# English language proficiency level of Higher Secondary level students in Nepal

# Keshab Kumar Sijali

PhD Scholar
Department of Education and Psychology
Mewar University, Rajasthan, India
keshu\_sijali@yahoo.com

## **ABSTRACT**

The objective of this study is to investigate the proficiency level of English language of higher secondary level students in Nepal regarding their gender, nature of institution, medium of instruction and stream. The subject of this study comprises 529 learners from 22 higher secondary school of academic year 2015/6 among whom an English language proficiency test was conducted. The data obtained were analyzed using mean, Mann-Whitney U-test and Kruskal Wallis H-test of non-parametric test. The result showed that the English language proficiency level of higher secondary level students in Nepal was poor (M = 10.4490). Regarding the gender, the result showed that there was no statistically significant difference between female and male ELT students in their English language proficiency level. However, ELT students of government higher secondary level were found statistically significantly less proficient in English language than that of private higher secondary level .Similarly, the Nepali medium ELT students were found statistically significantly highly less proficient in English language than that of English medium. The result further showed that there was statistically significant difference in the English language proficiency level of higher secondary level students in Nepal from different streams  $x^2(3) =$ 48.168, p < .001, with a mean rank of 257.25 for science, 302.44 for management, 166.61 for humanities and 212.47 for education stream.

**Keywords:** ELT students; English language proficiency level; higher secondary level students, language systems; language skills.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

English language proficiency (ELP) refers to the learners' command over English language to use it in the variety of purposes. There is a substantaial body of literature carried out in investigating the learners' English language proficiency level. However, relatively few studies have attempted to show the learners' English language proficiency level regarding the multiple variable like gender, medium of instruction, nature of institution where they read, faculties etc. No research has been carried out in revealing the English language proficiency level of higher secondary level students in context of Nepal especially in the margnalized area of Bara district. Hence, the objective of this study is to accomplish the task of investigating the English language proficiency level of higher secondary level students regarding the aforementioned strata in Bara district of Nepal.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

# 2.1 Language System

Language system refers to the specific aspects of language comprising vocabulary, grammar and communicative function and teaching such aspects of language is called teaching language system. These aspects of language are described below:

# 2.1.1 Teaching Vocabulary

Vocabulary is a word or set of words consisting of single word, compound word and idiom and teaching vocabulary means teaching such items. Words may be of content or function, active or passive. While teaching vocabulary, it is suggested to focus on active vocabulary since these words are the requirements of learners for day to day communication (Sharma, 2010). Teaching vocabulary entails teaching all aspects associated with it regarding word meaning, word use, word formation and word grammar (Wang, 2013).

The techniques required for teaching vocabulary consist of teaching pronunciation and spelling, explaining meaning of a word, stepwise procedure of presenting a word, vocabulary building games and exercises (Sharma, opt. cit). As he suggests, techniques like modeling or drilling, visual representation and use of phonetic symbols can be used for pronunciation and phonic method and spelling rules for teaching spelling. Similarly, for the presentation of word meaning, obstensive, linguistic and audio techniques can be used. The one way task technique of story narration and two way task technique of communication can be used for teaching meaning (Rahimian, 2013). Post teaching activities like the use of games, speaking tasks and story, role play are found to be facilitating in achieving vocabulary (Sadeghi & Sharifi, 2013).

Graphic organizer is an instructional technique of comprising the procedures of preparation, presentation, practice and evaluation which "helps students organize and structure information and concepts as well as promote thinking about relationships between concepts" (Chien, 2012, p. 49). It is found to be more effective than the traditional instruction in developing vocabulary building (Chien, 2012; Al-Hinnawi, 2012). Similarly, word guessing and use of literal meaning (Tran, 2012), threshold strategy (Abidin & Eng, 2013), task based approach (Sarani & Sahebi, 2012), semantic mapping strategy (Nilforoushan, 2012), field-independent cognitive learning style (Nezhad & Shokrpour, 2012) are effective in teaching vocabulary. Schmitt & McCarthy (as cited in Jian-Ping, 2013) suggest to use intentional language learning since learning English words intentionally can "give a sense of progress and a sense of achievement" (p. 250). The prime method applied for teaching vocabulary is Ps model but most of the students find it painstaking and ineffective; so Shi (2013) recommends to use the data-driven learning (DDL) approach based on observe-hypothesize-experiment (OHE) model, which "involves accessing vast data bases of corpora with software programs called concordancers, that help users access a large quantity of data bases, analyzing different language patterns and summarizing the general rules for using words" (pp. 66-67).

# 2.1.2 Teaching Grammar

Grammar comprises the aspect of syntax and morphology and grammar teaching focuses on the pattern of language and practice of these rules. There are two approaches used to teach grammar namely deductive approach and inductive approach. In deductive approach, there is a direct and explicit explanation of grammatical structures whereas in inductive approach, there is no direct explanation of grammatical explanation but it "favors induction or the learners' discovery of the grammatical rules through tasks" (Ellis as cited in Dang & Nguyen, 2013, p. 113). Hence, it is also called indirect explicit grammar instruction which is considered to "have great contributions to enhancing learners' rule comprehension" (Dang & Nguyen, 2013, p. 119). But, Azar (as cited in Ezzi, 2012) recommends the application of grammar based teaching instead of adopting any of them to benefit from the advantages of both approaches. For the practice of grammar, different grammar exercises can be conducted like awareness, controlled drills, meaningful drills, guided meaningful practices, free sentence composition based on structure, structure based discourse composition and free discourse (Sharma, 2010).

