

ADAMA SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY UNIVERSITY



**SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)**

***ERROR ANALYSIS IN WRITTEN ENGLISH SENTENCES:
GRADE ELEVEN EFL LEARNERS RA-E MELES PREPARATORY
SCHOOL IN FOCUSS***

By:

Abadi Niguse

**AUGUST 2016
ADAMA, ETHIOPIA**

***ERROR ANALYSIS IN WRITTEN ENGLISH SENTENCES: GRADE
ELEVEN EFL LEARNERS RA-E MELES PREPARATORY SCHOOL IN
FOCUS***

By

Abadi Niguse

Supervisor: Dr.Alemu Dissasa

**A Thesis Submitted to School of Humanities and Law, Department of
English Language Graduate Program in Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)**

Adama Science and Technology University

Adama, Ethiopia

August, 2016

ERROR ANALYSIS IN WRITTEN ENGLISH SENTENCES: GRADE ELEVEN EFL LEARNERS RA-E MELES PREPARATORY SCHOOL IN FOCUS

By:

Abadi Niguse

Approved by the Examining Board

Name

Signature

Advisor

Examiner

Examiner

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this research is my original work and it has not been presented for a degree in any other university for academic credit and that all sources of information used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Abadi Niguse

Date and Signature

Acknowledgements

Several people contributed to the success of this thesis, and I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to all of them. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Alemu Disassa, my supervisor for his professional guidance and support at every step of my research work. My deep appreciation also goes to teacher Seid Shumye who let me use his personal computer .This support covers part of my financial needs that enabled me to carry out this research. I also express my thanks to all EFL teachers specifically those who helped me in editing my draft and encouraged me to continue my study by covering all my work time when I was in hard time to do my research. My warmest thanks and love also goes to my dear wife Weizero Hareya Desta, whose motivation, reassurance, patience, love and priceless support helped me a lot to complete my study. My deepest appreciation and love also goes to my family whose prayers and encouragement were the basis of my success.

Table of contents

| Contents | Page |
|--|------|
| Acknowledgements..... | i |
| Table of Contents..... | ii |
| List of Tables | iv |
| Abstract..... | v |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Statement of the Problem..... | 3 |
| 1.3. Research Questions | 5 |
| 1.4. Objectives of the Study | 5 |
| 1.4.1. General Objective..... | 5 |
| 1.4.2. Specific Objectives..... | 5 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study..... | 6 |
| 1.6 Scope of the Study..... | 6 |
| 1.7 Limitation of the Study | 6 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 7 |
| 2.1 The Definition of Errors in Language..... | 7 |
| 2.2 Distinction between Error and Mistake..... | 7 |
| 2.3 Approaches to Error Analysis in Foreign Language Teaching..... | 9 |
| 2.3.1 Contrastive Analysis..... | 9 |
| 2.3.2 Error Analysis..... | 10 |
| 2.3.3. Inter-Language Approach..... | 11 |
| 2.4 Classification of Learners' Errors in Second Language Learning..... | 12 |
| 2.5 Models for Error Analysis..... | 14 |
| 2.5.1 The Six stage Model | 14 |
| 2.5.2 Corder's Model of Error Analysis..... | 14 |
| 2.5.3 The five – Stage Model..... | 15 |
| 2.6 Implication of Error Analysis in Language Learning and Teaching..... | 16 |
| 2.7 Taxonomy of Syntactic Errors Based on Communication Effect (global /local) | 17 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2.8 Causes and Sources of Error..... | 19 |
| 2.9 Chapter summary | 20 |
| CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 22 |
| 3.1 Research Design..... | 22 |
| 3.2 Samples and Sampling Technique | 22 |
| 3.3 Instruments of Data Collection..... | 22 |
| 3.3.1 Writing Test | 23 |
| 3.3.2 Questionnaire | 23 |
| 3.4 Data Collection Procedure..... | 24 |
| 3.5. Techniques of Data Analysis..... | 25 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND DISSCUTION | 26 |
| 4.1 Results of EFL Teachers’ Close-ended Questionnaires..... | 26 |
| 4.1.1 Order of Frequently Found Errors | 26 |
| 4.1.2 Types of Frequently Found Errors (global or local) | 27 |
| 4.1.3 Possible Causes of Frequently Found Errors..... | 28 |
| 4.2 EFL Teachers’ Feedback from Open ended Questionnaires | 32 |
| 4. 3 Analysis of Students’ Test Results..... | 34 |
| 4.3.1 Analysis of Test Results in Writing Paragraphs..... | 34 |
| 4. 3.2 EFL Students’ Ability in Identifying Sentence Errors | 39 |
| 4.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 41 |
| CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION..... | 43 |
| 5.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY..... | 43 |
| 5.1.1 Frequency of Syntactic Errors Found..... | 44 |
| 5.1.2 Error Types (global or local)..... | 44 |
| 5.1.3 Possible Causes of Frequently Found Syntactic Errors..... | 45 |
| 5.1.4. Errors Frequently Committed by EFL Students When Writing Paragraphs..... | 45 |
| 5.2 CONCLUSION..... | 46 |
| 5.3 RECOMMENDATION | 48 |
| REFERENCES | 49 |
| APPENDICES | |

List of tables

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 2. 1 presents examples of errors and error types given by Richards, et al(1985.96)... | 18 |
| Table 4.1 Order of frequently found errors..... | 27 |
| Table 4.2 Types of errors according to comprehensibility in sentence (global and local) in percent..... | 28 |
| Table 4.3 Six possible causes of students' syntactic writing errors marked by the EFL | 29 |
| Table 4.4 Average score of error types recorded and their frequency of occurrences in learners' written paragraphs | 35 |
| Table 4.5 Sentence Errors detected by EFL Students | 40 |

Abstract

The prime objective of this study was to examine types of syntactic writing errors most frequently committed by learners as well as possible causes of these errors at preparatory level. To this end, the data for this research were drawn from 11 EFL teachers and 46 students. Writing test and questionnaire were used as instruments of data collection for the present study. First, the EFL learners' written productions, specifically paragraphs and sentences, were analyzed using error analysis approach to find out the most frequent syntactic errors that the EFL learners commit. The errors were identified and calculated in percentages. The results of the study indicate that the total number of errors committed by the 39 EFL students was 967 in written paragraphs. The result showed that the errors committed in the use of verb tense had the highest percentage, which accounts for 11.58% of the total errors. The second most common error was wrong use of English articles, which accounts for 10.9% of the total error. Errors of capitalization which accounts for 9.4% of the errors came as the third most common error committed by the students. Apart from this, the researcher designed erroneous English sentence to notice learners' ability in detecting types of written syntactic errors. Results displayed that run-on sentence, verb tense, and wrong uses of articles were the most difficult structural elements for EFL learners to master. Furthermore, the analysis of the data collected from EFL teachers close-ended questionnaire showed that errors related to use of active /passive form with the frequency rate of (4.27), part of speech (4.18), articles (4.09), and conjunction (4.0) mean value were more frequently committed as compared to other syntactic errors. Regarding communication effect taxonomy, a comparison of error types was made. Results indicated that of the 14 syntactic errors provided to the EFL teachers, eight errors were viewed local. Other four errors were considered global. These include verb tens, wrong word order, run-on sentence, and fragment. In connection to the sources of second language learners' syntactic writing errors, all the EFL teacher participants responded that complexity of the English language, learners' lack of knowledge about certain language structures were among the major causes of errors. The error analysis also revealed that among all given intra-lingual causes, false concept hypothesized followed by over generalization received higher percentages than others. In light of the obtained results, group of recommendations were suggested in order to help EFL teachers in their attempt to reduce the difficulties concerning writing English sentences among English learners as second language.

CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Many scholars assert that writing is a crucial component of language performances. For example, the work of Leki (2001) revealed that English writing in both educational and professional settings is increasingly important in countries of non-speakers of English. Similarly, Hedge (2001, as quoted in Dana and Ayda 2013), affirms that writing is essentially a creative process which involves students in a learning process by motivating and building their confidence to communicate and look for the best ways of self-expression. In addition Khuwaile and Alishoumali (2000:303) claim; “there is no doubt that writing is the most difficult skill foreign language learners to master. The difficult lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating these notions in to legible text”. Yet, it is very necessary to look in to the dynamics of writing and its teaching, as writing is a skill that not only is tested in every valid language examination, but also a skill that learners should possess and demonstrate in academic contexts.

Since English language serves as language of international communication and as medium of instruction in our country, English writing ability plays a significant role in the academic and professional life of students in Ethiopia. The ability to write English sentences accurately at preparatory level has become essential for their ongoing successful academic studies of foreign language students. A number of researches reveal that for students entering tertiary level, their academic success depends on their academic writing skill (Kelley 2008). In other words, academic writing skill demonstrates eligibility for higher education. According to Kelly, the quality of an individual’s written work determines his or her scholarship and acceptance in academia.

As many agree, vocabulary knowledge and reading ability alone cannot end in accurate and effective writing. Writing involves composing, developing and analyzing ideas, implying the ability to rephrase information in the form of narratives, or transforming information into new texts as in argumentative writing (Myles, 2002). Communication demands the use of words in sentences; that is the need for grammatical knowledge is also unquestionable. For example, Deborah (2008) pointed out that one of the marks of a skilled writer is the ability to use sentence structure to effectively communicate meaning.

English language proficiency enables students to critically evaluate their own texts and those of others by identifying the grammatical choices and uses authors have made and how appropriate they are for the purpose and audience of the text. Strengthening this, Derewianka (1998, as cited in Susan, 2005) states that students need to learn about grammar and sentences structure to be able to reflect on how the English language works and to be able to make choices in order to use language more effectively and appropriately. This implies that learners use different types of sentences, and varying sentence structures can make their writing style more sophisticated and help them hold reader's attention.

Although a sentence is the basic unity of both oral and written communication, some scholars state that EFL students in high school often find it difficult to construct grammatically correct and meaningful sentences. For example, Stephen (2002) claims that one area of writing that is particularly problematic for high school learners and less skilled writers is independently constructing a well formed and sensible English sentence. Individuals with writing problems may have difficulties in one or more aspects of writing skills such as proper uses of grammar, punctuations, capitalization, spelling and some of the basic and initiating aspects of writing. Of all these errors, the major error which needs especial attention is syntactic error because such errors could inhibit readers understanding and create communication breakdown (Marina and Snuviskiene (2005). Therefore, identifying and analyzing the syntactic writing errors of students' plays a big role in improving the writing skills of students.

According to Corder (1974), analyzing students' syntactic writing errors in a systematic manner can help teachers identify those areas which need remedial teaching or reinforcements. In other words, this scholar believes that error analysis can serve as a diagnostic tool in identifying students' difficulties in teaching sentence skills. Therefore, this study focuses on investigating the most frequent types of syntactic errors that preparatory students commonly commit in writing English sentences and factors that cause these errors by taking Ra-e Meles preparatory school as study site.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Several linguists and language researchers have been greatly interested to study errors committed by second language learners. It is believed that analyzing learners' error play a significant role in improving language teaching-learning process. The learners' errors are manifested in the four language skills. Compared to errors in speaking, reading and listening, errors in writing are the most intricate and most complex one. The magnitude of errors committed varies between native speakers who think in the language used and non-native speakers who think in their L1. While writing, non-native speakers have, in general, to think about all those rules they need to apply, the rules that native speakers are supposed to have self-regulated. Therefore, non-native speakers are more prone to committing errors.

Thus, it is true that writing accurately is not an easy task to perform as compared to learning other skills of English language especially for second language learners. Many foreign language learners at preparatory level experience the problems in writing accurate and complete English sentences.

According to Ronald (2014), in the tertiary level, errors made by English language learners in their productions are so frequent that they could turn heads of so many specialists and language teachers, especially those who are at the front. More noticeable are the errors observed in learner's written productions that are more eye-catching for they are considered as permanent nature of writing. These errors still exist despite the fact that the students are exposed to the language in almost all of their academic subjects. Even if sentence writing is a much desired skill in foreign language, it is often perceived as overwhelming activity mainly due to EFL learners' lack of grammatical and linguistic competency.

It is true that non-native speakers are more prone to committing errors. A large number of students in Ethiopia at grade eleven continue to fail to master the basic of the English writing especially accurate sentences even after long years of formal education. Teachers of English feel satisfied to have a student who writes correct English sentence. Students in government schools in Ethiopia start learning English from the first primary, and by the end of the secondary stage of education, students have spent more than twelve years of learning English as foreign language. At the end of this period they are expected to understand advanced English, like to write a

sentence in English using basic structures of the language. However, during the researchers' long experience as a teacher of English at government schools in Ethiopia, he has found out that majority of students at the end of their secondary cycle have great difficulties in writing with accuracy that very few of them are able to write meaning full and error free English sentence. Although they have studied English for more than eleven years and that their knowledge of grammar rules is expected to master, most of the students are still notable to write a correct sentence using adequately the basic structures of the English language they have learnt.

Writing is not only a critical language skill for EFL learners' academic achievement but also a means of developing fluency and accuracy in the area of other language components like grammar and vocabulary (Demis2012, p.2). However, the English proficiency among Ethiopian students is relatively low despite learning English for many years. Previous research works on error analysis of EFL students have revealed that their written works are full of errors. For example Dawit, T. Gebretsadik, D.(2015) have conducted a study on error analysis in essays written by graduating trainees to investigate the common errors committed by trainee teachers in writing English essays and to find out the possible causes for which they undergo the errors during writing English. The results indicate that the learners committed extensive errors in spelling, word choice, sentence fragment, verb form, errors in punctuation, and run-on sentences. In relation to this Achoea, J. E. (2013) has also conducted a study on error analysis of students 'written sentences to investigate the kinds of sentences errors non- native English learners commit. In his study, he finally concluded that the common errors students commit in writing English sentences include subject -verb disagreement, wrong use verb tenses, wrong word order, wrong use of articles, faulty parallelisms, run- on sentences, and sentence fragments were among the frequent ones. To the best of the researcher's knowledge, the studies carried out on the errors committed by Ethiopian EFL students when writing English sentences are very limited. Consequently, this study comes to shed light on the most frequent syntactic errors made by grade 11 EFL students and the potential causes of these errors at Ra-e Meles preparatory school.

