Analysis of Students' Errors and Writing Flow in Descriptive Paragraph Written by the First Semester Students of English Department at the University of Mataram, Academic Year 2024/2025

1*Muhamad Sohibul Hamdani, 1Lalu Thohir, 1Lalu Jaswadi Putera, 1Agus Saputra

1 English Education Study Program, FKIP, University of Mataram, Mataram
Corresponding Author e-mail: soohib221202@gmail.com

Abstrak

This research would reveal the kinds and sources of grammatical errors, which occur in a descriptive paragraph writing by first-semester student from English Education Program at Universitas Mataram.Join as Indonesian EFL learners and ultimately it analyze on how these errors would affect paragraph organization. Fifteen low-achieving students were purposefully selected and a qualitative descriptive design was employed in this study with writing documents as well as interviews as data. Categories for types of errors were drawn from Dulay Surface Strategy Taxonomy; error causes were identified with reference to Norrish's theory and paragraph organization examined using categories based on Oshima A framework. The results showed that three types of errors had been detected, including misformation (the highest error rate of 71.43%), omission (26.19%) and addition (2.38%). No evidence for misordering was observed. The primary sources of errors were L1 interference, translation equialence, and carelessless. The merit of this study lies in that it combines grammatical error analysis with writing flow to form a comprehensive picture about students' writing competence. The results indicate that the majority of students face problem in using appropriate grammar and elaborating ideas coherently, suggesting explicit grammar instruction, error- treatment, guided writing are necessary EFL writing pedagogical implications in Indonesia.

Keywords: Error Analysis, Descriptive Paragraph Writing, EFL students, University of Mataram.

INTRODUCTION

Four central language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing need to be learned when learning a foreign language as English (EFL) (Hinkel 2006). Of these skills, writing is believed to be the most difficult one since students have to organize ideas, use correct grammar, choose accurate words, and arrange words into a paragraph logically (Setiawan et al., 2017). Writing is classified into numerous types according to its purpose such as descriptive, persuasive, expository, and narrative writing (Kellogg et al., 1991). In a learning environment such as EFL Indonesia, writing is reportedly the most difficult skill; students experience this due to limited exposure to language and practice of writing.

Descriptive writing Descriptive involved applying literal and metaphoric language to evoke images in readers' minds so that they can imagine what someone, somewhere or something looks like (Zeller, 1995). A paragraph that describes has 3 main parts: a topic sentence (the thing or person that you are describing) a body (4-5 sentences) and supporting details of your topic.a closing finally clarifies what you were writing about no new information.§ This is critical to understand for descriptive essays. Paragraph Descriptive paragraph is a paragraph that the author uses selective and specific detail to help the reader understand the topic while giving details about its parts, qualities, or features (Faisal & Suwandita, 2013).

On the contrary, learning is all about making mistakes. It is indeed natural that students will continue to make mistakes in the process of acquiring a language (Karim et al., 2018). Every mistake allows students to see where they need additional practice. Through monitoring their errors, students can enhance their comprehension of grammar rules, word bank and linguistic minutia (Pohan, 2018). Secondly an error being the consequence of ignorance where one simply does not know or understand, and typically occurs when someone is ignorant as to the correct rule or way things should be done (Funder, 1987). Nonetheless, in the first Semester students of University of Mataram find it hard to write a descriptive paragraph which increasingly leads to error on second language learning.

Preliminary interviews with novice students in the English Education program of Mataram University identified some problems. Students showed lack of self-confidence in their writing skills, disorganization of ideas as well as making errors which include omissions and additions of elements that have to be present or absent respectively, misshaping sentence structures and word reorderings. These difficulties are faced by Indonesian EFL learners in the early stages of mastering academic writing. * As highlighted in Jayanti (2020 appeared that EFL students usually encounter problems in choosing words resulting a dull and repetitive language that contributes to low coherence and clarity of their writing. Speaking about Indonesian EFL learners, their understanding of paragraph text organization itself was limited and the type of sensory details which had been included in a descriptive paragraph generally showed that the majority of students did not manage to make sufficient attempts (Rizkiani et al., 2023).

