Analysis of Students' Errors and Writing Flow In Example Paragraph Written By The First Semester Students of English Department At The University of Mataram

[1] Sabrina Zahira, [2] Lalu Thohir, [2] Lalu Jaswadi Putera, [2] Agus Saputra

[1] Student of English Education, FKIP, University of Mataram, Mataram
[2] Lectures of English Education, FKIP, University of Mataram, Mataram
Corresponding Author e-mail: sabrinazahira913@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the types and causes of grammatical errors found in example paragraph writing by first-semester students of the English Education Program at the University of Mataram during the 2024/2025 academic year. The participants were fifteen low-achieving students with beginner to intermediate levels of English proficiency, as determined by their writing course scores. The research employed a descriptive qualitative design, as this approach enabled the researcher to describe and interpret the data in depth without numerical generalization (Creswell, 2018). Data were collected from students' written paragraphs and semi-structured interviews to explore both linguistic difficulties and cognitive causes of errors. Findings revealed 22 total errors, with misformation (45.4%) as the most dominant type, followed by omission (31.8%), misordering (13.7%), and addition (9.1%). The main sources of errors were translation habits, first language interference, and carelessness. These findings theoretically support interlanguage and error analysis theories, indicating that learner errors represent natural stages of language development. The study contributes to EFL writing pedagogy by emphasizing the importance of guided grammar practice, peer-editing, and continuous feedback to enhance students' grammatical accuracy and coherence in example paragraph writing.

Keywords: error analysis, example paragraph, descriptive qualitative, writing flow, EFL writing

PENDAHULUAN

Writing is one of the most complex and demanding skills for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners because it requires not only linguistic accuracy but also the ability to organize ideas coherently (Hedge, 2005). In Indonesia, English functions as a foreign language that is rarely used in daily communication, leading to limited exposure and practice opportunities (Dardjowidjojo, 2003). This condition affects students' ability to produce accurate and well-organized English writing. Preliminary observation in the *Paragraph Writing* course at the University of Mataram

revealed that many first-semester students struggled to compose cohesive example paragraphs. Common problems included grammatical errors such as omission and misformation and weak example elaboration, which made their paragraphs less coherent and persuasive. These issues indicate that writing difficulties among EFL learners at the university level are still prevalent despite continuous exposure to writing instruction.

According to Richards and Renandya (2002), writing in a second or foreign language requires mastery of multiple components, including grammar, vocabulary, and discourse organization. However, Indonesian EFL students often rely heavily on literal translation from their first language (Bahasa Indonesia), which results in grammatical inaccuracies and unnatural expressions (Norrish, 1983; Murtiana, 2019). Moreover, as Rizkiani et.al (2023) explain, writing development demands self-directed learning and continuous evaluation two aspects that remain underdeveloped among beginning university writers. These linguistic and cognitive challenges create a pressing need for focused studies that examine how EFL students at the tertiary level construct paragraphs, particularly in the context of example paragraph writing.

From a theoretical perspective, this research is grounded in Interlanguage Theory proposed by Selinker (1972), which describes how second language learners develop an intermediate linguistic system influenced by their first language and target language exposure. Errors, according to Corder (1967), are not merely mistakes but reflect the natural stages of interlanguage development. Therefore, examining students' errors helps teachers understand their current stage of linguistic competence and the underlying cognitive processes shaping their learning (Ellis, 1997). Within this framework, Error Analysis serves as a tool to identify systematic patterns of deviation that reveal learners' interlanguage rules (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982). In this sense, grammatical errors in students' writing are valuable indicators of language development rather than mere deficiencies.

Previous research has extensively documented grammatical errors among Indonesian EFL learners, though most studies have focused on descriptive or narrative essays rather than example paragraphs. Fitrawati and Safitri (2021) found that misformation and omission were the most dominant types of errors in student essays. Similarly, Gulö and Rahmawelly (2019) reported frequent omission and misordering errors due to first language interference, while Ain (2023) identified tense misuse as a recurring issue in descriptive writing. However, limited studies have analyzed the relationship between grammatical errors and paragraph organization, particularly in example paragraphs, which require students to link abstract ideas with concrete examples to ensure coherence and flow (Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Zemach & Rumisek, 2003). This gap suggests the need for a deeper investigation into how grammatical errors interact with paragraph flow in beginner-level academic writing.

