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Abstract

Research proposals are the main benchmark for assessing postgraduate students’ competence in different disciplines at a university. Nevertheless, writing a research proposal in the English language can be a daunting challenge for both students and their supervisors if they lack grammatical mastery of the language usage. The paper investigated Honours English students’ grammatical competence in their written research proposals. A qualitative research approach was followed because it provides an in-depth understanding of the research topic. Data were collected using students’ written research proposals presented in the 2022 academic year in the Department of English, Media Studies and Linguistics at the University of Venda in Limpopo Province, South Africa. A document analysis was used to obtain insights from students’ use of English grammar in their written proposals. Three purposively selected students’ written research proposals were scrutinized based on the researcher’s preference. Preliminary and final investigations both revealed students’ deviant English competence. Nevertheless, after employing the ‘Humanistic approach-based didactic strategy for rural-based students’ and ‘Discourse-based grammar approach’, research proposal writers’ performance improved preternaturally. Therefore, it is high time that students adhered to the guidelines and procedures for composing an informed research proposal paper.
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INTRODUCTION

Research has been conducted since time immemorial to extract knowledge of a particular field of study. It is a systematic investigation into and study of materials and sources to establish facts and reach new conclusions. Research is the careful consideration of study regarding a particular concern or problem using scientific methods (Fleetwood, 2023). Writer (2020) asserts that it is a scientific process that
requires the testing of a hypothesis. In all academic pursuits, its purpose has always been to disseminate the information deemed fit for publication. However, publishing research is getting more challenging by the day (Awati, 2022; Li & Yang, 2023). The other purposes for research writing include acceptance by the academic community, exploring questions for more conclusive data collection and analysis, expanding knowledge on current issues using a process of data collection and understanding the impact of specific changes in existing standard procedures. A research proposal is a document that proposes a research project and sometimes makes a request for sponsorship of that research. It is a succinct and coherent summary of the proposed research, sets out the central issues or questions intended to be addressed, outlines the general area of study and references to the current status quo of knowledge and recent debates on the proposed research topic. Research proposals are evaluated on the soundness of the proposed plan including its cost and potential impact. Jansen (2020) claims that it entails a structured, formal document explaining what the researcher plans to research, why it’s worth researching and how it is to be investigated (McCombes & George, 2023). Furthermore, a research proposal is aimed to convince the research supervisor and university committee that the researcher is capable of researching, the research is suitable and manageable, and that the researcher's expertise is convincing to execute a particular degree program (Mugwe, 2022) at a given time.

Competence entails a collection of related abilities, commitments, knowledge and skills that enable the writer to act effectively in a broad variety of language usage (Mayhoub, Ali, & Mohamed, 2023). As regards the use of English, competence involves a state of being competent in its grammatical aspects (Álvarez-Cañizo, Afonso & Suárez-Coalla, 2023) essential for academic success (Bo, Fu & Lim, 2023). Deviation refers to a marked departure from the accepted norms and standards of the language including the incorrect use of grammar attributed to poor competence in grapheme-phoneme correspondence, incomplete application of rules and ignorance of the rule restrictions (Al-Jarf, 2023). Deviant English competence, therefore, concerns the inability to use grammatical aspects including disagreement between a third-person singular subject and the predicate leading to the misuse of the auxiliary verb in both affirmative and negative utterances, the phonological and lexical nature of the target language (Arhire, 2022).
The achievement of English Honours students becomes effective when they have a well-organised knowledge of research writing including a feasible chance of completing the research, informative abstract, adequate background, viable and researchable problem, acceptable plan of action, convincing literature review, achievable objectives, carefully crafted research questions, clear methodology and sufficient preparation to establish the rationale behind the research writing (Mugwe, 2022). A practice of ethics and code of conduct useful in data collection and data analysis, drawing conclusions, logical reasoning and accurate information is a necessity. The major approaches involved include quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods (Perez, Howell Smith, Babchuk & Lynch-O’Brien, 2023).

Nonetheless, proposal research writers face numerous grammatical challenges (Astuti, 2023) when attempting to write a convincing project. Research proposal writing is one toughest work that requires state-of-the-art structuring and appropriate guidelines (Li & Yang, 2023). Therefore, strong vigilance is required in the correct application of grammatical rules including morphosyntax, morphology, phonology and mechanics (Krishnan, Raghunathan & Sarma, 2023). The common and salient grammatical errors committed by the students comprise redundancy, ambiguity, inconsistencies, concord, spelling (Muriungi, 2023) and the use of the noun ‘reason’ and the adverb ‘why’ in the same sentence. Additionally, such usage can be ubiquitous even among highly renowned writers (Nichol (2023). In English, a similar word may exhibit similar syntactic behaviour by playing the same roles within the grammatical structure of sentences (Betti, 2022) and is often a source of language deviation. However, robust consistency in research proposal writing can enhance professional writing skills.

