

An Analysis of Turkish Students' Written Errors: A Case of an EFL Context

Nur Sürüç Şen¹, Anadolu University, PhD Student, nssuruc@anadolu.edu.tr
Asuman Şimşek², Middle East Technical University, Research Assistant,
simseka@metu.edu.tr

Recommended citation: Sürüç Şen, N. & Şimşek, A. (2020). An Analysis of Turkish Students' Written Errors: A Case of an EFL Context. *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 4(1), 58-68.

Abstract: The present study depicts the use of an authentic small-scale database consisting of students' written errors from a preparatory school at a private university based in Turkey, intending to analyze their learning errors and types of them. The data has been collected from 17 English preparatory school students, whose levels are reported as intermediate according to the proficiency test based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. To unveil the students' written errors, two researchers have investigated 17 essays thoroughly. Via briefing, the researchers have reached a consensus on the categories and analyzed the frequencies of errors using descriptive statistics. According to the findings, the participants have struggled mostly in the grammatical aspect, followed by lexical and mechanical aspects of language. The errors of the students have been further categorized into small groups by presenting sample errors. Overall, the present study has implications for teachers, curriculum designers and students.

Keywords: *error analysis, EFL writing, grammatical error, lexical error, mechanical error*

INTRODUCTION

English has been perceived as the inevitable language in some aspects due to a more globalized world. Therefore, mastering English and boosting English language skills such as reading, listening, writing, and speaking, have become compulsory. Among these skills, writing has been widely referred to mostly as a challenging skill to develop in English (Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013; Rattanadilok Na Phuket & Othman, 2015). The case is similar in higher education, according to Gillet (2004). This challenge continues in the contexts where English is taught as a foreign language; and the learners seem to have difficulties producing academic writings since writing demands cognitive analysis and linguistic synthesis (Seitova, 2016). Therefore, it doubles the challenge of writing and requires time and effort to master the skill. In the meantime, EFL learners inevitably and naturally commit various errors which might be utilized for several learning purposes (Raimes, 1983). Firstly, students have a chance to elaborate on the grammatical structures, vocabulary, and idioms that have been presented to them, and then, they necessarily get involved in the use of new language features in the writing process. In addition to this, Corder (1967) has demonstrated the significance of learners' errors in the language learning process. First of all, learners' errors inform teachers considering the extent of accomplishment of teaching-learning objectives and weaker areas of learners on which need to be elaborated. Moreover, learners can use the errors as a tool to enhance their language learning progress. As it has been acknowledged, the domain of errors is highly significant in that it provides various benefits not only to teachers but also to students themselves. Therefore, studying errors is of importance in foreign language teaching since it provides feedback to teachers and enlightens them in terms of the effectiveness of the instruction.

¹ ORCID: 0000-0003-3866-6994

² ORCID: 0000-0001-8871-438X

Submitted: 11.02.2020

Accepted: 26.11.2020



Among the ways of studying errors in a pedagogical context, Error Analysis seems to be undertaken by many researchers. Corder (1981) has explicated two reasons for performing Error Analysis (EA): theoretical and practical reasons. The former informs teachers regarding the teaching and learning process. The latter provides remedial steps needed to be taken to correct learners' errors. Hence, Error Analysis is a useful method to diagnose learners' writing problems, analyze them, and discover solutions to improve the teaching process. Moreover, Ferris (2002) has clarified that error analysis can increase language learning effectiveness and the teaching process alongside corrective feedback techniques. In a similar vein, Vahdatinejad (2008) has asserted that the Error Analysis method provides evidence of learners' errors, which help teachers determine what is missing in the learners' linguistic competence.

Considering the Turkish EFL context in the recent past, there seem to be a spark of interest (Can, 2018; Demirel, 2017; Kırmızı & Karcı, 2017; Lay & Yavuz, 2020; Polat, 2018; Taşçı & Aksu Ataç, 2018; Terzioğlu & Bensen Bostancı, 2020) investigating the L2 errors of students. Following the related literature traces, the present study set out to unveil the samples and frequencies of the participants' written errors. Therefore, the current study has been conducted to discover and analyze the errors made by EFL learners from preparatory school in a private university. To this end, the research questions of the present study are demonstrated hereunder:

- 1- What is the frequency of grammatical errors performed by students at a private university in an EFL context?
- 2- What is the frequency of lexical errors performed by students at a private university in an EFL context?
- 3- What is the frequency of mechanical errors performed by students at a private university in an EFL context?

