

CHAPTER-ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background

Language is a means of human communication through which we express our feelings, thoughts, wants and desires. It is extremely complex and highly versatile code for human communication. It is a powerful instrument, which transfers knowledge from person to person, from one generation to another generation. It is primarily a pragmatic phenomenon, a symbolic instrument used for communicative purposes. No one can believe the existence of human civilization without language. To Bloch and Trager (1942, p.5) ‘‘A language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group co-operates.’’

English, a global language occupies a dominant position in the world. More than 350 million people in the world speak English as their native language. According to the survey of UNESCO, more than 160 countries in the world use English as an official language, about 60 million people listen to English radio programs and over 60 million children study English at the primary level. In 1983, 3, 37,000 foreign students registered in the USA to study English. British councils teach English to millions of students in many countries of the world. A vast store of knowledge and technology is explored through English. It is a powerful means to achieve the end of development. English is undoubtedly of vital importance for accelerating the modernization process in Nepal.

In the past, it was believed that teaching is enough to obtain the objectives of language education. Later, testing is taken as complementary to teaching. Language education is mathematically represented as language education = Language teaching + Language testing. However, teachers used to neglect testing thinking it as time consuming task. According to Harrison (1991, p. 23) ‘‘A test is seen as a natural extension of classroom work providing teacher and

students with useful information that can serve each as a basis for improvement.”

Language testing is not only limited to language classroom to find the achievement or placement or prognostic test of students but it goes beyond the education centre which takes proficiency tests of international value like TOEFL, IELTS and so on.

Heaton (1988, p. 33) believes that tests may be constructed primarily as devices to reinforce learning and to motivate the students or primarily as a means of assessing the student’s performance in the language. A language test should accelerate the language learning process. It should be the highest good to find out one’s proficiency in language learning. A good classroom test helps to locate the areas of difficulty for average students and try to shape students’ scores within the lowest dispersion possible having expected objectives almost fulfilled. This is the main motto a language teacher needs motivating towards. Palmer et al. (1990, p. 12) says “Primary interest of language testing is language ability.”

1.1.1 IELTS and its Writing Module

The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) is widely recognized as a reliable means of assessing the language ability of candidates who need to study or work where English is the language of communication. These Practice Tests are designed to give future IELTS candidates an idea of whether their English is up to the required level.

IELTS is owned by three partners; the University of Cambridge ESOL Exam, the British Council and IDP: Education Australia (through its subsidiary company, IELTS Australia Pvt. Limited). This module consists of two tasks. It is suggested that candidates spend about 20 minutes on Task- 1, which requires them to write at least 150 words, and 40 minutes on task-2, which requires

them to write at least 250 words. The assessment of task -2 carries more weight in marking than Task-1.

Task-1 requires candidates to look at a diagram or some data (graph, table or chart) and to present and possibly compare data, describe the stages of a process, describe an object or event, or explain how something works.

In Task-2 candidates are presented with a point of view, argument or problems. They are assessed on their ability to present a solution to the problem, present and justify an opinion, compare and contrast evidence or arguments. Candidates are also assessed on their ability to write in an appropriate style.

1.1.1.1 Writing Skill

Writing is one of the two most common channels of communication, the other being speech. It is an activity of rendering the spoken language into its graphic form. To quote Rivers (1968, p. 242), “Writing can be an act of putting down in conventional graphic form something which has been spoken.” In this sense, writing is nothing more than the correct association of conventional graphic symbols with sounds. But it is not merely the jotting down of the spoken language in black and white. It involves encoding of a message of some kind or translating our thoughts into language in graphic form. In this connection, White and Arndt (1991) say, “Writing is far from a simple matter of transcribing language into written symbols. It is a thinking process in its own.” In its advanced form, writing refers to the expression of ideas in a consecutive way according to the graphic conversations of the language.

1.1.1.2 Writing Free Composition

The ability to write freely and independently is the ultimate goal of writing lessons. Thus, writing free composition is the final stage in the development of writing skill, which is mainly characterized by the student’s freedom in selection of vocabulary and structure. It includes describing, explaining, narrating, reporting, summarizing and exercises such as paragraph writing,

essay writing, literary writing, writing official notices and so on. It demands the power of imagination and creativity on the part of the writers. So it is also known as 'creative writing'. According to Miller and Webb (1992, p.10), it is done nonstop, it occurs intensely for a short period of time, it is unselfconscious, and it results in a kind of connected writing. Although free writing may produce much that is unusable, it can also produce much that will be surprisingly important, attesting to the notion that our subconscious minds contain enormous amounts of valuable information. Something when we find an approach to a subject through brainstorming, free writing unlocks a wealth of ideas to pursue. Heaton (1988, p.135) says, "The writing skills are complex and something difficult to teach, requiring mastery not only of grammatical and judgmental elements." He further groups the many and varied skills necessary for writing a good composition into five general components.

- a. Language use: the ability to write correct and appropriate sentences;
- b. mechanical skill: the ability to use correctly those conventions peculiar to the written language e.g. punctuations, spelling;
- c. treatment of content : the ability to think creatively and develop thoughts, excluding all irrelevant information ;
- d. stylistic skill :the ability to manipulate sentences and paragraphs, and use language effectively;
- d. Judgment skills: the ability to write in appropriate manner for a particular purpose with a particular audience in mind, together with an ability to select, organize and order relevant information.

A piece of writing should be so constructed that one sentence leads on naturally to the next and there should be a regular progression of thought. The logical sense relation between lexical items or sentences in a text is simply referred to as coherence. On the other hand, there are intra-textual relations of a grammatical and lexical kind, which knit the parts of a text together to convey the meaning of the text as a whole. This is technically called cohesion in

writing a free composition is not merely the transfer of ideas from to paper. It is more a process of generating meaning and refining ideas.

1.1.1.3 Error Analysis

Error refers to the deviant form of language produced by the second or foreign language learner consistently due to faulty or incomplete learning. And error analysis refers to the systematic study and analysis of the errors committed by second or foreign language learner. It is carried out to:

- a. find out how well someone knows a language.
- b. find out how a person learns a language.
- c. identify the causes of learner's errors.
- d. obtain information on common difficulties in language learning, as an aid in teaching or in the preparation of teaching materials.

When an error analysis is carried out, it helps teachers identify the students' strengths and weaknesses and provide feedback to the students during teaching learning process. Error analysis is carried out in successive stages. The principal stages are described along with the following subtopics:

1.1.3 Identification of Errors

Identification of errors indicates distinguishing error from what is not error. Therefore, it is crucial to make the distinction between 'mistakes' and 'errors'. All of us make mistakes; we even make mistakes while using the first language. If the learner produces the deviated form of language due to the lack of knowledge of underlying rules then the deviation is called an error. If he/she produces a deviated form not due to the lack of knowledge of underlying rules of language but due to his/her failure to make appropriate use of the rules in using language because of some non-linguistic reasons then the result is not an error but a mistake. To put it another way, mistakes are those part of conversations or compositions that deviate from the selected norms of mature language performance. These mistakes may occur at performance and

competence levels; the mistakes at competence level are technically known as errors. Thus, mistake can be seen as a cover term which includes both mistakes (at performance level) and errors (at competence level).

1.1.4 Description and Classification of Errors

After identifying errors, we try to look seriously at the kind of errors learners have committed. That is to say, errors are classified into different groups and categories at this stage.

There are different ways of describing and classifying errors.

