



RESEARCH PAPER

Speech Errors in English as Foreign Language: A Case Study of Bachelors Students

¹Dr. Neelma Riaz, ²Dr. Samia Tahir and ³ Dr. Irram Waheed

1. Assistant Professor, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences (SEECS), NUST, Islamabad, Pakistan.
2. Assistant Professor, School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (SEECS), NUST, Islamabad, Pakistan.
3. Assistant Professor, School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering (SMME), NUST, Islamabad, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: neelma.riaz@seecs.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This case study investigates speech errors in English as a foreign language (EFL) among six Bachelor's students from Fatima Jinnah Women University. Using Levelt's (1983) speech production and self-monitoring model, the study classifies and analyses errors occurring during a spontaneous narrative task. Participants watched a short Urdu-language cartoon and then described it in English, with their speech recorded, transcribed, and examined for lexical, grammatical, and phonological errors. Findings reveal frequent lexical issues, including L1 intrusions and misuse of phrasal verbs; grammatical errors, notably subject-verb agreement issues, article omission/misuse, and wrong word order; and phonological errors, primarily articulatory clumsiness and mispronunciations influenced by L1 phonetic patterns. Evidence of self-monitoring and repairs was also observed, though often delayed. The results highlight persistent challenges in L2 oral production despite extended exposure to English, supporting the view that speech production is a multi-layered cognitive process vulnerable to disruptions at various stages. The study underscores the pedagogical importance of targeted instruction to improve real-time monitoring, morphological accuracy, and phonological precision in EFL learners.

KEYWORDS Morphological Errors, Spoken English, ESL Learners, Speech Production

Introduction

Production of an utterance is a complex, demanding, and ongoing procedure, in which various elements of the mechanism of language creation may fail leading to speech mistakes (Kova and Horga, 2010).

Speech production process includes four principal activities that follow one another on each other in the following manner:

- a) Conceptualization i.e. content planning of the utterance;
- b) Formulation that consists of grammatical, lexical and phonological encoding;
- c) Articulation, the stage that signifies expressive talk and lastly
- d) Self-monitoring which involves checking of accuracy or appropriateness of the utterances made (Kormos, 2006).

Although the planning of contents in the native language can be done with more conscious consideration of the speaker, the generation and expression of contents is automatized or can be done simultaneously and with no involvement of the speaker mentally. Nevertheless, in spite of the automaticity of the mother tongue, the speakers

do not speak like paragons, on the contrary, their speech exhibit various types of disfluency, including hesitations, false starts, repetitions, vowel prolongations, speech errors etc. The speech mistakes refer to aberrations of the communicative intent of a speaker and are a key informant of the intricate processes related to the production of language.

The studies that were conducted on speech faults in the first language (e.g. Fromkin, 1973; Dell and Reich, 1981; Stemberger, 1985; Levelt, 1989; van Hest, 1996; Erdeljac, 2005) and the second language (e.g. Poulisse, 1999; van Hest, 1996) suggested that lexical faults which arise due to the faulty recall of lexemes in the foreign language, on the other hand, errors can either be a way of lack of understanding the language or the semantic chaos behind the communication process (Jaeger, 2005). The occurrence of speech errors has various theories to its cause. Dell (1986) claimed that mistakes of activation in some nodes resulted in speech errors because according to him, realization of a certain unit would also be based on its extent of activation, but on the extent of activation of other units which are incorporated in an associative network. What it implies is that the unit which is realization process has to deactivate at some time in the future so as to clear the place out to accommodate another unit.

Nooteboom (1980) managed to conclude that not all the mistakes can be corrected as half of the errors may not be corrected because of a number of reasons. Sometimes, the mechanism of monitoring does not detect and respond to an error or, in the view of the speaker, redundancy of speech is admissible i.e., the interlocutor has a solid grasp of the message without correction. However, most of the errors are removed without the participation of the interlocutor, and it demonstrates the presence of speech monitoring system and of the feedback loops. They should control the correctness of the speech acts and consequently when the need arises, carry out the correction or the predication of the propositional content.

There has been a greater preoccupation with language production in the last several decades giving rise to many psycholinguistic models which have tried to explain the mechanisms behind such service of language productions which are many in the form of speech error, self-correction and other sub-types of disfluencies.

This study was meant to investigate the frequencies of the different types of errors as well as find out how the type of task influenced the frequency of certain types of errors in the speech of students in technical studies. The paper includes a brief analysis of the results regarding speech errors and self-monitoring as well as the classification of errors based on the outlined model of the specified study. This is followed by the presentation of the research methodology before proceeding to provide the results of the research as well as the consequent findings.

