

**English Writing Activities and Students' Perception of Teachers'
Feedback in Urban Bangla Medium Higher-Secondary Schools in
Bangladesh.**

By

Md Siraat Mustakim

20303015

A thesis submitted to the Department of English and Humanities in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of English Language Teaching.

English and Humanities,

Brac University

May, 2024

© 2024. Brac University

All rights reserved.

Declaration

It is hereby declared that

1. The thesis submitted is my/our own original work while completing degree at BRAC University.
2. The thesis does not contain material previously published or written by a third party, except where this is appropriately cited through full and accurate referencing.
3. The thesis does not contain material which has been accepted, or submitted, for any other degree or diploma at a university or other institution.
4. I have acknowledged all main sources of help.

Student's Full Name & Signature:

Md Siraat Mustakim

Student ID: 20303015

English and Humanities

Brac University

Approval

The thesis titled “English Writing Activities and Students’ Perception of Teachers’ Feedback in Urban Bangla Medium Higher-Secondary Schools in Bangladesh.” submitted by Md Siraat Mustakim (20303015) of Spring, 2024 has been accepted as satisfactory in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of English and Humanities on [27-05-2024].

Examining Committee:

Supervisor:
(Member)

Md Al Amin
Associate Professor, Department of English and
Humanities Brac University

Departmental Head:
(Chair)

Professor Firdous Azim
Chairperson, Department of English and Humanities
BRAC University

Ethics Statement

This qualitative research study adheres to ethical principles by obtaining informed consent from participants, ensuring confidentiality of data, respecting participant autonomy and dignity, minimizing harm, practicing researcher reflexivity, maintaining transparency, and obtaining ethical approval. Participants are provided with comprehensive information about the study, their anonymity is preserved, and their rights are respected throughout the research process. Efforts are made to create a safe environment for participants, and any potential risks are minimized. The study aims to conduct research that is respectful, responsible, and beneficial to both participants and the broader community.

Name: Md Siraat Mustakim

ID: 20303015

Date: 27-05-2024

Abstract: This Study investigates the current English writing activities and teachers' feedback in the context of urban Bangla medium Higher secondary school students. This research explores the frequency of writing activities held in class, the perception of the students concerning teachers' feedback and the changes they bring after receiving the feedback. A qualitative research methodology was employed in this study where seven students from four different urban institutes were interviewed to grasp the students' perspective about the issues. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, coded and the categorized based on the themes of the research questions. The major findings included non-existing writing activities in classrooms, students' perception of the feedback being hollow and meaningless, and students' lack of scope to do meaningful changes in their writing after receiving the feedback. This study finds the current method of providing feedback to be ineffective in identifying the errors and it lacks the scope to make meaningful changes in English writing.

Keywords: L2 Writing, Classroom Activities, Teacher-Feedback, Error Correction, Grammar.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my family especially my father and mother for their unwavering encouragement, understanding, and patience during this research endeavour. Their love and support have been a constant source of strength and inspiration. Additionally, I would like to express My sincere gratitude to my supervisor Md Al Amin sir for his invaluable guidance, support, and encouragement throughout the duration of this thesis. His expertise, feedback, and mentorship have been instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of this study. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance and support received from the interviewees for granting their time for this research paper. Their contributions were essential to the successful execution of this study.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	ii
Approval	iii
Ethics Statement.....	iv
Abstract/.....	v
Acknowledgement	vi
Table of Contents	vii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Context.....	2
1.3 Research Questions.....	6
Chapter 2 Literature Review	7
2.1 Overview.....	7
2.3 Error Correction and Feedback	7
2.5 Grammar in L2 writing	14
2.6 Teachers Instructions in L2 Writing.....	17
Chapter 3 Methodology	20
3.1 Research Design.....	20
3.2Participants.....	20

3.3Interviews.....	20
3.4 Data Analysis.....	22
Chapter 4 Findings and Discussion.....	23
4.1 Non-Existing Writing Activities in Classroom.....	23
4.2 Students’ Perception of Teachers’ Feedback in Writing	25
4.3 Changes After Receiving the Feedback.....	31
Chapter 5 Limitations of the Study and Further Research.....	35
5.1 Limitations of The Study.....	35
5.2 Further Research.....	35
Chapter 6 Conclusion	37
References.....	39
Appendix A.....	49

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background: Writing is one of the most important skills to learn. For a second language learner (L2), writing makes a learner an effective international communicator both in academic and professional context. Writing gives a learner the opportunity to express himself, convey meanings, and engage with the audience. Writing stands as one of the pillars in the mastery of a language. However, at the same time, writing is considered to be of the hardest skill to master for a second language learner due to its complexity. Learners need to have the ability to choose the appropriate vocabulary, sentence, paragraph structure, organization, and problem solving capabilities to execute communication. In the modern globalised world, it is important for EFL learners to develop English due to the increased demand to study or work abroad. These abroad nations tend to be English-speaking countries. According to Rinnert and Kobayashi (2009), for EFL students, the stakes are high in developing English writing. This is because learners pursue higher education and most of the better higher education quality as well as opportunities are in countries where English is a native language. According to the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (2024), in 2023 a total of approximately 52 thousand Bangladeshi students went abroad to achieve higher studies. In the same report, it was mentioned that the top countries that Bangladeshi students went to are The United States of America, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia which are all English-speaking countries. Therefore, it is paramount that students pay much attention to the development of English writing.

To develop English writing it is essential that students are engaged with writing. That is why writing activities are important, as it enables them to practice and refine their ability to

express their ideas in a clear and cohesive way. It is through the feedback of the teacher the students learn their mistakes and rectify them. Feedback helps a learner the strengths and weaknesses of their writing. A learner can comprehend his writing from the perspective of the reader through feedback. Furthermore, by identifying the errors and solving them a learner makes his writing better. Students can make necessary revisions and develop their writing through feedback. Students become effective commuters by rectifying writing mistakes. For an academic learner, it is important to be an effective commuter. It is through writing students can show their creativity, critical thinking skills and confidence. While it is important, mastering writing is not easy and it takes years to grasp the generative notion of writing. However, with sufficient practice and proper feedback, a learner will be able to communicate his thoughts and ideas to others in a cohesive and clear way.

1.2 Context: Bangladesh follows a British model of education. Similar to the British education the education here is also contains three main sections. These three sections are primary, secondary, and tertiary (Ali et al., 2018). The primary education consists of grades 1-5. The secondary education consists from grade six to 12. However, the secondary education is also divided into three sub sections. They are junior secondary (grades 6-8), secondary (grades 9-10), and higher secondary (11-12). The National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB), have the responsibility to develop the curriculum and textbooks for the students. The NCTB also provides instructions for assessment. Evaluation of the students is executed by various tests. As the Asian Bank (2015) depicts the education of Bangladesh as a test-driven education system. The tests are administered both internally and externally. The internal exams are operated by the respective schools and colleges. The external exams are high-stakes exams which are administered by the nine educational boards. There are also two

alternative boards under NCTB. They are the Bangladesh Technical Board and the Madrasha Education Board.

After the Liberation of Bangladesh in 1971, various education commissions operated the education sector. However, in 2010, the National Education Commission was formulated which is still the current functioning educational policy. This policy contains comprehensive goals and objectives. The policy strongly recognizes the power of education. It looks at education as an active force that will help transform the country's social, political and economic state in a positive manner. One of the objectives of the policy is to ensure enhanced quality education for learners of all levels (Islam., et al, 2021).

