ASIAN EFL JOURNAL
The EFL Professional's Written Forum

Sex-Disaggregated Inventory of Sexist-Oriented and Other Types of Lexical Errors among First Year BSE English Students

Christine Iñez B. Aquino-Padlan, M.A. Ed. *Pangasinan State University – School of Advanced Studies Urdaneta City, Philippines*

Presley V. De Vera, DComm.
Pangasinan State University
Lingayen, Pangasinan, Philippines

Abstract

This study aligns to the field of Lexical Semantics that employ Error Analysis (EA) approach. It is a descriptive study that employed sex-disaggregated data to analyze the formal and semantic lexical errors, as well as the sexist-oriented lexical errors of sixty (60) First Year students of Pangasinan State University-Lingayen Campus, enrolled in the program Bachelor of Secondary Education, major in English (BSE English). Identifying the research population considered proportional sex distribution.

The study also aimed to clarify potential factors associated to students' susceptibility to commit lexical errors by correlating a list of variables based on the students' language-learning characteristics. Consequent to its objectives, the study generated a sex-disaggregated inventory of the lexical errors of ESL college learners. The inventory of errors is theoretically restricted by this study's arbitrary classification of lexical error types into formal lexical errors and semantic lexical errors, with various subtypes of errors registered under these general categories that were sourced from various taxonomies of lexical errors. The study also poses theoretical contribution with its inclusion of an additional type of lexical error, i.e. sexist oriented lexical errors (SOLEs). The study was carried out with a gender lens since all the research objectives are permeated by an aim to compare the accounts of the female and male

participants. Furthermore, the study used theory-informed and content-validated questionnaires to collect pertinent data.

Findings revealed that the female students are highly exposed to various types of authentic materials in English, but with slightly higher opportunity of exposure to "audio-visual materials and online publications". On the other hand, the male students are also highly exposed to various types of authentic materials in English, but with slightly higher opportunity of exposure to "audio materials". The female and male students manifest similar patterns of preference for all the lexical inferencing strategies (LISs) that range from "moderate" to "high", wherein "Meaning-focused strategy" is dominantly preferred, while "evaluating strategy" is least preferred. Moreover, the female and the male students have parallel accounts in terms of their preference for all the lexical processing strategies (LPSs) range from "low", "moderate", and "high". "Non-human resource strategy" is dominantly preferred, while "avoidance strategy" is least preferred. Furthermore, most of the female and the male students imbibe an "active vocabulary dominant (AVD)" orientation. Likewise, both the female and male students are highly susceptible to commit certain types of "formal lexical errors" and "semantic lexical errors". The two sexes exhibited exactly the same patterns of sexist-oriented lexical errors, which are actually drawn from the pool of formal lexical errors. The sex of the students does not significantly differentiate their rate of susceptibility to commit sexist-oriented lexical errors.

In almost all occurrences, the susceptibility of both female and male students to commit sexist-oriented lexical errors, formal lexical errors, or semantic lexical errors is not related to their exposure to any type of authentic material in English, or to their preferential use any lexical inferencing strategy and lexical processing strategy, or their vocabulary orientation based on their active-passive vocabulary index. This is only intercepted by some isolated occurrences such as their preferential use of "avoidance strategy" and "human resource strategy", which is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "inflectional error-noun" (a type of formal lexical error). Likewise, their preferential use of "avoidance strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "formal misinformation" (a type of formal lexical error). Likewise, their preferential use of "human resource strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "collocation errors" (a type of semantic lexical error).

On the merits of the research's findings and conclusion that were further signified to existing literature and studies in the field of Lexical Semantics, several recommendations are

offered to call the attention and initiative of ESL teachers, school agents, and even Gender and Development (GAD) advocates to reinforce their strategic interventions in order to assist students in their optimal development of lexical competence that should manifest in the alleviation of their lexical errors and their sexist tendencies manifest in their written and oral discourse production.

Keywords: *sex-disaggregated, sexist-oriented, lexical errors, formal errors, semantic errors, error analysis*

Introduction

Folse (2004), pointed out that having poor vocabulary significantly results to constraints in communication. He explained that "one can get by without grammar but one cannot get by without vocabulary" (Folse, 2004). Thus, it is suggested that communication problems may be overcome by working systematically to increase lexical competence as a catalyst to overall communicative competence (Caro & Mendinueta, 2017).

Just for a brief clarification in the use of terms, "lexical skill" is used synonymously and interchangeably with "vocabulary skill" by many language scholars (Schmitt, 1995). However, some scholars try to distinguish the two terms by saying that vocabulary competence is concerned with the mere acquisition of or familiarity with words. On the contrary, lexis is not only associated with words per se, but expands to include other layers of lexical knowledge, in which vocabulary is just one of the components. Lexis comprises a system of word units, which relates to other units creating a network of meanings (Nation, 2001). Thus, lexical competence has to do with one's ability to choose appropriate words in their right contextual usage, more than merely having an inventory of familiar words at hand. In relation to this, lexical skills refer to a specialized set of skills that contribute to the achievement of lexical competence. Concern over this type of skills is where this study is anchored. As prior mentioned, vocabulary skills lie within the larger scope of lexical skills which also includes knowledge of correct word structures as they transform morphologically and orthographically, as well as the appropriate choice of words to use as influenced by both linguistic and non-linguistic contexts. In this study, the correct choice of words based on non-linguistic contexts draws from the principles of gender-fair language, thereby significantly lending this research a "gender lens".

