Analysis of Tertiary Learners' Writing Errors through Surface Strategy Taxonomy

Kharence Grell Laquiao Dagson
Master of Arts in Education-English, Kalinga State University, Kalinga, Philippines

Article Info	ABSTRACT
	This study analyzed grammatical errors in the descriptive writing of Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSEd-English) students from private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Kalinga Province using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen. It aimed to identify error types, determine prevalent patterns, and examine factors contributing to learners' writing difficulties. Guided by Error Analysis Theory, the study employed a descriptive qualitative design and collected data from second- and third-year BSEd-English students during the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026 through purposive sampling. Findings revealed 383 grammatical errors with misformation (46.74%) and addition (40.99%) as the most frequent, while omission (9.92%) and misordering (2.35%) were less common. Misformation and addition errors—particularly in word choice, singular–plural forms, verb tenses, pronouns, and lexical devices—reflect learners' struggles with grammar, vocabulary, and sentence construction. Influencing factors included interlingual interference, intralingual transfer, pedagogical, and psychological issues emphasizing the need for improved instruction and feedback. To address these issues, a writing instrument for pre-admission evaluation was developed to strengthen grammar and writing proficiency among incoming English majors. The results provided insights for language instruction, curriculum development, and teacher education policy supporting quality education aligned with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4.

Corresponding Author:

Kharence Grell Laquiao Dagson,
Master of Arts in Education-English, Kalinga State University, Kalinga, Philippines
Email: kharencegrelldagson@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Language is a crucial element in facilitating communication and sharing of experiences (Hadi, 2021; Hasbi et al., 2022; Kohn & Hoffstaedter, 2017). In an increasingly interconnected world, proficiency in the English language has become a critical asset for academic advancement, professional mobility, and international collaboration (Codó, 2018). Globally, the United Nation's Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education, recognizing language proficiency—particularly in English—as a gateway to accessing global

knowledge systems and fostering cross-cultural engagement (Franco & Derbyshire, 2019; Tahiri, 2025). English proficiency enables learners to participate meaningfully in academic and professional communities, thereby supporting SDG 4's vision of lifelong learning and quality education for all (Yu et al., 2024).

In the Philippine context, English functions as an official language and serves as the primary medium of instruction across all educational levels. The Bilingual Education Policy (DO 52, s. 1987) institutionalized English as a second language (ESL) setting expectations for students to develop strong oral and written communication skills throughout their academic journey. Within second language acquisition, learners are expected to master the five macro skills—listening, reading, speaking, writing, and viewing—which are essential for academic success and professional competence (Ochoa, 2025). Among these, writing holds a particularly critical role as it not only assesses language proficiency but also develops higher order thinking skills such as critical analysis, creativity, and self-expression (Sarmadani, 2021; Rixha et al., 2021). Studies suggest that tertiary learners should already possess foundational experience in descriptive writing, as this supports vocabulary development, grammatical accuracy, and cognitive engagement (Zhao, 2025).

Despite prolonged exposure to English, numerous studies have documented persistent writing difficulties among Filipino ESL learners. Research highlights high levels of writing anxiety (Kabigting, 2020), grammatical inaccuracies resulting from interlingual and intralingual transfer (Esmalde, 2020; Garcia & Amado, 2025; Tuparan & Caturay, 2024), and instructional challenges rooted in limited teacher preparation and pedagogical support (Ghorbani et al., 2020). These studies collectively establish that writing difficulties remain prevalent even at the tertiary level, raising concerns about the effectiveness of current instructional approaches.

In teacher education programs, these concerns become more critical. The Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSEd-English), as stipulated in CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 75, series of 2017, is designed to produce graduates who demonstrate high proficiency in oral and written communication. The curriculum integrates descriptive writing tasks across general education, professional education, and major courses, reinforcing the expectation that future English teachers should exhibit minimal writing errors. However, emerging research reveals a gap between curricular expectations and actual student performance. Studies involving BSEd and AB English students report persistent grammatical and structural errors, particularly when analyzed through the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) framework developed by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, which categorizes errors into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering (Esmalde, 2020; Tuparan & Caturay, 2024; Garcia & Amado, 2025; Comeo, 2025).

While existing studies extensively examined writing errors among tertiary students in state universities in urban and semi-urban settings, a notable research gap remains. There is limited empirical evidence focusing on private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Kalinga Province which is also a semi-urban context. Moreover, previous studies often present generalized error trends and rarely investigate individual writing

faults in descriptive writing using a Surface Strategy Taxonomy framework. This lack of localized, institution-specific data limits the development of targeted interventions and policy reforms in teacher education.

This study addresses these gaps by offering several innovative contributions to existing literature. First, it provides a localized analysis of descriptive writing errors among BSEd-English students in private HEIs in Kalinga Province, an underrepresented research setting. Second, the Surface Strategy Taxonomy applies in a more focused and diagnostic manner, examining individual error patterns and their underlying causes rather than merely reporting frequency counts. Third, the study extends beyond descriptive analysis by linking writing proficiency to teacher quality and readiness, directly supporting SDG 4 and SDG 4.c, which emphasize access to qualified and competent teachers.

Most significantly, this introduces a practical and policy-driven innovation by developing a writing assessment instrument for pre-admission evaluation of BSEd-English students. Unlike previous studies that primarily offer pedagogical recommendations, this study translates empirical findings into an actionable tool that can support admission screening and quality assurance in teacher education programs. This is particularly relevant in Kalinga Province, where inconsistencies in pre-admission assessment practices exist among private HEIs.

In alignment with the Philippines' commitment to achieving quality education under the Sustainable Development Goals, this study contributes evidence-based insights that can inform institutional policy, curriculum refinement, and teacher education standards. By integrating global educational goals with local realities, the study advances current research and provides a meaningful framework for strengthening writing proficiency and teacher preparedness in ESL contexts. Utilizing the Surface Strategy Taxonomy developed by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (Diani et al., 2025; Pandapatan, 2022), the study seeks to identify errors and determine error patterns in the descriptive writing of Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) English students, analyze its causes, and create a writing instrument to support the pre-admission process for BSED English majors in Kalinga Province's Private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

2. METHOD

The study employed a descriptive qualitative research design, which aimed to describe the errors and types of errors present in students' writing (Rusmiati, 2019; Escuadra, 2024). This qualitative approach was used to examine the grammatical errors committed by tertiary learners and the factors contributing to these writing errors among Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English (BSEd-English) students in Private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Kalinga. The descriptive method was utilized as the study collected corpus from students' descriptive writing. It specifically focused on describing the frequency of error types, the patterns in which these errors were manifested, and the factors that contributed to writing difficulties.The study was conducted in Kalinga Province and analyzed tertiary learners' writing errors using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST). As a corpus-based study, it gathered descriptive

writing samples from BSEd-English students enrolled in Private HEIs in Kalinga, particularly Saint Louis College of Bulanao (SLCB), Saint Tonis College, Inc. (STCI), and Kalinga Colleges of Science and Technology, Inc. (KCSTI). The distribution of the 131 enrollees during the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026 consisted of 64 students from SLCB (48.85%), 16 from STCI (12.21%), and 51 from KCSTI (38.94%), from whom the corpora were collected.