To this end, the researcher addressed the following research questions.

1.3. Research questions

1. Which type of syntactic writing error is most frequently committed by grade 11 students?
2. How is the students' ability in identifying syntactic writing errors committed by others?
3. What are the causes of students' syntactic writing errors?
4. Are EFL learners' syntactic writing errors considered 'global' or 'local'?

1.4. Objectives of the study

1.4.1. General objective

The general objective of this study was to investigate English language syntactic writing errors committed by preparatory school students.

1.4.2. Specific objectives

In line with the above general objectives, this study has addressed the following specific objectives:

- Identifying English language syntactic writing errors most frequently committed by preparatory school students,
- Identifying preparatory school students' ability in detecting English language syntactic writing errors,
- Examining potential factors that can be mentioned as causes of the students' syntactic writing errors,
- Finding whether the syntactic errors are global or local?

1.5. Significance of the study

The results of this error analysis survey may benefit various bodies. For instance, there is the hope that EFL teachers and educators know the syntactic errors most frequently committed by EFL learners and make more objective decisions in adopting appropriate teaching strategies to help EFL students curb their deficiency. This can be done by identifying their students' level of syntactic knowledge and what the students need to learn. In other words, the findings of this study enable preparatory school English language teachers of the target school and other similar schools to have valuable feedback on their own teaching. The results of the current study may also help curriculum and material designers in preparing programs and instructional materials that address the real problems of students. Furthermore, the study helps students to identify their weaknesses regarding their sentence skill and take the necessary remedial actions to overcome their difficulties. Finally, the results of the current study could be used as a spring board for further researches that could be conducted in the area.

1.6 Scope of the study

This paper examined the English syntactic problems persistent in the written performance of grade eleven English language students at Ra-e Meles preparatory school in Tigray National Regional State. The study was limited to one grade level mainly due to unmanageability of the data to be analyzed. The investigation focused on students' errors in writing English sentences.

1.7 Limitation of the study

This study tried to identify the most frequently committed syntactic writing errors by preparatory school students and possible causes of such errors. It only observed syntactic errors in students' writings when answering erroneous English sentences and developed paragraphs. Other errors like pronunciations and spelling errors were not analyzed. In the present paper, the students did not differentiate between an error and a mistake as English in this country was learnt as a foreign language; therefore any deviation produced by the students was defined as an error. The second limitation was the limited number of participants that might not enhance the generalizability of the findings. The study dealt with a number of students and linguistic aspects involved in writing due to the limitations of space and time. Thirdly, since the study was conducted on governmental secondary school students whose writing competencies might be different from those in private schools, it should be noticed that the findings might not be applicable in a private school context. So, the researcher believes taking more samples from diverse sites could yield results which can be generalized to wider contexts.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to investigate EFL teachers' opinion and preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors, the researcher felt that it was helpful to examine the literature related to the topic. Hence the literature review in the current study focuses on the following areas: definitions of errors, distinction between error and mistake, general description of error theories for second/foreign language acquisition (SLA), models of error analysis, classification of errors, error correction, and sources of students' syntactic writing errors.

2.1 The Definition of Errors in Language

The term "*error*" is defined differently by many experts. These definitions contain the same meaning while the differences lie only on the ways they formulate it. Errors refer to the use of linguistic items in a way that is unacceptable to native speakers because of inappropriate use or incomplete learning (Klassen, 1991: 74). Norrish (1983) on his part postulates that errors are "a systematic deviation when a learner has not learnt something and consistently gets it wrong. "He further explained that when a learner of English as a foreign language produces an error systematically, mainly due to the learner's lack of the target language competence. Jie (2008) on his side defines error as "the linguistic phenomena deviant from the language rules and standard usages, reflecting learners' deficiency in the target language competence.

Thus it is clear from these definitions that the main point about error is "*systematic deviation*" which can be interpreted as the deviation which happens repeatedly by the L2 language learners.

2.2 Distinction between Error and Mistake

To analyze learner's difficulty in learning language in an appropriate perspective, it is crucial to make distinction between errors and mistakes which are technically two different phenomena. In this context, both Corder (1967, 1971) and James (1998) revealed criteria which distinguish the two concepts. According to these linguists, a mistake can be self-corrected, but an error cannot. Errors are not only systematic, but also likely to occur repeatedly without the learner's recognition. Hence, only the teacher or researcher would articulate them on the learners' written

work (Gass, and Selinker, 1994). Errors are lack of language competence, reflecting gaps in the learner's knowledge (Corder, 1971: 152; Brown, 1987; Ellis, 1997). Unlike errors, mistakes are unsystematic and of no pedagogical significance because they can be self-corrected, while errors cannot (Corder 1967, 1971; Ellis, 1997). Mistakes result from occasional memory lapses, physical states, and psychological conditions (Corder, 1967: 166). Simply put, learner makes a mistake, when he/she is unable to perform what he or she knows (Ellis (1997).

Gass and Selinker (1994) pointed out that errors are defined as “red flags “which provide evidence of the learner's knowledge of the second language. Moreover, Klassen (1991, as cited in Takwan B. 2013, p, 7) revealed that errors refer to the use of linguistic items in a way that is unacceptable to native speakers of the language because of inappropriate use or incomplete learning whereas a mistake is caused due to carelessness, or forgetfulness.

Permalink (2010) pointed out that ‘mistakes’ are a sure sign that learners are learning language especially second language. This statement suggests learners know a point or have used many times correctly, but somehow slip has occurred. Errors on the other hand, happened because learners do not probably know a particular point of target language.

As mentioned above, mistakes are unsystematic performance, random deviations, unrelated to any language system, and instead representing identical performance mistakes that might happen in the speech or writing of native speakers. But on the other hand, errors are regarded as the linguistic phenomenon deviant from the language rules and standard usages, reflecting learner's deficiency in language competence acquisition.

Based on the various definitions provided, the difference between these two concepts can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Errors are result of ignorance of forms, whereas, mistakes are results of stress.
- 2) Errors of a learner have a definite pattern, while mistakes don't occur in a pattern.
- 3) Errors cannot be rectified by its doer, on the other hand, mistakes can be.

And it is in this light that the researcher chose to focus on students' errors not mistakes.

2.3 Approaches to Error Analysis in Second Language Teaching

Second language teaching approaches were developed along the lines of first language acquisition theories. Studies in linguistics have focused on second language acquisition investigating how second language is acquired. In the field of second language acquisition (SLA), Contrastive Analysis (here after CA), Error Analysis and Inter-language theory have been influential approaches in dealing with L2 students' language errors.

2.3.1 Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive analysis is an approach generated from behaviorist learning theory. On the basis of contrastive analysis, applied linguists sought to use the formal distinctions between the student's native and second languages to predict errors. The basic concept behind contrastive analysis was that a structural picture of any language could be constructed that might then be applied indirect comparison with structural map of another language. In short, the assumption of CA holds that L2 would be affected by L1 (Jie, 2008). Here, language is considered as a set of habits and learning as the establishment of new habits, a view sprung from behaviorism, under which language is basically a system of habit formation.

Facts about contrastive analysis:

- Prime causes of difficulty and error in foreign language learning is interference coming from the learner's mother tongue.
- Difficulties are chiefly because of the variation between the two languages
- The greater the difference ,the more serious the learning difficulties will be
- The outcome of the comparison between the two languages are needed to predict the difficulties and errors which will occur in learning the target language
- What needs to be taught is discovered by comparing the languages and subtracting what is common to them (Corder, 1981, p.17)

This approach, however, cannot explain other error factors. Many researchers such as by Dulay and Burt (1982) support the fact that interference from L1 is not the only source of L2 learning problems. Due to its inefficiency and unreliability to pedagogical tool, CA becomes abandoned by linguists and second language teachers. However, the researcher focused on this approach is to make comparison between contrastive analysis and error analysis.

2.3.2 Error Analysis

Error analysis (here after EA) is a theory replacing the contrastive analysis. It also has a long history as far as second language acquisition is concerned. Error analysis is one of the most influential theories of second language acquisition. It is concerned with the analysis of the errors committed by second language learners by comparing the learners' acquired norms with the target language norms and explains the identified errors (James, 1988). According to Crystal (1999, p.108) Error Analysis in teaching and learning is the study of the unacceptable forms produced by someone learning a language, especially a foreign language. For James (2001, p.62) Error analysis is the study of linguistics ignorance, the investigation of what people do not know and how they attempt to cope with their ignorance. Corder (1981) explained two rationales for conducting error analysis: Theoretical reason and practical reason. In his theoretical reason, he believed that error analysis could help in the investigation of the language learning process. In this respect, methodologically, it resembles the study of the acquisition of the second language. Practically, it can guide the remedial actions that language teachers need to make so as to correct the errors for EFL learners. For example, it tells the teacher how far towards the goal the learners have progressed and what remains for them to learn (Corder, 1974: 257). It also provides insight to the teacher concerning how effective the teaching method and materials are, what the difficulties in the curriculum are and how to plan the lessons and supplementary materials.

To better understanding EFL learners' problems in composing grammatically correct sentence, Error analysis (EA) is preferable tool. Error analysis is one of the best tools of linguistic studies that mainly concentrate on the errors committed by learners. According to Zawahreh (2012), Error analysis is a tool that compares in the target language. In agreement, Richards and Schimd (2002:184-185) suggested that error analysis may be carried out in order to :identify strategies which learners' use in language learning, distinguish the causes of learner errors; offer information on common difficulties in language learning as an aid to teaching or in the preparation of teaching materials. Generally, Error analysis is crucial in the second language acquisition field because it allows the observation of actual learners' output and gives second language researchers the possibility to explain how learning progresses.

In spite of the fact that it can be considered as fundamental tool in language teaching to reorganize teachers point of view and readdress their technique for fixing the learners gaps in language competency, many significant weaknesses of error analysis have also been reported. For example Ellis (1997:73) noted that error analysis did not provide a complete picture of how learners acquire an L2, since it merely describes the learners' knowledge as a collection of errors. Jie (2008) also explained that, it was difficult to collect or access a large amount of data of learners' language. Also, EA cannot effectively describe learners' developmental stages. This is because it examines learners' errors at a single point in time and types and frequencies of learners' errors change in each acquisition phase. Moreover, it deals with only the learners' language production—speaking and writing, not their reception—listening and reading. Furthermore, it ignores where students perform correctly, and it fails to account for the strategy of avoidance. Again, since it was proposed in the 1960s, Error analysis has been criticized for being outdated theory and latter replaced by Inter-language theory (Selinker, 1992).

2.3.3. Inter-language approach

Inter-language (IL) is the term that describes the language learners' journey from their native language to acquisition of the second language. Larry Selinker, who first suggested the interlingual theory, was inspired by Corder's error analysis which attempted to examine and classify the errors of language learners. Takwan (2013) admitted "the existence of a separate linguistic system ... which results from a learner's attempted production of a target language norm". Other terms referring to language learners' language had been introduced earlier by different researchers such as 'approximate system' by Nemser (1971) and 'idiosyncratic dialects' by Corder (1971). IL refers to the study of language learners' language (Corder, 1981: 66), or the third language that is systematic and rule-governed (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 2000). It is a natural language system that can be described in terms of linguistic rules and principles (Doughty and Long, 2003). It suggests the half way position between knowing and not knowing the target language, which might be better understood as a continuum between L1 and L2 in which the learners are moving toward the state of a native speaker, but never reach it (James, 2001: 3, 7). Moreover, it may be viewed as an adaptive strategy that learners use through developmental stages toward target language proficiency.

These strategies include simplification, reduction, overgeneralization, transfer, formulaic language, omissions, substitutions, and restructurings (Selinker, 1992).

Since inter language realizes a complete shift of the focus from teaching perspective to learning perspective in SLA, it has been characterized a major approach to second language research and theory. IL, however, is not immune from criticisms. For example, IL is mostly limited to morpheme and syntax. So it fails to deal with semantic development (Ellis, 1982).

Moreover, it fails to define the concept clearly and to develop effective approaches to facilitate empirical studies (Jie, 2008, p. 40). The concept of Inter-language theory involves the following premises about second language acquisition: the learner constructs a system of abstract linguistic rules which underlies comprehension and production of the L2. This system of rule is viewed as a 'mental grammar' and is referred to as an 'Inter-language' (Avelina, A. 2013).

Based on the three error approaches reviewed, it can be concluded that Error Analysis (EA) and Inter-language (IL) have produced many benefits to the study of second language acquisition, more than Contrastive Analysis (CA). However, both EA and IL are not considered perfect theories on their own. They still fail to answer several questions concerning second language acquisition. Thus, the findings of the present study investigating EFL teachers' opinions of their students' syntactic errors, and potential causes of these errors are discussed based on Error Analysis theory.

2.4 Classification of Learners' Errors in Second Language Learning

There are several different ways in which language experts classify learner errors. One classification is errors in the taxonomy of Linguistic Category (one of four taxonomies presented by Dulay et al, 1982, p. 146) are categorized according to the level of language, namely phonology errors (pronunciation), lexical errors (vocabulary), morphological errors (morphemes), syntactic errors (grammar), and discourse errors (style). Of these errors, the present study was restricted to analysis syntactic errors.

Syntax is "the study of how words combine to form sentences and the rules, which govern the formation of sentences" (Richards et al, 1992, p. 370).

