

## Frequency and cause of verb tense error in students' writing

### *Kekerapan dan penyebab kesalahan penggunaan bentuk kata kerja pada karya tulis siswa*

Yenita Br Sembiring\*, Reynaldi Kuanda, & Parlingoman Gohae

Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia

Corresponding Email: [yenitasembiring@unprimdn.ac.id](mailto:yenitasembiring@unprimdn.ac.id)

#### Article History

Received 5 January 2026

Revised 21 February 2026

Accepted 6 March 2026

Published 31 March 2026

#### Keywords

verb tense errors; writing; error analysis.

#### Kata Kunci

kesalahan tenses kata kerja; tulisan; analisis kesalahan.

#### Read online

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.



#### Abstract

This study examines the frequency and causes of verb tense errors produced by English students of Universitas Prima Indonesia in academic writing. Using a qualitative descriptive approach supported by quantitative data, the study analyzed 60 short essays based on the Surface Strategy Taxonomy framework, which includes omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. A total of 200 tense-related errors were identified and categorized into five tense groups: simple past, simple present, present perfect, future, and continuous forms. The results show that errors in the simple past tense were the most frequent, followed by errors in the simple present and present perfect tenses. Among the error types, misformation errors accounted for the largest proportion, indicating that students struggle with selecting and forming appropriate verb structures. Interview findings further reveal that first language transfer, limited exposure to contextualized grammatical input, overgeneralization of rules, and inadequate proofreading strategies contribute to these errors. Overall, the findings suggest that students' tense errors are systematic and reflect interlanguage development rather than random mistakes. The study highlights the importance of combining explicit grammar instruction with contextualized writing practice to improve grammatical accuracy in EFL academic writing.

#### Abstrak

Studi ini meneliti kekerapan dan penyebab kesalahan penggunaan bentuk kata kerja yang dilakukan oleh mahasiswa program studi pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Prima Indonesia dalam karya tulis ilmiah. Menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif yang didukung oleh data kuantitatif, studi ini menganalisis 60 esai pendek berdasarkan kerangka *Surface Strategy Taxonomy*, yang mencakup penghilangan, penambahan, kesalahan bentuk, dan kesalahan urutan. Sebanyak 200 kesalahan terkait bentuk kata kerja diidentifikasi dan dikategorikan ke dalam lima kelompok bentuk kata kerja yakni: simple past, simple present, present perfect, future, dan bentuk continuous. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa kesalahan dalam bentuk *simple present tense* adalah yang paling sering terjadi, diikuti oleh kesalahan dalam bentuk kata kerja *present continuous* dan bentuk kata kerja *present perfect*. Di antara jenis-jenis kesalahan, kesalahan misformasi menyumbang proporsi terbesar, menunjukkan bahwa siswa kesulitan dalam memilih dan membentuk struktur kata kerja yang tepat. Temuan wawancara lebih lanjut mengungkapkan bahwa transfer bahasa pertama, paparan terbatas terhadap masukan tata bahasa yang terkontekstualisasi, generalisasi berlebihan dari aturan, dan strategi proofreading yang tidak memadai berkontribusi pada kesalahan-kesalahan ini. Secara keseluruhan, temuan tersebut menunjukkan bahwa kesalahan tenses siswa bersifat sistematis dan mencerminkan perkembangan antarbahasa daripada kesalahan acak. Studi ini menyoroti pentingnya menggabungkan pengajaran tata bahasa eksplisit dengan praktik menulis yang terkontekstual untuk meningkatkan ketepatan tata bahasa dalam penulisan akademik bagi pembelajar bahasa asing.

© 2026 The Author(s). Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya by Universitas Mulawarman

#### How to cite this article with APA style 7th ed.

Sembiring, Y. B., Kuanda, R., & Gohae, P. (2026). Frequency and cause of verb tense error in students' writing. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 9(1), 249–258. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v9i1.1779>



