

## Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences Review (JERSSR)

### Analyzing the Errors in Personal Writing Recount of Non-Major and Major English Students

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. <b>Asma Shahzad</b>  | MPhil Scholar, Department of English, University of Sargodha   |
| 2. <b>Azhar Pervaiz</b> | Associate Professor, Department of English Language & Linguistics, University of Sargodha Email: <a href="mailto:azhar.pervaiz@uos.edu.pk">azhar.pervaiz@uos.edu.pk</a>  |
| 3. <b>Aleena Rehman</b> | Lecturer in English (Visiting), Department of English, University of Sargodha Email: <a href="mailto:aleenarehman35@gmail.com">aleenarehman35@gmail.com</a> / MPhil Scholar, Department of English, University of Sargodha |

#### Abstract



*The present research focuses on two aspects; one is the types and percentages of errors that students make in writing recount text in comparison with Major English and Non-Major English students. Secondly, the researcher analyzes the student's beliefs about problems and errors in writing in a second language. Here in this research, the researcher's primary focus is on the types and percentages of errors that students make in using the second language concerning error analysis (Surface Strategy taxonomy). In this research, the instrument is a test item managed for two motives. The first one is a written recount text and the second one is a questionnaire to analyze students' perceptions and beliefs. To achieve this purpose, the elicitation method is adopted. The population of this research consists of Major English and Non-Major English students. The work utilizes a random probability sampling design to collect data from students. The subject of this work is 100 students from the University of Sargodha. The findings have been processed through SPSS software. From this research, it can be deduced that students have confusion in writing well-formed sentences because of misformation and omission errors usually found in the first two ranks and addition and misordering in the last two. Based on the findings, suggestions for the teachers and students are given. The findings of the study are expected to assist theoretically and practically to the readers and researchers.*

**Keywords:** Error Analysis, Recount Text, Surface Strategy taxonomy, Elicitation Method, Perceptions.

#### Introduction

The idea of human reliance on language is clearly articulated by Shams-i-Tabrīzī, who suggests that humans are greatly influenced by language, with many worldly issues stemming from linguistic errors and misunderstandings. According to Anderson and Anderson (1997), recount texts involve the retelling of past events in a logical sequence without confusion. These texts typically begin with an introduction that sets the context and may include an appraisal or realignment towards the conclusion. The sequential presentation of events is crucial, providing a clear account of past occurrences within their contextual framework. The final stage involves redirection, often featuring a concluding passage that either directly quotes from actual events or reflects the author's personal opinions and reactions to the narrative.

The transfer of concepts from a first language to a foreign language poses a significant challenge, influenced by various factors such as individual differences, age, and skill level. The importance of errors made by learners, as highlighted by Brown (2000), serves as evidence of how language acquisition occurs. Understanding the approaches and strategies employed by students in language learning is crucial. The concept of "inter-language," introduced by Larry Selinker, suggests that the acquisition of a foreign language reflects a systematic psychological organization of Second Language (L2) knowledge.

The research aims to enhance individuals' understanding of error analysis in English as a second language, given the significance of English as a lingua franca, particularly in Pakistan. Drawing on Corder's (1981) distinction between language analysis and contrastive linguistics, the study focuses on error analysis, transfer analysis, and contrastive analysis. It underscores how

bilinguals often rely on their native language, both as a learning aid and a source of errors. By examining recount writing in English as a second language, the research offers insights for learners, particularly in Pakistan, facilitating systematic English learning and error correction. Emphasizing the influence of the first language on second language writing, especially in terms of surface-level errors, the study explores lexical, grammatical, and syntactic mistakes, as well as gender differences among university students in Pakistan, including English majors and non-majors. It investigates the impact of the first language on writing and the types and percentage of errors made, alongside students' perceptions of language learning challenges.

### **Research Objectives**

The objectives of the present research are to:

- i. Find out the types and percentage of errors that the students make in using the second language.
- ii. Find out the significant differences in the perceptions of major English and non-English students about errors on the basis of gender.

### **Research Questions**

This research deals with the following research questions:

- i. What are the types and percentage of errors that the students make in using L2?
- ii. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of major English and non-English students about errors on the basis of gender.

### **Literature Review**

The idea of “language transfer” was first given by Lado (1957) in his course work *Linguistics Across Cultures*, in his work, he referred that in the case of second language acquisition, individuals are based on their first language (native), In addition to this they plan to transfer the forms, meanings and the classification of all mentioned before in first language and culture in second language acquisition (p.2).

Ellis (2009) delineates transfer as “a supposition that the studying of one task, A will have some aftermath in the learning of task B”, who had favoured that language transfer was possibly the most predominant term not only in the theory of education but also in the case of practice.

