INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES BULLETIN
ISSN: (E) 3007-1917 (P) 3007-1909
Volume 3, Issue 10, 2025

FROM URDU TO ENGLISH: A STUDY OF ERROR ANALYSIS IN THE WRITINGS OF PAKISTANI EFL LEARNERS

Dr. Nazia Anwar

Lecturer, University of Gujrat,

nazia.anwar@uog.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *
Dr. Nazia Anwar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17720754

Received	Accepted	Published
11 July 2025	27 September 2025	10 October 2025

ABSTRACT

The writings of the Pakistani EFL learners in English includes mistakes that could be traced to the first language, Urdu. It is possible to understand such mistakes to improve language teaching. This study seeks to establish the most common mistakes in the texts of EFL Pakistani learners and also explains the contribution of the Urdu language towards the occurrence of these mistakes. Descriptive qualitative study with the analysis of errors based on the Error Analysis model by Corder (1967) is used in this study. Short essays on the topic of The Role of Technology in Education are written by forty undergraduate students of the University of Gujrat. The errors are recognised, categorised into grammatical, lexical, syntactic and mechanical, and analysed as interlingual and intralingual. Grammatical errors are most common, then there are the lexical, syntactic and mechanical errors. Transfer of Urdu errors prevails in interlingual errors especially in sentence structure, articles use and the choice of words. Urdu has a great impact on the English writing of learners. Analysis of errors reveals information on pedagogical interventions to minimise L1 interference and improve accuracy of writing.

Keywords: *Urdu, English, error analysis, Pakistani, EFL learners*

INTRODUCTION

English has gained popularity as a lingua franca among the academic, professional and technological communication methods worldwide. In Pakistan, English is a foreign language (EFL) that is taught at early school level and it is a medium of instruction in higher education as well (Rahman, 2002). Although, they have been exposed to a considerable extent, a large number of Pakistani learners still find it difficult to master the English language as far as written communication is concerned. Writing mistakes are widespread and may hamper the process of understanding, negatively impact academic success and influence the confidence of learners (Abbas et.al., 2020).

The first language (L1) of the learners in Pakistan is one of the key aspects that determine EFL writing. Urdu and English are very different in terms of grammar, syntax, vocabulary and orthography. For instance, Urdu has Subject Object Verb (SOV) word order in contrast to the Subject Verb Object (SVO) word order in English. Urdu does not also have articles and certain tense inflections and this aspect commonly results in either omission or misuse of English writing (Rahman & Rashid, 2022). Thus, transfer of the Urdu language into English is one of the major contributors to error and the study of such patterns can offer constructive information to the study of interlanguage development in learners.

The error analysis (EA) offers systematic method of analyzing the written errors of the learners and this emphasizes the nature of errors and also the

causes behind the errors. Corder (1967) argues that errors are not haphazard but indicate the internalized linguistic rules of a learner hence providing evidence in the process of continuing learning. The study of mistakes committed by Pakistani EFL students is important due to a number of factors. To begin with, it aids in determining common difficulties in written language, and the teacher can create specific interventions. Second, it illuminates the position of Urdu as L1 so that educators can deal with interlingual interference in a systematic way. Third, the research adds to the increasing body of literature in the EFL pedagogy in South Asia, especially at the university level where the students are supposed to generate competent academic writing (Ellis, 1994).

Despite years of formal education in English, Pakistani students tend to write grammars, lexicals, syntactic and mechanical errors in their written texts. They are not only L1 transfer errors but also developmental errors in English (Ellis, 1994; Rahman & Rashid, 2022). Nevertheless, in Pakistan, the research on the subject has mainly centered on high school students or EFL students in general, which has left gaps in the knowledge about the patterns of errors of university students and the contribution of Urdu to these errors. It is important to fill this gap as a measure of enhancing the pedagogy of writing and the academic achievements of learners in the context of higher education. This current research sets out to discuss he mistakes made by the Pakistani undergraduate writers and to examine the effects of the Urdu language to the writing of English.

1.1 Research Objectives:

To identify the most frequently occurring errors in the writings of Pakistani EFL learners.

To analyze the contribution of Urdu as first language in making errors in the English writings of Pakistani EFL learners.

1.2 Research Questions:

What are the most frequently occurring errors in the writings of Pakistani EFL learners?

