Semantical Error Analysis in the Written Composition of First-Year BSED-English Students

Mardy C. Omongos, LPT* & Sydney Jay B. Villarin, LPT**

Mindanao State University at Naawan, Philippines, College of Education and Social Sciences
**Mindanao State University at Naawan, Philippines, College of Education and Social Sciences*

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed semantic errors in the written compositions of first-year BSEd English students. 86 participants were asked to write a narrative essay and provide feedback on their writing difficulties and language learning needs. The collected data were statistically analyzed. Semantic errors were categorized into 8 types: code-switching, spelling mistakes, assumed synonyms, assumed antonyms, collocations, similar forms, incorrect word usage, and wrong affixes. A total of 242 semantic errors were identified, with collocations being the most common (F=90) and code-switching the least common (F=8). In terms of writing difficulties, 50 out of 86 participants struggled with forming well-formed collocations, while 7 had difficulty spelling unfamiliar words. Regarding language learning needs, 66 participants expressed the need for clear guidelines on error codes, and 29 participants requested more time for learning readiness. Demographic profiles did not significantly impact the frequency of errors among participants (p>0.05).

KEYWORDS — *Semantic errors, Written compositions, First Year*

I. INTRODUCTION

Language, particularly English, is widely practiced in the Philippines, serving as one of the official languages and the medium of instruction in schools. Writing, considered a complex skill, poses challenges for learners, resulting in various difficulties and errors. This study aims to analyze semantic errors in the written compositions of first-year BSEd English students, focusing on a single area of English, semantics. It also investigates the writing difficulties and language learning needs of the students, as well as the potential impact of demographic profiles on error frequency.

The study aims to analyze semantic errors, writing difficulties, and language learning needs of first-year BSEd major in English students. It seeks to determine the demographic data of the respondents, the encountered difficulties in essay writing, the frequency of errors in different categories, the learning needs of the students, the types of semantic errors committed, and any significant differences based on demographic factors. The study is limited to the analysis of semantic errors in written compositions and focuses on a specific population within the College of Education and Social Sciences at MSU-Naawan during the 2021-2022 school year. The scope is restricted to semantics and does not cover broader aspects of linguistics. Data collection involved analyzing narrative essays and administering questionnaires.

II.   REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Several scholars' definitions and perspectives on semantic errors and error analysis are discussed. Lennon (1991) defines semantic errors as violations of the rules of the semantic system specific to the English language. Turner (2019) adds that semantic errors can be based on wrong word meanings or incorrect sentence construction. The study of errors is valuable for researchers, language teachers, and learners, as it provides insights into language acquisition and teaching methods (Corder, 1967). Chiang (1981) notes that a high frequency of errors in writing may indicate students' difficulty in mastering the written component of the language.

The analysis of errors can be approached through Contrastive Analysis (CA) and Error Analysis (EA). CA focuses on comparing the native language and target language to identify potential learning difficulties, while EA examines the errors made by learners to gain insights into their language acquisition process. Selinker (1972) introduces the concept of "interlanguage" to describe a learner's second language system that is structurally intermediate between the native and target languages. Error analysis involves classifying errors into categories. Different scholars propose various classification models, such as Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's (1982) six categories and James's (1998) five categories that include grammatical, substance, lexical, syntactic, and semantic errors.

Sources of errors are discussed by several researchers. Richards (1971) identifies overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules, ignorance of rule restrictions, and false concepts as causes of intralingual errors. Selinker (1972) suggests that errors can result from the learner's interlanguage, while Shuman and Stenson (1974) point out incomplete acquisition of the target grammar, learning/teaching situation, and language performance as possible reasons. Previous studies have explored various types of errors made by L2 learners. Abdul-Fattah and El-Hassan (1993) analyze syntactic errors among Arab learners of English, highlighting the influence of Arabic and the need for pedagogical improvements. Al-Shormani et al. (2012) investigate semantic errors made by Yemeni university students in English, categorizing them into lexical, collocational, and lexicogrammatical errors.

Overall, the literature review provides insights into the definitions of semantic errors, the importance of error analysis, different classification models for errors, and sources of errors identified by previous studies.

III.   METHODOLOGY

The research design used was descriptive research, aiming to gain insights into semantic errors made by participants, their writing difficulties, and language learning needs. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data, including tabulating and categorizing the percentage and frequency of semantic errors, as well as the frequency distribution of writing difficulties and language learning needs. The study was conducted at Mindanao State University at Naawan, with first-year college students majoring in English as the participants. The data collection instrument used was a questionnaire consisting of a respondent profile section, a composition test requiring participants to write a narrative essay, and a checklist to assess writing difficulties and language learning needs. The collected data was analyzed

using descriptive statistics, statistical tools such as frequency and percentage, and error analysis techniques to identify and classify semantic errors.