We suppose that the students who have to deal with a foreign language will feel some characteristics of it simple and uncomplicated but will find some very disturbing and arduous. The one that he is familiar with because that is like his native language will be easy for him to understand and on the other hand, the new one will be laborious to handle. The teacher who had given time or worked in analysing the foreign language along with the native language of the students has a better understanding of what problems learners faces while learning and can provide one step ahead and greater solutions for teaching those learners (Lado, 1957).

Brown (2000) points out that a learner’s fallacy plays a vital role in providing to the investigator verification of how language is grasped or acquired, what plans are carried out by the learner in the realization and learning of the language. Then error analysis has two tasks one is theoretical and the other is the practical view. The theoretical aspect is the part of the procedure that deals with the learning of language. By investigating language learning, it can better describe the learner’s knowledge of the language under study at any moment in their learning so they can connect this understanding to the teaching they have been getting.

As Hapsari (2011), proclaims that writing is commonly the most arduous of the four skills. The difficulty is most commonly seen in creating and arranging ideas which is finished by the proficiency of the different aspects of writing for instance grammar, spelling, word choice, vocabulary, punctuation, and much more, so in the process of learning, the students rarely make mistakes when they work or utilize English.

Apart from this, Koban (2011) investigated lexical errors and also grammatical errors of Turkish ESL learners utilizing 17 compositions. She concluded that prepositional related, verb, tense, and punctuation errors mostly are because of intra-lingual transfer, on the other hand, lexical errors and failures in word arrangement appear due to L1 intervention.

Ababneh (2017) studied particularly EFL writing problems that 50 students that are only females and are Saudi students came across at the Tabuk (university). In this research, all the errors were categorized. All the errors are divided into four prominent classes: the first one is grammatical, the second one is syntactic, the third one is substance error, and the last one is lexical ones. In this, the

commonly occurring types of errors are presented. Such as classification of grammar as in grammar there are tenses, verbs, and use of singular, plural, use of suitable articles. In syntax, there is SV agreement and in the end, there are spelling errors.

Ibnian (2017) investigated the hardships that university students come across during writing. The experiment includes students that have English as a major subject and the total sample is 82. They are from the University of World Islamic Sciences and Education that is in Jordan. All the results show that not having enough ideas was a major reason prominent factor behind these difficulties. Not only this but the wrong use of the procedure of writing. 'Not having enough knowledge of good evaluation. On the third rank, there are all the instruments, scales, and marking plan'. "Time restriction" is on the fourth level. On the fifth level, there are inappropriate techniques such as teaching writing' and 'vocabulary limitations. While on seventh and eighth there is 'improper topic ' and 'lack of consulting issues. On the ninth and tenth, there is ' Grammar, tense difficulties' and 'lack of teacher's aide'.

Some researchers point out the interference errors that were made by Turkish EFL learners. In research by Kırkgöz (2010), it is examined that EFL learners make inter-lingual errors more than intra-lingual errors. By studying 120 formats that were made by EFL learners, Kırkgöz (2010) infer that beginners who are at the start of their language learning procedure spontaneously make more mistakes than the ones who are at the higher levels of language learning reason behind is negative transfer. She delineates errors like grammar, preposition, punctuation, and technical language under the subject of inter-lingual errors and errors such as excessively generalized, using articles inappropriately, and spelling comes under intra-lingual errors.

In another study i.e. Error Analysis of Turkish Learners' Text of English from Lexical and Grammatical view by Ayar (2020), the group at A1 proficiency level was chosen with favourable sampling to show the most usual error types. Therefore, take-home papers gathered in the third week of the program were studied at five successive stages persisted by a sample constructed by Ellis (1997) to recognize written errors. In the procedure exploration and survey, grammatical errors were placed into verb related errors, while prepositions, articles, errors like spelling / punctuation / capitalization, word categorization, possessives, use of language zone, and subject-verb agreement respecting Alasfour's (2018), Following Diaz-Negrillo and Fernández-Domínguez's (2006) ICLE/Louvain and Dulay et al. (1982) error taxonomies, lexical errors were conventionally classified as interlingual and intralingual errors

### **Methodology**

This section outlines the research methodology employed for analysing students' writing of recount texts and their beliefs regarding writing in English as a second language. The research utilizes a mixed-method approach, combining quantitative and qualitative techniques to comprehensively examine writing issues. The research questionnaire, adapted from prior studies, addresses various writing errors and perceptions. Descriptive qualitative methods are employed to analyze errors based on surface structure taxonomy. Data collection involves an elicitation method, comprising four steps: soliciting written recount texts, reading and analysing the data, categorizing errors, and discussing findings and recommendations for teachers and students.