## 2.1.3 Teaching Communicative Function

Communicative function refers to communicative goal or purpose for the fulfillment of which language is used. Communicative function comprises requesting, ordering, asking for permission etc. Language is for communication. Therefore, to teach language means to make learners communicatively competent. This means teaching language should enhance learners' communicative competence which comprises the grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence by help of which learners become competent in handling any of the communicative situations.

## 2.2 Language Skills

Modes or manners in which language is used are called language skills that comprise listening, speaking, reading and writing. These skills are grouped into receptive and productive skills. Listening and reading skills belong to receptive skill and the rest belongs to productive skill. These skills can be discussed separately below:

# 2.2.1 Teaching Listening

Listening refers to the learners' ability to comprehend the speakers' pronunciation, grammar and meaning along with their accent and hence teaching listening skill refers to teaching listening comprehension which comprises identifying words, constructing information and their utilization (Sharma, 2010). There are different types of listening namely extensive, intensive, live and prerecorded listening. Use of audio video material (Harmer, 2008), the multimedia digital file of podcast (Qasim & Fadda, 2013), cooperative listening materials (Ghassemi, 2013) are found effective materials to enhance listening comprehension.

The activities for teaching listening skill may comprise dictation, listen and respond, jigsaw listening, cloze listening, music and sound effect etc (Sharma, 2010). Similarly, discrimination game, minimal pair game, listen respond game, Simon says etc are the popular listening game that can be used while teaching listening (ibid). Jannejad, Shokouhi, & Haghighi (2012) suggest for the explicit instruction of cognitive and metacognitive strategies to improve learners' listening comprehensive. In the virtual learning class, Tian & Suppasetseree (2013) show the significance of online task-based interactive listening model consisting of six phase like "identifying setting, setting instructional goals, designing lessons, producing online instructional package, conducting developed lessons and evaluating" (p.31). Ghoneim (2013) has made discussion on top down, bottom up and metacognitive strategies and states that advanced group learners prefer using top down strategies in which learners enhance their listening comprehension taping into "background knowledge of topic, context and the type of text and the language" (p. 102).

# 2.2.2 Teaching Speaking Skills

Speaking refers to the learners' ability to express target language fluently and appropriately using the combined form of grammatical pattern and vocabulary, suprasegmental features and meaning (Sharma, 2010). According to him, the main reason of teaching speaking is to provide learners opportunities to practice real life speaking in the safety of the classroom with their engagement activating their passively stored language elements. One of the major things to consider while teaching speaking is to incorporate cultural features of the target language society into instructional materials for the "development of pragmatic comprehension ability in English as a foreign language context" (Rafieyan, Majid, & Eng. 2013, p. 131). The usage of culture in foreign language teaching through culture "facilitates and empowers language education and acquisition" (Doganay, Ashirimabetova, & Davis, 2013, p. 15). In other words, intercultural approach "trains learners to be diplomats, able to view different cultures from a perspective of informed understanding and enhances their cultural understanding and intercultural competence" (Corbett as cited in Chinh, 2013, p. 1). Wei (2013) shows the significance of the western cultural non-verbal behavior such as time language, space language, body touch and personal distance, body language to "attract the students' attention, transmitting culture, improving language learning and cross cultural communication" (p. 194).

Discussions, describing objects, information gap activities, student presentation etc are common speaking activities that can be used to sharpen learners' speaking skill (Harmer, 2008). Amorim (2013) shows the importance of two step strategy of awareness-raising lesson for "calling learners' attention to the purpose of the activity" and small buzz group discussion for "helping learners in small buzz group who are reluctant to give their opinion in front of whole class due to lack of confident in their linguistic ability" (pp. 116-117). Bei (2013) shows the significance of repetition of narrative tasks for increasing fluency accuracy. Levelt (as cited in Bei, 2013) presents the model of speaking that comprises conceptualization of general knowledge for the formulation of vocabulary, grammar and meaning for the actual articulation.

# 2.2.3 Teaching Reading Skill

Reading is one of the language skills in which learners construct the message from the strings of graphic symbols (Sharma, 2010). Teaching reading skills aims at making learners practice the skill of reading and to provide language exposure that is useful for the acquisition of language. There are two type of reading namely intensive and extensive reading. It entails the skills of skimming for theme of a text, scanning for particular piece of information and reading for detailed comprehension. One of the major principles regarding the reading skill is that learners are to be encouraged to respond to the content of the text not only concentrate on its construction.

Silent reading, loud reading, answering the comprehensive questions of different types, finding the main idea, summarizing, discussion of problem, jigsaw reading, problem solving are suggestive activities for which text of different literary genres can be used for the practice of reading skill (Sharma, op. cit). For reading comprehension, Sadeghi & Ahmadi (2012) show the significance of the use of gloss, which is a definition of word given on the margin in a reading text. Similarly, application of schema theory (Zhao & Zhu, 2012), use of different model of reading like class discussion, and small group discussion (Shen, 2013; Hamra & Syatriana, 2012) teaching English through MI theory (Jing, 2013), adoption of cooperative learning (Pan & Wu, 2013), use of graphic organizer (D & Rajan, 2013), adoption of reading techniques of SQ3R i.e. survey, question, read, recite and review (Attaprechakul, 2013 & Mohammadi, Heidari, & Niry, 2012), use of metacognitive reading strategy (Ahmadi, Ismail, & Abdullah, 2013), use of fill in the map version of concept map technique (Soleimani & Nabizadeh, 2012), use of novel as a reading text (Tsai, 2012), use of authentic material (Guo, 2012), focus on language based approaches and strategy based approaches(Park, 2013) are found effective techniques to enhance learners' reading comprehension. In the virtual world of ELT, the use of blogs (Kashani, Mahmud, & Kalajahi, 2013) and application of blended learning (Alzumor et al., 2013) can also be beneficial for the enhancement of learners' reading comprehension.