These results further underscore the urgency of investigating types and causes, as well as writing flow, of error analysis in descriptive paragraph writing among first-semester students because they reveal problems that still exist which obstruct students' written proficiency. The present study makes a further one by not only classifying error types as well as causes but also in organization to paragraph. It is, however, with different research from that by Jayanti (2020) and Rizkiani et al., (2023) where we verify writing problem and grammatical analysis among EFL learners. These studies simply aimed to determine instances of grammatical mistakes or common writing problems, or why one error was made. This research combines Dulay (1982)'s 'Errors Type', Norrish (1983)'s errors cause classification, and Oshima (2006)'s descriptive paragraph structure to generate a comprehensive analysis on grammatical errors and writing flow. This study contributes originality by integrating these three frameworks into a single investigation.

Also, the present study's loci could only be restricted to Indonesian EFL learners, particularly those who are just beginning their first semester and generations

of students shifting from high school writing to university level writing. Their writing achievement presents a form of the early allo-academic literacy prob lems in Indonesian higher education. It is important to comprehend these challenges, as it encourages lecturers to think about their teaching strategies and how they design the syllabus. It is anticipated that the results of this study will have clear pedagogical applications which in turn should assist lecturers to offer more effective corrective feedback, design teaching practice more specifically and tailor make materials to directly target students' weaknesses in writing.

Considering the description above, this study is intended to: (a) describe the types and causes of grammatical errors made by first-semester students in writing descriptive paragraphs; and (b) investigate flow and organization. The research participants are fifteen low-achiever students of English education Program of University of Mataram. For (Corder 1967), error analysis is useful to understand the learning process of students and highlight the aspect which should be re-taught. Thus, error analysis is important to enable learners to raise their awareness about their errors and lead them towards improving writing competency of EFL (Truscott, 1999).

METHOD

A descriptive qualitative research design was used as it is appropriate when exploring how participants experience and describe particular phenomena in depth (Creswell, 2014). The method was used to investigate the kinds and causes of errors in descriptive paragraphs writing, as well as to categorize the organization of students' texts with regard to their coherence.

Source of Data

The research was conducted at The University of Mataram by taking a sample class of 2024/2025 academic year first-semester students in English Education Program. The group for paragraph writing documents consisted of fifteen purposively selected low-performing students according to their respective official writing scores provided through the university's SPADA platform and marked by a lecturer. This purposeful sampling was deemed to be acceptable as it allowed those participants most appropriate for the study objectives to be chosen (Etikan, 2016).

Research Instruments

Three primary instruments were employed in this study: student writing samples, semiformal interviews, and a writing flow checklist. First, the research data were taken from a lecturer as subject and (s)he was in charge of taking score on descriptive paragraph writing task contained exchange through SPADA platform in University of Mataram. Second, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of students who demonstrated the least error frequency. Finally, a writing flow checklist was used to evaluate the organization and structure of descriptive paragraphs written by students which include basic paragraph structure, topic sentence, supporting details and concluding sentence. Through the synthesis of text-analytical, student-perpective and methodical investiga- tion of writing flow, these tools provide a comprehensive qualitiatve perspective on the nature of written task difficulty for first semester English Education Program students.

Data Collection

Two methods were used to obtain the data required in this study. First, the main data were collected from students' writing files that had been uploaded in the university online learning services (SPADA). Selection of descriptive paragraphs Fifteen descriptive paragraphs were purposively chosen from students with scores between Grade B and D+ (numeric scores 55–<80). This focus on low-achieving students had no room for high achievers.

The second, semi-structured interviews with the participants to learn more about the possible reasons for these errors. Interview subjects were five low-achieving students with written text. The interviews were taped and noted, then transcribed for the written script. These interview transcripts were checked for confirmation of students' responses and findings from their writing documents. During this session, students reflected on why they made errors and responded to items about potentially problematic factors such as first language interference, not paying attention or translating the direct translation from L1.

Data Analysis

The analysis was initiated with the typology of errors proposed by Dulay (1982), which identifies four kind of errors: omission, addition, misformation and misordering. Every mistake on the chosen student writings was subsequently spoted, coded and classified based on this taxonomy. Second, in order to investigate the reasons behind these errors, the study compared the causes attributed to errors set out by Norrish (1983), consisting of three types of causes-linking language, carelessness and first language interference. Lastly, each descriptive paragraph was analyzed with a writing flow checklist modified from Oshima (2006), which aimed at three components of paragraph coherence: main idea sentence, supportive details sentence, and finalizing sentence. Through integrating these three developing phrases: error type classification, cause identification and writing flow evaluation, the analysis presented an overall review of students' descriptive paragraph writing drawing attention to both their linguistic errors and organizational difficulties.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

What types of errors are made by the student in descriptive paragraph writing?

