

A CEFR-ALIGNED GRAMMAR ERRORS ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS ' WRITING PERFORMANCE: A CASE OF KANZ ENGLISH GRAMMAR, COMPOSITION AND TRANSLATION

Muhammad Jawad Nasir (Kanzul Madaris Board International)

M Phil Scholar, Department of English, NUML University (Faisalabad Campus)

Email: kanz.english@gmail.com

Sana Mahfooz

M Phil Scholar, Department of English, NUML University (Faisalabad Campus)

Email: sanamehfooz702@gmail.com

Dr. Maimoona Abdulaziz

Prof. at National University of Modern Languages Faisalabad

Email: maimoona.aziz@numl.edu.pk

Abstract

This paper explores grammatical mistakes of matric English learners in Pakistan and studies the role of Kanz English Grammar as a way of enhancing writing and translation competency as per the CEFR standards. The study aims to determine the overall patterns of error in writings, composition, and translation of students, the comparison of their performance with the CEFR B1 requirements, and the effect of teaching based on textbooks on the grammatical development. Based on the Error Analysis (EA), Interlanguage Theory, and CEFR-aligned assessment, the study divides the errors into interlingual (L1 transfer), intralingual (L2 overgeneralization) ones, devoting special attention to the verb tense, subject-verb agreement (SVA), articles, prepositions, morphology, and sentence structure. The data was gathered on the basis of annual test designs comprising of writing and translation tasks and analysed in terms of frequency, type and correspondence with the CEFR descriptors. The results obtained show that students have a continual difficulty with tense consistency, SVA, use of articles and prepositions, and complicated constructions of sentences, which suggests that there is partial mastery of the B1-level grammatical competence. The research paper also shows that the accuracy, range and control in practice with the use of Kanz English Grammar are significantly enhanced, but errors in the complex structures continue to be present, which emphasize areas that require specific pedagogical intervention. The paper ends with a set of recommendations to design a curriculum with the focus on the CEFR, combined writing and translation activities, and the assessment of the textbooks to improve the grammatical competence, writing fluency, and general communicative proficiency at the matric level.

Keywords:

CEFR, Error Analysis, English Grammar, Matric-level learners, Writing and Translation, SVA, Verb Tense, Grammar book Evaluation.

1. Introduction

Grammar is the foundation of a viable conversation and a vital part of second language writing skill. Good grammar helps learners sound out their thoughts and ideas in a clear and coherent manner, whereas the constant use of bad grammar may distort the meaning and undermine the power of communication. Grammatical competence in the academic writing and translation tasks represents not only the linguistic knowledge of the learner but also the overall level of knowledge about language structure and its competency. As a result, grammatical error analysis would be a meaningful contribution to the understanding of interlanguage evolution in learners and the identification of the aspects that need to be addressed in terms of instruction.

CEFR is a popular international framework of language proficiency knowledge assessment and description, which is designed to measure the language proficiency level on six levels (A1-C2). It contains extensive number of descriptors of grammatical range, accuracy and control, offers a structured account on how to assess the progress of learners in writing, and other language proficiency. Assessment based on CEFR enables teachers to objectively test grammatical competence and develop teaching resources that correspond to a particular level of competence. Through the connection of error analysis to CEFR descriptors, the teacher and researchers can know whether the errors made by learners are developmental stages or lack of teaching and learning.

This research paper particularly aims at examining grammar, composition, and translation aspects of the Kanz English Grammar, a very popular textbook in the matric level in Pakistan. The study will help to assess the performance of the students in terms of writing and translation using grammatical descriptors that are related to CEFR and finding out what types of errors they usually make and how they are associated with certain levels of proficiency. The addition of the translation tasks to the analysis broadens the nature of analysis since translation involves the understanding of the source language structures as well as proper reproduction in the target language.

The mixed-method approach is taken, entailing quantitative analysis of the frequency of errors and qualitative interpretation of the pattern of errors. The analysis is aligned with CEFR descriptors to determine how far the grammatical teaching offered by Kanz English Grammar is aligned to the international language norms and to what extent the students are able to use these rules in real life writing and translation activities.

The results of the study are likely to contribute greatly to the field of applied linguistics as well as language pedagogy. Theoretically, the research gives results on the connection between grammar teaching, writing competence and CEFR descriptors. In practice, it provides the recommendations to the better grammar teaching, the construction of instructional materials on the basis of CEFR, and the increase of grammatical accuracy and the translation competence of the students in the matric level.

1.1. Research Gap

Despite the vast literature on grammatical error analysis (EA) during second language learning, there are still multiple gaps in the context of Pakistani and at the frames of CEFR. The majority of studies are devoted to the general error identification and do not correlate errors with the levels of the CEFR (A1-B1), and not many studies consider writing and translation tasks as one. Also, the validity of the local textbooks, like Kanz English Grammar, to facilitate the development with references to CEFR is under-studied. The pre-test/post-test designs that trace the change in progress of the learners with time are also limited. Lastly, the available literature does not offer much in terms of practical teaching than the recommendation of the research studies, which oversees the requirements of extensive, contextual research into learning, curriculum, and evaluation.

