Grammatical Errors Committed by the Student-Teachers in Their Theses

Monalisa[1]*, Syahrial[2], Urip Sulistiyo[3], Mukhlash Abrar[4]

[1]*Universitas Islam Negeri Sulthan Thaha Syaifuddin Jambi, [2,3,4]Universitas Jambi

*Corresponding Author: ✉ monalisa@uinjambi.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	This study aimed to recognize to what extent grammatical errors occurred in undergraduate theses. A qualitative content analysis was employed on 25 theses reported by student-teachers. The two significant taxonomies of errors - the linguistic category and surface taxonomy strategy – were used to make the errors easily classified and explained. Student-teachers and advisors participated in giving truthful data in the interview process. It was found 1397 erroneous sentences that were spread out into simple, compound, complex, and faulty sentences, and they derived 2278 grammatical errors. Concerning the ways language learners make errors, they were broken into five pieces of the process: omission, misinformation, addition, mis-ordering, and selection. The next findings were source of error issues which consisted of interlingual errors (transfer of structure) and intralingual ones (overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules, false analogy, misanalysis, exploiting redundancy). The results of the discussion on the findings led to reflect the student-teachers' language status, mainly their writing skill in the position of developmental stage. There are three ways to respond to these errors: error corrections, strategy training, and grammar instruction in the context of academic writing. A proto syllabus of the Thesis Writing course is proposed to facilitate students in producing an adequate thesis. ***How to Cite***: Monalisa, Syahrial, Sulistiyo, U., & Abrar, M. (2025). Grammatical Errors Committed by the Student-Teachers in Their Theses. *Indonesian Language Education and Applied Linguistics Reviews, 1*(1), 1-16.

1. INTRODUCTION

Like the other types of academic writing in the EFL context, a thesis is not also error-free grammatically. Six numbers of undergraduate research reports are presented here. Firstly, the common grammatical errors Sugeng (2016) found in the student's undergraduate theses were that rank as follows: verb groups, finite verbs, subject-verb concords, predicates, concords of nouns, concords of numbers, clauses, passive voice, and word choices. Secondly, similar grammatical errors were also identified in the undergraduate students' thesis proposals which were reflected by Chandra (2017). These errors were about the use of passive voice, subject-verb agreement, and tense verb. Specifically, the next research report was made by Yusuf & Jumriana (2015), who studied the errors at the syntactical level. They reported that the errors committed by undergraduate students were in terms of noun phrases, verbs, verb construction, and transformation. Then, the grammatical errors of the entire theses chapters were investigated by Niati & Eripuddin (2019), whose findings were about errors in tenses, prepositions, and punctuation. The result section of a research report is the other interesting part of a thesis where the student-researchers also struggle with grammatical issues. Tambunan et al. (2020) revealed the errors in this result segment. The results showed that the student-teachers were still struggling to use verb-form issues, nouns, and tenses; word form remained the most dominant issue of errors. Lastly, it was a study on grammatical errors in undergraduate thesis abstracts

conducted by Dinamika (2021). The errors focused on in this study were on the Subject-verb agreement (SVA). She revealed that the results were 51 SVA errors, of which one error was on using number agreement and 50 errors on using the tense agreement. Briefly stated, grammatical deviations remain in almost every part of the student-teacher reports.

Such worrying conditions were also experienced by the writer during some of her opportunities as one of the board examiners of the student-teachers thesis defense at her institution - the English Education Study Program of one Islamic University in Jambi. The unconventional language forms and functions on the drafts startled her sight. The deviances are varied regarding language items such as missing articles, unprecise prepositions, misused pronouns, misplaced adjectives/adverbs, verb forms, and tenses at both phrase and clause levels. Though the English Education Program students at this institution have undergone a series of both writing courses – basic writing, genre-based writing, and academic writing – and three terms grammar course, ironically, grammatical errors are still abundant in their research reports. Once the writer confirmed the issues to one of the examinees, the student-teacher admitted committing errors due to her unconcern and less competence to meet the correct rules.

The paragraph below contains some erroneous forms. It is an example of the data from this study that is taken from the result part/findings segment of a thesis written by one of the English Education Study Program undergraduate students. The author's name is intentionally not stated.

> *"In this research, the subject has been take the English teachers. Because here the researcher was analyze the teachers' strategies in teaching speaking English on online learning class. The research subject are two peoples, they are teachers at SMP N …".*

The paragraph above consists of three parts; the first is a simple sentence; the second is a dependent clause – it requires an independent clause to be a correct complex sentence; the third is considered a comma splice or run-on because the two simple sentences are only separated by a comma. Therefore, a semicolon is suggested to replace the comma for better construction. Every part contains grammatical deviations. These are common errors committed by many EFL learners in Indonesia. By reading this paragraph carefully, it is identified that the sentences are possibly constructed through both the incomplete knowledge of the L2 and the literal translation of the author's L1 form.

Such above deviances reflect serious grammatical issues in undergraduate students' research reports. Hence, an error analysis must be conducted to comprehensively describe the error issues as the sample of learner language (Ellis, 1997). These are essential for remediation; the occurrence and frequency of error are crucial for implementing pedagogical intervention (Gass & Selinker, 2008). To sum up, the undergraduate theses' drawbacks of the grammatical items are significant as they reflect the true L2 learners' status on what forms and functions have and have not been acquired in L2 writing.

Grammatical errors are commonly found in undergraduate students' written products, including theses. The underlying issues behind the errors are L1 negative transfer and incorrect L2 forms. This study is conducted to recognize to what extent such errors occur in undergraduate theses.

Even though there has been a significant amount of research done on grammatical errors, this subject remains pertinent. Some contributions are detailed here. First, languages are constantly changing and evolving. It permits a more in-depth examination of how language variation affects the occurrence of particular errors. Second, studying grammatical errors provides valuable insights into the process of language acquisition, including the challenges and patterns of error development that learners face. The third one is for pedagogical implication; understanding grammatical errors has direct effects on how languages are taught and how they are taught that helps teachers to figure out the most frequent errors students make, create focused ways to teach, and come up with effective ways to deal with these errors in the classroom. Fourth, studying grammatical errors contributes to our understanding of how language develops in both native and non-native speakers.

