

Errors and Difficulties: Grammatical Analysis of Student Essays

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.15470355

Stela Marie A. Reyes

Pal – ew High School, Tanjay City Division, Negros Oriental, Philippines
stelamarie.reyes@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to determine the most common errors in sentence construction committed by the Grade 12 students of Pal–ew High School. One hundred twenty-two pieces (122) of essay writing from Grade 12 General Academic Strand (GAS) and Technical Vocational Livelihood (TVL) Academic Year 2024 – 2025 were taken as the data of the study. They were collected and analyzed using the Linguistic Category Taxonomy and the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The results showed that the most frequent errors committed by students were mis formation of errors with a frequency of 152 or 55%, which includes subject–verb, preposition, verb construction, auxiliary, gerunds, and plural nouns. It is followed by omission of errors with a frequency of 120 or 43%, frequent omission of errors is article, verb (copula), plurals, auxiliary, preposition, and irregular/regular past tense. Lastly, addition errors show that the only recorded error is the simple addition of an article with a frequency of 4 or 1%. This error analysis assists teachers in refining their teaching methods and materials during the language teaching and learning process. As a result, the most frequent student errors and the strategies to address these challenges in essay writing were tackled through simplified grammar and a well-structured booklet.

Keywords: Error analysis, Writing Difficulties, and Grammatical Analysis

Introduction

Error analysis is a linguistic method that focuses on the errors made by learners and helps teachers gain insight into the language learning process (Subramaniam, 2009). It allows teachers to identify, classify, and explain the grammatical errors made by learners in the process of second language acquisition (Batu et al., 2018). According to Manuel (2019), error analysis provides insight into learners' understanding of the target language and how they use that knowledge in practice.

In addition, Catabay (2019) explained that errors are consistent grammatical deviations that reflect learners' understanding of the target language. According to Calanoga (2019), errors arise when learners repeatedly misuse language structures. (Shariq, 2020) pointed out, errors occur when learners lack proficiency in the target language, often making repeated errors without knowing how to correct them.

Moreover, grammatical errors are one of the difficulties faced by students in terms of writing. Students need to have more practice in writing essays and should follow the correct grammatical structure to produce good writing. Grammar is a fundamental aspect of language that requires focused attention and emphasis from teachers teaching English as a foreign language (Calanoga, 2019). According to Afdaleni (2018), grammar allows learners to combine linguistic categories in a grammatical sentence with its grammatical rules. Some students forget grammar rules like spellings, punctuations, and subject – verb – agreement. In this instance, students made errors, but they are not aware of it.

In line with this, teachers need to conduct error analysis to identify the common types of students' errors. Moreover, the researcher has observed the difficulties of students in terms of writing essays, as well as the significance of error analysis and its concerns for writing.

Therefore, the researcher wanted to find out the writing errors in terms of omissions, mis formation and addition errors made by the Grade 12 students at Pal – ew High School in Tanjay City Division, as the basis in making simplified guide booklet in writing essays focusing on the structures of grammar.

Literature Review

Various literatures were reviewed for the study. These are discussed and analyzed relative to the topic of the most common errors in sentence construction committed by the Grade 12 Students of Pal–Ew High School.

Error Analysis

The Error Analysis (EA) theory, developed by Pit Corder in the 1960s, plays a significant role in the study of second language acquisition. It provides a framework for identifying and understanding various types of learner errors,

including those related to syntax, grammar, and phonology (Emvula, 2020). According to this theory, learner errors should not be viewed purely as deficiencies; instead, they are seen as valuable indicators of language development.

In addition, error analysis is more than just spotting and listing mistakes. It offers a deeper way to understand how second-language (L2) writing develops over time. By studying the errors made by writers from different backgrounds, skill levels, and types of writing, researchers can better understand the unique features of L2 writing and the many factors that affect its quality (Mohideen, 2023). This method helps uncover how learners think, how their first language influences their second language use, and what strategies they use when writing. With this knowledge, teachers can create more effective lessons that focus on the specific areas students struggle with. For instance, if many students from a certain group frequently make the same grammar mistakes, teachers can design grammar lessons to directly address those problem areas.

Additionally, error analysis does not just look at individual mistakes; it also helps show common patterns in different second-language (L2) writing situations. For example, studying errors in various types of writing can reveal specific challenges, which can lead to better, genre-focused writing lessons (Khansir & Pakdel, 2020). Looking at errors made by learners from different language backgrounds can also help teachers create more culturally aware teaching methods, especially when the first language influence is involved.

Mubarak (2022) pointed out that interest in analyzing students' errors has grown over time. This increase comes from the understanding that learners naturally make mistakes, and these errors can be examined and classified to reveal how their language system works. Error analysis is a valuable tool for evaluating a learner's language ability and identifying common challenges faced during the language learning process.

In short, error analysis is important not just for finding mistakes, but for understanding how second-language writing develops. By exploring the types, causes, and effects of errors in different situations, researchers can improve teaching strategies and help second language learners become better, more confident writers.

Types of Errors

Error classification is based on four widely recognized descriptive taxonomies: (1) Linguistic Category Taxonomy, (2) Surface Strategy Taxonomy, (3) Comparative Taxonomy, and (4) Communicative Effect Taxonomy. For this study, the Surface Strategy Taxonomy will be used to categorize errors. According to Corder (2019), this approach identifies how learners modify the surface structure of sentences, leading to errors that fall into three types: addition, omission, and mis formation.

Omission of errors

Omission errors occur when students leave out parts of a sentence that should follow specific grammatical rules (Hikmah, 2020). Learners may choose to omit certain linguistic elements due to the difficulty in producing them. This is often seen in morphology, where learners frequently omit past-tense markers like -ed, plural markers such as -s, and third-person singular morphemes like -s.

Addition of errors

An addition of errors occurs when an "unnecessary" element is included in a sentence. These items don't belong in the sentence and typically appear when students incorrectly apply certain grammatical rules of the target language. According to Yuki (2021), addition errors can be categorized into three types: double markings, regularizations, and simple additions. Double marking occurs when a feature is applied incorrectly at two levels, as in the sentence "He does not know my name." Regularization happens when exceptions to a rule are treated as if they follow the same rule, such as with "sheep" and "putted." A simple addition error, on the other hand, is an error where no regularization or double marking is involved.

Mis formation of errors

Mis-formation of errors occurs when an incorrect form of a morpheme or structure is used. Unlike omission errors, where an element is missing, mis-formation errors involve the presence of an incorrect element, as explained by Azep Maulana (2022). For example, in the sentence "The chicken was consumed by the dog," the correct structure would be "The dog consumed the chicken." With the help of these errors, the researcher used grammatical analysis using Dulay's Theory.