To analyze errors based on the EA approach, classification should be based on psycholinguistic causes of errors, rather than level of language, in order to be able to explain the errors. And of

course, a better understanding of the errors in the ongoing of EFL writing will ultimately enable teachers know students' area of difficulties in learning second language. Below are examples of this way of error classification. For example, James (1998, as cited in Takwan 2013, p.13) classified learners' errors into three broad categories. These include: inter-lingual, intra-lingua and induced errors. According to him, inter-lingual error refers to L1 interference. But intra-lingual error is an error that shows the gap in knowledge of the language rules.

Third category of errors is the induced errors which result more from the classroom situation than from either the students' incomplete competence in English grammar (intra-lingual errors) or first language interference (inter-lingual errors) (Stenson, 1983, p, 256). These kind of errors are: material induced errors, the teacher talk induced errors, exercise based induced errors, errors induced by pedagogical priorities and look up errors.

Other scholars, Richards and Simson (1974) indicate errors based on seven sources. The first one is language transfer to which one third of the deviant sentences from second language learners could be attributed (George, 1971). The second is Intra-lingual. In 1970, Richards exposed four types and causes for intra-lingual errors. The first one is overgeneralization error which is associated with redundancy reduction. It covers instances where the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structures in the target language. Ellis (2004:89) pointed out that over generalization always indicates the ignorance of rule restrictions of lexis or other linguistic items. For instance, using the '-ed/d' suffixes to indicate past tense for verbs like "go", "eat", "cut", and "think". Ignorance of rule restrictions closely related to the generalization of deviant structures, is failure to observe the restrictions of existing structures, that is, application of rules to contexts where they do not apply like as in **I made him to do it**, In this example given the learner ignores restrictions on the distribution of '**the verb make**'. Incomplete application of rules, and semantic errors such as building false concepts hypothesized are also intra lingual errors. The false concept hypothesized error happens due to faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language. Poor teaching technique sometimes create this faulty comprehension. For example, in the teaching of the present tense, the teacher usually starts with teaching of verb to be (is, am, are then teaching other verbs). If the teacher presents the items poorly, the learner may have a false conclusion (is, am, and are) are the signs of present

activities. As a result the learner may produce sentences such as: **“My little brother is eats banana” for “My little brother eats banana.” and “They are write the report.” for “They write the report.”**(Abisamra2003, p.16).

The third source, socio linguistic situations involves motivation (instrumental or integrative) and settings for language learning. The remaining four sources include modality of exposure to the target language and modality of production, age, universal hierarchy of difficulty and successions of approximate systems.

Selinker (1972) in Richards, 1974, p, 37) on his side categories errors based on five different sources. These are language transfer, transfer of learning, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and over generalization of target language linguistic material.

As indicated in the above discussion, errors are classified into various types and in various ways according to their psychological causes or sources. From the classifications mentioned above, it can be concluded that the errors can be categorized into two major domains: inter-lingual and intra-lingual errors. The inter-lingual errors are caused by the interference of the learner’s native language when learning second language whereas intra-lingual errors are caused by the student’s efforts to learn the foreign language.

2.5 Models for Error Analysis

2.5.1 The six stage model

Gass & Selinker (2008:103) suggested the following six steps in conducting error analysis:

These include collecting data, identifying errors, classifying errors, and quantifying errors analyzing sources of errors, and remediating for errors

2.5.2 Corder’s Model of Error Analysis

Pit Corder’s (1967, 1974, and 1981, as quoted in Takwan 2013) more ever suggested model of error analysis phased in three steps .These are

- (1) Identifying learner errors: One has to identify idiosyncrasy and produce a reconstructed sentence, identical to that of a native speaker. Simply put at the end of this stage, there are two sentences which by definition have the same meaning. One is the idiosyncratic sentence, the other a well formed sentence or a translation equivalent.
- (2) Describing learner errors. The two languages are described in terms of a common set of categories and relations.
- (3) **Explaining learners' errors.** Once a researcher has identified systematically sample of learner language, he/she thinks of what might have caused those errors.

Brown (1994, pp.207-211) and Ellis (1994, PP.15-20) gave practical advice and provide clear examples of how to analysis students' errors. The initial step requires the selection of corpus of language followed by the identification of errors. The errors are then classified .The next step, after giving a grammatical analysis of each error, demands an explanation of different types of errors.

2 .5.3 the five – stage model

Ellis and Barkhuizen, (2005) on their part pointed out procedures for error analysis in second language acquisition. Their summaries of stages on how to make a successful analysis related to errors committed by foreign language learners include:

1. Collect learners' sample written work
2. Identify grammatical errors of the samples collected
3. Record error frequencies
4. Explain why the errors have been committed
5. Evaluate the errors to determine how much they deviate from the target language norms; to what extent they affect communication.

After having reviewed the literature concerned about models for error analysis in this study, it can be concluded that so as to analyze EFL written production errors the error must be clearly identified, thoroughly described, and completely categorized. Next, it can be explained evaluated based on error theories. This knowledge of error analysis steps facilitated the construction of survey questionnaire and discussion of the findings. All These models of error analysis provided clear insights of how to identify and analyze learners' errors.

Having all these models in mind, the researcher adopted the steps by Coder (1981) to analyze the data for the current study. This was utilized in order to have a thorough identification, categorization and analysis of students' syntactic errors. The initial step requires the selection of a corpus of language followed by the identification of errors. The errors are then classified. The next step after giving grammatical analysis of each error, demands an explanation of different types of errors. In general, this research recorded the errors in each category and ranked them based on their frequency and the reason for each error was explained.

2.6 Implication of error analysis in language learning and teaching

Educating students on the sources of errors can help them realize that although errors are not viewed positively and sometimes hinder communication, they can facilitate foreign language learning at large. Errors also play a crucial role in training teachers what needs to be taught. Thus, it is seen that the analysis of errors EFL writers make are significant in a number of respects. Evidence of the growing importance of error analysis becomes increasingly posted by several linguists. For example, pit Corder (1981) mentions the most obvious practical use of analysis of errors. According to the same scholar, errors (a) tell the teacher how the learner is progressing towards his or her language goal, (b) Provide the learners with an opportunity to test their second language hypotheses and (c) put the researcher with the evidence of strategies or procedures the learner uses in language learning. Brown (1994:205) on his side agrees that errors reflect the inter-language competence of the learner. Far from being unwanted forms, Edge (1989) points out that errors children make when learning their first language are sings of positive development, could indicate acquisition of language rules. This can also be reflected among adults learning a second language. When a learner makes errors such as:

- a) The man cuted the tree yesterday.
- b) I writed the letter and posted it immediately.

This kind of error can be an indication of

1. What and how much the learner has acquired specific language rules; in this case the learner knows that to form the simple past tense , he or she must add' -ed/d to the verb.
2. What and how much is still the learner learn; that some verbs have irregular past /verbs do not take – ed/d to make their past forms.

3. For the teacher, such evidence of the learner's progress is essential. During the execution of lessons and the subsequent post- lessons analysis, teachers can assess acquired part of the language and yet- to be acquired as of their students ' competence and thus tailor the lesson material and processing planning sub sequent lessons.

Error analysis is highly related to the study of error treatment in language teaching currently. It is particularly relevant for focus on form of teaching methodology. James (1998) viewed, "EA develop out of the belief that errors indicate the learner's stage of language learning and acquisition. He further explains errors are considered to be evidence of the learner's strategy as he builds competence in the target language. According him, these errors are defined as global which inhibit understanding and local errors which do not interfere with communication."

Error analysis has become an interesting task of the teachers' teaching writing skills as it is especially providing an alternative strategy based on the needs analysis carried out by observing the learner's deviated errors, in order to put it on a right track. Thus, researchers and teachers of foreign language came to realize that the errors a learner made in the process of constructing new system of language is needed to be analyzed carefully, for they possibly held in them some of the keys to the understanding of second language acquisition.

2.7 Taxonomy of syntactic errors based on communication effect (global /local)

Syntactic Errors are assessed according to the degree to which they interfere with communication. On the basis of how errors disrupt the comprehensibility of whole sentences, second language students' syntactic errors are put into two distinct categories: global and local errors (Burt and Kiparsky, 1972, p.73).

Global errors are those errors that make an utterance difficult to understand and to consider a sentence incomprehensible (as in this example *I like bus but my mother said so not that we must be late for school* (Burt and Kiparsky, 1972, p.112).Local errors, on the other hand, do not significantly block communication of a sentence's message. In the sentence "*I happy*" would be an example of local error since the meaning of the sentence is apparent.

Burt and Kiparsky's global/local error distinction was modified by Hendrickson in 1977. A

global error is a communicative error that causes a proficient speaker of a foreign language either to misinterpret a spoken or written message or to consider the message incomprehensible within the total context of the error. On the other hand, a local error is a linguistic error that makes form or structure in a sentence appear awkward but, nevertheless, causes a proficient speaker of a foreign language little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence, given its contextual framework.

Let us consider the following sample erroneous sentences:

(1) Since the harvest was good was rain lot last year.

Clause 1

Clause 2

Since the harvest was good

was rain a lot last year.

Table 2.1 presents examples of errors and error types given by Richards, etal. (1985:96)

| | Examples of errors | Error type |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Wrong place of 'since' it must be in the second clause ,not the first one | Global error: this error causes wrong meaning of the entire sentence. |
| 2 | Omission of ' it ' in front of 'was rain' | Local error: this error has an effect within a Clause, not more than that. |
| 3 | ' was rain ' 'must be rained' | Local error: this error has an effect within a Clause, not more than that. |

(2) The solders had been shooting when they are blind - folded.

| | Examples of errors | Error type |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | Wrong use of tense 'shooting' must be substitute by 'shot' | <i>Global error</i> : This error causes wrong meaning of the whole sentence. |
| 2 | 'Are' must be were | <i>Local error</i> : since the effect of this error in conveying meaning is minor. |

2.8 Causes and sources of Error

The analysis of error sources has been regarded as central aspect in the research of student error during second language acquisition as it stimulates the effectiveness of the analysis. Researchers believe that the clearer the understanding of the sources of learners' errors, the better foreign language learners will be to detect the process of second language learning.

Based on the studies reviewed on error analysis, it is obvious that there are two opposite views toward the sources of errors committed by EFL learners. Both of these two views have been advocated by different researchers and there is enough empirical evidence for each to be true. For example, a study carried out by Kirkagoz (2010) showed that students' errors fell in to two major categories of error sources: inter lingual and intra lingual errors. According to Gas and Selinker (2008) intra lingual errors have nothing to do with mother tongue and results from the target language itself that students are trying to learn. In contrast, inter lingual errors attributed to mother tongue interference, which generally takes its sources from learners' lack of knowledge in the target language and their reliance on L1 or more accurately on their inter lingual in such cases. However, Brown(1994) and Little wood (1995) ,cited in Lee(2001) seem to be more comprehensive in that they believed that as learners progress in acquiring the norms of the target language ,more and more intra lingual errors are manifested.

In connection to this, a research conducted by Takwan,B. (2013) showed that more than 50% of word order, fragment run- on conjunction (over marking of conjunction), and singular and plural forms formed by L1 interference. Mohamed Ali (1990) on his research "error analysis contributory factors to students' errors, with special reference to errors in writing English" recapitulated causes of errors. These include inherent difficulty of the target language, the model, the materials, over generalization, and communication strategies are some. English is a rich complex language. Consequently, certain features of the language, which are there, are inherently difficult for the learner especially as second language learner. To mention just a few in grammars for example, we have "preached", and "reached" as the simple past tense form of "preach", and "reach" respectively. We cannot say "teached" although the words teach rhymes with "preach," and "reach" and is orthographically very close. We can also form the adverb "quickly" from "quick" but we cannot form "hardly" from "hard" since the latter two pair words are different in meaning Mohamed (1990). The lack of model is also another factor that

contributes for the occurrence of students' errors when learning foreign language. According to Mohamed (1990) the teacher may not be a good model of the language with regard to the way he speaks, writes or teaches the language. Thus, some of the errors are ironically teacher induced errors: For example, "***The student must work more harder***". When a student sees the above committed sentence from an English teacher, the student uses the model sentence in his/her writing works.

Moreover, when an English language teacher uses a preposition where it is not needed as in:

"now let us ***discuss about*** the unemployment problem among graduates for writing your essay." It would not be surprising if the students write "I am going to ***discuss about*** the causes and effects of unemployment in my essay." Not only this but also materials which have teaching items sequenced in a certain way or lack organization could lead to errors. Norrish (1983) gives an example of material induced errors. Even though it is simple present tense is normally used to describe a sequence of events that take place at the present movement, some teaching materials use the present progressive aspect.

2.9 Chapter summary

The review of literature has presented issues relating to definitions of errors, basic distinction between second language learners' error and mistakes on the basis of different studies carried out by various researchers, error theories and foreign language acquisition, models for error analysis, classification of errors, theoretical background of error analysis, error types based on communication effect, implication of error analysis on teaching and learning second language, and sources and causes of second language learners' syntactic errors.

Errors refer to the use of linguistic items in a way that is unacceptable by the indigenous speakers of the target language. Errors are distinct from mistakes because they were caused by the lack of language competence. In contrast, mistakes are slips of the tongue and pen happen when the learners are tired and are self-corrected by the doer him or herself. Therefore, the current study investigated awareness of errors not the mistakes. Overview of error approaches highlight information concerning error analysis, contrastive analysis, and inter language theory, dealing with EFL students' language errors. The literature review of models for error analysis, classification of errors, facilitated the construction of the questionnaire and discussion of the

findings. In conclusion, the researcher found that this brief review of related literature of a great value and important to this study .In fact, it guided him in the process of: 1) shedding the light on the importance of studying and analyzing errors written English.2) determining the procedures of conducting the study and 3) providing him with insights to explain the sources of the committed errors in English sentences of the preparatory school students.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study was primarily designed to analyze students' errors in writing English sentences at preparatory school by focusing on Ra'e Meles preparatory school. This chapter mainly deals with research method, sources of data; sample size, sampling technique, instrument of data collection, data collection procedure, and method of data analysis.

