

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE  
COMMUNICATIVE PROFICIENCY BETWEEN  
STUDENTS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE  
SCHOOLS OF GRADE NINE**

**A Thesis**

**Submitted to the Department of English Education  
University Campus, Kirtipur,  
In Partial Fulfillment for the Master's Degree in  
Education  
(Specialization in English Language Education)**

**By**

**Ranju Kumari Yadav**

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

**2007**

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE COMMUNICATIVE  
PROFICIENCY BETWEEN STUDENTS OF PUBLIC AND  
PRIVATE SCHOOLS OF GRADE NINE**

**A Thesis**

**Submitted to the Department of English Education, University  
Campus, Kirtipur**

**In Partial Fulfillment for the Master's Degree in Education  
(Specialization in English Language Education)**

**By**

**Ranju Kumari Yadav**

**Faculty of Education, Tribhuvan University**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal**

**2007**

**T. U. Registration No:22085-93**

**Date of Approval of**

**Examination Symbol No:28269/057**

**Thesis Proposal: 2063-4-4**

**Date of Submission: 2063- 12-11**

## RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that Mrs. Ranju Kumari Yadav has prepared this dissertation entitled "a comparative study on the communicative proficiency between students of public and private schools of grade nine" under my guidance and supervision.

I recommended this dissertation for acceptance.

Date: 11-12-2063

---

Mr. Padma Lal Bishwakarma  
[Guide] Lecturer  
Central Department of English  
Language Education  
Faculty of Education  
University Campus, Kirtipur

## RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

The following "**Research Guidance Committee**" has recommended this dissertation for evaluation.

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra

Reader and Head

Department of English Language Education

---

Chairperson

Mr. Padma Lal Bishwakarma

Lecturer

Department of English Language Education

---

Member

[Guide]

Mr. Ram Ekwel Singh

Lecturer

Department of English Language Education

---

Member

Date: 14-12-2063

## EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This dissertation has been evaluated and approved by the following  
**"Thesis Evaluation Committee"**

Dr. Chandreswor Mishra

Reader and Head

Department of English Language Education

---

Chairperson

Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi

Professor

Department of English Language Education

---

Member

Mr. Padma Lal Bishwakarma

Lecturer

Department of English Language Education

---

Member

[Guide]

Date: 18-12-2063

## **DEDICATION**

To my parents whose ideals have been guiding my life along a valuable educational journey

To my husband, Binesh, whose care and support made my 'uni-life' easier

To all my teachers who gave a thousand lights of knowledge

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor Padma Lal Biswakarma, Lecturer of the Department of English Education; who provided me with continuous guidance, enlightening ideas, and Invaluable suggestions and encouraged me constantly.

My heartfelt gratitude goes to Prof. Dr. Shishir Kumar Sthapit, the senior most professor of the Department of English Education, Prof. Dr. Shanti Basnyat and Dr. Chandeshwor Mishra, Head of the Department of English Education for giving me invaluable suggestions and encouragement.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof.Dr. Jai Raj Awasthi for providing me with a lot of encouragement. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Govinda Raj Bhattarai, Assistant Dean, FOE, Dr. Anjana Bhattarai, Lecturer of the Department of English Education, Prof. Dr. Yogendra Prasad Yadav, Head of the Department of Linguistics, Ram Ekwil Singh, Lecturer of the Department of English Education, and Other Gurus of the Department of English Education for their kind support, encouragement and continuous inspiration.

My thanks also go to all the teachers and students who co-operated in my research study and enthusiastically participated in the research. I cannot remain silent without remembering the continuous encouragement, and support from my dearest friends.

My deepest appreciation also goes to Mr. Laxman Yadav, Mrs. Renu Yadav, Sita Aryal, Kalpana Pokherel, Chitra Rai and Prem Lata Pradhan for their kind help in my study.

Finally, I would like to express my special thanks to my husband Mr. Binesh Roy and all the family members for their encouragement and kind support in my studies.

Ranju Kumari Yadav

## **ABSTRACT**

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

The research work attempts to find out the ability to use communicative English of grade nine students from both public and private sectors. To do so, the researcher collected data from the public and private schools of grade nine. The total sample population of the study consists of eighty students selected by using simple random sampling procedure.

To elicit the required data, the researcher has used both type of sources; primary and secondary. The primary source of data consists of forty students from public and forty from private schools. Equal number of boys and girls were included in the study.

This study found that the proficiency in communicating abilities of grade nine is not satisfactory. Comparatively the proficiency of the private school students are found satisfactory than the students of public school students. All the students are better in receptive type of language function than the productive type of language function.

This study consists of four chapters–

Chapter one consists of the general background, review of the related literature, objectives of the study, significance of the study.

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

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

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

# CONTENTS

	<b><i>Page No.</i></b>
Recommendation for acceptance	i
Recommendation for evaluation	ii
Evaluation and approval	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abstract	vii
List of abbreviations	ix
List of Tables	
 <b>CHAPTER - ONE</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION 1-18</b>	
1.1 General Background	1
1.1.1 The English Language	3
1.1.2 English in Nepal	4
1.1.3 Language Function	4
1.1.4 Language Function: Some Classifications	5
1.1.5 Communicative Proficiency: A Theoretical Review	9
1.1.6 Communicative Competence	9