Grammatical Errors

According to Schurz & Coumel (2020), language learners need to develop certain grammatical competencies. These include understanding word order, grammar rules such as the use of articles, plural forms, word formation, as well as morphology and word functions. Additionally, learners should be familiar with compounding, conjunctions, logical connectors, contractions, and more. In addition, mastering grammatical concepts is essential for students learning a language.

Dean (2020) outlines additional types of grammatical mistakes frequently made by English language learners. These include the misuse of articles in sentence construction, incorrect application of prepositions, improper word order in

forming questions, and confusion between the use of -ing' and -ed' endings. Alnefaie's (2023), study on grammatical errors of fifth-year students at Santa Theresia II found that the majority struggle with the proper usage of auxiliary verbs. Moreover, Mailula's (2021) study revealed that learners frequently made grammatical mistakes, particularly in the misuse of prepositions and typographical errors, which often led to numerous fragmented sentences in their English descriptive essays.

Furthermore, the term "grammar error" is referred to as a "grammatical error." In general, linguists have proposed several theoretical frameworks for categorizing errors. Dulay (1982) categorized these errors into four main types: Linguistic Category Taxonomy, Surface Strategy Taxonomy, Comparative Taxonomy, and Communicative Effect Taxonomy.

Linguistic Category Taxonomy

Linguistic category taxonomies classify errors based on different language components. According to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), language consists of several components, including syntax, phonology (pronunciation), discourse, semantics and lexicon (meaning and vocabulary), and morphology (grammar). The smaller units that make up each of these components are known as constituents.

Surface Strategy Taxonomy

This approach emphasizes how learners modify the surface structure by omitting essential elements, adding unnecessary ones, providing incorrect information, or misplacing items. The error types within this category include omission, addition, mis formation, and mis ordering.

Moreover, students' writing errors often stem from difficulties in generating ideas, organizing discourse, structuring sentences, selecting appropriate vocabulary, and applying effective writing styles (Mohammed, 2019).

Furthermore, writing quality is determined by factors such as spelling, vocabulary, story structure or organization, and syntax (Chong, 2020). Among these components, syntax is a particularly crucial element that requires careful attention from writers.

Writing skills

Writing is an important skill that supports academic success and is essential in both civic life and the global community. In the Philippines, writing in English is a key part of developing students' literacy and communication skills. To improve students' academic performance, the Department of Education (DepEd) implemented the K to 12 Program as mandated by Republic Act 10533, also known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act.

The Senior High School (SHS) curriculum under the K to 12 Program emphasizes strong academic performance from students. To meet this goal, SHS subjects are designed with specific content and performance standards outlined by the Department of Education (DepEd), which students are expected to meet to successfully complete their senior high school education. One key indicator of academic success at this level is the ability to produce clear and well-developed academic writing.

In support of this, the SHS curriculum includes various subjects aimed at strengthening students' language and communication skills. These include English for Academic and Professional Purposes (EAPP), Creative Writing, Research in Daily Life, and Practical Research. Writing scientific papers in English can be challenging, as it requires attention to various aspects such as grammar rules, sentence structure, and syntax. These complexities often lead to mistakes, particularly in descriptive writing. One common issue is syntactic errors, which involve incorrect language usage. Typical examples include incomplete sentence construction, subject-verb disagreement, and misuse of conjunctions, prepositions, and articles (Reski, 2021).

Moreover, writing skills are considered one of the most difficult language skills for nearly all English learners, regardless of their education level, as pointed out by Khatoony and Nezhadmehr (2020). Effective writing involves tasks such as crafting an appropriate title, choosing a relevant topic sentence, expanding it into a complete paragraph, constructing grammatically accurate sentences, logically organizing supporting details, selecting the right vocabulary, and applying correct writing mechanics. Writing ability is influenced by a variety of factors. Since writing requires competencies like spelling, planning, and editing, many students may struggle to fully understand these demands.

In addition, writing is a fundamental language skill that language learners should develop. It involves transforming ideas into meaningful language and serves as a tool for communication and conveying concepts. Aukland (2020) states that the students continue to struggle with communicating their thoughts, emotions, and interest, particularly when written.

Additionally, learners' writing often contains many errors, showing that they still struggle to fully develop their writing skills. According to Dang et al. (2020), the biggest challenge students face in writing essays is related to their language abilities, especially in areas like vocabulary, grammar, and the flow of ideas.

Therefore, writing is the process of conveying ideas, emotions, and experiences to readers. In other words, it serves as a means of communication between the writer and the reader. Maulana (2022) further emphasizes that writing

is an effort to express ideas, making it a skill-based activity that requires students to apply their knowledge, reasoning, and critical thinking. Like speaking, listening, and reading, writing is an essential skill for students to master, as it plays a crucial role in communication. Students need to be able to communicate effectively both orally and in writing.

Writing Difficulties in Terms of Content

Developing coherent and substantial content remains a significant problem for many students. A study conducted by Herrera (2025) identified that tertiary students often struggle with clarity and coherence, organization of ideas, and word choice in their writing tasks. These challenges suggest a need for enhanced instructional strategies that focus on content development and idea organization.

Writing Difficulties in Terms of Language and Grammar

Grammar is a fundamental component of effective writing, as it ensures clarity, coherence, and the accurate delivery of ideas. A recent study revealed that approximately 44.86% of students encounter grammar-related difficulties when composing written texts (Alisha, 2019). These challenges include common issues such as subject-verb agreement, verb tenses, number agreement, word order, articles, pronouns, function words, and prepositions all of which are essential to mastering the structure of written English.

Nenotek et al. (2022) emphasized that improving students' grammatical competence is essential for developing well-organized and error-free compositions. They recommend regular writing practice, active proofreading, and seeking constructive feedback from both teachers and peers. In addition, utilizing grammar resources and style guides can support students in reinforcing grammatical concepts and minimizing errors. The findings of these studies underscore the importance of consistent exposure to and practice with grammar rules to enhance overall writing proficiency.

Writing Difficulties in Terms of Logical and Argumentative

Among the various forms of academic writing that EFL students are expected to produce, the essay remains one of the most common (Bulqiyah et al., 2021). Within this genre, however, argumentative essays are often perceived as particularly challenging. Several studies have reported that EFL learners frequently struggle with this type of writing due to its cognitive and linguistic demands (Fajaryani et al., 2021; Ozfidan & Mitchell, 2020; Rahmatunisa, 2014; Setyowati et al., 2020).

Argumentative writing requires students not only to construct grammatically correct sentences but also to engage in critical thinking, logical organization, and the effective use of evidence to support their positions. This involves coherently structuring ideas, acknowledging opposing viewpoints, and justifying claims with appropriate reasoning and examples, skills that can be difficult to develop, particularly for learners still acquiring English language proficiency.

