

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review
Print ISSN: 3006-5887
Online ISSN: 3006-5895
[**https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11**](https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11)

Analyzing Grammatical Errors in ESL Learners' Narrative Writing: A Case Study



Afia Niaz

PhD Scholar, English Linguistics, University of Sialkot, Pakistan Email: afianiaz401@gmail.com

Ali Furqan Syed

Lecturer, Department of English, University of Sialkot, Pakistan Email: alifurqan.syed95@gmail.com

Abstract

Errors are the most frequent possibility during the ESL learning process, and as long people are learning second or foreign languages, study into error analysis will continue. This study aims to identify the different types of grammatical errors in ESL learners' narrative writing. The aims of this study are: (1) To investigate the grammatical errors committed by the ESL learners, (2) to discuss the factors affecting ESL learners to commit errors in their narrative writing. This research used a mixed-method design integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches. For this research the researcher used a purposive sampling technique. A study has composed of 115 short stories written by the students of BS English department. This study has selected the participants from three sections. The students have given a task to compose short stories on six different topics. This study investigated the 13 types of grammatical errors proposed by Erel and Bulut (2007) in short stories. This study used the coding scheme to give codes of each error and also used Erel & Bulut model to analyze the learner's errors. After analyzing the errors percentage and frequency through tests the SPSS statistics 27 version tool used for the results. It implies that even though students may be aware of the rules of the target language, their inability to perform adequately is caused by a lack of practice. Error analysis is beneficial for students. Finding the errors plays a crucial role in discovering the problems which are faced by learners at any level. Students can learn from their mistakes and develop their mathematical thinking skills through the unique learning possibilities offered by error analysis. Enhancing teacher-student, student-student, and student-content exchanges also help to improve the calibre of classroom interaction.

Keywords: Error Analysis, Narrative Writing, ESL Learners, Categories Of Errors

INTRODUCTION

Errors are unavoidable in the language learning process, and error analysis is essential to language instruction and a need for students to learn constructively. Furthermore, Mahmoud (2011) states that "nobody goes from zero competence to full competence in one leap" (p. 29). Error analysis provides insight into instructional methods, student issue areas, and error causes. Effective teaching and learning strategies require an understanding of these problems, as demonstrated by Corder's (1981) extensive research in this field of error analysis and several theories he developed on topics like interlanguage, fossilization, idiosyncratic dialects, etc. According to Mahmoud (2011), errors can help teachers assess how well their students are learning. The results indicate that the development of a new pedagogical approach might enhance English language instruction in Pakistani classrooms.

Error analysis plays a significant role in both second and foreign language learning and applied linguistics. When acquiring a first language, a child frequently makes morphological, syntactic, and structural errors. Comparably, even though an adult and fully aware second language student encounters the same issues and makes the same errors, they nevertheless experience the same problems. Common errors include morphological, phonological, syntactic, context-related, meaning-transmission issues,

and first-language (L1) influences on second-language acquisition (L2).

Error analysis (EA) is a technique that gathers errors found in a learner's language, analyses them to see if they are systematic, and explains their root causes. Error analysis (EA) is a major theory of second language acquisition. It focuses on analyzing the errors made by second language learners by contrasting their assimilation standard with the rules of the target language and providing explanations for the errors that are identified. Error analysis is predicated on the recognition, characterization, and justification of errors made by students. To find their source, it is crucial to have a general understanding of them. Error analysis (EA) has become known as the most common approach for analyzing foreign or second languages. One of the greatest methods for linguistic studies that focus on the errors made by students is error analysis. An error analysis tool compares the errors produced by learners both inside and outside of the target language (Zawahreh, 2012).

Errors in teaching foreign languages, particularly English, are the kind of situations that are hard to avoid. Numerous factors might lead English language learners to make errors, and occasionally interference from one's mother tongue can also be one of the causes. Errors are common when learning a language. As a result, when teachers teach in a classroom, they will encounter a variety of situations: many students write well, many write mediocrely, and perhaps even a large number of students write poorly. This research aims to discover several grammatical errors, including punctuation, article, preposition, subject-verb agreement and so on. An additional objective of this research is to investigate the potential causes of these grammatical errors, both interlingually and interlingually, including mother tongue influence, fossilization, avoidance, incorrect instruction, and insufficient learning. Additionally, this study will categorize these problems as local or global errors and offer corrective actions to address these errors. According to the justification given above, the writer is interested in examining students' writing, particularly about grammatical errors. The writer aims to do research using the title "Analyzing Grammatical Errors in ESL Learners' Narrative Writing: A Case Study."