This section presents the results of the error analysis of 15 students' descriptive paragraphs. Using the classification of Omission, Addition, Misformation, and Misordering. A total of 42 errors were identified in the students' writing, showing the common difficulties they faced in using the language. Here is a descriptive paragraph example from student 4, in paragraph (My little cat Susi). The sentence "...*She is very naughty sometimes she steals some food from the kitchen, she once caught my father's bird which is certainly not cheap*" has an omission error because the student did not add the needed conjunctions or punctuation to separate the ideas. There are actually three different clauses, but they are joined only with commas, so the sentence becomes a run-on. To be correct, the student should add connectors or full stops, for example: *She is very naughty. Sometimes she steals food from the kitchen, and she once caught my father's bird, which was not cheap.* The missing connectors and punctuation make the original sentence unclear and grammatically incorrect.

Besides omission errors, the paragraph also has an addition error. This happens when extra words are used unnecessarily, making the sentence sound unclear or

awkward. An example of this can be found in Student 8, in paragraph (A Perfect Blend of Health and Taste) In the paragraph, the word "...zzzz" at the end is an example of an addition error. This error happens when unnecessary words or letters are added to a sentence. The word "zzzz" does not belong to the sentence and makes the writing look unclear or less formal. The correct sentence should end with "…a wholesome, colorful experience that leaves me feeling both healthy and satisfied," without the extra "zzzz."

In addition, the paragraph also shows cases of misformation. This type of error happens when words are written in the wrong form, such as using incorrect verbs, nouns, or adjectives. Such mistakes make some sentences awkward or unclear, which affects the overall readability of the text. An instance of this can be found in Student 12's paragraph. In paragraph (Benefits of Playing Volleyball) there are grammatical errors where words are not used in the right form. For example, the sentence "*The benefits of playing volleyball are not only increasing physical activity, but also training body coordination*" is incorrect because "increasing" and "training" are not the right forms after "are not only … but also …". They should be changed into "to increase" and "to train", so the sentence becomes *The benefits of playing volleyball are not only to increase physical activity, but also to train body coordination*. Using the wrong form of words like this makes the sentence awkward and less grammatically accurate. Another misformation case was written by a student, 15, in paragraph (The Timeless Wisdom of My Grandmother), there is a grammatical error in the phrase "*the wrinkles on hare face.*" The word "*hare*" is wrong because it refers to people, not a possessive pronoun. The correct word is *her*, so the sentence should be *the wrinkles on her face*.

Unlike misformation, the paragraph does not exhibit examples of misordering. Misordering is when words or ideas are ordered in the wrong way, causing some sentences to be more difficult to interpret. These types of errors, although they do not appear in the text, are however relevant and should be mentioned as they lower the clearness and fluency of expression.

Altogether, 42 errors were found, the most common error being misformation of formations (30 cases). Omissions occurred 11 times, and there was only 1 case of additions. There were no misordering errors in the students' written materials. Generally, misformation is the main problem which means that first semester students of Universitas Mataram should to be more careful about correct word forms, sentence structures and proper grammar to make a descriptive paragraph writing. Misformation errors were observed in three primary strategies: verb tense and subject-verb agreement, word forms, and pronouns. The types of misformation The major form of misformation was the verb, especially correct tense.

Table 1. Types of Errors Based on Dulay (1982)

Type of Error	Total Cases	Percentage
Omission	11	26.19%
Addition	1	2.38%
Misformation	30	71.43%
Misordering	0	0%
Total	**42**	**100%**

The overall errors that were noted among all of the students descriptive paragraph is in Table 1.1 below. misformation was the predominant error type, representing 71.43% of the total number of errors, which were primarily incorrect kind of word forms like verb and noun or adjective. Omission followed with 26.19 % in most cases missing articles, prepositions or auxiliary verbs. Misordering and addition were the least, 0% and 2.38%, respectively where sentences were not correctly arranged or addition of unwanted words happened. On the whole, misformation and omission are two biggest problems in terms of the grammatical accuracy and clarity in students' writing.

What are the causes of errors in descriptive paragraph writing from students' perspectives?

