EXPLORING SYNTACTIC FLAWS IN STUDENTS' ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING: AN ERROR-DRIVEN APPROACH

Sri Widyarti Ali
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
widyartiali@ung.ac.id

Indri Wirahmi Bay *[1]
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo
indriwirahmi@ung.ac.id

Nurfadiyah Palilati
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

Abstract
Writing well-formed sentences requires a strong grasp of grammar and vocabulary, which can be especially challenging for students when the target language differs significantly from their native language. When learning how words connect to form larger grammatical units, students often become confused about parts of speech, leading to errors. This study aimed to describe the syntactical errors found in 15 argumentative essays by fourth-semester English majors and identify the error sources through a descriptive qualitative method. The analysis revealed 47 syntactical errors across 5 categories: noun phrases with determiners (26 instances), conjunctions (6), numbers (5), auxiliary verbs (6), and prepositions (4). Both interlingual (native language influence) and intralingual (target language itself) factors contributed to these errors. Ultimately, this research hopes to raise awareness among students about producing grammatically correct written English.
Keywords: argumentative writing, Syntactical error, source of error.

INTRODUCTION

Writing allows an author to communicate their thoughts and ideas to a reader through text. It requires understanding text structure, conveying clear ideas, and using proper language elements to create a well-constructed and readable piece of writing. If the writer lacks skill, it can seriously impair the reader's ability to understand the intended meaning, disrupting the indirect communication between writer and reader.

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners often struggle with making various errors when writing due to the difficulties of mastering all aspects of the foreign language required to construct written text well. Research has shown that proper language usage and vocabulary selection are among the most challenging

---

[1] Correspondence author.

aspects for students. Factors like incorrect word order, verb tense issues, fragmented sentences, and meaning obfuscation contribute to the narrow language range and inappropriate word choices that obscure meaning in student writing. The limited linguistic proficiency of EFL students prevents them from producing clear English text, leading to pervasive errors - an expected part of the process of learning to write in a second language.

At the university level, writing essays is a common requirement for students. English department students, in particular, must write argumentative essays in English using academic English as per their Writing for Academic Purposes course. This can prove challenging for Indonesian students accustomed to speaking Indonesian, as composing academic writing in English on a given topic requires utilizing their full linguistic capabilities.

The field of error analysis, which involves studying student errors, has gained popularity stemming from Brown's (2014) assertion that errors can be identified, examined, and categorized to reveal insights into the learner's language acquisition process. Error analysis, a branch of linguistics, focuses specifically on the mistakes made by students. According to Brown (2014), error analysis entails analyzing the errors students make while learning a language. This area of study emerged due to the numerous phenomena surrounding student errors, as mistakes can be tracked, analyzed, and classified to uncover information about the language learning process.

When students produce written texts, errors are commonly found in their writing, especially related to sentence construction. This is known as a syntactical error, which occurs when words are incorrectly combined to form clauses, phrases, and sentences. For instance, an English Department student wrote "Learn English for students who lived in a country where English is not their first language" and "For this case, learn English is the only key so that their dream will come true" in an argumentative essay assignment for their Writing for Academic Purposes course. In these examples, the student made noun phrase errors by omitting the gerund form, and incorrectly using the simple verb "learn" instead of "learning." According to Leech (2007), a gerund is the -ing form of a verb functioning as a noun. The corrections should be "Learning English for students..." and "For this case, learning English is the only key..."

Based on this example, the researcher believes syntactical error analysis is crucial to discuss, as it is one of the best methods to characterize and clarify errors made by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. This type of study allows for identifying the errors and their sources. Once located, remedies and subsequent lesson planning can be determined, and students' awareness of argumentative essay writing can be increased. This research aimed to describe the syntactical errors and identify the sources of errors in students' argumentative essays.

