

## CHAPTER - ONE

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 General Background

Language is a distinct property of only human beings. We can perform several things by using language, we cannot think of any social, academic and artistic activities going on without language. It is the most valuable single possession of the human race. Communication is possible through aural- oral, visual olfactory gustatory and tactile media and human beings communicate through all of these media individually or in communication. Human beings use aural-oral means of communication, which is as important as food for survival in the speech community.

English is one of the UN languages, which is spoken by millions of people in this world. It is the first Language for the people of U.S.A., England, Canada, and Australia. According to Randolph Quick 'Here are now something like 250 millions people for whom English is the mother tongue or the first language' (Pahuja 1995). UNO has allowed English as an official language. Therefore, it is called the international language. One in every seven human beings can speak it. More than half of the world's books and three-quarters of international mail are in English, of all languages; English has the largest vocabulary-perhaps as many as two million words and one of the noblest bodies of literature. More than 60% of world's radio stations use English.

F.G. French notes 'Because of rapid speed of industrial development, science and technology, international trade and commerce and the close interdependence of nations, English has become a world language' (Pahuja, 1995).

The importance of English in Nepal dose not need to be exaggerated. Higher education is almost impossible without having knowledge of English.

English is taught from nursery to Bachelor level as a compulsory subject in Nepal.

The present English curriculum for Grades 9 and 10 has two main purposes. One is to enable students to exchange ideas with people of any nationality who speak or write English and the other is to expose them to the vast treasures of knowledge and pleasure available in written and spoken English. Language has been seen as a skill that allows one to get things done. The things that can be done through language are described as language functions such as expressing likes and dislikes, good wishes etc.

A function in language refers to the purpose for which an utterance or unit of language is used. Such functions are often described as categories of behaviour e.g. request, apologies, complain, offers, compliments etc. The functional use of language cannot be determined simply by studying of grammatical structures of sentence but also the purposes for which they are used. E.g. sentences in the imperative form may perform a variety of different functions:

- a) Give me that pen (Order)
- b) Pass the salt, please (Request)
- c) Turn right at corner (Instruction)
- d) Try the fried potatoes (Suggestion)
- e) Come round on Saturday (Invitation)

Malinowaki (1923) is of the opinion that language is dependent on the society in which it is used; therefore, it is not a self-contained system. More over, it is evolved to meet the demands of any given society and its use in that society is entirely depends on the context. The meaning comes.... not from a passive contemplation of the word, but from an analysis of its, functions, with reference to the given culture' (Malinowski, 1923 as quoted in Yalden 1985:52-53)

Through, various linguists and language practitioners have defined language function variously. In general language function means communicative function of language. Communicative function of language refers to anything that we can do with language such as greeting, requesting, inviting, denying, promising and soon. Teaching language basically means teaching language functions but teaching functions, in turn means teaching grammar, context and roles.

According to David Crystal (1978: 161) function refers to 'the role of language plays in the context of society or the individual is also referred to by the term 'function' (social function). For example: language is used (function) to communicate ideas, to express attitude and so on. It may also be used to identify specifies SOCIOLINGUISTIC situations such as informing, or intimacy, or VERITIES of language such as science and law, in such cases, one might talk, for instance, of the (function) of scientific language being to express a certain mode of experience in a certain way, and soon. Average detailed classifications of the social functions of language have been made especially in HALLADIAN linguistics, and in relation to pragmatics and the theory of SPEECH ACTS. The traditional classification of SENTENCE function falls between grammatical and SPEECH-ACT theory: sentences are said to 'function' as STATEMENTS, QUESTION, COMMANDS etc. In narratology, the term is used in the analysis of plots for a type of action performed by one or more types of character, such as 'villain harms member of family'.

Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics has defined communicative function of language as 'the extent to which a language is used in a community. Some languages may be used for specific purpose, such as the language called 'Pali', which is used only for religious purposes in Buddhism other languages are used for almost all the communicative needs of a community, e.g. Japanese in Japan.

Dr. Sthapit (2003) has stated in NELTA Journal Vol. 8, No. 1 'A thing can be said to have at least three facets; Substance, form and function. For example, the three facets of a glass can be described as

Substance: glass, steel, paper or plastic

Form: cylindrical with one end open

Function: Serving liquids

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

Substance: Sounds/letters and punctuation marks

Form: Patterns of sounds/letters words and phrases

Function: Communicating message.

So, what is a function? The function of a thing is the purpose it serves or the use it is put to. To put it more explicitly,

if 'x' serves the purpose of v-ing 'y'

or if 'x' is used to v 'y'

Then "v-ing y" is one of the functions of 'x' serving liquids, or it is used to serve liquids, therefore serving liquids is a function of a glass.

Similarly, language serves the purpose of describing people, or it is used to describe people; so describing people is one of the functions of language.

How many types of functions does language have? This question cannot be answered definitely, partly because the complex nature of language and society and their interrelationships defies any such enumeration and partly because there is nothing like the only right or proper way of classifying language functions. As a result the number of communicative functions of language depends on how broad or how narrow a given classification system is. For

instance, let us look at the following expressions and try to determine how many communicative functions they serve:

1. What's your name? (Asking or making query)
2. Stand at east. (Commanding)
3. Pass on the salt, please. (Requesting)
4. Could I have beer and chips, please? (Ordering)
5. Mind your head. (Cautioning)
6. Go straight up to the crossing and turn left. (Directing)
7. Write your name on the top of the answer-sheet. (Instructing)
8. Shall we go to the zoo this weekend? (Proposing)
9. You better see a doctor immediately. (Advising)
10. Leave this place right away if you care for your life. (Threatening)
11. Prestige is the only pressure cooker that has a double safety valve, buy it and show that you care for your wife's safety. (Persuading)

We can say that these eleven expressions serve eleven different communicative functions as indicated in parentheses we could also say that they serve two types of functions: (i) Asking for a verbal response and (ii) asking for a non-verbal response. The first expression serving function number (i) and the rest of the expressions serving function number (ii) yet, from a third angle, we can also say that all the eleven expressions serve only one type of function, namely, the function of regulating the behaviour of the addressee.

## 1.2 Classifications of communicative functions

Communicative functions of language have been classified variously from broad to narrow classifications. Some of the main approaches are the following:

1. Traditional approach: Traditional grammarians have classified sentences into five types on the basis of their communicative functions. They are assertive, imperative, interrogative, operative and exclamatory. These functions can be illustrated respectively in the following sentences.

- i) He is a doctor
- ii) Open the window.
- iii) What is your name?
- iv) May the god bless you. And
- v) What a beautiful garden.

2. Malinowaki's (1923) classification: In course of the study of the primitive societies, Malinowski has drawn the distinction between two language functions as i) Pragmatic function and ii) Magical function.

The first function states that language can be regarded as a form of action when it is used to perform the pragmatic function. The magical function of language has to do with the function of communication with the super natural beings.

3. Austin's classification: J. L. Austin has classified language functions into two types as constative and performative functions. The first type describes, tells or states us something about something, E.g., I am a student. The second function performs some action or does some acts. For example, 'Go ahead'.
4. Searle's classification: Searle in course of classifying speech acts, has classified language functions into five types. They are:
  - i) Representative function: This function commits the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition. E.g. asserting, concluding etc.

- ii) Directive Function: It is an attempt made by the speaker to get the addressee to do something. E.g. requesting, questioning etc.
  - iii) Commissive Function: It commits the speaker to some future course of action. E.g. promising, offering etc.
  - iv) Expressive Function: It expresses a psychological state. E.g. thanking, welcoming etc.
  - v) Declarative Function: It deals with the immediate changes made with the language in the institutional state of affairs. E.g. declaring war, christening etc.
5. Halliday's classification: M.A.K. Halliday classifies language functions into two broad types. They are macro and micro.
- a) Macro classification: Macro classification has been further classified into three sub types. They are ideational, interpersonal and textual functions. The first one deals with expressing ideas and message i.e. the speaker's experience of the real external world including the inner world of his consciousness. The second one deals with the use of language to maintain interpersonal relationship and the third one refers to the talking of language itself.
  - b) Micro classification: Micro classification are as follows:
    - i) The instrumental function (I want): satisfying material needs.
    - ii) The regulatory function (Do as I tell you): controlling the behaviour of other people.
    - iii) The interactional function (Me and you): getting along with other people.
    - iv) The personal function (Here come I): identifying and expressing the self.

- v) The heuristic function (Tell me why): exploring the world around and inside one.
  - vi) The imaginative function (Lets pretend): creating the world of one's own.
  - vii) The informative function (I have got something to tell you): communicating new information.
6. Jakobson's Classification: Roman Jakobson classifies language functions into six types corresponding to six components of speech events. They are:
- i) Emotive function: In this function speaker's feelings, desires and emotions are expressed.
  - ii) Conative function: In this function, the utterance is focused on addressee to behave in a certain way.
  - iii) Referential function: In this function, language is used to focus the context.
  - iv) Phatic function: This serves the function to discontinue, sustain or to initiate the conversation.
  - v) Metalingual function: Language is used to talk about the language itself.
  - vi) Poetic function: In this function, the message form is focused and the focus is used to arouse aesthetic feeling.
7. Corder's classification: Corder classifies language functions into six types similar to that of Jakobson but the wording is different slightly. They are: Personal, Directive, 'Referential, Phatic, Metalingual, and Imaginative functions.
8. Wilkins's classification: Wilkins D.A. has classified language functions into eight types. They are:



- i) Modality: to express degree of certainty, necessity etc.
  - ii) Moral discipline and evaluation: judgment, approval, disapproval etc.
  - iii) Suasion: persuasion, recommendation, prediction etc.
  - iv) Argument: agreement, disagreement, denial etc.
  - v) Rational inquiry and exposition: rational organization of thought and speech.
  - vi) Personal emotions: positive, negative etc.
  - vii) Emotional relations: greeting, flattering, hostility etc.
  - viii) Interpersonal relations: politeness of status, degree of formality and informality.
9. Van Ek's classification: Van Ek classifies language functions into six types. They are:
- i) Imparting and seeking factual information: It includes identifying, reporting, correcting, asking etc.
  - ii) Expressing and finding out moral attitudes: It includes apologizing, granting forgiveness etc.
  - iii) Expressing and finding out emotional attitudes: It includes pleasure, displeasure, surprise, hope, intention etc.
  - iv) Expressing and finding out intellectual attitudes : It includes expressing and inquiring about agreement and disagreement.
  - v) Getting things done (Suasion) : It includes suggesting, advising, warning etc.
  - vi) Socializing : It includes greeting, attracting attentions etc.

10. Finocchiaro's classification: Finocchiaro classifies the communicative functions into five broad categories. They are:

- i) Personal : It includes clarifying or arranging one's ideas, expressing one's thought or feelings.
- ii) Interpersonal : It enables us to establish and maintain desirable social and working relationship.
- iii) Directive : It attempts to influence the action of others, accepting and refusing direction.
- iv) Referential : It includes talking or reporting about things, actions, events or people in environment in the past or in the future.
- v) Imaginative : It includes discussing, expressing ideas, suggestion, solving problems etc.

The above classifications of language function show that they are more or less the same.

### 1.3 Language functions used for data collection

For the purpose of data collection eleven language functions are selected from English curriculum of grade nine. The language functions and their sample examples are presented below.

#### 1. Making plans and expressing intentions

*Simple present:* I plan to go to Kashmir.

*will future:* I will stay in a hotel there.

*Going to future:* I am going to Kashmir

*Ing future:* I will be staying at a hotel there.

#### 2. Suggesting and advising

*You'd better:* You'd better go to yoga club.

*How about:* How about going to a yoga club.

*If I were\_\_\_:*

If I were you I'd go to a yoga club.

**3. Making requests**

*Would you mind \_\_\_ ing:*

Would you mind putting my case on the rack?

*Could you possibly \_\_\_ ing?*

Could you possibly stop making noise?

*I wonder if you:*

I wonder if you could ask me something?

*I'd appreciate if you:*

I would appreciate if you can get me one of those books.

