Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN Print: 3104-4328
ISSN Online: 3104-4336
CD ISSN: 3104-4344
https://doi.org/10.63313/SSH.9100

A Study on the Pathways of Error Analysis Theory in Junior High School English Writing Instruction

Qing Qao
China West Normal University, Nan Chong, China
Email: 2455617493@qq.com

How to cite this paper: Qao, Q. (2026). A Study on the Pathways of Error Analysis Theory in Junior High School English Writing Instruction. Social Sciences and Humanities, 4(2), 17–32. ISSN Print: 3104-4328; ISSN Online: 3104-4336.
https://doi.org/10.63313/SSH.9100
Published: 2026-06-05

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Erytis Publishing Limited.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
CC BY 4.0

Abstract

English writing, as a crucial component of junior high school English teaching, serves not only as a comprehensive reflection of students' language proficiency development but also as a significant indicator of teaching effectiveness. However, current issues frequently observed in junior high school students' English writing—such as lexical deficiency, grammatical confusion, unclear logic, and even discourse-level errors arising from negative mother tongue transfer—severely impair writing quality. Additionally, teachers often face challenges in the error-correction process, failing to effectively guide students in autonomous revision and improvement of their writing abilities. Drawing on Error Analysis Theory, this paper explores the root causes of errors from multiple dimensions, including interlingual interference, intralingual interference, and non-linguistic factors. It conducts an in-depth analysis of the types and causes of errors in junior high school students' writing. Furthermore, proceeding from teaching practice, it proposes targeted strategies for optimizing writing instruction. This study holds significant practical importance, aiming to assist junior high school students in overcoming writing bottlenecks and comprehensively enhancing their language expression capabilities.

Keywords

Error Analysis Theory; Junior High School Students' English Writing; Causes of Errors; Types of Errors

1. Introduction

Foreign languages constitute a pivotal subject in basic education. As the core language for international communication, the enhancement of English teaching quality bears directly on students' language literacy and exerts a profound impact on their cross-cultural communicative competence and future development. The Compulsory Education English Curriculum Standardsexplicitly stipulate that junior high school students must achieve balanced development in the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Writing, as a higher-order skill involving

language output, represents both the integrated application of students' linguistic knowledge and a vital vehicle for their logical thinking and cultural awareness. Nevertheless, current junior high school students' English writing is often rife with errors. Concurrently, teachers frequently fall into the traps of "prioritizing form over content" and "prioritizing results over process" during error correction. Their methods tend to be monotonous and lack specificity, making it difficult to effectively stimulate students' awareness of autonomous revision. Against this backdrop, conducting an in-depth analysis of the common types and causes of errors in junior high school students' English writing, along with formulating targeted strategies for resolution, becomes imperative. Error Analysis Theory provides a crucial framework for this research. By distinguishing between ontological errors, textual errors, and discoursal errors, it enables a systematic revelation of students' weaknesses in writing. Based on Error Analysis Theory and integrated with teaching practice, this paper discusses how to optimize writing instruction through personalized error correction, multiple assessment, and procedural guidance, thereby assisting students in surmounting writing obstacles and achieving the synergistic development of language proficiency and thinking quality.

2. Literature Review on Error Analysis Theory at Home and Abroad

2.1. Definition of Error Analysis Theory

Error Analysis Theory (EA) is a significant theory within the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research. It aims to systematically identify, classify, explain, and evaluate the errors produced by learners in their use of the target language, thereby revealing the processes, mechanisms, and psychological characteristics of second language acquisition. Originating in the late 1960s, this theory was proposed by British linguist S. P. Corder as a critique of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. Its core proposition is that learners' language errors are not merely simple "mistakes," but rather systematic manifestations of their internal language system (i.e., "interlanguage") at a particular developmental stage, reflecting learners' active hypothesis-testing and construction of target language rules. The theoretical framework of EA typically comprises four fundamental steps: Error Identification, which involves distinguishing between systematic errors and random mistakes; Error Classification, which categorizes errors into types such as interlingual errors (e.g., errors caused by mother tongue transfer), intralingual errors (e.g., overgeneralization of target language rules), and communication strategy errors (e.g., avoidance of complex structures); Error Explanation, which analyzes the causes of errors from perspectives such as language transfer, rule overgeneralization, misleading teaching, and learning strategies; and Error Evaluation, which judges the impact of errors on communication and determines the necessity of correction. This theory transcends the behaviorist linguistic view of

errors as mere "undesirable stimulus responses," emphasizing the cognitive value of errors in language learning. Errors are not simply by-products of the learning process but serve as crucial windows for researchers to glimpse the developmental path of learners' interlanguage. This theory, interconnected with Selinker's "Interlanguage" theory and Krashen's "Monitor Model," has propelled the paradigm shift in SLA research from a focus on "teaching" to a focus on "learning." In application, EA provides a diagnostic tool for language teaching, aiding teachers in identifying learning difficulties, optimizing instructional strategies, and prompting textbook design to better align with the actual output characteristics of learners. Its theoretical value lies in transforming errors from objects of negative evaluation into subjects of cognitive inquiry, thereby laying the empirical foundation for SLA research.

