

# **CHAPTER – ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 General Background**

Education means change. It is the third eye of human beings. It is the backbone of development of any country. The type and structure of education provided in any country now determines the country's future. It is believed that modern education in Nepal began with the establishment of the first school in 1853. However, this school was only for the members of the ruling families and their courtiers. Schooling for the general people began only after 1951 when a popular movement ended the autocratic Rana family regime and initiated a democratic system. In the past fifty years, there has been a dramatic expansion of educational facilities in the country. The present day world is the outcome of the education system in the past and the future will be guided by the present education system of the world. In this contemporary world, education systems are geared to teach new skills and competencies to all students. The strategies of schools to meet these challenges are being questioned by politicians, business leaders and academics world wide. Strategies used in teaching process are necessary part of scientific teaching process. Without any plan in the teaching process no teacher can be effective in his delivery. Consequently, classroom teaching strategies have become one of the important themes of the world's education to maintain educational quality to bring change in the educated people.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many English language teaching strategies have been developed. Recent years have seen a good deal of concern for making teaching more scientific. There is now a substantial body of information about the strategies used in teaching. The last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century witnessed

several major initiatives taken in the field of educational reforms. In this context, primary level education system was considered as the pillar of whole education system. Many people can be found showing more serious concern about the sound physical and mental development of their children. Therefore, the focus of this study is on classroom teaching strategies. The study analyzes the classroom activities in terms of the use of curricular materials in the classroom teaching processes and assessment practices in the schools in general and in the English classroom in particular.

### **1.1.1 Primary Education in Nepal**

Although Nepal is a culturally rich and physically beautiful country, it is one of the worlds poorest and the least developed country. While the country's educational system has made a great deal of progress in a very short time, there is still much to be done. Many public schools are in poor physical shape; while others are extremely under-funded, especially in the rural areas. Furthermore, supplementary materials, children's books and computer labs are rare dreams.

Although primary education is free, public schools are often inadequate and overcrowded. Often these schools have no blackboards and furniture. Students usually walk several miles to go to schools. The inability of students to attend school is affected by many factors, including poor weather, overcrowded classrooms and family situations that keep older children at home, to care for younger siblings.

After the 1951 revolution, efforts have been made to establish a national education system plan. Formal schooling in modern time is still constrained by economy and culture. Children are generally needed to work in the field and at home, and educating females was viewed as unnecessary. In 1975, primary education was made free, and the government became responsible for providing school facilities, teachers, and educational materials.

The curriculum in Nepal has been greatly influenced by the United States models and was developed with assistance from the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO]. Despite these efforts to improve education for all, caste differentiation still influences access to education and especially to quality of education. Education remains largely urban-biased, the majority of education institutions are found in urban areas. As a result, 58% of Nepalese are illiterate, including 72% of women.

Not only does the universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) affirm people's right to free education, the Constitution of Nepal (1990) also declares that the state shall make necessary arrangements to safeguard the rights and interest of children and shall ensure that arrangements for free education be made (Art. 26 [8] ). Thus, both national and international areas have unquestionably recognized the state's responsibility for the basic primary education of all children.

The Ministry of Education and Sports (MOE) co-ordinates education activities throughout Nepal. The ministry is responsible for educational planning and management as well as in improving service delivery system across the country. Today, the country continues to work diligently to urge its leaders to do more to provide education for all. As this dedication to education continues to spread throughout the country, it is hoped that quality education for all children will continue to improve.

### **1.1.2 The Status of English Language in Nepal**

Though Nepal is a small country in the world's map, multilingual people reside throughout the nation. Nepali is the dominant language of Nepal. But, in course of time, Nepal established her diplomatic relation with foreign countries. Being a global language, the need of the English language in Nepal is great to earn livelihood.

To quote Awasthi (1979):

The history of the English Language in Nepal, as quoted in the annals of the Malla periods, goes back to seventeenth century when King Pratap Malla ruled over Kathmandu. Though at that time the English language was not popular among the ordinary people, the inscription at Hanuman Dhoka states that King Pratap Malla knew fourteen languages including English (1641-74). After that several changes took place and are recorded in the pages of history during the latter part of the regime of Malla King's (p.1).

Likewise Gopinath (2057) states:

The first Englishman who came in Nepal as Christian missionary called Craybrawl. He had come to Nepal in 1628 A.D.- - - the next catholic missionaries were Pope Grobber, disciples of Dorwill and Kepuchin priests who had come to Nepal in 1661A.D. through Lahsa. They were warmly welcomed by the language loving king Pratap Malla. Grobber had given a binocular to Pratap Malla as a present (p. 3).

Formally, English was introduced in our country along with the English model of education with the start of Durbar High school in 1853 A.D. following the visit of Junga Bahadur to the U.K. The content of the education provided under Durbar school was strongly influenced by external models of schooling and, in particular, the English system of education. Such emphasis further reinforced the disparity in status between the ruling elite and the rest of the population.

Beginning from about three hundred schools and two colleges with about ten thousand students in 1951, there are now thousands of schools and students. After the restoration of democracy in 1951 A.D., the wave of education spread all over the country. But, the government of Nepal decided to introduce English as a compulsory subject from grade one from academic year 2003.

### **1.1.3 Teaching Strategies**

Teaching strategies seem to be ‘tricks’ of the teachers to do teaching efficiently. Oxford (1990) takes us to a definition which breaks the term teaching strategies down to its roots- the word strategy. She informs us that this word comes from the Greek word ‘strategia’ which means generalship or the art of war. Strategy meant the management of the troops, ships, or aircraft in a war situation. She points out a similar word tactics which are tools to achieve the success of strategy. These two words used interchangeably mean planning, competition, conscious manipulation and movement toward a goal. Teaching strategies are plans, steps and conscious actions toward achievement of an objective. They are the specific action taken by the teacher to make teaching easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self- directed, more effective and more transferable to new situations.

In Nepal, though English language teaching (ELT) has a long history that goes back to many decades, it is not as satisfactory as it should be or is expected to be due to several reasons behind it. But, we should know that the trends, methods, techniques, strategies and styles in ELT are changing very rapidly.

Morten (1998) talks about four overall teaching strategies. They are as follows:

- a) Receptive strategy: Receptive strategy relies primarily on listening.
- b) Communicative strategy: It focuses that students learn by attempting to communicate.
- c) Reconstructive strategy: In this strategy student participates in reconstructive activities based on a text.
- d) Eclectic strategy: It combines two or more of the others (as cited in Cook, 1992, p.131).