According to Fauzan, Aulya, and Noor (2020), these errors often happen because students are not precise, or they have a limited vocabulary and lack understanding of word usage based on grammar rules. Unlike receptive skills such as listening, writing is a productive skill that requires consistent practice and experience to develop. It involves the process of composition, which means being able to convey or reconstruct information through narrative or descriptive forms, or to create new texts, such as in expository or argumentative writing. However, writing a paragraph effectively demands not only a wide vocabulary but also proper use of grammar (Qamariah et al., 2020).

Writing is a fundamental mode of communication that allows individuals to express and convey ideas, information, and messages in written form (Saputra et al., 2021). However, in the academic context, writing serves a broader purpose beyond communication. It is a key skill that significantly contributes to students' academic development and performance (Fajaryani et al., 2021). As one of the core productive language skills, writing is particularly vital for students in higher education.

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners are often expected to produce a variety of academic texts, such as essays, research papers, and reports, as part of their coursework or assessments (Setyowati et al., 2020). Consequently, the ability to write effectively and coherently is crucial for achieving academic success. Mastery of academic writing enables students to meet academic standards, obtain satisfactory grades, and successfully complete their studies (Bulqiyah et al., 2021).

Furthermore, giving students feedback and correcting their errors right away can greatly support their writing development. Teachers should understand the value of error analysis in identifying the areas where students struggle in writing (Setiyorini, Dewi, & Masykuri, 2020). Helping students become aware of their errors is a key step in enhancing their writing skills (Sari, 2019). This supports Huseynova's (2019) findings that grammar feedback and making revisions lead to better grammatical performance among learners.

Giving students timely feedback on their writing is important for improving their writing abilities (Khatter, 2019). When students understand the common errors they make, they learn how to correct them, which improves their

overall writing quality (Nguyen, Nguyen, & Phan, 2021). In short, analyzing common student errors not only aids in correction but also strengthens their writing skills.

Rizqullah and Abdul (2022) stated that errors understood as deviations from standard language use are often made repeatedly by students without clear reasoning. These mistakes can occur at different stages of learning a language and are commonly caused by a lack of understanding of grammar rules, suitable vocabulary, or proper sentence structure.

Writing errors often result from students' difficulty in organizing their ideas clearly and using correct structures that help readers understand their message. Preliminary findings support the view that students frequently make such errors in their writing, indicating that they may not be effectively learning the necessary grammar and vocabulary. The influence of their first language also plays a role in these mistakes.

Thus, some errors happen due to carelessness, while others are caused by directly translating from their native language into English.

Methodology

This study is a descriptive mixed method that employs qualitative and quantitative research to describe and to find the most common errors made by the respondents using frequency and percentage distribution. It utilized a questionnaire to gather data from the respondents of grade 12 students at Pal-ew High School in the Division of Tanjay City.

The respondents of the study encompassed 122 Grade 12 – GAS and TVL Senior High School students of Pal-ew High School in Tanjay City Division. The participants are all currently enrolled at Pal-ew High School for S.Y 2024-2025.

Before the conduct of the study, formal approval was obtained from the Graduate School Dean of St. Paul University, Dumaguete, to ensure that the research complied with institutional guidelines and ethical standards. Upon receiving authorization, the researcher proceeded with the data collection process in accordance with the approved methodology.

After the approval of the letter sent to the Schools Division Superintendent, the researcher pushed through with the conduct of her study.

The pilot testing of the questionnaire was conducted at Lourdes Del Prado High School to assess the reliability of the instrument before its official administration. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was measured using Cronbach's Alpha. The analysis yielded a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.962, indicating excellent reliability.

This result suggests that the items in the questionnaire are highly consistent and measure the same underlying construct effectively. Based on this outcome, the instrument was deemed reliable and appropriate for use in the main study at Pal-ew High School. The researcher seeks permission from the school's Principals to distribute the survey questionnaires to the respondents.

Moreover, the researcher also sent a parent's consent form to the respondents. An essay question was distributed to grade 12 GAS and TVL students. The answers to the essay were limited to a 5-to 10-sentence paragraph. Their answers to the essay question were collected and analyzed. Using Dulay's Linguistic Taxonomy theory that includes addition, omission, and mis formation.

The data collected in this research were analyzed using Dulay's theory and the percentage formula. All errors were recorded and categorized using frequency and percentage distribution and the most common errors were identified. Essays were checked by the five English teachers of Pal -ew High School.

Furthermore, data was consolidated, statistically treated, analyzed, and interpreted to develop findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Results

This chapter presents the collected data, the results of the statistical analysis, and the interpretation of findings. The data is organized into tables, following the sequence of the study's specific research questions. It specifically addresses the following aspects: 1) profile of the students in terms of sex and academic strands; 2) What is the percentage distribution of common errors found in paragraphs written by Grade 12 learners in terms of: omission errors, mis formation errors, and addition errors; 3) the level of writing difficulties of the respondents in terms of: content, language and grammar, logical and argumentative. 4) A significant relationship between the level of writing

difficulties of the respondents when grouped according to sex. 5) Significant relationship between the respondent's profile and the level of writing difficulties of the respondents.

1. Profile of the Respondents

This section presents the analysis of the tabulated data on the profile of Grade 12 students of Pal -ew High School. The profile of the respondents in terms of sex and academic strand was included with the notion that these would influence the most common errors in sentence construction committed by the Grade 12 Students of Pal -ew High School.

Table 1.1. Frequencies of Sex

Sex	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
Male	89	73.0%	73.0%
Female	33	27.0%	100.0%

Table 1.1 reveals that the majority of the respondents were females, with a frequency of 89 or 73.0%, while males had 33 or 27.0% of the total population. The study's findings may be more reflective of female students' writing tendencies. Influence on Error Trends, the errors identified could be skewed due to the larger female sample. Comparing male and female errors separately may reveal distinct writing challenges.

Moreover, tailored teaching strategies can be developed if gender differences in errors are found. Gender-related differences have been observed in academic contexts, particularly in reading and writing performance. However, a study by Muodumogu and Unwaha (2019) in Kogi State, Nigeria, examined the impact of the mini-lesson strategy on the essay writing performance of Senior Secondary 2 (SS II) students. The study involved 342 students from eight intact classes across four schools, selected through non-random sampling and divided into treatment and control groups. The results revealed that both male and female students performed similarly, indicating that gender did not significantly influence writing achievement.