How does Urdu as first language contribute in making errors in the English writings of Pakistani EFL learners?

2. Literature Review

The error Analysis (EA) has been considered one of the most important tools of the second language acquisition and effective pedagogical strategies construction long enough. Firstly theorized by Corder (1967), EA is concerned with the methodical recognition, classification, and explanation of errors made by learners, which are evidence of internal processes of learning a language. Mistakes are viewed as a normal of the language acquisition process, which unveils the assumptions that learners have made concerning the target language (Ellis, 1994). When analyzing the errors in English writing in the context of Pakistan where the first language (L1) is Urdu and the foreign language (EFL) is English, the analysis offers the information about the interlingual transfer of the Urdu language to English and the specificities of the difficulties that the learners have.

2.1 Theoretical Background

The conceptual basis of EA is the opposition between the interlanguage theory and the classical methods of errors correction. Introduced by Selinker (1972) the theory of interlanguage assumes that the learners develop a dynamic system of linguistic production which is affected by the input of both L1 and L2. This system is developed in phases of trial and error with systematic errors marking learning advancement not struggle. L1 transfer errors and the errors of overgeneralization or failure to fully apply L2 rules are the two main types of errors that are examined in EA (Corder, 1967; Ellis, 1994). Contrastive analysis is another informant of EA, which is focused on the structural differences between the native and the target language of learners. In Pakistan, English writing is highly affected by the grammatical and syntactic nature of Urdu, in which the word order is Subject-Object-Verb, there are no articles and the verb morphology can be flexible which generates error patterns that can be predicted (Abbas et.al., 2020).

2.3 Previous Research

There are a number of studies that have pointed out the importance of EA to the comprehension of the challenges facing EFL learners. Ellis (1994) has stated that the systematic error detection allows the teachers to establish the remedial

instruction that addresses particular language issues. Equally, Richards (1971) observed that EA offers information on the interlanguage development within the learners, which allows the educators to differentiate between the developmental and L1 interferences errors. Abbas et al. (2020) carried out a research on undergraduate students writing in the Pakistani context and the most common errors were grammatical mistakes especially in articles and verb tenses. The experiment also indicated that there were major lexical and syntactic mistakes as a result of Urdu interference. Mahmood et.al., (2019) also found that sentence patterns with an Urdu influence, literal translation, and unsuitable collocations were part of the common writing errors. The overall point of all these studies is to highlight that L1 continues to affect English writing even in learners who have years of formal English instruction.

2.4 English as an Influenced Language: Urdu

The influence of Urdu as L1 is that English interferes with phonological, syntactic and lexical interference in learners. The word order of Urdu SOV language tends to cause relocation of verbs and objects in the case of English SVO sentences. Articles that lack Urdu are often left out or abused, with a mistake made like- Technology is blessing for us rather than Technology is a blessing for us (Rahman & Rashid, 2022). The transfer of lexis is common also. Students tend to translate collision and idiomatic expressions literally in Urdu and end up with statements that make semantic sense in the English language but are syntactically wrong. An example is the use of the literal translation because of the Urdu semantics such as take benefit of the internet rather than take advantage of the internet (Dewaele & Wei, 2012). Mechanical mistakes such as punctuations, capital letter, and spelling mistakes are of less common occurrence though of significance. The Urdu script, not capitalized and with alternative punctuation marks, is one of the reasons of these mistakes in writing English (Ferris, 2010).

Although, there is existing literature that has confirmed the common occurrence of Urdu-based errors in English writing, no literature has provided a systematic categorization of the errors with reference to the Corder model (1967) among undergraduate students in Pakistani universities. The majority of the studies are based on high-school students or general EFL populations, which is why there is an empty space when it comes to writing proficiency on the university level. Additionally, there is scanty research literature that examines the comparative rates of interlingual and intralingual errors among this population. The resolution of these gaps can guide the specific pedagogical approaches in enhancing accuracy and fluency in writing by Pakistani EFL learners.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research design adopted in this study was a descriptive qualitative research design with quantitative aspects done to examine the errors in English writings of Pakistani EFL learners. The study relies on an Error Analysis (EA) model by Corder (1967), who offers a systematic theory on the identification, classification, explanation, and assessment of errors in the production of the second language. Corder argues that, not all learner errors are casual but they are a manifestation of the inner workings of language acquisition and interlanguage development. This model is especially appropriate to the present study since it enables the analysis of how Urdu affects the learners in their English writing and the interlingual (L1 transfer) and intralingual (L2 developmental) errors can be identified.

