



Analysis of Syntactic Language Errors in Narrative Written Discourse Texts

Muhammad F. Masrur¹(✉), Cicik Arista¹, Subandi Subandi¹, Hans Y. T. Dasion¹,
Yogi B. Adimas², and Rendy Aditya³

¹ Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia
muhammadmasrur@unesa.ac.id

² Universitas Padjajaran Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

³ Universitas Negeri Jakarta, East Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract. The learners' language logic still depends on the mother tongue logic. It is one of the factors causing language errors. At the syntactic level, language logic has become more complex. This research used a qualitative method to analyze the narrative texts of the 2019 Mandarin Education Study Program students at Universitas Negeri Surabaya. It is found that language errors at their syntactic level included the phrase level (misordering of particles, excessive use of particles, loss of construction particles, improper use of superlative particles, and diction errors in one of the particles), clause level (misuse of the subsidiary particles, loss of the subsidiary particles, and misplacement of the clause particles), and sentence level (improper use of certain function marker subsidiary particles, loss of construction particles, and unique errors). Based on the explanation, three categories of errors were found. The first is errors due to first language interference (level of phrases, clauses, and sentences). Interference at the sentence level has the highest frequency. The second is that developmental errors occur at all levels. The last category is unique errors. It is an illogical error due to an irregular sequence of structure construction particles resulting in the loss of cohesion and coherence.

Keywords: Language error · Narrative · Mandarin language · Syntax · Discourse

1 Introduction

Learners consider writing skills, especially in learning foreign languages, difficult. In this case, foreign language learning still leaves many problems related to writing skills [1, 2]. Although in the learning process, students are also taught about the rules of language, vocabulary and so on. But the fact is that students still make many errors when expressing thoughts and ideas in the form of written language. These errors include errors in using vocabulary, conjunctions or connecting words, sentence structure, and the syntactic tools that make up these particles.

The factors that cause difficulties in writing skills are the complexity of the components involved in writing skills. Subandi et al. [3] stated that writing skills are not only determined by aspects of language rules, but the accuracy of various written languages and diction usage are also determining factors. Therefore, forming writing skills

in learners is not easy, considering that writing skills involve not only linguistic knowledge and the accuracy of language particle usage but also non-linguistic knowledge and skills, such as learners' psychological aspects [1, 4, 5]. As stated in [6–8], linguistic aspects, such as the use of various written languages, the accuracy of diction usage, and non-linguistic aspects have a significant influence on writing activities. It means that although errors in the foreign language learning process are considered natural, it is prone to language errors. It can be said that the occurrence of errors in foreign language learning is a certainty [9–11]. Meanwhile, Stanley et al. [12] also mentioned that learners often make daily errors in learning a language.

The problems mentioned above also occur in students of Mandarin Education Study program, UNESA. Subandi et al. [3] stated the most frequent errors are in writing skills. At this level, the students' limitations of foreign language competence and logical intervention in the mother tongue are still dominant. The results found error due to students' first language interference and unique errors.

The complex problem of teaching students' writing competencies must still be used to improve the learning quality. It is because written language is often used to communicate the author's thoughts and ideas to others so that writing skills remain an essential competency [13–14]. Meanwhile, the errors made by students are still seen from the aspect of using Mandarin in writing. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the syntactic-level linguistic errors in narrative discourse texts written by Mandarin Education Study Program students, UNESA.

1.1 Error Analysis and Model of Error Analysis

Language error analysis is used to identify, classify, and interpret errors in foreign language learners by using linguistics theories [6, 15, 16]. Language errors are also often interpreted as a deviation form in the use of the target language particles due to not having mastered the rules perfectly [17]. Thus, the occurrence of errors in seems difficult to avoid. Language errors are caused by the involvement of learners' language logic of the first language, lack of foreign language rules mastery, and or improper teaching of foreign language [18–19]. In contrast, some researchers [20–22] argued that errors are actually part to fill in the gaps caused by incomprehension so that learners often use their language. However, errors in foreign language learning should still be viewed as an integral part since the occurrence of errors can reflect the developmental level of foreign language learners [15, 17, 23].

Ellis [15] mentioned that errors could not be separated from learning foreign language, especially in writing [10, 16, 24, 25]. Written language errors are analyzed by elaborated language error analysis procedures. Thus, the model for Error Analysis includes five stages [11, 16, 23, 26, 27]. However, the analysis process in this study only reaches the fourth stage: data collection, identification and classification of errors, description, and explanation.