In addition to the above, scholars conceived that a rich vocabulary makes the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing easier to perform, as these contribute to effective and successful communication (Alqahtani, 2015; Nation 1994). But this injunction can only be shallow if the importance of vocabulary skills is not viewed from the larger context of lexical competence, which is the larger scheme and to which vocabulary skills contribute to its maximized application. Thus, it is lexical instruction that should figure prominently in EFL / ESL teaching contexts so that learners are not plainly taught of vocabulary items that are devoid of locus (Thornbury, 2002). Vocabulary skills without lexical skills is like handling a mechanical tool to someone but not teaching how to use it properly.

The conceptualization of the framework of this study was anchored on lexical skills takes its impetus from this researcher's own observations of various written corpora of students. This researcher has been teaching English language courses to college students for several years now, and was made to handle courses where it is inevitable to encounter and assess students' written compositions, whether these may be in the form of essay tests, theme compositions, literary compositions or even business correspondence compositions. While a variety of linguistic and non-linguistic error types are notable from these student-generated corpora, some of the more prominent ones relate to lexical errors.

Moreover, to some extent, the lexical errors committed do not only qualify as simple linguistic errors but point out to some lack of familiarity with the principles of gender-fair language. Notably, this has been observed in the case of both female and male students. Hence, the observation of these lexical errors became a standpoint in which the researcher wished to intersect the learning objectives of English courses to the University's larger Gender and Development (GAD) agenda, since Pangasinan State University has a firmly institutionalized GAD unit, concentrated to promote gender-fair principles (PSU Echoes, 2019).

Anchored on the above considerations, this study is intended to promote greater emphasis on the development of lexical competence among the University students, and where this academic project may also be an adjacent venue to cascade the GAD agenda into the curriculum of English language courses. Since it is assumed that adequate emphasis on lexical competence is not currently solidly established in the curriculum, it may be presumptuous to measure the students' lexical competence if the latter is not anchored on the list of competencies for English courses. So instead of taking this route, an error analysis (EA) type of research is herein and by this means, the researcher was able to show the existence of a specific gap or a problem noted from the overall English proficiency of students. This study

aims to give evidence of skill deficiencies that can be the basis for the curriculum planners of English courses, as well as the GAD agents of the University, to cooperatively work on giving importance to lexical competence. These evidence required to raise such an awareness are the lexical errors manifest in student-generated corpora.

In relation to the aforementioned objective to be pursued by this study, several language scholars have already pointed out that, indeed, lexical errors are the most frequently occurring category of errors in written English (Hemchua & Schmitt, 2006; Grauberg, 1971). It was also unfortunately noted that while the bulk of existing language researches seem to credit the importance of vocabulary is ESL writing, studies do not seem to navigate further into the larger scheme of lexical competence, and that there has been relatively little research into the lexical errors. Despite the frequency and seriousness of lexical errors, they remained under-researched (Astika 1993; Ellis, R 1994; Engber 1995). But this type of errors significantly affects the quality of academic writing and that native speakers of English actually consider them the most irritating (Santos 1988). One of the reasons pointed out as to why lexical competence has not been very much emphasized is because of a general attitude among ESL teachers to disregard such errors even as they are constantly observed in students in favor of dealing with grammatical and other types of errors which are the ones more clearly emphasized in the contents of ESL courses. Carter (1998) explains this vividly:

> *"... 'mistakes' in lexical selection may be less generously tolerated outside classrooms than mistakes in syntax. This is probably because lexical selection consists mainly of content words, which convey the intended message. When inappropriate lexical choices are made (lexical errors), this can lead directly to misunderstanding of the message, or at least to an increase in the burden of interpreting the text. Since lexical errors are potentially disruptive, they deserve attention (Carter, 1998).*

For some of the few studies on lexical errors, their research objectives also focused on determining possible factors that explain ESL learners' susceptibility to commit such errors (Swan,1997; Laufer (1997). Some of the hypothesized factors include "L1-L2 interference" (Swan,1997; Laufer (1997). Moreover, it is also attributed to the cognitive process of language learning and language use (Corder,1992). Since this is a trend of query adopted by lexical EA

studies in the past, this study takes up to continue such tradition with its own hypothetical constructs. A new set of variables, besides those that are invoked in previous studies, are hypothesized as factors to explain learners' susceptibility to commit certain types of lexical errors, and even sexist-oriented lexical errors for that matter. This aspect is actually one of the unique features of this study as it tries to theoretically intersect the concerns of lexical competence with the principles of gender-fair language which has never been done before, whether in existing related literature or studies on lexical competence or lexical errors.

Notable, scholarly literature sets the typology of lexical errors only under two major classifications, i.e. "formal lexical errors and semantic lexical errors" (Hemchua & Schmitt, 2006). This theoretical classification only ties lexical errors to a linguistic context and undermines the possibility that lexical errors may also be conditioned by non-linguistic factors such as gender bias. This is the reason that even sexist-oriented lexical errors were, in fact, absorbed as mere superficial manifestations of either formal errors or semantic errors. In reality, sexist-oriented lexical errors must have its own domain and not merely reduced mere linguistically conditioned errors because the commission of such errors transcend linguistic factors. This aspect of the study advanced some possible theory-construction or its own modest contribution to currently existing theories on lexical competence and lexical errors.

In synthesis to the above considerations, this study was hereby advanced to contribute to one of the least explored researchable areas in the field of ESL linguistics and communication studies. It is a modest gesture of this researcher to perpetuate the tradition of lexical error analysis, and hopefully to re-ignite interest in this field for the sake of prospective researchers in this University and in other institutions. The merits of this study also addressed the possibility of instating the significance of lexical competence in the curriculum of English language courses in the University, and to forge the closer cooperation between the University's Gender and Development agents and the English language academicians.