To select the corpus for analysis, the study employed purposive sampling, a non-probability sampling technique that targets samples meeting specific criteria. The selected descriptive texts had to meet the following requirements: must not be AI-generated or AI-assisted, must be written inside the classroom during a supervised major subject class, must come from students enrolled in the first semester of Academic Year 2025–2026, must be a second- or third-year BSEd-English students, and the corpus must range from 150 to 300 words. These criteria ensured that the texts collected served as raw and authentic data. Coding was used to protect the privacy of participants and schools, identifying respondents as N1 up to the last participant. The data-gathering instrument consisted of three parts. Prior to administering the instrument, the researcher sought consent from the presidents, deans, and students of the participating Private HEIs. Meanwhile, the checklist on contributory factors to writing errors was adapted from Un Nisa & Wani (2024) and was subsequently modified and validated by experts. Part I gathered students' profile information to determine eligibility based on the selection criteria. Part II contained the descriptive writing prompts used to collect the corpus for error analysis. Part III included the checklist to identify factors contributing to writing errors. The data-gathering procedure involved administering descriptive writing prompts to the participants after securing approval from institutional authorities. The researcher personally distributed the writing instrument to the teacher handling English major subjects, who then facilitated its administration. Students wrote one descriptive text based on the provided prompts, with a required length of 150 to 300 words, and completed the checklist on contributory factors to writing errors.

Respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, their rights, and the way their responses would be used. Participation was voluntary, and students could opt out at any time without consequences. To ensure confidentiality, no names or personal identifiers were collected. All responses were used solely for academic purposes, securely stored, and handled responsibly. The writing instrument was designed to avoid any harm, discomfort, or offense, and the study underwent approval from the research adviser and school authorities to ensure adherence to ethical guidelines. The data gathered on writing errors and contributory factors were analyzed using several statistical tools. Frequency was used to quantify the number of errors committed under the categories of omission, addition, misordering, and misformation, computed using the formula $f = n/N$. Percentage was used to further quantify these errors using the formula $P = (F \times 100) / N$. Ranking was employed to arrange the types of errors from most frequent to least frequent using an ordinal ranking scale.

3. **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**
   Results
   Errors in the Corpora

   Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Errors Committed by BSEd-English students

Types Of Error	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Addition	157	40.99%	2
Misformation	179	46.74%	1
Misordering	9	2.35%	4
Omission	38	9.92%	3
TOTAL	383	100%	

The table revealed that Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English students from three Private Higher Education Institutions in Kalinga incurred four types of grammatical errors. Misformation was the most frequent with 179 instances (46.74% of total errors), followed by additional errors at 157 occurrences (40.99%). Omission errors were recorded 38 times (9.92%), while misordering was the least common type with 9 cases (2.35%).

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Misformation Errors Committed by BSEd-English students in their descriptive text

Misformation Errors	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Noun form	15	8.37%	6
Word choice	38	21.22%	1
Verb form & tenses	32	17.88%	3
Subject-Verb Agreement	29	16.20%	4
Prepositions	18	10.06%	5
Singular-Plural forms	33	18.44%	2
Pronoun	14	7.82%	7
TOTAL	179	100%	

Table 2 details the types and frequencies of misformation errors in the descriptive writing of BSEd-English students. A total of 179 errors were logged, with the most common word choice errors at 21.22% (38 instances). Singular-plural errors followed at 18.44% (33 occurrences), and verb form and tense errors were third at 17.88% (32 cases). Subject-verb agreement errors accounted for 16.20% (29 instances), while preposition errors were at 10.06% (18 occurrences). Noun form errors occurred 8.37% of the time (15 instances), and pronoun-related errors were the least frequent at 7.82% (14 cases). The analysis underscores that students struggle primarily with word selection and morphological consistency.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Addition Errors Committed by BSEd-English students in their descriptive text

Addition Errors	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Noun	16	10.19%	6
Verb form	25	15.92%	3
Adverb	12	7.64%	7
Lexical devices	28	17.84%	2
Prepositions	22	14.01%	4
Pronoun	29	18.48%	1
Adjectives	4	2.55%	8

Addition Errors	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Determiners	20	12.73%	5
Transitional marker	1	0.63%	9
TOTAL	157	100%	

Table 3 indicates that BSEd-English students committed 157 addition errors, categorized as follows: Pronoun additions (29 errors, 18.48%) were the most frequent, followed by lexical device errors (28 cases, 17.84%) and verb form additions (25 occurrences, 15.92%). Preposition additions had 22 instances (14.01%), determiner errors comprised 20 (12.73%), and noun errors accounted for 16 (10.19%). Adverbs were less frequent with 12 errors (7.64%), adjectives had 4 (2.55%), and transitional markers recorded the least with 1 instance (0.63%). The findings highlight that unnecessary pronouns and lexical elements are major sources of additional errors in students' descriptive writing.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Omission Errors Committed by BSEd-English students in their descriptive text

Omission Errors	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Noun	7	18.43%	3
Verb form & tenses	16	42.10%	1
Lexical device	1	2.63%	5
Prepositions	8	21.06%	2
Pronoun	1	2.63%	5
Determiner	5	13.15%	4
TOTAL	38	100%	

Table 4 shows that BSEd-English students made a total of 38 omission errors across six categories. The most common errors involved verb forms and tenses, accounting for 42.10% (16 instances), followed by prepositions at 21.06% (8 occurrences), and nouns at 18.43% (7 cases). Determiner omissions occurred 5 times (13.15%), while lexical device and pronoun omissions were rare, each with 1 instance (2.63%). This highlights students' frequent omission of essential verb elements, indicating difficulties in forming grammatically complete sentences.

The least frequent error type is misordering, affecting syntactic accuracy when sentence elements are misplaced. It occurs in only 2.35% of cases, indicating that learners generally maintain correct word order, a fundamental aspect of English syntax. However, its presence suggests some learners may still struggle with sentence structure in complex constructions.

Patterns of Manifestations of Errors

Table 5. Patterns of Manifestation of Word Choice (Misformation Errors)

Word Choice Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Verb	Writers use inappropriate verbs in their sentences, making the meaning unclear.
Lexical devices	Inappropriate use of lexical devices which confuses readers.
noun	Inappropriate use of nouns, showing a lack of vocabulary.
Adverbs	Interchanging the use of adverbs, causing ambiguity.
Determiner	Misuse of determiners
Pronoun	Interchanging of "to" and "it," leading to grammatical errors.

Word Choice Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Preposition	Interchanging prepositions, causing confusion.

Word choice errors in participants' writing highlighted deficiencies in lexical selection, particularly concerning verbs and function words. Errors spanned multiple categories, including verbs, nouns, adverbs, and prepositions, often resulting in awkward or imprecise meanings. For instance, participants frequently opted for general verbs like "make" instead of more specific terms such as "create" or "write," which diminished clarity and academic tone. Such limited lexical precision indicates a struggle to convey intended meanings effectively.

N25: "*This helps us grow our minds.*"
N10: "*...that they make a public education…*"
N13: "*...a common quotation that we always say when they question us about…*"
N15: "*Some students can't even make simple essays…*"

Lexical devices errors disrupt smooth idea transitions. For example, N1 incorrectly used the subordinating conjunction "when" instead of "if" to indicate condition. N3 opted for "however" rather than the correct "also" or "moreover," which denote addition rather than contrast. Additionally, N5 employed the prepositional phrase "due to" instead of the appropriate conjunctions "because" or "since," as "due to" cannot introduce a clause.

N1: "*...call your family when something happens…*"
N3: "*...avoid being ignorant. However, education makes us…*"
N5: "*...not be banned from school due to phones provide information…*"
N36: "*...listening in class and others…*"

Noun errors are notable in participants' responses, with incorrect noun usage leading to illogical phrases. For example, in N2, "education" was misused instead of the more fitting "dreams or aspirations." In N6, this term reappeared inappropriately, where "lessons" was the correct choice. N38 featured "prospective," which made the sentence nonsensical, as "prospect" was needed. Additionally, N11 contained a misspelling of "world" as "word," altering the intended message.

N2: "*… achieve our goals and education.*"
N6: "*… they can also apply the education they learned…*"
N38: "*...be a basis in the prospective school…*"
N11: "*In this modern word…*"

Adverb errors often lead to word choice inaccuracies, as demonstrated by the misuse of "specially" in place of "especially" in N31 and N1, creating ambiguity. Additionally, N13 incorrectly uses "always" instead of "often," which implies total occurrence and can mislead readers.

