

Error Analysis in the Writing Tasks of Higher Secondary Level Students of Bangladesh

Hasna Khanom

Abstract— This study explores the various types of errors apparent in Higher Secondary level students' writings due to which they fail to score satisfactorily in English examination. The aim of this research is to improve the writing skills of Bangladeshi secondary level learners through identification and analysis of the common errors their written corpus contains. Action research procedure (plan, act, observe, reflect and revise) has been used for this research. The answer scripts of 100 Higher Secondary level students were selected for data collection. The data was then analyzed following the traditional error analysis procedure of error identification, classification, explanation and evaluation. The result of the analysis reflects the various types of interlingual and intralingual or developmental errors learners make in their writing tasks. Based on the findings, eight teachers of those 100 students were interviewed to seek the answers to the questions as to why learners make such errors in spite of twelve years of formal education and what can be done to improve their writing skill. This research ends with some recommendations for effective teaching of the different aspects of writing.

Keywords— Error analysis, Higher secondary level, Spontaneous production, Written corpus

I. INTRODUCTION

It is inevitable that learners make mistakes and commit errors in the process of learning a second (L2) or a foreign language (any additional language learned besides the mother tongue). However, what is questioned by language teachers is why students go on making the same mistakes even when the concerned rules have been repeatedly taught to them through formal classroom instruction. Yet not all mistakes are the same; sometimes they seem to be deeply ingrained which are called errors, but at other times students correct their problems with ease which are termed as mistakes. Thus it is realized that the mistakes a person makes in the process of constructing a new system of language needs to be analyzed carefully as they may help understand second language acquisition.

English is not the official language in Bangladesh but it is the medium of higher education in both public and private universities. Also proficiency in both spoken and written English is a must require criterion to enter into any government or non-government job. Hence, whether their motivation is integrative or instrumental, Bangladeshi learners have to study English as a foreign language from the very beginning of their academic life. The real scenario, however, is not very satisfactory. It is seen that learners from both the rural and the urban areas have a fear of the English language. Every year a greater number of students fail in their

compulsory English course than in any other subjects in the Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) examination.

English is taught to our learners from class I through formal classroom instruction. In spite of the long and continued formal education, most of our students are found unable to speak the language, understand it when they hear it, or read English texts, or write English correctly. Although in schools and colleges, students are assessed by their writing skill only, unfortunately, Bangladeshi students of Higher Secondary level display poor proficiency in writing. They rote memorize grammar rules, paragraphs, essays, and letters which helps little in developing the skill of writing. As a consequence, students fail to score a good mark in the public examination. Even after two years' lesson on the same syllabus in class XI and XII, students' written corpus of the test examination held about 4 months before their HSC examination show various types of errors.

Error analysis is important in the language teaching pedagogy as it helps teachers identify the sources of errors and take pedagogical precautions. Thus, the analysis of learner language is essential. This study explores some of the common errors Higher Secondary level learners make in their writing and attempts to analyze them so that remedial measures can be taken by the teachers.

Research Questions

1. What types of common errors do Higher Secondary level students make in their spontaneous writing?
2. Why do these errors still occur even after 12 years of formal classroom instruction?
3. What can be done to improve the writing of students?

Hypothesis

Four assumptions were taken into account regarding this research. Students commit errors in writing because:

1. The teachers do not follow the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) method in the classroom according to which the text book has been designed.
2. The teachers do not teach grammar rules and their uses properly.
3. The learners fail to internalize the rules due to lack of adequate discussion and practice.
4. The learners do not get much feedback on their writing.

Literature Review

Error analysis has been an effective tool in treating specific error types in ESL/ EFL contexts such as error in the use of tense and of preposition [1] and [2] respectively, and also in helping language teachers engage in error correction through various ways of giving corrective feedback (CF) as is evident in Beuningen, Jong and Kuiken [3].

Analysis of errors has also helped teachers determine effectiveness of corrective feedback. Erlam, Ellis and Batstone [4] have pointed out that graduated feedback on students' errors in oral conferences in their study promoted self-correction while explicit feedback resulted in less self-correction but was accomplished quickly.