These students' mistakes in English writing are due to translation, L1 transfer and carelessness. Translation is the process in which Indonesian ideas are written directly into English. L1 Interference Lexicon: When Indonesian Grammar Meddles with English Sentences Carelessness is when students make mistakes because they are in a hurry or don't look over their work.

A significant theme that surfaced from the interviews was the adoption of a direct translation from Indonesian to English. A lot of students confessed that while they were writing in English, they actually translated the structures of sentences from Indonesian to fit their English paragraphs. For instance, Student 1 said, "I [always] think in Indonesian first because it seemed easy and fast."062 indicating a mindset of constructing sentence in native language before bringing into English. Likewise, Student 10 admitted "I don't want to make a grammar mistake so I translate my sentences one by one," highlighting the use of translation as a coping mechanism in response to lack of confidence in English writing. Student 11 also extra comments- d that I usually translate word by word I do not know how to make sentence naturally in English), implying that her translation habit was a matter of insufficient language resources. These examples show how overly literal translations often resulted in usages with incorrect word order and misuse of vocabularies.

The second factor was first language interference in which Indonesian grammar patterns were used in writing English. This interference manifested itself particularly clearly with regard to errors in articles, plural and verb forms. For example, Student 1 confessed that "I always forget about the/ s/ at the end of the words" which also indicates negative transfer from Indonesian where articles or plural markers do not occur as in English. In the same vein, student 14 stated: "I believe that I transfer my language to English unconsciously" indicating uncontrolled dependence on first language structure. Meanwhile, this anomaly was well-illustrated by Student 15 when she mentioned, "I wrote 'reading me bedtime stories' because it sounds correct in Indonesian is 'membacakan saya cerita', I am sure that literal translation from Indonesian will give us another wrong formation in English."

Negligence was also cited as an important factor for the writing errors. Many students confessed that their mistakes did not stem from a lack of comprehension but rather from careless reading or failure to overview their response. Student 15 openly told us, "To be honestly, I finished it in the last minute and so without check my writing," which means that he had a weak time control. Student 1 also commented, "I just skimmed through it and I didn't look at every sentence," and Student 14 reported, "I was only checking spellings not structure," revealing the absence of

thorough proofreading. Student 11: "Sometimes it was just … careless slips, not because I didn't know" (thus suggesting that better revision could have avoided many of the errors).

Table 1. Causes of Errors Based on Norrish (1983)

Student Code	Translation	L1 Interference	Carelessness	Dominant Causes
Student 1	✓	✓	✗	L1 Interference
Student 10	✓	✗	✓	Translation
Student 11	✓	✗	✓	Translation
Student 14	✓	✓	✗	L1 Interference
Student 15	✗	✓	✓	Carelessness

According to Table 1.2.Writing errors of students are primarily due to Translation followed by L1 Interference, and Carelessness respectively. The most errors made are those of translation as evidenced in Students 10 and 11, who confessed the need for Indonesian to English transfer. L1 Interference is the next for Student 1 and Student 14 since Indonesian grammar rules too had a sharp impact on their writting, English. Finally, Negligence from Student 15 illustrates that some errors were due to not carefully revising or writing in haste.

Do the students' descriptive paragraphs demonstrate the process paragraph writing flow appropriately?

For the analysis of 15 student paragraphs, each was assessed on three key features that make up structured paragraphs: Topic Sentence (TS), Supporting Details (SD), and Concluding Sentence (CS). This assessment allowed me to determine if the students were able to elaborately present their main idea and body of evidence, as well arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. It further brought up similar problems among students like those of the lack of or weak final sentence in which they might have encapsulated their paragraphs as in Student 9's paragraph that impacted the cohesion and overall organization seen throughout their paragraphs.

Nature's Symphony at Dusk

The sun slowly dipped below the western horizon, leaving a trail of vibrant colors across the sky. The golden light danced on the water's surface, creating a mesmerizing shimmer. A gentle breeze carried the distinctive scent of salt. The waves crashed against each other as if joining in the celebration of the sunset. Here, the silence was profound.

