



Analyzing Grammatical Errors in English Essays by EFL Students

Lok Raj Sharma PhD¹

¹Associate Professor of English
Makawanpur Multiple Campus

Corresponding Author

Lok Raj Sharma

Email: lokraj043@gmail.com

To Cite this article: Sharma, L. R. (2025). Analyzing grammatical errors in English essays by EFL Students. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 6(1), 15–40.

<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v6i1.77473>

Submitted: 6 March 2025

Accepted: 13 March 2025

Published: 31 March 2025

Abstract

Error analysis is a systematic scrutiny and elucidation of inaccuracies present in learners' written or spoken expressions due to a lack of their understanding of rules. This study, which executed a cross-sectional research survey design, is to analyze the grammatical errors in a corpus of 105 essays written by 105 BBM (Bachelor of Business Management) and BBA (Bachelor of Business Administration) third semester students studying English as a foreign language (EFL) at Makawanpur Multiple Campus Nepal in the Academic Year 2024. The instrument used for this study to collect data involved students' written essays in English language. All the students were asked to write an essay of almost 700 words on a topic "Significance of Effective Communication Skills". Essays of 105 students were selected from those of 143 students through a simple random sampling technique, especially a lottery method. The sample size, which included the essays of 105 students was determined by employing a software calculator, taking a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5%. The study identified 15 sorts of grammatical errors, such as verb tense, article, subject verb agreement, preposition, number agreement, parallelism, word choice, run-on sentence, modifier, fragment, collocation, word order, punctuation, pronoun, and double negative. The results depict that the highest error was in the use of the verb tense (163 occurrences / 14.0%), whereas the lowest error was observed in the use of double negatives (22 occurrences / 2.0%) while writing negative sentences. Mann-Whitney U test (Sig. or $p = .846$) revealed a uniform distribution of errors across categories of the BBM and BBA programs, ultimately leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. The implications of the study extend to language teaching methodologies and assessment practices, aiming to enhance the writing proficiency of EFL learners.

Keywords: error analysis, grammatical errors, english essays, EFL students, mistakes



1. Introduction

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education encompasses a diverse landscape of learners grappling with the complexities of English language acquisition, particularly in the realm of writing. Proficiency in writing English essays is often a significant marker of language competence and academic success for EFL students (Leki, 1992; Silva, 1993). However, the acquisition of grammatical accuracy in writing poses substantial challenges for EFL learners worldwide (Ferris, 2002; Hyland, 2003). This necessitates a comprehensive examination of the grammatical errors prevalent in English essays produced by EFL students. Understanding the nature and frequency of grammatical errors in EFL writing is crucial for several reasons. Firstly, it provides insights into the linguistic difficulties encountered by EFL learners during the writing process (James, 1998; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Secondly, it informs language teachers and curriculum developers about the specific areas that require targeted instruction and intervention (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Zhang & Yuan, 2020). Additionally, error analysis contributes to the ongoing refinement of language teaching methodologies and assessment practices (Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1999).

The purpose of this study is to conduct a systematic analysis of grammatical errors in English essays written by EFL students. By examining a corpus of essays from EFL learners at various proficiency levels, this research aims to identify the most common types of grammatical errors. Previous research studies identified a wide range of grammatical errors prevalent in the writing of EFL students. These errors often encompass issues, such as subject-verb agreement (James, 1998; Ferris, 2003), verb tense usage (Silva, 1993; Hyland, 2003), article usage (Leki, 1992; Ferris, 2002), and sentence structure (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Zhang & Yuan, 2020). However, the specific patterns and frequencies of these errors may vary among different learners and educational contexts (James, 1998; Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The article aims to identify and categorize common grammatical errors made by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students in their essays for the analysis. Moreover, it seeks to provide insights into the underlying reasons for these errors and propose effective strategies for improvement.

1.2 Statement of the problem

One of the significant challenges in analyzing grammatical errors in EFL writing is the diverse linguistic backgrounds and learning experiences of EFL learners (Leki, 1992; Silva, 1993). EFL students often bring unique sets of language-related difficulties shaped by their native languages and exposure to English instruction (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Zhang & Yuan, 2020). Furthermore, factors, such as instructional approaches, curriculum design, and assessment practices can influence the development of grammatical accuracy in EFL writing (Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1999). To address these challenges, this study employs a multi-dimensional approach to error analysis, drawing on a quantitative method. Although interviews or surveys might be conducted with EFL students and instructors to gather insights into the perceived difficulties in writing English essays and the effectiveness of current

instructional practices (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005). But this article delimits its study to a corpus of English essays produced by EFL students for systematic analysis in order to identify grammatical errors, classify them into specific error categories, and analyze their distribution across different proficiency levels.

1.3 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its contribution to understanding and addressing challenges faced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students in mastering English grammar. By systematically analyzing these errors, teachers and educators can tailor instructional strategies to better support EFL learners. Furthermore, insights gained from this research can inform the development of targeted interventions and resources aimed at improving EFL students' writing skills, ultimately enhancing their academic success and language proficiency (Saputro & Hallim, 2022). This research not only aids educators but also benefits EFL students by fostering a more effective learning environment.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

The study's findings may not generalize to all EFL student populations due to variations in language backgrounds and educational contexts. Moreover, the analysis may overlook contextual factors influencing error production and language acquisition.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

The study focused on analyzing grammatical errors in English essays written by 105 EFL students in the BBM and BBA programs at Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Hetauda, Nepal. It does not address other language aspects or proficiency levels, and may not cover all possible error types or contexts.

1.6 Null hypotheses

This study comprises 16 null hypotheses by employing one independent variable with two levels (BBM and BBA) and 15 grammatical errors as dependent variables.

