



WWJMRD 2019; 5(12): 29-31
www.wwjmr.com
International Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal
Refereed Journal
Indexed Journal
Impact Factor MJIF: 4.25
E-ISSN: 2454-6615

Ram Bahadur Chaudhary
PhD Scholar, Mewar
University, Rajasthan, India

Laxmi Bahadur Maharjan
Prof. Dr. Laxmi Bahadur
Maharjan, Tribhuvan
University, Kathmandu

Teaching Nepali Ambiguous and Nasalized Verbs to Mother Tongue Tharu Students Using Conventional Vs Group Discussion

Ram Bahadur Chaudhary, Laxmi Bahadur Maharjan

Abstract

Languages are important in human life. Verbs are key terms of any languages. To know any of the language, it is very important to know the verbs of the language because the verbs play important role in construction of any sentence. In the field of teaching and learning of any language, they are must. But one of the problems of language teaching and learning is -where two languages are different, negative transfer or interference would result (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991, cited in Maharjan, 2012). While teaching Nepali verbs to Tharu students, whose mother tongue is Tharu, special lesson plans were made and taught. The students learn and memorize more if they get participated in learning, Badheka, G. (2068). The objective of this study is to bring effectiveness in learning. The researcher used quantitative method. This study was based on experimental (pre-test - post-test) design. For the statistical analysis of the study, he used paired t-test, mean, spss, excel and word software. Group discussion technique is far better than conventional method. Though the conventional and the researcher's method (group discussion technique) of teaching shows the significant difference in table 1 but the researcher's method helped the students increase the marks more than the conventional method of teaching. Table 2 clearly shows group discussion is far better than conventional method. Participation of the students (students centre learning) play vital role in teaching learning.

Keywords: Pre-test, Post-test, Conventional, Group discussion, CA, MTT

Introduction

Lado (1957) claims that interference from the learner's native language is the main obstacle to second language learning and adds the greater the difference between the native language and the target language, the greater the difficulty is. He suggests these difficulties can be predicted with the help of a systematic and scientific analysis and the result of contrastive analysis can be used as a reliable source in the preparation of teaching materials, course planning and the improvement of classroom techniques. In the same way Subedi (2016) mentions that CA is the systematic analysis of similarities and differences between languages. According to Corder (1973) in nineteenth century, determining the similarities and differences between the languages was the central part of linguistics. And it can be utilized in teaching learning for the selection of teaching items and planning for class room teaching. Some Nepali verbs (teaching items) are ambiguous to Tharu native speakers while learning Nepali language. They have got negative transfer while learning Nepali language. Interference can be minimized by student centre teaching learning. Some of the verbs are as follows:

A. Ambiguous Verbs-

1. Khā(eat) and pī(drink). In Nepali language khāis frequently used for eat and drink but in Tharu language khā means eat only and pīmeans drink only. This has negative transfer in learning.

2. Mār (kill) and pit (beat) are the words of Nepali language. In Tharu language mār means beat. This interfere learning and the students of MTT commit mistakes in the words mār and pit.

Correspondence:
Ram Bahadur Chaudhary
PhD Scholar, Mewar
University, Rajasthan, India

3. Lagā (wear) andsār (transplant seedlings) too confuse Tharu students because lagā means transplant seedlings in Tharu language.
 4. Ghum/Dul (go round/roam) and fark (return) verbs are ambiguous to MTT speaking students. Ghum in Tharu language means go round/roam/return and therefore they commit mistakes.
 5. Kud (run), hām̄fāl (jump down /leap) and ufra (jump) are used in Nepali language. In Tharu language, kud means leap/jump down/ jump. MTT speaking students commit mistakes while using these types of verbs.
 6. MTT Speaking students mostly commit mistakes in the sounds like dental t, th, d, dh and alveolar ṭ, ṭh, ḍ, ḍh. Dangaura, Deukhuriya and Rajhatya speaking students do not have dental sounds. Kathariya and Rana speaking students mostly use alveolar sounds of the above but sometimes they also use the sounds very close to dental.
 7. Adverbs of time should match with forms of verbs. Tharu students have difficulties with some adverbs of time like hijo, bholi, parsi, asti, pohar, āgāmibarsa too match with proper form of the verbs. In the same way they feel difficulties to match bibhaktis like le, bāta, dwārā, dekhi, ko. The above mentioned verbs have negative impact on learning Nepali language by MTT students.
- B. Nasalized verbs and non-nasalized verbs-

