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Abstract

In Bangladeshi educational institutions L2 writers are found to encounter various writing problems. The circumference of this problem does not confine to the secondary and the higher secondary level. It reaches up to the tertiary level. But at this stage of learning students are generally expected to produce high standard writing. These learners practice writing at the different pre- university stages but this long time practice fails to bring any changes in their writing proficiency. Though they acquire grammatical accuracy but their writings reveal repetitions, inappropriate organization of ideas, parallelism, short-length, lack of variation, use of vague words, lack of appropriate information, etc which make it incoherent. So the goal of the current study is to spotlight the general writing problems encountered by the tertiary level students in Bangladesh. It also aims at finding out the reasons hidden behind these problems. The research used closed questionnaire and writing samples of the students. Analysis of findings revealed that the numerous problems faced by the students lies in their wrong attitude towards writing. I hope this research will be helpful for teachers and students to identify the writing problems. It will also help the syllabus planner to design course materials according to the students’ need.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Students in Bangladeshi educational institutions get acquainted with writing at the very early grade. But even after practicing writing for a long time students face numerous writing problems even when they reach the tertiary level.

Bangladeshi education system constitutes of four levels; namely, primary (from class I to V), secondary (from class VI to class X), higher secondary (from class XI to XII, that is college level), and tertiary level (university level). In tertiary level, students have to do a huge number of writing tasks – ranging from writing academic paragraph, essay to different types of academic papers, reports etc. So it is generally expected that students will be proficient in writing in this advanced level and their writing will be coherent, where the thoughts and ideas will be organized.

University students must be able to write clearly about topics related to their research fields (Cohen and Miller, 2003). It is often found that students may have knowledge about vocabulary and grammatical aspects (e.g. using the right tenses, collocation, and prepositions) but face problems in writing coherently and re-structuring ideas after evaluating them (Alam, 2007). But at this stage such problems in academic writing is absolutely undesirable. It is commonly found that in a writing class students can easily produce scattered sentences correctly, but when they are asked to write a discourse or any expository piece on a topic, they cannot do it successfully. They become haphazard. In other words they fail to transform their knowledge about L2, into the ability to function effectively in the L2, (Fraser, 1992, cited in Alam, 2007).
Again, most of the students have a misconception about the writing process. Chuo (2004), cited in Ismail, Hussin & Darus (2012) points that one of the most prominent problems that affects L2 learners’ success beside language area difficulties are the students’ attitude towards their writing task. In our context, students often “believe that writing is a natural gift rather than a learned skill” (Langun, 2000:12). They believe so because they are never taught that through practice and following writing strategies they can acquire writing proficiency.

In a typical ESL/EFL writing classroom in Bangladesh teachers often teach students writing, by teaching them how to write “Grammatically Correct English Sentences”? Though the students are given some writing tasks to practice in the class, such as – writing paragraphs, essays, letters etc. but the teachers do not interfere in the writing process and receives only the finished written product for correction. Teachers edit scripts giving feedback only on language errors. In other words, instead of teaching writing, teachers “test learners’ ability to write”. But according to White and Arntd (1991) teaching writing in this way ‘improves neither grammatical accuracy nor writing fluency, rather writing can be improved by paying attention to what the students say’.

On the other hand, in learning writing students attempt to translate L1 language words into L2 language(s). While writing they tend to use correct grammatical rules, struggle with vocabulary, do not make any plan or fix the goal, rarely revise, rearrange their ideas and never produce multiple drafts before they submit their finished product. In other words, they adopt, “Think-Say” (Alam, 2007) strategy while writing and believe that they have learnt writing.

Poor performance of writing can be improved if the writing problems are addressed properly and reasons are pointed out that are responsible for such problems. Therefore, this research aims at...
investigating the general writing problems among the tertiary level students in Bangladesh. It also intends to look into the reasons lies behind them.

1.1 Background of the Research

Many teachers of English think that acquiring writing skill is more laborious and difficult than acquiring the other skills. As an ELT teacher I have been teaching for 6 years in a private university in Chittagong. In my classroom teaching experience, I noticed that even at the university level students’ academic writing fail to exhibit their competence in writing. Some students are found to have a sound knowledge of grammatical rules but unable to apply those rules in producing different academic writing. Later, I realized that these students are taught English in Grammar-Translation Method at the primary level, they only memorized the grammatical rules and were asked to practice the “model composition”. Emphasis was given on accuracy and in writing classes teachers focused on the final product of writing which were received for correction without any intervention in the writing process.

Though in 2001 a new method named ‘Communicative Language Teaching’ was introduced in Bangladesh from class VI to class XII (that is from secondary school to higher secondary level), the condition of academic writing has not been improved. Even in this new method writing remain stereotyped, it is taught in traditional way. In fact, students are not aware of the fact that writing can be learned. From the very beginning of their academic career they only stick to memorizing model paragraph, essay, based on the suggestion. Consequently their creative faculty is completely destroyed. So when they enroll in university for higher study, they cannot
produce any writing creatively. Moreover, in most of the public and private universities the medium of study is English. So now-a-days, the public and private universities are offering fundamental or functional English course to improve the skills of the students. But the scenario remains unchanged. So the researcher deems it would be worthwhile to conduct a research to explore the composing problems among the tertiary level students in Bangladesh and identify the probable causes of these problems.

1.2 Research Aim

The aim of the study was to investigate the writing problems as well as the process of writing by focusing on writers’ composing behavior and by analyzing students’ misconception about writing. The findings of the research would have the potential to help language teachers improving their students’ writing skill and performance in bringing about a change in their teaching methodology. Moreover, it might have made the students aware of their writing problems and might work as needs analysis for them.

1.3 Research Questions

On the basis of the research aim the following questions have been formed to investigate the matter:

a) What are the writing problems faced by the tertiary level students in Bangladesh?
b) What are the reasons, hidden behind these problems?
Chapter Two: Review of Literature

In order to identify the composing problems of the tertiary level students, the researcher studied the different definitions of writing, pointing out the problems of L2 writers as presented by different researchers, discusses Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, writing as a cognitive process and the process approach of writing. The discussions of the researchers regarding the problems of L2 writers aided to understand the problems associated with L2 writing. SLA theory helped to find out how the Second Language Acquisition problems influence problems in writing. Further, the cognitive process viewed writing from the cognitive perspective, whereas the process approach of writing emphasised on the thinking process of the writer.