#### **1.1.4 Types of Teaching Strategy**

To avoid the various associations that the term strategy convey, let us use the more neutral terms 'teaching style and teaching technique. The actual point of contact with the students is the teaching style. A technique, as Clark (1984) puts it, is a 'label for what we do as teachers.' Teachers combine these teaching techniques in various ways within a particular teaching style. The word 'style' partly refers to the element of fashion and changeability in teaching. This chapter relates six teaching styles. They are listed below:

##### **1.1.4.1 The Academic Style**

The academic teaching strategy is characterized by teaching technique of grammatical explanation and translation, and by its reliance on texts. Hence, this style is similar in concept to Marton's reconstructive strategy or Allen et al's analytic activities. The academic style occurs even when the teacher is ostensibly using other styles. A teacher explains how to apologize in the target language; a teacher gives quick grammatical explanation of the present perfect tense: a teacher describes where to put the tongue to make the sound / /- all of these are slipping into an academic style.

The academic style does not directly teach people to use the language for some purpose outside the classroom. Ostensibly it is language teaching with individual goals aimed primarily at the learning of the L<sub>2</sub> as an academic subject, in other words at the creation of linguistic competence in the students' minds. It often tries in addition to train the students to think better, to appreciate other cultures and to foster other educational values.

Its view of learning emphasized the teaching of grammatical competence as rules of traditional type and as lists of vocabulary. It values what people know about the language rather than what they comprehended or produced. Students

are seen as acquiring knowledge of language rather than communicative ability directly.

The academic teaching style caters for academically gifted students, who will supplement it with their own Good Language Learner strategies, and who will probably not be young children- in other words, they are Skehan's analytic learners. But, while the style has often succeeded with such students, they represent the tip of an iceberg. Those who are learning language as an academic subject- the linguistics students of the future may be properly served by an academic style. The academic style would be more viable as a way of teaching within its stated goals, if it changed the grammatical and vocabulary core to something that better reflects how language is described today and something that relates better to the processes of conversation on which it relies. The goals of language awareness, mental training, and the appreciation of other cultures may not be achieved spontaneously if the teacher does not give them particular attention in planning lessons and in carrying them out.

#### **1.1.4.2 The Audio-Lingual Style**

The name 'audio-lingual' is attached to a teaching style that reached to its peak in the 1960s, best conveyed in Robert Lado's thoughtful book *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach* (Lado, 1964). It emphasizes on teaching the spoken language through dialogues and drills. A typical lesson in an audio-lingual style starts with a dialogue; say about buying food in a shop. The language in the dialogue is controlled so that it introduces only a few new vocabulary items, and includes several examples of any structural point. The students listen to the dialogue as a whole, they repeat it sentence by sentence, and they act it out. Then they drill grammatical points

connected with the dialogue, such as the polite questions used in requests; the drills practice a structure repeatedly with some variation of vocabulary. Finally there are expansion activities to make students incorporate the language in their own use. As Rivers puts it, "some provision will be made for the student to apply what he has learnt in a structured communication situation (1964, p.136)." Instead of homework, the students go to the language laboratory to practice dialogues and drills individually. Language is divided into the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, which have to be taught in that order. Hence, this teaching strategy, stresses the spoken language rather than the written and the so-called 'active' skills of speaking and writing rather than the 'passive' skills of listening and reading.

The audio-lingual style most blatantly reflects a particular set of beliefs about L<sub>2</sub> learning often referred to as 'habit formation'. Language is a set of habits, just like driving a car. Each habit is learnt by doing time and again. The dialogues concentrate on unconscious 'structures' rather than the conscious 'rules' of academic style. Instead of understanding every word and structure, students learn the text more or less by heart. Learning sentences mean learning structure and vocabulary.

The goal of audio-lingual style is to get the students to 'behave' in common L<sub>2</sub> situations. In one sense, it is practical and communication oriented. The audio lingual style is not learning language for its own sake but learning it for actual use, either within the society or without.

#### **1.1.4.3 The Social Communicative Style**

The social communicative style has its main emphasis on the joint functioning of two people in a situation, what Halliday (1975) terms the 'interpersonal' function of language. The archetypal social communicative techniques are



information gap exercises teaching how to give locations of people and places. Let's take an example from the textbook *Coast to Coast* (Harmer and Surguine, 1987). The students are divided into pairs; one has a map of a street showing where Jim, Kathleen and so on live, the other has a map of the same street showing where Kristy, Ben and others live. They have to "ask and answer questions to find where the people live" following a model exchange, and then write the names on the map.

The students are given the vocabulary on the map and have an example question and answer. But they have to improvise the dialogue themselves to solve their communicative task. The second standard technique of the social communicative style is guided 'role-play.' For example, the students in pairs act out conversations such as "You are vegetarian." Tell them when and what you would like for lunch and dinner in the party. Hence, this teaching strategy gives emphasis on information gap and role-plays.

The goal of the social communicative style is getting students to interact with other people in the L<sub>2</sub>. The teacher is no longer a dominant figure continuously controlling and guiding the students. Rather the teacher takes one step back and lets the students take over the activities, making up their own conversation in pairs and groups, learning language by doing. This style gives emphasis *laissez-faire* teaching (Cook, 1988, p. 141).

In social communicative style, the teacher using it with a particular class has to remember that it will not appeal to students with other types of goal, say an interest in language structure or a desire for personal liberation. The unexpectedness of the classroom situation it employs may need selling to the students. It needs balancing with other styles to make certain that the coverage

of language components is adequate even to achieve its own goal of communicative competence.

#### **1.1.4.4 The Information Communicative Style**

The social communicative and information communicative styles are in a sense two sides of the same coin. A conversation requires not only someone to talk to but also something to talk about. As de Saussure says, “Speech has both an individual and a social side and we can not conceive of one without the other, (1916, p. 143).” Teaching that emphasized the information that is transferred rather, than the social interaction between the participants can be called the information communicative style, equivalent to Marton’s receptive strategy. A typical technique in this style is Asher’s TPR method.