Based on these considerations, this study aims to analyze the types and causes of errors found in students' example paragraph writing and to examine how these errors influence their writing flow. Specifically, the research addresses the following questions:

1. What types of grammatical errors do first-semester students of the English Education Program at the University of Mataram make in writing example paragraphs?
2. What are the causes of these errors from the students' perspectives?

3. How do these errors affect the writing flow and coherence of students' example paragraphs?

The significance of this study lies in its contribution to understanding how beginner university students construct meaning in academic writing within the Indonesian EFL context. Theoretically, the research reinforces the interlanguage framework by demonstrating how errors reflect developmental stages in language learning. Practically, it provides pedagogical insights for writing instructors in higher education, emphasizing the importance of guided grammar practice, explicit feedback, and structured peer-editing to enhance students' grammatical accuracy and coherence in academic writing tasks. The findings are expected to inform curriculum design and instructional strategies for improving paragraph writing competence among EFL learners in Indonesia's higher education institutions.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design, which enabled the researcher to describe and interpret the data in depth without numerical generalization (Creswell, 2018). The approach was used to explore the types and causes of grammatical errors in students' example paragraph writing and to analyze their writing flow in detail.

Source of Data

The research was conducted at the English Education Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram, during the 2024/2025 academic year. The participants were fifteen first-semester students enrolled in the *Paragraph Writing* course. The students were categorized as low-achieving based on their SPADA platform writing scores, specifically those who scored below 70 (C or D range) in writing assignment. This criterion was used to focus the analysis on learners who exhibited the most difficulties in grammatical accuracy and paragraph organization. This sampling technique was chosen because it allows the researcher to select participants who are most relevant to the objectives of the study (Etikan,2016).

Research Instrument

Three primary instruments were used in this study. The first instrument was the students' writing documents, which consisted of example paragraphs collected from the SPADA learning platform and served as the main data source for identifying grammatical and structural errors. The second instrument was a semi-structured interview protocol, used to conduct interviews with five students who produced the highest number of errors. Each interview lasted approximately 10–15 minutes and followed a structured guide adapted from Norrish (1983), focusing on topics such as translation habits, attention during writing, and first-language interference. To ensure clarity and relevance, the interview protocol was reviewed by two writing instructors before implementation. The third instrument was a writing flow checklist adapted from Oshima and Hogue (2006), which was used to evaluate the flow and organization of each paragraph. The checklist consisted of three main criteria: (1) unity of ideas, (2) coherence through transitions, and (3) adequacy of supporting examples. The validity of this instrument was established through expert judgment by two lecturers from the English Education Program, who reviewed its content relevance and alignment with theoretical constructs.

Data Collection

Data collection was carried out in two stages. First, students' written assignments were downloaded from the SPADA platform and coded anonymously (e.g., S1–S15). Second, interviews were conducted to gain insights into the underlying causes of grammatical errors. Each interview was audio-recorded with participants' consent and transcribed verbatim for analysis. To maintain research ethics, participants were informed of the study's purpose and assured of the confidentiality of their responses.

Data Analysis

The data analysis in this study followed a systematic multi-step procedure. First, each grammatical error in the students' paragraphs was identified and categorized based on Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's (1982) surface strategy taxonomy, which includes omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Second, the causes of these errors were interpreted using Norrish's (1983) framework, consisting of translation, carelessness, and first-language interference. Third, the writing flow of each paragraph was evaluated using the validated writing flow checklist to determine its unity, coherence, and adequacy of supporting examples. To ensure the accuracy and depth of interpretation, triangulation was conducted by comparing data from students' writing, interview transcripts, and checklist results. This process provided converging evidence that strengthened the reliability of findings and minimized researcher bias. Finally, to maintain consistency in the analysis, intra-rater reliability checking was performed by re-analyzing 20% of the data after two weeks, and peer-debriefing was conducted with another writing lecturer to verify the accuracy of error categorization and interpretation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

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

This section presents the results of the study, focusing on three major aspects: the types of errors, the causes of errors, and the writing flow found in students' example paragraphs. The findings are presented through a combination of quantitative data and qualitative analysis to provide a clearer picture of the students' writing performance.

