An error analysis on Turkish EFL learners' writing tasks

Berfu Duygun[1]

Pınar Karabacak[2]

[1]Sakarya University, Turkey / Contact: berfuduygun@gmail.com iD
[2]Sakarya University, Turkey / Contact: kkarabacakpinar@gmail.com iD

Abstract

This descriptive qualitative study aimed to investigate the types and sources of errors committed by Turkish students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in their foreign language (L2) writings as well as find out whether there is a difference in terms of the number, classification, and sources of errors between students at two different proficiency levels. To this end, the study was carried out at the School of Foreign Languages at a non-profit foundation university in Turkey in the 2020-2021 academic year. The students participating in the study (N= 32), who were selected using the convenient sampling method and participated in the study voluntarily, were Turkish preparatory class students having two different English proficiency levels, namely A1 level (*n*= 16) and A2 level (*n*= 16). Data for the study came from three different narrative paragraphs (each ranging in a 100 - 200 word band) written by the students, and a total of 96 paragraphs were collected for the study. The analysis revealed that the most frequent type of error was grammatical errors overall, a large part of which was the inappropriate use of verb forms. Moreover, findings concerning the potential differences between two proficiency levels showed that A1 level learners committed more errors than A2 level learners in all types except the semantic errors. Based on these findings, a number of implications for L2 writing teachers are discussed.

Introduction

Writing, a complex productive skill that requires thinking and cognitive processes, is a significant skill for language learners because it allows them to clearly express their ideas and thoughts. It goes through many stages of pre-writing, while-writing, and post-writing as well as requires several overlapping factors, including organization, punctuation, capitalization, spelling, coherence, cohesion, and others (Prasetyawati & Ardi, 2020). In writing, the majority of students, learning English as a Foreign

Language (EFL), make mistakes and commit errors (Erdoğan, 2005; Hamouda, 2011; Kaweera, 2013; Mustafa et. al., 2017; Phuket & Othman, 2015; Wu & Garza, 2014). The study of errors and the understanding of their sources are essential in supporting students in successfully acquiring writing skills. The errors of language learners should be carefully examined since they reveal the process of acquiring the target language. Richards and Schmidt (2002) identify error as the use of a linguistic component in a way that a fluent or a native speaker of the language regards as showing faulty or incomplete learning. Errors are an inevitable part of learners' writings, and even if they seem disadvantageous, they might be informative in some ways. Corder (1967) implies that errors are valuable for learners, teachers, and researchers for they give the idea of how the learning process takes place. Along similar lines, Gürsel (1998) utters that error is an inevitable part of a learning process. Therefore, they shouldn't be seen as an indicator of failure. On the contrary, identifying and recognizing errors is one of the most essential components for the learning process to proceed more accurately.

Identification of errors

Identifying an error entails more than just stating what the error is. However, as linguists are concerned with the distinction between an error and a mistake, it's necessary to review the definitions of the two terms. A learner makes a mistake while writing or speaking due to lack of attention, exhaustion, carelessness, or other elements of performance, according to the Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (1992). When the learners pay attention, they can self-correct their mistakes. An error, on the other hand, is the usage of a linguistic item in such a way that a native or fluent speaker of the language considers it to be incorrect or incomplete learning. In other words, it occurs because the learner is unable to self-correct because he or she does not know what is correct. To distinguish between an error and a mistake, Ellis (1997) recommends that a mistake occurs when the learner uses the correct form sometimes and the incorrect form other times. However, if he consistently uses it wrongly, it is called an error.

Literature review

The errors of the students are crucial because they provide "insight into how far a learner has progressed in acquiring a language and showing how much more the learner needs to learn" (Ringbom, 1987, as cited in Huang, 2014, p.69). Error Analysis (EA) is a sort of linguistic analysis that concentrates on the errors that students make. Corder (1967) known as the "father" of the Error Analysis discipline is strongly related to this field. He approached errors from a completely different perspective than previous scholars. Errors were once seen to be "flaws" that needed to be eliminated, but Corder (1967) saw them as vital "devices'' that students utilise to learn. Later, with the emergence of contrastive analysis, which depends on behaviourist and structuralist theory, the effects of errors made in the mother tongue on second language learning began to be studied (Fisiak, 1985, p. 67).