1.2 Syntactic-Level Language Errors

Sentences that conform to the language rules are sentences with syntactic tools based on their functions. However, not all syntactic tools have to be present simultaneously in

one sentence; all are context-adjusted. Syntactic tools must be explicit and assembled based on syntactic rules to form a logical set of language particles [28]. It is in line with Fragan in [29] that the linguistics subfield known as syntax is concerned with sentence structure, and it deals with word categories and the rules for combining these categories from the language sentences. Richard [17] also explained that syntax is the study of how words combine to form sentences and the rules governing sentence formation. It can be interpreted that language particles are not just lined up where they like to form the language structure.

1.3 Writing Skills

Written language communication is indirect communication; thus, the written language that is used must be easily accepted and understood by the readers [10, 30]. In general, writing skills can be interpreted as skills to deliver ideas and thoughts into written language through language particles that form a sequence according to the rules completely and systematically [31–32]. Therefore, it constructs a meaning that the readers can understand. Writing competency not only relies on the language acquisition aspect, but also must be supported by other skills aspects formed through habits and practices [1, 3]. Writing skills are not formed within a short period, it needs extensive process and also habitual process. Therefore, training and practices must be given starting from the beginner level to form learners' habits and gradually build skills.

2 Methods

This study employs qualitative method using Mandarin Education Study Program students in Class A 2019/2020, UNESA, with 39 students as the research subjects. Meanwhile, the research data is in the form of syntax-level linguistic errors in the students' narrative writing discourse texts. Later, data of errors were identified and placed into a data classification table that consists of phrase-level errors with 13 data, clause-level errors with 23 data, and sentence-level errors with 26 data. Next, according to the classification table, the data were analyzed using Corder's analysis model [16] and were described to get a detailed and concreted depiction.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Phrase-Level Errors

Five error types were found in phrase-level errors. Each type of error can be described as follows.

3.1.1 Misordering of Words

An entire case of the error caused by misordering of words was dominated by phrase which one of its forming particles was functioned as an attribute. Compared to other error types in the phrase level, this error type had fewer errors. In Mandarin, an

explaining-explained law is applied in the unit phrase where attribute particles are put first and then followed by ordinate particles. As an example, the phrase “水果店的榴莲” (*shuiguodiàn de liúlián*) “durian fruit shop”. In this phrase structure, the word particle “水果店” (*shuiguodiàn*) “fruit shop” took a role as ordinate particles, which became the meaning center and placed as explained particles. On the other hand, the word particles “榴莲” (*liúlián*) “durian” worked as attributive particles, which explains the other particles “水果店” (*shuiguodiàn*) “fruit shop” that became the construction particles in the phrase structure. Based on the analysis result, the phrase structure above was deviated from Mandarin syntactic rules. It was marked with the arrangement of its construction particles, between particle “榴莲” (*liúlián*) “durian” which was functioned as an attribute to particles “水果店” (*shuiguodiàn*) “fruit shop” as ordinate elements swapped place. According to Mandarin syntactic rules, attribute particles must be placed before the ordinate particles. Hence, phrase structure “水果店榴莲” (*shuiguodiàn de liúlián*) “durian fruit shop” was obtained. Next, to show the relation of possessive attribute meaning, which worked to limit the meaning scope of ordinate particles, the lingual unit “的” (*de*) “~ of” was needed between two construction particles. Therefore, a proper phrase structure in accordance with Mandarin syntactic rules was obtained, which was “榴莲的水果店” (*liúlián de shuiguodiàn*) “fruit shop of durian”. Another example that was considered a part of this error category is “再要” (*zàiyào*) “again will”, “要再” (*yàozài*) “will again”.