Based on the analysis of fifteen students' example paragraphs, four types of errors were found according to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's (1982) taxonomy: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The total number of errors identified was 22, with misformation being the most dominant type, followed by omission, misordering, and addition.

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

Types of Errors	Total Cases	Percentage
Omission	7	31.8 %
Addition	2	9,1 %
Misformation	10	45.4 %
Misordering	3	13.7 %
Total	22	100 %

As seen in Table 1, misformation errors dominated students' writings (45.4%), indicating that students often used incorrect grammatical forms or structures. For instance, one student wrote:

The sentence "*She is always there when I needed someone the most*" contains a misformation error because of inconsistent verb tenses within the same sentence. The verb "*is*" in the clause "*She is always there*" is in the present tense, while "*needed*" in the clause "when I needed someone the most" is in the past tense. This inconsistency makes the sentence grammatically incorrect and confusing in terms of time reference. Since the sentence describes an ongoing situation or a general truth about the cousin's presence and support, both verbs should be in the same tense. The correct form is "*She is always there when I need someone the most.*" This correction maintains grammatical agreement and clearly expresses that the cousin's support is a continuous or habitual action. The use of the past tense "*needed*" gives the impression that the cousin's help occurred only in the past, which does not match the intended meaning of a consistent and current relationship.

In addition, omission errors (31.8%) were the second most frequent. These involved missing grammatical elements such as articles, auxiliaries, or plural markers. For example, the sentence "*I had to wait for a very long time to get waiter's attention*" contains an omission error because the writer left out the article "*the*" before the noun phrase "*waiter's attention.*" In English, singular countable nouns generally require an article (a, an, or the) to make the noun phrase complete and grammatically correct. Since the writer refers to a specific waiter, the definite article "*the*" must be used. The correct sentence should be "*I had to wait for a very long time to get the waiter's attention.*" The omission of the article makes the phrase incomplete and ungrammatical, as "*waiter's attention*" alone sounds unnatural and unclear. This type of error commonly occurs among EFL learners because in Bahasa Indonesia, articles like "*the*" do not exist, so learners often omit them when writing in English. Adding the article "*the*" not only corrects the grammar but also clarifies the meaning, showing that the speaker was waiting for attention from a specific waiter rather than any waiter in general.

Furthermore, addition errors (9.1%) occurred when students added unnecessary elements that made sentences redundant. For example, the sentence "*I hope Uncle Iki gives me more pocket money when I come to revisit him*" contains an addition error because of the unnecessary use of the verb "*revisit.*" The word "*revisit*" already means "*to visit again,*" so combining it with "*come to*" creates redundancy and makes the sentence less natural. The correct form should be "*I hope Uncle Iki gives me more pocket money when I visit him again.*" By removing "*come to,*" the sentence becomes clearer and grammatically correct. This type of error happens when learners add extra words or morphemes that are not needed, often due to confusion or an attempt to make the sentence sound more formal. However, in this case, the addition of "*come to*" changes the structure unnecessarily and disrupts the natural flow of the sentence. The corrected version expresses the intended meaning simply and accurately: the speaker hopes to receive more pocket money during their next visit.

And also, misordering errors (13.7%) were less common but still affected sentence clarity. For example, the sentence "*...not just a cousin but also a best friend*" contains a misordering error because the sentence structure does not follow the correct parallel pattern. In English, when expressing parallel ideas using correlative conjunctions such as *not only... but also...*, both parts must have grammatically balanced forms. The phrase "*not just a cousin but also a best friend*" is grammatically

understandable but slightly awkward and incomplete because it omits "only" after "not," which breaks the correlative balance. The correct and more natural form is "not only a cousin but also my best friend." The word "only" should follow "not" to maintain parallelism, and the possessive pronoun "my" is added for clarity and grammatical completeness. This misordering error happens because the elements in the correlative conjunction are not properly arranged, leading to an imbalance between the two compared phrases. The corrected version creates a smoother and more accurate sentence that clearly emphasizes that the cousin is both a family member and a best friend.

Based on the analysis, students made four types of grammatical errors: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The most frequent was misformation, showing that students often struggled with correct verb forms and sentence structures. Omission errors appeared quite often, while addition errors were less common, and misordering errors were rare. Overall, the results indicate that students still need to improve their grammatical accuracy, particularly in using correct word forms, articles, and sentence patterns to produce clearer and more effective example paragraphs. These findings show that grammatical errors especially misformation remain the most frequent problem in students' example paragraphs. Similar results were found by Fitrawati and Safitri (2021), who reported that misformation and omission were the most dominant error types among Indonesian EFL learners.