3.2 Participants

The sample consisted of 40 undergraduate students taking the 3 rd semester of BS English, the University of Gujrat. The respondents were all native speakers of Urdu and had some prior formal training of English before the age of 18 to 22 years. In the study, purposive sampling was employed to identify the study participants who had a common language and academic exposure. This sampling helped to guarantee that the data gave a homogenous set of EFL learners who would most likely show similar patterns of showing Urdu-influenced errors in English. The consent of the participants was gathered and their identities were treated as confidential.

3.3 Data Collection

The data was gathered by way of short essay writing. The respondents were requested to compose 150-200-word essays on the subject

matter, *The Role of technology in Education*. This subject was selected due to its familiarity, non-technical aspect and because it helps the learners have natural flow of ideas without depending on what they have memorized. The essays were done in a controlled classroom environment so as to reduce the incidence of external aid, such as using online resources or peer assistance. All the written answers were gathered, coded and tabulated to be analyzed later.

3.5 Analytical Framework

The examination was based on the five steps of Error Analysis model proposed by Corder (1967):
Gathering of learner language: Essays are collected by gathering all the participants.
Detection of mistakes: The essays were reviewed to detect grammatical, syntactic, vocabulary and mechanics deviations. Systematic errors only were taken into account; there were no slips or typing mistakes.
Error classification: The errors were divided into grammatical, lexical, syntactic and mechanical.
Elucidation of mistakes: The sources of mistakes were discussed as either interlingual (L1 transfer) or intralingual (L2 developmental).
Assessment of errors: The occurrence and the consequences of the errors were measured to establish their influence on the communication and precision.

3.6 Data Analysis

A mixed-method was used. Quantitative analysis was done to compute the frequency and percentage of every type of error in microsoft excel. The qualitative analysis aimed at the explanation of the causes of the mistakes, in particular, the Urdu influence on the sentence structure, word order, and vocabulary. The essays have representative examples that were used to show each type of error and its linguistic origin. Such a mixture of quantitative and qualitative approaches helped to make the results deeper and more reliable.

3.7 Validity and Reliability

The error classification was cross-checked to allow the validity of the situation to be ensured by a highly experienced English teacher who knows the errors analysis. Ideas of inconsistencies were communicated and agreed upon. Frequency analysis and interpretive explanation increased reliability and credibility of the study and gave a systematic and transparent approach to the assessment of errors.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The objective of the research was made clear to all the participants and informed consent was obtained prior to the collection of data. They were anonymous about their identities and institutional specificities. The information was only academic and not used to influence grades and other assessments of the participants. The ethical standards in accordance with the educational research standards were kept in a stringent manner.

Data Analysis

This study gives the study analysis and results of the study titled From Urdu to English: A Study of Error Analysis in the Writings of Pakistani EFL Learners. The sample size of 40 undergraduate students undertaking the 3rd semester of the BS English program in the University of Gujrat was used to collect the data. The short essay created by each participant was a 150-200-word assignment on a piece of information concerning the role of technology in education. The aim of the analysis was to find out which linguistic mistakes are the most common in the writings of the learners and how their first language, Urdu, plays a role in causing these mistakes. The explanation is based on the model of five steps of the Error Analysis suggested by Corder (1967):
Gathering of language samples of learners
Identification of errors
Classification of errors
Explanation of errors
Evaluation of errors
The quantitative-qualitative design allowed gaining an in-depth insight into the nature, prevalence, and origins of errors.

4.1 Identification of Errors

Once all the 40 essays were collected, they were scrutinized thoroughly in order to find out the deviations of the standard English grammar, syntax, vocabulary and mechanics. The errors were documented in a systematic manner and those errors which were related to typographical errors or mistakes which were not reflective of the learning problem were excluded. The total number of errors was found to be 532 in all

essays. Such mistakes were consistent within the usage of English in the learners, which most of them could be attributed to the effect of the Urdu linguistic construction.