N1: "*...help to us specially when we are inside the classroom.*"
N31: "*...in our lives specially…*"
N13: "*...a common quotation that we always…*"

Determiner errors manifest as word choice mistakes that disrupt clarity. For example, in N13, using "every" instead of "one" misleads readers by overgeneralizing. In N19, substituting "theirs" for the contraction "there's" lowers grammatical accuracy. Similarly, in N34, using "a" instead of "the" misrepresents a specific reference. These errors highlight how improper determiner selection impacts the precision of meaning.

N13: *"...because <u>every</u> requirement in a job is a diploma."*
N19: *"Without education, <u>there's</u> no improvement…"*
N34: *"...that is <u>a</u> final step…"*

Pronoun errors manifest as word choice errors, exemplified in N27 where the writer used "to" instead of "it," altering the word's grammatical function.

N27: *"...and <u>to</u> fosters their personal growth…"*

Preposition errors in word choice may cause confusion, as seen when N40 incorrectly used "with" instead of "from," suggesting that phones are the instruments of distraction rather than the source.

N40: *"...without distracting them <u>with</u> their phones."*

Errors in word choice indicate that learners face challenges with vocabulary precision and the selection of function words, which can distort meaning and weaken cohesion, conciseness, and academic tone.

Table 6. Patterns of Manifestation of Singular-Plural form (Misformation Errors)

Singular-Plural Form Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Misuse of –s	Adding-s to nouns incorrectly
Lack of Plural markers	Lack of the plural marker when needed
Wrong Selection of Singular vs. Plural for Context	Using singular when plural is required or vice versa

Participants exhibited misformation errors in singular-plural forms, notably in the misuse of –s, absence of plural markers, and incorrect singular-plural selection based on context. For example, N10 used "students" instead of "student" when 'a' indicated a singular noun. Likewise, N31 and N21 incorrectly wrote "tools and achievements" instead of "tool and achievement," as 'most powerful' necessitated singularity. These errors indicate learners' incomplete mastery of number agreement rules in English.

N10: *"As a <u>student</u>, education…"*
N31: *"Education is the most powerful <u>tools</u> in our lives…"*
N21: *"...the most powerful <u>achievements</u> we…"*

Lack of plural markers in singular-plural forms can create confusion and ambiguity in writing. Specific examples include the misuse of terms such as "hindrance" for "hindrances" and "student" for "students," leading to difficulty in discerning whether the writer refers to one or multiple items. This can ultimately result in misinterpretation of the intended message.

N28: *"Although there are many <u>hindrances</u> in order…"*
N38: *"...because most of the <u>student</u> cannot…"*
N3 : *"...different <u>language</u> and…"*
N16: *"We can be <u>professional</u> one day…"*

There are errors in singular vs. plural usage in the text. In instance N28, "these" should be "this," and in N11, "study" should be "studies," which could mislead readers regarding the subject's number or scope.

N28: *"...what matters in <u>these</u> generation…"*
N11: *"...finish your <u>study.</u>"*

These findings indicate that learners face challenges with morphological pluralization rules and number agreement. Errors in singular-plural forms highlight persistent difficulties with morphological inflections, particularly in academic writing where accuracy is essential, despite their common use in everyday communication.

Table 7. Patterns of Manifestation of Verb form and tenses (Misformation Errors)

Verb form and Tenses	Patterns of Manifestations
Base verb to gerund	Using a base form instead of a gerund when required
Past tense to present tense	Using a present tense verb where the past tense should be used
Present tense to past tense	Using a past tense verb where the present tense is needed
Base form to past participle	Using the past participle instead of the base verb form

Verb form and tense errors were identified, impacting grammatical consistency and meaning. For instance, N31 incorrectly wrote "to browsing" instead of "to browse," and N19 used "helped" instead of "help" after a modal auxiliary, indicating confusion in verb sequencing. Errors from past to present tense were noted, with N13 writing "realize" instead of "realized," while unnecessary tense shifts occurred, as seen with N6's "learn" instead of "learned." Additionally, some instances showed incorrect morphological forms, like N31's "prepare" instead of "prepared," highlighting confusion between verb aspect and participle usage.

N27: *"...education is <u>teaching</u> the students…"*
N31: *"...will use it to <u>browse</u> their social media account."*
N19: *"...it can also <u>help</u> you improve…"*
N9: *"...that everyone of us must <u>possessed</u> because…"*
N13: *"...when I <u>realize</u> education is very important."*
N6: *"...apply the things that they <u>learn</u> in…"*
N30: *"...builds a stronger, more <u>inform</u> population."*
N31: *"...stronger, more resilient, and better <u>prepare</u> for a better future."*

These examples highlight learners' struggles with consistent tense use and verb forms, often leading to errors like tense shifts in sentences and incorrect morphological applications. The findings indicate that while students have a partial grasp of English tense rules, they encounter difficulties in accurate application, especially when articulating complex ideas or extended thoughts.

Table 8. Patterns of Manifestation of Subject-Verb Agreement (Misformation Errors)

Subject-Verb Agreement Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Singular subject with plural verb	Using a plural verb when the subject is singular
Plural subject with singular verb	Using a singular verb when the subject is plural

Subject-verb agreement errors were identified, with participants incorrectly using plural verbs with singular subjects. Examples include N5 ("need" instead of "needs"), N8 ("send" instead of "sends"), N18 ("serve, mold, shape" instead of "serves, molds, and shapes"), and N21 ("teach" instead of "teaches"). The plural verbs do not agree with the singular subjects written.

N5: *"...when student <u>need</u> it."*
N8: *"...the teacher <u>sends</u> to our accounts."*
N18: *"Education <u>serve</u>..."*   *"It equips us, <u>mold</u> us, and <u>shape</u> us for our future."*
N21: *"Education <u>teach</u> us..."*
In contrast, N8 and N34 had subject-verb disagreement, using "is" instead of "are," and N34 used "has" instead of "have."
N8: *"Phones <u>is</u> helping us..."*
N34: *"...those people who <u>is</u> poor or <u>has</u> a hard..."*

These findings indicate that learners frequently struggle with applying concord rules, resulting in subject-verb agreement errors. Such errors occur in both directions, with students using plural verbs for singular subjects and singular verbs for plural subjects, highlighting an incomplete grasp of a key grammatical rule in English, which negatively impacts the clarity of descriptive writing.

Table 9. Pattern of Manifestation of Preposition Errors (Misformation Errors)

Preposition Errors	Pattern of Manifestations
Incorrect choice of preposition	Using a wrong preposition that changes or confuses the meaning

Incorrect preposition selection alters sentence meaning, as demonstrated by various examples: N2 and N21 incorrectly used "for" and "in" instead of "to"; N8 used "on" instead of "in"; and N15 used "in" instead of "on".
N2: *"...is the way <u>for</u> having a decent job." "...to pass <u>in</u> the next generation..."*
    "...is very useful <u>in</u> us today."
N21: *"Education is the key <u>to</u> our successful plan..."*
N8: *"...that the teacher sends it <u>on</u> our account."*
N15: *"...rely too much <u>in</u> Google..."*

Students frequently misstep in using prepositions, leading to grammatical errors and vague meanings. These persistent difficulties highlight preposition use as a major challenge for English second language learners. The findings suggest that while preposition errors may occur less often than those involving verbs or nouns, they still significantly impede clarity and coherence in descriptive writing.

Table 10. Patterns of Manifestation of Noun form (Misformation Errors)

Nouns form Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Adjective to noun	Instead of using a noun, the writer uses an adjective.
Noun to adjective	Instead of using an adjective, the writer uses a noun.
Gerund to noun	Instead of using a noun, the writer uses a gerund.
Noun to verb	Incorrect use of noun form instead of verb form making the sentence unclear
Incorrect noun form	Using of not valid nouns in English

The writing outputs of participants revealed a pattern of noun form errors, indicating difficulties in transforming words across different parts of speech. These errors are categorized into seven types: adjective to noun, noun to adjective, gerund to noun, noun to verb, and incorrect noun form. Specific examples, such as in sentences N6, N14, and

N27, show writers incorrectly using adjectives (e.g., "important") in place of nouns (e.g., "importance"), resulting in grammatical errors.