The institutionalization of English composition study is a recent development. However, historically, English in Bangladesh has always been a controversial but convenient language. After the British left the subcontinent, Bangladesh was a part of Pakistan. It was known as East Pakistan. The people in the East Pakistan was a monolingual group of people. Around 98% of the people spoke Bangla. (Choudhary and Ha, 2008). However, the West Pakistan government tried to impose Urdu as the national language for all of Pakistan. This decision led to the opposition and strong resistance of East Pakistan which resulted in lost lives in 1952. This Event of 1952 is also known as the year of the language movement. This language movement was believed to spark the war of independence of East Pakistan which later became Bangladesh. Bangladesh gained its independence in 1971. So, the language Bangla was a critical factor in defining and determining the identity of the new nation. So, after the independence of Bangladesh, nationalism based on the language Bangla was set in. This had huge implications on English as well. Due to the Bangla nationalism basis, English lost its status as a medium of instruction in all educational instruction. It was substituted by Bangla in all education levels (Hamid and Baldauf, 2008). In 1987, the Bangladeshi government at

that time passed the “Bengali Introduction Law”. This law enforces Bengali language to be used in all spheres and levels of governmental work (Banu and Sussex, 2001) which also included the education sector. So, English as an academic language came in late. However, implementation of English was urged not long after the independence. The commission of the Education Ministry recommended introducing English in an early grade. They proposed starting the English academia in either class 3 or class 6 depending on the availability of teachers (Ministry of Education, 1976). In reality, English as a compulsory subject came in very late. According to Ahmed (2005), in 1992, English was for the first time integrated into the curriculum as a compulsory subject which started from grade 1. In 2003, the National Education Commission reviewed the status of English. The commission was convinced that students needed the exposure of English from the primary level. They concluded that English was an extremely necessary foreign language and the students needed exposure. Therefore, they declared English to be integrated in the curriculum (Choudhury and Kabir, 2014). The commission also expressed the importance of teachers training in Primary, National and abroad. The government integrated English as an academic subject in 2010 after they have understood the importance of English in day to day affairs (Rahman and Pandian, 2018).

Currently, the curriculum for Higher Secondary English focuses on teaching and learning the subject as a skill-based subject. The objective is to enable the learners to develop the competence successfully communicate in real-life situations. The curriculum also approached a learner-centred approach and it is especially prioritized in the higher-secondary level. All four English language skills which are reading, writing, listening and speaking were included in the curriculum (National Curriculum, 2012). The Higher-secondary students are given two sets of contents in English. They are labelled as paper 1 and paper 2. While paper 1 is based on various themes, such as human achievements in science and technology, myths and literature, traffic education, human rights, peace, and conflict. The 2nd paper has content that

are based on the grammar and composition skills. As previously mentioned, the assessment method is operated both in internal examinations by the individual institutions as well as the public examinations operated by the ministry which is also known as Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) exam (Ali et al., 2018). While newer failed assessments were trailed in the secondary school level, for example in 2012 the education commission implemented continuous assessment (CA) (Bangladesh Examination Development Unit, 2016), the higher secondary level remained unchanged.

The current assessment method for Higher Secondary schools are paper and pencil based high stakes test. These tests are held on a large scale on reduced English syllabi. (Al Amin and Greenwood, 2018a, 2018b; Ali et al., 2018; Sultana, 2018). However, the impact of these high stakes tests are quite controversial. Several scholars (Cheng, 1998; Ferman, 2004; Saif, 2006; Shohamy, 2014; Spann & Kaufman, 2015) contends that they do more harm to the learners rather than help them to learn the language. The test entices the learners to do well on the exams rather than actually learning the language. According to Rahman, Kabir, & Afroze (2006), the current way of assessment entices the students' memorization of language structures, and premeditated pieces of language. She further added that they do it because they are desperate to pass the exams. This prompted Al Amin and Greenwood et al. (2018) to contend that the curriculum goals and objectives is not consistent with the national curriculum. This can be the reason why The overall English proficiency in Bangladesh is observed to be poor. In the English Proficiency Index (2019), Bangladeshi students have demonstrated poor English proficiency. The index accesses the proficiency in five different level. They are Very high, high, moderate, low and very low. According to the Proficiency Index Bangladesh was measured to have very low proficiency and obtaining 71 position in the index (Education First, 2019 mentioned in Islam., et al, 2021). Similarly, Alam (2018), Rahman and Pandian (2018) found out the lack of preparedness in English for Bangladeshi

students. They found out that among 1700 students who sat for the Elective paper admission test, only two students were considered eligible. The eligibility criteria were set by the university's English departmental teachers who devised a test that ensures only students with the necessary competence to study English at the tertiary level were admitted in the undergraduate program. This test revealed how poor the English proficiency is for Bangladeshi students. All the 12 years of constant learning and practicing English in primary, secondary and higher secondary level had not helped them or prepared them to the kind of language skill needed to study in the English department.

1.3 Research Questions: While there are many studies reflecting or exploring the state of writing in the context of tertiary level, I have yet to find studies that explore the classroom writing activities and the students' perception of teachers' error correction and feedback in English writing in the context of urban Higher Secondary School students. My purpose of the study is to fill out this gap with answering the following questions:

1. What is the frequency of writing activities in higher secondary level classrooms?
2. How do the students generally perceive feedback?
3. What changes do the students bring after receiving the feedback?

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 overview:

The central aspect of this paper is classroom activities and teachers' error correction and feedback concerning English writing. The field of L2 writing is still a relatively new field. Errors are inevitable for a second language learner as he uses his conscious mind rather than his sub-conscious mind. So, it is common for a learner to make mistakes. Various teachers classify errors differently and use various different means of feedback. The different background of teachers also affect how the instructors look at different errors. However, the use of feedback remains controversial. No conclusive study has yet to be made that gives off an indisputable principle of feedback. There are studies that find both the positive and the negative aspect of error correction and feedback. While giving error correction and feedback, L2 instructors usually emphasizes on the mechanical aspect of writing. Therefore, this chapter comprehensively looks at the past studies concerning error correction and feedback, Grammar in L2 writing and the background training of teachers.

2.2 Error Correction and Feedback:

Errors is simply infringement of the standard code in a particular language. However, this is simply an oversimplification in the definition of an error. According to Connors and Lunsford (1988), culture and time always had influenced teachers' reasoning the classifications and definition concerning errors. Teachers have always labelled various incidents as errors, referred them differently, and have also emphasized them differently. Researchers have observed that writing teachers mostly Points out errors. According to Ferris (2002) and Mantello (1997), for teachers, it is the most time-consuming and exhausting task and activity.

Even though teachers mostly point out error, error correction and feedback remain very controversial. The Purpose and output of error correction and feedback are still in debate. Recent studies have observed an animated yet inconclusive discourse between Ferris (1997, 2002) and Truscott (1996). While Ferris endorsed error correction and feedback (1997, 2002), the latter one called for a complete rejection on the matter (1996).

Before I delve into the matter of error correction and feedback, it is necessary to understand the classifications of feedback. Ellis (2009) categorized lecturer feedback to the student's errors in writing. She classified it into six basic strategies that teachers employ to give feedback. They are direct written corrective feedback, indirect written corrective feedback, metalinguistic written corrective feedback, focused versus unfocused written corrective feedback or selected versus comprehensive written corrective feedback, electronic feedback, and reformulation. In this paper only direct written corrective feedback and indirectly written corrective feedback is explained.

Directly Written Corrective Feedback: In directly written corrective feedback, the teacher or instructor provides the students with correct form of the target language by indicating the error and inserting the correct word above or near the indicated error. This feedback method can provide the learners explicit guidance when they do not know how to correct their errors. It is advantageous when the learner does not know what the correct form should be. Ferris and Roberts (2001), argued that this method is better than the indirect method for students with low-level proficiency. However, this method requires minimal processing from the learner and it may not constitute to long-term understanding.

Indirect Written Corrective Method: In this feedback method, teachers give indications to the student's error without giving the correct form in the text. Teachers usually underline or use cursors to indicate the error in learners writing. It is often that this indirect method is

preferred to its direct counterpart. This method leads to guided learning and problem solving and encourages the students to reflect upon their linguistic forms. This method is more likely to promote long-term learning. However, according to Indrastana (2018), studies have found mixed results regarding this claim.

Although there are many ways to provide feedback, the concept of feedback remains controversial. According to Murray (1981), writing is thinking. a few errors do not spoil a fine piece of writing. Errors are an inevitable part of learning a language, it comes in all processes of language acquisition which includes writing (Briedenback, 2006). However, according to Raimes (1991), writing instructors are neglecting to praise students or learners when they take risk and make errors and mistakes. It is because they are focused on the mistakes of the students. Pearl (1979) added to it by contending that students conceive writing as something mechanical not rhetorical when teachers or instructors look at writing as an error-focused pedagogy. In this method, the students are not exposed to the internal flow of composing. They become concerned with how their writing looks. Calonne (2006) contended that composing is about the synergy between flow and restriction. Therefore, L2 writing cannot be reified for an error emphasized pedagogical purpose. Errors are unavoidable as it is a by-product of writing. Raimes (1991) contended that in the case of teaching writing, purging of errors in writing is not a natural approach and it is reductive. Learners do not benefit from it as it does not make them avoid errors. Instead, purging of errors may have aggravated the crisis by leaning to more instructor prompted errors.

