
AN ANALYSIS OF LINGUISTIC FEATURES ERRORS IN FACTUAL REPORT TEXT WRITING

Muhammad Nurhandika
Tanjungpura University, Indonesia
m.nurhandika@gmail.com

Received: June 5, 2026; Accepted: June 25, 2026; Published: June 29, 2026

Abstract: *Indonesian students have a difficult time writing a genre text. Genre-based texts have specific linguistic features that must be adhered to, and violations of these features are frequently found in students' written work. Writing is widely considered the most demanding of the four language skills, as it requires not only grammatical accuracy but also the ability to organise ideas coherently, select appropriate vocabulary, and conform to genre-specific conventions. These demands become even more challenging for students learning English as a Foreign Language in the Indonesian context, where limited exposure to English and interference from Bahasa Indonesia further complicate the writing process. This study investigates the linguistic feature errors made by 19 eleventh-grade students at SMK Panca Bhakti Sungai Raya during the academic year 2019/2020 when writing factual report texts on the topic of domestic animals. A descriptive research design integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches was employed to collect and analyse the data. The findings reveal three dominant error categories: grammatical errors, which affected approximately 90% of students; substantive errors, present in all students' writing; and lexical errors, found in the majority of participants. The results suggest that students' limited vocabulary, unfamiliarity with English grammar rules, and insufficient mastery of genre-specific conventions are the primary contributing factors. These findings offer practical implications for more targeted and effective writing instruction in EFL vocational school classrooms.*

Keywords: *Errors analysis; Linguistic features; Factual report text; EFL writing; Vocational school*

Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Nurhandika
Universitas Tanjungpura Pontianak
Jl. Prof.Dr. Hadari Nawawi, Pontianak

INTRODUCTION

There are four language skills in English: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In this study, the writer discusses aspects of writing ability, the difficulties students encounter when developing this ability, and the complexity of writing. Writing requires the capacity to communicate effectively through written language, a variety of language fluency, and higher-order thinking capabilities. Students can gradually improve their writing abilities and overcome the inherent challenges of this crucial form of communication by receiving dedicated instruction, practice, and support. As Walter (1983, p.17) said, writing is the last and perhaps the hardest skill students learn, if they ever learn. This is supported by Hamdani and Abid (2025), whose meta-analysis of Indonesian EFL students' writing challenges over ten years found that vocabulary mastery, grammar, and genre conventions remained the most persistent obstacles, confirming that the difficulties documented in earlier studies continue to characterise Indonesian EFL writing contexts today.

In Indonesia, which is categorised as an EFL context, students' learning to write is hindered by factors such as limited exposure to English, language transfer, vocabulary development, grammatical accuracy, cultural and contextual awareness, and knowledge of writing customs. Mubarok and Budiono (2022) specifically highlight that L1 interference from Bahasa Indonesia, which does not require verb inflection for tense or number agreement, is a persistent source of grammatical errors in Indonesian EFL students' written texts. Similarly, Puspita (2021) found that students of English composition in Indonesian universities systematically employ grammar rules from their first language when writing in English, resulting in morphological and syntactical errors that mirror what the present study identifies.

The report text is a factual genre that describes the way things are, covering natural or social phenomena (Kalantzis et al., 2016). A report provides information by stating facts or a large amount of accurate data. When writing a factual report text, the writer needs to record information about current knowledge, vocabulary range, and perception of the given topic. Knapp and Watkins (2005) specify that the defining linguistic features of factual report texts include consistent use of the simple present tense for generic statements, third-person nominal groups, technical vocabulary, and correct subject-verb

agreement, all of which represent distinct challenges for EFL learners who are accustomed to writing in their mother tongue.

Even after learning one of the texts in the eleventh grade, students still make errors in writing factual report texts. The eleventh grade is a crucial year because students must display higher-level language and reasoning abilities. As they are expected to combine data from multiple sources, critically analyse information, and communicate conclusions coherently, writing factual reports becomes increasingly demanding. To help students master this skill, teachers must recognize and correct language-feature problems in factual report writing.