The research employs Krashen and Dulay's Surface Structure Taxonomy to analyse errors in students' writing of recount texts in English as a second language. Errors are classified into omission, addition, misformation, and disorder categories. Omission errors occur when necessary grammatical items are absent, while addition errors involve the inclusion of unnecessary linguistic items. Misformation errors arise from the incorrect use of morphemes or structures, and misordering errors occur due to the incorrect positioning of morphemes. These errors are identified and categorized to understand students' writing challenges. In the quantitative aspect of the research, a Likert scale is used to assess writing issues, with statistical analysis conducted using SPSS-23 software to determine mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and reliability. This approach provides insights into the frequency and nature of writing issues faced by students.

The research population consists of undergraduate students at the University of Sargodha, aged 19-24, enrolled in BS programs across semesters 1-4. Purposive sampling is employed to select participants based on the researcher's judgment. A total of 100 participants are chosen, with 50 each from the English department and the Mass Communication and Media Studies department. Data collection involves face-to-face interaction and questionnaire administration. The duration for

completing the subjective questionnaire varies between 45 minutes for non-English department students and 20 minutes for English department students. While the sample represents a specific subset of students, it may not be fully representative of the entire English department or students from other departments studying English as a minor subject at the University of Sargodha.

**Table: 1** *Department and Participants*

<b>Name of department</b>	<b>Number of Participants</b>
Department of English	50
Department of Mass. Com and Media Studies	50
Total	100

**Variables**

For quantitative analysis, variables include poor organization or illogical sequence, word choice issues, grammatical errors, spelling problems, confusion regarding supporting ideas, punctuation issues, and capitalization. These variables reflect students' perceptions of writing challenges when transitioning from their native language to English as a second language. Independent variables in the research questionnaire include gender and English and Non-English departments, while dependent variables comprise the questions (perceptions) selected for the research.

In qualitative research, variables selected based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy include grammatical errors, omission, blending, addition errors, and misinformation errors by students. These serve as dependent variables, while the independent variables are English and Non-English departments. However, due to the subjective nature of responses to a paragraph prompt about personal experiences during the COVID-19 era, analysing misinformation errors proves challenging.

The research utilizes a questionnaire as the primary tool for data collection, tailored to the study's methodology and objectives. The questionnaire assesses students' perceptions of writing issues and includes around 18 questions covering various aspects of writing in English as a second language, from spelling to coherence. Additionally, a subjective question prompts students to write a paragraph, analysed using surface structure taxonomy. Quantitative data recorded via questionnaires is analysed using SPSS-23 software, with analysis tables included in the thesis appendix. A written recall narrative assesses language proficiency, particularly in English, providing insights into grammatical errors and first language transfer. SPSS-23 software is utilized for analysis, applying tests such as frequency, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation to the collected data.

**Analysis and Discussion**

**English Department: Errors**

**Table 2** *Descriptive Statistics of English Department Errors*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Sum</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Article errors	50	9	.18
Punctuation Errors	50	35	.70
Subject-Verb agreement errors	50	6	.12
ed errors	50	33	.66
to /be error	50	7	.14
pronoun errors	50	10	.20
lexical error	50	54	1.08
Conjunction error	50	7	.14
singular plural errors	50	11	.22
Syntax errors i.e. misinformation	50	147	2.94
Valid N (list wise)	50		

This table represents the sum and means of error type of major English Students. First one is article errors. The sum of this error is 9 and the mean of this type is .18. The second one is punctuation errors. The sum of this error is 35 and the mean of this type is .70. The third one is Subject-Verb agreement errors. The sum of this error is 6 and the mean of this type is .12. The fourth one is ed errors. The sum of this error is 6 and the mean of this type is .12. The fifth one is to/be errors. The sum of this error is 7 and the mean of this type is .14. The sixth one is pronoun errors. The sum of this error is 10 and the mean of this type is .20. The seventh one is lexical errors. The sum of this error is 54 and the mean of this type is 1.08. The eighth one is conjunction errors. The sum of this error is 7 and the mean of this type is 0.14. The ninth one is singular/plural errors. The sum of this error is 11 and the mean of this type is 0.22. The tenth one is Syntax errors i.e. misinformation. The sum of this error is 147 and the mean of this type is 2.94.

