Teaching Writing to EFL Students through Error Analysis: A Cross-Sectional Study

By

Dr. Syed Sarwar Hussain

Associate Professor
Department of English Language
College of Language Sciences
King Saud University
Riyadh

Teaching Writing to EFL Students through Error Analysis: A Cross-Sectional Study

Syed Sarwar Hussain
Department of English Language, College of Language Sciences, King Saud University, Riyadh
Email: shussain1@ksu.edu.sa

ABSTRACT: Errors identified in English Language include, among others, grammar, punctuation, and mis-ordering. While it is not possible to correct grammatical errors instantaneously while speaking, it is quite possible in writing. This study aimed to analyze the errors that occur in English Language writing using real-time examples, according to the dictates of a cross-sectional study. To achieve the objectives of the study, one study center was randomly selected from an English language teaching center, in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Ten students and two instructors were selected from the center who participated in the study. The instructors graded and picked out errors from essays written by the students. The author also vetted the essays. Conclusively, the author noted the following errors in English Language committed by students: punctuation errors, grammatical errors, misuse, or omission of the verb '*to be*', verb conjugation and article errors. Students were unable to organize the paragraphs in their essays properly. To correct the errors mentioned above, and to write grammatically flawless English, it was suggested that content should be adjusted to encompass error analysis. This includes more lessons on the use of articles, verb conjugation, general grammar, and punctuation; and structuring and presenting of appropriate information without disordering.
Keywords: *ELT, Error Analysis, L2 Learners, Writing Skills.*

تدريس الكتابة لطلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من خلال تحليل الأخطاء: دراسة مقطعية

سيد سرور حسين

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية علوم اللغة، جامعة الملك سعود، الرياض، المملكة العربية السعودية.
البريد الإلكتروني: shussain1@ksu.edu.sa

ملخص:

تشمل الأخطاء التي تم تحديدها في اللغة الإنجليزية، من بين أمور أخرى، القواعد النحوية وعلامات الترقيم وسوء الترتيب. في حين أنه من غير الممكن تصحيح الأخطاء النحوية بشكل فوري أثناء التحدث، إلا أنه من الممكن تمامًا عند الكتابة. هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل الأخطاء التي تحدث في الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية باستخدام الأمثلة الواقعية، وفق ما تمليه الدراسة المقطعية. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة تم اختيار مركز دراسي واحد عشوائياً من أحد مراكز تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية في مدينة الرياض بالمملكة العربية السعودية. تم اختيار عشرة طلاب واثنين من المدرسين من المركز الذين شاركوا في الدراسة. قام المعلمون بتقييم الأخطاء واختيارها من المقالات التي كتبها الطلاب. قام المؤلف أيضًا بفحص المقالات. وبشكل قاطع، لاحظ المؤلف الأخطاء التالية في اللغة الإنجليزية التي يرتكبها الطلاب: أخطاء علامات الترقيم، والأخطاء النحوية، وسوء استخدام الفعل أو إغفاله، وتصريف الفعل، وأخطاء المقالة. لم يتمكن الطلاب من تنظيم الفقرات في مقالاتهم بشكل صحيح. لتصحيح الأخطاء المذكورة أعلاه، ولكتابة لغة إنجليزية خالية من العيوب نحويًا، تم اقتراح تعديل المحتوى ليشمل تحليل الأخطاء. يتضمن ذلك المزيد من الدروس حول استخدام أدوات المقالات، وتصريف الأفعال، والقواعد العامة، وعلامات الترقيم؛ وتنظيم وتقديم المعلومات المناسبة دون اضطراب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الترجمة، المراجعة التفاعلية، إعادة القراءة، التصحيح، الاختصاص.

1. INTRODUCTION

With reference to errors often committed in English writing, researchers have categorized them as grammar errors, misinformation, mis-ordering, and overgeneralization (Permatasari et al., 2018). Writing is an extremely intricate skill, and language learners are also expected to acquire a comprehensive understanding of grammatical structures and syntax to write flawless English. The written language has to be syntactically correct, cogently arranged, and lexically understandable (Ananda et al., 2014). It is, therefore, very important for language learners to learn how to write compositions accurately with confidence. It is also imperative for language teachers to address the issues related to writing and provide necessary advice to the students so as to make them better language users in writing. However, it has been variously observed by researchers that writing and phonetics (pronunciation) should not be taught separately. Correct English grammar and phonetics (pronunciation) go hand-in-hand (Al-Azzawi & Barany, 2015). The main importance in this study is given to the nature of errors the students are liable to make in addition to the techniques used by teachers in the correction of those errors. It is pertinent to make an extensive note of these facts which can help both the teacher and the taught in moving forward successfully in the teaching and learning of English language (Gilakjani & Sabouri, 2016). Research has repeatedly shown that many advanced English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners still commit language errors in writing despite years of study (Permatasari, et al., 2018; Phuket & Othman, 2015; Wee, Sim, & Jusoff, 2009). In fact, errors are the most important signals for English language development. They show which area of the language, the language learner is weak in, and their analysis helps language teachers to train him or her to make efforts to write immaculately in English.