Error correction and feedback also impact the writer's psychology. According to Murray (1982), writing is connected to the emotional state of the learner. it is a mental activity which operates in an emotional environment. Writing is affective and cognitive. Sommers (1982), states that the affective aspect of writing is not concerned in an error emphasized pedagogy. It

identifies the lacking of a student by the instructors. Conners and Lunsford (1988) also agreed with it and they also said that error correction makes the student feel stupid, wrong, trivial, and misunderstood. L2 writers already have a fragile confidence due to their egos being hurt. As Horning (2002) said L2 writers already contain a fragile confidence due to their lacking in writing facility. However, when the instructors enhance and point out these errors, their confidence as a writer goes down further. According to Karim and Ivy (2011), if negative feedback is not conveyed to the students in a delicate manner then the student loses his interest in writing. Furthermore, Burke and Pieterick (2010) concluded that feedback made learners lose confidence and motivation as well as making them impotent for further learning. Bradatan (2013) claims that second language learner goes through a death and re-birth experience when he tries to write in the target language. His implication is that L2 writers look at writing as constructive which is opposed to creative. They become linguist maniac and a compulsive grammarian. Zamel (1985) similarly says that observed that research has concluded that L2 students tend to emphasize the correctness rather than the discourse aspect of writing. Hedcock and Lefkowitz (1996) concerns that this mechanical correctness may lead students to think that formal accuracy is far more important than the transmission of meaning, organization and content development. Furthermore, weak students are unlikely to find the teachers feedback motivating, as their writing is heavily criticised. However, this is not what writing is about. Writing is about creativity. As Murray (1996) argued that writing is a process of discovering meaning from the confusion of different information. It necessitates creativity.

With the debate of the lack of effectiveness or adverse effect of feedback, Truscott (1996) contends that feedback is not effective and should it be rejected. For the developmental and sequential process of learning, feedback is not attuned for the learners. He argued that feedback only effects pseudo-learning. Both Krashen (1984) and Zamel (1976) supported this

claim. Indrastana (2016) found out that written corrective feedback on students writing in focused on three aspects. They are grammar, Language expression and mechanics. However, grammar is marginal in terms of writing (see 2.3 for further context). Lee (2005) has found out that error correction does not eliminate the errors. In her research, she has found out that most students will make the same mistakes again. Which brings the question if feedback is actually needed? The different content of the composition, new vocabulary uses and forgetting the problem is listed as the main reasons errors are always prevalent. She also found out that students believed that they did not make significant amount of progress while obtaining teachers' feedback. Lee (2005) further stated that the long-term goal of feedback should be to help the learners reduce their dependency on teachers. However, in her study, she found out that error correction and feedback makes the students more reliant on teachers. Due to the students' cravings for accurate writing, they want teachers to correct all errors for them. Thus becoming reliant on teachers in writing and the teachers become error hunters. Hairston (1986) has warned teachers to not to be 'composition slaves' but it seems his advice was not paid enough attention (Lee, 2005). Lee (2005) found students to heavily favour correcting all error. However, she found out that the intention of the students for this error correction cravenness is actually laziness from the students' side. So, they become less autonomous learners and becomes more reliant learners which goes against the long-term goal of learning a language.

While error correction and feedback has its problems and setbacks, it has proved to be useful in many studies. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) argue that feedback is fundamentally helpful. Same with Cada (2021) where she found that feedback is a necessity for the students to develop their writing skills. They looked from the perspective of how feedback should be given to students for merits and critical considerations and modifications rather than asking why feedback should be given. According to Purnawarman (2011), feedback indicates the

student about what is good and what needs to be looked again and improved. Similarly, Lightbrown and Spada (1999) contended that feedback makes the learner aware that his language has defects. Both the studies of Ferris and Roberts (2001) and Karim (2013) have found out that students who obtained teachers' feedback significantly performed better than the students who received no feedback. According to Chen (2009), feedback is the most appropriate way to develop a second language learners writing skill. Reid (1994) added that a teacher is more knowledgeable in academic writing. He very well knows about constraints and parameters of writing in academia. According to Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development, learner learns more proficiently when they are under the guidance or in collaboration with more competent peers (Vygotsky, 1978). So, giving feedback is also an important teaching characteristic (Leng, 2014). Therefore, it is the teacher's responsibility to intervene in students' writing. Goldstone (2004) added it by stating that The objective of feedback is to inform the students of how others read their writing and what revisions they should take to strengthen their writing. Lee (2005) in her study, found out that students actually want feedback and expects feedback from the teacher. In Bangladesh, most of the university students wanted direct form of feedback. 84.16% of studens wanted feedback from the instructor. Hartshorn, Evans, and Tuioti (2014) contend that most experienced teachers give feedback on the student's error in writing. Students also valued the provided feedback given by teachers. In a hierarchal culture the students held the feedback in high regards (Hu, 2002). It is also the case in another study conducted by Tsui and Ng (2000).

There may be many benefits to feedback however the dangers regarding feedback is that it is strictly teacher generated. Sommers (1982) calls it "idiosyncratic and arbitrary". The feedback that the student receives is not always related to the students. Students may prefer different types of feedback rather than the one that the teacher gave. For example, Barnett (1989) contends that learners are more absorbed in the comments on the content and

organization of their writing rather than accuracy and form. Instructors are not interested in the students' preferred needs. According to Zamel (1997), teachers are trapped by their own tendency to purge errors. They want to demonstrate writing as a mechanical skill. So, they reduce, categorize, and generalize the writings. Therefore, teachers or instructors become error hunters. Hairstone (1984) argues that teaching writing in a grammar correctness pedagogical approach persuades a teacher to be an error hunter. Leki (1991) harshly criticized feedback and error correction. He argued that there writing improvement and language instruction have yet to show any correlation. He further claims that error correction in the current form does not help or benefit the students to avoid mistakes. Teaching writing should be administered in a way to help students learn writing and the current principle does not look at the students writing. According to Zamel (1985), instructors have to stop with their vague and abstract feedback on students' writings. Error correction should be curated to text-specific as well as student-specific feedback (Sommers,1982). When a student succeeds in making expressions by making words come to life he feels joyous. According to Elbow (1981), When students successfully succeed to bring life in his used words, he/she feels a great sense of achievement. They discover autonomy and they feel better in their skill of strategic investment. Zamel (1985) contends that the most effective way to handle errors is by successfully identifying the errors. By identifying the grammatical and mechanical errors the student can correct his errors in a much easier way. This approach provides a sense of instant gratification for both the instructors and learners.

While giving feedback is controversial, the benefits of feedback cannot be neglected. Students wants feedback and most of the senior teachers prefer giving feedback to the students. The positives of error correction and feedback outweighs the negative side of it. With the guidance of teachers, a student can have more potential to achieve more challenging tasks regarding learning a second language. However, feedback needs to be curated to the

needs of the student rather than it being teacher induced. Therefore, feedback and error correction should not be abandoned rather it should be practiced among the teachers. However, the provided feedback and identification of errors should be curated to the needs according to the students.

2.3 Grammar in L2 Writing:

According to Shamsuzzaman (2015), in L2 writing, grammar aims at identifying and eliminating errors. In terms of writing, grammar is considered marginal. However, despite its marginal status, no teacher or theorist has been able to completely ignore or sidestep grammar. Ferris (2002) classified errors into two categories. They are treatable errors and untreatable errors. Treatable errors are what Ferris (2002) contends as errors concerned with grammar and mechanics. For treatable errors, a learner can be given manuals to understand the cause of errors to and learn how to eliminate those errors. That's why a lot of emphasis is put on grammar in foreign English writing teaching. Mahboob (2010) contends that in language, grammar regulates the structural patterns of it. So, they are a crucial aspect of language as in that they carry the physical signs that equates with meanings.