Table 1.2 Frequencies of Academic Strand

Track	Counts	% of Total	Cumulative %
GAS	87	72.5%	72.5%
TVL	33	27.5%	100.0%

Table 1.2 shows that 72.5% (87) of respondents are from the General Academic Strand (GAS), while 27.5% (33) are from the Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) strand. The table shows the distribution of students based on their academic track. The study's results may be more reflective of GAS students' writing tendencies. Errors may vary between GAS and TVL students due to differences in curriculum focus. Comparing error types per strand may reveal distinct writing challenges. Language instruction strategies can be tailored based on the specific needs of each strand.

Moreover, Krause (2019) emphasized the strong connection between writing and academic success, as many subject areas assess students through various forms of written outputs, such as reports, essays, research papers, and exam responses. This is particularly relevant in the context of the Senior High School (SHS) curriculum in the Philippines, especially in the General Academic Strand (GAS) and the Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) strand. Thus, as Krause (2019) suggests, the ability to write effectively is a key factor in academic achievement, regardless of the strand, because it is through writing that students demonstrate their learning and competencies.

2. What is the percentage distribution of common errors found in paragraphs written by Grade 12 learners?

Table 2.1. Omission of Errors

Omission of Errors	Count	Percentage	Cumulative %
Omission of article	40	33%	33%
Omission of the verb (copula)	35	29%	63%
Omission of plurals	5	4%	67%
Omission of auxiliary	24	20%	87%
Omission of preposition	9	8%	94%
Omission of irregular and regular past tense	7	6%	100%

Table 2.1 reveals that the most frequent omission error is the omission of articles with the frequency of 40 or 33%, followed by the omission of the verb (copula) with the frequency of 35 or 29%.

Moreover, Omission of plurals with the frequency of 5 or 4% and irregular/regular past tense with the frequency of 7 or 6% are the least frequent errors. The cumulative percentage shows that all omission errors account for 100% of the observed cases. Article and verb omission are the most common issues, suggesting a need for emphasis on these areas in instruction. The plural omission is the least frequent, meaning students generally understand pluralization but may need reinforcement.

In addition, grammar instruction should prioritize high-frequency errors, particularly articles and copulas, for effective improvement. In addition, error patterns may indicate gaps in foundational grammar knowledge, requiring targeted interventions through practice exercises and corrective feedback.

Moreover, Munder (2024) employed a descriptive approach to examine a corpus of 100 ESL learners from a private school in Marawi City, Lanao del Sur. The results revealed that the vast majority of 96.32% of the errors were local in nature, with mechanical or orthographic errors ranking highest, accounting for 1,677 instances or 33.7% of the total. The most frequent mistake involved the misuse or omission of verb tenses, followed by errors in capitalization and punctuation. Based on these findings, it is essential to immerse learners in the target language (TL) and for educators to design remedial writing programs that address the most challenging linguistic areas.

Furthermore, in an academic environment, fostering students' writing skills is a fundamental goal of education (Al Khazraji, 2019). As noted by Ceylan (2019), students are expected to create well-structured and coherent written work to enhance their writing proficiency.

Table 2.2. *Mis formation of Errors*

Mis formation of Errors	Count	Percentage	Cumulative %
Disagreement of Subject - Verb	42	28%	28%
Mis formations of preposition	31	20%	48%
Mis formations of verb construction	17	11%	59%
Mis formations of auxiliary	26	17%	76%
Mis formations of gerunds after preposition	20	13%	89%
Mis formations of plural nouns	16	11%	100%

Table 2.2 shows that subject-verb disagreement (42, 28%) was the most common mis formation error with a frequency of 42 or 28%, while Mis formation of prepositions with a frequency of 31 or 20% and auxiliaries with a frequency of 26 or 17% also occur frequently.

In addition, plural noun mis formation with a frequency of 16 or 11% and verb construction errors with a frequency of 17 or 11% are the least common. The cumulative percentage reaches 100%, accounting for all observed mis formation errors. Frequent subject-verb disagreement suggests a need for reinforcement in subject-verb agreement rules. Errors in prepositions and auxiliaries indicate challenges in grammatical structure and word usage. In addition, lower occurrence of verb construction and plural noun mis formation suggests partial understanding but still requires practice.

Furthermore, according to a study by Safitri (2021) conducted at Universitas Negeri Padang in Indonesia, subject-verb agreement errors were the most frequent among students. Out of 178 total grammatical errors identified, 150 were related to subject-verb agreement, accounting for 84% of all errors. This high percentage indicates significant difficulty among students in constructing grammatically correct sentences. The findings suggest that many students struggled with ensuring agreement between subjects and verbs, particularly when the subject was distant from the verb or when the subject's number was unclear.

Table 2. Addition of Errors

Addition of Errors	Count	Percentage	Cumulative %
Simple Addition of Article	4	100%	100%

Table 2.3 reveals that the only recorded addition error is the simple addition of an article, with the frequency of 4 cases or 100%. No other types of additional errors were observed in the study. The cumulative percentage confirms that all addition errors fall under this category.

In addition, addition errors are rare compared to omission and mis formation errors, suggesting students struggle more with missing or incorrect structures rather than unnecessary additions. Furthermore, the simple addition of articles may indicate confusion about when articles are necessary, requiring reinforcement in definite and indefinite article usage. Instruction should prioritize omission and mis formation errors but still address article overuse through targeted exercises.

Moreover, in a study conducted by Cruz (2019), the most common type of error found in the English sentence writing of Filipino ESL students was misinformation, which accounted for 37.43% of the total errors. This was followed by omission errors at 34.5%, addition errors at 19.88%, and mis ordering at 8.19%. These findings indicate that Filipino ESL learners often struggle with selecting the correct linguistic elements when constructing sentences in English. The prevalence of misinformation errors suggests that while students may attempt to apply grammatical rules, they frequently do so inaccurately, pointing to gaps in their understanding of English language structures.

Table 2.4. Major Errors

Types of Major Errors	Count	Percentage	Cumulative %
Errors by Omission	120	43%	43%
Errors by Mis formation	152	55%	99%
Errors by Addition	4	1%	100%

Table 2.4 shows that Mis formation errors with the frequency of 152 or 55% are the major error, followed by omission errors with the frequency of 120 or 43%.

Lastly, Addition errors with a frequency of 4 or 1% are the least frequent. The cumulative percentage confirms that these three categories account for 100% of the errors observed. Mis formation errors dominate, suggesting difficulties in constructing grammatically correct sentences. In addition, omission errors are also significant, indicating gaps in students' understanding of necessary sentence components.