Methodology

Study Design

On the perspective of this study's classification as a language research, it registers in the tradition of linguistic studies that employ Error Analysis (EA) approach. As there may be varying methods to conduct EA, this study used the method of Harris (1994, in Rumfaan, 2016) that employs "recognition" as a technique in conducting EA, as an alternative to EA mechanics usually applied to assess written corpus. The EA instrument of this study enabled the

identification of students' lexical errors using test types such as sentence completion and sentence correction.

In terms of methodology, this study adopted a descriptive design. Descriptive research is common to social researches (Bhat, 2018), since many of these studies aim to present the results of surveys or describe the profile of a target population in terms of some selected categories (socio-demographic or otherwise). This study took up "lexical errors" as the phenomenon of interest. Moreover, the phenomenon was explored with reference to the opposite sexes' peculiar encounter of and susceptibility to the different types of lexical errors. The major output of this study was a sex-disaggregated inventory of lexical errors committed by ESL learners, which entails a survey and a description of lexical errors using a specialized taxonomy.

In terms of this study's approach to data analysis, it employed both qualitative and quantitative modes of analysis. Other objectives of this study that presupposed the use of quantitative analysis was the use of inferential statistics, which entailed both analysis of variance and correlation. In this study, these analytical tools will be instrumental to determine if there is a significant variance in the experience and orientations of female and male ESL learners when it comes to committing lexical errors. Such analysis also determined the closeness of certain learner traits when it came to the rate of their susceptibility to commit certain error types. All these paved for a comprehensive description of the data that will be surveyed.

Respondents of the Study

The target respondents of this study were drawn from the raw population of first year college students actively enrolled in the program, Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE), major in English at Pangasinan State University - Lingayen Campus, during the academic year 2019-2020. Due to the complexity of this study's data-gathering instrument which entailed enormous effort to conduct the error analysis on the test results for every respondent, the research population was predetermined for a total of sixty (60) participants. The ideal composition of the target population comprised of 30 female students and 30 male students from two classes of first year BSE English students. By initially classifying the raw population into their sex categories, it was ensured that the ideal sex population was satisfied

Data Collection Procedure

Upon the final approval of the research proposal by the thesis committee, the intent to conduct this study was then cascaded to the concerned officials in the institutional research locale. This was done via a formal communication and the actual procedures were explained clearly to the concerned authorities and teachers to ensure that the students' regular school activities were disrupted when the instruments were administered.

The **ESL Lexical Learning Characteristics Profiler (ESL-LLCP)** was the first instrument that was personally administered by the researcher. Weighing the difficulty level of the ESL-LLCP, the running time to respond to this instrument was estimated at 40 minutes. All filled-out forms were collected before dismissing the group. A spreadsheet was used to easily collate the data and produce the summary of the students' responses in the ESL-LLCP.

On a separate schedule and setting, the **Lexical Error Elicitor Test (LE-ET)** was administered to the same set of respondents who were called again to meet as an entire group to take the test in a common classroom venue. Weighing the difficulty level of the ESL-LLCP, the running time to respond to this instrument was estimated at 90 minutes or 1.5 hours (maximum). The researcher evaluated the students' answer in the test using the rubric "Taxonomy of Lexical Errors". A spreadsheet was used to collate the data and produce the inventory of lexical errors.

Results and Discussion

Sex-Disaggregated Profile of BSE English Students along Lexical Learning Characteristics

1. **Students' Exposure to Authentic Materials in English**

Female students. Generally, the female students' exposure to authentic materials in English (AERMs) is High (AWM: 3.87), indicating a good volume of AERM resources in their environment, which are also available for the students to access. Likewise, the female students' have "high" exposure to the different types of AME classified into: (a) reading materials in print medium (AWM: 3.71), (b) audio materials (AWM: 3.88), and (c) audio-visual materials and online publications (AWM: 4.03). However, the female students are most likely to access "audio-visual and online publications", particularly "written articles posted on the internet". The AERM resources accessed the least compared to the others are the "reading materials in print medium".

Male students. Generally, the female students' exposure to AERMs is High (AWM: 3.81), indicating a good volume of AERM resources in their environment, which are also available for the students to access. Likewise, the male students' have "high" exposure to the different types of AERM classified into: (a) reading materials in print medium (AWM: 3.50), (b) audio materials (AWM: 4.07), and (c) audio-visual materials and online publications (AWM: 3.81). However, the male students are most likely to access "audio materials", particularly "music". The AERM resources accessed the least compared to the others are the "reading materials in print medium".

2. Preferred Lexical Inferencing Strategy

Female students. All the female students manifested varying levels of preference for all the lexical inferencing strategies (LISs), ranging from "moderate" to "high". Two of the strategies are "highly" preferred namely (a) form-focused strategy (AWM: 3.66) and (b) meaning-focused strategy. Between these, the latter is dominantly preferred. The other LISs are preferred only at a "moderate level", such as the (a) evaluating strategy (AWM:3.14) and (b) monitoring strategy (AWM:2.96). On the extreme opposites of the students' preferential scale, the "monitoring strategies" is least preferred over the others. Moreover, their practices that indicate their use of "meaning-focused strategy" are as follows:

- *I check the meaning of the word by analyzing its definition as stated in the dictionary (WM: 4.48, High)*
- *I check the meaning of the word by researching about its synonyms or even its antonyms (WM: 4.30, High)*
- *I research about the classification of the unfamiliar word (e.g. is it a food? An animal? A place? Or a type of profession? etc.) because this gives me a better grasp of the word's meaning (3.65, High).*
- *I paraphrase the sentence until the meaning becomes clearer and so with the unfamiliar word in that sentence (3.52, High).*