According to Shamsuzzaman (2015), The environment that an L2 writer comes from is very grammar-dependent. However, Scholars are polarized about their stance on grammar. As Williams (2003) contended that even with so much emphasis and attention given on grammar, it has not brought any positive effect on writing proficiency. Shamsuzzaman (2015) added to it by stating that multiple studies and empirical evidences show us that us that there is no positive relation between acquisition of a language skills and grammar instructions. For example, Bateman and Zidonis (1966), Crowley (1989), and Noguchi (1991) all found out

that writing instructions does not necessarily rise in terms of grammar instructions. Furthermore, Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer (1963) summarized contemporary research and concluded that grammar instructions actually have negative impacts on improving writing. Moreover, Elley, Barham, Lamb, and Wyllie (1976) found out that grammar instructions are repetitive, boring, difficult and useless. Shamsuzzaman (2015) adds upon it by stating that it is similar to second language learners who also finds it repetitive, dull, boring and useless. Draper (1969) finds grammar instructions to be counterproductive. He claims that students are not capable of converting their grammatical skills into composing. Composition is a complex process of portraying feelings and ideas together around a restrictive tone or mood. Grammar is the opposite of composing. According to Shamsuzzaman (2015), composition requires creativity and thinking skills while grammar encourages memorizing and recognising.

L2 writers are usually attributed as a monolithic group of learners. According to Sommer (1982), L2 learners' texts are characterized by accidents of discourse. Williams (2003) contended that grammar instructions are not transferable to writing. Grammar instructions discard the accidents of discourse which is not productive. Grammar is the building blocks of a sentence but it creates a limited number of sentence patterns. Therefore, the students are limited in expressing their emotions while writing. Writing is not linear nor formulaic as grammar is. Grammar is the opposite of writing because writing is generative, habitual and recursive (Shamsuzzaman, 2015). Similarly, these restrictive number of sentences restrict the higher-order thinking of a learner. According to sword (2012), higher-order thinking requires the use of complex and advanced vocabulary. Students will lose the ability to critically explain or analyse a topic. Furthermore, the cultivation of thinking and idea generation, and language acquisition are correlated (Bizzell, 2011). Which means an individual cannot possess a thought in his mind unless that individual has a word for it. The simple use of

words in a grammar dependant pedagogy restricts the thinking of the learner. Therefore, a grammar dependent pedagogy restricts the thinking of a learner. So, Raimes (1991) suggested that the writing instructions should provide the students in the direction of “extraordinary generative power of language”. Being proficient in grammar does not correspond to being a good writer. Williams (2003) found out emphasis on grammatical instructions does not necessarily corresponds to good writing. In his study he found out that the Japanese students who come to U.S. have a strong background in English grammar. However, they are poor writers. It is because grammar is only the surface of writing. As Elbow (1981) has stated that grammar is not writing’s substance. Grammar is not emphasized in L1 writing and as Shamsuzzaman (2015) has stated the approach between native writers and L2 writers should not be dissimilar as the process is still the same. Therefore, since grammar does not occupy the field of L1 writing it should not be dominantly present in the field of second language writing. Grammar instructions was famous early on. For 200 years since the ancient Greeks grammar instructions were popular. However, after the 1960s it started to decline in the interest of people, as it cannot grasp the complexities and fluidity of the production of language.

As much as scholars try to despise grammar and reveal its negatives, it cannot be denied that grammar plays a central role for both L1 and L2 learners in English writing. According to Pinker (2014), grammar is the solution of conveying complicated thoughts and ideas from one mind to another. It can navigate a learner to avoid confusing, convoluted and ambiguous writings. Learners needs awareness in syntax to avoid these mistakes and make their writing elegant, graceful and transparent. Leki (1992) contends that grammar should still be taught. The reason is that L2 learners are already used to learning English by grammar. Goldstein (2004) claims that grammar may have helped the l2 learners to succeed in entrance or exit

exams. Grammar does bring a short-term improvement in the students. This short-term improvement is needed for long-term improvement.

Grammar cannot be avoided as it is integral to a sentence. However, over-emphasis on grammar leads to the loss of the generative ability of the students. Excess reliance on grammar restricts the learner's ability to express critically. So, even though grammar should be taught to the students, it should not be the dominant focus of writing.

2.4 Teachers Instruction in L2 Writing:

According to Silva (2006), The way L2 writing instructors are taught, they similarly teach the learners the same way. Meaning, the teacher will eventually teach the learners either applied linguistics or composition. However, they will not teach not L2 writing. It is because L2 writing is a relatively new field and it does not have an independent and established principles and procedures for teaching. So, the field has to depend on its feeder disciplines such as applied linguistics and composition studies (Silva, 2006). The instructor's mode of instruction is monolithic even though the background training the instructors necessitates hybridity (Matsuda & Hamill, 2014). The mode of teaching is identical in both ESL and EFL context. It is due to the training of L2 writing revolving around North America (Silva, 2006). At the same time, learning and teaching of English has become a global phenomenon. So, now the instructors' background training has received critical attention (Bazerman, 2013).

According to Shamsuzzaman (2015), the encouragement of instructing L2 writing is somewhat damaged due to instructors lacking proper instructions. Silva (2005) contends that even though it is dependent on its feeder series, L2 learning is not built on the objective of epistemology nor is it political. He claims that it is established on interactionist epistemology.

In an EFL context, the teaching of writing is even at a more sorry state. It is due to instructors' background having a literature setting and their emphasis toward literature. Their concept is that composition is the stepchild of literature (Harris, 1990). For example, as Shamsuzzaman and Everatt, (2013) have pointed out that in 1993 is the when instructions for composition studies was formed. It is with the launch of private universities. Before that timeline there was no instruction for composition writing in English. The studies revolving around English was orbited around literature, which presupposed to the mastery of grammar. We have already established the marginal necessity of grammar in terms of L2 writing. On top of that literature instructions concerning teaching is based on philosophy, which is not parallel with the goals of composition. According to Elbow (2002), a literature classroom is based on the philosophy. So, it is not aligned with the goals of composition which is workshop. He added that it is because a composition studies classroom is based upon workshop based whereas literature classroom is lecture based. Furthermore, literature conceives work as research which has nothing to do with the genuine needs of a students. Because in composition studies, work means to teach. Therefore, he concludes that instructor having a literature background is perhaps not qualified to teach composition to a student. Professional teaching development is also important. According to Richards (2002), effective teaching comes from teachers who actively builds on their previously attained skills and intellect through various means and they are always engaged in inspecting their own teaching development. Estrem and Reid (2012) has critiqued the development of a professional writing instructor. They claimed that writing instructions is a complex process which is currently ongoing and always evolving. The pedagogy writing, is still in an emerging area of interest. For these various reasons Shamsuzzaman (2015) contended that in the field of writing development, scholars and experts are not able to develop an intellectual infrastructure for teaching writing while producing great output. The instructors of writing are unable to build

upon the previously published knowledge even though most of its feeder fields (psychology and literacy) are able to do so. So, the teaching of writing is not informed it is rather more intuitive. So, teaching of L1 writing is categorized by this phenomenon and the teachers of L2 writing are not unsusceptible to this. However, the potential implications of it for L2 writing instructors are more unsettling.

Composition studies is the central concept of L2 writing. In the field of L2 writing, L2 writing assists in the writing demands of learners of different contexts whom have specific and peculiar needs to be solved. However, potential teachers or instructors are unable to receive a sound background training of L2 writing. Therefore, no literature background teacher is able to meet the demands made by the L2 learners. According to Yi (2013), In the field of L2, writing has not been sufficiently dealt with. The instructors needed to be provided with the essential insights, knowledge and empirical evidence to develop learning outcomes.

Chapter 3

Methodology

3.1 Research Design: This study employed a qualitative research methodology for an in-depth understanding of the Challenges and causes of English Development in urban Bangla medium Higher-secondary school students. English development in Higher-secondary school is the central phenomena that this paper explored. I have used qualitative phenomena because the central phenomena necessitate studying the intricate details of the phenomena such as feelings and opinions of the students. It is difficult to find out these intricate details using the conventional methods. Therefore, qualitative method was the best suited methodology for this study.

3.2 Participants: For this study, I took 7 participants from four different higher-secondary Bangla medium schools located in the capital city of Dhaka. The four institutes I chose are considered to be top education institutes of Bangladesh at the time of the study. These institutes are usually the top choices for top-achieving and proficient learners. The participants were purposefully selected from two different streams which are science and commerce. 10 students were approached to participate in the research in which 7 of them agreed to participate in the research.