3.1 Research design

The major objective of this study was to find out and describe the common syntactic errors that preparatory school students commit in writing English sentences. To meet this objective, the investigator employed a mixed method design which includes both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Because such a method integrates both approaches to provide a much more detailed and comprehensive picture of what is being investigated and it expands the research in a way that a single approach can't.

3.2 Samples and Sampling Technique

The population of the study was grade 11 students at Ra'e Meles preparatory school. In the academic year 2015/16, there are a total of 322 grade 11 students in the target school attending their education in seven sections in both social science and natural science fields. Out of this total population, 46 students were selected using systematic random sampling technique. This decision was made for the explicit purpose of obtaining the richest possible sources of information to answer the research questions. To get the required sample size, the researcher first calculated the sampling interval by dividing the total number of students (322) by the number of sample (46). In this case the interval for selecting sample from random number table was seven. The researcher selected only 46 students mainly because he felt that the data to be collected could be difficult to manage. Besides, eleven English language teachers teaching in the target school were selected as participants using the purposive sampling particularly, the total population sampling technique.

3.3 Instruments of data collection

In order to cross check and strengthen the information produced from research study, more than one research instrument can be used. Through collecting more than one type of data, it can be

compared, contrasted, and cross checked, and therefore findings can be backed up by multiple sources of evidence (Burns, 2010 p.97). Therefore, writing test and questionnaire were used as instruments of data collection for the current study. The details of each instrument are discussed below.

3.3.1 Writing test

To check students' errors in sentences construction, the researcher administered two types of sentence skills test. The first test was writing paragraph based on given situations. Here, students were given some contexts up on which they produce a paragraph within limited time. Here student participants were requested to produce a paragraph on the title "*the danger of smoking*". Then their paragraphs were analyzed by the researcher and two evaluator English teachers for paragraph based on error category. Secondly, the researcher provided students with sentences with various types of errors and let them correct the errors. This helps to identify the EFL students' ability in detecting different types of syntactic writing errors.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

With regard to questionnaire, the researcher utilized two types of questionnaires both of them for the EFL teacher participants. The open-ended questionnaire was designed by the researcher and comprises 4 statements. On the other hand, the close-ended questionnaire was adapted from Takwan (2013). It is a five-point Likert scales questions design based on the fourteen types of EFL students' syntactic writing errors to obtain data on error frequency, error types, and possible causes of errors from EFL teachers experience of their students' writing ability. The questionnaire was used to find out English language teachers' awareness on the most frequent types of syntactic writing errors that students commit, and the types of errors they commit (local or global). It also helps to obtain data on the potential causes of these errors. The questionnaire used in this study was distributed to 11 English language teachers.

Degree of error frequency in teachers' questionnaire was rated in to 5 levels based on EFL teachers' experience in encountering each error.

Level 1: 0-20% (least frequently found error

Level 2: 21-40%

Level 3: 41-60%

Level 4: 61-80%

Level 5: 81-100% (most frequently found errors



(See the questionnaire in the appendix)

3.4 Data collection procedure

To collect the relevant data from the target students, first the researcher obtained the consent of the school principal and the teachers. Then, he arranged a meeting with teacher participants and explained the purpose of the study. Later on, pretesting survey questionnaire was made so as to test the questionnaire before collecting data. The participant of the pretesting activity was 11 EFL teachers. These participants were also participated in the actual activity. The ultimate objective of the pretesting was to determine whether respondents are familiar with research questionnaire or not. To do this the researcher invited the sample population and asked them to complete the survey questionnaire one at a time. The participants were informed that they should complete the questionnaire the same way that it will be completed in the actual study. While they were completing the questionnaire, the researcher looked for parts of the questionnaire that respondents hesitate and ask follow-up questions to make sure they understand and are giving valid answers. On the basis of data from the pretesting survey, the respondents were given briefings about syntactic errors that can be committed by EFL learners, and especially possible causes of errors like false hypothesized, over generalization, ignorance of rule restrictions, and incomplete application of rules with example erroneous English sentences for each intra lingual error causes. Besides research subjects were give orientation on about what error types (global/local) means to make it better and easier to complete questionnaire. Later after a week, questionnaires were administered to 11 EFL teachers.

Then the writing test was administered to the students during their free time in collaboration with the target English language teachers by appointed them during their free time and made them write the activity. Students were given 50 minutes to complete the writing test.

3.5. Method of data analysis

In this study, different types of data analysis techniques were used to analyze the data obtained through the three instruments. The data from writing test was analyzed by using sentence errors checklist which was developed by the researcher based on the reviewed literature in the area. The data obtained through checklist was quantified and reported in terms of frequency and percentage. The data gathered through questionnaires was also analyzed quantitatively. Qualitative analysis was used for the data regarding factors that cause or aggravate students' errors in writing English sentence. For error analysis, the researcher used two other English language teachers as inter raters to increase the reliability of the results of the study. To state how data was analyzed, the researcher utilized the combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the study in light of its objectives or the research questions stated in chapter one of this study. Results of the study came from the analysis of quantitative data obtained from parts A, B, and C of the EFL teachers' questionnaires. Part A was a five-point Likert scale questionnaire with responses (least frequently, close to least frequently, moderate, frequently, and most frequently scale). The next parts B and C were in the form of checklists describing the error types according to sentence comprehensibility and possible causes of the errors respectively. In addition to this, students' error in writing test was analyzed from ESL learners' written paragraphs.


4.1 Results of EFL teachers' close-ended questionnaires

This is data based on the opinions of EFL teachers who were asked to highlight frequency of errors, types of errors and their possible causes on EFL students' syntactic writing errors. The responses of the teachers have been presented below.

4.1.1 Order of frequently found errors

As shown in Table 4.1 below, EFL teachers at Ra-ey Meles preparatory school believe that students who take English as foreign language commit several errors when writing sentence. The data vividly presents order of frequently found 14 syntactic errors. Of the fourteen syntactic error classifications, the top-five most frequently committed errors include (1) passive/active form (4.27), part of speech (4.18), article (4.09), conjunction (4.0), and pronoun errors (3.91) mean values. The finding figured out that four error types which were at the 4th level (close to most frequently found) were active/passive forms, parts of speech, article, and conjunction. The frequency variation between the four errors is not significant. The frequency of the remaining 8 errors comprised of greater percent in the list was at the 3rd level (moderately found). To sum up, the findings showed that none of the 14 errors were least frequently found or close to least frequently found (2 and below). This indicates that the target school English language teachers understand their students' sentence skill as poor.

Table 4.1 Order of frequently found errors

| Order of Errors | Error types (overall picture of each error) | Mean from 5 levels | Remark |
|-----------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 1 | Active/passive form | 4.27 | Most frequently found errors  Least frequently found errors |
| 2 | Part of speech | 4.18 | |
| 3 | Article | 4.09 | |
| 4 | Conjunction | 4.0 | |
| 5 | Pronoun | 3.91 | |
| 6 | Run – on sentence | 3.71 | |
| 7 | Violation of S-V agreement | 3.61 | |
| 8 | Misuse of Verb tenses | 3.6 | |
| 9 | Wrong use of verb to be | 3.45 | |
| 10 | Double negative construction | 3.38 | |
| 11 | Possessive adjective and attributive structure | 3.36 | |
| 12 | Wrong word order | 3.27 | |
| 13 | Preposition | 3.18 | |
| 14 | Incomplete sentence | 3.09 | |

4.1.2 Types of frequently found errors (global or local)

As can be seen from Table 4.2, a comparison of error types was made and highlighted by all the EFL teacher participants for each group of the syntactic errors. Of the 14 syntactic writing errors given to them, eight errors were received more than 50% as local errors than global errors according to the data obtained from the teachers’ questionnaire under part B (error types). Percentages were found by calculating the numbers of respondents who put their responses under each error type. The participants put their view of ESL learners’ sentences writing errors highly characterized by local error types than global errors. Other four errors were categorized as global errors, which were higher than these considered as local. These mainly include verb tense 81.18%: 18.18%, word order 71.42%: 28.57%, incomplete sentence and run on sentence both received 63.36%: 36.36%. Even though most errors indicated as local errors, there was one

error received equal consideration (possessive adjective and attributive structure (50%:50%). In order to make conclusion about types of error (local or global) of frequently found errors, the investigator calculated the total average for the two types of errors. Accordingly, the average percentage of the two error types was 48.99% global errors, and 51.05% local errors respectively. Therefore, results revealed that most committed errors were local rather than global errors. However, it is possible to say that local error types are frequently found errors in ESL learners' syntactic writing errors.

Table 4.2 Types of errors according to comprehensibility in sentence (global and local) in percent

| Order of errors | Error types (overall picture of each error) | Global error | Local error |
|-----------------|--|--------------|-------------|
| 1 | Active/passive form | 45.45% | 54.54% |
| 2 | Part of speech | 36.36% | 63.63% |
| 3 | Wrong use of article | 45.45% | 54.54% |
| 4 | Conjunction | 40% | 60% |
| 5 | Pronoun | 27.27% | 72.72% |
| 6 | Run – on sentence | 63.63% | 36.36% |
| 7 | Violation of S-V agreement | 40% | 60% |
| 8 | Misuse of verb tenses | 81.81% | 18.18% |
| 9 | Wrong use of verb to be | 36.36% | 63.63% |
| 10 | Double negative construction | 44.44% | 55.55% |
| 11 | Possessive adjective and attributive structure | 50% | 50% |
| | | | |
| 12 | Wrong word order | 71.42% | 28.57% |
| 13 | Preposition | 40% | 60% |
| 14 | Fragment | 63.63% | 36.36% |

4.1.3 Possible causes of frequently found errors

To investigate the potential causes for sentences errors, 11 EFL teachers were requested to indicate possible causes of ESL learners' sentences writing errors. Table 4.3 below shows

percentages of six possible causes of each error given by the teachers. Here data was obtained from the checklist part (about possible causes of syntactic errors) and were calculated into percentages based on tallies. Manual tallying was used since there was a possibility for participants to select more than one cause for an error under part C of the teachers' questionnaire. Numbers I-vi in table 4.3 refers to the following causes:

- I. False concept hypothesized
- ii. Incomplete application of rules
- iii. Ignorance of rule restrictions
- IV .Interference of mother tongue (L1)
- V. Overgeneralization
- Vi. Other causes

Table 4.3 Six possible causes of students' syntactic writing errors marked by the EFL Teachers (%)

| N | Error categories | Error sub categories | i. | ii. | iii. | iv. | v. | vi. | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1 | Active/passive form | 1.1 | Omission of verb to be | 40% | 60% | 70% | 30% | 50% | 20% |
| | | 1.2 | Wrong use of have, has, had | 45.45% | 27.27% | 36.36% | 72.72% | 81.81% | 9.09% |
| | | 1.3 | Wrong voice | 62.5% | 50% | 37.5% | 25% | 12.5% | 25% |
| 2 | Part of Speech | 2.1 | Wrong selection for verb | 55.55% | 33.33% | 44.44% | 22.22% | 77.77% | 33.33% |
| | | 2.2 | Wrong selection for noun | 45.45% | 54.54% | 54.54% | 27.27% | 63.63% | 18.18% |
| | | 2.3 | Wrong selection for adjective | 27.27% | 63.63% | 54.54% | 18.18% | 45.45% | 9.09% |
| 3 | Wrong use | 3.1 | | 18.2% | 45.5% | 54.54% | 27.27% | 9.09% | 36.36% |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------|------|---------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| | of article | | Omission | | | | | | |
| | | 3.2 | Insertion | 18.2% | 27.3% | 63.63% | 81.18% | 9.09% | 27.27% |
| | | 3.3 | Wrong use of the, a ,an | 54.54% | 72.72% | 18.18% | 27.27% | 45.54% | 54.54% |
| 4 | Conjunction | 4.1 | Wrong selection | 55.55% | 33.33% | 66.66% | 44.44% | 22.22% | 33.33% |
| | | 4.2 | Over marking of conjunction | 45.45% | 54.54% | 27.27% | 18.18% | 9.09% | 36.36% |
| 5 | Pronoun | 5.1 | Subject object pronoun | 88.88% | 33.33% | 44.44% | 77.77% | 22.22% | 55.55% |
| | | 5.2 | Relative pronoun | 45.45% | 45.45% | 72.72% | 27.27% | 18.18% | 0% |
| 6 | Run_ on sentence | | | 27.27% | 54.54% | 36.36% | 18.18% | 9.09% | 27.27% |
| 7 | Violation of S-V agreement | | | 40% | 40% | 50% | 60% | 70% | 20% |
| 8 | Verb tense | 8.1 | Wrong tense selected | 55.55% | 66.66% | 44.44% | 33.33% | 55.55% | 22.22% |
| | | 8.2 | Wrong verb form | 62.5% | 75% | 50% | 25% | 37.5% | 12.5% |
| | | 8.3 | Wrong tense sequence | 57.14% | 85.71% | 14.28% | 28.57% | 42.85% | 14.28% |
| 9 | Verb to be | 9.1 | Omission | 77.77% | 66.66% | 55.55% | 22.22% | 33.33% | 44.44% |
| | | 9.2 | Insertion | 54.54% | 18.18% | 36.36% | 36.36% | 27.27% | 18.18% |
| | | 9.3 | Use of have ,had | 71.42% | 85.71% | 42.85% | 42.85% | 57.14% | 14.28% |
| 10 | Double negative construction | 10.1 | Over marking of negative construction | 30% | 50% | 60% | 30% | 20% | 10% |
| | | 10.2 | Wrong use of auxiliary verb | 66.66% | 55.55% | 22.22% | 44.44% | 44.44% | 55.55% |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|------|--|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| 11 | Possessive adjective & attributive structures | 11.1 | Omission of apostrophe s or possessive adjective | 45.45% | 54.54% | 63.63% | 36.36% | 18.18% | 27.27% |
| | | 11.2 | Wrong use of apostrophe | 54.54% | 45.45% | 63.63% | 72.72% | 72.72% | 36.36% |
| | | 11.3 | Use of there to replace their | 77.77% | 22.22% | 11.11% | 33.33% | 55.55% | 11.11% |
| 12 | Wrong word order | | | 33.33% | 27.27% | 77.77% | 66.66% | 33.33% | 55.55% |
| 13 | Preposition | 13.1 | Omission | 45.45% | 54.54% | 54.54% | 18.18% | 27.27% | 27.27% |
| | | 13.2 | Insertion | 72.72% | 36.36% | 54.54% | 45.45% | 27.23% | 9.09% |
| | | 13.3 | Wrong selection | 27.3% | 18.18% | 9.09% | 27.23% | 18.18% | 9.09% |
| 14 | Fragment | | | 36.36% | 54.54% | 63.63 % | 45.45% | 18.18% | 27.27% |