# 2.2.4 Teaching Writing Skill

Writing is a process of encoding of message in graphic form and the main purpose of teaching writing to learners is for language processing which is the learners' act of thinking in the target language that helps them to understand its construction better (Sharma, 2010). This skill comprises the different stages or skill of copying, reproduction, recombination, guided writing and free writing.

Harmer (2008) suggests different activities to develop writing skill of learners as to respond to a teacher in instant writing, to write the effect of music listening to it and to give the description of picture in written form; to develop a story in collaborative writing, messaging by writing to each other, to write in different genres etc. Li (2013) points out the importance of product-oriented, author oriented and reader- oriented model to enhance learners' writing skill. Salih (2013) shows the significance of peer response to target language writing since it provides opportunities to "share ideas, provide feedback, negotiate meaning and collaborate to provide the final drafts showing the need of more training on other aspects of essay writing" (p. 48). Yunus, Salehi, & Nordin (2012)

suggest the stepwise procedures of software paragraph punch writing comprising the procedures of selecting a topic, constructing a topic sentence, generating supporting ideas and writing a conclusion. Liangprayoon, Chaya, & Thepackraphong (2013) prescribe the topical structure analysis consisting of two segments namely topic and comment for raising learners' awareness in the textual coherence. Jingxia & Li (2013) prescribe the theme theory to help learners "get out of the narrow scope of syntax improving their writing coherence and overall writing proficiency" (p. 128). Similarly, other techniques for the enhancement of writing skill of learners are the problembased learning approach (Othman & Shah, 2013); use of textual, ideational and interpersonal metafunction (Pazirai, 2013); summary writing through key word and questions generation method (Chou, 2012); reflective learning portfolios writing (Hemmati & Soltanpour, 2012); use of reflective writing (Roux, Mora, & Tamez, 2012); use of processing instruction (Salen, 2013; Hashemnezhad & Zangalani, 2012); task based teaching writing (Cao, 2012) providing pre-task planning time on L2 learners' narrative writing (Seyyedi et.al, 2013); Sparing time on reviewing (Wakabayashi, 2013). In the virtual world of ELT, online collaborative writing (Grami, 2012); adoption of social networking sites (Razak, Saeed, & Ahmad, 2013; Yunu, Selehi, & Chenzi, 2012); the use of blog (Qi-yuan, 2013) are found to be very effective for the developing learners' writing skill.

# 3. METHODOLOGY

# 3.1 Research Questions

The research questions to facilitate the objective of this study are as below:

- 3.1.1 What is the ELP level of higher secondary level students in Nepal?
- 3.1.2 What is the difference between the learners' ELP level in terms of gender?
- 3.1.3What is the difference between the learners' ELP level in terms of nature of institution?
- 3.1.4 What is the difference between the learners' ELP level in terms of medium of instruction?
- 3.1.5 What is the difference between the learners' ELP level in terms of faculty?

#### 3.2 PARTICIPANTS

The participants of this research consist of 529 ELT students of grade 12 in the academic year of 2015/6 of 22 higher secondary schools of Bara district in Nepal. The participants were sampled using multi-stage cluster sampling and the schools were sampled using fish bowl procedure. Among the respondents, 331 (62.57%) were female and 198 (37.42%) were male; 492 (93.00%) were from Nepali and 37 (6.99%) were from English medium; 490 (92.62%) from government and 39 (7.37%) were from private higher secondary schools. Similarly, 315 (59.54%) were from management, 198 (37.42%) were from education, 14 (2.64%) were from humanities and 2 (0.37%) respondents were selected from science stream. Although all participants took part in listening, reading, writing and grammar test, the number of participants in speaking test was only 468. This means, 61 participants left the speaking test. The researcher couldn't force for the participation due to ethical consideration.

## 3.3 INSTRUMENTS

The instrument of proficiency test comprises the listening, speaking, reading and writing including grammar test distributing for each of the skills and aspect 10 marks and total as 50 allocating an hour time. In order to measure the learners' listening ability, the researcher used the listening script with two questions for answering short question and writing true false on the basis of listening text. Speaking test comprises three items as the first item for learners' introduction, the second item for describing the pie chart and the third for developing a story on the basis of given pictures. For measuring the level of reading skill, a reading passage with five items to be answered was used as an instrument extracted from the higher secondary exam board, 2065, Nepal. An essay writing task on the role of youth in nation building was assign to measure the level of their writing skill. For testing their grammatical competence, the researcher used 10 items extracting them equally from the *Meaning into Words* of grade 11 and 12. Generally grammatical level of learners can be tested in their writing skill since grammar is a part of writing skill. However, the separate question for grammar test was designed as it is taught as a separate subject in this level in Nepal.