**4. Expressing condolence/ sympathy**

*I'm/I was sorry to hear \_\_\_*

I was very sorry to learn about sudha's death.

That's too bad.

What a pity !

I know how you feel.

**5. Apologizing and responding to an apology.**

**Apologizing**

*I'm sorry\_\_\_*

I am terribly sorry.

*I didn't realize\_\_\_*

I didn't realize that it was your bag.

*I am sorry.*

*I lost my balance.*

**Responding to an apology**

Never mind

**6. Asking for permission**

*May I \_\_\_?*

May I go out, sir?

*Can I.....?*

Can I have a look at your book?

*Do you mind if I \_\_\_?*

Do you mind if I use your telephone?

*Is it all right if I \_\_\_?*

Is it all right if I use your book?

**7. Making offers:**

*Shall I \_\_\_?*

Shall I offer you a cup of tea?

*Would you like me to \_\_\_?*

Would you like me to get a cup of tea?

**8. Accepting and rejecting offers**

**Accepting:**

That would be very nice.

Thank you,

**Rejecting:**

I am sorry. I can't go with you.

*I'd love to, but \_\_\_*

I'd love it but I don't have time.

**9. Giving advice and warning**

*You should \_\_\_*

You should go to see a doctor.

*You ought to \_\_\_*

You ought to buy an English book?

**Advice**

A: My TV is broken,

B: You ought to buy a new one, or you should take it to the mechanic's.

### **Warning**

You are not allowed to make noise here.

*You can't \_\_\_\_*

You can't smoke here

### **10. Persuading someone to do something**

*I wouldn't \_\_\_\_ if I were you.*

Wouldn't it be better if you left this business.

### **11. Expressing Ability to do Something**

#### **Expressing Ability**

*I can.....*

I can drive car.

#### **Expressing Inability**

*I can't.....*

I can't read and write.

## **1.4 Relationship between structures and functions**

Language functions are always realized through structures. Structures are essential to carry out functions, however, they are not the end, but means to an end i.e. to communicate.

We have seen that a single language function can be expressed through more than one grammatical structure. Here, a 'request' can be expressed in a variety of ways.

Please lock the box.

Could you lock the box?

Would you mind locking the box?

The box is still open.

Could you please lock the box?

May I request you to lock the box? etc.

Similarly, one structure can perform a variety of functions:

Give me that open. (Order)

Pass the book. (Request)

Switch off before you change the bulb. (Instruction)

Come to my birthday party. (Invitation)

All the above sentences are imperative in structure, but they perform separate functions. Suprasegmental features of language play vital roles in language function.

He is married.

He is married?

The structure of the above sentence is same. But if we produce it in falling intonation pattern, it gives information and if it is produced in rising intonation pattern, it is a question to be clear about his marital status.

When a speaker likes to say something, s/he should have focus on a particular word or phrase. English sentences normally have end-focus, but as the requirement of the speaker, s/he may shift the focus to other words.

Examples:

Binod is cycling down to school. (Not to other place)

Binod is cycling down to school. (Not through school)

Binod is cycling down to school. (Not on foot)

Binod is cycling down to school. (Not Sita) Language function is associated with various related term like speech act theory, Socio-linguistics, pragmatics, functional linguistics etc. Therefore, the functional uses of language cannot be determined simply studying the grammatical structure of sentences. The above examples are enough to prove that a function can be carried out with a variety of sentence structures and one structure can convey a variety of functions with the help of different patterns.

Sthapit (2000: 4) has said that the knowledge of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary alone is not enough to grasp the communicative function the

speaker, apart from this knowledge, the hearer should also have a kind of grammatical sensitivity. The sensitivity helps a language user in relating the linguistic forms to appropriate non-linguistic situations, helps her/him in correlating linguistic forms with communicative functions and guide her/him in unfolding the underlying meaning of linguistic texts. So, it is important to note that there is no one to one correspondence between the grammatical structure of a sentence and its function in communication.

He has passed the exam. (Surprise)

The box is still open. (A command to lock it)

He has bought a computer. (An information)

He has got married? (A question)

The above sentences have same language structure, but they give different meanings.

Additional examples are:

<b>Grammatical Structure</b>	<b>Functions</b>	<b>Examples</b>
Declarative	Statement	He will be a teacher.
Sentence	Command	You will write your homework
	Request	I would like to for the post.
	Warning	The plate is very hot.
Interrogative	Request	Can you sing us a song ?
Sentence	Question	Who is your close friend ?
	Exclamation	Isn't that wonderful ?
Imperative	Command	What are you laughing at ?
	Command	Keeps silence.

Sentence	Wish	Have a nice dream.
	Invitation	Come and see us next week.
	Warning	Mind your head.
	Instruction	Heat the oil then pour the vegetables.
Exclamatory	Exclamation	What a fat man is ?
	Request	What lovely chocolates these are !
		(=Can I have another one ?)

(Aarts, 1986:96)

### 1.5 Literature review

English language has been taught as a compulsory subject in different educational institution in Nepal. Most of the students studying in public schools consider English subject as the most difficult subject. The SLC result has also shows that English is the students have failed in English every year. So, the rasher has tried to find out some reasons of the students being failed in English.

Thought there are significant books and articles on language functions. But very few researches have been carried out regarding the effectiveness of teaching communicative functions in secondary level.

Pandey , 1997 A Comparative Study of apologies between English and Nepali, has stated that even Nepali speaking people feel easy to say sorry. He has also stated that Nepali apologies are spilt into two forms; real apologies and context specific apologies. English people express more apologies than



Nepalese people. Educated people seem to use more apologetic than uneducated ones and tend to use apologies in English form.

Kattel, 2001, A Comparative Study on Terms of Address Used by English and Nepali Speakers has stated that speakers must recognize the social setting, relationship with other person as well as terms of address for attracting the attention of strangers, friends, members of the family, relatives or people in positions of authority are different. So, the speaker without the knowledge of these terms of address may fail to be polite and sometimes it can be offensive. The way in which people address one another usually depends on their age, sex, social class and personal relationship.

In his thesis he tries to find how the speakers of the two languages selects the terms of address according to the addressee's age, sex, status or relationship. His study shows how the native speakers of Nepali and English address their people according to their age, sex, status or relationship with the addressee.

Native speakers of Nepali try to establish kinship terms to address even stranger. Nepali has a greater number of kin titles than English. But native speakers of English largely rely on 'excuse me' phrase. Most of the Nepali kinship terms can function as terms of address where as, in English ascending generation only receives title and others are usually addressed by their first name. The paternal and maternal distinction is not important in English but the distinction is important in Nepali.

Chapagain, 2002, has carried out research on 'Request Forms in English and Nepali language and has compared the request forms used in Nepali and English language and stated that request symbolizes the civilization and culture of society. It is the marker of politeness.

She found that 68% of English and 22% of Nepali speakers use direct requests. So, English people were found more polite than Nepali people. British

informants were found more polite than their American counterparts. Females were found more polite than their male counterparts among Nepali speakers. British were more polite in the form of asking favors where as Americans for asking for help.

Sharma, (2000) carried out a research on "A Study on The Use of Communicative Functions by S.L.C. Students, A Comparative Study". He has found that the students of Parvat district in the use of communicative functions and their exponents were very weak.

So the researcher thought that the proficiency in the communicative functions of the grade 10 students of Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts might be a new study and it would be helpful for teachers, course designers and administrators.

## **1.6 Objectives of the study**

This study aims at achieving the following principal objectives:

- 1) To examine the student's performance in certain functions.
- 2) To find out the students' weakness and strengths in the structures and communicative functions.
- 3) To identify students' errors.
- 4) To suggest some pedagogical implications of the findings of this study.

## **1.7 Significance of the study**

A language is a means of communication. Every speaker wants to do things through her/his language and listener does verbal response of non-verbal response. The English functions with various structures are designed in the course of compulsory English of grade 9 and 10 in Nepal so that the students could be competence in communication. The research did endeavour to get the

proficiency of grade 10 students of Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts. It would be helpful for students, teachers, curriculum designers and administrators etc.

## **CHAPTER -TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **2 Introduction**

Methodology is a process to discover new facts and information about a particular subject matter. It helps to find out reliable and effective conclusion. So, it can be called a vehicle for carrying out any information successfully. In this study the researcher tried to present the proficiency in the use of language functions by grade ten students. This is a field study and it was applied in the practical field.

#### **2.1 Sources of data**

The researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data to complete the work.

##### **2.1.1 Primary sources of data**

The primary sources of data are the main instruments of this work because the researcher has used the acquired facts of primary data to come to the conclusions of this research. The researcher randomly selected five secondary, schools from Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts, i.e. five from each six students of grade ten were selected from each school consisting of 50% boys and 50% girls i.e. three boys and three girls from each sample schools. They were asked the questions and their responses were recorded in an audiocassette.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary sources of data**

Grammar books, articles published in NELTA journals, books on language functions of different writers were used for carrying out the work successfully.

### **2.1.3 Population**

#### **a) Population of the study**

All grade ten students of public schools in Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts constitute the population of the study.

#### **b) Sample population**

The researcher visited ten public schools of Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts five from each as the sample schools of the study.

Six students were selected consisting of 50% boys and 50% girls from each school as sample population. Oral interview was conducted and recorded in audiocassette with 50% boys and 50% girls from each sample school.

### **2.1.4 Tools for data collection**

For the purpose of data collection, the researcher had designed a test item of twenty-two questions from eleven language functions, two questions from each language function. All questions were asked to sample students and their responses were recorded in audiocassettes.

## **2.2 Process of data collection**

The researcher adopted the following process for data collection.

- a) First of all sample students were selected using random sampling method.
- b) The test items were distributed to the sample students consisting equal number of boys and girls.
- c) Each of the sample students was called for oral interview and responses were recorded in audiocassettes.

- d) The responses of the students were carefully checked on the basis of the language structures and functions referred by grade nine curriculum.
- e) The outcomes of their responses were tabulated for interpretation.

### 2.3 Limitations of the study

This study has been limited in following points.

i)a) It consists of eleven language functions and their structures that are set for grade nine students by Curriculum Development Center-Sanothimi, Bhaktapur-2055.

ii)b) It consists of ten public schools, five from each Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts of Kathmandu valley. Because of time limitation and financial constrain, six students consisting of 50% boys and 50% girls were randomly selected for oral interview.

iii)c) The research has been limited to oral interview only.

iv)d) It interprets the students' errors in structural and functional aspects and is not concerned with pronunciation aspect.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

## **CHAPTER -THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

#### **3 Introduction**

After collecting all the responses of the students, they were checked according to the structures and functions set to the students of grade nine by the curriculum Development Center, Sanothimi Bhaktapur. Then the data were tabulated in terms of schools and functions. On the basis of the tables, the analysis and interpretation has been done. So, this chapter consists of three parts.

- (i) School wise analysis of the students' proficiency.
- (ii) Function wise analysis of the student's proficiency.
- (iii) Item wise analysis of errors

#### **3.1 School wise Analysis of students' proficiency**

One of the objectives of this study is to find out the students' strengths and weaknesses over communicative functions. For the purpose, ten schools of Kathmandu and Lalitpur, five from each were selected randomly. Six students consisting 50% boys and 50% girls were selected using random sampling method. Twenty-two questions, two from each language functions were prepared and oral interview with the subjects was conducted. Students' responses were recorded in an audiocassette. So, this part deals with their strengths and weaknesses in the following sub- heading.

