English Language & Literature Teaching, *Vol. 30*, No. 4, Winter 2024
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2024.30.4.1

Oral Presentation Improvements in Korean College EFL Classrooms: Focusing on Presentation Script*

Sunmee Chang
(Hoseo University)

Chang, Sunmee. (2024). Oral presentation improvements in Korean college EFL classrooms: Focusing on presentation script. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *30(*4), 1-26.

This study investigates grammatical errors in presentation scripts written by Korean EFL learners, aiming to identify and assess writing proficiency improvements over two semesters. Eight participants in two consecutive English presentation courses during the 2022 academic year (spring and fall semesters) were analyzed. A total of 618 sentences from their scripts showed inaccuracies, mainly in omission, misformation, addition, and misordering errors. Omission errors were the most frequent in both semesters, followed by misformation and addition errors. Factors influencing the improvement of writing skills in their presentation scripts include building on previous knowledge from the spring semester. Learners became more familiar with the expectations and requirements of writing presentation scripts, and the process of writing and presenting in English became more ingrained through repeated practice. The study emphasizes the role of consistent feedback and iterative learning processes in fostering EFL learners' writing development. It also suggests that targeted instruction addressing specific error types, particularly omissions, can further enhance learners' proficiency. This research includes pedagogical implications, highlighting the importance of sustained practice, active engagement with course materials, and a structured curriculum in supporting students' writing accuracy and overall language skills in similar EFL contexts.

[error analysis/English presentation/oral presentation/EFL college learner]

* This research was supported by the Academic Research fund of Hoseo University in 2022. (Research # 202202250001)

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing skills at the tertiary level are fundamental to academic success, requiring learners to express their ideas and arguments with clarity and efficacy(Graham & Harris, 2005). For English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, mastering writing skills presents a unique set of challenges, particularly in academic contexts where precision and coherence are paramount(Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). Despite its crucial role in academic achievement, writing is often considered the most complex and demanding skill for EFL learners to acquire, surpassing the difficulties encountered in reading and listening skills (Berman & Cheng, 2010).

The challenge of writing in English extends beyond mere idea generation and organization; it encompasses the intricate task of transforming these ideas into coherent and comprehensible target language texts. Nunan (1999) asserts that writing coherently and fluently is the most likely demanding aspect of language for native speakers, and the difficulties are particularly great for EFL learners. This is because the challenge lies not only in generating and organizing ideas but also in transforming these ideas into coherent and comprehensible target language texts (Richards & Renandya, 2002). This complexity is particularly evident in the Korean EFL context, where learners face specific challenges in achieving native-like proficiency in their second language writing. These challenges often manifest in grammatical errors that can significantly impact the clarity and effectiveness of written communication.

One area that has received limited attention in existing research literature is the impact of presentation scripts on second language development (Agustín & Maria, 2006). One useful approach to measure general proficiency in L2 is to assess writing samples (Verspoor et al., 2012). Accordingly, this study investigates how Korean EFL (KEFL) learners' writing performance evolves over two semesters by conducting a grammatical error analysis of their presentation scripts. Yang (2018) and Yoon (2012) reveal that KEFL university learners do face some limitation in achieving a native-like L2 proficiency such as grammar accuracy in their writing. Several studies have shown that classroom presentations have significantly enhanced learners' speaking skills in EFL classrooms (Hammad & Madini, 2017; Riadil, 2020; Sirisrimangkorn, 2021). However, the potential of presentation scripts as a tool for developing writing proficiency remains relatively unexplored. This gap in research is particularly significant given that clear and accurate writing is essential for preventing misunderstandings and maintaining credibility in academic discourse.

This study investigates grammatical errors in presentation scripts written by Korean EFL learners, with the aim of identifying and assessing writing proficiency improvements over two semesters. The research focuses on eight participants enrolled in two courses where students do multiple presentations in English for two consecutive semesters. Through an

analysis of grammatical errors in presentation scripts, this study seeks to understand the progression of writing proficiency and the factors influencing improvement in writing skills.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Error Analysis

Language acquisition normally encompasses the occurrence of errors. According to Chomsky (1965), errors can be characterized as systematic deviations from the rules of a target language, resulting from gaps in learner's knowledge and lack of competence in knowing what is correct. Errors are difficult to be self-corrected by learners themselves as they are not aware that they have made errors or recognize the specific rules they have violated (James, 1998). Brown (2000) defines grammar errors as systematic deviations made by learners who have not fully comprehended the rules of the target language. Dulay et al. (1982) state that language errors represent the imperfect aspect of the learners in their speech or writing and nearly all non-native speakers experience grammatical errors in their writing (Abdulkareem, 2013). Chun et al. (1982) state that an error occurs when a linguistic element is used in a way that fluent users of the language would consider incorrect or incomplete learning. All these definitions point out that errors involve using language forms that go against the rules and norms of the target language.

Errors are an inevitable and necessary part of the natural process of learning (Ancker, 2000; Brown, 2007). While errors made by the learners are generally seen as undesirable by most educators in the past, they can be advantageous in language learning (Touchie, 1986). As Selinker (1972) suggests, errors are significant in three aspects: (1) errors are important for the language teacher because they indicate the learner's progress in language learning; (2) errors are also important for the language researcher as they provide insights into how language is learned; and (3) finally, errors are significant to the language learners as they get involved in hypothesis testing. Ellis (1997) emphasizes the need to distinguish between errors and mistakes made by the learners, as not all grammatical inaccuracies are categorized as errors. On the other hand, mistakes are seen as performance error where learners are unable to apply the rules that they know (Dulay et. al., 1982).

Moreover, the process of error analysis contributes to understanding the challenges encountered by L2 learners (Seddik & Kalapala, 2023) and teachers can take advantage of error analysis to refine their teaching methods and offer assistance to learners' learning endeavors (Kartini, 2022). Writing involves paying attention to grammar and sentence structure to ensure smooth delivery. Most learners are often unaware of the extent of their errors. Thus, the approach to correction of errors in phonology, intonation and stress, or lexis,

morphology and syntax, must take into account about what the learners have learned in their education (Mulligan, 2001).

2. Source of Errors

Selinker's (1972) identification of five sources of errors in language learning suggests that errors can arise from various factors. These include negative transfer from one's native language hindering the learning of L2, transfer of training influenced by specific training approaches, strategies employed for L2 learning to enhance linguistic and sociolinguistic competence, strategies used for L2 communication with native speakers, and overgeneralization of rules and semantic features in the target language without making necessary exceptions. Lightbown and Spada (2006) provide additional insights into overgeneralization, a phenomenon where L2 learners excessively apply the structure rules of the second language while producing language. For example, learners may incorrectly apply the –s ending or –ed ending to verbs, as seen in sentences like "I runs" or "I raned" (p. 81).