## A. Introduction

English has emerged as a global lingua franca across diverse sociocultural contexts (Suherman et al., 2024; Khoirotunnisa & Retnawati, 2025). English proficiency in both receptive and productive skills has become increasingly essential for students in Indonesia (Indriani, 2021). The productive skills is the language skills in which the students produce the language themselves (Harmer, 2007). Writing and speaking belong to productive skills. When students develop writing skills, they engage not only in the mechanical act of recording words but also in the process of expressing ideas through grammatically accurate structures at the word, sentence, paragraph, and discourse levels. Writing is one of the four core language skills, but it is often considered the most demanding and challenging because it requires learners to actively create language rather than simply receive it (Purnamasari et al., 2021). In writing, students must think, organize, choose appropriate words, and construct sentences that clearly communicate their intended meaning. Unlike listening and reading, which focus on understanding messages, writing requires personal involvement in producing a meaningful and well-structured text. Students must engage both cognitively and linguistically, making decisions about what to say and how to say it. Effective writing requires adherence to the conventions of the target language, including accurate grammar, appropriate lexical choice, correct spelling, and well-structured sentences (Niswah, 2022).

Writing involves the ability to produce sentences that are systematically organized and cohesively linked to create a coherent paragraph. This is a complex process, and students often face challenges when using the language in writing (Prihandani, 2023). Consequently, errors in their written products are inevitable (Halim & Halim, 2024). This could frequently happen because students are still influenced by Indonesian sentence form while creating and constructing English sentences for paragraphs.

Errors serve as indicators that students have not yet achieved a full understanding of English language rules (Singh & Kaushik, 2020). Errors are mistakes that students are unable to fix on their own and hence require explanations (Harmer, 2007). The acquisition of English language rules is inherently mediated by the production and subsequent analysis of errors, which serve as a critical mechanism in the learning process. Error analysis is the process of identifying, classifying, or characterizing the mistakes that students make most frequently (Muftah, 2023; Al-Khaza'leh, 2021). The study of students errors that can be seen, examined, and categorized to provide insight into the learners' internal systems is known as error analysis (Brown, 2000 in Ismahani et al., 2024). In order for both the teacher and the students to improve English during the teaching and learning process, it is intended to provide feedback regarding the types and causes of errors made by the students. As a result, when studying English, students frequently make mistakes, particularly when attempting to construct sentences or employ tenses when writing. Students often demonstrate grammatical inaccuracies in phrase construction, making it difficult for them to produce well-formed English sentences, especially since their first language does not impose clear temporal constraints that affect verb forms (Tambunan et al., 2022).

Dulay categorized learners errors into four main types: (a) omission, (b) addition, (c) misformation, and (d) misordering (Mubarok & Budiono, 2022). Conducting error analysis has been shown to be beneficial, as it helps learners identify recurring mistakes, minimize inaccuracies, and ultimately enhance their overall English proficiency. In the framework of error analysis, learners' error is classified into four surface structure categories: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. These categories remain influential in second language acquisition (SLA) research because they provide a systematic means of describing formal deviations in learner language. Rather than treating errors as random inaccuracies, this taxonomy enables researchers to interpret them as patterned manifestations of interlanguage development (Phuket & Otham, 2015).

An error of omission occurs when a required grammatical element is absent from an utterance. This type of error typically involves the deletion of function words or inflectional morphemes that are obligatory in the target language (Mertosono & Erniwati, 2023). For instance, a learner may

produce a sentence such as *She going to campus every day*, omitting the auxiliary verb *is*, or *He buy new book yesterday*, omitting the past tense marker and the article. Omission errors are frequently associated with early developmental stages, during which learners prioritize lexical meaning over grammatical marking. Such errors may also reflect limited awareness of morphological requirements or the influence of a first language that does not encode similar grammatical distinctions.

In contrast, an error of addition is characterized by the presence of an unnecessary linguistic element. In this case, learners insert forms that are not required within the grammatical structure of the target language. For example, the erroneous construction *She doesn't goes to school* exemplifies a case of double marking, in which the verb redundantly carries a third-person singular inflection despite the presence of the auxiliary *doesn't*. Similarly, the form *I am agreeing with you* reflects the overextension of progressive aspect marking to stative verbs, demonstrating a misuse of the auxiliary *be* in contexts where simple present forms are required. Addition errors often arise from overgeneralization, indicating that learners have internalized certain rules but have not yet mastered the constraints governing their appropriate use.

Misformation errors involve the use of an incorrect form in place of the correct one. Unlike omission, where a required element is missing, misformation entails the substitution of an inappropriate morpheme or structure (Hikmah, Hermansyah, Jumiati, Zulkifli N., et al., 2025). A common example includes the overregularization of irregular verbs, as in *She eated the food*, where the learner applies the regular past tense suffix *-ed* to an irregular verb. Subject verb agreement errors, such as *This books is interesting*, also exemplify misformation. These errors suggest that learners are actively constructing hypotheses about grammatical rules, even if their current internal representations do not yet align with target language norms.