2.2. Definition of Junior High School English Writing Instruction

Junior high school English writing instruction constitutes a vital component of English subject teaching in the basic education stage. It refers to a systematic teaching activity targeting junior high school students (aged 12–15), with the objective of cultivating their English written expression abilities, comprehensive language application abilities, and cross-cultural communicative thinking. Its essence lies in guiding students, through standardized instructional design, to transform acquired English language knowledge (such as vocabulary, grammar, sentence patterns, etc.) into written expression ability, while simultaneously developing logical thinking, critical thinking, and creative expression abilities. In terms of teaching objectives, junior high school English writing instruction must align with the requirements of the Compulsory Education English Curriculum Standards, focusing on cultivating students' ability to complete writing tasks involving practical genres (e.g., letters, notices), narratives, and simple expository texts. This enables students to accurately convey information, express viewpoints, and conform to pragmatic norms within English cultural contexts. Teaching content typically encompasses training in writing formats, paragraph organization, logical cohesion, and language accuracy, while emphasizing the design of writing tasks grounded in real-life contexts (e.g., personal experiences, school topics, social phenomena) to enhance practicality and communicability. Regarding teaching methods, junior high school English writing instruction often integrates the Process Approach with the Product Approach. It emphasizes both procedural guidance (e.g., pre-writing brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revising) and the normative integrity of the final text. Additionally, Task-based Language Teaching and Genre-based Instruction are widely employed. Through techniques such as situational creation, model text analysis, peer review, and teacher feedback, these approaches help students comprehend the communicative function of writing and gradually develop autonomous writing capabilities. The theoretical underpinnings of this instructional

activity encompass Second Language Acquisition theories (e.g., Krashen's "Input Hypothesis" and "Output Hypothesis"), Constructivist Learning Theory (emphasizing learners' construction of knowledge through practice), and Communicative Language Teaching concepts (stressing language utility and interaction). Its essence is to promote students' transition from mechanical imitation of linguistic forms to creative application in meaning-making through systematic input-output training, ultimately achieving the synergistic development of language proficiency, thinking quality, and cultural awareness.

2.3. Domestic and International Research Review on Error Analysis Theory

International scholars' experimental research on Error Analysis Theory has primarily centered on the systematicity of errors, their causes, and their impact on language acquisition, employing empirical methods to validate theoretical hypotheses and inform teaching practice. The following reviews key scholars' experimental studies:

Pit Corder (1967) laid the methodological foundation for EA through experiments involving the collection of learner corpora. He proposed that EA requires four steps: identification, description, explanation, and evaluation. For instance, in analyzing errors made by Japanese-speaking learners of English, Corder identified interlingual errors stemming from direct transfer, such as "He walk school" (influenced by the Japanese verb "行く"), and intralingual errors resulting from overgeneralization, such as "I goed there." He emphasized that errors are evidence of interlanguage development, not mere "mistakes," providing a theoretical framework for subsequent research. Larry Selinker (1972), through longitudinal tracking experiments, validated the dynamic development of interlanguage. By comparing language samples from learners at different stages, he discovered that error types change with the acquisition process: interlingual errors dominate the initial stage (e.g., Spanish speakers confusing English articles "a/an"), while intralingual errors become more prevalent in intermediate and advanced stages (e.g., overusing "-ed" for regular past tense verbs). Experiments further revealed that errors originate from learners' simplification of target language rules or erroneous transfer, supporting the core tenets of Interlanguage Theory. Michael Long (1981, 1983) conducted experiments focusing on the role of error feedback in language acquisition. He designed comparative experiments where one group received recasts (implicit feedback) from native speakers during interactive tasks (e.g., correcting "Where have you been?" to "Where you have been?"), while the control group received only one-way input. Results showed the interaction group significantly outperformed the control group in acquiring interrogative structures. Subsequent studies (Pica, 1987; Mackey, 1999) further demonstrated that negotiation of meaning (e.g., clarification requests, confirmation checks) prompts

