


GRAMMATICAL OMISSION IN ENGLISH DESCRIPTIVE TEXTS: INSIGHTS FROM SECOND SEMESTER EFL LEARNERS

Ekka Zahra Puspita Dewi^{*1}, Siti Ngaisah², Salma Hira³,

Anugrah Adi Muliawan⁴, Darmanto Darmanto⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}, Universitas Madani Indonesia, Blitar, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: zahradewi@umina.ac.id

<p>Info Article</p> <p>Received : 16 April 2025</p> <p>Revised : 10 Mei 2025</p> <p>Accepted : 27 Juni 2025</p> <p>Publication : 30 Juni 2025</p>	<p>Abstract. <i>This study investigates grammatical omission errors in descriptive writing by second-semester EFL students at Madani Indonesia University. Using a descriptive qualitative approach, the research analyzed 45 student-written essays from a mid-term exam. Data were examined using Surface Strategy Taxonomy, focusing specifically on omission errors. The results revealed 239 total omission errors categorized into five types: articles (33.05%), pluralization (21.75%), punctuation (21.33%), verb phrases (12.97%), and conjunctions (10.87%). Article omission emerged as the most frequent. These errors often disrupted clarity, coherence, and grammatical accuracy. Findings highlight the influence of L1 interference and a limited grasp of basic grammar rules. The study underscores the need for focused instruction on articles, plurality, and structure to enhance students' English writing accuracy and fluency.</i></p>
<p>Keywords: Omission Errors, EFL Students, Descriptive Text.</p> <p>Kata Kunci: Kesalahan Penghilangan, Mahasiswa EFL, Teks Deskriptif.</p>	<p>Abstrak: Penelitian ini mengkaji kesalahan penghilangan unsur gramatikal dalam penulisan deskriptif oleh mahasiswa EFL semester kedua di Universitas Madani Indonesia. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif, penelitian ini menganalisis 45 esai yang ditulis mahasiswa dalam ujian tengah semester. Data dianalisis menggunakan Taksonomi Strategi Permukaan (Surface Strategy Taxonomy) dengan fokus khusus pada kesalahan penghilangan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan terdapat 239 kesalahan penghilangan yang diklasifikasikan ke dalam lima jenis: artikel (33,05%), pluralisasi (21,75%), tanda baca (21,33%), frasa verba (12,97%), dan konjungsi (10,87%). Penghilangan artikel merupakan kesalahan yang paling sering muncul. Kesalahan-kesalahan ini sering mengganggu kejelasan, koherensi, dan ketepatan gramatikal. Temuan ini menyoroti pengaruh interferensi bahasa pertama (L1) dan lemahnya pemahaman terhadap aturan dasar tata bahasa. Studi ini menekankan pentingnya pengajaran yang terfokus pada artikel, bentuk jamak, dan struktur kalimat untuk meningkatkan akurasi dan kefasihan menulis bahasa Inggris mahasiswa.</p>
<p>Licensed Under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License</p> 	

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a pivotal skill in learning English, classified as a productive skill alongside speaking. Mastering writing is essential to measure how well language learners can apply their knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and structure in coherent and meaningful ways. Unlike receptive skills such as reading and listening, writing requires active construction of language, making it a complex and integrative process. Improving writing skills is crucial because students need to express their knowledge, ideas, and feelings clearly through written text (Asiah et al., 2020). Through writing, learners also develop their ability to organize thoughts, present logical arguments, and support opinions with appropriate language use. In this way, critical thinking, articulating ideas, and conveying emotions effectively are among the core competencies that sharpen students' intellectual and communicative abilities, both academically and professionally.

In the era of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and advanced technologies like ChatGPT, where humans are increasingly reliant on AI for various aspects of life—including communication, content creation, and decision-making—the ability to think critically is often called into question. As AI tools become more accessible and integrated into everyday tasks, there is a growing concern that students may rely too heavily on these technologies, potentially diminishing their independent thinking and problem-solving abilities. Training students in writing can serve as a counterbalance to these concerns by fostering original thought, personal expression, and analytical reasoning.