In terms of data collection and analysis, the study employed an online survey using Google Forms to administer the questionnaire to the participants. Descriptive statistics and statistical treatment were used to analyze and interpret the data obtained from the survey. Error analysis was conducted to examine the written compositions of the students, following a four-step process: data collection through narrative essays, identification of errors, classification of errors into different error types, and statement of error frequency. The analysis focused specifically on semantic errors, and error frequency counts were used for assessment. Overall, the study aimed to gain a deeper understanding of semantic errors, writing difficulties, and language learning needs among first-year college students majoring in English at Mindanao State University at Naawan.

IV.   FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the data obtained from the survey. The participants were the first year BSEd English students of Mindanao State University. The participants were asked to write a narrative essay, complete a demographic profile survey and answer two sections of checklist. Responses from the survey were examined, compiled, analyze and evaluated to answer the questions asked at the beginning of the study. The data were tabulated and displayed through tables. Finally, a discussion of the results has also been provided, linking the results to relevant literature and theory within the field of study.

5.1. Demographical data of the respondents in terms of;
a. Sex

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Male	16	18.60%
Female	69	80.23%
Prefers not to say	1	1.16%
Total	**86**	**100.00%**

   Table 2. Distribution of sample in terms of sex

Table 2 shows the distribution of sample in terms of sex. The data shows that among the first year BSEd English students in Mindanao State University, there are 69 (80%) students that are female, 16 (19%) students are male, and 1 (1%) student prefers not to say its sex, out of the 86 respondents being in the study. The data shows that students that are female are more dominant than male students in number frequency. According to data that first year BSEd English students are predominantly have female students than male students. On the other hand, the other student who prefers not to say its sex may have some personal reason/s not to reveal it.

b. Age

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
17-21	84	97.67%
22-25	1	1.16%
26-30	1	1.16%
30 and above	0	0
Total	**86**	**100.00%**

Table 3. Distribution of sample in terms of age group

Table 3 shows the distribution of sample in terms of age group. The data shows that among the first year BSEd English students in Mindanao State University, there are 84 (98%) students that belong to the age group of 17-21 years old, 1 (1%) student belongs to the age group of 22-25 years old, and another 1 (1%) student that belongs to the age group of 26-29 years old, out of the 86 respondents being in the study. The data shows that students at the age group of 17-21 years old are more dominant than other learners. The age of the respondents varied from 17-29 years old. According to the data number frequency, students in first year college are typically at the age ranging from 17 to 21 years old. While students from the age group of 22-25 years old and 26-29 years old may have some past experiences that cause them to fall behind from the normal age group of first year college students.

c. Marital Status

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Single	85	98.84%
Married	1	1.16%
Separated	0	0
Widowed	0	0
Total	86	100.00%

Table 4. Distribution of sample in terms of marital status

Table 4 shows the distribution of sample in terms of marital status. The data shows that among the first year BSEd English students in Mindanao State University, there are 85 (99%) students are single and only 1 (1%) student is married, out of the 86 respondents being in the study. According to the data, there is a big difference in the number of frequency between single and married students. The results indicates that first year college students are typically single.

d. Type of High School Graduated

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Public	56	65.12%
Private	30	34.88%
Total	86	100.00%

Table 5. Distribution of sample in terms of type of high school graduated

Table 5 shows the distribution of sample in terms of type of high school graduated. The data shows that among the first year BSEd English students in Mindanao State University, there are 56 (65%) students that came from public schools, whereas, 30 (35%) students came from private schools, out of the 86 respondents being in the study. According to the data, there is a big difference in number between students from private and public schools. The data indicates that students who came from public school are more dominant than other learners who came from private school.

e. Language used at home (Mother tongue)

	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Bisaya	76	88.37%
Cebuano	9	10.47%
Tagalog	1	1.16%
Ilokano	0	0
Hiligaynon	0	0
Waray	0	0
Bikol	0	0
Kapampangan	0	0
Pangasinan	0	0
Total	86	100.00%

Table 6. Distribution of sample in terms of language used at home

Table 6 shows the distribution of sample in terms of language used at home. The data shows that among the first year BSEd English students in Mindanao State University, there are 76 (88%) students speak Bisaya, 9 (11%) students speak Cebuano, whereas, 1 (1%) student speaks Tagalaog, out of the 86 respondents being in the study. The data indicates that students who used Bisaya language at home are more dominant than other students who speak Cebano and Tagalog. The data also shows that among the students, none of them uses or speaks Ilokano, Hiligaynon, Waray, Bikol, Kapampangan, and Pangasinan language at home.