Speech production

Producing speech model

An example of a theory that explains how speech is produced is that of Dell (1986) spreading activation theory. The lexicon that has the non-productive knowledge is regarded in this theory as the network of interconnected and united elements or, the so-called nodes, which is a combination of linguistic units including concepts, words, morphemes, phonemes etc. Following the lexicon conceptual nodes are related to nodes that define the words which in their turn are designated to be related to morphemic

nodes and designate definite morphemes. In addition, morphemic nodes and phonemic nodes exist in a relationship in deciding the phoneme and lastly the phonemic nodes are associated with phonemic feature nodes. The spreading activation is the mechanism that determines the creation of a sentence. In the process of speech processing the node of the needed category (i.e. the word node) is approached, that is, the node with the highest level of activation or arousal. Representational units spread upwards as well as downwards with activation passing between units that have semantic features (Nodes), the nodes that associate with the word or lemma, which is propagated to the phonemic nodes. This implies that there is an activation cascade of one level to another.

The model proposes that there are inhibitory links between the nodes at the same level of processing and hence the relevant selection of the nodes. Dell (1986) and his school assumed that the spread of activation may occur in either direction. This implies that a mischosen and activated node begins to spread activation opposite to this, that is in the bottom up methods. When words of incorrect choice are used, there will be propagation of activation at the level of nodes representing words to conceptual nodes. Assumption is that, the same feedback mechanism likely applies in the perception of speech and hence makes the monitor an inbuilt quality of the process of perception and speech production.

Self-monitoring and speech errors

The failures may be distributed at every stage of speech production, i.e., during lemma retrieving, grammatical and phonological encoding, and articulation. When the monitor detects an error it entails sending an alarm signal to the conceptualizer which in turn sends the same awaited preverbal plan hoping that the fresh message shall now be adequately expressed (Levelt, 1989).

The three fundamental levels of processing, as have been mentioned above include, lexical, syntactic and phonetic errors outlined by Levelt (1983). Lexical errors are simply those related to lexical items, words associated with color, direction, prepositions, articles among others (Levelt, 1989:54). Levelt (1989) implied that when there is the occurrence of a lexical error, it is a lexical representation that has incorrectly been activated that is subsequently articulated. Conclusions made in research about speech errors showed that the errors caused by a flawed L2 lexical are extremely regular (Poulisse, 1993), yet they also frequently happen in the L1 (Dell and Reich, 1981; Fromkin, 1973; 1980; Stemberger, 1985). According to Levelt (1989), content and functional words and collocations and idioms are also treated as a lexical entry in his theory. Misuse of derivational morphology, as in different instead of difference also fall into the lexical error category, since the derivations in the lexicon model of Levelt are categorized as different members in the lexicon. There are syntactic errors such as syntactic structure that results into a deadlock followed by a period during which the speaker is unable to proceed with the utterance (Levelt, 1983:54). Unluckily, Levelt failed to provide an exact definition of phonetic errors and failed to give a description of morphological errors.

Still, the speakers with most of the errors present do not interrupt the speech process as the interlocutor, which indicates the presence of the speech monitoring system.

The detection of erroneous output data is discussed in the perception loop theory postulated by Levelt (1983; 1989). The model incorporates three loops to test the utterance. The initial or idea loop

The preverbal plan is compared to the initial idea of the speaker prior to being delivered to the formulator by (Levelt, 1989; Blackmer and Mitton, 1991). It is charged with the job of evaluating the correctness of the expression i.e. to recognize conceptual mistakes. According to Blackmer and Mitton (1991) and Van Hest (1996), it was found that conceptual errors take place much longer before they are corrected as compared to lexical and phonological errors. It can be described by the hypothesis of the false concept being harder to reject and replace with new one and thus takes more time to correct conviction errors on oneself (Postma, 2000). The second or inner loop involved is the one which monitors phonetic plan or inner speaking before articulation, termed to be covert monitoring (Wheeldon and Levelt, 1995). It enables the speaker to open up the mist before the articulation. The analysis conducted by Nootboom (2010) is made of a sample of experimentally elicited spoonerisms and a sample of speech errors in spontaneous.