What are the causes of errors in example paragraph writing from students' perspective?

To identify the causes of these errors, interviews were conducted with five students whose writings contained the highest number of errors. Using Norrish's (1983) classification, the causes were grouped into translation, L1 interference, and carelessness. The analysis revealed that students' errors in writing example paragraphs were mainly caused by translation, first language (L1) interference, and carelessness. These causes were identified through interviews with five selected students whose writings contained the highest number of grammatical errors.

Translation was found to be one of the primary causes of students' errors. Several students admitted that they often thought in Indonesian first before translating their ideas into English. For example, Student 1 said, "*I think in Indonesian first, then I change it to English,*" while Student 5 stated, "*Yes, I make it in Indonesian first, and then I translate it.*" Similarly, Student 12 added, "*I usually translate from Indonesian because it's easier.*" This process of direct translation often led to structural and lexical errors, such as the misuse of verb forms and awkward word choices. It indicates that students relied heavily on Indonesian sentence patterns when constructing English sentences.

Another dominant factor was L1 interference, which occurred when students unconsciously applied Indonesian grammatical rules to English structures. For instance, Student 3 mentioned, "*Sometimes I forget to add 's' or 'is',*" and Student 5 said, "*Yes, because in Indonesian we don't have to add that.*" Likewise, Student 15 admitted, "*I think it's correct because in Indonesian it sounds right.*" These examples show that Indonesian grammatical patterns—such as the absence of articles, plural markers, or auxiliary verbs—strongly influenced students' English writing, leading to omission and misformation errors.

Moreover carelessness also played a role in students' writing problems. Some students confessed that they did not check their work carefully after writing. Student 1 stated, "*I didn't check it again because I was in a hurry,*" and Student 12 said, "*I forgot to reread it before submitting.*" Student 15 also admitted, "*I made some mistakes because I didn't focus when writing.*" These responses suggest that some errors were not caused by a lack of knowledge but rather by insufficient attention and limited time for revision.

Table 2. Causes of Errors Based on Norrish (1983)

Student Code	Translation	L1 Interference	Care less	Dominant Cause(s)
Student 12	✗	✗	✓	Carelessness
Student 3	✗	✓	✗	L1 Interference
Student 5	✓	✓	✗	L1Interference Translation
Student15	✓	✗	✓	Translation Carelessness
Student 1	✓	✓	✓	Translation L1Interference Careless

Based on Table 2, the most common cause of students' grammatical errors was translation, followed by L1 interference, and finally carelessness. Translation-related errors were especially frequent among students who tended to construct sentences in Indonesian before translating them into English, as seen in Students 5 and 12. L1 interference was the second most dominant cause, particularly in Students 1 and 3, whose errors reflected direct transfer from Indonesian grammar. Meanwhile, carelessness, found in Students 12 and 15, contributed to unintentional mistakes caused by haste or lack of revision. These findings align with Norrish (1983) who stated that translation, L1 transfer, and carelessness remain major sources of grammatical inaccuracy among Indonesian EFL learners.

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

The writing flow of students' example paragraphs was analyzed using three criteria adapted from Oshima and Hogue (2006): (1) a focused topic sentence, (2) the use of example signals and coherence devices, and (3) specific examples supported by a concluding sentence. These criteria were applied to evaluate the unity, coherence, and completeness of each paragraph.

My Guardian Angel

My best friend is the best person I have ever met. Her name is Ni Putu Mas Githa Carolina. She is a good listener. For example, when I tell her everything that happened to me, She always listens and responds kindly. She also always gives me advice. For instance, when I am unsure of myself, she reassures me and convinces me that I can do it. Additionally, she's always been my defender. For example, when people misbehave, she stands up for me. In short, she is the best person I have ever met and will always be my favorite.

To illustrate, Student 8's paragraph showed clear and logical writing flow. Each idea was well connected and consistently supported the main point that her best friend was the most admirable person she had ever met. The paragraph maintained unity because every sentence focused on one main idea, while coherence was achieved through transitions like *"For example," "For instance,"* and *"In short."* The ideas were arranged logically from listening and giving advice to defending and concluding and the consistent use of pronouns enhanced cohesion. Overall, the paragraph met Oshima and Hogue's (2006) criteria for unity and coherence.