H₀ 1-15: The distribution of each grammatical error (verb tense, article, subject-verb agreement, preposition, number agreement, parallelism, word choice, run-on sentence, modifier, fragment, collocation, word order, punctuation, pronoun, and double negative) is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

H₀ 16: The distribution of errors on the whole is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.

2. Literature Review

Literature review encompasses the distinction of errors and mistakes, concepts of grammatical errors, major types of grammatical errors, error analysis, English as a foreign language (EFL), writing, English essays and previous studies on grammatical errors.

2.1 Errors and Mistakes

In language learning and research, the terms "error" and "mistake" are often used to describe instances of incorrect language use, but they carry distinct meanings and implications. An error refers to a systematic deviation from the rules and conventions of a language, reflecting a lack of knowledge or competence in a particular linguistic feature (Corder, 1967). It is considered to be a natural and essential part of the language learning process, providing valuable insights into learners' developmental stages and areas needing improvement (James, 1998). It is taken as faulty or incomplete learning (Richards & Schmidt, 2002) and a systematic deviation due to a lack of proper learning of language (Norris, 1987), whereas a mistake takes place due to fatigue, carelessness and a lack of attention (Richards, 1984), and an inconsistent deviation that is corrected later by the writer himself or herself (Norris, 1987).

A mistake is an instance of incorrect language use that is recognized by the speaker as wrong and is typically attributed to lapses in attention, memory, or performance (Ellis, 2008). Unlike errors, mistakes are often random and not indicative of learners' underlying linguistic competence. While errors can be analyzed to understand learners' language acquisition processes, mistakes are typically not as informative in this regard.

Understanding the distinction between errors and mistakes is crucial for language teachers, educators and researchers. By recognizing and analyzing errors, they can design targeted instructional interventions to address specific areas of difficulty and support learners' language development (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Meanwhile, acknowledging and correcting errors can help learners refine their language skills and improve their overall communicative competence.

2.2 Grammatical Errors

Grammatical errors refer to deviations from the rules and conventions of grammar in language usage. They can manifest in various forms, including syntax, morphology, and punctuation, and are often indicative of learners' linguistic competence (Ellis, 2008). These errors may stem from factors, such as incomplete language acquisition, interference from the learner's native language, and insufficient exposure to the target language (Dulay et al., 1982).

Grammatical errors play a crucial role in second language acquisition research, serving as valuable indicators of learners' developmental stages and areas needing improvement (Corder, 1967). Analyzing these errors provides insights into learners' language proficiency levels and informs instructional practices aimed at addressing specific linguistic challenges (James, 1998). Furthermore, understanding the types and frequency of grammatical errors made by learners can help educators design targeted interventions to facilitate language learning and enhance learners' communicative competence (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). By addressing grammatical errors effectively, they can scaffold learners' language development and support their progression toward greater linguistic accuracy and fluency.

This article explores some common reasons for grammatical errors. One of the primary reasons for committing grammatical errors is a lack of linguistic competence regarding grammatical rules (Flege, 1995). This lack of proficiency can result in errors such

as subject-verb agreement mistakes or improper word order. Interference from one's first language can also lead to grammatical errors (Odlin, 1989), resulting in errors such as incorrect verb tense usage or misuse of articles. Cognitive processing constraints can impair an individual's ability to monitor and correct grammatical mistakes (Ellis, 2008). When cognitive resources are taxed, speakers may overlook errors or produce them inadvertently. The context in which communication occurs can influence the occurrence of grammatical errors. In informal settings or casual speech, speakers may prioritize fluency over accuracy, leading to more frequent errors (Chafe, 1982). In written communication, typographical errors and keyboard mistakes can introduce grammatical errors. Misplaced punctuation marks, misspellings, and accidental keystrokes can alter sentence structure and syntax, leading to grammatical inaccuracies.

Grammatical errors are complicated phenomena influenced by linguistic, cognitive, and situational factors. Understanding the reasons behind these errors can inform language teaching methodologies, assist in language proficiency assessment, and contribute to the development of tools for error detection and correction.

2.3 Major Types of Grammatical Errors

Grammatical errors can occur in various aspects of language structure and usage. They are as follows:

Subject-Verb Agreement: Subject-verb agreement dictates that the verb in a sentence must agree in number (singular or plural) with the subject. Errors in subject-verb agreement occur when there is a mismatch between the subject and the verb in terms of number. For example:
The boys is playing. (Incorrect)
The boys are playing. (Correct)

Verb Tense Error: Verb tense indicates the time at which an action takes place. Errors in verb tense occur when the tense of a verb does not match the timeframe of the action being described. For example:
He goes to the store yesterday. (Incorrect)
He went to the store yesterday. (Correct)
He can went to school on foot. (Incorrect)
He can go to school on foot. (Correct)
He was write a letter yesterday. (Incorrect)
He wrote a letter yesterday. (Correct)

Pronoun Usage: Pronouns are words that substitute for nouns. Errors in pronoun usage involve issues such as incorrect pronoun case. For example:
Him and me went to the park. (Incorrect)
He and I went to the park. (Correct)

Parallelism: Parallelism refers to the use of grammatically similar structures in a sentence, particularly in lists or series. Errors in parallelism occur when the elements in a series or list are not parallel in structure, leading to inconsistency or awkwardness. For example:

He likes singing, dancing, and to play. (Incorrect)

He likes singing, dancing, and playing. (Correct)

Modifiers: Modifiers are words or phrases that provide additional information about other elements in a sentence. Errors in modifiers occur when modifiers are misplaced, dangling, or ambiguous, leading to confusion or misinterpretation. For example:

Misplaced Modifier

He almost ate all the cake. (Incorrect)

He ate almost all the cake. (Correct)

Dangling Modifier

After studying all night, the exam was passed. (Incorrect)

After studying all night, he passed the exam. (Correct)

Collocation: It refers to the natural combination of words that are frequently used together in a language. For example:

Here's an example of collocation: "strong coffee." In English, "strong" and "coffee" often collocate because it's a common way to describe coffee. Similarly, "heavy rain," "fast car," and "deep sleep" are all examples of collocations where specific words tend to appear together due to habitual usage.

