CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
Becoming a monolingual, bi-lingual or multilingual is a way of life in a multicultural society. Therefore, the whole everyday activity is affected as people struggle to reach beyond the confines of their first language and into a new language, a new culture, a new way of thinking, feeling and acting. Their total commitment, involvement, physical, intellectual and emotional response is necessary to send and receive a message. Second language learning is not a set of easy steps that can be programmed in a quick succession. It has been observed that children acquire their first language easily and well, yet the learning of a second language particularly in an educational setting often meets with greater difficulty and sometimes failure.

Learning of language is everyday activities and guided by family social setting and formal school environment. These activities are taken for granted for learning language. Moreover, language learning is an individual, social and cultural process. Language is the means of communicating ideas, emotions and thought and it is also the reflection of environment. In addition to this, language learning is associated with learning outcomes and it plays a significant role in shaping and modifying the way of life of the children. In the process of socialization and schooling language learning plays a vital role because it is the medium of communication in that it is appropriate for the expression of thought and formulation of communication and achievement. Moreover, second language learning is not a uniform and predictable phenomenon; however, it is complex in its nature. There is no single theory and way in which or through which a learner learns the second language. Second language learning is the product of many factors pertaining intelligence, motivation, attitude and aptitude and exposure of the learners to learn and succeed and on the other, the learning environment in school and at home and students’ socio-economic background. So, their learning and learning outcomes are affected by these factors.

Nepal is multilingual and multicultural country and it has linguistic diversity. The Nepali language is the medium of instruction. Half of the population speaks languages other than Nepali. Children of the other minority languages learn the Nepali language with the children of this language. So,
they have difficulty to cope with the children of Nepali speaking background in school.

Most of the recent literatures reflect that children of linguistic minority face insurmountable problems in primary school if they are taught through the medium of their second language. Considering low achievement of successive second language learners of primary schools in Nepal, bilingual teaching and learning could be a hope for betterment.

Almost all national baseline surveys of primary school education in Nepal indicate the poor achievement of non Nepali speaking children. Researches conducted in the setting of schools in different linguistic minority children reflect that they obtain better academic achievement if they are taught through their mother tongue. This was the reason why present study was undertaken with the problem entitled "Effect of Simultaneous and Successive Second Language Learning on Academic Achievement of Primary School Children of Nepal in Relation to their Personal and Environmental Factors".

Objectives of the Study
For clarity and better understanding the study was carried out with following primary and secondary objectives.

Primary Objectives

- To analyze the status of achievement, intelligence and motivation of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) of primary schools in Nepal.
- To find out the relationship of intelligence and motivation with academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).
- To find out the relationship of intelligence with motivation of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).
- To make comparisons of academic achievement, intelligence, motivation, socio-economic status (SES), and parental support of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).
• To compare the achievement of public and community school students.
• To see the effect of personal factors i.e. intelligence and motivation on academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).
• To see the effect of environmental factors such as socio-economic status and parental support on academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).

Secondary Objectives

• To analyze the classroom practices followed by teachers to teach language and other subjects at primary schools.
• To conduct the case studies to analyze the status of public and community schools in respect of school environment, quality of teachers, motivation to learn and succeed, teaching learning environment and school leadership.

Research Hypotheses

Hypotheses for Primary Study:

The study was planned to test the following hypotheses for the primary study:

I) Hypotheses Pertaining to Status of Intelligence, Motivation and Academic Achievement

• The academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) falls above the 33 % which is set as pass percentage in schools of Nepal.
• The intelligence and motivation of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) exhibit the average level of intelligence and motivation.
II) Hypotheses Pertaining to Relationship Among the Variables

a. There exists a positive and significant relationship between intelligence and academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).

b. There is a positive and significant relationship between motivation and academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).

c. There exists a positive relationship between intelligence and motivation of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).

III) Hypotheses Pertaining to Various Comparisons

• Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) achieve academically better than the successive second language learners (SL2) in all the subjects and in all the classes at primary level of education.

• Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibit higher level of intelligence and motivation than the successive second language learners (SL2).

• Socio-economic status of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) is higher than the successive second language learners (SL2).

• Parental support in case of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) is better than the successive second language learners (SL2).

• Community school students achieve academically better than the public school students.

IV) Hypotheses Pertaining to Effect of Independent Variables on Dependent Variable of Academic Achievement of Simultaneous Second Language Learners (SL1) and Successive Second Language Learners (SL2).