The information communicative style is hard to illustrate from teaching materials because it mostly depends on the individual teacher’s preparation and improvisation during the class. The overall goal is to get students to use language, first by comprehending then by producing. Comprehension of information is not seen as a goal in its own right, but as a way in to fuller command of the language in use. Sometimes the overall goal is more specific. For example, the lesson starts with a 'Preview' section in which 'important words' are translated. In the next section, 'Lets listen', students hear a tape or by the teacher writing the name of land animal and carry out a task- listening exercise, first writing the animal’s name and details and then answering questions such as, “which is the biggest animal on land?” in writing. Such 'listening first' teaching requires the students to listen to actively but not produce sentences until they are ready. The point here is the information transfer. TPR students are listening to discover what actions to carry out; their social interaction with the teacher is quite unlike that found in any normal language exchange, except perhaps for the military drill square. The

concentration is in both cases on the information to be obtained from language, not on the social relationship between speaker and listener. Working out information is the key factor: take care of the message and the learning will take care of itself.

In terms of classrooms, it is teacher- dominated, with the teacher supplying, in person or through materials, the language input, the organization of the students' activities and classroom strategies. The information communicative style lends itself to classes of any size. It caters for a range of students types, provided they do not mind having to listen rather than speak in the classroom.

This style links listening and speaking in a conversation model. Listening is not just a separate skill from speaking but forms the foundation for speaking. Learning how to listen helps the person with other skills as well as listening knowledge acquired by listening converts into knowledge of speaking.

The information communicative style also has little connection with multilingual use of language but assumes an imitation monolingual speaker. The suggestions for the teacher are adapt to goals of students and to less class room based language. Similarly, it develops specific processes of listening.

#### **1.1.4.5 The Mainstream EFL Style**

In this strategy, the teacher teaches through demonstration in the real classroom situation. Teaching was to be organized around the language of the real life situations the students would encounter- the railway station, the hotel etc. The teacher starts the lesson with a presentation phase in which he/she introduces new structures and vocabularies. It also emphasizes on situational teaching. For example, the teacher demonstrates the use of "can" for ability "situationally" to the students by touching the floor and trying unsuccessfully to touch the

ceiling to illustrate 'can' versus 'can't' until there are clear signs that the students understand them.

#### **1.1.4.6 Other Styles**

Other teaching styles have been proposed in recent years that mark radical departure from those outlined earlier, either in their goals or in their execution. It is difficult to assign these a single name. Some have been called alternative methods, humanistic psychology; self- directed etc. The practice of these styles are still so rare that they are difficult to observe in full- blooded form.

The goal of teaching is to develop the students' potential and to enable them “come alive” through L<sub>2</sub> learning, not to help them directly to communicate with others outside the group. The student in some way becomes a better person through teaching. The concept of 'better' is usually defined as greater insight into one's self, one's feelings and one's relationships with others. Nevertheless much depends upon the role of the helper and the support system. Without suitable guidance, students may not be aware of the possibilities. The helper has different job of turning the student's initial pre-conceptions. To improve teaching we need to appreciate learning in all its complexity.

Each of the teaching styles captures some aspects of complexities of L<sub>2</sub> learning and misses out on others. None of the teaching styles is complete, just as none of the models of L<sub>2</sub> learning is complete. Eclecticism is only an issue. But teachers live in the present. They have to teach now rather than wait for a whole new L<sub>2</sub> learning framework to emerge. They must get on with meeting the needs of the students, even if they still do not know enough about L<sub>2</sub> learning. A psychoanalyst treating an individual patient has to set aside theories in order to respond to the uniqueness of that particular person. Teachers also have the duty to respond to their students. To serve

the unique needs of actual students, the teacher needs to do whatever is necessary, not just that which is scientifically proven and based on abstract theory.

## **1.2 Review of the Related Literature**

The related literature provides the researcher a rationale for the hypothesis and the findings help to conduct the new research in a systematic manner to sketch the framework of the research study. There are several researches carried out on teaching strategies. Review of some related studies are as follows:

Naiman and Pickett (1978) who identified mainly three learning strategies while learning vocabulary in the second language. Their subjects used strategies like preparing and memorizing vocabulary list, learning words in context and practicing vocabulary.

Bhattarai (1999) carried out a research on “A Survey of Techniques and Participation in ELT in Secondary Level of Kaski district” and found out more than seventy five percent teachers using traditional way of teaching English.

Devkota (2003) conducted the research on “Learning Strategies used in Learning Literature”. The objective of this study was to find out the learning strategies employed in learning literature by students of B. Ed. third year. He found out that students used the strategies of immediately noting down the unknown words, consulting dictionary, using reference materials and translating in some cases.

Gyawali (2004) conducted a research study on the title “A Study of Teaching Poetry in Secondary Level”. The objective of this study was to identify the strategies and problems of teaching poetry in secondary level. He concluded

that the majority of teachers were not acquainted with the learning strategies which create a lot of problems in teaching poetry.

Pant (2004) carried out a study on the ‘Effectiveness of Discovery Technique in Teaching Subject-Verb Agreement’. The study showed that the Discovery Technique was relatively more effective and successful than explanation and group work technique for subject- verb agreement.

Regmi (2004) carried out a practical study to find out the ‘Effectiveness of Group Work Technique in Teaching English Tense’. The study showed that the group work technique was relatively more effective and successful than explanation technique while teaching English tenses.

Bhandari (2005) carried a study to find out the ‘Effectiveness of Pair Work and Group Work technique in Teaching Communicative Function of English’. It was found out that the pair work technique was relatively more effective than the group work technique for teaching communicative functions of English.

Timsina (2007) carried out a study on ‘‘A Study on Teaching Poetry in Higher Secondary Level’’. The objectives of the study were to analyze the strategies and complexities of teaching poetry in developing language skills and aspects. He concluded that teaching learning process was completely teacher-centered and majority of teachers taught vocabularies, described the title and explained the pictures used in the poem.

I was very much interested to carry out a research on teaching strategies employed at primary level classes because no research work has yet been done on this area. Likewise, I believe that techniques used in teaching at primary level play a crucial role to pave the children's future career.

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

This study had following objectives:

- a. to find out the teaching strategies employed at primary level classroom.
- b. to suggest some pedagogical implications for conducting teaching process.

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

Particularly, this study will be beneficial for English language teachers of the primary level and the students.

Likewise, this study will provide support to syllabus designers, text book writers, trainers, English language experts and those who are directly and indirectly involved in teaching learning English.

### **1.5 Definition of Specific Terms**

The following terms have been used in specific ways in this research work.

#### **Strategy**

It refers to the styles, techniques that teachers employ to make teaching feasible.