Finally, misordering errors occur when sentence elements are arranged in an incorrect sequence. Because English relies heavily on word order to convey grammatical relationships, deviations in syntactic arrangement can significantly affect clarity. For example, a learner might produce *What you are doing?* instead of *What are you doing?* reflecting incomplete mastery of interrogative inversion. Similarly, *She is late all the time* may be incorrectly rendered as *She is all the time late*, demonstrating inappropriate placement of an adverbial phrase. Misordering errors often result from first language transfer or from a partial understanding of target language syntactic conventions. Misordering errors often result from first language transfer or from partial understanding of target language syntactic conventions.

These four categories illustrate that learner errors are not arbitrary but systematic. Each type reflects specific developmental processes, including rule simplification, overgeneralization, and restructuring within the learner's evolving interlanguage system. By examining omission, addition, misformation, and misordering errors narratively and analytically, researchers and educators gain valuable insight into the cognitive and linguistic mechanisms underlying second language development.

Learners' errors can generally be attributed to two primary sources: interlingual and intralingual factors. Interlingual errors occur when learners transfer features from their first language into the target language, resulting in deviations from target language norms. A major source of such errors is the assumption that the structures of the second language are comparable to those of the native language. However, not all errors arise from first language interference. Learners may also produce errors due to intralingual factors, particularly their limited knowledge of the target language, which can lead to incorrect generalizations and misuse of linguistic forms.

Conversely, intralingual errors arise from insufficient acquisition of the target language. For example, learners may attempt to use multiple tense markers within a single sentence due to an incomplete understanding of grammatical rules. An example is the erroneous form *he is come here*, which reflects confusion between simple present and present continuous constructions, as well as misapplication of subject verb agreement rules. In summary, intralingual errors result from learners' attempts to formulate hypotheses about the target language based on their limited exposure and experience.

The researchers took some related research to support the research being conducted. The first research the researchers took as a reference showed that several types of errors appeared repeatedly. The errors include problems with articles and determiners, incorrect use of verb tenses and aspects, subject verb agreement errors, misuse of prepositions, and difficulties with word order and overall sentence structure. In the interviews, many students pointed to factors such as interference from their first language, limited exposure to accurate grammatical input, incomplete understanding of grammatical rules, and a lack of effective proofreading strategies as contributing to their mistakes (Hikmah, Hermansyah, Jumiati, N, et al., 2025)

The second related research found that article errors accounted for the highest proportion of total errors (25.5%), followed by errors in prepositions (14.2%) and plural/singular forms (13.7%). In contrast, errors related to tenses (7%), passive voice (3.8%), and subject verb agreement (1.7%) were found to have the lowest percentages. The interview results further revealed that students experienced difficulties in academic writing at multiple levels. The primary causes identified included limited vocabulary knowledge, carelessness, and uncertainty regarding basic grammatical structures (Huynh et al., 2022)

A study showed that there are three main categories of errors: overgeneralization, omission, and distortion. These errors represent both the negative transfer from Indonesian and the interlanguage development of the learners. Students commonly used improper verb tenses and skipped required auxiliaries, and inconsistently implemented tense norms, especially when trying to create more intricate narrative sequences. The present perfect tense was found to be the most difficult of all the structures studied, primarily due to the fact that Indonesian does not have a grammatical form that is comparable, which causes ongoing confusion when attempting to map English verb forms to aspectual and temporal meanings. Additionally, the study discovered that students frequently depended on superficial norms rather than more profound semantic comprehension, which led to incorrect tense selection in a variety of scenarios (Nuruzzaman et al., 2018). These findings highlight the necessity of contextualized, awareness raising education that pushes students to make more systematic connections between form, meaning, and use. Overall, the study highlights the pedagogical value of integrating contrastive analysis and error analysis to enhance students' accuracy and proficiency in academic English writing (Saputra, 2023).