4.2 Classification of Errors

In accordance with the third step proposed by Corder (1967), the mistakes were classified into four big linguistic categories:

Grammatical Errors
Lexical Errors
Syntactic Errors
Mechanical Errors

Table 1 below summarizes the quantitative findings of these categories.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Major Error Types

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Grammatical Errors	214	40.2%
Lexical Errors	128	24.1%
Syntactic Errors	106	19.9%
Mechanical Errors	84	15.8%
Mechanical Errors	**532**	**100%**

The findings have shown that grammatical errors were the most predominant with a percentage of 40.2/100 of all the errors identified, lexical errors (24.1), syntactic errors (19.9), and mechanical errors (15.8). The following discussion explains each category in greater detail by giving examples of the same based on the essays of the participants.

4.3 Major Error Categories Analysis

4.3.1 Grammatical Errors

The most common mistakes were grammatical mistakes. They were primarily misuse of tenses, articles, prepositions and subjects-verb agreement. These mistakes indicate the general progress of knowledge of the English grammar and interference of the Urdu grammar, which has other structural and morphological rules.

Examples:

1. Our study is easy because of technology.

→ Grammatically correct: Technology makes our studying easy.

→ Explanation This lack of the third-person singular *-s* is due to the grammar of Urdu, which lacks person-number agreement in verbs the way English does.

2. The technology is weaving good things to us.

→ The proper way to say it is: Technology is a blessing to us.

→ Explanation: Urdu lacks the systematic use of articles (a, an, the) and thus causes the omission or wrong application of articles in English.

3. The merits of computer we talk of.

→ Good form: we talk about the benefits of computers.

→ Explanation: Transfer of preposition about is influenced by the Urdu, in which the same structure demands prepositions.

Interpretation:

The high number of grammatical errors proves that the learners depend on Urdu grammatical structures in the formation of English sentences. Urdu is flexible in its word order and does not have some grammatical markers (e.g. articles) therefore students unconsciously use Urdu rules in English writing.

4.3.2 Lexical Errors

Lexical errors were related to the wrong use of words, direct translation of Urdu words, and misuse of collocations. These inaccuracies constituted a quarter of the entirety. Students tended to replace English words with their Urdu counterparts directly and this distorted the normal expression.

Examples:

1. Technology is a great godsend.

→ There is a right way to say it: Technology is a great blessing.

→ Explanation: The term big blessing is translated literally as the Urdu term is called bari rehmat. English has a different combination of adjectives and noun.

2. Internet should be used to our advantage.

→ Grammatical structure: We ought to capitalize on the internet.

→ Elucidation: This mistake is a direct result of lexical transfer in the Urdu phrase faida uthana (to take benefit).

3. There is misuse of technology among the students.

→ Right choice: Students are abusing technology.

→ Explanation Urdu enables nominalization (e.g. galat istamal karna); as a result, learners form ungrammatical structures in English which contain nouns.

Interpretation:

Lexical errors indicate that students rely on word-to-word translation of Urdu to English a lot. This consequently leads to unnatural or wrong collocations and idiomatic phrases. These results validate the pronounced interlingual effect of the Urdu words and phrases on the English writing.

4.3.3 Syntactic Errors

The total number of syntactic errors was 19.9%. These mistakes were in the wrong sequence of words, the absence of the connecting devices, and run-on sentences based on the Urdu structure. The Urdu language adheres to the Subject Object Verb (SOV) structure as compared to English where the language adheres to Subject Verb Object (SVO) arrangement. The fact that learners preferred to adhere to the Urdu syntax led to the mispositioning of verbs and phrases.

Examples:

1. Students new skills are learned through the use of computer.

→ Proper construction: Students discover new skills through using computers.

→ Reasoning: This position of the verb is a result of the Urdu word order impact (Talib-e-ilm naye skills seekhte hain).

2. "The technology that we get knowledge through.

→ The right way to say it: we can apply technology to know-how.

→ Explanation: the Urdu language allows to position the topic at the front, whereas in English, the verbs and subjects have to come first before the object.

3. Internet is providing a lot of facilities to the students.

The internet provides students with numerous facilities and this is the correct form.

→ Explanation Urdu has more relaxed syntactic relationships, which can explain the absence of prepositions and connectors.

Interpretation:

These are just some examples that Urdu syntax structures play a significant role in the English sentence structure. The learners tend to adhere to Urdu sentence arrangement and order and this results into incorrect grammatical English structures. Such syntactic transfer is among the most effective signs of first language interference in EFL writing.

