Eight Levels of Writing Problems: Critical Examination of Research Findings Putting Them into Practice

Arun Nepal

Abstract

This article critically examines the findings of the large-scale action research that identified eight levels of writing problems faced by Bachelor's first-year students. The same writing problems are examined, putting them into practice after a year of the completion of the action research. The aim was to measure their credibility and trustworthiness in a natural classroom setting, which was identical to the action research. The research context for both studies was also similar except for the participants. The participants were also selected purposefully, and the data were collected through tests in both studies. The tests were administered among the twelve students in the action research and the thirteen students in this study. The findings indicated that the participants in both studies faced the eight levels of writing problems, and three writing problems, namely sentence level (SL), paragraph level (PL) and full body level (FBL) were found more difficult for almost all of them. Thus, this article further justified the need to involve students in writing processes as a part of their academic life to help them develop writing skills and achieve academic success.

Keywords: *Eight-level writing problems, writing processes, educational research, and natural setting*

Introduction

I frequently find during my classroom practice that many students not only face serious writing problems but also do not know their writing problems as Murray (2006) stated. Nepal (2007, 2014, 2023) conducted different studies comparing and contrasting the writing problems and solutions found in the literature at home and abroad. Some other scholars have also carried out some research focusing on writing problems faced by Nepali learners of English studying at a higher level. For example, Giri (2010) studied grammatical errors committed by Bachelor's level students of five different universities (Tribhuvan, Kathmandu, Pokhara, Purbanchal, and Mahendra Sanskrit universities) and indicated that many Nepali students faced writing problems at word, phrase, clause, and sentence levels. Similarly, Maharjan (2009) studied the grammatical errors committed by higher secondary level students of five development regions (eastern, central, western, mid-western, and far-eastern

regions) and presented the result from the most serious to less serious writing problems based on the number of participants who committed similar kind of errors.

Likewise, Nepal (2007) studied the spelling and grammatical errors committed by Bachelor's level students who faced such writing problems more frequently while being involved in writing practice. He identified eight kinds of spelling errors: in using 'e' and 'a' like 'arrengement' instead of 'arrangement'; error in the use of the 'e' word finally as 'develope' instead of 'develop'; in using 'e' and 'i' as in 'enteract' instead of 'interact'; in using 'i' and 'y' such as 'studing' instead of 'studying'; in using 'l' as in 'beautifull' instead of 'beautiful' and 'allways' instead of 'always'; errors in homophones as 'cut' instead of 'caught'; errors in syllable structure word initially like 'frist' instead of 'first'; errors in 'e' ending verbs such as 'comeing' instead of 'coming'. Similarly, he also identified four kinds of grammatical errors: errors in using 'modal' and 'main' verb sequences, as in 'can speaking' instead of 'can speak'; wrong use of 'be' verb like 'I am agree' instead of 'I agree'; sub-verb agreement error like 'she give' instead of 'she gives'; and in using 'to-infinitive' form such as 'to broke' instead of 'to break'.Nepal continued to verify those spelling and grammatical errors committed by the same-level students for many years in his real classroom. One such study is Nepal(2014) entitled "Writing Problems and Solutions" based on the data provided by 35 Bachelor level students in a real classroom setting. The data were collected by administering a written test in a natural classroom setting. First, the participants wrote an essay describing their campus life, which was a familiar topic for all participants. Then, they immediately made a list of difficulties they faced while writing the essay. Finally, they were asked to write possible solutions to address those difficulties. The qualitative data was analyzed following open, axial, and selective coding systems. He also critically examined writing problems and solutions found during the study, relating them to writing problems found through literature review. As a result, he synthesized eleven writing problems and regular writing practice by engaging in different writing activities as effective ways of solving those identified writing problems. The eleven writing problems consist of problems in basic writing, vocabulary, grammar, content, spelling, sentence structure, punctuation, cohesion, coherence, paragraph writing, and writing topic sentences.