Heavy water (Incorrect)

Heavy rain. (Correct)

Lazy car. (Incorrect)

Fast car. (Correct)

He bought a blue nose for the party. (Incorrect)

He bought a blue dress for the party. (Correct)

We respect her for her kindness and wise. (Incorrect)

We respect her for her kindness and wisdom. (Correct)

Word Choice: Word choice errors involve using the wrong word or choosing a word that does not fit the context of the sentence. This can lead to ambiguity, awkwardness, or misunderstanding. For example:

I wear skin shoes. (Incorrect)

I wear leather shoes. (Correct)

I drink bread. (Incorrect)

I drink water. (Correct)

A Run-on Sentence: A run-on sentence is a grammatical error that occurs when two or more independent clauses are joined together without proper punctuation or coordination. For example:

I went to the store I bought some apples. (Incorrect)

I went to the store. I bought some apples. (Correct)

I went to the store, and I bought some apples. (Correct)

Fragment: A sentence fragment is an incomplete sentence that lacks either a subject, a predicate, or both. Essentially, it's a group of words that does not express a complete thought. Sentence fragments can occur for various reasons, such as missing a subject, missing a verb, or being a dependent clause that's disconnected from the main clause. For example:

Walking down the street. (Incorrect)

Walking down the street, I met my close friend. (Correct)

Because she was tired. (Incorrect)

She did not go to the night club because she was tired. (Correct)

In the park, enjoying the sunshine. (Incorrect)

In the park, they were enjoying the sunshine. (Correct)

Double Negative: A double negative occurs when two negative words or constructions are used in the same clause or sentence, resulting in a cancellation of the negation and often conveying a positive meaning. In Standard English grammar, double negatives are considered nonstandard or incorrect usage. For example:

I don't have no money. (Incorrect)

I don't have any money. (Correct)

I didn't see nobody. (Incorrect)

I didn't see anybody. (Correct)

Incorrect word order

Incorrect word order in a sentence refers to arranging words in a way that doesn't follow the typical structure or order expected in the given language. This can lead to confusion or make the sentence difficult to understand. For example:

She eats apples. (Normal word order)

Eats she apples. (Abnormal word order)

The cat chased the mouse. (Normal word order)

Chased the mouse the cat. (Abnormal word order)

Punctuation: Punctuation marks such as commas, periods, semicolons, and quotation marks serve to clarify the structure and meaning of sentences. Grammatical errors in punctuation involve issues such as missing, misplaced, or incorrect punctuation marks. For example:

I like cooking baking and swimming. (Incorrect)

I like cooking, baking, and swimming. (Correct)

Where are you going now. (Incorrect)

Where are you going now? (Correct)

Article Error: An article error occurs when the wrong article (a, an, the) is used or when an article is omitted where it is needed in a sentence. Articles are determiners that precede nouns to indicate whether the noun is specific or nonspecific. . For example:

I want to buy an car. (Incorrect)

I want to buy a car. (Correct)

He is engineer. (Incorrect)
He is an engineer. (Correct)
She is a honest girl. (Incorrect)
She is an honest girl. (Correct)

Number Agreement Error: A number agreement error occurs when there is a mismatch between the number (singular or plural) and the corresponding nouns in a sentence. For example:

She has one cats. (Incorrect)
She has one cat. (Correct)
He bought two book. (Incorrect)
He bought two books. (Correct)
They are going to their house. (Incorrect)
They are going to their houses. (Correct)
There are some book on the table. (Incorrect)
There are some books on the table. (Correct)

A Preposition Error: A preposition error occurs when the wrong preposition is used in a sentence, leading to incorrect grammar or unclear meaning. Prepositions are words that indicate relationships between other words in a sentence, such as location, direction, time, or manner. For example:

I go to school by foot. (Incorrect)
I go to school on foot. (Correct)
She is good in English. (Incorrect)
She is good at English. (Correct)

2.4 Error Analysis

Error analysis is a linguistic approach that investigates the types, frequency, and sources of errors made by language learners in order to better understand the language acquisition process (Corder, 1967). It is the analysis of errors made by language learners (Richards & Schmidt, 2002) and a study of linguistic ignorance (James, 1998). It focuses on identifying patterns of errors in learners' language production and determining the underlying causes, which can range from interference from the learners' native language to overgeneralization of language rules (Dulay et al., 1982). Error analysis provides valuable insights into learners' language proficiency levels and helps educators tailor instructional interventions to address specific areas of difficulty (James, 1998). By systematically analyzing errors, researchers and educators can gain a deeper understanding of the challenges faced by language learners and develop more effective teaching strategies to support their language development. It can be taken as a prominent task in the field of teaching and learning language (Sharma, 2021).

2.5 English as a Foreign Language (EFL)

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students are individuals who are learning English in a non-English-speaking environment, typically in countries where English is not

the primary language (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). EFL students face unique challenges in acquiring English proficiency due to limited exposure to authentic language use and cultural contexts (Ellis, 2008). These challenges often manifest in various aspects of language learning, including grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and communicative competence. Research on EFL students has focused on understanding the factors influencing their language acquisition process and identifying effective instructional strategies to support their learning needs. Studies have explored the role of factors, such as language aptitude, motivation, and exposure to English input in shaping EFL students' language development (Gardner, 1985; Dörnyei, 2005). Furthermore, research has investigated the impact of different teaching methodologies and approaches on EFL students' language proficiency levels (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Lightbown & Spada, 2013).