This study is carried out to accumulate evidence on several characteristics of undergraduate students' grammatical errors in each part of their theses. The next practical contribution is that the grammar remediation on each particular part of a thesis is discussed by considering the common errors. Theoretically, the descriptions of what forms are and are not acquired yet are notable for both Second Language Acquisition (SLA) context and the Writing course. SLA discipline can extend the data about positioning learner language; the Writing course can be revisited for updating the syllabus.

2. METHODS

The writer applied a qualitative content analysis (Assarroudi, 2018; Glaser & Lauder, 2013; Mayring, 2000; Schreier et al., 2019). Since it focuses on the properties of language as communication, with an emphasis on the text's content or contextual meaning, its purpose is to gain knowledge and comprehension of the issue under investigation (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). As finding grammatical errors in the research reports of undergraduate students was the purpose of this study, the writer employed the four steps of errors analysis proposed by Ellis (1997). For the need to adjust to the purpose of the study, the two significant taxonomies of errors - the linguistic category and surface taxonomy strategy – from Dulay et al. (1982) were used to make the errors easily classified and explained. There were twenty-five theses whose authors were five males and twenty females as the source of data. Apart from documents, data were also obtained from interviews with student-teachers and their thesis advisors. For specific information on how grammatical errors were responded to and what reasons for committing the errors, they were asked through semi-structured interviews.

3. RESULTS
3.1. Linguistic-based Classification of Errors.
After studying 25 theses, it was found 1397 erroneous sentences that were spread out into simple, compound, complex, and faulty sentences, and they derived 2278 grammatical errors. The types of errors are subject-verb agreement, tense inconsistencies, verb, passive voice, clause, modality, gerund, concord of a noun, parallelism, subject omission, coordinating conjunction, subordinating conjunction, relative pronoun, demonstrative adjective, article, preposition, adjective, adverb, pronoun, word order, word choice, redundancy, and faulty.

3.2. Process-based Classification of Errors
The process-based classification results in 2153 errors less than the linguistic-based category because the other two types of errors - clause and faulty sentences- do not meet any of those classifications. Omission errors constitute 53.14% of the whole errors. Three categories of misinformation errors are calculated to be 15.19%. The second rank is addition errors, contributing 21.13% for the three categories. The last two most negligible errors are selection and misordering, which share 6.78% and 3.48%.

3.3. Source of Error Issues
There were 801 error occurrences dealt with interlingual errors that comprise into literal translation and substitution of preposition in which literal translation takes the biggest share. The amount of intralingual errors committed by student-teachers which spread out into overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules, false analogy, misanalysis, exploiting redundancy are presented as follows. Overgeneralization is the biggest category that contributes 47.25% to the total errors of intralingual one. Incomplete application of rules contributes 5.53% to the whole errors. False analogy came with 1.25% errors that was categorized into small number of errors. Misanalysis occurs 78 times. Exploiting Redundancy contributes 5.16% to all errors.

3.4. The Reasons for Grammatical Errors Occurred in the Student-teachers' Theses
The reasons for committing errors are (1) not good at grammar, (2) unawareness of committing errors, (3) limited corrective feedback, (4) relying more on less adequate grammar

checkers, (5) getting frustrated for lack of competence, and (6) carelessness. Their expectations of grammar mastery and thesis writing are (1) adequate time and opportunity to learn thesis writing, (2) having guidance how to write a thesis, (3) having a particular class for training grammar. From lecturers' sides, the causes may vary from lack of grammar knowledge, insufficient editing and proofreading, overreliance on automated tools, carelessness and typos, lack of language fluency, cognitive load and task complexity, limited feedback and revision opportunities.

3.5. The Status of Student-Teachers Language as Reflected by the Error Issues

There were 58 incorrect sentences categorized into faulty (2.55%) that could not be verified to the accepted English grammar norms used in various research publications. The structures have severe flaws, which makes them appear to be broken. Fixing these problematic sentences is challenging. Hence, they are categorized into global errors (difficult to understand because of serious violations). Making global errors shows that the student-teachers take risk for constructing their sentences. The small number of global errors indicates that they are still producing more intelligible sentences. In terms of sentence types, the errors occurred in three types of sentences: simple, compound, and complex. In addition, sentence boundary issues - runs-on and fragments - are other problems student-teachers execute. 401 simple sentences, 254 compound sentences, produced by student-teachers contained errors. The final kind of sentence is a complex one, and it has a total of 684 different constructions from at least four types of errors which potentially contribute more to complexity, like relative pronouns, incomplete clauses, SVA, and inconsistent tenses. However, fewer than half of those constructions (276 totals) are connected to either fragments or runs-on. These issues show that they are effortful to utilize new linguistic construction. Last information that contributes to determine the learner language from the findings of this study is the erroneous sentences caused by literal translation of L1 construction (interlingual errors). In term of intelligibility, they belong to local errors since they are still understandable as in T11.18. Such cases occurred 37.20% which meant that student-teachers do not rely more heavily on their L1 knowledge when constructing sentences. In other terms, their L2 knowledge benefits them more.

3.6. The Findings of Grammatical Errors Inform Pedagogical Practice for Academic Writing

Providing timely and constructive feedback on learners' language use helps them recognize and correct errors, reinforcing accurate language production. Feedback can be given by teachers, or through self-assessment activities, encouraging learners to reflect on their language use and make improvement. Production-based instruction often involves explicit instruction and feedback on language forms, structures, and accuracy. Learners are guided in their language production and provided with corrective feedback to enhance their accuracy and fluency.

Lastly, other important findings in giving corrective feedback to student-teachers are that the student-teachers get involved in teacher electronic feedback both synchronously (virtual meeting, chats, and voice notes) and asynchronously (comments in ms Word program).