Male students. All the male students manifested varying levels of preference for all the lexical inferencing strategies (LISs), ranging from "moderate" to "high". Two of the strategies are "highly" preferred, namely: (a) form-focused strategy (AWM: 3.55) and (b) meaning-focused strategy (AWM: 3.85). Between these, the latter is dominantly preferred. The other LISs are also preferred but only at a "moderate level", such as the (a) evaluating strategy

(AWM:3.33) and (b) monitoring strategy (AWM:3.20). On the extreme opposites of the students' preferential scale, the "monitoring strategies" is least preferred over the others. Further, their practices that indicate their use of "meaning-focused strategy" are as follows:

- *I check the meaning of the word by analyzing its definition as stated in the dictionary (WM: 4.48, High);*
- *I check the meaning of the word by researching about its synonyms or even its antonyms (WM: 4.20, High);*
- *I research about the classification of the unfamiliar word (e.g. is it a food? An animal? A place? Or a type of profession? etc.) because this gives me a better grasp of the word's meaning (WM: 3.48, Moderate);*
- *I paraphrase the sentence until the meaning becomes clearer and so with the unfamiliar word in that sentence (WM: 3.24, Moderate)*

3. Preferred Lexical Processing Strategy

Female students. All the female students manifested varying levels of preference for all the strategies, ranging from "low", "moderate", and "high". Two of the strategies are "moderately" preferred, namely: (a) human resource strategy (AWM: 3.00) and (b) non-human resource strategy (AWM: 3.83). Between these, the latter is dominantly preferred. "Avoidance strategy" (AWM: 2.37) is preferred at a "low level". Further, their more frequent practices that indicate use of "non-human resource strategy" are as follows:

- *I refer to the dictionary or thesaurus (WM: 4.65, Very High);*
- *I analyze the structure of the word and discover its possible relations to other words that I already know (WM: 3.57, High)*
- *I use context-clue to predict the meaning of the word (WM: 3.57, High)*

Male students. All the female students manifested varying levels of preference for all the strategies, ranging from "low" to "moderate". One of the strategies is "highly" preferred namely non-human resource strategy (AWM: 3.54). "Avoidance strategy" (AWM: 2.40) is preferred at a "low level". Further, their more frequent practices that indicate use of "non-human resource strategy" are as follows:

- *I refer to the dictionary or thesaurus (WM: 4.64, Very High);*

4. Active-Passive Vocabulary Index

Female students. Majority (20 or 67%) of the female students imbibe an "active vocabulary dominant (AVD)" orientation, and the remainder (10 or 33%) have "passive vocabulary dominant (PVD)" orientation. The female students with AVD orientation have fairly competent productive vocabulary, which enables them to easily retrieve from their word stock to actively use lexical items in different types of language productions (oral and written discourse). Those with PVD orientation also fare well in their lexical competence but only to the extent of their comprehension of texts and oral discourses encountered from listening. The major highlight of the students' AVD orientation is:

- *All English words that I am familiar of their meaning, I have been using them in my written compositions*

Male students. Majority (27 or 90%) of the female students imbibe an "active vocabulary dominant (AVD)" orientation, and the remainder (3 or 10%) have "passive vocabulary dominant (PVD)" orientation. The major highlight of the students' AVD orientation is:

- *All English words that I am familiar of their meaning, I have been using them in my written compositions*

Sex-disaggregated Data on the Extent of Lexical Errors Committed by the BSE English Students

Female students. Most female students have "high" level of susceptibility to commit formal lexical errors or FLE (53.33%), and the same "high" level of susceptibility to commit semantic lexical errors or SLE (48.67%). Moreover, there is slightly a greater number of students with high susceptibility to commit FLEs than SLEs, which may hypothetically indicate that female students are relatively more challenged to deal with formal lexical errors than with semantic lexical errors.

In terms of "formal lexical errors", findings reveal that all the female students are susceptible to commit all the twelve (12) types of FLEs. However, the levels of their susceptibility to commit each type of formal lexical error typically vary from high, average and low levels. Under the FLE type "Inflectional Error-Verb", most of the female students (18 or 60%) manifested "high" level of error susceptibility. This is also the case in FLE error types

such as “Inflectional Error-Noun” (24 or 80%), “Inflectional Error-Possessive” (23 or 76.67%), “Derivational Error” (18 or 60%), “Inaccurate Lexical Bundling” (30 or 100%), “Omission” (26 or 86.67%), and “Infusion” (30 or 100%). The aforementioned series of FLEs indicate lexical error types that most of the students commit in high frequencies. This means that these are the most difficult types of FLEs that most female students very challenging to deal with. Likewise, the FLEs “Inaccurate Lexical Bundling’ and “Infusion” stand out because these are types of lexical errors committed in maximum level by all the female students (100%).

In contrast to the above findings, that there are FLE types where most, or at least a larger number of the female students erred the least, to wit: “Inflectional Error-Adjective” (12 or 40%), “Formal Distortion” (17 or 56.67%), “Phonemic Confusion” (15 or 50%), and “Formal Misinformation / Interlingual Error” (25 or 83.33%). These are the series of FLE types obtaining the minimum evidence of errors as accounted for by the larger fraction of the female students, which may indicate that these lexical errors are not as problematic as the previous series reported.