1.1.7 A Theoretical Framework of Communicative Language Ability 10	
1.1.8 Measurement of Communicative Proficiency	13
1.1.8.1 Testing Communicative Function of Language	14
1.1.8.2 Testing Pragmatic Sensitivity	15
1.1.8.3 Testing Listening	15
1.1.8.4 Testing Speaking	16
1.2 Review of the Related Literature	17
1.3 Objectives of the Study	18
1.4 Significance of the Study	18
<b>CHAPTER-TWO</b>	
<b>METHODOLOGY 19-21</b>	
2.1 Sources of Data	19
2.1.1 Primary Sources	19
2.1.2 Secondary Sources	19
2.2 Sampling Procedure	19
2.3 Tools for Data Collection	20
2.4 Process of Data Collection	20
2.5 Limitations of the Study	21
<b>CHAPTER –THREE</b>	
<b>ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION</b>	<b>22-38</b>
3.1 Presentation of the Total Communicative Proficiency on the Whole	22
3.2 Communicative Proficiency of Public School Students	23
3.3 Communicative Proficiency of Private School Students	24
3.4 Total Communicative Proficiency between Public and Private School Students	24

3.5	Communicative Proficiency on the Basis of Gender	25
3.5.1	Proficiency of Boys between Public and Private Schools	26
3.5.2	Proficiency of Girls between Public and Private Schools	26
3.6	Item Wise Comparison of Communicative Proficiency between Public and Private School Students	27
3.6.1	Item Wise Presentation of Communicative Proficiency Of Public Schools	27
3.6.2	Item Wise Analysis of Communicative Proficiency of Private Schools	28
3.6.3	Item Wise Analysis of Total Communicative Proficiency	28
3.6.4	Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 1 in Terms of Schooling System	29
3.6.5	Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 2 in Terms of Schooling System	30
3.6.6	Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 1 with Reference to Gender	30
3.6.7	Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 2 with Reference to Gender	31
3.6.8	Presentation of Total Proficiency of Public Schools in Terms of Gender in Item No.1	31
3.6.9	Presentation of Total Proficiency of Private School in Terms of Gender	32
3.6.10	Presentation of Total Proficiency of Public School in Terms of Gender in Item No. Two	32
3.6.11	Presentation of Total Proficiency of Private Schools in Terms of Gender in Item No. Two	33
3.7	Communicative Proficiency of Golden Peak School	34

3.8	Communicative proficiency of Rajdhani Higher Secondary School	34
3.9	Communicative Proficiency of Mount View School	35
3.10	Communicative Proficiency of Societal Higher Secondary School	35
3.11	Communicative Proficiency of Rastriya Higher Secondary School	36
3.12	Communicative Proficiency of Nandiratri School	36
3.13	Communicative Proficiency of Pashupati Mitra Secondary School	37
3.14	Communicative Proficiency of Mahohar Secondary School	37

#### **CHAPTER – FOUR**

#### **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 39-42**

4.1	Findings	39
4.2	Recommendations	41

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

#### **APPENDIXES**

## LIST OF TABLES

	<i>Page No.</i>
Table 1: Total Communicative Proficiency	22
Table 2: Communicative Proficiency of Public School Students	23
Table 3: Communicative Proficiency of Private School Students	24
Table 4: Total Communicative Proficiency of Private and Public Schools	24
Table 5: Gender Wise Comparison of Communicative Proficiency	25
Table 6: Proficiency of Boys' Between Public and Private Schools	26
Table 7: Proficiency of Girls' Between Public and Private Schools	26
Table 8: Item Wise Presentation of Communicative Proficiency of Public Schools	27
Table 9: Item Wise Presentation of Communicative Proficiency of Private Schools	28
Table 10: Item Wise Analysis of Total Communicative Proficiency	28
Table 11: Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 1 in Terms of Schooling System	29
Table 12: Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 2 in Terms of Schooling System	30
Table 13: Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 1 with Reference to Gender	30
Table 14: Analysis of Total Proficiency in Item No. 2 with Reference to Gender	31
Table 15: Presentation of Total Proficiency of Public Schools in Terms of Gender in Item No. 1	31
Table 16: Presentation of Total Proficiency of Private Schools in Terms of Gender in Item No. One	32

Table 17: Presentation of Total Proficiency of Public Schools in Terms of Gender in Item No. 2	32
Table 18: Presentation of Total Proficiency of Private Schools in Terms of Gender in Item No. 2	33
Table 19: Communicative Proficiency of Golden Peak School Sarswatinagar	34
Table 20: Communicative Proficiency of Rajdhani Higher Secondary School Baneshwor	34
Table 21: Communicative Proficiency of Mount View School Mitrapark	35
Table 22: Communicative Proficiency of Societal Higher Secondary School New Baneshwor	35
Table 23: Communicative Proficiency of Rastriya Higher Secondary School Balaju	36
Table 24: Communicative Proficiency of Nandiratari School Naksal	36
Table 25: Communicative Proficiency of Pashupati Mitra Secondary School Chabhil	37
Table 26: Communicative Proficiency of Manohar Secondary School	37

**POST: TECHNICAL COORDINATOR**

**Submission to :**

**Trail Bridge Support Unit/Helvetas, Nepal**

**Pulchowk, Lalitpur**

**Submission by:**

**Chhabi Lal Roy**

**96/11 Panahiti Marg, Siphel**

**Kathmandu – W. No. 7**

**Tel. No. 01-4470854**

**P.o. Box. 9776**

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Avg. M.	–	Average Marks
Dr.	–	Doctor
e.g.	–	Exempligratia
etc.	–	Et cetera
F.M.	–	Full Marks
FOE	–	Faculty of Education
i.e.	–	id est (that is)
KTM	–	Kathmandu
M.Ed.	–	Master of education
Mr.	–	Mister
n't	–	not
No.	–	Number
Prof.	–	Professor
QN	–	Question Number
Reci.	–	Receptive
Regd.	–	Registration
S/he	–	She or he
SL	–	Secondary Level
Stud.	–	Student
T.U.	–	Tribhuvan University
Vi.	–	Vidyalaya (school)
Viz.	–	Namely
%	–	Percentage