5.2. Difficulties in writing the essay that the respondents encountered

Table 7. Frequency distribution for the difficulties in writing the essay that the respondents encountered.

Difficulties in Writing the Essay	FREQUENCY	RANK
Fail to use the correct grammatical form of one collocate to come up with a well-formed collocation	50	1
Fail to select the appropriate prefix to form the correct word to express in context	44	2
Difficulty in selecting appropriate synonymy of a word with closed meaning	42	3
Unable to find the exact word and/or phrases to use in L2	40	4
Difficulty in selecting suffix to be added to	28	5

a word in English		
Unaware of the idiomatic expression in L2 and tries to come up with an equivalent to the expression in L1	27	6
Difficulty in using proper collocations	27	6
Confusion in the use of binary terms	18	7
Words and phrases are literally translated from L1 and have been used instead of the English words and/or phrases	14	8
Difficulty in spelling an unfamiliar word	7	9
Total	**297**	

N=86

Table 7 presents the difficulties in writing the essay that the respondents encountered. The result found that out of *86* respondents 50 *of them* failed to use the correct grammatical form of one collocate to come up with a well-formed collocation, and *(44)* failed to select the appropriate prefix to form the correct word to express in context. Moreover, almost half of the respondents *(42)* experienced difficulty in selecting appropriate synonymy of a word with closed meaning, *(40)* unable to find the exact word and/or phrases to use in L2. However, nearly one-twelfth of the respondents *(7)* experienced difficulty in spelling an unfamiliar word. This indicates that most of the respondents have difficulties in selecting correct grammatical form, and select appropriate prefix to form, but only few of them experienced difficulty in spelling an unfamiliar words.

5.3. The frequency of errors committed by the respondents in writing their essays?

Table 8. The frequency of errors committed by the respondents in writing their essays.

Category of Error	Frequency	Percentage	No. of Respondents who committed the error	Percent of Cases
E1 (Code switching)	8	3.31%	5	5.81%
E2 (Misspelled words)	19	7.85%	16	18.60%
E3 (Assumed synonym)	61	25.21%	38	44.19%
E4 (Assumed antonym)	12	4.96%	12	13.95%
E5 (Collocation)	90	37.19%	54	62.79%
E6 (Similar forms)	30	12.40%	26	30.23%
E7 (Incorrect word usage)	13	5.37%	12	13.95%
E8 (Incorrect affixes)	9	3.72%	9	10.47%
Total	**242**	**100.00%**	**172**	**200.00%**

N=86

Table 8 presents the errors committed by the respondents in writing their essays. The result found that more than half of the respondents *(62.79%)* committed an error in collocation with (*F=90 identified errors*) indicates that there some of the respondents committed the errors in

several times, almost half of the respondents *(44.19%)* committed an error in assuming of synonym with (*F=61 identified errors*) indicates that there are some of the respondents committed the error in several times. However, nearly one-twentieth of the respondents *(5.81%)* committed an error I code switching with (*F=8 identified errors*) indicates that there is one respondent committed the errors four times. This indicates that most of the respondents committed an error in collocation and by assuming synonym, but only five of them committed error in code switching.

5.4 The type of semantic errors committed by the respondents in their essays

In this section, the researcher sought to give and explain examples of the specific errors committed by the respondents in their essays. In each error category, the researcher will give examples and explains the error.

a. Code switching (E1)

Errors in this category are committed when the respondents code—switch a word or phrase from English to L1. This category comprises 8 frequent errors, i.e. (3.31%) of the errors committed. Thus, such errors are exemplified in the following sentences.

(1) *This type of learning wherein obviously its quite hard but it can be practice and learn **naman ehh** ...*
(2) *I tend to be easily distracted for example whenever I do the task **diba** cellphone **gamit** I can't control myself to open those apps.*
(3) *I can't control myself to open those apps that can trigger my concentration towards answering school works, but **yun nga** it's important to do it so I believe and I'm trying to be more responsible as what I am before this pandemic happen.*
(4) *The second semester is where being a **dasig** student starts to fade.*

(1) through (4) present a code-switch words used by the respondents from their L1. A common reason we code-switch on word level is the feeling that there is that one word which succinctly pinpoints what it is you want to say. Linguistic code-switching is typically employed in bilingual and multilingual cultures, and one of the reasons we code-switch is to transmit thoughts and concepts that are easier to describe in one language over another (Heredia, e. al. 2001).

b. Misspelled words (E2)

When spelling a word wrongly, such word will be semantically distorted and this affects the production of an utterance in which such word is used (Al-shormani, 2012). This category comprises 19 frequent errors. Thus, these errors are exemplified in the following sentences.