On the basis of the EFL teachers' perception of possible causes for students' syntactic writing errors, it was found that there were six syntactic error categories with percentage of L1 interference more than 60 % as displayed in Table 4.3 above. These syntactic errors were (1) passive case: 77.72%, (2) wrong use of articles (Insertion of a, the, an):81.81%, (3) pronoun related errors: 77.77%, (4) violation of subject- verb agreement: 60%, (5) possessive adjective and attributive structure (wrong use of apostrophe):72.72% and (6) word order problem: 66.66%. Among the indicated intra-lingual causes, false concept hypothesized followed by overgeneralization received higher percentages than the other intra-lingual causes. As shown by the table, the syntactic errors with percentage of false concept hypothesized higher than 70% include pronoun related errors: 88.88%, verb to be (omission): 77.77%, possessive adjective attributive structure (use of there in place of their): 77.77%, preposition (unnecessary insertion):72.72%. A syntactic error caused by overgeneralization is higher than 70% also

include; passive case (use of have, had):81.81%, part of speech (wrong selection for verb): 77.77%, violation of subject –verb agreement: 70% and passive adjective and attributive structure (wrong use of apostrophe): 72.72% .Three of these errors with percentages higher than 70% in ignorance of rule restrictions include article (wrong use of a, an, & the):72.72%, verb tense (wrong verb form, and wrong tense sequence):75%:85.71%, verb to be (use of have, had): 85.71%. There were fourteen errors types with percentages of ignorance of rules restrictions higher than 50% but less than 70%.These error categories were part of speech (wrong selection for noun and adjective) : 54.54%, 54.54% respectively, article (omission) : 54.54%, article (insertion):63.63%,counjunction : 66.66% ,violation of subject verb agreement :50%, verb tense(wrong verb form): 50%, verb to be (omission) :55.55 % ,negative construction (over marking of negatives):60%,possessive adjective and attributive structure (omission of apostrophe) :63.63%,wrong use of apostrophe :63.63%, preposition(omission) : 54.54%,insertion :54.54%, fragment :63.63%.All of the 14 errors received more than 50% and less than70% of the percentage on ignorance of rule restrictions. In addition to these, there were three grammatical errors with percentage of higher than 80% intra lingual causes. Evidently these include active /passive form (wrong use of have, has, and had instead of be 81.81%), pronoun (subject object pronoun 88.88), and verb tense (wrong verb tense 85.71%). In conclusion, in addition to L1 interference, other possible causes for these syntactic errors include poor knowledge of the target language, over generalization, ignorance of rules restrictions; simplification and incomplete application of rules take the largest share.

4.2 EFL Teachers’ Feedback from open ended questionnaires

The use of open ended sections was to explore the most frequently committed syntactic writing errors as well as possible causes of grammatical errors. This section is indispensable since additional data elicited on the frequency of errors helped to triangulate the information provided in the Liker type statements administered to EFL teachers. Open ended questions have great diversity of response .This is certainly true when all respondents have no ability to formulate their attitudes towards the issue which they requested to articulate their responses.

Therefore, errors from participants elicited via the open- ended sections in the questionnaire were analyzed qualitatively. When EFL teachers were asked to forward their perception towards the

existence of errors in students' sentence writing, most of them clearly stated that many errors are often committed by students most frequently.

Majority (9) out of eleven (11) EFL teachers point out that constructing grammatically correct sentence is the most difficult task for their students. They agreed that their students' commit errors in almost every writing works they produce. Very few three (3) out of the total participants did not share the responses by the majority participants. According to these (the few) participant students' grammatical competence is not too that much poor. This implies that EFL learners are able to produce error free English sentences and can develop better writing skill. However, on the basis of the majorities' responses, it can be noticed that the students commit errors in syntax.

When EFL teacher participants were asked to identify the most frequently committed errors, eleven categories of errors (articles, possessives, Prepositions, pronouns, singular/plural, subject-verb agreement, verbs, infinitive "to", word choice and spelling) were found to be most common errors.

In order to understand the source of EFL learners' errors, participants were also asked to indicate the possible causes of syntactic writing errors committed by their students. Evidence collected throughout the participants responses confirmed that occurrences of errors is directly related to both inter-lingual transfer (-ve transfer of the L2) and the intra-lingual transfer, that is inadequate knowledge of the target language. Inadequate language competence ESL learners highly related with overgeneralization, an error caused by extension of target language rules to areas where they do not apply. This generally involves the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures.

Other causes pointed out by most participants were incomplete application of rules, ignorance of rules restriction, lack of practice with writing activities, limited exposure of learners, and complexity of English as second language. These phenomena have to do with the fact that many now days ESL learners in our country avoid including permanent self-study schedules in their routines, and rely on their L1 when attempt made to construct English sentences lead them to commit number of syntactic errors. It was noticed that students do not pay attention to details when writing or learning English language.

4.3 Analysis of Students' Test Results

Student participants were given free writing test set by the researcher to find out the type of errors they most frequently commit in writing English Sentences. The students were also provided with erroneous English sentences so as to examine their ability to identify different types of syntactic errors in writing English sentence.

Out of the 46 selected student participants, 39 students wrote a paragraph of 15 to 35 lines on the given topic "*the danger of smoking.*" The remaining 7 students returned black sheet. The test was directly administered and conducted by the researcher himself. Here all the students were given 50 minutes to write on the given topic.

4.3.1 Analysis of Test Results in writing paragraphs

In order to analyze the types of syntactic errors in students' paragraphs, errors of the collected data were identified for each paragraphs and counted according to the subheadings of the classification by two raters who were reliable English grammar. Errors were counted if it occurred repeatedly. The average score was used to calculate error frequency. The researcher also tried to interpret the structures as best as he could and emphasis was given more on syntactic errors as this is main theme for the present research. The types and frequency of errors committed in the writing paragraphs were recorded according to error categories, and then errors were quantified in terms of numbers and percentages. In addition, some examples of students' syntactic errors were selected and inserted in the analysis part to support by evidence.

Table 4.4 Average score of error types recorded and their frequency of occurrences in learners' written paragraphs

| Order | Error category | Frequency of error | Percentage (%) | Remark |
|-------|--|--------------------|----------------|--|
| 1 | Verb tense | 112 | 11.58% | Error type in a hierarchy of descending order |
| 2 | Misuse of articles | 105 | 10.9% | |
| 3 | Capitalization | 91 | 9.4% | |
| 4 | Punctuation | 75 | 7.8% | |
| 5 | Misuse of parts of speech | 56 | 6.8% | |
| 6 | Wrong use of preposition | 64 | 6.6% | |
| 7 | Spelling error | 63 | 6.5% | |
| 8 | Possessive adjective attributive structure | 54 | 5.6% | |
| 9 | Fragment | 50 | 5.2% | |
| 10 | Passive case | 44 | 4.6% | |
| 11 | Run – on sentences | 43 | 4.4% | |
| 12 | Pronoun related errors | 40 | 4.1% | |
| 13 | Wrong word order | 39 | 4.03% | |
| 14 | Double negative construction | 36 | 3.7% | |
| 15 | Conjunction | 34 | 3.5% | |
| 16 | Modal verbs | 28 | 2.9% | |
| 17 | Plurality | 23 | 2.4% | |
| | Total errors found | 967 | | |

Table 4.4 shows the frequency and percentage of each error type in a hierarchy of descending order. The results of the study indicate that the total number of errors committed by the 39 EFL students was 967. The maximum errors made by the subjects when writing paragraphs were from

the realm of verb tense, 112 which accounts for 11.58% of the total errors. The second highest error category made by the subjects was wrong use of articles 105 constituted 10.9% of total errors.

The results of the analysis of the grammatical errors shown in Table 4.4 reveal that the third most common errors were wrong use of capitalization, 91 errors making 9.4% of the total error committed by the subjects of the study. In this study, punctuation is another frequent error in EFL learners' paragraph. The total number of punctuation errors counted was 75 which constituted 7.8% of the recorded errors. There was also error category observed in wrong selection of parts of speech. This category comprises 66 errors with 6.8% of the total errors. According to the findings of the study, errors committed by the subjects could be ascribed to the fact that EFL learners at the study site have difficulties in identifying the uses of English parts of speech when constructing sentences. Sub categorization of errors in this parts of speech include: wrong selection of verb 18 errors which accounts for 27.27% ,wrong selection of adjective 23 (34.8%) ,and wrong use of noun 15 (22.72%) of total errors in parts of speech. The errors which the participants committed in the use of prepositions amounted to 6.6% of the total grammatical errors. This error category (wrong use of preposition) seems to cause more trouble for EFL learners' writing in English.

The results in the above table also indicate that of the total errors committed by the subjects, errors of spelling accounts for 6.5% of the aggregate errors. A total of 54 errors which came to 5.6% of possessive adjective and distributive structure were committed by 23 subjects. This is then followed by a total of 50 (5.2%) errors in aspects related to the use of incomplete sentences. Other types of errors which demand some attention from EFL learners as well as the English teachers include errors in passive case that indicate a total of 44 errors being committed by 13 subjects. These errors constituted 4.6% of the total errors. The last of the most significant types of errors found to be common among majority of the subjects were errors of run – on sentences which accounts for 4.4% of the total error followed by pronoun related errors (4.1%).The rest of the error categories namely wrong word order, double negative construction, conjunction ,modal verbs, singular and plural forms are less crucial judging from the total number of errors made as well as the number of respondents who committed errors in this aspect of paragraph analyzing. Of all the seventeen grammatical errors made, errors in verb tense were the most common or prevailing errors in EFL learners' written paragraphs.

For example, subjects wrote sentences with misuse of English tenses like the following:

“The negative impacts of smoking cigarette were; health impact, economical harm, and social discrimination.

“People smoke because they think that they will be relaxed.”

”At this time smoking cigarette will knock at the door of every *body’s home*.”

In these examples, the students don’t understand the right use of simple past and future tense. Consequently, instead of adding the infinitive form of the verb with the future tense, they inserted unnecessary verb to be and the participle.

In this study, wrong use of articles is another frequent problem in students’ written paragraphs.

The following are error examples in the use of articles taken from students’ text.

a) Wrong use of article ‘the’

The smoking is bad habit. (Erroneous)

Smoking is a bad habit. (Correct)

The *smoking* affectsinstead of smoking affects... (Error of insertion) **b)**

Wrong use of the article ‘a’ before words with vowel sounds:

If you smoke cigarettes, it costs you a expensive money. (an expensive) **c) Omission of articles:**

Smoking is one of major problems of health. (Instead of smoking is the major)

Most of smokers in the world are young. (most of the smokers)

Wrong use of preposition was ranked six after parts of speech. The following examples illustrate wrong choice of prepositions committed by the students:

1To help smokers quit smoking, go to a walk (for)

2.....Many diseases can be caused of smoking (by)

3.....A number of people die from smoking (of)

There is the possibility that the types of paragraphs written by the participants did not require the use of the passive voice .But what has been indicated in the present study is that there were

subjects who used passive cases in their paragraphs. The number of error concerned this language aspect was 44. For example, the following were taken from EFL students' wrong use of passive voice written production.

1. the habit which called smoking (Is called)
2. Smoking can be caused many serious diseases. (Can cause)
3. It can been said that smoking is bad habit. (It can be said)

In these examples, the students confuse between the use of active voice and passive voice in English. This might be due to lack of repeated exercises on this rule which lead to overgeneralization of the rules.

The following are also examples of wrong word order sentences from EFL learners' written paragraphs:

Smoking is a habit bad (a bad habit).

How we can stop smoking? (can we ?)

Broadly speaking, this result ascertains that the EFL learners seemed to have a tremendous difficulty in using appropriate English articles. The evidence strengthens that EFL learners did not master the difference between the two types of (definite and indefinite) articles. This also indicates that the learners are not exactly sure where it is optional and how to use the article at its appropriate place. The total errors of capitalization were also 91 with an error frequency of 9.4%. This result indicates EFL learners are not consistent with the use of appropriate capitalization. For example, the errors in the following sentences better illustrate the above discussion:

- 1 .there are so many dangers Of Smoking.
2. young people Smoking when they Are angry.
- 3.i believe negative impacts of smoking is...:
- 4.“ the most important thing i suggest to become health person smoking should give *up*. ”

The first letters of the sentences were written in the lower case rather than capital letters as shown in the above analysis. In addition, capital letters were put in inappropriate place. The error involved in wrong selection of part of speech was also analyzed and found to be most frequently committed errors. Following are some examples.

