

A STUDY ON THE PROFICIENCY IN THE USE OF ARTICLES

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master of Education in English**

Submitted by:

Arjun Parajuli

Roll No.:- 2270012 (2068/2011)

Academic Year:- 2066/067

T.U. Reg. No.:- 9-2-227-100-2006

To

Faculty of Education

Tribhuvan University

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar

Morang, Nepal

2017

A STUDY ON THE PROFICIENCY IN THE USE OF ARTICLES

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education
in Partial Fulfillment for the Master of Education in English**

**Submitted by:
Arjun Parajuli**

**Faculty of Education
Tribhuvan University
Koshi Campus, Biratnagar
Morang, Nepal
2017**

**T.U. Registration No.:- 9-2-227-100-2006 Date of Approval of the
Second Year Examination Thesis Proposal:2016/10/28
Roll No.:-2270012 (2068) Date of Submission:2017/04/02
Campus Roll No.:- 301(2066/067) Viva Date: 2017/04/09**

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Arjun Parajuli** has worked and prepared his M. Ed. thesis entitled “**A Study on the Proficiency in the Use of Articles**” under my guidance and supervision.

I recommended this thesis for acceptance

Date: 2017/03/09

Mr. Yubraj Bhandari

(Supervisor)

Department of English Education

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar, Morang,

Nepal

RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation from the following "**Research Guidance Committee**".

Mr. Dek Kumar Bastola

Head

Department of English Education

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar

Signature_____
Chairperson**Mr. Yuba Raj Bhandari**

Supervisor

Department of English Education

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar

Member**Mr. Ganesh Dulal**

Lecturer

Department of English Education

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar

Member

Date: 2017/04/07

EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following" **Thesis Evaluation and Approval Committee.**"

Signature

Mr. Dek Kumar Bastola

Head

Department of English Education

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar

Chairperson

Dr.Govinda Raj Bhattarai

Professor

Department of Education

University Campus, Kirtipur

Kathmandu, Nepal

Expert

Mr. Yuba Raj Bhandari

Supervisor

Department of English Education

Koshi Campus, Biratnagar

Member

Date: 2017/04/09

DECLARATION

I, hereby, declared to the best of knowledge, that this thesis is original; no part of it was earlier submitted for the candidature of research degree to any university.

Date- 2017/03/09

.....

Arjun Parajuli

DEDICATION

Dedicated

to my parents who devoted their entire life in making me what I am today.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First of all, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my thesis supervisor **Mr. Yuba Raj Bhandari**, lecturer, Department of English Education, Koshi Campus, Biratnagar for his valuable, guidance, constant encouragement, attention, cooperation and suggestions in the preparation of this thesis. Similarly, I am deeply indebted to **Mr. Dek Kumar Bastola**, Head, Department of English Education, Koshi Campus and **Mr. Ganesh Dulal**, Lecturer, Department of English Education, Koshi Campus for their suggestions.

I would like to extend my gratitude to the Headmasters, English teachers and students who helped me in collecting data of the study.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all the persons who directly or indirectly helped me during the preparation of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank **Mr. Arvind Yadav, Mr. Indra lal Suwal, Mr. Manoj Biswas and Mrs. Binita Pokhrel** for helping me to complete this thesis.

Arjun Parajuli

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study was to find out the proficiency in the use of articles by the students of grade Eight of Morang district, comparing different variables in terms of sex and school. For this study, the researcher took the sample students studying in grade eight from public and private schools of Morang district. The total sample of the study consisted of two hundred students. Five public and five private schools with equal sex ratio i.e. twenty students (ten girls and ten boys) from each school were randomly selected for the collection of data. The main findings of the study can be stated as the proficiency of the private school students was better than that of the public schools students. Similarly, the proficiency of the boys was found to be better than that of the girls in total. Among different types of test items, the item named “supply a/an and the where necessary in the given dialogue” was found to be the most difficult whereas multiple choice item was found to be the easiest one by all the students. It also consists of recommendation to teach articles on the basis of the findings.

