ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

INTRALINGUAL AND INTERLINGUAL ERROR ANALYSIS IN THE ORAL PERFORMANCE TASKS OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Resa Mae G. Basong; Donita May C. Valera, Ph.D.

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra20436
DOI No: 10.36713/epra20436

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the different sources of errors in the second language that were found in the oral performance tasks of Senior High School students. Using the error analysis, fifty-one (51) oral performance tasks were selected and categorized into two major errors, Intralingual and Interlingual, and further classified into sub-categories. Moreover, a recommendation will be drawn based on Oral Corrective Feedback to prevent committing errors during the oral performance. The study's findings revealed that the prevalent Intralingual errors were inadequate learning, overgeneralization, and simplification errors. On the other hand, the prevalent Interlingual error was the substitution error, where the learner tends to depend on their mother tongue during the English-oral performance by substituting words and phrases from L1 that do not align with the English grammatical structures. Additionally, oral corrective feedback can be used as a recommendation to avoid intralingual and interlingual errors during oral performance tasks. Out of fifty-one (51) oral performance tasks, only nine (9) displayed oral corrective feedback provided by the teacher, classmates, or both. Therefore, the oral corrective feedback was identified according to their types, the following were: recast, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and explicit correction.

KEYWORDS: *Education, Error Analysis, Intralingual, Interlingual, Oral Performance Tasks, Oral Corrective Feedback, Tagum City, Davao Del Norte*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is recognized as an integral part of verbal communication. It requires presenting and expressing ideas and sharing information at a certain verbal level, particularly in L2. Mastering grammar, content, structure, and pronunciation is a must in oral language (Chania & Amri, 2019). However, language errors are unavoidable, particularly in classroom settings.

In Thailand, a study conducted by Tiansoodeenon et al. (2022), shows that some participants committed errors in the target language, specifically misplacing the preposition, resulting in oral errors due to intralingual interference. In Isabela, Philipines, a study by Leaño et al. (2019), the following researchers noticed and documented the oral difficulties of native learners and the minimal contact with the English language, particularly in oral performance, causing oral language predicaments for the learners.

Given these scenarios, the researcher finds it necessary to conduct a study to find the errors in the second language, particularly during oral performance tasks of the Senior High School students in selected secondary schools. Moreover, the study's result will offer recommendations based on Oral Corrective Feedback on the identified errors to avoid creating or performing errors during oral performance tasks. These will particularly aid the learners in improving their verbal language skills to become effective and efficient speakers of the L2.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this error analysis is to identify and analyze the different sources of errors in the second language found in the oral performance tasks of Senior High School students. Furthermore, a recommendation will be drawn based on Oral Corrective Feedback to prevent committing errors during the oral performance.

Research Questions

1. What are the intralingual and interlingual errors that are prevalent in the oral performances of Senior High School Students?
2. What are the Oral Corrective Feedback to avoid errors in the oral performance tasks of Senior High School students?

Theoretical Lens

This corpus qualitative study has gleaned through the theoretical framework of Stephen Pit Corder's (1967) seminal work, The Significance of Learner's Errors. It is a tool in language teaching that looks through the teachers' perspective and helps to reconsider the approach in terms of supporting or fixing the gap between the learners in a language setting, particularly in a second language (Vásquez, 2008). Additionally, in 1974, Richards established the two major classifications of errors in the second language, Intralingual and Interlingual, to be used in identifying and analyzing the errors in oral performance tasks. Intralingual errors are caused when a student has acquired a new set of language systems within his learning strategy

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

(Brown, 1980, as cited in Huang & Benson, 2013). Furthermore, Touchie (1986) introduces the subcategories and definitions with examples. The intralingual errors that were used in this study were the following: simplifications, overgeneralizations, hypercorrections, faulty teachings, inadequate learnings, and false concept hypothesized.

On the other hand, Interlingual errors are the result of native language interference, also known as mother tongue (Touchie, 1986). In addition, Selinker (1994, as cited in Mardijono, 2003, p.67) points out that learners tend to stop acquiring knowledge once they discover the different rules between L1 and L2. There are three main factors under interlingual error presented by Al-Khresheh (2010) namely: transfer error, substitution error, and literal translation. Consequently, to address the second research question, the researcher will use Oral Corrective Feedback. According to Lightbrown and Spada (1999), it is a corrective response to the learners who incorrectly use the second language. There are six major categories identified by Lyster and Ranta (1997), five of which were employed specifically: recast, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and explicit correction.

METHODOLOGY

In this research study, the researcher employed a qualitative research approach. This approach was intended to study things in their usual setting. Additionally, it ventured to make sense of or be capable of explaining a phenomenon and its implications that were brought to the people (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, as cited in Davies & Hughes, 2014).