Learners experience persistent tense errors due to structural differences between Bahasa Indonesia and English (Wulandari & Harida, 2021). It emphasized the role of interlanguage development and negative transfer in shaping students' grammatical inaccuracies. In addition, a study also revealed that Indonesian university students struggled particularly with tense consistency and verb morphology in argumentative writing. The researchers argued that the complexity of the English tense aspect system, combined with limited contextualized grammar instruction, contributed to systematic errors in written production (Setyowati et al., 2016).

Collectively, these studies demonstrate that grammatical errors particularly those related to verb tense, agreement, and article usage remain persistent problems among Indonesian EFL learners. The studies also confirm that both interlingual and intralingual factors play significant roles in shaping learners' interlanguage systems.

The English tense system can be especially challenging for learners because it is more complex than it first appears. English traditionally includes twelve tense aspect combinations, and each one carries a specific meaning related not only to time but also to how an action is viewed. For many learners, this becomes difficult because their first language does not work in the same way. For example, Bahasa Indonesia does not require changes in verb forms to indicate tense. Instead, time is usually expressed through context or time markers. As a result, Indonesian learners often find it hard to adjust to a system where verb forms must change depending on when an action happens. This structural difference can lead to recurring errors, a phenomenon often explained through the concept of interlanguage an evolving language system shaped by both the learner's first language and the target language (Andiny et al., 2024)

Moreover, the difficulty of English tenses is not limited to marking time. The tense aspect system also interacts with aspect and modality, which means that verb forms reflect not only when

something happens but also how the speaker views the action whether it is ongoing, completed, habitual, or connected to the present. English verbs encode both temporal relationships and the speaker's perspective, making tense usage more nuanced than a simple representation of time. Due to these complexities, learners often struggle to distinguish among simple, progressive, and perfect forms. The overlapping meanings of these forms can lead to confusion, particularly in writing, where accurate tense selection is essential for maintaining clarity, coherence, and logical flow. (Andiny et al., 2024; Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

Although previous studies have extensively documented grammatical errors in EFL writing, several gaps remain evident. *First*, many prior studies focus broadly on general grammatical categories without providing in-depth analysis of tense aspect errors within specific academic writing genres. Limited research has examined how tense misuse specifically affects coherence and meaning construction in academic texts. *Second*, while earlier research has identified first-language transfer as a major cause of errors, fewer studies have explored learners' own awareness of their tense-related problems through qualitative inquiry. There is still insufficient understanding of how students perceive the causes of their grammatical errors and how this awareness relates to their writing strategies. *Third*, previous studies often emphasize frequency counts of error types but provide limited pedagogical implications grounded in contextual classroom realities. More research is needed to connect error patterns with targeted instructional interventions that address tense aspect complexity in writing contexts.

Therefore, the present study seeks to fill these gaps by focusing specifically on verb tense errors in students' academic writing, analyzing their forms based on surface structure taxonomy, and exploring underlying causes through students' perspectives. By integrating quantitative error identification with qualitative insights, this study aims to provide a more comprehensive understanding of tense-related difficulties among Indonesian EFL learners and to propose pedagogically relevant solutions.

## B. Method

This study employed a descriptive qualitative design supported by quantitative data. Descriptive qualitative research is an approach that aims to provide a rich and detailed account of a phenomenon as it occurs naturally, without the manipulation of variables (Nassaji, 2015). The quantitative component focused on identifying and categorizing the frequency of verb tense errors in students' writing. The qualitative component was used to explore the underlying causes of these errors through interviews. This mixed methods approach provided a more comprehensive understanding of the issue.

The participants of this research were 30 third semester students from the English Education Department at Universitas Prima Indonesia in Medan, Indonesia. In the 2025 academic school year, these students took a class on academic writing. They were chosen through purposive sampling because they had already learned the basics of grammar and writing (Etikan et al., 2016).

The main source of data was the essays that students wrote. Each student was assigned to compose a 250-word essay on a specified topic. The instrument employed for data analysis was an error analysis framework, concentrating specifically on verb tense errors. The researchers used semi-structured interviews to get more information about how students thought about why they made tense mistakes.

The data were gathered in two phases. Students first turned in their essays in a writing class. All of the essays were put together and coded without names. Second, ten students were chosen at random to be interviewed so that the researcher could learn more about what caused their tense errors. To enhance communicative clarity, all interviews were administered in Bahasa Indonesia and audio recorded following the participants' informed consent.