Another critical part of the theory of perceptual loop monitoring that Dutch supported by Levelt is that, inner speech and overt speech are being monitored in case of speech errors. It is 200 or 250 ms or perhaps far more, the time between the two depending on the amount of material that is being buffered in inner speech (Hartsuiker and Kolk, 2001). In the absence of the error detection in inner speech, it is quite logical to detect such error in overt speech. Attentional control has presumed to be monitoring the speech errors (Hartsuiker, Kolk and Martensen, 2005) meaning that the person can focus more on inner speech or overt speech. In spite of the absence of the possibility to restart, Postma and Kolk (1993) implied that the articulator possesses an autonomous potential to start over, and will repeat the old program in case it fails to find new data on time. This tends to occur at fast speech rates which do not allow temporary storage and hence hold a high probability of diverting the time until repetition of shorter speech pieces. Overt error detection Presence and capacity of the articulatory buffer manifests in error detecting. Increased talk rate lowers short term storing of speech (Levelt, 1989; Blackmer and Mitton, 1991; Van Hest, 1996). Lastly, an utterance is vetted once it has been articulated thus making up the outer loop of monitoring or acoustic-phonetic processor. Levelt holds that the monitor belongs to the conceptualizer but gets the information through another speech comprehension model, the parser that is linked to mental lexicon. When mistake or unsuitability is noticed in any of the processing stages, the monitor will send the alarm indicating so thus causing the same mechanisms of speech production to occur a second time. To prevent a duplication of knowledge, Levelt takes the view that the same lexicon is used in production and perception of own speech, and the same mechanism is applied of understanding and monitoring the interlocutor through the acoustic-phonetic module.

The comparisons of the speech errors occurring in the native language proved the effectiveness of this theory as compared to the others (e.g. Blackmer and Mitton, 1991; Nootboom, 2005; 2010). Furthermore, the theory of foreign language speech production (e.g. Kormos, 2006) also agreed with this theory and believe that there are no qualitatively different monitoring mechanisms in a foreign language.

Sample

The subject population of the study includes six students of the Bachelors degree of Fatima Jinnah Women University. The learners had all had 12 to 13 years of formal English language training and it was assumed that the instructional background of the participants was extremely much alike as they all alleged that a combined form-focussed and communicative syllabus was taught to them, as a mode of instructions, during their primary as well as secondary schooling. The subjects were selected randomly and no

proficiency test had been conducted prior which was used to identify the level of proficiency.

The data related to errors was gathered through the use of one task that was done in English (L2). All the measurements were obtained in a normal room. It was a better option as compared to an experimentation room since it would help create the informal setting where the tasks were conducted. The respondents sat facing the researcher and in the same table. The microphone cell phone was currently located between the subjects as well as the researcher. All students were audio-recorded individually and thereafter the speech samples were transcribed. As variables in the speech fluency, the errors were recorded through one task.

The students have seen the cartoon JAAN in urdu language. This cartoon was selected based on the considerations that it had not gained a lot of popularity among the subjects and that it contained a lot.

its cognitive effort with regard to discourse organization. Once they had viewed the five minute cartoon, all the subjects individually explained in their own words in English language, the sequence of events as they had seen them. The subject was not restricted by time and got a one-minute preparation time.

Error categorizing and reverse analysis

A taxonomy of errors is constructed on this premise that all prior taxonomies of errors or self correction were built (Levelt, 1983). It is the most comprehensive and the most frequently used system with regard to the reasons why Levelt model is selected. In studying the errors, the definition by Lennon (1991) was applied.

An error is a language form or combination of forms, which, in the same context and on similar conditions is devoid of meaning. The speaker, in all likelihood, would, on his own part never produce conditions of production

Assessing the orphanage is crucial, and this will determine whether they are outstanding or not (Lennon, 1991:182). Based on this definition, the researcher was able to uncover all the potential cases of transcript errors in six students.

The analysis of these errors was done under the error self-repair structure given by Levelt (1983:44) which consist of three stages namely: go again left to.. uh.. go again pink to blue, Original utterance, editing alteration stage, REPAIR

The initial section, i.e. the original utterance of Go from left again to is composed of a problem spot that needs to be rectified (i.e. left). Error can occur in shorter or longer parts of the speech, that is, extending between a misguided phoneme to an entire utterance. The talker can break the speech in the periodical language before or after making it directly explicit.

There is also a possibility of interruption delay. After an interruption, the next few disfluencies may be of various nature including editing terms, silent intervals, prolonging of vowels as the editing phase and lastly the repair. Once the errors were identified all other cases of the wrong statement made were also categorized according to the classification taxonomy.