Although the researcher asked the participants to write an essay on a very familiar topic, campus life, many students faced basic writing problems while writing the essay. The handwriting of many participants was rather rough. They did not leave the necessary margin, letter, word, or line space. Moreover, they could not express their ideas effectively due to the lack of the required vocabulary knowledge and appropriate choice of vocabulary. Although they were asked to write the essay in about 250 words, some could write only 56. Likewise, they faced serious grammatical challenges similar to those found in the literature review; the most frequent grammatical problems were tense, infinitive form, voice, 'be'verb, concordance, modal verbs, negative markers, and irregular verbs.

When they responded to the second question about identifying writing problems, they

accepted that they could not write more satisfactorily because they had little idea about the content to be included in their essay. Their essays also reflected this challenge: they could not write simple facts and activities about their campus life. Similarly, they faced similar spelling and grammatical problems in writing words and sentences, as indicated by the literature review. They also faced problems using punctuation marks like full stop (.) and comma (,). Their essays and responses about writing problems revealed that they had little or no idea about cohesion, coherence, paragraph writing, and topic sentences.

One of the most interesting findings was that many participants realized their writing problems and suggested effective ways of addressing them. Many students suggested an urgent need for regular writing practice agreeing with Murray (2006), who states that "learning comes through writing; quality comes through revision, and regular writing develops fluency" (p.7). They did not point out only the need for regular writing practice; they also suggested some specific ways of involving in regular writing practice, like writing a daily diary, sharing written text with their peers and teachers, reading authentic books, and writing the review of those books, doing homework more regularly, being involved in creative writing, and forming writing habit as a way of their academic life.

Similarly, they suggested different ways of practising vocabulary, such as maintaining a vocabulary notebook, using and revising the learned vocabulary, and using dictionaries and thesauri. For grammar practice, the participants were interested in self-learning/study, class/unit/internal tests, and practising grammar by doing different exercises in different grammar practice books. They also realized the need to form reading habits to be a good writer; as Morley (2007) says, "It is essential that you become a great reader if your purpose is to become a good writer" (p.5). Only a few participants suggested specific solutions regarding sentence structure, one of the serious writing problems found in their essays; however, Nepal (2014) endorsedWallwork's (2011) advice more appropriate to Bachelor's level students addressing writing problems related to sentence structure. Wallworkemphasizes four aspects: a) basic English word order: subject, verb, direct object, and indirect object; (b) short, clear sentences; (c) correct use of punctuation marks; and (d) repeating keywords without any worry for meaningful writing practice.

Some participants also pointed out the need for an effective teacher role to form the students' writing habits by involving them in different writing activities given in the curriculum. Many students could not suggest suitable ways of addressing writing problems regarding topic sentences, cohesion, coherence, and paragraph writing. Their essays also showed that they had little idea regarding these issues; however, Nepal (2014) attempted to give the concept of those issues based on some literature. For example, Chaplen (1970) says, "The paragraph is good if the reader completely understands the unit of information it contains and if its controlling idea is completely developed" (p.1).

Nepal (2014) did not identify only writing problems and their solutions but also attempted to engage students in regular writing

practice based on those findings as a part of their academic life, considering the concept of ZPD (Zone of Proximal Development) one of the characteristics of sociocultural theory of Vygotsky (1978, as cited in Oxford 2017). He identified actual writing problems and provided necessary feedback to improve their writing problems involving them in class work and homework as a way of their academic life. He developed this way of academic life as a culture of teaching writing in his real classroom. This culture and the findings of small-scale research encouraged him to identify the writing problems more systematically; as a result, he carried out the large-scale action research in 2023 focusing on writing problems faced by Bachelor's level students.

This large-scale research was the continuation of the small-scale research focusing on writing problems and solutions, and many problems and solutions were also similar to the findings of the large-scale research. Nepal (2023)categorized the writing problems into eight different groups in a more systematic way, putting them in ascending order. He also explored twenty-three learning strategies as effective ways of addressing those writing problems. He also recommended a learning strategies-based model (LSBM) for teaching writing. However, this article aims to critically examine only the eight-level writing problems based on real practice immediately after the completion of the study as an effort to document the implementation of research findings that have been becoming an urgent need for judging the research with evidence. Hall and Hord (2011) also indicate this need

and argue that "it is hard to imagine how professional development can be judged if its implementation has not been documented" (p. 52).