4.3.4 Mechanical Errors

The percentage of mechanical errors was 15.8 and covered mistakes in punctuation, capitalization and spelling. These mistakes were less common but they influenced the readability of the writing and presentation.

Examples:

1. technology has transformed the learning process.

→ Proper form It has altered the manner with which we learn through technology.

→ Explanation: The fact that capitalization is not used means that Urdu has no distinction of case.

2. It can assist us in our study, and in communication as well.

→ Proper expression: It assists us in our studies, and in communication too.

→ Explanation: The misplaced commas and irregular patterns of punctuations are typical because of the dissimilar writing conventions in Urdu.

3. There are numerous learning websites.

→ Right: There are numerous learning websites.

→ Explanation: Spelling mistakes, e.g. thier rather than there, can be a consequence of phonetic confusion.

Interpretation:

The case of mechanical errors demonstrates that learners do not have much experience when it comes to formal written English, and they tend to use Urdu orthographic patterns. The nature of Urdu script, in the direction, the capitalization and the punctuations between the words make a difference compared to English language, which adds to these mechanical inaccuracies.

4.3.5 Sources of Error Explained

Based on the model by Corder (1967), the errors found in the works by learners were further divided into subgroups according to the origin: interlingual (L1 transfer) and intralingual (within L2 system).

Table 2. Sources of Errors

Source of Errors	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Interlingual (L1 influence)	304	57.1%
Intralingual (L2 developmental)	228	42.9%
Total	**532**	**100%**

The results indicate that interlingual errors (57.1) are more than intralingual errors (42.9), which proves the high impact of Urdu on the English writing of the learners. A majority of the grammatical, lexical and syntactic mistakes were found to be of Urdu structures whereas intralingual mistakes were mostly due to overgeneralization or incomplete knowledge of English rules.

There are some examples of Interlingual Errors:

He is an extremely innocent boy.

She does not transfer the same pattern of Urdu verb agreement to English.

Some examples of Intralingual Errors:

He attended school. (Generalization rule of past tense into the present tense.)

Better facilities are given more.

These instances demonstrate that the L1 interference and the L2 developmental phenomenon interrelate in influencing the interlanguage of the learners but the syntactic and lexical influence of Urdu is still dominant.

4.3.6 Evaluation and Discussion

The frequency and types of errors evaluation give valuable information on the language problems of Pakistani EFL students. The prevalence of grammatical and lexical mistakes shows that students remain in a problematic situation with the structural and collocational features of English, which is not similar to Urdu. The issues of syntactic and mechanical errors are less common, though they point at the flaws in the order of words, cohesiveness, and orthographic rules. The high frequency of interlingual errors implies that the thought patterns of the learners remain to be framed in the Urdu language and direct translation is a significant strategy that they use when writing. These results are in line with past studies (Ellis, 1994; Corder, 1967) indicating that the errors that learners commit are systematic, predictable as well as demonstrate the internal process of learning a second language. The findings further demonstrate that the explicit teaching about the contrastive grammar, sentence structure, and the use of words are required to reduce the Urdu-to-English transfer.

4.3.7 Summary of Findings

The overall number of errors that were identified was 532, and grammatical errors were the most widespread (40.2%). Most of the errors were caused by interlingual influence of Urdu (57.1%). Patterns of common errors such as omission of articles, wrong word sequence, verbatim translation, and wrong usage of collocations existed. English sentence structure was highly influenced by reliance of Urdu grammar and vocabulary among learners. Altogether, the discussion shows that Urdu has a considerable influence on written English of Pakistani EFL students. These problems can be

addressed with the help of specific pedagogic intervention to improve the accuracy and competence of the students in writing English.

Findings and Discussion

The current study had an objective to determine what were the most commonly used mistakes that EFL learners of Pakistan were making in their writing and to understand how Urdu being their mother-tongue contributed to such mistakes. Data on 40 undergraduate students in the University of Gujrat were evaluated based on their short essays on the topic The Role of Technology in Education using the model of Error Analysis of Corder (1967). The analysis has shown that there were 532 mistakes and these were classified according to their categories, which included grammatical, lexical, syntactic and mechanical.

The most prevalent (40.2) were grammatical errors, then lexical (24.1) and syntactical (19.9) errors and mechanical errors (15.8). Errors on the basis of interlingual interference (57.1%), which showed the most significant influence on the English writing, constituted the highest percentage of the errors committed. Conversely, the intralingual errors (42.9) were attributed primarily to the overgeneralization and incomplete knowledge about the English grammatical rules. The frequentest errors were the omission of articles, the wrong verb agreement, the literal translation and the wrong word order.