In addition, this study employed Error Analysis as an organized process of identifying, describing, and recounting the learner's errors, particularly in oral performance. This approach was considered particularly valuable since English was the learners' second language. Additionally, Al-Sobhi (2019) revealed that repeatedly made errors or the linguistic elements that learners find difficult to generate with precision. Moreover, learners' errors could aid in formulating a possible explanation of how those errors occurred (Makamure & Jojo, 2020).

Furthermore, the errors were classified according to their type, following Richards's (1974) two main classifications of errors, Interlingual and Intralingual, including their subcategories. Interlingual errors occur due to native language influence, while intralingual errors happen within the target language, such as misusing its rules. On the other hand, Oral Corrective Feedback was a method of responding to the learners' errors in the L2, specifically during oral communication (Muslem et al., 2021).

Research Material

The corpus of this study was the transcribed fifty-one oral performance tasks of the Senior High School students in selected private schools in the Division of Tagum City, Davao del Norte, during the School Year 2023 – 2024. The scope of research materials that are needed to saturate the data for a corpus study ranges from ten to one hundred (Clark & Braun, 2013).

Data Analysis

This study employed Error Analysis, which was used in identifying and analyzing the errors during the oral performance tasks of Senior High School Students. Aligning with the method of Vásquez (2008), Error Analysis involves gathering the sample of the learner's language, recognition of errors, and explanation of errors. In addition, the errors in oral performance tasks of Senior High School students were categorized using the two major classifications and subclassifications of Richards (1974), Intralingual and Interlingual errors. Furthermore, to address the second research question, Oral Corrective Feedback was used. It provided a possible recommendation for avoiding errors in oral performance tasks. Lastly, the researcher sought expert aid from the expert adviser. The adviser and the expert debriefer, who held a doctorate in Linguistics, ensured effective coding and theming of data gathered from the study, making the study more credible and reliable.

RESULTS

Table 1.1
Intralingual Errors in Oral Performance Tasks of Senior High School Students

Classification	Sample Oral Performance Tasks	Analysis
Simplification Error	**OPT 25:** "…secretiveness is not wanting others to know or done privately so that others do not know."	The phrase "**not wanting others to know**" was repeated. This action was not unneeded in the sentence and weakened the conciseness. The misusage of the verb "**done**" occurred, where "**privately**" was followed by a past participle "**done**". This construction made a syntactically awkward impression. The secretiveness was an ongoing action, and "**done privately**" could present a singular complete action. Therefore, the corrected sentence should have been: "**Secretiveness is the desire to keep things hidden from others, often by acting privately.**"
Overgeneralization	**OPT 46:** "Communication is the very important for human…"	The definite article "**the**" was commonly used before the superlatives. However, "**very important**" in the sentence did not belong to superlative construction. Therefore, "**communication is very important for humans…**" would have been the corrected statement.
Inadequate Learning	**OPT 20:** "…he or she will know the truthness more than a lie."	The speaker used the word "**truthness**", a not standard in English or unlikely non-standard in the colloquial term, which presented the lack of familiarity of the speaker in standard vocabulary in English. It would have been, "**…he or she will know the truth more than a lie,**" the corrected statement.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Table 1.2
Interlingual Errors in Oral Performance Tasks of Senior High School Students

Classification	Sample Oral Performance Tasks	Analysis
Substitution Error	**OPT 06:** "…than like sa interesting in people's lives and it give…"	In Filipino, particularly in Bisaya language, the word "**sa**" could be translated into "**to**", "**at**", or "**in the**". The student may have expressed about finding something interesting. The rephrased sentence would be: "**…than being interested in people's lives, that can lead to…**"
	OPT 28: "…on the first day of school I found this section to be very silent kasi we are all very quiet for the first day of school."	In the original statement the word "**kasi**" was a Filipino word that was mostly utilized as an adverb or conjunction that meant "**since**" or "**because**" to express the reason for silence on the first day of school. The corrected statement would have been been, "**…on the first day of school I found this section to be very silent because we are all very quiet for the first day of school.**"

Table 2
Employing Recommended Oral Corrective Feedback to Avoid Errors during the Oral Performance Tasks of Senior High School Students