1.2. Significance of the Study

This research has significant implications to the learning of English and language learning. It links Error Analysis (EA) to the assessment based on CEFR to offer a means of assessing the grammar of the students through an internationally accepted standard. It allows the teachers to learn about the general grammatical errors of Pakistani EFL students to provide them with more specific and critical feedback. It can also assist curriculum planners and textbook authors, particularly the ones dealing with Kanz English Grammar to create materials that correspond to the CEFR levels. It also helps students by letting them know which strengths and weaknesses they have regarding grammar and offering motivation to make them better. Lastly, it assists the

policymakers in applying the CEFR standards to make fair and consistent evaluation of English proficiency in the secondary schools to occur.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1. Recognize the grammatical mistakes in writing and translation assignments of matric learners.
2. Assess the writing of the students based on grammatical accuracy descriptors that are CEFR-aligned.
3. Test the usefulness of Kanz English Grammar in promoting grammatical development on the basis of CEFR.

1.4. Research Questions

This paper aims at answering the following questions:

1. What are the most frequent grammatical errors made by matric-level students in writing, composition, and translation tasks?
2. How do these errors reflect students' CEFR proficiency level (B1) in writing and translation tasks?
3. To what extent does Kanz English Grammar support CEFR-aligned development of students' grammatical competence and writing proficiency?

The comprehension of these aspects is important towards enhancing pedagogical interventions. With the incorporation of CEFR descriptors and Error Analysis (EA) systems, one will be able to work out evidence-based teaching plans, adapt activities to the level of students, and objectively evaluate their improvement. In addition, the analysis of the errors can be utilized in order to define whether the current textbooks, including Kanz English Grammar, are able to meet the linguistic requirements of the students or they need the individual resources.

2. Literature Review

2.1. CEFR Overview

The language proficiency of CEFR is divided into six levels A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2 (Council of Europe, 2001). In the case of secondary or matric learners in Pakistan, levels A1 to B2 would be the most applicable. CEFR evaluates the performance in three dimensions:

- Accuracy -grammatical, morphological, syntactic correctness.
- Range — form and complexity of structures employed (e.g. simple or complex sentences, subordinate clauses, passive voice, conditional sentences).
- Control - possibility to be accurate and coherent through long discourse.

The advantage of CEF lies in the fact that it is standardized and thus can be assessed objectively, compared in other contexts, and brought in line with international standards.

2.2. EA-CEFR Integration: Current Research.

Integrating EA and CEFR-based tests provides more profound and pedagogically interesting outcomes. For example:

- In An Error Analysis of Expository Essay Writing, Ghayas and Sakhawat discovered that undergraduate essays contain grammatical and syntax errors, which allowed them to conclude that many learners were at lower levels of the CEFR (A1-A2) because of repetitive simple mistakes and restricted syntax (jelle.lgu.edu.pk).
- In Assessing Grammatical Competence through Error Analysis (2025), the researchers followed the distribution of errors in 140 undergraduates and found that there was an improvement in SVA, punctuation, and lexical accuracy, and still tense, prepositions, and sentence fragmentation. The achievement of learners was usually lower than expected at CEFR B1/B2. (wahacademia.com)

These researches demonstrate that a combination of EA with CEFR descriptors allows assessing whether the learners are able to meet both functional and structural expectations of every proficiency level.

2.3. CEFR in Pakistani ESL.

Assessment in most Pakistani ESL classrooms is still very much concentrated on discrete-point grammar activities, rote learning, and book-learning rule recall, with little attention being paid to communicative competence and writing fluency. Assessment based on CEFR has a number of benefits:

- Categorization of errors by level of proficiency- makes the outcome of the grammatical expected at particular levels clear.
- Authentic, genuine evaluation objectives - promotes activities that are a reflection of real language.
- Objective benchmarking Graham 1996, p. 160.
- Procedure advice to curriculum developers - transition to the use of complex text (B2) by means of simple sentences (A1).

As an illustration, in Faisalabad, a study indicated that SVA, punctuation and lexical accuracy improved with time, but chronic problems in tenses and prepositions indicated that grammar based courses could not alone achieve higher levels of functional competence.

2.4. Pedagogical Importance of CEFR-Aligned EA.

Combining EA and CEFR will make the analysis of errors formative and strategic instead of diagnostic. Specifically, it:

- Gives a guidebook on how to structure the curriculum and sequence of writing tasks and grammar topics by the levels of CEFR.
- Allows specific feedback and remediation, focusing on the types of errors that are limiting progress.
- Promotes tracking of learner improvement with time by pre-test/ post test designs.
- Facilitates the assessment and refinement of textbooks - whether they encourage precision, breadth and mastery.
- conscience raises decisions on policies, including the adoption of CEFR benchmarks on secondary-level curricula.