N6: "*All people need the <u>important</u> of education…*"
N14: "*…of education is its <u>important</u>…*"
N27: "*…know the <u>important</u> of education.*"

Some writers interchanged nouns for adjectives, such as using "education" instead of "educational" and "importance" instead of "important." This noun usage alters the meaning and clarity of the sentences.

N7: "*…check <u>education</u> background.*"
N10: "*Education is very <u>importance</u>…*"
N24: "*…helps us become <u>goods</u> citizens.*"
N30: "*Education is one of the most <u>importance</u>…*"

Using gerunds in place of nouns can lead to confusion in sentences. The example in N34 illustrates this, where "living" is incorrectly used instead of "life." The phrase "hard living" is informal and should be corrected to "hard life" for formal writing.

N34: "*…especially to those people who is poor or has a hard <u>living.</u>*"

Nouns to verb errors can lead to confusion regarding intended actions in writing, as illustrated in N3 where a noun ("success") is incorrectly used instead of the verb ("succeed"), resulting in a grammatically incorrect sentence.

N3: "*We should all learn until we <u>success.</u>*"

Incorrect noun form "expertation" was used instead of the correct "expertise," indicating a gap in vocabulary knowledge.

N3: "*… solve problems in everyday life with <u>expertation.</u>*"

Errors in vocabulary knowledge and word formation highlight learners' challenges with derivational and inflectional forms indicating confusion in grammatical roles. The study reveals that limited morphological awareness and weak mastery of word formation rules hinder grammatical accuracy and clarity in descriptive writing.

Table 11. Patterns of Manifestation of Pronoun Errors (Misformation Errors)

Pronoun Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Incorrect pronoun choices	interchanging of object vs. possessive pronouns and nonstandard vs. standard pronoun
Pronoun-antecedent disagreement	pronoun does not agree in number or gender with its antecedent

Incorrect pronoun choices, such as using "them" instead of "their" and "theirself" instead of "themselves," lead to confusion regarding relationships and ownership in writing.

N20: "*…you can teach <u>them</u> language.*"
N27: "*…to discipline <u>theirself.</u>*"

Pronoun and antecedent disagreement occur when a singular demonstrative pronoun "that" is incorrectly used instead of a plural demonstrative pronoun "those" to match the plural subject rules.

N36: "*With <u>those rules</u>, they will…*"

These examples demonstrate that learners struggle with pronoun case and agreement, which, although less frequent than verb or noun errors, significantly affect grammatical accuracy and clarity, ultimately weakening coherence in descriptive writing.

Table 12. Patterns of Manifestation of Pronoun Errors (Addition Errors)

Pronoun Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of personal pronouns	Insertion of unnecessary personal pronouns which caused redundancy and distorted sentence meaning.
Addition of relative pronoun	Insertion of an unnecessary relative pronoun resulting in awkward phrasing and loss of clarity.

Addition of pronouns in participants' writing has distorted the meaning of conveyed ideas, with examples including unnecessary personal pronouns like "we," "me," "it," "they," and "us," as well as the relative pronoun "which."

N33: *"It helps bridge gaps between social economics and we encourage…"*
N1: *"…And for me, we should not…"*
N8: *"…getting my products in the school carrying it."*
N12: *"…our phones which is everytime it is our forever friend."*
N13: *"Education is the key to success, a common quotation that we always say when they question us about the importance of education."*

These examples illustrate that learners tend to overuse pronouns, leading to redundancy that disrupts clarity and obscures meaning. The study confirms that unnecessary pronoun usage indicates overgeneralization and limited syntactic control, weakening sentence cohesion in descriptive texts.

Table 13. Patterns of Manifestation of Lexical Errors (Addition Errors)

Lexical Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of coordinating conjunctions	Insertion of unnecessary coordinating conjunctions that misleads readers
Addition of subordinating conjunctions	Insertion of unnecessary subordinating conjunctions that misleads readers

Participants' writing exhibited lexical errors, with examples including unnecessary coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. Specifically, N28 included "but" and "once"; N2, N1, N7, and N8 used "and"; and N4 applied "so that." Such additions result in redundancy.

N28: *"… in order to achieve or succeed but once you have it…"*
N2: *"Education is the only way to achieve our goals, and education is the way for having a decent job…"*
N1: *"And you use your phone in a good way…" "…And for me we should not…" "And it is a very big help…"*
N7: *"And also, education…"*
N8: *"…free education like the ALS and etc."*
N4: *"…not going to find job without education, so that im currently…"*

These errors indicate that learners frequently overuse lexical devices as fillers or attempts to create cohesion, leading to wordiness and awkward phrasing. The study highlights that overgeneralization and uncertainty about cohesive devices result in unnecessary conjunction use, ultimately compromising clarity and cohesion in descriptive texts.

Table 14. Patterns of Manifestation of Verb form Errors (Addition Errors)

Verb form and Tenses Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of gerund	Insertion of an unnecessary gerund creating redundancy and awkwardness
Addition of infinitive	Adding of an unnecessary infinitive which distorted the verb structure
Addition of main verb	Insertion of an unnecessary main verb resulting in a double verb construction
Addition of a linking verb	Addition of an unnecessary linking verb before the main verb making the sentence ungrammatical

Participants exhibited verb form errors in their descriptive texts, including unnecessary double verbs and elements. For example, writer N5 used an extraneous gerund ("carrying"), N19 included an unnecessary infinitive ("to") and main verb ("do"), and N33 wrote an unwarranted linking verb ("is"). These mistakes indicate a lack of proficiency in verb usage, leading to ungrammatical and awkward sentence structures.

N5: *"...getting my products in the school <u>carrying</u> it."*
N19: *"Education will help <u>to</u> develop or discover your own skills…"*
N33: *"Education <u>equips</u> individuals with the knowledge and skills…"*
N19: *"...you are not able to <u>do</u> get a job easily."*
N27: *"We, students, should <u>set</u> know the…"*

These errors highlight learners' difficulties with verb usage, resulting in ungrammatical and clumsy sentences. The inclusion of unnecessary verb forms suggests overgeneralization of grammar rules or confusion regarding proper verb patterns, ultimately distorting meaning and diminishing the grammatical accuracy of descriptive writing.

Table 15. Patterns of Manifestation of Preposition Errors (Addition Errors)

Preposition Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of preposition	Insertion of unnecessary preposition
Addition of prepositional phrase	Use of an entire prepositional phrase that is not needed in the sentence

Prepositions and prepositional phrases in participant outputs contributed to wordiness and reduced clarity. Examples include unnecessary prepositions in N29 ("to"), N1 ("for"), N7 ("of"), N15 ("in"), and N24 ("as"), as well as redundant phrases like "like that" and "into good" in N7 and N10, respectively.

N29: *"...you will be easy <u>to</u> find jobs."*
N1: *"And <u>for</u> me, we should not…"*
N7: *"...ask our background <u>of</u> education…"*
N15: *"...searching unnecessary <u>in</u> terms in education."*
N24: *"Education is one of the most powerful tools <u>as</u> a person can have."*
N7: *"...what is our dream job <u>like that.</u>"*
N10: *"Education can change a life of one person <u>into good.</u>"*

Students often overuse prepositions and prepositional phrases, leading to verbosity and awkwardness in writing. The study confirms that excessive preposition addition negatively impacts the conciseness and grammatical correctness of descriptive writing.