(5) *I was able to adjust and **adopt** the new way of living. adapt*
(6) *Everyday I go to my cousins house to **barrow** her laptop and also surf the internet because we don't have WiFi at home. borrow*
(7) *Some students are forced to stop the school year and some were had to work for them to afford and **but** gadgets for the next school year. buy*

(6) through (8) present wrongly spelled words used by the respondents. The errors committed by the respondents' misselection of letters. The words in (6) through (8) present the misselection of letter(s). As James (1998) has pointed out, these errors are L2 based. That is, the source of such errors is not L1 rather L2 itself.

Semantically, the meaning of the words in (6) through (8) affected the whole meaning of the sentence. In (S9), the word *'barrow'* is used, which refers to 'a wheelbarrow' (Cambridge dictionary) that is used to carry something from the ground/soil. This cause irregularity to the meaning of the sentence. It is much appropriate to use the word *'borrow'* which means 'to get or receive something from someone with the intention of giving it back (Cambridge dictionary).

c. Assumed synonym (E3)

This category includes considerable number of errors where 61 frequent errors were committed. In fact many researchers and applied linguistics believe that a word in many language may have more than one meaning. According to Al-shormani (2012), synonymy is determined by the number of terms in a language that have the same meaning. He also stated that, as a result of the influence of other languages and the borrowing phenomenon, English is rich with synonyms. Griffiths (2006), on the other hand, claims that two terms can be synonymous if they have the same or similar meanings, but there may be a difference in style, formality, vulgarity, the speaker's attitude, collocation, and potentially other factors. He further stated that these disparities can be defined in terms of characteristics that are more language specific than universal, as a foreign language learner might believe. Thus, the issues are exemplified in the following sentences/phrases.

(8) *During online classes, when the internet is weak, I can't understand our instructor because the* **speech** *was interrupted.* *lecture*

(9) *In face-to-face* **meetings** *it would be so full of fun and excitement.* *classes*

(10) *As a student participating in the home-learning program, during online classes it was* **confusing** *to adjust.* *difficult*

(11) *I've write this to* **express** *my experiences about the new normal classes or new learning modality.* *share*

Synonyms, especially those found in dictionaries, which SL students are frequently exposed to, are actually different in meaning in some other way (Al-shormani, 2012). Words with the same or similar meanings cannot be used in the reverse because there are several factors to consider before using a word, such as its appropriateness and context. For instance, in (S11), the word share and express, they both have the same characteristics when use to 'tell something'. However, using the word 'express' into telling something about your experience does not match to its context.

d. Assumed antonym (E4)

What is meant by this category is those errors which made the respondents get confused about lexical items that are usually categorized as 'relational opposites' (Laufer, 1997). This category comprises 12 frequent errors. Let's consider the following examples.

(12) *You need to be independent to* **teach** *by yourself.* *learn*

(13) *Its affecting my* **mental** *health, I can feel dizziness and headache.* *physical*

(14) *During online classes there were barriers such as the internet was* **stable**. *unstable*

(15) *I hope the next generation will* **ever** *have to go through what we have experienced today.* *never*

(16) *Some students are unfortunate and **privileged** to afford their education due to unemployed parents. Underprivileged*

Errors from (12) through (16) exhibit semantically erroneous utterances due to the respondents' confusion in the use of 'opposite' words. In (S12), for instance, the error results from the confusion between teach and learn and hence, the learner substitutes learn to teach. The whole meaning of the sentence is affected because of a certain word that has a contradicting meaning to the whole context. There are irregularities of the meaning from the utterances.

e. Collocation (E5)

Wray (2000) contends that collocational knowledge is considered a fundamental part of native speaker communicative competence. Collocation, according to O'dell and McCarthy (2008), is a natural combination of words that refers to how English words are closely related with one another. The error is discovered in this category when one of the two collocates is wrong, resulting in an inaccurate collocation. As a result, the collocation is inaccurate or semantically deviant. This category involves 90 frequent errors, which is the highest rate among other categories. A sample is exemplified below.

(17) Teachers are trying their best to **teach** knowledge to their students. *share*

(18) I can't **give** attention in my online class because of the noise outside our house. *pay*

(19) I can't manage my time properly just like doing school work and **house chore** at the same day. *Household chores*

(20) We are fortunate to have a complete set of computer at home for online classes, but what about those who are **not so** fortunate? *less*

(21) …in terms of **finding** money to simply purchase load for my online class. *Making*

In (17) through (21), the errors in the collocations; ***teach knowledge, give attention, house chore, not so fortunate,*** and ***finding money*** are a result of the wrong collocate in each respectively. This is due to the fact that ***give, finding,*** for instance, cannot collocate with ***attention and money*** respectively. Though the meaning of the incorrect collocation does not affect the whole meaning of the text, it does affect the semantic grammar of the utterance/sentence.

f. Similar forms (E6)

The errors from this category result from confusion between the incorrect and correct words to be used. Confused, the respondents, thus, chooses the incorrect word and substitutes it for the correct one. This category includes 30 frequent errors. The following sentences/phrases exemplify the issue.