3.7. The Contribution of Grammatical Errors' Findings for the Curriculum of English Education Study Program

The discovery of grammatical errors in student teachers' theses reveals their lack of proficiency, which results in low correctness in their thesis. It implies that they need to be advanced. Other findings include problems with sentence kinds (simple, compound, and complicated sentences), as well as challenges with sentence boundaries (fragments and runs-on sentences). Interviewing students is the second step since teachers can provide them information about what they desire. The outcomes of their adviser interviews provide insight into the language requirements for student teachers. The interviews suggest that they need a course to help them write a thesis that complies with the lexical and syntactic requirements of academic writing. These data are significant for language curriculum development. They become the items to learn in a course. Since they are found in student-teachers' theses, they may appropriate for Thesis Writing course.

4. DISCUSSIONS

Brown (2001) reveals that viewing writing as a process of thinking, a teacher's facilitative role is to respond to students' works, like commenting on their grammar. Grammatical errors committed by student-teachers require response or feedback. Among the ways of reacting to students' work, responding and correcting are two categories usually conducted in writing instruction. The first one is about discussing their writing rather than judging; the second one is the stage at which the teacher indicates some errors (Harmer, 2006). Error correction is a process to point out when syntax, concord, and collocation are incorrect. These concerns must be addressed to ensure well-constructed sentences in their academic writing products.

There have been various misunderstandings and even arguments about whether Writing teachers should ever note student errors. Focusing too much on student errors may impair students' capacity for critical thought and good writing, reducing writing into merely a vocabulary and grammar exercise rather than a way of comprehending and expressing meaning (Truscott, 1996).

However, in the L2 context, error correction and learning grammar are big parts of writing instruction; they may have even been the most important parts (Ferris, 2011). The effectiveness of error correction is regarded as especially important. L2 students frequently require specific and additional intervention from their writing teachers to close these gaps and develop strategies for identifying, fixing, and preventing errors because they are still learning the L2 lexicon, morphological systems, and syntactic structures in addition to being developing writers.

The debate over which errors to fix and when to fix them draws attention to the range of error feedback options available to writing teachers. Ferris (2011) demonstrates the potentials like the following: (1) direct versus indirect feedback, (2) error location versus error labeling, (3) marking broader versus narrower categories of errors, (4) codes versus symbols versus verbal comments, (5) textual corrections versus endnotes, (6) alternatives to written error correction. He further explains each of them as the following.

The first option is direct versus indirect feedback. Indirect feedback encourages students to think critically about their mistakes rather than just copying teacher corrections into their next drafts. Teachers should use direct feedback in three situations: (1) when students are starting English language learners, (2) when errors are "untreatable," and (3) when the teacher wants students to focus on certain error patterns but not others. The second option is error location versus error labeling. Teachers must decide whether to circle, highlight, or checkmark errors or to label them with symbols, codes, or spoken comments. Error location puts the most duty on the student writer to identify and solve the problem. The key benefit of labeling is that it gives students more information so they may utilize their past knowledge or grammar/editing handbooks to understand and implement the rule.

The third one is marking broader versus narrower categories of errors. Teachers can identify and teach "verb errors" (a broad category) or separate verb treatment into smaller categories like verb tense, verb form (which includes passive formation and modal usage problems), and subject-verb agreement. Narrower error feedback categories let students focus on fewer forms and rules while learning about a specific error type. The fourth one is codes versus symbols versus verbal comments. Codes and symbols speed things up. Yet, teachers who employ codes or symbols must ensure that students understand them and mark consistently. Otherwise teachers use verbal cues to spot errors.

The next option is textual corrections versus endnotes. Most errors are best fixed at the source. However, advanced writers who are improving at self-editing may benefit from error location (such as underlining) and a vocal summary at the end of the paper or on a teacher feedback form. While, electronic feedback makes it easier to insert brief rule reminders (metalinguistic explanations) in the margins using a word processing program's Comments feature. The last one is alternatives to written error correction such as color-coding error patterns with highlighters and the use of teacher-student conferences to discuss problematic language issues.

Consistently, research evaluating the short-term benefits of error feedback on modifications of existing texts has revealed that error feedback can aid students in improving the accuracy of those texts. It is acknowledged that these findings are evident and consistent. However, this body of research has been questioned because it does not indicate that students' ability to revise old texts translates into greater writing correctness and effectiveness over time (Ellis et al., 2009). Students believe that teacher criticism of their writing errors helps them improve their writing; this does not imply that teachers should grant their wish. Instead, teachers should assist students in adjusting to the lack of grammar correction.

On one side, lexical, morphological, and syntactic accuracy is vital for student writers since a lack of precision may make their message unintelligible and make them appear incompetent. On the other side, teachers may find correcting errors annoying and stigmatizing when facing many drafts. The limitations of teacher-driven corrective feedback on ESL student writing have been thoroughly investigated, as has research emphasizing the importance of student self-editing based on the Noticing Hypothesis (Hojeij & Hurley, 2017). It is a passive procedure when teachers give learners corrective written feedback, emphasizing areas where learners need improvement. According to the Noticing Hypothesis, SLA is primarily determined by what learners pay attention to and observe in TL input and how they interpret the significance of noticed input (Iwanaka & Takatsuka, 2007). Therefore, teachers must look at several active techniques that can assist students develop into "independent self-editors" of the work they produce.

According to Hinkel (2004), it is notoriously hard to edit one's own writing and learn to spot errors, even for advanced academic writers. Errors can be caused by many things, such as transferring from a first language, not fully understanding word meanings or syntactic rules, or intentionally making mistakes. In addition, grammatically and lexically distinct circumstances can lead to a variety of seemingly similar errors. For example, a lack of subject-verb agreement can be caused by a writer's inability to correctly identify the subject noun phrase, a misinterpretation of a count for a noncount noun or vice versa, or just leaving out the inflection marker -s with either a noun or a verb. Therefore, strategy training is required to encourage the students to be self-editor.

To be independent self-editors among students is an important part of teaching L2 writing. Some strategies for teaching L2 writers to edit their work exclusively at the textual level recommend doing so after addressing issues with discourse structure and content. Working on lexical and grammar problems, however, can take place at any stage of essay development because the ultimate goal of editing instruction is to teach students crucial self-editing skills that can be beneficial for the remainder of their academic careers (Ashwell, 2000).