### 3.1.1 Total proficiency of the students-

Table NO. 1

Items No.No-	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	89	74.16	29	24.16	2	1.66	120
Item-2	31	25.83	79	65.83	10	8.33	120
Item-3	67	55.83	45	37.5	8	6.66	120
Item-4	39	32.5	75	62.5	6	5.0	120
Item-5	51	42.5	52	43.3	17	14.16	120
Item-6	65	54.16	51	42.5	4	3.33	120
Item-7	17	14.16	86	71.66	17	14.16	120
Item-8	60	50.0	46	38.33	14	11.66	120
Item-9	14	11.66	87	72.5	19	15.38	120
Item-10	24	20.0	81	67.5	15	12.5	120
Item-11	70	58.33	40	33.33	10	8.33	120

The above table shows that in question No.No- 1, 120 questions were asked to 60 students, but only 74.16% responses were correct, 24.16% responses were wrong and 1.66% questions were not answered. In Item No.No- 2, 25.83% responses were correct, 65.83% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were not answered. In Item No.No- 3, 55.83% responses were correct, 37.5% responses were incorrect and 6.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No.No-4, 32.5% responses were correct, 62,5% responses were incorrect and 5% questions were out of answer. In Item No.No- 5, 42.5%

responses were correct, 43.3%, responses were incorrect and 14.16% questions were out of answer. In Item **No-No-6**, 54.16% responses were correct, 42.5% responses were incorrect and 3.33% questions were out of answer. In Item **No-No-7**, 14.16% responses were correct 71.66% responses were incorrect and 38.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-8, 50% of responses were correct 38.33% responses were incorrect and 11.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-9, 11.66% responses were correct, 72.5% responses were incorrect and 15.83% questions were out of responses. In Item No-10, 24% responses were correct, 67.5% responses were incorrect and 12.5 % Questions were out of answer. Similarly, in Item No-11, 58.33% responses were correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were not answered. Thus, student's performance in Item No- 1,3,6, 8 and 11 was satisfactory and in Item, Nos-2, 4,5,7,9 and 10 was not found satisfactory.

### 3.1.2 Students' proficiency of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. Chhauni

**Table No-No- 2**

Items <b>No-No-</b>	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
Item-2	1	8.33	5	41.66	6	50	12
Item-3	8	66.66	2	16.66	2	16.66	12
Item-4	2	16.66	8	66.66	2	16.66	12
Item-5	1	8.33	6	50.0	5	41.66	12
Item-6	6	50.0	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
Item-7	0	0	8	66.66	4	33.33	12
Item-8	5	41.66	3	25.0	4	33.33	12
Item-9	0	0	5	41.66	7	58.33	12
Item-10	0	0	7	58.33	5	41.66	12
Item-11	6	50	3	25.0	3	25.0	12

In above table shows that in Item **No-No- 1**, 50% responses were correct and 50% response were incorrect. In Item No-2, 8.33% responses were correct,



41.66 % responses were incorrect and 50% questions were out of answer. In Item No-3 66.66% response were correct 16.66% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were not answered. In Item No-4, 16.66% responses were correct 66.66% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were not answered. In Item No-5, 8.33% responses were correct, 50% responses were incorrect and 41.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-6, 50% responses were correct, 41.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were not answered. In Item No-7, 66.66% responses were incorrect and 33.33%. Questions were out of answer. In Item No-8, 41.66% responses were correct, 25% responses were incorrect and 33.33% questions were not answered. In Item No-9, 41.66% responses were incorrect and 58.33% questions were out of answerer. In Item No-10, 58.33% responses were incorrect and 41.66% questions were out of answer. Similarly in Item No-11, 50% responses were correct 25% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were not answered. Thus, students' proficiency in Item Nos- 1,3,6 and 11 was found satisfactory and students' proficiency in Item Nos- 2,4,5,7,8, 9 and 10 was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.3 Students' proficiency of Sitaram Higher Secondary School, Ramkot, Kathmandu

Table No.No- 3

Items No.No-	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	11	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	12
Item-2	1	8.33	11	91.66	0	0	12
Item-3	0	0	12	100	0	10	12
Item-4	3	25	9	75	0	0	12
Item-5	5	41.66	5	41.66	2	16.66	12
Item-6	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
Item-7	0	0	11	91.66	1	8.33	12
Item-8	5	41.66	6	50	1	8.33	12
Item-9	0	0	12	100	0	0	12

Item-10	3	25	8	66.66	1	8.33	12
Item-11	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12

The above table shows that. In Item No- 1, 91.66% responses were correct and 8.33% responses were incorrect. In Item No-2, only 8.33% responses were correct and 91.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-3, 100% responses were incorrect. In Item No-4, 25%, responses were correct and 75% responses were incorrect. IN Item No-5, 41.66% responses were incorrect, 41.66% response were in correct and 16.66% questions were out of answers. In Item, No- 6, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item No-7, 91.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were not answered. In Item No-8, 41.66% responses were correct 50% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ -9, 100% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~-10, only 25% responses were right, 66.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 11, 58.33% responses were correct and 41.66% responses were incorrect. Thus students' proficiency of Sitaram Higher Secondary School. In Item ~~No-No-~~1, 6 and 11 was found satisfactory and in Item ~~No-No-~~2,3, 4,5,7,8,9 and 10 was found satisfactory.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

### 3.1.43.1.4 Students' proficiency of Nandi Ma.Vi. Naxal

Table No-4

Items No.No-	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	6	50	4	33.33	2	16.66	
Item-2	0	0	11	91.66	1	8.33	
Item-3	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	
Item-4	2	16.66	9	75	1	8.33	
Item-5	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	
Item-6	6	50	6	50	0	0	
Item-7	2	16.66	4	33.33	6	50	
Item-8	8	66.66	3	25	1	8.33	
Item-9	1	8.33	6	50	5	41.66	
Item-10	1	8.33	10	83.33	1	8.33	
Item-11	9	75	3	25	0	0	

The above table shows the students' proficiency of Mandi Ma.vi. Naxal in 11 Items. In Item No-1, 50% responses were correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-2, 91.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of response. In Item No-3, 66.66% responses were correct and 33.33% responses were incorrect. In Item No-4, 16.66% responses were correct, 75% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-5, 58.33% responses were incorrect, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item N-6, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In item No-7, 16.66% responses correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 50% Questions were out of answer. In Item No-8, 66.66% responses were correct, 25% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No -9, 8.33% responses were correct, 50% responses were incorrect and 41.66% questions were out of answer. In item No-10, 8.33% responses were correct, 83.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In item No-11, 75% responses were correct and

25% responses were incorrect. Thus students' proficiency of Nandi Ma.Vi, Naxal in Item No-, 1,3,5,8 and 11 was found satisfactory and in tem No- 2,4,6,7,9,10 was not found satisfactory.

### 3.1. 5 Students'- proficiency of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School, Pharping

Table No- 65

Items No-No-	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12
Item-2	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-3	9	75	3	25	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-4	6	50	6	50	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-5	6	50	6	50	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-6	5	41.66	7	58.33	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-7	0	0	12	100	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-8	3	25	9	75	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-9	0	0	12	100	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-10	2	16.66	10	83.33	0	0	12 <del>77</del>
Item-11	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12 <del>77</del>

The above table shows that students' proficiency of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School in 11 items. In item No-1, 83.33% responses were correct and 16.66% responses were incorrect. In item No-2, 33.33% responses were correct and 66.66% responses were incorrect. In item No-3,75% responses were correct and 25% responses were incorrect. IN Item ~~No-No-~~ 4, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 5, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 6, 41.66% responses were correct and 58.33% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 7, 100% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 8, 25% responses were correct and 75% responses were incorrect. IN Item ~~No-No-~~ 9, 100% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 10, 16.66% responses were correct and 83.33% responses were correct. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 11, 83.33% responses were correct and 16.66% responses were incorrect. Thus students'

proficiency of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School in Item ~~No-No-~~ 1,3,4,5 and 11 was found satisfactory and in Item ~~No-No-~~ 2,6,7,8,9 and 10 was not found satisfactory.

### 3.1.6 ~~Student's~~ Students' proficiency of Navayug Ma.Vi. Lagan

Table No-6

<del>Items</del> <del>No-No-</del>	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	7	58.33	5	41.60	0	0	12
Item-2	0	0	10	83.33	2	16.66	„
Item-3	5	41.66	2	16.16	5	41.66	„
Item-4	0	0	10	83.33	2	16.66	„
Item-5	1	8.33	7	58.33	4	33.33	„
Item-6	9	75	3	25	0	0	„
Item-7	0	0	9	75	3	25	„
Item-8	4	33.33	5	41.66	3	25	„
Item-9	0	0	7	58.33	4	41.66	„
Item-10	1	8.33	7	58.33	4	33.33	„
Item-11	3	25	4	33.33	5	41.66	„

The above table shows that in Item No-1, 58.33% responses were correct and 41.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-2, 83.33% responses were incorrect. In Item No-2, 83.33% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were out of answers. In Item No-3, 41.66 % responses were correct, 16.66% response were incorrect and 41.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-4, 83.33% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-5, 8.33% responses were correct, 58.33% responses were incorrect and 33.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-6, 75% responses were correct and 25% responses were incorrect. In Item No-7, 75% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were out of answer. In Item No-8, 33.33% responses were correct, 41.66% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were out of answer. In Item No-9, 58.33% responses were incorrect and 41.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-10, 8.33% responses were correct,

58.33% responses were incorrect and 33.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-11, 25% responses were correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 41.66% questions were out of answer. Thus, students proficiency of Navayug Ma.vi in Item No- 1 and 6 was satisfactory in Item No- 2,3,4,5 7,8,9 10, and 11 was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.7 Students' proficiency of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. Imadol

Table No-7

Items No-No-	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	9	75	3	25	0	0	12
Item-2	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-3	6	50	6	50	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-4	4	33.33	7	58.33	1	8.33	<u>12</u>
Item-5	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-6	9	75	3	25	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-7	0	0	12	100	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-8	11	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-9	4	33.33	7	58.33	1	8.33	<u>12</u>
Item-10	1	8.33	11	91.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-11	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	<u>12</u>

The above table shows that in Item No-1, 75% responses were correct and 25% responses were incorrect. In ItemNo-2, 58.33% responses were correct and 41.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-3, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. Item No-4, 33.33% responses were correct, 58.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-5, 58.33% responses were correct and 41.66% responses were incorrect. In item No-6, 75% responses were correct and 25% responses were incorrect. In Item No-7, 100% responses were incorrect. In Item No-8, 91.66% responses were correct and 8.33% responses were incorrect. In Item No- 9, 33.33% responses were correct, 58.33% response were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-10, 8.33% responses were correct and 91.66 % responses were incorrect. In Item No-11, 58.33%

responses were correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Thus, students' proficiency of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. in Item No- 1,2,3, 5, 6 8 and 11 was satisfactory and in Item No 4,7, 9 and 10 was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.8 Students' proficiency of Hari Siddhi Ma. Vi. Lialitpur

Table No-8

Items No.No-	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12
Item-2	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-3	11	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-4	5	41.66	7	58.33	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-5	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-6	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12 <del>7</del>
Item-7	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-8	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-9	4	33.33	8	33.33	0	0	12 <del>7</del>
Item-10	4	33.33	6	50	2	16.66	12 <del>7</del>
Item-11	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12 <del>7</del>

The above table shows that in Item No-1, 83.33% responses were correct and 16.66% responses were incorrect. In ~~Item No-2~~, 58.33% responses were correct and 41.66% responses were wrong. In Item No-3, 91.66% responses were correct and 8.33% responses were incorrect. In Item No-4, 41.66% responses were right and 58.33% ~~response were~~ responses were incorrect. In Item No-5, 66.66% responses were correct and 33.33% responses were incorrect. In Item No-6, 50% responses were correct, 41.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33%, questions were out of answer. In Item No-7, 66.66% responses were correct and 33.33% responses were wrong. In Item No-8, 66.66% responses were right and 33.33% responses were wrong. In Item No-9, 33.33% responses were correct and 66.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-10, 33.33% responses were correct, 50% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were out of answer. In Item No-11, 58.33% responses were correct and 41.66% responses were incorrect. Thus students' proficiency of Harisiddhi Ma.Vi. in Item Nos- 1,2,3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 was satisfactory and in Item Nos- 4,9 and 10 was not satisfactory.