The primary set of criteria based on which the lexical and grammatical errors were discriminated was the mode of reaching lexical entries. Accessing the lexical entries may be performed through syntactic building processes or may be done on a lemma activation basis with the conceptual specifications. First, the suggestion has been made that derivational and inflectional morphological errors ought to be processed differently. Since derivations (rotate, rotating, rotation) are believed to represent different lexical entries and word-formation is believed to occur during lexical encoding (Levelt et al. 1999), the errors of derivational morphology are supposed to belong to lexical errors. Conversely, inflectional morphemes are encoded and processed at grammatical word encoding level and as such processed as morphological mistakes. Errors lower in the processing such as Lexical errors, syntactical errors, morphological and phonological errors are errors that originate at lower levels of processing whereby conceptual errors (Van Hest, 1996) originates at higher levels of processing and it occurs in response to an erroneous conceptual scheme. Conceptual errors are neither present in the level of Levelt classification system nor in the classification of the present study, since the author considered that it was only through a retrospective analysis that a decisive conclusion could effectively be reached that the error was due to faulty retrieval of lemmas or arose at conceptualization level.

a) Lexical errors

First among the errors to be discussed are lexical errors. Three subcategories of lexical errors have been established: idioms, collocations, functional and content words, errors of derivational morphology and unintentional use of L1 lexemes.

b) Grammar mistakes

i) Syntactic mistakes

The second stage is related to the production of types of speech errors which take place in the stage of grammatical encoding. The types of syntactic errors, which are outlined below, have been made: a) incorrect word order, b) failure to complete what is being said or false start, c) very unacceptable morpho-syntactic- and semantics structure, d) misencoded complements and specifiers, which are accessed through syntactic building procedures

ii) Morphological errors

They include inflexional errors, when the speaker chooses the wrong verb form, incorrect plural of nouns, omitted article, misused article

iii) Phonological mistakes

Phonological encoding and articulation are further processes of speech. Phonological errors primarily were comprised of articulatory clumsiness, and other kinds of phonological errors have not been analyzed, because they could possibly lead to severe complications as they cannot be differentiated systematically, since neither the speaker accent nor his ignorance of phonological forms of lexical entries can be differentiated.

Literature Review

Speech errors have been an unavoidable factor when it comes to both production of a second or foreign language that can be used to create a significant observation on how the human brain works on language learning. Where English as a Foreign Language

(EFL) is concerned, speaking mistakes tend to highlight difficulties encountered by the learners in terms of learning phonological, lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic features of the other language (Levelt, 1983; Fromkin, 1971). Such errors have been a subject of research over a long time to understand how the language is processed, and to guide a pedagogical practice.

Definition and Classification of Errors of Speech

Speech errors are inadvertent distortions in the communication that may appear in a certain piece of spoken language production (Fromkin, 1973). They are broadly divided into several categories which may include phonological slip, lexical mistake, morphological mistake and syntactic mistake (Cutler, 1982). Phonological errors in EFL setting are mostly caused by inability to pronounce the unknown sounds, whereas the lexical errors in EFL are caused by failure to recall the word or by the lack of vocabulary (Clark, Clark, 1977).

Slips of the tongue and Learn English as a second language.

The phenomenon of speech errors among the EFL learners is determined by the processes of interlanguage development as well as the negative effects of first language (L1) (Selinker, 1972). Interlanguage is the dynamic linguistic system developed by the learners, which has the components of both L1, and the targeted language. The study reveals that speech in this stage is not an error but a pattern of development (Gass and Selinker, 2008). Indicatively, a Pakistani student learning English might replace some English consonants with the closest ones in his/her L1 and therefore commit phonological inaccuracies injustice (Rahman, 2010).

Origin of speech errors

There is a number of causes of speech errors among the EFL learners. Anxiety, cognitive processes and time pressure are psychological variables that may interfere with the process of fluent speech production (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994). Possible catastrophes are related to linguistics, such as lack of exposure to genuine input, lack of full control over grammar and vocabulary size (Ellis, 2008). Researchers have also indicated the involvement of language transfer in which L1 structures will determine L2 production in which morphological and syntactic errors will occur (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008).

Phonological and Lexical Mislapse in EFL-Students

One of the most frequent kinds of mistake can be described as phonological, namely the ones that happen; it would occur frequently in the EFL environment where the target language does have some sounds that are not present in the native language of the learners (Major, 2001). Lexical errors are a common aspect of learners who write and use wrong words because of confusing semantics or false cognates (James, 1998). To take an example, Alhaysony (2012) studied the pattern of an Arab EFL learner and observed that phonological substitutions and the use of words with wrong choices were major dents to comprehensibility.