Table 16. Patterns of Manifestation of Determiner Errors (Addition Errors)

Determiner Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of articles	Use of unnecessary *a, an,* or *the* before nouns where they are not required
Addition of quantifier	Insertion of redundant quantity markers

Determiner errors in participants' writing diminished their academic tone, with examples including unnecessary articles ("the" by N28 and N33, "a" by N1 and N12) and a redundant quantifier ("one" by N10), which compromised clarity.

N28: *"Education is the most important not just in today's…"*
N33: *"…encourage the whole student…"*
N12: *"…but it should have a limit…"*
N1: *"…a phones in school because…"*
N10: *"Education can help a one society in order…"*

These examples indicate that learners frequently misuse determiners, inserting them unnecessarily, which diminishes clarity and precision and weakens the formal quality of their writing. The findings further support that such inappropriate use reduces the grammaticality and academic tone of students' descriptive texts.

Table 17. Patterns of Manifestation of Noun Errors (Addition Errors)

Noun Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of abstract noun	Insertion of unnecessary abstract nouns that make expressions wordy or redundant
Addition of common noun	Insertion of unnecessary common nouns that repeat meaning already expressed

Noun errors in the participants' writing led to redundancy, evident from unnecessary common nouns like "work" and "activities," as well as abstract nouns such as "qualities" and "education." These additions diminished the clarity and conciseness of their ideas.

N6: *"…need to find a job work in the future."*
N33: *"…fostering critical thingking and problem-solving activities..."*
N32: *"It teaches us discipline, patience, and responsibility qualities that are…"*
N2: *"Yes, it is very important education because…"*

These examples illustrate that learners frequently add nouns unnecessarily, either for emphasis or due to uncertainty, which leads to awkwardness and redundancy in their writing. The study confirms that this issue is a persistent problem in descriptive writing undermining precision and academic tone.

Table 18. Patterns of Manifestation of Adverb Errors (Addition Errors)

Adverb Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of adverb of degree	Use of unnecessary intensifier that makes the expression redundant
Addition of adverb of focus	Insertion of emphasizing adverbs that are not needed in the sentence
Addition of adverb of addition	Use of additive adverbs that duplicate the function of another connector

Addition of adverb errors were noted in participants' writing, characterized by unnecessary intensifiers and redundant modifiers. Examples include the use of "most" in N28 and "especially" and "also" in N7, both contributing to redundancy and diminishing clarity.

N28: *"Education is the <u>most</u> important not just in today's…"*
N7: *"<u>Especially</u> in applying a job, they need to check…"*
N7: *"And <u>also</u>, education is…"*

Unnecessary adverb use can create redundancy, leading to wordy and imprecise sentences. Learners often overgeneralize modifiers to enhance their statements, which ultimately weakens clarity and the formal tone of their writing. The study confirms that such additions hinder conciseness and lower the academic quality of descriptive texts.

Table 19. Patterns of Manifestation of Adjective Errors (Addition Errors)

Adjective Errors	Patterns of Manifestations
Addition of possessive + adjective	Redundant use of a possessive determiner with an adjective that already implies ownership
Addition of compound adjective	Insertion of an unnecessary evaluative compound adjective that makes the expression wordy or sarcastic

The analysis of adjective errors in participants' writing shows redundancy leading to wordiness and informality. Evaluative compounds were noted to introduce bias and sarcasm, undermining objectivity. Examples include unnecessary adjectives like "own" in statements of ownership and the compound adjective "so-called," which conveys sarcasm and detracts from the academic tone by implying difficulty in finding a job without a diploma.

N36: *"In my <u>own</u> opinion, it seems that…"*
N6: *"In my <u>own</u> opinion, all people need…"*
N10: *"In my <u>own</u> idea, phones should not…"*
N19: *"...get a job easily without your <u>so-called</u> diploma."*

Lessons for learners indicate that redundant adjectives and evaluative compounds can weaken arguments in academic writing by decreasing conciseness, distorting tone, and lowering formality. The study confirms that these additions negatively impact grammatical accuracy and the overall academic quality of descriptive texts.

Table 20. Pattern of Manifestation of Transitional Marker Errors (Addition Errors)

Transitional Marker Error	Pattern of Manifestations
Addition of Transitional Marker of Illustration	Insertion of unnecessary markers of exemplification that make the sentence wordy or awkward

Despite only having one error related to transitional markers, its existence hampers clarity, resulting in a wordy and awkward sentence. In N4, the writer included an illustrative transitional marker ("for example") to clarify the action of his/her cousin.

N4: *"You are nothing <u>for example</u> my cousin who did not…"*

Students may overuse transitional phrases, mistakenly thinking they enhance coherence; however, these devices can disrupt fluency and conciseness, ultimately compromising clarity in descriptive writing.

Table 21. Patterns of Manifestation of Verb form & tenses Errors (Omission Errors)

Verb form & tenses Error	Patterns of Manifestations
Omission of infinitive marker	The particle "to" before the base form of the verb is missing.
Omission of be verbs	Forms of the verb be are omitted, causing incomplete sentences.
Omission of linking verb	The verb "be" is used to link subject and complement is omitted.
Omission of modal auxiliary verb	A modal auxiliary is left out leading to grammatically incomplete verb phrases.
Omission of possessive marker (functioning as verb-related error)	Possessive pronoun/noun that works with the verb is omitted.

Omission errors in verb forms and tense usage were identified in participants' writing, specifically involving the absence of infinitive markers, linking verbs, and auxiliary verbs. For instance, sentences lacked essential elements that led to grammatical inaccuracies and unclear meanings, such as the omission of "to" in an infinitive phrase, linking verbs like "were" for subject completion, and auxiliaries like "be" for correct tense formation. Additionally, missing verb objects created vague sentences, impacting both clarity and grammatical correctness.

N36: *"...to play games _____ not _____listening in class and others_____ browsing their social media accounts."*
N36: *"...they will _____ going to implement..."*
N38: *"They must learn on how to manage their own _____ without the phones."*
N4: *"...her parents _____ disappointed because..."*
N15: *"Phones should not _____ normalize inside the classroom." "Phones should not _____ banned inside the classroom."*
N28: *"...and _____ be carried."*

The omission of verb form and tense markers in this research aligns with existing literature, indicating systemic issues with auxiliaries, linking verbs, and infinitive markers among learners. These omissions impact both grammatical accuracy and hinder fluency and cohesion in academic writing.

Table 22. Pattern of Manifestation of Preposition Errors (Omission Errors)

Preposition Error	Pattern of Manifestation
Omission of preposition	A required preposition is missing, causing incomplete or unclear relationships between words or phrases in a sentence.

Omission errors in prepositions in participants' written outputs led to incomplete and unclear sentences. Examples include N10's missing preposition in "they will not concentrate _____ their studies" (should be "on") and similar omissions by N26, N3, and N12. These errors disrupted grammatical relationships and affected clarity, indicating difficulties in selecting appropriate prepositions for expressing spatial, temporal, or logical relationships, a common challenge for learners in writing.

N10: *"If phones should not be banned, there are chances that some students will not focus on their learning and they will not concentrate _____ their studies."*
N26: *"As we embark _____ education..."*

N3: *"Because _____ those creators of technologies…"*
N12: *"…are prohibited _____ using cellphones."*

These omissions reveal learners' struggles with selecting appropriate prepositions for spatial, temporal, and logical relationships, a common issue in second language acquisition. Although less frequent than verb omissions, preposition errors still negatively impact sentence completeness and logical flow, indicating a need for focused teaching on functional words vital for precision in academic writing.

Table 23. Pattern of Manifestation of Noun Errors (Omission Errors)

Noun Error	Pattern of Manifestation
Omission of noun	The essential noun is missing, resulting in incomplete ideas or phrases that affect meaning.