1. On the basis of their nature

- a) Omission: There is dropping out of the necessary item(s), e.g. He is doctor (in this sentence, an article 'a' is omitted in between *is* and *doctor*).
- b) Addition: This is the case when unnecessary item(s) is /are added in a sentence, e.g. They went on last Friday (unnecessary addition of 'on')
- c) Substitution: When one element is used in place of the other, that will be the case of substitution, e.g. She is looking to me. (use of 'to' instead of 'at')
- d) Misordering: The order of words is broken down in this case, e.g. They asked her where was she going. ('was she' misordered)

2. On the basis of the level of language

On this basis, errors committed at different levels of language are mentioned.

a. Phonological errors: errors in pronunciation

She goes to*[isku:l]. Instead of 'She goes to [sku:l]' (addition of 'i' before 'sk' cluster, typically by Nepali learners of English)

- b. Graphological errors: spelling and punctuation errors in writing.
It is a lovely *whether. (Correct spelling: 'weather') writing 'p' as 'q' and 'b' as 'd', or vice versa.
- c. Grammatical (morphological and syntactic) errors: breaking of grammatical rules or systems.
- d. *She cans dance very well. (wrong use of tense marker in modal verb)
* Five childrens were playing there. (wrong use of plural morpheme)
- e. Lexical/semantic errors: errors related to wrong use of words/phrases.
E.g. 'skin shoes' instead of 'leather shoes'. *He lent a book from the library (in place of 'He borrowed a book form the library').
- f. Pragmatic/sociolinguistic/ stylistic errors: production of the wrong communicative effect, e.g. through the faulty use of speech act or one of the rules of speaking. The expressions may be grammatically correct but are not contextually appropriate. They are also called communicative or functional errors. For example,

(An employee to his boss): Hi guy, how is it going?

(A master to his servant): Would you mind not smoking here?

3. Corder's classification of errors

Corder (1973, p.271) has classified errors into pre-systematic, systematic and post systematic ones. These are also called the three stages of error.

In the first stage, the learner is unaware of the existence of a particular system or rule in the target language. His errors are quite random. He cannot correct them and the errors in this stage are not regular. This is the stage of random guessing.

In the systematic stage, the learner's errors became regular. He has discovered and is operating rules of some sort but the wrong ones. He cannot correct the errors but can give some correct account of the rule he has been following.

In the post systematic stage, the learner has learned the underlying rules but fails to apply it due to the lack of attention or lapses of memory. In this stage, the learner can correct the erroneous expressions as well.

We take only the systematic errors into account because the errors in the first and the last stage are not technically included under error due to the regularity of errors and correctable by the learner himself, respectively.

1.1.5 Explanation of Errors

This step is concerned with determining the causes or sources of errors.

According to Corder (1973, p. 282), this stage of EA is distinct from the earlier stage in that whereas the earlier stage is confined to linguistic activities, this stage comes under the scope of psycholinguistics. Here we are mainly concerned with investigating why and how the learner comes up with the particular erroneous expression- in other words- with finding out the factors causing learning problems.

The errors on the basis of their sources can be classified broadly into two types as follows:

a) Interlingual errors

Errors due to mother tongue interference in learning the target language are the errors due to L₁- interference. Such errors are termed as interlingual errors.

Thus, such errors are the ones that have resulted in from the transfer of rules from the mother tongue. Many errors bear a strong resemblance to the characteristic of the mother tongue, indeed many erroneous utterances read like word-for-word translations. This observation has led to the widely accepted theory of transfer, which states that a learner of a second language transfers into

his performance in the second language the habits of his mother tongue (Corder, 1973, p.266).

Thus, interlingual errors are those which are attributed to the native language. For example, a Nepali learner of English may pronounce 'school' as /*Isku:l*/ instead of /*sku:l*/ and uses '*skin shoes*' instead of 'leather shoes' due to L₁ interference. This is because there is no /*sk*/ cluster in the word initial position in Nepali and there is distinction between 'skin' and 'leather' in English lexical system but we have only one lexical item 'chhala' to represent the same semantic field.

b) Intralingual errors

Not all errors resulting from the learning process are related to the nature of the mother tongue. Intralingual errors do not reflect the structures of mother tongue but are faulty generalizations of the rules of the target language. Intralingual errors are those errors which result from faulty or partial learning of the target language, rather than from language transfer. They may be caused by the influence of one target language item upon another. For example, a learner may produce **She is dances* based on the blend of the English structures 'she is dancing' and 'she dances'. There are various explanations for intralingual errors. Some of them are given below:

i. Overgeneralization

The learners, having found a rule that appears to work well in one or more contexts, may apply it in the contexts where it is not applicable. As a result, they commit errors in language. Such errors are the result of faulty generalization about the rules of L₂. Thus, such errors are committed due to overgeneralization. For example,

quickly	boxes
slowly	foxes
* <i>fastly</i>	* <i>oxes</i>

ii. Analogical Creation

It is a particular kind of overgeneralization. Errors due to analogical creation are those errors committed due to wrong analogy because not all analogical creations are errors.

The learner searches for patterns and regularity in learning a second language to reduce the learning load by formulating rules. In case of analogical creation, the learner produces an erroneous expression analogous to the correct one. For example,

She told me the meaning.

*She *explained me* the meaning.

Thus, analogical creation refers to the overgeneralization of the learner's rules without considering exceptions because his/her exposure to the language is limited and he/she has insufficient data from which he/she can derive more complex rules.

All of the students left. All the students left.

Some of the students left. **Some the students* left.

None of the students left. **None the students* left.

iii) Hypercorrection

Sometimes, what a learner has learned correctly is corrected in a wrong way due to latter learning, which in turn results into a deviant utterance. Thus, the wrong way of making correction is called hypercorrection. For example, there is a probability of saying 'onty one' for 'eleven' due to over emphasis given while teaching twenty one, thirty one etc., if the child is presented with the cardinal numbers 1 to 20 for the first time and 20 to 100 after some interval of time. Similarly, such erroneous expressions are repeatedly found.

* I *lives* in Kathmandu.

* She *cans* dance well.

iv) **Erroneous input**

Sometimes teachers give rules which are not fully adequate and when students follow them they make errors similar to those caused by overgeneralization of L₂. For example, the rule 'If the action is in past, the verb must be in the past tense' may lead to errors such as *Last week, they tried to *took* me along with them. *When I saw him, he began to *ran* faster.

v) **Inherent difficulty**

Some features of the target language are inherently so difficult that they lead the learner towards committing errors no matter what the linguistic background of the learner is. For example, it is generally agreed that English pairs /**v**/-/**f**/ and /-/**ð**/ are very hard to distinguish not only for Nepali or other language speakers but also for native speakers. Similarly, English articles and prepositions are also considered inherently difficult items.

1.1.6 Correction and Remediation of Errors

When the errors are identified the task of correction and remediation begins with a view to compensating for the learner's inadequate understanding of any aspect of the target language. There are many contrasting views regarding correction and remediation of errors. Mainly there are two opposing views:

The first view holds that there is no need to correct the learner's errors. The teacher should not make correction, but just show that an error has been committed. The communicative approach to language teaching holds the view that the errors of form are seen as a natural outcome of the development of communicative skills. Thus students can have limited linguistic knowledge and still be successful communicators.

The other view holds the opinion that errors must be corrected every time they are committed by the learners very consciously because if errors are tolerated without making correction, bad habit of making wrong use of language goes on continuing in the student. So if we think that an error needs to be corrected, and if neither the student who committed the error, nor any other student can correct it, then the teacher has to give more help. The correction made immediately after one commits error is effective. Therefore, the errors should be corrected without delay.

If we accept that language (including punctuation) should be corrected, a problem arises: should all language mistakes be noted, even if there are so many that the page will be covered with corrections? If not, how do we judge which to relate to and which not? The correcting of mistakes is part of the language instruction, but too much of it can be discouraging and demoralizing. Thus some kind of compromise is obviously called for, which will vary according to context. We might correct only mistakes that actually affect meaning (that is, might lead to misunderstanding or confusion on the part of the reader), and/or those which are very basic; or, of course, vary our response according to individual need.