In the case of “semantic lexical errors”, three of the SLE types stand out for being committed at maximum level by majority of the female students, to wit: “Inappropriate Synonym Choice” (19 or 63.33%), “Confusion of Sense Relation-Hyponym Preference” (25 or 83.33%), and “Collocation Error” (16 or 53.33%). Across these three SLE types, “Confusion of Sense Relation-Hyponym Preference” stands out with the most number of female students committing this error.

Contrary to the above findings, there is one (1) SLE type that most of the female students commit the least. This is the case of “miscollocation”, which was noted to have minimum traces of error as accounted by majority of the female students (20 or 66.67%).

Male students. All the male students are susceptible to commit lexical errors under its general categories of “formal lexical errors” and “semantic lexical errors”. Most male students have “high” level of susceptibility to commit FLE across its different types (51.39%), and also a “high” level of susceptibility to commit SLE across its different types (46.67. Further, there is slightly a greater number of students with high susceptibility to commit FLEs than SLEs, which may hypothetically indicate that male students are relatively more challenged to deal with formal lexical errors than with semantic lexical errors.

In terms of “formal lexical errors”, findings reveal that all the male students are susceptible to commit all the twelve (12) types of FLEs. Under the FLE type “Inflectional Error-Verb”, most of the female students (18 or 60%) manifested “high” level of error

susceptibility. This is also the case in FLE error types such as “Inflectional Error-Noun” (23 or 76.67%), “Inflectional Error-Possessive” (22 or 73.33%), “Derivational Error” (19 or 63.33%), “Inaccurate Lexical Bundling” (26 or 86.67%), “Omission” (30 or 100%), and “Infusion” (29 or 96.67%). The aforementioned series of FLEs indicate lexical error types that most of the students commit in high frequencies. This means that these are the most difficult types of FLEs that most male students find very challenging to deal with. Likewise, the FLEs “Omission” and “Infusion” stand out because these are types of lexical errors committed in maximum level by the greater number of male students (i.e. 100% and 96.67%, respectively).

In the case of “semantic lexical errors”, three of the SLE types stand out for being committed at maximum level by majority of the male students. These SLEs include: “Inappropriate Synonym Choice” (16 or 53.33%), “Confusion of Sense Relation-Hyponym Preference” (25 or 83.33%), and “Collocation Error” (18 or 60%). Across these three SLE types, “Confusion of Sense Relation-Hyponym Preference” stands out with the most number of male students committing this error.

Contrary to the above findings, there is one (1) SLE type that half of the male students (15 or 50%) commit only at a “moderate” level. This is the case of “CSR-hypernym preference”.

Sex-disaggregated Data on the Sexist-Oriented Lexical Errors of BSE English Students

Female students. The female students’ sexist-oriented lexical errors are manifest in their (a) formal lexical errors, specifically the “derivational error” type, and in their (b) semantic lexical errors, specifically in the types: “CSR-hyponym preference” and “collocation errors. As to their other types of lexical errors, no manifestation of sexist use of terms or language are noted. It is also notable that all the female students, or at least, most of them, committed the aforementioned list of lexical errors that reflect sexist use of language.

There is only one type of FLE committed by the female students adjacently characterized as sex-oriented lexical error. This is the case of “derivational error”, wherein all the female students’ (30 or 100%) responses that manifest derivational error were analyzed to likewise contain traces of SOLE. This means that the students’ derivational errors likewise induced them to use sexist term.

Further, the sexist-oriented lexical errors are not only found under FLE types but also among their SLEs. All the female students’ (30 or 100%) CSR-Hyponym Preference errors are also indicative of SOLE. Moreover, almost all the female students’ (29 or 97%) collocation

errors contain traces of SOLE. These findings, thereby, indicate that the commission of errors in these two SLE types may also induce sexist oriented errors.

Male students. The male students' sexist-oriented lexical errors are manifest in their (a) formal lexical errors, specifically the "derivational error" type, and in their (b) semantic lexical errors, specifically in the types: "CSR-hyponym preference" and "collocation errors. As to their other types of lexical errors, no manifestation of sexist use of terms or language are noted. It is also notable that all the female students, or at least, most of them, committed the aforementioned list of lexical errors that reflect sexist use of language.

There is only one type of FLE committed by the male students adjacently characterized as sex-oriented lexical error. This is the case of "derivational error", wherein majority of the male students' (16 or 53.33%) responses that manifest derivational error were analyzed to likewise contain traces of SOLE. This means that the students' derivational errors likewise induced them to use sexist term.

Further, the sexist-oriented lexical errors are not only found under FLE types but also among their SLEs. All the male students' (30 or 100%) CSR-Hyponym Preference errors and collocation errors are indicative of SOLE. These findings, thereby, indicate that the commission of errors in these two SLE types may also induce sexist oriented errors.

Difference in the Lexical Errors of Female and Male BSE English Students

1. Difference in the female and male student's sexist-oriented lexical errors

The female and male students' rates of susceptibility to commit sexist-oriented lexical errors along "derivational error" (0.7978), "CSR-hyponym preference" (0.9997), and "collocation error" (0.9967) are not significantly different. This is based on the results of the Mann-Whitney U test that uses 0.05 threshold of significance. Thus, the finding rejects of the hypothesis of the study. The finding implies that regardless of sex, the three aforementioned sexist-oriented lexical errors can be committed by students.

2. Difference in the female and male student's accounts of formal lexical errors and semantic lexical errors

The female and male students' rates of susceptibility to commit "Inflectional Error Adjective" ($p = .0118$), "Inaccurate Lexical Bundling" ($p=.0207$), and "Formal Misselection" ($p = .0040$) are significantly different. This is based on the results of the Mann-Whitney U test

that uses 0.05 threshold of significance. As to their rates of susceptibility to the rest of the lexical error types, there is no significant difference. Thus, the finding partly rejects of the hypothesis of the study, only in the extent that some variables were found to be significantly related.

