
English Grammatical Speaking Errors of Sasakness Learners: A Case Study at English Literature Students

Panji Tanashur¹⁾, Nuralfi Lail²⁾, Erwin Suhendra³⁾

¹Universitas Bumigora, Mataram, Indonesia
panji.tanashur@universitasbumigora.ac.id,

²Universitas Bumigora, Mataram, Indonesia
nuralfilail@universitasbumigora.ac.id,

³Universitas Bumigora, Mataram, Indonesia
erwin@universitasbumigora.ac.id

Received: 3rd November 2023| Revised: 9th March 2024| Accepted: 22nd May 2024

Email Correspondence: erwin@universitasbumigora.ac.id

Abstract

The need for learning English as a foreign language is rising due to the interconnectedness of today's globe, where English is the universal language of academics, commerce, entertainment, and culture. This has raised interest in the automatic approach to evaluating spoken language competency. In this sense, learning grammar is one of the most important components of language competency. This study aims to analyze the grammatical speaking errors made by the second-year Universitas Bumigora students learning English as a foreign language in the Speaking 3 course. The research method involves a qualitative research design using the surface strategy taxonomy to analyze and classify the data collected from 20 English literature students. The errors are categorized into omission, addition, disordering, and selection. The research results show that types of errors identified include plural and singular nouns, subject-verb agreement, part-of-speech word orders, regular and irregular verb usage, and word order. Data were obtained through two cycles; in the first cycle, the participants receive feedback on their errors, and their insight on the errors is also considered in cycle 2. Data analysis on both cycles reveals that there were significant errors in singular and plural pronoun usage of above 20%; the subject-verb agreement has an increasing percentage of errors (4.16%) after being given feedback on the first cycle; part of speech has significantly lower errors (8.03% and 1.09%); the usage of articles is similar to subject-verb agreement errors, there was slight increasing percentage of errors (1.8% and 0.20%). Thus, the data revealed that learners are significantly influenced by both the interference of their first language and the challenges inherent in acquiring a second language. Therefore, errors in spoken articulation still existed, though learners were able to comprehend the grammar in written text. The implication of this study is that educators can tailor their teaching approaches to better address the needs of Sasak speakers learning English, ultimately facilitating a more effective language acquisition process

Keywords: addition, error analysis, grammatical speaking, omission

1. INTRODUCTION

Articulating in one's mother tongue can be demanding, and this challenge intensifies when communicating in a second language. Researchers have identified prevalent errors among second or foreign-language learners. Both speaking and writing are considered generative skills, as they facilitate expression in a second language, notably English. Error analysis is crucial as it identifies the causes of errors in second language learning, thus enhancing understanding of language acquisition. It also supports the adoption of effective teaching strategies and efforts to improve learners' grasp of the importance of learning a new language (Amjad, 2021; Fadloeli & Yusuf, 2018; Manirakiza & Hakizimana, 2020; Resmi et al., 2023; Zafar, 2016).

Because of its importance to language practitioners, examining errors made by language learners has become a prominent issue for many scholars studying Second Language Acquisition (SLA) throughout the years. A test or inspection can be used to construct the error's identification. When anticipating the mistake components, error analysis is thought to be an alternative to contrastive analysis, which separates learners' first and second languages (Fauziati, 2014; Gök, 2020; Jain, 2015; Saad et al., 2014). This has a big influence on figuring out the language learners' proficiency. When teaching languages, it can be crucial to create relevant teaching materials. The acquisition of a second language (L2) has been extensively studied, revealing that the process is influenced by a variety of factors, including contextual and personal elements. Contextual factors encompass the learning environment and exposure to the language, which can significantly impact the quality and frequency of language practice and, consequently, L2 development (Dubiner, 2019; Gök, 2020; Montrul, 2019; Toscu, 2023). Personal factors refer to individual learner differences such as motivation, cognitive style, personality, learning strategies, and aptitude, which affect how learners process and retain language input (Ayedoun et al., 2020; Cohen & Henry, 2019; Dörnyei, 2014). These factors can lead to the development of errors, which are a natural part of the language-learning process.

Since it indicated the main origins of Sasakness errors, this research will focus on how errors are acquired. Researchers, practitioners, and linguists were able to discuss why learners make mistakes and gain a better understanding of how errors are made thanks to the evidence presented in this study. Classifying the different sources of errors according to their consistency and relevance could help improve English language instruction and learning.