The present study might contribute to the related literature by bringing more examples from the aforementioned error types. Therefore, it might have practical implications in terms of potential errors to be committed by the learners. In this light, the practitioners might tailor their lessons, whereas curriculum designers elaborate on those areas more, according to the learners' needs. Likewise, the learners might be presented with the errors and asked to work on those errors collaboratively, which might yield a good practice of challenging language features.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Error Analysis is regarded as among the most common and beneficial methods used by researchers and educators in order to analyze the learners' errors. In previous studies pertaining to error analysis, the researchers employed different categorizations, reflecting either a particular interest or a holistic perspective. Their samples of interest also differed depending on the context, which is presented as global and local, respectively. In this section, emerging patterns of written errors and analyses are aimed to be unveiled.

Sun (2014) conducted a study to explore the frequent ungrammatical patterns found in Chinese EFL learners' free writings. Accordingly, the researcher aimed to find useful pedagogical implications for grammar teaching in the EFL context in China. 30 undergraduate students participated in this study. For the data collection, the students were asked to write about anything they want, including at least 250 words. The corpus of texts included 323 errors, and they were categorized into 13 error types as lack of S-V agreement, missing verb (predicate), multiple verbs, missing NP/Subject, "to" infinitive, wrong tense or verb form, misuse of determiners, misuse of the preposition, misuse of adverbials, violation of binding theories, zero use of the pronoun, misuse of quantifiers, and Chinese-English expressions. Among them, misuse of determiners errors (n=119) is the most repeated error type in the data, followed by Chinese-English expressions (n=43) and Wrong Tense or Verb Form (n=37). In conclusion, teachers can enable learners to notice these most frequent grammatical mistakes and help them restructure and internalize these structures through explicit grammar instruction.



Pescante-Malimas & Samson's (2017) conducted a study in which senior students' linguistic errors were analyzed. The research aim is to identify the grammatical syntactic and substance errors of the participants' thesis proposals alongside a justification per error qualification via employing content analysis, frequencies of errors, and student interviews. The researchers coded a compilation of 32 thesis drafts. Therefore, a comprehensive error analysis yielded three main categories of errors: grammatical, syntactical, and mechanics/substance. After coding, specific examples from errors were taken as a sample for the related category of the error to get a more in-depth insight. Moreover, to identify the relationship between the three major departments and linguistic errors, a chi-square test was implemented. To validate the previous data, the researchers conducted an interview with students to understand their awareness of their mistakes. According to the findings, the category of grammar attracted the most frequent number of errors from the participants, especially in terms of pronoun and antecedent agreement, proper tense usage, and verb-subject agreement. On the other hand, considering syntactic errors, fragments and run-on sentences led the error-prone areas, whereas punctuation and spelling were the top errors in mechanics-type errors.

Singh, Singh, Razak, and Ravintar (2017) investigated the most frequent grammatical errors of tertiary students from different areas of Malaysia. In this vein, the study follows the Error Analysis approach and qualitative approach. 144 tertiary students from different schools in Malaysia participated in the study. After the students took the university entrance exam, the data was collected from them, including 144 essays, including approximately 250 words. The essays were examined, and grammatical errors were marked. Those errors were divided into several categories, such as parts of speech and tenses. The errors were analyzed according to their types and frequencies through descriptive statistics. The results yielded that the error types belong to nine categories: subject-verb agreement, verb tense, noun, preposition, adjective, article, pronoun, adverbs, and conjunction. It was concluded that the total number of errors found in the corpus is 744. The most frequent error types were found as subject-verb agreement (n=258), verb tenses (n=226), noun (n=141), followed by preposition (n=44) and adjective (n=34). The least frequent ones were article (n=19), pronoun (n=16), adverb (n=4) and conjunction (n=2). This study contributed to the analysis of grammatical errors in texts written by EFL learners.