Similarly, Hoveid (2012) also encourages educational researchers to self-evaluate themselves by asking a series of questions themselves and argues that "as educational researchers, we care about our work, about what we do and about our field of research" (p. 60). My interest in conducting small and large-scale educational research is also about asking myself several questions reflecting on my classroom practice following a cyclic way of theorizing the practice and vice versa so that I can become a more effective teacher reflecting on my own teaching and researching experiences. Moreover, Nepal (2023) claims that he conducted large-scale research as his doctoral study aiming at developing a research culture in his academic life that could be bedrock for him for further investigation (p. 208). Therefore, it is an effort to judge the research findings with evidence comparing the eight-level writing problems identified by Nepal (2023) and the result of its implementation in a real classroom. The eight-level writing problems are presented in the following table:

Table 1

Eight-level Writing Problems in Ascending Order

General writing problems	Level-wise writing problems	Specific writing problems
Basic-level writing problems	1. Blank Level (BL)	1. Margin
		2. Indentation
		3. Letter Space
		4. Word Space
		5. Line Space
	2. Dot Level (DL)	6. Full Stop (.)
		7. Comma (,)
		8. Semi-Colon (;)
		9. Colon (:)
		10. Question Mark (?)
		11. Quotation Mark ("…")
		12. Exclamation Mark (!)
		13. Apostrophe (')
		14. Hyphen (-)
		15. Dash (_)
		16. Dots/Ellipsis (…)
		17. Slash/oblique(/)
		18. Brackets/Parenthesis ()
		19. Square brackets []
	3. Letter Level (LL)	20. Capitalization
		21. Letter Size and Shape
		22. Letter Style (Normal, Italic, Bold, Cursive)
	4. Word Level (WL)	23. Spelling
		24. Vocabulary (Precise, Concise, Formal, Informal)

	5. Phrase Level (PhL)	25. Phrasal verbs
		26. Prepositional phrases
		27. Idiomatic expressions
		28. Chunks
	6. Sentence Level (SL)	29. Grammar (Tense, Sub-verb agreement, etc.)
		30. Clause
		31. Fragments
		32. Simple Sentence
		33. Compound Sentence
		34. Complex Sentence
		35. Run-ons
	7. Paragraph Level (PaL)	36. Single Idea
		37. Topic Sentence
		38. Supporting Details
		39. Thesis Statements
		40. Unity and Coherence
	8. Full Body Level (FBL)	41. Topic writing
		42. Content and ideas
		43. Introduction
		44. Body
		45. Conclusion

(Left column spanning all rows, vertically: **Advanced-level writing Problems**)

Source: Nepal, 2023, p. 243

Nepal (2023) synthesized these writing problems as a result of his continuous effort to identify writing problems more systematically so that the students or practitioners could easily identify their writing problems and practice accordingly. To be more specific, he classified the writing problems into eight different groups after he completed the action research in two different phases following the cyclic process of action research that consists of four steps; i.e., planning, action, observation, and reflection. In the first phase, Nepal (2023) planned to finalize the participants, data collection tools, etc. at the planning step. He engaged the participants in homework, and classwork, and provided feedback regularly following the second step – action. He checked the written texts of the participants who did their homework and classwork through observation. Finally, he

categorized the writing problems into different groups and sub-groups reflecting on observed information.

Nepal (2023) began planning the second phase standing firmly on the results of the first phase. Firstly, he designed and prepared the final list of the participants. Secondly, he administered research tools involving participants in writing practice following the basic processes of writing given in their prescribed textbooks. Thirdly, he carefully checked the written texts and analyzed the progress of the participants comparing their written texts with the texts written at the beginning of the first phase putting them into the framework of the identified eight-level writing problems. Here, one of the most considerable things is that the action research was conducted in a natural classroom setting aiming at connecting teaching and researching as a natural part of the teaching life; and this article attempts to critically examine the research findings of the action research collecting the data from the similar kind of natural classroom setting where everything was similar except the research participants. More specifically, the classroom setting for collecting the data was more similar to the end of the second phase; i.e., the end of the session in both research. Thus, this article aims to critically examine the action research findings related to eight-level writing problems putting them into practice among the different participants; but being the research context similar to the action research to a great extent.