Moreover, addition errors are minimal, meaning students rarely insert unnecessary words. Instruction should focus on correcting mis formation and omission errors through targeted grammar lessons and practice. Hidayati (2023), this study focused on identifying the errors made by eleventh-grade students at Madrasah Aliyah PMU Sanrobone, Takalar Regency, during the 2023/2024 academic year in writing descriptive texts. The objectives were to determine the types of errors students commonly made and to identify the most frequent type of error. A descriptive quantitative approach was used, applying a case study design. The research involved 18 students, and data were collected through a writing test on descriptive texts. Analysis of the results revealed four types of errors based on the Surface Strategy Taxonomy: omission, addition, mis formation, and mis ordering. Mis formation errors were the most frequent, with 219 instances (36%). This was followed by addition errors with 190 cases (32%), omission errors with 112 cases (19%), and mis ordering errors as the least frequent, with 80 occurrences (13%).

Table 3.1. Content

Criteria	Weighted Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
Making sure my subjects and verbs agree in number (e.g., She goes instead of She go)	2.42	Difficult	5
Avoiding sentences like Yesterday, I eat pizza instead of Yesterday, I ate pizza.	2.51	Easy	2.5
Avoiding writing unclear sentences like Walking to school, the rain soaked my clothes (which makes it seem like "the rain" was walking).	2.5	Easy	4
Using pronouns correctly and ensure they match their antecedents (e.g., Each student brought his or her book, not Each student brought their book).	2.51	Easy	2.5
Choosing the right prepositions (e.g., interested in instead of interested in).	2.63	Easy	1
Grand Weighted Mean	2.51	Easy	

Table 3.1 shows that the grand weighted mean is 2.51, which falls under "Easy", suggesting that students generally believe they apply proper content in sentence construction. The highest-rated criterion is correct preposition usage (2.63, Rank 1), indicating stronger confidence in this area. The lowest-rated criterion is subject-verb agreement (2.42, Rank 5, "Difficult"), showing it as the most challenging aspect. Two criteria (verb tense consistency and pronoun-antecedent agreement) are tied at 2.51 (Rank 2.5). Students struggle the most with subject-verb agreement, highlighting the need for targeted instruction in this area. Despite agreeing with most content, their actual error patterns (from previous tables) suggest inconsistencies between perception and difficulties. Moreover,

grammar lessons should emphasize subject-verb agreement and sentence clarity to address gaps. Furthermore, preposition usage is relatively strong but still needs reinforcement to ensure accuracy in different contexts.

Furthermore, Putri (2020) study aimed to identify common difficulties students face with subject-verb agreement in the English Education Study Program at the University of Bengkulu. Employing a qualitative approach, the research focused on sixth-semester students from the 2022/2023 academic year. A total of 33 students (11 males and 22 females) participated in the study. Data was collected using a validated and reliable test composed of 30 items, each targeting six categories of subject-verb agreement: full verbs, linking verbs, modals, auxiliary *be*, auxiliary *have*, and auxiliary *do*. The data were analyzed using basic statistical tools such as percentages and averages. The results indicated that most students encountered challenges with subject-verb agreement, with a total of 540 errors recorded. The most common difficulties were with modals (23%), linking verbs (21.5%), full verbs (18%), auxiliary *be* (16.5%), auxiliary *have* (14%), and auxiliary *do* (7%).

Table 3.2. Language and Grammar

Criteria	Weighted Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
Using correct subject-verb agreement in my sentences. (Example: "She writes a letter" instead of "She write a letter.")	2.52	Easy	5
Using proper verb tense in my writing. (Example: "Yesterday, I went to the store" instead of "Yesterday, I go to the store.")	2.53	Easy	4
Using commas correctly in lists and compound sentences. (Example: "I like apples, bananas, and oranges.")	2.67	Easy	1
Identifying and correcting run-on sentences. (Example: "I was tired. I went to sleep early." instead of "I was tired I went to sleep early.")	2.55	Easy	3
Using correct pronouns in my sentences. (Example: "He gave the book to me" instead of "He gave the book to I.")	2.59	Easy	2
Grand Weighted Mean	2.57	Easy	

Table 3.2 reveals that the grand weighted mean is 2.57 ("Easy"), meaning students generally believe they follow proper language and grammar difficulties. The highest-rated criterion is correct comma usage (2.67, Rank 1), indicating confidence in punctuation. The lowest-rated criterion is subject-verb agreement (2.52, Rank 5), showing it as the most challenging area. Proper verb tense (2.53, Rank 4) and run-on sentence correction (2.55, Rank 3) also need improvement.

Despite agreement, actual errors (from previous tables) suggest students still struggle with subject-verb agreement and verb tense. Grammar instruction should focus on reinforcing these weak areas, especially subject-verb agreement. Moreover, comma usage is relatively stronger, but punctuation rules should still be reinforced for accuracy. Furthermore, more practice in identifying and correcting run-on sentences can improve

Therefore, a study by Hidayatullah, Syahrial, and Hati (2020), titled "Subject-Verb Agreement Errors Made by Sixth Semester English Education Students," revealed that learners demonstrated a limited understanding of subject-verb usage. The errors identified were primarily omissions (49%), followed by additions (25%) and misinformation (26%). The study also identified two potential sources of these errors: interlingual interference (2%) and intralingual or developmental factors (98%). Similarly, Alahmadi (2019), in a study titled "A Study of Grammatical Errors of Subject-Verb Agreement in Writing Made by Saudi Learners," investigated subject-verb agreement mistakes in writing. These grammatical errors were analyzed and categorized into three main types based on their consistency.

Table 3.3

Criteria	Weighted Mean	Verbal Description	Rank
Using correct subject-verb agreement in my sentences. (Example: "She writes a letter" instead of "She write a letter.")	2.42	Difficult	5
Using proper verb tense in my writing. (Example: "Yesterday, I went to the store" instead of "Yesterday, I go to the store.")	2.46	Difficult	4
Using commas correctly in lists and compound sentences. (Example: "I like apples, bananas, and oranges.")	2.47	Difficult	3
Identifying and correcting run-on sentences. (Example: "I was tired. I went to sleep early." instead of "I was tired I went to sleep early.")	2.5	Easy	2

Using correct pronouns in my sentences. (Example: "He gave the book to me" instead of "He gave the book to I.")	2.54	Easy	1
Grand Weighted Mean	2.48	Difficult	

Table 3.3 shows that the grand weighted mean is 2.48 ("Difficult"), indicating that students struggle with logical and argumentative sentence construction. The highest-rated criterion is correct pronoun usage (2.54, Rank 1, "Easy"), suggesting better understanding in this area. The lowest-rated criterion is subject-verb agreement (2.42, Rank 5, "Difficult"), showing significant difficulty. Verb tense (2.46, Rank 4) and comma usage (2.47, Rank 3) also received "Difficult" ratings. Run-on sentence correction (2.5, Rank 2) is the only other "Easy" category. Weaknesses in subject-verb agreement and verb tense suggest a need for reinforcement in these areas. Moreover, students struggle with punctuation and sentence clarity, impacting logical flow in writing. Grammar instruction should focus on improving sentence structure and coherence. Despite pronoun usage being the strongest area, all aspects still require improvement to enhance argumentative writing skills.