CEFR-based EA is therefore an effective model in matching local instructions with international standards as well as meeting communicative competence.

2.5. Performance of writing in Matric (Secondary) Level in Pakistan.

Despite the fact that much of the research on ESL error-analysis is conducted at tertiary level, research on secondary/matric learners indicates that there are huge and enduring grammatical challenges.

2.6. Grammar Weaknesses: Empirical Evidence.

- The analyzed sources include an essay study among 90 students in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades in FG secondary schools in Okara, which investigated the linguistic errors in writing English essays. Eight hundred and seventy-eight errors were made with the most being the highest error in grade 6 (about 52%), followed by 33% in grade 7 and 15% in grade 8. The most common errors were verb errors, sentence-structure, errors in noun-ending, and errors in articles. (historymedjournal.com)
- One of the studies in Abbottabad documented grammatical and structural mistakes such as poor choice of tenses, wrongly used articles, bad prepositions, bad usage of auxiliary verbs, poor structure, incorrect use of question marks, sentence fragments and poor capitalization. (plhr.org.pk)

By these findings, it can be inferred that despite years of teaching, the grammatical competence of the learners is still impaired even in lower secondary school.

2.7. Limitations and Trends of Development.

The number of errors is usually reduced with the level of academic achievement, but still a lot of mistakes remain, especially with complex structures (pluralization, the use of articles, the use of prepositions, the way to construct a sentence). This shows that there is some internalization of rules and fossilization, where the errors remain despite exposure and teaching.

Older teaching approaches that emphasize memorization of rules and individual exercises might not allow enough communicative practice to write with accuracy, independence in writing, required of students at matric-level in examinations in writing essays and making translations.

2.8. Implications of Secondary-Level Instruction.

The facts indicate vital requirements:

- Systemic instruction in grammar which extends beyond drills to contextualized writing and translating activities.
- Constant error analysis and feedback with correction, focused on common types of errors so that they do not fossilize.
- Introduction of CEFR-based curricula and assessment to measure instruction based on international standards.
- Simple sentence writing (A1/A2) to paragraph-level writing and systematic translation (B1/B2).

This is because such reforms prepare learners with the ability to write effective, accurate, and coherently.

2.9. The Part of Textbooks in Development of Grammar.

Textbooks that combine grammar with composition and translation activities also offer scaffolds practice on meaningful situations, and this practice is more effective in internalization of structures than through drills.

- Measurable improvements in punctuation, SVA and lexical accuracy were observed in structured writing and grammar lessons in undergraduate studies (Wah Academia, 2025). (wahacademia.com)
- Corpus-based researches reveal that regular practice of morphological errors reduces, which means that regular practice in writing facilitates grammatical internalization. It is important to note that an individual's preferences often evolve as time passes. It should be mentioned that the preferences of an individual usually change over time.
- Translation (L1 to L2) increases the knowledge of interlingual differences, which reinforces syntactic and morphological competence. The typology-oriented models indicate that translation exercises can predict and manage L1 influence.

Therefore, effective textbooks can help to fill the gap between the knowledge of the rules and the contextualized and accurate output.

2.10. CEFR Alignment Gap in the Evaluation of a Textbook.

There is little empirical research on how textbooks can be effective to meet CEFR-aligned results. The majority of studies are based on historical EA without mapping learners output to CEFR descriptors, which limits them:

- No certainty about the learners having reached an adequate grammatical range and control (B1/B2).
- L. No evidence to support content sequencing, task design or level labels.
- Limited instructions as to how to support learners to develop according to the levels of CEFR on the basis of available materials.

This gap is a major flaw considering that most learners use textbooks as their only resource.

2.11. Requirement of Empirical, CEFR Congruent Review of Textbooks.

Strict research must be carried out to:

- Pre-test 8 post test designs to monitor grammatical development.
- Integrate EA and CEFR-congruent assessment, measuring error level, structural scope, syntactic and control.
- Pay attention to the effectiveness of textbooks, e.g. whether Kanz English Grammar, Composition and Translation help to advance in the scale of the CEFR.
- Give pedagogical advice on the design of the curriculum, teacher training, remedial training, and assessment based on CEFR.

This research can lead to improvement in grammar teaching, the writing ability and correlation of the local training with the international standards.

2.12. Synthesis of Findings

The important trends in the literature are:

- Constant grammatical problems: verb tense, SVA, article and preposition problems, morphology, errors of sentence organization, and syntactic ordering are typical of L1 backgrounds.
- Minimal success of systematic teaching: improvement in agreement, punctuation, and lexical accuracy, but tense, prepositions, and complicated syntax are problematic.
- Weak CEFR correspondence: not many studies compare performance of learners with CEFR, which makes it difficult to make meaningful comparison.
- Few longitudinal studies: the majority of studies are cross-sectional, which do not allow seeing developmental changes. It is also true that underutilization of translation tasks: the idea of interlingual transfer and L1 interference has not been properly examined.
- Weaknesses of textbook evaluation: weak empirical evaluation of grammatical development in accordance with CEFR.