• Intelligence and motivation contribute significantly on academic achievement of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).
Socio-economic status and parental support are the significant contributors to the academic achievement of the learners.

**Hypothesis for Secondary Study:**

Classroom practices followed by the teachers are not in accordance with prescribed practices.

**Design of the Study**

The present study was descriptive and explorative. It employed quantitative and qualitative method of investigation.

**Field of Investigation**

The field of investigation was primary school students of class I, III and V of 4 public schools and 4 community schools. Banke and Bardiya from the Terai region and Tanahun and Kaski from the Hill of Nepal comprised the field.

**Sample of Study**

The sample of the study comprised students, teachers along with Head Master and parents of the students of public and community schools.

**Tools Used in the Study**

In order to collect quantitative as well as qualitative data the following tools were used.

**Tools Used to Collect Quantitative Data**

- Raven's Progressive Coloured Matrices: To measure intelligence.
- Locally prepared 3 point rating scale on motivation: To measure motivation of students towards learning.
- Interview schedule cum socio-economic status scale: To measure socio-economic status (SES) and parental support of students.
- Achievement data of class I, III, and V collected from school record: To measure academic achievement.

**Tools Used to Collect Interview and Classroom Observations Data**

- 2 Point rating scale on classroom observation: To see classroom practices
• Interview schedule for teachers: To analyze teaching and the problems faced by them in teaching.

Procedure Followed to Conduct the Study

As per the requirement, the study was conducted in three phases
(a) Phase I: Preparation, collection and validation of tools
(b) Phase II Collection of data from the field for the primary study
(c) Phase III: Conducting case studies

Techniques Used to Analyze the Quantitative and Qualitative Data

In order to answer research objectives and test hypotheses quantitative and qualitative data were gathered. The data were analyzed accordingly.

Techniques Used to Analyse the Data

• Descriptive Statistics (Mean, SDs, SEs, SK & KU): To see the nature and distribution of scores.
• Bivariate Product Moment Coefficients of Correlations: To see the strength and magnitude of association between the variables.
• Coefficients of Contingency: To see association between the variables
• Differential Statistics: (t test): To make comparisons between the variables.
• Analysis of Variance (ANOVA): To see the effect of independent variables on dependent variable.
• Classroom observation and Interview of teachers with descriptive statistics.
• Qualitative in-depth analysis : To analyse the case studies.

Results and Conclusions

In accordance with the various objectives and hypotheses of the study achievement scores, intelligence scores, motivation scores and the scores of socio-economic status along with parental support were analyzed with respect to group of students. Interview of teachers and classroom observation of teachers and case studies were analyzed.
Results and Conclusions Based on Descriptive Data

The objective of descriptive data was to see the status of academic achievement, intelligence and motivation of SL1 and SL2 learners.

Academic Achievement Data

When the data were analyzed through descriptive statistics, the mean achievement score of SL1 was found 359.97 which, was 60 % of the total score indicating above average level performance.

The mean achievement score of SL2 was 303.77 which, was 50.8 % of the total score showing average performance.

The mean achievement score 328.43 of the total sample was 54.5 % which indicated average level performance of children.

Therefore, the stated hypothesis of the academic achievement of simultaneous (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) falls above 33 % pass percentage was confirmed

Intelligence Data

The mean intelligence score of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) was found to be 19.62 which falls between 50th to 75th percentile indicating higher mental ability according to the Raven's test.

The mean intelligence score of successive second language learners (SL2) was found to be 14.37 which falls between 25th to 50th percentile that showed below average level of intelligence of this group.

The mean intelligence score of total sample was found to be 16.68 which falls above 50th percentile indicating an average level of intelligence of primary school children according to the manual.

Motivation Data

The mean on motivation 2.70 in case of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) was found to be above average. The mean on motivation 1.68 of successive second language learners (SL2) was found to be below average.

The mean on motivation of total sample was 2.13 which was above average.
Hence, the hypothesis of the intelligence and motivation of simultaneous (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) exhibit the average level of intelligence and motivation was partially accepted.

**Results and Conclusions Based on Coefficients of Correlation and Contingency of Coefficients**

The purpose of this analysis was to see the strength and magnitude of relationship between intelligence and academic achievement of SL1 and SL2 learners of primary school of Nepal.