**Non-English Department: Errors**

**Table 3** *Descriptive Statistics of Non-English Department Errors*

	N	Sum	Mean
Article errors	50	53	1.06
Punctuation Errors	50	51	1.02
Subject-Verb agreement errors	50	37	.74
ed errors	50	66	1.32
to /be error	50	31	.62
pronoun errors	50	38	.76
lexical error	50	54	1.08
Conjunction error	50	31	.62
singular plural errors	50	57	1.14
Syntax errors i.e. Misformation	50	169	3.38
Valid N (list wise)	50		

This table represents the sum and means of error type of Non-major English Students. First one is article errors. The sum of this error is 53 and the mean of this type is 1.06. The second one is punctuation errors. The sum of this error is 51 and the mean of this type is 1.02. The third one is Subject-Verb agreement errors. The sum of this error is 37 and the mean of this type is 0.74. The fourth one is ed errors. The sum of this error is 66 and the mean of this type is 1.32. The fifth one is to/be errors. The sum of this error is 31 and the mean of this type is 0.61. The sixth one is pronoun errors. The sum of this error is 38 and the mean of this type is 0.76. The seventh one is lexical errors. The sum of this error is 54 and the mean of this type is 1.08. The eighth one is conjunction errors. The sum of this error is 31 and the mean of this type is 0.62. The ninth one is singular/plural errors. The sum of this error is 57 and the mean of this type is 1.14. The tenth one is Syntax errors i.e. misformation. The sum of this error is 169 and the mean of this type is 3.38.

**English Department: Errors Percentage Analysis**

**Table 4** *Percentage Analysis of Errors: English Department*

Types	Percentage
Article errors	4.37 %
Punctuation Errors	10.68 %
Subject-Verb agreement	1.94 %
ed errors	6.80 %
to /be error	3.40 %
pronoun errors	3.40 %
lexical error	12.62 %
Conjunction error	2.91 %
singular plural errors	1.94 %
Syntax errors i.e. misformation	51.94 %

This table shows that there are 10 types of errors identified from Surface Strategy Taxonomy. Syntax errors (misformation) show the highest percentage of errors which is 51.94%. After that there is type of lexical errors which is 12.62%. The third type of errors is punctuation errors which is 10.68%. The fourth type of error is ed errors which is 6.80%. The fifth type of errors is article errors which is 4.37%. The sixth type of errors is pronoun errors which is 3.40 %. The seventh type of errors is to/be errors which is 3.40 %. The eighth type of error is conjunction errors which is 2.91 %. The ninth type of error is singular plural errors which is 1.94%. The tenth type of errors is subject verb agreement errors which is 1.94%.

**Table 5 Non-English Department: Errors Percentage Analysis**

*Percentage Analysis of Errors: Non-English Department*

Types	Percentage
<b>Article errors</b>	12.90 %
<b>Punctuation Errors</b>	7.79 %
<b>Subject Verb agreement</b>	8.27 %
<b>ed errors</b>	9.49 %
<b>to /be error</b>	4.38 %
<b>pronoun errors</b>	0.24 %
<b>lexical error</b>	13.14 %
<b>Conjunction error</b>	4.87 %
<b>singular plural errors</b>	8.76 %

<b>Syntax errors i.e. misformation</b>	29.93 %
--	---------

This table shows that there are 10 types of errors identified from Surface Strategy Taxonomy. Syntax errors (misformation) show the highest percentage of errors which is 29.93%. After that there is type of lexical errors which is 13.14%. The third type of errors is punctuation errors which is 7.79%. The fourth type of error is -ed errors which is 9.49%. The fifth type of errors is article errors which is 12.90%. The sixth type of errors is pronoun errors which is 3.40 %. The seventh type of errors is to/be errors which is 4.38 %. The eighth type of error is conjunction errors which is 4.87 %. The ninth type of errors is singular plural errors which is 8.76%. The tenth type of errors is subject verb agreement errors which is 8.27%.

**Table 6 English and Non-English Department: Cross Tabulation**

*Cross Tabulation of Errors: English and Non-English Department*

<b>ENGLISH</b>		<b>NON-ENGLISH</b>	
<b>Types</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Types</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Article errors	4.37 %	Article errors	12.90 %
Punctuation Errors	10.68 %	Punctuation Errors	7.79 %
Subject-Verb agreement	1.94 %	Subject Verb agreement	8.27 %
ed errors	6.80 %	ed errors	9.49 %
to /be error	3.40 %	to /be error	4.38 %
pronoun errors	3.40 %	pronoun errors	0.24 %
lexical error	12.62 %	lexical error	13.14 %
Conjunction error	2.91 %	Conjunction error	4.87 %
singular plural errors	1.94 %	singular plural errors	8.76 %
Syntax errors i.e. misformation	51.94 %	Syntax errors i.e. misformation	29.93 %

This shows the cross tabulation of error types of major English and non-English department. Each percentage is presented in comparison with other. The total errors committed by students of English department are 206 and the total errors by students of non-English department are 411. Percentage is according to the number of errors. So, the percentage of syntax errors of English students is 51.94% and the percentage of syntax errors of non-English students is 29.93%. After that there is type of lexical errors which is 13.14% for non-English students and 12.62% for English students. The third type of errors is punctuation errors which is 7.79% for non-English students and 10.68 for English students. The fourth type of error is ed errors which is 9.49% for non-English students and 6.80% for English students. The fifth type of errors is article errors which is 12.90% for non-English students and 4.37% for English students. The sixth type of errors is pronoun errors which is 0.24 % for non-English students and 3.40% for English students. The seventh type of errors is to/be errors which is 4.38 % for non-English students and 3.40% for English students. The eighth type of error is conjunction errors which is 4.87 % for non-English students and 2.91% for English students. The ninth type of error is singular plural errors which is 8.76% for non-English students and 1.94% for English students. The tenth type of errors is subject verb agreement errors which is 8.27% for non-English students and 1.94 % for English students.