### 3.1.9 3.1.9 Students' proficiency of Yashodhara Ma.Vi. Thainatol

Table ~~No-No-~~ 9

~~Table No-7~~

Items <del>No-No-</del>	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12
Item-2	8	66.66	3	25	1	8.33	<u>12</u>
Item-3	9	75	3	25	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-4	5	41.66	7	58.33	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-5	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	<u>12</u>
Item-6	3	50	6	50	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-7	3	25	9	75	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-8	8	66.66	3	25	1	8.33	<u>12</u>
Item-9	1	8.33	11	91.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-10	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
Item-11	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	<u>12</u>

The above table shows that in Item No- 1, 83.33% responses were correct and 16.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-2, 66.66% responses were correct, 25% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-3, 75% responses were correct and 25% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 4, 41.66% responses were right and 58.33% responses were wrong. In Item No-5, 58.33% responses were correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of responses. In Item No-6, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item No-7, 25% responses were right and 75% responses were wrong. In Item No-8, 66.66 % responses were correct 25%, responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item No-9, 8.33% responses were correct and 91.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-10, 33.33% responses were correct and 66.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No-11, 66.66% responses were correct and 33.33% responses were incorrect. Thus students proficiency of

Yashodhara Ma.Vi in Item No- 1,2, 3, 5, 6 8 and 11 was satisfactory and in Item No- 4, 7,8 and 10 was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.10 Students' proficiency of Patan Ma.Vi Patandhoka

Table No-10

~~Table No-7~~

Items <del>No-No-</del>	Correct responses	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item-1	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12
Item-2	0	0	12	100	0	0	12
Item-3	2	16.66	9	75	1	8.33	12
Item-4	4	33.33	6	50	2	16.66	12
Item-5	3	25	6	50	3	25	12
Item-6	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
Item-7	0	0	9	75	3	25	12
Item-8	2	16.66	7	58.33	3	25	12
Item-9	1	8.33	8	66.66	3	25	12
Item-10	2	16.66	7	58.33	3	25	12
Item-11	5	41.66	6	50	1	8.33	12

The above table shows that in item ~~No-No-~~ 1, 83.33% responses were correct and 16.66% responses were incorrect. In item ~~No-No-~~ 2, 100% responses were incorrect. In item ~~No-No-~~ 3, 16.66% responses were correct, 75%, responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 4, 33.33% responses were correct, 50% responses were incorrect and 16.66% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 5, 25% responses were correct, 50% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 6, 50% responses were correct, 41.66% were wrongly responded ~~and 8.33~~ and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 7, 75% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 8, 16.66% responses were perfectly right, 58.33% responses were wrong and 25% questions were not answered. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 9, 8.33% responses were correct, 66.66% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were not answered. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 10, 16.66% responses were correct, 58.33% responses were incorrect and 25% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No-No-~~ 11, 41.66% responses were right, 50% responses were wrong and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Thus students' proficiency of Patan Ma. Vi.

in Item No.No- 1 and 6 was satisfactory and in Item No.No- 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.11 Students' Proficiency of Namuna Machhindra Ma.Vi. Lagankhel

Table No.No- 11

Items	Correct responses	Percentage	Incorrect responses	Percentage	No response	Percentage	Total
Item <u>No.No- 1</u>	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 2</u>	3	25	9	75	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 3</u>	9	75	3	25	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 4</u>	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 5</u>	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
Item <u>No.No- 6</u>	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 7</u>	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 8</u>	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
Item <u>No.No- 9</u>	3	25	9	75	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 10</u>	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
Item <u>No.No- 11</u>	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12

The above table shows that in Item No.No- 1, 83.33% responses were correct and 16.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No.No- 2, 25% responses were correct and 75% responses were incorrect. In Item No.No- 3, 75% responses were correct and 25% responses were incorrect. In Item No.No- 4, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item No.No- 5, 50% responses were correct, 41.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33% responses were out of answer. In Item No.No- 6, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item No.No- 7, 33.33% responses were correct and 66.66% responses were incorrect. In Item No.No- 8, 50% responses

were correct, 41.66% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. In Item ~~No.No-~~ 9, 25% responses were correct and 75% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No.No-~~ 10, 50% responses were correct and 50% responses were incorrect. In Item ~~No.No-~~ 11, 66.66% responses were correct and 33.33% responses were incorrect. Thus, students' proficiency of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. in Item No- 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11 was satisfactory and in Item No- 2, 7 and 9 was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.12 Comparison of schools in Item No -1

Table No- 12

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
S.R.H.S.S	11	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	<u>12</u>
N. Ma.Vi.	6	50	4	33.33	2	16.66	<u>12</u>
A.H.S.S.	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
M.A.Ma.Vi.	9	75	3	25	0	0	<u>12</u>
H.S.Ma.Vi.	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
P.Ma.Vi.	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	<u>12</u>
N.M.Ma.Vi.	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	<u>12</u>

The above table shows the proficiency of the students of sample schools. The students of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses and 50% incorrect responses. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School answered 91.66% correctly and 8.33% incorrectly. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. could answer 50% correctly, 33.33% incorrectly and they remained silent in 16.66% questions. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave 83.33% correct responses and 16.66% incorrect responses. Similarly, the

students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 58.33% correct responses and 41.66% incorrect responses. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave 75% correct responses and 25% incorrect responses. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. answered 83.33% responses correctly and 16.66% incorrectly. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi., Patan Ma. Vi. and Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 83.33% correct responses and 16.66% incorrect responses. Thus, the students' proficiency of all sample schools was satisfactory because they could answer more than 50% questions correctly.

### 3.1.13 Comparison of schools in Item No-- 2

Table No- 13

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	1	8.33	5	41.66	6	50	12
S.R.H.S.S	1	8.33	11	91.66	0	0	12
N. Ma.Vi.	0	0	11	91.66	1	8.33	12
A.H.S.S.	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	0	0	10	83.33	2	16.66	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	3	25	1	8.33	12
P.Ma.Vi.	0	0	12	100	0	0	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	3	25	9	75	0	0	12

The above table shows that in item no. 2, the students of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. gave only 8.33% correct responses, 41.66% incorrect responses and they remained silent in 50% questions. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School could answer 8.33% questions correctly and 91.66% incorrectly. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. couldn't answer any of the questions correctly. They gave 91.66% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out

of answer. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave only 33.33% correct responses and 66.66% incorrect responses. Similarly, the students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 83.33% incorrect responses and 16.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave 58.33% correct responses and 41.66% incorrect responses. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. also gave 58.33% correct responses and 41.66% incorrect responses. The students of Yashodhara Ma.Vi. could give 66.66% correct responses and they couldn't answer 25% questions correctly and they remained silent in 8.33% questions. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave all 100% incorrect responses. Similarly, the students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave only 25% correct responses and 75% incorrect responses. So, students' proficiency of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi., Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. and Yashodhara Ma. Vi. in item no. 2 was satisfactory and other schools was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.14 **Comparison** of schools in Item **Ne-No - 3**

**Table No-No- 14**

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	8	66.66	2	16.66	2	16.66	12
S.R.H.S.S	0	0	12	100	0	0	<u>12</u>

N. Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12"
A.H.S.S.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12"
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	5	41.66	2	16.66	5	41.66	12"
M.A.Ma.Vi.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12"
H.S.Ma.Vi.	11	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	12"
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	9	75	3	25	0	0	12"
P.Ma.Vi.	2	16.66	9	75	1	8.33	12"
N.M.Ma.Vi.	9	75	3	25	0	0	12"

The above table shows that students' proficiency in item no. 3. The students of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. gave 66.66% correct response, 16.66% incorrect responses and 16.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave 100% wrong answer. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. gave 66.66% correct responses and 33.33% incorrect responses. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave 58.33% correct responses and 41.66% incorrect responses. The students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 41.66% correct responses, 16.66% incorrect responses and 41.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses, and 50% incorrect responses. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave 91.66% correct responses and 8.33% incorrect responses. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi. gave 75% correct responses and 25% incorrect responses. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave 16.66% correct responses, 75% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Similarly, the students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 75% correct responses and 25% incorrect responses. Thus, the students' proficiency of Panchakanya Ma. Vi., Nandi Ma. Vi., Arunodaya Higher Secondary School, Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi., Harisiddhi Ma. Vi., Yashodhara Ma. Vi. in item no. 3 was satisfactory and students' proficiency of Sitaram Higher Secondary School, Navayug Ma. Vi. and Patan Ma. Vi. was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.15 Comparisons Comparison of schools in Item No :- 4

Table No--15

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	2	16.66	8	66.66	2	16.66	12
S.R.H.S.S	3	25	9	75	0	0	12
N. Ma.Vi.	2	16.66	9	75	1	8.33	12
A.H.S.S.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	0	0	10	83.33	2	16.66	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	7	58.33	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	5	41.66	7	58.33	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	5	41.66	7	58.33	0	0	12
P.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	6	50	2	16.66	12
N.M.MaVi.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12

The above table shows that the students' proficiency in item no. 4. The students of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. could answer 16.66% correctly, 66.66% incorrectly and they remained silent in 16.66% questions. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave only 25% correct responses and 75% incorrect responses. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. gave 16.66% correct responses, 75% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Arunodaya higher Secondary School gave 58.33% correct and 41.66% incorrect responses. Similarly, the students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 83.33% incorrect responses and 8.3% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave 33.33% correct responses, 58.33% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave 41.66% correct responses and 58.33% incorrect responses. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi. answered 41.66% questions correctly and 58.33% questions incorrectly. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave 33.33% correct responses, 50% incorrect responses and 16.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses and 50% incorrect responses. Thus, students' proficiency of



Arunodaya Higher Secondary School and Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. was satisfactory and rest of other schools was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.16 ~~emparision~~ Comparison of schools in Item ~~No~~-No - 5

Table No- 16

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	1	8.33	6	50	5	41.66	12
S.R.H.S.S	5	41.66	5	41.66	2	16.66	12
N. Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	12
A.H.S.S.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	1	8.33	7	58.33	4	33.33	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	12
P.Ma.Vi.	3	25	6	50	3	25	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12

The above table shows that students of Panchakanya Ma.Vi. gave 8.33% correct responses, 50% incorrect responses and 41% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave 41.66% correct responses, 41.66% incorrect responses and 16.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. answered 58.33% correctly, 33.33% incorrectly and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave 50% correct and 50% incorrect responses. Similarly, the students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave only 8.33% correct responses, 58.33% incorrect responses and 33.33% questions were pout of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. answered 58.33% questions correctly and 41.66% questions incorrectly. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave 66.66% correct responses and 33.33% incorrect responses. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi. gave 58.33% correct responses, 33.33% incorrect

responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave 25% correct responses, 50% incorrect responses and 25% questions were out of answer. In the same way, the students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. answered 50% questions correctly, 41.66% questions incorrectly and they couldn't answer 8.33% questions. Thus, the students' proficiency Nandi Ma.Vi., Mahendra Adarsha Ma.Vi., Harisiddhi Ma.Vi., yashodhara Ma.Vi. and Namuna Machhindra Ma.Vi. was satisfactory. They gave more than 50% correct responses and rest of other schools was not satisfactory. Their proficiency was less than 50%.

### 3.1.17 Comparison of schools in Item No - 6

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Table No- 17

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
S.R.H.S.S	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
N. Ma.Vi.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
A.H.S.S.	5	41.66	7	58.33	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	9	75	3	25	0	0	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	9	75	3	25	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12
P.Ma.Vi.	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12

The above table shows that students' proficiency of all schools in item no. 6. The students of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses, 41.66% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave 50% correct responses and 50%

incorrect responses. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses and 50% incorrect responses. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave 41.66% correct responses and 58.33% incorrect responses. The students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 75% correct responses and 25% incorrect responses. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. answered 75% questions correctly and 25% questions incorrectly. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses, 41.66% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Yashodhara Ma.Vi. gave 50% correct responses and 50% incorrect responses. The students of Patan Ma.Vi. gave 50% correct responses, 41.66% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Similarly, the students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi, answered 50% questions correctly and 50% incorrectly. Thus, students' proficiency of all schools except Arunodaya Higher Secondary School was satisfactory.