# 4. RESULTS

# 4.1 Indicator of Determining Learners' Proficiency Level

As presented in the Table 1, the learners' score that falls between 33.34-50.00 will be categorized as good; those scoring between 16.67-33.33 will be categorized as average and between 0.50-16.66 will be categorized as poor.

| Table 1. Indicator of Determining Learners' Proficiency Level |             |  |  |  |
|---|-------------|--|--|--|
| Language Proficiency Level                                    | Mean        |  |  |  |
| Good  | 33.34-50.00 |  |  |  |
| Average   | 16.67-33.33 |  |  |  |
| Poor  | 0.50-16.66  |  |  |  |

# 4.2 Proficiency Level of ELT Students

The mean in Table 2 showed that the proficiency level of ELT students was comparatively very poor in writing (M = .6087). They were found grammatically less proficient (M = .6947). Their proficiency level was poor in reading (M = 2.2722) and speaking (M = 2.6891). Comparatively their proficiency level in listening was better than other skills however it was below average (M = 4.4943). In overall, the proficiency level of ELT students of higher secondary level in Nepal was poor (M = 10.4490).

| Table 2. ELT Learners' Proficiency Level                          |      |        |       |       |        |        |         |
|---|------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|---------|
| Respondents Reading Grammar Writing Listening Speaking Grand Mean |      |        |       |       |        |        |         |
| Student   | Mean | 2.2722 | .6947 | .6087 | 4.4943 | 2.6891 | 10.4490 |
|   | N    | 529    | 529   | 529   | 529    | 468    | 529     |
| Grand   | Mean | 2.2722 | .6947 | .6087 | 4.4943 | 2.6891 | 10.4490 |
| Mean  | N    | 529    | 529   | 529   | 529    | 468    | 529     |

# 4.3 Proficiency Level of ELT Students in Terms of Gender

The mean resulted in Table 3 showed that male students (M = 2.2197) were less proficient than female students (M = 2.3036) in reading. However, female students (M = .6495) were found grammatically less proficient than male (M = .7702). Female students (M = .4184) were found less proficient in writing in comparison to male students (M = .9268). Female students (M = 4.4924) in listening were found less proficient than male students (M = 4.4975). Female students (M = 2.4572) were also found less proficient than male students (M = 3.0739) in speaking. In overall, female ELT students (M = 10.0317) of higher secondary level in Nepal were found less proficient than male students (M = 11.1465).

| Table 3. ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Gender |      |         |         |         |           |          |            |
|---|------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Gender  |      | Reading | Grammar | Writing | Listening | Speaking | Grand Mean |
| Female  | Mean | 2.3036  | .6495   | .4184   | 4.4924    | 2.4572   | 10.0317    |
|   | N    | 331     | 331     | 331     | 331       | 292      | 331        |
| Male  | Mean | 2.2197  | .7702   | .9268   | 4.4975    | 3.0739   | 11.1465    |
|   | N    | 198     | 198     | 198     | 198       | 176      | 198        |
| Grand   | Mean | 2.2722  | .6947   | .6087   | 4.4943    | 2.6891   | 10.4490    |
| Mean  | N    | 529     | 529     | 529     | 529       | 468      | 529        |

However, the result of statistic test in Table 5 showed that there was no statistically significant difference between female and male ELT students in their English language proficiency level (U = 30106.500, p = .117) with their mean rank (Table 4) of 256.96 for female students and 278.45 for male students.

| Table 4. Mean Rank of Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Gender |        |     |        |          |  |  |  |
|--|--------|-----|--------|----------|--|--|--|
| Variable Gender N Mean Rank Sum of Ranks                             |        |     |        |          |  |  |  |
| English Language   | Female | 331 | 256.96 | 85052.50 |  |  |  |
| Proficiency  | Male   | 198 | 278.45 | 55132.50 |  |  |  |
|  | Total  | 529 |        |          |  |  |  |

|                       | glish Language Proficiency Level English Language Proficiency |
|-----------------------|---|
| nnn-Whitney U         | 30106.500   |
| lcoxon W              | 85052.500   |
|                       | -1.566  |
| symp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .117  |

Vol. 3. No. I www.phdcentre.edu.np 66

# 4.4 Proficiency Level of ELT Students in Terms of Nature of Institution

The mean in Table 6 showed that ELT students of government institution were less proficient than that of private institution in each of the skills and aspect of language i.e. government higher secondary level students (M = 2.0510) and private higher secondary level students (M = 5.0513) in reading; government higher secondary level students (M = .6010) and private higher secondary level students (M = 1.8718) in grammar; government higher secondary level students (M = .5337) and private higher secondary level students (M = 1.5513) in writing; government higher secondary level students (M = 5.0256) in listening and government higher secondary level students (M = 2.5466) and private higher secondary level students (M = 4.2564) in speaking. In overall, government higher secondary level ELT students (M = 9.8673) were found less proficient in English than private higher secondary level ELT students (M = 17.7564).