Brown (2007) classifies errors into four sources: interlingual transfer, where errors are influenced by L2 learners' mother tongue; intralingual transfer, where errors arise from the development of a new linguistic system in L2; errors due to the context of learning, caused by misleading explanations or contexts; and errors resulting from communication strategies, where incorrect techniques lead to errors.

Corder (1974) categorizes sources of errors into three parts: L1 interference leading to interlingual errors, learner's generalization and overgeneralization causing intralingual errors, and faulty teaching techniques resulting in teaching-induced errors. Richards and Sampson (1974) expand this to seven sources, including language transfer, intralingual interference, sociolinguistic situations, modality, age, successions of approximative systems, and a universal hierarchy of difficulty. These sources highlight factors contributing to errors in language acquisition.

A significant shift occurred in the 1970s with the introduction of the interlanguage concept. Selinker (1972) proposes that interlanguage is a distinct linguistic system observed through a learner's use of L2. Corder (1971) adds that, while acquiring an L2, the learner is creating their own grammatical system, shaped by diverse learning environments and exposure to the L2. Interlanguage thus reflects a learner's transitional competence between their L1 and L2, showcasing a unique linguistic system influenced by their individual learning background. Chan's (2004) study with 710 university learners from Hong Kong provides evidence of syntactic transfer from Chinese to English. The research suggests that many Chinese learners tend to think in Chinese before writing in English, with their interlanguage often mirroring Cantonese sentence structures.

3. Surface Strategy Taxonomy

According to Dulay et al. (1982), “A surface strategy taxonomy highlights the ways surface structures are altered: Learners may omit necessary items or add unnecessary ones; they may misform items or misorder them” (p.150). In the surface strategy taxonomy, grammatical errors can be recognized based on four main ways in which learners alter the intended or correct form of the language they are learning (Phettongkam, 2017). These errors are categorized into four types: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

Omission errors are identified by the absence of a morpheme that should be present in a well-formed utterance. Dulay et al. (1982) categorized morphemes into two types: content and grammatical morphemes. Content morphemes, such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs, convey the meaning of a sentence. Sentence examples are provided below.

(S1) Have you received (files) about the upcoming project?
(S2) I’ll (get) back to you (soon).
(S3) I could not (open).
(S4) I can’t check it (either)

In (S1) “files” is noun. “Get” in (S2) and “open” in (S3) are main verbs in each sentence. “Soon” in (S2) and “either” in (S4) are examples of adverbs. These examples are explaining that each word enclosed in brackets has its own specific meaning within its respective sentence. The words in brackets are labeled as “content morphemes” because they contribute significantly to the primary meaning of the sentences. Without these particular words, it can be difficult to comprehend the complete meaning of the sentences.

Grammatical morphemes, which function as words carrying only a limited part of a sentence's meaning, encompass articles, auxiliaries, modals, verb and noun inflections, prepositions, conjunctions, and personal pronouns. For instance, Dulay et al. (1982) emphasize that the sentence “Mary president new company” can be understood without including “is the of the” (p. 154), but the opposite is not possible. The occurrence of omitting grammatical morphemes is more common than the omission of content words.

Dulay et al. (1982) characterize addition errors as “the presence of an item which must not appear in well-formed utterance”(p. 156) which is the opposite of omission. It is a grammatical error where extra or unnecessary words are introduced, disrupting the intended meaning of the sentence. This type of error is the outcome of adhering too closely to certain rules. (S5) contains an addition error. The verb “can” is a modal auxiliary verb, and when it is used, the base form of the main verb “eat” should follow.

(S5) She can **eats** it.

Misformation errors are defined as “the use of the wrong form of the morpheme or structure” (Dulay et al., p. 158). For instance, (S6) points out a misformation error, suggests that the verb "inquire" in the subordinate clause should be in the past tense to align with the past tense of the main verb “informed” in the main clause.

(S6) The manager informed us that you **inquire** about the project yesterday

Misordering errors are defined as “the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance” (Dulay et al., p. 162). For example, (S7) explains that the phrase “pick up me” is misarranged because “pick up” is a phrasal verb. When using a pronoun with a phrasal verb, the pronoun must be placed between the verb and the preposition or adverb, not at the end of the phrasal verb.

(S7) Please **pick up me**

4. Previous Studies on Learners’ Corpora Analysis

Learners' corpora analysis refers to the examination and study of corpora, which are large collections of written or spoken texts produced by language learners (Yoon, 2019). These corpora provide valuable insights into the language learning process, allowing researchers and educators to analyze the patterns, errors, and developmental stages of learners’ language use in the process of acquiring a second language (Yoon, 2019). Analyzing learners’ written discourse is essential, as the assessment of academic quality in higher education relies on the written work produced by learners. In higher learning institutions, the quality of learners’ written work is a crucial factor in evaluating academic performance.

Many studies on learner errors have been conducted in writing, but there are not many studies on presentation scripts written by EFL learners. To provide some empirical studies that use learner corpora for error analysis, Shaumana (2019) conducts an analysis of written errors in Namibian EFL learners’ English Language and Literary examination scripts. The identified errors include challenges related to verb tense, subject-verb agreement, pronoun usage, punctuation, articles, singular and plural connections, inflection use, auxiliary verbs, spelling, colloquialism, compounds, omission of letters, mis-selection of letters, and mis-ordering of letters in sentences. Moreover, the study attributes these errors to interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and technological interference.

Ramadhani (2020) undertakes an examination of errors in learners’ English written texts

through the lens of the surface strategy taxonomy. Employing a qualitative descriptive approach, the study reveals that omission is the most prevalent error, succeeded by misformation, addition, and misordering. These identified errors predominantly stem from mother-tongue interference, in which the first language exerts an impact on the acquisition of the target language. Additionally, observations made by Mu (2006) highlighting the significance of research in second language writing, particularly in understanding the differences between the learner's first language and the second language. These differences may pose challenges and potential interferences in the process of second language writing.

Gilquin et al. (2007) compare native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) of English corpora. It is discovered that NNSs frequently committed errors in terms of frequency, like excessively using words or phrases uncommon in NSs' language. They also reveal the errors in register, suggesting that English learners often integrate spoken language elements into their academic writing, and vice versa.