**Relationship between Intelligence and Achievement**

The relationship between intelligence and achievement of the total sample (729) was $r = .642$ which was found to be significant at .01 level.

The positive and significant relationship $r = .368$ was found in case of SL1 learners, and also a positive and significant relationship $r = .460$ was found in case of SL2 learners. Both the values were determined to be highly significant at .01 level.

Positive and significant values of "r" in case of three groups' i.e. total sample, SL1 and SL2 learners reflect that these two variables are interdependent. Therefore, the hypothesis of there exists a positive and significant relationship between intelligence and academic achievement of simultaneous (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) was accepted.

**Relationship between Motivation and Achievement**

The main objective to workout Contingency of Coefficients was to show the association between motivation and achievement of SL1 and SL2 learners.

The value of 'C' for the total sample was found to be .558, significant even beyond 1 percent level.

The Coefficients of Contingency in case of SL1 learners and SL2 learners was .389 and .406 respectively which was significant at .01 level in case of both the groups.

It can be concluded that motivation is a potent factor to enhance or lower the academic achievement of the learners. Thereby giving support to the stated
hypothesis that there is a positive and significant relationship between motivation and academic achievement of simultaneous (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2).

Relationship between Intelligence and Motivation

A positive relationship "C" of .511 was observed between intelligence and motivation of the total sample which was significant at .01 level.

Positive significant Coefficients were found in case of SL1 and SL2 learners. .303 and .373 in respect order.

The data revealed that a positive and significant relationship between intelligence and motivation in all the cases as reflected by Coefficients "C" were significant at .01 percent level. Hence, this proved that intelligence and motivation go hand in hand with each other to contribute to the academic achievement of SL1 and SL2 learners of primary school of Nepal.

The hypothesis that there exists a positive relationship between intelligence and motivation of simultaneous (SL1) and successive second language learners (SL2) was accepted.

Results and Conclusions Based on Differential Statistics

The objective of differential statistics was to make comparisons of all the variables under study.

The comparison on academic achievement was done in respect to subgroups of SL1 and SL2 learners, classes and subject.

The comparison on intelligence and motivation was done in respect of subgroups of SL1 and SL2 learners and classes.

The comparison on socio-economic status and parental support was done in respect of subgroups of SL1 and SL2 learners in primary school of Nepal.

The comparison on academic achievement was also done in respect of the type of schools.
Comparison on Achievement in Nepali

The mean achievement on Nepali of SL1 learners was 55.67 and that of SL2 learners was 41.65. The calculated value of t= 26.54 was large to be significant at .05 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in the subject of Nepali. Hence, it is concluded that the SL1 learners' proficiency in Nepali language was higher than their counterparts of non Nepali speaking background (SL2) learners.

Comparison on Achievement in Mathematics

The mean achievement on Mathematics of SL1 learners was 72.42 and that of SL2 learners was 65.55. The calculated value of t = 14.51 was large to be significant at .05 level. SL1 learners performed better than their counterparts SL2 learners in the subject of Mathematics.

Comparison on Achievement in English

The mean achievement on English of SL1 learners was 43.33 and the mean achievement of SL2 learners was 39.79. The calculated value of t= 7.02 was large enough to be significant at .01 level. Hence, it is concluded that SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in English which is a foreign language. The reason behind this might be also the medium of instruction because even for teaching of English, the teachers totally relied on translation method. Use of Nepali as medium of instruction may be the reason of performing poorly in English by SL2 learners.

Comparison on Achievement of Social Studies

The mean achievement on Social Studies of SL1 learners was 64.78 and the mean achievement of SL2 learners was 58.80. The calculated value of t = 15.57 was to be significant at .01 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in the subject of Social Studies.

Comparison on Achievement of Science and Environment Education

The mean achievement on Science and Environment Education of SL1 learners was 66.40 and that of SL2 learners it was 53.11.
The calculated value of $t = 22.68$ was large enough to be significant at .01 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in the subject of Science and Environment Education.

**Comparison on Achievement of Local Subject**

The mean achievement on Local Subject of SL1 learners was 57.37 and the mean achievement of SL2 learners was 48.87.

The calculated value of $t = 10.92$ was significant at .01 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in the Local Subject.

**Comparison of Total Achievement**

The mean of total achievement of SL1 learners and SL2 learners were 359.96 and 303.76 respectively.

