

# COMMON ERRORS IN WRITING AMONG FIRST YEAR COLLEGE STUDENTS

**Uni Grace P. Porras**

Department of Education  
Philippine Normal University - Agusan Campus  
Philippines

**Abstract:** This study is anchored on the premise that everyone has the capacity to write, teaching can be taught, and teachers can help students become better writers by addressing the errors they commit in conventions important to the readers. It identifies and analyzes the common errors in writing of the first year college students of Philippine Normal University-Agusan Campus in relation to their first language (L1), the type of high school from where they graduated, and their exposure to media and technology in order to streamline English instruction, making it more attuned to the students' needs in acquiring proficiency in writing. It also determines which categories the errors are commonly committed (content, organization/discourse, vocabulary, mechanics, or syntax) and whether there is a significant difference in the percentage of errors committed by the students according to the categories.

**Keywords:** writing, errors, content, organization, vocabulary, syntax, mechanics

## INTRODUCTION

English, as the universal language, is fast becoming more important than any other language (Clark, 2012). Not only is it used as the default or common language when people of different languages speak to one another, it is now the language in the global market, in systems of transportation, computer networking and telecommunications, and scientific and medical endeavours (Grandin, 2006). Furthermore, it is a tool for learning in the various disciplines since it is the language commonly used in instruction and in books, journals, magazines, and other printed media.

Indeed, learning English has acquired special status and it is now chiefly taught as second or foreign language in academic institutions (Crystal, 2003). Learning English, however, is riddled with problems, especially in non-English countries wherein learning English as a second language (ESL) creates language problems caused by social and cognitive factors such as negative attitudes toward the target language (TL), continued lack of progress in the second language (L2), a wide social and psychological distance between the user and the target culture, and a lack of integrative and instrumental motivation for learning (Myles, 2007).

Needless to say, writing in English also poses difficulties to the learners of the language which leads to their poor performance (Leland, 2002). Learners whose first language (L1) is not English face greater challenge than those who are native speakers (NSs) since aside from learning the conventions of writing, the former must also take into consideration the rhetorical style and vocabulary choices that the latter take for granted (Levin, 2013).

Difficulties in writing may ultimately result to errors. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) defined errors as morphological, syntactic, and lexical deviations from the grammatical rules of language that violate the intuition of NSs. They attested that focusing on these errors rather than on style and addressing them appropriately and constructively through instruction and strategy training could be beneficial to learners.

One way to address these difficulties is through error analysis. Its main objective is to enable English as Second Language (ESL) writers to analyze their weaknesses and impose control when they write. It prepares the writers to assess and edit their own work and find strategies that work for them in reducing their errors (Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, 2014).

## **BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY**

This study was conducted to identify the common errors of students in five categories, namely, content which includes how they write the thesis statement and the supporting ideas in their composition; organization which refers to the transition and unity and coherence of ideas and how the introduction and conclusion are written; vocabulary which denotes word choice and use of idioms; mechanics which covers spelling, indentation, punctuation, capitalization, margins, and handwriting; and syntax which includes verb forms and tenses, modals and conditionals, word order, formation of dependent clauses, and conjunctions.

Since the students in PNU-Agusan come from multicultural background, the respondents were grouped according to their L1 to determine if their native tongue affects the errors they commit in writing. They are also grouped according to the type of high school where they graduated because most public schools in the province use the mother tongue as medium of instruction while private schools implement the “speak English” policy. The researcher would like to find out if this difference in the background of the students has an impact on their writing errors. Moreover, the respondents were grouped according to their exposure to different media because this affects how much they are exposed to the English language.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

This study used the descriptive type of research. Furthermore, it used the content analysis technique in determining the errors in writing committed by the respondents and employed the correlational-survey technique in determining whether their demographic data have any relationship with the errors made.