Omission errors in nouns led to unclear ideas, as evidenced by instances where key nouns were left out, such as "person" in "Being an educated _____" and "skill" in another example. This pattern, along with other omissions like "effects," "growth," and "person," indicates learners' difficulty in recalling or using appropriate nouns, disrupting sentence coherence.

N34: *"Being an educated _____ or a person with college degree…"*
N38: *"…to have a better higher thinking _____ order."*
N11: *"…and other things that can give negative _____ while you…"*
N16: *"…our country's economy is going down and the population _____ is really alarming."*
N27: *"…we are like a stray _____."*

Table 24. Pattern of Manifestation of Determiner Errors (Omission Errors)

Determiner Error	Pattern of Manifestation
Omission of article	Articles were left out, making noun phrases incomplete or grammatically awkward.

Omission errors in determiners among participants led to incomplete noun phrases, as evidenced by missing articles in N11 ("…most of _____ people"), N32 ("It is _____ process"), N15 ("As ____ future teacher"), and N18 ("not _____ educated person"). These errors compromised sentence clarity and underscored learners' struggles with using appropriate articles and determiners, vital for grammatical accuracy.

N11: *"…most of _____ people choose to study…"*
N32: *"It is _____ process of shaping…"*
N15: *"As _____ future teacher, phones should…"*
N18: *"If you are not _____ educated person, you are not qualified to a job…"*

Table 25. Pattern of Manifestation of Lexical devices and Pronoun Errors (Omission Errors)

Lexical devices and Pronoun Error	Patterns of Manifestations
Omission of lexical device	A required lexical device is missing, causing the sentence to sound incomplete or disjointed.
Omission of pronoun	A pronoun that serves as subject is omitted, resulting in fragmented or unclear sentences.

Omission errors in lexical devices and pronouns were observed in participants' outputs. For example, in N29, the phrase "...decide _____ the good and the bad" lacked the necessary word "between." Similarly, N9 had an incomplete sentence "_____ would help them," which required the pronoun "It." These errors indicate learners' challenges in using small yet critical words for sentence clarity and completeness.

N29: *"...decide _____the good and the bad."*
N9: *"_____ would help them…"*

Omission errors in conjunctions and pronouns, though infrequent (2.63%), detract from writing accuracy and cohesion, indicating that learners need more practice with these crucial grammatical elements for precise and complete sentence construction.

Misordering errors were identified in participants' outputs, leading to ungrammatical sentences. Examples include adverb misordering, such as "you will be easy to find jobs" instead of "you will easily find jobs," and subject-verb order confusion, illustrated by "there something is wrong with you" instead of "there is something wrong with you." Other issues involved improper modifier placement and disorganized word sequences, impacting clarity and coherence. These errors indicate learners' difficulties in structuring sentences according to English syntax.

N29: *"...you will be <u>easy to find jobs</u> in the future."*
N28: *"...be carried <u>entire in your life</u>."*
N1: *"...there <u>somethings is wrong</u> with you."*
N2: *"...because <u>it is the gift only,</u> we can give…"*
N4: *"...because <u>forever that degree is</u> mine."*
N9: *"...also shape their <u>values attitude and</u> would…"*
N21: *"...crucial role in our lives. <u>Is it</u> because it helps us…"*
N38: *"...to have a better <u>higher thingking order</u>…"*
N11: *"...relax our mind from <u>overload information</u> during our class."*

Misordering errors, though less common than misformation or omission errors, significantly impact sentence clarity and coherence, highlighting the necessity for specific teaching strategies to improve syntactic sequencing in students' writing.

Table 26. Contributory Factors in Writing Errors among the BSEd-English students

Indicators	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
1. I often translate ideas directly from my first language when writing in English.	Yes	26	63.41%
	No	15	36.59%
2. I follow the sentence order of my native language when writing in English.	Yes	20	48.79%
	No	21	51.21%
3. I use vocabulary from my native language when I do not know the English word.	Yes	31	75.60%
	No	10	24.40%
4. I tend to mix my native language with English in writing.	Yes	19	46.34%
	No	22	53.66%
5. My spelling in English is influenced by how words are spelled in my first language.	Yes	20	48.79%
	No	21	51.21%
6. I make grammar errors because I apply rules from my first language.	Yes	23	56.10%
	No	18	43.90%
7. I switch to my native language when I can't find the English equivalent.	Yes	30	73.18%
	No	11	26.82%
	Yes	22	53.66%

Indicators	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
8. I confuse verb tenses while writing in English.	No	19	46.34%
9. I add unnecessary words like "to" or "be" because I think they are always needed.	Yes	31	75.60%
	No	10	24.40%
10. I struggle to differentiate between present and past tense forms.	Yes	11	26.82%
	No	30	73.18%
11. I am unsure about when to use articles such as "a", "an", or "the."	Yes	12	29.27%
	No	29	70.73%
12. I forget English grammar rules when writing long paragraphs.	Yes	28	68.30%
	No	13	31.70%
13. I lack confidence in writing English sentences.	Yes	20	48.79%
	No	21	51.21%
14. I have a lot of spelling mistakes in writing.	Yes	13	31.70%
	No	28	68.30%
15. I am careless in writing.	Yes	11	26.82%
	No	30	73.18%
16. I am unwilling to learn, especially in writing.	Yes	10	24.40%
	No	31	75.60%
17. It is difficult for me to write down my ideas.	Yes	19	46.34%
	No	22	53.66%
18. I don't have enough vocabulary to express my thoughts.	Yes	27	65.86%
	No	14	34.14%
19. I avoid writing complex ideas because I might make mistakes.	Yes	31	75.60%
	No	10	24.40%
20. I use simpler words to avoid errors.	Yes	41	100%
	No	0	0
21. I rely on memorized expressions or "safe phrases" when writing.	Yes	23	56.10%
	No	18	43.90%
22. I sometimes invent English words when I can't think of the correct term.	Yes	22	53.66%
	No	19	46.34%
23. I cannot connect sentences and ideas together.	Yes	3	7.32%
	No	38	92.68%
24. I have inadequate application of writing mechanics.	Yes	19	46.34%
	No	22	53.66%
25. My teachers use the native language often during English writing lessons.	Yes	15	36.59%
	No	26	63.41%
26. I am confused when teachers model incorrect grammar or spelling.	Yes	18	43.90%
	No	23	56.10%
27. I do not get enough feedback on my grammar mistakes in writing.	Yes	21	51.21%
	No	20	48.79%
28. I lack immediate and sufficient written corrective feedback.	Yes	22	53.66%
	No	19	46.34%
29. My teachers emphasize speaking more than writing.	Yes	36	87.80%
	No	5	12.20%
30. I don't fully understand my teachers' explanations of grammar rules.	Yes	11	26.82%
	No	30	73.18%
31. I do not have enough writing practice in English at school.	Yes	9	21.96%
	No	32	78.04%
32. I rarely get the chance to write full essays or paragraphs in class.	Yes	22	53.65%
	No	19	46.34%
33. The examples in our textbooks do not match real English usage.	Yes	16	39.02%
	No	25	60.98%

Indicators	Responses	Frequency	Percentage
34. The learning materials I use lack clear	Yes	20	48.79%
grammar explanations.	No	21	51.21%
35. I do not get enough exposure to	Yes	24	58.53%
authentic English texts (e.g., articles, essays)	No	17	41.47%
36. I have limited access to English media	Yes	26	63.41%
like books, newspaper, or videos.	No	15	36.59%
37. I have difficulty identifying and	Yes	27	65.86%
correcting my own writing mistakes.	No	14	34.14%
38. I rely too much on grammar-checking	Yes	20	48.79%
tools without understanding the rules.	No	21	51.21%

Table 26 identifies multiple contributory factors affecting writing errors among BSEd-English students, encompassing linguistic, pedagogical, and psychological dimensions. The predominant factor is students' reliance on simpler vocabulary to avoid errors (100%), which limits their expressive capacity and critical engagement in writing. This necessitates increased vocabulary instruction and exposure to academic texts to encourage risk-taking in language use. Another significant finding is the emphasis on speaking over writing (87.80%), highlighting an imbalance in teaching practices; this necessitates a re-prioritization of the curriculum to equalize the focus on writing. Teacher training should involve strategies to enhance writing development.