In the field of English Language Education, many scholars and researchers have been studying error analysis within the scope of second language achievement. There is a rapidly growing literature on error analysis (Altıner, 2018; Atmowardoyo, 2018; Ellis, 2019; Eroğlu et. al., 2022; Hadi, 2021; Iqbal et. al., 2021; Navidinia et. al., 2018; Pokrivčáková, 2019; Sürüç Şen & Şimşek, 2020; Wulandari & Harida, 2021) which indicates that it has a crucial impact on students' success. The current study's literature has focused on the previous studies related to the number of errors committed more often by the students, the classification of the errors, and lastly, the sources of errors.

At the outset, Saltık (1997) conducted in the tertiary level Turkish EFL context to scrutinize in which part of the written language the students have most difficulty and which language items need special attention. To this end, he identified the errors committed by intermediate level Turkish preparatory school EFL students (N= 80) who were from social and physical science departments. The data collected through essays of at least 2 paragraphs in 80 mid-term exams were analysed through error analysis. The study revealed that the most problematic parts are in the three main areas of linguistics, orthography, lexicosemantics, and syntactico-morphology. Another similar study was conducted by Gürsel (1998), who aimed to classify errors of the writings of engineering students in a preparatory school. Participants were

Turkish EFL students (N= 76) at a state university. The study revealed that Turkish learners had problems in morphology, syntax, and prepositions respectively. Along similar lines, Şimşek and Sürüç Şen (2020) carried out a study with intermediate level preparatory class students (N= 17) chosen by convenience sampling method from various departments that require English proficiency at a certain level. The participants were asked to write an advantages and disadvantages or effect essay of the given topics in the range of 350-450 words. According to Corder's Error Analysis scheme, the data collected from the participants were then identified by the researchers and described as the next step. According to the findings, it was found out that areas where students are most prone to making mistakes were grammatical and lexical aspects of language. With the aim of investigating the sources of errors in writing, a study was conducted by Sermsook, Liamnimitr, and Pochakor (2017) with the help of second-year Thai EFL students (N= 26). The study revealed that both interlingual and intralingual interference have an effect on students' writings combined with the students' carelessness. Based on the same purpose Çepni (2014) conducted a study on the writings of bilingual students (N= 16) of Turkish and Kurdish majoring in English at a state university. The data gathered in the study suggest that Turkish has a higher effect on the errors of students' writings and grammatical errors generate most of them. In terms of the sources of errors, it was found out that intralingual transfer has the highest percentage among the sources of errors.

Regarding the studies that investigated the classification of errors committed by the learners, Ridha (2012) looked into the errors made by EFL Iraqi college students in writing English essays by classifying them into the following categories: grammatical, lexical, semantic, mechanics, and word order errors. The most serious and common errors were grammatical and mechanical problems as well as the Arabic interference caused the majority of the students' errors. Another study conducted by Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013) in Thailand demonstrated that interlingual errors fell into 16 categories: verb tense, word choice, sentence structure, article, preposition, modal/auxiliary, singular/plural form, fragment, verb form, pronoun, run-on sentence, infinitive/gerund, transition, subject-verb agreement, parallel structure, and comparison structure, respectively. The findings of this study also revealed that the frequency of errors varied by writing type. In conclusion, the written essay

analyses revealed that the native language continues to have a detrimental impact on Thai EFL students' writing. Also, Karim et. al., (2018) used the error analysis method suggested by Ellis (1997) to investigate the most frequent types of errors committed by secondary school EFL learners in Bangladesh and what their perceptions are about error correction in writing classes. Along with this, a survey of students' attitudes about error correction was adapted. According to the findings, grammar, misinformation, misordering, and overgeneralization were among the most common errors identified. Furthermore, the study discovered that EFL students prefer to have their errors corrected by their instructors.