The gaps reveal the necessity of context-related and holistic research involving EA, CEFR assessment, writing, and translation activities, textbook assessment, and pre-post designs.

2.13. Implications to the Present Study.

The present study will:

- Determine the level of common grammatical mistakes (tense, SVA, articles, prepositions, sentence structure) in writing and translational works of matric level learners using Kanz English Grammar.
- Compare the performance of learners with the descriptors of CEFR (accuracy, range, control) in order to identify the alignment with the anticipated level of performance (A1 to B1/B2).
- Relate the effectiveness of textbooks in developing grammar.
- Pedagogy and curriculum design: Use data to inform curriculum design.
- Align local educational standards with international standards making English competence testing on matric levels standard.

This method goes past the error lists to practical, curriculum-related information in the applied linguistics and practical English teaching in Pakistan.

2.14. Conclusion

Grammatical mistakes, in particular, the use of verb tense, SVA, articles, prepositions, morphology, sentence structure, are some of the prominent challenges facing ESL/EFL students at the international and national levels in Pakistan. Although EA is a useful diagnostic tool, its role is minimal in the absence of correlation with CEFR. Textbooks of structured

grammar, composition, and translation are the most popular ones, but their role in fostering writing competence in the level of CEFR is not adequately studied.

The consistent gaps of the lack of CEFR-supported assessment, lack of longitudinal research, understudied textbook production, and under researched textbook assessment all indicate the necessity of the extensive, context-specific studies. The gaps identified in the current research are filled with the help of CEFR-based assessment, writing and translation, textbook evaluation, and pre-post designs to build the academic knowledge and practical advances in grammar teaching, curriculum design, and assessment implementation.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Type of Research

The research design applied in this study was empirical and evaluative research design since it was aimed at investigating the grammatical errors among the students by direct analysis of their test scripts and evaluating their progress with the help of the CEFR framework. The empirical research uses actual observable learner performance and the evaluative research assesses the efficiency of instructional resources, like Kanz English Grammar. The study selected and scored the most frequent types of errors through the analysis of the writing, composition, and translation tasks in order to present a picture of grammatical proficiency in learners based on facts and numbers (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2018).

3.2 Research Paradigm

In this study, the mixed-methods research paradigm has been followed which involves both quantitative and qualitative methods to enable a holistic assessment of the grammatical competence of the learners. The quantitative analysis of empirical data was conducted through systematic identification, counting, and category of grammatical mistakes to understand their prevalence and common patterns whereas the qualitative analysis was performed to understand the essence, trends and potential causes of such mistakes based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) grammatical descriptors. Frequency-based analysis combined with the interpretation interventions using the CEFR helped to track the learning strains and the underlying learning problems, and provide an evaluative analysis of grammatical competence and learning progress of students based on the principles of mixed methods research (Creswell, 2014).

1. Quantitative Analysis: Tables of the frequency of errors were made to determine the most frequent error categories.

2. Qualitative Analysis: The character, trends, and potential source of errors were interpreted in order to uncover structural learning difficulties and developmental trends. This mix of quantitative and qualitative analysis guaranteed the thorough and CEFR-based assessment of grammatical competence and learning progress of students.

3.3 Research Framework

An Error Analysis Framework (Corder, 1967; Dulay et al., 1982) was followed in the study which corresponded to CEFR grammatical accuracy descriptors (B1). The framework included:

1. Error Identification: The errors in grammar of writing, composition and translation exercises in students.

2. Error Classification: classifying the errors into:

- Lexical Errors: spelling, affixes, word formation, synonyms/antonyms.
- Syntactic: errors in forms of verbs or their parts of speech, indirect speech, the use of combinations of words in a sentence.
- Discourse Errors: text, question answering, paragraph, and essay and summary writing.
- Translation Errors: English-Urdu translation and Urdu- English translation.

3. CEFR Alignment: The assessment of grammatical performance in regard to the CEFR range, accuracy, and control descriptors.

This framework guaranteed the systematic analysis of errors and interpretation of grammatical competence of students informed by CEFR.

3.4 Population and Sampling

a. Population Group

The sample comprised of matric-level English learners who were attending the Model Jamia Civil Line, Faisalabad where Kanz English Grammar, Composition, and Translation are taught.

b. Sampling Type

The sampling adopted in the study was non-probability.

c. Sampling Technique

To select participants with certain criteria a purposive sampling method was used:

- Matric level student taking English.
- Instructions: received with Kanz English Grammar.
- Participated in texts of the CEFR-aligned and annual texts.