#### **Texts**

It refers to the lesson presented in the classroom.

#### **Laissez-faire**

In this teaching style, learning takes place in the students minds in ways over which teachers have no control and so the students should be trusted to learn without the teachers' interference.

**Public school**

A free local school paid for by the government.

**Private School**

A school that receives no money from the government and where the education of the students is paid for by their parents.



## **CHAPTER - TWO**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter deals with methodology adopted during the study. The study was carried out as follows:

#### **2.1 Sources of Data**

In order to carry out this research, the researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data.

##### **2.1.1 Primary Sources of Data**

The primary sources of data were English teachers of the primary level.

##### **2.1.2 Secondary Sources of Data**

The secondary sources for this research were the related literature, TESOL journal, www. Rebecca Oxford and books such as Harmer (1991), Cook (1992), Hedge (2000).

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

The population of the study were the teachers of primary level of Kathmandu district.

#### **2.3 Sampling Procedure**

The researcher selected ten different schools of Kathmandu district using stratified random sampling procedure. Five schools were private and five public. The researcher observed eighty classes of twenty teachers with the help of observation sheets. Four classes of each teacher were observed. Two teachers of each school were selected. Similarly, the researcher administered the questionnaires to each teacher to have more information to her research work.

## **2.4 Process of Data Collection**

First, the researcher prepared the research tools. The main research tools were questionnaire sheets and observation checklists. The researcher visited the selected schools and requested the authority for co-operation. The researcher explained the purpose and process of the study to the principal. After granting permission from them, she established rapport with the concerned teachers. Then, she distributed the questionnaire sheets to twenty teachers and requested them to write their responses. With the help of observation checklist, the researcher observed eighty classes in different days. She observed the classes as a non-participate observer and recorded the activities in the checklist.

## **2.5 Tools of Data Collection**

The researcher used the following research tools while collecting data

- a. Questionnaire: Questionnaires were administered to the teachers of the selected schools.
- b. Observation: The classes of the ten primary school English teachers' were observed.

## **2.6 Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of the study were as follows:

- a. This study was limited to identify the teaching strategies adopted by primary level English teachers.
- b. This study was confined with the twenty teachers of ten schools of Kathmandu district.
- c. This study was limited to school environment, teachers and students.

## **CHAPTER – THREE**

### **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA**

This chapter is related with the analysis and interpretation of data. The data obtained through the observation sheets and questionnaire sheets are interpreted separately. The data obtained from the observation sheets are interpreted in the following headings;

- a. Holistic analysis of the teaching strategies employed in public and private schools.
- b. Teaching strategies employed in public schools.
- c. Teaching strategies employed in private schools.

The researcher collected the data from the ten different schools of Kathmandu district. She observed eighty classes with the help of observation sheet. Forty classes were observed from private schools and forty classes were from public schools. The researcher observed four classes of each teacher. Likewise, the researcher administered the questionnaire sheets to the teachers of each school. Altogether twenty teachers were included in the study. She interpreted the data with the help of table. The teaching activities were interpreted relating with teaching styles. The data obtained from questionnaire sheets were analyzed descriptively and logically.

### 3.1 Holistic Analysis of the Teaching Strategies Employed in Public and Private Schools

#### Distribution of Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts

**Table No. 1: Academic Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1.	Academic	Translation	-	23.75%	47.5%	22.5%	6.25%

The above table shows that there was no use of translation excellently while teaching texts. No teachers applied excellent translation method. Nearly twenty-three percent teachers mostly used this teaching strategy in good rank. More than forty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, about twenty three percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And about seven percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 2: Audio – Lingual Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1.	Audio-Lingual	Dialogues	-	11.25%	36.25%	48.5%	5%
		Drills	8.75%	26.25%	43.75%	18.75%	2.5%

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Dialogues* while teaching texts or not. No teachers used this strategy excellently. Nearly twelve percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Similarly, more than thirty six percent teachers used this strategy in average. Nearly forty nine percent teachers used this strategy in below average. It means very few teachers used this strategy while teaching. Only five percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Similarly, another teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Drills* while teaching texts or not. More than eight percent teachers used this strategy in an excellent way. It means their teaching style was totally depended on drill strategy. About twenty seven percent teachers used this strategy in a good rank. Nearly forty four percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, about nineteen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Most importantly, nearly three percent teachers used this strategy poorly while teaching texts at primarily level.

**Table No. 3: Social Communicative Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1.	Social Communicative	Information gap	-	-	-	68.75%	8.75%
		Role play	-	18.75%	35%	31.25%	11.25%

The above teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Information- gap* while teaching or not. No teachers used this strategy in excellent, good and average ranks. Most of the teachers, about sixty nine percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly nine percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The another teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Role play* while teaching texts or not. No teachers used this strategy excellently. More than eighteen percent teachers used this strategy in good rank. Thirty-five percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, about thirty two percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And about twelve percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 4: The Mainstream EFL Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1.	The main stream EFL	Presentation	-	20%	50%	27.5%	1.2%
		Substitution	-	11.25%	43.75%	32.5%	6.25%

The above teaching style incorporated in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Presentation* while teaching texts or not. No teachers used this strategy excellently. Only twenty percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Fifty percent teachers used this strategy in average. About twenty eight percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly two percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Similarly, another teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Substitution* while teaching texts or not. No teachers used this strategy excellently. Only about twelve percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than forty three percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, nearly thirty-three

percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly seven percent teachers poorly used this strategy while teaching texts.

**Table No. 5 Miscellaneous**

S.N.	Teaching Style	Rank				
		Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1.	Warming-up	-	35%	33.75%	18.75%	11.25%
2	Encouragement	-	30%	22.5%	42.5%	6.25%
3	Use of picture	-	11.25%	55%	26.25%	8.75%
4	Use of realia	1.25%	15%	20%	53.75%	10%
5	Group work	-	16.25%	41.25%	31.25%	11.25%
6	Pair work	-	16.25%	32.5%	37.5%	13.75%
7	Self-directed	-	-	23.75%	46.25%	6.25%
8	Lecture	-	17.5%	35%	26.25%	6.25%
9	Discussion	-	16.25%	52.5%	22.5%	1.25%

The above table shows that there was no use of *Warming up* excellently while teaching texts in the classroom. Thirty-five percent teachers used warming up in a good way. About thirty four percent teachers used that strategy in average. Nearly nineteen percent teachers used that strategy in below average and about twelve percent teachers used it in poor. It showed that majority of the teachers used warming up strategy in good rank.