Despite the fact that academics have consistently demonstrated that mistake correction is inefficient for developing students' writing, there is no disputing that students grow upset due to a lack of teachers' feedback. It is clear that students expect teachers to notify them of their mistakes, believing that such feedback will benefit them. As a result, proponents of error correction say that language instructors should ask pupils about their mistakes. It is also worth noting that accurate classification of learners' faults should be determined so that students can understand which areas need improvement, given that learners' errors might vary. Grammar, omission, misinformation, and mis-ordering, for example, may all result in mistakes, as discussed further in the article. It would be simpler for students to swiftly remedy their faults if teachers categorize the errors (Lee, 2020). Although studies have been conducted on learners' mistakes, the present study is unusual in

that it includes the classification of errors, which might help ESL instructors identify areas where their students need to improve. This research carefully aims to analyze the errors that occur in English Language writing using real-time examples. Furthermore, the goal of this research is to learn about the students' perspectives on correction of errors.

1.1 Study Objectives

The objective of this study is to analyze the errors that occur in English Language writing using real-time examples - a cross-sectional study. It is a form of databased investigation that examines facts and figures collected from different individuals at a single point in time (Thomas, 2023). The variables are observed without influence from the researcher. The advantage of this method of data collection and research is that it captures useful data from a specific moment in time. This data is analyzed, and inferences are made at that time, that is, it presents a snapshot of conditions of a single population at a point in time. This study aims to present reasonable examples of English Language writing transfer errors. It is aimed that this would ultimately help to recommend how English Language writing errors committed by language learners can be imbibed into the learning process. Consequently, it would help teachers identify these errors, help students avoid them, adjust, and ultimately improve their English Language writing skill proficiency.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teaching EFL

Researchers have down the years developed and implemented several effective methods for teaching English as a foreign language or as a second language. Several tried-and-tested methods have been devised and employed over the past decades for teaching English as a foreign language in countries where English is not a dominant language, and as a second language where the language is widely spoken (Sharma, 2021). These methods are listed below:

- Grammar-based orientation

- Grammar-translation method

- Communicative orientation

- Direct method

- Audio-lingual method

- Notional-functional approach

- Suggestopedia; and

- The silent way

All these methods have proven to be useful in different ways. Chang (2011) examined and elucidated the grammar-translation approach for teaching English language as well as the communicative approach. Both approaches have played a significant role in shaping English language teaching. Chang (2011) focused exclusively on these methods, and according to his study design selected two groups of English language learners. They were taught using both the grammar-translation method and the communicative method. After using the evidence available to him, and analyzing the results, he deduced that both these methods were equally advantageous for his students as used in ELT classes in Taiwan. Prior to the use of these methods in the research study, it was noted that students from both classes shared similar levels of overall English language proficiency scores before intervention. The pretest showed no difference between either class in their grammatical competence. Subsequently, one group of students was chosen as the experiment group while the other was the control group. The same content was delivered to the experimental group using the grammar-translation method and the communicative approach. The control group was taught using the prevalent method of teaching (without the structured grammar-translation method or the communicative approach). The posttest result showed that the scores of students in the experimental group were higher than those in the control group. The study also noted that the communicative approach is more particular about fluency, while the grammar-translation method emphasizes accuracy. Fluency and accuracy are the basic targets of English Language proficiency. A combination of both of these methods has proven to be effective for ELT.

2.2 Teaching Writing to EFL Learners

In their research paper, Firkins, Forey, & Sengupta (2007) elucidated the genre-based literacy pedagogy which they found suitable to be employed for second language learners of English. It blended two perspicuous teaching methodologies: genre-based and activity-based. The study, although focused on students between 11 - 18 years of age, can be applied to learners of all ages. The study team was composed of two English teachers from the school, a native English speaker, and

co-researchers from Hong Kong, China, and three others from a university in the Hong Kong region of China. Interview responses with the teachers of English language, along with classroom observation, and close examination of students' assignments presented useful insights. While teaching writing using the genre-based literacy pedagogy, the researchers focused on strategies that enhanced students' writing. The methods enabled teachers to present explicit instruction in a semantic and logical manner. This method was chosen because researchers believed that it would assist students with their cognitive organization of information. This model of teaching has proven to be successful with students from similar, non-privileged backgrounds (Firkins, Forey, & Sengupta, 2007). First, students' deficiencies were analyzed. Naturally, it was found that students had a knowledge of the generic structure of the text. They in turn, produced a text based on the generic pattern. This was the pattern of the text direction. They had always been used to following this pattern. Consequently, they were less productive because of the limitation posed by vocabulary. Hence, the new teaching method was designed to build up vocabulary along with the activity approach. The information report focused on describing sensory functions of touching, smelling, and hearing. The students were tasked with the development of a descriptive text while using these senses - smelling, touching, tasting, and hearing using relevant vocabulary.