3.1.2 Excessive Use of Particles

The syntactic rules of each language already set the relations among phrase construction particles. Syntactic rules are fixed and must be obeyed when composing the phrase-level structure. Each particle’s existence that caused excessive usage of particles could not be accepted. It is because the existence of particles outside these rules would interrupt the relation between construction particles in the structure and the semantic relation among its construction particles. For instance, phrase structure “红毛丹的果实” (*hóng máodān de guoshí*) “rambutan fruit”. According to the Mandarin syntactic rules, the phrase structure above has no errors in the placement of phrase construction particles because it was proper. A problem will arise if it is observed from a semantics aspect, where the existence of word elements “的果实” (*de guoshí*) “fruit” caused doubled meaning and language redundancy. It was an unrequired particle that was presented in the structure. It happened because the phrase unit “红毛丹” (*hóng máodān*) “rambutan” already has a fruit reference meaning. It means that from the case of phrase structure above, the word particle “的果实” (*de guoshí*) “fruit” presence was no longer needed. Thereby, in order to keep the phrase structure appropriately, the phrase structure with the construction particle “红毛丹” (*hóng máodān*) “rambutan” was already sufficient.

3.1.3 Loss of Construction Particles

A case of language errors where one of the phrase loss of construction particles is missing was also found. For instance, it happened in the phrase structure “买了” (*maile*) “buy”. This phrase structure physically has two loss of construction particles, which are the verb “买” (*mai*) and time pronoun “了” (*le*) to show that the event happened in the

past. Based on the lingual unit level in Mandarin, the pronoun “了” (le) is a unit of a bound morpheme with a semantic function to mark the past. Thus, it cannot occupy the word level and become one of the construction particles of the phrase structure. According to the grammatical context, phrase “买了” (*maile*) “buy” must be added with one construction particle “一共” (*yígòng*) “all”, which works as the attribute particle. It explained the quantity aspect towards the ordinate particle “一共买了” (*yígòng maile*) “all that already bought” was properly and appropriately in line with the grammatical context demand in the discourse text. Below is an example of a phrase structure with similar errors, “种水果” (*zhǒng shuǐguǒ*) “type of fruits”, “几种水果” (*jǐzhǒng shuǐguǒ*) “several types of fruits”.

3.1.4 Improper Use of Superlative Particles

There were several types of superlatives in Mandarin language, such as “太” (*tài*) “too”. Based on Mandarin syntactic rules, the use of superlative requires that the particle “了” (le) must be presented at the end of the structure. Hence, the pattern “太...了” (*tài...le*) could be attained. As an example, the phrase structure “太贵了” (*tài guìle*) “too expensive”. Word particle “太” (*tài*) “too” played the role as an attribute that explains the superlative aspect towards the ordinate particle “贵” (*guì*) “expensive” and followed by lingual unit “了” (le) “final marker” to fulfill the syntactic demand of Mandarin language. It is due to “太” (*tài*) “too” presence as a construction particle. However, in the students’ written discourse text, the phrase structure “太贵子” (*tài guìzi*) “too expensive” was found. In this phrase structure, a misuse of the final marker particle happened “子” (*zi*), which the particle includes at the word level. Yet, it did not own the semantic function of the final marker according to Mandarin syntactic rules requirements. Therefore, the phrase structure “太贵子” (*tài*) “too expensive” consisted of three singular words as the construction particles. Meanwhile, “太贵了” (*tài guìle*) “too expensive” consisted of two particles, which are one singular word “太” (*tài*) “too” and one invented word “贵” (*guì*) “expensive”. With the replacement of the final marker particle “了” (le) with particle “子” (*zi*), the phrase structure “太贵子” (*tài guìzi*) “too expensive” definitely could not be accepted because it deviated from Mandarin syntactic rules. Hence, the phrase structure must be corrected, such as the phrase structure “太贵了” (*tài guìle*).

3.1.5 Diction Errors in One of the Particles

In linguistic theory, the construction particles of phrase structures had no solid relation to each other. However, if there was a error in selecting the word, it would change the phrase meaning and the phrase structure errors. For instance, based on the learners’ language logic, the phrase structure “味酸” (*wèi suan*) “sour taste” had no errors physically. However, if it is observed from Mandarin language logic and syntactic aspects, the phrase structure could not be accepted since it deviated from Mandarin syntactic rules. Firstly, the word (*suan*) with letter “酸” already had “taste” reference meaning in Mandarin. Thus, if “味” (*wèi*) “taste” was added as a construction particles, there would be a meaning accumulation of “taste”. Secondly, even though the word element “酸” (*suan*) “sour” is semantically an independent word, but morphologically, it cannot stand by itself, and it must follow a word that has a superlative meaning, such as

“很” (*hen*) “very”. Hence, the phrase structure “很酸” (*hen suan*) “very sour” is formed. This phrase structure can be accepted both in syntactic rules and in grammatical context aspect where the phrase originated.