The findings of the study showed there are 48 errors in total that the students made in their writings (Qamariah et al., 2020). In addition, the errors were categorized into 11 classifications such as verb-use errors, tenses errors, singular/plural noun errors, adjectives errors, preposition errors, to be errors, articles errors, modal/auxiliary errors, noun errors, objective pronoun errors, and phrasal verb errors. In conclusion, the grammatical errors made by 10 students of second grade in SMK-SMTI Banda Aceh in their writing showed their flaws in composing good writing.

4. Significant Difference between the level of writing difficulties of the respondents when grouped according to sex.

Table 4.1. Test on the significant difference between the levels of writing difficulties of the respondents when grouped according to sex

Content	Student's t	Statistic	df	p
		-0.0755	120	0.940

Note. $H_a: \mu_{Female} \neq \mu_{Male}$

Table 4.1 shows that the t-statistic is -0.0755, and the p-value is 0.940, which is much higher than the common significance level (0.05). This means there is no significant difference in content writing difficulties between male and female students. The null hypothesis ($H_0: \mu_{Female} = \mu_{Male}$) is not rejected, meaning both genders perform similarly in content. Sex does not influence the level of writing difficulties in content construction.

Moreover, interventions and writing programs can be applied universally without needing gender-specific strategies. In addition, future studies could explore other factors, such as academic strand or learning styles, that may impact writing proficiency.

In a study conducted by Anggraini (2019) sought to find out if gender would make a distinction in the achievement in the writing of 110 undergraduates of PGRI University, Palembang (55 males and 55 females) who were purposively chosen for the study. Scores from students' essays formed the data, which were analyzed with a t-test, means, and standard deviation. Results showed that being male or female did not play any major role in the writing achievement of study participants.

Table 4.2. Test on the significant difference between the levels of writing difficulties when grouped according to sex, language, and grammar

Language and Grammar	Student's t	Statistic	df	p
		-1.16	120	0.248

Note. $H_a: \mu_{Female} \neq \mu_{Male}$

Table 4. 2 reveals that the t-statistic is -1.16, and the p-value is 0.248, which is higher than the significance level (0.05). This indicates no significant difference in language and grammar between male and female students. The null hypothesis ($H_0: \mu_{Female} = \mu_{Male}$) is not rejected, meaning both genders perform similarly in this area. Gender does not play a significant role in language and grammar proficiency. Moreover, instructional strategies can be designed without gender-based differentiation. Furthermore, other factors, such as academic background or learning strategies, may have a greater impact on writing performance.

Therefore, another study was conducted by Mutar (2019) to examine Iraqi university students' attitudes toward learning English and investigate if there are any significant differences in learning English among students based on their gender and college. According to the findings, students showed a positive attitude toward learning English, and

in terms of gender and college, there was no substantial difference between the respondents of this study. As a result, males and females share a similar level of awareness regarding language learning and the global state of communication.

Table 4.3. Test on the significant difference between the levels of writing difficulties when grouped according to sex, Logical and Argumentative

	Statistic	df	p
Logical & Student's t Argumentative	0.186	120	0.853

Note. $H_a: \mu_{\text{Female}} \neq \mu_{\text{Male}}$

Table 4.3 shows that the t-statistics is 0.186, and the p-value is 0.853, which is much higher than the 0.05 significance level. This means there is no significant difference in logical and argumentative writing difficulties between male and female students. The null hypothesis ($H_0: \mu_{\text{Female}} = \mu_{\text{Male}}$) is not rejected, indicating similar performance across genders. Logical and argumentative writing skills do not significantly differ between male and female students. Moreover, teaching strategies can be applied universally rather than being tailored to gender differences. Furthermore, future research could explore other variables, such as academic strand or writing experience, that may affect logical and argumentative writing skills.

Onuoha (2022) conducted a study to examine whether gender differences had any impact on the writing performance of newly admitted undergraduates at the Federal University of Technology Owerri. The findings revealed that there was no significant difference in writing achievement between male and female participants.

Furthermore, the study concluded that gender did not affect students' writing performance or achievement; rather, success was attributed to individual effort and determination. This research contributes significantly to the existing body of knowledge on gender and academic writing, particularly within tertiary education settings involving science and technology students in Nigeria. It serves as a motivational insight for both students and non-students alike, emphasizing that dedication and hard work, regardless of gender, are key to achieving success.

Table 5.1. Test on the significant relationship between the respondents' profile

	Content	Language and Grammar	Logical and Argumentative
Sex	0.396	0.887	0.396
Track	0.44	0.477	0.767

Table 5.1 displays that all p-values are greater than 0.05, indicating no significant relationship between the respondents' profile (sex and academic track) and their writing difficulties (content, language and grammar, logical, and argumentative). This means that sex and academic track do not significantly influence writing performance in any category. Writing challenges are not dependent on gender or academic track, suggesting that difficulties in writing difficulties are universal among students. Interventions and teaching strategies should focus on addressing common writing issues rather than tailoring them based on sex or track. Other factors, such as prior writing experience, exposure to reading materials, or instructional methods, may have a greater impact on writing proficiency and should be explored in future studies.

Haberman et al. (2020) conducted a quasi-experimental study using a pre-test, post-test, and control group design involving 425 first-year undergraduate students from the Federal University of Technology Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria, during the 2019/2020 academic year. The sample consisted of 253 male and 172 female students from four intact classes across various faculties, selected through simple random sampling. Three departments were designated as experimental groups and received writing-focused instructional treatment, while one served as the control group and received no intervention. Pre-test and post-test data were collected and analyzed using one research question and one hypothesis.

The t-test analysis showed no significant difference in writing achievement between male and female students. These findings suggest that gender had no substantial impact on writing performance, regardless of academic discipline, and therefore is not a significant factor in explaining differences in writing achievement.

Discussion

Based on the data gathered, there were only 122 respondents. Most respondents were females with a frequency of 73.0% (89), while 27.0% (33) were male. In addition, 72.5% (87) of respondents are from the General Academic Strand (GAS), while 27.5% (33) are from the Technical-Vocational-Livelihood (TVL) strand.

In terms of the omission of errors, the most frequent omission error is the omission of articles with a frequency of 40 or 33%, followed by the omission of the verb (copula) with a frequency of 35 or 29%. Omission of plurals with a frequency of 5 or 4% and irregular/regular past tense with a frequency of 7 or 6% are the least frequent errors.

In addition, the omission of the article was the first dominant error made by the students. There were 40 errors in omission of article a/an. Analysis of students' essays revealed several grammatical errors, including issues with article usage. For instance, a student wrote, "it will make it better life," which demonstrates incorrect article omission. The corrected form should be, "it will make it a better life." This suggests a need for improved understanding of article usage in written English among the students.