| Table 6. ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Nature of Institution |      |         |         |         |           |          |            |
|--|------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Nature of Institution  |      | Reading | Grammar | Writing | Listening | Speaking | Grand Mean |
| Government   | Mean | 2.0510  | .6010   | .5337   | 4.4520    | 2.5466   | 9.8673     |
|  | N    | 490     | 490     | 490     | 490       | 429      | 490        |
| Private  | Mean | 5.0513  | 1.8718  | 1.5513  | 5.0256    | 4.2564   | 17.7564    |
|  | N    | 39      | 39      | 39      | 39        | 39       | 39         |
| Grand Mean   | Mean | 2.2722  | .6947   | .6087   | 4.4943    | 2.6891   | 10.4490    |
|  | N    | 529     | 529     | 529     | 529       | 468      | 529        |

The result of statistic test in Table 8 showed that ELT students of government higher secondary level were statistically significantly less proficient in English language than that of private higher secondary level (U = 3721.500, p < .001) with their mean rank (Table 7) 253.09 for government higher secondary level ELT students and 414.58 for private higher secondary level ELT students.

|   |                       |     |           | •            |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------------|-----|-----------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Table 7. Mean Rank of ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Nature of Institution |                       |     |           |              |  |  |  |
| Variable  | Nature of Institution | N   | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |  |  |  |
| Proficiency Level   | Government            | 490 | 253.09    | 124016.50    |  |  |  |
| in Terms of   | Private               | 39  | 414.58    | 16168.50     |  |  |  |
| Institution   | Total                 | 529 |           |              |  |  |  |

| Table 8. Statistic Test for ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Nature of Institution |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | Proficiency Level in Terms of Institution |  |  |  |
| Mann-Whitney U  | 3721.500                                  |  |  |  |
| Wilcoxon W  | 124016.500                                |  |  |  |
| Z   | -6.355                                    |  |  |  |

| 1   | 201   | _ |
|-----|-------|---|
| ıan | ı 201 | n |

| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)                      | .000 |
|---|------|
| a. Grouping Variable: Nature of Institution |      |

## 4.5 Proficiency Level of ELT Students in Terms of Medium of Instruction

The mean resulted in Table 9 showed that ELT students of government institutions were less proficient than that of private institutions in each of the skills and aspect of language i.e. Nepali medium ELT students (M = 2.0518) and English medium ELT students (M = 5.2027) in reading; Nepali medium ELT students (M = .5904) and English medium ELT students (M = 2.0811) in grammar; Nepali medium ELT students (M = .5152) and English medium ELT students (M = 1.8514) in writing; Nepali medium ELT students (M = 4.4309) and English medium ELT students (M = 5.3378) in listening and Nepali medium ELT students (M = 2.5128) and English medium students (M = 4.7432) in speaking. In overall, Nepali medium ELT students (M = 9.7896) were found less proficient in English than English medium ELT students (M = 19.2162).

| Table 9. ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Medium of Instruction |      |         |         |         |           |          |            |  |
|--|------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|--|
| Medium   |      | Reading | Grammar | Writing | Listening | Speaking | Grand Mean |  |
| Nepali   | Mean | 2.0518  | .5904   | .5152   | 4.4309    | 2.5128   | 9.7896     |  |
|  | N    | 492     | 492     | 492     | 492       | 431      | 492        |  |
| English  | Mean | 5.2027  | 2.0811  | 1.8514  | 5.3378    | 4.7432   | 19.2162    |  |
|  | N    | 37      | 37      | 37      | 37        | 37       | 37         |  |
| Total  | Mean | 2.2722  | .6947   | .6087   | 4.4943    | 2.6891   | 10.4490    |  |
|  | N    | 529     | 529     | 529     | 529       | 468      | 529        |  |

The result of statistic test in Table 11 showed that higher secondary level ELT students of Nepali medium in Nepal were statistically significantly highly less proficient in English language than that of English medium (U = 2602.000, p < .001) with the mean rank (Table 10) 251.79 for Nepali medium ELT students and 440.68 for English medium ELT students.

| Table 10. Mean Rank of ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Medium of Instruction |  |     |        |           |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|-----|--------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Variable   | Variable Medium N Mean Rank Sum of Ranks |     |        |           |  |  |  |  |
| Proficiency Level in   | Nepali                                   | 492 | 251.79 | 123880.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Terms of Medium English 37 440.68 16305.00   |  |     |        |           |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total                                    | 529 |        |           |  |  |  |  |

| Table 11. Statistic Test for ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Medium of |                                      |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Instruction  |                                      |  |
|  | Proficiency Level in Terms of Medium |  |
| Mann-Whitney U   | 2602.000                             |  |
| Wilcoxon W   | 123880.000                           |  |
| Z  | -7.255                               |  |

| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)       | .000 |
|------------------------------|------|
| a. Grouping Variable: Medium |      |

# 4.6 Proficiency Level of ELT Students in Terms of Different Streams

The mean in Table 12 showed that in reading test, the ELT students from education (M =1.9369) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from science (M =2.2500); management (M =2.4683) and humanities (M =2.6071). In grammatical test, the ELT students from education (M =.4167) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from science (M =.5000); humanities (M =.6429) and management (M =.8730). In writing test, the ELT students from education (M =.3485) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from humanities (M =.7143); science (M =.7500) and management (M =.7667). In listening test, the ELT students from science (M = 2.0000) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from humanities (M = 2.6429); education (M = 4.2424) and management (M = 4.7508). In speaking test, the ELT students from education (M = 2.1250) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from humanities (M =2.3750); management (M = 2.9899) and science (M = 3.7500). In overall, the ELT students from education (M = 8.6187) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from humanities (M = 8.6429); science (M = 9.2500) and management (M = 11.6873).