Sermsook, Liamnimit, and Pochakorn (2017) carried out a study to investigate the types and the sources of language errors found in the writings of 26 major English students from Thai University. 104 pieces of written work were collected from the students. Besides, the researcher employed a questionnaire and individual/group interviews to support the data. After the researcher collected the students' written work, each sentence was examined and marked by the researcher. The errors were categorized into two groups as the sentential level errors and the word-level errors. 17 types of errors were identified in the students' written works. In total, 296 errors were detected in the data. Among the sentential level errors, punctuation errors (n=42) were the most frequent error type found in the data. It is followed by subject-verb agreement errors (n=35) and capitalization errors (n=24). On the other hand, among the errors at the word level, the most common error type was articles (n=39), followed by spelling errors (n=29) and verbs (n=14). These errors might be seen as valuable indicators of the language learning process. Using evidence of error types from this study, teachers can help their learners lessen their writing errors. Teachers might enable learners to notice the differences between Thai and English.

When it comes to the Turkish context, it seems that written errors have been of more interest in the last decade. Regarding Yalçın's (2010) Ph.D. dissertation, it was organized as a cross-sectional study upon analyzing the syntactic errors of 34 Turkish students' argumentative essay writings. First-year and third-year students were compared based on their error types. As a result, the use of articles (31.4%), verbs (25%), nouns (16.6%), pronouns (12.8%) attracted the errors mostly. The comparison across the year of study did not yield any significant difference in the frequency of errors. Article-related errors, on the other hand, were regarded as significantly different from the rest of the error types.



Focused on particular types of errors, Kırmızı and Karcı (2017) aimed to investigate the types and the frequencies of grammatical and lexical errors in the essays of higher education Turkish ELL students in terms of function words, grammar and morphology, syntax, and lexical errors; the predominant errors in the essays of higher education Turkish ELL students and the sources of the errors in higher education Turkish ELL students' essays. 30 undergraduate students majoring in English Language and Literature were selected as participants. They were required to write an essay on "The qualities of a good teacher". As for the data analysis, the classification was adopted from Wakkad (1980) and Tan (2007), which has six categories (function words, morphology, and grammar, syntax, word order, lexical errors) and several subcategories at each level. Overall, the results of the study implied that wrong word choice, the addition of "the," and word order type of errors are more error-prone than the rest. As for "function words"; "addition of the" and "confusion of prepositions" were the most frequent errors, whereas "confusion of articles" attracted the least frequency of errors. As for the category of "morphology and grammar"; "lack of agreement between the subject and the main verb", while "irregular verb" attracted the least amount of errors. Under the category of "lexical items"; "wrong word choice" dominated the errors, whereas "typical Turkish construction" had the least number of errors. Within the category of "syntax"; "omission of the verb to be" attracted a frequent amount of errors; on the contrary, "using progressive" had the least amount of errors. In the category of "word order"; the most predominant subcategory was "sequence of the sentence" whereas the least predominant was "wrong use of word group". As for the category of "confusion of tenses"; it can be said that the most frequent amount of errors belongs to this category, which might be further associated with L1 interference and interlingual interference. It is noteworthy that overgeneralization errors are still prevalent at this high level of proficiency; thus, L1 influence should not be disregarded at higher proficiency levels. It is suggested that possible sources of errors could be studied from the students' point of view.

As for error analysis studies focusing on genre, Demirel (2017) conducted a study in the Turkish EFL context. The purpose was to describe the learners' performance clearly to enhance teaching practices and provide evidence about non-native learners' writing for the literature. The corpus of the study included 150 student essays of different genres: the extended argument, argument, process, and definition essays from 45 undergraduate students. The study's findings indicated that the most problematic areas for the students were verbs, nouns, and prepositions. Verbs use-related errors comprised of 26.3% of all errors in the study, while noun use-related errors accounted for 23%. Proposition use-related errors were 15.7%, and these error types were regarded as interlingual transfer errors. Among the style related errors, while the majority of them was in-text citation errors, it was followed by wordiness errors (19.6%) and lack of reference (9%). This corpus analysis study provided an essential resource for language professionals because the findings in this study might help them improve and adjust their activities and materials.