Permadi (2012) investigate the accuracy levels and classification of grammatical inaccuracies in the Promotion Media of Tourism in Batu-East Java, while Yudharaharja (2013) focused on grammatical error analysis in tourism and object information on the Malang City Tour Website. Both studies discovered that the most frequently occurring grammatical error was the omission of plural identification (-s, -es).

In the Korean EFL context, Kim (2016) focuses on error analysis is conducted on 238 English argumentative essays written by Korean university learners, focusing on errors related to the confusion of lexical categories. The study identifies 10 types of confused lexical categories, such as coordinators or subordinators mistaken for adverbs, adverbs for conjunctions, and gerunds for nouns. The analysis explores reasons for this confusion, including homogeneous L1 translation, punctuation challenges, insufficient L2 grammar proficiency, negative transfer of L1 morphosyntactic properties, and limited L2 lexical knowledge. Lee (2016) explores the prevalent types of errors in summaries written by Korean EFL university learners. It compares and contrasts error patterns between high and low proficiency English learners using 128 summaries of English news articles. The analysis reveals that higher proficiency learners, although having lower overall error frequencies, exhibit more errors in specific subcategories like verb tense, verb form, and determiners. The study suggests that higher proficiency learners may struggle due to increased paraphrasing and complex sentence production, while lower proficiency learners tend to produce simpler sentences.

Numerous studies have explored learner errors in writing; however, there is a limited body of research on presentation scripts authored by EFL learners. This paper seeks to address this research gap by scrutinizing and analyzing presentation scripts written by Korean EFL learners, aiming to uncover specific errors prevalent in this context. Additionally, the study aims to assess improvements in writing across two semesters,

drawing from Sakha's (1999) observation that writers, upon recognizing common errors and actively checking their work, can bring their written texts closer to the target language.

III. METHODS

1. Research Questions

Two research questions guiding this study are as follows:

1) How does the frequency of presentations influence the progression of writing performance among Korean EFL university learners over two semesters?
2) What are the causes that influence the improvement in presentation scripts writing performance of Korean EFL university learners?

2. Participants and Setting

The subjects of this study were selected among the students enrolled in two courses, Creative Presentation 1 and Creative Presentation 2. These courses are supplemented with assigned textbooks, weekly handouts and class materials prepared by the instructor each week. The course objectives of these courses encompassed the enhancement of organization skills (10%), responsive skills (10%), content materials (10%), and language skills (10%). The students met once a week and the class lasted two hours. Due to the COVID-19 situation, the lessons shifted from offline classes to online classes. Total number of enrolled students were 22 but only 8 students took both classes in a row. The written scripts from those 8 students were selected for the analysis.

3. Research Design

This study examine the progression of writing proficiency among Korean EFL university learners over two consecutive semesters. This investigation involved a comprehensive analysis of grammatical errors within the presentation scripts from two courses, CP1 (Creative Presentation 1) and CP2 (Creative Presentation 2), both of which were conducted at a 4-year university situated in mid area of South Korea. The topics for the presentations were chosen from the textbooks titled Present Yourself 1 and Present Yourself 2 (Gershon, 2015) as shown in Table 1. The topics were general and learners were able to select more specific subtopics to present under the given themes.

TABLE 1
Presentation Topics for Creative Presentation 1 and 2

No	Creative Presentation 1	No	Creative Presentation 2
1	A Good Friend	1	A Person to Admire
2	A Favourite Place	2	A Great Vacation Idea
3	A Prized Possession	3	Young People Today
4	A Memorable Experience	4	Let Me Explain

4. Data Collection and Analysis

For their class presentations, learners were expected to prepare two essential components: Power Point Presentation and their presentation scripts. These materials were then uploaded onto the Learning Management System (LMS) by the learners a day prior to the presentation week. The written English presentation scripts of the learners were compiled to identify and analyze the common grammatical error patterns that Korean EFL university learners exhibit and to evaluate potential language developments resulting from repeated presentations. Total 16 scripts were collected, two longest scripts per student, one from CP1, the other from CP2. The age, gender and grades of the participants are not included in the discussion.

To categorize errors, this study developed an error analysis taxonomy adapted from Dulay et al.'s (1982) framework, which includes omission, addition, misformation, and misordering-related errors. To cover a broader range of errors made by Korean English learners, 8 error categories under omission, addition, misformation and misorder categories were identified based on English grammar rules. These categories encompass language challenges such as the omission or incorrect addition of articles or determiners, the word choice by the learner, instances of improper usage of auxiliary verbs, and the omission of pronouns. The selection of these categories aims to comprehensively capture various types of language inaccuracies commonly observed in the written English expressions of Korean learners. The goal is to provide a detailed understanding of the specific linguistic difficulties faced by these learners when writing their presentation scripts, with a particular focus on these identified areas through error analysis, and to observe an improvement of their writing skills from CP1 to CP2.

IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter outline the results of an error analysis conducted on the assignment tasks for CP1 and CP2, featuring 16 selected presentation scripts written by 8 Korean EFL university learners. A total of 618 sentences displayed grammatical inaccuracies, predominantly stemming from omission, misformation, addition and misorder errors. Tables 2 and 3 provide

a comprehensive summary of commonly observed grammatical errors found in the presentation scripts of Korean EFL university learners, with error types numbered and arranged based on their frequency. These categories are based on previous studies in error analysis (Chatsanguthai, 2022; Dulay et al., 1982; Erdoğan, 2005; Iamsiu, 2014; James, 1998).

1. Error Types of Grammar in the Presentation Scripts

As outlined in Table 2, when Korean EFL learners composed their presentation scripts in the CP1 class, omission errors make up the majority of total errors at 56%, emerging as the primary grammatical error. Among omission errors, the highest percentage of errors was in articles (29.2%), followed by prepositions at (9.5%), noun inflections and pronouns (4.8%), conjunctions (3.2%), verb inflections (2.4%), and auxiliaries (2.1%).

The second most prevalent category is misformation, accounting for 25%, in which the highest percentage of errors was in prepositions (11%), followed by verb inflections (6.4%), word choice (3.2%), and other errors such as conjunctions (2.1%), auxiliaries (1.3%) and articles (1%).

Addition errors constitute the third category at 15%, with prepositions as the highest percentage errors (5.6%), followed by articles (3.4%), noun inflections (2.4%), conjunctions and verb inflections (1.3%), and lastly pronouns (1%). The last category is misordering errors at 4.0%. The total number of sentences with grammatical errors stands at 377.