Utilized Oral Corrective Feedback	Sample Oral Performance Tasks	Analysis
Metalinguistic Feedback	**OPT 12:** "…aysa ma'am… Hello, everyone! The to—ay sa diay… (reminded by the teacher to follow the set rules) Hello, everyone the topic that I picked ay! Introduce sa diay, hello everyone, I'm (name)."	The teacher first reminded the student to follow the set rules for speaking performance. This was an example of metalinguistic feedback, where the input directed learners to correct their speech structure by introducing themselves. Furthermore, this feedback encouraged the learner to think about the rules to be followed, leading to the learner's self-correction.
Explicit Correction	**OPT 46:** "For me, sir is uh… very important to communicate uh human, sir? (the clarification was promptly answered by the teacher). Human because uh… because for asking for someone or dealing a business or kining entertain others or many purposes—many purposes and unsa to siya, sir? Communication no? (the clarification was promptly answered by the teacher). Communication is the very important for human is—for—for—for human—for communicate the ano loved ones and parents."	The learner was displaying struggles with certain words or phrases that were related to the given topic. During the verbal performance, the learner asked for clarification by saying "**communicate uh human, sir?**" and "**unsa to siya, sir? Communication no?**" The teacher straightforwardly answered the clarification. This oral corrective feedback is an example of Explicit Correction.
Elicitation	**OPT 14:** "Good afternoon, everyone. My name is (name) and… (guided by teacher what to say next) ang akong… unsa to? (hinted by the teacher on what to say next by saying my topic)	There were multiple Oral Corrective Feedback in OPT 14. First, before the learner stated the phrase, "ang akong… unsa to?", the teacher used Elicitation as the Corrective Feedback. This feedback cued the learner to recall or produce the correct phrase by themselves, rather than answering straightforwardly.
Recasts	My topic is kanang we… unsa to? (Shortly answered by the teacher) Ge—geren—unsa to ma'am? (Shortly answered by the teacher, what was the topic given to the student)	On the other hand, the next statement of the student during the oral performance, where the learner began to say "**My topic is kanang we… Ge—geren—unsa to ma'am?**" and "**Ge—geren—unsa to ma'am?**" the teacher answered both instances in providing the correct form of the word. This feedback was Recast, where the teacher implicitly corrected the error by providing the formal form without needing to point out that an error was made during oral performance tasks.
Clarification Request	**OPT 51:** "…Oral communication is… for me oral—oral communication is to… communi—communica… (the teacher gave a follow-up inquiry by rephrasing the question). For oral communication is a need to communicate with each other… through telephone and texting."	During the oral performance, the learner displayed a sign of struggle when expressing their thoughts, "**…for me oral communication is to… communi—communica…**", and was interrupted by the follow-up inquiry of the teacher by rephrasing the question. This corrective feedback was a Clarification Request, encouraging learners to reformulate their responses.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

DISCUSSIONS

The Intralingual and Interlingual Errors that are Prevalent in the Oral Performances of Senior High School Students

Intralingual

Intralingual errors came from the target language; they were caused by not having adequate knowledge of rules in the target language structure (Myint, 2020). When a learner continually learns the target language, Intralingual errors could occur due to inappropriately applied rules, particularly in this study, the learner's verbal performance. Similarly, the study of Damaiyanti (2021), where the study concluded that the learner's intralingual errors were due to poor vocabulary and lack of adequate knowledge. These factors affected the learner's speaking performance.

Additionally, Intralingual errors in verbal performance were more challenging than writing. The learners needed to process the necessary grammar and fluency due to its spontaneous nature compared to writing. Verbal errors arose from the pressure of the actual communication, leading to Intralingual errors such as simplification and overgeneralization errors (Kusmaryani & Fitriawati, 2023). Moreover, the irregularity and complexity of the English language contribute to the Intralingual errors that happen during oral performance tasks, the learner might overgeneralize rules, simplify structures, or utilize incomplete grammatical rules (Rajan et al., 2024). There were fifty-plus-one (50+1) oral performances as the corpora of the study. The Intralingual errors were found in the transcribed oral performances of the Senior High School Students. Hence, the errors were identified as Intralingual Errors and were categorized according to their sub-classification. The prevalent Intralingual subcategories were Inadequate Learning, Overgeneralization, and Simplification Error.

Inadequate Learning

The study's results showed that Inadequate Learning was one of the prevalent sub-categories of Intralingual errors by Touchie (1986) in the learners' oral performances. The errors that were committed mostly were subject-verb agreement, syntactical structures, and incorrect sentence structures. Subject-verb errors were frequent due to the following factors. First, according to Nichol (n.d.), the complexity of the rules, wherein the L2 contained several rules including the exceptions that could result in the learner's confusion. Meanwhile, syntactical structures occurred according to Gayo and Widodo (2018) when redundancy and word choice, incorrect word usage, and parallelism issues. Utilizing redundancy and word choice in the sentence made it unclear and imprecise. Additionally, incorrect sentence construction where the errors could include incorrect application of prepositions, articles, and verb forms, eventually led to unclear or grammatically incorrect sentences. The learners committed errors in constructing relative clauses and phrases, which displayed a lack of understanding of the target language, English, in terms of syntax and grammar. Therefore, the identified sources of Intralingual error that resulted in inadequate learning due to the intricacy of the L2 as argued by Celce-Murcia and Yoo (2014, as cited in Agbay & Reyes, 2019), where mastering the grammar was a complicated process that needed a series of making decisions of when and why to use a specific form rather than the other forms.

Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization error is a sub-category introduced by Touchie (1986) under Intralingual error, the error occurs when the learner exercises a grammatical rule where it does not belong, resulting in incorrect language usage (Marsden, 2022). Furthermore, the results showed incorrect usage of articles; according to RifaMahroof (2014), learners frequently overgeneralize a rule. In this case, the article uses without being aware of the exceptions or looking into a particular context where different rules were applicable. Furthermore, overgeneralizations often happen in articles as explained by Esperanza et al. (2024), it was commonly utilized by learners, causing overapplication in various contexts without considering the rule. Consequently, redundancy was found in the oral performances of the learners and was the frequent result of overgeneralization. This can be seen as an attempt by the learners to emphasize or clarify a statement. In line with the study of Tan (2022), where the author classified redundancy under overgeneralization error, it occurred when an unneeded element was added to the sentence, resulting in repetition or excess information. Furthermore, the identified overgeneralization errors also showed several incorrect uses of subject-verb agreement. Subject-verb agreement errors in overgeneralization were usually seen when a learner had mastered the other basic grammatical structures (Gass et al., 2020, pp. 307-308).

Simplification Error

A Simplification Error is an error that occurs frequently among language learners; it is a failure to apply the entire grammatical structure in their sentences (Sumakul et al., 2023). The errors that led to simplification errors were missing prepositions, pronouns, and incorrect subject-verb agreements. There was also the redundancy, the repetitive phrases and words that complicated the sentences. This is similar to the study of Molin (2020), where the learners omitted prepositions and pronouns, constructed incorrect subject-verb agreements, and made redundancies due to simplification errors. These errors came from the differences between L1 and L2 grammatical rules. Moreover, Simplification Errors resulted from incomplete grammatical structures that hindered the clarity and effectiveness of second-language speaking. This suggests learners avoid complex structures and opt for simpler forms, which will turn to various error types (Neupane, 2023). These errors presented simplification errors, where learners failed to apply the correct grammatical rules, leading to incorrect sentence structures, particularly during oral performance. This showed that the learners still acquired the needed grammar to form accurate sentences (Handayani, 2023).

Interlingual

One of the two major errors introduced by Richards (1974) was the Interlingual error, which happened when a learner used a grammar, word choice, or sentence structure from their native language in the target language. The error occurred because the two languages had different grammatical rules and cultural meanings (Brown, 2020). During the verbal performance of the learner, according to Rajan et al. (2024), even if the learner

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

knew how to construct a sentence correctly in their first language, their second language was incorrect or difficult to understand due to Interlingual interference.

This reliance on their first language led to Interlingual errors, where the learner incorrectly applied first language patterns to the second language. This was further supported by Murtiana (2019), that Interlingual errors happened as a result of students' native language influencing their second language. Furthermore, when habits from the native language of the student interfered with their ability to learn the pattern and rules of the target language, such as English, this interference resulted in Interlingual error (Suputra, 2024). Interlingual errors can lead to misinterpretation or confusion when idiomatic expressions or phrasal verbs from their native language are translated into the target language (Lightbrown & Spada, 2019). Among the various sub-classifications of the Interlingual errors, Substitution errors emerged as the most prevalent.

Substitution Error

Substitution errors, as defined by Siregar (2021), happen when a learner tries to communicate in a second language; they may sometimes mix the grammar and structures from their native tongue. This caused errors and made their oral communication sound strange or incorrect. In this case, during the oral performances, the learners were noted to substitute Bisaya words and phrases, their first language, directly into English, their second language. Throughout the identified substitution errors, the researcher noticed the incorrect usage of articles, prepositions, pronouns, tenses of verbs, adverbs, and adjectives. Similarly, this was observed in the study of Alahmadi and Lahlali (2019), where learners' speech contained substitution errors, often replacing correct words with ones from their native language. They frequently used incorrect grammatical structures, such as prepositions, pronouns, verb tenses, adverbs, adjectives, and articles. This may have been due to learners' limited understanding of the target language, English, in terms of grammar and vocabulary usage, which prevented them from expressing the precise meaning in their speech (Villarroel & Estrada, 2019). Hence, the learners' dependency on their mother tongue, Bisaya, during speaking performance in the target language, English, led to errors in grammar and vocabulary.