3.2 Clause-Level Errors

Errors in this clause-level are relatively few, both from the number of errors and the types of errors. Overall, three error types related to structural were found. It is depicted as follows.

3.2.1 Misuse of Subsidiary Particles

In clause structure, the presence of subsidiary particles has a c role since it also determines the clarity and certainty of the clause’s meaning. In addition to causing syntactic deviations, errors in the use of subsidiary particles also cause biased meaning. For example, the clause structure “买二个西瓜” (*mǎi èr gè xīguā*) “buying two watermelons”. In the clause structure above, there is an error in the use of subsidiary particles “二” (*èr*) “two”. In Mandarin, the word “二” (*èr*) “two” belongs to the type of numeral word and is used to express the numeral amount without being followed by a unit marker. When the numeral word “二” (*èr*) “two” is followed by a unit marker particle, such as “个” (*gè*) “fruit”, then the word numeral “二” (*èr*) “two” cannot be used and must be replaced with a numeral word with the same meaning, namely “两” (*liǎng*) “two”. So, the clause structure can be obtained “买两个西瓜” (*mǎi liǎng gè xīguā*) “buying two watermelons” based on the Mandarin syntactic rules. On the other hand, the numeral word “两” (*liǎng*) “two” independently cannot stand alone. It must be followed by a unit marker particle other than “个” (*gè*) “fruit”. It can also be followed by “两张纸” (*liǎng zhāng zhǐ*) “two sheets of paper”, “两辆车” *liǎng liàng chē* (*liǎng liàng chē*) “two cars”, and “两位老师” (*liǎng wèi lǎoshī*) “two teachers” and etc. Based on the description above, although it has the same meaning semantically, the clause structure “买二个西瓜” (*mǎi èr gè xīguā*) “buying two watermelons” cannot be accepted and clause structure “买两个西瓜” (*mǎi liǎng gè xīguā*) “buying two watermelons” is accepted. Another example of this type of error is in the following phrase structure “吃酸” (*chī suān*) “eating sour” “吃酸的” (*chī suānde*) “sour food”.

3.2.2 Loss of Subsidiary Particles

Errors due to the loss of the core particles that make up the clause structure can result in structural errors and changes in the clause’s meaning. An example of this type of error is “还Ø 我妈妈” (*hái wǒ māma*) (still my mother). The above clause is correct if it is viewed from the order in which the constituent particles are placed. However, suppose it is seen from the Mandarin syntactic rules. In that case, the clause structure as above is not acceptable since it causes the clause meaning to be grammatically inconsistent (in addition to a vacancy (Ø) in the clause structure due to the absence of subsidiary particles in the structure). Therefore, subsidiary particles must be presented so that there is no vacancy in the clause structure and its meaning is grammatically coherent. “有” (*yǒu*) must be presented so that the clause structure “还有我妈妈” (*hái yǒu wǒ māma*) (my

mother, too) will be obtained. This clause structure is acceptable since it is in accordance with Mandarin syntactic rules, and semantically, it has a coherent meaning with the clause's grammatical aspect. Another example of error due to the loss of subsidiary particles is “买 Ø 种水果” (*mǎi Ø zhǒng shuǐguǒ*) “buying Ø kinds of fruit”. The clause structure will be acceptable if it is presented with subsidiary particles “几” (*jǐ*) in the position of an empty clause structure so that a clause structure “买几种水果” (*mǎi jǐ zhǒng shuǐguǒ*) “buying **some** kind of fruit” will be obtained.