TABLE 2
Error Categories and Their Frequencies in Korean EFL Presentation Scripts in Creative Presentation 1

No	Categories	No. of errors	%
1.	**Omission**	**211**	**56**
	Article	110	29.2
	Prepositions	36	9.5
	Noun inflections	18	4.8
	Pronouns	18	4.8
	Conjunctions	12	3.2
	Verb inflections	9	2.4
	Auxiliaries	8	2.1
2.	**Misformation**	**94**	**25.0**
	Prepositions	41	11.0
	Verb inflections	24	6.4
	Word Choice	12	3.2
	Conjunctions	8	2.1
	Auxiliaries	5	1.3
	Articles	4	1.0
3.	**Additions**	**57**	**15.0**
	Prepositions	21	5.6
	Article	13	3.4

	Noun inflections	9	2.4
	Conjunctions	5	1.3
	Verb inflections	5	1.3
	Pronouns	4	1.0
4.	**Misorder**	**15**	**4.0**
	Total	377	100.0

In CP2 class, a similar pattern of errors is observed, where omission errors dominate as the primary grammatical error, comprising 59.2% of total errors. Among omission errors, the highest percentage was in article (32.5%), seconded by prepositions (7.5%), noun inflections (5%), verb inflections (4.6%), pronouns (3.8%), conjunctions (3.3%) and auxiliaries (2.5%).

The second most prevalent category is misformation, accounting for 25.8%. Within the category of misformation errors, the highest percentage was observed in prepositions (11.3%), followed by verb inflections (5.4%), word choice (4.2%), auxiliaries (2%), articles (1.7%) and conjunctions (1.3%).

Addition errors constitute the third category at 13.3%, with prepositions and conjunctions (3.3%) being the highest proportion of errors, followed by articles (2.5%), noun inflections and verb inflections (1.7%) and lastly pronouns (0.8%). The last category is misorder errors at 1.7%. The total number of sentences with grammatical errors in Creative Presentation 2 is now 240, reflecting a reduction from Creative Presentation 1, where there were 377 sentences. This signifies a decrease of 137 sentences.

TABLE 3
Error Categories and Their Frequencies in Korean EFL Presentation Scripts in Creative Presentation 2

No	Categories	No. of errors	%
1.	**Omission**	**142**	**59.2**
	Article	78	32.5
	Prepositions	18	7.5
	Noun inflections	12	5.0
	Verb inflections	11	4.6
	Pronouns	9	3.8
	Conjunctions	8	3.3
	Auxiliaries	6	2.5
2.	**Misformation**	**62**	**25.8**
	Prepositions	27	11.3
	Verb inflections	13	5.4
	Word Choice	10	4.2
	Auxiliaries	5	2.0
	Articles	4	1.7
	Conjunctions	3	1.3
3.	**Additions**	**32**	**13.3**
	Prepositions	8	3.3

	Conjunctions	8	3.3
	Article	6	2.5
	Noun inflections	4	1.7
	Verb inflections	4	1.7
	Pronouns	2	0.8
4.	**Misorder**	**4**	**1.7**
	Total	240	100

2. Overall Findings

When comparing the grammatical error percentages between CP1 and CP2, several noteworthy patterns emerge. The following sections involves an analysis of each error type, supported by detailed examples. Extracted from the presentation scripts, the sentences showcase grammatical inaccuracies, with the highlighted bold text pinpointing the specific error. In these examples, the caret symbol (^) denotes the omission of an essential grammatical word, while the asterisk symbol (∗) indicates an incorrectly inserted one.

1) Omission

In comparing the percentages between CP1 and CP2, omission errors persist as the predominant grammatical issue, with 56% in CP1 and 59.2% in CP2. While the overall percentage of omission errors increased slightly from CP1 to CP2, the specific error categories within omission errors reveal nuanced shifts.

(1) Articles

Delving into specific categories within omission errors, omission of articles accounted for the highest percentage. Specifically, omission of article in Creative Presentation 1 recorded a percentage of 29.2%, while Creative Presentation 2 demonstrated an increase to 32.5% as shown in Table 2 and 3. This suggests a notable rise in challenges associated with the use of articles in their Creative Presentation 2's presentation scripts.

As shown below, in (S8) and (S9), proper placement of the indefinite article "an" at the start of the noun group "adventurous person" and the indefinite article "a" before "president" is necessary. However, the participants did not incorporate these articles into their presentation scripts. Additionally, in (S10) and (S11), correct use of the definite article "the" at the beginning of the noun group "grip's black tape" and "advantages and disadvantages of alcohol" is essential, but they omitted these articles.

(S8) He is **(an)** adventurous person… (CP1)
(S9) …even though he was not **(a)** president… (CP2)

(S10) …never changed **(the)** grip's black tape… (CP1)
(S11) I'll tell you about **(the)** advantages and disadvantages of alcohol… (CP2)

(2) Preposition

The notable decrease in the percentage of preposition errors, declining from 9.5% in CP1 to 7.5% in CP2, suggests that the learners made relatively fewer mistakes in the use of prepositions in the latter presentation. For example, the sentence in (S12) lacks the preposition "about." Including "about" is crucial for conveying the intended meaning and providing additional information about the subject's life and achievements. Similarly, (S13) omits the preposition "in." The inclusion of "in" is essential for properly indicating the destination, making the sentence grammatically correct and contextually clear.

(S12) Today I'm going to tell you **(about)** her life and achievements. (CP1)
(S13) As soon as you arrive **(in)** Dubai… (CP2)

(3) Noun Inflections

The percentage of noun inflections errors saw a slight increase. It accounted for 4.8% in CP1, rising to 5% in CP2. The total percentage is influenced by the total number of sentences. Since CP2 has fewer sentences than CP1, each error contributes more significantly to the overall percentage. This unveils subtle nuances of the learners' linguistic performance in their presentation scripts. Omission of noun inflection errors such as noun inflection '-s' denoting possessiveness and specifically plural markers indicated by suffix '-s,' were observed in the presentation scripts. Below examples indicate the excerpts of the errors.