Employing a holistic perspective, Polat's (2018) conducted a study, which was a type of comparative error analysis with regards to the writings of A2-leveled undergraduate preparatory school students who were from Turkey (n=5), Syria (n=5), and Azerbaijan (n=5) in terms of lexical, spelling and grammatical errors. In the related literature, it was found that understanding the learners' struggles in writing was crucial so as to improve the quality of L2 writing. Nonetheless, there was no comparative writing analysis concentrating on the differences between learners' errors from distinct cultures. In light of this aim, the study was guided through three research questions focusing on the distribution of grammar errors, lexical items, and spelling. Qualitative data was collected via 60 pieces of writing by following the error analysis steps suggested by Corder (1974) to answer these questions. Interestingly enough, findings revealed that Turkish and Azerbaijani students had a good number of commonalities regarding the types of errors, although the three groups had some differences in terms of frequency and type of errors. This similarity was linked to the similar features of the culture and language of Azerbaijani and Turkish. In contrast, the underlying reasons for differences among the three groups were related to negative transfers from L1 or the effect of the background culture. This study is of importance when its comparative nature has been considered within the boundaries of error analysis.



In the study conducted by Can (2018), learner corpus data was utilized to analyze agreement errors of Turkish and Greek learners, who were reported as in the range of B1-C2 proficiency according to CEFR. Corpus-based data was used within the framework of Corder's (1971) Error Analysis method, which is also established as a foundation for the present study. According to the analysis, Verb Agreement, Noun Agreement, Anaphor Agreement, Determiner Agreement, Agreement Error, and Quantifier Agreement errors were ranked the most erroneous domains, respectively. Overall, the teachers in the EFL context are recommended to make use of authentic learning materials alongside data-driven teaching methods to maximize the learning experience. By observing written and oral productions, teachers can have the opportunity to highlight and build on the areas that learners tend to make errors. Building on the data-driven learning and corpus studies, Lay and Yavuz (2020) investigated 30 low-intermediate Turkish learners' written errors through pre and post-test design. Their analysis focused on Turkish to English interlingual errors, which were gathered in more than ten weeks. The findings suggested that corpus and contextualized data-driven learning eventually contribute to decreasing the participants' written errors.

With the aim of analyzing grammatical errors only, Taşçı and Aksu Ataç (2018) designed a study in which the learners were given a free writing task. The grammatical errors of the learners were categorized, relying on ICLE/ Louvain Taxonomy of Errors. After analyzing the errors individually, three coders reached common ground and finalized the analyses. The findings demonstrated that preposition errors ranked the most, preceded by the errors pertaining to verbs, articles, word classes, and pronouns. Parallel to the related literature, the potential sources were associated with developmental processes and interference of L1.

Terzioğlu and Bensen Bostancı (2020) gathered data following a quasi-experimental design from 58 Turkish Cypriot students studying in tenth grade. The errors were divided into syntactic, morphological, orthographic, and lexical categories. The results yielded that errors were ranked respectively as of the areas related to articles, prepositions, word order, verb tense, plural -s, possessive -s, comparative adjectives, spelling, punctuation, capitalization, and word choice. Moreover, there was a significant difference between experimental and control groups regarding the total number of errors. Whereas the syntactic category attracted more errors from both groups (experimental=133; control=175), morphological category (experimental=72; control=103), orthographical (experimental=24; control=37), and lexical category (experimental=3; control=5) followed. Both interlingual and intralingual interference were considered as significant factors affecting the production of errors.

In the present study, it is aimed to build upon the literature based on the analysis of written errors through Error Analysis following Corder (1967), which has also been established as a foundation to recent research conducted in the Turkish context (Polat, 2018; Can, 2018), as well. By providing more examples from this context, it might be beneficial in the following terms:

- i. Turkish learners' written error samples might be compared and contrasted to those with similar proficiencies,
- ii. The error types might be compared to those in the other EFL contexts,
- iii. The distribution of errors might be beneficial in informing the teachers and curriculum designers.

METHODOLOGY

Following the convenience sampling method, 17 English preparatory school students have been selected. They are undergraduate students from various departments that require the completion of preparatory school with a substantial level of English language proficiency. The participants' level is reported as intermediate, B1 according to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Council of Europe, 2001), which has been determined through a proficiency exam conducted at the beginning of the term. The proficiency exam focuses mostly on academic English and covers reading, listening, writing, and speaking skills. The participants' age range, who stated to be instructed in EFL for over nine years, is between 19 and 21.