The utilized recommended Oral Corrective Feedback to avoid errors during the Oral Performance Tasks of Senior High School Students

Oral Corrective Feedback

Oral Corrective Feedback is facilitated when it comes to the prevention of committing an error during oral performance tasks. As stated by Muslem et al. (2021), it is a type of feedback that focuses on helping the students by pointing out and correcting errors, particularly in their spoken errors. In different educational settings and conditions in correcting errors, the teacher frequently gives different types of oral corrective feedback depending on the learners' demand, such as in the form of inquiry, clarification, confirmation, or correction (Almekhlafy & Alqahtani, 2022).

Moreover, in the corpus of the study, there were fifty-plus-one (50+1) oral performances. Only nine recorded and transcribed oral performances displayed oral corrective feedback provided by the teacher, classmates, or both. Of these nine recorded and transcribed oral performances, there were eleven instances of Oral Corrective Feedback provided by the teachers. Therefore, the oral corrective feedback was identified according to their types, which were: recast, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, and explicit correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Recast

One of the Oral Corrective Feedback introduced by Lyster and Ranta (1997) is Recasts. It is a kind of oral corrective feedback that allows the teacher to repeat the learner's utterance and correct the learner's error by giving the correction without indicating that the learner's utterance was incorrect (Sultana, 2015). The short responses of the teacher to the learner in both instances were identified as Recasts. The teacher immediately corrected the learner's incomplete or hesitant language by providing the right word. This aided the learner in continuing the performance, while the teacher's correction stayed within the course of the interaction. Furthermore, Savvani (2020) suggests using immediate Recasts in speech class as an implicit correction technique. This feedback is highly effective in motivating the learners and improving their phonetic skills, which can help them avoid future errors in pronunciation.

Elicitation

Elicitation is a type of corrective feedback presented by Lyster and Ranta (1997); it is where the teacher pauses during the student's speaking performance to encourage them to self-correct and fill in the missing word or phrase (Nadifa, 2022). Consequently, the result of the study showed that during the oral performances, the teacher opted to use Elicitation Feedback. This was observed when the teacher hinted at what should come next by providing cues but did not give the correct answer, allowing the student to self-correct (Thiri, 2022). The teacher was also observed to repeat and rephrase the student's utterance. Similarly, the study of Hidayati and Prasetyarini (2023) showed that Elicitation as corrective feedback utilizes a technique where the teacher repeats the correct part of the student's utterance, ignoring the erroneous part, and using a rising intonation to signal the learner to complete it.

Clarification Request

Teachers use clarification requests, according to Eslami and Derakhshan (2020), to highlight the learner's errors. This type of corrective feedback allows the teacher to gently point out the inconsistencies or inaccuracies in the learner's response. In line with the study's result, the teacher utilizes clarification requests as corrective feedback to direct the learner to a clearer and more precise expression of their thoughts. Furthermore, by rephrasing the questions and asking the learners to refine their responses, the teacher encourages them to self-correct without directly emphasizing the error. Clarification requests can also indicate that the teacher does not understand the learners' phrases and words (Amalia et al., 2019). Therefore, reformulating their responses can persuade the learners to engage in deep thinking, reflect on their language use, and improve their oral communication skills.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Metalinguistic Feedback

Metalinguistic feedback, according to Lyster and Ranta (1997, as cited in Tran & Nguyen, 2020, is oral corrective feedback that the teacher uses to help the students in the form of comments, information, or questions about their utterances. Although the particular error is not given, the teacher's feedback can serve as a hint about the particular error. Consequently, the teacher uses metalinguistic feedback to urge the students to consider the rules and self-correct their errors. Instead of simply giving the correct form, the teacher urges the students to consider the structure of their introduction and the proper language to use. This will lead the student to independently modify their speech during the oral performance. In line with the study of Nurjanah et al. (2024), metalinguistic feedback is used to explain the technical linguistics during error correction and is advantageous for students. By providing a better understanding of language rules, students were better at identifying and correcting their own errors.

Explicit Correction

This type of corrective feedback offers instantaneous feedback and supports the learner in gaining the appropriate information quickly (Hidayati & Presetyarini, 2023). As stated by Mendez et al. (2010), explicit correction is considered to be one of the effective corrective feedback that helps the learner to learn better by highlighting errors and giving necessary corrections. According to Nurjanah et al. (2024), learners who receive explicit correction are likely to be aware of their errors, which motivates them to improve their communication skills and develop their language skills in terms of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. Additionally, in the study of Mulyadin (2022), teachers who frequently use explicit correction found it suitable for senior high school learners. It reportedly provides detailed and clear explanations.