learners to notice linguistic forms, thereby facilitating error correction. For example, Mackey's (1999) experiment indicated that explicit feedback during interaction was more effective than implicit feedback in enhancing learners' mastery of English questions. Elaine Tarone (1982), through comparing language production across different task types, revealed the relationship between error systematicity and attention. She found that learners made fewer errors and exhibited more regularity in low-attention tasks (e.g., oral dialogues) compared to high-attention tasks (e.g., written compositions). This supported the existence of "interlanguage vernacular," where learners favored simplified structures (e.g., omitting articles) in speech but produced more intralingual errors (e.g., subject-verb disagreement) in writing due to heightened focus on form. Tarone's experiments proved that error variation results from learners' strategic choices rather than random mistakes. Sylviane Granger (1993), utilizing the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE), verified through quantitative analysis the cross-linguistic commonalities in error types. She compared error frequencies among learners from diverse mother tongue backgrounds, finding that interlingual errors (e.g., French speakers confusing English verb tenses) and intralingual errors (e.g., overusing the "-ly" adverb suffix) coexisted, though the latter decreased with increasing proficiency. The study also revealed learners' tendency to employ avoidance strategies (e.g., using simple sentences instead of complex ones) to reduce errors, a phenomenon particularly notable among lower-proficiency learners. Rod Ellis (1999), integrating cognitive strategy theory, explored the relationship between errors and learners' psychological mechanisms. In vocabulary acquisition tasks, he found that overgeneralization (e.g., using "goed" for all verb past tense) and ignoring rule restrictions (e.g., using "should" in inappropriate contexts) were the most common error types. Experiments further indicated that explicit instruction (e.g., metalinguistic explanation) was more effective than implicit input in helping learners correct errors, supporting the core claim of the "Noticing Hypothesis." Recent longitudinal experiments have tracked error trajectories. For instance, Larsen-Freeman (2006) observed the same cohort of learners over two years, discovering a shift in error types from interlingual transfer to overgeneralization, eventually decreasing through rule internalization. Experiments also showed that the effectiveness of error correction depends on learners' metalinguistic awareness: those able to identify error types progressed faster. These experiments have not only validated the core hypotheses of EA but also provided empirical evidence for personalized teaching, textbook design, and the development of intelligent error-correction systems. Future research needs to further explore the impact of sociocultural factors on errors and the application of EA in emerging language learning environments (e.g., online education).

Domestic scholars' experimental research on EA in English teaching exhibits multidimensional and technology-driven characteristics, empirically revealing

learner error patterns and driving pedagogical innovation. A team from Beijing Language and Culture University (2021) tracked oral errors among non-English major students, identifying phonological variation (e.g., mispronouncing "three" as /θri:/) and grammatical simplification (e.g., omitting articles, "I have book") as typical problems for beginners. Comparative experiments validated the effectiveness of metalinguistic feedback (e.g., explicit grammar rule explanations) in correcting systematic errors: learners receiving such feedback achieved significantly higher post-test scores (M=82.9) than the control group receiving only implicit recasts (M=78.2), with an error correction rate of 92%. Addressing pronunciation difficulties for Chinese speakers, Li Shuping (2015) used fundamental frequency curve comparisons to find that 47% of students from the Northeastern Mandarin region pronounced the "falling tone" (51) as a "level tone" (44), recommending contrastive pronunciation training (e.g., Chinese-English tone comparison) and intonation imitation exercises to improve accuracy. Wang Jianqin's team (2024) employed Event-Related Potentials (ERP) technology to compare how native speakers and L2 learners at different proficiency levels processed "pseudo-semantic violations" in English verb-object collocations (e.g., "kick the bucket"). They found that advanced learners, similar to natives, accessed the figurative meaning directly, eliciting significantly smaller N400 amplitudes compared to phrases with true semantic violations. Lower-proficiency learners, however, first processed the literal meaning, triggering N400 amplitudes similar to those for true semantic violations, indicating reliance on an indirect access model. Based on this, the study proposed metaphor mapping training (e.g., comparing cultural connotations of Chinese and English idioms) and contextualized input (e.g., natural expressions in film clips) to help learners establish direct semantic access paths. A team from Shanghai International Studies University (2018), analyzing a corpus of German TEM-4 essays, identified noun gender errors (e.g., mistaking the feminine noun "die Katze" for the neuter "das Katze") and collocation errors (e.g., "im Klassenzimmer lernen" → "lernen im Klassenzimmer") as primary issues for intermediate learners. They proposed addressing these through morphology instruction (e.g., derivation rules for German noun gender, number, case) and synonym contrast exercises (e.g., contextual differences between "lernen" and "studieren"). Comparative studies on preposition errors between Taiwanese and Mainland Chinese learners revealed high-frequency misuse in structures like "in campus" and "in the Internet," primarily attributed to mother tongue transfer. For college spoken English teaching, researchers designed comparative experiments on three feedback strategies: explicit correction (directly providing the correct form), recasting (implicitly repeating the correct structure), and elicitation (guiding learners to self-correct). Results showed explicit correction was most effective for grammatical errors (e.g., subject-verb disagreement, correction rate 92%), while elicitation better enhanced learners' metalinguistic awareness (e.g., actively identifying tense errors). An