### **Subjects of the Study**

The subjects of this study were 190 out of 363 total population of first year college students of the Philippine Normal University- Agusan Campus. This sample size was determined using Slovin’s formula that is given as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{\quad}$$

$$1 + N e^2$$

where: n= sample size

N= population size (363)

e= desired margin of error (.05)

The elements were chosen through systematic sampling. Thus every 2<sup>nd</sup> in the array was selected.

### **Data Gathering Instruments and Procedure**

The study sourced its data from the 190 written compositions of the first year college students. The compositions consisted of three to four paragraphs or approximately 150 to 300 words.

The respondents were given eight topics from which they chose one to write about. The topics included (1) what they like best about school, (2) how important their classmates and friends are to their life as students, (3) the TV personality who has a positive influence on them, (4) how will they help a student-counselee if they are members of a peer-counselling group, (5) how do they express their support to an extension program in school, (6) how much they appreciate their parents, (7) the summer job they plan to apply for, and (8) their most remarkable vacation.

The prompts were validated to ensure that they were interesting to write about and were neither too easy nor too difficult for the respondents because the topics were within their sphere of experience. Validation was done by selecting as many as 15 topics. Freshmen who were not participants in the study rated the topics based on human interest or relevance to student life and level of difficulty. Faculty handling English subjects were also asked to validate the prompts. The prompts deemed most appropriate by the validators were the ones used in the study.

Once the prompts were validated, the composition writing was conducted by the researcher. She made sure that all 190 participants did the activity on one day to make sure that nobody brought pre-written compositions inside the classroom where the actual writing was conducted. The classroom was specifically chosen for its proper ventilation and lighting, ensuring that it is conducive for the writing process. The participants were given two hours to write about the topic they have selected. They were also given freedom to choose the type of writing appropriate to their preferred topic.

After the composition writing, the error analysis was done. Each composition was analyzed and rated using the error analysis form adapted from Brown (2001) and Gayeta (2002). The form consisted of five parts or categories in which errors may be committed; namely, content, organization, vocabulary, mechanics, and syntax or language use.

Each of the above-mentioned categories was divided into subcategories. Content was subdivided into thesis statement, related ideas, development of ideas, and consistent focus. Organization, on the other hand, was subdivided into introduction, unity and coherence, transitions, and conclusion. Vocabulary covered word choice and idiom form and usage, while

mechanics included spelling, punctuation, capitalization, margins, indentation or paragraphing, syllabication, and handwriting. Lastly, syntax was divided into global errors and local errors. Global errors encompassed verb tense, verb form, use and formation of modals, conditional sentences, passive voice, and dependent clause, sentence structure, word order, and connecting words. Local errors covered subject-verb agreement, use of articles, number of nouns, word form, prepositions, comma splice, dangling modifier, fragments, pronoun reference, run-on, and unclear meaning.

A set of 1-to-6-scale rubrics was used to rate the subcategories. Ratings 3 to 6 were considered *with errors* based on the frequency with which the errors occurred and how they affected the meaning of the sentence. On the other hand, ratings 1 to 2 were considered *no errors* or just *mistakes* because they were only committed once or twice in the composition. If 50% or more of the respondents were rated 3 to 6 in a subcategory, that was considered as *common error*.

### Statistical Treatment

In analyzing and interpreting the data gathered from the error analysis, the researcher used the frequency and percentage distribution to describe the demographic profile of the respondents, the common errors in writing committed by each group, and the category in which they committed the most number of errors. To determine the significant differences in the errors committed by the subjects in the different categories, Chi-square was computed by the researcher.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Profile of the Respondents

As shown in Table 1, most of the respondents speak *Cebuano-Visayan* as their L1. *Cebuano-Visayan* speakers comprise 144 (75.79%) of the total population. Those who have other L1 than those mentioned above such as *Waray* and *Bol-anon* have the least number, with only 3 (1.58%) of them.