3.2.3 Misplacement of the Clause Particles

The misplacement of clause particles is indicated by the presence of position errors in all particles that construct the clause structure, especially the incorrect position of the verb core particles. For example, in the clause structure “妈妈交给售货员钱” (*māma jiaogěi shòuhuòyuán qián*) “mother gives the waiter money”. The clause structure above contains no errors based on the logic of the learner's language using Indonesian as the first language. However, in the Mandarin syntactic rule system, some rules arrange that if a clause or sentence has the meaning concept of giving and or receiving activity, then the particles of it must be placed behind the verb give and or receive. Besides, the object given and or received is placed in front of the verb give and or receive, and in front of the object, it must be added with the subsidiary particle “把” (*bǎ*), a marker of the transferred meaning of an object from the giving party to the receiving party. In clause structure “妈妈交给售货员钱” (*māma jiaogěi shòuhuòyuán qián*) “mother gives the waiter money,” verb particle “交” (*jiao*) “give” plays a role as a core particle so that its position in the structure determines the other particles' position. The particle that acts as an object is a noun “钱” (*qián*) “money” so that, at the beginning of this noun, it must be added with a subsidiary particle “把” (*bǎ*), meaning marker of the object displacement so that the composition “把钱” (*bǎ qián*) is obtained. Next, composition “把钱” (*bǎ qián*) must be placed after the subject “妈妈” (*māma*) “mother” and in front of the verb “交” (*jiao*) “give” so that the structure “妈妈把钱交” (*māma bǎ qián jiào*) will be obtained. Next, at the end of this structure, it is followed by a particle that acts as a goal, namely “给售货员” (*gěi shòuhuòyuán*) “to the waiter” so that overall, a clause structure that is acceptable and based on the Mandarin syntactic rules can be obtained, namely “妈妈把钱交给售货员” (*māma bǎ qián jiào gěi shòuhuòyuán*) “Mother gives the money to the waiter”. Meanwhile, the factors causing the non-acceptance of the clause structure “妈妈交给售货员钱” (*māma jiaogěi shòuhuòyuán qián*) “mother gives the waiter money” are nominal particle “钱” (*qián*) “money” which becomes the object occupies a position behind the particle that is the goal, namely “售货员” (*shòuhuòyuán*) “the waiter”. Second, the absence of subsidiary particles “把” (*bǎ*) is a meaning marker of displacement in front of the nominal, which functions as an object. The syntactic rules that arrange the clause and or sentence structures are quite difficult for beginners or intermediate Mandarin learners who speak Indonesian as their mother tongue. Thus, it is very vulnerable to cause learners' language errors.

3.3 Sentence-Level Errors

The sentence-level error can be classified into three. The first error is the improper use of certain function marker subsidiary particles. In this case, the placement of sentence-construction particles order is correct. However, due to the inappropriate use of subsidiary particles, the sentence structure is not in accordance with Mandarin syntactic rules, and semantically, its meaning becomes illogical. Below is the example of it.

- (1) “这个葡萄是太酸了和苹果是太甜了” (*Zhège pútáo shì tài suānle hé píngguǒ shì tài tiánle*)

“This grape **is** too sour and apple **is** too sweet.”

The presence of subsidiary particles “是, 是” (*shì, shì*) “is, is” is a factor causing the incompatibility of the sentence structure with the provisions of the Mandarin syntactic rules. It causes the sentence meaning become grammatically illogical. Therefore, the presence of subsidiary particles is undesirable. It is a result of a syntactic mechanism existence that regulates the use of subsidiary particles “是” (*shì*) “is” which is also a binder for the use of these subsidiary particles. It is the subsidiary particle “是” (*shì*) “is” can only be used in nominal sentence structures and declarative sentence.

Based on the sentence type, data (1) is categorized as a declarative sentence, but based on the structure type, it is an adjective sentence. It is since semantically, it emphasizes the information on the meaning of circumstances, conditions, character of an object. Through this logic of understanding, it can be ascertained that the presence of subsidiary particles “是” (*shì*) “is” in the adjective sentence structure (1) above is incorrect and causes an error. It is due to the deviations from Mandarin syntactical rules, and also causes the meanings to be grammatically illogical. Thus, the subsidiary particles must be removed as follows.

- (2) a. “这个葡萄和苹果都太酸了”

(*Zhège pútáo hé píngguǒ dōu tài suānle*)

“Wine and these apples are all too sour.” or

- b. “这个葡萄太酸了但是 这个苹果太甜了”

(*Zhège pútáo tài suānle danshi, zhège píngguǒ tài tiánle*)

“This wine is too tart, **but** this apple too sweet.”

Sentence structures (2a) and (2b) are syntactically appropriate and semantically meaningful. Thus, the existence of the those two structures can be accepted.

Second, errors due to the loss of subsidiary particles result in differences in the sentence’s meaning. Syntactically, this error is not completely deviated, but the resulting meaning is very different from the actual meaning. The correcting process of it must be carried out to convey the correct information as follows.

(3) “售货员给我们 \emptyset 苹果”

(*Shòuhuòyuán gěi wǒmen \emptyset píngguǒ*)

“The waiter **gave** us \emptyset apples.”