Regarding the technique of correction, there are mainly two techniques. They are:

- i) Teacher correction technique
- ii) Student correction technique

In teacher correction technique, the role of teacher is vital. In student correction technique, the teacher does not make correction himself but makes the students correct their errors themselves. Student correction technique can be divided into two sub techniques:

- a) Self correction technique
- b) Peer correction technique

In self-correction technique, the teacher gives some hints so as to make the learners correct their errors themselves. In peer correction technique, the teacher asks the students to exchange their tasks and to prepare the correct version of each other's erroneous tasks. The students may be allowed to make discussion if necessary.

Correcting errors means correcting the underlying rules the learner is learning in a wrong way. That is to say, correction does not mean only correcting the particular instance of error. Therefore, only the substitution of incorrect expression by correct one is not the purpose of correction. Most importantly, while making correction we should not forget to give illustrations which should be contextually appropriate as far as possible and we should correct the erroneous instance by explaining the underlying rules the learner is learning in a wrong way. Edge (1989, pp.23-65) gives some tips for the correction of mistakes, which are equally true to error correction.

- Do not correct the mistake yourself, but show that a mistake has been made. Then give the students a little time to recognize the mistake and correct it.
- Correction should not mean insisting on everything being absolutely correct. Correction means helping students to become more accurate in their use of language.
- Give a chance for self-correction and, if possible, use peer correction rather than direct teacher correction.
- Encourage peer correction. When two students work together on correcting each other's work, the discussion helps each one to learn from his or her own errors. Two heads are better than one.
- Reacting to the content of what students write is a positive way of helping them improve a draft of a text. In this way, it is an important part of correction.

- Reacting to the content improves writing linguistically and gives encouragement. In this way, it is an important part of teaching.
- Concentrate on the main point of an exercise, or on one or two types of mistakes in less controlled writing.
- Give time for self-correction and peer correction and help the students by showing where mistakes are and/or what kind of mistakes they have made.
- React to the ideas that the students write and use them as a way of encouraging writing.
- Collect important mistakes for correction with the whole class.
- Not all written work should be corrected. The desires to express oneself, to experiment, and to communicate are more important to language learning than being absolutely correct.
- We are trying to make correction a part of the teaching learning process, not something for learning to fight against.

To conclude, student errors are seen as a natural, indispensable part of the learning process. Errors are inevitable since the students are encouraged to explore the language. The teacher uses student errors as a basis for deciding where further work is necessary. Putting it differently, the teacher uses the students' errors as evidence of where the language is unclear to them and, hence, where to work.

After locating the errors of the students, the teacher does not supply the correct language until all self-correction options have failed. If students are simply given answers, rather than being allowed to self-correct, they will not retain them. The teacher works with the students in getting them to self-correct. If

they are unable to self-correct and peers cannot help, then the teacher would supply the correct language, but only as a last resort.

1.1.7 Errors in Free Writing

Errors are the systematic and regular mistake Committed by the second thing (here, a second language). If they are made aware of such errors, it serves as a feedback for the language learners. The study of errors is imperative language learner at competence level due to linguistic reason. Every second language learner commits errors at any level or area of language. When the teacher makes corrections on the student's writing, the page may even be covered with red blots. And this is where, some teachers think, the real problem begins. Nevertheless, this is not a problem actually but a party of solution. To commit errors is often a first step to words learning the correct form since those errors indicate the sign of successive learning in any course of instruction. The making of errors indicates the sign of successive learning employed by children in learning a new for the language teachers too to know how much the learners have learned and consequently what remains for them to learn.

Writing is found to be the most difficult of the four skills and which is not a spontaneous activity either. Free writing at the lower secondary level is of the most fundamental type where we cannot expect the writing that is absolutely error free. The learners may commit errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar and organization style. There are many specific areas under each broad area of written discourse that the beginners may commit errors of different types. To exemplify, under grammatical errors they may commit errors in agreement, tense, aspect, number, preposition, article, transformation and so on and so forth.

1.1.7.1 Agreement in English

A verb must agree with its subject in person and number. Most mistakes are made because of one's failure to catch singular subject with a singular verb, or a plural subject with a plural verb.

In many English sentences subject-verb number agreement is straightforward and noncontroversial. However, it is quite clear, that a number of unresolved questions remain. Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999, p p. 72-74) present the summary of conventional subject-verb agreement rules, based on Frodesen and Eyring (1997, p p. 34-51) which serves as a checklist of rules that ESL/EFL students need to learn or review for TOEFL preparation or for a formal academic writing course.

Non-count noun subjects take singular verb: (The food/John's advice) is good.

- a. In most cases collective noun subjects take singular verbs, but if the group is viewed as individual members, use a plural verb:
 - The class is going on a field trip.
 - The class have been arguing about where to go.
- b. Subject nouns that are derived from adjectives and describe people take plural verbs:
 - The rich are in favor of a tax cut.
- c. Some proper noun subjects that end in *-s* such as names of courses, diseases, places, as well as book and film titles and the word *news*, take singular verbs:
 - Wales is a beautiful region.
 - Mathematics is a difficult subject.
 - Measles often has side effects.
 - The news was very good.
- d. Plural subject nouns of distance, time, and money that signal one unit take a singular verb:
 - Six hundred miles is too far to drive in one day.

- e. Basic arithmetical operations (add, subtract, multiply, divide) take singular verbs:

Four times five equals twenty.

- f. For items that have two parts, when you use the word *pair*, the verb is singular, but without *pair*, the verb is plural:

My pair of scissors is lost.

My scissors are lost.

- g. Clausal subjects are singular even if the nouns referred to are plural:

What we need is more reference books.

- h. Gerund (verb + *ing*) and infinitive (to + verb) subjects take singular verbs:

Reading books is my hobby.

To err is human.

- i. With fractions, percentages, and the quantifiers *all (of)*, *a lot of*, *lots of*, verb agreement depends on the noun coming after these phrases:

- i. A singular noun, noun clauses, or non count noun takes a singular verb:

A lot of the (book/information) is about urban poverty.

- ii. A plural noun takes a plural verb:

A lot of computers need to be repaired.

- iii. A collective noun can take either a singular or a plural verb depending on the meaning.

All my family (lives/live) in Ohio.

- j. With *each*, *every* and *every one* as subject, use a singular verb.

Every student has a lunch box.

- k. With *a number of* as subject, use a plural verb.

A number of students are taking the exam.

- l. With *the number of* as subject, use a singular verb:

The number of students taking the exam is seventy-five.

- m. With *none* as subject, use a singular verb:

None of the magazines is here.

- n. With *either* or *neither* as subject, use a singular verb:
 (Either/neither) was acceptable to me.
- o. With correlative subjects *either...or* or *neither....nor*, the verb agrees with the closest subject:
 Either Bob or my cousins are going to do it.
 Neither my cousins nor Bob is going to do it.
- p. With *there* subject, the verb is singular or plural depending on whether the noun phrase following the verb is singular or Plural (sometimes referred to as object-verb rule):
 There is one book on the table.
 There are (three books/a book and a pen) on the table.

1.1.7.2 Capitalization in English

A capital letter is one that is written in the large form, i.e. in UPPER CASE. There are various conventional rules of capitalization in English. Some of the rules as presented by Strong and Lester (1996, p. 657) are given below:

- a. Capitalize the first word of every sentence, including the first word of a direct quotation that is a complete sentence.
 Winston Churchill said, “**I** have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat.”
- b. Always capitalize the pronoun **I** no matter where it appears in the sentence.
I began to read the encyclopedia when **I** was ten years old because **I** had great thirst for knowledge.
- c. Always capitalize a proper noun but capitalize a common noun only when it is the first word of a sentence.
Boston Tea Party **England** **William Blake**
Honda Accord **The Winter’s Tale**
- d. Capitalize proper adjectives (adjectives formed from proper nouns).
Einsteinium theory **G**regorian chant
 Egyptian cotton Native **A**merican music
 Vatican policy **B**uddhist shrines

1.1.7.3 Cohesion in Free Writing

Cohesion refers to the intra-textual relations of the grammatical and lexical items that make the parts of the text together as a whole to convey the complete meaning of it. Thus, the lexical connectedness between or among the lexical items and the grammatical connectedness between or among the grammatical kind can be termed as cohesion. Two levels of cohesion have been identified: Sentential (Intrasentential) cohesion and textual (intersentential) cohesion. Sentential cohesion occurs within a sentence whereas textual cohesion occurs across sentences.