**Table 1**  
**L1 spoken by respondents**

	<b>L1 Spoken</b>	<b>Frequency (f)</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
1	Kamayo	17	8.95
2	Manobo/ Higaonon	4	2.11
3	Surigaonon	11	5.79
4	Cebuano	144	75.79
5	Tagalog/Filipino	11	5.79
6	Others	3	1.58
	Total	190	100

Most of the students graduated from public high schools, comprising 156 (82.11%) of the population. Only 34 (17.89%) graduated from private high schools.

**Table 2**  
**Type of high school attended by respondents**

	Type of High School	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Public	156	82.11
2	Private	34	17.89
	Total	190	100

In terms of the type of media and technology which the respondents were exposed to, it can be seen in Table 3 that the large majority (93.16%) of them are exposed to TV/VCD/DVDs. Those exposed to internet comprise the least number, with only 80 (42.11%) out of the total population.

**Table 3**  
**Type of media and technology that respondents are exposed to**

		Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
1	Radio/Cassette/Karaoke	141	74.21
2	TV/VCD/DVD	177	93.16
3	Computer	93	48.95
4	Internet	80	42.11
5	Books/Journals/Magazines/ Newspapers	128	67.37

N=190

### Common Errors in Writing

#### Grouped According to L1 Spoken

***In Terms of Content.*** All the groups committed common errors in *thesis statement*. Among the groups, *Manobo/Higaonon* and *other L1* speakers committed the most errors, with 100% of them recorded to have made errors in their thesis statement. The *Surigaonons* committed the least errors with 82% of the respondents committing an error in the said subcategory.

As regards *related ideas*, all groups also commonly committed errors in this subcategory. Among the groups, the *Tagalog/Filipino* and *other L1* speakers committed the most errors. One hundred percent (100%) of the respondents in these groups committed errors. The

*Manobo/Higaonon* speakers committed the least errors, with only 75% of them who committed errors in this subcategory.

As for *development of ideas*, 100% of five (5) out of six (6) groups and 98% of the Cebuano respondents committed errors in this subcategory. This goes to show that in terms of content, the respondents committed the most serious errors in *development of ideas*.

In *consistency of focus*, only four (4) groups commonly committed errors. Among these groups, the *Surigaonon* speakers committed the most errors, with 82% of the subjects having committed an error. *Tagalog/Filipino* and *other LI* speakers did not commit common errors in this subcategory, having less than 50% of the subjects to have committed an error.

The data shown in Table 4 point out those common errors in terms of content are committed by all groups in all subcategories. The most errors the respondents committed are errors in *development of ideas*. Errors in *consistency of focus* are the least among the subcategories.

***In Terms of Organization.*** All of the groups commonly committed errors in all of the subcategories in organization. They committed most errors in *connecting words* and *introduction* with an average of 93.83% and 93.50% errors, respectively. The group with *other LIs* (*Bol-anon*, *Waray*, etc.) committed more errors compared to the other groups with 100% of its respondents to have committed errors.

***In Terms of Vocabulary.*** All of the groups also commonly committed errors in all of the subcategories. However, it could be seen that all of the groups committed more errors in *word choice* than in *idiom form and usage*, having an average of 90.00% to have committed errors in *word choice* compared to 71.33% in the other subcategory. It could also be seen that among the groups, the *other LI* (*Bol-anon*, *Waray*, etc.) speakers committed the most errors, with 100% of them to have committed errors in all of the subcategories.

***In Terms of Mechanics.*** All of the groups commonly committed errors in *punctuation* (63.17%), *margins* (77.50%), and *handwriting* (87.83%). Among these subcategories, it is in *handwriting* that the groups committed more errors, having an average of 87.83% of the respondents to have committed errors. As a whole, among the groups, only the *Tagalog/Filipino* and *other LI* speakers committed common errors in mechanics, both groups having more than 50% of the subjects to have committed errors.

***In Terms of Syntax (Global Errors).*** As a whole, none of the groups committed common errors in syntax (global errors). However, if each subcategory is to be analyzed, it could be seen that common errors are committed by the respondents in sentence structure, with an average of 70.67% of them to have committed errors in the said subcategory.