Another method that has proven effective for teaching writing to EFL students is the modeling approach. Modeling involves demonstrating, prompting, praising, and indicating direction with instructional language. Direction-instructional approaches involve a more enhanced and careful use of structured materials. Overall, it was found that if this method was to be sufficient for students with low proficiency in English Language, it should encourage the development of themes (Saskatchewan Education, 1991). This approach enables students to organize their writing; it aids the understanding of the writing material required, based on context. Hence, it encourages joint and independent construction of text. Alternatively, different approaches can be combined, modified, and applied to create positive English Language Teaching (ELT) opportunities. Other methods also exist for teaching writing to English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students (McDonough & Shaw, 2012).

2.3 ERROR ANALYSIS

Error analysis is a branch of applied linguistics which is employed with the goal to investigate features of second language learning by compiling, studying, and analyzing errors made by second language learners. To fully understand error

analysis, the concept of interlanguage transfers must also be studied because of their close relationship (AlKhazaleh, 2021).

Alsher (2021) believed that in English as a Second Language classroom instructors were required to educate students about the intricacies of English grammar and develop their logical and analytical thinking by combining different pedagogical strategies which can draw and motivate language learners towards the learning process by becoming committed and enthusiastic learners. He stressed the need for teachers to put emphasis on the process of learning and not merely on the content, and desist from using outmoded methodologies such as, structured drills and memorization (Alsher, 2021).

In his paper on approach to critical thinking as a necessary aspect of teaching writing skills to language learners, Atkinson (1997) presented four reasons why language teachers should exercise maximum precaution in implementing critical thinking strategies in language classrooms. He held the view that critical thinking must not be based on the traditionally ambiguous teaching practice but on a distinct and ingenious teaching strategy that stimulates the learner' willingness to learn. It should be inclusive and not over simplistic while employing the analysis of a complex problem. He also laid stress on the aspect of cultural differences while teaching writing to language learners and emphasized on the employment of "*cognitive apprenticeship*" (Atkinson, 1997; 71) that focused on teaching by way of a principled approach on developing thinking ability through knowledge and understanding of the cognitive and metacognitive processes involved in language transfer.

Some academics distinguish error analysis from transfer analysis, in which the learner's data is compared to the learner's first language, whereas error analysis compares the learner's data to the target language norm and discovers and explains errors accordingly (Hussain, 2019). The method of error analysis involves the documentation of learner's language errors, focusing on their systematic violations of patterns, determining whether they are systematic and (if feasible) explaining what caused them. In the 1960s, error analysis originated as a branch of Applied Linguistics to indicate that errors made by learners reflected some universal strategies and were not just majorly influenced by learner's local language. This countered the Contrastive Analysis Theory which suggested that the learner's local language played a bigger role in errors made in second language learning. "Applied error analysis, on the other hand, is concerned with the organization of remedial courses as well as the development of appropriate materials and teaching practices

based on the findings of theoretical error analysis" (Erdogan, 2005; 263). Therefore, error analysis focuses on dealing with the difference between how people learning a language speak and how the native speakers of the language use the language. Explaining this aspect of language debility, Norrish (1983) notes that error in the use of a word, speech act, or grammatical item is a systematic linguistic aberration that takes place when a language learner fails to learn something, and constantly gets it wrong. One of the flagrant and most common error concerning the grammatical item is the common misconception among new language learners that the *to-infinitive* must be used after all base verbs and modal verbs, And, therefore, incautious learners of English language tend to erroneously use the *to-infinitive* after the modal verb '*must*', '*may*', '*can*', etc. Once students become familiar with the verbs *want* (+ *to*), *require* (+ *to*), and perhaps, *ought* (+ *to*), and with other common verbs, and base verbs with which *to-infinitive* must be used, they will be producing the correct grammatical form and continue to say or write in that manner (Norrish, 1983). Students should also be made to learn and remember that the form a foreign language takes and the target audience it addresses are completely different from those of their native language. This explained the concept of interlanguage, that is, the idea that second language learners have programmed their mentality to speak and understand the language grammar in terms of linguistic rules and principles they have been taught (Qiaolan, 2022). An example of this is, using '*must* (+ to)' until students are told otherwise, or until they realize that native speakers are not influenced by any other indigenous language and are quite unlike them in their language use.