1 Smoking harms our economical. (Our economy)

2 Individuals became less production. (Less productive)

To conclude, the results indicated that all 39 respondents contribute to a total of 967 different grammatical errors in writing paragraph. Most of the errors, as discussed so far, were certainly due to ignorance of rules restriction, false hypothesized, incomplete application of rules and so on. The above examples demonstrate that learners have limited knowledge of language competency. For example, the misuse of "*production*" in place of "*productive*" and "*economical*" instead of "*economy*" explains the errors evidently caused by the ignorance of rules restriction. The suffixes (_ tion) and (_ cal) as formation of noun and adjective, can be after an adjective and before a noun respectively.

4. 3.2 EFL Students' Ability in Identifying Sentence Errors

The first section of the research instrument focused on finding out student ability in identifying errors in English sentences and to demonstrate the students' ability to construct a string of well-connected sentences that is grammatically and logically correct. It is undeniable fact that an understanding of a language grammar is an essential part of language acquisition and as it is said vocabulary is flesh of the language and grammar is the skeleton. In order to do this, the researcher provided students with erroneous English sentences in different error categories. The types of error categories which include in the test paper were: verb tense, articles, wrong word order, fragment, passive case, conjunction, run-on sentences, negative construction, verb to be, parts of speech, prepositions, and pronoun related errors. Regarding these grammatical categories, 27 total numbers of erroneous English sentences were given to the students to identify error types and to write the correct forms of the given sentences. Although 46 question papers were administered to participants, only 31 papers were fully attempted. After getting the required data and completed the process of sampling, the test was analyzed and calculated in terms of percentage as follows.

Table 4.5 Sentence Errors detected by EFL Students


| Number | Error classification | No. of students who detect the sentence errors. | (%) | No. of students who didn't detect the sentence errors | % | Remark |
|--------|---------------------------|---|-------|---|-------|--|
| 1 | Errors of passive form | 31 | 72.09 | 12 | 27.9 | Most identified syntactic errors  Least identified syntactic errors |
| 2 | Conjunction | 30 | 69.8 | 13 | 30.23 | |
| 3 | Verb to be | 29 | 67.4 | 14 | 32.6 | |
| 4 | Parts of speech | 26 | 60.5 | 17 | 39.53 | |
| 5 | Double (-ve) construction | 23 | 53.5 | 20 | 46.5 | |
| 6 | Wrong word order | 21 | 48.8 | 22 | 51.2 | |
| 7 | Incomplete sentence | 19 | 44.2 | 24 | 55.8 | |
| 8 | Pronoun related errors | 18 | 41.9 | 25 | 58.14 | |
| 9 | Preposition | 15 | 34.9 | 28 | 65.11 | |
| 10 | Misuse of articles | 13 | 30.2 | 30 | 69.8 | |
| 11 | Verb tense | 10 | 23.3 | 33 | 76.74 | |
| 12 | Run-on sentences | 7 | 16.3 | 36 | 83.7 | |

Table 4.5 gives a detailed account of the different grammatical errors and the hierarchy of these errors from most detected to least detected. Evidently, one of the most difficult structural elements for EFL learners was run –on sentence with only 7 respondents accounting for (16.3%) of the total subjects that gave positive responses. These types of syntactic errors were found quiet difficult for the EFL learners to construct meaningful English sentence. The second highest in terms of difficulty for EFL learners was, using verb tense properly received merely 10 subjects who correctly identified the error type and made correct form of it. This makes (23.3%) of the total respondents. In the current study, realizing the use of English articles was another frequent

problem. The total number of subjects who were unable to recognize the use of articles was 30 (69.8%). Among other analyzed syntactic errors, errors in applying correct prepositions were also among the most prevailing errors of the students in their constructing English sentence with only 15 respondents who answered correctly constituted (34.9%) of the total examinee. It was clearly observed from the study that most students were not consistent in the use of correct prepositions. The fifth difficult grammatical category for EFL learners to master in writing English sentences was, using appropriate pronouns and only 18 (41.9 %) respondents gave positive answer. Learners also were not aware of the features of complete English sentence. Among the participants who were asked to identify sentence errors, only 19 respondents identified the error type. Based on the findings five errors were moderately identified, close to 50% and higher of the subjects. These include: errors of passive form (72.09%), conjunction (69.8%), verb to be (67.4%), parts of speech (60.5%), and double negative construction (53.5%). Since there were altogether twelve errors and only five were thought to be identified by 50% or more participants. The number of responses gives a good picture of which items are being mastered and which are not. The result shows that most of the errors were not identified by the learners. Therefore, it can be concluded that EFL learners could hardly identify the various sentence errors and these forms of errors are attributed to students' poor knowledge of grammar.

4.4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings from EFL teachers' questionnaires revealed that none of the 14 errors were least frequently found (level 1) or close to least frequently found (level 2). The mean score of four error categories including active/passive form (4.27), part of speech (4.18), article (4.09), and conjunction (4.0) were closer to most frequently found errors. Most of them (10 errors) were moderately found (level 3) and their frequencies are ranged from 3.91-309

Based on the analysis made from the EFL teachers' close-ended questionnaire, these fourteen syntactic errors were neither absolute global errors nor absolute local errors. According to the communicative effect taxonomy, the research subjects indicate that, majority of the errors were considered local rather than global. Here judgment was drawn from the basis of the EFL teacher participants' 'close-ended questionnaire indicated in the study. Accordingly, all the syntactic errors except 4 errors were related to local errors. The four syntactic errors with global percentages higher than local errors include verb tense (81.81%, 18.18%), word order (71.42%,

28.57 %,) and two errors having the same percentage were run-on sentence and fragment rated (63.63%, 36.36%), global and local error percentage respectively.

Regarding possible causes of the errors mentioned, it was found that there were three main error categories with percentages of L1 interference rated closely to 52.5%. Those errors were (1) wrong word order (66.66 %), (2) subject verb disagreement (60%), and (3) pronouns (52.52%). The other sources of learners' errors were also generated from intra-lingual or developmental errors. Among all the given developmental causes, false concepts hypothesized and incomplete application of rules covered higher percentage than the other intra lingual causes as findings showed. The errors as investigated in this study were mainly due to inadequate application of the rules of the target language even though considerable errors were caused by the interference of learners' mother tongue.

When diagnostic test was made to determine what EFL learners already know about the structure of English sentences, findings showed that there were seven grammatical error categories which ESL learners often commit .These include: run-on sentences, wrong verb tense, misuse of articles, preposition related errors, pronoun errors incomplete sentence (fragment), and wrong word order according to their hierarchy of difficulty. Furthermore, seventeen categories of errors were found to be most common errors made by 39 subjects when writing paragraphs in English. The first most common errors made by the subjects were due to lack of the knowledge of verb tense (11.58%). The second highest error category made by the subjects that constituted 10.9% of the total errors, was wrong use of English articles. The results of the analysis of the grammatical errors shown in table 4.5 reveal that the third most common errors were related with wrong use of capitalization.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study made use of both quantitative and qualitative analysis method. It was aimed at analyzing the frequency and possible causes of preparatory school EFL learners' syntactic writing errors. It is specifically sought to identify and describe the most frequent and order of these syntactic errors in the English writing of students. Moreover, it investigated the possible causes of these errors. Using systematic sampling technique, 46 grade 11 students were selected as study participants. The study comprised two major phases: (1) construction of a survey questionnaire and investigation of EFL teachers' opinion of EFL learners' syntactic writing errors, (2) Designing sentence writing test and examining students' ability in identifying sentence errors. Another instrument utilized in the present study was student participants' written paragraph. All the syntactic errors committed by the EFL students were checked and categorized in to different error categories.

As far as construction of a survey questionnaire is concerned, fourteen page of English version questionnaire was designed based on the 14 types of EFL students' sentences written errors, namely verb tense, article, subject-verb agreement, modal verb, verb to be, active or passive voice, pronoun, wrong word order, double negative construction, misuse of prepositions, part of speech, conjunction and, possessive and attributive structure, fragment (incomplete structure), and run-on sentence. The questionnaire consisted of two sections. The first the section consisted of three parts: A, B, and C. Part A was five-point Liker scales questions concerning awareness towards the fourteen types of students' syntactic errors. Part B and C were checklists to collect error types and possible causes for the students' errors respectively. The second section was an open ended question designed to explore order of frequently committed sentence errors as well as their order of frequency. Apart from this, digging out the possible causes of the frequently found errors was the center of the investigation.

Furthermore, the researcher prepared two kinds of tests for student participants .The first section was collection of erroneous English sentences to find out EFL learners' ability in identifying sentence errors. The second section was paragraph writing test.

Questions were not different from that of EFL teachers' questionnaires in terms of purpose, but enable the researcher to triangulate data from all participants of the study. The gathered data were analyzed and the following results were found out.

5.1.1 Frequency of syntactic errors found

Findings from EFL teachers' close-ended questionnaires revealed that none of the 14 syntactic errors listed were least frequently found (level 1) or close to least frequently found (level 2). Four error categories including: active/passive form (4.27), part of speech (4.18), article (4.09), conjunction (4.0) mean values from five level errors were closer to most frequently found errors. Ten errors were moderately found (41-60% degree of error frequency) and their frequency is listed from 3.91 to 3.09. A very similar study done by Takwan (2013) indicates that only two syntactic errors which include wrong use of articles and verb tense were close to most frequently found (61-80% degree of error frequency) while active/passive, part of speech, wrong use of articles and conjunctions were found to be closer the most frequent errors in this study. It has so far been noticed that EFL students at preparatory level had probably committed majority of syntactic errors at a moderate level when writing English sentences. However, the finding of high-frequency errors does not always mean that the students are not successful in language learning. Some errors such as articles and prepositions naturally have more opportunities to occur, even in simple sentences. Consequently, they should not be compared to other errors which have fewer chances to occur in sentences. In other words, it cannot be concluded that less frequently found errors were less important or less difficult (Dusk ova, 1999).

5.1.2 Error types (global or local)

Because the EFL students at preparatory level have made various syntactic errors in all types as found in the study, being able to distinguish global errors from local ones is essential. The global /local distinction is the most pervasive criterion to determine the communication effect of syntactic errors (Burt and Kiparsky 1972). A global error is a communicative error that causes a proficient speaker of a foreign language either to misinterpret a written message or to consider the message incomprehensible within the total context of the error. On the other hand, a local error is a linguistic error that makes a form or structure in a sentence awkward, but nevertheless, causes a proficient speaker of a language little or no difficulty in understanding the intended message of the sentence given.

Based on the analysis made in this study, majority of the errors found were considered local rather than global. The findings indicate that except four syntactical errors, the rest were related to local errors. The four errors with global percentages higher than local errors include verb tense (81.81%), (18.18%),(71.42%),(28.57%), and two errors having the same percentage were run-on sentence and fragment rated(63.63% ,36.36%). EFL teachers at Ra-ey Meles preparatory school viewed most errors as local rather than global. This indicated that most of the syntactic errors in the majority of cases were considered less important or they did not significantly hinder communication of sentences' message. On the basis of the obtained data, in most cases fragment, run-on sentence, verb tense, and wrong word order errors were more important than others.

5.1.3 Possible causes of frequently found syntactic errors

Regarding possible causes of the errors listed, it was found that there were six main error categories which were caused by L1 interference and this is rated closely to 60% or higher. These errors were (1) faulty word order scored 66.66 %, (2) violation of subject verb agreement with percentage of 60% , (3) pronoun related errors with 77.77%, (4) passive case making 77.77 %, (5) possessive adjective and attributive structure constituted 72.72%, and (6) article (omission of a or the) 81.81%. The other sources of learners' syntactic errors were also generated from developmental causes. Among all the given intra lingual causes, false concepts hypothesizing and incomplete application of rules covered higher percentage than the other intra lingual causes as findings showed. Similarly, as per for the types and causes of syntactic errors made by Thai under graduate students' syntactic writing errors research conducted by Takwan (2013), reported that incomplete application of rules and ignorance of rules restrictions received higher percentages than other intra lingual causes. In conclusion, the errors as investigated in this study were mainly due to inadequate application of the rules of the target language even though considerable errors were caused by the interference of learners' mother tongue.

5.1.4. Errors Frequently Committed by EFL Students when writing paragraphs

In terms of error frequency committed by EFL learners, the findings of this study is equivalent with Khuwaile and Alishoumali (2000) who conducted a study to investigate the Jordanian students' writing errors and they found that tense errors were the most frequent ones committed by learners similarly wrong use of verb tense was found to be the most frequent errors in the

current study. Likewise, Huang (2001) investigated the nature and distribution of different kinds of grammatical errors made by 32 English majors of a Taiwanese university. A total of 1700 errors were found and categorized into 13 syntactic error categories. Accordingly the top six common errors were: (1) wrong use of verb tense, (2) wrong selection for nouns, (3) spelling errors, (4) wrong use of articles, (5) prepositions, and (6) wrong word choice.

5.2 CONCLUSION

In line with analysis made in the above sections, the following conclusions have been made:

The most common and noticeable syntactic errors which were found in students' writing paragraphs as well as teachers' response in the current study include: (1) wrong use of verb tense, (2) errors related to passive case, (3) double negative construction, (4) misuse of English articles (omission and /or insertion), (5) faulty word order, (6) incomplete sentences (fragments),

(7) Conjunction related errors, (8) inappropriate use of verb to be, (9) run-on sentences, (10) violation of subject verb agreement. Based on the results of the present study, even though EFL students are following their preparatory programs in the English medium, recorded errors in sentence writing illustrate the incomplete knowledge they have in grammatical rules correctly.

In connection to error frequency, results from EFL teachers' close-ended questionnaire displayed that four grammatical errors were found under close to most frequently found errors (4th level). The rest 10 syntactic error categories were found under level three (moderately found errors). According to the results of the present study, one can reasonably conclude that preparatory students had probably committed all errors at a moderate and high level of writing English sentences. Besides EFL teachers in Ra-ey Meles preparatory school viewed most errors committed by their students as local rather than global errors. It can be said that in the majority cases syntactic errors were considered less important or they did not significantly hinder communication of sentences' message.