Harmer (2006) proposes some ways to train students to self-edit. They can learn to self-edit and self-correct by carefully reading their own works. First, teachers place inaccurate statements on the board, and students come up and underline the inaccuracies. Afterwards, instructors present a mixture of accurate and wrong statements and ask students to select the correct one. Next, they need to be familiar with correction symbols. Once they have acquired familiarity with the symbols, the students remove them gradually. Then, teachers give homework to train them to make correction. Some teachers give their students error checklists that they can use to check their own work for errors. Using error checklists helps them work carefully. Instead of a checklist, the teachers give the students a series of questions to think about when editing their drafts. When teaching them how to deal with comments and corrections, it is quite beneficial to talk with students about the problems and hear their thoughts for how comments and corrections might be supplied.

Despite error corrections and strategy training, coping with a lack of accuracy can be done through grammar instruction in L2 writing class. It has been recommended that in order to teach students how to spot, fix, and steer clear of specific recurrent patterns of error, writing instructors may need to offer in-class teaching in the form of grammar mini-lessons and editing approach training (Hinkel, 2004). Rozimela (2021) reveals that as writing requires the appropriate and accurate use of language, grammar instruction is essential. Writing assignments provide a purposeful setting for studying grammar. Teachers need to plan lessons in a way that allows students to put their understanding of grammar into practice in authentic writing assignments.

Concerning this, Frodesen & Holten (2012, p. 114) state that " in recent years, L2 acquisition researchers stressed the need for focus on form, not in the 'old' or traditional sense of decontextualized lessons on grammar, but as a component of instruction that starts with a focus on form." They also recommend paying persistent attention to language difficulties throughout the drafting process, drawing on research on the role of grammar in an individual's writing process.

Most L2 grammar experts believe that classroom grammar training works best when accompanied with opportunities for students to apply what they've learned to their own writing (Ferris, 2011; Hinkel, 2004; Hyland, 2003) . The most obvious application of grammar and editing mini-lessons in writing class is for students to practice newly acquired grammatical ideas by discovering and correcting problems in example student papers and subsequently in their own texts.

Furthermore, grammar instruction can be effective for students if the curriculum is planned to build on the structures that students already know or to go from the formally and functionally simple to more sophisticated structures. So, grammar instruction can begin with formal written discourse structure analysis (Xavier et al., 2020) even at moderate student proficiency. Building on this base, grammar structure regularities can be explicitly addressed and practiced in academic writing.

Hinkel (2015) explains that grammar instruction at high intermediate and advanced levels can focus on structures from beginning academic textbooks (e.g., history texts heavily rely on the use of the past tense, and political science and sociology books can be practical in instruction on the present tense and passive voice). At higher proficiency levels, training can emphasize how grammatical aspects affect context, dialogue, and text. In addition, referential and impersonal pronouns, modal verbs, and parallel phrase formations are abundant in academic language and can be noted, examined, and practiced. Practice with grammar structures helps students develop productive fluency in academic writing and, to some extent, automaticity in writing academic style. For more advanced students, practice exercises include short recaps of chapter/section subjects, objective summaries, paraphrases, and explanations, as well as using sources to support the thesis in longer essays.

Research has identified two types of vocabulary and grammar learning: explicit learning, which occurs through focused study, and incidental learning, which occurs through language exposure and use. Yet, research shows that learners require repeated exposures to a word to learn it well (Coday, 1997). Further complicating matters, multiple studies of adult L2 learners found that long-term memory of terms learnt incidentally and through extensive reading can be particularly low.

However, Renandya (2007) states that extensive reading provides massive input on syntactical and lexical items from various written texts. In practicing extensive reading, students read a lot of books and other resources in a setting that encourages a lifetime of reading. Much exposure to forms works for abundant input, which then facilitates the acquisition. Acquisition occurs when comprehensible input is abundant and the student repeatedly concentrates on the meaning of many exciting messages; several studies have demonstrated its effectiveness in fostering linguistic proficiency. (e.g., reading ability, vocabulary, writing and spelling skills) (Elley, 1991).

Currently, when many fun activities can be enjoyed through audiovisual from various digital platforms, the position of extensive reading seems no longer optimal. Moreover, Kim et al. (2020) state that since L2 exposure in foreign language learning environments is typically limited, there is little evidence to suggest that starting early inevitably results in higher L2 proficiency. Therefore, extensive reading can be shifted to reading extensively of various academic texts for gaining ideas and linguistic knowledge.

For college students who are preparing their research projects, the need for kinds of literature for their academic writing products is paramount and urgent. Before beginning to write, according to one of Krashen's most influential theories in language acquisition, which he also applies to writing ability, students need a massive amount of input. The mode of language input proposed by Krashen is reading. Reading and writing are intimately connected. Reading books with a lot of vocabulary and rhyming or repetitive patterns can help students use their higher order thinking

skills to create their own story line (Wilson, 2016). Reading allows students to improve their writing skills and writing quality by expanding their vocabulary, learning text coherence, and applying grammar knowledge (Rozimela et al., 2022).

A lot of studies have been done to show that reading improves a person's ability to write. Experiments have shown that reading in writing is the most important factor; this is supported by research evidence (Emak & Ismail, 2021; Nguyen, 2022; Tuan, 2012). Further evidence for the idea that reading interventions can enhance students' writing performance comes from correlational studies evaluating connections between reading and writing, as it serves information gathering in the writing process (Khoirunnisa & Safitri, 2018). Because students utilize reading as the model for how to write, Harl (2013) bolstered the claim that reading has a significant impact on writing. It implies that if students want to improve their writing, the exposure to a lot of academic writing products such as article journals, research reports, and books should be maintained. In brief, writing should be facilitated by reading.

Furthermore, the findings of grammatical errors committed by student-teachers in their theses provide information for linguistic needs, which are then essential for meeting the features of academic writing. These data are crucial for initial work for developing an academic writing program. A grammatical perspective is one of the ways to look at the writing assignment. A similar purpose is also more likely gained from diagnosing grammatical errors committed by L2 authors in their theses.