Through writing, learners are encouraged to reflect, evaluate, and construct their own arguments—skills that cannot be outsourced to machines. Therefore, writing remains essential for maintaining students' intellectual autonomy and humanity. Moreover, writing critically aligns with the Indonesian government's literacy program (Zahra et al., 2021), which promotes the development of literate individuals who are capable of filtering, interpreting, and responding wisely to the overwhelming flow of information from social and global media. In this context, strengthening students' writing abilities is not only a linguistic goal but also a societal necessity in building a thoughtful and discerning generation.

In writing practice, learners produce various types of texts such as paragraphs, essays, messages, emails, and other written forms of communication. These tasks not only serve academic purposes but also prepare students for real-world communication in both professional and personal contexts. The writing process involves several

interconnected aspects, including critical thinking, vocabulary selection, grammatical accuracy, coherence, cohesion, and idea organization. It demands that learners plan, draft, revise, and edit their work to ensure clarity and effectiveness. Compared to other language skills—such as reading, speaking, and listening—writing is arguably the most difficult to master due to its complexity and the cognitive load it imposes. Writing requires the integration of multiple language components and skills simultaneously (Daulay & Asrul, 2021), making it a challenging yet essential component of language learning.

Furthermore, writing is not merely about forming grammatically correct sentences; it is fundamentally a form of communication that reflects the writer's ability to express thoughts, convey emotions, and present arguments clearly and persuasively (Rixha et al., 2021). For English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, this means considering not only what they want to say but also how to say it in a way that is understandable and appropriate for the target audience. Poor writing can lead to ambiguity or misunderstanding, which can hinder effective communication. Therefore, developing writing proficiency is crucial for learners to become competent, confident communicators in academic and global contexts.

One of the text types learned by EFL learners is descriptive text. In general, description refers to portraying an object, place, person, or concept through words. Descriptive text can be defined as a text that depicts people, objects, or places in detail. According to Purnamasari et al. (2021), descriptive text provides detailed information about the subject, including animals, objects, people, or locations. For an effective description, the text should include sufficient and varied elaboration of details to convey a clear image of the subject (Yoandita in Daulay & Asrul, 2021). Descriptive texts present vivid imagery, enabling readers to imagine the physical and character traits of a person, such as height, weight, skin tone, hair color, and personality. When describing a place, the text might elaborate on elements such as wall color, furniture arrangement, and other features in detail.

Descriptive texts must follow a generic structure: the identification section introduces the subject in general terms, while the description section elaborates on its specific characteristics, such as appearance, qualities, functions, or behaviors. This structure helps readers understand the subject clearly and logically. In addition to following this format, writing a descriptive text requires various elements to meet the standards of effective writing. These include the use of precise and vivid vocabulary,

logical organization, coherence between sentences, and appropriate transitions. Alongside these, the correct use of grammar is essential for ensuring that ideas are conveyed accurately and professionally. As noted by Purnamasari et al. (2021), descriptive texts typically employ simple present tense because they describe facts or habitual actions. Therefore, writers must understand and consistently apply the correct grammatical forms associated with this tense, including subject-verb agreement and appropriate verb usage.

Grammar remains one of the most persistent challenges in writing for non-native speakers. This is largely due to fundamental structural differences between their first language (L1) and English as a second language (L2). These differences can result in transfer errors—where rules or habits from the learner’s native language influence their English usage—leading to mistakes in tense, article usage, pluralization, and sentence structure. Such errors are particularly evident in descriptive writing, where consistency and clarity are vital. To address these challenges, it is important for language instruction to emphasize both grammatical rules and their application within meaningful contexts, helping learners internalize correct patterns through guided practice and feedback.

Dulay’s Surface Strategy Taxonomy emphasizes how grammar structures in sentences or utterances are altered due to learners’ interlanguage development and limited mastery of target language rules (Esmalde, 2020). This taxonomy highlights not just the presence of errors but the specific strategies learners use—consciously or unconsciously—when constructing language. Learners may omit essential elements, add unnecessary parts, or misform and misorder components, each reflecting different cognitive processing challenges.

The four categories include: (1) Omission, which refers to the absence of necessary elements such as articles, auxiliaries, or verb markers, often resulting in grammatically incomplete or ambiguous sentences that hinder meaning or disrupt syntactic structure; (2) Addition, which is the inclusion of superfluous elements not required by English grammar, such as double markings or redundant auxiliaries; (3) Misformation, where incorrect forms are used in place of correct ones. These are further classified into regularization (applying regular rules to irregular forms), archi-forms (use of a single form to represent several), and alternating forms (random switching between forms); and (4) Misordering, which involves incorrect placement of sentence elements, such as adjectives following nouns or auxiliary verbs placed out of sequence.