Statement of the Problem

Students from Pakistan studying English as a second language make grammatical errors that hinder their ability to acquire the language. Students make errors while writing English stories or while acquiring the English language. Urdu is the official language of Pakistan, and English is taught as a second language. Students at the primary level make various errors that make it difficult for them to acquire the language. There are a lot of studies (Zawaherh, 2012; Mehmood et al., 2017; Behlaaj, 1997; Salebi, 2004) on the written compositions of ESL learners. Many researchers did the work on written compositions like written essays, paragraphs, translation papers, summaries etc., but there is a lack of research on short stories. There is no such work or research on error analysis of narrative writing. This study will investigate the written narrative short stories. In this study, the researcher will investigate the errors in the written short stories of 4th 5th, and 6th- students at BS-level in Gift University. The researcher will also examine the errors made by students at the same grade level and try to offer solutions.

Research Objectives

The following are the main objects of the current research:

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

To investigate the writing errors committed by the undergraduate ESL Learners of English department

To discuss the factors affecting ESL learners to commit errors in narrative writing

Research Questions

The current study will answer the following research questions:

Which types of errors are the most frequently committed by the undergraduate ESL learners?

What are the factors affecting ESL learners for committing errors?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Language proficiency involves four elements. The first is listening skills; the second is speaking skills; the third is reading skills; and the fourth is writing abilities. There is a relationship between the four language proficiency areas. According to Septiaji (2017), the four language skills are useful not just in the context of language but also in everyday life. Every pupil should ideally be able to do all of these tasks. Of the four language skills, writing skills more precisely, the ability to write short stories are the most challenging, as noted by Halim, Hartati, and Lestari (2019).

Writing can be defined as the process of expressing one's thoughts, feelings, and ideas through written language. It is considered one of the productive abilities in the English language. According to Iftanti (2016), writing is a part of the ability for unrestricted expression. Just like speaking, listening, and reading, writing is an essential skill that students must acquire. Students can convey their desires through writing. Second language learners must develop the talent of writing properly because it has a significant impact on the students' lives. Writing also gives someone a means of communicating ideas and emotions in a way that is understandable to them and to other people. It implies that one can use writing to express their opinions and emotions by structuring their ideas into coherent sentences and paragraphs (Siddiq, 2013). It is clear from the description above that writing is an essential component of learning English for students because it is a productive ability that is frequently used to convey ideas to others in addition to speaking.

Writing is a fundamental English language ability that requires a great deal of practice. It is a challenging skill since to be understood, the learner must express his feelings and ideas in writing (Nur Fitria, 2020). According to Jayanti (2019), students must practice their writing abilities a lot to become proficient in them. She continued by saying that providing students with writing exercises that challenge them to write well will help them learn writing techniques. After that, the student could make some mistakes or errors. When students commit these types of errors and mistakes, they should fix them so that they won't happen in the future when they have to write.

Yaghi and Abdullah (2015) made a distinction between an error and a mistake in the context of language acquisition. They clarified that the mistake is a linguistic gap in the learner's target language. This explanation aligns with Corder's (1975) definition: "Errors of performance (mistakes) are characteristically unsystematic, and errors of competence are systematic". To illustrate, the learner does not have the necessary knowledge to self- correct the error. On the other hand, the student can fix his own mistakes as he is aware of the proper form, but he committed these mistakes as a result of some anxiety, weariness, or fatigue.

Writing in English can be challenging for certain students. They will encounter difficulties when utilizing written language. When they write, they make errors

because they don't know which is right (Karim et al., 2018). This means that there will be errors, which come through in their writing. Students often struggle with writing in English, which leads to errors when they write goods. Here, an error falls into three categories: syntactic, semantic, and morphological (Liu, 2008). Making errors when learning a second language can be viewed as a way for students to improve their skills and learn more from their errors when using the target language. According to Fitria (2020), errors can also be caused by a learner's lack of proficiency in the language, such as ignorance of the appropriate rules of the target language. James (2013) claims that the best method for identifying the specifics of an incident, its causes, and the effects of poor language is to do an error analysis

Error analysis is the process of looking at, analyzing, and identifying the rules in the language of interest and exposing the mistakes that the language's operating systems have made. According to Richards (1974), error analysis is the study of mistakes made by second and foreign-language learners. According to Brown (1980), the process of identifying, evaluating, and classifying errors from language learners' norms is known as error analysis (EA). As a result, we can identify common student errors and help students correct their problems by using error analysis. This is very useful for teachers. The process of examining the nature of foreign learning in language acquisition, which entails locating, characterizing, evaluating, and elucidating the errors, can thus be characterized as error analysis.