The study has been presented in five chapters; the first chapter consists of general background, statement of problem, objective of the study, research question, significance of the study, delimitations of the study and operational definitions of the key terms. The second chapter describes the review of related literature and conceptual framework. Under it, review of theoretical literature, empirical literature, implication of review for the study and conceptual framework. The third chapter consists of method and procedure of the study. Under it, design and method of the

study, population, sample and sample strategy, study area, data collection tools and techniques, data collection procedure and data analysis and interpretation procedure

The fourth chapter consists analysis and interpretation of results of item wise analysis of the status of proficiency in using articles, status of total proficiency in each item, comparison of different variables with the average of each item, analysis and interpretation of the total proficiency of the students, comparison of total proficiency by sex and schools, comparison of their total proficiency within the schools, comparison of the proficiency of ten different schools with the total average and comparison of proficiency with the secondary norm. The fifth chapter consists conclusions and recommendation. In the final section of the study the work plan, references and appendices are included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
CHAPTER- ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study	3
1.4 Research Questions	3
1.5 Significance of the Study	4
1.6 Delimitations of the Study	4
1.7 Operational Definitions of the Key Terms	4
CHAPTER- TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	
2.1 Review of Theoretical Literature	6
2.1.1 Present English Curriculum in Secondary Schools	7
2.1.2 The Grammar and its Importance	8
2.1.3 The Articles in English	12
2.1.4 Pronunciation of the Articles	13
2.1.5 The Meaning of Articles	13
2.1.6 Rules of Articles	14
2.1.7 The Use and Omission of the Indefinite and Definite Articles	19
2.1.8 Using an Articles Chart with Common Nouns	26
2.1.9 Areas of Difficulties and Easiness in the Use of Articles	26
2.2 Review of Empirical Literature	29
2.3 Implication of Review for the Study	32
2.4 Conceptual Framework	33
CHAPTER- THREE: METHOD AND PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY	
3.1 Design and Method of the Study	35
3.2 Population, Sample and Sampling Strategy	35
3.3 Study Area	36

3.4 Data Collection Tools and Techniques	36
3.4.1 Multiple Choice Items	37
3.4.2 Fill in the Blanks Items	37
3.4.3 Cross out the Wrongly Used Articles and Make Necessary Correction	37
3.4.4 Supply A/An and 'The' in the Given Dialogues	37
3.4.5 Allotment of the Marks	37
3.5 Data Collection Procedure	38
3.6 Data Analysis and Interpretation Procedure	39

CHAPTER – FOUR: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1 Analysis and Interpretations	40
4.1.1 Analysis and Interpretation of Total Proficiency	40
4.1.2 Item wise Analysis of the Status of Proficiency in Using Articles	40
4.2 Item wise Analysis and Interpretation of the Status of Proficiency in Using Articles	41
4.3 Summary of Findings	62

CHAPTER- FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions	65
5.2 Recommendations	66
5.2.1 Policy Related	66
5.2.1 Practice Related	66
5.2.3 Further Research Related	67

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

	Page No
Table No.1: Allotment of Marks	38
Table No.2: Total Proficiency	41
Table No. 3: Comparison of Difference with the Average Score	42
Table No.4: Study of Proficiency by Public and Private Schools	43
Table No. 5: Status of Proficiency by Sex	44
Table No. 6: Comparison of Their Total Proficiency within the Schools	46
Table No. 7: Comparison of the Proficiency of Ten Different Schools with the Average Score	49
Table No.8: Comparison of Proficiency with the Secondary Norm	51
Table No.9: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in ItemNo.1	52
Table No.10: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.1	53
Table No.11: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in Item No.2	54
Table No.12: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.2	55
Table No.13: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in Item No.3	57
Table No.14: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.3	58
Table No.15: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in Item No.4	59
Table No.16: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.4	60

LIST OF DIAGRAMS

	PageNo
Diagram No.2: Total Proficiency	41
Diagram No. 3: Comparison of Difference with the Average Score	42
Diagram No.4: Study of Proficiency by Public and Private Schools	43
Diagram No. 5: Status of Proficiency by Sex	45
Diagram No. 7: Comparison of the Proficiency of Ten Different Schools with the average Score	49
Diagram No.8: Comparison of Proficiency with the Secondary Norm	51
Diagram No.9: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in ItemNo.1	52
Diagram No.10: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.1	53
Diagram No.11: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in Item No.2	54
Diagram No.12: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.2	56
Diagram No.13: Analysis of the Total proficiency in Item No.3	57
Diagram No.14: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.3	58
Diagram No.15: Analysis of the Total Proficiency in Item No.4	59
Diagram No.16: Comparison of Different Variables with the Average Score in Item No.4	60

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS

viz.	Namely
CDC	Curriculum Development Centre
CUP	Cambridge University Press
Dif.	Difference
T.U.	Tribhuvan University
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United State of America
PCL	Proficiency Certificate Level