Similarly another teaching style included in the observation sheet showed that there was no excellent use of *Encouragement*. While teaching text, thirty percent teachers used encouragement in a good way. More than twenty two percent teachers used this strategy in average. Nearly forty-three percent teachers used this strategy in below average and about seven percent teachers used this teaching strategy in poor rank at primary level.

Another teaching style included in the table shows that whether the teachers used the *Use of picture* while teaching or not. It showed that no teachers used

this strategy in an excellent way. More than eleven percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Fifty five percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, about twenty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And nearly nine percent teachers poorly used this strategy. It showed that most of the teachers used this strategy in average at primary level.

Similarly another teaching style included in the table shows that whether the teachers used use of *Realia* while teaching texts or not. Only nearly two percent teachers used this strategy excellently. Fifteen percent teachers had been found to use this strategy in a good way. Twenty percent teachers used this strategy in average. Nearly fifty four percent teachers used this strategy in below average and finally ten percent teachers used this strategy poorly while teaching text at primary level.

Another teaching style incorporated whether the teachers used *Group work* while teaching texts or not. No teachers used this strategy excellently in the classroom. Only nearly seventeen percent teachers engaged the students in group work in a good way. About forty two percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than thirty-one percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Likewise, nearly twelve percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

This teaching style inquired about whether the teachers used *Pair- work* while teaching texts or not. No teachers used this strategy excellently while teaching texts. Only nearly seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. About thirty-three percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, nearly thirty eight percent teachers used this strategy in below average. About fourteen percent teachers poorly used this strategy while teaching texts.

This teaching style inquired about whether the teachers used *Self-directed* styles or not. No teachers used this strategy in an excellent and good way. Only



nearly twenty four percent teachers used this strategy in average. About forty seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly seven percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Similarly, another teaching style inquired about whether the teachers used *Lecture* while teaching or not. The researcher had not found excellent lecture in the primary level classroom. Only nearly eighteen percent teachers used this strategy in good rank. Thirty-five percent teachers used this strategy in average. About twenty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly seven percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Likewise, another teaching style incorporated whether the teachers used *Discussion* while teaching or not. No teachers used this teaching strategy excellently. Only about seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. About fifty-three percent teachers used this strategy in average. Nearly twenty three percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And nearly two percent teachers poorly used this teaching strategy.

### 3.2 Teaching Strategies Employed in Private Schools

The researcher observed forty classes of ten teachers to find out the strategy employed in the private schools. Four classes of each teacher were observed while teaching. The result of the study is given below: (For further details see Appendix: D)

#### Distribution of Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts

**Table No. 1: Academic Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Academic	Translation	-	15%	45%	27.5%	12.5%

The above table shows that there was no excellent use of *Translation* while teaching texts. Fifteen percent teachers used translation in a good rank. Forty-five percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than twenty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. More than twelve percent teachers poorly used this strategy at primary level in private schools.

**Table No. 2: Audio-Lingual Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
	Audio-Lingual	Dialogues	-	15%	52.5%	32.5%	-
		Drills	7.5%	15%	50%	22.5%	5%

The above table shows that there was no excellent use of dialogues while teaching texts. Not a single teacher used this strategy in an excellent way. Only fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than fifty-two percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than thirty-two percent teachers used this strategy in below average. The researcher had not found to use this strategy poorly.

Another teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Drills*. More than seven percent teachers used this strategy excellently. It means their teaching focused only on drills method. Fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Fifty percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, more than twenty-two percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Only five percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 3: Social Communicative Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Social communicative	Information gap	-	-	-	47.5%	7.5%
		Role play	-	25%	45%	17.5%	12.5%

Similarly the teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Information gap*. None of the teachers used this strategy in excellent, good and average ranks. The huge amount, more than forty-seven percent teachers used this strategy. More than seven percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Another teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Role play* while teaching or not. The researcher had found out that even a single teacher did not use this strategy excellently. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Forty-five percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Similarly More than twelve percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 4: The Mainstream EFL Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	The main stream EFL	Presentation	-	22.5%	52.5%	25%	-
		Substitution	-	15%	52.5%	25%	75%

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Presentation* while teaching or not. Not a single teacher used this strategy in an excellent way. More than twenty-two percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than fifty-two percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. The researcher found out that none of the teachers presented the lesson poorly.

The teaching style incorporated about the teaching style of *Substitution*. The researcher found out that even a single teacher did not use this strategy in an excellent way. Only fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Nearly fifty-three percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And more than seven percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 4: Miscellaneous**

S.N.	Teaching Style	Rank				
		Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Warming-up	-	15%	52.5%	20%	12.5%
2	Encouragement	-	42.5%	40%	7.5%	10%
3	Use of picture		15%	75%	5%	5%
4	Use of realia	2.5%	25%	15%	47.5%	10%
5	Group work		20%	50%	17.5%	12.5%
6	Pair work		25%	40%	25%	10%
7	Self-directed			47.5%	5%	
8	Lecture		10%	52.5%	25%	12.5%
9	Discussion		25%	62.5%	12.5%	

The above table no. 4 shows that not a single teacher used *Warming –up* strategy excellently. Fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than fifty-two percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly thirteen percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Similarly, another teaching style incorporated about the teaching style of *Encouragement*. More than forty-two percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Forty percent teachers used this strategy in average. Likewise, More

than seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The next teaching style in the observation sheet inquired about the strategy of *Use of picture* in teaching texts. It found-out that no teachers used this strategy excellently. Only fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Seventy-five percent teachers used this strategy in average. Five percent teacher used this strategy in below average. Likewise, Five percent teachers used this strategy poorly.

Similarly, the teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used use of *Realia* while teaching texts or not. Nearly three percent teachers used this strategy excellently. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than forty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Another teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Group work*. Not a single teacher used this strategy in an excellent way. Only twenty percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Fifty percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly thirteen percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Pair-work* while teaching or not. The researcher had found out that even a single teacher did not use this strategy excellently. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Forty percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Similarly, another teaching style inquired about the strategy of *Self-directed* while teaching texts. The researcher had not found excellent and good ranks of self-directed teaching. More than forty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in average. Similarly, five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. There was not poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet inquired about the teaching style of *lecture*. There was no use of lecture in an excellent way. Ten percent teachers used this strategy in a good rank. Nearly fifty-three percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Only more than twelve percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet inquired about the strategy of *Discussion* while teaching texts. The researcher had not found to use discussion excellently. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than sixty-two percent teachers used this strategy in average. Nearly thirteen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. There was not poorly used of this strategy.