Different cohesive devices are used to produce a cohesive piece of writing. Five linguistic mechanisms that Halliday and Hasan (1976, in Celce-Murica and Freeman, 1999, p.23) point to in order for texts to have cohesion at the level of discourse are the following:

- i. Reference: *The boy wanted a new bike. One day he...* (*he* refers back to the boy)
- ii. Ellipsis: A: *who wrote the letter?*
B: *Marty*. (The response *Marty* elliptically signals that *Marty* wrote the letter.)
- iii. Substitution: *I want to enter college next year. If I do, ...*
(*do* substitutes for *enter college*)
- iv. Conjunction: *Peter needed some money. He, therefore, decided to get a job.* (*therefore* makes explicit the causal relationship between the first and the second sentences)
- v. Lexical cohesion (here through synonym): *He was grateful for the money he had been given. He slipped the coins into his pocket and hurried down the street.* (*Coins* refer back to *money*.)

1.1.7.4 Coherence in Free Writing

If we have to read a paragraph several times to figure out the connections between ideas, it is likely that the writing lacks coherence. A piece of writing is coherent when its sentences proceed logically and smoothly with no gaps in reasoning.

The ideas in a paragraph should be connected and developed in a logical order to maintain coherence. According to Narayanswami (1994), the paragraph should be so constructed that one sentence leads on naturally to the next, and there should be a regular logical progression of thought. The material in a paragraph can be ordered in many ways, like chronological order, spatial order, logical order, statement leading to a climax, comparison and contrast, enumeration or classification, definition and conclusion. Among these many ways, the most common ways are noted below:

- i. Chronological orders: It is the time order; the material is presented according to the order of time. We can arrange our material from past to present, present to future or present to past.
- ii. Spatial/spacial order: This is the order of presenting the material according to the space or position. When we follow a spatial arrangement, we can arrange our material from near to far or from far to near, from outside to inside or inside to outside, from more prominent to less prominent or vice-versa.
- iii. Logical order: The central idea is expressed in a statement and then supported by means of examples and other supporting details. Reasons are given leading to a conclusion, or a cause and effect relation is also presented. In this order, the controlling idea is developed by means of supporting details leading to a conclusion.

In order to obtain coherence in a piece of writing, different types of connectives (logical connectors, which are also called transitional words or phrases) can be used.

Writing is coherent when readers can move easily from one sentence to the next, leading the paragraph as an integrated whole. You can ensure this smooth progression by using transitional words and phrases. Transitions can introduce illustrations (for example), add details (also, in addition), show comparison or contrast (although, nevertheless), indicate time or space order (later, above), or draw conclusions (therefore). (Strong & Lester, 1996, p. 80)

1.2 Review of the Related Literature

There are several studies carried out on different language skills. There are also a number of researches carried out in writing skill focusing on different levels and aspects of writing. In the department of English Education only a few number of research studies related to errors in writing free composition have been carried out till date.

Sharma (1998) carried out a research study to identify the areas of errors in the use of articles committed by the secondary level students. He also aimed at finding out the level of difficulty in using different types of articles. He used a questionnaire consisting of 110 gap-filling items to elicit the required data for his study. His study showed that the students hardly differentiate the words with consonant and vowel sounds and consequently committed 26.13% errors in the use of indefinite articles (i.e. 15.53% in using 'a' and 10.60% in using 'an'). He also found that they committed 30.43% and 43.44% errors in the use of definite and zero articles respectively as they could not find much difference between the definite article and the zero articles. He came up with the conclusion that the use of indefinite article was the least difficult and the use of zero articles was the most difficult for the students.

Barakoti (2001) carried out a research study on "Errors committed by PCL Second Year Student in writing free composition." The main objective of his study was to identify and determine the errors. He also compared the proficiency between the students of humanities and Education streams. He used a questionnaire consisting of three subjective questions to draw the required data for his study. His study showed that the student committed the highest number of errors in the tense and the lowest number of errors in using prepositions. He found that the students committed 47.52%, 23.57%, 17.18% and 11.71% errors in the tense, article, agreement and preposition respectively. He also found that the students of humanities stream committed more number of errors than the student of Education stream did.

Paudel (2005) carried out a research study to find out the ability of B.ED. first year students in establishing cohesion in writing. She used a questionnaire consisting of both types of test items (i.e. objective and subjective) to draw the data for her study. Her study showed that the students performed more appropriately in given contexts than in free contexts. She also compared the students of T.U. constituent and T.U. affiliated campuses and found that the students of affiliated campuses were better (70.20% in given contexts and 48.18% in free contexts) than the students of constituent campuses (61.7% in given contexts and 39.66% in free contexts). She also found that girls are somewhat better than boys in most of the devices of cohesion.

Niroula (2005) carried out a research study to find out the achievement of logical connectors of twelfth graders. He used a questionnaire consisting of three types of test items, viz. tick the best answer, join the sentences and make sentences, to elicit the required data for his study. He found the level of achievement of logical connectors of the students satisfactory (i.e. 57.91%). He also compared the proficiency between boys and girls and found that boy (59%) were better than girls (56.83%) even though the difference was not so much significant.

Neupane (2005) conducted research on “Proficiency of students in interpreting Para-orthographic texts”. He has conducted research on the students of grade 10. In his findings student’s performance in interpreting Para orthographic texts was satisfactory.

Chapagain (2005) entitled his research “proficiency in Listening Comprehensive of Grade-9 students”. Its objective was to find out the Listening proficiency of ninth graders of public and private schools in Kathmandu valley. He concluded the study using the IELTS based test of listening and found that the students’ average proficiency in listening was 5.0.

Khadka’s (2006) research was on the proficiency in listening comprehension of Bachelor Third Year students in TOEFL based listening tests across different faculties (i.e. Faculty of Education, Faculty of Management, and Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences) that came out with the result that students scored below the proficiency requirement. The students were found significantly better in short dialogue than in long conversations.

Although the research works mentioned above are related to the analysis of errors in free writing, no any study has been carried out on the errors committed by the students of IELTS in writing free composition in the department of English Education yet. So this research study will be an invaluable treasure for the department and the English teachers in general as well. It will equally be valuable for the further research works in the related field.

Since the students of this level begin the fundamental practice of free writing, it is at this level where the problems of errors in free writing begin. And the researchers should have carried out researches of this type earlier. Unless and until we know the real nature of errors committed at the basic level and make the students aware of such errors, how can we expect our learners to write errors free compositions at higher levels? Furthermore, the role of cohesion and coherence, which play a rather crucial role in free writing, has been neglected

in those studies. If we are checking only grammatical errors, free writing exercise may not be the best test item. That can be tested by other means either. Only when we look for the logical organization of ideas and interconnectedness of grammatical and lexical elements in a piece of writing, we will undoubtedly be testing the students' competence in free writing. Moreover, there may not be any other better alternative rather than free writing test to measure such competence. Considering all these facts, this study seeks to analyze not only the grammatical errors but also the errors in organizational aspects of writing. Thus, the proposed study is distinct from the other researches done on error analysis so far.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

This study had the following objectives:

- a) To identify the errors committed by the IELTS students in the areas of agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence in writing free composition,
- b) To describe the errors committed by the IELTS students
- c) To suggest some pedagogical implications based on the findings of the study.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study will bear considerable significance to IELTS appearing Nepalese candidates, IELTS instructors, IELTS training institutions, IELTS scholars, researchers, linguists, and to any reader who has a taste for IELTS. The study highlights the needs, importance, and the current floor of IELTS in the context of Nepalese students who are going to join the undergraduate to post graduate degrees in British, Canadian, Australian, and other IELTS seeking western universities.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The following methodology was adopted by the researcher to fulfil the above mentioned objectives.