Understanding the characteristics and needs of EFL students is essential for language educators and curriculum developers to design appropriate instructional materials and activities that cater to their diverse learning contexts (Harmer, 2007). By recognizing the unique challenges faced by EFL students and addressing their specific learning needs, educators and teachers can create a supportive and engaging learning environment conducive to their language development.

2.6 Writing

Writing is a complex and multifaceted skill that involves the generation and organization of ideas, the selection of appropriate vocabulary and grammar, and the structuring of coherent and cohesive texts (Flower & Hayes, 1980). It is a highly complex task and writing in English as a foreign language makes the task further complicated (Sharma, 2018). It is a fundamental aspect of language proficiency and plays a crucial role in academic, professional, and personal communication.

Research on writing has explored various aspects of the writing process, including planning, drafting, revising, and editing (Hayes, 1996). Studies have investigated the cognitive processes involved in writing, such as idea generation, text organization, and revision strategies (Kellogg, 1996). In addition, research has examined the role of feedback, peer review, and teacher intervention in supporting writing development (Ferris, 2003; Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Effective writing instruction incorporates both product-oriented and process-oriented approaches, emphasizing not only the final written product but also the strategies and skills used to produce it (Silva, 1993). Instructional practices that promote writing fluency, accuracy, and coherence have been shown to enhance students' writing proficiency (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). Furthermore, fostering a supportive writing environment that encourages creativity, critical thinking, and reflection can nurture students' writing confidence and motivation (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997).

Understanding the complexities of writing and the factors influencing writing proficiency is essential for educators to design effective writing curricula and instructional practices that meet the diverse needs of learners (Hyland, 2003). By providing students with opportunities for meaningful writing experiences and targeted feedback, educators can

empower them to become competent and confident writers across various contexts and genres.

2.7 English Essays

An English essay is a written composition that typically presents an argument, analysis, or interpretation of a topic in the English language. It is characterized by clear organization, logical structure, and effective use of language to convey ideas and support arguments (Zamel, 1983). English essays serve various purposes, including academic assignments, standardized tests, and scholarly publications, and they may cover a wide range of subjects and genres.

The structure of an English essay typically includes an introduction, where the main topic or argument is introduced, followed by body paragraphs that present supporting evidence and analysis, and a conclusion that summarizes the main points and restates the thesis statement (Swales & Feak, 2012). The style and tone of English essays may vary depending on the intended audience and purpose, ranging from formal and academic to informal and personal.

Writing an effective English essay requires critical thinking, research skills, and proficiency in English grammar and vocabulary. Authors must carefully select and organize evidence to support their arguments and use language effectively to engage and persuade readers (Weigle, 2002). Additionally, attention to conventions of academic writing, such as proper citation and formatting, is essential to maintain credibility and integrity (Gibaldi, 2016).

English essays play a vital role in assessing students' writing proficiency and analytical skills in academic settings (Hinkel, 2004). They provide opportunities for students to develop and demonstrate their ability to articulate ideas, engage with complex texts, and construct coherent arguments (Williams, 2004). Moreover, English essays contribute to the broader discourse in various fields by presenting original research, critical analyses, and scholarly insights (Swales & Feak, 2012).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study was based on a cross-sectional survey design which involved in collecting grammatical errors as primary data from the essays of respondents in 2024.

3.2 Population

The population for the study consisted of 143 BBM and BBA third Semester students pursuing their bachelor degrees in the Faculty of Management at Makawanpur Multiple Campus, Hetauda, Nepal in the academic year 2024.

3.3 Participants

The research study included only third semester students within the Faculty of Management, encompassing both male and female students.

Table 1: *Distribution of Population Based on Program*

Program	Population	Percent
BBM	88	62
BBA	55	38
Total	143	100

A large percent of the population was composed by the students from the BBM Program.

3.4 Sampling Design

Proportional stratified sampling was utilized during participant selection by categorizing the entire population based on two dimensions: BBM Program and BBA Program.

3.5 Sample Size

Sample size of the study involved 105 students. The sample size was determined by following the sample size calculator software <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html> with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 5%.

Table 2: *Sample Size Based on Program*

Respondents	Population		Proportionate Stratified Sampling	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
BBM	88	62	65	62
BBA	55	38	40	38
Total	143	100	105	100

The percent of the students of the BBM Program was higher than that of the students of the BBA Program in the sample size (105).

3.6 Data Collection Tools

The researcher after mentioning the objective of the research requested third-semester students in BBM (Bachelor of Business Management) and BBA (Bachelor of Business Administration) programs to compose an essay of about 700 words on “The Importance of Effective Communication Skills”. Their essays were collected after 30 minutes. The errors committed by the students were identified through an extensive study. The noted errors were then classified.

3.7 Variables in the Study

The study centered its attention on the grammatical errors as dependent variables maintained on the ratio scale and one independent variable with two levels retaining BBM and BBA programs.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

I conducted this research study by prioritizing the ethical principles of integrity and respect for the welfare of the participants and the broader academic community. I meticulously addressed several crucial ethical considerations throughout the research process. The participants were provided with clear and concise information regarding the nature and purpose of the research, with a strong commitment to safeguarding their identities and responses in a confidential manner. Their names and any other identifying information were strictly dissociated from their respective responses. Their involvement in the research was entirely voluntary, and at all times, I ensured that every participant was treated with the utmost respect and dignity.

4. Analysis and Interpretation of Data

This researcher employed both descriptive statistics, such as frequency and percent for the analysis of data, and Mann-Whitney U test as inferential statistic for testing null hypotheses with the help of SPSS as the data were not normally distributed, and the test required was non-parametric.