Numerous scholars have examined the writing errors made by EFL/ESL students in their studies. There have been several studies done to look into the errors that students make while they write. Abushihab et al. (2011) conducted research in which they analyzed 62 Jordanian EFL students' written discourse from the English Literature and Translation department at Alzaytoonah Private University in Jordan. This study's primary goal was to identify and categorize the grammatical errors those students made when producing written works. According to the findings, prepositions, verbs, articles, tenses, morphology, and active and passive forms were the areas where students made errors the most frequently. As a result, the results showed that prepositional errors, which made up 26% of all errors, were the most common category of errors. In 2018, Al Zoubi performed a study that examined essay writing errors made by English language majors. The findings indicated that spelling and word choice errors were the most frequently encountered, while pluralism and possessive usage problems were the least frequent. The study also showed that there were other factors contributing to the inaccuracies. The study found that inadequate learning resources or instructors who lacked language teaching experience were two contributing factors. Darus (2009) conducted a study to investigate the errors analysis of essays written by 72 students of secondary level in Malaysia. The participants were 37 males and 35 females in Form Four Malay students from secondary school in Malaysia.

They had completed primary and high school in Malaysia; thus, their total educational experience was roughly equal. A significant number of participants were non-native speakers who hardly ever used the English language for communication outside of the classroom. The instrument which was used in this project was a participant's written essays and Markin software. All of the essay's errors were found and ordered into several categories. The findings of the study showed that the most frequent errors of the participants were singular/plural, word choice, word order, verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and prepositions. For participants, these are the most

difficult aspects of writing in English. The researcher shed light on how students interiorize the laws of the target language which in this case was English. Teachers gain from this understanding of language-learning concerns because it provides data on common language-learning obstacles that can be utilized to plan useful sessions. Zawaherh (2012) conducted a study to investigate the writing errors committed by tenth-grade students who were studying at Ajloun governorate school in Jordan. For analysis 350 students were selected randomly from a group of schools in Ajloun. The study's major objective was to find out the writing errors in the written essays. For a typical English language assignment, they were required to compose an essay about "a journey to the ancient city of Jerash in Jordan." The results of this study showed that the most prominent error among the tenth-grade students in Ajloun schools was a deficit of agreement between the subject and the main verb. The results also suggested that the students' writing errors could be ascribed to Arabic obstruction. Moreover, Behlaaj (1997) conducted a study in which he investigated the errors made by his students in their translation papers. This study aims to find out the errors made by the students in the translation. The study's findings demonstrated that the grammatical errors made by the students fell into the following categories based on how frequently they occurred: verb-created tense errors, relative clauses, adjectives, prepositions, nouns, articles, and miscellaneous. The significance of this study is in the way it presents a cross- level analysis of errors to look at how students learn English grammar at each of the four departments within the English Department at Al-Azhar University in Gaza. Furthermore, it seeks to identify specific English language segments that department teachers should take immediate notice of.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a mixed-methods approach to investigate the types and frequency of writing errors among BS-level English department students at GIFT University, Gujranwala, Punjab, Pakistan. Qualitatively, error analysis was conducted on students' short stories using a task-based approach, where participants wrote narratives on assigned topics. Quantitatively, a closed-ended questionnaire was analyzed via SPSS to identify factors influencing errors. The theoretical framework draws from Chomsky's Universal Grammar (1965), which shifted focus from behaviorist views of errors as flaws to cognitive perspectives treating them as evidence of innate language abilities. Corder (1967) further advanced this by pioneering error analysis in L2 learning, emphasizing consistent learner errors as hypothesis-forming tools, as echoed by Selinker (1992). Errors were tagged using an adapted Divsar (2017) coding scheme—previously employed by Chuang and Nesi (2006), Dagneaux et al. (1998), and Hou (2016)—with 13 major categories: prepositions (P), spelling (S), word choice (WC), word order (WO), articles (Art), nouns (N), punctuation (Pun), verb tense (V), singular-plural (SP), subject-verb agreement (SV), capitalization (Cap), redundancy (Redun), and pronouns (Pron). This hierarchical system, supplemented by Erel and Bulut's (2007) error identification model (see Table 3.4.1), enabled precise qualitative and quantitative error categorization.