2.1 Sources of Data

The study made use of both primary and secondary sources of data.

2.1.1 Primary Sources

The IELTS students from 5 consultancies located in Kathmandu were the primary sources from whom I collected the required data for the research.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources

The secondary source of data for this research were different authentic and related books such as Chomsky(1957) Coder (1973), Quirk et al. (1985), Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1990). The different books pertaining to IELTS, journals, magazines, theses, internets, and others were consulted.

2.2 Sampling Procedure

Fifty students from five educational consultancies located in Kathmandu were selected using random sampling procedure to administer the test. In this study, the sample consisted of 50 IELTS students who were studying in the selected five consultancies. From each of the five consultancies, 10 students consisting of equal number of boys and girls were selected for administering the test. The following table shows the name of the selected consultancies and the sampling population.

Table No. 1

Sampling Population

S. No.	Name of the Consultancies	Boys	Girls	Total
1	Cambridge Educational Consultancy	5	5	10
2	Dynamic Universe	5	5	10
3	Career Launcher	5	5	10
4	Goodwill Consult	5	5	10
5	Scholar's Planet	5	5	10
Total		25	25	50

2.3 Tools for Data Collection

The researcher made use of an IELTS based complete writing test (Task-2) from one of the past IELTS Exam papers (Some people believe that children's leisure activities must be educational otherwise they are a complete waste of time. Do you agree or disagree?)

2.4 Process of Data Collection

In the beginning phase, the selected consultancies were visited by the researcher in person, talked to authority and the permission was taken to carry out the proposed study. All the students were informed of the purpose of the study and the required attention as well as cooperation from their part. In addition, the time was fixed for administrating the test on the selected students.

2.5 Limitations of the study

The proposed study had the following limitations:

- a) The study was limited to the IELTS Academic writing task-2
- b) The study was limited to 50 IELTS students selected from five Educational Consultancies situated in Kathmandu.
- c) The study was limited to the following grammatical areas, mechanics and organizational aspect of writing:

- Agreement -Capitalization
- Cohesion - Coherence

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This part is the core of the study which deals with the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data. The errors committed by IELTS students in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence are dealt with here. And the analysis and interpretation of the data has been carried out using descriptive and simple statistical tools like percentage. The collected data have been analyzed and described under the following sub-headings:

- Holistic analysis
- Consultancy wise errors in total,
- Consultancy wise errors in each item,
- Errors in agreement,
- Errors in capitalization,
- Errors in cohesion, and
- Errors in coherence.

3.1 Holistic Analysis of Errors

Table No. 2

Total Errors in Each Item

S. No.	Item	Errors in agreement	Errors in capitalization	Errors in cohesion	Errors in coherence	Total errors
1	I	89	35	68	225	417

The table presents the numbers of errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence under one item. Under the item, the students committed 89, 35, 68, and 225 errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence respectively. They committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization. In total, they committed 417 errors.

3.2 Consultancy wise Errors in Total

Table No. 3
Consultancy wise Errors in Total

S.No.	Consultancy	Errors in agreement		Errors in capitalization		Errors in cohesion		Errors in coherence		Total errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Cambridge	29	32.58	3	8.57	7	10.29	30	13.33	69	16.54
2.	Dynamic Universe	19	21.34	16	45.71	16	23.52	35	15.55	86	20.62
3.	Career Launcher	13	14.60	6	17.14	14	20.58	45	20	78	18.70
4.	Goodwill	17	19.10	3	8.57	13	19.11	50	22.22	83	19.90
5	Scholar's Planet	11	12.35	7	20	18	26.47	65	28.88	101	24.22
Total		89	21.34	35	8.39	68	16.30	225	53.95	417	100

The table above presents the consultancy wise errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence. The students of Cambridge Consultancy committed 29(32.58%), 3(8.57%), 7(10.29%), and 30(13.33%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. They committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization.

Similarly, the students of Dynamic Universe committed 19(21.34%), 16(45.71%), 16(23.52%) and 35(15.55%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence respectively. These data showed that they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization.

Likewise, the students of Career Launcher committed 13(14.60%), 6(17.14%), 14(20.58%) and 45(20%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. These data showed that they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in the use of capitalization.

The students of Goodwill Consult committed 17(19.10), 3(8.57%), 13(19.11%) and 50(22.22%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. These data showed that they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in using capitalization.

The students of Scholar's planet committed 11(12.35%), 7(20%), 18(26.47%) and 65(28.88) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. These data showed that they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in using capitalization article.

In total, the students committed 417 errors. Out of which, 89(21.34%), 35(8.39%), 68(16.30%) and 225(53.95%) errors were committed in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. These data showed that they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in the use of capitalization.

3.3 Consultancy wise Errors in Each Item

Table No. 4

Consultancy wise Errors in Each Item

S. No.	Item	Cambridge		Dynamic Universe		Career Launcher		Goodwill		Scholar's Planet		Total
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	NO
1.	I	69	16.54	86	20.62	78	18.70	83	19.90	101	24.22	417

The above table presents the errors in each item committed by the students of different consultancies. In the first item, the students of Cambridge, Dynamic Universe, Career Launcher, Goodwill Consult and Scholar's Planet committed 69(16.54%), 86(20.62%), 78(18.70%), 83(19.90%) and 101(24.22%) errors respectively. The students of Scholar's Planet committed the highest number of errors and the students of Cambridge committed the lowest number of errors in the first item.

3.3.1 Errors Committed by the Students of Cambridge Consultancy

Table No. 5

Errors Committed by the Students of Cambridge Consultancy

S. No.	Item	Errors in agreement		Errors in capitalization		Errors in cohesion		Errors in coherence		Total errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	I	29	42.02	3	4.34	7	10.14	30	43.47	69	

The table presents the errors in each item committed by the students of Cambridge. Under the first item, they committed 29(42.02%), 3(4.34%), 7(10.14%) and 30(43.47%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. In this item, they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization.

3.3.2 Errors Committed by the Students of Dynamic Universe

Table No. 6

Errors Committed by the Students of Dynamic Universe

S. No.	Item	Errors in agreement		Errors in capitalization		Errors in cohesion		Errors in coherence		Total errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	I	19	22.09	16	18.60	16	18.60	35	40.69	86	

The table given above presents the item wise errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence committed by the students of Dynamic Universe. The students committed 86 errors in the first item. Under this item, they committed 19(22.09%), 16(18.60%), 16(18.60%) and 35(40.69%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. In this item, they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization and cohesion.

3.3.3 Errors Committed by the Students of Career Launcher

Table No. 7

Errors Committed by the Students of Career Launcher

S. No.	Item	Errors in agreement		Errors in capitalization		Errors in cohesion		Errors in coherence		Total errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	I	13	16.66	6	7.69	14	17.94	45	57.69	78	

The table given above presents the item wise errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence committed by the students of Career Launcher. The students committed 78 errors in the first item. Under this item, they committed 13(16.66%), 6(7.69%), 14(17.94%) and 45(57.69) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. In this item, they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization.

3.3.4 Errors Committed by the Students of Goodwill Consult

Table No. 8

Errors Committed by the Students of Goodwill Consult

S.No.	Item	Errors in agreement		Errors in capitalization		Errors in cohesion		Errors in coherence		Total errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	I	17	20.48	3	3.61	13	15.66	50	60.24	83	

The table presents the item wise errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence committed by the students of Goodwill Consult. The students committed 83 errors in the first item. Under this item, they committed 17(20.48%), 3(3.61%), 13(15.66%) and 50(60.24%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. In this item, they committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in capitalization.