The primary goal of error analysis is to illustrate how learning takes place by looking at the learner's output, which includes both correct and incorrect statements. Interlanguage, according to Norrish (1983), can be viewed as a restructuring or an analysis; and error analysis is widely acknowledged as a field of Applied Linguistic Science and an important concept in language acquisition. EFL students are, to a large extent, unaware of the grammar, sentence structure, spellings, rules, and principles guiding English language. The study of the learner's errors has long been interested in two basic methodologies, namely contrastive analysis, and error analysis. Errors can be classified into three major theories. They are contrastive analysis, error analysis, and interlanguage theory, and they cannot be effectively studied without addressing the concept of contrastive analysis (Karim et al., 2018). It is quite usual to commit errors in language transfer. In English Language writing, such errors include articular errors (articles), grammatical errors (grammar), negative transfer or interference of learner's first language, and

propositional errors (prepositions). These errors are discussed in the Discussion of the study.

2.4 Linking Learners' Errors, Error Correction and Error Analysis

Errors occur naturally in the language acquisition process, according to educators and experts. Teachers, linguists, and syllabus designers are all interested in learners' faults, especially those committed in writing; they divided instructors' perceptions of students' mistakes into four categories. The first set of thinking believes that the learners' mistakes reveal the instructional inadequacy (Perkinson, 1979). Another school of educators, on the other hand, sees faults as a byproduct of the imperfect world we live in (Sobahle, 1986). Errors, according to Corder (1967), are systematic, consistent, and aberrant properties of a learner's language system at a certain developmental stage.

Error correction has a dual meaning since it is sometimes made spontaneously by instructors and is occasionally made in response to a request from students to repair the incorrect component (Lee, 2004). On the one hand, it refers to the general feedback given by instructors on students' mistakes, while on the other, it refers to the corrections advised by teachers on students' errors. According to Lee (2004), the latter is a form of error feedback approach. This difference is highlighted in the present paper because it pertains to the incorrect corrections offered by instructors to students. In other words, it is the overt correcting of students' blunders (Lee, 2004). According to Didenko & Zhukova (2021), foreign language learners prefer the grammatical correction provided by instructors. Furthermore, such research suggests that students prefer instructors to correct their mistakes (Lee, 2020). There is a wide range of mistake correction choices among students. Some students like to correct them themselves, while others prefer to have it done by classmates or teachers. Omaggio (1986) defined the following categories of error corrections and the steps to be taken by instructors for their correction:

(a) Peer correction: Here instructors train students to provide corrective feedback on the scripts of their co-learners. This helps learners to work in collaboration by taking the focus away from the teacher.

(b) Teacher Correction: This way of correcting the errors depends on teachers providing learners with the most appropriate answers.

(c) Self-correction: It is the most effective method for correcting what has been written. Students accept responsibility for correcting their own mistakes.

The practice of discovering, categorizing, and systematically evaluating the unsatisfactory forms generated by a student of a foreign language is known as error analysis. This kind of analysis reveals learners' mistakes and, as a result, the level of competence they have gained. Errors are seen as an element of error analysis by researchers. As Didenko & Zhukova (2021) explain, error analysis is used to discover learners' areas of opportunity. He suggests that specific procedures be followed while analyzing mistakes. These tasks include gathering a sample of learner language, identifying mistakes, describing errors, explaining errors, and assessing errors. It encompasses not just grammatical mistakes, but also errors caused by omission, ignorance, and mis-ordering. As a result, comprehensive detection of learners' faults is possible. Furthermore, the boundary between mistake and error has been clearly highlighted here. As a result, we may more easily label the incorrect component as an error or a mistake. It becomes simpler for instructors to manage difficulties with pupils' writing if they understand which one is an error and which one is a mistake (Didenko & Zhukova (2021).

According to Ellis (2002), errors and mistakes may be determined based on the regularity with which learners substitute one for another. However, Ellis (2002) advises that if learners are observed utilizing the right form throughout their writing and then use the erroneous form at some point, it should be considered a mistake.

Muliyah et al., (2020) suggest breaking down mistakes into categories such as verb errors, omissions, misinformation, and mis-ordering. Verb mistakes, according to him, are errors involving verbs. Omission occurs when one of the items necessary for a certain speech is not stated. Misinformation is defined as replacing one grammatical structure with another, while mis-ordering is defined as putting words incorrectly. According to Bhella (1999), such compartmentalization of errors can aid in the diagnosis of learners' learning issues. The explanation of mistakes is the next step. Some mistakes are the product of learners' own rules which he imbibes from his first language, and which are not the same as English language rules (Bhella, 1999). Furthermore, certain mistakes are universal, meaning that learners prefer to replace one grammatical form for another at various stages of the language acquisition process. Overgeneralization is another mistake that students make. This inaccuracy happens as a result of the learners' learning process. Finally, error transfer always occurs along with L1 interference.