Past Research on Speech Errors in Higher learning Institutions

The studies involving the EFL undergraduate students show the presence of speech errors at the time of advanced stages in the language acquisition process.

Boonthum-Denecke and Srisawasdi (2018) observe that the errors that are experienced in an academic setting can be caused by either impromptu scenarios or rehearsed oral practice. A study conducted among Thai university learners indicated phonological errors as the most significant, ensuing grammatical errors, which indicated that years of English studies did not bring much improvement in accuracy in oral errors (Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013). Likewise, it has been reported that frequent morphological and pronunciation errors are acquired by Pakistani undergraduate students, which, in most of the cases, can be explained by the L1 influence (Nisa & Arif, 2019).

Pedagogical Implications

Recognition of the needs of speech errors and their causes can be used by educators to come up with interventions that address the specific needs. Error analysis can determine the pronunciation practice, boost vocabulary, and grammar. Moreover, it also become possible to decrease the number of errors in speaking, including by means of adopting communicative practice and employing corrective feedback techniques (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Effective teaching of EFL therefore needs to be balanced where considerations are given to influence and accuracy.

Material and Methods

The current study takes the form of qualitative case study research design to explore the nature of the type, frequency, and potential causes of speech error among Bachelor students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Participants are 15 students selected on the basis of purposive sampling method (of the undergraduate Department of English in Fatima Jinnah Women University) who show an active involvement in oral classroom activities. Audio recordings of spontaneous speech were obtained over four weeks (during classroom discussions, oral presentations, and informal interviews) in terms of audio recordings. The recordings were transcribed verbatim and examined with respect to classification of speech errors by Fromkin (1973) consisting of phonological, lexical, morphological and syntactic errors. Error frequencies and qualitative accounts were also included in the analysis to identify trends and possible error causes, which could be L1 interference, overuse of the cognitive resources or not enough exposure to the target language. In order to promote reliability, the researcher carried out peer review of the transcriptions and coding, and ethical implications were addressed by carrying out an informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality.

Theoretical Framework

The research is based on the Error Analysis Theory (Corder, 1967) and Interlanguage Theory (Selinker, 1972) that lead to a balanced vision of the study of speech production of the EFL learners. Error Analysis perceives speech errors as systematic deviations that may give clues to developing linguistics competence of learners and guide instructional decision-making. Interlanguage Theory underlines the fact that the learners fashion an intermediate language system, which is affected by the first language and the target language, which leads to the maintenance of some erroneous behaviour over an extended period of time. Also, the Model of Speech Production by Levelt (1989) is used to explain where the cognitive process that can display speech errors may reside, whether conceptualization, formulation, or articulation. The combination of these frameworks has enabled the study not only to certify errors but also puts them in context

in relation to the overall process of psycholinguistics and the acquisition of second language.

Results and Discussion

Lexical errors

The first type of error to be discussed is lexical errors. Three subcategories of lexical errors have been established:

Unintentional use of L1 lexemes

Speakers unintentionally insert L1 (first language) words when the equivalent L2 (second language) lexical item is momentarily inaccessible.

*Jaan .. **nahi** sorry Mith accidentally spill the juice*
Jaan's (kia kehtay hain story bhool gai)
(naam yaad nai ata)

Misuse of idioms, collocations, functional and content words, errors of derivational morphology

In the given example the subject utters a wrong content word.

*accidentally juice **fell** on the .. shirt of Marth*

In the given example the subject confuses the use of phrasal verbs.

*he did not want to (3 seconds) **take out or take off** that shirt*

Jaan ..show him the picture of fish..picture of him
then their mother..uh.uh call them to drink juice.

Grammatical errors

Grammatical errors were categorized into syntactic, morphological, and article-related issues.

Syntactic Errors

The following subcategories of syntactic errors have been established i.e. unintentional use of first language structure resulting in wrong word order, unfinished expressions or false starts and incorrect plural of nouns and wrong use of pronoun.

Wrong word order

Speakers arrange words incorrectly in a sentence, disrupting the natural syntactic structure of English and affecting clarity.

friend of Jaan Marth .. er er wore a shirt er having er having er.. picture of (3 sec)
flying roaster on his shirt

show him the picture of fish..picture of him

Unfinished expressions or false starts

Speakers begin an utterance but abandon or revise it midway, often indicating hesitation, self-correction, or cognitive overload during speech.

Jaan show him some .. some pictures of er.. him which.. in which he was wearing er shirt.

