

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE COMMUNICATIVE  
PROFICIENCY OF BACHELOR LEVEL STUDENTS**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education,  
University Campus, Kirtipur  
in Partial Fulfillment for Master's Degree in English Education**

**By  
Dhurba Kumar Shahi**

**Faculty of Education  
Tribhuvan University  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal  
2007**

**T.U. Regd. No.: 6-1-325-48-98  
Second year Exam Roll No.: 280192/063**

**Date of Approval of the  
Thesis Proposal: 2064-2-10  
Date of Submission: 2064/04/09**

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE COMMUNICATIVE  
PROFICIENCY OF BACHELOR LEVEL STUDENTS**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education,  
University Campus, Kirtipur  
in Partial Fulfillment for Master's Degree in English Education**

**By  
Dhurba Kumar Shahi**

**Faculty of Education  
Tribhuvan University  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal**

**2007**

## RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Dhurba Kumar Shahi** has prepared this dissertation entitled "A Comparative Study on the Communicative Proficiency of Bachelor Level Students" under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend the dissertation for acceptance.

Date.....

.....

**Dr. Shanti Basnyat**

(Guide)

Professor and Chairperson

English and Other Foreign Language

Education Subject Committee

Department of English Language Education,

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

## RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This dissertation has been recommended for evaluation by the following 'Research Guidance Committee':

**Signature**

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

Reader and Head

Department of English Language Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

**Chairperson**

**Dr. Shanti Basnyat (Guide)**

Professor and Chairperson

English and Other Foreign Language

Education Subject Committee

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

**Member**

**Mrs. Tapasi Bhattacharya**

Reader

Department of English Language Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

**Member**

Date: .....

## EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following  
'Thesis Evaluation Committee':

**Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra**

Reader and Head

Department of English Language Education

T.U., Kirtipur

**Signature**

.....

Chairperson

**Dr. Shanti Basnyat (Guide)**

Professor and Chairperson

English and Other Foreign Language Education

Subject Committee

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Member

**Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi**

Professor,

Department of English Language Education

T.U., Kirtipur

.....

Member

Date: .....

# DEDICATION

*I dedicate this work to my  
ideal parents who scarified  
a lot of things in  
their life for me and my education*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation has been prepared for the partial fulfillment of Master's Degree in English Language Education. First of all, I would like to express my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to my research supervisor Dr. Shanti Basnyat, Professor of the Department of English Education and Chairperson of English and other Foreign Languages Education Subject Committee, who guided me through out the study. Her patience, enthusiasm, cooperation, suggestions and keen interest in this study are ever memorable. For this I always extend my profound gratitude to her.

I would like to express my hearty gratitude to Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra, Reader and Head of the Department of English Education for his keen cooperation; interest and valuable suggestion during the dissertation work and giving the opportunity to carry out this work.

I'm extremely indebted to our retired Prof. Dr. Shishir Kumar Sthapit, ever living giant in the history of English language education. Similarly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Jai Raj Awasthi, Prof Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai, the assistant Dean of the Faculty of Education and Prof. Dr. Tirth Raj Khaniya, Professors of the Department of English Education for their valuable suggestions, regular inspiration and encouragement to develop this work.

I have great pleasure to express my deep sense of gratitude to Mrs. Tapasi Bhattacharya, Dr. Vishnu Singh Rai, Dr. Anjana Bhattarai, Dr. Bal Mukunda Bhandari, Mr. Prem Bahadur Phyak, Mrs. Madhu Neupane, Mrs. Sawraswati Dawadi, Mr. Durga Pokhrel, Mr. Balkrishna Sharma and other faculty members for their encouragement and suggestions.

My deepest appreciation also goes to Mr. Ganesh Paneru, L.B. Bohora, Dhan Bahadur Budha, Yadu Gyawali, Prem Bahadur Chalaune who directly or indirectly helped me.