A total of 35 errors related to sentence construction involving the verb "to be" were identified in the students' writing. These errors typically occurred when students omitted the appropriate form of the verb. For example, one student wrote, "I will going to help my parents," instead of the grammatically correct form, "I am going to help my parents." This indicates a recurring issue with the correct use of auxiliary verbs in sentence formation.

The third most common error identified was the omission of plural forms, with students making a total of 5 such errors. A typical example is the sentence, "There are many kinds of..." which should be correctly written as "There are many kinds of..." This reflects a lack of understanding regarding subject-verb agreement and plural noun formation.

Additionally, 7 errors were related to the incorrect use of irregular and regular past tense verbs. For instance, one student wrote, "Before, I want to become a flight attendant," instead of the correct form, "Before, I wanted to become a flight attendant." These mistakes indicate difficulty in applying the correct tense forms, particularly with irregular verbs.

Moreover, in terms of mis formation of error. Subject-verb disagreement with a frequency of 42 or 28% is the most common mis formation error. The disagreement of Subject and Verb (Subject and Number) was ranked first made by the students. There were forty-two errors committed by the students in constructing sentences. An example of this error is the phrase "being an independent women," which should be corrected to "being an independent woman." This suggests that many students struggle with maintaining grammatical agreement in sentence construction.

In addition, mis formation of prepositions with a frequency of 31 or 20%, and auxiliaries with a frequency of 26 or 17% also occur frequently and ranked as the second common error made by students. There were thirty-one mis formation of prepositions made by students. An example of this error is the sentence, "my emotion is not the same from 10 years passed," which should be corrected to "my emotion is not the same as 10 years passed."

The least common errors identified were related to plural noun mis formation and verb construction errors. Mis formation of plural nouns occurred 16 times, representing 11% of all errors. An example of this error is "10 years from now, I am going to built a house," which should be corrected to "10 years from now, I am going to build a house."

Verb construction errors were also noted 17 times, accounting for 11% of the total errors. These errors typically involved incorrect verb forms, further illustrating the students' challenges in constructing grammatically correct sentences. The only recorded addition error was the unnecessary inclusion of an article, with 4 instances observed, representing 100% of the addition errors. An example of this error is the sentence, "I want to graduate the college," which should be correctly written as "I want to graduate college." This error suggests a misunderstanding of when to use articles in certain contexts.

Mis formation errors were ranked first as the most common errors made by students with a frequency of 152 or 55% that includes, disagreement of subject – verb, mis formations of preposition, mis formations of verb construction, mis formations of auxiliary, mis formations of gerunds after preposition, and mis formations of plural nouns.

In addition, omission errors ranked as second errors made by students with a frequency of 120 or 43% that includes, omission of article, omission of the verb (copula), omission of plurals, omission of auxiliary, omission of preposition, and omission of irregular and regular past tense.

Furthermore, addition of errors was the least frequent error made by students, with a frequency of 4 or 1%, which is the addition of article. Rina (2019) found that students' errors, based on the surface strategy taxonomy, fell into four types of grammatical errors: mis formation (42 errors or 41.1%), addition (30 errors or 29.5%), mis ordering (17 errors or 16.6%), and omission (13 errors or 12.8%).

In terms of content, the highest-rated criterion is correct preposition usage, had the highest weighted mean of 2.63, indicating stronger confidence in this area, while the lowest-rated criterion is subject-verb agreement with lowest weighted mean of 2.42, showing it as the most challenging aspect. The weighted mean had a different verbal description of Easy and Difficult. It can be concluded that teachers agreed that students struggled in subject – verb agreement in their writing practices.

Regarding students' language and grammar, the highest-rated criterion was correct comma usage, which received the highest weighted mean of 2.67. This suggests that students demonstrate confidence in their ability to use punctuation correctly, as exemplified by the sentence: "I like apples, bananas, and oranges." Conversely, the lowest-rated criterion was subject-verb agreement, which had the lowest weighted mean of 2.52. This indicates that subject-verb agreement was the most challenging area for students. Both weighted means were verbally described as "Easy," highlighting that the teacher identified subject-verb agreement as a major issue in students' language and grammar.

Regarding students' logical & argumentative, the highest-rated criterion is correct pronoun usage, had the highest weighted mean of 2.54, suggesting better understanding in this area. While the lowest-rated criterion is subject-verb agreement, it had the lowest weighted mean of 2.42, showing significant difficulty. The weighted means had a different verbal description of Easy and Difficult. It can be concluded that teachers found that students committed errors in their subject-verb agreement in logical and argumentative.

The statements below summarized the findings on the significant differences between the level of writing difficulties of the respondents when group according to sex, in terms of content. The t-statistic is -0.0755, and the p-value is 0.940, which is much higher than the common significance level (0.05). This means that there is no significant difference in content writing difficulties between male and female students.

In terms of language and grammar, the t-statistic is -1.16, and the p-value is 0.248, which is higher than the significance level (0.05). This means that no significant difference in language and grammar between male and female students.

Regarding students' logical and argumentative skills, the t-statistic is 0.186, and the p-value is 0.853, which is much higher than the 0.05 significance level. This means there is no significant difference in logical and argumentative writing difficulties between male and female students.

The statements below summarize the findings on the significant difference between the respondents' profile and the level of writing difficulties of the respondents. All p-values are greater than 0.05, indicating no significant relationship between the respondents' profile (sex and academic track) and their writing difficulties (content, language and grammar, logical, and argumentative).

Conclusion

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that most of Grade 12 students in Pal – ew High School generally made the most frequent errors in mis formation, which have 152 frequencies (55%) in total. The dominant mis formation errors include subject and verb agreement, preposition, verb construction, auxiliary, gerunds, and plural nouns. The second type of errors are omissions 120 omission errors (43%) in total) were found in this study. The dominant linguistics errors in omission cover articles, verb (copula), plurals, auxiliary, preposition, and irregular/regular past tense. Lastly, addition of errors, the only additional error recorded is the simple addition of an article, there were 4 errors made by the students, or 100%.

Overall, the findings suggest that the most common challenges for students lie in sentence structure and grammatical accuracy. The dominance of mis formation and omission errors indicates a need for targeted instructional strategies to address these issues, particularly in areas such as verb agreement, article use, and proper tense formation. Focused teaching on these specific linguistic areas may help improve students' overall writing proficiency.