The paper was underpinned by Noam Chomsky’s (1965) grammatical competence theory which states that a human being is born with innate and unconscious knowledge. This knowledge requires a particular refinement to produce a competent learner. Secondly, it was guided by Pit Corder’s (1967) error analysis (EA) approach which holds that errors are systematic deviations or inappropriate use of grammatical features revealing the students’ knowledge of their target language. The EA approach aims at establishing the way students learn their second language (L2) although in the past they were considered undesirable. It informs supervisors to devise the most tactical involvement, techniques and materials for teaching the target language. As errors are indispensable in teaching and learning, it is a
requirement for an incessant empirical examination of grammatical errors committed in the research proposal writings and mitigation of this challenge. Additionally, Pit Corder (1967) recommends manipulation of EA steps, namely, the collection of the sample of learner language, identification, categorisation, description and explanation of their causes to ensure informed research process.

Different studies have been conducted a study in the deviant use of English. For example, in Spain, Álvarez-Cañizo et al. (2023) investigated students who experience fluent reading and writing in English and found that students with dyslexia had difficulties in acquiring fluent reading, spelling, vocabulary and writing. In Ghana, Fenyi and Morrison (2023) investigated errors committed in postgraduate dissertations published between 2020 and 2021 in Ghana and discovered that grammatical errors were committed. Similarly, Mandor (2021) analyzed grammatical errors in the writing of second-year students in a Ghanaian university and found that they committed errors including omission, addition and lack of cohesion and coherence.

In Egypt, El-Mahdy (2023) studied categories of grammatical errors committed by two hundred freshmen college students learning English as a foreign language (EFL). Using Dulay, Burt, and Krashen’s (1982) surface strategy taxonomy. The study found that substitution and omission errors occurred. In Yemen, Al-Hamzi, Nababan, Santosa, Djatmika, Sumarlam and Yustanto (2023) investigated Grammatical errors committed in essay writing by 20 EFL eighth-semester Arabic-speaking students at Sana’a University. The study revealed that students committed errors such as verb-tenses and concord.

In Indonesia, Rastri, Rezeki, Salam, Riyanti and Surmiyati (2023) conducted a study of the challenges faced by 91 English Education Study Program students in FKIP Universitas Tanjungpura, West Kalimantan. The study established that students experienced grammatical errors apart from psychological and socio-cultural factors. Equally, Astuti (2023) investigated grammatical errors committed by 15 students studying English writing in the 2B class of the Multimedia study program of SMK Negeri 1 Hulu Gurung, Kapuas Hulu. The investigation discovered that students committed grammatical errors in their writings.

Although numerous investigations have consistently been conducted by researchers to assess the writing of research proposals, none of them have positively come up with informed approaches for repairing deviant English competence
Due to a considerable number of attempts to arrive at an advanced stage regarding proposal research writing, the current paper aimed to identify effective approaches in this regard. Thus, the approaches for writing a research proposal are discussed in the subsequent paragraphs:

**Humanistic Approach-Based Didactic Strategy for Rural-Based Students**

This strategy is based on the premise that the more the students feel about themselves, the more effective English learning development becomes (Delgado & Lozada, 2023). It involves respect for a fully human etiquette that brings a contribution to the world socially, historically, and thoughtfully. In this principle, students are taught to initially experience their actual situation followed by strategies for making them possible. In this essence, the learning achievements of students are associated with their personality inclusion to the learning milieu, teacher-centred and entails collaborative learning and freedom to choose a desirable topic. If a broad range of learning English materials, logistic support and suitably qualified teachers are available, a ‘Humanistic approach-based didactic strategy (HADS) for rural-based students’ can be worthwhile. This strategy is backgrounded by students’ knowledge inquiry, experiences, and exploration, and offers the flow of rapport, critical thinking, collaborative learning and experiential learning based on students’ experiences. Several steps useful in teaching and learning comprising pre-planning, activation of existing knowledge, learning engagement, feedback and community engagement that encourage positive learning of the language from rural areas are illustrated hereunder:

Adapted from Delgado and Lozada’s (2023) elaboration Stages

Pre-planning step concerns a classroom milieu where fear and anxiety are removable, activation of previous knowledge serving as a framework for this strategy, learning immersion involving teachers’ support and monitoring as well as dialogue feedback between students and the community to share the learnt skills.
Discourse-based Grammar Approach

El-Mahdy’s (2023) proposed an integrative program for overcoming students’ grammatical errors using this approach. EFL students’ linguistic competence can be enhanced by alleviating grammatical using the ‘Discourse-based grammar (DB) approach’ that was first proposed by Celce- Murcia and Olshtain (2005). They suggest that language students must be exposed to genuine L2 material and provided with enough opportunities for using target language structures in real-life situations. Although discourse includes spoken and written language in which form and meaning are closely related to external communicative purposes. The underlying premise of this model concentrates on the meanings of syntactic structures than on language structures although it monitors the use of English grammar.

Using a DG approach in learning improves communicative function, grammatical features and other syntactic structures that group around them for performing other minor language functions. Students may be exposed either to oral or written discourse reflecting real language manifestations to know how L2 writers and speakers use the language to convey meanings, express feelings and present points of view using grammar. In this regard, the DG approach focuses on the linguistic function with its sociocultural and pragmatic aspects.

The first objective of this research paper was to identify approaches for repairing deviant English competence in written research proposals by Honours English students at the University of Venda (Univen) in Limpopo Province, South Africa. Furthermore, the second objective was to describe how the identified approaches can be utilized to the benefit of the proposal research writers. The paper endeavored to answer the research questions, namely, 1) What are the approaches for repairing the use of deviant English competence? and 2) How can the identified approaches be described in such a way that the research proposal writers obtain advanced skills for writing?

METHOD

The paper adopted a descriptive qualitative approach as the findings often include qualities of appearance including texture and textual description of in-depth knowledge (Mandor, 2021) about students’ use of English grammar. Document analysis was utilized to identify grammatical errors committed by English honors
students in their research writing proposals. The researcher purposively selected three written research proposals presented by English Honors students to the Department of English, Media Studies and Linguistics in the 2022 academic year over others because they fitted the researcher’s profile. Data were collected using students’ written research proposals presented. A Surface Structure Taxonomic Analysis (SSTA) approach developed by Dulay et al. (1982) was used to categorize and interpret errors such as addition, mis formation, mis ordering and omission committed by English Honors students in their written research proposals. To adhere to the ethical authenticities of the Research offices at Univen, students’ written research proposals were coded A to D.

The identified errors were categorized and sorted according to their types and correct versions. The researcher used MAXQDA software as it is a candid structure and procedure enabling the researcher to adapt the method of special need (Rash, 2020). Also, using the following steps were employed in running the document analysis process, namely, listing resources such as preferences and the number of written research proposals, deciding how to organize the information such as units of meaning and set of categories, making copies for notes to highlight and annotate the information, ensuring authenticity to ensure the trustworthiness of data, checking for biases for filtering the research, asking questions that help to determine the background of the document and how the resources could help with the research and evaluating the written research proposal documents (Indeed Editorial Team, 2022).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Data collected using document analysis and the SSTA approach were employed to answer the research questions mentioned earlier in this study. Data were interpreted to enhance the approaches for repairing deviant English competence in written research proposals at a rural-based university. The HADS approach for rural-based students and discourse-based grammar approaches were used to alleviate deviant English competence. Three written and presented research proposals assisted in establishing the strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the HADS and DB approaches. Using Dulay’s et al. (1982) SSTA categories for EA, namely, Addition, omission, misformation and misordering, the coding of the identified sampled errors and their correct version were placed in tables A to D.
Moreover, other errors that cut across all the sampled research proposals were identified and analysed in Table E. To comply with the ethical realities of Univen Research Ethics such as anonymity and confidentiality, the written research proposals were coded in the form of tables A to E.