(22) *I've been having a hard time **cooping** up with the lessons. coping*

(23) *I went to my cousins' house to **barrow** her laptop. borrow*

(24) *I **lose** my interest in studying. lost*

(25) *The new normal education is quite **rough**. tough*

(26) *People were **aloud** to talk with each other. Allowed*

Errors in (26) through (30) exhibit a tendency of incorrectly choosing a word similar to that intended and thus resulting in a semantically deviant utterance. The respondents are perplexed as to whether the similarity is graphic or phonetic. For instance in (S26), where the word *aloud* was incorrectly used instead of *allowed*. This could affect the meaning of the whole sentence thus creating unclear sentence-meaning. According to several studies, these errors are developmental in nature, resulting from a lack of appropriate information that prevents the learner from distinguishing between forms and their applications. As a result, the source of these errors is L2, i.e., English itself.

g. Incorrect word usage (E7)

The errors from this category consist in using one or more collocates whose word usage is not correct. This category includes 13 frequent errors. Now, consider the following examples.

(27) Aside from ***finance*** problems, I also experience difficulties in answering the given tasks. *financial problems*

(28) But months ***past*** by I already get used to online classes. *passed by*

(29) Even though I have the means of ***communicating***, … *means of communication*

(30) I ***missing*** the old days. *missed*

(31) I was ***struggle*** to find a distraction-free space at home. *struggling*

In (27) through (31), exemplify the errors in incorrect word usage category where the respondents fail to use the correct word to form a collocation, thus, creating a semantically deviant collocation. For instance, in (27), the respondent fails to use ***financial problems*** instead he/she uses ***finance problems.*** It has been suggested that the most difficult challenge for SL learners is their inability to comprehend how lexical collocations function in the language they are learning (James, 1998). "Learners with good ideas often lose marks because they don't know the four or five most crucial collocations of a key word that is central to what they are writing about," according to (Hill, 1995). As a result, people come up with longer, wordier ways of characterizing or discussing the problem, thereby leading to more errors (Al-shormani, 22012).

h. Incorrect affixes (E8)

This category refers to the errors when the respondents commit errors in selecting and using the correct prefix and/or suffix of a word. Also, when the respondents were unable to use the corresponding affixes of a word and paraphrased it instead. This category comprises 9 frequent errors. The following examples exemplify such errors:

(32) But the ***inexpected*** thing happened, the spread of the virus is rapidly increasing. *unexpected*

(33) How about those who are ***not fortunate*** who cannot afford to enter online classes? *unfortunate*

(34) The new way of learning is ***unconvenient*** in my opinion. *inconvenient*

(35) My network is ***not stable***, I can't concentrate well on answering modules and I became lazy. *unstable*

(36) Even though I have the means of ***communicating.*** *Communication*

(32) through (36) show how affixes have been wrongly chosen and unable to use it accordingly. For instance, in (34), the respondents uses the prefix **un-** and adds it to the adjective **convenient** instead of **in-**. In (33), the respondent was unable to use the prefix **un-** to add up in the word **fortunate**, instead, paraphrased it into '**not fortunate**'. Thus, this misselection renders such sentences semantically erroneous.

5.5. Language learning needs

Table 9. Language learning needs should be fostered in order for the respondents to commit these errors.

Learning Needs	FREQUENCY	RANK
Providing students with strategy training with some guidelines of error codes that are not confusing	66	1
Emphasis on the students' error awareness	62	2
Provide corrective feedback in a non-threatening way	58	3
To model complete sentence and lexical use in order to provide students more exposure in English	54	4
Supplementary grammar instruction through inductive method and remedial classes	48	5
To be trained to work on their errors through peer and self-editing activities	47	6
Provide explicit and/or implicit corrections	42	7
Designing activities for areas needed for improvement	42	7
To support students with effective materials and workshops	40	8
To develop independent editing skills	37	9
Allow students to learn when they are ready	29	10
Total	**525**	

N=86

Table 9 presents the Language learning needs should be fostered in order for the respondents not to commit the errors. The results found out that out of the 86 respondents, three-quarters of them *(66)* needs a strategy training with some guidelines of error codes that are not confusing, *(62)* emphasis on their error awareness. However, nearly one-third of the respondents *(29)* needs time to learn when they are only ready. Thus, most of the respondents needs strategy training with some guidelines of error codes that are not confusing, and emphasis on their error awareness, but only some of them needs time to learn when they are ready.