3. Research Design

For this cross-sectional study, a unique approach was utilized. One Study Center of English Language was selected. The Center focuses on teaching English Language proficiency tests tutorials to English Language learners. Such exams include International English Language Testing System (IELTS), Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT) and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). The learners usually require these professional exams for further studies, career growth and residency in a new country; one, usually where English Language is the native language - USA, UK, Canada, and Australia. Although the study center also caters to non-English Languages - Arabic and French.

To analyze the writing of incoming participants, a survey guide was distributed among them. This survey contained partly open-ended questions and an essay part which was graded by instructors at the Center for error analysis. The student participants were also observed in class without interference from the researcher. Following the collection of data, data analysis was carried out to generate meaningful inferences for the attainment of the objectives of the study.

4. Result

The data generated from the field study were analyzed. Specifically, teachers of English Language at the Center were asked to grade the assessment of students on the essay of their choice that they had chosen. Since students were studying English Language at the English specialty center, they were asked to choose from one of the following essay topics:

- Studying English Language as a Career Development Plan

- Studying English Language for Residency in a New Country

- Studying English Language for Proficiency Improvement

The aim of the researcher was not, in particular, to become aware of the motive of students for studying English Language. Rather, the motive was to assess each essay and sieve out consistent errors students make. This process, initially conducted by instructors at the Center was also vetted by the researcher. In general, the instructors gave their opinions, based on the essay the students have written, in line with the dictates of a cross-sectional study. They also provided opinions on methods they have devised in teaching English Language, with particular emphasis on the implementation of error correction that they notice in students' works.

4.1 Demographics

Because of the complexity of the survey method (the survey was required to be filled by students, as well as ELT instructors, in filling the survey, students were required to write an essay, which was then graded by instructors, this was in turn vetted by the ELT researcher), a case study technique was employed. A total number of 10 students were selected to take part in the study. Tables 1 and 2 contain information on the demographic (age) of the respondents, as well as their essay of choice. A summary of their demographic information is presented below.

- Studying English Language as a Career Development Plan

- Studying English Language for Residency in a New Country

- Studying English Language for Proficiency Improvement

Table 1: Demographic (Age) of Students and Essay of Choice

	Student 1	**Student 2**	**Student 3**	**Student 4**	**Student 5**
Age	18	32	47	21	16
Essay of choice	My Efforts towards Proficiency in English Language	My Career Goal	My Career Goal	My Plan for Residency in a New Country	My Efforts towards Proficiency in English Language

Table 2: Demographic (Age) of Students and Essay of Choice

	Student 6	**Student 7**	**Student 8**	**Student 9**	**Student 10**
Age	20	48	32	15	19
Essay of Choice	My Plan for Residency in a New Country	My Career Goal	My Career Goal	My Efforts towards Proficiency in English Language	My Plan for Residency in a New Country

In total, the students differed variably in age, and observation of the data showed that the students chose essay topics based on their ages. While the youngest, Students 1, 5 and 9 aged 18, 16 and 15 respectively studied English for proficiency purposes; the mid-range aged students, Students 4, 6 and 10 aged 21, 20

and 19 respectively studied English Language in order to move to a different country (usually, one which is more advanced). The oldest set of students, students 2, 3, 7 and 8, aged 32, 47, 48 and 32 studied English for career development purposes. As careerists at their ages, their goal of English Language study was no longer for proficiency, rather it was more ascertained and specific. Neither was it for moving to a different country. These students had families to support, and they were already settled in their home countries or countries of residence. Consequently, their aim of improving their proficiency was to attain higher career goals.

Relating the errors noted by instructors at the institute, two instructors, working together compiled the following errors according to the essays submitted by students. Tables 3 and 4 give a comprehensive list of these errors. Where students performed above average in each of the section, the boxes are marked (√), where they performed below average, the boxes are marked (X).

Table 3:   An Overview of the Errors Committed by Students in English Writing (Cross-Sectional Data)

	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4	Student 5
Adequacy of information provided	√	√	X	√	X
Grammar	X	√	√	√	X
Use of vocabulary	√	√	√	√	X
Spelling	√	√	√	√	√
Punctuation	X	√	√	√	X
Additional	This student especially used idiomatic expressions appropriately	The students mentioned that she is particular about acquiring language skills through retentive and expressive skills	This learner mentioned that he has been learning English Langue for many years, and adds that language acquisition is a skill that entails continuous error analysis	Although this learner provided adequate information and scored well in all the various aspects, his write-up was not well structed, and he did not provide an appropriate conclusion to his essay.	This writer's essay was not well structure, and was full of grammatical errors

Table 4:   An Overview of the Errors Committed by Students in English Writing (Cross-Sectional Data)

	Student 6	Student 7	Student 8	Student 9	Student 10
Adequacy of information provided	√	√	X	X	X
Grammar	X	√	√	√	X
Use of vocabulary	√	√	√	√	X
Spelling	√	√	√	√	√
Punctuation	X	√	√	√	X
Additional	This student, in particular, employed idioms in his language expression.	This student is particular about developing language skills through the component skills of English language, especially listening and speaking skills.	This student stated that he has been studying English for a long time and that language acquisition is a talent that requires constant error analysis.	Although this student presented ample information and performed well in all areas, his write-up was poorly structured, and he failed to conclude his essay appropriately.	The essay of this writer was not quite impressive. It was full of grammatical errors and not quite legible.