This research holds both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, it contributes to a better comprehension of syntactical errors. The findings make a significant contribution to knowledge in linguistics and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction. For scholars interested in exploring syntactical errors, the results offer a fresh perspective. For EFL students, the descriptions of findings and discussions aim to provide a holistic understanding of how syntactical errors manifest in student essays. For EFL teachers, the identified syntactical errors can guide efforts to raise student awareness of proper written English production. Moreover, the study is anticipated to yield practical insights. For EFL educators, understanding the research can inform better pedagogical approaches throughout the learning process. For EFL learners, it may assist in recognizing potential types of English syntactic errors, consequently raising awareness of proper English production. Additionally, for researchers exploring syntactical errors with different foci and subjects, this study can serve as an empirical reference. Lastly, this research is expected to catalyze a growing body of work on syntactical errors.

Syntactical error is the central issue, focusing on identifying and describing students' syntactic errors and their sources in argumentative essay writing. The data comprises sentence constituents from 15 argumentative essays by English Department students at Gorontalo State University's Letters and Cultures Faculty. Furthermore, the data is analyzed and categorized using Politzer and Ramirez's (2006) linguistic category taxonomy on syntax error types, including noun phrase, verb phrase, prepositional phrase, and conjunction errors. Then, Dulay et al.'s (2016) surface category taxonomy is employed to explain the classifications, encompassing omission, addition, misordering, and misformation. Following the analysis of error types, the data is elucidated based on interlingual and intralingual error sources from Brown (2014). This study solely utilized data from students' argumentative essays, without interviews or other data collection techniques. Therefore, future researchers are recommended to incorporate interviews or additional methods to gain alternative perspectives on the study

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach, as the data comprised words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs derived from documents. The approach facilitated data collection to substantiate the study's aims. Data sources were 15 argumentative essays written by fourth-semester English Department students at Gorontalo State University, which were collected by identifying students who wrote argumentative essays, obtaining their essays, analyzing the syntactic construction of each element to determine syntactical errors and their sources, and classifying the errors based on the data.

For data analysis, this study followed Corder's (in Ellis, 2012) suggested steps: (1) Error identification, underlining erroneous phrases and sentences. (2) Error description using Politzer and Ramirez's (2006) Linguistics Category Taxonomy, followed by Dulay's (2016) four-category Surface Category Taxonomy of Errors (omission, addition, misformation, and misordering) to characterize errors in students' writing. (3) Error explanation, employing the surface strategy taxonomy's four error types and their causes. Subsequently, data was evaluated and classified using Politzer and Ramirez's (2006) linguistics category taxonomy on syntax error types. Dulay's (2016) surface category taxonomy elucidated surface modifications. Finally, error sources were determined by applying Brown's (2014) theory of interlingual and intralingual errors to address the second research question, providing in-depth justifications for students' errors.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this investigation unveiled a multitude of syntactic errors in the argumentative essays produced by fourth-semester students at Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, totaling 47 instances. These errors were categorized into five distinct types, with the most prevalent being errors in noun phrases, comprising 26 occurrences, followed by errors in conjunctions (6 occurrences), numbers (5 errors), auxiliary verbs (6 errors), and prepositions (4 occurrences). Moreover, the study identified both interlingual and intralingual errors as contributing factors to the observed syntactic errors. The presentation of the data findings is organized according to each error type, and detailed subsequently.

Syntactic Errors in Students' Argumentative Essay

After analyzing the data, numerous syntactic errors were identified in students' argumentative essays. Fifteen essays were examined, revealing various types of errors. These errors were categorized and explained based on predetermined codes, focusing on their linguistic categories. The researcher found that errors in students' writing primarily fell into categories such as noun phrases (including determiners, prepositions, and numbers) and verb phrases (involving auxiliary verbs and subject-verb agreement), as well as other instances like conjunctions. However, only select data findings are elaborated upon in this section to illustrate each type of syntactic error. The subsequent subsections present and analyze the gathered data concerning these syntactic errors.