5.6 Significant Difference between students' errors when group according to demographic profile

Table 10. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test for the difference between the levels of frequency of errors when group according to demographic profile

Demographic Profile	Level of frequency of Errors		
	F-value	**p-value**	**Remarks**
Sex	2.48	0.0902	Not Significant
Age	1.13	0.3266	Not Significant
Marital Status	0.27	0.6042	Not Significant
Type of High School Graduated	0.0033	0.9545	Not Significant
Language used at home	1.19	0.1395	Not Significant

P-value > 0.05 level of Significance

Table 10 presents the difference between the levels of frequency of errors when group according to demographic profile. The results found that the level of frequency of errors by the respondents when group according to their demographic profile are not significantly differ since all p-values are greater than *0.05* level of significance. Thus, the respondents profile have nothing to do with their level of frequency of errors in writing essay, it is likely to say that whatever your sex, age, marital status, type of high school graduated, and language used at home your level of frequency of errors is most likely the same as with the other groups as the data results.

V.   SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the course of this study, four factors were highlighted namely; the difficulties encountered by the respondents while writing the essay, the type of semantic errors found in the essays, the language learning needs, and the significance difference between the demographic profile and the level of frequency of errors.

In this paper, it can be seen that out of the 86 respondents, (50) of them have difficulties in selecting grammatical forms of one collocate to come up with a well-formed collocation. On the other hand, nearly one-twelfth of the respondents (7) experienced difficulty in spelling an unfamiliar word. This indicates that most of the respondents have difficulties in selecting correct grammatical form, but only few of them experienced difficulty in spelling an unfamiliar words.

According to Bulqiyah, et. al. (2021) the important aspect of writing is the linguistic area. It involves lexico-grammatical competences. Not surprisingly, linguistics knowledge in general and grammar in particular, have become the students' difficulties in writing essays. For another thing, the problem in vocabulary mastery is a crucial aspect of students' essay writing. Likewise, students confirmed the difficulty in selecting grammatical forms of one collocate to come up with a well-formed collocation. For that reason, linguistic knowledge,

specifically semantics, as the primary aspect of academic writing should have serious attention for EFL students and teachers.

In this study, semantic errors committed by the first year BSEd English students are classified into several categories. In general they are classified into 8 categories; *code switching, misspelled words, assumed synonym, assumed antonym, collocation, similar forms, incorrect word usage, and incorrect affixes.* There were 242 semantic errors identified in this study. It has been found that *collocation* category scores the highest number of errors with more than half of the respondents (62.79%) committed the errors with 90 identified errors. On the other hand, *code switching* category is the lowest with nearly one-twentieth of the respondents committed the error with 8 identified errors. This indicates that most of the respondents committed an error in collocation, but only five of them committed error in code switching. This could be taken into account by English instructors, linguists, scholars, and researchers when deciding which semantic area to focus on more than any other when developing courses/lessons and even while presenting such semantic units in the classroom.

In language learning needs, it can be seen that out of the 86 respondents (66) of them needs a strategy training with some guidelines of error codes that are not confusing. However, nearly one-third of the respondents (29) needs time to learn when they are only ready. Thus, most of the respondents needs strategy training with some guidelines of error codes that are not confusing, but only some of them needs time to learn when they are ready.

According to Terry, et. al. (2017). Language learning needs are very important for learners to boost their language learning and have scaffolding to pursue their lifelong language learning. He also added that English learning is a complex and long term-process, so we need to have the right strategies in order to master the target language in the most effective way.

As for the sources of the semantic errors committed by the respondents, there are two different sources of errors, based on the framework of Corder (1971), namely, L1, i.e. Interlingual interference and L2, i.e. Overgeneralizing/Developmental interference. As for L1 based sources, the sources of these errors can be drawn into different strategies such ass translating, code-switching, or applying the rules of L1 to English. Interlingual error has been identified as one of the most important variables influencing deviant behavior caused by negative transference from the first to the second language (Kaweera, 2013). ESL errors, according to Bhela (1999), are clearly caused by a word-for-word translation method or thinking in the mother tongue language. When it comes to L2 based sources, the most common source is misunderstandings about how meaning networks work in English (Al-shormani, 2012), such as incorrect spelling, similar forms, incorrect word usage, and incorrect affixes. It was also discovered that the common L2 source is respondents' lack of understanding of the English semantic system, which leads to such inaccuracies.