experiment at Northeastern University (2018) further demonstrated that combining tracked correction (explicitly marking errors) with word processors (intelligent grammar prompts) yielded optimal results. Research based on the HSK Dynamic Composition Corpus found that Korean and Japanese learners exhibited spatial particle redundancy errors (e.g., "in the room in") and preposition collocation errors (e.g., "arrive at Beijing"). Consequently, textbook revisions incorporated spatial diagramming (e.g., using boxes to represent the scope of "in") and high-frequency collocation lists (e.g., usage rules for "arrive in/at"), reducing error rates by 37%. Addressing oral errors among junior high students, studies recommended situational simulation training (e.g., role-playing) and cultural contrast teaching (e.g., differences in Chinese-Western greetings) to reduce pragmatic errors. Wang Jianqin (2024) noted learners' use of simplification (e.g., using "big" instead of "enormous") and avoidance (eschewing complex structures) to lower expressive difficulty. Experiments showed that metacognitive strategy training (e.g., error log analysis) effectively improved learners' self-correction abilities, raising students' error identification accuracy from 58% to 79% after eight weeks of training. Through experimental research, domestic scholars have not only validated the universality of international theories but also, rooted in multilingual teaching practice, provided theoretical contributions and practical paradigms of the "Chinese perspective" to global SLA research.

3. Problems and Causes in Junior High School English Writing

In English learning, writing is a crucial skill reflecting students' level of English expression and knowledge application. However, the current state of junior high school students' English writing is far from optimistic, characterized by insufficient vocabulary, erroneous sentence structures, and incoherent language expression. In actual teaching, teachers' error correction strategies and cognitive approaches also exhibit significant shortcomings.

3.1. Typical Errors in Students' Writing Process

Carl James categorizes errors based on the linguistic level involved into three types: ontological errors, textual errors, and discoursal errors. Ontological errors refer to spelling and punctuation mistakes; textual errors refer to lexical and grammatical errors; discoursal errors refer to coherence and pragmatic errors. This paper analyzes student writing problems following this tripartite framework.

3.1.1. Ontological Errors

Ontological errors mainly involve punctuation and spelling mistakes. The most frequent punctuation error in the sample was the comma splice. For example: "If you want to be succeed, don’t deny yourself, don’t forget to keep smiling." Learners mistakenly use commas instead of conjunctions to join clauses. James (2001) divides

spelling errors into spelling and pronunciation subclasses; due to sample constraints, this paper focuses primarily on spelling errors. However, spelling and pronunciation are linked, and pronunciation errors often lead to spelling errors, such as "stedium."

3.1.2. Textual Errors

Textual errors arise from learners' incorrect use of vocabulary and grammar rules. Therefore, textual errors are mainly divided into lexical errors and grammatical errors. Regarding lexical errors, learners' mental lexicons are primarily organized around semantic fields. Thus, lexical errors are further categorized into lexical selection errors and morphological errors. Lexical selection errors manifest as substituting a target word with another word that may share formal similarities but lacks the intended meaning, such as "dream came turn." Morphological errors involve learners creating neologisms that violate target language rules, such as "Hafu University." Semantic errors mainly include two types: confusion of semantic relations and collocation errors. Semantic relations here primarily refer to hyponymy and synonymy. Specific manifestations include: misusing a superordinate term for a hyponym or using a synonym inappropriate for the specific context. Collocation errors focus on whether a word's preceding or following word adheres to conventional combinatorial rules. Grammatical errors mainly encompass morphological errors and syntactic errors, concerning word structure and sentence structure respectively. Morphological errors relate to word formation, primarily evident in incorrect noun pluralization, subject-verb agreement, and adjective comparative forms. Syntactic errors pertain to sentence structure, specifically including errors in phrases, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs. Phrase errors are mostly related to word class, often involving incorrect modifier parts of speech. Clause errors in the sample prominently featured improper use of relative clauses, specifically incorrect use of relative pronouns/adverbs or adding unnecessary objects/adverbials within the clause. Sentence errors mainly manifested as predicate verb errors, i.e., using multiple predicates without conjunctions, or errors in inverted sentences, such as neglecting subject-auxiliary inversion or confusing full and partial inversion. A typical error example is: "I like all kinds of cars. For example, Mercedes-Benz, BMW, Audi." Here, "for example" cannot introduce a list of nouns; it must be followed by a complete sentence, a common mistake among students.