Knowing grammatical errors means knowing L2 learners' lack likewise. Nation & Macalister (2010) look at necessities, lacks, and wants as possible tools for conducting a needs analysis to develop a course. Here, L2 learners lacks are essential information for looking at where the students are at present. Diagnosing such grammatical errors contributes data for the curriculum design of the writing course at the need analysis stage. To precisely put the findings of this study into the pedagogical practice of academic writing, the following explanations are elaborated.

There are three themes for the pedagogical practice of academic writing. Firstly, all types of grammatical errors are essential regardless of the numbers; a priority to serve one or two types in common is acceptable due to the limited amount of time possessed by both learners and teachers to make a maximum gain (Nation & Macalister, 2010). The types of grammatical errors found in the student-teachers' theses can be viewed into two common types: error types associated with their core sentences (subject and verb) and those that are uninvolved in their core sentences. The first comprises subject-verb agreement, tenses inconsistency, verbs, passives, incomplete clauses, subject omissions, coordinating conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions, relative pronouns, modals, gerunds, and redundancy. In the process of determining the grammatical error types, they are frequently involved one of either the subjects or verb/predicate or both. The rest of them are included in the second common types, which: are parallelism, demonstrative adjective, article, preposition, adverb, adjective, word order, and word choice that do not rely on their core sentences.

Results of identifying sentence types in the first cluster put complex sentences at higher errors than simple and compound sentences through omission, addition, and misinformation. The occurrence of errors is due to ignorance of concordance issues, violating tenses consistency, sequential verbs, failure to notice similar ideas, and unfamiliarity with particular forms. The problems of complex sentences are essential because they utilize subordinations that function to achieve efficiency. Acquiring knowledge of complex sentences is crucial for academic writing as it requires well-arranged information for effectiveness. Efficiency can be achieved by inserting ideas into a subordinate clause in a main clause. Hence, it can avoid using separated simple sentences as the same essential in using relative pronouns to connect a main clause and its relative clauses to produce logical relations among ideas.

As complex sentences are significant, they can be brought into academic writing class. Learning particular grammar, e.g., complex sentences in a writing course, does not turn it into grammar class. It is called 'in-class grammar instruction' by Ferris (2011). He suggests a mini grammar lesson. One point of grammar is discussed at once. It is similar to what Hinkel (2020) called incidental learning, which refers to picking up new grammar from exposure and language experience. For more facilitative, L2 learners need extensive exposure through reading authentic

sources with formal language style while finding complex sentences, such as from articles published in reputable journals. L2 learners can practice complicated grammar concepts by finding them out from those articles. Thus, complex sentences are proposed as one of the topics for the writing course program, mini grammar lessons as one of the strategies, and reading articles from reputable journals as models of authentic language in academic writing in which these contribute valuable information at the stage of need analysis for a writing course.

In conclusion, since the findings of this study are about linguistic errors, it implies that responding to these errors is fundamental for better progress of the L2 learners' drafts. L2 lecturers can response to the errors by situating, shaping, and negotiating them in such a way for the progress L2 learners' accuracy. Training them to be familiar in locating and labelling the errors for being independent self-corrected is crucial. Familiarizing them to read various academic written products like articles, research reports, and books are important not only for having ideas but also linguistic features or language knowledge of those texts. By reading them, the students will get exposures to both lexical and syntactical efficiency due to rich subordinations of academic texts. It also implies that a necessity for L2 learners to keep practicing writing frequently to develop L2 knowledge for communication as regular assignments and projects are other appreciated information for the writing course.

Given the study's findings and meeting the study gaps, a course that facilitates thesis writing and addresses the need for more accuracy is demanded. After reviewing the current curriculum of the English Education Program of State Islamic University (*UIN*) Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi, it is noticed that a series of grammar courses and a series of writing courses are distributed separately with different credit hours.

Three grammar courses with two credit hours for each are considered inadequate to meet the objectives of the courses for some reasons; the problems are an insufficient time for in-depth coverage, inadequate individualized attention, limited practice opportunities, and limited time for application and real-world contexts, limited time to explore authentic materials, real-life examples, and interactive activities that provide practical application opportunities.

Similarly, it is believed that a total of eight credit hours spread among four writing courses is insufficient to accomplish each curriculum goal. They result in short time for skill development, limited coverage of writing genres and styles, minimal focus on the writing process, little attention to grammar and language usage, reduced opportunities for peer collaboration and feedback, few opportunities for peer review, group work, and collaborative writing may be minimized, depriving students of valuable insights and perspectives from their peers, instructors may face challenges in providing extensive individualized feedback to each student, limited engagement with authentic writing tasks.

Inaccurate calculations with the two types of courses above are likely reasons for the inaccuracy of student theses. Therefore, having one course that explicitly handles the thesis and student grammar is quite reasonable. Hence, integrating grammar into thesis writing is most likely proposed.

Though thesis writing is part of academic writing, they have differences in some important ways. In term of scope, writing course has a broader scope, covering general writing skills applicable to various academic disciplines. A thesis writing course is more specialized, focusing specifically on the process of writing a thesis. Regarding to target audience, a writing course is typically open to a wider range of students, including undergraduate and graduate students from various disciplines. A thesis writing course is usually targeted towards students who are in final stages of their degree program and are specifically working on their thesis.

Moreover, the depth of content between the two is less identical. A thesis writing course delves deeper into the intricacies of thesis writing, providing in-depth guidance on research design, data analysis, and reporting of research findings. An academic writing course may cover these topics more superficially, focusing more on foundational writing skills applicable to a range of academic tasks.

One of the ways to accomplish the above higher order tasks in thesis writing is by utilizing grammatical sentences. A need for particular thesis writing which includes grammar lesson is essential for meeting the demand for high accuracy of a thesis for students of the English

Education Program of UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin Jambi. Therefore, a proto-syllabus for a thesis writing course is proposed.