| Table 12. ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Different Stream |      |         |         |         |           |          |            |
|--|------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|
| Faculty  |      | Reading | Grammar | Writing | Listening | Speaking | Grand Mean |
| Science  | Mean | 2.2500  | .5000   | .7500   | 2.0000    | 3.7500   | 9.2500     |
|  | N    | 2       | 2       | 2       | 2         | 2        | 2          |
| Management   | Mean | 2.4683  | .8730   | .7667   | 4.7508    | 2.9899   | 11.6873    |
|  | N    | 315     | 315     | 315     | 315       | 298      | 315        |
| Humanities   | Mean | 2.6071  | .6429   | .7143   | 2.6429    | 2.3750   | 8.6429     |
|  | N    | 14      | 14      | 14      | 14        | 12       | 14         |
| Education  | Mean | 1.9369  | .4167   | .3485   | 4.2424    | 2.1250   | 8.6187     |
|  | N    | 198     | 198     | 198     | 198       | 156      | 198        |
| Total  | Mean | 2.2722  | .6947   | .6087   | 4.4943    | 2.6891   | 10.4490    |
|  | N    | 529     | 529     | 529     | 529       | 468      | 529        |

The result of statistic test in Table 14 showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the proficiency level of ELT learners of higher secondary level in Nepal from different stream in English language  $x^2(3) = 48.168$ , p < .001, with a mean rank (Table 13) of 257.25 for science, 302.44 for management, 166.61 for humanities and 212.47 for education stream.

| Table 13. Mean Rank of ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Stream |         |   |        |
|---|---------|---|--------|
| Variable Faculty N Mean Rank  |         |   |        |
| in  | Science | 2 | 257.25 |

| Proficiency Level | Management | 315 | 302.44 |
|-------------------|------------|-----|--------|
| Terms of Streams  |            |     |        |
|                   | Humanities | 14  | 166.61 |
|                   | Education  | 198 | 212.47 |
|                   | Total      | 529 |        |

| Table 14. Statistic Test for ELT Learners' Proficiency Level in Terms of Stream |                                      |  |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
|   | Proficiency Level in Terms of Stream |  |  |
| Chi-Square  | 48.168                               |  |  |
| Df  | 3                                    |  |  |
| Asymp. Sig.   | .000                                 |  |  |
| a. Grouping variable : Stream   |                                      |  |  |

#### 5. DISCUSSION

After all analysis of the data, grand mean showed that the proficiency level of ELT students of higher secondary level in Nepal was found poor (M = 10.4490).

Regarding the gender, the result showed that female ELT students (M = 10.0317) of higher secondary level in Nepal were found less proficient than male students (M = 11.1465). However, the result of statistic test showed that there was no statistically significant difference between female and male ELT students in their proficiency level in English language (U = 30106.500, p = .117) with their mean rank of 256.96 for female students and 278.45 for male students.

Regarding the nature of institution, the result showed that government higher secondary level ELT students (M = 9.8673) were found less proficient in English language than private higher secondary level ELT students (M = 17.7564). The result of statistic test also showed that ELT students of government higher secondary level were statistically significantly less proficient in English language than that of private higher secondary level (U = 3721.500, p < .001) with their mean rank 253.09 for government higher secondary level ELT students and 414.58 for private higher secondary level ELT students.

Regarding the medium of instruction, the result showed that Nepali medium ELT students (M =9.7896) were found less proficient in English language than English medium ELT students (M = 19.2162). The result of statistic test also showed that higher secondary level ELT students of Nepali medium in Nepal were statistically significantly highly less proficient in English language than that of English medium (U = 2602.000, p < .001) with the mean rank 251.79 for Nepali medium ELT students and 440.68 for English medium ELT students.

Regarding the different stream or faculty, the result showed that the ELT students from education (M = 8.6187) ranked the least proficient in English language followed by ELT students from

humanities (M = 8.6429); science (M = 9.2500) and management (M = 11.6873). The result of statistic test also showed that there was statistically significant difference in the proficiency level of ELT learners of higher secondary level in Nepal from different stream in English language  $x^2(3) = 48.168$ , p < .001, with a mean rank of 257.25 for science, 302.44 for management, 166.61 for humanities and 212.47 for education stream.

#### 6. CONCLUSION

After analysis of all items of proficiency test and discussion made, conclusion can be drawn that the English language proficiency level of ELT students of higher secondary level education in Bara district of Nepal is very poor. Therefore, ELT teachers are recommended to adopt the effective methods and techniques so as to enhance learners' proficiency level of English language.