(S14) I want to ask some question**(s)**. (CP1)
(S15) I'm going to introduce one of my best friend**(s)**. (CP1)
(S16) I want to introduce positive and negative side**(s)** of Korea. (CP2)
(S17) Each of pizzas **(')** sizes, tastes… (CP2)

(4) Verb Inflections

The data indicates as shown below, a rise in verb inflection errors, transitioning from 2.4% in CP1 to 4.6% in CP2. The examples from (S18) to (S22) showcase instances of different verb inflection errors. In (S18), the verbs "try" and "listen" should be inflected to "trying" and "listening" to convey the continuous aspect of the action. In (S19), the verb "break" should be inflected to "breaking" to match the gerund form needed in this context. The verb

"represent" in (S20) should be inflected to "represents" to match the singular subject "person or object." In (S21), the verb "want" should be inflected to "wants" to match the singular subject "Someone." In (S22), the verb listen should be inflected to "listening."

(S18) I have no power like him, but I will keep try**(ing)** and listen**(ing)** (CP2)
(S19) They said the reason is break**(ing)** up with their girl friends… (CP2)
(S20) … the person that represent**(s)** Korean Wave these days… (CP2)
(S21) Someone want**(s)** to walk (CP2)
(S22) Thank you for listen**(ing)** (CP1)

(5) Pronouns

The data indicates a decrease in pronoun errors, declining from 4.8% in CP1 to 3.8% in CP2. The omission of personal pronouns such as "it," "you," "I," "her," "their", "me," and "he" is evident in various instances. In (S23), there is a noticeable absence of the objective pronoun "it," a phenomenon attributed to L1 transfer. (S24) showcases the omission of the pronoun "you," a pattern often linked to the use of dative verbs. Both (S25) and (S28) exhibit the omission of main clause subjects, specifically "I" and "he," respectively. Additionally, (S26) and (S27) show that the learners failed to include possessive pronouns "her" and "their" in their presentation scripts. Examples are illustrated below.

(S23) I liked soccer, so I want to enjoy **(it)** more often (CP1)
(S24) Then I'll tell **(you)** what I usually do (CP1)
(S25) but **(I)** also had a chance to work in Everland. (CP1)
(S26) When she has **(her)** own time (CP1)
(S27) they get stress because of **(their)** parents (CP2)
(S28) His passionate efforts led to his mastery of printing skills and **(he)** also began to increase his writing skills (CP2)

(6) Conjunctions

The data shows a minimal difference in conjunction errors between CP1 and CP2 with conjunction errors accounting for 3.2% in CP1 and slightly increasing to 3.3% in CP2.

In (S29), the omission of conjunction "and" is essential to connect and coordinate two related elements in the sentence. Excerpt in (S30) contains an omission error, specifically the absence of the conjunction "than." The conjunction "than" is essential in this context to convey a comparative relationship.

(S29) It has a large animal kingdom, **(and)** wonderful magic kingdom (CP1)
(S30) We became more **(than)** good friend (CP2)

(7) Auxiliaries

As shown in the examples below, the observation related to auxiliary errors reveal the comprising 2.1% in CP1, showing a slight increase to 2.5% in CP2. In their presentations, the omitted main verbs could be broadly classified into two types. The first type is the non-auxiliary be, do, and have, as shown in (S31), (S32), and (S33), respectively.

A KEFL learner in (S31) omitted "was" and unable to incorporate the past tense form, in the sentence which is essential for describing events that occurred in the past. Meanwhile in (S32), there is a missing auxiliary verb "do" before the phrasal verb "make up." Sentence in (S33) is incomplete due to the omission of the auxiliary verb "have." This indicates that learners struggle with using different verb tenses accurately in their writing. Although the sentences make sense, the learners find it challenging to construct correct tense structures (Celik & Erin, 2023).

(S31) She **(was)** always late (CP1)
(S32) I enjoy watching it when I rest, **(do)** make up even before I go to bed (CP2)
(S33) …being with friends and co-workers can make you feel happy and **(have)** good effect your body (CP2)

2) Misformation

The occurrence of misformation errors, representing 25% in Creative Presentation 1 and a slightly elevated 25.8% in Creative Presentation 2, highlights a significant facet of linguistic challenges apparent in the presentation scripts.

(1) Prepositions

Misformation of preposition errors in the presentation scripts hold 11% in CP1 and 11.3% in CP2. In (S34), The preposition "in" is used incorrectly; it should be "at" university. When referring to a specific location like a university, the correct preposition is "at". For (S35), "as have as" is not a correct comparison structure. The correct structure for expressing equality is "like".

(S34) Ji-young and I met 4 years ago **in*** university (CP1)

(S35) Don't you have good memories when you went to Everland **as have as*** me? (CP2)

(2) Verb inflections

From the provided information in Table 2 and 3, it appears that in CP1, verb inflections hold 6.4% of the errors, while in CP2, the percentage decreases to 5.4%. Errors of this category include subject-verb agreement and tense (e.g. present participle, past tense).

In (S36) and (S38), the errors committed here are in the verb tense. “Rent” should be changed to “rented” to match the past tense of the verb “arrived.” Likewise, in (S38), “is” should be changed to “was” to maintain consistency in referring to a time when the artist was alive. In (S37), the error involves subject-verb agreement. “Appears” should be changed to “appear” to agree with the plural subject “director and actor.” In (S39), the present participle form of the verb “cause” is “causing.” In the original sentence, there was an error with the parentheses. In this study, KEFL learners continue to face challenges with verb inflections usage. Below are the extracted examples:

(S36) As soon as we arrived, we **rent*** the car which I drove around (CP1)
(S37) the director and actor who **appears*** in the webtoon-based movie are important (CP1)
(S38) This is the only National Museum dedicated to his name when the artist **is*** alive (CP2)
(S39) alcohol is famous for damaging liver cells, and **causes*** numerous liver diseases (CP2)

(3) Word choice

It can be inferred that there is an increase in the percentage of word choice issues from 3.2% in CP1 to 4.2% in CP2. This suggests a potential shift in the frequency or nature of word choice errors as the writing in the presentation scripts progresses. In (S40), the sentence “travel that trip” is considered as unconventional as the verb “travel” is usually used with a destination or mode of transportation, not with the noun “trip”. In (S41), the adjective “higher” was used instead of “increased.” In (S42), the adjective “FUNNY” was used instead of the noun “fun.” In (S43), the verb “jumped” was used instead of “immersed.” In (S44), the verb “added” was used instead of “collected.” All these examples can be considered as L1 transfer.