Table 3: *Descriptive Presentation of Types of Grammatical Errors and Error Counts*

Grammatical Errors	Error-Committers' Count	Respondents' Error Count	Percent
Verb -Tense	105	$1 \times 56 + 2 \times 40 + 3 \times 9 = 163$	14.0
Article	105	$1 \times 63 + 2 \times 41 + 3 \times 1 = 148$	12.8
Subject	Verb 96	$0 \times 9 + 1 \times 55 + 2 \times 38 + 3 \times 3 = 140$	12.0
Agreement			
Preposition	91	$0 \times 14 + 1 \times 53 + 2 \times 28 + 3 \times 10 = 139$	11.9
Number Agreement	68	$0 \times 37 + 1 \times 41 + 2 \times 27 = 95$	8.2
Parallelism	57	$0 \times 48 + 1 \times 53 + 2 \times 4 = 61$	5.3
Word Choice	56	$0 \times 49 + 1 \times 56 = 56$	4.8
Run-On Sentence	52	$0 \times 53 + 1 \times 52 = 52$	4.5
Modifier	51	$0 \times 54 + 1 \times 50 + 2 \times 1 = 52$	4.5
Fragment	51	$0 \times 54 + 1 \times 51 = 51$	4.4
Collocation	48	$0 \times 57 + 1 \times 47 + 2 \times 1 = 49$	4.2
Word Order	46	$0 \times 59 + 1 \times 45 + 2 \times 1 = 47$	4.1
Punctuation	45	$0 \times 60 + 1 \times 45 = 45$	3.9
Pronoun	37	$0 \times 68 + 1 \times 35 + 2 \times 2 = 39$	3.4
Double Negative	22	$0 \times 83 + 1 \times 22 = 22$	2.0
Total		1159	100

Table 1 illustrates the prevalence of 15 types of grammatical errors, detailing the number of respondents who made each error, the total number of errors, and the percentage of errors, all arranged in ascending order. A total of 1159 errors were recorded across all respondents. Notably, all 105 respondents committed both verb tense and article errors, while only 22 respondents made double negative errors. Subject-verb agreement errors, preposition

errors, number agreement errors, parallelism errors, word choice errors, run-on sentence errors, modifier errors, fragment errors, collocation errors, word order errors, punctuation errors, and pronoun errors occupied ranked from 3 to 14 respectively. Furthermore, verb tense errors (163 / 14%), article errors (148 / 12.8%), and subject-verb agreement errors (140 / 12.0%) ranked as the first, second, and third highest errors, while double negative errors (22 / 2.0%) were the least common. Remarkably, run-on sentence errors and modifier errors had an equivalent number of occurrences.

The findings from Table 1 reveal valuable insights into the grammatical proficiency of the respondents. The prevalence of certain errors, such as verb tense and article errors, suggests areas where individuals may require additional instruction or practice. Conversely, the low incidence of double negative errors indicates a relatively higher level of competence in that aspect of grammar. The consistent occurrence of certain errors, such as run-on sentence and modifier errors, highlights specific areas that may benefit from targeted interventions or instructional strategies. Overall, these results can inform educational approaches aimed at improving grammatical accuracy and language proficiency.

4.1 Null Hypothesis Test

H₀ 1: The distribution of verb tense errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 4: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of verb tense errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.224	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

An analysis conducted using the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .224) to explore the relationship between the students and verb tense errors revealed a consistent distribution of the errors across categories of the BBM and BBA programs, ultimately resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 2: The distribution of article errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 5: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of article errors is the same across categories of the	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.920	Retain the null hypothesis

students of BBM and BBA programs.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

An analysis was performed utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test, with a significance level set at .920, to investigate the association between students and subject verb agreement. This analysis revealed a uniform distribution of errors across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs, ultimately leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 3: The distribution of subject-verb agreement errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 6: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of subject verb agreement errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.044	Reject the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

An analysis executed using the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .044) to explore the relationship between the students and article errors showed an inconsistent distribution of the errors across categories of the BBM and BBA programs, ultimately resulting in the rejection of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 4: The distribution of preposition errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 7: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of preposition errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.917	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test (at a significance level of .917), an examination into the correlation between students and verb tense errors showcased a uniform error distribution across BBM and BBA program categories, culminating in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 5: The distribution of number agreement errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 8: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of number agreement errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.844	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .844), an analysis aimed at exploring the relationship between students and verb tense errors unveiled a consistent error distribution within BBM and BBA program classifications, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 6: The distribution of parallelism errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 9: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of parallelism errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.359	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

An investigation utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .359) to probe the relationship between students and verb tense errors demonstrated a consistent error distribution across BBM and BBA program categories, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 7: The distribution of word choice errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 10: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of word choice errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.082	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test (at a significance level of .082), an analysis was conducted to explore the connection between students and verb tense errors, revealing a uniform error distribution across BBM and BBA program divisions, ultimately leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 8: The distribution of run-on sentence errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 11: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of run-on sentence errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.261	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .261), an analysis was conducted to investigate the correlation between students and article errors. The findings revealed a uniform distribution of errors across BBM and BBA program categories, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 9: The distribution of modifier errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 12: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of modifier errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.585	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .585), an analysis was conducted to investigate the correlation between students and article errors. The findings revealed a uniform distribution of errors across BBM and BBA program categories, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 10: The distribution of fragment errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 13: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of fragment errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.076	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .076), an examination was executed to explore the relationship between students and article errors. The results indicated a consistent dispersion of errors across BBM and BBA program classifications, ultimately resulting in the null hypothesis being accepted.