The paragraph starts with the lines "When the sun gradually lowered behind its western limits, leaving behind a splash of colors across the horizon." While this opening line is colorful and imagery provoking, it is actually more of a supporting detail than an actual topic sentence. A good topic sentence should express the central idea that will control the remainder of the paragraph; and in this case, describe is telling me what happened, but not why it was beautiful or how it affected him, as does.Great Writing 3: From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays Copyright © Houghton Mifflin Company. And thus, the plane of this paragraph is not as neat, for the

sentences about shiny water and salty air and breaking waves and the sound of a mute are all separate images rather than specifics sharing one kernel. This weakens the paragraph's unity and it makes writing less effective.

All students then were successful in incorporating supporting sentences into their descriptive paragraphs (see Figure 1). Meanwhile, this indicates that in general they were able to grasp the idea of developing and explaining the main idea in the body of a paragraph. Supporting sentences additionally facilitated coherence, and the reader could quickly identify what the paragraph was about as well as how details linked to the topic sentence. But while students could come up with details, some of them are more likely to resort simply in describing the simple and surface-details rather than going into greater detail such as explanation, exemplification or reasons in order to form. On the other hand, in the ending sentence errors were noted, such as student 14.

The Peace I Find at Lendang Luar Beach

Lendang Luar, for me, is more than just a stretch of white sand and blue ocean. This place is the perfect escape from the hustle and bustle of life. Every time I set foot on the soft sand, it's as if a million pieces of the puzzle of my life are perfectly reassembled. The crashing waves that greet my ears are the soothing rhythms of nature, inviting me to contemplate and let go of all burdens. *The gentle breeze brings with it the refreshing scent of the sea, as if whispering the secret of peace that can only be found here.*

In the research article, there is no distinct starkusterung / cationic contrast between the previous mention of Lendang Luar Beach and this paragraph. For instance, the paragraph ends with: "Bringing with it a refreshing scent of the sea, as if whispering the secret of peace that can only be encountered here." While this sentence provides contributing detail and a meditative feel to the beach, it's still just co-matter rather than concluding matter. The Concluding Statement The concluding statement should reflect the main point of the paragraph and provide closure to your readers. Here, the speaker's central point is that they find the beach to be a calm and significant location. Thus, you can sow with a really good concluding sentence that restates the topic and emphasizes its importance, tying up the paragraph into a neat little package.

Table 2. Writing Flow Analysis Based on Oshima & Hogue (2006)

Student	TS	SD	CS	Notes
1	✓	✓	✓	Complete.
2	✓	✓	✓	Complete.
3	✓	✓	✗	CS missing.
4	✓	✓	✗	CS missing.
5	✓	✓	✓	Complete
6	✓	✓	✓	Complete.
7	✓	✓	✓	Complete

8	✓	✓	✗	CS missing;
9	✗	✓	✗	Lacks of TS and CS.
10	✓	✓	✓	Complete
11	✓	✓	✓	Complete.
12	✓	✓	✗	Missing CS
13	✓	✓	✗	Missing CS.
14	✓	✓	✗	Missing CS.
15	✓	✓	✗	Missing CS.

Note: (TS: Topic Sentence) (SC: Supporting Sentence) (CS: Concluding Sentence)

Table 1.3 presents the overall findings for fifteen student-produced paragraphs, only some of which resulted in full-fledged writing that included a clear TS (Topic Sentence), supporting details, and a CS (Concluding Sentence). Students 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10 and 11 (approximately two-thirds of the students) successfully incorporated all three elements rather easily as judged by the clarity with which they organized their paragraphs. Whereas students 3, 4, 8, 12,13,14 and15 frequently had no concluding sentence to their paragraphs student9 lacked a topic sentence75 and conclusion making their paragraph less complete.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, examined errors made by freshmen in producing descriptive paragraphs with respect to three criteria; types of error, reasons for their production, and control over flow in paragraph organizations. Error pattern analysis revealed that the most frequent errors were misformation (71.43%), then omission (26.19%) and finally addition (2.38%); no testee made a misordering error. This observation is consistent with reports of Sundari et al. (2021) and Setiani et al. (2024), who also indicated grammatical errors, such as misformation and omission, as the most common challenges that students find in writing. It is in contrast with the research of Masagus and Syahri (2022) that found misordering as the highest error. The distinction between the two shows that, though grammatical errors continue to be the main problem in all contexts, there could still be some different distribution of types of errors caused by students' background, teaching methodology or institutional foci. The lack of misordering in the current study might be a new discovery, which means that students may have learned more about English word order though they encountered challenges with their form accuracy.