In recent years there has been an emphasis in analyzing errors in the writing of Generation 1.5 to help design remedial courses. Doolan and Miller [5] have identified more errors being made by Generation 1.5 community college students versus L1 students with the error types of verb errors, prepositional errors, word form errors, and a total identified errors while revealing specific patterns of difference between Generation 1.5, L1 and L2 verb error production. In another important study on the writing of Generation 1.5, L1 and L2 tertiary students in the US, Doolan [6] has found significant differences between Generation 1.5 and L2 students on holistic writing quality, word order, word class errors, verb errors, total identified errors, and spoken features of language. He has suggested that the developmental Generation 1.5 writing may be more similar to L1 writing than has been reported previously. Thus, error analysis help take pedagogical precautions towards specific error types.

Error analysis in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) was established in the 1960s by Stephen Pit Corder and colleagues [7]. Error analysis was an alternative to contrastive analysis, an approach influenced by behaviourism through which applied linguists sought to use the formal distinctions between the learners' first and second languages to predict errors. Error analysis showed that contrastive analysis was unable to predict a great majority of errors which are produced by learners making faulty inferences about the rules of the target language. 'The most significant contribution of Error Analysis, apart from the role it played in the reassessment of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, lies in its success in elevating the status of errors from undesirability to that of a guide to the inner workings of the language learning process' [8]. For Corder [9], learners' errors "are not properly to be regarded as right or wrong in themselves, but only as evidence of a right or wrong system".

Error Analysis procedure involves "collecting samples of learner language, identifying the errors in the sample, describing these errors, classifying them according to their hypothesized causes, and evaluating their seriousness" [8]. In the context of language teaching and learning, error analysis is a "technique for identifying, classifying and systematically interpreting the unacceptable forms produced by someone learning a second/ foreign language, using any of the principles and procedures provided by Linguistics" [10].

The primary task of error analysis is to identify errors which are different from mistakes. Corder [11] has revealed a criterion that helps us to distinguish between mistakes and errors. It is a self-correctibility criterion. A mistake can be self corrected, while an error cannot be. Errors are systematic, i.e., likely to occur recurrently and not recognized by learners. Mistakes, on the other hand, are deviations due to performance factors (memory limitation, emotional strain, lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness, etc.) that are typically random and readily corrected by the learners when pointed out.

To distinguish between an error and mistake, Ellis [12] has suggested two ways. The first one is to check the consistency of learner's performance. If he sometimes used the correct form and sometimes the wrong one, it is a mistake. However, if he always uses it incorrectly, it is then an error. The second way is to ask learner to try to correct his own deviant utterance. Where he is unable to, the deviations are errors; where he is successful, they are mistakes.

A number of different categories for describing errors have been identified. Firstly, Corder [9] has classified the errors in terms of the difference between the learners' utterance and the reconstructed version. In this way, errors fall into four categories: omission of some required element; addition of some unnecessary or incorrect element; selection of an incorrect element; and misordering of the elements. Corder has categorized overtly and covertly errors. Overt errors are unquestionably ungrammatical at the sentence level and covert errors are grammatically well-formed at the sentence level but are not interpretable within the context of communication.

Errors in pluralization, use of articles, tenses etc. are local errors and Erdogan [13] is of the opinion that these errors are less important than errors regarding word order, the choice of placement of appropriate connectors in terms of comprehensibility of the sentence. Therefore, he implies that priority in terms of error correction should be given to global errors in order to develop the student's communication skills. Erdogan puts emphasis on correction of errors according to the objective of learning English. He says that the reaction of the teacher towards errors and the type of feedback to be given is usually determined by the position of the error in the objective of the task.

The sources of error can be categorized within two domains:

1. Interlingual transfer: Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics [14] defines interlingual errors as being the result of language transfer which is caused by the learner's first language (native language) or L1 features (e.g. lexical, grammatical, or pragmatic).
2. Intralingual transfer and developmental errors: This type of errors results from faulty or partial learning of the target language rather than language transfer [13]. They may be caused by the influence of one target language item upon another. Richards [8] identifies various strategies associated with developmental errors, or as he calls them, intralingual errors: (1)

Overgeneralization is a device used when the items do not carry any obvious contrast for the learner. For example, the past tense marker, ‘-ed’, often carries no meaning to context, since pastness can be indicated lexically (e.g. ‘yesterday’). (2) Ignorance of rule restrictions occurs when rules are used in context where in target language usage they do not apply. (3) Incomplete application of rules involves a failure to learn the more complex types of structure because the learner finds he can achieve effective communication by using relatively simple rules. (4) False concepts hypothesized refers to errors derived from faulty understanding of target language distinctions.