2.1 What is writing?

Researchers give different definitions of writing. In all these definitions writing skill aims to obtain such goals as – effectiveness, comprehensibility, clarity, coherence etc.

In ‘Glossary of Education’ (Lewis, 2012), writing is described as a skill that enables an individual to write lucidly, coherently and grammatically, or to handwrite legibly with ease and speed. According to HRSDC’S originally proposed definition, ‘writing skills are those needed to compose meaningful text of sentence length or longer, communicating ideas, messages and information in understandable words and language for a variety of audiences.’
Further, writing skills are described as specific capabilities which enable a writer to express his thoughts, ideas, and knowledge into words in an effective, clear and comprehensible way (Servitokss, 2013).

Brown (2001, p.336) has seen writing from a different perspective focusing on the thinking process of the learners. He states that writing is a thinking process, when a writer produces a final written product, he does so based on his thinking process. Brown also quotes Elbow (1973:14-16) as saying that writing should be thought as an organic, developmental process … not as a way to transmit a message but as a way to grow and cook a message.

So it is a myth that writing means to work with pen and paper to produce a piece of writing where the focus is given only on the finished product without any consideration of the writing process rather writing is seen as a process that establishes a relation between the writer and his internal world.

2.2 Writing Problems of the L2 Writers

The writing problems of L2 learners as documented by different researchers help to give a clear understanding of L2 learners’ problems. After doing a research on EFL students Leki (1992) finds that though students could write grammar-based guided compositions, and even though they had a good knowledge of grammar, they still produced peculiar, non-English sounding sentences when asked to do any creative writing. So the researchers were able to trace the writing problems by taking into consideration the influence of L1, comparing skilled and less skilled writers’ writing and analyzing their composing processes and written text features.
Although strategically, rhetorically and linguistically L2 writing is different from L1 writing (Silva, 1993), but most of the L2 writing research has been closely dependent on L1 research. While making a comparative study of skilled and less-skilled writers of L1 and L2, Raimes (1985), and Cumming (1989) [cited in Alam, 2007] found that the writing behaviors of L2 writers were similar to their L1 in the matter of planning less, revising more at the word and phrase level. Emphasizing the similarity between L1 and L2, Ismail Baroudy (2008) says that it is often found that expert L1 writers are more likely to have expertise in L2. The implication is that L2 writers’ writing skill is strongly influenced by their L1 writing skill.

By comparing skilled and less-skilled writers, researchers comment that the reason for differences between skilled and less-skilled writers lies in their use of strategies and their composing process (Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981; Raimes, 1985; Scardamalia and Bereiter, 1987; Cumming, 1989; Silva, 1993; Alam, 2005; and others) [cited in Alam, 2007]. So, according to these researchers, the L2 writers fail to attain success in writing because they do not use strategies and major problems lies in their general writing processes.

Again, Tony Silva (1993) focuses light on the distinct nature of L2 writing. In order to understand the true nature of L2 writing, Tony Silva (1993) compared L1 and L2 based on the composing processes and written text features. In her study she found that unskilled L2 writers did less planning (both at the global and local text levels), faced difficulty in generating material, often became unsuccessful as more time was spent on it and less useful material was generated. They hardly had set goals and found difficulties in organizing materials. Besides, they frequently consulted dictionary, showed more concern and difficulty with vocabulary, spent more writing.
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time but produced fewer words of written text. They rarely review, reread and reflect on their written texts. Even if they revised, they focused more on grammar than on the mechanics of writing. Consequently, L2 written texts were less fluent, shorter, exhibited more errors, seldom addressed the audience or reader, and were less effective. These written texts were marked with unnecessary or irrelevant detail and repetition of ideas. They used more of compound constructions and less complex sentence constructions in their written texts. They used shorter and vaguer words and it lacked lexical control, variety and sophistication. He further added that unskilled L2 writers could not copy information from the background reading texts.

Like Raimes (1985), Zamel (1982) and Cumming (1989), Victori (1999) [cited in Alam, 2007] also compared successful and less successful writers. Victory (1999) in his think-aloud protocol study compared two skilled and two less skilled writers’ L2 writing knowledge. He identified three main areas in which the students might find difficulty, such as: person knowledge (i.e., motivation, self-concept and writing problems), task knowledge (i.e., text knowledge, concern for purpose; concern for audience), and strategy knowledge (i.e., planning ideas, organizing ideas, evaluating and resourcing). Victori summed up that successful writers have “a broader and complex view of their knowledge about writing problems(person knowledge), the nature and requirements of the writing task(task knowledge) and their own approach to writing(strategy knowledge)” (p.549) . On the other hand less successful writers’ knowledge about their L2 writing is simple, controlled and often inappropriate. So, the problems of the L2 writers lie in their approach to writing. They lack meta-cognitive knowledge, i.e. lack awareness of the requirements and processes involved in successful writing and they also lack specific knowledge about L2 writing (Victori, 1999; cited in Alam, 2007).
In all these above mentioned research one thing become clear that successful writers differ from unsuccessful writer in their approach to L2 writing that is in their use of strategies and their general writing processes.

2.3 SLA Theory (Second Language Acquisition Theory)

The writing of ESL learners is often influenced by the challenges that they face in acquiring second language. This fact can be traced in the SLA theories. For example in Stephen Krashen’s Monitor Model (1982, 1985) he refers to Acquisition Learning Hypothesis, Input Hypothesis, Affective Filter Hypothesis. In Acquisition Learning Hypothesis he speaks of acquisition and learning. In Input Hypothesis Krashen tells that a learner’s learned language is one step beyond his current level of language. In the Affective Filter Hypothesis Krashen views various affective factors (motivation, self confidence and anxiety) that facilitates language learning. So according to Krashen, if a learner receives comprehensible input and their affective filter is low only then their language learning will be successful.

Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (1983, 1996) suggests that input comprehended through conversational modification has an important role to play for L2 acquisition. When two interlocutors engage in conversation they would receive feedback in the form of clarification request, comprehension checks, confirmation checks, etc. This draws their attention to some specific features of language through their understanding of feedback (Long, 1996). Thus this hypothesis posits that through interactional modifications while negotiating meaning learners become able to give attention to some specific features of language and it quickens their acquisition of those features.
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2.4 Cognitive Psychology and Writing as a Cognitive Process

Language learning is influenced by cognitive factors to a great extent. In practicing academic writing students often face cognitive difficulty. In cognitive perspective language acquisition is seen as a mental process which making use of strategies, explain how the L2 knowledge system is developed and used in communication (Ellis, 1994). Thus idea about L2 learners’ competence and performance can be drawn from cognitive psychology.