### **3.3 Teaching Strategies Employed in Public Schools**

In order to find-out the strategies of teaching texts in English, sixteen items consisting of strategies were included in the observation sheet. Forty classes of ten teachers' were observed. The researcher observed four classes of each teacher while teaching texts. The overall analysis and interpretation of the result regarding the strategies of teaching texts have been given below and delineated separately. (For further details see Appendix: E)

**Table No. 1: Academic Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Academic	Translation	-	32.5%	50%	17.5%	-

The above table shows that there was no use of translation excellently while teaching texts. The researcher had found out not a single teacher done his teaching totally on translation. More than thirty-two percent teachers used this strategy in a good rank. Fifty percent teachers used this strategy in average. Nearly eighteen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. There was not poorly used this strategy at primary level.

**Table No. 2: Audio-Lingual Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Audio-Lingual	Dialogues	-	7.5%	50%	24%	47.5
		Drills	10%	37.5%	37.5%	15%	

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was incorporated the strategy of *Dialogues*. The researcher had found out that even a single teacher did not use this strategy in an excellent way. More than seven percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Fifty percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty-four percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly forty-eight percent teachers poorly used this style.

Another teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Drills*. Ten percent teachers used this strategy excellently. It means their teaching focused only on drill methods. More than thirty-seven percent

teachers used this strategy in a good way. Similarly, nearly thirty-eight percent teachers used this strategy in an average. Fifteen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. None of the teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 3: Social Communicative Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Social communicative	Information gap	-	-	-	90%	10%
		Role play	-	10%	25%	52.5%	12.5%

The teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Information-gap*. None of the teachers used this strategy in an excellent, good and in an average ranks. The huge amount, ninety percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Only ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

Similarly, the teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Role play* while teaching or not. The researcher found out that even a single teacher did not use this strategy excellently. Ten percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in an average. More than fifty-two percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly thirteen percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 4: The Mainstream EFL Strategy**

S.N.	Strategy	Teaching Style	Rank				
			Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	The main stream EFL	Presentation		17.5%	47.5%	24%	5%
		Substitution		7.5%	35%	40%	17.5%

The teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Presentation*. Not a single teacher used this strategy in an excellent way.



Nearly eighteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than forty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in average. Twenty-four percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Five percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style incorporated about the teaching style of *Substitution* while teaching or not. Not a single teacher used this strategy in an excellent way. More than seven percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Thirty-five percent teachers used this strategy in an average. Forty percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And more than seventeen percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

**Table No. 5 Miscellaneous**

S.N.	Teaching Style	Rank				
		Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor
1	Warming-up	-	55%	17.5%	17.5%	10%
2	Encouragement	-	17.5%	37.5%	45%	2.5%
3	Use of picture		7.5%	35%	47.5%	12.5%
4	Use of realia		5%	20%	62.5%	10%
5	Group work		12.5%	32.5%	45%	10%
6	Pair work		7.5%	25%	50%	17.5%
7	Self-directed				87.5%	12.5%
8	Lecture		25%	47.5%	27.5%	
9	Discussion		7.5%	42.5%	47.5%	2.5%

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used *Warming-up* strategies while teaching or not. The researcher had found out that even a single teacher did not use this strategy. Fifty five percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in an average.

Similarly, more than seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style incorporated in the observation sheet was whether the teacher used *Encouragement* while teaching or not. The strategy of encouragement was not found to use excellently. More than seventeen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Nearly thirty eight percent teachers used this strategy in average. Likewise, Forty-five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly three percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style inquired about the teaching style of *Use of picture* in teaching texts. It found out that no teachers used this strategy excellently. More than seven percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Thirty-five percent teachers used strategy in an average. About forty-eight percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Similarly, more than twelve percent teachers used this strategy poorly.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teachers used use of *Realia* while teaching texts or not. None of the teachers used this strategy excellently. Five percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Twenty percent teachers used this strategy in average. More than sixty-two percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Group work*. Not a single teacher used this strategy in an excellent way. About thirteen percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than thirty-two percent teachers used this strategy in an average. Forty-five percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Ten percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style incorporated about the teaching style of *Pair work* while teaching or not. Not a single teacher used this strategy excellently. More than seven percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. Twenty-five percent teachers used this

strategy in an average. Fifty percent teachers used this strategy in below average. And nearly eighteen percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet was whether the teacher used *Self-directed* while teaching texts or not. The researcher had found out most of the teachers not used this strategy excellently, good and an average ranks. More than eighty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in below average. Nearly thirteen percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Lecture*. The researcher had found out that not a single teacher totally dependent on lecture. Excellent lecture class had not found. Twenty-five percent teachers used this strategy in a good rank. More than forty-seven percent teachers used this strategy in an average. Nearly twenty-eight percent teachers used this strategy in below average. The researcher found out not a single teacher poorly used this strategy.

The teaching style included in the observation sheet incorporated the strategy of *Discussion*. The researcher had found out not a single teacher used this strategy excellently. Nearly eight percent teachers used this strategy in a good way. More than forty-two percent teachers used this strategy in an average. About forty-eight percent teachers used this strategy in below average. More than two percent teachers poorly used this strategy.

### **3.4 Analysis of the Data Obtained from the Questionnaires**

To make the research work more valid and reliable, pre prepared questionnaires were administered to the teachers teaching at Primary Level. The researcher aimed to seek teaching strategies employed by Primary teachers teaching at Kathmandu district. The reason why the teachers from the respective schools were administered questionnaire sheets were to find-out differences between saying and doing. It means whether the

teacher applied the teaching strategies written in the questionnaire sheets practically or not. Not only this, the researcher had keen interest to search about how teachers taught in the classroom. Seventeen items of questionnaire were filled up by two different teachers of each school. Fifteen questions included in the questionnaire were related to teaching strategies. Rests of the questions were related to the teaching problem and school environment. Twenty teachers filled up the questionnaire sheets.