One of them uh3 sec(naam yaad ai)

In another instance the subject again commits the same error.

then Jaan er er then Jaan told him that and then Jaan then Jaan told him that once you were once once I had a T shirt which had a fish printed on.

Incorrect plural of nouns and Wrong use of Pronoun

They also committed certain errors where they has misused the usage of pronouns. For instance,

*.. cloth are not necessary
their name was Jaan*

Participants have also used wrong pronouns in the description.

*then Jaan told him that once she had a shirt
.. then her mother say that*

Morphological Errors

These errors include the inflectional errors; when the speaker chooses the wrong verb form resulting in misplaced subject verb agreement and wrong use of pronoun and present tense instead of past tense.

Inflectional errors, when the speaker chooses the wrong verb

Speakers use incorrect verb forms, such as wrong tense or subject-verb agreement, due to errors in applying English inflectional rules.

*he was very excited to hear it er er then **their** mother call inside the home.*

*Once two friends Jaan and Myth (Merth) **was** playing in the garden*

*mother **ask** him to er to give her the shirt but he said no, it was his favorite shirt so he **cannot** give it to her and then Jaan **show** him some so they went to the ground and they **play** again.*

*When the mother of Jaan **call** him inside and .. **ask** him to drink the juice and Jaan*

Omitted article

Speakers leave out required articles, typically before singular countable nouns, reflecting gaps in grammatical competence or transfer from article-less L1 structures. Several such instances are,

Several such instances are,

*their mother call them to drink juice.
in which he was wearing er --shirt on which fish was printed
he refused to give her er – shirt*

Misused article

Speakers incorrectly use definite or indefinite articles, often due to L1 interference or incomplete understanding of English article rules.

When **the** mother of Jaan call him inside and .. ask him to drink **the** juice

then their mother call inside **the** home

iii). **Phonological errors**

Phonological errors due to articulatory clumsiness

Phonological errors mainly included articulatory clumsiness in pronouncing name where both the participants called the character Merth as Ma: rth and Mith, and wrong pronunciation e.g saying roaster instead of rooster in example 1.

*Two friends named Jaan and .. **maar marth** (Merth)they were playing .. er flying roaster..*

*Once two friends Jaan and Mith (Merth) was playing in the garden.
Their name was Jaan and Math..Math ..Math*

Self-Monitoring and Repair

Participants have also shown the instances of self monitoring and repair of their errors in speech

*.. Jaan's mother call him..er call them to drink the juice
to her so that she can washed ..wash it..
show him the picture of fish..picture of him*

The purpose of the current study was to classify and identify speech faults made by Fatima Jinnah Women University bachelor's students describing an English-language Urdu cartoon. Six participants' speech samples were transcribed and analysed, and the results were categorised using Levelt's (1983) model of speech production and self-monitoring.

Lexical Errors

Lexical errors were among the most frequently observed error types. These included:

- **Unintentional L1 Lexeme Insertion**, such as "*nahi sorry*" and "*naam yaad nahi ata*," indicating code-switching due to retrieval difficulties.
- **Misuse of Content Words and Phrasal Verbs**, such as "*accidently juice fell*" instead of "*the juice accidentally spilled*", and confusion between "*take off*" and "*take out*."

These results are consistent with other research (e.g., Poulishse, 1993), which indicates that lexical encoding and lemma retrieval are frequently disrupted for second language learners. Such interruptions are exacerbated by reliance on L1 conceptualisation and inadequate exposure to real L2 input.

Grammatical Errors

Grammatical errors were categorized into syntactic, morphological, and article-related issues.

Syntactic Errors

- **Wrong word order** (e.g., *"friend of Jaan Marth"*) and **false starts** were frequent, indicating cognitive overload and disrupted formulation.
- Repetition and restructuring of clauses mid-sentence (e.g., *"then Jaan told him that and then Jaan then Jaan told him..."*) suggest monitoring delays and formulation hesitations.

Morphological Errors

- Frequent **subject-verb agreement** errors (e.g., *"Jaan and Myth was playing"*) reflect underdeveloped grammatical encoding.
- **Incorrect pluralization** (*"cloth are not necessary"*), **pronoun misuse** (*"she had a shirt"* for a male character), and **tense inconsistency** were also prominent.

These grammatical difficulties show that learners still struggle with automatic grammatical processing even after 12–13 years of English instruction. This may be because L2 grammar rules are not procedurally well-organised.