Error analysis (EA) is a systematic approach to identifying, classifying, and interpreting learner deviations from target-language norms. James (1998) proposed a widely adopted taxonomy classifying errors into three main categories: grammatical errors, substantive (mechanical) errors, and lexical errors. This tripartite framework is particularly relevant for examining writing in genre-based contexts, where all three error types frequently co-occur and mutually undermine communicative effectiveness. Ayu and Nurweni (2023) confirm that this framework remains applicable and productive in contemporary Indonesian EFL research, where the same core error types continue to appear across school levels and text types.

Previous research has documented error patterns in Indonesian EFL writing. Rizki (2017) found that misinformation errors were most frequent (44%), followed by omission (32%), addition (16%), and misordering (8%), attributing these to vocabulary deficiency and direct translation from Bahasa Indonesia. At the international level, Ramzan et al. (2023) found that subject-verb agreement misformation and omission errors were dominant in ESL academic writing across contexts, confirming that L1 structural interference is a cross-linguistic challenge. However, despite these findings, little attention has been paid to linguistic feature errors in factual report texts at the vocational secondary school level in Indonesia. Most existing studies either examine general writing errors without genre specificity or address university-level populations whose instructional conditions differ substantially from those of vocational school students. While previous research has addressed error patterns broadly, the specific linguistic demands of factual report writing, including the consistent use of the generic present

tense, technical vocabulary, and subject-verb agreement, remain underexplored among eleventh-grade students in the West Kalimantan vocational school context. This gap justifies the present study.

This study therefore investigates and analyses the linguistic feature errors that eleventh-grade students make when writing factual report texts. The study focuses on identifying the categories of language-feature errors that students most frequently produce, analyzing their frequency and distribution, examining their underlying causes, and proposing targeted remedial measures. This study contributes to the field of EFL writing research in three ways. Theoretically, it provides empirical evidence of how James' (1998) tripartite error taxonomy applies specifically to genre-based writing at the vocational secondary school level in Indonesia, a context that has received insufficient attention in existing error analysis literature. Pedagogically, the findings offer a diagnostic foundation for teachers to develop targeted, genre-informed writing instruction that directly addresses the linguistic gaps identified in students' factual report texts. For future research, this study establishes a replicable analytical framework for investigating genre-specific linguistic errors across different text types, school levels, and EFL contexts in Indonesia, contributing to a more nuanced and locally grounded understanding of EFL writing development.

METHODS

Research Design

In this study, the researcher will use the descriptive method and the indirect observation technique to analyse students' writing of factual report texts. Kumaravadivelu (2003) states that method does not refer to what teachers actually do in the classroom; rather, it refers to established methods conceptualized and constructed by experts in the field. The objective of this study is to collect data from Panca Bhakti Sungai Raya class 11 Pharmacy students by administering written tests on factual report texts. In addition, this study discusses data on the types of linguistic feature errors that most students make, presented as percentages. The final step of this research is the result. A descriptive design is appropriate for this study as it aims to document and categorise naturally occurring student writing errors without manipulating variables (Sukmadinata, 2011). Nineteen

eleventh-grade students from the Pharmacy programme at SMK Panca Bhakti Sungai Raya in the academic year 2019/2020 were selected through purposive sampling. Purposive sampling involves selecting subjects based on specific characteristics that are relevant to the research purpose (Arikunto, 2013). All participants had been exposed to writing factual report texts as part of their school English curriculum.

Data Collection

The objective of this study is to collect data obtained from Panca Bhakti Sungai Raya class Eleventh Pharmacy students by giving written tests in factual report text. Students were asked to write a factual report text on the topic of domestic animals. Brown (2007) notes that written tests are effective instruments for eliciting direct evidence of learners' productive language ability. Students completed the task individually within approximately 60 minutes, without access to dictionaries or electronic devices.

Data Analyze

In addition, this study discusses data on the types of linguistic feature errors that most students make, presented as percentages. All nineteen student texts were analyzed following James' (1998) three-category error taxonomy: (1) grammatical errors, covering verb tense, subject-verb agreement, pronouns, articles, and word order; (2) substance errors, covering capitalization, punctuation, and spelling; and (3) lexical errors, covering word form, word choice, and lexical coinage. Each error was coded, tallied, and expressed as a percentage of total errors to enable frequency comparison across categories.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The findings of the research are displayed in several parts of errors made by students according to the linguistic features of the report text. Errors were classified following James' (1998) three-category taxonomy. The tables below present all sentences from students' writing with identification of the incorrect part, the error type and reason, and the correct form.