Figure 1: Grammatical Errors Committed to Written Research Proposal A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Errors</th>
<th>Selected Error Examples</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>*In addition, students also fail to research it.</td>
<td>In addition, students fail to research about it. Also, students fail to research about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>*Furthermore non-native speakers are to blame.</td>
<td>Furthermore, non-native speakers are to blame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis ordering</td>
<td>*Conducting a provide for evidence research.</td>
<td>Provide evidence for conducting research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mis formation</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 titled ‘Grammatical errors committed to written research proposal A’ shows that the research proposal writers committed errors such as addition, omission, mis ordering, inconsistency and redundancy. In the errors of addition category, research proposal writers committed several addition errors because they were not competent in the use of English. In contrast, the researcher decided to use the ungrammatical sentence ‘*In addition, students also fail to research it because it challenged the students drastically. This grammatical error indicates that the participants were not aware of the fact that the prepositional phrase ‘in addition’ is equivalent to a range of English adverbs including ‘also’, ‘furthermore’, ‘further’, ‘moreover’ and besides. The finding supports El-Mahdy (2023) who suggests that errors of omission and substitution occur frequently in research proposal writings.

This sentence construction revealed that the student was not grammatically competent in the use of words that have nearly the same meaning. To him, the word ‘also’ might have been correct because it seemed to be referring to the ‘inability to research a certain topic’. Conversely, the prepositional phrase ‘in addition’ might have been thought to be adding another point or value to the discussion. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use the words ‘in addition’ and ‘also’ in the same sentence. Nonetheless, using the HADS and DB approaches in this paper assists students to construct grammatically correct sentences such as ‘In addition, students fail to research about it’ or ‘Also, students fail to research about it’ instead of the ungrammatical ‘*In addition, students also fail to research about it’. The discovery supports Delgado and Lozada’s (2023) suggestion that students’ feeling about themselves is a necessity in English the teaching and learning process.
In the error of omission category ‘*Furthermore non-native speakers are to blame*, the sampled written research proposal shows that students were incompetent in the use of punctuation. Punctuation marks including commas, semicolons, colons, apostrophes, full stops and question marks are used to enhance meanings in sentences.Regardless of the various rules concerning the use of a comma in English sentences, a comma was omitted between the adverb ‘furthermore’ and the adjective ‘non-native’. In the process, using the HADS and DB approaches can ensure the writing of grammatically apropos sentence ‘Furthermore, non-native speakers are to blame’ instead of the ungrammatical sentence ‘*Furthermore non-native speakers are to blame*. The finding is in line with Grammarly’s (2023) claim that the factors that determine whether a comma is to be used are quite subtle and that a comma is the most misused punctuation mark of all of them. Nevertheless, the HADS and DB approaches assisted the research proposal writers to be competent in the use of English.

In this paper, the students might have been confused by the rules regarding the use of a comma. These rules state that a comma is used to indicate a smaller break between words, clauses or ideas within a sentence, for example. In this case, the adverb ‘furthermore’ is used to introduce a fresh contemplation in an argument. Moreover, such rules include: ‘don’t separate two nouns that appear together as a compound subject or compound object’, with few exceptions, a comma should not separate a subject from its verb and a comma alone is not strong enough to join two independent clauses. On the other hand, the HADS and DB approaches and services of a conjunction or a semicolon are a requirement as suggested by Grammarly (2022).

Errors of mis ordering revealed the ungrammaticality of the sentence ‘*Conducting a provide for evidence research* demonstrates that research proposal writers experience difficulties in organizing an informed research proposal A. The correct version should have been ‘Provide evidence for conducting research’. The student might have been confused by the rules regarding the use of word order in sentence constructions. The simple ‘rule of thumb’ for sentences that have a subject, verb, and object in English is that the subject should always come before the verb followed by the object as suggested by Romani (2020). The finding is congruent with Lado’s (1957) Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAT) theory which holds that the reason for meaningless sentence constructions might be due to incomplete
application of rules, incomplete application of rules or overgeneralization. However, no registration of the errors of misformation category was identified in written research proposal A.

Figure 2: Grammatical Errors Committed to Written Research Proposal B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Errors</th>
<th>Selected Error Examples</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>(Madima, 2020;) Namely;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Fraser et al., 2016..)</td>
<td>(Madima, 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Namely,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Fraser et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misformation</td>
<td>* They wrote it limited because of their because disposal time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* They ethnolinguistic a attended discussion group.</td>
<td>They wrote it because of limited time at their disposal. They attended an ethnolinguistic group discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misordering</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 2 named ‘Grammatical errors committed to written research proposal B’, the errors of the addition category demonstrate that the students were not competent in the use of punctuation and in-text citation because they placed a semicolon after the date of publication and before the closing bracket in *(Madima, 2020;) instead of leaving it as it was as in (Madima, 2020). Another semicolon was placed after the adverb ‘namely;’ which is used to introduce detailed information or a specific example. On the one hand, the correct construction must have been the adverb ‘namely’, after a comma has been placed after it. Furthermore, another error of addition was registered in *(Fraser et al., 2016.) by adding a second dot after the other instead of using (Fraser et al., 2016). This confusion encourages deviation from the correct standards of using the correct citation in the body of a written research proposal. The discovery is in line with Lado’s (1957) suggestion that students overgeneralize the rule regarding a particular grammatical aspect due to either incomplete application of rules or ignorance of rule restrictions.