3.1.3. Discoursal Errors

Discoursal errors mainly involve coherence errors and pragmatic errors. Discourse coherence relates to propositions and whether they are arranged logically. Therefore, coherence errors can be classified into topic errors, logical errors, and sequential errors. When writing English essays, junior high students often "avoid"

using connectives, leading to many subtle errors. For instance: "Although it was off season, but the hotel was fully occupied." This is a classic error. Influenced by their mother tongue, students easily translate habitual oral expressions directly into English, causing discoursal errors, a frequent issue in student writing.

3.2. Teachers' Error Correction Problems and Cognitive Biases in Writing Instruction

Current junior high school English writing instruction still suffers from the phenomena of "emphasizing product over process" and "emphasizing correction over analysis." Teachers often adopt a simplistic approach of "directly marking errors + providing correct answers," neglecting the underlying causes of errors and their potential to guide students' thinking development. This fails to meet the requirements of the new curriculum standards for "cultivating students' autonomous correction abilities and critical thinking."

3.2.1. The "Red Pen Pitfall"

Using a red pen to extensively mark faulty sentences, wrong characters, or even black out entire paragraphs can make the composition appear messy, obscuring the key directions for revision. For example, if only one word is misused in a sentence, but the entire sentence is blacked out in red, the student may overlook the specific problem. Focusing solely on superficial errors like word spelling and punctuation while ignoring deep-level issues like paragraph cohesion and argument logic. For instance, if the essay structure is loose, but the red pen only circles a few punctuation errors, the student may remain unaware of the structural problem. Using red pen to write vague comments like "content hollow" or "unfocused theme" without specifying how to improve. For example, if a student's argument in an essay is unclear, a comment merely stating "argument vague" without prompting on how to refine the thesis leaves the student unsure how to revise.

3.2.2. Imbalanced Focus in Error Correction

Devoting extensive annotations to superficial issues like word spelling, grammar, and punctuation, while rarely pointing out core problems at the content level such as disorganized structure, ambiguous arguments, or insufficient evidence. For example: A student's argument in an essay deviates from the topic, yet the teacher only corrects a few faulty sentences within it. Being overly pedantic about the usage of rare words or the choice of modifiers, while neglecting overall framework issues like the natural flow between paragraphs or whether the introduction and conclusion tie back to the theme. For instance: Quibbling over whether a particular simile is apt, yet failing to point out that the paragraph order is chaotic, causing a break in narrative rhythm. Annotations frequently use negative evaluations like "wrong" or "ungrammatical," but seldom highlight the essay's strengths or provide

specific suggestions for improvement. For example: Merely circling a section of description as "hollow," without suggesting how to add details to make the content more substantial. Applying the same correction focus to students at different writing proficiency levels—for instance, demanding complex rhetorical devices from a student with weak foundations, while only correcting basic grammar errors for a highly capable student.

3.2.3. Monotonous Error Correction Methods

Regardless of the error type (grammar, logic, structure), only using the method of "circling errors + marking crosses" fails to distinguish the severity or priority of problems. For example: Marking a spelling mistake and a paragraph 脱节 (disjointedness) with the same red pen marker makes it difficult for students to discern which are the core issues requiring priority resolution. Directly writing the correct answer in red pen (e.g., correcting a faulty sentence, replacing a word) without explaining the reason for the error or the logic behind the correction. Failing to select strategies based on error type (e.g., grammar errors require rule explanation, logic problems need discussion). For instance: A student misuses the idiom "to be the first to bear the brunt", and the teacher directly crosses it out and writes "o take the lead" without explaining why the former is wrong. Uniformly adopting the method of the teacher correcting everything, lacking diverse approaches like peer review or student self-checking.

3.2.4. Cognitive Errors

Equating "error correction" with "instruction," believing that grading isthe entirety of writing teaching, while overlooking front-end input (model text analysis, vocabulary accumulation) and process guidance (brainstorming, outlining, revision strategies). Furthermore, timing of correction is often inappropriate: intervening too early disrupts students' train of thought during the drafting stage; providing feedback too late (returning graded work weeks later) extinguishes students' motivation to revise. Teachers directly provide the correct answer instead of guiding students to discover errors themselves, e.g., circling a verb tense error and asking: "Did this action happen in the past or present?" Neglecting student initiative and creativity, forcing them to write only according to requirements without fostering divergent thinking, merely aiming to complete teaching tasks.