3.3 Interviews: This study was conducted through interviews with the participants. The interviews were physical one-on-one sessions that were recorded using mobile phone recording. I have conducted the research using a semi-structured interview method with open-ended questions to encourage in-depth conversations with the participants (Appendix A). The participants were given the choice to speak in Bangla, English or a mixture of both. The interview focused on the participant's perspectives on their development in English

writing in higher secondary education. The participants were asked about their preferred strategies, their ways of learning vocabulary, usage of the newly learned vocabularies, difficulties in developing vocabulary, their emphasis on particular aspects, teacher's preference and expectations, receiving teacher's feedback and how it affected them, their usage of creativity and their opinion on their development in the current system in the context of English writing. The interviews were recorded with the participant's permission. Before the interview the participants were given a consent form. After complying with the consent form, the interview took place. Pseudonyms is used throughout the paper to contain the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. The list of these participants with pseudonyms are given below,

Participant Name (pseudonyms)	Age	Current Class	Gender	Stream
Shadman	17	Class XI	Male	Science
Rayan	17	Class XI	Male	Science
Akib	17	Class XI	Male	Science
Al Taufiq	17	Class XI	Male	Commerce

Ragib	18	Class XII	Male	Commerce
Nisharga	18	Class XII	Male	Science
Khaled	18	Class XII	Male	Commerce

3.4 Data Analysis: I used inductive method and focused on the emerging themes from the data to analyse the data for the research. The recordings were transcribed and then translated in English by the researcher. I carefully read the English transcription multiple times and identified recurring themes and meanings from the interviews. The themes were generated by triangulating the interview's important points with other evidences such as published documents.

Chapter 4

Findings and Discussion:

Data from the interviews exhibit students' lack of classroom writing activities, their negative perception concerning teacher's feedback and their lack of meaningful changes to their writing after receiving feedback.

4.1 Non-Existent Writing Activities in Classroom:

Although 40% of marks are allocated in the composition section, writing is hardly taught in classes. Barely any classes were held where the class was based on writing. Senior students did not receive any writing based classes. They were at their end of their higher secondary school education but still did not get a single class which had activities or task related to writing. Khaled said,

“In college, classes based on writing till now have not happened and it will not happen because there is no time. (The board exam is supposed to occur within the next two months)”

Similarly, even first-year students did not receive any classes based on writing. Furthermore, they got the impression that writing classes will not happen. They have not experienced any writing classes for now and they do not feel that they will get any classes in the future. Rayan said,

“No. for the first year, there was no classes for writing. ... there will be no separate classes for writing. I don't think any classes will happen.”

For the writing part, teachers usually prepare their students by addressing the syllabus and making them aware of the basic structures of different writing parts (paragraph, letter, story, etc.). It is done in a revision class just before any major exams. Teachers take one class before the exams where they inform the students about the syllabus and revise the structures

of different writing tasks (paragraph, letter, story, etc.). Other than that classes based on writing is not observed. Nisharga explained,

“For writing, before the exam, the teachers mention what we ought to read and the different rules of writing. That is about it.”

So, students have no scope to practice their writing in class. Since, writing is never taught in the classroom, no writing activities are held in class. Students never get a chance to practice their writing or get feedback without thinking about consequences. The only feedback students receive is from the exams scripts which is again not clarified. Rafi explained,

“No, it has never been done (writing activities). Only in exams do we write our writings and only at that time do we get our feedback.”

In the contemporary world, English writing is very important. However, for a second language learner, writing is not easy. It is considered of the most difficult skills or abilities to master for a L2 learner (Graham, 2010). In academic context, its significance is more profound. This skill enables a learner to show others what he has learned (Javid and Umer, 2014). However, from the interviews, we can see that writing instructions are not given nor is it practiced. It is predominantly ignored. Students will not develop their writing skills if there is not writing activities or practice. Simply mentioning the syllabus or even the structures is not a viable method to increase learners writing skills. It is already established that writing is a challenging task for the learner. A lot of complex process makes writing difficult. It is more difficult for a second learner to express their own thoughts and ideas from their first language into the target language (Al-samadani, 2010). It is very unfortunate that even being such a crucial skill in both real world and in the exam, writing is predominantly neglected in the classrooms.

Therefore, it is not surprising to hear students' frustrations when asking them about their opinion concerning their English writing. So, when asked if their English writing is

improving with the lack of classroom activities, not even a single participant expressed that his English is improving in the current system. Students have explained that within the current system development of writing is not possible. Rayan explained,

“No, writing is not improving. This way is making our writing worse.”

Similarly, Nisharga explained,

“No. I do not think writing is improving. With the current practice it is very hard to find scope to improve our writing.”

Therefore, from the interviews, it is evident that classroom writing activities is totally non-existent. This non-existent writing activity is damaging the writing developments of students. Students cannot get feedback without having to face the consequences of mistakes. Without proper practice under the guidance of a competent teacher, the students cannot achieve their maximum potential.

4.2 Students’ Perception of Teachers’ Feedback in Writing:

The students felt that the feedback they received was not sufficient. They received very little amount of feedback on their writing. Even when the student received undesirable marks, they felt that sufficient feedback was still not given by the teachers. They perceived the amount of feedback to be severely lacking. As Khaled explained,

“I received very little amount of feedback in my writing. Sometimes they would give some feedback however there was no explanation in it. ... (one time) I got 4 or 5 marks out of 15 in paragraph writing but there was not a single feedback in it.”

Similarly, Ragib explained,

“Sometimes I would get my obtained number on the paragraph but there would not be sufficient feedback. Maybe there would be only one or two underlines, but that’s all about it.”

While feedback maybe controversial, students need feedback. Feedback makes the learner aware about the good part and the parts that needs to looked and improved upon. It is an important teaching characteristics (Leng, 2014). Receiving feedback helps students to strengthen their writing. By feedback they know how others perceive and read their writings and what changes they should bring (Goldstone, 2004). From the students complaining about feedback, it can be concluded that students want more feedback which is similar to Lee's (2005) research. A teacher is more competent individual who should guide the students. In the presence of a more accomplished and competent individual which is a teacher, a student has more potential (Vygotsky, 1978). So, under the guidance of a teacher a student creates better writing. It is why teachers are professionally obliged to help the students in writing correctly. it is also not ethical nor sound for an instructor to not provide feedback.

Even-though it is insufficient, students do get some feedbacks from the instructors in their exam copies. The feedback that students do eventually get is in the form of underlines under the sentences which had 'errors' in them. However, the students felt that the underlines are hollow and they do not explain the specific errors they have made. The underlines are given to the whole sentence or under most of the sentence. These underline does not specify nor identify the exact error in the sentence. So, these underlines were not only rare but they were also not clarified enough for the students. The students feel that the number of lines which 'identified' the errors, corresponds to the number that would be deducted from the writing. As Shadman said,

“Teachers usually give us feedback in the exam copies. However, I do not understand their feedback. That is because they only put a singular line under the (incorrect) sentence. In my whole writing, sir underlines two or three lines and based upon the

number of lines, decreased my number. Sir do not explain why my sentence is incorrect. I do not understand if it is a grammatical problem or a structural problem.”.

While students do receive some feedback, they feel they do not receive it for their full writing. They claimed that teachers did not look at their writings thoroughly. They felt that the teachers only checked the opening few lines and sometimes the last few lines of the paragraph. According to the students, the middle part or the body part of their writings is heavily ignored by the teachers. Since the teachers do not give importance to the body part, the students also do not give importance to the body part. Similar to the teachers, the students also emphasized the opening few lines and the ending lines. They considered these few lines to be crucial in obtaining marks. However, in this way the body part of their writings was being ignored. While a good opening and closure in a writing is important as it grabs the reader’s attention and summarises the contents, it in the body paragraph where the argument or discussion is conveyed. So, the body part is the most important part in a writing. However, since the students perceive the teachers to neglect it, they similarly themselves do not emphasize on the body part. According to Chen (2009), feedback is the most appropriate way to develop second language learning. Without having any feedback on the body part, the students would have trouble to develop their writing in the body section. They will have difficulties developing their discussion and argument abilities as they do not receive feedback on that particular area. Khaled said,

“Frankly, our teachers most of the time do not read the paragraphs. They look at the style, the first few lines of the paragraph. ... Most of the time they do not give importance to the writings (writing part).”

Similarly, Rayan said,

“Number is given to the student who has a good opening and closing line.”