I would like to express my particular thanks to Janak Chalaune, who created appropriate environment and constantly encouraged me carry out this research work successfully. I would also like to thank Mr. Rajiv Maharjan (Friend's Computer Service) for attractive type setting.

Finally, I would like to express my special thanks to my parents, uncles and brothers (Amber, Lokendra, Janak) for their encouragement and kind support in my study.

Dhurba Kumar Shahi

## **ABSTRACT**

The importance of communicative English use can be hardly exaggerated. Avoiding the 'day to day' and real life communicative English, the purpose of language teaching can't be fulfilled. So to find out the basic objective of language teaching and learning and mainly, to test that the current English language course has been able to fulfill the learners' need or not is the main concern of this dissertation. In order to do so, the researcher has tried to examine the communicative proficiency of Bachelor level students.

The research work attempts to find out the ability to use communicative English of B.A. and B.Ed. first year students. The researcher collected data from B.A. and B.Ed. first year students. The total sample population of the study consists of 100 students selected by using random sampling procedure.

To elicit the required data, the researcher has used both types of sources, primary and secondary. The primary source of data consists of Bachelor Level Students. Equal number of boys and girls were included in the study. The communicative abilities were determined using simple statistical tools such as average, percent, etc.

The study found that the proficiency in communicating abilities of B.A. and B.Ed. 1<sup>st</sup> year was not satisfactory. Comparatively the proficiency of B.Ed. students was found slightly satisfactory than the students of B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> year. Communicative proficiency of all the students was better in receptive and written (production) abilities of language function than oral (production) test.

The study consists of four chapters. Chapter one consists of the general background, review of the related literature, objectives of the study and significance of the study.



Chapter two consists of the methodology of the study. It encompasses the sources of data, population of study, sampling procedures, tools for data collection, process of data collection and limitations of study.

Chapter three consists of the analysis and interpretation of the collected data. The data were analyzed on the basis of variables specified objectives i.e. the holistic, stream-wise, campus-wise, gender-wise, and item-wise analysis of the students' proficiency in communication in English.

Chapter four consists of the major findings and recommendations of the study.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page No.</b>
Recommendation for Acceptance	i
Recommendation for Evaluation	ii
Evaluation and Approval	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vi
Contents	viii
List of Tables	xi
Abbreviations and Symbols	xiii
<b>CHAPTER - I: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-22</b>
1.1 General Background	1
1.1.1. The English Language	2
1.1.2 English in Nepal	3
1.1.3 Language Function	4
1.1.4 Language Function: Some Classification	5
1.1.5 Communicative Proficiency: A Theoretical Review	9
1.1.5.1 Communicative Competence	9
1.1.5.2 A Theoretical Framework of Communicative Language Ability	10
1.1.5.3 Sthapit's Description and Characterization of Communicative Competence	13
1.1.6 Measurement of Communicative Proficiency	17
1.1.6.1 Testing Communicative Functions	18
1.1.6.2 Testing Pragmatic Sensitivity	19
1.1.6.3 Oral Production Tests: (Speaking test)	19
1.2 The Review of Related Literature	20
1.3 Objectives of the Study	21
1.4 Significance of the Study	22

<b>CHAPTER-II: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>23-24</b>
2.1 Sources of Data	23
2.1.1 Primary Sources of data	23
2.1.2 Secondary Sources	23
2.2 The Population of the Study	23
2.3 Sample Population	23
2.4 Tools for Data Collection	23
2.5 Process of Data Collection	24
2.6 Limitations of the Study	24
<b>CHAPTER -III : ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>25-45</b>
3.1 Analysis and Interpretation of the Total Communicative Proficiency	25
3.2. Communicative Proficiency of B. Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	27
3.3 Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	28
3.4. Analysis and Comparison of the Total Stream-wise Communicative Proficiency	29
3.5 Campus-wise Analysis and Interpretation of Communicative Proficiency	30
3.6. Gender-wise Analysis and Comparison of Communicative Proficiency B.A. and B.Ed. First Year Students	35
3.6.1. Proficiency of Boys between B.A and B. Ed 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	35
3.6.2. Proficiency of Girls between B. Ed and B.A 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	36
3.7. Items-wise Comparison of Communicative Proficiency between B.A and B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	36
3.7.1 Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. First Year Students	37
3.7.2. Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	38