References

- Ailinah, B. N. (2022). Grammatical Errors Committed by Students of Mts Nurul Huda Sawo in Writing Descriptive Texts. *The Art of Teaching English as a Foreign Language*.
- Afdaleni. (2018). Students' Interest Level in Learning English Grammar. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(4), 61–65.
- Alisha, F., Safitri, N., Santoso, I., & Siliwangi, I. (2019). Students' difficulties in writing EFL. *Professional Journal of English Education*, 2(1), 20–25.
- Azep Maulana, A. M. (2022). Analysis of Students Error in Writing Descriptive Text At the Ninth Grade of Smpn 07 Kotabumi Academic Year 2020/2021. *Griya Cendikia*, 7(2), 159–177. <https://doi.org/10.47637/griya-cendikia.v7i2.244>
- Batu, P. N. F. L., Barasa, L. P. L., & Sitepu, V. T. (2018). Grammatical Errors in Students Speaking English: An Error Analysis on Indonesian Maritime Students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(7), 88–93

- Bulqiyah, S., Mahbub, Moh. A., & Nugraheni, D. A. (2021). Investigating writing difficulties in essay writing: Tertiary students' perspectives. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 4(1), 61. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v4i1.2371>
- Calanoga, M. C. M. (2019). Mechanics and Grammar Error Analysis in Students' Write-Ups: Basis for Incidental Teaching in the Classroom. *Asian EFL Journal*, 23(3.3), 104-125.
- Cruz, A. O.de la. (2019). Surface Structure Taxonomy-Based Analysis of Errors in Written English Sentences of ESL Learners. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 24(4.1), 13- 37.
- Dang, T. H., Chau, T. H., & Tra, T. Q. (2020). A STUDY ON THE DIFFICULTIES IN WRITING ARGUMENTATIVE ESSAYS OF ENGLISH-MAJORED SOPHOMORES AT TAY DO UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i1.3389>
- Dean C.L. (2020). The Most Common Grammar Mistakes English Learners Make; Writers Write. Available at <https://www.writerswrite.co.za/the-most-grammar-mistakes-english-learners-make/> (accessed in 20 May 2023).
- Faisal, M., Mulya, K., & Syamsul, B. (2017). Errors in EFL writing by junior high students in Indonesia. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 6(1), 38-52.
- Fauzan, U., Aulya, S. F., & Noor, W. N. (2020). Writing error analysis in exposition text of the EFL junior high school students. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 5(2), 517-533. <https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v5i2.330>
- Haberman, P., Afzaal, M., Ghaffar, A., & Alfadda, H. (2020). Various Roles in the Development of EFL Learners' English Skills. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(4), 609-622. doi: <http://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13438a>
- Herrera, P. D. P. (2025). Challenges and interventions in writing from the perspective of selected tertiary students: Basis for an enhanced and context-sensitive writing curriculum. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2025.25003>
- Hikmah, H. (2020). Analysis of Omission and Addition Errors Found in the Students' English Texts. *ELTICS: Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.31316/eltics.v5i1.526>
- Huseynova, S. S. (2019). Assessing English grammar assessment and feedback: A case study of King Khalid University (KKU) students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 44-55. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/efl1.4>
- Khansir, A. A., & Pakdel, F. (2020). A Study of Written Errors of Iranian Learners: A Systematic Review. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(8), 982-982. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1008.18>
- Khatteer, S. (2019). An analysis of the most common essay writing errors among EFL Saudi female learners (Majmaah University). *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3), 364-381. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.26>
- Maulana, A. M. A. (2022). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS ERROR IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT AT THE NINTH GRADE OF SMPN 07 KOTABUMI ACADEMIC YEAR 2020/2021. *Griya Cendikia*, 7(2), 159-177. <https://doi.org/10.47637/griya-cendikia.v7i2.244>
- Mohideen, S. (2023, January 30). Error Analysis of a Sample of Kuala Kangsar University Students' English Placement Writing Test. *SALTel Journal (Southeast Asia Language Teaching and Learning)*, 6(1), 27-33. <https://doi.org/10.35307/saltel.v6i1.100>
- Mubarak, F. (2022). Error Analysis of Students' Digital Writing in Using Sentence Connectors At the Fourth Semester Students of English ..., 8(2), 58-67. Retrieved from <https://tinyurl.com/b634bkmk>
- Mubarak, Y., & Budiono, T. (2022). An error analysis on EFL students' writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(2), 187-203. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i2.11386>
- Nenotek, S. A., Tlonaen, Z. A., & Manubulu, H. A. (2022). Exploring university students' difficulties in writing english academic essay. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(1), 909-920

- Nguyen, T. H. (2020). Common grammatical errors in English writing-A case study with second-year students of information technology at HAU. *CTU Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 12(1), 37-44. doi: <https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2020.005>
- Nila, S. F. (2017). Problems in Writing English Business Letter: Errors and Factors. *Publikasiilmiah.ums.ac.id*. <https://publikasiilmiah.ums.ac.id/handle/11617/8844> [19.] Norrish, John. 1983. *Language learners and their errors*. London: MacMillan Press
- Okonkwo, A. O. (2015). Gender in students' achievement in English essay writing using collaborative instructional strategy. *International Journal of English Language Education* 3(1) 85-91.
- Putri, M., Ariyani Pedro, V., & Pawestri, N. (2020). Analyzing the Factors Influencing Students' Fluency in English Speaking Skills: A Case in Bina Nusantara University. *ICLLT 2019*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.12-10-2019.2292184>
- Qamariah, H., Sri Wahyuni, & Meliana. (2020). an Analysis of Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing English Text in the Second Grade Students of Smk-Smti Banda Aceh. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, 7(1), 58-71. <https://doi.org/10.46244/geej.v7i1.1041>
- Rizqullah, M., & Abdul, S. (2022). A closer look at the EFL students' grammatical errors in writing descriptive text, 33- 43. <https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.559>
- Sari, D. M. M. (2019). The effectiveness of corrective feedback to the students' grammatical construction on paragraph writing class. *Journal of English Educational Study*, 2(2), 122-131. <https://doi.org/10.31932/jees.v2i2.520>
- Setyowati, L., Agustina, F., Sukmawan, S., El-Sulukiyyah, A. A., & Mabaroh, B. (2020). The Students' Problems and Solutions in Writing an Argumentative Essay on Gender Issue. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(3), 279. doi: <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v5i3.424>
- Shariq, M. (2020). Difficulties Facing Saudi EFL Learners with Translation: Contrastive and Error Analysis. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(3.3), 13-27.
- Tica-A, P. F. (2024). Students' grammatical errors in essay writing. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 13(15). <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2024.24826>
- Zhang, M., Bennett, R. E., Deane, P., & Van Rijn, P. W. (2019). Are there gender Differences in How Students Write Their Essays? An Analysis of Writing Processes. *Educational Measurement Issues and Practice*, 38(2), 14-26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emip.12249>