out of 100 responses, 24% were categorized under formal forms of MARO in Nepali.

For example,

  a) Please, have a piece of sandwich.

  b) I'll bring wine if you like.

  c) Kripaya hamisanga piunaka lagi aamantrana gardachhu.

In the same way, 58.41% and 57% responses were used under quite formal forms of MARO in the English and Nepali languages respectively.

For example,

a) Please, have some drink.

b) Can you join with us to drink?

c) Aau ekaichin ghumera aaun.

d) Masanga biwaha garna sakchhau?

Likewise, 32.74% responses were expressed under informal forms of MARO in English whereas Nepali speakers used 19% responses informally.

Some of the examples from both languages are presented below:

a) Have a piece of sandwich.

b) Come on to join with us.

c) Samosa khana aau.

d) E samosa khane ho?

The discussion given above presents that both English and Nepali speakers used quite formal forms more than formal and informal forms of MARO to their friends of opposite sex. In contrast, English speakers were more informal than Nepali speakers in making offers to their friends of opposite sex.

3.1.5 Total Forms of MARO Between a Male Shopkeeper and a Female Customer

The offers made between a male shopkeeper and a female customer which was obtained through questionnaire are presented in the table below:

Table No. 6

Total Forms of MARO Between a Male Shopkeeper and a Female Customer

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	12,27	34	44.16	18	23.38	25	32.46
Nepali	12,27	37	43.02	35	40.70	14	16.28

The table given above presents the fact that English speakers responded 44.16% exponents out of 77 responses formally whereas Nepali speakers responded 43.02% responses out of 86 responses formally while making offers.

Some examples are:

a) How about taking goods by a taxi?

b) It would be lovely if you call a taxi.

c) Kripaya malai baraph upalabdha garauna saknuhunchha?

d) Kripaya ramro khalko barph dinuos.

Similarly, out of 77 responses in English, 23.38% and out of 86 in Nepali, 40.70% responses were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO.

For example,

a) Do you want me to help you?

b) -I'll deliver the goods to your home?

c) K sahayog garaun?

d) Malai baraph dinuhos.

On the other hand, the native English speakers used 32.46% responses informally. Only 16.28% responses were expressed informal forms in Nepali while making offers between a male shopkeeper and a female customer.

For example,

    a) Give me some ice cream.

    b) How much does it cost?

    c) Euta krim malai deu ta.

    d) Kasto mahango hola?

The given data above shows that the native English speakers used more formal forms of MARO than Nepali speakers while making offers that the Nepali speakers extended offer informally than that of English speakers in shopping.

3.1.6 Total Forms of MARO Between Two Relatives of Opposite Sex

The researcher collected information from different respondents asking them as to how they made offers to their relatives of opposite sex. The responses made by them through questionnaires are presented in the table below:

Table No. 7

Total Forms of MARO Between Two Relatives of Opposite Sex

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	3,5, 25	16	20.78	30	38.96	31	40.26
Nepali	3, 4, 5	7	16.28	30	69.77	6	13.95

The table given above shows that the native English speakers used more formal forms of MARO than those of the Nepali speakers while making offers to the

28

relatives of opposite sex. Out of 77 responses in English, 20.78% were used formally whereas out of 43 responses, 16.28% were used formally in Nepali.

Some examples are presented below:

    a) Would you like me to carry your suitcase?

    b) Would you like to rest for a while?

    c) Kripaya ekaichhin aaram garnuhos.

    d) Kripaya ma tapainko saman bokidinchhu.

In the same way, 38.96% and 69.77% responses were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO in the English and Nepali languages respectively. This exerts that Nepali speakers made offers quite formally to a great extent to their relatives of opposite sex than English speakers.

For example,

    a) I offer you to go to visit with me.

    b) May I bring some coffee for you?

    c) Ma euta jhola bokindinchhu.

On the other hand, out of 77 responses, 40.26% were categorized under informal forms in English whereas out of 43 responses, 13.95% were categorized under informal forms of MARO in Nepali.

For example,

    a) Wait, I'll call a taxi.

    b) Don't worry. I'll help you to carry.

    c) Ekaichhin aaram gara.

    d) Khoi timro jhola ma bokindinchhu.

This reveals that English speakers were more informal in making offers to their relatives of opposite sex than Nepali speakers.

3.1.7 Total Forms of MARO Between a Male and Female Staff

The researcher collected information from different official staff asking them as to how they made offers to their staff of opposite sex. The responses made by different official staffs through questionnaire are tabulated as follows:

Table No. 8

Total Forms of MARO Between a Female and a Male Staff

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	14,16,30	10	28.57	17	48.57	8	22.86
Nepali	14,16,17	23	38.33	25	41.67	12	20

The table given above shows that Nepali speakers used formal forms of MARO more than English speakers. Out of 35 responses, 28.57% were used formally in the English language whereas out of 60 responses, 38.33% were used formally in the Nepali language.

Some examples are presented below:

   a) How about taking tea?
   b) Would you take tea with me?
   c) Kripaya chiya piuna gaisiyos.
   d) Kripaya tapain masanga nachna saknuhunchha?