H₀ 11: The distribution of collocation errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 14: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of collocation errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.002	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

An analysis conducted using the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .002) aimed to explore the association between students and article errors. It demonstrated an unsteady distribution of errors across categories of the BBM and BBA programs, ultimately leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 12: The distribution of word order errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 15: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of word order errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.603	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .603), an investigation was carried out to examine the relationship between students and article errors. The findings showcased a consistent distribution of errors across BBM and BBA program categories, thereby affirming the null hypothesis.

H₀ 13: The distribution of punctuation errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 16: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of punctuation errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.248	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test, with a significance level set at .248, an analysis was conducted to explore the correlation between students and subject-verb agreement. The findings unveiled a uniform distribution of errors among BBM and BBA program categories, resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 14: The distribution of pronoun errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 17: Hypothesis Test Summary

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of pronoun errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.411	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Employing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .411), an analysis was conducted to investigate the correlation between students and article errors. The findings revealed a uniform distribution of errors across BBM and BBA program categories, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

H₀ 15: The distribution of double negative errors is the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs.

Table 18: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of double negative errors is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.075	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

Utilizing the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .075), an examination was executed to explore the relationship between students and article errors. The results indicated a consistent dispersion of errors across BBM and BBA program classifications, ultimately resulting in the null hypothesis being accepted.

H₀ 16: The distribution of errors on the whole is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.

Table 19: *Hypothesis Test Summary*

Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
The distribution of errors on the whole is the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs.	Independent Sample Mann-Whitney U Test	.846	Retain the null hypothesis

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

An analysis conducted using the Mann-Whitney U test (with a significance level of .846) aimed to explore the association between students and article errors. It demonstrated a steady distribution of errors across categories of the BBM and BBA programs, ultimately leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

5. Results and Discussion

The research findings depicted the prevalence of errors spanning various grammatical aspects and errors, including errors in verb tense 163(14.0%), article 148 (12.8%), subject-verb agreement 140 (12.0%), preposition 139 (11.9), number agreement 95 (8.2%) , parallelism 61 (5.3%), word choice 56 (4.8%), run-on sentences 52 (4.5), modifier 52 (4.5%), fragment 51(4.4%), collocation 49 (4.2%), word order 47 (4.1%), punctuation 45 (3.95), pronoun 39 (3.4%), and negative structure 22 (2.0%). The number of total grammatical errors committed by the students was 1159. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency and percentage, clearly demonstrated variations in error occurrences among students and the diverse arrays of

errors committed by individuals. The Mann-Whitney U test showed that the distribution of each grammatical error, such as verb tense (Significance = .224), article (Significance = .920), preposition Significance = .917) number agreement (Significance = .844), parallelism (Significance = .359), word choice (Significance = .082), run-on sentence (Significance = .261), modifier (Significance = .585), fragment (Significance = .076), word order (Significance = .603), punctuation (Significance = .248), pronoun (Significance = .411), and double negative (Significance = .075), was the same across categories of students in BBM (65 students) and BBA (40 students) programs. However, the distribution of each grammatical error, such as subject and verb agreement (Significance = .044), and collocation (Significance = .002) was not the same across categories of students in BBM and BBA programs. Ultimately, the distribution of errors on the whole (Significance = .846) was the same across categories of the students of BBM and BBA programs. It exhibited that the level of students in both programs was similar. Both needed an equal treatment or intervention.

In a study conducted by Sarfraz (2011) titled "Error Analysis of the Written English Essays of Pakistani Undergraduate Students: A Case Study," involving 50 undergraduate Pakistani students from FAST-National University of Computer and Emerging Sciences Lahore Campus, Pakistan, a total of 76 errors were identified. Out of these errors, 61 were attributed to learners' interlanguage process, while 15 were a result of mother tongue (MT) interference. In the present study, grammatical errors were committed due to a lack of linguistic competence regarding grammatical rules.

Another research by Sharma (2018) focused on "Error Analysis with 70 students from bachelor first year education students studying compulsory English as a foreign language at three community campuses in Makawanpur District, Nepal. The results showed that the students in this study committed sixteen common errors: noun, main verb, auxiliary verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunction, article, singular / plural, verb tense, sub-verb agreement, possessive, conditional sentences, punctuation, capitalization and spellings. The most committed errors at the lexical level and the syntactic level were preposition errors and addition errors with the frequency of 261 (13.14%), and 722 (36.35%) respectively.

Ridha (2012) examined English writing samples from 80 English as Foreign Language (EFL) college students, categorizing errors into grammatical, lexical/semantic, mechanics, and word order types. The majority of errors were attributed to L1 transfer, with many learners relying on their mother tongue for expression. Grammatical and mechanical errors were identified as the most serious and frequent.

Sawalmeh (2013) conducted a study on "Error Analysis of Written English Essays: The case of Students of the Preparatory Year Program in Saudi Arabia," involving 33 male students from Saudi secondary schools. They identified 10 categories of errors, totaling 1422 instances. Verb tense errors were most prevalent, occurring 235 times (16.5%), while capitalization errors were least common, happening 88 times (6.3%). The study concluded that L1 transfer was the primary cause of errors.

Amiri and Puteh (2017) explored "Error Analysis in Academic Writing: A Case of International Postgraduate Students in Malaysia," with 16 Iranian international students. They found a total of 389 errors, with sentence structure being the most frequent at 32.90%. Mother tongue interference, intralingual interference, and overgeneralization were cited as the main reasons for these errors.

Onyinyechi (2017) conducted a study on "Error Analysis of the Written English Essays of Junior Secondary School Two Students in Owerri North," involving 42 students. They identified 587 errors, with punctuation errors being the most common, occurring 196 times (33.4%). Mother tongue interference, intralingual transfer, and participant carelessness were identified as the main causes of errors. All these studies collectively indicate that there are multiple factors contributing to errors in students' writings.