This paper aims to address common grammatical errors produced by Sasak speakers in Indonesia, specifically focusing on Sasak-speaking students studying English as a second language. Examining these errors will make it possible to defend their accumulation critically. They will be broken down and

examined in each area to provide valuable insight into the causes of the errors Sasakness pupils make when learning English. Therefore, more analysis of these errors will be given, with a focus on the relationship and area of comparison of the errors made by the research participants and the students. This will include the linguistic variations between Sasak and English, consistency mistakes, and good and negative interferences.

Indonesia is a country that uses English as a foreign language. English is taught only in instructed learning, found in Indonesian schools. The first Indonesian language is Bahasa Indonesia, which is significantly different from English. The existence of a local language that is frequently used in almost every setting could also affect language production. For example, the Sasak tribe speaks the Sasak Language as their first language. Sasak is one of the tribes that inhabit one of the islands in Indonesia, namely Lombok. A small island located east of the island of Bali with a population of approximately 6 million people.

The significant difference between a learner's first language (L1) and second language (L2) can indeed be a source of errors in the language learning process. Differences in grammar, phonology, and vocabulary between L1 and L2 can lead to negative transfer, where learners apply rules from their native language to the new language, resulting in errors (Amara, 2015; Brogan & Son, 2015; Budiharto, 2019; Kwon & Starr, 2023). However, Richards and Schmidt (2013) argued that the learners commit errors that are not always caused by their mother tongue. It might be a problem of targeted language as well as the communicative strategy used (Hashim, 2017). This situation is similarly found by (Yu, 2019), he found that learners who utilize learning strategies to enhance their learning are more likely to achieve positive learning outcomes. This suggests that more intrinsically motivated students tend to be deep learners, leading to better outcomes. He emphasizes that the language being taught is irrelevant to the use of language in the environment. Many teachers do not speak the language that they teach. Moreover, in this case, English is not used either in the classroom or outside. It makes the goal of learning a language more difficult to achieve. Moreover, making errors is an obvious thing that happens during the language-learning process.

James (2015) divided error analysis into two categories: linguistic structure and surface structure taxonomy are used to identify these problems. Language structure deals with phonological, grammatical, and lexical categories, while surface structure relates to descriptive taxonomy. The aforementioned categories can be sources of error, which include selection, mis ordering, addition, and omission (Heydari & Bagheri, 2012). The Error analysis concept is an answer to the dissatisfaction with Contrastive Analysis, which is claimed to be a sufficient approach to compare and identify the differences and

similarities between two languages (L1 & Target Language) (Alkresheh & Hamad, 2013). Those languages with many similarities might be easier to master, but the different ones are probably difficult and lead to different kinds of errors. Based on the above argumentations, there are gaps that have not been resolved by previous research namely grammatical errors made by Indonesian adults. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the grammatical errors made by Indonesian adults speaking in an extremely different language structure from the targeted language (English) within the spontaneous talks. Though several types of research have been conducted on identifying these issues (Amara, 2015; Aristia & Ismiati, 2024; Hikmah, 2020; Ma'mun, 2016; Mashoor & Abdullah, 2020; Rochmadi, 2020) those researchers were identifying writing skills students unlike those, and it is still interesting to identify factors that occur within the English Literature students who are exposed by English Language and Literature during the learning process.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study concentrated on qualitative research by gathering empirical data from students' speeches through script document analysis. This approach is used to obtain precise data collecting. The result of this error analysis is obtained by the researcher conducting a specific investigation using surface strategy taxonomy. According to Corder (1981), the surface strategy taxonomy is a classification of superficial error that serves as the foundation for further in-depth systematic investigation. Surface structures are changed, and the taxonomy of surface strategies is high and low. It encompasses addition, omission, disordering, and selection. This research aims to discover the source of errors made by Sasakness, who speak English as their second language. Specifically, it is finding out whether the errors committed were made because of the influence of L1 or the results of their learning process. This research involved 20 participants who are currently in their second year of studying at Universitas Bumigora, majoring in English literature. Those participants are categorized as having an intermediate level of English competency, which has been completing Speaking 1 and basic grammar subjects. The ages are around 19 to 24 years old. Data were collected by using oral tasks in which all of them were asked to describe 3 different pictures within 2 cycles respectively. This is because the author wanted to see whether the errors are consistently made or fixed in one of the cycles. It recorded roughly 2 to 4 minutes for each cycle using a handphone. After that, the data were collected by typescript and the error based within the script was analyzed. The interval between cycle 1 and cycle two was roughly 10 minutes. Once they've described the supplied photographs, we'll also ask them questions about their grammar comprehension in an interview. Then, it was checked to see if their speaking abilities and comprehension of grammar were correlated.