(S40) **travel*** that trip (CP1)
(S41) My height got **higher*** (CP1)

(S42) but just for FUNNY* (CP1)
(S43) She also **jumped*** herself among mentally challenged children and began educating them. (CP2)
(S44) I **added*** the IVY leaves when I travelled to IVY League Universitys. (CP2)

(4) Auxiliary

In CP1, 1.3% error rate was observed in the misformation of auxiliaries. However, in CP2, the error rate for auxiliaries rose to 2%. In (S45) and (S47), "have" in both sentences are incorrect because the subject "open class" and "she" require the singular form of the auxiliary verb. Therefore, "has" is the correct auxiliary verb in both sentences here. In the context of (S46), instead of "do," "go" is the appropriate verb to use. Some of the examples are presented below.

(S45) My first open class **have*** begun (CP1)
(S46) Places to **do*** and places to stay in Gyeongju (CP1)
(S47) Because she **have*** gone to Daejeon (CP2)

(5) Conjunctions

It is observed that in CP1, conjunction errors were noted with a rate of 2.1%. As the learners progress to CP2, the error rate for conjunctions has decreased to 1.3%. In (S48), the error lies in using "so" as a conjunction, which suggests a consequence, but the context requires a conjunction like "because" to indicate a reason. In (S49), the error is using "than" to introduce the clause that explains the shocking result. In this case, "that" is the appropriate conjunction in this context.

(S48) sometimes people ask if we are sisters, **so*** we have similar looks (CP1)
(S49) Most shocking result was **than*** only 5 percent of the participants (CP2)

3) Addition

Addition errors consistently appear as the third category in CP1 at 15%, and decrease to 13.3% in CP2. The learners might have paid closer attention to this type of error when working on their presentation scripts for Creative Presentation 2, leading to fewer instances of this error.

(1) Prepositions

The data indicates that in CP1, prepositions accounted for the highest percentage of errors at 5.6%, while in CP2, this category saw a decrease to 3.3%. In (S50), the preposition “to” is deemed unnecessary after the verb “entered.” In (S51), the verb “respect” is reflexive in this context, and “with” should be omitted. In (S52), using “of” after “respect” is not grammatically correct in standard English, and in (S53), the sentence structure is improved by removing the unnecessary preposition “at”. It maintains clarity and proper phrasing without the inappropriate use of “at.” Some of the examples are depicted below.

(S50) I entered **to*** school (CP1)
(S51) We respect **with*** each other (CP1)
(S52) I really respect **of*** his effort (CP2)
(S53) people enjoy doing activities **at*** indoors (CP2)

(2) Article

The provided data indicates a disparity in article error rates between CP1 and CP2. Specifically, CP1 shows an article error rate of 3.4%, while CP2 demonstrates improvement with a lower error rate of 2.5%. This discrepancy implies a noteworthy variance in the accuracy of article usage between the two semesters.

In (S54), the error in this sentence is the unnecessary article “a” before “good friends.” The correct phrase should be “but we become good friends.” In this context, “friends” is a plural countable noun, and using the indefinite article “a” is inappropriate. In (S55), the error here is the inclusion of the article “the” before “what.” The correct sentence should be “After that, I can’t forget what I saw.” The use of “the” before “what” is unnecessary because “what” is a relative pronoun introducing a clause, and it doesn't require an article. For (S56), the error in this sentence is the addition of a definite article “the” before “Frozen 2.” When referring to the title of a movie or a specific production, it's not necessary to use the definite article “the.” The correct sentence should be “Did you see Frozen 2?” In the case of (S57), definite article “the” is typically used to a specific location. However, in this case, “Gyeongju” is already specified as a specific place/ Therefore, it is more appropriate to omit the definite article before “scenic spot” in this context. Examples are shown below.

(S54) but we become **a*** good friends (CP1)
(S55) After that, I can’t forget **the*** what I saw (CP1)
(S56) Did you see **the*** Frozen 2? (CP2)

(S57) I hope the information I've provided you today about scenic spot in **the*** Gyeongju (CP2)

(3) Noun Inflections

In CP1, the noun inflection error rate is 2.4%, while CP2 exhibits a lower rate of noun inflection errors at 1.7%. This study focuses on errors involving the addition of noun inflections, such as incorrect pluralization. In sentence (S58), the identified error is the improper pluralization of the noun "season." The accurate form should be "each season" since "season" is a countable noun, and using the plural form "seasons" is unnecessary when referring to multiple occurrences. Similarly, sentence (S59) features an error with the incorrect pluralization of the noun "ride." The correct phrasing should be "What is the name of this ride?" as "ride" is a countable noun, and the context pertains to a specific ride. In sentence (S60), the error is associated with the improper pluralization of the noun "information." The correct form is "interesting information" since "information" is an uncountable noun and does not take the plural form "informations."

(S58) you have to go there each **seasons*** (CP1)
(S59) What is the name of this **rides***? (CP1)
(S60) interesting **informations*** (CP2)

(4) Verb Inflections

This study reveals that in CP1, there is a verb inflection error rate of 1.3%, whereas in CP2, the error rate increases slightly to 1.7%. Verb inflection errors in this study encompass issues such as incorrect conjugation, tense agreement, or other aspects related to the grammatical forms of verbs.

In (S61), the verb "got" is sufficient without the auxiliary "was" in this context. The more standard form of sentence is "This line got in the way." Sentence (S62) exhibits both tense inconsistency and a lack of parallelism, and the revised version is "I usually use this when I listen to music and watch videos." The error in sentence (S63) lies in the use of the base form "booking" after "have to," with the corrected form being "When we travel, we have to book an airline ticket." Sentence (S64) features an error in the use of "be" after "make". The accurate phrasing is "young people can make the Korean Wave the most powerful."

In sentence (S65), a subject-verb agreement error is present in which the verb "reminds" doesn't match the plural subject "experiences." The corrected sentence is "These precious and memorable experiences remind me."

(S61) This line **was*** got in the way (CP1)
(S62) I usually use this when I listen to music and **watching*** video (CP1)
(S63) When we travel, we have to **booking*** airline ticket (CP2)
(S64) young people can make Korean Wave **be*** the most powerful (CP2)
(S65) These precious and memorable experiences **reminds*** me (CP2)

4) Misorder

According to the data, CP1 showcases a 4.0% error rate in mispositioning, while CP2 reflects a decreased disorganization error rate of 1.7%. In (S66), the error lies in the misordering of the possessive pronoun and the adjective. The correct order is "We each had our roles" because the possessive pronoun "our" should come before the adjective "each." Sentence in (S67) consists of misordering of the verb and the subject. The correct order is "It was my first birthday present my boyfriend gave" because the subject (my boyfriend) should come before the verb (gave). In (S68), the error includes misordering of adjectives and nouns. The correct order is "Nice was a resort where European royal and nobles had avoided the cold winter." Adjective like "cold" should precede the noun "winter" for proper syntax in English. Sentence in (S69) involves misordering of the adjective and noun. The correct order is "Popular Korean music" because adjectives typically precede the noun they modify.