In Anderson’s (1982, 1985) learning theory, Adaptive Control Thought Theory (ACT), (as cited in Fraser, 1992), new knowledge is considered as declarative knowledge which is stored in the learners’ memory. This declarative knowledge turns into procedural knowledge when put into performance (Fraser, 1992) [cited in Alam, 2007]. This alteration from ‘declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge is done through repeated practice (McLaughlin, 1978; Bialystok, 1981; Ellis, 1984; Fraser, 1992).[cited in Alam, 2007].

Anderson’s (1985) [cited in Myles, 2002] model of language production can be divided into three stages such as: construction, in this stage, by using a mind map or outline and by brainstorming a writer makes plan about what he/she will write; transformation, in this stage at the time of composing or revising, the writer applies rules to transform intended meaning into the form of the message; and execution, which involves the physical process of producing the text. The ‘construction’ and ‘transformation’ stages seen as “setting goals and searching memories for information than using production system to generate language in phrases and constituents” (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990, p.42)
So Anderson’s learning theory suggests such teaching approaches that focus on the development of language and content knowledge, together with practice in using this knowledge and teaching strategy to encourage independent learning (Snow, 2001) [cited in Myles, 2002].

According to Bialystok, (1990) L2 learners store two types of knowledge in memory such as analyzed (that is explicit) knowledge and unanalyzed (that is implicit) knowledge, whereas the learners can skillfully use analyzed knowledge in different contexts and tasks applying their cognitive control, but his/her use of unanalyzed knowledge is limited. Learners’ level of analyzed knowledge “can be increased by the experience of tasks that demand higher levels of analyzed knowledge (Fraser, 1992; p.56). Both Bialystok and Anderson (1982, 1985) stress on the repeated practice and form focused instruction to increase L2 expertise.

So, synthesizing all the literature it is evident that writing as a cognitive process gives us idea that learners store knowledge in memory and when that knowledge is put into performance through repeated practice their language learning is facilitated.

When writing was recognized as a cognitive process researchers came up with different cognitive models. Flower and Hayes’ Cognitive Model (1977, 1980, 1981, 1984) (cited in Grabe and Kaplan, 1996) views writing as a problem solving activity having a recursive process. The main points of this cognitive model are: “a) writing processes are interactive, intermingling and potentially simultaneous, b) composing is a goal directed activity, and c) expert writers compose differently than novice writers” (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996; p. 91). This model has been evolved.
through three steps- i) Model of Composing Process- this phase explains while writing how writers’ long term memory, his composing process (i.e. planning, transcribing and reviewing), and task environment (i.e. rhetorical situation and writers’ goal) work simultaneously; ii) The Theory of Revision- shows the revision process of the writers and it also tells why revision at the global text level (e.g. changing organization or plans, restructuring information) is difficult. It further focuses on the revision processes of skilled and less- skilled writers, iii) Relation between task environment and composing process – it is presented in Flower and et.al. (1990) (cited in Grabe and Kaplan, 1996) and implies that in spite of being a cognitive process writing is contextually constrained.

Flower and Hayes’ Cognitive Model draw a distinction between the composing and revision process of the expert and novice writers. So it is quite apparent that if the novice writers are taught strategy like experts they will be able to use their knowledge skillfully from Knowledge Telling into Knowledge Transforming (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996).

Bereiter & Scardimalia’s Two Model Theory of Writing (1987), (cited in Alam, 2007) tells of two different writing processes. As a reaction to Flower and Hayes’s Cognitive Model, it shows the different causes and the ways skilled and less- skilled writers compose. According to this theory, while writing, the less- skilled writers search in their memory and get back necessary information that has been stored in their memory. Later, they just copy the information without making any change in the content. In other words, they use Knowledge Telling model and write in a simplified manner. On the contrary, the skilled writers use the Knowledge Transforming model. In case of complex processing (such as – problem analysis, goal setting, planning,
ordering information, considering the audience expectations, organizing arguments logically) and for modifying content, the expert writers use Knowledge Transforming model. Thus they become able to convert information into meaningful sentences. This is how the text becomes coherent. Again in a Two Model Theory of Writing, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987), asserts that while writing the expert writers involve themselves in reflective and intricate problem solving activities and convert their knowledge through cognitive processing, the less-skilled writers avoid this kind of intricate problem solving activities and they only think of the topic and write whatever they know about the topic. In other words, they follow a ‘think-say’ or ‘what next’ strategy (Grabe and Kaplan, 1996) [cited in Alam, 2007]. So through this model a strategy-based writing approach has been suggested.

2.5 The Process Approach

In order to meet up the challenges of L2 writing and to make skilled L2 writers various approaches of writing were introduced. Among all these approaches researchers found the process approach to be preferred and approved one in ESL context.

The process approach views writing as a ‘thinking process’. In this approach emphasis is given on writers’ creativity and “the cognitive relationship between the writer and the writers’ internal world” (John Swales, 1990, 220). Applebee (1986) (cited in Kroll, 1990) claims that the process approach “provided a way to think about writing in terms of what the writer does (planning, revising and the like) instead of in terms of what the final product looks like (patterns of organization, spelling and grammar)” (p. 96). Stressing on the importance of the process
approach Brown (2001) regards it as advantageous to students in language learning and states that in the process approach students become able to manage their own writing as they get a chance to think as they write. In this approach students’ writing on a given topic is not limited by time constraint. As Raimes (1983) states that while writing in the process approach students do not have any restriction of time … ‘rather they explore a topic writing (p.10).

In the light of all these discussions, it can be said that the process approach concerned with the composing process of the learners, where the writers’ thinking process and creativity are given priority. Learners write, taking plenty of time, and making the best use of their abilities receiving feedback from their teachers or peers and organize their ideas, revise and develop their drafts till they produce a better organize written product. In its various stages the process approach makes use of different types of classroom activities which enhance writing ability of the learners and helps to develop a positive attitude towards this difficult task.