Considering the private institution they study at, the participants are provided with a 4-hours separate class focusing on only writing instruction. The institution follows a writing booklet generated by the instructors based on the results of need analysis. Accordingly, the writing curriculum includes different genres such as cause and effect essay, advantages and disadvantages essay, opinion essay, compare and contrast essay. After students master these genres, they focus on the 'mix type' essay, a term created by a group of instructors working specifically on the writing skill. The mix type essays are a combination of different genres in one task, which is formed due to need analysis. For instance, students are supposed to write about the advantages of something and its causes, which is called the advantages and causes essay. This method's rationale is not to limit students within the border of the genres and let them express their opinions freely.

In this study, the participants have been asked to write an essay on the disadvantages/effects of living in a city/countryside, disadvantages/ effects of smoking as a requirement of the writing course. The essays have been produced as 350- 450 words-long in general. As for the analysis, the steps of Error Analysis laid out by Corder (1967) are applied, which comprises the collection, identification, and description of errors. In this light, firstly, the articles have been collected through the learners' production, and the researchers have identified their errors. Categorization conducted in the present study is similar to those in JMPVK and Premarathna (2011) and Pescante-Malimas and Samson's (2017). Firstly, grammatical errors denote the wrong usage of the parts of speech, such as verb tenses, prepositions, and articles. Lexical errors cover the errors affecting the meaning of the constructions such as substitution, omission; meanwhile, mechanical errors cover the errors related to the technical part of sentence construction such as punctuation, capitalization.

Upon describing the errors with the main categories, emerging themes and codes have been demonstrated with authentic examples derived from the collected data. The researchers have compared and contrasted their coding and reached a consensus on the final categorization via briefing. Some subcategories have been unified under broader categories to have a bigger picture of error-prone areas. This analysis procedure might be interpreted as content analysis since systematic labeling has been utilized to discover the characteristics of a document (Polat, 2018). After the analysis, the errors have been counted to demonstrate and summarize the data so that the descriptive statistics would contribute to unearthing the participants' patterns of errors.

FINDINGS

Table 1. Distribution of Errors – Main Categories

	Frequency	Percentage
Grammatical Errors	143	52.38
Lexical Errors	80	29.3
Mechanical Errors	50	18.31
Total	273	100

The present study's findings have demonstrated that the participants have difficulty in all three categories of error. As it can be clearly seen in Figure 1, grammatical errors (n=143; 52.3%) have attracted the highest number of frequency, followed by lexical errors (n=80; 29.3%) and mechanical errors (n=50; 18.3%), respectively. It might be beneficial to elaborate on the error types and the subcategories via examining examples to have a better understanding of the phenomenon.



Table 2. Distribution of Errors – Subcategories

		Frequency	Percentage
Grammatical Errors	Preposition	30	20.97
	Singularity/ Plurality	25	17.48
	Verb Conjugation	21	14.68
	Article- related	20	13.98
	Subject-Verb Agreement	15	10.48
	Conjunction	13	9.09
	Auxiliary verb	10	6.99
	Word order	9	6.29
Lexical Errors	Substitution	49	61.25
	Omission	13	16.25
	Spelling	11	13.75
	Wrong word class	7	8.75
Mechanical Errors	Punctuation	24	48
	Conjunctions	7	14
	Incomplete sentences	7	14
	Capitalization	7	14
	Written-mode	5	10

a. Grammatical Errors

The findings have yielded that the corpus of the study consisted 143 grammatical errors. Among them, errors related to singularity/plurality (n=25) are the most frequent category, followed by verb conjugations errors (n=21). On the other hand, the least common grammatical error is related to using the addition of prepositions (n=8). The other types identified in this category are the omission of the auxiliary verb(n=10), subject-verb-agreement errors (n=15), the wrong verb conjugation(n=21), wrong use of conjunction or omission of conjunction (n=13), the omission of the preposition (n=13), the addition of preposition (n=8), wrong use of preposition (n=9), wrong word order (n=9), and omission and addition of articles (n=20).