A research study showed that grammatical errors in English essays written by EFL students, focusing on common error patterns and their impact on writing performance. The findings highlighted the prevalence of errors related to verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and article usage, shedding light on areas where EFL students struggle the most.

Non-native speakers encounter numerous grammatical hurdles when composing English essays. These challenges include issues with verb tense consistency, article usage, subject-verb agreement, preposition selection, sentence structure complexity, word choice precision, punctuation accuracy, and pronoun clarity. Overcoming these obstacles demands focused practice, feedback incorporation, and a deep understanding of English grammar rules. By addressing these challenges, non-native speakers can enhance the clarity and coherence of their written English expression.

5.1 Strategies for Overcoming Grammatical Errors

The results of this article revealed significant insights into the types and frequency of grammatical errors made by EFL students in their essays. Through meticulous analysis, it was found that errors related to verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and article usage were particularly prevalent among the EFL student population. By observing the nature of grammatical errors, it was realized that some grammatical errors were committed due to limited exposure to English input, and ineffective instructional practices as possible contributors to the observed error patterns. The same result was derived in the research study conducted by Saputro and Hallim (2022). Providing explicit instruction, targeted feedback, and ample opportunities for practice to address grammatical difficulties and support EFL students' language development was highlighted in the study of (Abdulrahman & Alshumaimeri, 2015).

Overall, the results and discussion of the article provided valuable insights into the nature of grammatical errors in English essays by EFL students and offered practical implications for educators and curriculum developers aiming to enhance writing instruction and support EFL learners' language proficiency.

This article provides some effective strategies for overcoming grammatical errors. Regular practice and exposure to the target language are crucial for improving grammatical accuracy (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Engaging in activities such as reading, writing, speaking, and listening helps reinforce grammatical structures and fosters familiarity with correct usage. Seeking feedback from teachers, peers, or language learning resources can help identify recurring mistakes and provide guidance on how to correct them (Nunan, 2004). Constructive feedback facilitates error recognition and promotes self-correction. Systematic study of grammar rules and structures can enhance language proficiency (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Learning grammatical concepts in a structured manner, through textbooks, online courses, or language classes, provides learners with a foundation for

understanding and applying rules accurately. Analyzing grammatical errors systematically can aid in identifying patterns and underlying causes (James, 1998). Keeping a record of errors, categorizing them by type, and practicing targeted correction exercises can reinforce learning and prevent recurrent mistakes.

Immersing oneself in environments where the target language is spoken facilitates natural language acquisition and error correction (Krashen, 1982). Engaging in conversations with native speakers, participating in language exchange programs, or living in a foreign country exposes learners to authentic language usage and encourages adaptation to correct grammatical norms. Utilizing technology and language learning tools can supplement traditional methods and aid in error detection and correction (Chapelle, 2003). Saputro and Hallim (2022) conducted a detailed error analysis of EFL students' essays, exploring the underlying causes of grammatical errors and proposing strategies for error correction and language improvement. Their research underscored the importance of targeted feedback and explicit instruction in addressing specific grammatical difficulties faced by EFL learners.

Furthermore, a study by Abdulrahman and Alshumaimeri (2015) investigated the effectiveness of different error correction strategies in improving EFL students' writing accuracy. The findings suggested that a combination of direct corrective feedback and guided practice yielded the most significant improvements in students' grammatical accuracy over time.

Grammar-checking software, language learning apps, and online resources provide immediate feedback on grammatical accuracy, helping learners identify and rectify errors efficiently.

Overcoming grammatical errors requires a combination of active engagement, systematic study, and exposure to authentic language use. By implementing effective strategies such as regular practice, error analysis, and feedback incorporation, learners can improve their grammatical accuracy and enhance overall language proficiency.

6. Conclusion

The analysis of grammatical errors in English essays by EFL students exposes the persistent challenges faced by them in composing grammatically correct and appropriate essays. The findings underscore the prevalence of errors related to verb tense, article, subject verb agreement, preposition, number agreement, parallelism, word choice, run-on sentence, modifier, fragment, collocation, word order, punctuation, pronoun, and negative structures. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency and percent obviously depict that there are variations in the occurrences of errors and individual students who commit different errors, however Mann-Whitney U test reveals a consistent dispersion of errors across BBM and BBA program classifications, ultimately resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis on the whole. Despite variations in error patterns among individual students, common error types emerge, suggesting shared difficulties in language acquisition and writing proficiency among EFL learners.

It is obvious that addressing grammatical errors in EFL students' essays requires a multifaceted approach that integrates explicit instruction, targeted feedback, and ample opportunities for practice. By providing continual support and personal guidance, teachers

can empower EFL students to develop greater grammatical accuracy and fluency in their writings. Furthermore, ongoing research is needed to explore additional factors influencing grammatical errors in EFL student writing and to evaluate the effectiveness of various instructional interventions. Collaboration between researchers and practitioners is essential to bridge the gap between theory and practice and to ensure that writing instruction meets the diverse needs of EFL learners. Future researchers are recommended for conducting a longitudinal study tracking the same cohort of students over multiple semesters or years to provide insights into the effectiveness of instructional interventions in reducing errors.