**Section-1 Poor Organization/Illogical Sequence:**

Section one contains four questions based upon the error of poor organization skills and illogical sequence. The questions were compared and the mean, median, mode along with standard deviation obtained from the questionnaire were analysed based upon the findings of the following tables. Add the No. to all the tables

**Group Statistics based on Gender**

**Table 7 Group Statistics based on Gender: Poor Organization/ illogical sequence**

<b>Group Statistics</b>					
	gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Male	20	1.9500	.82558	.18460
	Female	30	2.0667	.63968	.11679
Q2	Male	20	2.7000	.57124	.12773
	Female	30	2.7333	.63968	.11679
Q3	Male	20	4.1500	.48936	.10942
	Female	30	3.7667	1.04000	.18988
Q4	Male	20	1.8000	.69585	.15560
	Female	30	2.0333	.88992	.16248

This Table carries out a comparison if the student responses based on gender differences. In this table, group means of male and female participants have been computed. The table displays 20 male students and 30 female students who participated in this research. The group mean of male students related to the question is 1.95 and same for the female is 2.06. The result shows that mean value of female responses is more than that of male responses. The group mean of male students related to the second question is 2.70 and for female ones it is 2.73 which shows that both the genders strongly agreed. The group mean of the third question for the responses of male students is 4.1500 that represent the disagreement while for female it is 3.7667 which fall in between neutral point and Disagree point. The Group Mean of fourth question for the responses of male students is 1.8000 while for female students it is 2.0333. The result shows that both genders are agreed with the statement of the question.

**Section-2 Problem of Word Choice**

While learning English as a second language, it is problematic for most of the Pakistani students to choose correct vocabulary in order to convey the right or intended meanings. Thus, the students were asked about the choices of words problem in the questionnaire and the data obtained are shared here to calculate the ratios as well as discuss those results.

**Group Statistics based on Gender**

**Table 8** Group Statistics based on Gender: Problem of Word Choice

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q5	Female	30	1.7667	.56832	.10376
	Male	20	1.7000	.47016	.10513
Q6	Female	30	2.0667	.58329	.10649
	Male	20	1.7500	.55012	.12301
Q7	Female	30	2.2333	.77385	.14129
	Male	20	1.9000	.71818	.16059
Q8	Female	30	2.0000	.58722	.10721
	Male	20	1.9500	.68633	.15347

The table executes a comparison of student responses based upon gender. In this table, group means of male and female participants have been computed. The composition of the table involves 20 male students and 30 female students who contributed in data collection. The group mean of the female student related to the fifth question is 1.7667 and the same for the male ones is 1.7000. The result shows that the mean value of female responses is more than that of female responses. The group mean of female students related to the sixth question is 2.0667 which is greater than that of male which is 1.7500. Thus, more female participants agreed with question than males. For the group mean of seventh question, the mean score of female is 2.2333 again greater than that of males which is 1.9000. The same evidence is there for the seventh question like that of two above. If to talk about eighth question, mean value of female participants is 2.0000 greater than that of males which is 1.9500 and thus conclude the same results.

**Section-3 Grammatical Error**

Grammatical or syntax error is another biggest issue for the students of Pakistan while learning English as a second language. As the ways acquired for teaching English as a second language in Pakistan are typically through the Grammar translation method, therefore, the students have issues while writing grammatically correct sentences. Most of the students agreed with the questionnaire stating that they do have grammatical errors in their writing. The data charts and tables given under show the ratios and frequency with which the error occurs.

**Group Statistics based on Gender.**

**Table 9** Group Statistics based on Gender: Grammatical Errors

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q9	Female	30	1.6667	.92227	.16838
	Male	20	1.6000	.94032	.21026
Q10	Female	30	1.7333	1.04826	.19139
	Male	20	1.3500	.81273	.18173
Q11	Female	30	2.1667	.83391	.15225
	Male	20	1.9500	.75915	.16975

Tables carry out a comparison of student responses based on gender. In this table, group

means of male and female have been computed. The table display 20 male students and 30 female students who participated in their research. The group means of male student related to the ninth question is 1.6000 and the same for female is 1.6667. The result shows that both genders agreed with the content of the statement. The group mean of male students related to the tenth question is 1.3500 and for female students it is 1.7333. The results indicate that participants are agreed with the statement. The group mean of eleventh question for male students is 1.9500 and for female it is 2.1667 which, similarly shows the agreed responses of both genders.