Some of the errors related to singularity/plurality committed by learners are as following:

- (1) *Another disadvantages* is the risk of lung cancer.*
- (2) *These structure* make a city bad.*



(3) *A lot of effect* of smoking cigarette...*

Some of the errors related to the wrong verb conjugation committed by learners are as follows:

(4) *People want to living* in the countryside.*

(5) *There are many disadvantages, such as not have* a private life.*

(6) *People who living* in a city are not happy.*

b. Lexical Errors

When the lexical errors were analyzed, it was discovered that the majority of the error types were related to the use of the wrong word (n=49). However, errors pertinent to misuse of word-class were very few. The other lexical errors were related to misspelling (n=11), wrong word class (n=7), and omission of the word (n=13).

Some of the errors related to wrong word use are as following:

(7) *Social activities provide* (encourage) the people*

(8) *Cigarettes have got* (include) tobacco, carbon monoxide.*

(9) *They are false* (wrong) role models for kids.*

c. Mechanical Errors

The findings of the analysis include 50 mechanical errors, of which the most repetitive error type was the omission of punctuation (n=24). The majority of this error category (n=17) includes the omission of a comma after conjunctions.

Some of the errors related to the omission of punctuation committed by learners are as follows:

(10) *Firstly* I would like to start with the disadvantages.*

(11) *However* we are not sure about it completely.*

(12) *They are many disadvantages and* also* effects on people.*

The least frequent mechanical error type was related to the use of informal language in academic writing. In this category, the contraction was the most repetitive error type in the learners' paper.

Some of the errors related to contraction are as following:

(13) *It's a big mistake for adults.*

(14) *I can't describe how it looks like.*

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This study investigates the written errors committed by English preparatory school students via examining their essays in terms of grammatical, lexical, and mechanical errors. The findings have revealed that the participants have had the highest number of errors in the category of grammatical errors (n=143; 52.3%), whereas lexical errors (n=80; 29.3%) and mechanical errors (n=50; 18.3%) have attracted less number of frequency by the students. The findings inform us further that errors



pertaining to substitution (n=49), preposition (n=30), singularity/plurality (n=25), punctuation (n=24), verb conjugation (n=21), articles (n=20), subject-verb agreement (n=15), conjunction (n=13), omission (n=13), spelling (n=11), auxiliary verb (n=10), word order (n=9), wrong word class (n=7), conjunctions-comma (n=7), incomplete sentences (n=7), capitalization (n=7), written modality (n=5) ranked as the most error occurring fields, respectively.

In line with the present study's category of grammatical errors, prepositions have been ranked as the most occurring error type in the study of Taşçı and Aksu Ataç (2018). According to the results of a study conducted by Sermsook et al. (2017), punctuation errors are the most frequent error type identified in the data. Likewise, this error type is the most frequently occurring error type in this study within the mechanical error category boundaries. This study has also discovered that the wrong word use is the learners' major lexical error, which might be related to mother tongue influence as choosing the appropriate vocabulary items for the related context. This result is parallel to Sun's study (2014), which indicated evidence for many Chinese-English expressions under the influence of L1 interference.

On the other hand, contrary to the studies that found article-related errors most occurring in their data set (Yalçın, 2010; Kırmızı & Karıcı, 2017; Terzioğlu & Bensen Bostancı, 2020), the present study has found the articles as relatively lower ranking compared to other types. However, the articles still occupy a significant proportion (n=20; 13.9%) when the overall distribution of errors is analyzed. Therefore, special attention might be needed for Turkish EFL learners to overcome this type of errors. As suggested by Can (2018) and Lay & Yavuz (2020), the data-driven learning method and authentic data utilizing contextualized corpus might establish a way for guiding the learners to overcome the errors.

In the related literature, the researchers have utilized various perspectives regarding the error analysis. The present study has employed a holistic perspective while analyzing the written errors of the students. Apart from the perspectives, categorizations have differed across various studies. For instance, instead of the syntactic category, which has been exploited by Pescante- Malimas & Samson (2017), this study has used the lexical category. By categorizing some errors under the lexical category, it has been aimed to find some common errors concerning lexical items' usage. Similarly, Kırmızı & Karıcı (2017) have formed two categories as lexical and grammatical, which makes the category of mechanical errors distinctive in this study. Since genre-based writings emphasize the organization of the writing besides other aspects, apart from these two categories (grammatical, lexical), in the present study, mechanical aspects have been examined, as well. As for the results, Pescante- Malimas & Samson (2017) have found high frequencies of errors in the grammatical error category, which is in accordance with the present study. Furthermore, JMPVK et al. (2011) have discovered that the majority of the errors are pertinent to grammar, which is in line with this study. On the other hand, under the grammatical category, pronoun and antecedent agreement, proper tense usage, and verb-subject agreement have been reported to attract a higher number of errors, while in the present study, singularity/plurality and verb conjugations have been identified as the most frequent subcategories.