In data (3), there is a vacancy in the \emptyset position as a result of not presenting the construction particles. When data (3) stands alone, it is syntactically acceptable since it is under Mandarin syntactical rules. However, from the grammatical aspect, the sentence's meaning (3) will result in an illogical meaning, since it only presents one verb particle “给” (*gěi*) “to give”. The resulting meaning is a giving activity, not buying and selling meaning.

In contrast, based on the grammatical meaning of the sentence that precedes (a process of asking for a price) or the accompanying sentence (high price information), data (3) must contain the concept of buying and selling meaning. Thus, it is grammatically unacceptable. This understanding reinforces the assumption that in data (3), there is a language error (loss of the construction particles) which results in a vacancy in the \emptyset position and causes a grammatical discrepancy in the sentence meaning. Therefore, data (3) will be accepted syntactically and semantically if the construction particle “卖” (*mài*) “to sell” presents as in data (4).

(4) “售货员给我们卖苹果”

(*Shòuhuòyuán gěi wǒmen mài píngguǒ*)

“The waiter **sells** us apples.”

The construction particle of the verb “卖” (*mài*) “to sell” lexically means to buy, but after being inserted into a sentence structure that comes with the verb particle “给” (*gěi*) “to give” undergoes a grammatical process and produces the meaning of “selling”.

The third is unique or illogical errors. This type of error, syntactically, the sequence and the use of irregular structural construction particles and the absence of the necessary construction particles and/or subsidiary particles in sentence structure. Besides, semantically, the meaning relationship between construction particles is illogical. The example can be seen as follows.

(5) “我还要 \emptyset 来 \emptyset 榴莲的水果店”

(*Wǒ hái yào \emptyset lái \emptyset liúlián de shuǐguǒ diàn*)

“I will still come durian fruit shop.”

The construction particles in data (5) do not occupy their proper position and structural construction, and subsidiary particles are lost. Thereby, there is a vacancy in the position of \emptyset , and the resulting meaning is also illogical. Since the sentence structure (5) cannot be accepted, basic adjustments must be made as below.

Table 1. Samples of category errors

Level Category	Phrase	Clause	Sentence
Interference	红毛丹的果 <i>hóng máodān de guǒ</i>	找西瓜 <i>Zhǎo xīguā</i>	售货员给我们 \emptyset 苹果 <i>Shòuhuòyuán gěi wǒmen \emptyset píngguǒ</i>
Developmental	多少种 <i>duōshǎo zhǒng</i>	草莓味酸 <i>cǎoméi wèi suān</i>	这个葡萄是太酸了和苹果是太甜了 <i>Zhège pútáo shì tài suānle hé píngguǒ shì tài tiánle</i>
Unique	不贵很好吃 <i>Bú guì hěn hào chī</i>	妈妈给售货员钱 <i>māma gěi shòuhuò yuán qián yuán</i>	我还要 \emptyset 来 \emptyset 榴莲的 水果店 <i>wǒ hái yào \emptyset lái \emptyset líulían de shuǐguǒ diàn</i>

(6) “我还要再来买水果店的榴莲”

(*wǒ hái yào zàilái mǎi shuǐguǒ diàn de líulían*)

“I will still come to the fruit shop to buy more durians.”

Syntactically, data (6) follows Mandarin syntactic rules so that the sentence meaning is logical.

3.4 Explanation of Errors

The explanation of the errors is done by elaborating the concepts by Corder [11] and Dulay et al. [10]. To simplify, the results are displayed in Table 1.

4 Conclusion

Based on the research findings, language errors at the syntactic level occur at the level of phrases, clauses, and sentences in students' written discourse texts. At the phrase level, errors include misordering particles, excessive use of particles, loss of construction particles, improper use of superlative particles, and diction errors in one of the particles. At the clause level, errors consist of misuse of the subsidiary particles, loss of subsidiary particles, and misplacement of the clause particles. Besides, at the sentence level, errors include improper use of certain function marker subsidiary particles, loss of construction particles, and unique errors.

In the error explanation, three errors types are found. The first is errors due to first language interference occurring at the level of phrases, clauses, and sentences. Interference at the sentence level has the highest frequency. Overall, the number of interference-type errors is the most since students are still at the intermediate level. The second is developmental errors, which also occur at all levels, although not as many as interference category errors. In this category, errors are not fundamental but only

need refinement. The last error category is unique which has the lowest frequency of occurrence.