Methodology

This research follows the features of qualitative research design like flexible process, natural setting, small participant size, and interpretive analysis as Dornyei (2007) has indicated. I collected the data in a natural classroom setting involving the students who wrote an essay in a real classroom. The research participants for this study were selected purposefully. The number of participants who attended the particular class was only thirteen; therefore, all were selected. The participants are given certain numbers instead of their real names while analyzing the data to maintain their anonymity. They were asked to write an essay about the status of English in Nepal which was given in their course and was asked even in the final examination as a long question. I asked them to write the essay freely without any hesitation and I was flexible about the time that they could submit the essay at any time during the period. Thus, the method for collecting the data was the test. I analyzed the collected information through a test comparing and contrasting the eight-level writing problems which were identified as research findings of the large-scale action research conducted by Nepal (2023). I analyzed and interpreted the data based on the writing problems faced by the participants and examined them contemplating the writing problems faced by the participants of the action research categorizing them into different themes.

Result

As mentioned in the methodology, I involved the students in writing an essay in my regular class as a classwork. All the participants wrote their essays very sincerely sitting on different benches. They did not ask any questions to each other. They submitted their answer papers before the bell rang for the next class. I collected the answer papers and analyzed them following the three stages of the coding system of qualitative research design; i.e., open, axial, and selective coding. Then, I put them into the framework of the eight-level writing problems following the same process that Nepal (2023) applied while carrying out the action research as in the following table:

Table 2

Putting the Eight-level Writing Problems Together Faced by All Participants

SN	P	Writing Problems (WP)							
		BL	DL	LL	WL	PhL	SL	PL	FBL
1	S4	Appropriate margin, unnecessary word space	Satisfactory	'Language' for 'language'	'Socity' for 'society'	-	Cannot used, 'watched' for 'watch', 'language have' for 'language has', cannot communicated, etc.	Poor in writing the essay following the norms of parts and sub-parts of an essay given in their course	Poor content and organization of the essay
2	S20	Appropriate margin, word space, and attractive handwriting	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Unnecessary use of 'you', 'their' instead of 'there', 'themself' for 'themselves', 'it's' for 'it'	-	'Future tense' instead of 'present tense', 'giving' instead of 'is giving', 'used' for 'use', 'to became' for 'to become', 'good' instead of 'is good'	No thesis statement, less cohesive, too long paragraphs	Parts and sub-parts of an essay are not maintained well
3	S24	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	'messanger' for 'messenger', 'living' for 'leaving'	Satisfactory	-	Use of 'past tense' instead of 'present tense'	Although parts of an essay are considered, sub-parts are not considered	Satisfactory contents
4	S26	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	'We' for 'I'	-	'considered' for 'consider', 'is' for 'are', 'is teach' for 'is taught', 'help' for 'helps'	Tried to write the thesis statement	Satisfactory content, tried to maintain a balance between the parts and the sub-parts of an essay