The results found that there is no significant difference between the respondents' demographic profile and the level of frequency errors committed. Thus is it likely to say that whatever your sex, age, marital status, type of high school graduated, and language used at home your level of frequency of errors is most likely the same as with the other groups as the data results.

.

VI.   IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident that errors are an unavoidable element of EFL/ESL writing, which, of course, is influenced by a variety of factors when writing in the target language. One of these is the learners' mother tongue language's influence, which results in interlingual mistake. On the other hand, frequent errors occur during the process of learning the target language, a phenomenon known as intralingual error, demonstrating that initial language transfer is not the only cause of language error. Both types of errors, on the other hand, can provide us a picture of a learner's linguistic development, and many of them can give us clues about the learning process (Corder, 1974).

The results implies that most of the first year BSEd English students cannot use the correct grammatical form of a well-formed collocation. They are likely unfamiliar with the different collocations in English, in which they fail to form one collocate.

The results implies that more than half of the first year BSEd English students had committed errors in collocation.

The results implies that the semantic errors committed by the respondents in their essays have a direct effect to the whole meaning of the sentence. It results into irregularities of the semantic grammar structure. It causes confusion and vague meaning of the context from the sentence.

The results implies that the first year BSEd English students need a strategy training with some guidelines of error codes that are not confusing and the need to emphasize error awareness.

The results implies that there is no significant difference between the students' demographic profile and the level of frequency of errors. Thus, the respondents' profile have nothing to do with their level of frequency of errors in writing essay.

Teachers should look into their students' mistakes to see what defects need to be addressed. Teachers should look for ways to benefit from errors and use it to determine how far students have gone toward the things that they still need to learn.

Despite the fact that errors are often related with inadequacy and learning. This study recommend teachers to design associated teaching methodologies for students to avoid the fossilization of their error.

Teachers should pay attention on how to make their students aware of the differences between L1 and L2 to minimize their roles in committing such errors.

Educators should provide a well-designed methodology that caters to the demands of ESL and/or EFL students.

Learners should be exposed to English as often as possible and encouraged to use it without fear or embarrassment both within and outside of the classroom.

Teachers of English should create exercises or tasks such as speaking, reading, and writing. They should also devise methods for reward systems. Learners will be motivated to make a conscious effort to pronounce and utilize words correctly as a result of this.

Page : 14

When students make mistakes, teachers should not punish them because this makes them afraid to speak up. Error correction should be carried out using a method that is well-designed.

Curriculum developers should create syllabuses and materials/resources focusing on the parts of the target language that learners have the most trouble producing correctly, as well as the kind of errors that most distract learners from communicating effectively.

REFERENCES

i.   Aramburo, S. (1970). The English Errors of Filipino Students: A Contrastive Analysis. California State University. https://repository.library.fresnostate.edu/ bitstream/handle/10211.3/193190/ARAMBUROsalvacion.pdf?sequence

ii.   Aycan, N. (1990). Errors in Tense in the Written English of Turkish Students with Special Reference to the Semantic Bases. Institute of Economics and Social Sciences of Bilkent University. https://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/bitstream/handle/ 17693/172281/13003041.pdf

iii.   Al-khresheh, M.H. (2010). Interlingual Interference in the English Language Word Order Structure of Jordanian EFL Learners. European Journal of Social Sciences, 16(1). https://w ww.researchgate.net/profile/Mohammad-Al-Khresheh/publication /206206253_ Interlingual_Inference_in_the_English_Language_Word_Order_Structure_of_Jordanian _EFL_Learners/links/542b20cf277d58e8a12c1/Interlingual-Inference-in-the-English-Language-Word-Order-Structure-of-Jordanian-EFL-Learners.pdf

iv.   Al-Sohbani, Y.A. et.al. (2012). Semantic Errors Committed by Yemeni University Learners: Classifications and Sources. International Journal of English Linguistics, 2(6). https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Yehia_Al_Sohbani/publication/279496154_Semant ic_Errors_Committed_by_Yemeni_University_Learners_Classification_and_Sources/lin ks/5661a7d008ae4931cd5a072b/Semantics-Errors-Committed-by-Yemeni-University-Learners-Classifications-and-Sources.pdf

v.   Amin, E.A. (2019). Using Awareness Raising in Syntactic and Semantic Errors to Foster Translation Performance among Majmaah University EFL Students. Arab World English Journal,10(2), 196-212. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fultext/EJ1275206.pdf

vi.   Bulqiyah, et. al. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: Tertiary students' perspectives. English Language Teaching Educational Journal. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1296404.pdf

vii.   Cohen, B. et. al. (1988). A Semantic Analysis of Children's Oral and Written Narrative Retellings. University Microfilm International. https://file:///e:/users/Mardy/Downloads/seman.pdf