The calculated value of $t = 30.42$ was significant at .01 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in the total achievement.

Hence, it may be concluded that learning Nepali simultaneously with one’s mother tongue before going to school helps the child perform better compared to students with learning Nepali successively only after going to school.

Subject wise comparative analysis revealed that SL1 learners performed much higher than SL2 learners in all the six subjects. The reason may be the use of Nepali as medium of instruction to teach all the subjects which did not favour SL2 learners because of their linguistic background.

Comparisons on individual subjects taught at primary schools revealed significance difference in favour of SL1 learners thereby giving full support to the hypothesis the SL1 learners achieve academically better than SL2 learners.

**Comparison on Achievement of Class I**

The mean achievement 366.00 of SL1 learners was higher than the mean achievement 311.15 of SL2 learners. The calculated value of $t = 22.48$ was large to be significant at .01 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners in class I.
Comparison on Achievement of Class III

The mean achievement of SL1 and SL2 learners were 370.59 and 311.01 respectively. The value of t = 21.19 was significant at .01 level. SL1 learners achieved academically better than the SL2 learners.

Comparison on Achievement of Class V

The mean achievement of SL1 learners was 340.02 and it was 287.30 of SL2 learners. The calculated value of t = 16.13 was significant at .01 level.

SL1 learners did academically better than that of their counterpart SL2 learners.

The data also showed strong evidence in favour of SL1 learners in all the classes. The t = ratios in all the classes were found to be significant at the .01 level.

It leads to the conclusion of the importance of mother tongue as a medium of instruction or bilingual medium of instruction is a deciding factor for high or low achievement of the learners.

Hence, the hypothesis of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) achieve academically better than the successive second language learners (SL2) in all the subjects and in all the classes at primary level of education was accepted.

Comparison of SL1 and SL2 Learners on Intelligence

The purpose of comparison of intelligence was to see the status of intelligence of SL1 and SL2 learners of primary school of Nepal.

Comparison of Class Wise Status of Intelligence

Class I

The mean intelligence 17.60 of simultaneous second language learners (SL1) was higher than the mean intelligence 13.57 of SL2 learners.

The t= value 9.55 was to be at .01 level. Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibited higher level of intelligence than the successive second language learners (SL2) in class I.
Class III

The mean intelligence of SL1 and SL2 learners were 20.68 and 16.00 respectively.

The value of t = 9.21 was to be significant at .000 level. Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibited higher level of intelligence than the successive second language learners (SL2) in class III.

Class V

The mean intelligence of SL1 and SL2 learners were 20.63 and 13.88 respectively. The t = value 11.98 was to be significant at .01 level. Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibited higher level of intelligence than the successive second language learners (SL2) in class V.

Class Wise Comparison on Motivation of SL1 and SL2 Learners

The main purpose of the comparison on motivation was to compare status of motivation of SL1 and SL2 learners in respect of class.

Class I

The mean on motivation of SL1 and SL2 learners were 2.76 and 1.73 respectively. The t = value 14.50 was large to be significant at .01 level that simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibited higher level of motivation than the successive second language learners (SL2) in class I.

Class III

The mean on motivation of SL1 and SL2 learners were 2.75 and 1.78 respectively. The value t = 12.20 was large to be significant at .01 level. Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibited higher level of motivation than the successive second language learners (SL2) in class III.

Class V

The mean on motivation of SL1 and SL2 learners were 2.57 and 1.52. The value of t = 11.84 was large enough to be significant at .01 level that simultaneous second language learners (SL1) exhibited higher level of motivation than the successive second language learners (SL2).
Hence, it may be concluded that school environment and family environment play an important role in shaping intelligence and motivation of the students. SL2 learners were mostly absent in the class so that they were rated low by the teachers.

SL2 learners were from poor family background which did not favour SL2 learners to attend school regularly. Thus, class wise comparisons on intelligence and motivation revealed significance difference in favour of SL1 learners thereby giving full support to the hypothesis the SL1 learners exhibit higher level of intelligence and motivation than the SL2 learners.

**Comparison of SL1 and SL2 Learners on Socio-Economic Status**

The mean SES of SL1 and SL2 learners were 19.07 and 9.77 respectively. The value of $t = 8.11$ was large enough to be significant at .01 level. Socio-economic status of SL1 learners was higher than SL2 learners. Hence, it is concluded that a relatively little higher level of socio-economic background of SL1 students leads to the fact that environment at home plays a great role in the academic success of students. Financial and material resources at home contribute to conducive learning environment for the child. Thus, the hypothesis that the socio-economic status of SL1 learners is higher than the SL2 learners was accepted.