Previous studies have extensively investigated grammatical errors in students' writing, highlighting omission as one of the most prevalent types. For instance, Islam & Mufidah (2022) analyzed writing tasks by second-grade students at Islamic Senior High School Nurul Jadid. From 26 student samples, they identified 155 errors, with omission accounting for the highest proportion at 44%, followed by addition (27%), misformation (23%), and misordering (6%). Their findings emphasized the importance of addressing recurring student errors in grammar instruction, particularly those related to missing linguistic components, which can significantly hinder clarity and comprehension.

Another notable study by Zulfariati (2021) focused exclusively on omission errors, excluding the other categories defined in the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. This study found that omissions of critical grammatical elements—such as head nouns, subjects, and verbs—frequently led to distorted meanings and reduced the overall quality of students' theses. Such omissions disrupted the syntactic and semantic integrity of sentences, making it difficult for readers to understand the intended message. These findings underscore the pedagogical urgency of emphasizing grammar awareness, especially in higher education settings, where academic writing standards are more rigorous. Both studies contribute to a growing body of research that confirms omission errors as a persistent challenge for EFL learners, necessitating more focused and corrective strategies in the language learning process.

Harefa & Laoli (2022) examined descriptive writing by 10th-grade students in the Agriculture Department of SMK Negeri 1 Gunungsitoli Alo'oa. They found 26.53% omission errors, 57.14% misformation, 6.12% misordering, and 10.21% addition errors. Kadiatmaja (2021) analyzed errors in students' writing compositions, particularly focusing on passive voice. The study examined texts written by 16 ESP students from the Arabic Department at STAI Ali bin Abi Thalib Surabaya. The most frequent error type was omission (51.06%), followed by addition (31.96%), misordering (10.64%), and misformation (6.38%). Nurhamidah (2021) analyzed the misuse of prepositions of place—in, on, and at—among junior high school students. Results showed 35 errors with 'in', 14 with 'on', and 12 with 'at', indicating 'in' as the most commonly misused preposition. Research shows that structural differences between L1 and L2 contribute significantly to these errors. Therefore, this study aims to analyze grammatical errors focusing on omission errors in students' writing of Madani Indonesia University.

METHOD

The current study employed a descriptive qualitative research method to explore the grammatical omission errors in the descriptive writing of second-semester university students. Descriptive qualitative research aims to provide in-depth understanding through systematic observation, interpretation, and categorization of real-world data. According to Fitria (2022), the primary objectives of this method are description, comprehension, and interpretation, which align with the study's aim to investigate and interpret patterns of omission errors in student writing. This research design was selected because it allows for a detailed analysis of linguistic phenomena within authentic student-produced texts. The researchers observed the contextual and functional use of language, particularly in how learners omitted essential grammatical components in English writing. The study did not attempt to manipulate variables or test hypotheses but rather sought to describe the nature and frequency of omission errors found in the students' written outputs.

The data source comprised written descriptive text assignments collected from students of the Faculty of Education at Madani Indonesia University, during the even semester of the 2025 academic year. The assignment was part of the Bahasa Inggris course, specifically the mid-term examination conducted on April 29, 2025. Each student was instructed to write a descriptive essay based on a topic assigned by the lecturer. These essays were written under exam conditions, ensuring that the work was authentically produced by the students without external assistance. A total of 45 student papers were collected and analyzed, corresponding to the entire second-semester student cohort enrolled in the course.