Regarding the errors of omission category, the student who wrote research proposal B indicated that no knowledge of in-text citation in research writing has been acquired because instead of writing *(Nhlapo, 2017)* the student has written ‘*(Nhlapo, 2017’ without the closing bracket. Correspondingly, another sign of incompetency was demonstrated in the construction ‘A rura-based university’ because the consonant ’l’ was omitted after the incomplete and meaningless word ‘rura’ instead of ‘rural’ in the sentence ‘A rural-based university.’ These grammatical errors demonstrate that research proposal writer B lacked advanced knowledge of composing a research paper. These errors might have been due to carelessness,
inadequate rule restrictions or an incomplete application of rules suggested by Lado in 1957. The result supports Rastri’s et al. (2023) argument that students experienced difficulties in English usage apart from psychological and sociocultural factors. The HADS and DB approaches enabled the student to compose a grammatically written research proposal.

The errors of mis formation category indicate that research proposal writer B was incompetent in the use of English grammar. This student wrote the meaningless and ungrammatical sentence ‘*They wrote it limited because of their because disposal time’ instead of ‘They wrote it because of limited time in their disposals.’ In addition, students wrote the meaningless sentence ‘*They ethnolinguistic a attended discussion group’. However, the student should have written ‘They attended an ethnolinguistic group discussion.’ Grammatical errors committed to written research proposal B, showed that the writer did not know how to compose an error-free sentence in the attempt to compose a research proposal paper. The discovery is congruent with Astuti’s (2023) claim that students commit grammatical errors in their research proposal writings. The approaches for boosting competence in the use of the English language were indispensable to alleviating deviant sentence constructions. Nonetheless, there were no errors registered in the mis ordering category.

Table 3: Grammatical Errors Committed to Written Research Proposal C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Errors</th>
<th>Selected Error Examples</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Indicate the reason why research proposal writing is difficult.</td>
<td>Indicate why research proposal writing is difficult. Indicate the reason for the research writing's difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>In Namibia country, native speakers usually enjoy the lessons.</td>
<td>In Namibian country, native speakers usually enjoy the lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misformation</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 3 titled 'Grammatical errors committed to written research proposal C', the errors of addition category show the student’s poor competence in the use of the English language. The sentence ‘Indicate the reason why research proposal writing is difficult’ reflects addition errors of the words ‘reason’ and ‘why’ that must not go together because redundancy occurs. This finding is in line with Nichol (2023) who argues the use of ‘reason’ and ‘why’ together in a sentence is ubiquitous even among highly respected writers. Nichol argues that in place of ‘I want to know the reason why you took my book,’ for instance, it is appropriate to say ‘I want to know
the reason (that) you took my book', 'I want to know why you took my book' or "I want to know your reason for taking my book." (Nichol, 2023). Therefore, Nichols' reasons support the correct versions indicated in the preceding table, namely, 'Indicate why research proposal writing is difficult' or 'Indicate the reason for research writing's difficultness'.

In the errors of omission category "In Namibia country, native speakers usually enjoy the lessons' the research proposal writer C was incompetent in the use of English because a lexical item such as the consonant '-n' was omitted in the noun 'Namibia' to form an adjective 'Namibian' that could have qualified the noun 'study'. The student did not understand how the open word classes are used in the transformation of a noun word class to an adjective class. The result supports Betti’s (2022) assertion that words that are assigned to the same word class commonly exhibit similar syntactic behavior by playing the same roles within the grammatical structure of sentences, sometimes similar morphology in that they undergo inflection for similar properties and even similar semantic behavior.

The student confused the rule regarding morphological inflection of a word class from a noun class to another noun, for a noun to an adjective word class. The research proposal writer C might have been bamboozled using this rule. Accordingly, this rule states that a particular noun can also be formed by changing a word from one noun class to another noun as in the formation of a noun class 'production' to 'productivity'. Nevertheless, to qualify a noun’s agreement with another noun an '-n' letter must be morphologically inflected to the end of the noun 'Namibia' as in South African universities. In this situation, it could have been correct if the research proposal writer has written the sentence 'In Namibian country, native speakers usually enjoy the lessons’. Again, there was no error registration in misformation and misordering categories in the written research proposal C. However, using the HADS and DB approaches enhanced an alleviation of deviant English competence in written research proposals.