Nearly seventy seven percent teachers mentioned that they engaged the students in pair-work, group work, demonstration, role play, communication, discovery, explanation gesture and game. Ten percent teachers preferred to use translation while teaching texts. Nearly six percent teachers mentioned that they preferred to use drill style while teaching. Two percent teachers sometimes used realia. None of them used drama.

Regarding teaching strategies, the researcher requested them to mention problems relating to apply teaching strategies in the classroom. The teachers put forward the following reasons behind not applying teaching strategies:

1. Classroom management,
2. Bilingualism,
3. Lack of sufficient teaching material,
4. Number of students,
5. Teachers' Training,
6. Level of Students,
7. Family background, and
8. Schools' routine

The above mentioned problems were crucial problems in the teaching field. But the dominant problems in applying teaching strategies were teacher's irresponsibility towards teaching.

## **CHAPTER – FOUR**

### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This chapter presents findings based on the analysis of data and recommendations.

#### **4.1 Findings**

On the basis of the analysis and interpretation, the findings of this study are:

1. Translation, Discussion, Lecture, Drills, Use of realia, Warming up, Encouragement, Group work, Peer work were the strategies used while teaching texts at primary level.
2. In public schools, translation was the mostly used strategy while teaching texts because fifty percent teachers used it in average at primary level.
3. In private schools, use of picture was the mostly used teaching strategy while teaching texts because nearly sixty three percent teachers used it in average at primary level.
4. In both public and private schools, use of picture was mostly used strategy while teaching texts because fifty five percent teachers used it in average.
5. This study found out that only nearly two percent teachers excellently used realia in both public and private schools. Similarly, nearly nine percent teachers excellently used Drills.

6. Likewise, this study found out that only nearly two percent teachers poorly used discussion and nearly three percent teachers poorly used drills. It showed that all the teachers included in the research work used other kinds of teaching styles also.
7. Most of the teachers, out of twenty teachers, fifteen teachers did not effectively apply the teaching styles in the classroom. They mentioned these only in the questionnaire sheets.

## **4.2 Recommendations**

After analyzing the findings of the study the investigator makes the following recommendations:

1. Different kinds of teachers' training should be executed to all the teachers of public as well as private schools. So, those teachers should have access to different strategies to enhance the teaching activities
2. Use of picture is preferable strategy for teaching texts to the beginners.
3. Teaching is one of the toughest jobs. So to make teaching purposeful, the teachers should have keen interest to meet the students need.
4. This research has been limited to only primary level of Kathmandu district. So, other researches are recommended to be carried in other level and districts as well.

## References

- Bhandari, H. (2005). *Effectiveness of group work and peer work technique in teaching communication function of English*. An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Bhattarai, A. (2002). *A brief survey of school level English language teaching situation in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Ratna pustak bhandar.
- Bhattraai, G. (1999). *A survey of techniques and participation in ELT in secondary level of Kaski district*. An Unpublished Thesis of M.A., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of second language learning and language teaching*. London: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Campbell, C. & Kryszevka, H. (1994). *Learner based teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Cook, V. (1992). *Second language learning and language teaching*. London: Melbourne.
- Cross, D. (1992). *A practical language learning and language teaching*. London: Melbourne.
- Devkota, H. (2003). *Learning strategies used in learning literature*. Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Gyawali, K. (2004). *A study of teaching poetry in secondary level*. An Unpublished Thesis of M. Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. Long man: Prentice Hall.
- .



Marton, W. (1998). *Methods in English language teaching*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Pant, A. (2004). *Effectiveness of discovery technique in teaching subject-verb agreement*. An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.

Regmi, B. (2004). *An Effectiveness of group work technique in teaching English tense*. An Unpublished Thesis of M.Ed., T.U., Kathmandu.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenden, A. & Rubin, J. (1987). *Learners strategies in language learning*. London: Prentice.

www.Rebecca Oxford.

## APPENDIX-C

**Table No. 1: Distribution of teachers' Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts**

S.N.	Strategies	Rank									
		Excellent (Freq.)	Per.	Good (Freq.)	Percent	Average Freq.)	Per.	Below average freq.	Per.	Poor freq.	Per.
1	Warning up			28	35%	27	33.75%	15	18.75%	9	11.25%
2	Encouragement			24	30%	18	22.5%	34	42.5%	5	6.25%
3	Use of picture			9	11.25%	44	55%	21	26.25%	7	8.75%
4	Use of realia	1	1.25%	12	15%	16	20%	43	53.75%	8	10. %
5	Dialogues			9	11.25%	29	36.25%	38	48.5%	4	5%
6	Drills	7	8.75%	21	26.25%	35	43.75%	15	18.75%	2	2.5%
7	Role-play			15	18.75%	28	35%	25	31.25%	11	13.75%
8	Group work			13	16.25%	33	41.25%	25	31.25%	9	11.25%
9	Pair work			13	16.25%	26	32.5%	30	37.5%	11	13.75%
10	Information gap							55	68.75%	7	8.75%
11	Presentation			16	20%	40	50%	22	27.45%	2	4.5%
12	Substitution			9	11.25%	35	43.75%	26	32.5%	5	6.25%
13	Self-directed					19	23.75%	37	46.25%	5	6.25%
14	Lecture			14	17.5%	28	35%	21	26.25%	5	6.25%
15	Discussion			13	16.25%	42	52.5%	21	22.5%	1	1.25%
16	Translation			19	23.75%	38	47.5%	18	22.5%	5	6.25%

## APPENDIX-D

**Table No. 2: Distribution of Teachers' Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts.**

S.N.	Strategies	Excellent (Freq.)	Per.	Rank							
				Good (Freq.)	Per	Average Freq.	Per	Below average freq.	Per	Poor Freq.	Per
1	Warning up			6	15%	21	52.5%	8	20%	5	12.5%
2	Encouragement			17	42.5%	16	40%	3	7.5%	4	10%
3	Use of picture			6	15%	30	75%	2	5%	2	5%
4	Use of realia	1	2.5%	10	25%	6	15%	19	47.5%	4	10%
5	Dialogues			6	15%	21	52.5%	13	32.5%		
6	Drills	3	7.5%	6	15%	20	50%	9	22.5%	2	5%
7	Role-play			10	25%	18	45%	7	17.5%	5	12.5%
8	Group work			8	20%	20	50%	7	17.5%	5	12.5%
9	Pair work			10	25%	16	40%	10	25%	4	10%
10	Information							19	47.5%	3	7.5%
11	Presentation			9	22.5%	21	52.5%	10	25%		
12	Substitution			6	15%	21	52.5%	10	25%	3	7.5%
13	Self directed					19	47.5%	2	5%		
14	Lecture			4	10%	21	52.5%	10	25%	5	12.5%
15	Discussion			10	25%	25	62.5%	5	12.5%		
16	Translation			6	15%	18	45%	11	27.5%	5	12.5%