4 major categories were selected to represent the specific, significant errors frequently made by Sasak learners in the analysis and classification of grammatical errors that Sasakness learners spontaneously produced. The classification of these errors was initially based on comparing the grammatical structures of the two languages, Sasak and English. Some mistakes were made, and it was considered that some of these inaccuracies were due to language transfer and the introduction of some Sasak characteristics into the English language. Additionally, because students frequently transfer and overgeneralize the laws of the two languages, some represent the contradiction between the two systems.

This part presents the research design, research scope or objectives, research tools and primary data, research setting, data collection technique, operational research, and data analysis technique.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings show that the errors made by participants will be classified into 4 categories: selection, disordering, addition, and omission and the data are presented in Table 1. Selection is a form of error that is caused by inappropriate selection items or vocabularies. Disordering is also one of the error forms due to the improper placing of items.

Table 1. Type, frequency, and Percentage of Errors Surface Strategy Taxonomy Analysis

No	Type of Errors	Classifications	Frequency of Error	Percentage of error
1	Omission	Misuses of plural and singular nouns	30	24.59%
		Subject verb agreement	20	16.39%
		Articles	12	9.84%
2	Addition	Misuses of plural and singular noun	34	27.87%
		Part of Speech	24	19.67%
		Articles	15	12.29%
3	Disordering	Part of speech	3	2.46%
		Word order	0	-
4	Selection	Part of Speech	0	-
		Regular and Irregular verbs	4	3.28%
Total				100%

The addition is another error caused by adding incorrect or unnecessary items while omission is an omitting process of an item resulting in an error. In this case, the author found significant errors related to misusing singular and plural nouns, regular and irregular verbs, prepositions, articles and verb tense.

3.1 Cycle 1

In the first cycle, the type of error most often done by participants is addition. For example;

- a. *I am going to describing three pictures.*
- b. *I think they just laying down*

Unnecessary and incorrect additions are committing the error in sentence structure. Specifically, they frequently add the suffix -ing in the verb which is preceded by a to-infinitive. This is causing an error in the sentence. This error is categorized as the misuse of the present participle tense. The second is that he also adds morpheme -ing to a sentence not categorized as progressive tense. No to be or other aspects allow morpheme -ing to appear in the sentence. This error occurred 20 times even though most of the participants understood the concept of subject-verb agreement, but it is worth noting that they seem accustomed to using additional suffixes in sentences to clarify certain contexts in their first language (Sasak Language).

Sasakness experiences difficulties when it comes to the use of suffixes. This might be influenced by the use of the Sasak Language in their day-to-day communication. Sasak Language widely recognizes the importance of using suffixes in the form of Clitics. Clitics in Sasak are often found in the main verb of a sentence such as:

- 1) *Jangkek tokol*
Jangke=k tokol
PROG=1 sit.
I am sitting.

This sentence has no pronoun. However, the personal pronoun (subject) has been represented by clitic (-k) in the word *jangke* (as *host*).

- 1) *Mun ebengk klambi no*
Mu=n ebeng=k klambi =no
AT=3 give=1 shirt DEF
He/she gave me that shirt

Following the phenomenon, we conducted interviews on the relationship between local language and English to see how much influence the L1 has on the L2. The questions were about how often they use the local language in the school environment, and family, and how much influence the local language accent has on the language translation process. We found that most of them felt that their habit of using the local language affected the way they translated a language, although not significantly. However, in the context of using suffixes and prefixes, they are very used to using them in Sasak.

The second most common error in cycle 1 is called omission. The participants tend to remove suffix -es/-s in the context of plural form and simple present tense. For example:

- a. *a modern house with two bedroom*
- b. *two bathroom are very tidy*
- c. *Panji ask me to describe 3 picture*

Based on the above examples, the participant omits the suffix -s / -es in the form of plural forms and present tense. Many of them failed to form the bedrooms and bathrooms words, which is seen as more than one room in the picture. Moreover, the noun is also preceded by are and must be followed by a plural noun. This similar form appears several times. In the present tense, most of them struggle to add the suffix -s in the verb *ask* since the subject is a third singular person. It turns the sentence error. The fact that English is "an inflectional language, in which prefixes or suffixes play a significant grammatical role" (Heydari & Bagheri, 2012; Kwon & Starr, 2023) should be mentioned. These prefixes and suffixes play a crucial role in how nouns and verbs are formatted. For example, adding an "s" makes the single form of a noun plural.