Noun Phrase

Leech (2007) defines a noun phrase as a group of words centered around a noun or pronoun, which plays various roles within a sentence. These roles include being the subject, object, complement, or prepositional complement. Additionally, a noun phrase consists of components such as a determiner, modifier, head, and another modifier. This study aimed to identify errors in students' syntactic structures

by analyzing data categorized according to the linguistic taxonomy developed by Politzer and Ramirez (2006). This taxonomy classifies noun phrases into determiners, numbers, pronouns, nominalizations, and prepositions. The collected data were then further categorized using the surface category taxonomy by Dulay et al. (2016), focusing on omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

Determiner

Regarding determiners, the study specifically examined errors related to the use of "a(n)" and "the" articles, as well as possessive pronouns, as outlined in Politzer and Ramirez's taxonomy (2006). It is worth noting that participants in this study were already familiar with determiners. As per Leech (2007), determiners are words that specify the reference of a noun phrase, indicating its location or presence, rather than describing its qualities. They encompass articles like "a(n)" and "the," dependent pronouns, numerals, and phrases such as "a few," "a number of," "a lot of," etc. Analysis revealed 26 syntactic errors in students' writing concerning determiners, predominantly comprising 14 omissions, 11 additions, and 1 misformation.

Omission

Omission errors occur when an element is missing from a sentence. For instance, consider the sentence:

> "*They even state that in today's global environment, English skill is necessarily needed when it comes to interacting with colleagues from different country*."

Here, the student omitted the indefinite article required before the noun phrase "different country," which should be singular. The term "country" in this context is a singular noun that necessitates a premodifying determiner; the appropriate one is the indefinite article "a." As noted by Radford (1997), "a(n)/another" can only premodify a singular count noun. Therefore, the sentence should include the indefinite determiner "a" before the noun phrase "different country." Thus, the correct sentence reads: "*They even state that in today's global environment, English skill is necessarily needed when it comes to interacting with colleagues from a different country.*"

Addition

An addition error in the use of determiners occurs when an unnecessary determiner is present in a well-constructed sentence. This typically happens when the subject of the sentence is a proper noun, which does not require the presence of a determiner. Consider the following example:

> "*Cases of people living with HIV/AIDS in the Gorontalo area in March 2019 rose in 2018 to around 494 people, 176 people in Gorontalo City, 102 people in Gorontalo Regency, ...*"

In this sentence, the noun phrase "the Gorontalo area" contains the proper noun "Gorontalo." The issue lies in the determiner "the" modifying the noun phrase, which is incorrect and can impact the syntactical structure. According to Radford (1997),

there is a distinction between two subclasses of nouns: common nouns and proper nouns. Proper nouns typically denote names of people, places, dates, or magazines, and they are usually capitalized. Syntactically, common nouns can be modified by determiners like "the," whereas proper nouns generally cannot. However, in the construction of the sentence by the student, a determiner "the" is used to modify the proper noun, which is incorrect.

To correct this error, the sentence should remove the determiner, resulting in: "*Cases of people living with HIV/AIDS in Gorontalo area in March 2019 rose in 2018 to around 494 people, 176 people in Gorontalo City, 102 people in Gorontalo Regency, …*"

Misformation

The misformation error in determiners occurs when an inappropriate form of determiner is used in the sentence structure. Consider the following example:

"If a teenager makes the wrong decision, the risks borne will also have an impact on the future, both in the short and long term."

In this sentence, there's a misformed article used in the noun phrase "the wrong decision." The correct article to use in this context should be "a." According to the Cambridge Dictionary, the indefinite article "a/an" is used before a noun when what is referred to is not already known to the speaker, listener, writer, and/or reader. In this case, it's still unknown what the phrase "wrong decision" refers to. Therefore, the sentence can be corrected as follows: *"If a teenager makes a wrong decision, the risks borne will also have an impact on the future, both in the short and long term.*"

From the examples and explanations provided, it becomes evident that applying the correct syntactic structure is crucial in constructing sentences. Ignoring the rules of syntax can lead to misunderstandings and disrupt syntactic structures.

Number

Syntactic errors in noun phrases occurred when the head of the phrase necessitated either a singular or plural form of the noun, but the students used a different form. These errors typically arose from either omitting or adding another form of the noun, although only omission errors were identified in this study. The total number of errors observed was five.

Omission

Two examples of data illustrate errors involving the omission of plural markers in noun phrases. In the first instance, the sentence *"Mastering English will definitely help you in other country"* contains an omission error in the word "*country*," where the plural marker "-s" is omitted. This error occurs after the determiner "other," indicating a plural amount. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, "other" denotes additional items in a list without specifying them precisely. Such an omission can impact syntactic rules and necessitates correction by adding the plural marker "-s" to "country," resulting in "countries."