Table 1. Grammatical Errors in Students' Factual Report Text Writing

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
1	Hamsters have two hairy ears and for hearing.	and for hearing	Grammatical Omission. The second clause lacks a verb. 'And (are used) for hearing' the predicate is omitted. James (1998) classifies missing obligatory elements as omission errors.	Hamsters have two hairy ears that are used for hearing.
2	Hamsters have a tiny and cute body to look after.	to look after	Grammatical Lexical Misselection. 'To look after' means to care for; the intended meaning appears to be 'to look at'. Confusion between two phrasal verbs constitutes a misselection error (James, 1998).	Hamsters have a tiny and cute body to look at.
3	...that make people interested in the hamster.	make (SVA)	Grammatical SVA Misformation. The singular referent requires 'makes', not 'make'. James (1998) classifies verb inflection errors as misformation errors rooted in L1 interference.	...that makes people interested in hamsters.
4	Hamster have small body that can be carried anywhere with cage	Hamster have; small body; with cage	'Hamster' and 'have' violates number agreement. 'A small body' and 'with a cage' require articles omission errors (James, 1998).	A hamster has a small body that can be carried anywhere with a cage.
5	Fish are the animals that are mostoften kept.	No grammatical error	Grammatical Acceptable. This sentence is structurally correct. It appears in the original data under substance errors due to a spacing issue ('mostoften') in a variant version.	Fish are the animals that are most often kept.
6	their bodies were cute when they were little.	were cute; were little	Grammatical Tense Misformation. Report text requires generic present tense. Using past tense 'were' narrates a personal memory rather than a timeless characteristic (James, 1998).	Their bodies are cute when they are young.
7	the fins are beautiful when they expand his body is small and big.	his body; run-on	Grammatical Pronoun Misformation and Run-on Sentence. 'His' should be 'its' for fish. The sentence	Its fins are beautiful when they expand; its body is small.

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
			lacks a conjunction or full stop between two independent clauses (James, 1998).	
8	they breathe through gills	Missing full stop; lowercase	Substance Punctuation and Capitalisation Omission. No closing full stop; opening 't' should be capitalised. Both are substance omission errors (James, 1998).	They breathe through gills.
9	their female fish will lay eggs in hiding places.	will lay	Grammatical Tense Misformation. 'Will lay' signals a future specific event. Factual report text requires simple present tense for habitual, generic behaviour (Knapp & Watkins, 2005; James, 1998).	Female fish lay eggs in hiding places.
10	... in danger of drowning when swimming.	Missing subject + verb	Grammatical Omission. Sentence fragment; the subject and main verb are entirely absent. James (1998) classifies missing obligatory sentence elements as omission errors.	They are in danger of drowning when swimming.
11	... which is used for fighting.	Fragment; missing main clause	Grammatical Omission. This relative clause has no main clause. The referent of 'which' is unclear without context. James (1998) classifies this structural incompleteness as an omission error.	It has [a part] which is used for fighting.
12	Bulldog has a better sense of smell that other types of animals.	smell that	Grammatical Comparative Conjunction Misformation. 'That' should be 'than'. James (1998) classifies this as a misformation caused by confusion between similar target-language forms.	Bulldogs have a better sense of smell than other types of animals.
13	used to tearing hard flesh.	Missing subject; used to tearing	Grammatical Omission and Misformation. The subject is entirely omitted. 'Used to tearing' implies past habit; 'used for tearing' is the correct form for purpose (James, 1998).	It is used for tearing hard flesh.