In the light of the findings of the present study, the researcher concludes that the errors committed by the students were caused both from the intra-lingual and inter-lingual. This is while the errors caused by L1 interference were in a small proportion. He finally noticed that False concept hypothesized and over-generalization intra-lingual errors received higher percentages than others. This has been a challenge for EFL teachers because of not only the fact that students

have less exposure to learning English as foreign language, but EFL learners in general do not have good reading experiences. Without good reading habits, the writing improvement rate and minimizing error frequencies is difficult because of the umbilical relations between reading and writing.

Acquiring a second language mostly entails by errors. But, a number of linguists in the field of error analysis have now the following area of consensus as regard of error benefit. Errors are indispensable part of language acquisition as they are the signs of the stage or progress of learner's language learning. Therefore, errors must not be considered as evils that hinder progress of language learning. Rather errors clearly reveal the strategies and ways that students devise and use to learn in their struggle to master the language system of the target language. As a result, errors provide priceless insights in to language learning process not just only to the learners of the target language, but also to EFL teachers (Masorong 2010). This view is supported by Strak (2001:19) in his study, who also explained that the teachers need to view students 'errors positively and should not regard them as the learner's failure to grasp the rules and structures but view the errors as process of learning. Therefore, the finding of high frequency errors in the current study may not always mean that the students are not successful in language learning.

5.3 RECOMMENDATION

In line with the above findings, the following recommendations have been forwarded:

- First EFL teachers should arrange the remedial materials on the bases of the degree of error frequency recurrence and they must contribute effectively to ensure their students' ability in using the foreign language, accurately and fluently in writing. They should also be more aware of these types of errors and provide the necessary following up work to eradicate the problem areas as discussed earlier.
- The researcher also would like to recommend that material developers and curriculum designers need to emphasize on these major syntactic errors of the students when they design teaching materials for this grade level.
- In addition, it is suggested that students must have adequate exposure and practice in the second language writing to be able to internalize language rules and reduce the tendency of committing errors in their sentence writing. In terms of teaching and learning strategies, improving self-studying coordinated with peer's correction and teachers' corrections is considered as one suggestion to ameliorate the EFL learners' writing proficiency.
- Finally, it is suggested that conducting similar study with a large sample size could lead to findings that can be better generalized to wider population.

REFERENCES

- Abisamra, N. (2003). *An analysis of errors in Arabic speakers' English writings at the University of American Beirut* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Beirut. Beirut, America.
- Achea, J.E. (2013). Sentence errors: review of selected GNs 112 test scripts of students of the University of Ilorin. *European Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 1(2), 88-98.
- Alishoumali and Khuwaile (2000) *second language written*. The writing process and error analysis in secondary students written sentence Mahwal NJ: Taiwan.
- Brown, H.D. (1987). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. 2nd edn. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Brown, D.B. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. 3rd edn. NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* 4th edn. White Plains, NY: Long man
- Burt, M. and Kiparsky, C. (1972). *The Goofing: A repair manual for English*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. vol, 5, 4:161-170.
- Corder, S. P. (1974). *Error analysis and techniques in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University press
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and inter-language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Dana, A. and Ayda, B. (2013). Writing Difficulties and New Solutions: Blended learning as an Approach to Improve Writing Abilities. *International Journal of Humanities and Social science*. Vol, 3 .No.9.
- Doughty, C.J. and Long, M.H. (2003). *The hand book of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., and Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. NY: Oxford University Press.
Deborah, L. (2008). Sources of errors in foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*. vol. 7: 11-36.

Demis G/Tsadik, (2012). *Analysis of writing errors committed by second year university students*. Unpublished MA thesis. Jimma University. Jimma

Edge, J. (1989). Mis takes and correction London long man and Masters degree students in three disciplines in a Norwegain university written communication, 19, 493-544.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University press

Ellis, R. and Barkuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erdogan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching.

Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education. Vol.1, No. 2:261-270.

Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition an introductory Course*.

Mahwah, NJ: LEA.

Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition an introductory course*.

3rd edn. NY: Routledge Taylor and Francis group Mahwah, NJ: LEA

Hasyim, S. (2002). "Error Analysis in the Teaching of English, (1)42-50.

Hendrikson, J. (1977). Error analysis and error correction in language teaching.

RECL, Occasional Papers. No.10 .Singapore.

Huang, S.J. (2001) Error analysis and teaching composition at the *University of National Tsing* (unpublished master's thesis) Hua University.

- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. London: Long Man.
- James, C. (2001). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Jie, XU. (2008). Error theories and second language acquisition. *US-China ForeignLanguage*, Vol.6 (1):35-42.
- Keshaverz, M.H. (2012). *Contrastive analysis, & error analysis*. Tehran: Rahnama Publication
- Kirkagoz, Y. (2010). An analysis of written errors of Turkish adult learners of English. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science, Vol. 2, 4352-4358*
- Klassen, J. (1991). Using Student Errors for Teaching. *Forum. Vol.29 (1)*
- Larsen-F, D. and Long, M. (2000). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Lee, E.p. (2001) .*Error analysis on medical students' writing*. From <http://www.stc.arts.chula>.
Accessed October 21/ 2008
- Leki,I.(2001) . "Hearing voices: *Second language students' experiences in L2 writing courses*," In Saliva and P.K Matsuda(eds.),on second language writing .Mahwah,NJ:Lawren Er.
- Myles. *Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts*. TESL-EJ. '[http://www..test.ej.org/issues/vol.6/ej22](http://www.test.ej.org/issues/vol.6/ej22):Accessed 17 Sept. (2010)
- Mohammed, A. (1990). Inter lingual comparisons in foreign language grammar instruction. *The Educational Journal, Vol, 13:317-353*
- Nemser, W. (1971). Approximate systems of foreign language learners. *IRAL. 9 (2): 115-124*.
- Norrish, J. (1983). *Language learners and their errors*. London: Macmillan.

- Richards, J.C. (1971). *Error analysis and second language strategies*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J.C (1972). *Social Factors, inter language, and language learning*. London: Longman.
- Richards, J. C. and Simpson, G. (1974). *English the study of learner*. In J. C. Richards (ed.) *error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman.
- Richards, et al. (1985). *Errors in language learning and use exploring error analysis* London: long man
- Richards, et al. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (2nd ed.) Harlow: Longman
- Richards, J. C. and Schimid, G. (2002). *The study of Learner English*. In J. C. Richards (ed.). *error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman
- Selinker, L. (1992). *Rediscovering inter language*. New York: Long Man.
- Stephen, K. T. (1990- 2002). *Encouraging student writing*: A guide for *Instructors*. Berkley: University of California Retrieved from <http://www.teaching. Berkley. Edu>.
- Susan, E. G. (2005). *The role of sentence recall in reading and language skills of children with learning difficulties*. United Kingdom: University of Durham.
- Takwan, B. (2013). *Awareness and tolerance of EFL teachers of students' syntactic writing errors*, University of the Thai: Chamber of Commerce.
- Zahoor, H. (2013). An error analysis of second language writing at higher secondary level. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*.vol, 4, (11) 35 – 41.
- Zawahren,F.(2012) Applied error analysis of written production of English essays of tenth grade Students in *Ailoun Schools,Journal*,(2) 16-35.

Appendices

Appendix 1: EFL teachers' Questionnaire

Dear Teacher:

This questionnaire is primarily designed to gather data on students' syntactic writing errors. Therefore, you are kindly requested to reply to the following questionnaire regarding your awareness and views towards your students' sentence writing skill. Your responses are highly appreciated and help me to identify the most frequently committed syntactic errors by EFL students and major causes of these errors.

Thank you in advance!!

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-e Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Direction: Pleas mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples. | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible causes of Errors |
|------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|-------------|---|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | Please write a, b, or c, in the boxes. You can select more than one cause for each type of errors. (You can write a1 and a2 instead of 'a', if their cause (s) are different.) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 1 | <p>Verb tense(overall picture) Examples: a) Wrong tense selected 1. She was <u>burning</u> her finger while she was cooking. 2. She <u>written</u> a letter yesterday.</p> <p>b) Wrong verb from 1. I <u>thicked</u> to become a doctor. 2. We have never <u>forget</u> the trip.</p> <p>b) Tense sequence 1. They couldn't do anything they <u>want</u>. 2. We looked our dinner <u>& take</u> a bath.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Verb tense</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes</p> <p>(mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Pleas mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion.

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | Please write a, b, or c, in the boxes. You can select more than one cause for each type errors. (You can write a1 and a2 instead of 'a; if their cause (s) are different.) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 2 | <p>Articles (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>a. Omission</p> <p>1. It was- unforgettable trip</p> <p>2. They went to-school.</p> <p>b. Insertion</p> <p>1. He had a launch in a hotel.</p> <p>2. She drank a much water</p> <p>C. Wrong use of a, an, the</p> <p>1. A sun is shying</p> <p>2. A umbrellas is useless in a stormy weather.</p> | | | | | | | <p>Articles</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other cause (mistakes are excluded)</p> | |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 Refers to learner's mother tongue

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion.

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|--|--|--------|---------|---|---|----------------------|--|---|
| | | Least frequently \rightarrow most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | Please mark 'x' in the boxes. You can select more than one cause. (You can also write 1,2,3... instead of 'x' to separate each example's cause from others. |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | | | |
| 3 | <p>Subject -Verb agreement (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I have to stay with the people who is unknown 2. Whenever he meet me he <u>talk</u> about his illness. 3. My father was not angry with me. 4. They and I was present here last night. | | | | | | | <p>Subject -Verb agreement</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> | |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ 1, 2, 3.... under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|--|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|-------------|--|
| | | Least frequently \rightarrow most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 4 | <p>Verb to Be (overall picture) Examples:</p> <p>a. Omission</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The party __so interesting. 2. My cell phone_ expensive. 3. The weather in Asela _ too cold <p>b. Insertion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Finally was the time had come. <p>c. misuse of 'have' 'had'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The party had fantastic. 2. The children have happy. | | | | | | | | <p>Verb to Be</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-e Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|--------------------|-------------|--|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | Please write a, b, or c, in the boxes. You can select more than one cause for each type errors. (You can write a1 and a2 instead of 'a'; if their cause (s) are different.) |
| 5 | <p>Active/passive voice (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>a. Omission of 'be'</p> <p>1. The letter _ written yesterday.</p> <p>2. I _ very frightened</p> <p>b. misuse of 'have' 'has, had'</p> <p>1 They had excited and surprised.</p> <p>2. Slogans have written by her.</p> <p>c Wrong voice</p> <p>1. This cake prepared for children.</p> <p>2. Finally we were arrived at the campus.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Active/passive voice</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|-------------|--|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 6 | <p>Pronoun (overall picture) Examples:</p> <p>a. Subject- object pronoun 1. My sister wanted to see me and he</p> <p>2. The mare not honest.</p> <p>b. Omission of relative pronoun 1. I am a person _ doesn't lie.</p> <p>2. Do you know_ bicycle is this?</p> <p>c. Wrong selection 1. Name the color who you like the most.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Pronoun</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference ofL1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|--|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|-------------|---|
| | | Least frequently \rightarrow most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | Please write a, b, or c, in the boxes. You can select more than one cause for each type errors. (You can write a1 and a2 instead of 'a; if their cause (s) are different.) |
| 7 | <p>Negative construction (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>a. Over-marking of negative construction</p> <p>1. I never don't forget everything.</p> <p>2. There is not no way to go.</p> <p>b. Wrong auxiliary verb</p> <p>1. We felt very happy that we were not die.</p> <p>2. Are you remember the accident?</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Negative construction</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b, under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinions.

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|-------------|---|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 8 | <p>Preposition (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>a. Omission</p> <p>1. They went—the hotel.</p> <p>2. Food is cooked here_ pure butter.</p> <p>b. Insertion</p> <p>1. The teacher entered <u>to</u> the class.</p> <p>2. I know <u>with</u> many friends</p> <p>c. Wrong selection</p> <p>1. Lack <u>for</u> knowledge brings ignorance.</p> <p>2. She went to Addis <u>on</u> April.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Preposition</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------|---|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 0- 20% | 2 21- 40% | 3 41- 60% | 4 61- 80% | 5 81- 100% | | | |
| 9. | <p>Parts of speech (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>a. Wrong selection for a verb</p> <p>1. You had to <u>dinner</u> with me.</p> <p>2. I <u>shopping</u> all day.</p> <p>b. Wrong selection for a noun.</p> <p>1. She is <u>hopeful</u> of her parents.</p> <p>2. Their <u>decide</u> was correct.</p> <p>c. Misuse for an adjective</p> <p>1. There were <u>variety</u> products.</p> <p>2. We made <u>success</u> presentation.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Parts of speech</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a Restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing error