**Section-4 Spelling Problem**

As English is the second language of Pakistani students, the students of English department chose that they do face a minor issue while learning English vocabulary but round 31 agreed that they do have spelling errors in their writing.

**Group Statistics based on Gender**

**Table 10** Group Statistics based on Gender: Spelling Problem

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q12	Female	30	1.6000	.85501	.15610
	Male	20	1.5000	.82717	.18496

This Table carries out a comparison of student responses based on gender. In this table, group means of male and female have been computed. The table display 20 male students and 30 female students who participated in their research. The group means of male student related to the twelfth question is 1.6000 and the same for female is 1.5000. The result shows that both genders agreed with the content of the statement.

**Section-5 Confused On Supporting Ideas Group Statistics based on Gender.**

**Table 11** Group Statistics based on Gender: Capitalization

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q17	Female	30	4.1667	1.23409	.22531
	Male	20	4.7500	.44426	.09934
Q18	Female	30	3.7333	.86834	.15854
	Male	20	3.8500	.93330	.20869

Tables carry out a comparison of student responses based on gender. In this table, group means of male and female have been computed. The table display 20 male students and 30 female students who participated in their research. The group means of male student related to the seventeenth question is 4.7500 and the same for female is 4.1667. The result shows that both genders disagreed with the content of the statement. The group mean of male students related to the eighteenth question is 3.8500 and for female students it is 3.7333. The results indicate that participants disagreed with the statement.

**Data obtained from Non- English department students**

**Table 12 Group Statistics based on Gender**

*Group Statistics based on Gender: Poor Organization/Illogical Sequence*

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Male	17	3.059	1.0880	.2639
	Female	33	2.939	.9981	.1737
Q2	Male	17	3.235	.9701	.2353
	Female	33	2.970	.9515	.1656
Q3	Male	17	2.824	1.1851	.2874
	Female	33	3.061	1.1163	.1943
Q4	Male	17	2.294	1.3117	.3181
	Female	33	2.394	1.2485	.2173

This Table carries out a comparison if student responses based on gender differences. In this table, group means of male and female participants have been computed. The table displays 20 male students and 30 female students who participated in this research. The group mean of male students related to the question is 3.059 and same for the female is 2.939. The result shows that mean value of female responses show agreed response than that of male responses. The group mean of male students related to the second question is 3.235 and it shows somewhat neutral response and for female ones it is 2.970. The group mean of the third question for the responses of male students is 2.824 that is



between agree and neutral while for female it is 3.061 which fall in between neutral point. The Group Mean of fourth question for the responses of male students is 2.294 while for female students it is 2.394. The result shows that both genders are agreed with the statement of the question

**Section 2: Problem of Word Choice**

**Group Statistics based on Gender.**

**Table 13** Group Statistics of Problem of Word Choice

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q5	Male	17	2.647	1.1695	.2836
	Female	33	1.879	1.2185	.2121
Q6	Male	17	2.529	1.2307	.2985
	Female	33	2.091	1.3078	.2277
Q7	Male	17	2.588	1.2277	.2978
	Female	33	2.364	1.0252	.1785
Q8	Male	17	3.000	1.5000	.3638
	Female	33	2.545	1.1481	.1999

The above table executes a comparison of student responses based upon gender. In this table, group means of male and female participants have been computed. The composition of the table involves 17 male students and 33 female students who contributed in data collection. The group mean of the female student related to the fifth question is 1.879 and the same for the male ones is 2.647. The result shows that the mean value of female and male responses showed agreed response. The group mean of female students related to the sixth question is 2.091 which are greater than that of male which is 2.529. Thus female and male participants agreed with questions. For the group mean of seventh question, the mean score of female is 2.364 and that of males which is 2.588 and it shows agreed response. The same evidence is there for the seventh question like that of two above. If to talk about eighth question, mean value of female participants is 2.545 and that of males which is 3.000 and thus conclude that most of the females agreed than males. Males showed neutral response.

**Section Three: Grammatical Error**

**Group Statistics based on Gender.**

**Table 14**

Group Statistics based on Gender: Grammatical Error

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q9	Male	17	2.118	1.1661	.2250
	Female	33	2.788	.9275	.2030
Q10	Male	17	3.000	1.1726	.2844
	Female	33	2.667	1.1902	.2072
Q11	Male	17	2.765	1.1472	.2782
	Female	33	2.697	1.2115	.2109

Table 14 carries out a comparison of student responses based on gender. In this table, group means of male and female have been computed. The table display 17 male students and 33 female students who participated in their research. The group means of male student related to the ninth question is 2.118 and the same for female is 2.788. The result shows that both genders agreed with the content of the statement. The group mean of male students related to the tenth question is 3.000 and for female students it is 2.667. The results indicate that female participants are agreed with the statement and male participants show neutral response. The group mean of eleventh question for male students is 2.765 and for female it is 2.697 which, similarly shows the agreed responses of both genders.