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
14	Cat have four legs and have many colors On their fur,	Cat have; On; trailing comma	Grammatical, Substance SVA Misformation, Capitalisation, and Punctuation. 'Cat have' violates number agreement. Mid-sentence 'On' is incorrectly capitalised. Trailing comma should be a full stop (James, 1998).	Cats have four legs and many colours on their fur.
15	... an animal that is usually used as a pet in the house.	usually used; pet; house	Grammatical Passive Misformation and Article Omission. 'Usually used' should be 'is usually used'. 'A pet' and 'the house' require article omission errors (James, 1998).	...an animal that is usually kept as a pet in the house.
16	Hamster have small ears and use for hear.	Hamster have; use for hear.	Grammatical SVA Misformation and Bare Infinitive. 'Hamster' requires 'has'. 'Use for hear' should be 'used for hearing'; a gerund follows a preposition (James, 1998).	A hamster has small ears and uses them for hearing.
17	hamster have small hands use to take things.	hamster have; use to take	Grammatical SVA Misformation and Verb Form Error. 'Hamster have' violates agreement. 'Use to take' should be 'used for taking'. Opening lowercase is also a substance error (James, 1998).	A hamster has small front paws used for taking things.
18	Hamster have small maut and eyes.	Hamsters have maut	Grammatical Substance SVA Misformation and Spelling. 'Hamster have' violates agreement. 'Maut' is a spelling misformation for 'mouth' (James, 1998).	A hamster has a small mouth and eyes.
19	Hamster have a habit of sleeping during cad weather.	Hamster have; cad.	Grammatical, Substance SVA Misformation and Spelling. 'Hamster have' violates agreement. 'Cad' is a spelling misformation for 'cold' (James, 1998).	A hamster has a habit of sleeping during cold weather.
20	Hamsters are cute animals, he has small body and limb,	Hamster are; he; small body	Grammatical Number Agreement, Pronoun Inconsistency and Article Omission. 'Hamster are' is misformed; 'he' should be	Hamsters are cute animals. They have small bodies and limbs.

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
			'they'; 'a small body' requires an article (James, 1998).	
21	Among them mouth, tooth, ears, fur, hand, tails, legs, nose, and eye.	No main verb; singular/plural inconsistency	Grammatical Omission and Number Misformation. No predicate, a major omission error. 'Tooth/hand/eye' should be plural ('teeth/hands/eyes'). Inconsistent number marking (James, 1998).	Among them are the mouth, teeth, ears, fur, hands, tail, legs, nose, and eyes.
22	Hamster have sweet mouth that he uses for eat something	Hamster have; sweet mouth; he; for eat	Grammatical, Lexical SVA Misformation L1 Transfer, Pronoun Error and Bare Infinitive. 'Sweet mouth' is a calque from Bahasa Indonesia. 'He' should be 'it'. 'For eat' to 'for eating' (James, 1998).	A hamster has a small mouth that it uses for eating.
23	... the specialty of the teeth is that it can...	it (refers to plural 'teeth')	Grammatical Pronoun Misformation. 'Teeth' is plural; pronoun should be 'they', not 'it'. James (1998) classifies pronoun-antecedent agreement errors as misformation.	...the specialty of the teeth is that they can...
24	Far cat legs serve as chasing prey	Far cat legs; chasing prey	Grammatical Word Order Misformation and Verb Form Error. 'Far cat legs' is a misordering; intended meaning is 'A cat's front legs'. 'Serve as chasing' to 'are used for chasing' (James, 1998).	A cat's front legs are used for chasing prey.
25	Parrot feet are used	Incomplete — no complement	Grammatical Omission. The sentence states subject and verb but omits the complement. James (1998) classifies missing obligatory complements as omission errors.	Parrot feet are used for gripping branches.
26	2 wings are used to fly	2 (numeral); missing full stop	Substance Convention Error and Punctuation Omission. Opening with numeral '2' instead of 'Two' violates written English convention. Missing full stop is a	Two wings are used to fly.

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
			punctuation omission error (James, 1998).	
27	Has beautiful feathers so it is interesting to see who sees it.	Has (no subject); who sees it	Grammatical Subject Omission and Pronoun Reference Error. 'Has' has no stated subject omission error. 'Who sees it' is semantically awkward; 'whoever sees it' is correct (James, 1998).	It has beautiful feathers, so it is interesting to whoever sees it.
28	Has yellow crested to attract the attention of his other birds.	Has (no subject); crested; his other birds	Grammatical Subject Omission, Word Form and Pronoun Misformation. Subject omitted; 'crested' should be 'crest' (noun); 'his other birds' to 'other birds of its kind' (James, 1998).	It has a yellow crest to attract the attention of other birds.