The sources of errors were L1 interference, translation, and carelessness. These findings are in line with Sundari et al., (2021), Nuralisaputri & Megawati, (2023) that stressed L1 interference and translation had a profound advantage to the students' English writing. The current study also reinforces this fact by demonstrating that Indonesian grammar rules are usually unconsciously used by the students when writing in English and thus face structural problems. Henrick's (2003) journal entry mentions another consideration though, and this study puts attentiveness as part of the problematique in sense that it is an area where students reported on their interviews. This suggests that errors are due not only to ignorance per se but also to

performance based reasons, making the results congruent with previous research but adding to it.

Regarding paragraph structure, 67% of students managed to use topic sentences, supporting details and concluding sentences successfully and 33 % failed to attain coherence (mainly because of absence of conclusion). These results are similar to Setiani et al., (2024) who found that although many students are able to organize ideas, they may continue struggling in maintaining the coherence and completeness. What's similar is that both were challenged in trying to 53 get a fleshed out paragraph, the difference being that more students in our study did seem to start off with some concept of organization. While it is not consistent with all those parts, this shows improvement in organizing the paragraphs. This study's results cannot be generalized broadly, since only 15 students in one class and a single university. It indicates that the findings may not be applicable to all first-semester EFL students in other settings. In addition, only descriptive writing was addressed in the study; therefore, the kinds of errors could change if another genre such as narrative, argumentative texts were considered. Accordingly, these results should be considered specific to this study.

To conclude, this study examined first-semester students' errors in writing descriptive paragraphs and sought to identify the types of errors, causes of them, and their organization as coherent/ cohesive paragraph both supporting and extending existing research. Results showed that misformation was the most predominant error (71.43%), followed by omission (26.19%) and addition (2.38%) and there were no errors of misordering. These results are in agreement with those of Sundari et al. (2021) and Setiani et al. (2024) also found misformation and omission as common grammatical mistakes in students" writing but they disagree with Masagus and Syahri (2022), which the number of of them is more than other errors) who discovered misordering as being the highest occurrence error. Error analysis also revealed that the dominant causes of errors were L1 interference, translation and carelessness which was in line with what was found by Nuralisaputri & Megawati (2023) and it has supported the students tendency to transfer Indonesian grammar to get into English when writing. In the paragraph writing, 67% of students can write a topic sentences and give supporting details but many have difficulties in writing concluding sentence that cannot make them to connect one sentence to another (paragraph coherence), it is same with the research of Setiani et al. (2024). Nevertheless, it is important to interpret these findings with caution given that the investigation was conducted with just 15 learners in one class and dealt solely with descriptive writing; therefore, the results may not be generalizable to a wider EFL context.

CONCLUSION

The result of analyzing first semester students' descriptive writing at Universitas Mataram shows that there are four types of errors proposed by Dulay et al. 's Surface Strategy Taxonomy, with misformation predominating the results (71.43%), followed by omission (26.19%), addition (2.38%) and no occurrence of misordering. The errors were primarily attributed to translation, and first-language

(L1) transfer, where the students tended to translate ideas from Indonesian direct into English and employ Indonesian grammatical structures; carelessness as a minor cause. Paragraph organization was a great difficulty area for students; two in every three failed part of it (67% could produce paragraphs with clear topic sentence, supporting details and concluding sentence while 33% could not write coherently and completely).

These findings support Norrish's (1983) error analysis theories and corroborate prior studies concerning the L1 effect on SLA and interlingual transfer, as well as that of Sundari et al. (2023) to be the most challenging aspect of EFL writing. In theory, the present study builds upon previous research by highlighting that misformation is still the most frequent error in beginners, demanding continued explicit grammar instruction. These findings have practical implications for writing materials development, which can incorporate focused activities on accurate grammatical forms, guided translation techniques to alleviate negative L1 transfer and a step-by-step paragraph planning activity to enhance coherence in descriptive writing.

SUGGESTION

Several practical implications are suggested for students, teachers and institutions with regard to descriptive paragraph writing based on the results of this study. Students are also recommended that they could avoid the errors which include as misformation, omission and addition by routine practice of grammar while scroll down to self-correction checklists and resist translating directly in other languages making sure they revise it before committing. It is suggested that teachers undertake more systematic writing instruction from supplementary weekly grammar reinforcement, teacher-modelled guided writing and peer review based on explicit rubrics with a view to providing continued corrective feedback in order to develop both linguistic accuracy and paragraph coherence. Institutions are advised to provide writing support in the form of writing clinics, more practical-based writing sessions in the curriculum and workshops or mentoring programs for improving students' academic writing performance.