The population comprised 115 BS English students from the 4th, 5th, and 6th semesters at GIFT University, selected via purposive sampling for accessibility and relevance to the study's focus on ESL writing errors. Initially, 150 students from three sections—Section A (Semantics, 29 students), Section B (Morphology, 37 students),

and Section C (Grammar & Syntax, 49 students)—participated by writing two short stories each over three to four days (e.g., "Do Good, Have Good" for Section A; see Table 3.9.1 for full distribution). After data cleansing, 35 incomplete or blank submissions were excluded, yielding 115 valid narrative samples for analysis.

Data collection involved two phases. First, qualitative data from the 115 short stories were manually examined for the 13 error categories, with errors counted, symbolized, and analyzed for frequency and percentages. Second, quantitative data came from a 15-item closed-ended questionnaire (three items per domain: faulty teaching materials, ignorance of rules, lack of writing practice, mother tongue interference, and insufficient feedback) administered to 100 students. SPSS analysis produced frequencies, histograms, and reliability statistics (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.876 for 15 items; see Table 3.11.1), confirming strong internal consistency. Instructions were provided during tests to ensure standardized task completion.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

This section covers the results of the study obtained from detailed data analysis. First of all, the researcher discusses about the total errors by category.

Total Errors by Category

The researcher conducted an analysis using the following stages, which Corder (1974) listed: To identify the different kinds of errors, the researcher first examined each student's paper, word to word and phrase by phrase. Secondly, the researcher used a coding scheme according to Erel & Bulut's model (2007) to divide these types into different categories, which was subsequently translated into a percentage to look at the frequency. Third, the researcher contrasted these errors with findings from previous investigations.

The researcher analyzes the grammatical errors and categorizes them into thirteen categories: verb tense, pronouns, prepositions, spellings, punctuation, word order, word choice, capitalization, articles, nouns, subject-verb agreement, singular plural, and redundancy. This allows the researcher to understand the nature of the grammatical problems in the students' work. These thirteen categories of grammatical errors with frequency and percentage are mentioned in table1 below.

Table 1*Total Numbers of Errors and Frequency of Each Type of Error*

Errors Categories	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Punctuation	817	26.5%
Capitalization	248	8.05%
Articles	384	12.4%
Pronouns	125	4.05%
Verb Tense Errors	567	18.4%
Noun Errors	48	1.55%
Subject-Verb Agreement	121	3.92%
Redundancy	12	0.38%
Singular Plural	154	5%

Word Choice	95	3.08%
Word Order	18	0.58%
Preposition	248	8.05%
Spelling	243	7.8%
TOTAL	3,080	100%

This table provides a detailed breakdown of various types of errors encountered, along with their frequencies and percentages. Punctuation errors are the most prevalent, accounting for 817 instances, or 26.5% of the total errors. Verb tense errors follow closely with 567 occurrences, making up 18.4% of the errors. Article errors are also significant, with 384 errors representing 12.4% of the total. Capitalization and preposition errors each contribute 8.05% to the error count, with 248 errors each. Spelling errors are slightly less frequent, comprising 7.8% of the errors with 243 instances. Pronoun errors account for 4.05%, while subject-verb agreement errors make up 3.92%. Word choice errors are at 3.08%, and singular-plural errors represent 5%. Redundancy and word order errors are less common, at 0.38% and 0.58%, respectively. The table summarizes a total of 3,080 errors, illustrating a range of common writing issues with varying frequencies.

a) Section Wise Frequency and Percentage of Errors

The researcher now counted down the error's frequency and percentage according to the sections wise A, B, and C and mentioned in the tables which is mentioned below.

Table 2
The Use of Punctuation

Sections	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	189	23.1%
Section B	230	28.1%
Section C	398	48.7%

This table presents the frequency and percentage of grammatical errors identified in three different course sections. Section C has the highest number of errors, with 398 errors accounting for 48.7% of the total. Section B follows with 230 errors, representing 28.1% of the total. Section A has the fewest errors, totaling 189, which makes up 23.1% of the total errors. This distribution highlights that Section C encountered the most significant number of grammatical issues, while Section A had the fewest and it is a numeric data.

Table 3
The Use of Capitalization

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	47	18.9%
Section B	57	22.9%
Section C	144	58.06%

This table shows the distribution of grammatical errors across three sections of a

course. Section C exhibits the highest frequency of errors, with 144 errors making up 58.06% of the total. Section B follows with 57 errors, which constitutes 22.9% of the total errors. Section A has the lowest number of errors, totaling 47, representing 18.9% of the total. This breakdown indicates that Section C experienced the most frequent grammatical issues, while Section A had the fewest.