Though language researchers often speak of different stages that writers need to go through, while writing but they have differences among them regarding the names and numbers of those stages. According to Donald Grave there are three stages that a writer should follow: prewriting, composition and post-writing (cited in Tompkins 1990, 67-70). Gail Tompkins (1990) suggests five stages of the writing process such as: pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing and sharing(72). James Britton describes (cited in Tomokins, 1990) three stages: conception, incubation and production. Naming each stage does not mean that writing process is linear. While dealing with the advanced ESL students’ writing process, Zamel (1983) points out three stages which are
recursive, not linear, they are: pre-writing, writing, and revising. The process writing model of Ron White and Arndt see writing process as recursive as seen in Figure -1.

In this process model White and Arndt emphasize interaction among different stages and asserts that the writers have to solve many problems at the same time and produce a coherent text keeping the intended readers in mind.
Tribble (1996) states that “although there are identifiable stages in the composition of most extended texts, typically writers will revisit some of these stages many times before a text is complete”.

So after analyzing the various frameworks and models of writing process, it can be said that there are five stages involved in writing process, such as: pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, and sharing.

In the pre-writing stage students’ creativity is stimulated. They are also lead to think about what they should write and how to approach the chosen topic. Tricia Hedge tells that at this stage students must keep in mind: the purpose of their writing and its intended readers. Brown (2001)
suggests the following classroom activities for the pre-writing stage: Brainstorming; Listing (in writing individually); Clustering (begin with a key word, then add other words, using free association); Freewriting; Reading (extensively) a passage; skimming and/or scanning a passage (348).

In the drafting stage learners try to generate their ideas, write them down without being concerned about grammatical and mechanical errors. Fulwiler (cited in Bae, 2011) states that teachers should not expect that the early drafts of the learners will be error-free. Producing ideas, organizing ideas, developing a theme, evolving a plan, taking audience into account and getting started are the sort of activities that writers do to write the first draft (Tribble 1996, p. 113). The succeeding drafts will receive feedback from teachers and peers.

Revising process is also called writing process. Tompkins describes revision process as: “Revision is not just polishing writing; it is meeting the needs of readers through adding, substituting, deleting and rearranging material” (83). Writing experts (Silva, 1993) find that in the revision stage less–skilled writers concentrate on vocabulary and local grammatical errors but the skilled writers focus on developing content and organization of ideas. So ideas must be given to the students that revision does mean to correct the minor grammatical errors but to take into consideration content and organization of the whole text.

Editing is considered to be the most important stage in ESL classroom.
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Though in the previous stages, students focus on the content of the text but in the *editing* stage they pay attention to grammar errors or mechanics. In this stage students edit their own writing or peer’s writing by checking grammar, spelling, handwriting, choice of words, and punctuation.

In the *sharing* stage students share their writing not only with their teachers and their peers but to other readers outside the classroom. According to Tompkins (1990) by sharing their completed written products with audiences such as peers, friends or families students can develop a real communication between them and readers.

To deal with the writing problems of the L2 learners and to improve their expertise in acquiring this complicated skill students needs to practice writing following the process approach.
Chapter Three : Research Methodology

3.1 Research Approach

After a detail discussion of the writing problems and the different stages of the writing process the researcher describe the framework of the research in this chapter. In doing research attempt is made to find answers to different questions. From the scientific perspective, research means ‘the organized, systematic search for answers to the questions we ask’(Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991; cited in Dornyei, 2007).

The aim of this research is to explore the composing problems of the tertiary level Bangladeshi students. For achieving this aim, this study made use of the mixed methods approach where both quantitative and qualitative methods were applied.

3.2 Participants

The participants were chosen from a private university where the researcher work and a public university of Chittagong. These two universities are BGC Trust University and the University of Chittagong. As sample I chose 140 students of B.A Honours. Among them 20 participants are the students of the Department of English, University of Chittagong and 120 students of BGC Trust University are-- from BBA and Department of English. The students of public university are studying in the 2nd year and those of private university are from 1st semester and 2nd semester. These students were chosen because almost all of them have some language courses in the first
two years of their academic career in which they have to do some writing tasks. So I deemed they can give a broader view of their problems. Besides, the Department of English, in BBA also the medium of education is English and they have a non-major English course which has been included in their first semester syllabus. I followed a convenience sampling style to select the sample of the study in hand.

3.3 Data collection instruments

The research instruments that used to collect data were, questionnaire and writing samples of the participants.

   a) Questionnaire

The reasons that work behind choosing questionnaire are varied such as, it is time saving and help to get desired information (Brown and Rodgers, 2002). Questionnaire designed for this research included close ended questions covering the research questions as well as subject related. The closed ended questions were designed because they are easy to fill in and help to provide necessary information. It is also possible to get reliable scoring of the responses (Wallace 1998. P.135)

The type of data that I get through the questionnaire yield a huge number of necessary information about the respondents. The total 20 questions are categorized in three sections.

Section A contains eleven questions. It inducted the factual and behavioral questions. This question helped to obtain information about the participants’ personal history and the amount of
time spent in an L2 environment. Such information was demanded because they provided opportunity to the participants to assess themselves as writers. This information helped to decide whether such facts have any impact on their attitude and performance.

In section B four questions were included. These attitudinal questions elicited information about the attitude, opinions, belief of the participants about writing as academic task. For example: these questions would provide information about the participants’ use of strategies by their teacher, the first problem they face during writing and about their completion of the writing. Though all these four questions of this section are closed ended, only one has got an extended part which was designed to gather information about teaching of writing strategies by the teachers. In this extended part the respondents were asked to express their opinion about teaching of strategies. Their opinion may vary according to their academic practice.

Section ‘C’ included five pedagogical questions. These questions were about brainstorming on the topic, making plan before writing, revising their written task. The participants who would give ‘positive’ answer to these questions would write about these facts in detail. These questions were designed to gather information about the classroom practices which reflect students’ approach to writing. From the responses of the participants the researcher traces the reasons of their writing problems. In this group three closed ended questions have extended parts.

The questionnaire was distributed among 140 students selected from both private and public universities. The students of English from the private university are the direct students of the researcher. So in her scheduled class time she could distribute the questionnaire, but needed to
take prior permission from the Dean of B.B.A. of BGC Trust University and Head of the Department of English, University of Chittagong.

a) Writing Samples

Writing samples were chosen as research instrument to have a firsthand experience about the writing problems of the students and for analyzing the language data.