While Richard [8] has documented a number of intralingual and developmental errors which reflect the general characteristics of rule learning, Jain [15] has viewed the learner’s language as manifesting a general learning strategy to simplify the syntax of the language he is learning. In his study he highlights L1 independent errors and points out that there is a system in learner’s errors in spite of their apparent arbitrariness in performance data. He suggested that the motivation to add new rules to one’s idiosyncratic dialect may decline, once a degree of proficiency has been achieved for the language to function adequately as an operational tool, and illustrates the concepts of overgeneralization as a learning strategy.

The studies regarding errors are carried out in order to (i) identify the strategies learners use, (ii) identify the causes of learner errors, and (iii) obtain information on common difficulties in language learning as an aid to teaching or in development of teaching materials [13]. Thus, language teaching cannot stand away from the findings of Error Analysis. Students’ errors, as has been observed, have always been of interest and significance to teachers, syllabus designers and test developers since this may lead educators to devise appropriate materials and effective teaching techniques, and constructing tests suitable for different levels and needs of learners [13].

In this connection, Keshavas [16] suggests two branches in which the field of Error Analysis can be divided into: (a) theoretical, and (b) applied. Theoretical analysis of errors primarily concerns the process and strategies of language learning and its similarities with first language acquisition. In other words, it tries to investigate what is going on in the minds of language learners. Applied error analysis, on the other hand, concerns organizing remedial courses, and devising appropriate materials and teaching strategies based on the findings of theoretical error analysis. It is this second branch of Error Analysis that this study is concerned with.

Error analysis contributes significantly by helping in the organization of remedial courses in the teaching of writing skill. It has been argued that learning to write fluently and expressively is the most difficult of the macro skills for all language users regardless of whether the language in question is a first, second or foreign language. Bell and Burnaby [17] have pointed out that writing is an extremely complex cognitive activity where the writer is required to demonstrate control of a number of variables simultaneously. At the

sentence level these include control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling and letter formation. Beyond the sentence, the writer must be able to structure and integrate information into cohesive and coherent paragraphs and texts.

Among the researchers who have worked on adult L2 learner’s errors Richards [18] holds a prominent place. He has examined intralingual or developmental errors produced by speaker of Japanese, Chinese, Burmese, French, Czech, Polish, Tagalog, Maori, Maltese, and the major Indian and West African languages. He has found 6 types of intralingual errors which are: a) errors in the production of verb groups (e.g. *be+ verb stem* for *verb stem*, wrong form after *do*, wrong form after modal verb etc.), b) errors in the distribution of verb groups (e.g. *be+ verb+ ing* for *be+ verb+ ed* etc.), c) errors in the use of prepositions (e.g. omission of *the*, *a*, and use of *the*, *a*, *an* when no article is needed), d) errors in the use of articles (e.g. omission of *the*, *a*, and use of the articles when not needed), e) errors in the use of questions (e.g. omission of inversion, wrong form of auxiliary, omission of *do* etc.), and f) miscellaneous errors (e.g. wrong verb form in adverb clause of time, object omitted or included unnecessarily, errors in tense sequence, confusion of *too*, *do*, *very*, etc.). Jain [15] also has highlighted such L1 independent intralingual or developmental errors and suggests that there is a system in learner’s errors in spite of their apparent arbitrariness in performance data.

There are also some studies conducted on the errors of Bangladeshi learners who learn English as a foreign language from the very beginning of their academic life. Khan [19] has conducted a case study on some undergraduate students of a public university which explores learners’ errors in present and past tense usage in composition writing and points out the underlying reasons behind this problem. In another study Saleheen [20] has identified fifteen types of recurrent and systematic errors made by tertiary level students, and has also categorized them under the sources of interlingual and intralingual errors. The fifteen types of errors he finds are: a) subject- verb agreement, b) possessive case, c) passive sentence, d) choice of appropriate word, e) parallelism, f) double negative, g) unfinished sentences, h) pluralization, i) preposition, j) adverb of place, k) omission of *that*, l) use of double infinitive, m) misuse of verbs, and n) omission of verbs. This work aims at making learners conscious of their errors so that they can rectify the errors and write “socially acceptable and academically correct English”.