Phonological Errors

- **Articulatory Clumsiness** was evident in mispronunciation of character names (e.g., *"Marth"* pronounced as *"Ma:rth"*, *"Mith,"* or *"Math"*), and lexical items (e.g., *"roaster"* instead of *"rooster"*).
- Such errors illustrate the limitations in phonological encoding and articulation, often influenced by first language phonetic patterns and anxiety during speech.

Self-Monitoring and Repairs

All participants exhibited instances of self-monitoring and repairs, such as:

- *"Jaan's mother call him...er call them to drink the juice to her so that she can washed ..wash it..."*

According to Levelt's perceptual loop theory, this suggests that students have some capacity for internal monitoring. The majority of fixes were made instantly and inside the utterance, indicating that the inner loop (covert monitoring) was used. However, delays and repetitions suggest to occasional outer loop (post-articulatory) reliance, especially when errors were not recognised during planning or inner speech.

Postma (2000) and Van Hest (1996) found that conceptual errors are more difficult to fix because they are at the top of the speech production hierarchy. This is supported by the delay in correction, especially for conceptual errors (e.g., difficulties recalling or rephrasing L1 concepts).

Discussion

This case study shows that even Bachelor students whose first language is not English, who have undergone the formal education process, are still inconsiderable in terms of the speech deviations and mistakes they have endured after several years of

education. The most common errors found were phonological and lexical and the least were the morphological and the syntactic deviations. This can be regarded as the results of the previous studies by Alhaysony (2012) and Nisa and Arif (2019), who commented that the use of phonological substitutions and the presence of the misused word were prevalent among the EFL learners in Saudi Arabia and Pakistan accordingly. Such errors persisting even after many years of instruction implies that pronunciation and lexical access challenges are long-term issues in EFL conditions, which probably are caused by the first language (L1) interference, as well as inadequate access to target language authentic output (Major, 2001; Rahman, 2010).

The analysis also shows that several phonological mistakes were due to the fact that the phonetic patterns in L1 were transferred to the L2 production hence confirming the Interlanguage Theory by Selinker (1972). As an example, consonant clusters and vowel differences that do not exist in the learners first language would be commonly simplified or replaced. This reflects what Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) have observed where they point out that crosslinguistic influence is indeed a very critical determinant in the shaping of learner output. Lexical errors were, in their turn, usually based on semantic approximation and problems of finding the right words, which meant that there were gaps in the active vocabulary of learners, as James (1998) states in his study of error analysis.

The data also indicate the level of influence of performance related factors including cognitive load and speaking anxiety to cause speech errors. There were multiple examples of self-correction and pauses, which coincides with the model of speech monitoring and repair offered by Levelt (1983). Such interventions indicate that students were actively engaged in performance feedback although they did not have the automaticity to enable them produce fluent speech. The present finding is consistent with the analysis of MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) who assert that language anxiety may impede the neurological function of the brain and contribute to breakdowns in L2 communication.

Interestingly, morphology and syntax errors were less prevalent, but they were present in controlled speech (e.g. during presentation), so we may conclude that learners are still struggling with some grammatical formulations possibly in spite of the lesson. This accords with Ellis (2008) argument, that grammatical accuracy can be developed slowly and once proper constraints are not imposed through meanings practice, it becomes prone to fossilization. In addition, the occurrence of the errors in the rehearsed speech presupposes that insufficient possibilities of the participation in genuine communicative activities involving the use of English can be hindering the process of the internalization of the correct forms among learners.

In pedagogical terms, the research results confirm the necessity to implement training in pronunciation, vocabulary dissimilar, and grammar strengthening into EFL training. Yet, these interventions are to be incorporated in the communicative activities minimizing anxiety and stimulating spontaneous speech functioning. An equilibrium between fluency and accuracy is vital in successful language learning as Lightbown and Spada (2013) claim. When constructively applied, error analysis may help teachers collect data that can be used to determine which areas consistently create problems and address those areas.

On the whole, the findings are indicative of the fact that speech mistakes among EFL students are multidimensional, which rely on the interaction of multiple linguistic,

cognitive, and affective factors. They further support the worth of speech error analysis as a diagnostic instrument to learning about interlanguage of the learner and guidance of instructional strategy.