The need for having this course is supported by some crucial points. First, the finding of 23 types of grammatical errors committed by student-teachers in their theses describes their lack which causes low accuracy in their thesis. It means that they require advancing them. Other findings are sentence boundary issues (fragments and runs-on sentence) and problems with sentence structure types (simple, compound, complex sentence). Second, conducting interviews with the students- teachers provide the data on what they want. The results of interviews with their advisors give insides into what is necessary for the student-teachers' use of language. It can be inferred from the interviews that they require a course to facilitate them in writing a thesis meeting the lexical and syntactical features of academic writing demand.

The discussion on how to respond to the errors provides the data for the course's techniques or strategies. Corrective feedback, training strategy, and form-focused instruction (input-based instruction and production-based instruction) are promoted in the course. Corrective feedback can be carried out by both lecturers and peers through corrections, peer review, mini lesson when specific grammar needs to discuss. An example of training strategy is to model Thinking Aloud for promoting students' independence. Training to edit their own texts is another way to train students' independence. An example of input-based instruction is to assist learners in reading an article for having the input of various sentence constructions, academic lexicon, organizing ideas, and depth content. Preparing a final project of a mini research report is an example of production-based instruction. A combination of the two is also likely applied.

Since it is a thesis writing course which includes grammar lesson, the materials will be arranged as a thesis structure draft. Grammar will not separately occur as individual lesson. It will always be inserted at all topics learned during thesis writing. It begins with Developing a Thesis Proposal, Method and Data Collection, Thesis Structure and Organization, Academic Writing and Language Style, Preparation of research finding, Revision and Editing, Formatting and Finalizing the Thesis.

While grammar is essential, it should not overshadow the larger objectives of teaching effective thesis writing skills. Balancing the focus on grammar with the overall goals of the thesis writing course has to be established wisely. Some suggestions for balancing the two are scaffold the writing process, grammar as a revision and editing focus, target grammar instruction to specific needs, incorporate grammar feedback into individualized writing support, use peer review and collaborative learning, provide grammar resources and support, encourage self-reflection, and balance time allocation.

5. CONCLUSION

There are 1397 erroneous sentences that are spread out into simple, compound, complex, and faulty sentences, and they derive 2278 grammatical errors which are categorized into 23 types under linguistic-based classification. The types of errors are subject-verb agreement, tense inconsistencies, verb, passive voice, clause, modality, gerund, concord of a noun, parallelism, subject omission, coordinating conjunction, subordinating conjunction, relative pronoun, demonstrative adjective, article, preposition, adjective, adverb, pronoun, word order, word choice, redundancy, and faulty.

Then, the ways through which language learners make errors are omission addition, misinformation, misordering, and selection In addition, two sources of errors are interlingual and intralingual. The first was transfer of structure and substitution of preposition. The intralingual consisted of overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules, false analogy, misanalysis, exploiting redundancy.

The reasons for committing errors are (1) not good at grammar, (2) unawareness of committing errors, (3) limited corrective feedback, (4) relying more on less adequate grammar checkers, (5) getting frustrated for lack of competence, and (6) carelessness. Furthermore, the grammatical errors committed by student-teachers could reflect their language status at

development stage it means that their language is not fossilized yet. When they keep writing, their skill may develop.

Next, the information underlying the error issues is required to respond in the context of academic writing through error corrections, strategy training, and grammar instruction. Students can benefit from error feedback to improve the accuracy of their writings. Strategy training including editing instruction is required to encourage the students to be independent. Coping with inaccuracy can be accomplished through grammar instruction in an L2 writing class.

Finally, knowing grammatical errors means knowing L2 learners' lacks likewise. The result of interview drives to have a thesis writing course which include grammar lesson. Therefore, a proto-syllabus of Thesis Writing course is proposed.

The results of this study indicated that different forms of grammatical errors may be found in virtually all categories, and the number of instances found in each category is unique. For future research, it is recommended that errors on specific grammar topics that are highly demanded by academic writing to study for accurate responses to the errors in question. This will ensure that the linguistic requirements of L2 students are met by the linguistic characteristics of academic writing. The grammatical errors of all English department students may not be sufficiently described by analyzing only 25 documents. Therefore, studying more documents will be closer to real description of L2 learners' accuracy. Lastly, the proto-syllabus of Thesis Writing course has to meet the expert validation, and tried it out to the student-teachers. Final version will be significant after meeting all the demands.

6. REFERENCES

Abdalla, I. (2021). Difficulties in using correct English prepositions among EFL students. *Journal of English Educators Society*, *6*(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i2.1640

Al-khasawneh, F. M. (2014). Error analysis of written English paragraphs by Jordanian undergraduate students: A case study. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, *11*(8), 85–100. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Fadi_Al-Khasawneh/publication/281864190_Error_Analysis_of_Written_English_Paragraphs_by_Jordanian_Undergraduate_Students_A_Case_Study/links/55fc3fb808aeafc8ac442957/Error-Analysis-of-Written-English-Paragraphs-by-Jorda

Al-khresheh, M. H. (2016). A review study of error analysis theory. *Journal of Advances in Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(6), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.20474/jahss-2.6.5

Alahmadi, N. (2019). A study of grammatical errors of subject verb agreement in writing made by Saudi learners. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *7*(6), 48–59. https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/A-Study-of-Grammatical-Errors-of-Subject-Verb-Agreement-in-Writing-Made-By-Saudi-Learners.pdf

Alhaisoni, E., Gaudel, D. R., & Al-Zuoud, K. M. (2017). Article errors in the English writing of Saudi EFL preparatory year students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(1), 72–78. https://doi.org/10.7575/AIAC.ALLS.V.8N.1P.72

Andarwati. (2004). Chomsky ' s school of linguistics. *Ulul Albab*, *5*(1). https://ejournal.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/ululalbab/article/download/6145/6795

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., Razavieh, A., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Nelson Education, ltd.

Ashwell, T. I. M. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom : Is content feedback followed by form feedback the est method ? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 227–257.