**Section 4: Spelling Problem**

**Table 15** Group Statistics based on Gender.

Group Statistics based on Gender: Spelling Problem

Group Statistics					
Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error of Mean	
Q12	Male	17	2.118	1.0537	.2556
	Female	33	2.303	1.1315	.1970
Total			2.240	1.0984	.1553

This Table carries out a comparison of student responses based on gender. In this table, group means of male and female have been computed. The table display 17 male students and 33 female students who participated in their research. The group means of male student related to the twelfth question is 2.118 and the same for female is 2.303. The result shows that both genders agreed with the content of the statement.

**Section 5: Confused On Supporting Ideas**

**Table 16** Group Statistics based on Gender: Confused on Supporting Ideas

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q13	Male	17	2.824	1.2367	.2999
	Female	33	2.667	.8539	.1486
Q14	Male	17	3.353	1.0572	.2564
	Female	33	3.030	.9180	.1598
Q15	Male	17	3.294	.9196	.2230
	Female	33	3.061	1.2232	.2129
Q16	Male	17	3.176	1.3800	.3347
	Female	33	2.727	1.0390	.1809

This Table carries out a comparison if student responses based on gender differences. In this table, group means of male and female participants have been computed. The table displays 17 male students and 33 female students who participated in this research. The group mean of male students related to the thirteenth question is 2.824 and same for the female is 2.667. The result shows that the mean value of female and male responses show agreed response. The group mean of male students related to the fourteenth question is 3.353 and for female ones it is 3.030 which show that both genders move towards neutral response. The group mean of the fifteenth question for the responses of male students is 3.294 that represent the disagreement while for female it is 3.061 which fall in between neutral point. The Group Mean of sixteenth question for the responses of male students is 3.176 while for female students it is 2.727. The result shows that female genders are agreed with the statement of the question while male gender showed neutral response.

**Section 6: Capitalization**

**Table 17** Group Statistics based on Gender: Capitalization

No	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q17	Male	17	2.647	1.3666	.3315
	Female	33	3.333	1.2162	.2117
Q18	Male	17	2.824	1.3339	.3235
	Female	33	2.970	1.1588	.2017

Tables carry out a comparison of student responses based on gender. In this table, group means of male and female have been computed. The table display 17 male students and 33 female students who participated in their research. The group means of male student related to the seventeenth question is 2.647 and the same for female is 3.333. The result shows that males showed agreed response and female showed neutral response. The group mean of male students related to the eighteenth question is 2.824 and for female students it is 2.970. The results indicate that participants agreed with the statement.

**Conclusion**

The research objectives are threefold: firstly, to identify the most common areas of errors in grammar, syntax, and lexicon usage, along with their frequencies; secondly, to uncover the root causes of these errors; and thirdly, to propose effective strategies for addressing them. The study aims to conduct a needs analysis of student errors, exploring their perceptions and beliefs, to pinpoint obstacles and offer solutions. By understanding the underlying factors contributing to errors, students can grasp standardized English patterns more accurately. Teachers play a crucial role in minimizing errors and enhancing student proficiency in both writing and speaking. Analysis of data using Surface Strategy Taxonomy reveals key problematic areas such as prepositions, noun forms, tenses, and word choices, which can be addressed through effective teaching tools and methodologies. The study emphasizes the importance of creating a supportive learning environment where learners feel comfortable addressing their errors and recommends that teachers utilize advanced materials and instructional techniques to facilitate the English learning process effectively. Overall, the research contributes to

the field of language education by shedding light on common sources of errors and providing actionable findings for improvement.

The study reveals that errors classification varied among informants based on gender and department differences. Misformation and omission were the most common errors, while misordering and addition were less frequent. Notably, data were obtained from both Major and Non-Major English students, providing a comprehensive understanding. Major English students tended to make more syntax-related errors, while Non-Major English students made more lexical errors. Despite different backgrounds, both groups shared common errors, emphasizing the need for targeted improvement strategies.

The findings suggest focusing on misformation errors, subject-verb agreement, and singular/plural forms of nouns. Addressing these issues could enhance students' self-assessment and improve their English proficiency. The prevalence of errors may stem from out-dated teaching methods like the Grammar Translation Method. To keep pace with global standards, both teachers and students should adopt advanced learning techniques.