On the further details of the above finding, it was noted that the female students have significantly committed more lexical errors than the male students along "Inflectional Error Adjective", "Inaccurate Lexical Bundling", and "Formal Misselection". This further indicates a higher rate of susceptibility among the female students to commit such errors. As to the other types of lexical errors, susceptibility is fairly equal between female and male students. It is also notable that the three aforementioned lexical errors register as types of formal lexical errors. Hence, what significant differentiation of female and male susceptibility to lexical errors is associated with the FLE types but not in the SLE types.

Relationship between the Students' Profile and their Susceptibility to Commit Lexical Errors

The following findings are generated from statistical correlation analysis using Non-Parametric Spearman Rho test. Computed p values were the basis to determine level of significance relative to this study's established 0.05 threshold of significance. The Spearman Rho values were also accessed to determine positive and negative correlations.

1. The students' profile variables and extent of their sexist-oriented lexical errors

Exposure to authentic materials in English. The extent of the students' exposure to any of the three AERMs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented derivational errors". This is indicated by the p values for (a) Reading materials in print medium (p value: 0.981); (b) Audio materials (p value: 0.666), and (c) A-V materials and online publications (p value: 0.696). With all corresponding p values found to be greater than the established 0.05 threshold of significance, these findings summarily indicate that the students' extent of exposure along the three AERMs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented derivational errors.

Parallel to the above finding, the extent of the students' exposure to any of the three AERMs is also "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented lexical errors via "CSR-hyponym preference". This is indicated by the p values for (a) Reading materials in

print medium (p value: 0.600); (b) Audio materials (p value: 0.079), and (c) A-V materials and online publications (p value: 0.852).

Likewise, the students' exposure to any of the three AERMs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented collocation errors. This is indicated by the p values for (a) Reading materials in print medium (p value: 0.173); (b) Audio materials (p value: 0.246), and (c) A-V materials and online publications (p value: 0.280).

Preference for lexical inferencing strategies. The extent of the students' preference for any of the 4 LISs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented derivational errors This is indicated by the p values for (a) Form-focused strategy (p value: 0.791); (b) meaning-focused strategy (p value: 0.831), (c) evaluating strategy (p value: 0.758); and (d) monitoring strategy (p value; 0.178).

The extent of the students' preference for any of the 4 LISs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented lexical errors via "CSR-hyponym preference". This is indicated by the p values for (a) Form-focused strategy (p value: 0.838); (b) meaning-focused strategy (p value: 0.070), (c) evaluating strategy (p value: 0.400); and (d) monitoring strategy (p value; 0.324).

The extent of the students' LIS preference is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented collocation errors. This is indicated by the p values for (a) Form-focused strategy (p value: 0.427); (b) meaning-focused strategy (p value: 0.403), (c) evaluating strategy (p value: 0.340); and (d) monitoring strategy (p value; 0.468).

Preference for lexical processing strategies. The extent of the students' preference for any of the 4 LPSs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented derivational errors. This is indicated by the p values for: (a) avoidance strategy (p value: 0.534);
(b) human resource strategy (p value: 0.835), and (c) non-human resource strategy (p value: 0.122).

The extent of the students' preference for any of the 4 LPSs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented lexical errors via "CSR-hyponym preference". This is indicated by the p values for (a) avoidance strategy (p value: 0.805); (b) human resource strategy (p value: 0.552), and (c) non-human resource strategy (p value: 0.377).

The extent of the students' LPS preference is "not significantly related" to the extent of their sexist-oriented collocation errors. This is indicated by the p values for (a) avoidance strategy (p value: 0.847); (b) human resource strategy (p value: 0.123), and (c) non-human resource strategy (p value: 0.239).

Active-passive vocabulary index. The p values obtained for each type of SOLE range either higher or lower than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. The extent of the students'; sexist-oriented derivational errors (0.994) and CSR-hyponym preference (0.919) is "not significantly related" to their active-passive vocabulary index. On the contrary, their extent of sexist-oriented collocations (0.048) is the one that is significantly related. Moreover, the Spearman rho value (-0.256) corresponding to "collocation errors" further indicate an "inverse relationship" between the variables.

2. The students' profile variables and extent of their formal lexical and semantic lexical errors

The following findings are generated from statistical correlation analysis using Non-Parametric Spearman Rho test. Computed p values were the basis to determine level of significance relative to this study's established 0.05 threshold of significance. The Spearman Rho values were also accessed to determine positive and negative correlations.

Exposure to authentic materials in English. The p values obtained for each AERM type in relation to all FLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that the extent of the students' exposure to any of these three AERMs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of formal lexical errors. This means that there is no significant association between their access to any type of authentic material in English and their susceptibility to commit any one of the FLE types.

Preference for lexical inferencing strategies. The p values obtained for each LISs in relation to all FLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that the extent of the students' preference for the different lexical inferencing strategies is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of formal lexical errors. This means that there is no significant association between their preferential use of any lexical inferencing strategy and their susceptibility to commit any one of the FLE types.

Preference for lexical processing strategies. The p values obtained for almost all LPSs in relation to all FLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that in majority of the occurrences, the extent of the students' preference for the different lexical processing strategies is "not significantly

related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of formal lexical errors. Conversely, this goes with the exception of certain variables.

The students' preferential use of "avoidance strategy (0.030)" and "human resource strategy (0.021)" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "inflectional error-noun". Moreover, the statistical findings also indicate a negative correlation (-0.289) between these variables, thereby implying their inverse relationship. Similarly, the preferential use of "avoidance strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "formal misinformation", which is also known as "interlingual error" (0.012).