All fifteen students (100%) began their example paragraphs with a clear topic sentence. For example, Student 1 started with *"The worst service I've ever experienced was at a meatball stall not far from my house,"* while Student 12 opened with *"My older sister is an amazing dancer who loves to perform."* This shows that students understood how to introduce their main ideas effectively.

In addition, twelve out of fifteen students (80%) used coherence devices such as *for example, for instance,* and *in addition* to connect ideas smoothly. Student 3 used transitions effectively to describe why his cousin was his favorite relative, while Student 15 varied her connectors well. However, some students, like Student 11 and Student 5, relied on limited or repetitive transitions, making their writing less cohesive.

The main weakness appeared in the use of specific examples and conclusions. Only eight students (53.3%) provided detailed examples and strong closing sentences. Student 3 and Student 15 gave clear examples and concluded effectively, while Student 5 and Student 7 ended their paragraphs weakly or without sufficient detail. This shows that while students are generally good at organizing their paragraphs, many still need to improve in presenting vivid examples and writing stronger conclusions.

Table 3. Writing Flow Analysis

Student	UI	EX	SE	Notes
1	✓	✓	✗	Incomplete
2	✓	✓	✓	Complete
3	✓	✓	✗	Incomplete
4	✓	✓	✓	Complete
5	✓	✗	✗	Incomplete
6	✓	✓	✓	Complete
7	✓	✓	✗	Incomplete
8	✓	✓	✓	Complete
9	✓	✓	✓	Complete
10	✓	✓	✓	Complete
11	✓	✗	✗	Incomplete
12	✓	✓	✓	Complete
13	✓	✓	✗	Incomplete
14	✓	✓	✓	Complete
15	✓	✗	✗	Incomplete

Note: (UI: Unity Ideas) (EX: Example Signal) (SE: Supporting Example)

As shown in Table 3, all students (100%) successfully wrote clear and focused topic sentences, twelve students (80%) used coherence devices effectively, while only eight students (53.3%) provided specific examples and proper concluding sentences. These findings suggest that students generally have strong paragraph-level organization, particularly in introducing their ideas and maintaining logical flow through transitions. However, many still need improvement in developing detailed examples and writing strong conclusions that reinforce their main ideas. Overall, while students show good awareness of paragraph structure, they require further guidance and practice in strengthening micro-level writing skills such as elaboration, coherence, and closure.

DISCUSSION

The analysis revealed that the most frequent grammatical errors were misformation (45.4%), followed by omission (31.8%), misordering (13.7%), and addition (9.1%). The results revealed that misformation was the most frequent type of error (45.4%), particularly involving tense inconsistency, subject–verb agreement, and lexical form selection (e.g., *teached → taught*; *I'm not a master at cooking → I'm not good at cooking*). This pattern aligns with Selinker's (1972) interlanguage framework and second language acquisition (SLA) theory, which emphasize that learners construct an interim system containing hypotheses about the target language. Two SLA mechanisms account for the dominance of misformation errors. The first is overgeneralization, where learners overapply grammatical rules (e.g., adding *-ed* to irregular verbs) or misuse tense and aspect markers. According to Ellis (1997), this reflects a normal stage of interlanguage development, showing that learners are constructing linguistic rules rather than simply making random mistakes. The second is incomplete acquisition of tense aspect and agreement systems, caused by the greater complexity of English verb morphology compared to Indonesian. Learners may understand temporal meanings (such as habitual or past) but struggle to express them morphologically, leading to inconsistent verb forms. As one participant explained, "*In Indonesian, we don't change the verb when talking about time,*" illustrating conceptual transfer from L1. These findings align with Corder's (1967) idea that such errors signal developmental progress. In task-based EFL contexts, frequent misformation errors likely represent a transitional phase in which students' ability to organize discourse develops faster than their control of grammatical details.