According to Cohen (2007), purposive sampling enables the researcher to sample out cases that are representative or have the specific attributes of interest in the research and therefore the sample will be representative enough to reflect the target population.

d. Sample Size

The sample consisted of 35 students aged between 14 and 16 years old and were taking the matric-level English program. In order to assess their grammatical performance, they were given tests in agreement with CEFR B1 after they were taught Kanz English Grammar.

| Test | Instruction Goal | Numbers of Students |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| CEFR-aligned Tasks | B1 | 35 |

3.5 Delimitations and Limitations.

Delimitations

1. It was restricted to the students of matric-level at one institute (Model Jamia Civil Line, Faisalabad).
2. The tasks that were analysed were only writing, composition and Urdu-to-English/ English-to-Urdu translation.
3. The analysis was carried out on the grammatical domains highlighted by the Kanz English Grammar.
4. As a reference scale, CEFR level B1 was used.

Limitations

- The unrepresentative sample (n=35) does not make it possible to extrapolate to a bigger group.
- Classroom exposure to English was not controllable since learners had been exposed to it before.
- There might be some subjectivity in the interpretation of errors although structured checklists were used.

3.6 Data Collection Tool

The collection of data was done using various instruments so as to ascertain the validity and comprehensiveness:

1. Writing and Composition Activities:

- Paragraphs and essays on familiar things (e.g. my day to day routine, my school, memorable day).
- Tested to determine writing and composition grammatical accuracy.

2. Translation Tasks:

- Urdu-to-English and English-to-Urdu passages were chosen out of the Kanz English Grammar.
- Applied to measure structural translation in grammatical control in translation.

3. CEFR-Aligned Checklist of Evaluation:

- The researcher created it using CEFR grammatical accuracy descriptors.
- Concentrated on verb tense/form, agreement, articles, prepositions, sentence structure, punctuation and morphology.

4. Annual Tests:

- The development of the instrument was based on the CEFR standards to measure the grammatical performance of the learners.
- Tasks included:
 1. Observing the proper verb forms.
 2. Correcting spelling errors
 3. Determining synonyms and antonyms.
 4. The correction of grammar (Parts of Speech)
 5. Comprehension questions
 6. Urdu–English translation
 7. Sentences with pairs of words.
 8. Change into indirect Speech
 9. Summarizing poems
 10. Essays or paragraphs writing.

All instruments were given under some controlled conditions, and the scripts of learners were anonymised to maintain confidentiality.

3.7 Data Analysis Procedures and Tools.

Analysis of data was done in a three-step methodical manner:

3. Error Identification:

- All the scripts were analysed to identify grammatical errors as suggested by Corder (1967) and Dulay et al (1982).

4. Error Classification:

- The errors were divided into lexical, syntactic, discourse and translation errors.

5. CEFR Alignment:

- To assess the accuracy, range, and control, grammatical performance was assessed with reference to CEFR descriptor (B1).

4. Findings and Analysis

The section outlines the research findings on quantitative and qualitative level, according to grammatical performance of the students in terms of lexical, syntactic, discourse and translation tasks. The materials were gathered using annual exams at CEFR B1 level after the instruction with Kanz English Grammar.

4.1 Lexical Errors

Lexical errors were determined using two tasks Q.1 (B) Correct Spellings and Q.1 (C) Synonyms/Antonyms. Students were given 35 marks and scored each out of 5 marks.

4.1.1 Quantitative Analysis

Step 1: Correct Spellings (Q.1 B)

| Students | Mark Obtained in total | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|------------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1–S35 | 171 | 175 | 4.89 | 97.7 |

Observation:

Most of the students scored full or half-full marks meaning that they were very accurate in spelling.

Step 2: Synonyms/Antonyms (Q.1 C)

| Students | Marks obtained in total | Obtained Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage |
|----------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------|------------|
| S1-S35 | 133 | 175 | 3.8 | 76 |

Observation:

Moderate level of difficulty with synonyms and antonyms was seen in students. Some of the students had earned up to 1-2 marks as the lowest marks, this is a sign of poor vocabulary and semantic comprehending.

4.1.2 Qualitative Analysis

Spelling:

The spelling competence of students was satisfactory and mistakes were few and occasional. This implies a good instructional support and knowledge of simple forms of lexicon.

Synonyms/Antonyms: The most common mistakes were:

The choice of inappropriate synonyms (e.g., big, but in place of large).

Misusing the antonyms or can be irrelevant words.

Interpretation:

Even though spelling says good command is observed, the depths in semantic relation and vocabulary use are little among the students. Greater emphasis on the contextualized synonym-antonym practice can thus be suggested.

4.1.3 Summary Table

| Type of errors | Maximum marks | Total marks achieved | average score | Percentage % | Interpretation |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|---|
| Correct Spellings | 5 | 171 | 4.89 | 97.7 | High accuracy; great spelling competence |
| Synonyms/ Antonyms | 5 | 133 | 3.8 | 76.0 | Moderate difficulty; semantic knowledge should be reinforced. |

Key Findings:

There is good spelling ability among the students with a majority scoring close to a hundred percent. The richness of vocabulary especially synonyms and antonyms is also relatively poor. Although Kanz English Grammar is effective in supporting the process of spelling, further focus in instructional learning in the areas of semantic and lexical enrichment is needed.