In the same way, in Nepali language, nasalized verbs and non-nasalized verbs carry different subjects (singular/plural) for agreement. For example nasalized sound at the end of the past verb (khāyē) is used with first person singular subject, non-nasalized of the same verb (khāye) fits with the third person plural subject. Nasalization like this is not found in Tharu language (Dangha, Deukhariya and Rajhatya). Nasalization is used for making honor in Rana and Kathariya. As this is not

found in Tharu language, it interferes in learning Nepali language. But the above mentioned interference can be decreased or in other way round their marks can be increased using group discussion technique.

Methodology

The researcher used quantitative method. This study was based on experimental (pre test - post test) design. For the experiment, 220 Tharu native speaking students of Grade Eight were selected keeping 104 into control and 116 into experiment group. He used group discussion technique for ambiguous verbs and cue-drill for nasalized verbs on treatment group and conventional method on control group for a month. For group discussion, teacher divides the treatment group into different subgroups. Each subgroups consists of five students. They select their leader to answer when needed. He provides printed multiple choice exercise to each and every group. For e.g. Usle malai (hereu/dekheu). They have to discuss and tick the best verb which is appropriate in the sentence. They do have to note the reason for the answer. Teacher observes them while they discuss. He asks them to present their answer. Correct answer is rewarded by the words like 'well done', 'thank you' and so on. If the answer is not satisfactory, the turn goes to the next group. He clarifies the ambiguity if none of the groups is able to answer. For evaluation, the teacher gives the verbs and asks them to use in their own sentences. He used stratified random sampling and simple random sampling to divide Tharu students into experiment and control group. Pre test was taken before teaching and post test after teaching. For the statistical analysis of the marks scored by the groups in pre test and post test, he used paired t-test, mean, spss, excel and word software.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Paired sample test for mark scored by MTT students in ambiguous verbs (Pre test - Post test)

Group	Test Type	Mean	Mean of difference (Pre-test - Post-test)	Interval of (95% confidence)		F.M	t value	P value	Remarks
				Lower	Upper				
Control	Pre-test	4.31	-1.37	-1.81	-0.92	10.5	-6.04	0.00	Significant
	Post-test	5.67							
Treatment	Pre-test	4.89	-3.69	-4.06	-3.32	10.5	-19.71	0.00	Significant
	Post-test	8.58							

From the above table 1, the mean of pre-test was 4.31 and post test was 5.67 of control group. The t value was -6.04. The mean of difference between pre-test and post- test was -1.37 which means the students of control group increased the marks by 1.37 after teaching. Talking with 95% of confidence level, they could increase the marks 0.92 (minimum) and 1.81 (maximum). P value 0.00 shows there was significant difference in between the pre-test and post-test of control group.

In the same way, the mean of pre-test and post-test were 4.89 and 8.58 respectively of treatment group. The t value was -19.71. The mean of difference of pre-test and post-test of treatment group was -3.69 which indicates the students of control group increased the marks by 3.69. In 95% of confidence level, they could increase the marks 3.32 (minimum) and 4.06 (maximum). P value 0.00 shows there was significant difference. The teaching item was based on ambiguous verbs and the full mark was 10.5.