**3.1.183.1.18 Comparison of schools in Item No. No - 7**

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**Table No- 18**

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	0	0	8	66.66	4	33.33	12

S.R.H.S.S	0	0	11	93.66	1	8.33	12
N. Ma.Vi.	2	16.66	4	33.33	6	50	12
A.H.S.S.	0	0	12	100	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	0	0	9	75	3	25	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	0	0	12	100	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	3	25	9	75	0	0	12
P.Ma.Vi.	0	0	9	75	3	25	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	12

The above table shows that students' proficiency of all sample schools in item no. 7. The students of Panchakanya Ma.Vi. gave 66.66% responses incorrectly and 33.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave 91.66% correct responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. could answer 16.66% questions correctly and 33.33% questions incorrectly and they remained silent in 50% questions. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave all 100% incorrect responses. The students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 75% incorrect responses and 25% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave all 100% incorrect responses. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. answered 66.66% questions correctly and 33.33% questions incorrectly. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi. gave 25% correct responses and 75% incorrect responses. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. answered 75% questions correctly and 25% questions were out of answer. The students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 33.33% correct responses and 66.66% incorrect responses. Thus students' proficiency of all school;s except Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. was not satisfactory. Their proficiency was below 50%.

### 3.1.19 ~~Comparision~~Comparison of schools in Item ~~No~~No - 8

Table No- 19

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	5	41.66	3	25	4	33.33	12

S.R.H.S.S	5	41.66	6	50	1	8.33	12
N. Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	3	25	1	8.33	12
A.H.S.S.	3	25	9	75	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	5	41.66	3	25	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	11	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	8	91.66	1	8.33	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	3	25	1	8.33	12
P.Ma.Vi.	2	16.66	7	58.33	3	25	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	6	50	5	41.66	1	8.33	12

The above table shows that the students' proficiency of all sample schools in item no. 8. The students of Panchakannya Ma. Vi. gave 41.66% correct responses, 25% incorrect responses and 33.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School could answer 41.66% questions correctly and 50% incorrectly. They remained silent in 8.33% questions. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. gave 66.66% correct responses, 25% incorrect responses and they remained silent in 8.33% questions. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave 25% correct responses and 75% incorrect responses. The students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 33.33% correct responses, 41.66% incorrect responses and 25% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. could answer 91.66% questions correctly and 8.33% incorrectly. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. also gave 91.66% correct responses and 8.33% incorrect responses. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi. gave 66.66% correct responses, 25% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave only 16.66% correct responses, 58.33% incorrect responses and 25% questions were out of answer. The students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. could answer 50% questions correctly and 50% incorrectly. Thus, students proficiency of Nandi Ma. Vi., Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi., Harisiddhi Ma. Vi., Yashodhara Ma.

Vi. and Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. was satisfactory and other schools was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.20 ~~omparisien~~ Comparison of schools in Item No.No - 9

Table No- 20

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	0	0	5	41.66	7	58.33	12
S.R.H.S.S	0	0	12	100	0	0	12
N. Ma.Vi.	1	8.33	6	50	5	41.66	12
A.H.S.S.	0	0	12	100	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	0	0	7	58.33	5	41.66	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	7	58.33	1	8.33	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	1	8.33	11	91.66	0	0	12
P.Ma.Vi.	1	8.33	8	66.66	3	25	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	3	25	9	75	0	0	12

~~3.1.21~~ The above table shows that students' proficiency of all schools in Item No.No- 9. The students of Panchakannya Ma. Vi. gave 41.66% incorrect responses and 58.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School answered all 100% questions incorrectly. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. gave only 8.33% correct responses, 50% incorrect responses and 41.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School answered all 100% questions incorrectly. The students of Navayug Ma.Vi. gave 58.33% incorrect responses and 41.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave only 33.33% correct responses, 58.33% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. could answer 33.33% questions correctly and 66.66% questions incorrectly. The students of Yashodhara Ma. Vi. gave only 8.33% responses correctly and 91.66% responses incorrectly. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave only 8.33% correct responses, 66.66% incorrect responses and 25% questions were out of answer.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 25% correct responses and 75% incorrect responses. thus, students' proficiency of all schools in item no. 9 was no satisfactory. They couldn't answer 50% questions correctly.

### 3.1.21 Comparison of schools in Item **No.No - 10**

**Table No- 21**

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	0	0	7	58.33	5	41.66	12
S.R.H.S.S	3	25	8	66.66	1	8.33	12
N. Ma.VI.	1	8.33	10	83.33	1	8.33	12
A.H.S.S.	2	16.66	10	83.33	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	1	8.33	7	58.33	4	33.33	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	1	8.33	11	91.66	0	0	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	6	66.66	2	16.66	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	4	33.33	8	66.66	0	0	12
P.Ma.Vi.	2	16.66	7	58.33	3	25	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	6	50	6	50	0	0	12

**3.1.22** The above table shows the students' proficiency of all sample schools in item no.10. The students of Panchakannya Ma. Vi. gave 58.33% incorrect responses and 41.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave only 25% correct responses, 66.66% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. could give only 8.33% responses correctly 83.33% responses incorrectly and they remained silent in 8.33% questions. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave only 16.66% correct responses and 83.33% incorrect responses. The students of Navayug Ma. Vi. gave 8.33% correct responses, 58.33% incorrect responses and 33.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. answered only 8.33% questions correctly and 91.66% questions incorrectly. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave 33.33% correct responses, 66.66% incorrect responses and 16.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave only 16.66% correct

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

responses, 58.33% incorrect responses and 25% questions were not answered. The students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses and 50% incorrect responses. Thus, students' proficiency of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. in item no. 10 was satisfactory and rest of other schools was not satisfactory.

### 3.1.22 Comparison of schools in Item **No.No - 11**

**Table No- 22**

Name of the school	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
P.K. Ma.Vi	6	50	3	25	3	25	12
S.R.H.S.S	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12
N. Ma.Vi.	9	75	3	25	0	0	12
A.H.S.S.	10	83.33	2	16.66	0	0	12
N.Y.Ma.Vi.	3	25	4	33.33	5	41.66	12
M.A.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	4	33.33	1	8.33	12
H.S.Ma.Vi.	7	58.33	5	41.66	0	0	12
Y.D.Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12
P.Ma.Vi.	5	41.66	6	50	1	8.33	12
N.M.Ma.Vi.	8	66.66	4	33.33	0	0	12

The above table shows that students' proficiency of all schools in item no. 11. The students of Panchakanya Ma. Vi. gave 50% correct responses, 25% incorrect responses and 25% questions were out of answer. The students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave 58.33% correct responses and 41.66% incorrect responses. The students of Nandi Ma. Vi. gave 75% perfectly correct responses and 25% incorrect responses. The students of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School gave 83.33% correct responses and 16.66% incorrect responses. The students of Navayug Ma. Vi. could give only 25% correct



responses. They gave 33.33% incorrect responses and 41.66% questions were out of answer. The students of Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. gave 58.33% correct responses, 33.33% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. The students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave 58.33% correct responses and 41.66% incorrect responses. The students of yashodhara Ma. Vi. could give 66.66% correct responses and 33.33% incorrect responses. The students of Patan Ma. Vi. gave 41.66% correct responses, 50% incorrect responses and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Similarly, the students of Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. gave 66.66% correct responses and 33.33% incorrect responses. Thus, the students' proficiency of all schools except Navayug Ma. Vi. and Patan Ma. Vi. was satisfactory.

### 3.1.23 Comparison of Schools in a Nutshell

**Table No - 23**

Name of the School	P.K. Ma.vi			S.R.H.S.S			N.Ma.vi			A.H.S.S			N.Y.Ma.vi		
	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R
Item No. 1	50	50	0	91.6	8.3	0	50	33.3	16.6	83.3	16.6	0	58.3	41.6	0
Item No. 2	8.33	41.66	50	8.3	91.6	0	0	91.6	8.3	33.3	66.6	0	0	83.3	16.6
Item No.3	66.6	16.6	16.6	0	100	0	66.6	33.3	0	75	25	0	41.6	16.6	41.6
Item No.4	16.66	66.66	16.6	25	75	0	16.6	75	8.3	50	50	0	0	83.3	16.6
Item No.5	8.33	50	41.6	41.6	41.6	16.6	58.3	33.3	8.3	50	50	0	8.3	58.3	33.3
Item No. 6	50	41.66	8.33	50	50	0	50	50	0	41.6	58.3	0	75	25	0
Item No. 7	0	66.66	33.3	0	91.6	8.3	16.6	33.3	50	0	100	0	0	75	25
Item No. 8	41.6	25	33.3	41.6	50	8.3	66.6	25	8.3	25	75	0	33.3	41.6	25
Item No. 9	0	41.66	58.3	0	100	0	8.3	50	41.60	0	100	0	0	58.3	41.6
Item No. 10	0	58.3	41.6	25	66.6	8.3	83.3	83.3	8.3	16.6	83.3	0	8.3	58.3	33.3
Item No.11	50	25	25	58.3	41.6	0	75	25	0	83.3	16.6	0	25	33.3	41.6

Name of the School	M.A.Ma.vi			H.S. Ma.Vi.			Y.D. Ma.vi			P. Ma.vi			N.M. Mavi		
	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R	C.R.	I.R	N.R
Item No. 1	75	25	0	83.3	16.6	09	83.3	16.6	0	83.3	16.6	0	83.3	16.6	0
Item No. 2	58.3	41.6	0	58.3	41.6	0	66.6	25	8.3	0	100	0	25	75	0
Item No.3	50	50	0	91.6	8.3	0	75	25	0	16.6	75	8.3	75	25	0

Item No.4	33.3	58.3	8.3	41.6	58.3	0	41.6	58.3	0	33.3	50	16.6	50	50	0
Item No.5	58.3	41.6	0	66.6	33.3	0	58.3	33.3	8.3	25	50	25	50	41.6	8.3
Item No. 6	75	25	0	50	41.6	8.3	50	50	0	50	41.6	8.3	50	50	0
Item No. 7	0	100	0	66.6	33.3	0	25	75	0	0	75	25	33.3	66.6	0
Item No. 8	91.6	8.3	0	66.6	33.3	0	66.6	25	8.3	16.6	58.3	25	50	41.6	8.3
Item No. 9	33.3	58.3	8.3	33.3	66.6	0	8.3	91.6	0	8.3	66.6	25	25	75	0
Item No. 10	8.3	91.6	0	33.3	50	16.6	33.3	66.6	0	16.6	58.3	25	50	50	0
Item No.11	58.3	33.3	8.3	58.3	41.6	0	66	33.3	0	41.6	50	8.3	66.6	33.3	0

The above table shows the overall proficiency of communicative functions by the students of sample schools. The students' proficiency of Panchankanya Ma.vi in item No 1, 3,6 and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 2 , 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The students' proficiency of Sitram Higher Secondary school in item No. 1, 6, and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 2,3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The students' proficiency of Nandi Ma.vi in item No, 1, 3, 5, 6 and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The students proficiency of Arunodaya Higher Secondary School in item No. 1, 3, 4, 5, and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The student's proficiency of Nawayug Ma.Vi. in item No. 1 and 6 was satisfactory and in other items was not satisfactory. The student's proficiency of Mahendra Adrash Ma.Vi in item No. 1,2,3,5,6,8 and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 4, 7, 9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The student's proficiency of Harisiddhi Ma.Vi in item No. 1,2,3,5,6,7, 8 and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 4,9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The students' proficiency of Yashodhara Ma.vi in item No. 1,2,3,5,6, 8 and 11 was satisfactory and in item No. 4,7 9 and 10 was unsatisfactory. The students' proficiency of Patan Ma.Vi in item No. 1 and 6 was satisfactory and in rest o the items was not satisfactory. Similarly the student's proficiency of Namuna Machhindra Ma.V. in item No, 1,3, 4, 5 6, 8, 10 and 11 was satisfactory and in item no. 2,7 and 9 was not satisfactory.

### 3.2 Functionwise Function wise Analysis of Proficiency

The ~~research~~research designed 22 questions from eleven language functions from grade nine English textbooks. All the questions were asked orally to six students consisting of 50% boys and 50% girls from each sample school. In this research he tried to find out students' weakness and strengths in the structures and functions. In these following subheadings they are described.