The participant students were asked to produce an expository piece of writing describing the scenic beauty of their campus. Expository piece is chosen because this type of writing put forward a writer’s opinions, point of view, ideas, concepts, arguments on a particular topic. It includes an introduction, a discussion and a conclusion.

Students were asked to do the writing task immediately after filling up the questionnaire. Total 140 writing samples were collected. The participants were given 20 minutes to complete their writing and their word limit was 150. The writing samples present a vivid picture about the students’ composing problem.

3.4 Challenges I have encountered

Dealing with students’ writing problems where data collected from the participant students posed some challenges for me. I confronted a number of problems in the data collection process. First and foremost the problem lies with the time constraint. The students were given the questionnaire followed by a writing task. The duration of a class was of 50 minutes, in which the
first 10 minutes were spent to explain the aim of the research. In the other 40 minutes they filled up the questionnaire and produced an expository writing by giving 20 minutes for each task. But it was found that some of the students wanted more time to complete the task and complained about the time limitation.

Further, in the initial draft of the questionnaire I included only the open-ended questions and did not insert any question to gather information about the writing strategies. Later with the valuable suggestion of my supervisor I got it right after the third correction.

As a result of the busy schedule of my professional life, I delayed to collect data from the students of the public university. By the time when I managed to go there, the classes of the participants (students of 2nd year) were already suspended. However, I managed to get 20 students for the survey. If it had been done earlier, the sample size could have been larger.

3.5 Ethical Issues

There are various ethical issues that arise while conducting research regarding confidentiality, informed consent and information sharing (Monette et al, 2005). Some may include:

- Privacy of the possible and actual respondents.
- Consent and possible description of the participants.
- Behaviour and objectivity as a researcher
- Reactions of the participants (Saunders et al, 2007)
Ethical issues were given importance while conducting the research, as this was a sensitive matter with the respondents to ask them to relate their own problems. A major issue was confidentiality, which had been dealt with precision. While filling up the questionnaire, students were asked that writing their name was not mandatory, it is optional. Another issue that had been resolved was informed consent regarding sharing of information. The authority of University of Chittagong and BGC Trust University gave informed consent that information could be shared with others for future research.
Chapter Four: Data analysis & Discussion

Data analysis refers to the process of finding the right data to answer the research questions. It would accept or reject the research hypothesis (Dornyei, 2007). Mixed method research approach was carried out to conduct the research in hand. As the mix method research method was applied both the Quan and Qual data were integrated at the data analysis state. This study ended by exploring the writing problems faced by the tertiary level students in Bangladesh. And pointing out the reasons hidden behind these problems. As the data was collected through 120 questionnaires and writing samples of the students, data analysis was carried through two stages. The three different stages of the questionnaire used to collect three different types of information which lead to analysis of data in three phases.

4.1 Data Collected Through Questionnaire

The main research instrument used by the researcher to collect data was a written questionnaire (appendix A) which comprises three different sections and includes 20 questions with fixed alternatives.

In section – A, the factual and behavioral questions were inducted. These questions helped to obtain information about the participants’ personal history and the amount of time spent in an L₂ environment. Such information was demanded because they provided opportunity to the participants to assess themselves as writers. This information helped to decide whether such facts have any impact on their attitude and performance.
In section – B, the attitudinal questions elicited information about the attitudes, opinions belief about writing as academic task.

Section – C, gathered information about the classroom practices which reflect students’ approach to writing.

Uses of graphical measures such as bar and pie charts are applied where appropriate for readers’ convenience. However, comparative analysis was also conducted among the three sections of the questionnaire at the end to give overall view to sum up the whole data analysis in a nutshell.

4.1.1 Section – A (Self evaluation as writer)

In this section the total eleven questions were designed to elicit information from the students about their idea of themselves as writer. An analysis of the student’s assessment of themselves shows that most of the students have a very high opinion about their writing skill. Majority of them think that they are good writers both in their L1 and L2, can use their background reading knowledge while writing and often read books in English other than their text books.

Results of Question no. 8

Question no.8 contained 3 options, the participant students responded by ticking one from these, which they thought most appropriate to assess them as writer in L2. It is seen that 50% of the total participants comment that they can easily write on any topic in English. Again 43% say that they cannot organize their ideas properly. Only 7% admits that they face problems in writing and they do not know how to start writing.
Results of Question no. 9

Three options were given to question no. 9. These were asked to participant students to find perception about their writing in Bengali. 53% of the students say that they can easily write on any topic in Bengali. It is interesting to find that 47% reveal that they face the same kind of problems in Bengali writing which they usually face in writing in English. None of them reports that they cannot write in Bengali.

Results of Question no. 10

This question carrying 3 options were designed to elicit information about students’ reading other books in English apart from their course books. Most of them express that they sometimes read books. So it is seen that 77% participants read books which are out of their syllabus. 20% students claim that they have a good reading habit as they always read other books. Only 3% says that they never read any other books, they read only text books.

Results of Question no. 11
Question no. 11 includes 2 options was designed to elicit information about students using background reading knowledge when using a synonym for the first time. 90% students agree that when using a synonym for the first time they can recall their reading of that word in a text. Only 10% of the total participants replied negatively that they cannot recollect when they use that word in a text.

4.1.2 Section B – (Writing as an academic task)

The second part of the questionnaire contains question no 12 to 15. These questions tended to record students’ perception about writing as an academic task. In all these four close ended questions one has extended part where the participants were asked to write how the strategies of writing were taught to them by their teachers.

Most of the participants agreed in the matter of using the strategies of writing and teaching writing strategies by the teachers. But surprisingly enough they avoid the extended part of question no. 13 or give confusing answers.