REFERENCES

Corder. (1967). *The Significance of Learner Autonomy in TESOL.* https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161

Creswell, J. W. (2014). RESEARCH DESIGN Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*.https://share.google/kk9K6Hmap9l057aOQ

Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Faisal, F., & Suwandita, K. (2013). The Effectiveness of FRESH Technique to Teach Descriptive Paragraph. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, *7*(4), 239–248.

https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v7i4.199

Funder, D. C. (1987). Errors and Mistakes: Evaluating the Accuracy of Social Judgment. *Psychological Bulletin*, *101*(1), 75–90. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.75

Heidi C. Dulay. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford University Press.https://books.google.co.id/books?redir_esc=y&hl=id&id=FspoAAAAIA AJ&focus=searchwithinvolume&q=type+of+error

Hinkel, E. (2006). Current Perspectives on Teaching the Four Skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 109. https://doi.org/10.2307/40264513

Jayanti, A. D. (2020). View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk brought to you by CORE provided by e-Jurnal STAIN Curup Students' Writing Ability on English Descriptive Text at Grade VIII in SMPN 33 Padang Ade. https://journal.iaincurup.ac.id/index.php/english/article/view/843/pdf

Karim, A., Mohamed, A. R., Ismail, S. A. M. M., Shahed, F. H., Rahman, M. M., & Haque, M. H. (2018). Error Analysis in EFL Writing Classroom. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *8*(4), 122. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n4p122

Kellogg, R. T., Krueger, M., & Blair, R. (1991). *The Relative Ease of Writing Narrative Text*. https://share.google/AlqVfcTtfSN3G4l4b

Masagus, S., & Syahri, I. (2022). Errors on Efl Students' Paragraph Writings. *International Journal of English and Applied Linguistics (IJEAL)*, *2*(3), 379–386. https://doi.org/10.47709/ijeal.v2i3.1802

Norrish's. (1983). Language Learners and Their Errors. In *Language Learners and Their Errors*. Macmillan Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(84)90033-2

Nuralisaputri, V. V., & Megawati, F. (2023). Writing Descriptive Texts: What Makes this Difficult for Lower Secondary School Learners? *Indonesian TESOL Journal*, *5*(2), 120–133. https://doi.org/10.24256/itj.v5i2.2718

Oshima, A. H. (2006). *Longman Academic Writing Series 3 Paragraphs to Essays, with Essential Online Resources (Alice Oshima, Ann Hogue)*. https://www.scribd.com/document/513651953/Alice-Oshima-Ann-Hogue-Longman-Academic-Writing-Series-3-Paragraphs-to-Essays-With-Essential-Online-Resources-Pearson-Education-ESL-2016

Pohan, A. E. (2018). The Students' Types Error on Writing Descriptive Text (An Analysis Study at Senior High School). *Anglo-Saxon*, *9*(1), 92–100. https://share.google/LRtODrflXSdhLHRch

Rizkiani, W., Zamzam, A., & Arafiq. (2023). The Correlation Between Self-Directed Learning and Students' Academic Writing Skills Undergraduate Program of English Education. *Journal of Classroom Action Research*, *5*(2), 198–203. https://jppipa.unram.ac.id/index.php/jcar/article/view/3314

Setiani, R., Sartipa, D., & Novia, S. (2024). Students' Problems in Writing Paragraph: Study At the Bachelor Students' English Education. *Jurnal Eduscience*, *11*(2), 299–312. https://doi.org/10.36987/jes.v11i2.5094

Setiawan, R., Sujana, I. M., & Apgrianto, K. (2017). The Effect of Think Talk Write (TTW) Technique on Students ' Writing Ability. *English Language Teaching and Technology Journal*, *1*(1), 31–39. https://doi.org/10.17509/elt%20tech.v1i1.9429

Sundari, D., Hidayah, J., Edy, S., & Esmianti, F. (2021). Error Analysis of English Sentence Structure in Students. https://journal.iaincurup.ac.id/index.php/english/article/view/2173

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(2), 111–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80124-6

Zeller, N. (1995). Narrative strategies for case reports. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *8*(1), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839950080108