Interlingual influences are also prevalent, with many students utilizing their native language due to gaps in their English vocabulary (75.60%), indicating the need for explicit instruction in contrastive analysis to minimize negative transfer. There are also intralingual errors such as unnecessary word additions (75.60%) and confusion with verb tenses (53.66%), suggesting a requirement for instruction that goes beyond basic grammar to foster deeper grammatical understanding and provide tailored feedback.

Psychological factors play a significant role, with many students expressing a lack of confidence in their writing abilities (48.79%) and fear of making mistakes (75.60%), impacting their language output as described by Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis. This highlights the importance of fostering a supportive classroom environment that normalizes mistakes through positive reinforcement and peer reviews.

Minor factors contributing to writing difficulties include an inability to connect ideas (7.32%) and insufficient writing practice in English (21.96%), which suggests that the challenges are more systemic and cognitive in nature rather than stemming from a lack of motivation. It emphasizes the need for policy interventions to address structural gaps in the curriculum. Additionally, contextual challenges like inadequate teaching practices and limited access to authentic materials further exacerbate these issues. Thus, a comprehensive pedagogical framework integrating linguistic accuracy, psychological support, and balanced instruction is essential to prepare English majors for their academic and professional writing needs.

Discussion

The prevalence of misformation mistakes in this study aligns with a significant corpus of literature (Rixha et al., 2021; Hakim et al., 2022; Hadi, 2021; Amado &

Garcia, 2025). Consistent with similar research, the current findings suggest that learners frequently have conceptual awareness of grammatical rules yet have difficulties in their accurate application during writing tasks. This convergence substantiates the prior research's claim that intralingual interference and inadequate rule internalization are primary obstacles in tertiary ESL writing.

Nonetheless, the results contrast with the studies that indicated omission as the predominant error type (Rochmadi, 2020; Khansa & Sutrisno, 2019). In the current study, omission was placed third, but additional errors were identified as the second most prevalent category. This discrepancy indicates a context-dependent trend wherein learners, especially those engaged in formal teacher education, often overextend grammatical rules to achieve more refined and precise writing. This transition from omission to addition builds upon prior research by suggesting that error patterns may develop alongside learners' growing grammatical understanding and academic experience. In accordance with almost all examined studies (Rusmiati, 2019; Hakim et al., 2022), misordering was the least prevalent error type. This convergence indicates that English word order is relatively constant among tertiary learners, whereas morphological and lexical accuracy present larger obstacles than syntactic sequencing.

The internal distribution of misinformation mistakes in this investigation closely resembles patterns recorded in the literature. Prevalent errors included word choice, verb tense and form, singular-plural inflection, and subject-verb agreement, corroborating the findings of Rusmiati (2019), Hadi (2021), Comeo (2025), and Garcia and Amado (2025). The prevalence of unsuitable lexical choices confirms the assertion of prior studies that vocabulary constraints and semantic ambiguity continue to be significant deficiencies, even among advanced skill levels.

The recurrent presence of pronoun redundancy and the overutilization of additive connectors correspond with the findings of Hakim et al. (2022). These patterns suggest that learners frequently mitigate structural ambiguity by incorporating linguistic aspects, a characteristic that is less highlighted in omission-centric studies. This discovery enhances literature by emphasizing redundancy as a prominent characteristic of advanced student writing.

The study's finding of intralingual factors as the principal source of errors strongly corroborates previous research, which highlights overgeneralization, erroneous rule application, and incomplete rule acquisition. Although interlingual factors persist, including direct translation and L1 lexical borrowing, it seems to be less pronounced, corroborating the assertion that L1 interference diminishes but does not vanish at elevated proficiency levels (Damayanti et.al, 2022; Rochmadi, 2020; Mehat & Ismail, 2021).

Psychological and pedagogical aspects, such as writing fear, diminished confidence, restricted writing exposure, and a curricular focus on speaking skills, are in close alignment with the findings of Adelita et al. (2023), Hapsari et al. (2022). These findings corroborate Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis by illustrating how emotional barriers inhibit learners' propensity to engage with intricate linguistic patterns (Jawed et al., 2025).

This study posits that, contrary to Un Nisa and Wani (2024), who ascribed writing errors mainly to learner neglect, students exhibit a desire to enhance their skills but are hindered by institutional, instructional, and linguistic constraints. This divergence offers a localized viewpoint in the literature, highlighting institutional and educational factors instead of learner indifference.

This study's findings possess significant theoretical significance for Second Language Acquisition and Error Analysis research. The prevalence of misformation and addition errors reinforces the perspective of interlanguage as a dynamic and changing system (Barone, 2024), wherein learners actively formulate linguistic rules instead of merely transferring or omitting forms. The transition to addition errors indicates that advanced learners are progressively involved in hypothesis testing and rule overgeneralization, enhancing their interlanguage via trial and error. Secondly, the findings augment Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's Surface Strategy Taxonomy by demonstrating that mistake hierarchies are contingent upon context (Keumala & Idami, 2022). This study illustrates that, despite the prevalent reports of omission in numerous EFL and ESL contexts, misformation and addition may be more prominent among tertiary learners with more grammatical awareness. This discovery indicates that SST categories ought to be understood in a developmental context rather than a universal one.

The prevalence of intralingual errors supports cognitive and usage-based models of second language acquisition, highlighting internal processing limitations and incomplete rule acquisition rather than direct interference from the first language. The prevalence of lexical and morphological errors underscores the necessity of more closely integrating grammar and vocabulary development in theoretical models of writing acquisition. The impact of affective and pedagogical elements reinforces Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis and sociocognitive theories of language acquisition, highlighting the relationship between emotional conditions, educational settings, and language proficiency.

The findings have immediate implications for curriculum design, instruction, and evaluation in higher education English and teacher education programs. The prevalence of misinformation and addition errors underscores the necessity for grammar-focused and writing-centric courses that extend beyond superficial corrections to tackle fundamental rule application and lexical accuracy. Instruction must prioritize contextualized grammatical application, morphological awareness, and regulated practice within genuine writing assignments. Due to the common occurrence of redundancy and superfluous elements, clear guidance on conciseness, cohesiveness, and lexical economy is necessary. Writing activities must encompass revision-oriented tasks, peer editing, and model analysis to assist learners in identifying and removing extraneous parts.

The recurrence of errors in verb tense, agreement, and word choice indicates the need for diagnostic writing evaluations and personalized feedback to address persistent error patterns. Teacher education programs must integrate continuous writing practice to

guarantee that prospective language instructors cultivate both grammatical precision and pedagogical insight on learner faults.

Mitigating psychological hurdles necessitates the establishment of a low anxiety writing atmosphere. Positive reinforcement, constructive feedback, and collaborative writing assignments help mitigate the anxiety of making mistakes and promote linguistic risk-taking. Furthermore, curricular equilibrium must be reinstated by distributing equal instructional focus on writing and speaking competencies. The persistent presence of interlingual effect underscores the importance of contrastive analysis and metalinguistic awareness exercises that specifically focus on L1–L2 distinctions. Incorporating these tactics into writing teaching can assist learners in diminishing dependence on translation and fostering increased autonomy in English writing.

4. CONCLUSION

The study revealed that students' challenges in descriptive composition are predominantly linked to deficiencies in grammatical mastery, lexical selection, and the consistent adherence to linguistic conventions. These challenges signify that although students exhibit a fundamental understanding of sentence structure, they face difficulties in applying this knowledge to produce clear and precise written communication. The results affirm the primary objectives of the study to identify the errors, its patterns, and fundamental causes of writing challenges and underscore the necessity for pedagogical strategies that enhance learners' linguistic awareness and writing skills.