## 7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the ELT learners of grade 12 of Bara district in Nepal in the academic year of 2015/6 for their kind cooperation in providing their valuable time by appearing in the proficiency test for the purpose of this study.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, M. R., Ismail, H. N., & Abdullah, M. K. (2013). The Importance of Metacognitive Reading Strategy Awareness in Reading Comprehension. *ELT*, 6 (10), 235-244.
- Al-Hinnawi, A. N. (2012). The Effect of the Graphic Organizer Strategy on University Students' English Vocabulary Building. *ELT*, *5* (12), 62-69.
- Alzumor, A. W., Refaai, I. K., Eddin, E. A., & Al-Rahman, F. H. (2013). EFL Students' Perceptions of a Blended Learning Environment: Advantages, Limitations and Suggestions for Improvement. *ELT*, 6 (10), 95-110.
- Amorim, R. M. (2013). Transforming Passive Listeners into Active Speakers: A Study with Portuguese Undergraduates in English for the Social Sciences. *ELT*, 6 (4), 110-119.
- Attaprechakul, D. (2013). Inference Strategies to Improve Reading Comprehension of Challenging Texts. *ELT*, 6 (3), 82-91.
- Bei, G. X. (2013). Effects of Immediate Repetition in L2 Speaking Tasks: A Focused Study. *ELT* , 6 (1), 11-19.
- Cao, L. (2012). A Feasibility Study of Task Based Teaching of College English Writing in Chinese EFL Context. *ELT*, 5 (10), 80-91.
- Chien, C.-w. (2012). Use of Graphic Oganizers in a Lnguage Tachers' Pofessional Dvelopment. *ELT*, 5 (10), 49-57.

- Chinh, N. D. (2013). Cultural Diversity in English Language Teaching Learners' Voices. *ELT*, 6 (4), 1-18.
- Chou, M.-h. (2012). Implementing Keyword and Question Qpproaches in Teaching EFL Summary Writing. *ELT*, 5 (12), 36-41.
- D, P. S., & Rajan, P. (2013). Using Graphic Organizers to Improve Reading Comprehension Skills for the Middle School ESL Students. *ELT*, 6 (2), 155-170.
- Dang, T. T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2013). Direct Versus Indirect Explicit Methods of Enhancing EFL Students' English Grammatical Competence: A Concept Checking Based Consciousness-raising Task Model. *ELT*, 6 (1), 112-121.
- Doganay, Y., Ashirimabetova, M., & Davis, B. (2013). Making Culture Happen in the English Langue Classroom. *ELT*, 6 (10), 11-16.
- Ezzi, N. A. (2012). Yemeni Teachers' Beliefs of Grammar Teaching and Classroom Practices. *ELT* , 5 (8), 170-184.
- Ghassemi, M. (2013). The Impact of Cooperative Listening Materials Adaption on Listening Comprehension Performance of Iranian EFL Learners. *ELT*, 6 (2), 45-54.
- Ghoneim, N. M. (2013). The Listening Comprehension Strategies Used by College Students to Cope with the Aural Problems in EFL Classes: An Analytical Study. *ELT*, 6 (2), 100112.
- Grami, G. M. (2012). Online Collaborative Writing for ESL Learners Using Blogs and Feedback Checklists. *ELT*, 5 (10), 43-48.
- Guo, S.-c. (2012). Using Authentic Materials for Extensive Reading to Promote English Proficiency. *ELT*, 5 (8), 196-206.
- Hamra, A., & Syatriana, E. (2012). A Model of Reading Teaching for University EFL Studetns: Need Analysis and Model Design. *ELT*, *5* (10), 1-11.
- Harmer, J. (2008). How to Teach English. London: Pearson Longman.
- Hashemnezhad, H., & Zangalani, S. K. (2012). The Effects of Processing Instruction and Traditional Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Ability. *ELT*, 5 (11), 125-135.
- Hemmati, F., & Soltanpour, F. (2012). A Comparison of the Effects of Reflective Learning Portfolios and Dialogue Journal Writing on Iranian EFL Learners' Accuracy in Writing Performance. *ELT*, 5 (11), 16-28.
- Jannejad, M., Shokouhi, H., & Haghighi, S. B. (2012). The Eects of Controlled Language Processing on Listening Comprehension and Recall. *ELT*, 5 (9), 155-165.
- Jian-Ping, L. (2013). Is Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition Feasible to EFL Learning? *ELT*, 6 (10), 245-251.

- Jing, J. (2013). Teaching English Reading through MI Theory in Primary School. *ELT*, 6 (1), 132-140.
- Jingxia, L., & Li, L. (2013). An Empirical Study on the Application on Theme Theory in the Field of Writing Pedagogy. *ELT*, 6 (5), 117-128.
- Juan, W. X., Abidin, M. J., & Eng, L. S. (2013). A Study on the Relationship between English Vocabulary Threshold and Word Guessing Strategy for Pre-university Chinese Students in Malaysia. *ELT*, 6 (9), 168-176.
- Kashani, H., Mahmud, R. B., & Kalajahi, S. A. (2013). Comparing the Effect of Blogging as well as Pen and Paper on the Essay Writing Performance of Iranian Graduate Students. *ELT*, 6 (10), 202-218.
- Li, X. (2013). The Application of Three Dimensional Model in the Teaching Design of EFL Writing. *ELT*, 6 (2), 32-44.
- Liangprayoon, S., Chaya, W., & Thepackraphong, T. (2013). The Effect of Topical Structure Analysis Instruction on University Students' Writing Quality. *ELT*, 6 (7), 60-71.
- Mohammadi, E. N., Heidari, F., & Niry, N. D. (2012). The Relationship between Critical Thinking Ability and Reading Strategies Used by Iranian EFL Learners. *ELT*, 5 (10), 192-201.
- Nezhad, G. R., & Shokrpour, N. (202). The Impact of Task Type and Cognitive Style on Vocabulary Learning. *ELT*, 5 (9), 17-.
- Nilforoushan, S. (2012). The Effect of Teaching Vocabulary through Semantic Mapping on EFL Learners' Awareness of the Affective Dimensions of Deep Vocabulary Knowledge. *ELT*, 5 (10), 164-172.
- Othman, N., & Shah, M. I. (2013). Problem-based Learning in the English language Classroom. *ELT*, 6 (3), 125-134.
- Pan, C.-Y., & Wu, H.-Y. (2013). The Cooperative Learning Effects on English Reading Comprehension and Learning Motivation of EFL Freshmen. *ELT*, 6 (5), 13-27.
- Park, G.-P. (2013). Relation among L1 Reading, L2 Knowledge and L2 Reading: Revisiting the Threshold Hypothesis. *ELT* , 6 (12), 38-47.
- Pazirai, M. E. (2013). The Effect of Textual Metafunction on the Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Performance. *ELT*, 6 (2), 71-83.
- Qasim, N. A., & Fadda, H. A. (2013). From CALL to MALL: The Effectiveness of Podcast on EFL Higher Education Students' Listening Comprehension. *ELT*, 6 (9), 30-41.
- Qi-yuan, S. (2013). Use of Blog to Improve English Writing in the Chinese Tertiary EFL Classroom. *ELT*, 6 (10), 51-56.