3.3.5 Errors Committed by the Students of Scholar's Planet

Table No. 9

Errors Committed by the Students of Scholar's Planet School

S.No.	Item	Errors in agreement		Errors in capitalization		Errors in cohesion		Errors in coherence		Total errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	I	11	10.89	7	6.93	18	17.82	65	64.35	101	

The table presents the item wise errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence committed by the students of Scholar's Planet. The students committed 101 errors in the first item. Under this item, they committed 11(10.89%), 7(6.93%), 18(17.82%) and 65(64.35%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. In this item, they

committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in the use of capitalization.

3.4 Detailed Description of Item wise Errors

3.4.1 Errors in Agreement

Table No. 10

Errors in Agreement

S. No.	Consultancy	Errors in				Total Errors	
		S-V Agreement		O-V Agreement			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Cambridge	22	32.35	7	33.33	29	32.58
2.	Dynamic	14	20.58	5	23.80	19	21.34
3.	Career Launcher	10	14.70	3	14.28	13	14.60
4.	Goodwill	13	19.11	4	19.04	17	19.10
5.	Scholar's Planet	9	13.23	2	2.24	11	12.35
Total		68	76.40	21	23.59	89	100

The table shows the errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement. It shows that the students committed 68(76.40%) and 21(23.59%) errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement, respectively. The students of Cambridge Consultancy committed 29(32.58%) errors in agreement. Of which, they committed 22(32.35%) and 7(33.33%) errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement, respectively. Similarly, the students of Dynamic committed 19(21.34%) errors in agreement. The data showed that they committed 14(20.58%) and 5(23.8%) errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement, respectively. Likewise, the students of Career Launcher committed 13(14.60%) errors in agreement. Out of which, they committed 10(14.70%) and 3(14.28%) errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement, respectively. In the same way, the students of Goodwill Consult committed 17(19.10%) errors in agreement. Particularly, they committed 13(19.11%) and 4(19.04%) errors in subject-verb agreement

and object-verb agreement, respectively. And finally, the students of Scholar’s Planet committed 11(12.35%) errors in agreement. Particularly, they committed 9(13.23%) and 2(2.24%) errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement, respectively.

Some typical erroneous examples under this category were:

1. **Children doesn’t** do any work. (S- V; Cambridge)
2. **Every students take** it seriously. (S-V; Cambridge)
3. **They involves** in different types of activities (S-V; Cambridge)
4. Here **is so many activities** to perform. (O-V; Dynamic)
5. **Each have** gained their own facility.(S-V; Dynamic)
6. There **is many things** to do.(O-V; Career Launcher)
7. **She sing** very well.(S-V; Career Launcher)
8. There **is many things to do**.(O-V; Goodwill)
9. **It** depend on their interests.(S-V; Goodwill)
10. There **is four member** in my family. (O-V; Scholar’s Planet)
11. All the **gives** equal knowledge.(S-V; Scholar’s Planet)
12. Their activities has close connection with their future.(S-V; Dynamic)

3.4.2 Errors in Capitalization

Table No. 11
Errors in Capitalization

S.No.	Consultancy	Description of Errors				Total Errors
		Sentence initial	Pronoun I	Proper noun/adjective	Other category	

		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Cambridge	1	33.33			1	33.33	1	33.33	3	8.57
2.	Dynamic	5	31.25	1	6.25	2	12.5	8	50	16	45.71
3.	Career Launcher	2	33.33	1	16.66	2	33.33	1	16.66	6	17.14
4.	Goodwill Consult	1	33.33			1	33.33	1	33.33	3	8.57
5.	Scholar's Planet	2	28.57			2	28.57	3	42.85	7	20
Total		11	31.42	2	5.71	8	22.85	14	40	35	100

The table presents the description of errors in capitalization. The students committed 11(31.42%), 2(5.71%), 8(22.85%) and 14(40%) errors in sentence initials, pronoun 'I', proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. The students of Cambridge Consultancy committed 3(8.57%) errors in capitalization.

More particularly, 1(33.33%), 1(33.33%), and 1(33.33%) errors were committed in sentence initials, proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. Not a single error was recognized in pronoun 'I'. Similarly, the students of Dynamic committed 16(45.71%) errors in capitalization. Out of which, they committed 5(31.25%), 1(6.25%), 2(12.5%) and 8(50%) errors in sentence initials, pronoun 'I', proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. Likewise, the students of Career Launcher committed 6(17.14%) errors in capitalization. Particularly, 2(33.33%), 1(16.66%), 2(33.33%) and 1(33.33%) errors were committed in sentence initials, pronoun 'I', proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. In the same way, the students of Goodwill Consult committed 3(8.57%) errors in capitalization. Precisely, they committed 1(33.33%), 1(33.33%) and 1(33.33%) errors in sentence initials, proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. Not a single error was recognized in pronoun 'I'. And the students of Scholar's Planet

committed 7(20%) errors in capitalization. Particularly, they committed 2(28.57%), 2(28.57%) and 3(42.85%) errors in sentence initials, proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. Not a single error was recognized in pronoun ‘I’.

Some typical examples of erroneous sentences under this category were:

1. Now **i** thanks my parents.(Pronoun I; Nabin, Cambridge)
2. **If** we apply it in our leisure activities, then it will benefit us. (Sentence initial; Ramila, Cambridge)
3. They always sit in the TV and **They** forget daily routines.(Other category; Saurav Samsheer, Dynamic)
4. I argue with the question maker that **The** word some people must be replaced by many people.(Other category; Binu, Dynamic)
5. Firstly, **It** belongs on the parents of the children.(other category; Madhav Ghimire, Career Launcher)
6. Yes, **i** agree with this statement.(Pronoun I; Namrata, Goodwill)
7. Finally, **In** my point of view children should get good education.(Other category; Sagarika, Scholar’s Planet)
8. Thus, **The** period of children life is complicate.(Other category; Sangdolma, Scholar’s Planet)

3.4.3 Errors in Cohesion

Table No. 12
Errors in Cohesion

S. No.	Consult	Cohesive Devices	Total
--------	---------	------------------	-------

	Agency	Reference		Substitution		Ellipsis		Conjunction		Lexical Cohesion		Errors	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Cambridge	1	14.28	1	14.28	1	14.28	2	28.47	2	28.57	7	10.29
2.	Dynamic	2	12.5	3	18.75	3	18.75	4	25	4	25	16	23.52
3.	Career Launcher	3	21.42	2	14.28	1	7.14	3	21.42	5	35.71	14	20.58
4.	Goodwill	1	7.69	2	15.38	3	23.07	3	23.07	4	30.76	13	22.41
5.	Scholar's Planet	2	11.11	2	11.11	3	16.66	5	27.77	6	33.33	18	26.47
Total		9	13.23	10	14.70	11	16.18	17	25	21	30.88	68	100

The table presents the description of errors in cohesion under different cohesive devices. The students committed 9(13.23%), 10(14.70%), 11(16.18%), 17(25%) and 21(30.88%) errors under reference, substitute ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively. The students of Cambridge Consultancy committed 7(10.29%) errors in cohesion. Out of which, 1(14.28%), 1(14.28%), 1(14.28%), 2(28.47%) and 2(28.47%) errors were committed under reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively. Similarly, the students of Dynamic Universe committed 16 errors in cohesion. More particularly, 2(12.5%), 3(18.75%), 3(18.75%), 4(25%) and 4(25%) errors were committed under reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively. Likewise the students of Career Launcher committed 14(20.58%) in maintaining cohesion. Out of which 3(21.42%), 2(14.28%), 1(7.14%), 3(21.42%) and 5(35.71%) errors were committed under reference,

substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively. In the same way, the students of Goodwill Consult committed 13(22.41%) in cohesion. Precisely, 1(7.69%), 2(15.38%), 3(23.07%), 3(23.07%) and 4(30.76%) errors were committed under reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively. And finally, the students of Scholar's Planet committed 18(26.47%) errors in cohesion. Particularly, 2(11.11%), 2(11.11%), 3(16.66%), 5(27.77%) and 6(33.33%) and 69(40.12%) errors were committed under reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively.