Results of Question no. 12

The four options of question no. 12 sought to find out students’ idea about the strategies of writing. It is found that 53% students agreed that they know the strategies of writing. 4% participants say that they do not have any idea about writing strategies. Among them 43% claim that they have some ideas about writing strategy.
Results of Question no. 13

In question no 13, two options were presented one of which has an extended part which was designed to know how the students are taught writing strategies by their teachers. 37% participants state that their teachers do not teach them any strategies of writing. Though 63% answers positively about the teaching of writing strategies by their teachers but they fail to give any satisfactory answers when asked, in what ways those strategies were taught to them. Remaining students though have said ‘yes’ but do not bother to signify any ways of teaching strategies for their answers.
Results of Question no. 14

Three options of this question tended to identify students’ problem to produce any writing. Grammatical mistake is considered to be the main obstacle by 47% participants. 40% think that they do not find appropriate vocabulary while writing. Only 13% regard the inability to organize ideas as their main problem.
Results of question no. 15

In question no. 15, three options were designed to gather information about students’ completion of their writing tasks. Most of the participants unanimously opine that they can complete their writing timely. 73% of them claim that they can complete their writing within the stipulated time. Only 23% say that they seldom complete writing within the fixed time.
4.1.3 Section – C (Students’ approach to writing)

All the five questions in this section intended to trace the real situation as the students practice writing in the class which focus on their approach to writing.

Results of Question No – 16

Three items were included to find out the first thing that the participants do when they are asked to write on a topic, so that an idea can be formed about their approach to writing. 73% said that when asked to write on a certain topic, at first they think of the selected topic so that they can gather ideas to write on it. The participants around 20% reply that they seldom spend much time in thinking about the topic. They say that whatever they know about the topic they transform them into ideas.
Results of Question No – 17

Question number 17 was meant to find whether the participant students reflect or brainstorm on their writing topic. Two options to elicit ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ responses were included in which the ‘positive’ answer has an extended part. The extended part was designed to know ‘why’ and ‘how long’ they brainstorm on their writing topic. It is interesting to note though 87% of them explicitly acknowledge the idea of brainstorming on the topic. Only 13% of the participants are averse to reflecting on the topic.
Results of Question No – 18

In order to draw out information about the students’ composing process this question intended to know whether the participants make any plans before writing. A significant number of participants that is 83% admit that they organized their ideas according to a plan. But they avoid answering when they are asked to write how they make the plan. Those who give the answer seem to be unable to comprehend the real meaning of ‘planning’. A small number of the participants which is 17% deny the fact of organizing their ideas according to a plan.
Results of Question No – 19

This question sought to form idea about how do the participants consider their finished written piece of work. So, question is asked to them whether they revise their writing and why and how do they revise. The majority of the participants acknowledged that they do revise their written work. Though 83% of the total participants admit the fact of revising their written work, but all of them show the common reason for that, is to check grammatical mistakes, spellings and the other language related problems. The 17% of the participants say that they do not revise their work.
Results of Question No – 20

The concluding question aimed to find out students using of irrelevant detail or repetition of the same points. Five items were included to determine their ratio of writing unnecessary detail ranging from 75% to 0%. It is seen that among the total participants, 40% claim that their rate of repetition is only 5%. Again 24% of them are averse to any kind of repetition. Though 17% say that they only repeat 25% and the other 17% say that their repetition rate is 10%. Only 2% assert that 50% of their produced work contains irrelevant details or the repetition of the same points.
4.2 Language Data

An open ended qualitative analysis of the writing samples help to address the writing problems of L2 writers. Samples of the 120 students were collected. Though initially collected works were 140, but only the writings of the participants who could complete the questionnaire as well, were taken into consideration. This language data helped the researcher to trace the problems of L2 writers. Around 140 students from a private and a public university were asked to write an expository piece of 150 words describing the scenic beauty of their respective campus. But it is interesting to find that 108 participants submit their writing which is less than 100 words. This written works lack fluency, their writing samples exhibit innumerable errors i.e. lexio-semantic
errors, errors with verbs, prepositions, articles, nouns. These samples create the impression that the participants fail to form any clear idea about their writing topic. These samples exemplify that the participants fail to generate ideas and lack appropriate information (e.g. fail to make appropriate estimation about the total land area). It is seen that the written product of these students are replete with unnecessary detail or irrelevant ideas, (e.g. though they are to write about the scenic beauty of their campus, most of them include the description of other infrastructural detail). Among them around 50 participants make use of vague words (e.g. it is a place of taking enjoy) and their writing display inconsistency of ideas. All these ‘written products’ illustrate that the participants write without any planning, their writing is audience free and purpose-less. It can be said otherwise that their writings have no goals; they do not seem to be aware of their intended audience. Only a small number of writing samples, that is written products of 12 participants become able to meet the required word limit, these written works exhibit, fewer errors, organize ideas coherently, seldom include any irrelevant ideas. But all these 120 writing samples are marked by some common features such as all the participants write in a simplified easy manner. And they write choppy and fragments sentences.

4.3 Discussion of findings

4.3.1 Findings

By analyzing the information that are procured from the questionnaire and by examining the writing samples of the students it can be presumed that a significant number of the students that is 90% cannot organize their ideas. While writing they show more concern for language related problems therefore fail to pay attention to the organization of ideas. Among 120 participants, 56
are of opinion that grammatical mistake is the main impediment in their producing a written work. Lack of vocabulary is considered to be the main obstacle by 48(40%) participants. Their writing samples exhibit innumerable errors. A significant number of them (90%) cannot generate ideas, consequently their written texts are found to be short in length. They do not know the strategies of writing and hardly use any of them in written works. About teaching strategies by their teachers 33% say that their teacher asked them ‘to write grammatically correct sentences,’ ‘to write in simple easy language’, or ‘to write in such a way that they can pass in the exam’. This is how they have been taught strategies by their teachers. The other 30% respondent though have acknowledged the fact of teaching strategies but do not bother to signify any ways of teaching strategies for their answers. Around 108 participant students do not have any clear idea about their writing topic. An equal number of them insert unnecessary detail and repeat the same idea. Although they produce grammatically correct sentences but these sentences present incoherent ideas which sound weird and non-English.

The responses of the questionnaire lead us to estimate reasons that are responsible for the general composing problems of the tertiary level students in Bangladesh.

The root causes lie in their attitude to writing. The way they practice writing in their academic setting, make them to focus on the finished written product rather than the writing process. Their ideas are not organized because they rarely make any plan or set goals. The participants who claim that they ‘pre-plan’ before writing seem to have wrong idea about planning. Around 83% say that to them ‘planning’ means to write through an easy process, or to transform their knowledge into ideas.
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They do not brainstorm or reflect on the topic though a huge number of them acknowledge the idea of brainstorming. As a result, they cannot generate ideas and adopt ‘think-say’ or ‘what-next strategy’. Most of the students do not re-arrange their ideas. Participants around 73% claim that they can complete their writing within the stipulated time. In fact the students always tend to submit their writing without giving revision.