Implications for Teaching Practice

Speaking in a second language, particularly during oral performance tasks where the learners' proficiency is assessed. Many students may find it difficult to communicate effectively in a second language due to errors produced by Intralingual and Interlingual. Consequently, teachers are not trained to deal with the students' Intralingual and Interlingual errors. The academe could address this by organizing specialized seminar programs and teacher training workshops to enhance teachers' understanding of these errors and provide them with effective management strategies. In addition, it is important to address the inconsistent application of Oral Corrective Feedback during oral performance. Continuous professional development programs focusing on corrective feedback should be implemented to ensure teachers apply these strategies effectively.

Furthermore, contextual and communicative approaches to language learning are frequently underemphasized in instructional practices. Teachers should create tasks that simulate real-life scenarios, encouraging the students to communicate in the second language, English, in practical settings. This will help the students internalize correct grammar and language use, resulting in fewer errors. Furthermore, contextual and communicative approaches to language learning are frequently underemphasized in instructional practices. Teachers should create tasks that simulate real-life scenarios, encouraging the students to communicate in the second language, English, in practical settings. This will help the students internalize correct grammar and language use, resulting in fewer errors. Finally, a supportive classroom environment that views errors during oral performances as learning opportunities is important yet frequently underemphasized. Teachers should encourage students to actively participate in oral performance tasks, practice regularly, and view corrective feedback as a constructive tool.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study provides valuable insights, but further research is needed to fully understand these language learning phenomena and refine existing pedagogical approaches. First, future studies should adopt a longitudinal approach to examine the process of error change over time. By observing the students for an extended period, researchers can analyze how Intralingual and Interlingual errors change and how different types of Oral Corrective Feedback mediate these changes. Second, future researchers should employ experimental designs to investigate the processes through which different types of Oral Corrective Feedback minimize specific errors. Rather than comparing the effectiveness of Recasts, Elicitation, Clarification Requests, Metalinguistic Feedback, and Explicit Correction.

Moreover, future research should explore the interplay between corrective feedback and individual learner differences. Rather than determining whether specific feedback types are more effective for diverse learners, future studies should investigate why this might be the case. Another area for future exploration is the analysis of cross-linguistic influences on the process of error correction. By comparing learners with different native languages, researchers can investigate how L1 transfer affects both types of errors produced and the effectiveness of different corrective feedback strategies. Finally, future researchers should investigate the affective processes involved in responding to oral Corrective Feedback, rather than purely measuring anxiety, confidence, and motivation.

Concluding Remarks

Error analysis is a unique approach to language research that has piqued my interest as a researcher. The curiosity to delve deeper into this concept and understand how it contributes to our current knowledge of language. Intrigued by the concept of error analysis, I saw this as an opportunity to explore both Intralingual and Interlingual errors. Additionally, I was interested in investigating the use of oral corrective feedback to prevent errors in the oral performance tasks of senior high school students. Consequently, the results of this study gave me new knowledge because as an English teacher in the 21st century, where oral performances come in different forms such as oral recitations and delivering different types of speech. I can attest that from my experience, students were displaying a struggle in delivering their thoughts in a second language.

The awareness of these errors, Intralingual and Interlingual, gives a clearer view of the students' challenges when speaking the second language in the classroom setting. Furthermore, it enables them to know where their weakness lies, either

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Intralingual or Interlingual. Moreover, as a teacher, the study highlights the importance of providing oral corrective feedback to help students correct their errors and improve their communication skills. Oral corrective feedback from the teachers, when used effectively, can avoid such errors and motivate students to self-correct.