Similarly, in another example, the sentence "*Education is one of the aspect that trusted can open up opportunities to improve the quality of life*" contains an omission error in "aspect," where the plural marker "-s" is lacking. This error arises from the closed-class quantifier "one of," which is typically used with plural count nouns. However, the incorrect noun form is used here, leading to the omission error. Omission errors stem from missing required elements in well-formed sentences and can disrupt syntactic rules. To rectify this error, the plural marker "-s" should be added to "aspect," resulting in "aspects."

Preposition

As per Leech (2007), a preposition is a word typically positioned before a noun phrase. Within a noun phrase, a preposition serves as a post modifier, enhancing the detail of the noun or noun phrase. In this study, errors involving prepositions were identified as misformations, totaling four instances. Such errors occur when students produce incorrect formations of the appropriate prepositions within noun phrases.

Misformation

The error arises from the inappropriate use of the preposition in the sentence. For example:

"*Are you doing an online learning <u>at</u> this pandemic?*"

"*So, the online learning should be stopped and the government should find the other ways to do <u>a learning **at** this pandemic</u> such as learning with face-to-face methods by using health protocol*"

The error happened because the sentence uses the wrong form of the word *"at"*. The word *at* which was placed after *online learning* was inappropriately used. In the sentence above, the preposition *"at"* is used to clarify the noun *"pandemic"*. The preposition *at* is used to talk about points in time, ages, and some periods (Cambridge Dictionary). It is only used in specific points of time, for example at 6 am, at night, at that time, at Halloween, etc. Meanwhile, the appropriate preposition should be *"during"*. According to *Cambridge Dictionary*, *"during"* is used before noun and noun phrases to refer to when something happens over a period of time. It can refer to something that happened while the main event was taking place. In this context, online learning refers to something that happened when the main event was taking place (pandemic). So, the preposition word *"at"* should be changed to the preposition *"during"*. The use of prepositions incorrectly will affect the syntactic rules, so that, the sentence should change the preposition *"at"* to become the preposition *"during"*. Therefore, the sentence can be improved as:

*Are you doing <u>an online learning **during** this pandemic</u>?*

> *So, the online learning should be stopped and the government should find the other ways to do <u>a learning **during** this pandemic</u> such as learning with face-to-face methods by using health protocol.*

Verb Phrase

A verb phrase includes a group of words that essentially contain a verb as its head and which may be preceded by one or more auxiliary verbs (Verspoor & Sauter, 2000). The use of auxiliaries will indicate the speaker intention whether the process that is being written as progressive, past, passive and so on. Thus, the crucial point of constructing verb phrase is a *head* verb and the use of auxiliary will depend on the verb tense form. Errors in verb phrase that was found in students' writing are divided into auxiliary verb with the amount of errors appear 6 times.

Auxiliary verb

Auxiliary verbs in constructing sentence help the speaker or writer easily explain the tense form in accordance with the situation and time of the event which is being discussed. According to Verspoor and Sauter (2000), we can express differences in how an event or situation is viewed by using a different tense or helping verb.

Related to the use of auxiliary verb as a helping verb which indicates time of event or a situation, there are some problem that is erroneous found in students writing. Errors that related to the use of auxiliary verb occur 6 times, which distributed into two subcategories of error such as omission 3 and addition 3.

Omission.

Omission errors in students writing occur because student omitted the use of auxiliary verb which is required to be used. Here is one of the data:

> *Thus, we can see <u>the effects or consequences of the pandemic outbreak in educational world not entirely bad.</u>*

The sentence contains two clauses. The first one is *we can see* and the second one is *the effects or consequences of the pandemic outbreak in educational world not entirely bad*. The second clause contains plural noun phrase *'the effects or consequences'* and it also contain an adjective phrase *'not entirely bad'*. The existence of an auxiliary is required to connect two phrases, which a linking verb that is an auxiliary followed by noun or adjective. Miller (2002) explains that the verb links the subject noun phrase with another phrase, in this case an adjective phrase). However, the sentence omitted the auxiliary verb. Regarding the subject that is a plural noun, it means a plural auxiliary verb that is appropriate to use is *'are'*. So, the structure of the verb phrase will be well-formed by adding the auxiliary. Apparently, the use of noun

clause marker "that" which required to link the two clauses is also omitted here but it not the focus since this section about auxiliary. Therefore, the correction of the sentence is:

*Thus, we can see **that** the effects or consequences of the pandemic outbreak in educational world **are** not entirely bad.*

Addition.