On the contrary, the native English speakers used quite formal forms of MARO more than Nepali speakers while making offers to their staff of opposite sex.

Out of 35 responses, 48.57% responses were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO in English whereas out of 60 responses in Nepali 41.67% responses were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO.

For example,

   a) Can I dance with you?

   b) Do you take tea with me?

   c) Chiya piyera chhutauna ta.

   d) Yaso chiya piuna sakchhau?

Likewise, 22.86% and 20% responses were categorized under informal forms of MARO in English and Nepali respectively.
Some of the examples from both languages are presented below:

   a) Come on, let's dance together.

   b) Let's go to visit for a while.

   c) Hinda jaun chiya piuna.

   d) Timi masanga nachchhun?

This shows that English speakers used more informal forms than Nepali speakers between opposite sex staffs in making offers. From this data the researcher came up with a conclusion that the opposite sex staffs used quite formal forms more than formal and informal forms of MARO in both languages.

3.1.8 Total Forms of MARO Between Two Children

The offers made between two children which were obtained through a questionnaire are presented in the table below:

Table No. 9

Total Forms of MARO Between Two Children

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	18,22,23	3	15	6	30	11	55
Nepali	18,22,23	6	13.04	31	67.39	9	19.57

The table given above shows that English speaking children used formal forms of MARO more than Nepali children. Out of 20 responses in English, 15% were categorized under formal forms of MARO whereas out of 46 responses, 13.04% were categorized under informal forms of MARO in Nepali.

For example,

a) Would you like me to come in the garden?

b) Would you like to go to the garden?

c) Maph garnuhola ma tapainko sart sapha garidinchhu.

d) Sathi masanga bagainchha tarpha ghumna jana saknuhunchha?

Similarly, out of 20 responses 30% in the English and out of 46 responses, 67.39% in the Nepali were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO. This point shows that Nepali children used quite formal forms of MARO more than English children to their age groups.

Some examples are:

    a) Do you want to play football with me?

    b) Aren't you interested to play football?

    c) Ei phutbal khelna aaunuhos.

    d) Hamisanga kelera ramailo garaun.

Likewise, the English speaking children used informal forms of MARO more than Nepali children to their age groups while making offers. Out of 20 responses in English 55% the native English speakers used and out of 46 responses, 19.57% responses in Nepali were categorized under informal forms of MARO.

For example,

    a) Hey! Come to play.

    b) Don't you play football with me?

    c) Khelna aija yar.

So, this data clearly shows that English children extend their offers more informally to their age groups than those of the Nepali speaking children.

3.1.9 Total Forms of MARO Between a Young Child and an Old One

The researcher collected information from different respondents asking them as to how they made offers to the elder children. The responses made by different respondents through questionnaire are presented in the table below:

Table No. 10

Total Forms of MARO Between a Young Child and an Old One

Language	S. N.	Formal		Quite Formal		Informal	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
English	6, 8	10	26.32	20	52.63	8	21.05
Nepali	6, 8	16	45.71	12	24.29	7	20

The table given above shows that the English speaking children used formal forms of MARO to the elder children more than that of the Nepali speaking children. Out of 38 responses, 26.32% responses and out of 35 responses 45.71% were categorized under formal forms of MARO in the English and Nepali languages respectively.

For example,

   a) Would you like to sit on a seat?

   b) Would you like me to read newspaper?

   c) Kaka, yahain sit chha. Kripaya aayera basnuhos.

 Similarly, the English speaking children used quite formal forms of MARO more than Nepali speaking children while making offers to the elder ones. Out of 38 responses in English, 52.63% were expressed and out of 35 responses in Nepali, 24.29% responses were categorized under quite formal forms of MARO.

Some of the examples are presented below:

   a) Please, have a seat, uncle.

   b) Can I read that newspaper for you?

   c) Yata aaunuhos sit khali chha.

   d) Bistarai aaunuhos ladunhola.

Likewise, 21.05% responses in English and 20% in Nepali were categorized under informal forms of MARO.

For example,

a) Here, have a seat.

b) Hey uncle, here is a seat.

c) Ma ramrari padhidinchhu.

d) Yata sit khali chha.

So, the above discussion shows that English speaking children used quite formal forms of MARO more while making offers to the elder ones whereas Nepali speaking children used formal forms of MARO more while making offers to the elder ones in comparison between English and Nepali speaking children.

CHAPTER – FOUR
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENATION

This chapter deals with the major findings of the study. On the basis of the findings the recommendations have been presented on.

4.1   Findings

After analyzing and interpreting the collected information the following findings have been found:

1. The gravity of making, accepting and rejecting offers seemed to depend on the situations rather than the relationship between the interlocutors in case of English speakers, whereas it depended on the relationship between the interlocutors rather than the situation in case of Nepali speakers.

2. In total 30.31% English and 27.24% Nepali speakers used formal forms of MARO, which proved that English speakers were more formal and polite than the Nepali speakers.

3. Regarding relationship among friends, the majority of both English and Nepali speakers used quite formal forms of making accepting and rejecting offers.