Aim and Significance

A considerable number of studies were conducted to analyse errors that learners commit in their writing in the L2 learning process (e.g., Hamouda, 2011; Saltık, 1997; Sermsook et. al., 2017; Sürüç Şen & Şimşek, 2020; Wu & Garza, 2014). However, even though many previous studies showed error sources and types, less attention has been paid to the difference in terms of the number, classification, and sources of errors between students at two different proficiency levels, namely A1 and A2. Therefore, this study attempts to fill the gap by finding out the types of errors that EFL learners who are enrolled at School of Foreign Languages at a foundation university in Turkey in the 2020-2021 academic year, make in their writings and comparing A1 and A2 level writings in terms of the errors they make.

Accordingly, a comparative error analysis between the writings of A1 and A2 levels of EFL students is carried out in line with the following research questions:

1. What type of errors do A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students make in their narrative writings?

2. What are the sources of the errors that A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students make in their writings?

3. Is there a difference between A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students in terms of

    a. the number of errors?

    b. classification of errors?

    c.   sources of errors?

Method

Design

This study is a descriptive qualitative study as it aims to find out the common errors in students' writings. A descriptive study is defined as a kind of research design that covers the observation and description of a pattern (Polit & Hungler, 1999).

Setting and participants

A total of thirty-two Turkish university-level EFL students (18 females and 14 males) aged between 18-21 and studying at various departments at the university participated in the study. They were all enrolled in the English Preparatory School at a non-profit foundation university in İstanbul, Turkey in the 2020-2021 academic year Fall term. Specifically speaking, two different groups of students from two different language proficiency levels participated in the study voluntarily. The English level of the participants was determined according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001), which was determined by a placement test held at the beginning of the semester, which measures reading, listening, grammar and vocabulary skills in a foreign language. Accordingly, the first (n=16)and the second (n=16) group of students were selected from A1 and A2 proficiency levels respectively using the convenience sampling method. In the modular system consisting of 7 weeks, the students took a total of 12 hours of writing lessons, during the first two weeks. In the writing lessons offered by the same instructor, detailed information was provided to students on how to write a narrative paragraph.

Data collection instruments and procedure

Data for this qualitative study came from 96 narrative paragraph writing tasks written by 32 students; i.e., each participant produced three paragraphs. The tasks were implemented online and they were prepared by the researcher in line with the topics covered in the classroom. Before collecting the data, both level groups were trained on how to write a narrative paragraph for twelve hours. The grammatical structures, spelling rules, and how they should ensure paragraph integrity were emphasised. At the end of the training, how data would be collected was told and general procedures

were explained. In order to minimise the risk of using an online dictionary or translation, a Moodle-based system which keeps track of the transition between the tabs was used. Participants were given three narrative writing assignments two days apart which were of about 100-120 words (see Appendix A). On the first day, students were informed about how the data collection process would progress. Then, necessary warnings were made about the important parts during the writing process. Before writing, all participants were asked to submit a consent form. Two days later, they were asked to write their second paragraphs under the same conditions; eventually, they were asked to write their last paragraphs three days later. In total, it took six days to collect the data.

Data analysis

Data that came from narrative paragraphs written by students were analysed. As consistency is a requirement for a research (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011), in order to ensure the consistency in the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained from the study, the consistency of the interpretations in the previous similar studies was checked, and at the same time, the consistency was supported by reaching consensus in the expert opinions. Errors were first divided into two groups according to their types and then according to their sources. Types of errors were based on the classification of Selinker (1972) including grammatical, lexical, morphological, syntactical, and semantical errors. Another categorization involved Richards's (1974) taxonomy, which indicates that sources of errors can be classified into two groups: interlingual and intralingual. After students' errors in sentences were determined by two raters separately, the detected errors were compared and discussed again in terms of their differences. Errors were counted and determined how often they were made taking into account the types and sources of errors in the list prepared by the researcher (see Appendix B) and adding the types of errors that hadn't been included in the form but were found in the writings. After the frequencies of the errors were determined, their percentages in their type and in the overall total were determined. Data were checked for normality and analysed by administering descriptive statistics, frequency analysis, and Mann-Whitney U tests.

Findings

Types of Errors

Errors were analysed under five main categories: grammatical, morphological, lexical, semantic, and syntactic errors. Data related to the types of errors and some examples of them are presented in this section.