Yet, in another study, Rida [21] has explored the causes behind the problem of writing in Bangladesh context is explored. Some of the problems she brings into focus are: a) practice of writing skill in classroom is not adequate, b) teachers are not trained well enough to deal with the CLT syllabus, c) teachers are not good at explaining grammar rules to the learners, d) the learners do not get adequate exposure to English language since the medium of classroom instruction is Bangla, and so on.

In another study on errors in writing, Nasrin [22] has explored the real life situation of teaching writing in Higher Secondary level and its relation with the testing system. She

finds that a) writing tasks and activities are hardly done in classroom, b) the teachers do not follow the textbook which advocates the CLT method, rather classes are taken in the traditional Grammar-Translation method, c) the teacher plays the dominant role in the class while the students remain passive, d) students do not pay attention to the class as they depend on private tuition, e) the testing system is not consistent with the textbook which reflect the CLT method, and f) classes are exam oriented and so students prefer to memorize than to practice writing skill.

Thus quite a good number of studies have been conducted on the writing problems of tertiary level students. But this researcher believes that intensive attention is to be given first to the Higher Secondary level so that learners can move forward to the next stage of their academic life with a satisfactory writing skill in English. This study aims at exploring and analyzing the common errors Higher Secondary level students of Bangladesh frequently make in their writing and also at exploring ways to minimize such errors.

II. PROCEDURE AND APPROACH FOR DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS:

The procedure for Error Analysis is spelled out in Corder [8]. It is as follows.

1. A corpus of language is selected. This involves deciding on the size of the sample, the medium to be sampled, and the homogeneity of the sample (with regard to the learners' ages, L1 background, stage of development, etc).
2. The errors in the corpus are identified. This involves identifying errors from mistakes.
3. The errors are classified. This involves assigning a grammatical description to each error.
4. The errors are explained. In this stage of the procedure an attempt is made to identify the psycholinguistic cause of the errors.
5. The errors are evaluated. This stage involves assessing the seriousness of each error in order to take principled teaching decisions.

The researcher has tried to follow all the steps of Error Analysis procedure suggested by Corder [8] as mentioned earlier in the literature review. These steps also cover the first five steps of Croft's [20] methodology of Error Analysis except only one step which suggests remedial therapy. This final step could not be followed because the researcher could not reach the collaborators as their classes were already suspended before the HSC Test Examination. So there was no scope for any sort of remedial classes with that particular group of students.

Collaborators

This researcher collected data from the answer script of 100 (one hundred) Higher Secondary level students of a well-known college situated at the center of the capital Dhaka city. It is a women's college which offers HSC, 4-year Honours

degrees, 3-year BA degree, and masters degrees. All the 100 collaborators were native speakers of Bangla and have had Bangla medium schooling. Their average age is 17 years. The corpus was selected from all the three groups of studies: 30 scripts from Science group, 30 scripts from Humanities group, and 40 scripts from Business Studies group. Almost all of these 100 students are from middle class families as the researcher was informed. All these collaborators had to sit for the Test Examination. Getting 33% score in all the subject in this exam was a must to be allowed to sit for the HSC Examinations which is why this researcher assumed that the students' true proficiency level will be reflected in their writing scripts of this important exam i.e. the corpus will be reliable for error analysis.

This researcher also interviewed eight teachers of this college who were teaching English at the HSC level for minimum seven years.

Data Collection

Error analysis is largely confined to the study of errors in written performance. Therefore, from a practical point of view, it is easier to make a systematic study of written materials. We can divide the learners' written works into two groups: spontaneous production and controlled production [translation, gap filling].

Students' answer scripts of English 2nd paper have been selected as corpus for this study. The question-paper for this course is divided in two parts. Part- A asks students to answer nine types of grammar questions for 40 marks such as completing a passage with suitable words from a given list, filling blanks with suitable prepositions, filling blanks with articles, filling blanks with suitable linking words from a given list, making meaningful sentences with given phrases and idioms, re-writing in the reported speech, transforming sentences, filling blanks with tag questions and completing sentences.

On the other hand, Part- B asks students to write composition items for 60 marks which are: writing a report, a short composition, an application, a dialogue or a summary, completing a story.