Some students perceived that teachers at any level do not read their writings at all. Students attributed this problem to teachers having a short time, being tired after assessing the extensive grammar part, etc. But they strongly think that teachers do not read the writing part. Shadman said,

“I feel that teachers get irritated after reading the grammar part in our scripts. So, they do not have the time also the mood to read all the students writings. I do not think even the board examiners read our writings fully.”

Similarly, when asked about if he thinks teachers read the writings, Rayan replied,

“I do not think so. Even in board exams, I do not think they read it.”

Students also expressed their frustrations that they feel most of the time teachers do not look at content. Rather, they look at the page count or sentence count in a text. In other words, they feel that teachers look at the quantity of the writing in contrast to the quality of writing. So, students try to write as much as possible to make a paragraph, story, letter, etc. They want it to have more lines and more information. They inflate the writing in hopes to get more marks. Since, they believe that writing more usually grants more marks than a concise and short writing, they write as much as possible. So their writing also becomes information heavy. Khaled stated,

“Sometimes teachers look at external things rather than the content of the text. For example, they prioritize the page count of the text. A student can write within 1 page but has very good content and does not repeat sentences. Another student can write up to 3 pages but his writing may consist of many repetitions. I will say that most teachers look at the number of pages of the text rather than the content. In my opinion, this is how our writing is being neglected.”

Ragib said,

“I try to write more. For that reason, I put a lot of information in my writings. If I put a lot of information, my writing will also be bigger. Then I can get more marks.”

This emphasis on quantity rather than quality perception is very detrimental in developing writing. Writing is not about throwing in as much information as possible but rather writing is about the creative discussion of information. Murray (1996) called writing a creative process of discovering meaning from the confusion of information. However, due to emphasis on information rather than description, students would struggle to compose their writing. Writing is generative (Williams, 2003) and just stating information does not constitute in better writing.

Usually, feedback can be based on both the form of writing as well as the content of the writing. The form represents the grammar, mechanics, spelling, punctuation of the writing while content is concerned about the organization, ideas and details of the writing. Different students from the interviews had variable focus between the two aspects. Some students put their emphasis on grammar, and some emphasize on the content part more. There were also students who put emphasize on both grammar and content. However, when it comes to teacher's focus, the students strongly felt that almost all the teachers predominantly emphasize more on the grammar aspect of writing than the content part. All but one teacher had a background of literature. That singular teacher had a background of linguistics. However, all the teachers prefer to emphasize more on the grammar, mechanics and punctuation than the organization, ideas and details of the writing. As Shadman said,

“(sir) emphasises the grammar part. He watches the grammar, preposition, sentence structure, etc.”. Teachers are more inclined to provide more marks for grammatically correct writing rather than writing with better content.”

Similarly, Khaled said,

“Rarely did teachers give me good marks in a text having good content. The teachers gave more marks to texts which had more grammatically correct sentences.”

It is through feedback and markings that have made the students to perceive the teachers to be more inclined towards the grammar aspect in the text. We have already seen that students receive very little amount of feedback. In that little amount of feedback, it is mainly the incorrect grammar and mechanics that the teacher “identifies”. So, even though students like to receive teacher’s thoughts and feedbacks, they only get it for the grammar part. It is similar to Sommers (1982) he found errors to be instructor generated and called it idiosyncratic and arbitrary. Students might want different feedback for example they might want feedback on their content part. However, feedback to be predominantly on the grammar and mechanics is not curated to the students’ needs. A student might need feedback on his content or organization. However, with the current teachers’ tendencies, the students are restricted to only receiving feedback predominantly for the grammar and mechanics aspect in their writings. This emphasis on grammar might be due to the teachers’ background of literature. Silva (2006) has contended that teachers teaches the students how they themselves were taught. All but one teacher here has the background of literature which is the presupposed mastery of grammar (Harris, 1990). This maybe the reason why teachers are more focused on the grammar aspect of the students writing. The higher secondary English teacher is usually dominated by the background of literature. It is because most of the time higher secondary institutes employ senior teachers and since it was only in 1993 where composition studies have started in Bangladesh (Shamsuzzaman and Everatt, 2013), most of the senior teachers have a background of English literature. So, emphasis on only the mechanics aspect in writing can be attributed to the literature background of the student. Therefore, the students perceive their feedback to be insufficient and the feedback they do get is valueless to them.

4.3 Changes After Receiving the Feedback:

As previously found, students do not understand the hollow underlines under their ‘incorrect’ sentences. So, they are unable to understand and identify their faults in the writing. As they do not understand their faults they do not change their writing. Therefore, they keep their writings identical as before. Without understanding their errors, they have no scope to change their writings. As Rayan exclaimed,

“No, I do not know or understand why the teacher underlined that part. As I do not understand my mistakes I do not make any changes to my writing.”.

Similarly, Khaled said,

“Truthfully, I do not change anything (After getting the feedback). I do not understand what even the error is. So, I repeat the same thing. Therefore, the same mistake keeps happening again and again.”.

According to Zamel (1985), errors can be effectively dealt with if the error is identified by the student. Identification of errors can help students to make it easier to correct their mistakes which also gives them a sense of gratification. However, as we see students are unable to identify the errors by the underlined feedback. So, they have a tough time solving the incorrect sentences. These unclear feedbacks also make them confused.

Since most of the time they fail to understand their mistakes in their provided feedback, they find their feedback to hold little value. Making meaningful changes becomes very challenging for the students as they cannot identify the errors. For this reason, they rarely look back at their provided feedback. Therefore, they perceive the provided feedback to be valueless. As Shadman said,

“Typically when I give an exam and I see sir put underlines below some sentences, I just take the exam papers in my home and put it somewhere. I never bother to look

back at the paper. Why was my writing fault or where was the error, I never find out. Eventually, I do not achieve learning.”.

Students write the sentences knowing the sentence to be correct. However, when they find out the sentence is incorrect and they are unable to identify what the error is, they become confused and lose their confidence. Some of the students try make changes after feedback even they do not understand the feedback. The students have already stated that they perceive teachers to focus mainly on the grammar aspect of writing. So, most of the time when they see underlines under the incorrect sentence, they assume it to be a grammatical mistake. So, the only way for them to make changes is to write the sentence in a more basic manner. That is because they perceive writing in a more basic sentence has a lot less probability of a grammatical mistake. Nisharga said,

“I do not understand the underlines. However, I have to make some changes to not get deduction of marks in the future. I usually write the same sentence using much simpler words, so there is less chance of grammatical errors and I might get more marks.”

While no theorist is able to sidestep grammar, it has quite a marginal influence when it comes to teaching writing. The negative impacts of a grammar-dependent assessment are apparent from the participant's interviews. Students are so afraid of making a grammatically error sentence that they do not push their writing to be better. The students feel that writing in the most basic way possible is the most consistent way to obtain good marks. Since most of the students’ incentive to learn English is academic, they do what they can to improve their grades. In the current high-stakes exam method, they perceive grammatical correctness is the best way for them to achieve desirable marks. However, grammar can only generate a limited

number of sentence patterns (Williams, 2003). So, the students are therefore restricted in expressing their thoughts, ideas and emotions in their writings. As while grammar makes more predictable and formulaic writings (Raimes, 1991), it is the opposite of writing which is creativity and it requires thinking (Shamsuzzaman, 2015). While teachers might find it easy and time saving to access students by grammar because they can be referred to manuals to find the solutions of errors (Ferris, 2002). However, the semantic and rhetorical aspects of writing cannot be solved by giving a manual. By emphasizing grammar, the skills of organization; details and ideas are neglected and untouched. To improve their writing, emphasis should be on the content as well. These students will struggle to convey higher-order thinking according to sword (2012). Higher order thinking necessitates use of complex and complicated words. But as we saw from the participants due to the grammar dependency, students are more inclined to write in using simple versed sentences.

Therefore, English teachers in higher secondary school provide to the students' in the indirect written corrective method where the teachers underline to indicate the incorrect sentence. However, even though this method promotes long-term learning by guiding the students to their errors (Ellis, 2009), it becomes completely valueless to the higher secondary students as they cannot identify the mistakes with these hollow and vague underlines. Without understanding the mistakes, they cannot make changes in their writing. So, as Zamel (1985) contended, teachers should give more direct feedback to their students. Even though this may lead the students to be more dependent on the teachers which is against the long-term goal of feedback, it will at least give the students the opportunity to make meaningful changes in their writing. However, due to the hollow feedback the students fail to identify their mistakes and thus makes no meaningful changes. The changes they do make also does not necessarily

make the writing better. In fact, it can be argued that the change of using much simpler language is detrimental to writing as it becomes regressed.