The last error in auxiliary verb is addition errors, where there is an addition of an auxiliary in a sentence that does not require an auxiliary. It can be seen in this following example:

*English **is also will give** you a better chance to get a better job.*

The sentence is actually formed as a future tense form of sentence that is correct, however, the additional word *"is"* has ruined its correctness. Based on Cambridge Advance Learner's Dictionary third edition, auxiliary *is* is typically used in a progressive tense or passive form of tense. Thus, in future tense it is not required. Addition errors are characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance (Dulay et all, 2016). Therefore, the sentence should omit the auxiliary in order to make the sentence correct. The correct sentence is:

English also *will give you* a better chance to get a better job.

Another example is:

*"Mastering English will definitely **helps** you in other country".*

In the sentence, the error is occured in the word *helps*. The student might think that the sentence is well-constructed by knowing the pattern singular noun phrase (mastering English) always followed by a plural verb. However, the sentence above consists of modal. According to Leech (2007), modals (will) always function as operator and occur in first position in the verb phrase. Its formation constructs with bare infinitive of another verb. So, the appropriate usage of the verb is *help* without adding *-s.* In this case, the students are failed to apply the rules of the modals construction in the sentence. As a result, the correction of the sentence is:

*Mastering English **will definitely** **help** you in other country.*

Another Finding

In light of the findings of this investigation, an additional classification not accounted for within the established framework was identified in the current research. This

classification pertained to a specific class of syntactic errors associated with conjunctions.

Conjunction

As per Leech (2007), the term "conjunction" broadly denotes words that fulfill a linking or connecting function in grammar. In practical terms, "conjunction" encompasses two distinct categories of words: coordinating conjunctions (such as "and," "or," "but," and occasionally "nor") and subordinating conjunctions (including "if," "when," "because," and so forth). These are alternatively referred to as "coordinators" and "subordinators," respectively. Coordinators serve to coordinate or link two or more units of equal status, while subordinators are positioned at the outset of a subordinate clause to integrate it with the main clause.

Regarding the employment of conjunctions as linking elements, errors are observed in student writing. Specifically, errors pertaining to conjunction usage are identified six times, manifesting in two subcategories of error: one omission and five additions.

Omission.

Omission errors in student writing arise when a student fails to include a conjunction that is necessary for proper usage. Below is the relevant data:

Because not <u>every book, magazine, newspaper</u> we will read can provide the information we want.

The dependent clause mentioned above includes the noun phrase "every book, magazine, newspaper." The presence of a conjunction is essential for linking two or more units of words. However, the sentence omitted the coordinating conjunction required for this purpose. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, a coordinating conjunction connects items of the same grammatical type, such as words, phrases, and clauses. In this instance, the sentence necessitates the inclusion of the coordinating conjunction "or" to link words of equal status. "Or" is a conjunction that signifies alternatives or possibilities. It is used after the negative form of a verb, in place of "and" (Cambridge Dictionary). This condition is also known as asyndeton, which denotes the omission of connectives, particularly "and," "or," or "but," deviating from the standard coordination constructions. Coordination can occur at various levels of syntax, such as between words. Therefore, the correct sentence would be:

*Because not <u>every book, magazine, **or** newspaper</u> we will read can provide the information we want.*

Addition.

Addition errors are distinguished by the inclusion of an item that should not be present in a grammatically correct sentence (Dulay et al., 2016). The presence of the conjunction in the following sentences is deemed erroneous.

And it makes it easier for them to find information using these tools.

Though there are still obstacles to an area beyond the reach of the internet.