Findings showed that a total of 478 errors were found for A1 level students whereas 280 errors were found for A2 level students. Errors A1 level students committed (f= 478) consist of grammatical (f= 316), lexical (f= 120), syntactic (f= 24), morphological (f= 11) and semantic (f= 7) errors. On the other hand, errors A2 level students committed (n=280) consist of grammatical (f= 173), lexical (f= 78), semantic (f= 12), syntactic (f= 10) and morphological (f= 7) errors. Tables that show frequencies and percentages of the errors of A1 and A2 level students are below.

Table 1.

Grammatical errors

Type of Error	Frequency (A1)A1 level	Percentage In General (A1)	Frequency (A2)A2 level	PercentageIn General (A2)
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Use of Verb Forms	127	26%	63	23%
Subject-Verb Agreement	3	1%	8	3%
Use of Articles	27	6%	11	4%
Use of Prepositions	42	9%	8	3%
Use of Pronouns	25	5%	10	4%
Use of Conjunctions	7	1%	3	1%
Use of Adjectives/Adverbs	2	1%	4	1%
Use of Singular-Plurals	20	4%	16	6%
Missing Items	63	13%	50	17%
Total	316	66%	173	62%

The rate and type of grammatical errors are indicated in Table 1. It can be seen that grammatical errors (f= 316) committed by A1 level students constitute 26% of verb usage errors, 13% of missing items, and 9% of preposition errors.

Regarding the writing of A2 level students in terms of grammatical errors, it can be seen that the students had the most errors in verb usage with 23%, followed by the missing items with 17%.

Some of the grammatical mistakes made by students are as follow

''My mother's aunt were so old and couldn't come with us.'' *(Subject-verb agreement)*

''Everyday we woke up early on the morning.'' *(Use of prepositions)*

''Us celebrated the New Year at midnight.'' *(Use of pronouns)*

''Our hotel was very comfortable because I want to go again.'' *(Use of conjunctions)*

That evening, I posted my most happiest photo on Instagram.'' *(Use of adjectives/adverbs)*

Table 2.

Morphological Errors

Type of Error	Frequency (A1)A1 level	Percentage In General (A1)	Frequency (A2)A2 level	PercentageIn General (A2)
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Affixation Errors	11	2%	7	3%
Total	11	2%	7	3%

In terms of morphological errors, it can be seen that all of the errors were caused by affixation. It forms 2% of the total errors of A1 level students and 3% of A2 level students.

Some of the morphological errors made by students are indicated as follow:

''I was very tiring.'' *(Affixation error)*

''Sudden, there was a noise.''*(Affixation error)*

''Then we went to hotel by car, but they were very strangely.'' *(Affixation error)*

In terms of lexical errors, the majority of errors for both levels were spelling errors. This was followed by low percentages of eggcorn errors and errors which were sourced by language transfer.

Table 3.

Lexical Errors

Type of Error	Frequency (A1)A1 level	Percentage In General (A1)	Frequency (A2)A2 level	PercentageIn General (A2)
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Spelling Errors	106	22%	59	21%
Eggcorn Errors	8	2%	11	4%
Errors sourced by Language Transfer	6	1%	8	2%
Total	120	25%	78	27%

Some of the lexical errors made by students are given as follow

''I asked "Where is my girlfirend?" *(Spelling Error)*

''They said let's go to trabzon." *(Spelling error)*

''Than I had a shower." *(Eggcorn error)*

''We usually stay for 3 or 4 mouths." *(Eggcorn error)*

''We went to see in the morning and swam." *(Eggcorn error)*

''We stayed at the hotel until one week." (*Errors sourced by language transfer)*

''I went to Cyprus near my brother." *(Errors sourced by language transfer)*

''I played at the wedding." *(Errors sourced by language transfer)*

Table 4.

Syntactic Errors

Type of Error	Frequency (A1)A1 level	Percentage In General (A1)	Frequency (A2)A2 level	Percentage In General (A2)
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Errors Sourced by Language Transfer	24	4%	6	1%
Errors Sourced by Overgeneralization of Rules	0	0	4	1%
Total	24	4%	10	2%

As indicated in Table 4, while all syntactic errors at A1 level were caused by language transfer, in addition to this, at A2 level, overgeneralization of rules was also seen.