### 3.2.1 Students' proficiency in 'Making plans and Expressing Intentions'.

Table No- 24

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No.No-</del> 1	89	74.16	29	24.16	2	1.66	120

The above table shows that 120 questions were asked to sixty students. Out of 120 questions asked, 74.16% responses were correct, 24.16% responses were incorrect and 1.66% questions were not answered thus students' proficiency in Item ~~No.No-~~ 1 was satisfactory.

### 3.2.2 Students' proficiency in 'Suggesting and Advising'.

Table No- 25

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No.No-</del> 2	31	25.83	79	65.83	10	8.33	120

The above table shows that students answered only 25.83% questions correctly, 65.83% questions were wrongly answered and 8.33% questions were not answered. Thus, students' proficiency in Item ~~No.No-~~ 2 was not satisfactory.

### 3.2.3 Students' proficiency in 'Making Request'.

Table No- 26

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <u>No.No- 3</u>	67	55.83	45	37.5	8	6.66	120

The above table shows that students gave 55.83% correct answer 37.5% answers were incorrect and 6.66% questions were not answered. Thus students' proficiency in Item No.No- 3 was not very good but satisfactory.

### 3.2.4 Students' proficiency in 'Expressing Condolence and Sympathy'.

Table No- 27

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <u>No.No- 4</u>	39	32.5	75	62.5	6	5.0	120

The above table shows that students gave 32.5% correct responses, 62.5% incorrect responses and 5% questions were not answered. Thus students' proficiency in Item No.No- 4 was not found satisfactory.

### 3.2.5 Students' proficiency in 'Apologizing and responding to an apology'.

Table No.No- 28

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <u>No.No- 5</u>	51	42.5	52	43.3	17	14.16	120

The above table shows that In Item No.No- 5, students gave 42% correct responses and 43.3% incorrect responses. They couldn't answer 14.16% questions. Thus, student's proficiency in Item No.No- 5 was not satisfactory.

### 3.2.6 Students' proficiency in 'Asking for Permission'.

Table No- 29

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No.No-</del> 6	65	54.16	51	42.5	4	3.33	120

The above table shows that students answered 54.16% questions correct, 42.5% questions were wrongly answered. 3.33% questions were not answered. Thus, students' proficiency in Item ~~No.No-~~ 6, was satisfactory but not very good.

### 3.2.7 Students' proficiency in 'Making Offers'.

Table No- 30

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No.No-</del> 7	17	14.16	86	71.66	17	14.16	120

The above table shows that students could give 14.16% correct answer and 71.66% incorrect answer. 14.16% questions were not answered. Thus, students' proficiency in Item ~~No.No-~~ 7 was not satisfactory. Their performance was very low.

### 3.2.8 Students' proficiency in 'Accepting and Rejecting Offers'.

Table No- 31

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No.No-</del> 8	60	50	46	38.33	14	11.66	120

The above table shows that students gave 50% correct responses and 38.33% incorrect responses. They remained silent in 11.66% questions. Thus, students' proficiency in Item ~~No-No-~~ 8, was satisfactory but not very good.

### 3.2.9 Students' proficiency in 'giving advice and warning'

**Table No- 32**

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No-No-</del> 9	14	11.66	87	72.5	19	15.83	120

The above table shows that students gave 11.66% correct responses and 72.5% incorrect responses. 15.83% questions were out of answer. Thus, students' proficiency in Item ~~No-No-~~ 9 was very poor.

### 3.2.10 Students' proficiency in 'Persuading Someone to do Something'

**Table No- 33**

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No-No-</del> 10	24	20	81	67.5	15	12.5	120

The above table shows that students gave 20% correct responses and 67.5% incorrect answer. They didn't answer 12.5% questions. Thus students' proficiency in Item ~~No-No-~~ 10 was not satisfactory.

### 3.2.11 Students' proficiency in 'Expressing Ability to do something'

**Table No- 34**

Item	Correct response	%	Incorrect responses	%	No responses	%	Total
Item <del>No-No-</del> 11	70	58.33	40	33.33	10	8.33	120

The above table shows that students gave 58.33% correct responses and 33.33% incorrect responses. 8.33% questions were not answered. Thus students' proficiency in Item ~~No-No-~~ 11 was satisfactory.

### 3.2.12 Functionwise analysis of Errors in a Nutshell in descending order

**Table No-35**

Item No	Language Function	C.R %	I.R%	NR%	Total
1.	Making plans and Expressing Intention	74.16	24.16	1.66	100
2.	Suggesting and Advising	25.83	65.83	8.33	100
3.	Making Request	55.83	37.5	6.66	100
4	Expressing condolence and sympathy	32.5	62.5	5.0	100
5.	Apologizing and Responding to an apology	42.5	43.3	14.16	100
6.	Asking for permission	54.16	42.56	3.33	100
7.	Making Offers	14.16	71.66	14.16	100
8.	Accepting and Rejecting offers	50	38.33	11.66	100
9.	Giving advice and Warning	11.66	72.5	15.38	100
10.	Persuading someone to do something	20	67.5	12.5	100
11.	Expressing ability to do something	58.33	33.33	8.33	100

The above table shows the students' proficiency in the language, functions in descending order. Students' proficiency in item No.1 Making plans and expressing intrusions was satisfactory 74.16% responses were correct, 24.16% responses were incorrect and 1.66% responses were not answered student's proficiency in item No 11. Expressing ability to do something was also found satisfactory. 58.33% responses were correct, 33.33% responses were incorrect and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Students proficiency in item No. 3 "making request was satisfactory. In item No.3 students gave 55.83% correct response, 37.5% incorrect response and they remain silent in 6.66% questions. Students' proficiency in term NO. 6 Asking for permission was also seen satisfactory. They gave 54.16% correct response, 42.56% in correct response and 3.33% questions were not answered. Students' proficiency in item No. 8 'Accepting and rejecting offers' was found satisfactory. 50% responses were correct, 38.33% responses were incorrect and 11.66% questions were out answer. Students' proficiency in item No-5 "Apologizing and responding to an Apology" was not found satisfactory students gave only 42.5% correct responses, 43.5% incorrect responses and 14.16% questions were unanswered. Students' proficiency in item No. 4 Expressing condolence and sympathy' was also not satisfactory. Students gave only 32.5% correct response, 62.5% in correct response and 5% questions were not answered. Students' proficiency ion item No. 2' suggesting and advising' was 25.83% questions correctly, 65.83% in correctly and 8.33% questions were out of answer. Students' proficiency ion item No. 10 'persuading someone to do something' was not seen satisfactory. Only 20% responses were correct 67.5% responses were incorrect and 12.5% questions were out of answer. Students' proficiency in item No. 7 ' Making offers' was found pitiable. Only 14.16% responses were correct 71.66% responses were incorrect and 14.16% questions were not answered. Similarly, in item No. 9 'living advice and warning' was also pitiable. Only 11.66% responses were correct, 72.5% responses were incorrect and 15.35% questions were not answered.



### 3.3 Item wise Analysis of Errors.

The researcher had selected six students from each sample school consisting equal no of boys and girls. He had prepared twenty-two questions selected from eleven language functions i.e. two questions from each function.

All the questions were asked orally and responses were recorded in an **audio cassetteaudiocassette**. The responses were analysed structurally, and functionally. In the following sub-heading some of the errors committed by the students in each Item are analysed.

#### 3.3.1 Analysis of Errors in Item **No.No- 1**

In Item **No.No- 1** some of the no table errors, the researcher has found are as follows:

##### 1) Inappropriate structure

- ◆ During my holidays, I'd like to visit my community.
- ☐ During my holidays, I will visit my community.
- ◆ I've plan to go my house.
- ☐ I plan to go my house.
- ◆ I can go to my relative house.
- ☐ I go to my relative's house.

##### 2) Wrong use of article:

- ◆ I watch the T.V.
- ☐ I watch T.V.

##### 3) Overgeneralization of function

- ◆ On saturday, I want to read something which is related to our ordinary study.

On Saturday, I will read books.

**4) Deletion of complement and subject**

- ◆ I will go.
- I will go home.
- ◆ Going to market.
- I am going to market.
- ◆ Going to Mamaghar.
- I am going to mamaghar.

**5) Preposition deletion**

- ◆ I will go my Mamaghar.
- I will go to my mamaghar.
- ◆ I plan to go Dakshinkali.
- I plan to go to Dakshinkali.

**6) Auxiliary verb addition**

- ◆ ~~—◆~~ I was visit my friend's house
- I will visit my friend's house.

**7) Adverb Addition.**

- ◆ ~~◆—~~ I probably go to my aunt's house.
- I go to my aunt's house.

**3.3.2 Analysis of Errors in Item ~~No-No-~~ 2**

The following errors were noted in Item ~~No-No-~~ 2

**1) Overgeneralization of function**

- ◆ If he has little money, I'll suggest him to buy cheapest thing.

- What about buying a cheap thing.
- ◆ You give a cheap present.
- If I were you, I would give a cheap present.
- ◆ You join to the extra tuition class.
- You had better join extra tuition class.

**2) Had deletion**

- ◆ You better take a tuition class.
- You had better take a tuition class.

**3) Will Addition instead of had**

- ◆ You will better ask the money.
- You had better ask money.
- ◆ You will better not to lose your hope.
- You had better not lose your hope.

**4) Essay type Answer**

- ◆ I'll suggest him to buy gift which is very cheap.
- What about buying a cheap gift.
  
- ◆ Please don't afraid with your exam. Don't be nervous.
- If I were you, I wouldn't be nervous.
- ◆ Don't mind you have little money but you have to buy a little prize.
- If I were you, I would buy a little present.

**5) To Addition**

- ◆ You'd better to practice more.
- You had better practice more.
- ◆ You'd better to take tuition.
- You had better take tuition.

**6) Inappropriate structure**

- ◆ If I were you, I'll buy a small present.
- ☐ If I were you, I would buy a small present.

**7) Wrong pronoun use**

- ◆ If I were him, I'd buy a cheaper prize.
- ☐ If I were you, I'd buy a cheaper present.

**8) Instruction Instead of suggestion**

- ◆ Buy small gift
- ☐ How about buying a small gift.

**9) Syntactic Error**

- ◆ ~~◆~~ If I were you, I'd give the exam next time.
- ☐ If I were you, I'd appear the exam next time.

**3.3.3 Analysis of Errors in Item ~~No-No- 3~~**

The following errors have been found while analyzing Item ~~No-No- 3~~

**1) Please Insertion**

- ◆ Could you possibly please give me the sugar bowl.
- ☐ Could you possibly give me the sugar bowl?

**2) Inappropriate Structure**

- ◆ Could you mind passing me the sugar bowl ?
- ☐ Would you mind passing me the sugar bowl?
- ◆ Would you like to pass me a sugar bowl ?
- ☐ Will you pass me the sugar bowl?
- ◆ Would you mind open the window ?
- ☐ Would you mind opening the window?
- ◆ Will you mind to give that sugar ?

Would you mind giving me that sugar bowl?

3) ~~Irrelevant~~**Irrelevant** answer

◆ Please put some sugar.

Please pass me the sugar bowl.

4) **Essay Type**

◆ If you don't mind, will you like to pass a bowl of sugar ?

Will you pass me the sugar bowl?

5) **Addition and Deletion**

◆ Could you please to pass----- the sugar?

Could you please pass me the sugar bowl?

◆ Excuse me, please pass -----the sugar bowl.

Excuse me. Please pass me the sugar bowl.

◆ Would you mind to passing me the sugar bowl?

Would you mind passing me the sugar bowl?

6) **Not Request but Request for permission**

◆ Do you mind If I open the window?

Please, open the window.

3.3.4 Analysis of Errors in Item ~~No.~~**No- 4**

While analyzing the responses of students, the following types of errors are found:

1) **In appropriate structure**

◆ I express sympathy by try again until you success.

Better luck next time.

◆ Oh ! ~~that's~~**That's** too sympathy.

- I know how you must feel.
- ◆ After knowing the news, I feel bored.
- I am very sorry to hear that,
- ◆ If you read hardily, you'll pass in next exam.
- I can imagine you feel bad.