**Parental Support**

The mean parental support of SL1 and SL2 learners were 5.30 and 3.52 respectively. The value of $t = 5.67$ was large enough to be significant at 0.01 level. Parental support in the studies of SL1 learners was higher than that of SL2 learners.

Thus, it is concluded that educational background and income of the parents help the parents support and involve in child’s education. Hence, the hypothesis that the parental support in case of SL1 learners is better than the SL2 learners was accepted.
Comparison on Achievement of Public and Community Schools

The purpose was to compare the status of achievement of the students of public and community schools.

Comparison on Achievement of Public and Community Schools

The mean achievement of public school students was 325.27 whereas the mean achievement of community school students was 331.77. The calculated value $t = 2.36$ was significant at .02 level. The students of community school achieved academically better than the students of public schools. The reason behind this was that community schools are run by the local community with regular monitoring, while the public schools are run by the government. The poor performance of public schools children could be due to the lack of monitoring and supervision of teachers. Hence, it leads to the importance of regular monitoring and supervision of the school activities which is important and a potent deciding factor for the high and low achievement of schools.

Hence, the hypothesis of community school students achieve academically better than the public school students was accepted.

Results and Conclusions Based on Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

The main objective was to see the effect of simultaneous and successive second language learning on academic achievement of primary school children in relation to their personal and environmental factors.

The ANOVA was applied on the total sample (729) as well as on SL1 and SL2 learners.

Effect of Intelligence and Motivation on Academic Achievement (Total Sample)

Main Effects:

The F ratio 21.91 for the variable of intelligence was significant beyond the value required at .01 level of significance. Likewise the F ratio of 101.51 for the variable of motivation was also significant beyond .01 level.
For the interaction effect between the variables of intelligence and motivation, the F ratio of .64 was not significant. It was much less than required value at .05 percent level of significance.

The results of ANOVA of the total sample revealed that both the independent variables, intelligence and motivation contribute individually to the academic success of the students. But the conjoint effect of the two variables was not significant.

The F ratio for the main effects as well as interaction effect were found to have mixed results of significance.

The three levels of intelligence and motivation independently account for the level of achievement of the students. High, Average and Low intelligence and also High, Average and Low motivation may result in High, Average and Low achievement of the students.

With low intelligence and low motivation the achievement is also low (284.31). Likewise, with average intelligence and motivation the mean achievement is average 317.99 whereas with high level of intelligence as well as motivation the performance level shot up to 367.89.

The non significant interaction effect of intelligence and motivation on academic achievement may be attributed due to the measurement error of judgment.

**Effect of Intelligence and Motivation on Academic Achievement of SL1 Learners**

**Main Effects:**

The F ratio 8.91 for the variable of intelligence was high to be significant .01 level that intelligence of SL1 learners significantly contributed to the academic success.

Likewise, the F ratio 18.98 for the variable of motivation was high to be significant at .01 level that motivation of the learners significantly contributed to the academic achievement.

For the interaction effect between the variable of intelligence and motivation, the F ratio 3.22 was large enough to be significant at .05 level.
The results of ANOVA of SL1 learners revealed that both independent variables i.e. intelligence and motivation could significantly contribute to the academic success of the SL1 learners.

It was also found that with low intelligence and low motivation the achievement was also low (310.25). Likewise, with average intelligence and motivation the mean achievement was average 343.64 and with high level of intelligence as well as motivation the performance level shoots up to 369.76.

Hence, it is concluded that F ratios for all the effects i.e. the main effect and the interaction effect were significant and both intelligence and motivation contributed individually and conjointly to the academic success of the SL1 learners.

Effect of Intelligence and Motivation on Academic Achievement of SL2 Learners

Main Effects:

The F ratio 1.77 for the variable of intelligence was large to be at .01 level that intelligence contributes to the academic achievement of SL2 learners.

Likewise, the F ratio 28.41 for the variable of motivation was also large to be significant at .01 level that motivation significantly contributes to the academic achievement of SL2 learners.

For the interaction effect between the variables of intelligence and motivation, the F ratio of 3.30 was large to be significant at the .05 level that both intelligence and motivation contribute to the academic success of SL2 learners.