Some of the syntactic errors made by students,

''My first day at university I was so excited.'' *(Errors caused by language transfer)*

''For this reason, very early get up.'' *(Errors caused by language transfer)*

''I don't remember when was this happened.'' *(Errors caused by overgeneralization of rules)*

Table 5.

Semantic Errors

Type of Error	Frequency (A1)A1 level	Percentage In General (A1)	Frequency (A2)A2 level	Percentage In General (A2)
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Errors Caused by Language Transfer	7	3%	12	4%
Total	7	3%	12	4%

As can be seen in Table 5, semantic errors made in both levels were caused by language transfer.

Some of the semantic errors made by students,

''My first university is Kırklareli University, civil technician division.'' *(Errors sourced by language transfer)*

''My friends exploded a champagne for me.'' *(Errors sourced by language transfer)*

''We used to chat and play games in empty lessons.'' *(Errors sourced by language transfer)*

The Sources of Errors

According to their sources, errors committed by students were also analysed as interlingual and intralingual.

Table 6.

Sources of Errors

Sources of Error	Frequency (A1)A1 level	Percentage In General (A1)	Frequency (A2)A2 level	Percentage In General (A2)
	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Interlingual	37	7%	26	9%
Intralingual	441	93%	254	91%
Total	478		280	

While 441 of the 478 errors made by A1 level students were caused by intralingual, 37 of them sourced from interlingual. For A2 level students, of the 280 errors 254 were sourced from intralingual, 26 of them sourced from interlingual.

Some of the interlingual errors made by students,

''Because I didn't live New Year's Day.''

"My friends exploded a champagne for me."

Some of the intralingual errors made by students,

"I was very happied."

"Antalya was an good choice for an holiday."

Discussion and conclusion

The main aim of this study was to focus on the errors A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students commit in their writings. In the following section, the findings obtained for each research question are interpreted.

RQ 1: What type of errors do A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students make in their writings?

The aim of the first research question was to classify the types of errors that A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students make. Findings (see Table 1) indicated that, in terms of grammar, wrong use of verb forms, subject-verb agreement,

articles, prepositions, pronouns, conjunctions, adjective/adverbs, singular/plurals, and missing items were detected. The reason for the wrong use of "verb tense", in which students commit most errors, may be due to the fact that students do not use auxiliary verbs in their mother tongue Turkish and they cannot make sense of it while learning English. When it comes to morphological errors (see Table 2), the only problematic area was affixation. Since the use of affixation in the curricula of preparatory schools is more prevalent at A2 and higher levels, this error rate may have been high, especially for students at A1 level. In addition, most of the affixation mistakes made by the students are due to the wrong affix to be added to the end such as using the word "boring" instead of "bored". Regarding lexical errors (see Table 3), spelling errors, eggcorn errors and language transfer errors were found. Spelling errors, which constitute the majority of lexical errors, may be due to students' carelessness or their desire to write and finish in a hurry. In addition to this, spelling errors were seen quite often in words with similar spellings in Turkish. Students may have confused the spelling rules in both languages and therefore spelling mistakes may have occurred. As for syntactic errors (see Table 4), it can be seen that they can be sourced by language transfer or overgeneralization. Since the syntax rules in Turkish and English are different, students may be more likely to err in this area. Finally, in terms of semantic errors (see Table 5) it can be said that all of the errors were sourced by language transfer.

The findings of this study concur with those of Şimşek and Sürüç Şen (2020) which focused on university level EFL students' errors in their writings. At both levels, students are not good at forming verbs accurately, as well as missing item errors are seen. Apart from these, findings showed that spelling errors also made up a large percentage of total errors. It can be considered that the rate of this error was high since students were given a time limit; in other words, they wrote under a limitation. Finally, findings showed that students' mistakes were due to generalization rather than transfer errors originating from their native language. It turns out that these areas require more attention than other areas. These three areas could be emphasized in remedial teaching.

RQ 2: What are the sources of the errors that A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students make in their writings?