Thus, while Part-A checks students' controlled production of English, Part- B checks their spontaneous production of the language. After checking the corpus, it is found that students have done relatively better in Part-A than in Part-B. The corpus shows that students get a good score in discrete point grammar test but fail to apply those same rules when they are asked to write descriptive writings such as paragraph, essay, and letters on their own. Another reason behind this inconsistency may be that learners memorize the grammar rules for discrete point test or take help from each other in the exam hall, but when they are asked to write descriptive writing they are on their own and their true proficiency level is revealed exposing various types of errors. So the researcher has chosen to collect data from Part-B question types. Thus, the researcher attempts to find errors from the subjects' spontaneous production so that error analysis can be done following a qualitative approach.

III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Following the procedure for error analysis spelled out by Corder [8] mentioned earlier in the methodology, it becomes evident that the subjects who have the same L1 background, the same age range, and the same educational background also seem to have the same stage of development in their proficiency in writing of English texts.

After checking all the answer-scripts 16 (sixteen) types of common errors have been identified. Among them, interlingual errors are subject-verb agreement errors, and mixing up between 'he' and 'she'. On the other hand, intralingual and developmental errors are pluralization, omission or misuse of articles, capitalization, omission or misuse of preposition, choosing the wrong word from a word family, *be + verb stem* for *verb stem*, problems in the use of tense, problem with the formation of questions, incomplete sentences, problem in writing reported speech, use of possessive pronoun, problem with the use of transition markers, and problem with spelling. Among these 16 types, 10 are different from those found in Saleheen [20]. The percentage and syntactic category of these errors are shown below:

Table A: Frequency rate of each error type

| Sl no. | Error type | Syntactic category | Frequency rate (%) |
|--------|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| a. | Pluralization | morphology | 71% |
| b. | Sub-verb agreement | syntax | 46% |
| c. | Omission/ misuse of article | morphology | 63% |
| d. | Capitalization | Word formation | 50% |
| e. | Omission/ misuse of preposition | Syntax | 66% |
| f. | Wrong choice of word | morphology | 54% |
| g. | <i>Be + verb stem</i> for <i>verb stem</i> | syntax | 32% |
| h. | Omission/ misuse of auxiliary verbs | Auxiliary system | 42% |
| i. | Tense | syntax | 85% |
| j. | Question formation | syntax | 65% |
| k. | Sentence fragments | Sentence fragments | 34% |
| l. | Reported speech | syntax | 40% |
| m. | Possessive pronoun | morphology | 32% |
| n. | Transition markers | syntax | 36% |
| o. | Use of he/she | morphology | 32% |
| p. | Spelling | morphology | 82% |

As is seen in this table, the frequency rate of errors range from 32% to 85%. This gives the impression that almost

every student's script contains one error or the other. The percentage of errors is quite high for a group of students who are HSC candidates where they are to be assessed by their writing skill only. It is also evident that students not only have problem in grasping the grammar rules, they also do not have the basic knowledge of what a successful writing involves as described in Nunan [17]. 50% students have problems with capitalization, 82% have problem with spelling, 34% have problem with incomplete sentence and 36% do not know the proper use of transition markers; the statistics says it all about why students cannot get a satisfactory score in the public examination. The quality of writing falls at a much lower level because of the frequent occurrence of such common errors which is undesirable at the Higher Secondary level. All these 16 types of errors are a bar to get a good score in the written examination.

Findings of the general causes from the teachers

In order to find out the reasons behind such a large number of students making such basic errors, also to seek solution as to what can be done to improve students' writing skill at this crucial stage of their academic life, this researcher has interviewed eight teachers of the college. It needs to be mentioned that all these teachers were very good in English and all of them have been in the teaching profession for no less than seven years. The reasons these teachers gave are listed below:

1. These students lack in integrative motivation and have very limited writing practice.
2. Unsatisfactory reading skill and limited exposure to reading texts in English explain poor language output in their writing.
3. Both the students and the teachers are exam oriented which encourages rote memorization.
4. The affective filter of almost all the students is high from their very childhood. They have a fear of the English language and this explains their lack of motivation.
5. The Higher Secondary level students have to sit for a lot of exams/quizzes within a year due to which they hardly get time to practice writing outside class.
6. The teachers have only the white board and chalk as teaching aid to use in the classroom which they do not want to use much because of dust problem. Thus the students hardly get any visual aid to help them internalize whatever is taught in the class.
7. The time constraint of 45 minute long classes is another reason for insufficient writing practice in class. The teachers do not give students writing assignments at home either, because there is no time for script checking or giving feedback.
8. The overcrowded classrooms neither allows teachers to give corrective feedback to each student nor to follow the CLT method according to which the

textbook (English 1st paper which is the only exposure to English these students get) is designed.