A critical analysis of the relationship between error types and their causes showed clear patterns. Misformation was mainly linked to translation, L1 interference, and incomplete rule internalization, as many students translated directly from Indonesian or applied immature morphological rules (e.g., *teached*). Interview results revealed an L1 → translation → L2 process, reflecting learners' developing interlanguage. Omission errors (31.8%), especially of articles and plurals, were tied to the absence of equivalent structures in Indonesian and automatization failure. Since Indonesian lacks articles and plural markers, these elements were often omitted unless explicitly practiced. While some omissions resulted from carelessness, most were systematic. Addition errors stemmed from overcorrection and uncertainty, as learners added redundant elements (e.g., *come to revisit*) to strengthen meaning, which instead reduced naturalness. Misordering was the least frequent, generally caused by L1 syntactic transfer and limited exposure to idiomatic English patterns. Overall, the findings indicate that error causes are multifactorial, with misformation often

resulting from combined influences (e.g., translation and overgeneralization), while omission is mainly structural. Therefore, teaching interventions should take an integrated approach, emphasizing form-focused practice, L1–L2 contrastive analysis, and proofreading strategies to improve grammatical accuracy.

A notable finding in the data is the contrast between the high rate of grammatical errors and the students' strong paragraph organization (100% with topic sentences and 80% with proper cohesion signals). This can be explained by several factors. The Paragraph Writing course likely emphasized structure more than grammar, helping students internalize rhetorical patterns faster than grammatical accuracy. As Ellis (2008) notes, discourse competence often develops earlier than grammatical control, allowing students to build coherent ideas even with imperfect forms. In addition, the frequent use of formulaic expressions and connectors shows reliance on memorized patterns that enhance coherence despite sentence-level errors. Task familiarity also influenced performance, as students prioritized fulfilling the expected structure over grammatical precision. These results suggest that focusing only on discourse organization may cause grammatical errors to fossilize, highlighting the need for integrated instruction that balances rhetorical and grammatical development.

The findings align with previous research while adding new perspectives. Similar to Fitrawati and Safitri (2021) and Ain (2023), this study found misformation or verb-related errors as the most frequent type, confirming that tense and verb issues are persistent in Indonesian EFL writing. It also supports Gulö and Rahmawelly (2019), who linked omission errors of articles and plurals to L1 structural differences. However, unlike larger studies such as Ganai and Naikoo (2024) that reported more spelling errors, this variation likely results from differences in genre (example paragraph) and participants (first-semester low achievers). Consistent with Vijayakumar (2024), this study also found that only about 53% of students provided concrete supporting examples. Yet, it revealed a new nuance: students showed strong rhetorical organization despite weak elaboration, suggesting that rhetorical competence may develop earlier than grammatical accuracy. Overall, this study confirms common EFL error patterns in Indonesia while highlighting a new insight valuable for teaching organizational skills can progress faster than linguistic precision.

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results. The small, purposive sample (n = 15; interviews n = 5) focused on low-achievers, offering depth but limiting generalization. The use of one task type (example paragraph) and a single data source (SPADA submissions) may not reflect students' broader writing abilities, especially under different contexts or longer assignments. Its cross-sectional nature also prevents tracking developmental changes over time. Although the writing flow checklist was validated by experts, relying on one instrument may have simplified the complexity of writing flow. In addition, manual analysis and interview-based interpretations carry a degree of subjectivity, despite intra-rater checks and peer review. These limitations suggest the need for future research with larger, more varied samples, longitudinal or experimental designs, and stronger instrument triangulation to ensure more comprehensive insights.

Based on the above discussion, several pedagogical recommendations can be proposed. First, contrastive L1–L2 practice focusing on articles, plurals, and tense/aspect through drills and controlled exercises should be implemented to reduce

omission and misformation errors. Second, form-focused feedback should be integrated into rhetorical writing tasks, allowing structured grammar correction during paragraph construction through peer-edited formats. Third, activities that promote noticing, such as monitoring and error detection tasks, can help students become more aware of frequent grammatical issues. Lastly, longitudinal interventions involving a series of tasks and continuous feedback are recommended to prevent the fossilization of errors and support sustained language development.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of first-semester students' example paragraph writing at the University of Mataram identified four major grammatical error types based on Dulay et al.'s (1982) taxonomy: misformation, omission, misordering, and addition. Misformation was the most common (45.4%), followed by omission (31.8%), misordering (13.7%), and addition (9.1%). Most misformation errors involved verb tense, subject–verb agreement, and word form, showing students' partial grasp of grammar. Omission of articles and plural markers was linked to structural differences between English and Indonesian, while addition and misordering stemmed from overcorrection or limited syntactic awareness.