Errors were noted in grammatical and punctuation aspects. Some of the essays submitted did not provide adequate information on the students' goals. On a positive note, an effective use of vocabulary was noticed in the essays of all students. Some of the students were especially critical with the information they provided (Student 2 and 7). Both of these students classified the skill they were trying to acquire while learning English Language as receptive skills, listening skill and expressive skill. Conclusion of some of these essays were not up to par either.

While students provided some information on their plans (Student 4 and 9), they failed to finish well and provide conclusive information. Table 3 and 4 present a highlight of these information.

Mapping out the information relayed by the students, the author noticed the following errors which are categorized into the following subheadings.

4.2 Punctuation and Grammar

The following excerpt from student 3 and student 8 pointed out an often-made error: punctuation and grammatical errors:

"*First and Foremost, I plan of becoming a farmer, why*?"   - Student 3 and 8

Not only does this represent a punctuation error by the use of a capital (F), but there is also an omission of the 'to be' verb (have). – "*First and foremost, I have plans of becoming a farmer.*" *Why*?

Students made quite a number of mistakes in terms of verb conjugation. This was evident in the case of student 3. In grammar-translation method, as used in language-learning centers, meanings are mostly lost, or prepositions misplaced or used wrongly. It was evident in the written essays submitted by students. This, as well, was the opinion of Robertson & Jung (2006) who studied Taiwanese students' text while analyzing errors made with an aim to improve the grammar-translation method. An example of such error was found in the essay of Student 1 and 5.

Another issue of grammar is the misuse or omission of articles. This occurred with all the students. English articles (*a*, *an*, and *the*) are one of the most difficult aspects of English Language for Second Language Learners to master (Crompton, 2011). It is one of the oft-committed errors. Prepositions and verbs follow at similar percentages (Robertson & Jung, 2006).

4.3 Misinformation and Mis-ordering

In the aspect of structuring a write-up, students either provided inadequate information, or failed to structure their write-ups properly, or both (Hidayati, 2018). Conclusion of essays mostly, always, did not summarize the valid points (3, 5, 8, 9 and 10). A case of over-generalization was also noticed in the essay of Student 4 who also had issues with overgeneralization. While he made known his ideas, they were overgeneralized in that he did not in particular provide information as regards to himself. He only looked through a bigger lens. Problems were noticed in the structural representation of materials, except in the case of student 4, who expressed

herself really well. Writing is a complex adventure in the first language. It is even more so in a second language. Students have a problem ordering their information, or even determining what should be included and what should be excluded (Hidayati, 2018). This was the case with Students 3, 5, 8, 9 and 10.

Additionally, while English Language is a subject-prominent language, it is not true for many other languages. Such linguistic differences can be catered for by error analysis. Language transfer errors lead to misinformation and mis-ordering. Mis-ordering is a mistake often made by new learners of the language. Many a times, they have the words and vocabulary, however, there is a high chance that they would often order the words wrongly thereby leading to error in expression. This was the case in the essays of Student 4.

Student 4 - "*I want to develop my country. And I will cancel bad habit and character. I will life of people change. And there will be good standend eduation.*".

This can be correctly rephrased as: *I want to develop my home country. I will put an end to crimes. I will ensure people live a good life and have access to good, standard education.*

5. Discussion

The results show that students have made quite a number of mistakes in terms of verb conjugation. These results are comparable to those discovered in both ESL and EFL contexts. The observation of Muliyah et al., (2020) also illustrates the great need for mistake correction among Foreign Language (FL) students. The study shows how students or teachers, who rely on instructors' extensive corrective feedback, show a reluctance to even notice the corrections and hence continue to make the same mistakes again and again. The source of this is students' reticent attitude towards English (they study English solely because it is required in their curriculum), which often results from an uneven educational program.