5	S36	No margin	No correct use of (.); i.e., no use of full stops!	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	-	'teaches' for 'teach'	Less cohesive writing	Poor in content and maintaining a balance between the parts and sub-parts of an essay
6	S44	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Poor vocabulary knowledge	-	'is speak' for 'is spoken', 'people wants' for 'people want'	No thesis statement	Poor content
7	S49	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	'english' for 'English'	'vellage' for 'village'	-	'have' for 'has'	Poor in writing introduction	Poor paragraph management
8	S51	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	'english' for 'English'	Satisfactory	-	'can speaks', 'can't be for 'wasn't', 'people wants' for 'people want'	Tried to maintain a balance between parts and sub-parts of an essay, but not satisfactory	Poor content
8	S51	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	'english' for 'English'	Satisfactory	-	'can speaks', 'can't be for 'wasn't', 'people wants' for 'people want'	Tried to maintain a balance between parts and sub-parts of an essay, but not satisfactory	Poor content
9	S54	No appropriate margin	Satisfactory	'english' for 'English'	'spoken' for 'speak', 'their' for 'there'	-	Wrong word order, 'are try' for 'try', 'are provide' for 'provide'	Parts and sub-parts of an essay are not maintained well	Poor content
10	S64	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	'english' for 'English'	Satisfactory	-	'people comes' instead off 'people come'	Tried to write cohesively, but not satisfactory	Poor content

11	S68	No appropriate margin	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Poor vocabulary knowledge	-	'studied' for 'study', 'people isn't' for 'people aren't'	Less cohesive	Poor content
12	S71	No appropriate margin	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	-	Satisfactory	Short paragraphs, but not well-cohesive	Poor content
13	S74	Less margin	Satisfactory	'english' for 'English'	Satisfactory	-	'are' for 'is'	Tried to maintain a balance between parts and sub-parts of an essay, but not satisfactory	Satisfactory content but less cohesive

Table 2 demonstrates the specific examples of eight-level writing problems faced by thirteen participants who wrote an essay in a natural classroom setting as their classwork. The samples of essays written by two participants (i.e., S36 and S54) are given in the appendix. The writing problems faced by the participants have been put together in the table aiming at analyzing and interpreting them more consistently and systemically. The table shows that seven participants (S20, S24, S26, S44, S49, S51, and S64) made satisfactory progress regarding the blank-level (BL) writing problems; and the rest of the six students (S4, S36, S54, S68, S71, and S74) faced some problems like inappropriate margin. The result in dot-level (DL) writing problems was more satisfactory that twelve students used the punctuation marks satisfactorily; however, one participant (S36) did not use the period (.) correctly.

The table also indicates that seven participants' (S20, S24, S26, S36, S44, S68, and S71) performance in letter-level (LL) writing problems was also found satisfactory; but other six participants (S4, S49, S51, S54, S64, and S74) committed errors in capitalization. Likewise, five participants' (S36, S51, S64, S71, and S74) progress in word-level (WL) writing problems was satisfactory; however, the rest of the eight students (S4, S20, S24, S26, S44, S49, S54, and S68) faced spelling and vocabulary problems. Very surprisingly, no problems were found in phrase-level (PhL) writing problems because they hardly used phrases in their essays.

Similarly, only one student (S71) wrote the essay satisfactorily regarding the sentence-level (SL) writing problems; and the rest of the twelve students faced various problems in the use of tense, modal verbs, concord, 'be' verbs, etc. as presented in the table. The result in paragraph-level (PL) writing was more considerable that no participants could write the essay following the parts and sub-parts of an essay; i.e., introduction (hook, background information, thesis statement), body (topic sentence, supporting details, and concluding sentence), and conclusion (restatement of the thesis, advice, insight, etc.).

The result in full body-level (FBL) writing problems was also similar to the PL to a great extent that ten participants had poor content

except three participants (S24, S26, and S74) who tried to write the essay mentioning necessary contents. Very interestingly, the result in the eight-level writing problems faced by thirteen participants of the study was identical to the findings of the twelve students who were the participants of the large-scale action research conducted by (Nepal, 2023). The results of both research regarding the eight-level writing problems have been critically discussed in the following paragraphs.

Discussion

Indeed, I was interested in carrying out research focusing on identifying the writing problems faced by my students in the real classroom setting; and I planned to conduct action research as my PhD study based on the data from students who were involved in real writing activities like class work and homework. This large-scale research itself was a result of reflecting on the findings of other small-scale research that I had conducted before I carried out the large-scale action research. As discussed in the introduction, Nepal (2007& 2014) carried out small-scale research focusing on writing problems faced by Bachelor's level students who studied at Mahendra Ratna Multiple Campus, Ilam. The major findings of the previous small-scale research laid the foundation stone for the large-scale action research; and my interest in examining eight-level writing problems; i.e., blank level, (BL), dot level (DL), letter level (LL), word level (WL), phrase level (PhL), sentence level (SL), paragraph level (PL) and full body level (FBL), which were original contributions to the field of writing problems, led me to carry out this research.