The sentences above include the coordinating conjunction "and" and the subordinating conjunction "though." Both conjunctions are deemed erroneous as they are used inappropriately. According to Vespoor and Sauter (2000), a coordinator links parts of a sentence that have "equal" syntactic value, while a subordinator links a dependent clause or phrase to a clause or phrase of a higher level. However, in the given sentences, neither "and" nor "though" link parts of a sentence that are syntactically equal, nor do they connect any clauses or phrases. Therefore, the sentences will be correctly constructed if the conjunctions are removed, as shown below.

It makes it easier for them to find information using these tools.

There are still obstacles to an area beyond the reach of the internet.

Sources of Error

According to the analysis of the data findings, it is evident that students produce several errors across different classifications in their writing. However, these errors arise due to several factors influencing students, leading to the production of errors. As per Brown (2014), errors produced by students are attributed to interlingual and intralingual factors.

Interlingual Error

Interlingual errors arise from the influence of students' native language on the target language, wherein students inadvertently apply the grammatical rules of their mother tongue to the target language, resulting in erroneous expressions. An illustrative instance of such interlingual errors, drawn from the findings of this study, is evident in the sentence: "In this way, the baby may have difficulty breathing and breastfeeding like other normal babies." Here, the student commits an error concerning a prepositional phrase. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, a prepositional phrase comprises a preposition followed by its complement, typically an -ing clause. However, in the given sentence, the student omits the preposition. The

inclusion of the preposition "in" is requisite to form a prepositional phrase, serving as a post-modifier in the noun phrase "difficulty in breathing and breastfeeding like other normal babies." This error occurs due to the students' tendency to transfer the syntactic structure of their native language to the target language, stemming from a literal translation from Indonesian. In Indonesian grammar, prepositions may be omitted if they do not alter the intended meaning, aiming for sentence neutrality. In Indonesian, the preposition "in" can be translated as "di," "dalam," "di dalam," "pada," "dengan," "menurut," or "dari." In this context, "dalam" accurately conveys the meaning of the preposition "in." However, in Indonesian, the use of the preposition "dalam" can be omitted to enhance the natural flow of the phrase. Furthermore, the absence of "dalam" in the phrase allows Indonesian speakers to infer the implicit meaning of the preposition. Consequently, when adhering to correct English syntax, students inadvertently transfer linguistic structures from their native language, resulting in errors.

Intralingual Error

Intralingual errors represent another significant source of error in students' writing, stemming from the erroneous generalization of the rules within the target language. Through data analysis, various factors contributing to these errors have been identified, including students' disregard for rule restrictions and their incomplete understanding thereof.

Ignorance of rule restriction

Ignorance of rule restrictions constitutes a type of error wherein students fail to adhere to the prescribed rules governing the structure of the language. An example of this error is found in the sentence: "Mastering English will definitely helps you in other country." The error arises in the phrase "will definitely helps you." As per Leech (2007), modals such as "will" invariably function as operators and occupy the initial position in the verb phrase. Their formation entails the bare infinitive of another verb. Thus, the appropriate usage of the verb in this context is "help" without the addition of "-s." In this instance, the students neglect to apply the prescribed rules governing the construction of modals in the sentence. Therefore, the correction of the sentence should be: *"Mastering English **will definitely <u>help</u>** you in other country"*

Incomplete of the rule restriction

Incomplete rule restriction represents another category of errors stemming from students' failure to fully apply the structural rules within the language. In essence, this error arises from learners' inability to construct complete sentence structures. From the data findings, an example of such an error produced by students

is: "Mastering English will definitely help you in other country." In this sentence, the students fail to adhere to the complete rule restriction governing noun phrases. This deficiency is evident in the use of the determiner "other," which should be followed by a plural noun. However, the students erroneously use the singular form of the noun. Additionally, the head of the phrase, "country," should be replaced with another form by adding the morpheme "-es" to indicate the plural form of the noun. Therefore, the correction of the sentence should be: "Mastering English will definitely help you in other countries."