(S66) We **had our each*** roles (CP1)
(S67) It was my first birthday present **gave my boyfriend*** (CP1)
(S68) Nice was a resort where European royal and nobles had avoided the **winter cold*** (CP2)
(S69) Korean popular music* (CP2)

3. Discussion

The analysis of grammatical errors in presentation scripts by KEFL learners across CP1 and CP2 classes reveals consistent challenges in language proficiency. Both classes reveal the same orders of grammatical errors committed in which omission errors emerged as the primary grammatical issue. Following closely as the second most prevalent category are misformation errors, while addition errors constitute the third category, and the final category is attributed to misordering errors.

Notably, articles were consistently the most omitted elements. According to Lee (2016), omission errors in articles are more common among Korean learners than misformation errors. According to Lee (1997), KEFL learners are more likely to omit the indefinite article,

especially when it precedes a mass noun. This deletion tendency might be influenced by the general association of the indefinite article with singular concrete nouns. This aspect could pose challenges for Korean second language learners. Similarly, Koo (2008) revealed that KEFL learners had a higher tendency to omit the definite article "the," reaching a rate of 51%. This slightly surpassed the omission rate of the indefinite article "a" or "an," recorded at 49%.

Apart from articles, prepositions continued to be a significant source of errors in this study. The omissions of the prepositions in the sentences do not allow the main verbs to function properly (Cowan, 2008). Observations from the previous studies denote that omission of prepositions occurs due to the interference from the mother tongue and the ignorance of the rules (Mulligan, 2001; Phettongkam, 2017; Song, 2022).

In the case of misformation error, this study suggests that the learners made relatively fewer mistakes in the use of prepositions in the presentation scripts of CP2 as compared to the presentation scripts of CP1. This improvement may indicate a growing proficiency in the application of prepositions, reflecting a positive trend in the learners' language skills. It could be attributed to enhanced understanding, increased awareness, or possibly more focused language instruction (Zaabalawi, 2021) between the two Creative Presentation classes.

However, Lee et al. (2020) notes that KEFL learners found the precise use of prepositions to be equally challenging as the use of articles. In particular, he observed that the most common errors for the prepositions "at" "on," and "in" were prevalent among KEFL learners. A study by Yoon (2012) reveals a similar pattern in which among the misformation errors, prepositions had the most errors committed by KEFL learners.

Verawati (2002) highlights that English learners often overlook the plural marker in their writing, with the primary factor for the omission of noun inflection being the neglect of plural '-s.' As observed in the excerpts, the learners committed errors when there was a plural quantifier before the noun, which was needed to be inflected with plural -s. Lee (2016) observes that Korean does not always distinguish the singular and plural forms unless absolutely necessary, whereas English regularly makes this distinction.

The study also reveals the errors that stem from the multifaceted nature of verb inflections, serving purposes like indicating continuity or forming a gerund. This complexity makes it easier for learners to make such errors (Celik & Erin, 2023). Furthermore, Song (2022) states that Korean speakers of English to face challenges when utilizing English pronouns as Korean pronoun system does not specify gender indication. Speakers whose native language has no gender pronouns may encounter difficulties incorporating gender-specific pronouns in foreign language production. This study also indicates that learners struggle with using different verb tenses accurately in their writing. Although the sentences make sense, the learners find it challenging to construct correct tense structures (Celik & Erin, 2023).

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study investigates the progression of grammatical accuracy in presentation scripts written by Korean EFL learners over two semesters in 2022. The research examines the writing performance of eight participants in consecutive English presentation courses and analyzes 618 sentences for grammatical inaccuracies, focusing on omission, misformation, addition, and misordering errors. Omission errors were found to be the most frequent, particularly in articles and prepositions, followed by misformation and addition errors. These findings reveal persistent challenges in grammar proficiency, highlighting the difficulties Korean learners face in achieving native-like writing fluency.

The topics in the presentation scripts of Creative Presentation 1 and Creative Presentation 2 emphasize the aspect of communication in written English within the context of daily life. However, even minor grammar errors in writing can significantly affect the writing proficiency of Korean EFL learners. Repeated exposure to writing exercises emerges as a crucial factor for improving not only grammatical accuracy but also broader writing skills, including constructing proper sentences and expressions that resemble those in a second language. Korean EFL university students encounter limitations in achieving native-like proficiency, with grammar accuracy being a persistent challenge (Yoon, 2012).

Furthermore, repeated practice in writing presentation scripts in paragraph form has several pedagogical implications, positively influencing learners' writing skills. This practice enhances language proficiency by requiring students to articulate their ideas in a clear and concise manner. It also allows them to experiment with vocabulary, sentence structure, and overall language use, contributing to improved communication skills.

The study suggests incorporating targeted instruction focused on high-frequency error categories, such as articles and prepositions, to address learners' specific challenges. Integrating extensive writing exercises and providing detailed, formative feedback can further enhance the effectiveness of English writing instruction. Structured practice and explicit teaching strategies for grammar and sentence structure, alongside opportunities for peer review and reflective practice, are essential for fostering linguistic accuracy and communicative competence. These findings underline the pedagogical value of sustained, iterative writing tasks in improving Korean EFL learners' grammar proficiency and overall writing skills.

REFERENCES

Abdulkareem, M. N. (2013). An investigation study of academic writing problems faced by Arab postgraduate students at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM). *Theory*

and Practice in Language Studies, 3(9), 1552-1557. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.9.1552-1557

Agustín, L., & María Pilar, P. (2006). Lexical errors in young EFL learners: How do they relate to proficiency measures? *Interlingüística, 17*, 63-73.

Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 38*(4), 20-24.

Berman, R., & Cheng, L. (2010). English academic language skills: Perceived difficulties by undergraduate and graduate students, and their academic achievement. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 25-40.