For the analysis of grammatical errors, the researchers adopted the Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST) developed by Bialystok et al., 1983. SST classifies grammatical errors into four types: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. However, the present study focused exclusively on omission errors, defined as the absence of necessary grammatical elements such as articles, plural markers, conjunctions, verb phrases, or punctuation. The decision to focus solely on omission was based on the observed frequency and pedagogical significance of these errors in EFL writing. The data analysis procedure included two main stages: classification and quantification. Each student's essay was read carefully, and omission errors were identified. The errors were then grouped into five linguistic categories: omission of articles, conjunctions, punctuation, verb phrases, and pluralization. Frequencies and

percentages were calculated to determine the most common types of omission errors, which were then interpreted in relation to student performance and linguistic competence. The findings are presented and discussed in the subsequent section.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 2 presents the distribution of omission errors found in the students' writing tasks, categorized into five linguistic types. Out of 239 total omission errors, the most frequent was the omission of articles, with 79 instances (33.1%). The second highest category was the omission of pluralization (52 errors, 21.7%), followed closely by punctuation errors (51 errors, 21.3%). The omission of verb phrases accounted for 31 errors (12.9%), while conjunction omission was the least frequent (26 errors, 11%).

Table 1. Omission Errors

No	Linguistic Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Omission of Articles	79	33.05
2	Omission of Conjunction	26	10.87
3	Omission of Punctuation	51	21.33
4	Omission of Verb Phrases	31	12.97
5	Omission of Pluralization	52	21.75
Total		239	100

Source: Processed Data

Omission of articles was the most common grammatical error found in the students' writing tasks, with a total of 79 errors, accounting for 33.1% of all omission errors.

- (1). My hobby is reading novels and book such as textbooks.
- (2). I have house in Blitar City.

Example (1) contains two omission errors: the first is the omission of an article, and the second is the omission of a plural marker. The initial error involves the absence of an article before the singular countable noun "book." In English grammar, singular countable nouns generally require an article (either a, an, or the) when used in isolation. Therefore, the phrase should include the indefinite article "a" to form "a book." The corrected sentence would be "My hobby is reading novels and a book..." However, when considering the broader context of the sentence—especially with the plural noun "novels"—it is likely that the writer intended to refer to multiple types of reading materials. This suggests that the noun "book" should be pluralized. Thus, the more appropriate revision would be "My hobby is reading novels and books such as

textbooks.” This version reflects both grammatical accuracy and clarity in meaning, aligning the noun “books” with the already plural subject “novels.”

Meanwhile, example (2) contains a similar type of omission, specifically the omission of an article before the noun “house.” In this sentence, the noun “house” is a singular, countable noun and, therefore, requires an article. The indefinite article “a” is appropriate here, as the sentence refers to a non-specific house. The corrected sentence should read: “I have a house in Blitar City.” This correction not only aligns with grammatical rules but also ensures the sentence is natural and contextually appropriate in English. Both examples illustrate how omission of basic grammatical elements such as articles and plural markers can significantly affect sentence structure and meaning. These types of errors are particularly common among EFL learners due to differences in how articles and pluralization are used—or not used—in their first languages. Addressing these omission errors through explicit grammar instruction and context-based writing exercises can help learners develop greater accuracy and fluency in their English writing.

(3). I studied in my hometown, finally study in Blitar now.

(4). *She likes to go to beach, park, forest.*

Example (3) contains two grammatical errors: the omission of a conjunction and the semantic misuse of the verb “study.” The original sentence, “I studied in my hometown, finally study in Blitar now,” lacks clarity and fluency due to improper sentence structure. The two clauses are not properly connected, making the transition from past to present action awkward. To improve this, the coordinating conjunction “and” should be inserted after the comma to link the past action with the current situation. Moreover, the verb “study” should be changed to the present continuous form “am studying” to express an ongoing action at the present time. This also aligns with subject-verb agreement and proper tense usage. The fully revised sentence is “I studied in my hometown, and now I am studying in Blitar.” This correction enhances the logical flow of the sentence and maintains proper tense consistency. The sentence begins with a completed action in the past (“studied”) and transitions into a current, ongoing situation (“am studying”), clearly showing the student’s educational journey. Such errors often occur when learners attempt to express time relationships without a full understanding of tense shifts and clause linking, which are essential components of academic writing in English.

Example (4) also includes two significant errors referring to the omission of a conjunction and the omission of a definite article. The original sentence, “She likes to go to beach, park, forest,” lacks fluency and completeness. First, the noun “beach” should be preceded by the article “the,” as it refers to a general but identifiable location. Similarly, while “park” and “forest” do not necessarily require repetition of the article, the list should be completed with a coordinating conjunction “and” before the final item (“forest”) to follow proper English listing conventions. The corrected sentence would be “She likes to go to the beach, park, and forest.” This version adheres to grammatical rules and improves readability. Such articles and conjunction omissions are common in EFL writing, especially for learners whose first languages do not use articles or employ different syntactic rules for listing items. This example highlights the need for learners to understand not only the forms of articles and conjunctions but also their functions in structuring clear and grammatically sound sentences.