4.2 Syntactic Errors

The assessment of the syntactic errors was conducted in four tasks:

Q.1 (A): Correct Form of Verb: 10 marks

Q.1 (D): Grammar (Parts of Speech): 5 marks.

Q.6: Transform Direct Speech into Indirect Speech: 10 marks.

Q.7: - Sentence making from Pair of Words: 10 marks.

4.2.1 Quantitative Analysis

Step 1: Correct Form of Verb (Q.1 A)

| Students | Total Score Obtained | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1-S35 | 314 | 350 | 8.97 | 89.7 |

Step 2: Grammar (Parts of Speech, Q.1 D)

| Students | Marks Obtained in total | Mark maximum in total | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|
| S1-S35 | 141 | 175 | 4.03 | 80.5 |

Step 3: Transformation into Indirect Speech (Q.6)

| Students | Number Obtained in total | Mark Maximum | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| S1-S35 | 192 | 350 | 5.49 | 54.9 |

Step 4: Using Pair of Words in Sentences (Q.7).

| Students | Total Obtained Marks | Mark Maximum | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| S1-S35 | 288 | 350 | 8.23 | 82.3 |

4.2.2 Qualitative Analysis

Proper Verb Form: There was also a high score on the correct form of verbs, which means that students had a good understanding of the simple forms of verbs; the performance of the students was high in Group 2.

Parts of Speech: Moderate difficulty was noted, and some of the responses had confusion of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

Indirect Speech:

This proved to be the hardest assignment and many of the students garnered zero marks. Some of the common issues were wrong tense changes, wrong changes of pronouns, and wrong reporting structures.

Word Pairs: The general performance was good, and the few mistakes were connected with the appropriateness of context and sentence structure.

4.2.3 Table of Syntactic errors:

| Type of Question | Max Marks | Total Obtained | Average Score | Percentage (%) | Interpretation |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| Verb Correction (Q.1 A) | 10 | 314 | 8.97 | 89.7 | High accuracy: basic verb forms understood. |
| Correct Grammar (POS) (Q.1 D) | 5 | 141 | 4.03 | 80.5 | Moderate level of difficulty: possibly some confusion with POS. |
| Conversion to indirect Speech (Q.6) | 10 | 192 | 5.49 | 54.9 | Poor performance; inability to change sentences |

| | | | | | |
|--|----|-----|------|------|--|
| Use of Pairs of Words in Sentences (Q.7) | 10 | 288 | 8.23 | 82.3 | Good overall with few contextual and structural errors |
|--|----|-----|------|------|--|

Key Findings:

1. Good knowledge of verbal forms and usage of word pairing.
2. There is need of reinforcement of parts of speech.
3. The area that is the most difficult is the indirect speech, which means that specific training should be conducted.

4.3 Discourse Errors

Discussion errors were evaluated by:

Q.2: Simple paragraph, Answer Questions /15 marks.

Q.4: Summary – 10 marks

Q.5: Essay or Paragraph – 15 marks

4.3.1 Quantitative Analysis

Step 1: Replying to the Questions / Simple Paragraph (Q.2)

| Students | Total Obtained Marks | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1–S35 | 474 | 525 | 13.54 | 91 |

Step 2: Summary Writing (Q.4)

| Students | Total Obtained Marks | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1–S35 | 219 | 350 | 6.26 | 62.6 |

Step 3: Essay or paragraph writing (Q.5)

| Students | Total Obtained Marks | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1–S35 | 344 | 525 | 9.83 | 73.3 |

4.3.2 Qualitative Analysis

Simple Paragraph / Short Answer:

They showed good levels of understanding and only small mistakes in grammar were found.

Summary Writing:

Students have had problems in extraction of important points, arrangement of information in a logical manner, and coherence.

Essay/Paragraph Writing:

Some of the common problems included the inadequate development of ideas, ineffective paragraph structure, the repetition of ideas, and some grammatical errors.

Interpretation:

Although students are already skilful to complete simple comprehension and brief written assignments, they still need to practice extended writing tasks in a systematic and guiding manner to enhance their competence in the area by achieving cohesion, coherence, and discourse-level control, according to CEFR B1 writing descriptors.

4.3.3: Summary Table: Faults of Discourse.

Question Type Mark Maximum Marks Marks Obtained Marks Obtained Average Score
Percentage (%) Interpretation

| Type of Question | Maximum Marks | Obtained Marks | Obtained Average Score | Percentage (%) | Interpretation |
|-------------------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------------|----------------|---|
| Answer the Questions (Q.2) | 15 | 474 | 13.54 | 91 | High accuracy; high level of understanding short responses. |
| Summary Writing (Q.4) | 10 | 219 | 6.26 | 62.6 | Moderate level of difficulty; finds it hard to condense and give coherence. |
| Essay/Paragraph Writing (Q.5) | 15 | 344 | 9.83 | 73.3 | moderate; needs to work on its organization and content development. |

4.4 Translation Errors

Translating tasks were measured by:

- Q.3: Translate into Urdu: 8 marks
- Q. 8: English translation: 7 marks.