This study contributes novel insights to error analysis, offering unique perspectives on common mistakes. By incorporating writing recount data and students' beliefs, it provides a comprehensive understanding of error patterns. The research methodology allows for flexible data collection, ensuring students are adequately prepared for exams and writing competitions. Emphasizing the importance of punctuation marks is recommended to enhance written and oral communication skills.

### **Recommendations**

Further researchers can examine a Greater Number of Students: To obtain more comprehensive and trustworthy data, future researchers can incorporate additional volunteers from various universities and colleges. They can also compare Various Writing Styles: Errors in other types of writing, like essays or reports, can be examined in more detail to discover if the same error patterns recur. In addition further researchers may analyse the Impact of Instructional Approaches: how various instructional strategies or kinds of feedback will lessen students writing errors

### **References**

- Ababneh, I. (2017). Analysis of Written English: The Case of Female University Students in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 5(4), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v5i4.2264>
- Alasfour, A. (2018). *Grammatical Errors by Arabic ESL Students: An Investigation of L1 Transfer through Error Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.6436>
- Amara, M. N. (2019). Errors,s Significance And Treatment In Foreign Language Teaching. <https://doi.org/10.34277/1454-000-019-012>
- Anderson, M., & Anderson, K. (1997). Text types in English. 2 2. In *Open WorldCat*. Macmillan Education Australia. <https://www.worldcat.org/title/text-types-in-english-2/oclc/38412596>
- Ariffin, K., Darus, N. A., Abdul Halim, N., & Awang, N. A. (2021). Analysing Morphological Errors in ESL Graduating Students' Writing based on Surface Structure Taxonomy. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 42. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ijmal.v5i3.14231>
- Ayar, Z. (2020). Error Analysis of Turkish Learners' English Paragraphs from Lexical and Grammatical Aspects. In *ELT Research Journal*. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1372135>
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (Vol. 4). New York: Longman.
- Cook, V. J. (1991). The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument and multicompetence. *Interlanguage studies bulletin (Utrecht)*, 7(2), 103-117.
- Correlation in SPSS - Statistics Solutions*. (2009, March 16). Statistics Solutions. <https://www.statisticssolutions.com/correlation-in-spss/>
- Covariance (Statistics) - Quick Introduction*. (n.d.). Retrieved September 12, 2022, from <https://www.spss-tutorials.com/covariance-what-is-it/>
- Crystal, D. (1987). Towards a 'bucket'theory of language disability: Taking account of interaction between linguistic levels. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 1(1), 7-22.
- Díaz-Negrillo, A., & Domínguez, J. F. (2006). ERROR TAGGING SYSTEMS FOR LEARNER CORPORA. *Undefined*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ERROR-TAGGING->

- SYSTEMS-FOR-LEARNER-CORPORA-D%C3%ADaz-Negrillo-Dom%C3%ADnguez/11fb64f6928d1101819aa5a58e0a5e353e5287fd
- Dulay, H. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016.
- Dulay, H. C., Burt, M. K., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language two*. In *Open WorldCat*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.worldcat.org/title/language-two/oclc/572229823>
- Eckman, F. R. (2008). Typological markedness and second language phonology. *Phonology and second language acquisition*, 36, 95-115.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction*. London: Longman.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 43(2), 182–201. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444809990139>
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. P. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. P. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hapsari, A. S. (2011). *THE USE OF ROUNDTABLE TECHNIQUE TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT (a Case of Grade XI Students of SMA Negeri 1 Batang in the Academic)*. <http://lib.unnes.ac.id/6829/1/7894.pdf>
- Ibnian, S. S. K. (2017). Writing Difficulties Encountered by Jordanian EFL Learners. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies*, 5(3). <https://www.ajouronline.com/index.php/AJHSS/article/view/4785>
- Jabeen, A., Kazemian, B., & Shahbaz Mustafai, M. (2015). The Role of Error Analysis in Teaching and Learning of Second and Foreign Language. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 1(2), 52. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v1i2.8189>
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. London: Longman.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2010). An analysis of written errors of Turkish adult learners of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 4352–4358. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.692>
- Koban, K. D. (2011). A Case Study of Turkish ESL Learners at LaGuardia Community College, City University of New York, NYC: Error Analysis. *Avesis.hacettepe.edu.tr*, 26. <https://avesis.hacettepe.edu.tr/yayin/efa13b36-299a-4821-9354-aa3c98644836/a-case-study-of-turkish-esl-learners-at-laguardia-communitycollege-city-university-of-new-york-nyc-error-analysis>
- Lado, R. (1957). Contrastive analysis: An overview.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan press.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2005). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511808838>
- Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). The Impact of Teacher Corrective Feedback on EFL Student Writers' Grammatical Improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), 43-49.