(5). the town has culinary places[] the cooking are delicious

(6). *blitar is calm city not crowded and people it so friendly*

Example (5) contains several grammatical and structural errors that impact both clarity and accuracy. First, the sentence begins with the word “the”, which should be capitalized to “The” as it starts a new sentence. There is also an omission of punctuation, as the sentence lacks a full stop after the word “places” and again after “delicious”. This omission creates a run-on sentence, making it difficult for the reader to identify where one idea ends and another begins. Additionally, the phrase “has culinary places” requires an article or determiner to make it grammatically correct. In this context, inserting “some” after “has” would be appropriate, yielding “has some culinary places.” Moreover, the word “cooking” is a misformation error; while grammatically correct in other contexts, “cooking” does not accurately function as the subject of the second clause in this sentence. The intended meaning suggests “meals” or “dishes,” which are more precise and semantically appropriate. The corrected sentence could be expressed in two ways belonging to “The town has some culinary places. The meals are delicious,” or, if the writer wishes to express a single compound sentence, it would be “The town has some culinary places where the meals are delicious.” These revisions ensure subject-verb agreement, article usage, and logical sentence flow.

Example (6) also demonstrates multiple issues involving capitalization, omission of articles and linking verbs, and lack of punctuation. The word “blitar” should be capitalized as “Blitar” because it is a proper noun referring to a place. The phrase “is

calm city not crowded” is grammatically incomplete due to the omission of the article “a” before “calm city” and the missing conjunction or linking structure between clauses. In addition, the phrase “and people it so friendly” is grammatically incorrect. It lacks a linking verb (“are”), and the subject “people” should not be followed by “it.” These errors disrupt the overall coherence and correctness of the sentence. The original sentence attempts to express three distinct ideas: Blitar is calm, it is not crowded, and the people are friendly. These should be clearly structured and punctuated. A grammatically accurate and semantically clear revision would be “Blitar is a calm and uncrowded city, and the people are very friendly.” This version includes the correct use of articles, conjunctions, and linking verbs, while presenting a clear and cohesive description of the town. Errors such as these are common among EFL learners, especially when they attempt to combine multiple ideas without a solid grasp of sentence structure. Through targeted instruction in sentence coordination and grammatical accuracy, students can improve the fluency and professionalism of their written English.

(7). I’ll say read everything in English.

(8). My neighbors have park, but we didn’t for pond.

Example (7), “I’ll say read everything in English,” presents two notable grammatical issues: misuse of contraction and incorrect verb form. The contraction “I’ll” (short for “I will”) is generally acceptable in informal communication, but in formal or academic writing, contractions should be avoided. Therefore, it should be written in its full form as “I will.” This is considered a word form error, categorized under misformation, since the form is inappropriate for the context. Secondly, the verb “read” in this sentence should take the gerund form “reading”, as it functions as a noun—the object of the verb “say”. Without this correction, the sentence lacks grammatical coherence, especially in expressing an intention or suggestion. The revised sentence should be “I will say reading everything in English.” However, even this version remains slightly awkward in academic writing. A clearer and more natural revision would be “I would suggest reading everything in English.” This version not only corrects the grammar but also aligns better with formal academic tone and clarity.

Example (8), “My neighbors have park, but we didn’t for pond,” contains several grammatical flaws affecting both structure and meaning. First, the noun “park” requires the indefinite article “a” before it, since it is a singular, countable noun. The corrected phrase should be “a park.” Second, the phrase “we didn’t for pond” is ungrammatical due to the omission of the main verb “have” after the auxiliary “didn’t.” This results in

a fragmented clause. Furthermore, the preposition “for” is unnecessary and incorrect in this context, as it adds confusion rather than contributing meaning. To correct these issues, the sentence should be revised to “My neighbors have a park, but we did not have a pond.” This version includes appropriate article usage, correct verb structure (“did not have”), and eliminates redundant elements. This kind of error reflects common challenges among EFL learners, especially in forming negative sentences with auxiliary verbs and maintaining parallel structure between coordinated clauses. Providing learners with targeted instruction on verb auxiliaries and article-noun agreement can significantly improve sentence formation and overall coherence in writing.