Even if they revise, 83% claim that it is done to check the grammatical and other language related problems. Their inability to revise their written texts at the global text level renders their writing to be incoherent.

4.3.2 Discussion

The study in hand reveals that the respondents have misconceptions about writing. Their wrong attitude towards writing lead them to focus on the final product of writing. They are taught the pattern–product approach where they only learn to produce correct grammatical sentences and practice paragraphs and essays with fixed patterns. So the students struggle to develop those skills. But they are not aware of the fact that writing is a creative activity and cognitive process. As the learners are not taught how to develop appropriate organization of ideas they fail to achieve expected writing proficiency even at the advanced level. Consequently, the learners who consider writing as a natural gift rather than as a learned skill fail to produce standard writing which results in their poor performance in writing.
The most interesting part of the findings of the study is the responses of the participants collected through questionnaire. In question no. 8 when they are asked ‘what is your idea about your writing in English’, 50% of the participants explicitly express that they can easily write on any topic. So they have high opinion of themselves as a writer. This high importance that they ascribe to their writing ability does not commensurate with their performance in the writing samples. Students having such opinions about their writing are expected to write with plan, incorporating strategies, brainstorming, generating appropriate ideas, organizing ideas, evaluating and editing their writing. Though the questionnaire responses imply that the participants have a process-oriented approach to writing, but an analysis of the writing samples unfold mismatches between their idea and performance, even in the questionnaire responses some of their ideas do not conform to the other parts. As for example , when the participants are asked in two different questions about strategies, 53% conform to the idea of knowing writing strategies and 63% agree with the idea of teaching strategies by their teachers. But surprisingly enough avoid the extended part of the question or give confusing answers where they are asked to explain the ways those strategies were taught to them. Another incongruity is noticed when they are asked to point out the main problem to produce any writing. Among 120 participants 87% attribute the main obstacle to grammatical mistake and vocabulary problem. Only 13% refer to the appropriate organization of ideas as the impediment to produce writing .On the contrary, from the analysis of their writing sample it becomes evident that though they have some grammatical mistakes but their actual problem lies in their inappropriate organization of ideas, which make their writing incoherent (refer to Appendix-B). Mismatch is also noticed when students express their opinion on the idea of brainstorming on their writing topic. Though 87% of them admit that they reflect or brainstorm but evade the extended part of the question where a
detail information is sought about their brainstorming. Even those who write answers to the extended part give weird reasons, such as they think by brainstorming ‘they can make the topic acceptable’, or by brainstorming ‘they try to remember the vocabularies which are related to the topic.’ This incongruity is also exemplified by the shorter length of their writing and incorporation of irrelevant detail (refer to Appendix-B). It further emphasizes the fact they hardly have any idea of ‘brainstorming.’ So when 73% participants admit that they think of the topic while asked to write on a certain topic. I deem they actually do not think of the topic. Rather they only look at the topic while writing and write what they know about the topic. In other words they adopt a “think-say” or “what-next strategy” (Alam, 2007).

Similar disparity is noticed regarding their idea of ‘planning’ during writing. Students positive response in the questionnaire about ‘planning’ seem to be absent in their performance in ‘writing samples’ which seldom address audience, do not have any goal and bear the testimony of less-planning.

The mismatch between students’ approach to writing and their text features is also revealed through their rate of inserting unnecessary details or irrelevant ideas. In the questionnaire 40% participants assert that their writing contain only 5% irrelevant ideas, whereas the analysis of the writing samples document that 90% student make use of unnecessary detail or irrelevant ideas.

A comparative study of the questionnaire responses and the writing samples of participant students bring a vital point which is worth considering. Their opinion about process of writings as expressed in the questionnaire imply that some of them are familiar with the different stages.
of writing process. But their performance as revealed in their written work demonstrate that they are unknown of the fact that there can be anything like strategies of writing. A small number of them who can write coherently and seems to be proficient in writing do so not because they are acquainted with the different stages of writing. There is no conscious effort behind it either by themselves or by their teachers. They do it because have a natural bend towards writing.

The findings of the current study regarding the use of strategies are analogous to the findings of the study conducted by Flower & Hayes (1980), Zamel (1982), Raimes (1985), Scardamalia & Bereiter (1987), and Silva (1993). But the difference is that whereas these researches made a comparative study between skilled and less skilled writers, the current study does not make any such comparison. It only address the problems and point out the reasons behind it.

Further, the findings of the study dealing with the textual features of the writing samples largely conform to the findings of the study conducted by Tony Silva. But the difference lies in the participants’ number and work domain, Tony Silva made an empirical research of 72 reports comparing L1 and L2 writing to have an idea of L2 writing but in the present study 120 participants’ L2 writing problems are taken into consideration. The features of written text found in both are similar.
Chapter Five: Conclusion

5.1 Implications for future research

In the current study the researcher has tried to examine some relevant issues in the sphere of L2 writing. The issues concerns are the writing problems encountered by the tertiary level students in Bangladesh and the reasons which create such problems. The writing problems are investigated through the examination of the students’ writing samples and attempt is made to point out the reasons through the analysis of the questionnaire responses. In my study, I found that the writing problems constitute the inappropriate organization of ideas, inclusion of irrelevant ideas, short length of the writing test, use of vague words, lack of necessary information and inability to generate ideas. Students’ misconception and attitude towards writing are the reasons of their writing problems. This attitude indicate that they were never given any idea about the different stages of writing process- that is, using of strategies, brainstorming about the topic, organizing ideas and evaluating the written text.

Students’ perception about L2 writing problem and their approach to writing are explored in this study, these issues are not examined from the pedagogical perspective. One further probable extension of the study could be the inclusion of the language teachers’ perception in this matter. Further research can also be done to know the perception of the language teachers about L2 writers’ problems. It could have been more holistic.
In this study participants gave confusing answers regarding their teaching of strategies, so classroom observation could have been more representative to have a complete view of the problem. A comparative study between the teachers’ and student’ perception about writing problems can add a new knowledge to the study. A large scale empirical study can open up a new avenue in the field of L2 writing.