viii.   De Vera, P. et. al. (2019). Sex-Disaggregated Inventory of Sexist-Oriented and Other Types of Lexical Errors among First Year BSE English Students. Asian EFL Journal Research Articles. https://files.eric.edu.gov/fultext/ED604156.pdf

ix. Duignan, B. (2017). Historical and Contemporary Theories of Meaning. Britannica. semantics - Historical and contemporary theories of meaning | Britannica

x. Jeptarus, K. et. al. (2016). Lexico-Semantic Errors of the Learners of English: A Survey of Standard Seven Keiyo-Speaking Primary School Pupils in Keiyo District, Kenya. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(13). http://files.eric.ed.gov/fultext/EJ1102824.pdf

xi. Kafipour, R. et. al. (2011). The Study of Morphological, Syntactic, and Semantic Errors Made by Native Speakers of Persian and English Children Learning English. Studies in Literature and Language, 3(3). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259645138_The_study_of_morphological_syntactic_and_semantic_errors_made_by_native_speakers_of_Persian_and_English_children_learning_English

xii. Kaweera, C. (2013). Writing Error: A Review of Interlingual and Intralingual Interference in EFL Context. English Language Teaching, 6(7). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fultext/EJ1077017.pdf

xiii. Khalid, S. M. et. al. (2021). The Analysis of Semantic Grammatical Errors in Various Arabic Translations. Journal of Arabic Studies, 6(1), 15-25. https://journal.imla.or.id/index.php/arabi/article/view/315

xiv. Mendoza, P.J. (2016). Analysis of in-class Writing Errors of College Freshmen Students. Philippine ESL Journal. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322789805_Analysis_of_in-class_Writing_of_College_Freshmen_Students

xv. Ngongbam, H. (2016). Analysis of Syntactic Errors Committed by Students of English Language Class in the Written Composition of Mutah University: A Case Study. European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature, 3(1). https://www.idpublications.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Full-Paper-AN-ANALYSIS-OF-SYNTACTIC-ERRORS-COMMITTED-BY-STUDENTS-OF-ENGLISH-LANGUAGE.pdf

xvi. Nasser, S.M. (2020). A Cognitive-Semantic Analysis of Preposition on: An Experimental Study at University of Baghdad. Arab World English Journal, 11(3). https://files.eric.edu.gov/fultext/EJ1269255.pdf

xvii. Obeidat, H.A. (1986). An Investigation of Syntactic and Semantic Errors iin the Written Composition of Arab EFL Learners. University Microflims International Dissertation Information Service. https://www.proquest.com/openview/a6ab1dbb0fb9820db89325f4ef31e9f2/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

xviii. Rezai, M. et. al (2019). The Study of Formal and Semantic Errors of Lexis by Persian EFL Learners. Worl Academy of World Science, Engineering and Technology International Journal of Cognitive and Language Sciences, 13(1). https://publications.waste.org/10009945/the-study-of-formal-and-semantic-errors-of-lexis-by-persian-efl-learners

xix.   Sermsook, K. et. al. (2017). An Analysis of Errors in Written English Sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL Students. Canadian Center of Science and Education, 10(3). https://eric,edu.gov/fultext/EJ1130033.pdf

xx.   Speaks, J. (2019). Theories of Meaning. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Archive. Theories of Meaning (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy/Spring 2021 Edition)

xxi.   Tran, T.H. (2013). Approaches to Treating Student Written Errors. Missouri University of Science & Technology. https://files.eric.edu.gov/fultext/ED545655.pdf

xxii.   Tajbakhsh, P. (2017). Lexico-Semantic Errors: Their Effect on Readability Level and Comprehensibility of the Written Texts. IOSR Journal of Research & Methods in Education, 7(4), 84-88. https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jrme/papers/Vol-7%20Issue-4/Version-4/P0704048488.pdf

xxiii.   Terry, et. al. (2017). English Learning Strategies among EFL Learners: A Narrative Approach. IAFORJournal of Language Learning. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167252.pdf

xxiv.   Wu, H. et. al. (2014). Types and Attributions of English Writing Errors in the EFL Context-A Study of Error Analysis. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5(6), 1256-1262. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.655.7110&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=40

xxv.   Yazan, S.A. et. al. (2017). Understanding Syntactic and Semantic Errors in the Composition Writing of Jordanian EFL Learners. International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 6(6). https://www.journals.aiac.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/3549

xxvi.   Yoshinga, C. (1983). Syntactic and Semantic Characteristics in the Written Language of Hearing Impaired and Normally Hearing School Aged Children. https://www.proquest.com/openview/3f7358b814739b3b521e7c140609bb92/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y