The evaluation of students' essays was performed by using a series of steps. The first step is to make sure that no verb forms were missed, which made for a complete and correct analysis. The

next step was to sort the tense mistakes into groups based on type, like past, present, or future tense mistakes. This classification helped the researcher sort and group the most common kinds of mistakes.

The third step was to count how many times each type of tense mistake was made in the students' writing. This quantitative method gave exact numbers on how many times each mistake happened. After that, the percentage of each type of error compared to the total number of tense errors was worked out. This calculation helped the researcher figure out which kinds of tense mistakes the students made the most.

In addition to analyzing essays, data were also gathered from interviews with chosen participants. The interview transcripts were thematically analyzed to ascertain prevalent causes of tense errors. This method helped the researcher figure out what caused the mistakes, such as the students' grammar knowledge, learning strategies, and the effect of their first language.

The quantitative data on the frequency and percentage of tense errors were shown in tables and charts to make the results clearer. These pictures gave a clear and simple picture of the patterns of tense errors that students made. The thematic analysis of the interviews provided in-depth qualitative insights that added to the quantitative results, giving a full picture of the problems students have with using tense in their writing.

### C. Results and Discussion

After analyzing the students' essays, all verb tense errors were identified, classified, and quantified. To provide a clear overview of the patterns observed, the errors were organized according to tense type, including past, present, and future forms. The table below shows how verb tense mistakes were spread out. It provides a clear visual summary of the areas in which students experienced the most difficulty.

**Table 1. Distribution of Types and Frequency of Errors**

No.	Type of Tense Error	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Simple Past	85	42.5
2	Simple Present	60	30.0
3	Present Perfect	25	12.5
4	Future Tense	15	7.5
5	Continuous	15	7.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

The data presented in Table 1 were derived from the analysis of 60 short academic essays written by English Departments students of Universitas Prima. Each essay was examined at the clause level, with particular attention to finite verb phrases. Every instance of tense misuse was identified, coded, and categorized according to its respective tense type. A total of 200 tense related errors were identified across all essays. These errors were classified into five categories: simple past, simple present, present perfect, future tense, and continuous forms. The frequency of each error type was determined by counting the number of occurrences within the corpus of student writings.

The percentage of each error type was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage} = \frac{\text{Frequency of a specific errors}}{\text{Total number of tense}} \times 100\%$$

The table above shows that simple past tense errors were the most frequent, accounting for 42.5% of the total errors, followed by simple present tense errors (30%). Present perfect tense errors appeared less frequently but were still notable.

**Table 2. Distribution of Causes of Verb Tense Errors**

No.	Cause of Error	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	First language interference	12	40.0
2	Overgeneralization of tense rules	8	26.7
3	Lack of practice / insufficient feedback	6	20.0
4	Confusion between similar tenses	3	10.0
5	Memory lapses / carelessness	1	3.3
<b>Total</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

To complement the quantitative findings, selected excerpts from students' interviews illustrate how learners themselves perceived their difficulties with verb tense usage. Several participants explicitly acknowledged confusion regarding tense consistency: *"Sometimes I know it should be past tense, but when I focus on ideas, I forget to change the verb form"* (Student 4). This statement indicates that cognitive load during idea generation interferes with grammatical monitoring. It supports the finding that simple past tense errors (42.5%) were dominant.

Another student highlighted L1 influence: *"In Bahasa Indonesia, we don't change the verb. So when writing fast, I just write the base form"* (Student 7). This response clearly reflects interlingual transfer, where the absence of tense inflection in Bahasa Indonesia affects English tense production.

Overgeneralization was also evident: *"If it is past, I just add -ed. Sometimes I am not sure if the verb is irregular"* (Student 9). This supports the category of misformation errors due to rule overgeneralization.

Regarding feedback and practice, one participant stated: *"We learn the formula, but we don't practice enough in real writing. Usually, we just do grammar exercises"* (Student 2). This comment indicates that limited contextualized practice may hinder the internalization of tense usage in authentic writing tasks.

In addition to categorizing errors based on tense type, the identified errors were further analyzed using surface structure taxonomy, which classifies errors into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. This classification enables a deeper understanding of the structural patterns underlying students' tense-related deviations.