**2) Essay Type**

- ◆ Failure is the pillar of success. You shouldn't lose your hope, You've to practice more.
- That's a shame. Better luck next time.
- ◆ Birth and death is the natural thing. So, don't mind about your father's death.
- I am sorry to hear about your father's death.

**3) Instruction instead of Expressing condolence and sympathy.**

- ◆ Don't worry. It's a god gift.
- I am sorry to hear that your father died.
- ◆ Don't be sad. We mustn't lose out hope so go ahead.
- What a pity! Try again.

**4) Request instead of Expressing condolence and sympathy**

- ◆ Please, don't weep; you give to next year exam.
- Better luck next time.

**5) Ability instead of expressing sympathy**

- ◆ You can pass the exam next year.
- I know how you must feel. Try again.

**6) Wrong verb form**

- ◆ I'm really so sad to heard that your father died in motorcycle accident.

I'm really sad to hear that your father died in motorcycle accident.

**7) Wrong use of preposition and incomplete form.**

◆ Sorry about your father.

I am sorry to hear that your father died.

**8) Encouraging instead of expressing sympathy.**

◆ ~~◆~~ It's well.

I am sorry to hear that.

**9) Meaningless answer**

◆ My friend my father is very excited, you can meet him in a hospital.

I know how you feel in this terrible condition.

**3.3.5 Analysis of Errors in Item ~~No-No~~- 5**

While analyzing Item ~~No-No~~- 5, following types of errors have been located.

**1) Auxiliary verb Deletion**

◆ I am sorry. I confused. So, I took your bag.

I am sorry. I am confused. So, I took your bag.

**2) Wrong form function Relation.**

◆ It's my pleasure.

It's all right.

◆ Your bag is here. Take yourself.

I am very sorry.

**3) Syntactic error.**

◆ I'm sorry, mistaken.

I am sorry. By mistake I took your bag.

◆ Please sit your seat and don't touch.

Mention not.

4) **Wrong verb form and incomplete sentence**

- ◆ I'm sorry. I mistake.
- I am sorry. I made a mistake.
- ◆ I'm sorry. I think this bag is mine.
- I'm sorry. I thought this bag is mine.
- ◆ I'm sorry. I've take up your bag.
- I'm sorry for taking your bag.

5) **Inappropriate Response.**

- ◆ It's not my fault.
- It's o.k.
- ◆ I don't know you bumped.
- It really doesn't matter.
- ◆ Don't bump in a bus.
- Never mind.

7)6) **Promise instead of apology**

- ◆ I'm sorry. I'll not do it again.
- I'm sorry. It won't happen again.

8)7) **Responding for apology instead of apologizing.**

- ◆ It's O.K.
- I'm really sorry.

9)8) **Essay type without form function relation.**

- ◆ You can't bump in the bus because it is the passengers helping bus.
- No problem.

3.3.6 **Analysis of Errors in Item No.No- 6**

Item No.No- 6 was analysed carefully. The following errors were found in Item No.No- 6

1) **Request instead of asking for permission.**

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering



- ◆ ~~would~~ Would you mind lending me your book for ~~somedays~~ some ~~days~~?

May I take your book for some days?

- ◆ Please give me your book, will ~~you~~ you?

Can I take your book?

2) ~~2)~~ **Meaningless Response**

- ◆ Could you please borrow me the book for few ~~days~~ days?

May I borrow your book for few days?

3) ~~3)~~ **Order Instead of Asking for permission.**

- ◆ Give me your English book.

May I take your English book?

4) ~~4)~~ **Inappropriate form.**

- ◆ Will you like to lend your book for ~~somedays~~ someday?

Can I use your book for some days?

- ◆ Would you mind to lend me your ~~book~~ book?

May I take your book?

5) ~~5)~~ **Syntactic Error.**

- ◆ Can I lend your ~~book~~ book?

Can I borrow your book?

6) ~~6)~~ **Auxiliary verb addition with inappropriate sentence structure.**

- ◆ May I can have look on your ~~book~~ book?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

May I have look at your book?

### 3.3.7 Analysis of Errors in Item ~~No-~~No- 7

While analyzing students' responses in Item ~~No-~~No- 7, following errors were found.

#### 1) Request instead of offer.

Would you mind if I arrange a room for ~~you-?you?~~

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Shall I arrange a room for you?

You can have a room in my house. It's empty.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

I will manage a room for you if you like.

~~si~~Sir, I bring you a cup of tea.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Shall I bring a cup of tea for you, sir?

Will you like to take a cup of tea?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Would you like me to get a cup of tea?

#### 2) Offering Oneself.

Would you please offer the ~~tea-?tea?~~

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Would you like a cup of tea?

#### 3) Order instead of Offer.

Take tea.

Would you like to have a cup of tea?

#### 4) Question instead of offering

What do you prefer tea or ~~coffee-?coffee?~~

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Shall I offer you a cup of tea?

#### 5) Welcoming instead of offer.

◆ → ◆ You've my guest. You're welcome to my room for ~~somedays~~some days.

I will offer you a room if you like.

#### 6) Suggestion instead of offer

◆ What about staying in my ~~room~~room?

Would you like to stay in my room?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

#### 7) Request for permission

◆ Would it be ~~allright~~all right if I arrange a room for ~~you~~you?

Would you like me to arrange a room for you?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

#### 8) ~~Ambiguous~~Ambiguous answer

◆ Shall I make you a cup of tea, ~~sir~~sir?

Shall I prepare a cup of tea for you, sir?

◆ Sir, May I get you a ~~coffee~~coffee?

Would you like me to get a cup of tea, sir?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

#### 9) Inappropriate Structure

◆ Namaste, you may live happily.

I shall provide you a room if you like.

◆ You can stay in my room.

Would you like me to arrange a room for you?

◆ Can you drink ~~tea~~tea?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

I will prepare a cup of tea for you if you like.

**9)10) Description instead of offer**

i) \_\_\_\_\_ My house is small but here are many rooms. When you live, you'll be very happy.

Would you like me to manage a room for you?

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**3.3.8 Analysis of Errors in Item ~~No-No- 8~~**

Students' responses of Item ~~No-No- 8~~ were analysed carefully. The following errors were found.

**1) ~~irrelevant~~ Irrelevant addition and preposition deletion**

♦ ~~it's~~ It's my pleasure that you asked me but I'm ~~very sorry~~ very sorry

I don't like to join any club.

Sorry. I don't appreciate your idea.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**2) Wrong tense use**

♦ Sorry. I didn't appreciate your idea.

Sorry. I don't appreciate your idea.

♦ No thank you. I didn't like to join the club because I'm very busy in my extra class.

No thank you. I don't like to join any club because I'm very busy in my extra class.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**3) Accepting instead of rejecting offer.**

♦ O.K. I join.

Oh! I'm afraid. I have already been the member of another club.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

4) **Rejecting instead of accepting offer.**

Sorry, I'm not able to take a cup of tea.

Thank you.

No thank you. I've already taken.

I really like to have the tea.

No thanks

Thanks.

I'm sorry. I'm not hungry.

Thank you. I really appreciate your offer.

5) **Wrong use of Auxiliary verb**

I'm sorry. I'm not ~~join~~joining the club.

I'm sorry. I don't like to join the club.

6) **Irreverent Answer.**

Why ~~don't~~?don't?

I'm afraid. I can't join the club.

You ~~shouldn't join~~shouldn't join the club.

Sorry. I am going to Pokhara for five months.

I'll drink

Thank you very much for the tea.

7) **Article Deletion**

Thank you very ~~much for~~much teafor tea.

Thank you very much for the tea.

3.3.9 Analysis of Errors in Item No-9

~~Students Errors~~Students Errors in Item No-9 were analysed structurally and functionally. The following types of errors were found while analyzing responses in Item No-9.

1) **Irrelevant Expression.**

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- ♦ Show the temple about temple.
- You should take a map with you.
- ♦ ~~talk~~ talk about temple.
- Why don't take help from somebody.
- ♦ First of all you teach swimming then you can go.
- First of all you should learn to swim much.

2) **Request instead of warning.**

- ♦ Please, swim carefully.
- You ought to swim carefully.
- ♦ Would you learn to ~~swim~~ swim?
- You should learn to swim from an expert.

3) **Order instead of warning with syntactic error.**

- ♦ Don't take photo without ~~permission~~ permission.
- You are not allowed to take photos of that temple.
- ♦ Don't allow take photo.
- Taking photos is forbidden in that temple.
- ♦ You ought to wear waterproof jacket.
- You ought to wear a life jacket.

4) **Inappropriate language form.**

- ♦ ~~will~~ Will you ~~mind~~ to mind ~~go to go~~ with ~~me~~ me?
- You're forbidden to go to temple with leather shoes.

5) **Suggestion instead of warning with to addition.**

- ♦ You had better to learn swimming from expert.
- You ought to learn to swim from an expert.
- ♦ You had better to take a map with you.
- You ought to take a map with you.

6) **Possibility instead of giving advice and warning.**

- ♦ You may go to ~~the swimming~~ the swimming class.
- First of all you should join the swimming class.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

7) **Suggestion instead of warning with syntactic error.**

- ♦ If I were you, I'd wear waterproof jacket.
- You ought to consult with somebody.

8) **Description instead of warning.**

- ♦ This temple is very nice.
- You ought to visit this temple. It is very nice.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

### 3.3.10 Analysis of Errors in Item No- 10

1) **Order instead of persuading with wrong use of preposition.**

- ♦ Concentrate in your business.
- If I were you, I would quit it otherwise you will go bankrupt.

2) **Suggestion instead of persuading with incorrect form.**

- ♦ If I were you, I will leave that business.
- If I were you, I would leave that business because you are getting loss.

3) **Request instead of persuading.**

- ♦ Please leave that business and start another.
- Wouldn't it be better, if you left that business and start a new one because it is not profitable?

- ♦ Could you possibly stop smoking?
- If I were you, I'd stop smoking because it is injurious to health.

- ♦ Please avoid that bad habit.
- If I were you, I'd give up smoking otherwise you won't live long.

4) **Order with Syntactic error.**

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- ♦ Don't smoke, you'll be cancer.
- If I were you, I'd stop smoking because it causes cancer.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**5) Sympathy instead of persuading with incorrect word class.**

- ♦ Don't worry. If you are not success, you can short another.
- Wouldn't it be better, if you started another business because it isn't advantageous?
- ♦ There are so many jobs, so you can do anything.
- If I were you, I'd leave the business and have a job because having job is better.

**6) Advice instead of persuading**

- ♦ You should leave this business.
- Leave this business and start a new one.
- ♦ How about starting new business (suggestion)
- Start new business otherwise you will suffer from a heavy loss.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**7) Meaningless Answer.**

- ♦ You don't smoking cancer.
- Stop smoking otherwise you will suffer from cancer.
- ♦ don't stop your smoking.
- Wouldn't it be better if you left smoking or you won't live long.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**3.3.11 Analysis of ~~Errors in~~ Errors in Item No-11**

Following errors were found anglicizing Item No-11

**1) Irrelevant answer.**

- ♦ I'm sorry. I don't know how to swim.
- I'm sorry. I can't swim.
- ♦ I no swimming properly.
- I can't swim properly.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

**2) Irreverent answer with be addition.**



- I will be go with my friend.
- Sorry. I can't swim.

**3) Incomplete answer.**

- Play badminton.
- I can play badminton.
- Singing and swimming.
- I can perform singing and swimming.