3.7.3	Item-wise Analysis of Total Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. and B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	39
3.7.4	Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Gender	40
3.7.5	Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Graduated from HSL vs PCL	41
3.7.6	Item-wise of Communicative Proficiency of B. Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Constituent campuses vs Affiliated campuses	42
3.7.7	Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Gender (Boys vs Girls)	43
3.7.8	Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Graduated from HSL vs PCL	44
3.7.9	Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Constituent campuses vs Affiliated campuses	45

## **CHAPTER - IV: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46-48**

4.1.	Findings	46
4.2	Recommendations	48

## **REFERENCES**

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix I: Test Items

Appendix II: Test Item Addressed to the Informants from B.Ed. 1<sup>st</sup> Year Students

Appendix III: Test Item Addressed to the Informants from B.A. 1<sup>st</sup> Year Students

Appendix IV: Name of the Informants with Marks Obtained

Appendix V: Name of the Campuses

## LIST OF TABLES

	<b>Page No.</b>
Table No. 1: Analysis and Interpretation of the Total Communicative Proficiency	25
Table No. 2: Communicative Proficiency of B. Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	27
Table No. 3: Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	28
Table No. 4: Analysis and Comparison of the Total Stream-wise Communicative Proficiency	29
Table No. 5: Students' Communicative Proficiency of Sanothimi Campus (Bhaktapur)	30
Table No. 6: Students Communicative Proficiency of Mahendra Ratna Campus Tahachal (Kathmandu)	31
Table No. 7: Students' Communicative Proficiency of Institute of Community Service, Baneshwor, Kathmandu	31
Table No. 8: Students' Communicative Proficiency of Gramin Adarsha Multiple Campus, Nepaltar, Kathmandu	32
Table No. 9: Students' Communicative Proficiency of Saraswati Multiple Campus, Thamel, Kathmandu	32
Table No. 10: Students Communicative Proficiency of Tri-Chandra Campus Ghantaghar (Kathmandu)	33
Table No. 11: Students' Communicative Proficiency of Kathmandu Campus, Kalimati, Kathmandu	34
Table No. 12: Students' Communicative Proficiency of Sigma College, Sorkhutte, Nayabazar, Kathmandu	34
Table No. 13: Male vs Female	35
Table No. 14: Proficiency of Boys between B.A and B. Ed 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	35
Table No. 15: Proficiency of Girls between B. Ed and B.A 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	36
Table No. 16: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. First Year Students	37

Table No. 17: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	38
Table No. 18: Item-wise Analysis of Total Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. and B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students	39
Table No. 19: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Gender	40
Table No. 20: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Graduated from HSL vs PCL	41
Table No. 21: Item-wise of Communicative Proficiency of B. Ed. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Constituent campuses vs Affiliated campuses	42
Table No. 22: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Gender (Boys vs Girls)	43
Table No. 23: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Graduated from HSL vs PCL	44
Table No. 24: Item-wise Communicative Proficiency of B.A. 1 <sup>st</sup> Year Students in terms of Constituent campuses vs Affiliated campuses	45

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Avg.	Average
B.A.	Bachelor of Arts
B.Ed.	Bachelor of Education
CLA	Communicative Language Ability
Dr.	Doctor
e.g.	For example
et al	and other people
etc.	et cetera
F.M.	Full Marks
FOE	Faculty of Education
HSL	Higher Secondary Level
i.e.	that is
M.A.	Master of Arts
M.Ed.	Master of Education
Mr.	Mister
No.	Number
PCL	Proficiency Certificate Level
Prof.	Professor
Regd.	Registration
T.U.	Tribhuvan University
Voc.	Vocabulary
Vs.	versus
%	Percentage