Through these explanations, it becomes evident that both intralingual and interlingual errors, as proposed by Brown (2014), manifest in the students' argumentative essays.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study's analysis is to address the research question: "How are the syntactic errors manifested in students' argumentative essays?" The findings of this study, based on Politzer and Ramirez's (2006) classification, reveal that out of 14 types of syntactic errors, 5 types are prevalent. Consequently, a total of 47 syntactical errors are identified in students' writing. These errors encompass various syntactic categories, with the largest proportion attributed to errors in noun phrases, specifically those involving determiners, totaling 26 occurrences. This is followed by errors in conjunctions (6 occurrences), numbers (5 occurrences), auxiliary verbs (6 occurrences), and prepositions (4 occurrences). Furthermore, another notable finding is the occurrence of errors in conjunctions.

Furthermore, the data analysis aims to identify the sources of errors contributing to students' syntactic inaccuracies. The findings suggest that interlingual and intralingual errors are the primary factors leading students to make syntactic mistakes. Interlingual errors occur when the influence of the mother tongue interferes with the target language. Students often struggle to translate the rules or structures of their native language into the target language, resulting in difficulties in articulating their ideas in written or oral form due to the differing structural characteristics between the two languages. Conversely, intralingual errors stem from erroneous generalizations of the rules within the target language, independent of the influence of the mother tongue (Richard, 2014). Failure to adhere to rule restrictions occurs when students overlook exceptions or fail to apply rules when necessary, a phenomenon closely linked to overgeneralization, as elucidated by Richard (2014). Additionally, incomplete application of rules arises when students inaccurately represent essential components of words, phrases, or sentences. Richard (2014) highlighted that the absence of linguistic norms during the acquisition of the target language contributes to the imperfect application of rules.

In conclusion, several recommendations are proposed for students, teachers, and future researchers. Firstly, considering the significance of English language proficiency in the global community, particularly for EFL learners engaging with global issues, mastering English grammar rules is imperative. Thus, addressing language-related challenges should commence with fostering self-awareness to rectify language issues. For English teachers, identifying the root causes of errors offers valuable insights into devising effective teaching strategies. Teachers can offer targeted instruction on utilizing determiners in sentences, introduce comprehensive lessons on word classes, and underscore the importance of constructing grammatically correct sentences. As for future researchers, there is an opportunity to develop strategies aimed at mitigating syntactic errors identified in this study. Additionally, there is potential to address any shortcomings present in this current research, thereby enhancing the overall understanding of syntactic errors and their resolution.

REFERENCES

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (6th Edition)*. Pearson Education ESL.

Choshen, L., Nikolaev, D., Berzak, Y., & Abend, O. (2020). Classifying Syntactic Errors in Learner Language. *CoNLL 2020 - 24th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, Proceedings of the Conference*, 97–107. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.conll-1.7

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (2016). *Language Two (Second Edition)*. Nada Productions LLC.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Hafiz, M. S., Omar, A.-M. A., & Sher, K. ur R. M. G. (2018). Analysis of Syntactic Errors in English Writing : A Case Study of Jazan University Preparatory Year Students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(11), 113–120.

Leech, G. (2007). *A Glossary of English Grammar (Glossaries in Linguistics)*. Edinburgh University Press.

Muniroh, Z., & Hapsari, F. S. (2018). An Analysis on the Syntactical Errors in the Students' Narrative Writing. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2(02), 133. https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v2i02.2381

Ngangbam, H. (2016). An analysis of syntactic errors committed by students of English language class in the written composition of Mutah University: A case study. *European Journal of English Language, Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 1–13. www.idpublications.org

Politzer, R. L., & Ramirez, A. G. (2006). An Error Analysis of the Spoken English of Mexican-American Pupils in a Bilingual School and a Monolingual School. *A Journal*

of Research in Language Studies.

Radford, A. (1997). *Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English: A Minimalist Approach.* Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2014). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition.* Routledge.

Saputri, N. L. (2018). Morphological and Syntactical Error Analysis on The Students' Descriptive Composition of Private Vocational High School. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching, 1*(02), 174. https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v1i02.1353

Tati, J. S., Gedion, A., & Peter, J. C. (2020). A Syntactic Errors Analysis in the Malaysian ESL Learners ' Written Composition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 3*(6), 96–104.

Verspoor, M., & Sauter, K. (2000). *English Sentence Analysis: An introductory course.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.