Table 4*The Use of Articles*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	76	19.7%
Section B	135	35.1%
Section C	173	45.05%

This table illustrates the distribution of grammatical errors among three sections of a course. Section C has the highest number of errors, with 173 errors accounting for 45.05% of the total. Section B follows with 135 errors, which make up 35.1% of the total errors. Section A has the fewest errors, totaling 76, representing 19.7% of the total. This distribution indicates that Section C faced the most frequent grammatical issues, while Section A encountered the fewest.

Table 5*The Use of Pronouns*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	18	14.4%
Section B	42	33.6%
Section C	65	52%

This table displays the frequency and percentage of grammatical errors across three course sections. Section C has the highest frequency of errors, with 65 instances, making up 52% of the total. Section B follows with 42 errors, representing 33.6% of the total errors. Section A has the lowest number of errors, totaling 18, which constitutes 14.4% of the total. This data highlights that Section C experienced the most grammatical issues, while Section A had the fewest and this table shows the numerical data.

Table 6*The Use of Verbs*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	111	19.5%
Section B	191	33.6%
Section C	265	46.7%

This table presents the frequency and percentage of grammatical errors across three different course sections. Section C has the highest number of errors, totaling 265,

which represents 46.7% of the overall errors. Section B follows with 191 errors, accounting for 33.6% of the total. Section A has the fewest errors, with 111 instances, constituting 19.5% of the total. This distribution indicates that Section C experienced the most significant number of grammatical issues, while Section A had the least.

Table 7
The Use of Nouns

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	16	33.3%
Section B	8	16.6%
Section C	24	50%

This table shows the distribution of a specific type of grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest frequency of this error, with 24 instances, making up 50% of the total. Section A follows with 16 errors, representing 33.3% of the total. Section B has the fewest occurrences, totaling 8 errors, or 16.6% of the total. This data highlights that Section C encountered the most frequent instances of this particular error, while Section B had the least and this shows a numeric data.

Table 8
The Use of Subject-Verb Agreement

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	9	7.43%
Section B	28	23.1%
Section C	84	69.4%

This table details the distribution of a specific type of grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest frequency, with 84 errors, which represents 69.4% of the total. Section B has 28 errors, accounting for 23.1% of the total. Section A has the fewest errors, totaling 9, or 7.43% of the total. This distribution reveals that Section C encountered the most frequent instances of this particular error, while Section A had the fewest.

Table 9
The Use of Singular Plural

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	22	14.2%
Section B	48	31.1%
Section C	84	54.5%

This table summarizes the occurrence of a particular type of grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest frequency with 84 errors, making up 54.5% of the total. Section B follows with 48 errors, representing 31.1% of the total.

Section A has the fewest errors, totaling 22, which accounts for 14.2% of the total. This distribution indicates that Section C experienced the most frequent occurrences of this error, while Section A had the least.

Table 10*The Use of Redundancy*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	6	66.6%
Section B	3	33.3%
Section C	3	33.3%

This table presents the distribution of a specific grammatical error type across three course sections. Section A has the highest frequency, with 6 errors, which constitutes 66.6% of the total. Sections B and C each have 3 errors, representing 33.3% of the total for each section. This data indicates that Section A experienced a significantly higher occurrence of this error compared to Sections B and C, which had an equal number of instances.

Table 11*The Use of Spelling*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	49	19.6%
Section B	89	35.7%
Section C	111	44.5%

This table outlines the distribution of a specific type of grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest number of occurrences, with 111 errors, representing 44.5% of the total. Section B follows with 89 errors, accounting for 35.7% of the total. Section A has 49 errors, making up 19.6% of the total. This distribution reveals that Section C encountered the most frequent instances of this error, while Section A had the fewest.

Table 12*The Use of Preposition*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	48	19.3%
Section B	85	34.2%
Section C	115	46.3%

This table details the frequency and percentage of a particular grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest occurrence, with 115 errors, representing 46.3% of the total. Section B follows with 85 errors, accounting for 34.2% of the total. Section A has 48 errors, making up 19.3% of the total. This data indicates that Section C experienced the most frequent instances of this error, while Section A had the least.