Perceptions might be the outcome of how FLs are taught or assessed (that is, using form-focused, discrete-point assessments) or both. Learners understand the importance of accuracy since it helps them get a high grade on the test. It is worth noting that vivid assessments were created only to measure pupils' correctness in writing proper bits of language. Lee (2020) advocates for successful mistake correction focusing on patterns of errors, assisting trainers and students in concentrating a few main categories at a time rather than hundreds of different errors. According to a study conducted by Lee (2004), not all instructors believe

that using error codes is useful. Notifying the kinds of mistake committed is believed to provide a cue for reinforcing language learning. However, Lee (2004) is concerned that when instructors note all of the problems and code them, an essay produced by a student seems to include error codes throughout, leading to the reasonable issue of whether this can remedy the errors.

The majority of students want teachers to note their mistakes thoroughly. Perhaps such expectations and inclinations are preceded by instructors' classroom activities. Students develop such expectations as a result of their instructors' actions. Learners' expectations and preferences may emerge from earlier instructional experiences that may not always be useful for the development of writing. According to Lee (2004), if instructors fix students' faults, they will believe that teachers are entirely responsible for correcting their mistakes. In most countries, English teachers often use red pen to mark the incorrect portions of students' work. After circling, some instructors write the right version in the script. Learners have been exposed to this kind of correction from the beginning of their education. As a result, they expect their teachers to correct their mistakes.

In this setting, the present study would benefit ELT specialists, academics, and educational policymakers by providing a concentrated overview of the type of student mistakes as well as learners' perceptions. This research provides a categorized description of the most frequent mistakes made by students. Mis-ordering, overgeneralization, disinformation, and grammatical problems, such as article, preposition, pronoun, verb, and tense, are the most common. The study's results may serve as a scaffold for instructors, since identifying and rectifying these faults is their primary priority. These mistakes degrade the quality of students' writing and are sometimes caused by L1 interference and a lack of awareness of grammatical norms. As previously stated, EFL students are routinely exposed to all grammar rules by the eighth grade. As a result, it is expected that they are familiar with the rules and thus capable of producing correct writing. However, the study's findings show that students are still having difficulty producing even a single phrase (Muliyah et al., 2020).

According to the results received in this research, it is pertinent and appropriate to suggest that teachers should always adapt their teaching techniques, They may alter student expectations by reversing their classroom practice. In this context, Lee (2004) suggests that instructors abandon their get-the-job-done approach. Teachers may help students by connecting the pre- and post-writing grammar teaching, as explained. They may, for example, specify which tense

should be used for a certain piece of writing. Furthermore, class size is a significant element that complicates the correction of individual mistakes. Crompton (2011) states that teachers spend almost all of their class time lecturing about writing skills and evaluating students' writing by providing teachers' feedback, due to the large class size, which forces teachers to spend the majority of class time correcting individual students' writing assignments. It is, therefore, recommended to use online peer feedback and direct corrective feedback through the use of technology tools to minimize the time required for instructors' such activity.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, following the analysis of these errors, the relevant question that arises here is how errors can be utilized to help students achieve better proficiency. In general, researchers, and in turn language instructors, use the assessment of errors to help language comprehension and expand language knowledge. It was noticed that L1-related errors were the most common, as a result of language transfer. So, sentence structure, wrong verb forms and sentence fragments or run-offs were the constantly occurring errors. Errors in tense forms are usually expected. It requires a lot of effort for students to master tenses forms and then use them appropriately (Rahman & Ali, 2015). The instructors who participated in this study presented a validated error analysis method. They were of the opinion that instructions in language learning could rely on Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation and Evaluation (ADDIE). Hence, adjusted content on error analysis should contain more explanation on the use of, and common errors encountered in the use of grammar, articles, verbs, prepositions, structuring, punctuation, and presenting appropriate information without mis-ordering.

Reference

Al-Azzawi, M.B., & Barany, L.K.S. (2015). Teaching Pronunciation: Revisited. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ). 6*(4). 153-165. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2843935.

AlKhazaleh, B.A. (2021). Error Analysis of Writing Among Third- and Fourth-Year College EFL   Students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research, 3*(6), 1-5.

Alsher, T. (2021). Error Analysis of Written Essays: Do Private School Students Show Better EFL   Writing Performance? *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES), 7*(3). 608-629. DOI: 10.46328/ijres.1815.

Ananda, R., Gani, S., & Sahardin, R. (2014). A study of error analysis from students' sentences in writing. Studies in English Language and Education, 1(2), 81-95.

Atkinson, D. (1997). A Critical Approach to Critical Thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(1). 71-94. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587975.

Bhela, B. (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. *International Education Journal,* 1(1), 22-31. Available on https://openjournals.library.sydney.edu.au/index.php/IEJ/article/download/6747/73 92#page=26

Chang, S.-C. (2011). A Contrastive Study of Grammar Translation Method and Communicative   Approach in Teaching English Grammar. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(2). 13-24.   DOI: 10.5539/elt.v4n2p13**.**

Corder, S. (1967). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LEARNER'S ERRORS. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *5*(1-4), 161-170.

https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161

Crompton, P. (2011). Article errors in the English writing of advanced L1 Arabic learners: The role of transfer. *Asian EFL Journal, 50*, 4-35.