As mentioned earlier, the research context of this research was almost identical to the large-scale action research except for the participants. Most importantly, both researches aim to bring about a change in students' writing performance by involving them in a natural classroom setting at the local level. Moll & Diaz (1987) also argue that "why and how students succeed or fail are inseparable questions whose answers must be found in the social manipulation that produces educational change" (p.311). They further emphasize the importance of local setting and claim that "success or failure is in the social organization of schooling in the organization of schooling, in the organization of the experience itself" (ibid). The critical examination of research findings regarding those eight-level writing problems and putting them into practice also intends to examine the success or failure in writing practice through homework and classwork at the local level.

The participants of both researches practised writing through homework and classwork as regularly as possible. The textbooks, classroom, teacher, etc. were similar. The students' linguistic, educational, social, and cultural backgrounds were identical greatly. From the methodological perspective, both studies followed the qualitative research paradigm and the test as a data collection method. However, the specific questions asked in the test were different. The participants were selected purposefully in both studies. The data were also analyzed and interpreted following the three stages of qualitative data analysis; i.e., open, axial, and selective coding system categorizing the data into eight themes related to the eight-level writing problems faced by the participants in both studies.

The emphasis on the product rather than writing processes suggested by different scholars was also found similar in both studies. Nepal (2023) states that "many students emphasize product while writing rather than the writing processes to develop necessary writing skills" (p. 185). The paragraph-level (PL) writing problems in both studies justify this claim. The participants could easily tell the parts and sub-parts of an essay orally; however, they could not apply the knowledge of parts and sub-parts because of the dearth of writing practice following the writing processes like planning, researching, drafting, revising, and editing.

The next significant similarity between these two research is that the participants of both studies faced the SL, PL, and FBL more frequently and seriously compared to the rest of the writing problems; i.e., BL, DL, LL, WL, and PhL. The critical examination of the eight-level writing problems identified through the action research and several similarities between the results of this research and the action research justify the credibility and trustworthiness of the research findings. Moreover, the critical examination also indicates that such a comparative study between the research findings and classroom practice connects teaching and research meaningfully which has become an urgent need today primarily in the field of educational research.

Conclusion

This article critically examined the eight-level writing problems which were the findings of the previous action research putting them into practice in a real classroom setting after a year of completing the action research. The research context in both studies was identical greatly except for the participants. However, the participants of both studies faced similar kinds of writing problems; as a result, they justified the credibility and trustworthiness of the research findings. Furthermore, this article also pointed out the need for connecting the research findings with classroom practice that can bridge the gap between educational research and real classroom practice. Indeed, the need to bridge the gap has been becoming more popular due to the growing trend of connecting teaching and researching for more effective teaching and learning. This trend leads teachers to become teacher-researchers practicing the theory into practice and theorizing the practice in a cyclic way that can strengthen the teaching profession more meaningfully.

The Author

Arun Nepal, PhD is a life member of NELTA and a Reader who has been teaching English for twenty-six years at Mahendra Ratna Multiple Campus, Ilam. He has published research articles in different peer-reviewed journals. He has conducted mini-research in ELT and linguistics and completed PhD in 2023 from Tribhuvan University.

References

Chaplen, F. (1970). *Paragraph writing.* Oxford University Press.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research methodology in applied linguistics.* Oxford University Press.

Giri, A. (2010). Errors in the use of English grammar. *Journal of NELTA, 15*(1-2), 54-63.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2011). Implementation: Learning builds the bridge between research and practice. *The Learning Professional, 32*(4), 52-57.

Hoveid, M. H. (2012). Educational research and useful knowledge: Production, dissemination, reception, implementation. *European Educational Research Journal, 11*(1), 58-61.