Furthermore, the research substantiates that both linguistic transfer and pedagogical circumstances exert a substantial influence on the development of students' writing proficiency. Elements such as the impact of the primary language, restricted exposure to genuine English input, and inadequate emphasis on writing instruction collectively result in limited fluency and expressive capability. In view of these findings, the research endorses the hypothesis that specifically targeted pedagogical interventions—especially those that integrate substantial language exposure, focused grammatical assistance, and structured writing exercises—are vital for enhancing learners' proficiency in descriptive writing.

REFERENCES

Adelita, D., Kurniati, E. Y., & Daulay, S. H. (2023). Difficulties and strategies in producing English writing text: What do EFL students perceive? *Education and Human Development Journal, 8*(1), 93–108. https://doi.org/10.33086/ehdj.v8i1.3698

Barone, S. (2024). The importance of interlanguage in language teaching: an analysis of its development in l2 learners. *Vestnik of Samara State Technical University Psychological and Pedagogical Sciences*, *21*(3), 81-97. https://doi.org/10.17673/vsgtu-pps.2024.3.6

Codó, E. (2018). The intersection of global mobility, lifestyle and ELT work: A critical examination of language instructors' trajectories. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *18*(4), 436-450. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1482905

Damayanti, A., Dewi, S. U., & Prasetyo, W. (2022). Error analysis of college students' paragraph writing. *LinguA LiterA: Journal of English Language Teaching, Learning, and Literature,* *5*(2), 26–36. https://jurnal.stkippgritrenggalek.ac.id/index.php/lingua/article/view/484

Diani, N. W., Retsi, O. D., Amalia, N., & Luardini, M. A. (2025). Students' Error in Writing Descriptive Text Viewed from Surface Strategy Taxonomy. *Jurnal Edulanguage: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, *11*(2), 33-46.

Escuadra, D. (2024). Grammar errors in argumentative writing of junior high school ESL students: An analysis. *Journal of Humanities and Education Research and Development, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.65023/jherd.v9i1.236

Esmalde, V. S. (2020). Surface strategy taxonomy in error analysis: Basis for grammatical competence enhancement program (GCEP). *International Journal of Science and Research, 9*(7), 785–792. https://doi.org/10.21275/SR20707113109

Franco, I. B., & Derbyshire, E. (2019). SDG 4 quality education: governing education for sustainable development: towards inclusive and equitable quality education. In *Actioning the global goals for local impact: towards sustainability science, policy, education and practice* (pp. 57-68). Singapore: Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-32-9927-6_5

Garcia, M. B., & Amado, R. F. (2025). Error analysis in first-year AB English language students' written compositions. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3*(2), 45–60. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2024.0596

Ghorbani, M., Jalalvandi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. R. (2020). Investigating the factors affecting writing skills of students from the teachers' perspective. *Journal of Teaching Persian to Speakers of Other Languages, 9*(19), 91–106. https://doi.org/10.30479/jtpsol.2020.12314.1465

Hadi, I. (2021). An error analysis of active and passive voice in English texts of university students in South Jakarta. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan, 7*(2), 9–16. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4657081

Hakim, F., Waluyo, U., & Soepriyanti, H. (2022). Patterns of grammatical errors in students' thesis. *Journal of English Education Forum, 2*(1), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.29303/j.v2i1.274

Hapsari, E. W., Sudarman, S., & Utami, S. (2022). Sources of students' errors in EFL writing in Indonesia. *JADEs Journal of Academia in English Education, 3*(2), 141–160. https://doi.org/10.32505/jades.v3i2.4678

Hasbi, M., Inayah, N., Latif, F., & Fahira, A. (2022). Improvement Of Scientific Work Writing In English With The Task-Based Language Teaching Method In The English Education Program. *Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat Patikala*, *1*(3), 115-121. https://doi.org/10.51574/patikala.v1i3.278

Jawed, M., Ali, K., & Ahmed, T. (2025). Exploring the Connection between Presence and Absence of Krashen's Theory on Learner's Input and Affective Filters: A Triangulation Approach. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, *3*(2), 1811-1839. https://doi.org/10.71281/jals.v3i2.305

Kabigting, R. P. (2020). Utilizing the RAFT strategy: Its effects on the writing performance of Filipino ESL learners. *Journal of English Teaching, 6*(3), 173–182. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v6i3.1982

Keumala, M., & Idami, Z. (2022). Using Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) in analyzing students' errors in conducting recount paragraph. *JET (JOURNAL OF ENGLISH TEACHING) ADI BUANA)*, *7*(02), 169-177. https://doi.org/10.36456/jet.v7.n02.2022.6058

Khansa, A. S., & Sutrisno, A. (2019). Grammatical errors in Indonesian university students' posters in Yogyakarta. *Lexicon, 6*(2), 190–199. https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v6i2.53153

Kohn, K., & Hoffstaedter, P. (2017). Learner agency and non-native speaker identity in pedagogical lingua franca conversations: Insights from intercultural telecollaboration in foreign language education. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(5), 351-367. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1304966

Mehat, S. Z., & Ismail, L. (2021). Malaysian tertiary ESL students' writing errors and their implications on English language teaching. *Asian Journal of University Education, 17*(3), 235–242. https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v17i3.14504

Ochoa, N. C. (2025). Examining the influence of writing anxiety and writing efficacy on English writing skills among senior high school students: Basis for a writing intervention program. *Diversitas Journal, 10*(2). https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v10i2.3262

Özkayran, A., & Yilmaz, E. (2020). Analysis of higher education students' errors in English writing tasks. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 11*(2), 48–58. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.11n.2p.48

Pandapatan, S. A. (2022). Surface structure taxonomy on journal texts: The case of Filipino ESL learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, *5*(4), 56-65. https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2022.5.4.8

Rixha, A. I. N., Alhamid, I., Rokhmah, S., & Ukka, S. B. (2021). Surface strategy taxonomy: Grammatical errors analysis in third-semester students' descriptive essays. *Kariwari Smart: Journal of Education Based on Local Wisdom, 1*(2), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.53491/kariwarismart.v1i2.39

Rochmadi, I. (2020). Error analysis of English written texts of higher-level EFL learners. *IJELAL (International Journal of English Learning and Applied Linguistics), 1*(1), 44–55. https://doi.org/10.21111/ijelal.v1i1.5009

Rusmiati. (2019). Surface strategy taxonomy on foreign language writing: A study on verb tense usage. *Jurnal Serambi Ilmu, 20*(2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.32672/si.v20i2.1453

Sarmadani, S., Asriati, S. A. M., & Ilmiah, I. (2021). Students' difficulties in using adjective phrases in writing English texts. *Journal of Language Testing and Assessment, 1*(1), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.56983/jlta.v1i1.213

Tahiri, A. (2025). Mother Tongue Teaching and Educational Policies for Sustainable Global Quality Education (SDG4). *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, *5*(5), e5147-e5147. https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730X.SDGsReview.v5.n05.pe05147

Tuparan, R. T., & Caturay, W. S., Jr. (2024). An error analysis of English education students' academic essays. *Silliman Journal, 65*(1). https://sillimanjournal.su.edu.ph/index.php/sj/article/view/540

Un Nisa, S., & Wani, N. H. (2024). Investigating factors influencing academic writing skills among female students in India. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University, 59*(4). https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.59.4.20

Yu, B., Guo, W. Y., & Fu, H. (2024). Sustainability in English language teaching: strategies for empowering students to achieve the sustainable development goals. *Sustainability*, *16*(8), 3325. https://doi.org/10.3390/su16083325

Zhao, D. (2025). The impact of teacher, peer, and automated writing evaluation feedback on developing deep writing skills: a comparative study. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-025-09469-x