***In Terms of Syntax (Local Errors).*** In terms of local errors in syntax, it is only in *preposition* (61.17%) and *fragment* (52.17%) that the groups committed common errors. Remarkably, however, *Kamayo* and *other LI* speakers have high percentage of errors in *subject-verb agreement*, having 65% and 67%, respectively. It is also worth to note that

*Higaonon/Manobo* speakers have high percentage of errors in the subcategory *unclear*, with 100% of them to have committed errors. Generally, only the *other LI* speakers showed common local errors in syntax.

### **Grouped according to type of High School attended**

***In Terms of Content.*** Students from both public and private high schools commonly committed errors in all of the subcategories in content. Further, it is revealed that both groups committed the most errors in *development of ideas* and *related ideas*, having the percentage of errors 99% and 98.50%, respectively. In general, the two groups have almost equal percentage of errors in all of the subcategories.

***In Terms of Organization.*** Both groups commonly committed errors in all of the subcategories and have almost equal percentage of errors in each subcategory.

***In Terms of Vocabulary.*** The two groups commonly committed errors in the two subcategories but they committed more errors in *word choice* as shown by the higher percentage of errors in the said subcategory, which is 89.50% compared to 61.50% of *idiom form and usage*.

***In Terms of Mechanics.*** The two groups committed common errors in *punctuation* (55%), *margins* (84%), and *handwriting* (86%). Taking the category mechanics as a whole, however, results reveal that both groups did not commit common errors in this category.

***In Terms of Syntax (Global Errors).*** Results show that common errors are committed in *verb form* (54.00%), *dependent clause* (61.50%), and *sentence structure* (53.50%) by the two groups. Results also show that students from private high schools commonly committed errors in *verb tense* (56%) but students from public high schools did not. This implies that both groups have difficulties in *verb form*, *dependent clause*, and *sentence structure* but only those from private high schools have difficulties in *verb tense*.

***In Terms of Syntax (Local Errors).*** None of the two groups commonly committed local errors in any subcategory in syntax.

### **Grouped according to type of media and technology exposed to**

***In Terms of Content.*** All groups commonly committed errors in all of the categories with almost equal percentage of errors in each category.

***In Terms of Organization.*** Results reveal that all groups commonly committed errors in all of the subcategories.

***In Terms of Vocabulary.*** All groups also commonly committed errors in all of the subcategories. More errors, however, are committed in *word choice* since 89.80% committed errors in this subcategory while only 66.20% committed errors in *idiom form and usage*.

***In Terms of Mechanics.*** All groups commonly committed errors in *punctuation* (57.60%), *margins* (87.00%), and *handwriting* (90.20%). In addition to this, results reveal that all groups have almost equal percentage of errors.

***In Terms of Syntax (Global Errors).*** Common errors are committed in only one subcategory, *sentence structure*, with a percentage of errors of 54.80%.

***In Terms of Syntax (Local Errors).*** In terms of syntax (local errors), common errors are committed only in the *use of prepositions* with a percentage of errors of 51.00%.

### Categories Where Errors are Commonly Committed

As shown in Table 4, the categories where common errors are committed are *content*, *vocabulary*, and *organization/discourse*, having a mean of 84.50, 89.25, and 75.00, respectively.

**Table 4**  
**Categories where errors are commonly committed**

Categories	Subcategories	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
<b>Content</b>	Thesis statement	177	93	
	Related ideas	179	94	
	Development of ideas	187	98	
	Consistent focus	101	53	
				<b>84.50</b>
<b>Organization/ Discourse</b>	Introduction	183	96	
	Unity and Coherence	139	73	
	Transitions	180	95	
	Conclusion	179	94	
				<b>89.25</b>
<b>Vocabulary</b>	Word choice	167	88	
	Idiom form and usage	118	62	
				<b>75.00</b>
<b>Mechanics</b>	Spelling	65	34	
	Punctuation	105	55	
	Capitalization	30	16	
	Margins	161	85	
	Indention/Paragraphing	50	26	
	Syllabication	11	6	
	Handwriting	175	92	
				<b>44.86</b>