Maharjan, L. B. (2009). Learners' errors and their evaluation. *Journal of NELTA, 14* (1-2), 71-81.

Moll, L. C., & Diaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 18*(4), 300-311.

Morley, D. (2007). *The cambridge introduction to creative writing.* Cambridge University Press.

Murray, R. (2006). *How to write a thesis.* Tata McGraw-Hill Edition.

Nepal, A. (2007). A study of some common spelling and grammatical errors in writing skill made by TU campus students. *Anweshana, 18*(5), 21-29.

Nepal, A. (2014). *Writing problems and solutions* [An unpublished Mini Research Report]. Tribhuvan University, The Research Unit, Mahendra Ratna Multiple Campus, Ilam.

Nepal, A. (2023). *Learning strategies employed by bachelor's first-year students vis-à-vis writing problems:* An action research [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Tribhuvan University, Nepal.

Oxford, R. L. (2017). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self- regulation in context* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Wallwork, A. (2011). *English for writing research papers.* Springer.

Appendix: Samples of Essays

RollNo-36
Date-2081|02|25   P-1 [36± DL]

1) Write an essay on THE Status of English in NEPAL?

Ans-) English is common language in nepal many people sp eak English nowdays English is phenomeon of history of language many people Speak english language There are two types of English which Spoken one is british english another in american english this importance is Nepal many people and students teach es the English language very indgernous in Nepal literaty of Nepal ethic and english typical language and this pronouns vocabularly Spelling words which we learn now many people speak English language their own style and In Nepal arevery common En En glish philosy philosphoy and litecure and major common english language very Nepali while talking they produce the English language

English most importance of our life language in our life nowdays the Every children can learn English language own their school in School they can teachs in english language So they can learn the english we can learn En glish language it very easay easier if we donot learn English properly it may not easier English history of literature language and we should learn the English language to so it maye become easier In our country many toursist visted in our so they have their own english language so our nepali peop le learnt English they learnt something.

English is spoken language in Nepal have own language in Nepal also many indeginco indigenous Nepal live their have own congage and religous and custom and English also spoken the language moinly people used British English are used in Nepal

Name:
RollNo: 54
Date: 2081/02/25

| S54 – | BL | LL | WL | SL | FBL |

(1) Write an essay on own the The status of English in Nepal?

⇒   The Status of English in Nepal

english language in very important of us. english language is an land lock country. There are many spoken own many countries china, india, America Africa, there they spoken own english language. In Nepal also try to be the english language. many people are be to be speaking english language.

In Nepal allover the spoken own english language. english is language is very important for our life. In Nepal also be the provide in english language. many peopl. People try to be the english language. english language is for us. english language is very important in our life. and In Nepal allover the world their are to be in english language. like a Job and school in their to be a english language. In Nepal their are many people try to be the english world. In Nepal is also provide the english world. many people are their in spoken own english world try to be a spoken.

we can be English language is our is for us. english language is very Important for us. and many people a spoken own english language. It is a provide a english in Nepal. Nepal is also provide a english world. Their are many country thy are spoken own english world. many people try to be a spoken own english world. english language is very Important for w. english is very in Nepal all over the world. english language for w. many people try to be a spoken own english language. In Nepal try to be

P-2, S54

Spoken own english language. english language is benifited for us. most of people to be a english world. Hers are many country try to be the spoken own english language. many country try to be english world. and their are promotive promote be a life. english world try to be a sucess and in our life. english language is very importance for our life. We can provide the english world. and many people can be the english World. In Nepal also provide the english language. many people try to be english language. english elanguage is importance for our life. every people are try to be a english world. In other country like to be, America, canada, Africa, Japan, an other country are also provide the english world. In nepal are also provide the english World. The status of english in Nepal. In all over the world try to be english language. In Nepal are also spoken own english language. english language is importane o for our ous. english language is an very importance for our life. and every people try to be a english world. and many people are promot promotive and many people try to be english world. english language is are spoken own every people try to be spoken own english language.