Some typical examples of erroneous sentences under this category were:

1. Everest always does **his** best to achieve success.(Reference; Ramila, Cambridge)
2. I **practice** all the things in scheduled time .(Lexical cohesion; Nabin, Cambridge)
3. He left the school and **so I**. (Ellipsis; Kamala,Dynamic)
4. I am **doing** a description of my school. (Lexical; Suraj, Dynamic)
5. Rodrick is a type of person **that** is very simple and good mannered. (Reference; Binita, Career Launcher)
6. Who could be my best friend but Rupak **could be**. (Substitution; Madhav, Career Launcher)
7. **My** mommy always cares us. (Reference;Manju ,Goodwill Consult)
8. I hope... you get this ,you'll become happy.(Conjunction; Khegendra, Goodwill)
9. He was not good. **And** he passed the exam.(Conjunction; Anish, Scholar's Planet)

3.4.4 Errors in Coherence

Table No. 13
Errors in Coherence

S. No.	Consultancy	Errors in maintaining						Total Errors	
		Chronological order		Spatial order		Logical order			
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1.	Cambridge	8	26.67	7	23.34	15	50	30	13.33
2.	Dynamic	10	28.57	9	25.71	16	45.71	35	15.56
3.	Career Launcher	12	26.67	10	22.23	23	51.11	45	20
4.	Goodwill	11	22	10	20	29	58	50	22.22
5.	Scholar's Planet	18	27.69	15	23.07	32	49.23	65	28.85
Total		59	26.22	51	22.67	115	51.11	225	100

The table presents the description of errors in coherence. The students committed 59(26.22%), 51(22.67%) and 115(51.11%) errors in maintaining chronological order, spatial order and logical order, respectively. The students of Cambridge committed 30(13.33%) errors in coherence in total. Particularly, 8(26.67%),7(23.34%), and 15(50%) errors were committed in maintaining chronological order, spatial order and logical order, respectively. Similarly, the students of Dynamic committed 35(15.56%) errors in coherence in total. Out of which, 10(28.57%), 9(25.71%) and 16 (45.71%) errors were committed in maintaining chronological order, spatial order and logical order, respectively. Likewise the students of Career Launcher committed 45(20%) errors in coherence in total. Precisely, 12(26.67%), 10(22.23%) and 23(51.11%) errors were committed in maintaining chronological order, spatial order and logical order, respectively. In the same way, the students of Goodwill Consult committed 50(22.22%) errors in coherence in total. More particularly, 11(22%), 10(20%) and 29(58%) errors were committed in maintaining

chronological order, spatial order and logical order, respectively. And finally, the students of Scholar's Planet committed 65(28.89%) errors in coherence in total. Out of which, 18(27.69%), 15(23.07%) and 32(49.23%) errors were committed in maintaining chronological order, spatial order and logical order, respectively.

Some typical examples of erroneous sentences under this category were:

1. Educational activities only make children for another academic knowledge. If the leisure time is consumed in different other activities, they can be multinational. On the other hand, some of the leisure time of children should be consumed in sports also.(Logical order; Gaurab, Scholar's Planet)
2. They like playing football in their school at the playground. (Spatial order; Ramila, Cambridge)
3. They prefer to play in the afternoon outside the school.(Chronological order;Suraj, Dynamic)
4. They like to play different games. Children have their own world of freedom. (Logical order ; Nabin, Cambridge)
5. When they have the holiday time, students mostly have leisure time. As children mind is like a muddy soil or mud by which we can make a pot. (Chronological/logical order; Kripa, Career Launcher)
6. The children can go to nearby the city to see the cinema hall. (Spatial order; Manju, Goodwill)
7. As we know that time is the most precious things which we need to utilize it and must important of it. Each every second of life is educational for children.(Chronological order; Binu, Dynamic)
8. In our country if people have not knowledge in every sector, they shouldn't sell themselves in future. (Logical Order; Deepak, Goodwill)
9. In every classroom, there are some posters and a blackboard. There is a canteen. And twelve sets of desk-benches are there in the class. (Spatial; Dipika, Scholar's Planet)

10. There is one room for accountant, and one for the Principal. The teachers are very nice here. There are two classroom blocks. (Spatial order; Kishor, Career Launcher)

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Findings

The researcher carried out a rigorous analysis of the errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence in free writing to meet his objectives and to make his study precise. From the recognition, analysis and interpretation of the errors committed by the IELTS students in writing free composition, the researcher came up with the following findings:

1. The students committed 417 errors in total in the given essay.
2. The students committed 89(21.34%), 35(8.39%), 68(16.31%) and 225(53.96%) errors in agreement, capitalization, cohesion and coherence, respectively. They committed the highest number of errors in coherence and the lowest number of errors in the use of capitalization. Thus, coherence was found to be most problematic for the students.
3. The students committed 68(76.40%) and 21(23.59%) errors in subject-verb agreement and object-verb agreement, respectively. Thus subject-verb agreement was found to be more problematic for them.
4. In case of capitalization, the students committed 11(31.43%), 2(5.71%), 8(22.88%) and 14(40%) errors in sentence initials, pronoun 'I', proper noun/adjective and other category, respectively. They committed the highest number of errors in other category and the lowest number of errors in writing pronoun I.
5. While maintaining cohesion, the students committed 9(13.23%), 10(14.705), 11(16.18%), 17(25%), and 21(30.88%) errors under reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion, respectively. It showed that they committed the highest number of errors under lexical cohesion and the lowest number of errors under reference.
6. To take the case of coherence, the students committed 59(26.22%), 51(22.67%) and 115(51.11%) errors in maintaining chronological order,

spatial order and logical order, respectively. They committed the highest number of errors while maintaining logical order and the lowest number of errors while maintaining spatial order.

4.2 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of the study, the following recommendations have been made for pedagogical implications.

1. The students should be provided with the format, structures, model, and brainstorming exercise while teaching essay and such other free writing skill developing tasks. Ample practices should be done on generating relevant ideas and organizing those ideas in a proper way to produce a coherent piece of writing.
2. The concept of singular, plural and non-count nouns and the forms of verbs that agree with those nouns/noun phrases should be explicitly taught to the students. So, subject-verb agreement should be taught by relating the form of verb to the number of subject (May it be gerund or to-infinitive) and object-verb agreement by relating the form of verb to the number of object. Special attention should be paid while teaching subject-verb agreement and constant practice should be provided in the classroom.
3. Special attention should be paid while teaching capitalization. The information on *upper case* and *lower case* should be provided. And explicit teaching of the most likely areas of errors in capitalization should be carried out. They should be made familiar with the basic capitalization rules in a comprehensive way.
4. The students should be provided with ample exercises on reference (pronoun), elliptical sentences, conjunctions, etc. to maintain cohesion in a piece of writing. It is better to teach pronoun in combination with masculine, feminine, and neuter gender rather than teaching in isolation.

5. Coherence should be taught with the help of guided writing exercises. Such exercises like ordering the sentences of a story, description of a place, narration of some events should be given to practice coherence.
6. More practice exercises on each of the problematic areas should be provided.
7. The students should be encouraged to write free compositions and to self correct and peer correct, and finally, the teacher should look over the samples selected from their writings. And he/she should reteach the areas of grammar, mechanics, and/or organization style where they have committed the most errors. This leads to continuous reduction of the number of errors they commit in each of the areas.