The second research question sought to determine the sources of errors that A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students make in their writings. Findings (see Table 6) showed that most of the errors detected were caused mainly by intralingual transfer. Richards and Schmidt (2002) define intralingual errors as the ones resulting from incomplete learning, rather than language transfer. Therefore, it's understood that students tend to overgeneralize rules, especially grammar. Even in a low percentage (7%), interlingual errors were made by students in paragraphs. In a similar study conducted by Liu (2013), it was discovered that Chinese learners made errors when writing English sentences. She cited carelessness and the negative influence of the subjects' mother tongue as the sources.

RQ 3: 3.a. Is there a difference between A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students in terms of the number of errors?

Findings indicated that the total number of errors committed by A1 level students (M= 21. 94) was much higher than that of A2 level students (M= 11.06). Furthermore, findings of the Mann-Whitney U test showed a statistically significant difference between the two different proficiency levels ($U = 41$, $p = .001$). Since students who study A2 level have passed a group of exams in order to successfully complete A1 level and their language knowledge level is higher than the A1 students, it should be considered normal that the mistakes made in A1 level students are more.

Table 7.

Results of Mann-Whitney U Test

Students' Level	Number of Students	Mean
A1	16	21.94
A2	16	11.06
Total	32	

3.b. Is there a difference between A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students in terms of classification of errors?

Findings of descriptive statistics analysis showed that A1 level students committed a comparatively higher number of grammatical, morphological, lexical, and syntactic

errors as compared to A2 level students, except for the semantic errors where A2 level students committed more errors than the A1 level students.

In order to investigate whether these differences in the mean scores were statistically significant or not, a Mann-Whitney U test was conducted. Findings illustrated that the difference in grammatical $(U = 33.5, p = .000)$, lexical $(U = 65.5, p = .018)$, and syntactic $(U = 69.5, p = .019)$ errors were statistically significant while the differences were not significant in morphological $(U = 100.5, p = .238)$ or semantic $(U = 106.5, p = .362)$ errors.

Table 8.

Results of Mann-Whitney U test

Type of Error	Students' Level	Number of Students	Mean Rank
Grammatical Errors	A1	16	22.41
	A2	16	10.59
Morphological Errors	A1	16	18.22
	A2	16	14.78
Lexical Errors	A1	16	20.41
	A2	16	12.59
Syntactic Errors	A1	16	20.16
	A2	16	12.84
Semantic Errors	A1	16	15.16
	A2	16	17.84

3.c. Is there a difference between A1 and A2 level Turkish university-level EFL students in terms of sources of errors?

Descriptive statistics analysis showed that A1 level students committed a comparatively higher number of errors in both interlingual (M= 18.97) and intralingual (M= 21.94) errors when compared to A2 level students' interlingual (M= 14.03) and intralingual (M= 11.06) errors.

Mann Whitney U analysis further indicated that whereas a statistically significant difference was found between A1 and A2 level students in intralingual errors $(U = 41, p = .001)$, the difference in the mean scores was not statistically significant in interlingual errors $(U = 88.5, p = .126)$.

Tablo 9.

Results of Mann-Whitney U test

Sources of Error	Students' Level	Number of Students	Mean Rank
Interlingual Errors	A1	16	18.97
	A2	16	14.03
Intralingual Errors	A1	16	21.94
	A2	16	11.06

In conclusion, based on the findings, this study figured out that the most committed error type was grammatical errors by Turkish university-level students. At both levels (A1-A2), students had some difficulties in informing verbs accurately and they were prone to miss some necessary items while writing paragraphs. Apart from these, the study revealed that spelling errors also made up a large percentage of total errors. It could be interpreted that students were more likely to make such mistakes due to time constraints. Finally, it was seen that students' mistakes were due to overgeneralization rather than transferring errors originating from their native language. The purpose of this study was to examine errors made by Turkish EFL university-level students when writing paragraphs in English and to identify the sources of the errors, and lastly, comparing the differences between committed errors by two different English proficiency levels as A1 and A2. The data revealed that the students committed more errors as a result of intralingual inference, limited English grammar knowledge, and carelessness.