Table 4: Grammatical Errors that Cut across Written Research Proposal A to C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Errors</th>
<th>Selected Error Examples</th>
<th>Correct Version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>*Univen was build in 1982.</td>
<td>Univen was built in 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>*Learners will be sampled.</td>
<td>Learners will be sampled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>*Progress are being made.</td>
<td>Progress is being made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy</td>
<td>*They made a call for decades of years.</td>
<td>They made a call for decades/years’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In this research study, sampling will be done.</td>
<td>'In this research study, sampling will be done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the paper employed Dulay’s et al. (1992) SSTA approach, the other grammatical errors committed in the writing of a research proposal were identified. For example, regarding the use of ‘tense’, there were various errors committed but the researcher chose to use the ungrammatical sentence ‘*Univen was built in 1982*. In this sentence, the students were generally incompetent in the use of ‘terminal consonant changes’ as a way of forming a verb ‘built’ form ‘build’ by adding the final ‘-t’ after the removal consonant ‘-d’. The students might have been confused by the rule regarding zero-making where there is no change in the form of a word when transforming it from the simple present tense form to the simple past tense. The correct version should have been ‘Univen was built in 1982’. In this regard, the finding is in line with Al-Hamzi (2023) who claims that students commit several grammatical errors when attempting to write their research proposals.

The research proposal writers were incompetent in the use of ‘spelling’ errors because an error was committed in the sentence ‘*Leaners will be sampled*’ instead of constructing a grammatically accepted sentence ‘Learners will be sampled’. Similarly, a concord error was committed in the sentence ‘*Progress are being made*’ rather than writing the sentence ‘Progress is being made’. The cause of a grammatical error in ‘*Leaners will be sampled*’ might be due to carelessness, inadequate rule restriction, incomplete application of rules or overgeneralization as suggested by Lado (1957). In the sentence ‘*Progress are being made*’, the students might have been confused using concord rules. The discovery is in line with Al-Hamzi’s et al. (2023) suggestion that the subject-verb agreement rule states that there must be an agreement between the subjects and verbs in the construction of English sentences. Moreover, mixing American and British spellings indiscriminately can be cumbersome in the academic world as in ‘globalization’ and ‘globalization’ although some academic members do not care. The result supports Hamukoshi (2020) who advises being consistent is an important factor in terms of professional writing skills.

Redundancy errors are a nuisance in scholarly advancements. However, in this paper, one student committed an error in ‘*They made a call for decades of years*’ and ‘In this research study, sampling will be done’. In the first sentence, the nouns ‘decade’ and ‘years’ means the same thing and can be corrected using either of them, so is the situation in ‘research’ and ‘study’. To these research proposal writers, these pairs of words are different and could be used in the same sentence.
This usage demonstrates poor competence in the use of English semantics. The cause of these errors can be apportioned to Lado’s (1957) incomplete application of rules, incomplete application of rules or overgeneralization of rules.

CONCLUSION

After having attempted to identify approaches for repairing deviant English competence in the research proposal writings, the current paper presented the results from ‘document analysis’ and ‘surface structure taxonomic analysis. Data collected from the students’ written research proposals presented to the Department of English, Media Studies and Linguistics in the 2022 academic year at Univen in Limpopo Province South Africa, attempted to answer the research questions 1) What are the approaches for repairing the use of deviant English competence? and 2) How can the identified approaches be described in such a way that the research proposal writers obtain advanced skills for writing? The paper described the indispensability of employing HADS and DB approaches in the writing of Honours research proposals that the researcher attempted to discuss in the preceding paragraphs. Therefore, evidence-based data from the students’ research proposal writings A to C sanction what the cited authors highlighted regarding the alleviation of deviant English competence.

The paper recommends the use of the HADS and DB approaches in the teaching of the Honours English students so that they be able to write informed and convincing written research proposals not only at Univen in Limpopo Province, South Africa but also to a considerable number of research writers elsewhere. Additionally, the research writing proposal students are encouraged to study different learning materials that would assist them in the organization of ideas for writing several researches. Future researchers can get an abundant niche for conducting further research about the current topic.
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