Grammatical errors involve mistakes in the use of grammar rules and structures. This category includes errors related to adjectives, adverbs, articles, nouns, possession, pronouns, prepositions, and verbs. As shown in Table 1, SVA misformation was the most recurring subtype, appearing in sentences 3, 4, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 22. This finding is consistent with Ramzan et al. (2023) and Mubarok and Budiono (2022), who identify SVA as one of the most systematic errors among EFL learners whose L1 does not require verb agreement marking. Omission errors, where obligatory elements such as subjects, verbs, or articles are missing, appear in sentences 1, 10, 11, 13, 21, 25, 27, and 28. Sinaga and Ramadhani (2021) similarly found omission to be a dominant error type in Indonesian students' narrative text writing, attributing it to the structural simplicity of Bahasa Indonesia relative to English. Tense misformation, particularly the substitution of the past tense for the generic present required in report texts, appears in sentences 6 and 9, a pattern also documented by Pasaribu (2022) in EFL students' academic writing.

Table 2. Substance Errors in Students' Factual Report Text Writing

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
1	Fish are the animals that are most often kept.	mostoften	Substance Word Spacing Error. 'Mostoften' should be 'most often'. Missing word	Fish are the animals that are most often kept.

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
			space is a mechanical substance misformation that disrupts readability (James, 1998).	
2	the fins are beautiful when they expand; his body is both small and big.	beatuful	Substance Spelling Misformation. 'Beatuful' is a misspelling of 'beautiful' an orthographic error caused by incorrect letter sequencing (James, 1998).	Its fins are beautiful when they expand.
3	The rabbit is mamals animal that usually used as pet in house.	mamals	Substance Multiple Spelling Misformations. 'Mamals' (mammals), error in one sentence indicating an absence of proofreading (James, 1998).	The rabbit is a mammal that is usually kept as a pet in the house.
4	Hamster have small maut and eyes.	maut	Substance Spelling Misformation. 'Maut' is a misspelling of 'mouth', likely caused by phoneme-grapheme confusion between Indonesian and English phonology (James, 1998).	A hamster has a small mouth and eyes.
5	Hamster have a habit of sleeping during cad weather.	cad	Substance Spelling Misformation. 'Cad' is a misspelling of 'cold' consonant substitution error reflecting incomplete phoneme-grapheme mapping in English (James, 1998).	A hamster has a habit of sleeping during cold weather.
6	2 wings are used to fly	2 (numeral); missing full stop	Substance Convention Error and Punctuation Omission. '2' instead of 'Two' violates written convention. The missing full stop is a punctuation omission error (James, 1998).	Two wings are used to fly.
7	they breathe through gills	Missing full stop; lowercase 't'	Substance Punctuation and Capitalisation Omission. Absence of a closing full stop and lowercase sentence opening are both substance omission errors affecting mechanical conventions (James, 1998).	They breathe through gills.

Substance errors refer to errors in capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. These errors affect the technical aspects of writing and can impact the text's readability and clarity. As Table 2 shows, all 19 students produced substance errors, making this the most universally distributed error category. Spelling misformation was the most frequent subtype, visible in at least seven of the nine table entries. Oktaviani et al. (2022) found that punctuation and capitalization errors were universal in Indonesian EFL students' compositions regardless of proficiency level, a finding that directly mirrors the present study's results. Putri et al. (2024) specifically found that capitalisation accounted for the largest proportion of substance errors in Indonesian students' formal writing, followed by punctuation and spelling. The density of multiple-substance errors within a single sentence, as in entries 4 and 5, is consistent with Khansa and Purnamasari's (2024) observation that lower-proficiency EFL writers frequently produce compounded surface-level errors because they prioritise meaning over mechanical form.