It is concluded that with low intelligence and low motivation the achievement was also low (279.99). Likewise, with average intelligence and average motivation the mean achievement was 308.68 and with high level of intelligence as well as motivation the performance level was high 335.27.

Thus, it is said that intelligence and motivation play a vital role to determine the performance and success level of students. The three level of intelligence and motivation go hand in hand to account for the level of achievement of the students: High, Average and Low intelligence and also
motivation: High, Average and Low together result in High, Average and Low achievement of the students.

Hence, it is concluded that both intelligence and motivation contributed individually and conjointly to the academic achievement of SL2 learners.

The stated hypothesis was confirmed in case of SL1 and SL2 learners giving full support to the significant effect of intelligence and motivation both individually as well as having conjoint effect on academic achievement. It leads to the conclusion that academic achievement is determined by intelligence and motivation of the learners.

Effect of Socio-economic Status and Parental Support on Academic Achievement of Children

Main Effects:

The F ratio 32.52 for the variable of socio-economic status was significant at .01 level showing that socioeconomic status of the learners significantly contributes to the academic success of the students.

Likewise, the F ratio 11.23 for the variable of parental support was significant at .01 level leading to the conclusion that parental support contributes to the academic achievement of the students.

For the interaction effect between the variables of SES and parental support the F ratio of 4.28 was significant at .05 level. Thus, both socio-economic status and parental support contribute to the academic success of the students.

It is concluded that the socio-economic status (SES) and parental support both contributed individually and conjointly to the academic achievement of the students. The two levels of socioeconomic status (SES) and parental support were responsible for the level of achievement of the students i.e. High and Low together resulted in High and Low achievement of the learners.

It was also found that with low SES and low parental support the mean achievement was also low (299.13). Likewise, with high SES and high parental support the mean achievement was high 361.53.
Socio-economic status (SES) and parental support play an important role to determine the performance and success level of students.

**Results and Conclusions Based on Interview of Teachers**

In addition to the above quantitative achievement, intelligence, motivation, socio-economic status and parental support data, interview data of teachers were collected to support the findings of quantitative analysis with the help of interview and classroom observations of the teachers.

For exploring the classroom practices followed by the teachers, ten questions related to teachers' mother tongue, subjects taught and medium of instruction used in class, methods used in teaching subjects, difficulties faced by teachers in teaching, comparative performance of simultaneous and successive second language learners, steps taken to solve the problems of successive second language learners (SL2), strategies used to remove learning difficulties of successive second language learners (SL2), teachers' interaction with parents, what needs to be done to improve the learning of successive second language learners, effectiveness of teachers required to teach simultaneous and successive second language learners. The views of the teachers are given below.

Result based on mother tongue revealed that (62.5%) of the teachers spoke Nepali and 34.5% of them spoke local language. The data revealed that Nepali speaking teachers were large in number in schools of linguistic minority area.

Results based on the subject taught revealed almost all the teachers performed subject teaching along with one optional subject.

Results based on medium of instruction revealed that (63%) of teachers used Nepali as a medium of instruction only 37% employed bilingual medium of instruction.

The views on methods used in teaching greatly varied text book and translation method was predominantly preferred by the teachers, which are now regarded old fashioned method in teaching different subjects.
By and large, the use of prescribed methods of teaching was restricted to teaching of Social Studies and Science and Environment Education.

Results on difficulties faced by teachers in the classroom revealed that all the difficulties in the classroom were basically caused by the language of SL1 and SL2 learners.

The answers on the performance of SL1 and SL2 learners showed that 95% teachers found the SL2 learners quite weak in studies while negligible 5% of the teachers found them at par with their counterparts.

Results on measures adopted to solve the problems of SL2 learners showed that almost all teachers seemed to encourage students to perform better.

Results on strategies used to remove learning difficulties of students revealed that teachers took different measures to help them to remove their learning difficulties in class.

A query on interaction with parents revealed that 37.5% parents were not aware about the problems of their children’s in school.

Results on the need to improve the performance of students revealed that majority teachers were found in favour of the maximum use of Nepali. May be it was because of their own mother tongue.

Responses on the effectiveness of teacher revealed that 92.5% teachers favored the criteria to be teachers who have the knowledge of students’ mother tongue.