According to Norrish's (1983) framework, the main causes of errors were translation, first language interference, and carelessness. Translation was most dominant as students often composed ideas in Indonesian before translating, causing structural and lexical errors. L1 interference led to further deviations, while carelessness such as skipping revision resulted in avoidable mistakes. These reflect cognitive, linguistic, and affective influences on language production.

In terms of writing flow, most students produced clear topic sentences and transitions but lacked detailed examples and strong conclusions, affecting paragraph coherence. This suggests that their organizational skills developed faster than grammatical accuracy. In line with Interlanguage Theory (Selinker, 1972), such errors represent a natural developmental stage rather than failure.Overall, the study indicates that while students demonstrate good paragraph organization, they still struggle with grammar. Therefore, combining grammar-focused feedback with rhetorical training is essential to balance linguistic and discourse competence in EFL writing development.

SUGESSION

Based on the findings, several practical recommendations are proposed for lecturers, students, and future researchers. Lecturers are encouraged to implement integrated grammar instruction that combines grammar exercises with paragraph writing practice. Activities such as sentence reconstruction, guided error correction, and contrastive analysis between Indonesian and English can enhance students' grammatical awareness. Providing clear and timely feedback, encouraging peer editing using error checklists, and assigning revision-based tasks can further improve accuracy and self-correction skills. For students, it is advisable to plan and write directly in English rather than translating from Indonesian. Keeping a grammar journal to record frequent errors, practicing systematic proofreading, and engaging in peer review can help them become more self-aware writers. Consistent writing practice through short reflections or journals can also strengthen both grammatical accuracy and fluency. Finally, future researchers are recommended to involve larger and more diverse samples or adopt longitudinal designs to explore the development

of students' grammatical accuracy over time. Experimental studies on targeted interventions such as grammar workshops, peer-feedback models, or integrated error correction would also provide valuable insights into effective strategies for reducing EFL writing errors.

REFERENCES

Ain, Q. (2023). An analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing descriptive text. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 8(1), 34–41. https://doi.org/10.31603/jes.v8i1.6562

Chaudhary, T., & Zahrani, A. (2020). Careless mistakes among ESL learners: An analysis of causes and solutions. *TESOL International Journal*, 15(2), 22–36. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n2p357

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5*(1–4), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486999

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2003). The role of English in Indonesia: A dilemma. In Soekamto, K. E. (Ed.) *Rampai* Bahasa, pendidikan, dan budaya: kumpulan esai Soenjono Dardjowidjojo (pp. 41-50). *Jakarta: Yayasan obor Indonesia*

Dulay, H. C., Burt, M. K., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford *University* Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/327086

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive *sampling*. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Fitrawati, F., & Safitri, Y. (2021). An analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing essay. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 263–273. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v10i3.112330

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Gulö, I., & Rahmawelly, M. (2019). Omission errors made by EFL learners. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 5(2), 97–104. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v5i2.1312

Hedge, T. (2005). *Writing*. Oxford University Press. https://www.scribd.com/document/444925106/Writing-Hedge-2005-OUP-pdf

Murtiana, R. (2019). First language interference in second language acquisition. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 13(2), 123–132. https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v13i2.18892

Norrish, J. (1983). Language *learners and their errors.* Phoenix ELT / Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(84)90033-2

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Longman academic writing series 3: Paragraphs to essays*. Pearson Education.

Özkayran, F., & Yılmaz, D. (2020). An analysis of misordering errors in EFL writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(3), 1651–1659. https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.803539

Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667190

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://doi.org/10.29303/jcar.v5i2.3314

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10*(3), 209–231. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209

Sumiati, S., Baharuddin, B., & Saputra, A. (2022). *The analysis of Google Translate accuracy in translating procedural and narrative text*. Journal of English Education, Literature and Linguistics Studies (JEELS), 2(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.29303/j.v2i1.270

Vijayakumar, P. (2024). Exemplification in student essay writing: A study of learner corpus of essay writing (LCEW). *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 13(1), 88–95. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.13n.1p.88

Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. A. (2003). *College writing: From paragraph to essay*. Macmillan Education.