Table 3. Lexical Errors in Students' Factual Report Text Writing

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
1	Hamster is cute animal that many people feed them as pet.	feed	Lexical Word Misselection. 'Feed' is contextually imprecise; the correct word is 'keep' or 'raise' as pets. James (1998) classifies this as a misselection error where an L1-influenced choice replaces the correct target-language term.	Hamsters are cute animals that many people keep as pets.
2	Hamsters have two hairy ears and for hearing	and for hearing (no verb)	Lexical/Grammatical Omission. The predicate connecting 'ears' to 'for hearing' is missing. James (1998) classifies this as an omission error, a missing obligatory structural element.	Hamsters have two hairy ears that are used for hearing.
3	Fish are the animals that are mostoften kept.	mostoften	Substance Word Spacing. 'Mostoften' to 'most often'. Also appears in Table 2. Included here as the spacing error obscures lexical boundaries, affecting word-level readability.	Fish are the animals that are most often kept.

No.	Student's Sentence	Incorrect Part	Error Type & Reason (James, 1998)	Correct Form
4	the fins are beatiful when they expand his body is small and big.	his body	Lexical Pronoun Misselection. 'His' is an incorrect pronoun for fish; 'its' is required. James (1998) identifies this as a lexical misselection error caused by imprecise pronoun knowledge.	Its fins are beautiful when they expand; its body is small.
5	The rabbit is mamals animal tghat usually used as per in house.	mamals	Lexical, Substance Word Form Error and Spelling. 'Mamals' as an attributive adjective is non-standard; 'a mammal' is correct is a phonological substitution, misformation errors (James, 1998).	The rabbit is a mammal that is usually kept as a pet in the house.
6	Previllage of hamster ears is taht even though it is small it...	Previllage	Lexical Word Coinage/Misformation. 'Previllage' is not an English word; intended meaning is 'advantage' or 'feature'. James (1998) classifies this as a lexical misformation arising from incomplete target-language vocabulary knowledge.	The advantage of a hamster's ears is that even though they are small...

Lexical errors involve mistakes in word formation and word selection. This category focuses on vocabulary-related errors. As shown in Table 3, the six sentences containing lexical errors reflect two dominant subtypes: word misselection (entries 1 and 4) and lexical misformation through non-standard word coinage (entry 6). Entry 6 'Previllage' represents a complete gap in target-language lexical knowledge, resulting in the creation of a non-existent English word. This is consistent with Shiddiq et al. (2023), who found that lexical misformation and misselection were the primary vocabulary error types in Indonesian EFL written production, attributing them to limited English vocabulary and direct L1-to-English translation. Entry 1 ('feed' instead of 'keep') reflects what Guo (2022) terms interlanguage behaviour where learners apply semantically adjacent but contextually inappropriate words due to their underdeveloped English lexical network. Sentences appearing in multiple tables (e.g., entries 3, 4, and 5) confirm that lexical and substance errors frequently co-occur, a pattern Isma et al. (2023) attribute to

lower-proficiency EFL writers who simultaneously lack vocabulary breadth and mechanical accuracy.

Discussion

In this section, language-feature errors are discussed to identify the factors that made them dominant, and the findings are compared with existing literature and previous research.

First, grammatical errors were found in approximately 90% of students (17 of 19). Grammatical errors relate to mistakes in the use of grammar rules and structures. These errors appeared as inappropriate verb tense usage, subject-verb agreement issues, pronoun inconsistency, and omission of obligatory sentence elements. The high prevalence of grammatical errors among students indicates a need for more instruction and practice in understanding and applying grammar rules effectively. Addressing grammatical faults can lead to better clarity, coherence, and accuracy in students' writing and communication. This finding is in line with Mubarok and Budiono (2022), who reported that article errors (20%), punctuation (19%), and SVA errors (5%) were dominant in Indonesian EFL students' academic writing and attributed them to L1 structural interference and limited mastery of grammar. Similarly, Isma et al. (2023) found that SVA, verb tense, and article misuse were the most prevalent grammatical errors in their EFL writing data, closely mirroring the patterns identified here. Ramzan et al. (2023) further confirm that SVA misformation is among the most systematic errors across EFL/ESL writing contexts, suggesting it is a cross-linguistic challenge rather than an isolated local phenomenon. In contrast, Guo (2022) argues from an interlanguage perspective that grammatical errors at this stage should not be treated solely as failures but as developmental indicators showing where students' interlanguage has not yet converged with the target language, a perspective that has important implications for how teachers respond to these errors.