As the phenomenon happened, most participants felt unaware of how they produced the error sentence. Even though they understand the rules of grammar and morphemes in a plural form, but number of them failed to utter the correct sentence when speaking spontaneously. Despite being concerned about grammar rules, they highlighted what they thought was the idea they wanted to convey. Initially, I assumed that the error he made was included in the category of mistakes or errors of performance. They realized that their L1 (Sasak language) affected this. Although the rule of making singular forms plural by adding an "s" at the end is not recent, as seen in the instances, they frequently simplified the nouns without doing so. Sasak pupils have been studying this guideline ever since they started learning English in school.

However, to further appreciate this phenomenon among students, it is important to note that they literally translate the meaning of the Sasak language (their L1) into English rather than using the English language's literal form of the rule. Sasak language does not recognize tenses and the use of suffixes when indicating certain tense. The usage of plural nouns in Sasak is the same in this regard. Sasak just lists the quantity and number necessary to express a certain amount of an item or Sasak often mentioned the word twice to show the plural form of a word. For example: *dengan-dengan*: means people, *dengan* means person.

Another existing error is called selection, where the view of participants incorrectly uses "there is" and "there are", For example;

- a. *there is also trees*
- b. *there is kangaroos standing up*

The examples show that to be (is) is an error since it addresses the plural object. It should be ‘are’, not ‘is’. We didn't find many errors of this type in the first cycle. Therefore, we assumed this as a category of mistake because after we conducted a brief interview related to their understanding of the use of "there is" and "there are," it turned out that they had understood it. Even though this is a minor error, it is still found since they were too focused on thinking about what content they would convey by the picture instead of thinking about sentence structure or grammar.

3.2 Cycle 2

After 15 minutes, we felt the need to conduct a second test cycle to provide a consistent picture of the types of errors that appear. The findings can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Type, frequency, and Percentage of Errors

No	Type of Errors	Classifications	Frequency of Error	Percentage of error
1	Omission	Misuses of plural and singular nouns	33	22.60%
		Subject verb agreement	30	20.55%
		Articles	19	13.01%
2	Addition	Misuses of plural and singular noun	25	17.12%
		Part of Speech	17	11.64%
		Articles	18	12.33%
3	Disordering	Part of speech	2	1.37%
		Word order	0	-
4	Selection	Part of Speech	0	-
		Regular and Irregular verbs	2	1.37%
Total				100%

The pattern of errors made by participants seems to be influenced by the failure of the learning process of L2. The errors could be sourced by the incomplete application of the rules that they learned. These assumptions are strengthened by the pattern of error found in both cycles. The same pattern consistently appears in either cycle 1 or 2 with also the same type of errors. However, after conducting some interviews about the error that appeared, it might be categorized as a mistake or error of performance. It is because some participants claim that they are familiar with the rules and grammatical

structures. They are sometimes able to explain the idea of subject-verb agreement, the rule of using suffixes in plural nouns, and the third singular person in the simple present tense. Somehow, they failed to perform it in spontaneous speech because they focused on the picture, not the grammatical rules.

Another reason is the direct transfer from L1 to the targeted language, sometimes producing errors. Language translation produced the sentence he says in the incorrect selection. It may be accepted if it were translated into Sasak, but it is not in English. This demonstrates that his L1 has an impact on this particular inaccuracy. As stated (Storch & Aldosari, 2010), if EFL/ESL learners tend to use their L1 as a tool for their learning, some errors may emerge. Thus, the data collected through oral descriptions of pictures over two cycles revealed several patterns.

Firstly, omission errors, these were most prevalent, with a significant portion attributed to the misuse of plural and singular nouns, followed by subject-verb agreement errors and article omissions. From cycle 1 to cycle 2, there was an increase in errors related to subject-verb agreement and article omissions, suggesting that these areas might be particularly challenging for the learners or possibly more influenced by L1 interference. Secondly, addition errors, similarly, misuse of plural and singular nouns was the most common addition error, followed by incorrect part of speech usage and article additions. The frequency of plural and singular noun errors decreased in the second cycle, indicating some improvement or adjustment by the learners. However, article addition errors increased, highlighting another area of difficulty. Thirdly, disordering and selection errors, these errors were less frequent but notable for the presence of part-of-speech errors in disordering and regular and irregular verb errors in selection. The minimal presence of these errors could indicate that while learners struggle with these aspects, they are not as predominant as omission and addition errors.