Brown, D. H. (2000). *Principles of language learning & teaching* (4th ed.). Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language teaching and learning* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and conctext in language teaching: A guide for language teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

Çelik, F., & Erin, Z. (2023). Taking advantage of L2 errors in EFL learners' written language. *MEXTESOL Journal, 47*(4), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v47n4-3

Chan, A. W. (2004). Syntactic transfer: Evidence from the interlanguage of Hong Kong Chinese ESL learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(1), 56-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00218.x

Chatsanguthai, C. (2022). An investigation on the acquisition error of Chinese complement of result by foreign language learners at an international University. *The New English Teacher, 16*(2), 39-59.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. M.I.T. Press

Chun, A. E., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native-nonnative conversations. *TESOL Quarterly, 16*(4), 537-547. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586471

Corder, S. P. (1971). Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *IRAL: International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 9(2)*, 147-160. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1971.9.2.147

Corder, S. P. (1974). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9*(2), 161-171. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161

Cowan, R. (2008). *The teacher's grammar of English.* Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language two.* Newbury House.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford University Press.

Erdoğan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 1*(2), 261-270. https://doi.org 10.17860/efd.22900

Gershon, S. (2015). *Present Yourself 1 Experiences Student's Book* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Gilquin, G., Granger, S., & Paquot , M. (2007). Learner corpora: The missing link in EAP pedagogy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6*, 319-335. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2007.09.007

Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2005). Improving the writing performance of young struggling writers: Theoretical and programmatic research from the center on accelerating learner learning. *The Journal of Special Education, 39*(1), 19-33. https://doi.org/10.1177/00224669050390010301

Hammad, S., & Madini, A. (2017). Effective solutions for reducing Saudi learners' speaking anxiety in EFL classrooms. *Arab World English Journal, 8*(2), 308−322. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.22

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Routledge.

Iamsiu, C. (2014). *An analysis of grammatical errors in Srinakharinwirot University students' writing* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Srinakharinwirot University.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis.* Longman.

Kartini, T. W. (2022). Error analysis on the use simple past tense in narrative text. *ETNOLINGUAL, 6*(1), 51-58. https://doi.org/10.20473/etno.v6i1.34122

Kim, S. (2016). Revisiting causes of grammar errors: Commonly confused lexical category dyads in Korean EFL student writing. *English Teaching, 71*(2), 61-85.

Koo, B. (2008). (An) *Error analysis of English articles by Korean and Chinese learners* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kwangwoon University.

Lee, C. W. (2016). *Error trait analysis of high school students' English articles* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Chung-Ang University.

Lee, H. (1997). English article deletion in Korean EFL learners' compositions. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 13*(2), 41-50. https://repository.upenn.edu/handle/20.500.14332/49401

Lee, Y., Yoo, I., & Shin, Y. (2020). The use of English prepositions in lexical bundles in essays written by Korean university students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 45,* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100848.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How language are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford.

Mu, C. (2006). An exploratory study of Chinese University students' English textual competence. *US-China Foreign Language, 3*(7), 1-8.

Mulligan, M. (2001). Error analysis of written and spoken English: Practical suggestions. *Revista De Lenguas Para Fines Específicos, 8*, 401-412. https://ojsspdc.ulpgc.es/ojs/index.php/LFE/article/view/212

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning.* Heinle & Heinle.

Permadi, M. B. (2012). *Grammatical accurary in the promotion media of tourism in Batu-East Java* [Diploma thesis, Universitas Negeri Malang]. Universitas Negeri Malang Repository.

Phettongkam, H. (2017). Grammatical errors in spoken English of undergraduate Thai leaners in a communicative business English course. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network, 10*(1), 95-118.

Ramadhani, A. (2020) Analysis of students' writing by using surface taxonomy strategy at pre-planet program of Kresna English Language Institute. *Journal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Proficiency*, *2*(1), 1-9, https://doi.org/10.32503/proficiency.v1i1.1379

Riadil, I. G. (2020). A study of students' perception: Identifying EFL learners' problems in speaking skill. *International Journal of Education Language and Religion,* 2(1), 31-38. https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v2i1.2256

Richards, J. C., & Sampson, G. P. (1974). The study of learner English. In J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 3-18). Longman.

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190

Sakha, S. (1999). *An error analysis of documents on Thai culture translated by the External Cultural Relations Division of the National Culture Commission* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Naresuan University.

Seddik, A. M., & Kalapala, K. K. (2023). Error analysis in EFL students' writing skill. *The Seybold Report*. https://doi.org/ 10.17605/OSF.IO/9ZNPC

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10,* 209-241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.20

Shaumana, J. (2019). *A linguistic error analysis of examination scripts by learners at the University of Namibia's Southern campus* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of Science and Technology.

Sirisrimangkorn, L. (2021). Improving EFL undergraduate learners' speaking skills through project-based learning using presentation. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *12*(3), 65-72. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.12n.3.p.65

Song, S. (2022). Analysis of gender pronoun errors in Korean speakers' English speech. *English Teaching, 77*(1), 21-39. https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.77.1.202203.21

Touchie, H. Y. (1986). Second language learning errors their types, causes and treatment. *JALT Journal, 8*(1), 75-80.

Verawati, I. (2002). *An error analysis of the inflectional morphemes produced by speaking I student of the English Department of Petra Christian University* [Unpublished Bachelor thesis]. Petra Christian University.

Verspoor, M., Schmid, M., & Xu, X. (2012). A dynamic usage based perspective on L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*, 239-263. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.007

Yang, H. (2018). Efficiency of online grammar checker in English writing performance and learners' perceptions. *Korea Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 18*(3), 328-348. https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.18.3.201809.328

Yoon, H. (2012). Grammar errors in Korean EFL learners' TOEIC speaking test. *English Teaching, 67*(4), 287-309. http://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.67.4.201212.287

Yoon, S. (2019). The learner corpora of spoken English: What has been done and what should be done? *Lanaguage Research, 56*, 29-51. https://doi.org/10.30961/lr.2020.56.1.29

Yudharaharja, A. P. (2013). *Grammatical error analysis in tourism objects information of website of Malang City Tour* [Unpublished Bachelor Thesis]. Universitas Briwijaya.

Zaabalawi, R. S. (2021). Mastering prepositions in English: Explicit versus implicit instruction. *Arab World English Journal, 12*(3), 411-431. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol12no3.29

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Sunmee Chang (professor)
Department of English Language and Literature
Hoseo University
31066 Hoseodae-gil 12, Dongnam-gu, Cheonan, Korea
Email: schang@hoseo.edu

Received: October 31, 2024
Reviewed: December 11, 2024
Revised version received: December 23, 2024