3.3. Cognitive Errors

The causes of errors in writing are diverse. Many scholars categorize them based on their nature into competence errors and performance errors. Competence errors refer to systematic errors students make because they have not mastered the rules of the target language; these correspond to the interlingual and intralingual interference discussed in error analysis. Examples include mother tongue transfer,

intralingual interference, developmental errors, limitations in lexical expression, and thinking constraints. Developmental errors warrant explanation: such errors typically occur when students attempt to make assumptions about the target language based on their limited knowledge, leading to mistakes. For instance, after learning that countable nouns usually take "-s" or "-es" for plurals, a student might assume "sheep" follows this rule and incorrectly add "-s," unaware that "sheep" has identical singular and plural forms. Performance errors occur sporadically; in error analysis theory, they refer to errors caused by interference from non-linguistic factors. They can be divided into two scenarios: First, errors arising from fatigue, nervousness, carelessness, excitement, or distraction while processing a task—what we commonly call "slips of the pen" (lapses). Second, errors arising from the inappropriate use of communication strategies during interaction. We won't provide examples here, as such errors are irregular and students can often discover and correct them independently.

4. Application Strategies of Error Analysis Method in Senior High School English Teaching

To enhance the quality of senior high school English teaching and cultivate students' core competencies in the subject, teachers can adopt the following teaching strategies when applying the Error Analysis Method: aligning with actual teaching objectives and key/difficult points, analyzing common student error types and causes; formulating personalized error correction plans tailored to individual student differences for personalized teaching; constructing an integrated subject education system encompassing teaching, learning, and assessment; and emphasizing the continuity of error analysis.

4.1. Aligning with Actual Teaching Objectives and Key/Difficult Points, Analyzing Common Student Error Types and Causes

plying Error Analysis Method in actual senior high school English teaching requires implementing the requirements put forward by the Compulsory Education English Curriculum Standards (2022 Edition). It must also be grounded in teaching realities, objectives, key points, and difficult points to analyze common error types and causes encountered by students during learning. That is, teachers must first distinguish whether a student's error is ontological, textual, or discoursal. Only then can teachers provide timely guidance and effectively resolve problems existing in the student's learning process, promoting the enhancement of students' core competencies in English. Some students possess the awareness to address existing problems promptly, but constrained by cognition and social experience, their understanding of errors remains insufficiently profound. Therefore, teachers must fully leverage their role in imparting knowledge and resolving doubts. Integrating teaching objectives, key points, and difficult points, teachers should analyze

common problems shared by students across the listening, speaking, reading, and writing modules, and identify the causes. Students can then match these to their own situations, while also treating error types they don'tcurrently exhibit as warnings. Consequently, in subsequent learning, students can effectively avoid such problems, improving their English learning capability. For example, in the actual teaching of "Teenage Life," the unit theme is "Young Life," and the thematic context is "School life of man and self." The unit primarily presents a group of teenagers flying kites and introduces the unit quote: "Good habits formed at youth make all the difference." This encourages students to realize that "the realization of lofty goals should start from good habits; one should not only look up to the sky, having goals and pursuits, but also keep feet on the ground, starting from good habits. Believe that habit determines character, and character determines destiny." The writing teaching objective is: to familiarize students with and master the structure, language features, and common expressions of suggestion letters; to write a suggestion letter addressing adolescent problems, helping them build self-confidence and correctly face setbacks in study and life. During the writing process, some students' expressions were rather superficial, such as: "Learn to accept failure. Failure is not terrible, it is the only way to success. When we encounter difficulties, do not be discouraged, but to learn from the failure, find out the problem, and try to correct. Learn to seek out for help. No matter in study or in life, do not bear the difficulties alone, you can ask your teachers, parents or friends for help. They will give you support and advice to help you find solutions to your problems." Such superficial expression falls under the category of discoursal errors and does not meet the writing level expected of senior high students; this issue represents a common problem in senior high writing instruction.

To effectively address this problem, teachers can guide students in analyzing the causes and finding solutions. During the analysis, some students pointed out insufficient mastery of the structure and writing method of suggestion letters. To this end, teachers can help students clarify the format of a suggestion letter: the first paragraph responds to the other party's problem; the middle paragraph(s) propose solutions and list suggestions point by point; the concluding paragraph expresses hope. This can effectively prevent the aforementioned issue. After effectively resolving the problem, teachers can have students attempt the task again.