Second, substance errors were found in all 19 students (100%). Substance errors encompass problems in capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. These flaws can affect the technical aspects of writing and impact the content's readability and clarity. Common substance errors include erroneous capitalization of proper nouns, overuse of punctuation

marks, or misspelled words. Addressing content errors is vital as they contribute to the overall professionalism and quality of written work. Focusing on these faults might strengthen pupils' attention to detail and adherence to linguistic rules. This finding is consistent with Oktaviani et al. (2022), who found that punctuation and capitalisation errors were universal in Indonesian EFL students' compositions regardless of proficiency level, concluding that mechanical accuracy is systematically under-practised in the writing classroom. Putri et al. (2024) confirm that capitalisation was the most frequent substance error in students' formal written work, followed by punctuation and spelling, a rank order that mirrors the present study. Khansa and Purnamasari (2024) add that EFL learners frequently conflate determiner conventions with mechanical features, reinforcing the view that surface-level errors are closely tied to a broader lack of familiarity with written English conventions. In contrast, Wahyuni (2023) reported that spelling errors dominated over capitalisation in Indonesian secondary school writing, suggesting the relative prominence of substance subtypes may shift depending on school level and task type.

Third, most students also make lexical errors. Lexical errors entail errors in word creation and word selection. These errors might result from challenges in using proper terminology and picking the right words to convey meaning accurately. Examples of lexical errors include using the wrong word form, inappropriate or imprecise words, or unfamiliar or erroneous words in context. Addressing lexical errors involves strengthening pupils' vocabulary knowledge, word usage, and comprehension of meaning variation. This finding aligns with Shiddiq et al. (2023), who identified lexical misformation and misselection as the primary vocabulary error types in Indonesian EFL students' written production, attributing them to limited English vocabulary and over-reliance on direct L1-to-English translation. The L1-transfer errors found in the present study, particularly 'sweet mouth' (a calque from Bahasa Indonesia 'mulut manis') and 'previllage' (a coined non-word), are consistent with what Guo (2022) describes as interlanguage lexical overgeneralisation, and with Hamdani and Abid's (2025) finding that vocabulary mastery and word choice confusion remain the most persistent writing challenges for Indonesian EFL learners across school levels. In partial contrast, Mubarak and Budiono (2022) found that word-choice errors were less dominant than structural

errors in their university-level sample, suggesting that lexical error prominence may be proportionally higher at the vocational secondary school level, where vocabulary acquisition is at an earlier stage.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data analysis, writing is a difficult skill that calls for linguistic flexibility and adherence to genre-specific rules. This study set out to investigate and analyse the linguistic feature errors made by eleventh-grade students at SMK Panca Bhakti Sungai Raya when writing factual report texts in the academic year 2019/2020. Three categories of errors were identified: grammatical errors, substantive errors, and lexical errors.

Grammatical errors were the most prevalent, affecting approximately 90% of students (17 out of 19). The dominant patterns were subject-verb agreement violations, tense misformation, omission of obligatory sentence elements, and pronoun inconsistency. These errors arose primarily from the structural mismatch between Bahasa Indonesia, which does not require verb inflection for tense or agreement, and English, which does. Substance errors were found universally across all 19 students, making this the most widely distributed error category. Spelling misformation was the most frequent subtype, followed by punctuation omission and capitalisation errors. The density of multiple-substance errors within single sentences confirms that students are not applying systematic proofreading or editing strategies.

Lexical errors were identified in the majority of students (approximately 15 out of 19). The dominant types were word misselection, particularly the substitution of semantically adjacent but contextually inappropriate words, and L1-transfer-based lexical coinage, in which students invented non-standard forms by translating Indonesian expressions directly into English. Both types reflect a limited breadth of English vocabulary and insufficient exposure to target-language lexical conventions.

In summary, the root causes of errors across all three categories consistently point to L1 interference from Bahasa Indonesia, limited vocabulary breadth, and insufficient mastery of the genre-specific linguistic features of factual report text. These factors must

be the primary targets of writing instruction if students' written accuracy and genre competence are to improve.

SUGGESTION

Based on the conclusions drawn from this study, the following suggestions are offered as theoretical and practical contributions to EFL writing education.