**Table 4 (continue)**  
**Categories where errors are commonly committed**

Categories	Subcategories	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
<b><u>Global errors</u></b>				
	verb tense	94	49	
	verb form	87	46	
	use and formation of modal	17	9	
	use and formation of conditional	13	7	
	sentences			
	use and formation of passive	4	2	
	voice			
	use and formation of dependent	57	30	
	clause			
<b>Syntax/ Language Use</b>	sentence structure	105	55	
	word order	24	13	
	connecting words	15	8	
				<b>24.33</b>
<b><u>Local errors</u></b>				
	subject-verb agreement	84	44	
	use of article	51	27	
	number of noun	66	35	
	word form	69	36	
	preposition	87	46	
	comma splice	49	26	
	dangling modifier	15	8	
	fragment	59	31	
	pronoun reference/agreement	70	37	
	run-on	35	18	
	unclear	67	35	
				<b>32.27</b>

In content, the students committed the most errors in development of ideas, committing 187 (98%) errors. Examples of errors in development of ideas are given below.

*(S1) As a first year student here in Philippine Normal University, I can really say I am blessed for I have been enrolled in this institution. At first I found it very unpleasant because honestly, I don't love my course. But then, I learned to love it the way that I should, during the early weeks of study. I found my professors very good, and the school, a very lovely place to stay and study. Yes, PNU may have insufficient facilities but I really do appreciate the administration for trying to meet the needs of the students.*

In this example, the writer, Student 1 (S1) is able to discuss the topic logically, providing evidence that supports his claim that he is blessed to be enrolled in PNU. However, the evidence he presented was limited. He did not elaborate what made his professors very good and what made the school a lovely place to stay and study. Furthermore, he failed to discuss the measures taken by the administration to meet the needs of the students. In addition to these, the pieces of evidence he gave were dull and trivial, making the essay less interesting.

*(S12) One of the things that I like in this institution is the faculty. The school chose efficient and effective teachers who can help producing future globally competent teachers. They share their knowledge, some experiences enable to help students learn new things and insights. They really do their responsibilities as teachers. They know how to interact with students and separate personal and academic matters.*

In this example, S12 is able to provide details that support his claim that the faculty is one of the things he likes in the school. He presented these details deductively. The information he gave, however, is limited in breadth and range in the sense that he failed to expound each idea. For instance, he did not explain what made the faculty efficient and effective and how do they help in producing competent would-be-teachers. Moreover, his ideas are dull and trivial. The reasons he gave are common traits of teachers that do not exactly set the PNU faculty apart from other teachers. Another example on paragraph development is shown below.

*(S144) My father is working hard to send me in school even if he is sick. He is so strick about our love life but I understand because I know he only protect us and he only wants is to give us a better future. My mother understand me in the problems that come in our life but sometimes I feel that you are in the far place even your body is with us. She inspire me how to fight and be strong in all the time.*

Although the paragraph is developed logically and the reader could easily grasp the message of the writer, S144, wanted to convey, it lacked the breadth and range and the interest that would hold the readers' attention for long. S144 did not elaborate some vital information that may broaden the paragraph and make it more interesting to the readers. For instance, there was no further discussion of his father's illness. Additional details about it would certainly appeal to the readers' emotions and make them want to continue reading. In addition to this, the part where S144 tells about his mother being only physically present was given very little attention when in fact it is another point of interest in the paragraph. Establishing a relationship between his father's sickness and his mother's behavior will not only make the paragraph broader but make it more effective as well.

In vocabulary, the respondents committed the most errors in word choice, with 167 (88%) errors. Hereunder are examples of errors in word choice.