Abdalla, I. (2021). Difficulties in using correct English prepositions among EFL students. *Journal of English Educators Society*, *6*(2), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v6i2.1640

Al-khasawneh, F. M. (2014). Error analysis of written English paragraphs by Jordanian

undergraduate students: A case study. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, *11*(8), 85–100. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Fadi_Al-Khasawneh/publication/281864190_Error_Analysis_of_Written_English_Paragraphs_by_Jordanian_Undergraduate_Students_A_Case_Study/links/55fc3fb808aeafc8ac442957/Error-Analysis-of-Written-English-Paragraphs-by-Jorda

Al-khresheh, M. H. (2016). A review study of error analysis theory. *Journal of Advances in Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(6), 49–59. https://doi.org/10.20474/jahss-2.6.5

Alahmadi, N. (2019). A study of grammatical errors of subject verb agreement in writing made by Saudi learners. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, *7*(6), 48–59. https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/A-Study-of-Grammatical-Errors-of-Subject-Verb-Agreement-in-Writing-Made-By-Saudi-Learners.pdf

Alhaisoni, E., Gaudel, D. R., & Al-Zuoud, K. M. (2017). Article errors in the English writing of Saudi EFL preparatory year students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(1), 72–78. https://doi.org/10.7575/AIAC.ALLS.V.8N.1P.72

Andarwati. (2004). Chomsky ' s school of linguistics. *Ulul Albab*, *5*(1). https://ejournal.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/ululalbab/article/download/6145/6795

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., Razavieh, A., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Nelson Education, ltd.

Ashwell, T. I. M. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom : Is content feedback followed by form feedback the est method ? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 227–257.

Assarroudi, A. (2018). Directed qualitative content analysis : the description and elaboration of its underpinning methods and data analysis process. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, *23*(1), 42–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987117741667

Ayuningsih, A., Ali, S. W., & Malabar, F. (2020). Faulty parallel structure in students' writing. *TRANS-KATA: Journal of Language, Literature, Culture, and Education.*, *1*(1), 14–21. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.54923/transkata.v1i1.5

Azar, B. S., & Azar, D. A. (1999). *Fundamentals of English Grammar - Workbook* (2nd ed.). Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Azar, B. S., & Hagen, S. A. (2006). *Basic English Grammar* (3rd ed.). Person Education.

Aziz, Z. A., Fitriani, S. S., & Amalina, Z. (2020). Linguistic errors made by Islamic university EFL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(3), 733–745. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i3.23224

Babanoğlu, M. P. (2017). A corpus-based study on the use of contractions by EFL Learners in argumentative essays. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *6*(2), 56. https://doi.org/10.7575/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.56

Bak, N. (2013). *Guide to academic writing*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236229397_Guide_to_Academic_Writinghttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/236229397_Guide_to_Academic_Writing

Barcroft, J., & Wong, W. (2013). Input, input processing and focus on form. In J. Herschensohn & M. Young-Scholten (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of second language Acquisition* (p. 842). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139051729

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Written-Corrective-Feedback-in-Second-Language-Acquisition-and-Writing/Bitchener-Ferris/p/book/9780415872447

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008a). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and

international students. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 409– 431. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008b). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 409– 431. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924

Boardman, C. A., & Frydenberg, J. (2002). *Writing to communicate: Paragraphs and essays* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Boonyarattanasoontorn, P. (2017). An investigation of Thai students' English language writing difficulties and their use of writing strategies. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *2*(2), 111–119. https://doi.org/10.26500/jarssh-02-2017-0205

Brown, D. H. (2006). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_347

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Longman.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Pearson education, Inc.

Burt, M., & Kiparsky, C. (1972). *The gooficon: A repair manual for English*. Newbury House.

Chandra, J. (2017). An analysis of grammatical errors in EFL college students' proposal thesis writing. *Proceeding 1 St ICoLTE*, 185–193.

Chen, C. (2020). A study on positive transfer of native language and second language teaching methods. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *10*(3), 306. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1003.06

Coday, J. (1997). L2 vocabulary acquisition through extensive reading. In J. Coday & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second Language vocabulary acquisition: A Rationale for pedagogy* (p. 297). Cambridge University Pres.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Hodder Education.

Corder, S. . (1967). The significance of learner errors. *International Review of Apllied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *5*(4), 161–170.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press. https://www.academia.edu/23088670/Error_Analysis_and_Interlanguage

Cox, C. (2013). *Teaching language arts: A student- and response-centered classroom*. Pearso Allyn & Bacon. https://www.google.com/books/edition/_/mg2uMgEACAAJ?sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi9h4W_n9f9AhX-U2wGHd5iD-AQre8FegQIDxAI

Cui, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2021). Peer feedback and teacher feedback : a comparative study of revision e ff ectiveness in writing instruction for EFL learners. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *0*(0), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2021.1969541

Dawson, C. (2009). *Inroduction to reseach methods: A practical guide for anyone undertaking a research report* (4th ed.). How To Books Ltd.

Decapua, A. (2008). Grammar for teachers: A guide to American English for native and non-native speakers. In *Grammar for Teachers: A Guide to American English for Native and Non-Native Speakers*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-76332-3

Denzilveigas, A., & Wilson, D. D. (2021). Grammatical errors among L2 learners at the undergraduate level. *Annals of R.S.C.B*, *25*(1), 5621–5635.

Dinamika, S. G. (2020). Grammatical errors in undergraduate thesis abstracts. *International Seminar on Language, Education, and Culture*, 53–56.

Dinamika, S. G. (2021). Grammatical errors in the thesis absracts written by the undergraduate students. *Journal of Applied Limguistics and Literature*, *6*(1), 72–86. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.33369/joall.v6i1.12443

Dinamika, S. G., & Siregar, E. B. A. (2020). A morphological error analysis of students' written reports on Indonesia's 2014 presidential election. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *7*(1), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v7i1.16978

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

Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring literacy in a second language: The effect of book-based programs. *Language Learning*, *41*, 375-411.