Chapter 5

Limitations of The Study and Further Research

6.1 Limitations of The Study:

The study contains critical information regarding the frequency of writing activities and the perception of error correction and feedback in the context of urban High School Students. However, even though the study collected the information of students the teachers' perception was neglected. This study only included only four different High School Institutions from Dhaka. The institutions selected for this study is among the top rated institutions from the capital. Nor does this study take into account of the average and middle rated institutions nor does it concern about the institutions from outside the capital Dhaka. Moreover, students from rural areas were also avoided in this study due to strictly keeping the data collection procedure at a physical level. Furthermore, due to constraints of being an undergraduate student, it is difficult for me to operate the study in a documentation methodology which might have produced data that would help to cross check the interviewees data. Therefore, a generalized frequency and perception of the whole country cannot be drawn from this study alone.

6.2 Further Research:

Teachers' perception should be studied before coming to a mutual solution of the current crisis. Moreover, studies need be operated in the rural areas and also in the institutions which is not considered to be among the top. Furthermore, while researching the interviewee data, I found out that students are told to read and reproduce writings from various guides and publications. Research can be proceeded with the view of understanding the implications of these practices. Students have also said that they use simplest of words to avoid any

‘unnecessary’ errors that would eventually make them lose marks. Further research can be done in the view to find out the implications of students’ writing by only following simplex vocabulary. Finally, documentary data collection methodology can be used to cross-check this study to find out the generalized correct perception and frequency of the problem.

Chapter 7

Conclusion:

English writing development in higher secondary school is in a chronic state. In the education institutes, students hardly find any scope to develop their writings. Writing practices or activities is non-existent in the institutes. While a big chunk of marks is allocated for the writing part (40%), teachers continue to ignore the writing part. Students do not get any exposure to any in-class writing activities. The only thing with in the relevance of writing they receive in class is the syllabus and the structural patterns of the different writings which does not help the students to develop their writings. Since, the assessment is done in the high-stakes method, without any writing activities the students cannot improve their writings without having major consequences if they make any errors. The fear of these major consequence is preventing the students to truly develop their writings instead of just reproducing writings from other sources. Moreover, Students can hardly develop their writing due to poor feedback from the instructors. Furthermore, the provided feedback is insufficient according to the students. The minimal feedback they do get is valueless to them as it does not identify the errors in the text. The feedback they receive is rather vague. Students also felt that feedback is also not given to the text as a whole rather the feedback is only for the opening and closing lines in the text due to the teachers only reading the opening and closing lines and neglecting the body of the writing. Feedback is also perceived as predominantly concerned with the grammar of the text while ignoring any other the particular needs of the student. Therefore, for this reasons the students perceive feedback to be useless. So, as a consequence of the hollow feedback, the students fail to make any meaningful changes in their writing. Failure to identify their mistakes or errors is one of the big reasons why they are not unable to develop their writing. Even when the students try to make changes, it causes

their writings to be regressed. It is because they change their writing using much simpler words in order to express or explain their own individual thoughts.

References:

- Ahmed, M. (2005). Teaching English in the primary school: Challenges and options. *Bangladesh Education Journal*, 4(1), 17–23
- Alam, F. (2018). Revisioning English studies in Bangladesh in the age of globalisation and ELT. In *Engaging in educational research*, (pp. 241–261). Singapore: Springer.
- Ali, M. M., Hamid, M. O., & Hardy, I. (2018). Ritualisation of testing: Problematising high-stakes English-language testing in Bangladesh. *Compare*, 00(00), 1–21
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2018.1535890>.
- Al Amin, M., & Greenwood, J. (2018a). The examination system in Bangladesh and its impact: On curriculum, students, teachers and society. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1), 1–8 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-018-0060-9>.
- Al Amin, M., & Greenwood, J. (2018b). The UN sustainable development goals and teacher development for effective English teaching in Bangladesh: A gap that needs bridging. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability*, 20(2), 118–138 <https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2018-0019>
- Al-samdani, H.A. (2010). The Relationship between Saudi EFL Students' Writing Competence, L1 Writing Proficiency, and Self-regulation. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 53-63.
- Asian Development Bank [ADB]. (2015). Policy reform in Bangladesh's secondary education (1993–2013) tracing causal processes and examining ADB's contribution. Retrieved from: <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/evaluationdocument/177777/files/topical-ban-sec-educ.pdf>
- Bangladesh: EF English proficiency index: EF Global Site (English)*. EF Education First. (2023). <https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/regions/asia/bangladesh/>

- Bangladesh Examination Development Unit (2016). Status of the implementation of continuous assessment in secondary schools in Bangladesh. Dhaka: Directorate of Secondary and Higher Education.
- Bateman, D., & Zidonis, F. (1966). The effect of a study of transformational grammar on the writing of ninth and twelfth grades. Champaign, IL: NCTE.
- Banu, R., & Sussex, R. (2001). English in Bangladesh after independence: Dynamics of policy and practice. In B. Moore (Ed.), *Who's centric now? The present state of post-colonial Englishes* (pp. 122-147). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, M. A. (1989). Writing as a process. *The French Review*, 63(1), 31-44.
- Bazerman, C. (2013). Understanding the lifelong journey of writing development. *Infancia Y Aprendizaje*, 36(4), 421-441. doi: 10.1174/021037013808200320.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Bizzell, P. (2011). Cognition, convention, and certainty: What we need to know about writing. In V. Villanueva & K. L. Arola (Eds.), *Cross-talk in comp theory: A reader* (pp. 367-391). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Bradatan, C. (2013). Born again in a second language. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/08/04/born-again-in-a-second-language/>
- Braddock, R., Lloyd-Jones, R., & Schoer, L. (1963). *Research in written composition*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Breidenbach, K. (2006). Practical guidelines for writers and teachers. In A. Horning & A. Becker (Eds.), *Revision: History, theory, and practice* (pp. 197-219). West Lafayette, Indiana: Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse.
- Burke, D., & Pieterick, J. (2010). *Giving students effective written feedback*. London, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

- Cada BA. (2021). Learning styles and academic performance of teacher education students, *Br. J. Arts Humanit.*, 3(4), 86-96.
- Calonne, D. S. (2006). Creative writers and revision. In A. Horning & A. Becker (Eds.), *Revision: History, theory, and practice* (pp. 142–176). Anderson, SC: Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse.
- Chowdhury, R., & Ha, P. L. (2008). Reflecting on Western TESOL training and communicative language teaching: Bangladeshi learners' voices. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 28(3), 305-316.
- Chowdhury, R., & Kabir, A. H. (2014). Language wars: English education policy and practice in Bangladesh. *Multilingual Education*, 4(1), 1–16
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13616-014-0021-2>
- Cheng, L. (1998). Impact of a public English examination change on students' perceptions and attitudes toward their English learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 24(3), 279–301
- Chen, L. (2009). A Study of Policy for Providing Feedback to Students on College English. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 162-166.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083704.pdf>
- Connors, R. J., & Lunsford, A. A. (1988). Frequency of formal errors in current college writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle do research. *College Composition and Communication* 39(4), 395-409.
- Crowley, S. (1989). Linguistics and composition instruction: 1950-1980. *Written Communication*, 6(4), 480-505. doi: 10.1177/0741088389006004004.
- Draper, A. G. (1969). Teach the process of writing. *The English Journal*, 58(2), 245-248.
- Elbow, P. (1981). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. New York: Oxford University Press

- Elbow, P. (2002). The cultures of literature and composition: What could each learn from the other? *College English*, 64(5), 533-546.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63, 97- 107. , <http://www.lrc.cornell.edu/events/past/ellis.pdf>
- Elley, W., Barham, I., Lamb, H., & Wyllie. M. (1979). The Role of grammar in a secondary school curriculum. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Estrem, H., & Reid, E. S. (2012). Writing pedagogy education: Instructor development in composition studies. In K. Ritter & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Exploring composition studies: Sites, issues, and perspectives* (223-240). Logan, UT: Utah State UP.
- Fithriani, R. (2019). ZPD and the benefits of written feedback in L2 writing: Focusing on students' perceptions. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 63-73. [https://www.readingmatrix.com/files/20-c6t93b93. pdf](https://www.readingmatrix.com/files/20-c6t93b93.pdf)
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588049>
- Ferris, D. (2002). Treatment of error in second language student writing. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161–184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743\(01\)00039-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(01)00039-x)
- Ferman, I. (2004). The washback of an EFL national oral matriculation. In L. Cheng, Y. Watanabe, & A. Curtis (Eds.), *Washback in language testing: Research contexts and methods*, (pp. 191–210). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 63-80. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.006