Hence, it is concluded that there was a visible language gap between the SL1 learners learning Nepali simultaneously with their mother tongue before going to school and SL2 learners learning Nepali after going to school. The successive second language learners (non-Nepali speaking) children were disadvantaged because of the monolingual classroom practices and lack of bilingual teachers. The schools served both SL1 and SL2 learners in the same manner. As a result, SL2 learners faced difficulty with the Nepali language as well as with other subjects.
Result and Conclusion Based on Class-Room Observations of Teachers

The main purpose of class-room observation was to assess classroom practices followed by teachers. The focus of the classroom observation was on Teachers' knowledge of the subject matter, presentation of the materials with the lesson plan, methods of teaching, linkage of the new items with the familiar ones, use of relevant visual aids and text books, allocation of time for the classroom activities, practice and evaluation and evaluation of the taught lessons and correction of class work and home work.

Regarding the teachers knowledge of the subject matter out of 40 teachers, (52.5%) of were found good knowledge of the subject matter while in case of (48.5%) teachers had satisfactory knowledge.

The presentation of the materials with the lesson plan, (35%) teachers were found teaching with lesson plan and (65%) taught without lesson plan.

A query of methods of teaching, (40%) of the teachers were good and (60%) of teachers' methodology was only found satisfactory.

Results based on the linkage of new items with the familiar ones, (35%) teachers were found good and it was satisfactory in case of (65%) teachers.

Regarding use of relevant visual aids and textbooks (37.5%) of teachers were found using visual aids while (62.5%) teachers were found teaching without visual aids.

In allocation of time for classroom activities, practice and evaluation, (25 %) teachers were found good and rest of the (75%) were found satisfactory in handling class-room activities.

Regarding evaluation of students and correction of class work and homework (32.5%) teachers was good while other (76.5%) were rated satisfactory.

It is concluded that majority of the teachers were found only satisfactory in all the aspect except the knowledge of the subject matter.

Hence, the hypothesis of classroom practices are not in accordance with the prescribed classroom practices was partially accepted.
Results and Conclusions Based on Case Studies

The objective of case studies of one public and one community school was to substantiate the quantitative findings of the major study.

The schools exhibited distinct differences on the parameters of school environment, quality of teachers, motivation to learn and succeed, teaching learning environment and school leadership.

The community school had better facilities, multilingual teachers, conducive learning environment and active Head Master. On the other hand, public school had poor infrastructure, qualified but disinterested teachers, consequential poor teaching learning environment, negligible conditions to motivate the students and a headmaster lacking in commitment to his leadership.

The candid views expressed by the stakeholders: School Management Committee members, parents, students, teachers threw light on the ground realities in these particular two schools which substantiated the main findings.

Conclusions at a Glance

Simultaneous second language learners (SL1) achievement, intelligence, motivation, socio-economic status and parental support was higher than the successive second language learners (SL2).

The independent variables i.e. intelligence and motivation, were significantly correlated with achievement.

Both intelligence and motivation had a significant effect on achievement individually as well as conjointly in case of SL1 and SL2 learners.

Thus, assumed hypothesis in primary research stand accepted.

Teachers’ observation of classroom practices, in depth analysis of two types of schools observation and case studies substantiate the main findings.
Suggestions and Recommendations

Suggestion for the Government

Recommendation

In multilingual societies comprising linguistic minorities, medium of instruction should be bilingual so that the linguistic minority children benefit and learn maximally at the primary stage.

Implication

At the time of recruitment of teachers for primary level, bilingual teachers should be preferred.

For the Teachers

Recommendation

Teachers should be trained to cater the learning needs of linguistic minorities students and should be able to provide individualized instruction to the learners.

Implication

During the teacher training, provision to be made so that the prospective teachers are linguistically efficient, effective and sensitized to the components of multilingual teaching process.

For the Parents

Recommendation

There should be a law for free and compulsory education so as to enable every child to be in school rather than remain absent.

Implication

The Government should enforce the law in letter and spirit to achieve the goal of universalization of education at the primary stage.
For the School

Recommendation

The school should have provision of remedial teaching after school for the weak students in a multilingual society.

Implication

Incentives and acknowledgement of such provisions and initiatives should be introduced.

Suggestion for Further Research

It is suggested that to understand nature of simultaneous and successive second language acquisition more detailed studies with other factors need to be done.

A detailed study other linguistic minority languages and their simultaneous and successive second language acquisition can also be done.