The large number of grammatical and lexical mistakes indicate that Pakistani students have a long-standing problem with structural and collocational accuracy of English. Urdu lacks some system of articles or strict rules of subject-verb agreement and students forget or abuse these elements in English. Such mistakes as "Technology is blessing to us or he go to university day to day are examples of point-blank grammatical transfer of Urdu. These findings substantiate the opinion of Corder (1967) that the errors made by learners are not accidental but are the results of the internal actions of language acquisition. The predominance of interlingual errors also goes to prove the argument put forward by Ellis (1994), where the first language of learners is a strong force on their acquisition of a second language, particularly at an early and intermediate level. The Subject Object Verb (SOV) arrangement of Urdu is often reflected in English sentences where the verb is misplaced or the subject is misplaced like in Students new skills learn by using computer. These patterns reflect the occurrence of syntactic transfer in which the learners use the Urdu sentence structure in building English utterances.

Lexical errors like literal translation of take benefit of internet, take advantage of the internet are cognitive in nature and are due to a tendency of direct translation of words to the first language. This is also consistent with Dewaele and Wei (2012) who discovered that bilinguals usually rely on L1 mental lexicons during the processing or production of L2 vocabulary and the resulting collocations and semantic errors. The present results can be compared to the previous studies in the same Pakistani EFL situations. According to Abbas et al., grammatical errors, especially in the article and tenses, were the most prominent among undergraduate students; this is because of the interference of Urdu (2020). Equally, Mahmood, Asghar and Jabeen (2019) have found that excessive use of the Urdu structures and expressions by learners also led to syntactic and lexical mistakes that are similar to those that were observed in this research.

On a bigger scale, Al-Khresheh (2016) discovered parallels between interlingual influence of Arabic EFL learners, which comes to the conclusion that first language transfer is a universal process in foreign language writing. On the other hand, Richards (1971) pointed out that intralingual errors (those that occur due to the second language system) become more predominant as the learners become more proficient. But in the Pakistani situation, Urdu keeps playing an important role even at university as it is also confirmed by Rahman and Rashid (2022). This complements and indicates that the exposure that learners get to the English language beyond the classroom is still minimal and further goes to support the structural and cognitive superiority of Urdu in the languages of the learners.

This study has a number of pedagogical implications on the English language teaching in Pakistan. First, the fact that Grammatical and syntactic transfer is predominantly based on the Urdu language is an indication of the necessity of teaching grammar in a contrastive manner, whereby a teacher deliberately brings out the

structural difference between the Urdu and English language. Nunan (2015) explained that metalinguistic awareness can be achieved by teaching learners through the methods of targeted instructions that emphasize the sources of errors. Second, the unnatural collocations and literal translations that occur due to lexical transfer must be avoided, thus vocabulary teaching should be based on the contextualized use and not memorization. Corpus-based learning techniques and exposure to natural English materials can help the students to identify natural lexical patterns.

Third, the rate of mechanical error, albeit less common, indicates the significance of express feedback regarding the spelling, punctuations, and capitalization. Ferris (2010) asserted that corrective feedback and revision activities can be used to enhance the accuracy of L2 writing. Therefore, teachers are advised to incorporate cyclic feedback that encourages the students to notice and correct their repetitive mistakes. Lastly, the study suggests that written practice needs to be incorporated into other disciplines because the little time available in written expression limits the capacity of the learners to internalize English grammatical and lexical norms. Long-term accuracy and fluency can be achieved through error-based remedial instruction together with writing workshops.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the commonest mistakes that occurred most of the time in the English texts of Pakistani EFL learners and to determine the role played by the Urdu as the first language in creating the errors. A total of forty (40) undergraduate learners in the 3rd semester of the University of Gujrat were used to gather data. All respondents authored a brief essay of the topic, The Role of Technology in Education. Analysis was done based on the Error Analysis model developed by Corder (1967), which consisted of identifying, classifying, explaining, and evaluating errors.