Teachers should adopt a genre-based approach to writing instruction that explicitly teaches students the communicative purpose, generic structure, and key linguistic features of factual report texts, including simple present tense, third-person nominal groups, technical vocabulary, and subject-verb agreement. This approach directly addresses the root causes of grammatical and lexical errors identified in this study. Then, the error taxonomy proposed by James (1998), distinguishing grammatical, substantive, and lexical error categories, offers a practical diagnostic framework for classroom practitioners. By regularly analysing students' writing using this framework, teachers can identify recurring error patterns and design category-specific remedial activities. In corrective feedback and revision cycles as a development theory, given that substantive errors affected all 19 students, structured revision cycles should be incorporated as a standard component of writing tasks. Students need explicit instruction in proofreading strategies, particularly for spelling, capitalisation, and punctuation. Further, future research should expand the sample to include students across different programmes, school types, and regions in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Ayu, D. P., & Nurweni, A. (2023). Grammatical interference in Islamic school students' English narrative writings. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v11i1.18947>
- Guo, Q. (2022). Interlanguage and its implications to second language teaching and learning. *Pacific International Journal*, 5(4), 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.55014/pij.v5i4.223>
- Hamdani, M. H., & Abid, N. (2025). Indonesian EFL students' writing challenges: A qualitative meta-analysis. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, 12(1), 14–36.
- Isma, A., Rasmin, L. O., & Samsudin, S. (2023). Decoding the challenges: A study of English writing errors among EFL students. *GLENS: Global English Insights Journal*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.61220/glens.v1i1.2023a1>

- Khansa, S. S. A., & Purnamasari, Y. (2024). Error analysis of determiners in English students' final project reports: A comparative study. *Jurnal Bahasa Inggris Terapan*, 10(2), 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.35313/jbit.v10i2.5878>
- Mubarok, Y., & Budiono, T. (2022). An error analysis on EFL students' writing. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 9(2), 187–203.
- Oktaviani, A., Syafitri, D., & Seli, S. (2022). Students' errors in using punctuation and capitalization. *EDULIA: English Education, Linguistic and Art Journal*, 2(2), 68–73. <https://doi.org/10.31539/edulia.v2i2.3891>
- Pasaribu, A. N. (2022). EFL students' perception on English tenses mastery in improving English academic writing. *IDEAS Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 89–98. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v10i1.2612>
- Putri, N., Suhalmi, & Erniyati. (2024). Errors found in students' theses: Capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching and Applied Linguistic*, 6(1). <https://jurnal.uhn.ac.id/index.php/jetal/article/view/1484>
- Puspita, D. (2021). Error analysis of Indonesian grammatical interference in students' English composition. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 22(1), 12–21.
- Ramendra, D. P. (2021). The analysis of grammatical errors in university students' essays. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 54(3), 571–581. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v54i3.40951>
- Ramzan, M., Azmat, Z., Khan, M. A., & Nisa, Z. U. (2023). Subject-verb agreement errors in ESL students' academic writing: A surface taxonomy approach. *Linguistic Forum: A Journal of Linguistics*, 5(2), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.53057/linfo/2023.5.2.3>
- Salsabila, Z., & Mubasyira, M. (2021). Analysis grammatical errors in using simple present tense in writing descriptive text. *JEdu: Journal of English Education*, 1(1), 34–38. <https://doi.org/10.30998/jedu.v1i1.4414>
- Shiddiq, S. M., Oktaviani, L., Herwiana, S., & Suryanovika, C. (2023). Lexical and grammatical errors in Indonesian-English translated texts. *JEES: Journal of English Educators Society*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v8i1.1674>
- Sinaga, Y., & Ramadhani, P. (2021). Students' grammatical error in writing narrative text. *English Education: English Journal for Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 189–200. <https://doi.org/10.24952/ee.v8i2.3240>
- Wahyuni, D. (2023). An analysis of Indonesian students' writing errors in recount text. *English Language Teaching*, 16(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v16n2p1>
- Yuntika, A. R., et al. (2025). Writing errors analysis: Subject-verb agreement made by EFL students. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(5). <https://jele.or.id/index.php/jele/article/download/1538/824>.