9. The book is designed to develop writing skill, along with the other three macro skills- reading, speaking and listening, through active participation on the part of the students. But the testing system checks the writing skill only with question items that encourage rote memorization.
10. Poor foundation of the English language from the first 10 years of school life slows down the process of further improvement.
11. The prescribed text book has no literary text in it which could have made language learning more interesting.
12. These Bangladeshi English-language-learners do not get enough scope to communicate in English once they are out of the class. That is why no subconscious learning takes place.
13. A large number of students of this Higher Secondary level are too busy with modern pocket-technology or with other entertainments to be able to study a couple of hours at a stretch. They are always busy chatting by exchanging text-messages through cell phones. This explains the presence of sms language in some of the scripts.

These are the principal causes that the interviewee teachers expressed to be the case. But when asked some specific questions regarding some specific errors they said that they do not teach the use of article, preposition, auxiliary, spelling and vocabulary in the class and that they assume that students have been taught these in their Secondary level. Some of the teachers think that the text book is quite effective but it depends on how effectively the teachers can use it. And only one of these eight teachers think that writing practice can be done even in this short 45 min class if the teacher wants to.

Causes for the error types

The responses from the teachers regarding the reasons for these errors to occur persistently in students' writing corpus has helped the researcher categorize each error type into a domain as has been mentioned by Richards (1974).

Table B illustrates that the subjects of this study display a greater number of errors in the process of construction of their L2. These L2 error types occur as a result of their attempt to build up concepts and hypothesis about the target language from their limited experience of it in the classroom or textbook.

Table B: Specific causes for each error type

| Sl | Domain | Specific causes | Error type |
|----|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 1. | Interlingual transfer | L1 interference | Sub-verb agreement, capitalization, omission/misuse of auxiliary verbs, use of he/she |
| 2. | Intralingual transfer and developmental errors | overgeneralization | Tense, question formation |
| | | Ignorance of rule restrictions | Wrong choice of word |
| | | Incomplete application of rules | Pluralization, mission/misuse of articles, sentence fragments, reported speech, possessive pronoun, transitional markers |
| | | False concepts hypothesized | Be+verb stem for verb stem, spelling, omission/misuse of preposition |

Recommendations from Teachers

When asked what can they do to help students improve in writing, they gave the following suggestions:

1. Self-study on the part of the learners is important. The learners have to have integrative motivation and be responsible for their own learning.
2. Feedback on their erroneous production should be given constantly.
3. English classes should be two-hour classes.
4. The classroom has to be well equipped; at least with white board and OHP so visual aid can be given to help internalization.
5. The teachers need good training on the learner centered method of CLT.
6. Inclusion of a few pieces of literature could make the textbook more interesting to the learners and that would mean exposing learners to higher quality of writing.
7. Well trained specialized teachers should teach English from the school level.
8. Rote memorization should be discouraged and to do this the testing system needs to be changed. Questions that promote critical thinking should be included.

9. Students do not need so many quizzes or tutorials to divert their attention. The more exams they get, the more they memorize to get the pass mark.
10. Role play can be done to make students participate and dictation practice needs to be done to improve spelling.
11. The teachers have to apply some effective classroom management techniques to retain students' attention in the class.
12. Teachers have to be friendly and encouraging to lower their affective filter.

Recommendations from the researcher

This researcher believes that a good number of both types of errors can be rectified simply by giving students individual corrective feedback (CF) on their writing. The language teacher has to focus on the interlingual errors first, like error of subject-verb agreement, before they get fossilized. The teachers need to address the common errors with sympathy. They have to treat errors as a sign of development, not as a sign of bad learning so that the learners do not feel disinclined to learn. Learners must be encouraged to revise and identify their errors for themselves and on other occasions they can be engaged in peer checking. The teacher needs to give corrective feedback only when the learner fails to identify the errors on their own. Another important point to note is that whatever method the syllabus advocates to be followed in the language classroom, the useful way would be to follow any approach that facilitates the learning of writing. The teachers also need to teach the rules and conventions of writing in context and reinforce the new learning throughout the course. Most importantly, the teachers have to be aware of the learners' needs.