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

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*(2), 11.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J., & Reinders, H. (2009). *Implicit and Explicit Knowwledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching*. Short Run Press Ltd.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796580

Elo, S., & Kyng, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis. *Journal of Advanced Nursing ·*, *62*(1), 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x

Emak, L., & Ismail, H. H. (2021). Incorporating reading in writing classes and its Effects on ESL learners' writing. *Creative Education*, *12*(8), 1949–1962. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.128149

Ene, E., & Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *41*(May), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2018.05.005

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203137093

Gay, L. R., & Geoffrey E. Mills. (2018). *Educational Research Competencies for analysis and application* (12th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Gilquin, G., & Granger, S. (2015). Learner language. In D. Biber & R. Reppen (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of English Corpus Linguistics* (pp. 418–436). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1007/9781139764377.024

Glaser, J., & Lauder, G. (2013). Life with and without coding: Two methods for early-stage data analysis in qualitative research aiming at causal explanations. *Forum:Qualitative Social Research*, *14*(2), 1–24. http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1886/3528%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2014.10.008

Gunner, J. (2022). *Coordinating conjunctions: Essential joining words*. https://grammar.yourdictionary.com/parts-of-speech/conjunctions/coordinating-conjunctions.html

Han, Z., & Tarone, E. (Eds.). (2014). *Interlanguage: Forty years later*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Handayani, R., Ihsan, D., & Mirizon, S. (2019). Interlanguage analysis of syntactic and diction errors found in theses written by magister students. *International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching*, *3*(1), 102–116. https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.2019.030110

Harl, A. L. (2013). A Historical and Theoretical Review of the Literature: Reading and Writing Connections. In A. S. Horning & E. W. Kraemer (Eds.), *Reconnecting Reading & Writing*.

Parlor Press and The WAC Clearinghouse.
https://wac.colostate.edu/docs/books/reconnecting/reading.pdf

Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing. Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hinkel, E. (2015). *Effective curriculum for teaching L2 writing: Principles and techniques*. Taylor & Francis.
https://www.google.co.id/books/edition/Effective_Curriculum_for_Teaching_L2_Wri/_2XA BgAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=Grammar+instruction+at+high+intermediate+and+advance d+levels+can+focus+on+structures+from+beginning+academic+textbooks&pg=PA229&pri ntsec=frontcover

Hojeij, Z., & Hurley, Z. (2017). The Triple Flip : Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing The Triple Flip : Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Article*, *11*(1).

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students ' Writing Skill. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 668–674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466

Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Iwanaka, T., & Takatsuka, S. (2007). lnfluences of Attention and Noticing on Second Language Acqulsltlon. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, *17*, 21–30.

James, C. (2013). *Errors in language learning and use : Exploring error analysis*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315842912/errors-language-learning-use-carl-james

Jin, Y., & Yang, M. (2020). A study of three variants of gerund construction from the contrastive perspective of social and natural academic abstracts on construction grammar theory. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 219–230. https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2020-0014

Johnson, K. (2005). *Expertise in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. Palgrave macmillan.

Johnson, K. (2017). *An introduction to foreign language learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315734675

Jufrizal, & Refnita, L. (2021). Gerund in English : A morpho-semantic note for EFL learners in Indonesia. *Lingua Didaktika*, *15*(1), 83–97. https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v15i1.114512

e present tense by using interlanguage analysis as an approach. A case study. *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, *1*(1), 77–94. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v1i1.1196

Pipit, M. (2019). The Expression of English Linguistic Time through Simple Past Tense by Indonesian Learners. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, *254*(Conaplin 2018), 202–205. https://doi.org/10.2991/conaplin-18.2019.41

Politzer, R., & Ramirez, A. (1973). An error analysis of the spoken English of Mexican-American pupils in a bilingual school and monolingual school. *Language Learning*, *23*(1).

Purnomo, W. W., Basthomi, Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2021). *EFL university teachers ' perspectives in written corrective feedback and their actual applications*. *10*(3), 1089–1099. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i3.21641

Putri, D. M., Christina, D., & Amna, S. (2022). Analysis of Sentence Fragments In Students ' Academic Writing Task of English Department. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, *6*(2), 10605–10615.

Sugeng, B. (2016). Common grammatical errors in the use of English as a foreign

Vanpatten, B., & Benati, A. G. (2015). *Key Terms in Second Language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Publishinh Plc.

Walizer, M. ., & Wiener, P. . (1990). *Research method and analysis: Searching for relationship*. Harper and Row.

Weaver, C. (1979). *Grammar for teachers: perspectives and definitions*. National Council of Teachers of English.

White, M. G. (n.d.). *Parallel structure examples*. Retrieved December 5, 2022, from https://examples.yourdictionary.com/parallel-structure-examples.html

Wijesinghe, W. (2020). Undergraduate writing errors in English in a generative syntactic perspective. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Review*, *5*(1), 47. https://doi.org/10.4038/jsshr.v5i1.50

Wilson, L. O. (2016). *Anderson and krathwohl Bloom ' s taxonomy revised*. https://quincycollege.edu/wp-content/uploads/Anderson-and-Krathwohl_Revised-Blooms-Taxonomy.pdf

Wood, J. (2021). Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education Making peer feedback work : the contribution of technology-mediated dialogic peer feedback to feedback uptake and literacy Making peer feedback work : the contribution of. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *0*(0), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1914544

Wu, H., & Garza, E. V. (2014). Types and attributes of English writing errors in the EFL context—A study of error analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(6), 1256–1262. http://www.academypublication.com/ojs/index.php/jltr/article/view/jltr060612571268/452%0Ahttps://www.mendeley.com/catalogue/dca028ce-4a98-36be-97c1-dcd6d6336f5b/

Wulandari, I. (2014). Grammatical errors found in articles' abstarcts of Indonesiaan scholarly journals. *JEELS*, *1*, 12–30.

Xavier, C. A., Hong, H. M., & Renandya, W. A. (2020). Grammar in Writing : Teachers ' Reflections. *PASAA*, *60*(December), 199–221.

Yang, X. (2019). A review of negative language transfer regarding the errors in english writing in chinese colleges. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *10*, 603–609. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1003.24

Young, D. J. (1984). *Introducing English grammar*. Century Hutchinson Ltd.

Yule, G. (2006). *The Study of Language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Pres.

Yuliarsih, & Amalia, L. (2022). An analysis of sentence fragment found in students ' writing paragraph. *SELL Journal*, *7*(2), 122–133.

Yusuf, F., & Jumriana. (2015). Syntactical errors made by the students in writing thesis. *English and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 16–30.