4.4.1 Quantitative Analysis

Step 1: Translate into Urdu (Q.3)

| Students | Total Obtained | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1-S35 | 222 | 280 | 6.34 | 79.3 |

Step 2: Translations into English (Q.8)

| Students | Total Obtained | Max Marks | Average Score | Percentage (%) |
|----------|----------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|
| S1-S35 | 151 | 245 | 4.31 | 61.6 |

4.4.2 Qualitative Analysis

Translation into Urdu:

The general meaning was mostly correctly conveyed and there were only slight lexical and syntactic mistakes, which is evidence of a good level of understanding the source text.

Translation into English:

Students experienced prominent difficulties, such as the use of wrong word order, tense inconsistency, less lexical choice, and making complex sentences.

Interpretation:

The process of translation into a target language (English) was more challenging than translation into a native language (Urdu). This result is in line with the expectations of CEFR B1, when learners have a typical level of understanding but inaccurate and poor control of productive language activities.

4.4.3 Table of Results Abbreviated Table: Translation errors.

| Type of Question | Maximum Marks | Obtained Marks | Average Marks | Percentage (%) | Interpretation |
|------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---|
| Translating into Urdu (Q.3) | 8 | 222 | 6.34 | 79.3 | Good comprehension; small lexical/syntactic mistakes. |
| Translating to English / paragraph | 7 | 151 | 4.31 | 61.6 | grammatical, vocabulary and sentence structure errors |

Key Findings:

1. Students had scored higher in translating into Urdu when compared to translating into English.
2. The presence of mistakes in English translation shows the necessity of special training on the grammar, sentence structure, and vocabulary development.
3. Translating exercises demonstrate errors and gaps due to transfer processes and productive skills on the CEFR B1 level, which put patterns in transverse, syntactic, and discourse analyses in the spotlight.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations.

5.1 Conclusion

The current research examined grammatical mistakes among students in their matric level and explored the importance of Kanz English Grammar in facilitating the CEFR B1 based development in writing and translation activities. The results, the results of quantitative and qualitative analysis, answer the objectives and questions of the research in the following way:

1. Identification of Grammatical Errors (Research Question 1):

- o Lexical Errors: The students showed good spelling competence and some middle competence in using synonyms and antonyms, which means semantic knowledge gaps.
- o Syntactic Errors: The students were average in the simple forms of verbs and use of word-pairs, but in the parts of speech and indirect speech transformation, the students had problems. The most complicated area was indirect speech and it pointed to the challenges in the restructuring of the sentence, use of tenses and use of pronouns.
- o Discourse Errors: The tasks on short-answer and simple paragraphs were managed in an appropriate way, however, the tasks on summary writing and essay/paragraph composition were problematic, which pointed to the inability to condense the information, be coherent, and develop the ideas.
- o Translation Errors: With relative ease, students translated to Urdu and experienced significant complications translating to English, which were indicative of a constraint in grammar, sentence structure, and lexical proficiency.

2. CEFR B1 Proficiency Reflection (Research Question 2):

Grammatical performance of students, in terms of CEFR B1 level is stated in the following two cases:

- o They have Powerful mastery over spellings, verbs, and word pairs.
- o They show weaknesses in more complicated tasks, like indirect speech, Paragraph writing, and translation of English.

The results show that the basic competence of the students is good, but such productive abilities as long discourse and target-language translation need to be developed further.

3. Kanz English Grammar Effectiveness: (Question 3)

- Kanz English Grammar was effective in reinforcing spelling, basic verb conjugation and basic grammar in general.
- Nevertheless, it was not so pronounced in the higher-order skills, including semantic depth, sentence transformation, discourse organization, and productive translation.
- The implication of this is that although the text facilitates learning that is CEFR compliant in terms of basic grammar, there is a need to use additional exercises and practice in order to achieve B1-level proficiency in writing and translation assignments.

Overall Conclusion:

The basis of basic grammatical accuracy and learning at the CEFR level B1 is provided by Kanz English Grammar. Students demonstrate strong performance in terms of spelling, verb use and short-answer writing but need the further support of instructions to improve semantic comprehension, transformation of sentences, discourse structure, and efficient translation.

4. 5.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested based on the results of the study and the objectives of the research:

Lexical Development:

- Focus on the semantic knowledge and use semantic exercises such as synonym-antonym exercises and contextual use of vocabulary.
- Introduce word-map and graded reading exercises to deepen lexical levels.

Increased Syntactic Teaching:

- Offer specialized activities on the differentiation of the parts of speech and indirect speech transformation.
- Sentence-restructuring exercises, peer-guided correction and incremental complexity exercises should be used.

Discourse-Level Construction:

- Explain and guide them the techniques of summary writing, such as finding points, and sustaining flow.
- Promote planning templates, peer review in structured essay/paragraph writing.
- Combine writing in the various genres to enhance cohesion, coherence, and development of ideas.