(9). *My sister love pet. [She has cat, fish and rabbit.]*

(10). *Penataran Temple has many temple there.*

Example (9), “My sister love pet. [She has cat, fish and rabbit.], contains several grammatical errors related to subject-verb agreement, pluralization, and article omission. Firstly, the verb “love” should be conjugated to match the third person singular subject “my sister” by adding the suffix “-s”, forming “loves.” This is a common subject-verb agreement error among EFL learners. Secondly, the noun “pet” should be pluralized as “pets” to correspond with the meaning implied in the next sentence, which lists multiple animals. In the second sentence, the omission of articles before “cat,” “fish,” and “rabbit” also disrupts grammatical accuracy and natural sentence flow. In English, singular countable nouns typically require an article such as “a” or “some” when generalized. Additionally, since the sentence implies ownership of more than one pet, it would be more appropriate to pluralize these animal nouns if they are meant in general or multiple form. Therefore, a fully corrected and natural version of the sentence could be “My sister loves pets. She has a cat, a fish, and a rabbit.” or, to reflect plural intent, it could be “My sister loves pets. She has some cats, fish, and rabbits.” It is important to note that “fish” can be either singular or plural, depending on context, but in this sentence, it is acceptable as plural without the “-es” suffix.

Example (10), “Penataran Temple has many temple there,” presents a pluralization error that is directly tied to quantifier-noun agreement. The word “many” is a quantifier that requires a plural countable noun, so “temple” must be pluralized to “temples.” This is a straightforward morphological omission of the suffix “-s.” Additionally, the use of “there” at the end of the sentence is somewhat redundant and may be omitted entirely unless used for emphasis or clarity of location. A more concise and grammatically accurate revision would be “Penataran Temple has many temples.”

Alternatively, if the speaker intends to emphasize the location, the sentence could read “There are many temples at Penataran Temple complex.” These examples highlight frequent challenges faced by EFL learners, particularly those stemming from L1 interference, limited exposure to plural forms, and uncertainty around article usage. Emphasizing these aspects in instruction, especially within descriptive writing tasks, can greatly enhance learners’ grammatical competence and written expression.

CONCLUSION

These findings highlight specific areas of grammatical weakness among the students, particularly in the use of articles, punctuation, and plural forms. The prevalence of omission errors suggests a need for focused instruction and practice in these aspects of grammar. Understanding the types and frequencies of these errors can help educators design more effective learning strategies, exercises, and feedback to support students in developing greater grammatical accuracy in their writing. This also reinforces the importance of explicit grammar instruction in EFL writing classrooms.

This study identified and analyzed omission errors in the descriptive writing of EFL students, focusing specifically on grammatical aspects based on Dulay’s Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The results revealed that out of 239 total omission errors, the most frequent were related to the omission of articles (33.05%), followed by pluralization (21.87%), punctuation (21.33%), verb phrases (12.97%), and conjunctions (10.87%). These findings underscore the persistent challenges EFL learners face when constructing grammatically accurate sentences, especially within the context of academic writing. The frequency and variety of errors indicate the need for more targeted grammar instruction and support in writing development.

Examples from students’ writing further illustrate how such omission errors disrupt clarity and coherence. In cases like “My hobby is reading novels and book such as textbooks,” both article and plural marker omissions resulted in grammatically incorrect phrases that could obscure meaning. Similarly, sentences such as “I have house in Blitar City” reflect the lack of awareness regarding article use with singular countable nouns. These examples emphasize the impact of even minor omissions on the overall comprehensibility and professionalism of student writing. Additionally, errors involving omitted conjunctions and misuse of tenses, such as in “I studied in my hometown, finally study in Blitar now,” reveal deeper issues in clause connection and tense consistency. Inadequate use of punctuation and omission of linking devices often lead to fragmented

or run-on sentences, as seen in “the town has culinary places the cooking are delicious.” These types of structural issues not only affect grammar but also hinder logical progression and clarity of ideas in student writing.