**Table 3. Surface Taxonomy Errors**

No.	Type of Error	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Omission	50	25.0
2	Addition	30	15.0
3	Misformation	95	47.5
4	Misordering	25	12.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3 that misformation errors were the most dominant type, accounting for 47.5% of the total identified errors. This finding suggests that students attempted to apply grammatical rules but frequently selected incorrect verb forms. Common examples included the use of regular past markers for irregular verbs (e.g., *eated instead of ate*) and incorrect past participle forms in present perfect constructions (e.g., *has finish instead of has finished*). These patterns indicate intralingual overgeneralization and incomplete internalization of morphological rules.

Omission errors constituted 25% of the total errors. These errors primarily involved the absence of obligatory tense markers or auxiliary verbs, such as *She going to campus yesterday* (missing auxiliary was) or *He walk to school yesterday* (missing past tense marker -ed). Such errors reflect learners' tendency to prioritize lexical meaning over grammatical marking, as well as the influence of Bahasa Indonesia, which does not require verb inflection to indicate tense.

Addition errors accounted for 15% of the data. These errors involved unnecessary insertion of grammatical elements, such as *She did went to campus* or *He doesn't goes to school*. This pattern suggests that learners partially understood tense formation but applied rules redundantly, demonstrating rule overextension.

Misordering errors represented the smallest proportion (12.5%). These errors were mostly

related to incorrect placement of auxiliary verbs or adverbials in tense constructions, such as *What you did yesterday?* instead of *What did you do yesterday?*. Misordering errors indicate incomplete mastery of English syntactic structure, particularly interrogative inversion.

In summary, the findings show that students' verb tense errors are not merely careless mistakes but reflect deeper challenges in adapting to a language system that differs significantly from their first language. The structural contrast between Bahasa Indonesia and English, combined with learners' developing understanding of tense rules, shapes the pattern of omission, addition, misformation, and misordering errors observed in this study. These results suggest that students are actively building their interlanguage system, and therefore require instructional support that not only explains grammatical forms, but also provides meaningful opportunities to apply them in real writing contexts.

#### D. Conclusion

This study examined the distribution and causes of verb tense errors in Indonesian EFL students' academic writing particularly students in English department of Universitas Prima Indonesia. The findings show that tense errors are systematic rather than random. The study also found that simple past tense errors were the most frequent, and misformation emerged as the dominant error type. These patterns indicate that students struggle not only with selecting appropriate tenses but also with forming correct verb structures. Interview data further suggest that first language influence, partial understanding of grammatical rules, limited exposure to meaningful input, and inadequate proofreading practices contribute to recurring errors.

These findings imply that grammar instruction should be integrated into writing practice rather than taught separately. Teachers are encouraged to provide feedback that highlights recurring error patterns, raise students' awareness of differences between Bahasa Indonesia and English tense systems, and guide learners in applying self-editing strategies before submission.

This study was limited to a single academic context and focused only on tense related errors in written data. Future research may involve broader samples, longitudinal designs, or intervention-based studies to examine how targeted instruction can reduce tense errors over time. Overall, tense errors should be seen as part of learners' developmental process, requiring sustained instructional support rather than simple correction.

#### E. AI Declaration

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) to assist in drafting preliminary text, organizing ideas, and improving the clarity and readability of the manuscript.

#### References

- Al-Khaza'leh, B. A. (2021). Errors analysis of writing among third and fourth year college EFL students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research (IJM CER)*, 3(6), 1–5. [https://www.ijmcer.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/IJM CER\\_A0360106-1.pdf](https://www.ijmcer.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/IJM CER_A0360106-1.pdf)
- Andiny, A. D., Anggraini, N., & Permana, D. R. (2024). An analysis of grammatical errors in Indonesia-English writing descriptive text translation. *Journal on Education*, 7(1), 6216–6222. <https://jonedu.org/index.php/joe/article/view/7226>

- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Freeman, D. L., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Halim, A., & Halim, N. M. (2024). *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Linguistics and Culture (ICLC-4 2023)* (M. Hasyim, Ed.; Vol. 839). Atlantis Press SARL. <https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-251-4>
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hikmah, N., Hermansyah, S., Jumiati, J., Zulkifli, N., Rahayu, S., Syarif, N., & Syamsuriani, S. (2025). Common grammatical errors in students' writing: A qualitative error-analysis study. *DEIKTIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 5(4), 3053–3056. <https://doi.org/10.53769/deiktis.v5i4.2178>
- Huynh, N., Anh, M., Yen, N. H., Tho, N. T. Y., & Nhut, L. M. (2022). Grammatical errors in academic writing of English second year students. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(6), 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v7i6.4547>
- Indriani, K. S. (2021). Motivasi tenaga kerja RSD Mangusada Badung-Bali dalam mempelajari bahasa Inggris. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 4(1), 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v4i1.130>
- Ismahani, S., Nasution, S., Nasution, R. U. T., Harahap, I. P., & Harahap, G. R. (2024). Contrastive and error analysis of Indonesian learners' tense and aspect usage in English writing. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Sastra Inggris*, 4(3), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jupensi.v4i3.6299>
- Mertosono, S. R., & Erniwati, E. (2023). Error analysis: Types and causes of EFL learners' errors in writing analytical exposition text. *Eralingua: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Asing dan Sastra*, 7(1), 64–77. <https://doi.org/10.26858/eralingua.v7i1.37875>
- Mubarok, Y., & Budiono, T. (2022). An error analysis on EFL students' writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(2), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i2.11386>
- Muftah, D. M. (2023). Error analysis in second language acquisition (SLA): Types and frequencies of grammatical errors of simple present and past tense in the elicited written production task of Arab EFL undergraduate learners. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 25(1), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.19202>
- Niswah, A. A. (2022). Speedy Grammar: Aplikasi game untuk meningkatkan kemampuan tata bahasa Inggris siswa. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 5(1), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v5i1.309>
- Nuruzzaman, M., Shafiqul Islam, A. B. M., & Jahan Shuchi, I. (2018). An analysis of errors committed by Saudi non-English major students in the English paragraph writing: A study of comparisons. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(1), 31–39. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.1p.31>
- Phuket, P. R. N., & Otham, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(32), 99–106. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083531.pdf>
- Prihandani, A. M. (2023). An analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing narrative texts. *International Journal of Language and Literature*, 7(2), 60–66. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijll.v7i2.29453>

- Purnamasari, D., Hidayat, D. N., & Kurniawati, L. (2021). An analysis of students' writing skill on English descriptive text. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 14(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v14i1.7943>
- Saputra, R. (2023). Students' error analysis in writing essay of English language teaching. *Dharmas Education Journal (DE\_Journal)*, 4(1), 252–260. <https://doi.org/10.56667/dejournal.v4i1.912>
- Setyowati, L., Latief, M. A., & Widiati, U. (2016). The implementation of planning and its effect on EFL student's writing performance. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 22(1), 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um048v22i12016p26-35>
- Singh, M., & Kaushik, R. (2020). Errors and English language teaching. *International Journal of Research Culture Society (IJRCS)*, 4(1), 18–22. <https://ijrcs.org/wp-content/uploads/IJRCS202001002.pdf>
- Suherman, L. O. A., Hamka, N., & Akfan, S. S. (2024). Perceiving Duolingo beyond the classroom: Insights from non-English major students in higher education. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 7(4), 715–724. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v7i4.1069>
- Tambunan, A. R. S., Andayani, W., Sari, W. S., & Lubis, F. K. (2022). Investigating EFL students' linguistic problems using Grammarly as automated writing evaluation feedback. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.46428>
- Wulandari, R. S., & Harida, R. (2021). Grammatical error analysis in essay writing. *DEIKSIS*, 13(1), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v13i1.5356>

## Author Information

### Yenita Br Sembiring

PUI Bahasa, Sastra dan Literasi, FKIP, Universitas Prima Indonesia  
Jalan Sampul, No. 3, Medan, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia  
Email: [yenitasembiring@unprimdn.ac.id](mailto:yenitasembiring@unprimdn.ac.id)  
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6266-8872>

### Reynaldi Kuanda

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Prima Indonesia  
Jalan Sampul, No. 3, Medan, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia  
Email: [kuandamin@gmail.com](mailto:kuandamin@gmail.com)  
Orchid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1026-918X>

### Parlingoman Gohae

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Prima Indonesia  
Jalan Sampul, No. 3, Medan, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia  
Email: [sitorusbetaria86@gmail.com](mailto:sitorusbetaria86@gmail.com)  
Orchid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7223-9676>



**Open Access** This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under a CC BY-SA 4.0 license. The images or other third-party material in this work are included under the Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material.