References:

- Adhikari, G. (2007). *Study on the viva of verbs and in free writing by 10 graders*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis Kathmandu, TU.
- Aarts, F. & J. (1986). *English syntactic structures*. London: Oxford Institute of English.
- Barakoti, D. P. (2001). *Errors committed by PCL second year students in writing free composition*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, TU, Kathmandu.
- Bharati, T. B. (2007). *Comparing speaking and writing ability of grade X students*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, TU, Kathmandu.
- Bloch, B. & Trager, G.L. (1942). *Outline of linguistic analysis*, New York: Linguistic Society of America.
- British Council (2008). *IELTS information for candidates*. Kathmandu: British Council.
- Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1992). *Grammar dimension*. London: Newbury House.
- Corder, S.P. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Dangal, P. P. (2006). *Errors committed by tenth graders in writing guided composition*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, T.U., Kathmandu.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction*. London: Longman.
- Frodesen, J. & Eyring, J. (1997). *Grammar dimension*. New York: Routledge.
- Gear, J. & Robert, G. (2007). *Cambridge preparation for the TOEFL Test*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Ghimire, N. R. (2006). *Errors committed by twelfth graders in writing free composition*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Kathmandu: T.U.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hassan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Blackwell.
- Harrison, A. (1991) *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Heaten, S. (1988) *Religion & family formation*. London: Newbury House.

- Jakeman, V. & McDowell, C. (2006). *Action plan for IELTS*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Jakeman, V. & McDove, C. (2007). *Insight into IELTS Extra*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kadel, K.P. (2004). *English language proficiency of the B.Ed. students on the basis of IELTS*. An unpublished M.Ed. thesis, Kathmandu, T.U.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- McCarter, S & Easton, A. (2006). *A book for IELTS*. Delhi: New Age International Publication.
- Miller, R. K. & Webb, S. S. (1992). *Motives for writing*. California: Mayfield Publishing Company
- Narayanswami, N. (1988) *Plant cell & tissue culture*. Biomed pres, Amsterdam.
- Palmer et al. (1990). *The principles of language study*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Rivers, W. M. (1968). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: The University Press of Chicago.
- Strong, W. & Lester, M. (1996). *Writer's choice: Grammar and composition*. New York: Glencoe McGraw-Hill.
- Pierce, D. & Kinsell, S. (2006). *Cracking the TOEFL iBT*. The Princeton Review.
- Richards et al. (1986). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

APPENDIX-I

Test Items

These test items are prepared to collect the data for a research study on error analysis entitled “Errors Committed by IELTS Students in Writing Free Composition” for an M.Ed. Thesis in English Education. The researcher hopes that you all co-operate in making this study complete. The information that you provide have significant contribution not only to this research work but also to the whole programme of English language teaching-learning activities.

Thank you.

Researcher

Krishna Prasad Gautam

T.U.,Kirtipur

Please supply necessary information and answer all the items that follow:

Name:.....Sex: Male Male

Address.....

Consultancy.....

1. Some people believe that children’s leisure activities must be educational; otherwise they are a complete waste of time. Do you agree or disagree?

APPENDIX-II
LIST OF CONSULTANCIES AND STUDENTS

I. Cambridge Consultancy, New Baneshwor

1. Ramila Rai
2. Soni Khatri
3. Digpal Kayastha
4. Tara Gautam
5. Rakshya Parajuli
6. Anjeela Deuja
7. Sagar Dhungel
8. Nabin Paudel
9. Suden Madhikarmi
10. Tulsi Koirala

II. Dynamic Universe, Putalisadak

1. Chandra man Karki
2. Kamala Thapa
3. Kalpana Shrestha
4. Bimala Phuyal
5. Suraj Panday
6. Kapil Hamal
7. Sandip Gurung
8. Binu Acharya
9. Saurav Samsher
10. Sunita Shrestha

III. Career Launcher, Putalisadak

1. Binita Pandit
2. Kripa Chhetri
3. Ram Pokhrel
4. Kishor Nepal
5. Madhav Ghimire
6. Nirmala Ghimire
7. Namrata Gurung
8. Sarmila Ghimire
9. Lalit Ghimire
10. Nav Raj Khatri

IV. Goodwill Consult, Kamalpokhari

1. Khagendra Nepal
2. Vivak Gurung
3. Manju Shrestha
4. Kalpana Khatri
5. Vishnu Acharya
6. Nabina Thapa
7. Saroj Raj Shrestha
8. Deepak Giri
9. Nita Gautam
10. Deepika Giri

V. Scholar's Planet, Putalisadak

1. Anish Paudel
2. Gaurab Raj Ojha
3. Ganga Ram Basnet
4. Sangdolma Tamang
5. Dipaka Sapkota
6. Jeevan Sharma Acharya
7. Sanjay Lama
8. Viva Pokhrel
9. Sugarika Dhakal
10. Prabata Thapa

APPENDIX-III

ERRORS COMMITTED BY ALL THE STUDENTS

I. The Students of Cambridge

S. No.	Name	Test Item	Errors in				Total
			Agreement	Capitalizati	Cohesion	Coherence	
1.	Ramila	I		1	1	2	4
2.	Soni	I	1	1		3	5
3.	Digpal	I	2	1	2	4	9
4.	Tara	I	5			3	8
5.	Rakshya	I	4			4	8
6.	Anjeela	I	2		2	3	7
7.	Sagar	I	2			4	6
8.	Nabin	I	8			2	10
9.	Suden	I	1		1	3	5
10.	Tulsi	I	4		1	2	7
Total			29	3	7	30	69

II. The Students of Dynamic Universe

S.No.	Name	Test Item	Errors in				Total
			Agreement	Capitalization	Cohesion	Coherence	
1.	Chandra	I	2		3	3	8
2.	Kamala	I	6	7	1	6	20
3.	Kalpana	I	2		2	4	8
4.	Bimala	I				2	2
5.	Suraj	I	1		2	3	6
6.	Kapil	I	3		1	4	7
7.	Sandip	I	3			6	9
8.	Binu	I			2	2	4
9.	Saurav	I	2		4	3	9
10.	Sunita	I			1	2	3
Total			19	16	16	35	86

III. The Students of Career Launcher

S. No.	Name	Test Item	Errors in				Total
			Agreement	Capitalization	Cohesion	Coherence	
1.	Binita	I				2	2
2.	Kripa	I			1	4	5
3.	Ram	I	1		3	6	10
4.	Kishor	I	2		3	4	9
5.	Madhav	I	1	1	2	5	9
6.	Nirmala	I		4	2	6	12
7.	Namrata	I	2	1	1	4	8
8.	Sarmila	I	1			6	7
9.	Lalit	I	5		2	5	12
10.	Nava Raj	I	1			3	4
Total			13	6	14	45	78

IV. The students of Goodwill Consult

S. No.	Name	Test Item	Errors in				Total
			Agreement	Capitalization	Cohesion	Coherence	
1.	Khagendra	I	1			4	1
2.	Vivek	I	4		1	6	11
3.	Manju	I	3		2	4	9
4.	Kalpana	I	1	1		6	8
5.	Vishnu	I	3		4	6	13
6.	Nabina	I	2			3	5
7.	Saroj Raj	I	1		1	5	7
8.	Deepak	I		2	1	6	9
9.	Nita	I			1	3	4
10.	Deepak	I	2		3	7	12
Total			17	3	13	50	83

V. The students of Scholar's Planet

S. No.	Name	Test Item	Errors in				Total
			Agreement	Capitalizati	Cohesion	Coherence	
1.	Anish	I		2	2	6	10
2.	Gaurab Raj	I	2		6	9	17
3.	Ganga Ram	I	2	1	2	6	11
4.	Sangdolma	I	1	2		7	10
5.	Dipika	I			1	6	7
6.	Jeevan	I			4	8	12
7.	Sanjay	I	3		3	7	13
8.	Viva	I				4	4
9.	Sagarika	I		1		6	7
10.	Prabata	I	3	1		6	10
Total			11	7	18	65	101

APPENDIX-V
Sample Test Papers