Furthermore, subject-verb agreement errors, such as “My sister love pet,” alongside article and pluralization issues, highlight how foundational grammar rules are frequently overlooked or misunderstood by EFL learners. These errors are compounded by first language interference and insufficient exposure to authentic English usage. Quantifier-noun mismatches, like “many temple,” indicate that morphological accuracy (e.g., use of suffixes like –s) remains a major hurdle. As seen throughout the data, these seemingly simple errors have complex underlying causes tied to learners’ syntactic awareness and language transfer.

In light of these findings, it is essential for EFL instructors to emphasize both form and function in grammar instruction. Providing contextualized practice that reinforces article usage, subject-verb agreement, conjunctions, punctuation, and pluralization will equip learners with the tools to produce clearer, more coherent writing. Additionally, integrating error analysis into the learning process allows students to recognize patterns in their own mistakes and apply corrective strategies. Ultimately, consistent feedback, grammar-focused activities, and awareness of common omission types can contribute significantly to improving the grammatical competence of EFL students in their academic writing. This approach not only enhances linguistic accuracy but also builds learners’ confidence in expressing complex ideas in English. As students become more aware of their grammatical choices, their overall writing fluency and critical thinking skills are also likely to improve.

REFERENCES

- Asiah, N., Ardian, E., & Amri, S. (2020). A STUDY ON THE STUDENTS’ FACTOR DIFFICULTY IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT AT VIII GRADE OF MTS SABILAL MUHTADIN TEMBILAHAN. *J-Shelves of Indragiri (JSI)*, 1(2), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.32520/jsi.v1i2.1057>
- Bialystok, E., Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1983). *LANGUAGE TWO. IN THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/327086>
- Daulay, I. K., & Asrul, N. (2021). THE EFFECT OF MEDIA GUESSING GAME TOWARDS UNIVERSITY STUDENTS’ WRITING ABILITY ON

- DESCRIPTIVE TEXT LOCAL TOURISM CONTENT. English Review: Journal of English Education, 9(2), 389–398. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v9i2.4379>
- Esmalde, N. (2020). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' GRAMMATICAL ERRORS USING SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY. Journal of English Studies, 5(2), 123–130.
- Fitria, T. N. (2022). USING CANVA AS MEDIA FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING (ELT): DEVELOPING CREATIVITY FOR INFORMATICS STUDENTS. ELT Echo : The Journal of English Language Teaching in Foreign Language Context, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.24235/eltecho.v7i1.10789>
- Harefa, H. S., & Laoli, R. M. (2022). AN ERROR ANALYSIS ON THE USE OF PREPOSITION ON STUDENTS' WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT. Tamaddun Life, Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra Dan Budaya, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.33096/tamaddun.v20i2.126>
- Islam, S., & Mufidah, P. N. (2022). AN ANALYSIS OF GRAMMATICAL ERROR ON STUDENTS' WRITING. International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL), 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v4i1.3826>
- Kadiatmaja, A. P. (2021). ERROR ANALYSIS IN STUDENTS' WRITING COMPOSITION. Jurnal Al-Fawa'id: Jurnal Agama Dan Bahasa, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.54214/alfawaid.vol11.iss1.151>
- Nurhamidah, R. (2021). AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF PREPOSITIONS IN STUDENTS' DESCRIPTIVE WRITING. Asian TESOL Journal. <https://doi.org/10.35307/asiantj.v1i1.20>
- 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>
- Rixha, A. N., Alhamid, I., Rokhmah, S., & Ukka, S. Bin. (2021). SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY: GRAMMATICAL ERRORS ANALYSIS IN THE THIRD-SEMESTER STUDENTS' DESCRIPTIVE ESSAY. KARIWARI SMART : Journal of Education Based on Local Wisdom, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.53491/kariwarismart.v1i2.39>
- Zahra, G. M., Emilia, E., & Nurlaelawati, I. (2021). AN ANALYSIS OF COHESION AND COHERENCE OF DESCRIPTIVE TEXTS WRITTEN BY JUNIOR

HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 2020), 546.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210427.030>

Zulfariati, Z. (2021). THE OMISSION OF GRAMMATICAL COMPONENTS: ERRORS AND ITS EFFECTS ON STUDENT'S ACADEMIC WRITING QUALITY. *Ekasakti Jurnal Penelitian & Pengabdian*, 2(1).
<https://doi.org/10.31933/ejpp.v2i1.475>