Implications, Limitations and Suggestions for Further Studies

This descriptive qualitative study sought to determine the types and sources of errors made by Turkish students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in their foreign language (L2) writings. It also sought to determine whether there were differences between students at two different proficiency levels in terms of the number, classification, and sources of errors. Numerous research studies have examined the writing errors that students make when learning a second language. Nevertheless, despite the fact that earlier research demonstrated error sources and types, less focus has been placed on the distinction between students at two different competence levels, namely A1 and A2, in terms of the number, classification, and sources of errors. The current study has shown that the most committed error type was

136

grammatical errors by Turkish university-level students. Based on the same purpose, Çepni (2014) also conducted a study on the writings of bilingual students, and his study revealed that grammatical errors were the most common type of errors that students committed in their writings.

Also the study revealed that A1 students tended to make more errors when it was compared to A2 students except semantic errors. In terms of the sources of errors (interlingual & intralingual), A2 learners made less errors in their writing, but A1 learners had some difficulties in writing and committed more errors. Making mistakes while learning a foreign language is pretty normal, and it is a necessary stage before fully understanding the language in each proficiency level. As a result, it is safe to say that error analysis is the ideal method for identifying the types and sources of errors in students' writing. It is the ideal instrument for assessing the current situation and determining the deficiencies of learners. Using accurate learner error analysis, more efficient teaching techniques can be used (Çepni, 2014). Upon the results of this study, a few recommendations are suggested for further research in the light of its limitations. First of all, since this study was conducted with a limited number of participants in a limited time, more precise results can be obtained by increasing the number of participants in subsequent studies. In addition, more different findings can be obtained by making comparisons between different levels of students. Also, motivation, attitudes, and beliefs of learners give promising research topics for future studies which could be conducted with larger groups.

Notes on the contributors

Berfu Duygun graduated from Ankara University, department of English Language and Literature. She is currently doing her master's degree in English Language Teaching at Sakarya University. She works as an English instructor at the School of Foreign Languages of a foundation university in Istanbul.

Pınar Karabacak received her B.A. degree in the department of English Language Teaching from Sakarya University. She is doing her M.A. in the same department. She works as a teacher of English at a foundation school in Sakarya, Turkey. Her research interests are program evaluation, motivation of L2 learners, and pronunciation skills.

References

Atmowardoyo, H. (2018). Research methods in TEFL studies: Descriptive research, case study, error analysis, and R & D. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *9*(1), 197-204.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). Research methods in education. *Routledge Publishers, 3*(6), 147-156.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL), 4*(5), 161-170.

Çepni, G. (2014). *Error analysis in writings of English language teaching prep students: A study on bilinguals of Kurdish and Turkish majoring in English*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Çağ University, Turkey.

Ellis, R. (2019). Towards a modular language curriculum for using tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, *23*(4), 454-475.

Erdoğan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1*(2), 261-270.

Eroğlu, S., Alabay, S., & Keklik, H. (2022). A study on the usage of verb's complements with cases by French bilingual Somali students learning Turkish as a foreign language. *International Education Studies*, *15*(2), 113-122.

Fisiak, J. (1985). *Contrastive linguistics and the language teacher*. Pergamon Press.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). Second language acquisition: an introductory course. *Journal for English as a Second Language, 1*(3), 243-249.

Gürsel, E. (1998). *Error analysis of the English writings of the students from the department of foreign language at the University of Gaziantep*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Gaziantep University, Turkey.

Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(3), 128-141.

Karim, A., Mohamed, A. R., Ismail, S. A. M. M., Shahed, F. H., Rahman, M. M., & Haque, M. H. (2018). Error analysis in EFL writing classroom. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *8*(4), 122-138.

Kaweera, C. (2013). Writing error: a review of interlingual and intralingual interference in EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(7), 9-18.

Kennedy, M. M. (2010). Attribution error and the quest for teacher quality. *Educational Researcher*, *39*(8), 591-598.

Mustafa, F., Kirana, M., & Bahri, S. (2017). Errors in EFL writing by junior high students in Indonesia. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *6*(1), 38-52.