Table 13*The Use of Word Choice*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	21	22.1%
Section B	24	25.2%
Section C	50	52.6%

This table provides a breakdown of the frequency and percentage of a specific grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest number of occurrences, with 50 errors, which accounts for 52.6% of the total. Section B follows with 24 errors, representing 25.2% of the total. Section A has 21 errors, making up 22.1% of the total. This distribution highlights that Section C experienced the most frequent instances of this error, whereas Section A had the fewest.

Table 14*The Use of Word Order*

Section	Errors Frequency	Errors Percentage
Section A	3	16.6%
Section B	4	22.2%
Section C	11	61.1%

This table shows the frequency and percentage of a specific grammatical error across three course sections. Section C has the highest number of errors, with 11 instances, making up 61.1% of the total. Section B follows with 4 errors, accounting for 22.2% of the total. Section A has the fewest occurrences, totaling 3 errors, which represents 16.6% of the total. This distribution indicates that Section C experienced the most frequent occurrences of this error, while Section A had the least.

Tabular Results of Error Analysis Questionnaire**Table 15***The teaching materials provided for writing skills are often outdated*

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	16	16.0	16.0	16.0
Disagree	14	14.0	14.0	30.0
Neutral	33	33.0	33.0	63.0
Agree	30	30.0	30.0	93.0
Strongly Agree	7	7.0	7.0	100.0

The table above summarize respondents' opinions on whether teaching materials for writing skills are outdated. Among the participants, 16% strongly disagreed, 14% disagreed, 33% remained neutral, 30% agreed, and 7% strongly agreed with the statement. Overall, 37% agreed or strongly agreed that the materials are outdated, compared to 30% who disagreed, with 33% undecided on this issue.

Table 16*Teaching materials lack clarity and contribute to errors in writing*

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
Disagree	31	31.0	31.0	40.0
Neutral	32	32.0	32.0	72.0
Agree	24	24.0	24.0	96.0
Strongly Agree	4	4.0	4.0	100.0

Table 16 provides a breakdown of opinions on the statement “Teaching materials lack clarity and contribute to errors in writing.” Among respondents, 9% strongly disagreed, 31% disagreed, 32% were neutral, 24% agreed, and 4% strongly agreed. Overall, 28% agreed or strongly agreed that the materials lack clarity and contribute to writing errors, while 40% disagreed, with 32% offering neutral feedback on their clarity and effectiveness.

Table 17*Teaching materials are not sufficient to understand writing concepts*

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	12	12.0	12.0	12.0
Disagree	35	35.0	35.0	47.0
Neutral	28	28.0	28.0	75.0
Agree	23	23.0	23.0	98.0
Strongly Agree	2	2.0	2.0	100.0

Table 17 summarizes respondents' views on the statement “The examples in the teaching materials are not sufficient to understand writing concepts.” Among participants, 12% strongly disagreed, 35% disagreed, 28% were neutral, 23% agreed, and 2% strongly agreed. Overall, 47% disagreed (indicating sufficient examples), while 25% agreed or strongly agreed with the insufficiency claim, and 28% remained neutral.

Table 18*Students often ignore grammatical rules when writing*

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	5	5.0	5.0	5.0
Disagree	11	11.0	11.0	16.0
Neutral	22	22.0	22.0	38.0
Agree	51	51.0	51.0	89.0
Strongly Agree	11	11.0	11.0	100.0

Table 18 displays the distribution of responses to the statement “Students often ignore grammatical rules when writing.” Among respondents, 5% strongly disagreed, 11% disagreed, 22% were neutral, 51% agreed, and 11% strongly agreed. In summary, 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed (indicating students do not frequently ignore rules), while 62% agreed or strongly agreed that this is a prevalent issue, with 22% remaining neutral.

Table 19*Lack of knowledge of grammatical rules leads to frequent writing errors*

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
Disagree	10	10.0	10.0	14.0
Neutral	17	17.0	17.0	31.0
Agree	53	53.0	53.0	84.0
Strongly Agree	16	16.0	16.0	100.0

Tables 19 and the accompanying graph display the distribution of opinions on the statement “Lack of knowledge of grammatical rules leads to frequent writing errors.” Among respondents, 4% strongly disagreed, 10% disagreed, 17% were neutral, 53% agreed, and 16% strongly agreed. Overall, 69% agreed or strongly agreed that insufficient grammatical knowledge causes frequent writing errors, in contrast to 14% who disagreed or strongly disagreed, with 17% remaining neutral.