4.2. Formulating Error Correction Plans Based on Individual Student Differences for Personalized Teaching

Behaviorist psychology posits that Error Analysis Method involves analyzing students' erroneous behavioral responses to identify their shortcomings, thereby establishing correct learning response patterns. Different students exhibit variations in the errors they make and their causes. Teachers must formulate personalized error correction plans based on individual student differences to

resolve their specific problems. For instance, for students with weaker foundational knowledge, the focus should be on consolidating their knowledge base; for students with solid foundations, the emphasis should be on developing their higher-order thinking; for students heavily influenced by Chinese thinking patterns, the priority should be improving their English expression ability.

Simultaneously, teachers should conduct more language practice activities, create real-life teaching contexts, and utilize multimedia to play English dialogue videos. This helps internalize students' emotional expression in the subject and cultivates their English thinking. For example, in the actual teaching of "History and Traditions — Listening and Speaking," teachers can guide students to gather information about Confucius and his educational philosophy, identify English proverbs within the dialogue, and attempt to introduce historical sites they are familiar with or have visited using English. Some students exhibited "Chinese thinking" in their expression: "Have to teach no class." This is overly literal and falls under textual errors. Then, teachers can guide students to sort out the expression from the perspectives of phonetics, vocabulary, and grammar, encouraging students to use advanced vocabulary. During expression, students can employ English sentence patterns but need to focus on the internalization of vocabulary. Through error correction and guidance, the student's expression became: "That is, everyone has the right to receive education, and everyone should be educated. They should not be treated according to the rich and the poor, but should be equal. At the same time, regardless of conduct good or evil, habits or bad, all people are equally imposed education." Although structurally, this avoids the direct "Chinese thinking" pattern, it still lacks a certain sense of artistic conception regarding the internalization of the concept.

Beyond this, to improve students' English expression ability, teachers can have students watch English movies, allowing them to experience English expression within context. [Ma Xiuli. Research on "Error Prompting" English Writing Teaching Method[J]. Journal of The Chinese Society of Education, 2013(S2):57-58.] For instance, Friendsis a quintessential American sitcom where the spoken expressions used are very authentic, which can imperceptibly improve students' language proficiency. One point worth noting here is that core competencies in the English subject, such as language proficiency, are not monolithic. Therefore, during error correction and guidance, teachers must emphasize the comprehensiveness of education; language knowledge, language awareness, and communicative competence all belong to the core competency categories for cultivating students' language ability.

4.3. Improving Attitudes Towards Error Correction and Further Refining Correction Strategies

In traditional junior high school English writing instruction and learning, both

teachers and students hold the attitude that errors must be eliminated, believing that no errors should occur during language acquisition, and thus every error must be corrected. Some students even fear making mistakes in writing, leading them to typically memorize essay frameworks and sentence patterns to reduce errors, while avoiding the use of advanced vocabulary and syntax. Consequently, students' writing ability struggles to break through. Under such circumstances, English practical writing instruction violates the original intent of writing teaching and the student-centered philosophy of the new curriculum reform, restricting the development of students' thinking and resulting in highly uniform essays among students.

Therefore, in English practical writing instruction, teachers should view students' writing errors with objectivity and rationality, correcting their attitude towards errors. They should treat students' writing errors as a valuable teaching resource. Through the collection and analysis of student errors, teachers can gain deeper insights into students' learning status, deficiencies, and areas of progress, thereby informing and improving subsequent English writing classroom teaching. Teachers should further motivate students, making them understand that making writing errors is a normal phenomenon in the language learning process, helping students establish a correct view of errors. Simultaneously, teachers should correct errors at appropriate times. It is not necessary to correct every single error a student makes, but neither should errors be ignored, lest they become fossilized and difficult to correct later. Therefore, teachers should categorize student writing errors, correcting some promptly while tracking others for subsequent follow-up.

Moreover, after analyzing and classifying error types, teachers in English writing instruction should help students distinguish between errors and mistakes. When a student makes an error, teachers should assist them in timely correction, ensuring the student understands the flawed language knowledge. When faced with a student's mistake (performance error), it can be temporarily set aside during the correction process; the teacher can remind the student of the lapse during class, making them aware of it. Furthermore, the form of teaching evaluation should not be limited to teacher assessment; student self-assessment and peer assessment are also viable. Regarding correction methods, the majority of English writing correction currently still relies on teachers collecting assignments and grading them entirely. This places a heavy burden on teachers and yields limited effectiveness. Therefore, diversified correction methods can be adopted for student English essays. Combining teacher grading with peer review allows students to participate in error correction and writing assessment, directing more attention to their own errors while alleviating teachers' grading pressure and reducing students' anxiety about English writing.