Active-passive vocabulary index. The p values obtained across the active-passive vocabulary indices of the students in relation to all FLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that the extent of the students' vocabulary orientation is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of formal lexical errors. This means that there is no significant association between the students' vocabulary orientation and their susceptibility to commit any one of the FLE types.

3. The students' profile variables and extent of their semantic lexical errors

The following findings are generated from statistical correlation analysis using Non-Parametric Spearman Rho test. Computed p values were the basis to determine level of significance relative to this study's established 0.05 threshold of significance. The Spearman Rho values were also accessed to determine positive and negative correlations.

Exposure to authentic materials in English. The p values obtained for each AERM type in relation to all SLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that the extent of the students' exposure to any of these three AERMs is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of semantic lexical errors. This means that there is no significant association between their access to any type of authentic material in English and their susceptibility to commit any one of the SLE types.

Preference for lexical inferencing strategies. The p values obtained for each LISs in relation to all SLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that the extent of the students' preference for the different lexical inferencing strategies is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of semantic lexical errors. This means that there is no significant

association between their preferential use of any lexical inferencing strategy and their susceptibility to commit any one of the SLE types.

Preference for lexical processing strategies. The p values obtained for almost all the LPSs in relation to all SLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that in majority of the occurrences, the extent of the students' preference for the different lexical processing strategies is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of semantic lexical errors. Conversely, this goes with the exception of certain variables.

The students' preferential use of "human resource strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "collocation" (0.010).

Active-passive vocabulary index. The p values obtained across the active-passive vocabulary indices of the students in relation to all FLE types are consistently higher than the established 0.05 threshold of significance. Summarily, therefore, these indicate that the extent of the students' vocabulary orientation is "not significantly related" to the extent of their lexical errors across all types of semantic lexical errors. This means that there is no significant association between the students' vocabulary orientation and their susceptibility to commit any one of the SLE types.

Conclusions

Based on the merits of the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The female students are highly exposed to various types of authentic materials in English, but with slightly higher opportunity of exposure to "audio-visual materials and online publications". On the other hand, the male students are also highly exposed to various types of authentic materials in English, but with slightly higher opportunity of exposure to "audio materials".

All the female students have varying levels of preference for all the lexical inferencing strategies (LISs), ranging from "moderate" to "high". "Meaning-focused strategy" is dominantly preferred, while "evaluating strategy" is least preferred. Exactly the same pattern applies to the male students.

All the female students have varying levels of preference for all the lexical processing strategies (LPSs), ranging from "low", "moderate", and "high". "Non-human resource strategy" is dominantly preferred, while "avoidance strategy" is least preferred. Exactly the same pattern applies to the male students.

2. Most of the female students imbibe an "active vocabulary dominant (AVD)" orientation. Same is true to the male students.

3. All the female students are highly susceptible to commit certain types of "formal lexical errors" and "semantic lexical errors". The same is true to the male students.

4. The female students' sexist-oriented lexical errors are certain types of formal lexical errors. Exactly the same types of lexical errors also characterize the sexist-oriented lexical errors of the male students.

5. The sex of the students does not significantly differentiate their rate of susceptibility to commit sexist-oriented lexical errors.

6. The susceptibility of both female and male students to commit sexist-oriented lexical errors is not related to their exposure to any type of authentic material in English, or to their preferential use any lexical inferencing strategy and lexical processing strategy, or their vocabulary orientation based on their active-passive vocabulary index.

The susceptibility of both female and male students to commit formal lexical errors is not related to their exposure to any type of authentic material in English, or to their preferential use any lexical inferencing strategy, or their vocabulary orientation based on their active-passive vocabulary index, or to their preferential use any lexical processing strategy. On the latter, their preferential use of "avoidance strategy" and "human resource strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "inflectional error-noun". Likewise, their preferential use of "avoidance strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "formal misinformation".

The susceptibility of both female and male students to commit semantic lexical errors are not related to their exposure to any type of authentic material in English, or to their preferential use any lexical inferencing strategy, or their vocabulary orientation based on their active-passive vocabulary index, or to their preferential use any lexical processing strategy. On the latter, their preferential use of "human resource strategy" is significantly associated to their susceptibility to commit "collocation errors".

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the set of recommendations below are hereby offered.

1. On account of the findings that both female and male students are highly exposed to various types of authentic materials in English (AERMs), it was also noted that certain

AERMs are less accessed than others. Inasmuch as the various AERM types offer specialized linguistic forms that are all together beneficial to ESL learning, they should all be ideally accessed to the same degree. Strategic intervention from the initiative of teachers, school agents, family members and social members in the learning environment of learners are expected to assist in the optimal exposure of students in accessing varied types of AERMs.

On account of the findings along the female and male students' preference for the different lexical inferencing strategies (LISs) and lexical processing strategies (LPSs), there is a further need to reinforce students' awareness and appreciation for those LISs and LPSs, as well as the individual practices under each LIS / LPS, that were noted to be less preferred, and thereby less accessed. This shall be done in the context of optimizing the effects of all LISs and LPSs, that should be adopted integrally to help advance students' lexical competence.

That most of the female and male students were noted to imbibe "active vocabulary dominant (AVD)" orientation is outstanding and should be sustained as this is beneficial not only to their vocabulary learning and development, but also in their productive use of such vocabulary in their varied written and oral communication practices, in both academic and non-academic settings.