Prasetyawati, O. A., & Ardi, P. (2020). Integrating Instagram into EFLwriting to foster student engagement. *Teaching English with Technology*, *20*(3), 40-62.

Polit, D. F., & Hungler, B.P. (1999) *Nursing research: Principles and methods (6th edition)*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

Pokrivčáková, S. (2019). Preparing teachers for the application of AI-powered technologies in foreign language education. *Journal of Language and Cultural Education*. 5(3), 135-153.

Phuket, P. R. N., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(32), 99-106.

Richards, J. C. (1974). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition, 3*(7), *172-188.*

Richards, J. C., and Schmidt, R. (2002). *Dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics.* Pearson Education Limited.

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*, *60*, 22-45.

Saltık, S (1997). *A Study of error analysis in the essays of freshman students at the Middle East Technical University.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Turkey.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(3), 209-231.

Sermsook, K., Liamnimit, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A case study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching, 10*(3), 101-110.

Sürüç Şen, N., & Şimşek, A. (2020). An Analysis of Turkish students' written Errors: A case of an EFL context. *Journal of Language Research*, *4*(1), 58-68.

Thornbury, S. (2017). *The New A-Z of ELT: A dictionary of terms and concepts.* Macmillan.

Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(1), 67-78.

Wulandari, R. S., & Harida, R. (2021). Grammatical error analysis in essay writing. *Deiksis*, *13*(1), 73-81.

Wu, H. P., & Garza, E. V. (2014). Types and attributes of English writing errors in the EFL context-A study of error analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(6), 1256-1262.

Appendıces

Appendix A- Data Collection Instrument

I consent voluntarily to be a participant in this study. I accept that my responses may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs. / Bu çalışmaya gönüllü olarak katılmayı kabul ediyorum. Yanıtlarımın yayınlarda, raporlarda, web sayfalarında ve diğer araştırma faaliyetlerinde alıntılanabileceğini kabul ediyorum*.

*Your names will be kept confidential. / İsimleriniz gizli tutulacaktır.

Name Surname/İsim Soyisim:

Date/Tarih:

Instructions/Talimatlar

- Your paragraph should be in the range of **100-120** words. / Paragrafınız **100-120** kelime aralığında olmalı.
- You will be allowed **50 minutes** to complete the paragraph. / Paragrafı bitirmek için size tanınan süre **50 dakikadır**.
- **DO NOT** use any sources that help you to write this paragraph. (Such as dictionary, translation, anyone to help you) / Paragrafı yazarken hiç bir şekilde dışarıdan yardım **almamanız** gerekir. (Sözlük, çeviri, yanınızda başka birisi olması gibi)

Question 1: Write a narrative paragraph on **"A memorable event in your life"**.

Question 2: Write a narrative paragraph on **"Your last holiday"**.

Question 3: Write a narrative paragraph on **"Your first day at university"**.

Appendix B- Data Analysis Tool

CLASSIFICATION OF ERRORS	
Grammatical Errors	
Type of Error	Error Code
Use of Verb Forms Errors	GVERB
Subject-Verb Agreement Errors	GSUVE
Use of Articles Errors	GARTC
Use of Prepositions Errors	GPREP
Use of Pronouns Errors	GPRON
Use of Conjunctions Errors	GCONJ
Use of Adjectives / Adverbs Errors	GADAD
Use of Singulars / Plurals Errors	GSIPL
Missing Items (Subject, Verb, Object)	GMISS
Overgeneralization of Rules	GOVER
Morphological Errors	

Type of Error	Error Code
Affixation Errors	MAFFX
Overgeneralization of Rules	MOVER
Language Transfer Errors	MLANG

Lexical Errors

Type of Error	Error Code
Spelling Errors	LSPEL
Eggcorn Errors	LEGGC
Language Transfer Errors	LLANG

Syntactic Errors

Type of Error	Error Code
Language Transfer Errors	SYLANG
Overgeneralization of Rules	SYOVER

Semantic Errors

Type of Error	Error Code
Language Transfer Errors	SMLANG

SOURCES OF ERRORS

Interlingual	SINTER
Intralingual	SINTRA