Translation Competence Improvement:

- Translation competence is enhanced through increased training.
- Offer well-structured translations practice of Urdu-to-English with teacher feedback to solve both grammatical and lexical weaknesses.
- Identify typical errors of transfers and promote corrections at the sentence level.
- Promote paragraph level writing of the English language to enhance productive skills.

Instructional Integration and Assessment:

- Analysis of errors should be a part of the classroom practice and should regularly be performed with identification of frequent errors and teaching guidance.
- Monitor the progress using formative assessment based on CEFR descriptors to modify instructional strategies.
- Enhance the foundational and higher-order skills by using supplementary materials, exercises, and technology-assisted tools to support the teaching of English grammar.

The application of specific intervention in lexical, syntactic, discourse, and translation abilities will help students to acquire a holistic CEFR B1-level skills. Although the Kanz English Grammar is useful in building the basic skills, it is necessary that special practice and guided training be aimed to attain greater accuracy, fluency, and competence in productive activities.

References

1. Ahmad, M., Shabeer, & Ali, I. (2025). Interlanguage morphology and subject–verb agreement errors: An error analysis of secondary school learners in Tehsil Hazro. ASSA Journal, 4(01), 4261–4267.
2. Ahmed, A., et al. (2016). [Composition errors of Pakistani ESL learners: Agreement, spelling, articles, prepositions, etc.] (as summarized in Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review, 2017).
3. Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.
4. Erviana, R. I., & Kurniasih, V. (2024). A grammatical errors analysis in students' comparison and contrast paragraph writing. Lexeme: Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.32493/ljlal.v6i2.42406>
5. Ghyas, M., & Sakhawat, H. (2024). An error analysis of expository essay writing of ESL undergraduate learners in Pakistan. Journal of English Language, Literature and Education, 6(1), 63–80.
6. Gunawan, R., Indah, R. L., & Mulyani, P. (2024). Error analysis of subject verb agreement made by students in narrative writing: A case study at Meurandeh Langsa. Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching. <https://doi.org/10.30743/ll.v2i2.571>
7. Hughes, R. (2003). English grammar: An intermediate course. Macmillan Education.
8. Ijaz, et al. (2014). [Error-analysis study of graduation-level Pakistani learners' compositions] (as reported in Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review, 2017).
9. JALT. (2025). Grammatical and linguistic errors in EFL writing: A case study of college students in Dera Ghazi Khan. Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL, 8(2).
10. Mahmood, S., Aolakh, M. S., & Mujtaba, A. (2020). Morphological errors: A study of the written expressions of Pakistani ESL students. Pakistan Social Sciences Review (PSSR), 4(1), 930–942.
11. Mushtaq, S., Naz, S., Bakhsh, K., & Khan, M. A. (2024). Analyzing linguistic errors in English essay writing: A case study of ESL learners at FG secondary schools in Okara, Pakistan. History of Medicine, 10(2), 1988–2004. <https://doi.org/10.48047/HM.10.1.2024.1988-2004>
12. Naz, W., Safarish, A., Syed, A. F., Jabbar, S., & Nawaz, A. (2023). An analysis of errors in present indefinite tense sentences: A case of 6th grade ESL learners of Sialkot, Pakistan. Journal of Education and Social Studies, 4(1), 98–105.
13. Qamariah, H., Wahyuni, S., & Meliana. (2020). An analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing English text in the second grade students of SMK SMTI Banda Aceh. Getsempena English Education Journal (GEEJ), 7(1), 58–71. <https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v7i1.1041>
14. Ramzan, M., Azmat, Z., Afsheen Khan, M., & Nisa, Z. un. (2023). Subject–verb agreement errors in ESL students' academic writing: A surface taxonomy approach. Linguistic Forum – A Journal of Linguistics, 5(2), 16–21.
15. Rashid, I., & Saleem, M. (2025). Error analysis of English language in the composition of Pakistani ESL learners: A corpus-based study. Journal of Applied Linguistics and TESOL (JALT), 8(2).
16. Saher, N. (2022). An analysis of prepositional errors committed by undergraduate ESL learners of Pakistan. Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics (JLLL), 53, 1–?

17. Saleem, S., Jan, Z., & Rizwan, Y. (2025). Syntactic challenges in English writings of Pakistani L2 learners: A corpus-based study. *International Research Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 268–284.
18. Simanjuntak, L. W., Sinaga, S., Tampubolon, S., Hutahaean, D. T., & Sinaga, Y. K. (2023). An analysis of subject verb agreement errors on students' narrative writing at eleventh grade SMA Singosari Delitua. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.31316/jk.v6i3.3918>
19. Swan, M., & Walter, C. (2014). *How English works: A grammar practice book* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
20. Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
21. Wah Academia. (2025). Assessing grammatical competence through error analysis in Pakistani undergraduate ESL learners' writing: A prescriptive contextual perspective. *Wah Academia Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1577–1604.