2. On account of the profuse evidence of the female and male students' susceptibility to both formal lexical and semantic lexical errors" and "semantic lexical errors, this should pose alarm to ESL teachers and even curriculum designers as these findings cue to them to reinforce vocabulary teaching or promote efficient vocabulary learning strategies among the students. The specific areas that highlight the students' lexical error susceptibility must all the more be the focus of instruction.

3. On account of the findings that female and male students commonly manifest sexist-oriented lexical errors, these must be treated as inputs for the awareness of ESL teachers as well as the schools' supervisory units for gender and development. Evidence of such errors may transcend mere issues of sociolinguistic proficiency but may also be indicative of subconsciously ingrained values of gender stereotyping among the students, which may be addressed using gender sensitivity intervention programs.

4. On the statistical finding that sex does not significantly differentiate students' rate of susceptibility to commit sexist-oriented lexical errors, subsequent parallel investigations are highly recommendable to solidify this claim or otherwise, prove it as contentious. The methodology, framework and tools used by this study to perform the analysis are launching points for further improvement by future researchers.

5. On account of the overwhelming consistency across the correlational findings which point out that students' exposure to authentic materials in English, their preferential use of lexical inferencing and lexical processing strategies, and their active-passive vocabulary indices are not significantly related to their susceptibility to commit lexical errors of varied types, these findings are not all together meritorious because they somehow indicate the irrelevance of such variables to the students' lexical learning. On this note, it is highly recommendable for ESL teachers and concerned school agents to reinforce the connection of these variables to lexical learning by ensuring that these variables assist in providing relevant language inputs to guide students in their lexical use and selection, and thereby alleviate their susceptibility to commit lexical errors.

References

Bhat, A. (2018). Descriptive Research: Definition, Characteristics, Methods, Examples and Advantages. QuestionPro. Retrieved from https://www.questionpro.com/blog/descriptive-research/.

Engber, C. A. (1995). The Relationship of Lexical Proficiency to the Quality of ESL Compositions. Journal of Second Language Writing, 4, 139–155.

Espinosa, D. (1997, March). English in the Philippines. Global Issues in Language Education. Retrieved from http://gilesig.org/26Phil.htm

Harris (1994), cited by Rumfaan, F.E. (2016). Steps in Doing Error Analysis. LinkedIn. Retrieved from https://www.slideshare.net/anonrumkor/clea-46901659

Laufer, B. (1997). The Lexical Plight in Second Language Reading: Words You Don't Know, Words You Think You Know and Words You Can't Guess. In J. Coady, & T. Huckin (Eds.), Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy (pp. 20-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from http://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje)) /reference/ReferencesPaper .aspx?ReferenceID=1581207.

Laufer, L. and S. Eliasson (2008). What Causes Avoidance in L2 Learning? Studies in Second Language Acquisition. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/studies-in-second-language-acquisition/article/what-causes-avoidance-in-l2-learning/FAAF95C18AB 86FA0F7A400AF94CFE622.

PSU Echoes (2019). GAD Regional Body Visits PSU-UGRC. Retrieved from https://psu.edu.ph/category/campus-news/lingayen.

Santos, T. (1988). Professors' Reactions to the Academic Writing of Nonnative Students. TESOL Quarterly, 22, 69–90.

Swan, M. (1997). How Much Does Correctness Matter? The Language Teacher Online, 21(9). Retrieved from http: / / langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp / jalt/pub/tlt.

Zazulak, S. (2015). Why is Learning English So Vital to Your Global Career? Perason. Retrieved from https://www.english.com/blog/why-is-learning-english-so-vital-to-your-global-career.

Published and Unpublished Theses / Dissertations and other Journal Publications

Alqahtani, M. (2015). The Importance of Vocabulary in Language Learning and How to be Taught. International Journal of Teaching and Education, 3(3), 21-34. doi: 10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002.

Astika, G. G. (1993). Analytical Assessment of Foreign Students' Writing. RELC Journal, 24, 61–72.

Caro, K. & Mendinueta, N.R. (2017). Lexis, Lexical Competence and Lexical Knowledge: A Review. Journal of Language Teaching and Research 8(2), 205-213. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0802.01.

Corder, S. P. (1967). "The Significance of Learners' Errors". International Review of Applied Linguistics. 5: 160–170.

Folse, K. (2004). Myths About Teaching and Learning Second Language Vocabulary: What Research Says. TESL Reporter 37. 2, 1- 13.

Hemchua, S. & Schmitt, N. (2006). An Analysis of Lexical Errors in the English Compositions of Thai Learners. Prospect Journal 21(3). Retrieved from http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/prospect_journal/volume_21_no_3/21_3_1_Hemchua.pdf.

Lasaten, R. C. S. & Patoc, L. A. F. (2019). Grammatical Errors Reflected in the Narrative Compositions of Grade 7 Students: Basis in the Development of a Learning Support Material in English Grammar. Asian EFL Journal 21(2), 57-87. Retrieved from https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/pubcon2018/breakout-sessions-schedule/grammatical-errors-reflected-in-the-narrative-compositions-of-grade-7-

students-bases-in-the-development-of-a-learning-support-material-in-english-grammar/.

Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.

Schmitt, N. (1995). A Fresh Approach to Vocabulary: Using A Word Knowledge Framework. RELC Journal 26.1, 86-94.

Zaidi, M. (2019). Grammatical and Lexical Errors in English. Retrieved from https://englishassimilators.blogspot.com/2019/01/grammatical-and-lexical-errors-in.html?fbclid=IwAR2lvS35zMIaLzreHjQnCENTj4hy1UKn2pdbx_F4q1UmTxJITf_MsAeuRM.