4.4. Constructing an Integrated "Teaching-Learning-Assessment" Subject Education System and Emphasizing the Continuity of Error

Analysis

Implementing the requirements of the Compulsory Education English Curriculum Standards (2022 Edition), educators should focus on constructing an integrated "teaching-learning-assessment" education system within subject education. Among these, teaching assessment serves as the final closed loop of the overall teaching process. The essential role of teaching assessment extends beyond merely evaluating students' comprehensive performance during learning; it also involves adjusting teaching plans and implementation methods based on student feedback, thereby creating efficient classrooms.

Thorndike's Trial-and-Error Theory posits that only through positive stimulus-response (S-R) can new cognition of the subjective object be established. This type of stimulus-response can be effectively linked with what Erikson termed "inner drive," using positive evaluation as a mode of stimulus-response. For instance, when a student can promptly discover and correct errors during the learning process, the teacher can provide positive evaluation as encouragement. While satisfying students' needs and cognitive motivations, this promotes their development in a better direction. For example, regarding formative assessment, teachers can take one unit as a cycle, evaluating whether students' errors have improved during the overall unit learning process, as well as assessing the feasibility of students' error correction strategies. Subsequently, teaching objectives, instructional design, implementation steps, and student error correction strategies can be adjusted based on student feedback. For example, in the actual teaching of "Wildlife Protection," teachers can center the thematic context on "Protect wild animals," helping students understand the work of organizations like WWF and animal rescue teams. Thus, they can "Establish the awareness of wildlife protection." Taking this unit as a cycle, teachers can identify and correct common problems students encounter across the listening, speaking, reading, and writing modules. Detection can occur during unit-wide review or in subsequent unit teaching.

5. Conclusion

Errors in language produced during the second language learning process, particularly in writing, represent an inevitable stage of foreign language acquisition. Teachers should adopt a scientific attitude towards errors, treating them as significant teaching resources. Grounded in Error Analysis Theory and integrated with teaching objectives, they should analyze error types and causes, implementing targeted measures. In teaching practice, teachers need to avoid the traditional "red pen pitfalls" and imbalances in error correction. Instead, they should adopt stratified strategies: reinforcing grammar rules and vocabulary accumulation for students with weaker foundations, while emphasizing discoursal logic and critical thinking cultivation for more capable students. Simultaneously, error correction methods should be optimized by combining teacher grading with peer review and

student self-assessment. Supplemented by model text analysis, contextual practice, and extensive reading, these approaches help students accumulate language resources and cultural background knowledge. Furthermore, teachers need to construct an integrated "teaching-learning-assessment" system. Through positive reinforcement and continuous feedback, they can guide students in establishing a correct view of errors. Consequently, while reducing interlingual and intralingual errors, students' language application abilities and core subject competencies can be comprehensively enhanced.

References

[1] Corder, S. P. The Significance of Learner's Errors[J]. International Reviews of Applied Linguistics, 9, 1967: 149-159.

[2] Corder, S. P. The Significance of Learner's Errors[J]. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 1967(4).

[3] Corder, S. P. Error Analysis and Interlanguage[M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

[4] Ellis, R. The Study of Second Language Acquisition[M]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 1997.

[5] Taylor, G. C. Errors and Explanations[J]. Applied Linguistics, 7/2, 1986: 144-166.

[6] Qin Xiaoqing. Questionnaire Survey Methods in Foreign Language Teaching[M]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2009.

[7] Shi Junjie. Enlightenment of Error Analysis Theory on Senior High School English Writing Teaching[D]. Shanghai Normal University, 2012.

[8] Shi Yun, Meng Xiangqi. Guiding Senior High School English Writing with Error Analysis Theory[J]. Teaching and Management, 2013(21): 117-119.

[9] Ma Xiuli. Research on "Error Prompting" English Writing Teaching Method[J]. Journal of The Chinese Society of Education, 2013(S2): 57-58.

[10] Wang Chuming. Applied Psycholinguistics — Research on Foreign Language Learning Psychology[M]. Hunan: Hunan Education Press, 1990.

[11] Wang Gaili, Sun Zhihui. Enlightenment of Error Analysis on English Writing Teaching[J]. Overseas English, 2021(09): 50-51+76.

[12] Yi Dongfeng. Attribution of Errors in Senior High School English Writing[D]. Nanjing Normal University, 2004.

[13] Zhang Fengjiao. Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Junior High School English Writing and Teaching Suggestions[J]. Famous Teachers Online, 2023(33): 71-73.