Conclusion

The speech production patterns and error types of Pakistani bachelor's degree students speaking English as a foreign language were investigated in this case study. Several types of speech errors were found using a spontaneous narrative task, including phonological misarticulations, grammatical inconsistencies, lexical retrieval problems, and disfluencies in self-monitoring. The results indicate that despite prolonged exposure to English, the subjects continued to struggle with collocation usage and lexical selection, grammar encoding, particularly syntax and morphology; phonological articulation as a result of L1 interference and real-time speech output monitoring and repair. These difficulties support the idea that speech creation is a multi-layered cognitive activity susceptible to interruptions at different stages, particularly in L2, and are in line with Levelt's speech production model and Dell's spreading activation hypothesis. Furthermore, the study confirms that mistake analysis can guide certain instructional practices and offers insightful information about learners' interlanguage development. For more broadly applicable results, future studies should investigate proficiency-level disparities, increase the sample size, and incorporate quantitative error frequency data.

Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest that targeted pedagogical interventions are essential to address the recurring speech errors identified among EFL learners. Greater emphasis should be placed on improving article usage through contextualised speaking activities that help learners overcome omission and misuse. Similarly, explicit training in subject-verb agreement and correct word order, delivered through communicative grammar exercises, can enhance grammatical accuracy. To strengthen lexical retrieval and minimise L1 interference, learners should be provided with increased exposure to authentic spoken English via films, podcasts, and interactive tasks. Pronunciation drills and phonological awareness activities can help reduce articulatory errors, while structured opportunities for self-monitoring during speaking tasks can train students to detect and correct their errors in real time. Collectively, these measures can contribute to improving morphological accuracy, phonological precision, and overall fluency in EFL learners' oral production.

References

- Abutalebi, J., Cappa, S. F., & Perani, D. (2001). The bilingual brain as a function of functional neuroimaging. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 4(2), 179–190. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S136672890100027X>
- Abutalebi, J., Cappa, S. F., & Perani, D. (2005). What can functional neuroimaging tell us about the bilingual brain? In J. Kroll & A. M. B. De Groot (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingualism: Psycholinguistic perspectives* (pp. 497–515). Oxford University Press.
- Alhaysony, M. (2012). An analysis of article errors among Saudi female EFL students: A case study. *Asian Social Science*, 8(12), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n12p55>
- Al-Subaihi, A. A. (2000). A Monte Carlo study of the Friedman and Conover tests in the single-factor repeated measures design. *Statistical Research*, 7, 1–30.
- Avery, P., & Radišić, M. (2007). Accounting for variability in the acquisition of English articles. In A. Belikova, L. Meroni, & M. Umeda (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America (GALANA)* (pp. 1–12). Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Blackmer, E. R., & Mitton, J. L. (1991). Theories of monitoring and the timing of repairs in spontaneous speech. *Cognition*, 39(3), 173–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(91\)90052-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(91)90052-6)
- Boonthum-Denecke, C., & Srisawasdi, P. (2018). Analysis of speech errors in EFL presentations. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(4), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n4p44>
- Clark, H. H., & Clark, E. V. (1977). *Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Cutler, A. (1982). *Slips of the tongue and language production*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- De Smedt, K., & Kempen, G. (1987). Incremental sentence production, self-correction and coordination. In G. Kempen (Ed.), *Natural language generation: Recent advances in artificial intelligence, psychology and linguistics* (pp. 365–376). Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dell, G. S. (1986). A spreading activation theory of retrieval in sentence production. *Psychological Review*, 93(3), 283–321. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.93.3.283>
- Dell, G. S., & Reich, P. A. (1981). Stages in sentence production: An analysis of speech error data. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 20(6), 611–629. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(81\)90202-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(81)90202-4)
- Demšar, J. (2006). Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7, 1–30.
- Ekiert, M. (2007). The acquisition of grammatical marking of indefiniteness with the indefinite article *a* in L2 English. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 7(1), 1–43.

- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Field, A. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. SAGE Publications.
- Fromkin, V. A. (1971). The non-anomalous nature of anomalous utterances. *Language*, 47(1), 27-52. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412187>
- Fromkin, V. A. (1973). *Speech errors as linguistic evidence*. Mouton.
- Fromkin, V. A. (Ed.). (1980). *Errors in linguistic performance*. Academic Press.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Longman.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Routledge.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, 14(1), 41-104. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(83\)90026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(83)90026-4)
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44(2), 283-305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1994.tb01103.x>
- Major, R. C. (2001). *Foreign accent: The ontogeny and phylogeny of second language phonology*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nisa, S., & Arif, M. (2019). A study of speech errors committed by Pakistani undergraduate students. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(3), 195-205. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n3p195>
- Rahman, T. (2010). *Language policy, multilingualism and language vitality in Pakistan*. Quaid-i-Azam University Press.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10(1-4), 209-232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- Watcharapunyawong, S., & Usaha, S. (2013). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 67-78. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p67>