References

1. Amiri, F., & Puteh, M. 2017. Error analysis in academic writing: A case of international postgraduate students in Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(4), 141-145. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.4p.141>
2. Abdulrahman, R., & Alshumaimeri, Y. (2015). Effective error correction in grammar classes: a students' perspective. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 6, 127-138. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376809716_Effective_Error_Correction_in_Grammar_Classes_A_Students'_Perspective
3. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle. <https://tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume3/ej12/ej12r7/>
4. Chafe, W. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy* (pp. 35-53). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing. https://www.sweetstudy.com/sites/default/files/qx/16/03/03/11/chafe_paper1.pdf
5. Chapelle, C. A. (2003). *English language learning and technology: Lectures on applied linguistics in the age of information and communication technology*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.7>
6. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1-4), 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
7. Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781410613349/psychology-language-learner-zolt%C3%A1n-d%C3%B6rnyei>
8. Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://www.scribd.com/doc/316701747/Dulay-Burt-Krashen-1982-Language-Two>
9. Ellis, N. C. (2008). The dynamics of second language emergence: Cycles of language use, language change, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(2), 232-249. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25173025>
10. Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://www.amazon.com/Study-Second-Language-Acquisition/dp/0194422577>

11. Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201>
12. Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80110-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6)
13. Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. <https://press.umich.edu/Books/T/Treatment-of-Error-in-Second-Language-Student-Writing-Second-Edition2>
14. Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611505>
15. Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
16. Flege, J. E. (1995). Second language speech learning: Theory, findings, and problems. In W. Strange (Ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language research* (pp. 233-277). Timonium, MD: York Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333815781_Second_language_speech_learning_Theory_findings_and_problems
17. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L. W. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 31-50). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://scispace.com/papers/the-dynamics-of-composing-making-plans-and-juggling-epu095e1hr>
18. Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0083787>
19. Gibaldi, J. (2016). *MLA handbook*. New York: Modern Language Association of America. <https://www.amazon.com/Handbook-Modern-Language-Association-America/dp/1603292624>
20. Grabe, W., & Kaplan, R. B. (1996). *Theory and practice of writing*. Harlow: Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835853>
21. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Longman. https://books.google.com.np/books/about/The_Practice_of_English_Language_Teachin.html?id=DIMpYgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
22. Hayes, J. R. (1996). A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271429714_A_new_framework_for_understanding_cognition_and_affect_in_writing
23. Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609427>

24. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667251>
25. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: contexts and issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742>
26. James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Essex: Longman. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842912>
27. Saputro, A., & Hallim, A. (2022). Grammatical errors in EFL students' writing. *Al Lughawiyat*, 3 (1), 18-26. [10.31332/alg.v3i1.2351](https://doi.org/10.31332/alg.v3i1.2351).
28. Kellogg, R. T. (1996). A model of working memory in writing. In C. M. Levy & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 57-71). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279589731_Working_Memory_in_Written_Composition_An_Evaluation_of_the_1996_Model
29. Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press. https://www.sdkrashen.com/content/books/principles_and_practice.pdf
30. Leki, I. (1992). *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook. <https://archive.org/details/understandingesl0000leki>
31. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://books.google.com.np/books?id=5PadBgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
32. Norrish, J. (1987). *Language learning and their errors*. London: Macmillan Publisher Ltd. <https://archive.org/details/languagelearners0000norr>
33. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336>
34. Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524537>
35. Onyinyechi, O. G. (2017). Error analysis of the written English essays of junior secondary school two students in Owerri North. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation*, 3(5), 64-74. <https://www.iiardjournals.org/abstract.php?j=IJEE&pn=Error+Analysis+of+the+Written+English+Essays+of+Junior+Secondary+School+Two+Students+in+Owerri+North&id=820>
36. Richards, J. C. (1984). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *English Language Teaching*, 25, 204-219. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-non-contrastive-approach-to-error-analysis-Richards/9f93818163047fb30d9c70223e2a18b75d4d0383>
37. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305.021>
38. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. London: Longman.

- https://www.academia.edu/44568181/Longman_Dictionary_of_Language_Teaching_and_Applied_Linguistics
39. Ridha, N. (2012). The effect of EFL learners' mother tongue on their writings in English: An error analysis study. *Journal of the College of Arts University of Basrah*, 60, 22-45.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311854673_The_Effect_of_EFL_Learners'_Mother_Tongue_on_their_Writings_in_English_An_Error_Analysis_Study
 40. Sarfraz, S. 2011. Error analysis of the written English essays of Pakistani undergraduate students: A case study. *Asian Transactions on Basic & Applied Sciences*, 1(3), 29-51.
https://www.academia.edu/10192252/Error_Analysis_of_the_Written_English_Essays_of_Pakistani_Undergraduate_Students_A_Case_Study
 41. Sawalmeh, M. (2013). Error analysis of written English essays: The case of students of the reparatory year program in Saudi Arabia. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 14(40), 1-17.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265210536_Error_Analysis_of_Written_English_Essays_The_case_of_Students_of_the_Preparatory_Year_Program_in_Saudi_Arabia
 42. Sharma, L.R. (2018). Error analysis of written English essays: The case of bachelor first year education students of three campuses in Makawanpur district, Nepal. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 5 (8), 433-440.
<https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/ERROR-ANALYSIS-OF-WRITTEN-ENGLISH-ESSAYS%3A-THE-CASE-Sharma/d06db48168daf8c2f0005b67fc5f9240bce011ff>
 43. Sharma, L.R. (2021). Analysis of errors committed by students in writing English essays. *International Research Journal of MMC*, 2 (4), 27-35.
<https://doi.org/10.3126/irjmmc.v2i4.41551>
 44. Silva, T. (1993). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 657-677.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3587400>
 45. Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). "Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills." Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
<10.1163/26659077-01802006>
 46. Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 49(2), 327-369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
 47. Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732997>
 48. Williams, J. M. (2014). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. New York: Longman.
https://www.clc.hcmus.edu.vn/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Style_-_Joseph_M._Williams_Joseph_Bizup.pdf
 49. Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL Students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165-187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647>

50. Zhang, J., & Yuan, R. (2020). A systematic review of research on error analysis in Chinese EFL writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100739. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13540602.2020.1806049>
51. Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22(1), 73-101. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1997.0919>