In light of this study's findings, educators might take some remedial steps to lessen the number of errors committed by the learners. Owing to the high frequency of wrong word choice, it could be emphasized that students should not only use a bilingual dictionary but also monolingual dictionaries in order to avoid the effect of mother tongue. Furthermore, students might be encouraged to elaborate on how to use a concordance. Hence, they might be able to see the word in the context. Further studies might employ a comparative study on the error analysis across different genres to see the patterns of errors. Designing a quasi-experimental study comparing different genres and isolated use of specific genres might be fruitful. In this way, the results might reflect the differences among such a twist on the genre-based approach and its benefits/drawbacks regarding student production.



REFERENCES

- Can, C. (2018). Agreement errors in learner corpora across CEFR: A computer-aided error analysis of Greek and Turkish EFL learners' written productions. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 6(5), 77-84.
- Council of Europe. (2001). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment. Cambridge, U.K: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Corder, S.P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5.
- Corder, S.P. (1981). Error analysis and interlanguage. 1st Edn.: Oxford University Press.
- Demirel, E. T. (2017). Detection of Common Errors in Turkish EFL Students' Writing through a Corpus Analytic Approach. *English Language Teaching*, 10(10), 159. doi:10.5539/elt.v10n10p159
- Ferris, D. (2002). Treatment of error in second language writing. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gillet, A. (2004). The ABC of ELT. EAP. *IATEFL Issues*, (178): 11.
- JMPVK, J., & Premarathna, C. D. H. M. (2011). A linguistics analysis on errors committed in English by undergraduates. *International Journal of scientific and research publications*, 1(1), 2250-3153.
- Kırkgöz, Y. (2010). An analysis of written errors of Turkish adult learners of English. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 4352-4358.
- Kirmizi, O., Karci B. (2017). An Investigation of Turkish Higher Education EFL Learners' Linguistic and Lexical Errors. Educational Process. *International Journal*, 6(4), 35-54.
- Lay, K. J., & Yavuz, M. A. (2020). Targeting Turkish-to-English Interlingual Interference Through Context-Heavy Data-Driven Learning. *SAGE Open*, 10(2), 2158244020920596.
- Pescante-Malimas, M. A., Samson, S. C. (2017). Linguistic Error Analysis on Students' Thesis Proposals. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 193-209.
- Polat, M. (2018). A Comparative analysis of written errors of Turkish, Azerbaijani, and Syrian students in English writing skills. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*, 5(2), 64-78.
- Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rattanadilok Na Phuket, P., & Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(32), 99-106.
- Seitova, M. (2016). Error Analysis of Written Production: The Case of 6th Grade Students of Kazakhstani School. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (232), 287-293. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.022
- 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.
- Singh, C. K. S., Singh, A. K. J., Razak, N. Q. A., & Ravinthar, T. (2017). Grammar Errors Made by ESL Tertiary Students in Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 10(5), 16-27. doi:10.5539/elt.v10n5p16
- Sun, X. (2014). Ungrammatical Patterns in Chinese EFL Learners' Free Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 7(3). doi:10.5539/elt.v7n3p176
- Taşçi, S., & Aksu Ataç, B. (2018). Written Grammatical Errors of Turkish Adult Learners of English: An Analysis. *Online Submission*, 4(1), 1-13.
- Terzioğlu, Y., & Bensen Bostancı, H. (2020). A Comparative Study of 10th Grade Turkish Cypriot Students' Writing Errors. *SAGE Open*, 10(1), 2158244020914541.
- Vahdatinejad, S. (2008). *Students' error analysis and attitude towards teacher feedback using a selected software: a case study*. Unpublished Master's thesis. University Kebangsaan, Malaysia, Bangi.
- 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. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p67



Yalçın, I. (2010). *Turkish speaking first year and third year ELT students' syntactic errors in their argumentative essays*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