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | Please write a, b, or c, in the boxes. You can select more than one cause for each type errors. (You can write a1 and a2 instead of 'a'; if their cause (s) are different.) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 10. | Conjunction (overall picture) Examples: a. Wrong selection 1. I studied hard, <u>and</u> I did not pass my exams. 2. I don't know Addis well <u>unless</u> I was not born there. b. Over making of conjunctions 1. Even though he is rich, <u>but</u> he leads simple life. 2. Since she was lazy, <u>so</u> she didn't pass the UEE. | | | | | | | Conjunction <input type="checkbox"/> False concept <input type="checkbox"/> Hypothesized <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules <input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a Restrictions <input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1 <input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization <input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded) | |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b, c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|---|--|--------|---------|---|---|----------------------|-------------|--|
| | | Least frequently \rightarrow most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | | | |
| 11 | <p>Word order (overall picture) Examples:</p> <p>1) It was fantastic my song that day. \rightarrow</p> <p>2) The doctor some medicine gave the child.</p> <p>3) Every meal my family and I ate together.</p> <p>4) We went to sea together nine persons.</p> <p>5) I bought a package five days for travelling in Lalibela.</p> | | | | | | | | <p>Word order</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept Hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules Ignorance of rule a Restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ 1, 2, 3... under part c represent for the error examples.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | Please mark(x) in the boxes. You can select more than one cause. (You can also write 1,2,3... instead of (x)to separate each example's cause from others. |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 12 | <p>Run –on Sentence (overall picture)</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>1) Adam is a sweet boy he really loves animals</p> <p>2) I visited my friend's room that has a chair, bed, shoes, spoon and fork everything in this room are very big sizes.</p> <p>3) It was a beautiful day there was not a cloud in the sky.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <p>Run –on Sentence</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of Rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a Restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</p> |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ 1,2,3... under part c represent for the error examples.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A | | | | | Part B | | Part C |
|------------|---|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | Frequency of errors committed Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | Error type global error | local error | Possible cause of Errors Please mark(x) in the boxes. You can select more than one cause. (You can also write 1, 2, 3... instead of (x) to separate each example's cause from others. |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 13 | <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 10px;">→</p> <p>Incomplete Structure/Fragment (overall picture) <i>Examples:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) At this period be tired. 2) First camp of me on October last year. 3) What I want you find everything. 4) That picture still in my mind. 5) It was the first time went to foreign country. 6) Someday study half a day or full day | | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Fragment False concept hypothesized <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules <input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions <input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1 <input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other causes (mistakes are excluded)</i> | |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ 1,2,3.... under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

Questionnaire

EFL Teachers' Awareness and Experience of Ra-ey Meles preparatory school students' syntactic writing errors

Directions: Please mark (x) in the boxes that best reflects your experience, and opinion

| Error item | Error classification with examples | Part A Frequency of errors committed | | | | | Part B Error type | | Part C Possible cause of Errors |
|------------|--|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | Least frequently → most frequently | | | | | global error | local error | Please write a, b, or c, in the boxes. You can select more than one cause for each type errors. (You can write a1 and a2 instead of 'a; if their cause (s) are different.) |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% | | | |
| 14 | <p>Possessive Adjective and Attributive Structure (overall picture)</p> <p><i>Examples:</i></p> <p>a. Omission of apostrophe-s or a possessive adjective</p> <p>1) My friend ___ family went to the concert.</p> <p>2) I had a dinner with ___ friend.</p> <p>b. Wrong use of apostrophe-s</p> <p>- It's cub is very attractive.</p> <p>c. Use of 'there' to replace 'their'</p> <p>E.g. They love there children.</p> | | | | | | | <p>Possessive Adjective and Attributive Structure</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> False concept hypothesized</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete application of rules</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ignorance of rule a restrictions</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Interference of L1</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Over generalization</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other causes (<i>mistakes are excluded</i>)</p> | |

Remark:

- ✓ A global error is an error which causes a misinterpreted or incomprehensible message for a native speaker.
- ✓ A local error is an error which causes an awkward message for a native speaker, but he/she has little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence.
- ✓ a,b,c under part c represent for the error classifications.
- ✓ L1 refers to learner's mother tongue.

SECTION TWO: Open Ended Questions

The following statements are general about your experience and opinion towards ESL students' syntactic writing errors and possible causes. So, you are kindly requested to give me your genuine responses on the bases of the questions.

1. Do your students commit errors of different types of grammatical categories when writing English sentences?

If yes, ordering the errors from most to least common.

| | |
|---------|----------|
| 1 _____ | 4 _____ |
| 2 _____ | 5 _____ |
| 3 _____ | 6 _____ |
| 7 _____ | 8 _____ |
| 9 _____ | 10 _____ |

2. Specify the most frequent syntactic writing errors committed by your students.

3. To what extent are these errors likely to disrupt the intended message?

4. What do you feel is the potential causes of the students' syntactic writing errors at your school?



Appendix 2: Writing test for student participants

SECTION 1: Identifying sentence errors

Direction: Each of the following sentences contains grammatical errors. Read them very carefully and identify the errors of these sentences and then write them correctly.

1. They **go** Australia last week.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

2. She **thought** to become a nurse.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

3. **A** people of America are more liberal than **a** people of Europe.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

4. There is **the** man waiting for you outside the gate.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

5. If you want to go with me.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

6. Because his car was in the shop.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

7. Ethiopia is know all over the world.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

8. Water produced by mixing two parts of hydrogen and one parts of oxygen.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

9. The students started disturbing as a result the teacher was absent.

10. Because she was lazy, **so** she didn't pass the final exam.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

11. don't know **not thing** about political issues.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

12. John married a wife for love **or** his friend married a wife for money.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

13. Helen extremely happy when she received the present.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

14. Her duty to deliver letters.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

15. The old woman **is needs** a special room to live in.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

16. Cell phones first developed in 1997 by the Swedish company Ericson.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

17. If I knew the answers, I **would have passed** the examination.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

18. The enemy attacked many places in the night **aggressive**.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

19. Is there any one in your family you are similar **with**?

Error type _____

Correct form _____

20. We have to do it **our self** as there are not enough workers to finish it on time.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

21. He is a very good friend of me.

Error type _____

Correct form _____

22. One of the students didn't submit **their** assignment as per the instruction.

Appendix 3: Detailed Analysis of test results in EFL learners' written paragraphs

| No | Error category | Analysis No | Analysis No | Analysis No | Analysis No | Analysis No | Analysis No | Analysis No | Total no of each error Category |
|----|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 1 | Punctuation | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| 2 | Spelling error | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | – | – | – | 8 |
| 3 | Preposition | – | – | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 20 |
| 4 | Conjunction | 2 | 4 | – | 3 | – | – | – | 9 |
| 5 | Pronouns | 2 | – | – | – | 5 | – | 2 | 9 |
| 6 | Articles | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 24 |
| 7 | Passive case | – | 1 | 2 | – | – | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 8 | Negative construction | 2 | 1 | 2 | – | 1 | – | 1 | 7 |
| 9 | Capitalization | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | – | 1 | 12 |
| 10 | Word order | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | – | 2 | – | 9 |
| 11 | Fragment | – | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | – | – | 12 |
| 12 | Run on sentence | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | – | 1 | 9 |
| 13 | Possessive adjective & attributive structure | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | – | – | 7 |
| 14 | Part of speech | – | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| 15 | Modal verbs | – | – | 1 | 2 | – | – | – | 3 |
| 16 | Redundancy | – | – | 2 | – | 1 | – | 2 | 7 |
| 17 | Verb tense | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | – | 1 | – | 10 |
| | Total number of found | 23 | 29 | 37 | 31 | 26 | 17 | 21 | 187 |

| No | Error category | Analysis No. | Analysis No. | Analysis No. | Analysis No. | Analysis No. | Analysis No. | Analysis No. | Total number of each category |
|----|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| | | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | |
| 1 | Punctuation | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | – | 12 |
| 2 | Spelling error | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | – | – | 11 |
| 3 | Preposition | – | – | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| 4 | Conjunction | 2 | 1 | – | 3 | – | – | – | 6 |
| 5 | Pronouns | 2 | – | 1 | – | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| 6 | Articles | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 19 |
| 7 | Passive case | – | 1 | 2 | – | – | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 8 | Negative construction | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | – | – | 3 | 10 |
| 9 | Capitalization | 5 | 4 | – | 1 | 1 | – | 1 | 12 |
| 10 | Word order | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | – | 2 | – | 11 |
| 11 | Fragment | – | 3 | 2 | – | 2 | – | – | 7 |
| 12 | Run sentence | – | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | – | 1 | 8 |
| 13 | Possessive adjective attributive structure | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | – | – | 6 |
| 14 | Part of speech | 3 | 2 | 1 | – | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12 |
| 15 | Modal verbs | 2 | – | 1 | 2 | – | – | 2 | 7 |
| 16 | Redundancy | – | – | – | 2 | – | – | 1 | 3 |
| 17 | Verb tense | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | – | 1 | – | 12 |
| | Total number of errors found | 31 | 27 | 33 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 14 | 166 |

| No | Error category | Analys is No | Analys Is No | Analys is No | Analys is No | Analys is No | Analys is No | Analys is No | Total number of each error Category |
|----|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| | | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | |
| 1 | Punctuation | 2 | – | 3 | – | 5 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| 2 | Spelling error | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 | – | 3 | 15 |
| 3 | Preposition | 3 | – | 1 | 4 | – | – | 1 | 9 |
| 4 | Conjunction | 1 | – | 2 | – | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 5 | Pronouns | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | – | – | 2 | 10 |
| 6 | Articles | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | – | 5 | 3 | 22 |
| 7 | Passive case | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | – | 3 | – | 10 |
| 8 | Negative construction | – | 2 | – | – | 3 | – | – | 5 |
| 9 | Capitalization | 5 | – | 2 | – | – | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| 10 | Word order | 1 | – | – | 1 | – | 2 | – | 4 |
| 11 | Fragment | – | 3 | 2 | – | – | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| 12 | Run on sentence | 2 | – | 3 | 2 | – | 1 | – | 8 |
| 13 | Possessive adjective & attributive structure | 2 | 2 | – | 2 | 2 | – | 1 | 9 |
| 14 | Part of speech | 2 | 1 | – | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 15 |
| 15 | Modal verbs | – | – | 1 | 2 | – | – | 2 | 5 |
| 16 | Redundancy | 1 | – | – | – | 1 | – | 1 | 3 |
| 17 | Verb tense | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 26 |
| | Total number of errors found | 34 | 19 | 31 | 30 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 185 |

| No | Error category | Anal ysis No. | Analy sis No. | Analy sis No. | Analy sis No. | Anal ysis No | Anal ysis No | Analy sis No | Total number of each error Category |
|----|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|
| | | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | |
| 1 | Punctuation | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | – | 3 | – | 13 |
| 2 | Spelling error | 2 | – | 1 | – | 3 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| 3 | Preposition | 1 | 2 | – | 3 | | – | 1 | 7 |
| 4 | Conjunction | – | – | 1 | 1 | 1 | – | 3 | 6 |
| 5 | Pronouns | 2 | – | 2 | – | 1 | – | 1 | 6 |
| 6 | Articles | 3 | – | 3 | 2 | 2 | – | 1 | 11 |
| 7 | Passive case | – | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | – | 1 | 7 |
| 8 | Negative construction | – | – | 2 | – | 1 | 1 | – | 4 |
| 9 | Capitalization | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 | – | 5 | 21 |
| 10 | Word order | – | – | – | 3 | – | 2 | – | 5 |
| 11 | Fragment | – | – | 2 | – | 2 | 3 | 3 | 10 |
| 12 | Run on sentence | 1 | 2 | – | – | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 13 | Possessive adjective & attributive structure | 3 | 5 | 2 | – | 1 | 2 | – | 12 |
| 14 | Part of speech | 5 | – | – | 3 | – | 1 | 2 | 11 |
| 15 | Modal verbs | 1 | – | 1 | 2 | – | | – | 4 |
| 16 | Redundancy | 1 | – | 2 | – | 1 | – | 1 | 5 |
| 17 | Verb tense | – | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 24 |
| | Total number of errors found | 25 | 16 | 32 | 22 | 30 | 17 | 29 | 169 |

| No | Error category | Anal sis No. | Anal ysis No. | Anal ysis No. | Anal sis No. | Anal ysis No. | Anal sis No. | Anal ysis No. | Total number of each error category |
|----|--|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | |
| 1 | Punctuation | 4 | 1 | 1 | _ | 1 | 5 | 2 | 14 |
| 2 | Spelling error | 1 | _ | 3 | _ | _ | 1 | 5 | 10 |
| 3 | Preposition | _ | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 13 |
| 4 | Conjunction | _ | _ | 1 | 1 | _ | 1 | _ | 3 |
| 5 | Pronouns | 1 | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | 1 |
| 6 | Articles | 5 | _ | 3 | 3 | 2 | _ | 2 | 15 |
| 7 | Passive case | _ | 1 | 2 | 2 | _ | _ | 1 | 6 |
| 8 | Negative construction | 2 | _ | _ | _ | 1 | 1 | _ | 4 |
| 9 | Capitalization | _ | _ | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 18 |
| 10 | Word order | _ | _ | 3 | _ | _ | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 11 | Fragment | 1 | _ | | _ | 2 | _ | 1 | 4 |
| 12 | Run on sentence | 2 | _ | _ | 2 | _ | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 13 | Possessive adjective & attributive structure | 1 | 1 | 2 | _ | 2 | 2 | _ | 8 |
| 14 | Part of speech | 2 | 3 | _ | 1 | _ | 1 | _ | 7 |
| 15 | Modal verbs | _ | _ | 1 | 2 | _ | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 16 | Redundancy | _ | _ | 1 | _ | 1 | _ | _ | 2 |
| 17 | Verb tense | 3 | 1 | _ | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 18 |
| | Total number of errors found | 22 | 11 | 22 | 19 | 20 | 26 | 24 | 144 |

| Error category | Anal ysis No. | Anal ysis No. | Anal ysis No. | Anal ysis No. | Total number of each error category |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | |
| Punctuation | – | – | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Spelling error | 2 | 5 | – | 1 | 8 |
| Preposition | 1 | – | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Conjunction | 2 | – | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Pronouns | – | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| Articles | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 14 |
| Passive case | – | 4 | – | 3 | 7 |
| Negative construction | – | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Capitalization | 5 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 16 |
| Word order | 1 | 1 | 2 | – | 4 |
| Fragment | 1 | – | 5 | 2 | 8 |
| Run on sentence | 3 | – | – | 1 | 4 |
| Possessive adjective & attributive structure | – | 3 | 3 | – | 6 |
| Part of speech | – | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 |
| Modal verbs | – | – | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Redundancy | – | – | 3 | – | 3 |
| Verb tense | 11 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 22 |
| Total number of errors found | 32 | 32 | 30 | 39 | 132 |