Authors' Contributions. All authors contributed to the research's design and implementation, the results analysis, and the manuscript's writing.

References

1. C. Arista and S. Subandi, "Analysis of language errors at the level of syntax in writing free discourse text," in *International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2020*, pp. 714–721.
2. K. Hyland, *Second Language Writing*. UK: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
3. S. Subandi, X. Renfei, and G. Wibisono, "The error analysis of narrative text on Mandarin discourse: Case study of Indonesian students in China," in *International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2020*, pp. 747–754.
4. J. A. Jassem, *Study on Second Language Learners of Arabic: An Error Analysis Approach*. Malaysia: AS Noordeen, 2000.
5. S. Subandi, "Peningkatan keterampilan berbicara mahasiswa Bahasa Jepang melalui pendekatan lesson study dengan menggunakan materi ajar apresiatif," *Paramasastra: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Sastra dan Pembelajarannya*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 92–108, 2014.
6. D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. UK: Blackwell Publishing, 2011.
7. S. K. Sharma, "Practical and theoretical consideration involved in error analysis," *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics New Delhi*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 74–83, 1980.
8. M. Javed, W. X. Juan, and S. Nazli, "A study of students' assessment in writing skills of the English language," *International Journal of Instruction*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 129–144, 2013.
9. H. D. Brown, *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching (4th ed.)*. New York: Longman, 2000.
10. H. Dulay, M. Burt, and S. Krashen, *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
11. S. P. Corder, *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1981.
12. L. C. Stanley, D. Shimkin, and A. H. Lanner, *Ways to Writing: Purpose, Task, and Process (2nd ed.)*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988.
13. P. W. Peterson, *Developing Writing: Writing Skills Practice Book for EFL*. Washington: US Department of State, 2003.
14. A. Oshima and A. Houge, *Writing Academic Essay: Forth Edition*. White Plains: Longman, 2006.
15. R. Ellis, *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1994.
16. S. P. Corder, *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. London: Penguin Books, 1973.
17. J. C. Richard, *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Routledge, 1984.
18. T. McEnery, and R. Xiao, "What corpora can offer in language teaching and learning," in *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, E. Hinkel, Eds. New York: Routledge, 2011, pp. 364–380.
19. F. Xie and X. M. Jiang, "Error analysis and the EFL classroom teaching," *US-China Education Review*, vol. 4, no. 9, pp. 10–14, 2007.
20. D. Larsen-Freeman and M. H. Long, *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Routledge, 2014.
21. F. Sa'adah, "Analisis kesalahan berbahasa dan peranannya dalam pembelajaran bahasa asing," *Wahana Akademika: Jurnal Studi Islam dan Sosial*, vol. 14, no. 1, 2016.
22. A. Khansir, "Error analysis and second language acquisition," *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 1027–1032, 2012.

23. D. A. Londoño Vásquez, “Error analysis in a written composition,” in *Profile Issues in Teachers’ Professional Development*, no. 10, pp. 135–146, 2008.
24. H. Irawati, “Error analysis on grammatical aspects of student’s narrative writing,” *Getsempepa English Education Journal*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2015.
25. A. Andrian, “An error analysis of EFL students’ English writing,” *English Education Journal*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 511–523, 2015.
26. S. M. Gass, J. Behney, and L. Plonsky, *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
27. L. M. Kotsyuk, “English language error analysis of the written texts produced by Ukrainian learners: Data collection,” *Cognitive Studies*, no. 15, pp. 389–395, 2015.
28. M. H. Keshavarz, *Contrastive Analysis: Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Tehran: Rahnama Press, 2015.
29. D. B. S. Murad, L. Azizah, and M. Mannahali, “Analisis kesalahan sintaksis pada karangan deskripsi Bahasa Jerman,” *Interference: Journal of Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 105–116, 2021.
30. V. S. S. Durga and C. S. Rao, “Developing students’ writing skills in English: A process approach,” *Journal for Research Scholars and Professionals of English Language Teaching*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1–5, 2018.
31. J. D. A. Frank, *Process and Composition*. Cambridge: Wintrop Publishert, 1980.
32. R. Badger and G. White, “A process genre approach to teaching writing,” *ELT Journal*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 153–160, 2000.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