Table 20*Students do not prioritize learning grammar as part of their writing skills*

Responses	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	4.0	4.0	4.0
Disagree	12	12.0	12.0	16.0
Neutral	23	23.0	23.0	39.0
Agree	48	48.0	48.0	87.0
Strongly Agree	13	13.0	13.0	100.0

Table 20 displays responses to the statement “Students do not prioritize learning grammar as part of their writing skills.” Among respondents, 4% strongly disagreed, 12% disagreed, 23% were neutral, 48% agreed, and 13% strongly agreed. Overall, 61% agreed or strongly agreed that students deprioritize grammar in writing skills development, while 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 23% remained neutral.

Discussion

An in-depth examination of the errors made by BS English students in two distinct sections offers a clear picture of their level of academic language skills. By recognizing, categorizing, and tactfully explaining errors, Corder (1974) developed a procedural technique for studying the nature of errors. In a similar vein, the goal of the current research is to provide students feedback on how well they wrote in the target

language. Teachers were also allowed to reflect deeply on their teaching practices and the issues that students encountered while writing essays for assignments. In the current study, the purposive sample was evaluated, and the results show that learners' writing performance exhibits a variety of errors rather than only one type (Nartiningrum et al., 2021). In the same way, the current study examines how frequently learners' written compositions contain seven distinct kinds of errors. This study's primary goal was to identify the common errors of BS English language learners made while writing short stories. Error identification is a crucial step in determining the issues that students, regardless of ability level, are facing. By using various teaching tactics, these issues can be further eliminated. Corder (1981) suggested three ways in which errors can be beneficial: First, they notify the teachers of the students' advancement in their language learning process and help them choose which language structure needs more attention. Second, these errors give the researchers insight into the methods and approaches involved in learning a new language. Thirdly, the learners find that these errors are beneficial when they utilize them as a tool for further study. Furthermore, the categorization of errors can benefit students' language acquisition. Based on an investigation of learners' errors in their written composition, the current study identified 13 different categories. The researcher also determined the frequency of each error to identify common writing errors made by learners.

Conclusion

The study's goal was to examine the errors made by BS students in three different English department sections at Gift University Gujranwala. To eliminate errors and enhance students' writing abilities, the research assisted in bringing typical errors to light. The researcher's focus was on the whole BS English department students but his main focus was on the three different sections and the names of the sections were Semantics (Section-A), Morphology (Section-B), and Grammer & Syntax (Section-C) in which tests were conducted from the students. Thirteen categories of common test errors were examined by the researcher, who classified them into codes according to the coding scheme which is based on their analysis: capitalization, spelling, punctuation, articles, subject-verb agreement, singular-plural, verb tense, nouns, word choice, redundancy, preposition, pronoun, and word order. The researcher analyzed all the tests in which the researcher found 3,080 total errors which included all the categories of errors. This study used tables and figures to illustrate the percentage of total words and the error count for each category. After this, the researcher prepared an error analysis questionnaire with 15 questions. This questionnaire was made up to know the factor that affects the students to commit the writing errors. The researcher gave the questionnaire to the 100 students and filled by it. After their responses, the researcher analyzed them by using the SPSS software to check the frequency in tables and histograms. The researcher concluded that teachers and relevant institutions prioritized these writing errors just as much as students did. These errors can occasionally be attributed to unqualified staff members and educational materials.

Here, Urdu and Pashto are the primary languages of instruction; English receives less attention, which allows for errors like this. The sociolinguistic element is another. Since English is these students' second language, they frequently translate from Pashto, their first language of acquisition, to Urdu and then English when writing in English. Because it is a truth of language that the syntactic structure of one language

does not necessarily correspond to the syntactic structure of another. Similarly to this, certain errors were made by the students when they attempted to fit the grammatical structures of Pashto and Urdu into English. Finally, the researcher suggested that teachers and students use doable strategies to get past these types of errors. The steps involve selecting grammar reference books and practicing grammar every day. In a secondary language used for academic purposes, the teacher should help students understand that sentence structure is just as important as content. According to this research firstly the students who conducted tests they are doing majorly English. Secondly, they have already taken these three basic courses in the first semesters. These courses are totally based on the English language and are based on their writing skills but still they are making errors. The study also recommended that teachers conduct tests every week and focus particularly on students' grammatical mistakes to help them avoid making the same errors in the future.

References

Abushihab, I., El-Omari, A. H., & Tobat, M. (2011). An analysis of written Grammatical errors of Arab learners of English as a Foreign language at Alzaytoonah private university of Jordan, European Journal of Social Sciences, 20(4), 543-552.