The results demonstrated that there were 532 linguistic errors that included grammatical, lexical, syntactic, and mechanical errors. Grammatical errors were the most prevalent with 40.2 percentage of all errors whereas lexical (24.1%), syntactic (19.9%), and mechanical (15.8) errors followed. Moreover, 57.1% of the errors were interlingual (as a consequence of the influence of Urdu) and 42.9% were intralingual, and this is the developmental factor in English. These findings validated that Urdu is influential in interlanguage construction of learners and patterns of English language use in Pakistani learners. Domination of grammatical and lexical mistakes suggests that students have severe problems with learning English morphology and syntax that is quite different to Urdu. Urdu does not have the use of articles, strict subject verb agreement, and definite tense markings that can be compared to English. As a result students tend to adopt the Urdu grammatical patterns in writing in English and end up with sentences such as Technology is blessing to us or He go to school every day. These patterns of interlingualism describe how Urdu exerts a systematic effect on the acquisition of English.

These syntactic mistakes (with particular confusion of verbs and violation of the word sequence) are caused by the fact that Urdu is a Subject- Object-Verb (SOV) language, whereas English is a Subject- Verb-Object (SVO) language. The observation is corroborated by Ellis (1994) who claims that syntactic transfer between L1 and L2 is an innate process during the initial phases of the second language acquirement. On the same note, Al-Khresheh (2016) discovered that the sentence structure of learners tends to be similar to the grammatical structure of their native language, which results in foreseeable interference patterns. Lexical mistakes such as literal translations and unnatural combinations of words also supported the fact that learners use their Urdu vocabularies a lot when communicating in English. The learners who are multilingual, as Dewaele and Wei (2012) noted, will use L1 conceptual frameworks in the retrieval of L2 vocabulary leading to expression of semantically distorted expressions. Thus, the results highlight the importance of the linguistic system of Urdu that makes the written English of Pakistani learners considerably accurate, fluent, and coherent.

The findings of the research have multiple implications to the teaching of English language in Pakistan. The teachers should include the contrastive grammar, which clearly discusses the structural differences between the Urdu and English languages, particularly on the use of articles, the tense usage, and sentence structure.

Ferris (2010) suggests that explicit corrective feedback allows learners to become aware and internalize repeated patterns of error, which eventually results in accuracy in the long run.

In addition, vocabulary instruction must also emphasize collocational competence and contextual meaning, but not literal translation. This strategy can assist the learners to identify and prevent Urdu-infected lexical mistakes. Similar to Nunan (2015), task-based language learning has the potential to offer productive contexts that stimulate the natural languages and minimise the reliance on L1 structures. Lastly, educators are encouraged to encourage long-term writing based on peer review and corrected drafts and to encourage student independence and sensitivity to grammatical correctness. Although, the research has some good insights, its research magnitude is restricted because it had a limited number of respondents and utilized one institution. In future research, it is recommended to include individuals working in various universities and different educational levels to increase the generalizability. It is also possible to conduct longitudinal studies of the changes in error patterns of learners that may happen throughout semesters with improvement in their proficiency. There are also chances that future studies uses use the corpus-based approach of analyzing Urdu written discourse more objectively and in bulk, which is suggested by Rahman and Rashid (2022). A more detailed picture of interlingual influence would also be gained through the study of oral errors and written production.

REFERENCES

Abbas, N., Gulzar, M. A., & Hussain, S. (2020). Error analysis of Pakistani university students' written English: Causes and remedies. International Journal of English Linguistics, 10(5), 120–132. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n5p120

Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2016). A review study of interlingual and intralingual interference in EFL Saudi learners' English writing. Arab World English Journal, 7(4), 394–408. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol7no4.27

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5(4), 161–170.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Wei, L. (2012). Multilingualism, empathy and multilingual identity. International

Journal of Multilingualism, 9(4), 352–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2012.714380

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA:

Intersections and practical applications. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490

Mahmood, M. A., Asghar, A., & Jabeen, F. (2019). Exploring L1 interference in Pakistani learners' English writing. Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences, 39(2), 555–566.

Nunan, D. (2015). Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction. Routledge.

Rahman, F., & Rashid, S. (2022). Interlingual transfer and grammatical difficulties in Pakistani EFL

learners' writings. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 13(4), 654–662. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1304.03

Rahman, T. (2002). Language, ideology, and power: Language learning among the Muslims of

Pakistan and North India. Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. English Language Teaching Journal, 25(3), 204–219. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/XXV.3.204