4. In maintaining relationship with a customer and a shopkeeper, the majority of the English speakers (32.5%) used formal forms while MARO whereas the majority of the Nepali speakers (64.29%) used quite formal forms of MARO while making accepting and rejecting offers.

5. Similarly, the majority of English speakers (54.24%) used formal forms whereas the majority of Nepali speakers (65%) used quite formal forms while making, accepting and rejecting offers among relatives.

6. Likewise, both English and Nepali speakers used quite formal forms more than formal and informal forms of MARO to their friends of opposite sex. In the comparison, English speakers were more informal than Nepali speakers in making offers to their friends of opposite sex.

7. The English speakers used more formal forms of MARO than Nepali speakers with their opposite sex while shopping. This means that Nepali speakers extended offers informally than those of English speakers with their opposite sex in shopping.

8. The English speakers used more formal forms of MARO than those of Nepali speakers while making offers to the relatives of opposite sex. It is also found that Nepali speakers made offers more quite formal to a great extent to their relatives of opposite sex than English speakers.

9. Nepali speakers used formal forms of MARO more than English speakers while making offers between staff of opposite sex. Both language speakers used quite formal forms to a great extent with their staffs of opposite sex.

10. Nepali speakers seemed to have used quite formal forms more whereas English speakers used informal forms to a great extent among children in making, accepting and rejecting offers.

11. Regarding the relationship between a young child and an old one, the Nepali speakers used formal forms more whereas English speakers used quite formal forms while making, accepting and rejecting offers.

4.2   Recommendation

The language function, making, accepting and rejecting offers plays a vital role in maintaining social relationship in the society. On the basis of findings, some suggestions which could be beneficial to the language teachers and students of English and Nepali as a second languages are given below:

i. Language teacher should enact dialogues that require expressions of making, accepting and rejecting offers in the class.

ii. The teacher should create different situations in which students need to be engaged in making, accepting and rejecting offers in English and Nepali. After making the students know all the uses of making, accepting and rejecting offers of English and Nepali, they should be enabled to find out the uses of these offers in English which have no counterparts in Nepali.

iii. The teachers should give the students opportunity to discuss social norms for making, accepting and rejecting offers.

iv. Group work, pair work could be useful for teaching making, accepting and rejecting offers.

v. The teacher should make a list of exponents of making, accepting and rejecting offers on the basis of their level of formality and teach to the students.

vi. The learners of both the English and Nepali languages can make a list of the forms of making, accepting and rejecting offers in English and Nepali situations and make practice of it.

References

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Barker, L. L. (1982). *Communication in the classroom.* London: Prentice Hall.

Basnet, S.M. (2006). *Terms of greeting and taking leave used in Nepali and English.* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis Kathmandu: T.U.

Bhandari, B.M. & Adhikari, Y.P. (2064). *Communicative English.* Kathmandu: Vidyarthi Prakashan.

Champagain, G. (2002). *Request forms in the English and Nepali Languages: A comparative study.* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis Ktm: T.U.

Corder, S. P. (1993). *Introducing applied linguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Book.

Crown, G. et al. (1999). *Teaching the spoken language: An approach based on the analysis of conversational English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cystal, N. (1978). *The cambridge encyclopedia of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dallos, D. (2003). *Speak English with audiocassette.* Hydrabad: Longman.

Giri, A. (1982). *English and Nepali kinship terms: A comparative study.* An Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu: T.U.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching.* London: Longman.

Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English language tests: A practical guide for teachers of English as second or foreign language.* Hongkong: Longman.

Hornby, A.S. (ed) (2005). *Oxford advanced learners dictionary.* Oxford: OUP.

Jones, L. (1981). *Functions of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kafle, H. P. (2000). *Relationship between acquired formal and functional competence of graduate level English students*. An Unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu: T.U.

Leech, J & Savartvik (2002). *A communicative grammar of English*. New York: Pearson Education Press.

Matreyek, W. (1983). *Communicating in English functions*. New York: Pergamum Press.

Pandey, B. (1996). *Teaching English: Theory of methods*. Kathmandu: M.K. Publishers and distributors.

Pandey, G.P. (1997). *A comparative study of apologies between the English and Nepali language.* An Unpublished M.Ed. thesis. Kathmandu: T.U.

Richard, et al. (1985). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistic.* London: Longman.

Sapir. (1978). *Language.* New York: Hartcourt Brace & world INC.

Sthapit, S.K. (2000). Teaching language for communication. *Journal of NELTA.* vol-5 no.1 Kathmandu.

Tembe, H. (2007). *A comparative study of apologies between English and Limbu.* An Unpublished. M.Ed. Thesis. Kathmandu: T.U.

Underhill, N. (1987). *Testing spoken language: A hand book of oral testing techniques*. Cambridge: CUP.

Van Ek, J.A. (1975). *The threshold level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Wardhaugh, R. (1972). *An introduction to sociolinguistic.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wills, J. (1984). *Teaching English through English: A course in classroom language and techniques*. Singapore: Longman.