Didenko, I., & Zhukova, N. (2021). Teaching writing and error correction in

an English for Specific Purposes classroom in 2014-2020 in Ukraine. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, *9*(3), 363-375. Available on http://espeap.junis.ni.ac.rs/index.php/espeap/article/view/1108

Ellis, N. (2002). Frequency effects in language processing: A Review with Implications for Theories of Implicit and Explicit Language Acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *24*(2), 143-188. doi:10.1017/S0272263102002024

Erdogan, V. (2005). Contribution of Error Analysis to Foreign Language Teaching. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, *1*(2). 261-270. DOI: https://doi.org/10.17860/efd.22900.

Firkins, A., Forey, G., & Sengupta, S. (2007). Teaching writing to low proficiency EFL students. *ELT Journal*, *61*(4), 341–352. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm052.

Gilakjani, A. P., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). Learners' Listening Comprehension Difficulties in English Language Learning: A Literature Review. English Language Teaching, 9, 123-133. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n6p123

Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching Writing to EFL Learners: An Investigation of Challenges Confronted by Indonesian Teachers. *Langkawi: Journal of the Association for Arabic and English*, *4*(1), 21-31. https://doi.org/10.31332/lkw.v4i1.772.

Hussain, R.A.M., (2019). An Analysis of Undergraduate Saudi EFL Female Students' Errors in Writing English Essays. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), Special Issue: The Dynamics of EFL in Saudi Arabia*. 241-258. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/efl1.17.

Karim, A., Mohammed, A.R., Ismail, S.A., Shahed, F.H., Rahman, M.M., and Haque, M.H. (2018). Error Analysis in EFL Writing Classroom. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *8*(4). 122-138. DOI: 10.5539/ijel.v8n4p122.

Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of second language writing*, *13*(4), 285-312. Available on https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1060374304000360

Lee, I. (2020). Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*,

49, 100734. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734

McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (2012). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide*. Third Edition. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Muliyah, P., Rekha, A., & Aminatun, D. (2020). Learning from Mistakes: Students' Perception towards Teacher's Attitude in Writing Correction. *Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, *2*(1), 44-52.

Norish, J. (1983). *Language Learners and their errors. London*. Oxford: Modern English Publication.

Omaggio, A. (1986). *Teaching Language in Context: Proficiency-Oriented Instruction*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Permatasari, A. D., Wijayatiningsih, T. D., & Mulyadi, D. (2018). Error Analysis on EFL Learners' Analytical Exposition Writing. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, *1*(1), 22-30. https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v1i1.204.

Perkinson, H. J. (1979). Learning from our Mistakes. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, *36*(1), 37–57. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42575890

Phuket, P. R. N., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL Students' Errors in Writing. *Journal of Education   and   Practice*, *6*(32).   99-106. DOI: 10.14456/rjas.2016.13.

Qiaolan, G. (2022). Interlanguage and Its Implications to Second Language Teaching and Learning. *Pacific International Journal*, *5*(4), 08-14; DOI: 10.55014/pij.v5i4.223

https://rclss.com/index.php/pij

Rahman, M. S., & Ali, MD. M. (2015). Problems in Mastering English Tense and Aspect and the Role of the Practitioners. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, *20*(4), *Ver.1*.   131-135.   DOI: 10.9790/0837-2041131135.

Robertson, P., & Jung, J. (2006). The Effect of the Use of L1 in a Multimedia Tutorial on Grammar Learning: An Error Analysis of Taiwanese Beginning EFL Learners' English Essays. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, *8*(2). Retrieved   from   http://asian-efl-journal.com/June_2006_EBook_editions.pdf#page=76.

Saskatchewan Education. (1991). Instructional Approaches: Chapter 2: Instructional Models, Strategies, Methods, And Skills. Retrieved from Uidaho.edu website: https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/cte492/Modules/M3/Methods Strategies.htm.

Sharma, L.R., (2021). *Analysis of Errors Committed by Students in Writing English Essays. - International Journal of MMC (IRJMMC), 2*(4). 27-35. DOI:https://doi.org/   10.3126/irjmmc.v2i4.41551

Sobahle, P. (1986). Error analysis and its significance for second language teaching and learning. PER LINGUAM, 2(2), 25-30. DOI:10.5785/2-2-485

Thomas, L. (2023). *Cross-Sectional Study | Definition, Uses & Examples.* Scribbr. Retrieved September 11, 2023, from https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/cross-sectional-study/

Wee, R., Sim, J., & Jusoff, K. (2009). Enhancing the quality of EAP writing through overt teaching. *English Language Teaching, 2*(3), 58-68. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v2n3p58