Al-Zoubi, S.M. (2018). The Significance of Error Analysis in Written Production: A Case Study of Ajloun National University Students. International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 7(4), 150-159.

Brown, H. Douglas. (1980). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Prentice Hall Inc

Corder, S. P. (1981). Error analysis and inter language. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. (1981). The significance of learners' errors in International Review of Applied Linguistics. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Edge, J. (1989). Mistakes and Corrections. Longman.

Corder, S. P. (1974). Error analysis. In J. P. B. Allen, & S. Pit Corder (Eds.), Techniques in applied linguistics. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. (1975). Error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition. Language teaching, 8(4), 201-218.

Corder, S. P. (1992). Introduction a la lingüística aplicada. México: Limusa

Chuang, F-Y., & Nesi, H. (2006). An analysis of formal errors in a corpus of 12 English produced by Chinese students. Corpora, 1(2), 251-271

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors.

Darus, S. (2009). Error Analysis of the Written English Essays of Secondary School Students in Malaysia: A Case Study, European Journal of Social Sciences – 8(3) 483-495

Dagneaux, E., Denness, S., & Granger, S. (1998). Computer-aided error analysis. System, 26(2), 163-174.

Divsar, H., & Heydari, R. (2017). A corpus-based study of EFL learners' errors in IELTS essay writing. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 6(3), 143-149.

Erel S, Bulut D (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. Erciyes University J. Soc. Sci 22:397-415.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

Halim, I. A., Hartati, A., & Lestari, Z. W. (2019). THE USE OF PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT OF WRITING SKILL IN DESCRIPTIVE TEXT. *JALL (Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature)*, 75-85.

Hou, H. I. (2016). Learner corpus and academic writing: Identifying the error pattern of Taiwanese EFL students. *Journal for the study of English linguistics*, 4(1), 19–30.

Iftanti, E. (2016). IMPROVING STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS THROUGH WRITING JOURNAL ARTICLES. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, 8(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.2016.8.1.1-14>

James, C. (2013). *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. Routledge.

Jayanti, A. (2019). Students' Writing Ability on English Descriptive Text at Grade VIII in SMPN 33 Padang. *ENGLISH FRANCA: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*. 3. 71. 10.29240/ef. v3i01.843.

Karim, S. M. S., Fathema, F., & Hakim, A. (2015). Common errors on the usage of verbs in English composition: A case study of Bangladeshi EFL learners. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2).1-7

Liu, Y. (2008). The Effects of Error Feedback in Second Language Writing. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 15, 15

Mahmoud, A. (2011). The role of interlingual and intralingual transfer in learner-centered EFL vocabulary instruction. *Arab World English Journal*, 2, 28-49.

Mehmood, S. Farukh, A. & Ahmad, M. (2017). Error analysis of English composition at intermediate level. *Ponte*, 73(5): 56-72.

Nartiningrum, N., Rayuningtya, P., & Virgiyanti, D. (2021). Error analysis of undergraduate students' writing performances: IELTS-based activities. *Journal of Educational Management and Instruction (JEMIN)*, 1(1), 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.22515/jemin.v1i1.3446>

Nur F, T. (2020). Error Analysis Found in Students' Writing Composition in Simple Past Tense of Recount Text. *English Franca Academic Journal of English Language and Education*. 4. 141-160. 10.29240/ef. v4i2.1154

Radwan, M.A. (1988). A Linguistic Analysis of the Grammatical and Lexical Errors in the Nominal Group found in the Written English of Syrian University Students. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nottingham. U.K

Richards, J. C. (1974). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman

Septiaji, A. (2016). Kritik Sastra dalam Majalah Sastra Horison sebagai Media Publikasi Budaya Literasi dan Berpikir Kritis. *Prosiding Language Education and Literature*, 101-108.

Salebi, M.Y. (2004). Saudi college students' perception of their errors in written English. *Scientific Journal of King Faisal*, 5, 209-228.

Siddiq, A. (2013). THE USE OF SEMANTIC MAPPING TECNIQUE TO IMPROVE WRITING SKILL IN THE DESCRIPTIVE TEXT.

Selinker, L. 1992. *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman Group U.K. Limited, Essex.

Yaghi, E & Abdullah, A. (2015). Review of learners' errors: an error analysis perspective

Zawahreh, F. (2012). *Applied Error Analysis of Written Production of English Essays*

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

of Tenth Grade Students in Ajloun Schools, Jordan. International Journal of Learning and Development, 2(2), 16-35.