5.2 Limitations of the study

This study has various limitations. The first limitation is the small number of the target population. Instead of 120 if 200 participants had been covered, then the study could have got some more valid ideas. Again, the participants of the private university are mainly from rural areas. If one more private university in the city were covered it could provide more solid information. Another demerit of the study is that the data is collected through questionnaire and the writing samples, but in answering the questionnaire some of the students submit without completing it. So in addition to these research instruments, interview of the students could have been more helpful to collect appropriate data.

5.3 Reflection

An analysis of the tertiary level L2 writers’ problems and the probable causes to these problems make one thing very clear that L2 writers should recognize the fact that there is a difference between correct writing and effective writing. As teachers are facilitators and guides of learning, they can inculcate this idea among their students. But the reality is that the students of
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Bangladesh are not taught writing, not at any level of their schooling. They mainly write to pass in the examination and their teachers also teach them to write for passing in the examination. They are not aware of the fact there is a difference between writing in an exam situation and writing in general. In order to pass in the exam they only gather knowledge about their course and produce that knowledge on their exam script. They learn some model paragraphs and essays and think that they have learnt writing. On the contrary, writing in general refers to the students’ ability to analyze his ideas logically and organize them weaving sentences together in a smooth way so that they can write in a coherent way on a particular topic. In fact, the students who are taught writing in the traditional way do not know how to write standard paragraphs and essays.

If these students are taught the basics and strategies of writing in general, they will learn to write for exam as well as acquire the ability to produce coherent writing on any topic. Measures should be taken to teach them writing at different level of their education. So, it is needed to introduce writing courses, firstly in the mother tongue and secondly in the L2. It is because learners who are not proficient in writing in L1 also lack the ability in their L2, in the matter of planning and organizing their ideas. As teachers will teach these courses to the students they should provide proper training to make the effort successful.
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Appendix –A
Students’ Questionnaire

[As a part of my studies for M.A. in ELT at the Institute of Modern Languages, Chittagong University, I am conducting a research project entitled, “Writing problems among the tertiary level students in Bangladesh: a study in Chittagong region”. The study aims at identifying various writing problems faced by tertiary level students even though they practice writing from the very early grade. Information provided in this questionnaire will be used solely for the purpose of the research and will remain confidential.]

[Students will fill in where necessary]

Section A: Self-evaluation as writer

1. Name (optional) : ………………………………………………………

2. Permanent Address : …………………………………………………

3. Name of the institution you are studying at present: …………………………………

4. Its address : ……………………………………………………………

5. Gender: Male/ Female

6. Which language do you mostly use in English language classroom?
   a) English
   b) Bengali
   c) a mixture of English and Bengali.
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7. Which language do your teacher mostly use in language class?
   a) Only English,
   b) Bengali,
   c) a mixture of English and Bengali.

8. What is your idea about your writing in English?
   a) I can easily write on any topic
   b) writing letter
   c) story writing
   d) writing SMS

9. Do you think you can easily write on certain topic in Bengali?
   a) always
   b) never
   c) sometimes face difficulty which I usually face in writing in English

10. Do you read books other than your text books?
    a) always
    b) sometimes
    c) never

11. When using a synonym for the first time do you recall ever reading that word in a text?
    a) yes
    b) no

**Section B: Writing as an academic task**

12. Do you know the strategies of writing?
a) yes  
b) no  
c) I have some ideas about the techniques of writing.  
d) other ............ (specify)  

13. Does your teacher teach you the strategies of writing?  
   a) No  
   b) Yes, (If yes , write how?) .................................................................  

14. When you are asked to write on a topic, what is the problem that you face?( v any one)  
   a) Do not find suitable vocabulary  
   b) make grammatical mistakes  
   c) cannot organize ideas  
   d) all the above  

15. Can you complete your writing at the right time which is fixed by the teacher . (v any one)  
   a) most of the time  
   b) sometime  
   c) never  

Section C: Students’ approach to writing  

16. When you are asked to write on a certain topic what is first thing that you do?  
   a)  at first I think of the topic  
   b)  I do not know how to start  
   c)  Whatever I know about the topic, I transform them into ideas  

17. Do you reflect (brainstorm) on the topic? ( v one)  
   a) yes  
   b) no  
   if yes, write why .......................................................  
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how long ..................................................

18. While writing do you organize your idea according to a plan

a) yes
b) no
if yes, write how .................................................

19. Do you revise your writing? (v tick one)

a) No
b) Yes, if yes, write why ...........................................

how.................................................................

20. Do you write irrelevant or unnecessary detail or repeat the same points in your writing? (v approximate rate of repetition)

a) 75%
   b) 50%
   c) 25%
   d) 10%
   e) 5%
   f) 0%
Shakila Mustaque, M.A. in English and M.A. in ELT
Writing Problems among the Tertiary Level Students in Bangladesh: A Study in Chittagong Region
Appendix –B

Writing Samples

The beauty at BCU University is very charming, and agreeable to the students. It provides good natural scenery different in well-decorated in different kinds of trees. These trees increase the beauty at university. Sometimes we have seen different kinds of birds that give us pleasure. I think it is a place at being enjoyable and learning knowledge. It includes various display grown in a restaurant and a medical, every thing relevant included.

Appendix –B

Writing Samples

The beauty at BCU University is very charming, and agreeable to the students. It provides good natural scenery different in well-decorated in different kinds of trees. These trees increase the beauty at university. Sometimes we have seen different kinds of birds that give us pleasure. I think it is a place at being enjoyable and learning knowledge. It includes various display grown in a restaurant and a medical, every thing relevant included.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:1 January 2014
Shakila Mustaque, M.A. in English and M.A. in ELT
Writing Problems among the Tertiary Level Students in Bangladesh: A Study in Chittagong Region
The scenic beauty of BGIC campus

BGIC Trust University is situated in Chandanaish. Around this area, a canal runs. The most spectacular term in that it is full of trees and environment. Always, we hear the chirping of birds. A beautiful lake flows beside it.

The student can feel a harmony between the nature and reality here. They can learn their lesson with the environment. The campus is full of trees. I'm proud of it.
The Scenic Beauty of B.G.C. Campus

The scenic beauty of B.G.C. campus is very nice, wonderful. Here, in the campus, there are many trees, when I am looking at the trees, I feel very happy. And it's looking green. The atmosphere of this campus is very fresh.

It is situated far away from the city about 5 km. The campus has a lake. When my mind is unhappy, I am going to the lake to freshen my mind. Here, has a big gallery and has a big ground where the boys played.