Table 2: Paired sample test for mark scored by MTT students in verbs with nasal sounds (Pre test - Post test)

Group	Test Type	Mean	Mean of difference (Pre-test - Post-test)	Interval of (95% confidence)		F. M	t value	P value	Remarks
				Lower	Upper				
Control	Pre-test	0.38	-0.16	-0.34	+0.02	5	-1.80	0.07	Not Significant
	Post-test	0.54							

	test									
Treatment	Pre-test	0.44	-2.91	-3.20	-2.63	5	-20.05	0.00	Significant	
	Post-test	3.35								

Above table 2 indicates, 0.38 was the mean score of control group in pre-test and 0.54 in post test. The time gap between these two tests was of a month. Pre-test was taken before teaching and post-test after teaching by conventional way of teaching. the mean of difference (pre-test - post-test) was - 0.16 that tells the students increased the marks by 0.16 number. Interval of lower level -0.34 shows the students could increase maximum 0.34 marks and the marks might decrease by 0.02 because the interval of upper level was + 0.02. t value was -1.80 and P value 0.07 indicates there was no significant difference of the score of pre-test and post-test of control group.

Above table 2 also shows the mean of pre-test of treatment group was 0.44 and post-test was 3.35. Post-test was taken after teaching for a month using group discussion technique. The mean of difference -2.91 tells the students increased the marks by 2.91 numbers. In 95% of confidence level, they could increase the marks 2.63 (minimum) to 3.20 (maximum). It was significant because the P value was 0.00. The teaching item was based on nasal sound and the full mark carried by the question was 5.

According to Kri, V P and Prabhavati, S G (2014) the students with high level ability in the experimental group had higher gain in achievement when compared to control group. Co-operative learning like group discussion plays the role in effectiveness. Fajar Prayoga's (2018) experiment too shows there is significant difference in level 0.05 because students' performance was improved after they were taught through group discussion. In the same way Thotakura and Dr. Anuradha has found that the mean scores in MCQ test in traditional teaching were 8.724 ± 3.614 , for a total of 20, and that in fishbowl group dynamics was 10.769 ± 2.875 which was statistically significant with p-value 0.025.

Conclusion

Students' mother tongue has got positive impact in learning if the target language is similar to it but has got negative impact if it is different. Conventional method of teaching is not suitable for better learning. Though the conventional and the researcher's method of teaching (here group discussion) shows the significant difference in ambiguous verbs but the researcher's method helped the students increase the marks more than the conventional method of teaching. For nasalized and non-nasalized verbs it was clear that group discussion was better than conventional method because conventional method did not show significant difference but group discussion did. It is therefore concluded that group discussion is far better than conventional method of teaching. The students learn and memorize more if they get participated in learning like the method in group discussion.

References

1. Badheka, G.(2068). *Divaswapna*. (S. Basti, Trans.) Sikshyak Masik, Lalitpur, Kathmandu (Original work published 1932 AD)
2. Corder S. Pit (1973). *Introducing Applied Linguistics*.Penguin, UK.

3. Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across culture*. An Arbor University of Michigan Press.
4. Maharjan, L. B. (2012). *How teachers perceive English language errors*. Kirtipur research point, Kirtipur, Kathmandu.
5. Sharrma, S. and Dr Chawla, N. (2013). A comparative study of English communication skill of students studying in government and private schools. *Journal of Indian Research .1(2)*, 125 - 132. ISSN: 2320-7000
7. The group discussion as a teaching method
8. Retrived from <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08878737409554580?journalCode=utte20> (11/7/2019)
9. Subedi, H. L. (2016). *Foundations of language and linguistics*. Neema Pustak Prakashan, Kathmandu, Nepal.
10. Prayoga, F. (2018). The impact of topic based group discussion and EFL learners' speaking performance. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 8 (2), pp 40-45 e- ISSN: 2320-7388.
11. Thotakura, N. and Dr. Anuradha (2018). Effectiveness of small group discussion over traditional lecture: a cross sectional comparative study. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 8(4), PP 21-26,) e- ISSN: 2320-7388.
12. Kri, V P and Prabhavati, S G (2014). *Effect of co-operative learning model on the IX standard students achievement and their attitude towards geography*. (Post Graduate),Karnatak University, Dharwad.