IV. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate into the problem of our Bangladeshi Higher Secondary learners' writing due to which they get poor score in the examinations. This research has not taken the content related problems into focus as they do not come under Error Analysis and deserves a separate study. All the 16 types of errors found in this study and the formal interview with the teachers provide a concrete proof that Bangladeshi young learners do have some major and unsolved difficulties in writing in English. This research aims at the practical side of error analysis and has tried to draw attention to learners' errors of syntactic category, auxiliary system, vocabulary and at the end suggested some recommendations to treat those errors so that efforts can be made to improve the writing skills of the learners before they get fossilized due to inattention.

This research has some limitations as well. The researcher could not interview the subjects, for reasons stated earlier, to take their opinions and suggestions which could have given a wholesome view of the research. Another limitation is that a longitudinal study on this large number of errors would have made this research a complete one with concrete suggestions for language teachers and researchers.

The researcher considers this study a preliminary one that just gives an idea of the teaching- learning situation in Bangladesh.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. H. K. Reishaan, "The use of tenses in the Iraqi advanced EFL learners' writings: an error analysis," *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov, Series IV: Philology & Cultural Studies*, vol 6, pp. 99-116. 2013.
- [2] W. A. T. Al-Bayati, "Errors made by Iraqi undergraduates in the use of prepositions," *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov, Series IV: Philology & Cultural Studies*, vol 6, pp. 41-56. 2013.
- [3] C.G.V. Beuningen, N. H. D. Jong and F. Kuiken, "Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing," *Language Learning*, vol 66, pp. 1-41. 2012.
- [4] R. Erlam, R. Ellis, and R. Batstone, "Oral corrective feedback on L2 writing: two approaches compared," *System*, vol 41, pp. 257-268. 2013.
- [5] S. M. Doolan and D. Miller, "Generation 1.5 written error patterns: a comparative study," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol 21, pp. 1-22. 2012.
- [6] S. M. Doolan, "Comparing language use in the writing of developmental generation 1.5, L1 and L2 tertiary students," *Written Communication*, vol 31, pp. 215-247. 2014.
- [7] S. P. Corder, "The significance of learners' errors," *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, vol 5, pp. 161-70. 1967.
- [8] R. Ellis, *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- [9] S. P. Corder, *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. Middlesex: Penguin. 1973.
- [10] S. M. F. Haque, "What can we learn from learner's errors?," *Journal of the Institute of Modern Languages*, 1992-93 issue, pp. 92-102. 1993.
- [11] S. P. Corder, *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1981.
- [12] R. Ellis, *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1997.
- [13] V. Erdogan, *Contribution of Error Analysis to Foreign Language Teaching*. 2005.
- [14] J. C. Richards, *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Essex : Longman. 1992.
- [15] M. P. Jain, "Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance," In J. C. Richards (1974). *Error Analysis*. London: Longman. 1974.
- [16] M. H. Keshavas, *Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis*. Tehran: Rahman publishers. 1997.
- [17] D. Nunan, *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1989.
- [18] J. C. Richards, "A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. English Language Teaching," vol. 25. London: Oxford University Press. 1971.
- [19] M. F. R. Khan, "Bangladeshi Learners' Errors in Using the Categories of the Present and Past Tenses in English: a case study," M.A. thesis, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh, 2005.
- [20] M. S. U. Saleheen, "Errors in Writing: Identification of Problems and Need for Refinement," M.A. thesis, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. 2005
- [21] H. Rida, "Problems in Writing at Higher Secondary Level Students in Bangladesh," M.A. thesis, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. 2008.
- [22] S. Nasrin, "Suitability of Classroom Activities for Testing Writing at HSC Level," M.A. thesis, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. 2007.

Hasna Khanom teaches undergraduate language courses and also graduate courses in the MA in TESOL programme at the BRAC Institute of Languages (BIL), BRAC University. Her research areas include reflective teaching, assessment tools, material development, innovation in teaching English as a foreign language in context of Bangladesh, and syllabus evaluation and designing. Email address: hasnakhanom@yahoo.com