- Graham, S. (2010). Facilitating writing development. In D. Wyse, R. Andrews, & J. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of English language, and literacy teaching* (pp. 125–136). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hairston, M. (1986). On Not Being a Composition Slave. In C. W. Bridges (Ed.), *Training the New Teacher of College Composition* (pp. 117-124). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teacher of English.
- Harris, J. (1990). *Expressive discourse*. Dallas, TX: Southern Methodist University Press.
- Hartshorn, K., Evans, N., and Tuioti, E. (2014). Influences on teachers' corrective feedback choices in second language writing. *Writing Pedagogy*, 6(2).
(online),(<http://www.equinoxpub.com/journals/index.php/WAP/article/view/178> 13
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf, R. B. (2008). Will CLT bail out the bogged down ELT in Bangladesh ? *English Today* 24(03), 16-24.
- Hedgcock, J. S., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *the Modern Language Journal/the Modern Language Journal*, 80(3), 287–308. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1996.tb01612.x>
- Horning, A. S. (2002). *Revision revisited*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential cultural resistance to pedagogical imports: The case of communicative language teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 15(2), 93–105
- Indrastana, N. (2018). *Written corrective feedback in teaching writing: a review of theory, research and practice*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Written-corrective-feedback-in-teaching-writing%3A-a-Indrastana/17e3a791bc931006bff69d0c54a9dc9085aff830>.

- Islam, S., Hasan, K., Sultana, S., Karim, A., & Rahman, M. M. (2021). English language assessment in Bangladesh today: principles, practices, and problems. *Language Testing in Asia*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00116-z>
- Karim, K. M. R. (2013). The effects of direct and indirect written corrective feedback (CF) on English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students' revision accuracy and writing skills (Doctoral dissertation). <http://hdl.handle.net/1828/5157>
- Karim, M. Z., & Ivy, T. I. (2011). The nature of teacher feedback in second language (L2) writing classrooms: A study on some private universities in Bangladesh. *J. of the Bangladesh Association of Young Researchers*, 1(1), 31-48.
- Krashen, S. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory, and application*. New York: Pergamon Institute of English.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v22i2.84>
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x>
- Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.
- Mahboob, A. (2010). World englishes and higher education. *Kritika Kultura* (15), 5-33.
- Mantello, M. (1997). Error correction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/the Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(1), 127–131. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.54.1.127>
- Matsuda, P. K., & Hammill, M. J. (2014). Second language writing pedagogy. In G. Tate, A. Rupiper, K. Shick & B. Hessler (Eds.), *A guide to composition pedagogies* (pp. 266-282). New York: Oxford University Press

- Ministry of Education (1976). Bangladesh Shikkha Commission Report. Dhaka: Ministry of Education, People's Republic of Bangladesh.
- Murray, D. M. (1981). Making meaning clear: The logic of revision. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 3(3), 33-40.
- Murray, D. M. (1982). Teaching the other self: The writer's first reader. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(2), 140-147.
- Murray, D. M. (1996). *Write to learn*. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Pub
- NCTB (2012). *National Curriculum*. Dhaka: National Curriculum & Textbook Board
- Noguchi, R. R.(1991). *Grammar and the teaching of writing: Limits and possibilities*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Pikhart, M., & Klímová, B. (2019). Utilization of linguistic aspects of Bloom's taxonomy in blended learning. *Education Sciences*, 9(3), 235.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9030235>
- Pinker, S. (2014). *The sense of style: The thinking person's guide to writing in the 21st century*. New York: Viking.
- Purnawarman, P. (2011). Impacts of different types of teacher corrective feedback in reducing grammatical errors on ESL/EFL students' writing. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. (online), (<http://www.scholar.lib.vt.edu/available/unrestricted.pdf>)
- Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). The Chaotic English language policy and planning in Bangladesh: Areas of apprehension. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 26(2), 893–908
- Rahman, A., Kabir, M. M., & Afroze, R. (2006). Effect of BRAC–PACE training on English language teachers of rural non-government secondary schools. Dhaka: Research and Evaluation Division, BRAC Retrieved from http://www.bracresearch.org/srch_dtls.php?tid¼417

- Rahman, M. M., & Pandian, A. (2018). The Chaotic English language policy and planning in Bangladesh: Areas of apprehension. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 26(2), 893–908.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Errors: Windows into the mind. *College ESL* 1(2), 55-64.
- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: The myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 273-292. doi: 10.2307/3587434.
- Richards, J. C. (2002). 30 years of TEFL/TESL. A personal reflection. *RELC Journal* 33(2), 1-35.
- Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2009). Chapter 1. Situated Writing Practices in Foreign Language settings: The role of previous experience and instruction. In *Multilingual Matters eBooks* (pp. 23–48). <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691859-005>.
- Saif, S. (2006). Aiming for positive washback: A case study of international teaching assistants. *Language Testing*, 23(1), 1–34.
- Shamsuzzaman, M., & Everatt, J. (2013). Teaching writing in English at tertiary level in Bangladesh: Deconstructing error and reconstructing pedagogy. In J. Greenwood, J. Everatt, A. H. Kabir & S. Alam (Eds.), *Research and educational change in Bangladesh* (pp. 69-84). Dhaka, Bangladesh: Dhaka University Press
- Shamsuzzaman, M. (2015). *Perceptions and practices in learning and teaching second language writing in English : influences of backgrounds and language skills*. <https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/items/06f28095-e730-4965-be01-d168bef85d9d>
- Shohamy, E. (2014). *The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. London: Routledge.
- Silva, T. (2005). On the philosophical bases of inquiry in second language writing: Metaphysics, inquiry paradigms, and the intellectual zeitgeist. In T. Silva & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Second language writing research: Perspectives on the process of*

- knowledge construction (pp. 3-15). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Silva, T. (2006). Second language writing. In K. E. Brown & A. Anderson (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 111-118). Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com.ezproxy.canterbury.ac.nz/science/article/pii/B0080448542006313>
- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication* 33(2), 148-156.
- Spann, P. & Kaufman, D. (2015). The negative effects of high-stakes testing. Retrieved from: <http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/law/centers/childlaw/childed/pdfs/2015studentpapers/Spenn.pdf>
- Sultana, N. (2018). Test review of the English public examination at the secondary level in Bangladesh. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1), 1–9 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-018-0068-1>.
- Sword, H. (2012). *Stylish academic writing*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Tsui, A. B. M., & Ng, M. (2000). Do secondary L2 writers benefit from peer comments? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(2), 147–170.
- Global flow of tertiary-level students*. UNESCO UIS. (n.d.). <https://uis.unesco.org/en/uis-student-flow>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Williams, J. D. (2003). Grammar and usage. In I. L. Clark (Ed.), *Concepts in composition: Theory and practice in the teaching of writing* (pp. 313-337). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Yi, Y. (2013). ESOL teachers as writing teachers: From the voices of high school preservice teachers. In L. C. de Oliveira & T. Silva (Eds.), *L2 writing in secondary classrooms: Student experiences, academic issues, and teacher education* (pp.132- 148). New York: Routledge.
- Zaman, M. M., & Azad, M. A. K. (2012). Feedback in EFL writing at tertiary level: Teachers' and learners' perceptions. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 139-156
- Zamel, V. (1976). Teaching composition in the ESL classroom: What we can learn from research in the teaching of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 67-76.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 79-101.
- Zamel, V. (1997). Toward a model of transculturation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 341-352.

Appendix A

1. Throughout your High school life how many classes were held that addressed the writing aspect of English?
2. How does your teacher address the writing part?
3. What does the teacher expect from you in writing part?
4. How much feedback did you receive after receiving your exam copy?
5. How was the feedback provided?
6. What perception did you have concerning teachers' feedback concerning your English writing?
7. What changes do you bring after receiving the feedback?
8. What do you think teachers give more value to your writing? Grammar or content?