Thus, in both Cycle 1 and Cycle 2, Sasakness learners faced challenges in using correct grammar in English, with omission errors being the most common, indicating difficulties in using the right words and structures. Addition errors were also significant, suggesting a tendency to add unnecessary words. While there were some improvements in Cycle 2, such as a reduction in addition errors, omission errors remained prevalent, highlighting the need for continued focus on this aspect of grammar instruction. Disordering errors remained low in both cycles, indicating a relatively strong grasp of word order, while selection errors were minimal, suggesting a basic understanding of verb forms. The findings were quite similar to the results conducted by other researchers. Even though the students understood it theoretically, they still made some errors frequently. Thus, the results of this research are in line Adib (2012); Anandari, (2015); Evans (2019); and Gozali (2018) mentioned that with targeted instruction, practice, and feedback were essential for improving grammatical accuracy in spoken English for Sasakness learners.

4. CONCLUSION

The analysis suggests that the grammatical errors made by Sasak learners are significantly influenced by both the interference of their first language and the challenges inherent in acquiring a second language. The persistence of errors, particularly in omission and addition categories, highlights Sasak speakers' complexities in adapting to English grammatical structures that differ from their native language. The increase in certain errors from cycle 1 to cycle 2, such as subject-verb agreement and article omissions or additions, underscores the need for targeted instructional strategies. These should focus on areas of significant difficulty, which seem to be influenced by the transfer of linguistic structures from Sasak to English, and the learners' attempts to overgeneralize English language rules based on their L1 understanding. Furthermore, the relatively stable or slightly improved errors in other categories suggest that with appropriate feedback and teaching methods, learners can adjust and improve their English grammatical accuracy. This implies that both the influence of L1 and the learning process contribute to the errors, with L1 interference being a significant, but not insurmountable, factor. By recognizing the patterns of errors and their potential origins, educators can tailor their teaching approaches to better address the needs of Sasak speakers learning English, ultimately facilitating a more effective language acquisition process.

This research can serve as a foundation for future studies about grammatical errors, speaking or writing. It is anticipated that English teachers will use it as guidance, particularly when it comes to writing and speaking, to identify the areas in which students still need to improve. Hence, the instructions made in the classroom should be clear because the different language used by the lecturer might affect the student's understanding of receiving the instruction. Practices within the classroom were rarely given constructive feedback beyond the classroom, which created a gap in students' understanding.

REFERENCES

- Adib, Q. (2012). Grammatical error analysis of speaking of english department students (a study at 2010 speaking class of ELT department of IAIN Walisongo). *Walisongo State Institute for Islamic Studies Semarang*.
- Amara, N. (2015). Errors Correction in Foreign Language Teaching. *TOJNED: The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 5(3), 58–68.
- Amjad, M. (2021). Practicing Error Analysis Techniques to Enhance Academic Essay Writing Skills. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 2(III), 292–305. [https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2021\(2-III\)26](https://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2021(2-III)26)
- Anandari, C. L. (2015). Indonesian EFL Students' Anxiety in Speech Production: Possible Causes and Remedy. *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 26(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i1/1-16>