*(S1) Speaking of PNU, there's no doubt of liking it. Philippine Normal University offers high quality education. I like this school not just of its cheap tuition fee, but of the competitive and well-trained teachers.*

Besides syntactical errors, it could be seen that the writer committed an error in word choice in the sense that he used “tuition fee”, a classic case of redundancy.

*(S13) Going to college may mean another 4 or more years of great challenges, efforts, sacrifices, another **hard-working days**....*

In this example, it could be seen that S13 used an inappropriate adjective (hardworking) to describe the days he would be spending in college. The adjective he used is suitable for describing a person, not days.

*(S73) The **most** thing I admire about him is in his self-confidence and **self-determination**.*

In this sentence, the writer, S73, used the word *most* instead of the word *best*. Aside from this, he used the term self-determination when in fact the correct word is only determination.

In organization, the subjects committed the most errors in introduction with 183 (96%) errors. Examples of errors in this subcategory are shown below.

*(S1) College life is really different from that of high school; new environment, new faces to deal with, everything just seems new. There are a lot of adjustments, as expected, more complicated tasks and more serious challenges.*

*(S2) I never had an idea why am I here. I just woke up one day and saw myself in a new place, a new environment. Unknowingly, I was already walking down the road going to the orientation. I was amazed with the attitude of the one who sat beside me and I hadn't feel I'm out of place from that day on. And then, I began liking the school, the new place where I am in.*

*(S123) Vacation is a remarkable day. You got many experience and friends. It's nice to have a vacation, to relax and set you free in all trouble. You can also learned many things I your vacation day.*

The errors in grammar adversely affect the clarity of these introductory paragraphs. Further, the writing style and the lack of striking and novel ideas in the paragraphs lessened their interest and effectiveness. They do not motivate the readers to continue reading the other paragraphs.

### **Relationship between Percentage of Errors Committed and the various Categories**

To determine if there is a difference in the magnitude of errors committed by the respondents in the different categories, Chi-square was computed.

As can be seen in Table 5, the computed  $\chi^2$ -value of 134.08 is greater than the  $\chi^2$ -critical value of 11.07 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, there is a significant difference in the percentage of errors committed by the respondents according to the categories.

**Table 5**  
**Significance of Difference in the Percentage of Errors Committed**  
**by the Respondents According to the Categories**

Categories	Percentage of Errors						df	x <sup>2</sup> -value	x <sup>2</sup> -critical value
	Content	Organization	Vocab	Mechanics	Syntax (Global Errors)	Syntax (Local Errors)			
Observed	85.26	90.53	74.74	44.36	31.64	31.49	5	134.08	11.07
Expected	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00			

### Ranking of the Percentage of Errors in the Different Categories

Since there is a significant difference in the percentage of errors committed by the respondents in the categories, the percentage of errors are ranked in order to identify the most common and serious errors.

Table 6 shows that organization ranks first with a percentage of errors of 90.53. Content ranks second with a percentage of errors of 85.26. Vocabulary follows content, with a percentage of errors of 74.74. Mechanics ranks fourth with a percentage of errors of 44.36. Syntax follows mechanics with a percentage of errors of 31.64 for global errors and 31.49 for local errors.

**Table 6**  
**Ranking of the Percentage of Errors Committed by the Respondents**  
**in the Different Categories**

Categories	Percentage of Errors	Rank
Content	85.26	2
Organization	90.53	1
Vocabulary	74.74	3
Mechanics	44.36	4
Syntax (Global Errors)	31.64	5
Syntax (Local Errors)	31.49	6

## **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS**

The data shows that the students in PNU-Agusan predominantly speak Cebuano-Visayan. This is consistent with the finding that most of them graduated from public high schools wherein the prevailing medium of instruction is Cebuano-Visayan, the dialect used in Mindanao Region where Agusan is located. The finding that the respondents are mostly exposed to TV/VCD/DVDs also supports this result. Their limited exposure to the internet wherein English is primarily used entails their use of Cebuano-Visayan in their school and home life.