REFERENCES

1. *Agbay, N. G., & Reyes, Y. D. (2019). Scrutinizing Interlingual and Intralingual Error: Basis for English Writing Program. The Educational Review, 3(10), 42-151. DOI:10.26855/Er.2019.10.003*
2. *Alahmadi, N. S., & Lahlali, M. (2019). The Role of Learners' Gender Differences in L2 "Inter-Language" Errors of Intermediate-Level Saudi Language Learners. Journal of Arts and Humanities, 8(11), 63-74.*
3. *Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2010). Interlingual interference in English language word order structure of Jordanian EFL learners. Proceedings of the European Journal of Social Sciences, 16 (1), 105-116.*
4. *Almekhlafy, S. S. A. & Alqahtani, A. A. J. (2022). "Text" Interaction in EFL Virtual Classroom During the COVID-19 Era: Actual Use and Sense of Virtual Community. Front. Educ., 7, 946120. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.946120*
5. *Al-Sobhi, B. M. S. (2019). The Nitty-Gritty of Language Learners' Errors--Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage. International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies, 7(3), 49-60.*
6. *Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Male and female students' preferences on the oral corrective feedback in English as Foreign Language (EFL) speaking classroom. Humaniora, 10(1), 25-33.*
7. *Brown, H. D. (2020). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (7th ed.). Pearson Education*
8. *Celce-Murcia, M., & Yoo, I. W. (2014). Discourse-based Grammar and the Teaching of Academic Reading and Writing in EFL Contexts. English Teaching, 69(1).*
9. *Chania, S., & Amri, Z. (2019). An Analysis of Students' Grammatical Errors on Speaking at Sea Debate at English Department of Faculty of Languages and Arts of Universitas Negeri Padang. Journal of English Language Teaching, 8(4), 515-521*
10. *Clarke, V. & Braun, V. (2013). Teaching Thematic Analysis: Overcoming Challenges and Developing Strategies for Effective Learning. Psychologist, 26(2), 120-123. Http://Www.Thepsychologist.Org.Uk/Archive/Archive_Home.Cfm?Volumeid=26 &Editionid=222&Articleid=2222*
11. *Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learner's Errors.*
12. *Damaiyanti, S. (2021). Grammatical errors made by students in speaking English. Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning (JETLE), 2(2), 2-3.*
13. *Davies, M. & Hughes, N. (2014). Doing a Successful Research Project Using Qualitative or Qualitative Methods. 2. https://Www.Macmillanihe.Com/Page/Detail/Doing-Asuccessful-Research-Project/?K=9781137306425*
14. *Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry. Https://Psycnet.Apa.Org/Record/2008-06339-001*
15. *Eslami, Z. R., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Promoting Advantageous Ways for Teachers and Learners to Deal with Corrective Feedback. Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 19, 48-65.*
16. *Esperanza, M. E. B., Espinosa, J. S. F., Gambalosa, F. M., Opalsa, C. M., Tumbagahan, C. M., & Pomentil, R. A. G. (2024). Common informative writing errors among junior high school students: input to lesson exemplars. International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 11(2), 1606-1622.*
17. *Gass, S. M., Behney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2020). Second Language Acquisition: An Introduction Course. Fifth Edition. New York: Routledge.*
18. *Gayo, H., & Widodo, P. (2018). An analysis of morphological and syntactical errors on the English writing of junior high school Indonesian students. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 17(4), 58-70.*
19. *Handayani, T. C. K. (2023). An Analysis of Students Grammatical Errors in Writing Recount Text (A Case Study on Eighth Grade Students in Al-Fath Junior High School, BSD) (Bachelor's thesis, Jakarta: FITK UIN Syarif Hidayatullah jakarta).*
20. *Hidayati, L., & Prasetyarini, A. (2023). Lecturers' Corrective Feedback To Prospective Teachers In Speaking Virtual Class: An Exploratory Study In English Education Department Of Ums (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).*
21. *Huang, J. P., & Benson, P. (2013). Autonomy, Agency and Identity in Foreign and Second Language Education. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 36(1), 7-28.*
22. *Kusmaryani, W., & Fitriawati, F. (2023). Intralingual and Interlingual Grammatical Error Analysis on Students' Writing. Linguistics and ELT Journal, 11(1), 40-48.*
23. *Leaño, A. J., Rabi, N. M., & Piragasam, G. A. G. (2019). Speaking Difficulties of Philippine Indigenous Learners In English Phonology. International Journal of Academic Research In Business And Social Sciences, 9(1).*
24. *Lightbrown, P. And Spada, N. (1999). How Languages Are Learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*
25. *Lightbrown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2019). How Languages Are Learned (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.*
26. *Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND LEARNER UPTAKE: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(1), 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034*
27. *Makamure, C., & Jojo, Z. M. (2022). An Analysis of Errors for Pre-Service Teachers in First Order Ordinary Differential Equations. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 18(6), Em2117.*
28. *Mardijono, J. J. (2003). English Accent Evaluation: A Study on Indonesian EFL Learners' Perception. 5(2), 147-164.*
29. *Marsden, E. (2022). PREDICTION AND ERROR-BASED LEARNING IN L2 PROCESSING AND ACQUISITION. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 44(5), 1384-1409.*
30. *Mendez, E., Arguelles, L., & Castro, A. (2010). Oral corrective feedback: Some ways to go about it. FEL International, 33(1), 254-270.*
31. *Molin, V. (2020). An Error Analysis of Subject-Verb Agreement by Swedish Learners of English: Corpus-Based Study of the Difficulties Surrounding Subject-Verb Agreement for Swedish Students.*
32. *Mulyadin, A. (2022). An Analysis of Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies on Students' Speaking*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 3| March 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Performace. International Journal Of Pedagogical Novelty, 1(2), 46-54.