- Rafieyan, V., Majid, N. B., & Eng, L. S. (2013). Relationship between Attitude toward Target Language Culture Instruction and Pragmatic Comprehension. *ELT*, 6 (8), 125-132.
- Rahimian, M. (2013). Negotian on Meaning and Modified Output Elicitation across Two Tasks. *ELT*, 6 (12), 114-128.
- Razak, N. A., Saeed, M., & Ahmad, Z. (2013). Adopting Social Networking Sites (SNSs) as Interactive Communities among English Foreign Language Learners in Writing: Opportunities and Challanges. *ELT*, 6 (11), 187-198.
- Roux, R., Mora, A., & Tamez, A. (2012). Reflective Writing of Mexican EFL Writers: Levels of Reflection, Difficulties and Perceived Usefulness. *ELT*, 5 (8), 1-13.
- Sadeghi, K., & Ahmadi, N. (2012). The Effect of Gloss Type and Mode on Iranian EFL learners' Reading Comprehension. *ELT*, 5 (12), 100-110.
- Sadeghi, K., & Sharifi, F. (2013). The Effect of Post-Teaching Activity Type on Vocabulary Learning of Elementary EFL Learners. *ELT*, 6 (11), 65-76.
- Salen, A. A. (2013). The Effect of Using Writer's Workshop Approach on Developing Basic Writing Skills (Mechanics of Writing) of Prospective Teachers of English in Egypt. ELT, 6 (7), 33-45.
- Salih, A. R. (2013). Peer Response to L2 Student Writing: Patterns and Expectations. *ELT*, 6 (3), 42-50.
- Sarani, A., & Sahebi, L. F. (2012). The Impact of Task Based Approach on Vocabulary Learning in ESP Courses. *ELT*, 5 (10), 118-.
- Seyyedi, K., Malik, S. A., Ismail, M., Orang, M., & Neijad, M. S. (2013). The Effect of Pre-task Planning Time on L2 Learners' Narrative Writing Performance. *ELT*, 6 (12), 1-10.
- Sharma, U. N. (2010). A Course in ELT Methods. Kathmandu: Highland Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- Shen, F.-Y. (2013). Using Group Discussion with Taiwan's EFL College Students: A Comparison of Comprehension Instruction for Book Club, Literature Circles and Instructional Conversations. *ELT*, 6 (12), 58-78.
- Shi, J. (2013). The Application of Constructivism: Activities for Enlivening Comprehensive English Class. *ELT*, 6 (2), 63-70.
- Soleimani, H., & Nabizadeh, F. (2012). The Effect of Learners Constructed, Fill in the Map Concept Map Technique and Summarizing Strategy on Iranian Pre-university Students' Reading Comprehension. *ELT*, 5 (9), 78-87.
- Tian, X., & Suppasetseree, S. (2013). Development of an Instructional Model for Online Taskbased Interactive Listening for EFL Learners. *ELT*, 6 (3), 30-.

- Tran, H. Q. (2012). An Explorative Study of Idiom Teaching for Pre-service Teachers of English. *ELT*, 5 (12), 76-86.
- Tsai, C.-h. (2012). Students' Perceptions of Using a Novel as Main Material in the EFL Reading Course. *ELT*, 5 (8), 103-112.
- Wakabayashi, R. (2013). The Effects of the Peer Feedback Process on Reviewers' own Writing. *ELT*, 6 (9), 177-.
- Wang, Y.-C. (2013). Learning L2 Vocabulary with American TV Drama from the learner's Perspective. *ELT*, 5 (8), 217-225.
- Yuehong. (2013). A Study o the Functions of Western Cultural Non-verbal Behavior in English Classroom in China. *ELT*, 6 (12), 189-196.
- Yunu, M. M., Selehi, H., & Chenzi, C. (2012). Integrating Social Networking Tools into ESL Writing Classroom: Strengths and Weakness. *ELT*, 5 (8), 42-48.
- Yunus, M. M., Salehi, H., & Nordin, N. (2012). ESL Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions on the Use of Paragraph Punch in Teaching Writing. *ELT*, 5 (10), 138-147.
- Zhao, X., & Zhu, L. (2012). Schema Theory and College English Reading Teaching. *ELT*, 5 (11), 111-117.