It was found in the study that even if the respondents are grouped according to their L1, the type of high school where they graduated, and the type of media they are exposed to, they commit the same errors. They have common errors in all of the subcategories of content, organization, and vocabulary.

With these findings, it can be concluded that students have difficulty in conveying meaning in their writing because content, organization, and vocabulary have to do with how writers use words to form sentences and paragraphs in order to express their ideas. This implies that fluency is a problem in writing among students. They do not know the appropriate words and idioms to use; consequently, they commit errors in phrasing their thesis statements. Since they cannot concretize their idea in their mind for lack of the appropriate vocabulary, they have difficulty identifying the main idea and the supporting details, creating more problems in organization.

In the category of mechanics, the respondents have common errors in punctuation, margins, and handwriting. In syntax, on the other hand, they have common errors in sentence structure, prepositions, verb form, and use and formation of dependent clause.

The common errors committed in the subcategories of mechanics and syntax are consistent with the respondents' problem on fluency. For instance, the respondents know the use of punctuations in isolated sentences. However, when it comes to paragraphs in which many and varied types of sentences are strung together, they commit errors in using the correct punctuation.

The errors that the respondents commit in sentence structure, verb form, prepositions, and use and formation of dependent clause also have something to do with fluency. The respondents' knowledge of the use of the English language is limited to analyses of isolated sentences during classroom discussions. When met with the task of combining sentences to form longer discourses, their sentences appear awkward and disjointed. The subcategories mentioned (sentence structure, verb form, etc.) are also taught in isolation even though one has something to do with the other, hence, aggravating the errors committed by the students.

The results of the study imply that teachers should have a shift in their learning focus. More attention should be given to use of the language; hence, more writing practice exercises be given to students instead of constantly giving them exercises on grammar rules. A holistic and

communicative approach to the teaching of English is also implied by the results because the common errors in writing of the students point to the lack of fluidity or fluency on conveying ideas rather than the accuracy of grammatical items.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results, it is recommended that content, organization, and vocabulary be given emphasis in the teaching of writing. Activities that develop students' fluency in writing will greatly help the students achieve competence in these areas.

In addition, it is recommended that error analysis be done regularly to provide learners feedback regarding their writing performance. However, teachers should be knowledgeable in providing feedback, especially in marking errors. It should be done in such a way that the students learn what their errors are but do not become stigmatized that they lose their interest in writing.

Furthermore, learners could be taught to become self-editors of their own compositions by leading the class in formulating rubrics to assess their own work. Peer-editing could also be employed in the writing class for feedback.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. (2014). *Overview on error analysis*. Retrieved from [http://www.carla.umn.edu/learnerlanguage/error\\_analysis.html](http://www.carla.umn.edu/learnerlanguage/error_analysis.html).
- Clark, D. (2012). *English- the language of global business?* Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/dorieclark/2012/10/26/english-the-language-of-global-business/>.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate in the classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14(1), 1-23.
- Ferris, D. R., Hedgcock, J. S. , (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gayeta, M. S. (2002). *Improving the compositions of selected college students through process writing*. Unpublished Thesis, PNU, Manila.

- Heining-Boynton, A. L. (Ed.). (2006). J. Grandin: *Globalization and Its Implications for the Profession*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). *World Englishes: Approaches, issues, and resources*. London: Prentice-Hall.
- Leland, C. T. (2002). *The creative writer's style guide*. Ohio: F & W Publishers.
- Levin, K. (2013). *For writing consultants: Guidelines to working with non-native speakers*. Retrieved from <http://writing.umn.edu/tww/responding/WorkingNonnativeSpeakers.pdf>.
- Myles, J. (2007). *Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts*. Retrieved from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej22/a1.html>
- National Council of Teachers of English Executive Committee. (2004). *NCTE beliefs about the teaching of writing*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/prog/writing/research/118876.htm>
- Olshtain, E. (2001). Functional tasks for mastering the mechanics of writing and going just beyond. In M. Celce- Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign Language* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 207-217). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.