-
- Aristia, E. S., & Ismiati, I. (2024). Analyzing Errors in Students' Writing. *Linguistics and ELT Journal*, 11(2), 164–172. <https://doi.org/10.31764/leltj.v11i2.20193>
- Ayedoun, E., Hayashi, Y., & Seta, K. (2020). Toward Personalized Scaffolding and Fading of Motivational Support in L2 Learner–Dialogue Agent Interactions: An Exploratory Study. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 13(3), 604–616. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2020.2989776>
- Brogan, F. D., & Son, J. (2015). Native Language Transfer in Target Language Usage: An Exploratory Case Study. *Voices*, 3(1). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7cd3n9xh>
- Budiharto, R. A. (2019). Native Language Interference on Target Language Writings of Indonesian EFL Students: An Exploratory Case Study. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(1), 107–116. <https://doi.org/10.25134/ieflj.v5i1.1630>
- Cohen, A. D., & Henry, A. (2019). Focus on the language learner: Styles, strategies and motivation 1. In *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (pp. 165–189). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429424465-10>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2014). *The Psychology of the Language Learner*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410613349>
- Dubiner, D. (2019). Second language learning and teaching: From theory to a practical checklist. *TESOL Journal*, 10(2), e00398. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.398>
- Evans, D. (2019). *Speaking to be understood: Indonesian students' perceived and actual understanding of Indonesian academics' English speech*. Lancaster University.
- Fadloeli, O., & Yusuf, F. N. (2018). Utilizing Error Analysis in Teaching Practice: Is It Meaningful? *Proceedings of the 1st Bandung English Language Teaching International Conference*, 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0008216402430249>
- Fauziati, E. (2014). Contrastive Analysis, Transfer Analysis, Error Analysis, And Interlanguage: Four Concepts One Goal. *Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies*, 1(1–2), Article 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.26555/adjes.v1i1-2.1680>
- Gök, Ş. (2020). Contrastive error analysis of Turkish EFL learners in writing. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 2(4), 236–242. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v2i4.429>
- Gojali, I. (2018). *Local Vs Global Errors: Comprehensibility Judgment On The Speech Of Indonesian Students By Native Speakers*. 152–158. <http://repository.ukwms.ac.id/id/eprint/26278/>
- Hashim, M. J. (2017). Patient-Centered Communication: Basic Skills. *American Family Physician*, 95(1). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28075109/>
- Heydari, P., & Bagheri, M. S. (2012). Error Analysis: Sources of L2 Learners' Errors. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(8), 1583–1589. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpsls.2.8.1583-1589>
- Hikmah, H. (2020). Analysis of Omission and Addition Errors Found in the Students' English Texts. *ELTICS: Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.31316/eltics.v5i1.526>
- Jain, M. P. (2015). Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance. In *Error Analysis* (pp. 189–215). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315836003-15>
- James, C. (2015). *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. Routledge. <https://www.abebooks.com/9781138836723/Errors-Language-Learning-Use-Exploring-1138836729/plp>
- Kwon, J., & Starr, G. (2023). How L1-Chinese L2-English learners perceive English front vowels: A phonological account. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.9282>
- Ma'mun, N. (2016). The Grammatical Errors on the Paragraph Writings. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 5(1), 95–131. <https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv5i1862>
-

-
- Manirakiza, E., & Hakizimana, I. (2020). Engaging Students in Error Analysis and Correction: A learner-Centered Approach to Improving Linguistic Accuracy. *European Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2(3), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.33422/ejte.v2i3.361>
- Mashoor, B. B. N., & Abdullah, A. T. H. bin. (2020). Error analysis of spoken English language among Jordanian secondary school students. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 8(5), 75–82.
- Montrul, S. (2019). How Learning Context Shapes Heritage and Second Language Acquisition. In M. Dressman & R. W. Sadler (Eds.), *The Handbook of Informal Language Learning* (1st ed., pp. 57–74). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119472384.ch4>
- Resmi, R., Rahman, A., Sobirov, B., Rumbardi, R., Al-Awawdeh, N., Widoyo, H., Herman, H., & Saputra, N. (2023). Incorporating Teachers' Views on Different Techniques for Teaching Foreign Languages in the Classroom. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(8), 210–210.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (0 ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833835>
- Rochmadi, I. (2020). Error Analysis of English Written Text of Higher Level English Foreign Language Learners. *International Journal of English Learning and Applied Linguistics (IJELAL)*, 1(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.21111/ijelal.v1i1.5009>
- Saad, M. A. H., Sawalmeh, M. H. M., & Bmi, U. (2014). *Error Analysis in Role-play Presentations among Less Proficient L2 Malaysian Learners*. <http://localhost/jspui/handle/123456789/10242>
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 355–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810375362>
- Toscu, S. (2023). Exploring classroom interaction in online education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(9), 11517–11543. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11622-x>
- Yu, B. (2019). The predicting roles of approaches to learning, L2 learning motivation, L2 learning strategies and L2 proficiency for learning outcomes: A comparison between Mainland and Hong Kong Chinese students. *Educational Studies*, 45(4), 520–532. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2018.1509775>
- Zafar, A. (2016). Error Analysis: A Tool to Improve English Skills of Undergraduate Students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 217, 697–705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.02.122>