33. *Murtiana, R. (2019). An Analysis of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors in EFL Learners' Composition. Journal of Education Studies, 4(2), 204. http://dx.doi.org/10.30983/educative.v4i2.2544*
34. *Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' Perception toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes: A Case at English Education Department Students. International Journal of Language Education, 5(4), 244-259.*
35. *Myint, M. M. (2020). An Analysis of Interlingual Errors and Intralingual Errors Found in The Narrative Essay Written by Non-English Specialization Students of Meiktila University in The Academic Year (2019-20) (Doctoral Dissertation, Meral Portal).*
36. *Nadifa, I. D. (2022). INVESTIGATING THE USE OF EFL TEACHERS'ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SPEAKING CLASSES. Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Language Teaching, 6(2), 344-352.*
37. *Neupane, R. N. (2023). Error Analysis of Written English Composition: A Case of Basic Level Students. Tribhuvan Journal, 1(1), 101-109.*
38. *Nichol, M. (n.d.). 5 Common Subject-Verb Agreement Mistakes of ESL Students | EnglishClub. https://www.englishclub.com/efl/articles/grammar/subject-verb-agreement-mistakes/*
39. *Nurjanah, L., Rahmaningtyas, H., & Yaniafari, R. P. (2024). EXAMINING STUDENTS' ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PREFERENCES FOR IMPROVING SPEAKING PROFICIENCY. Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics, 11(1), 23-38.*
40. *Rajan, P. B., Makarevicius, A., & Hartrup, P. (2024). Exploring Arabic Learners' English Errors Interlingual vs. Intralingual Analysis and Remedial Teaching Strategies. Academicus International Scientific Journal, 15(30), 126-137.*
41. *Richards, J. C. (1971). Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies.*
42. *Richards, J. C. (1974). A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis. Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition, 172-188.*
43. *RifaMahroof, S. (2014, January). Article usage: a challenge for second language learners of English. In Proceedings of 7th International Symposium, SEUSL (pp. 31-33).*
44. *Savvani, S. (2020). Meaningfully Engaging EFL Students in the Digital School: Teacher Attitudes and Best Practices: Education Book Chapter | IGI Global. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/meaningfully-engaging-efl-students-inthe-digital-school/26851*
45. *Siregar, I. (2021). Analysis of Betawi Language Interference on the Morphology of Adolescent Speech in Jakarta. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies, 3(8), 54-60.*
46. *Sultana, R. (2015). The Survey on Using Oral Corrective Feedback in ESL Classroom in Bangladeshi Context. Undergraduate Thesis, Bangladesh: Brack University*
47. *Sumakul, F. H. D., Tuerah, I. J., & Damopolii, V. L. (2023). An Analysis Of Intralingual Errors In Research Proposals Made By English Language And Literature Students (A Study Was Conducted At Universitas Negeri Manado). JoTELL: Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature, 2(5), 646-667.*
48. *Suputra, I. G. W. (2024). Investigating Interlingual And Intralingual Error Of Diploma III Program In Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Mataram: An Error Analysis Of Learners' Use Of English As A Foreign Language. International Journal of Linguistics and Discourse Analytics, 5(2), 200-214.*
49. *Tan, X. (2022, December). An Analysis of Syntactic Errors: One Case Study. In 2022 5th International Conference on Humanities Education and Social Sciences (ICHESS 2022) (pp. 489-501). Atlantis Press.*
50. *Thiri, S. (2022). Corrective feedback in language teaching. Journal of International Cultural Studies, 28(April), 155–162. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203836507.ch36*
51. *Tiansoodeenon, M., Rungruangsuparat, B., Poomarin, W., Khunasathitchai, K., & Tarapond, S. (2022). Speaking Errors Analysis: A Case Study Of English-Major Undergraduate Students At Rajamangala University Of Technology Thanyaburi. Rmutsb Academic Journal (Humanities And Social Sciences), 7(2), 131-145.*
52. *Touchie, H. Y. (1986). Second Language Learning Errors: Their Types, Causes, And Treatment. Jalt Journal, 8(1), 75-80.*
53. *Tran, N. K., & Nguyen, C. T. (2020). TEACHERS'PERCEPTIONS ABOUT ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL SPEAKING CLASSES: A CASE AT COLLEGES IN THE MEKONG DELTA, VIETNAM. European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 5(2).*
54. *Vásquez, D. A. (2008). Error Analysis in a Written Composition. Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development, (10), 135-146.*
55. *Villarroel, W. R., & Estrada, S. C. (2019). Analysis of interlingual and intralingual interferences found in writings of efl learners at UTA. Ciencia Digital, 3(2), 124-137.*