**4) Rejecting instead of Inability.**

- I' am afraid of this.
- I can't go with you.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

### Types of Errors in a Nutshell

**Table No-36**

Item No.	Language Function	Types of Errors
1.	Making plans and Expressing intentions	1) In appropriate structure (2) Wrong use of article (3) Overgeneralization of function (4) Deletion of complement and subject (5) Preposition deletion (6) Auxiliary verb addition (7) Adverb addition
2.	Suggesting and Advising	1) Overgeneralization of function (2) Had deletion (3) Will addition instead of had (4) Essay type answer (5) To addition (6) In appropriate structure (7) Wrong pronoun use (8) Instruction instead of suggestion (9) Syntactic error
3.	Making Request	1) Please insertion (2) In appropriate structure (3) Irrelevant answer (4) Essay type (5) Addition and deletion (6) Not request but request for permission.
4.	Expression of condolence and sympathy	1) Inappropriate structure (2) Essay type (3) Instruction instead of expressing condolence and sympathy (4) Request instead of expressing condolence and sympathy (5) Ability instead of expressing sympathy (6) wrong verb form (7) Wrong use of preposition and incomplete form

		(8) Encouraging instead of expressing sympathy (9) Meaningless answer
5.	Apologizing and Responding to an Apology	1) Auxiliary verb deletion (2) wrong form function relation (3) syntactic error (4) Wrong verb form and incomplete sentence. (5) Inappropriate response (6) Promise instead of apology (7) Responding for apology instead of apologizing (9) Essay type without form function relation.
6.	Asking for permission	(1) Request instead of asking for permission (2) Meaningless response (3) Order instead of asking for permission (4) Inappropriate form (5) Syntactic error (6) Auxiliary verb addition with in appropriate sentence structure.
7.	Making Offers	1) Request instead of offer (2) offering oneself (3) order instead of offer (4) Question instead of offering (5) Welcoming instead of offer (6) Suggestion instead of offer (7) Request for permission (8) Ambiguous Answer (9) Inappropriate structure (10) Description instead of offer
8.	Accepting and Rejection Offers	1) Irrelevant addition and preposition deletion (2) Wrong tense use (3) Accepting instead of rejecting offer (4) Rejecting instead of accepting offer (5) Wrong use of auxiliary verb (6) Irrelevant answer (7) Article deletion.
9.	Giving Advice and warning	1) Irrelevant expression (2) Request instead of warning (3) Order instead of warning with syntactic error (4) Inappropriate language form (5) Suggestion instead of warning with to addition (6) Possibility instead of giving advice and warning (7) Suggestion instead of warning with syntactic error (8) Description instead of warning.

10.	Persuading someone to do something	Order instead of persuading with wrong use of preposition (2) suggestion instead of persuading with incorrect form (3) Request instead of persuading (4) Order with syntactic error (5) sympathy instead of persuading with incorrect word class (6) Advice instead of persuading (7) Meaningless answer.
11.	Expressing Ability to do something	1) Irrelevant answer (2) Irrelevant answer with be addition (3) Incomplete answer (4) Rejecting instead of ability.

## CHAPTER - FOUR

### FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

#### 4.1 Findings

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation of the collected data, the following findings have been listed.

- i) All the aimed population of the students took part in oral interview though some of the questions were not answered i.e. students directly said 'I don't know'.
- ii) In Item No-1 i.e. 'making plans and intentions'. Students of Sitaram higher secondary School were found very good. They gave 91.66% correct responses and students of Nandi Ma.vi. were found weak though their performance was satisfactory. They gave 50% correct responses.
- iii) In Item No- 2 ' Suggesting and Advising' Students of Yashodhara Ma.Vi. were seen better than other schools. They gave 66.66% correct responses. The students of Nandi Ma.Vi, Nava Yug Ma.vi and Patan Ma.vi. were found weak. They couldn't answer any of the questions correctly.
- iv) In Item No-3 'Making Request' students of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi. gave the highest percentage of correct responses. i.e. 91.66% and the students of Sitaram Higher Secondary School gave 0% correct response.
- v) While analyzing Item No- 4 ' Expressing condolence and sympathy'. The students of Namuna Machhindra Ma.Vi. gave 50% correct responses. Their performance was seen satisfactory but not very good. Students of other schools gave less than 50% correct answer. So, their performance was not satisfactory.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

- ~~vi~~vi. In Item No-5 'Apologizing and Responding to an Apology' students of Hari Siddhi Ma.Vi. were found better than other schools. They gave 66.66% correct responses. The students of Panchakanya Ma.Vi. gave only 8.33% correct responses which was the least one.
- ~~vii~~vii. In Item No-6, 'Asking for permission' students of Navyung Ma.Vi. and Mahdnera Adrasha Ma.vi. were found better than other schools. They gave 75% correct responses. All schools performed satisfactory except Arunodhaya Higher Secondary School. They gave 41.66% correct responses.
- ~~viii~~viii. In Item No-7 'Making offers' students' performance of Harisiddhi Ma. Vi was found satisfactory. Students of other schools could give below 50% correct responses. So, their performance was not satisfactory.
- ~~ix~~ix. In Item No- 8 'Accepting and Rejecting Offers' students' proficiency of Nandi Ma. Vi., Mahendra Adarsha Ma. Vi. and Namuna Machhindra Ma. Vi. was found satisfactory because they could give more than 50% correct responses. Student's proficiency of other schools was not satisfactory.
- ~~x~~x. In item No-9 'Giving Advice and warning' the maximum correct responses was only 33.33%. So, in this Item student's proficiency of all schools was not satisfactory.
- ~~xi~~xi. In Item No-10 'Perusing someone to do something, students of Namuna Machhindra Ma .vi gave 50% correct responses. So their proficiency was only satisfactory. Students, proficiency of other schools was not satisfactory.
- ~~xii~~xii. In Item - No-11 'Expressing Ability to do something' students' proficiency expect Navayug Ma. Vi. and Patan Ma. Vi. was satisfactory.

## 4.2 Recommendations

This research is a comparative study on the proficiency in the use of language functions by grade ten students of Kathmandu and Lalitpur districts. The findings of the study are useful for everyone who is involving in teaching the English language at secondary level. The research shows that students' proficiency in English language functions is not satisfactory. Students are found weak in both structures and functions. Thus, the researchers would like to suggest the following recommendations for the betterment of the existing situation.

- i) ~~The schools~~ The schools should have listening materials 'cassettes and language lab' to help children in understanding native accent.
- ii) ~~Class size~~ Class size should be small to make students involve in practice with out adequate practice language can't be learned.
- iii) ~~The use of mother tongue~~ The use of mother tongue in English language class should be prohibited. The students should be encouraged to communicate English to learn English. It provides them practical knowledge.
- iv) ~~Proficiency in language~~ Proficiency in language can't be evaluated only by the exam so language teaching shouldn't be exam oriented. Equal emphasis should be given in using correct exponents for all language functions.
- v) ~~Each students~~ Each students should be provided chance to involve and practice language functions in the class. For this, teachers should be provided various training to enable them to create situations in the class.
- vi) ~~The students~~ The students should be motivated in language class and encouraged to use target language whether they are correct speaker or not.
- vii) ~~The Students~~ The Students should be given chance to participate in language seminars, meetings workshops etc. where they can taste the variety of English language and its features from the scholars, experts, teachers, linguists etc.
- viii) ~~In exam~~ In exam, some questions from language functions should be included. So that students are ready to use language functions with their correct exponents.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

## Bibliography

- Aarts, Flor and Jan (1986). *English Syntactic Structures*. Oxford. Pergaman Press.
- Austin, J.L. (1962), *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford Clarendon press.
- Awasthi, J.R. and R.A. Giri. (1996), *Evaluation of Errors Committed by Nepali Learners of English*, Journal of NELTA. Vol. 1, no-2, Kathmandu.
- Best John W. and Khan, James V. (2000), *Researcher in Education*. New Delhi; Prentice-hall of India PVT. Ltd.
- Bhattarai, A (2001), *A Brief Survey of School Level English Language Teaching Situation in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Bhattarai G.R. (2001), *A Thematic Analysis of Research Reports*. Kathmandu: Ratna Pustak Bhandar.
- Chapagain, G. 2002 *Request Forms in English and Nepali Language*, an Unpublished Dissertation.
- Chomsky, N. (1986), *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York and London: Praeger.
- Chomsky, N. (1957), *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton : Cemelish, H. Van.
- Chomsky, N. (1965), *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Corder, S.P. (1973), *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Harmondsworth : Penquin.
- Crystal, D. (1985), *A dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, second edition, Basil Black Well.
- Finanocchiaro, M. and C. Brumfit (1983). *The Functional -Notional Approach : From Theory to Practice*. New York : OUP.
- Halliday, M. (1973), *Exploration in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M (1970), *Language Structure and Language Function in J. Lyons (ed.)* New Horizons in Linguistics, Harmonds Worth England; Penguin.

- Jones, Leo (1991), *Functions of English* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kattle, R.C. (2001), *A comparative Study of on Terms of Address used by Nepali and English Speakers*, an Unpublished Dissertation.
- Matreyak W. (1983), *communicating in English : Functions* : Pergamon Press. New York.
- Pahuja, N.P. (1998), *Teaching of English*. New Delhi : Anoml Publication.
- Pandey, G.P. (1997), *A comparative Study of Apologies between English and Nepali*, an Unpublished Dissertation, T.U.
- Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum (1970), *Elicitation and Experiment in English : Linguistics Studies in use and Attitude*, London: Longman.
- Rai et. al. (2000), *A text Book of Grade IX English*, Janak Shikshya Samagri Kendra.
- Richards, J. et.al. (1978), *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*, Essex, London.
- Searle, J. (1970), *Speech Acts*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Secondary School English Curriculum, CDC, (2055).
- Sharma. L.P.(2004), *A study one the proficiency in the communicative functions and their exponents: A comparative Study*: An unpublished Dissertation. T.U.
- Sthapit, S.K. (2003), *Teaching Language for communication*, Journal of NELTA, Vol.8, No. 1-2 . Kathmandu.
- Van Ek, J.A, (1975), *The Threshold Level*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Walter Matreyek, (1983), *Communicating in English*, Pergamon Press.
- Wilkins, D.A.(1972), *Linguistics and Language Teaching* : London : Edward Arnold, London.
- Yalden, J. (1985), *The Communicative Syllabus : Evaluation, Design and Implementation*, Oxford Pergamon.



## Appendix - A

Students are required to listen the questions carefully and answer the questions in their own way.

### 1) Making Plans and expressing Intentions

- i) What will you do during your holidays?
- ii) What do you plan to do on coming Saturday ?

### 2) Suggesting and advising

- i) Your friend is going to buy a birthday present but has very little money. How do you suggest him/her?
- ii) Your younger brother is going to take an exam but is not prepared well. How do you advise him?

### 3) Making Request

- i) There is some sugar in a bowl. You are not able to get it easily. Make a request to your friend to pass the sugar bowl.
- ii) You are sitting in a room and feeling hot. Make a request to a person sitting near the window to open it.

### 4) Expressing Condolence and Sympathy

- (i) Your friend's father has died recently in motorcycle accident. How do you express condolence to your friend ?
- (ii) Your sister failed in the exam. She is still weeping. How do you express sympathy to her?

### 5) Apologizing and Responding to an Apology.

- i) You picked up somebody's bag by mistake; She asked her bag with you. How do you apologize in such situation?
- ii) Somebody bumped you in a bus. She apologies for that. How do you respond to her apology ?

**6) Asking for Permission**

- i) You want to take English book from your friend. How do you ask him to lend you his book?
- ii) Your teacher in teaching in the class. You want to go to the toilet. What do you say to take permission to go out of the class ?

**7) Making Offers**

- i) Your teacher has come to your house. You want to offer him a cup of tea. How do you express your offer ?
- ii) A tourist has come to your village. He wants a room in your house. You want to offer a room for him. Make an expression of offer a room for him.

**8) Accepting and Rejecting Offers**

- i) A stranger offers you a cup of tea. How do you accept his offer ?
- ii) Your friend proposed you to join a club after your SLC. You don't like the idea. How do you reject his/ her offer?

**9) Giving Advice and Warning**

Give advice or warning to these people

- i) Someone learning to swim
- ii) Someone visiting a temple

**10) Persuading someone to do Something**

- i) One of your neighbors is suffering loss from his business. How do you persuade him to leave that business?
- ii) Your friend has the habit of smoking. How do you persuade him to quit smoking?

**11) Expressing ability to do something**

- i) Your elder brother proposed you to do for swim. You don't know how to swim. How do you express your inability to join with him?
- ii) Write any two things that you can do.

\*\*\*