## APPENDIX-E

**Table No 3: Distribution of Teache’s teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts.**

S.N.	Strategies	Rank									
		Excellent (Freq.)	Per	Good (Freq.)	Per	Average Freq.	Per.	Below average freq.	Per.	Poor freq.	Per
1	Warning up			22	55%	7	17.5%	7	17.5%	4	10%
2	Encouragement			7	17.5%	15	37.5%	18	45%	1	2.5%
3	Use of picture			3	7.5%	14	35%	19	47.5%	5	12.5%
4	Use of realia			2	5%	8	20%	25	62.5%	4	10%
5	Dialogues			3	7.5%	6	15%	12	24%	19	47.5%
6	Drills	4	10%	15	37.5%	15	37.5%	6	15%		
7	Role-play			4	10%	10	25%	21	52.5%	5	12.5%
8	Group work			5	12.5%	13	32.5%	18	45%	4	10%
9	Pair work			3	7.5%	10	25%	20	50%	7	17.5%
10	Information							36	90%	4	10%
11	Presentation			7	17.5%	19	47.5%	12	24%	2	5%
12	Substitution			3	7.5%	14	35%	16	40%	7	17.5%
13	Self directed							35	87.5%	5	12.5%
14	Lecture			10	25%	19	47.5%	11	27.5%		
15	Discussion			3	7.5%	17	42.5%	19	47.5%	1	2.5%
16	Translation			13	32.5%	20	50%	7	17.5%		

## APPENDIX C

**Table No. 1: Distribution of teachers' Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts**

S.N.	Strategies	Rank									
		Excellent (Freq.)	Per.	Good (Freq.)	Percent	Average Freq.	Per.	Below average freq.	Per.	Poor freq.	Per.
1	Warning up			28	35%	27	33.75%	15	18.75%	9	11.25%
2	Encouragement			24	30%	18	22.5%	34	42.5%	5	6.25%
3	Use of picture			9	11.25%	44	55%	21	26.25%	7	8.75%
4	Use of realia	1	1.25%	12	15%	16	20%	43	53.75%	8	10. %
5	Dialogues			9	11.25%	29	36.25%	38	48.5%	4	5%
6	Drills	7	8.75%	21	26.25%	35	43.75%	15	18.75%	2	2.5%
7	Role-play			15	18.75%	28	35%	25	31.25%	11	13.75%
8	Group work			13	16.25%	33	41.25%	25	31.25%	9	11.25%
9	Pair work			13	16.25%	26	32.5%	30	37.5%	11	13.75%
10	Information gap							55	68.75%	7	8.75%
11	Presentation			16	20%	40	50%	22	27.45%	2	4.5%
12	Substitution			9	11.25%	35	43.75%	26	32.5%	5	6.25%
13	Self-directed					19	23.75%	37	46.25%	5	6.25%
14	Lecture			14	17.5%	28	35%	21	26.25%	5	6.25%
15	Discussion			13	16.25%	42	52.5%	21	22.5%	1	1.25%
16	Translation			19	23.75%	38	47.5%	18	22.5%	5	6.25%

## APPENDIX D

**Table No. 2: Distribution of Teachers' Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts.**

S.N.	Strategies	Excellent (Freq.)	Per.	Rank							
				Good (Freq.)	Per	Average Freq.	Per	Below average freq.	Per	Poor Freq.	Per
1	Warning up			6	15%	21	52.5%	8	20%	5	12.5%
2	Encouragement			17	42.5%	16	40%	3	7.5%	4	10%
3	Use of picture			6	15%	30	75%	2	5%	2	5%
4	Use of realia	1	2.5%	10	25%	6	15%	19	47.5%	4	10%
5	Dialogues			6	15%	21	52.5%	13	32.5%		
6	Drills	3	7.5%	6	15%	20	50%	9	22.5%	2	5%
7	Role-play			10	25%	18	45%	7	17.5%	5	12.5%
8	Group work			8	20%	20	50%	7	17.5%	5	12.5%
9	Pair work			10	25%	16	40%	10	25%	4	10%
10	Information							19	47.5%	3	7.5%
11	Presentation			9	22.5%	21	52.5%	10	25%		
12	Substitution			6	15%	21	52.5%	10	25%	3	7.5%
13	Self directed					19	47.5%	2	5%		
14	Lecture			4	10%	21	52.5%	10	25%	5	12.5%
15	Discussion			10	25%	25	62.5%	5	12.5%		
16	Translation			6	15%	18	45%	11	27.5%	5	12.5%

## APPENDIX E

**Table No 3: Distribution of Teacher's Teaching Style about the Strategies of Teaching Texts.**

S.N.	Strategies	Rank									
		Excellent (Freq.)	Per	Good (Freq.)	Per	Average Freq.	Per.	Below average freq.	Per.	Poor freq.	Per
1	Warning up			22	55%	7	17.5%	7	17.5%	4	10%
2	Encouragement			7	17.5%	15	37.5%	18	45%	1	2.5%
3	Use of picture			3	7.5%	14	35%	19	47.5%	5	12.5%
4	Use of realia			2	5%	8	20%	25	62.5%	4	10%
5	Dialogues			3	7.5%	6	15%	12	24%	19	47.5%
6	Drills	4	10%	15	37.5%	15	37.5%	6	15%		
7	Role-play			4	10%	10	25%	21	52.5%	5	12.5%
8	Group work			5	12.5%	13	32.5%	18	45%	4	10%
9	Pair work			3	7.5%	10	25%	20	50%	7	17.5%
10	Information							36	90%	4	10%
11	Presentation			7	17.5%	19	47.5%	12	24%	2	5%
12	Substitution			3	7.5%	14	35%	16	40%	7	17.5%
13	Self directed							35	87.5%	5	12.5%
14	Lecture			10	25%	19	47.5%	11	27.5%		
15	Discussion			3	7.5%	17	42.5%	19	47.5%	1	2.5%
16	Translation			13	32.5%	20	50%	7	17.5%		