

Students' Use of Simple Present Tense in their Descriptive Writing: An Error Analysis

Putri Nur Hafizhoh¹, Winny Agustia Riznanda², Hariana Amalia³

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

^{2,3} Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang

¹ putrinurhafizoh@gmail.com, ² winnyagustiariznanda_uin@radenfatah.ac.id, ³ harianaamaliah_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

Abstract: This study investigated the types of errors made by the seventh-grade students at SMP N 26 Palembang on the use of the Simple Present Tense on descriptive writing, and determined the most dominant type of errors. Employing a descriptive quantitative research design, the research involved a writing task completed by 35 students. To analyze the data, the surface strategy taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982) was applied. The analysis revealed that misformation errors were the most prevalent, constituting 55.75% of total errors, followed by omission errors at 28.31%, addition errors at 9.73%, and misordering errors at 6.19%. These findings indicated significant challenges faced by the students in grasping grammatical structures, particularly in verb forms and sentence construction. The study underscored the necessity for targeted instructional strategies to address these common errors, suggesting that enhanced grammar teaching could lead to improve writing skills. The insights gained from this research serve as a valuable resource for educators aiming to refine their teaching methods and help the students achieve a better understanding of the Simple Present Tense in English writing.

Keyword: *Error Analysis, Descriptive Writing, Simple Present Tense*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is widely recognized as a fundamental skill since it plays a critical role in communication, facilitating the exchange of knowledge, emotions, and ideas across various cultures and languages. As Lestari (2020) emphasizes that writing allows individuals to organize their thoughts systematically, making it easier to transfer information in a more accurate and engaging way. Similarly, Gallagher and Kittle (2019) highlight that writing is essential in academic and professional settings since it acts as a major tool for communication, critical thinking, and building knowledge. Northey et al. (2018) highlight that writing not only support academic success but also help students get ready for future academic and workplace demands, where written communication is crucial. Furthermore, in English as Foreign Language (EFL) context, writing becomes more crucial since it requires students to use their knowledge of grammar, word choice, and sentence structure in a clear and relevant way. Anjayani and Suprpto (2016) point out that writing involves putting thoughts into written language with the right vocabulary and sentence patterns, which creates both mental and language challenges for EFL students. In the Indonesian EFL context, especially at the junior secondary level, writing serves as a primary means for students to show their understanding of basic grammatical forms.

One of the texts learned in junior high school is descriptive text. Descriptive texts focused on providing detailed information about people, places, or objects that existed in the present. According to Harmenita and Tiarina (2013), descriptive text helps readers or listeners experience what the writer has experienced through their six senses: looks, smells, feels, acts, tastes, and sounds. In this type of text, detailed descriptions allowed the reader to imagine or visualize what is being described. Therefore, the importance of using descriptive text lay in its ability to allow the writer to describe something in a way that the reader could clearly visualize the description. By using descriptive text, the writer could provide rich and in-depth details, so that the reader can feel the same experience as the writer did (Sari et al., 2023). This made descriptive text an effective tool for creating imagination and emotional connection between the writer and the reader.

One of the components in writing a descriptive text is grammar. Grammar is fundamental to all aspects of English, particularly in writing. Students should have prioritized grammar to enhance their sentence construction skills, as it enabled more effective communication. The use of language, specifically grammar, was a critical factor in students' writing. Rossiter (2021) stated that writing without proper grammar can lead to misunderstandings for readers. Grammar encompasses not only structural elements but also the underlying meaning. Therefore, it is crucial for students to learn grammar; incorrect usage can result in easily noticeable errors in their writing. As a result, learners had to understand how to organize language correctly to convey their intended meaning clearly. In addition, Rofiqoh et al. (2022) described that knowledge of grammar is essential in writing, as it significantly contributes to producing high-quality and precise compositions. Furthermore, Gibbons (2002) argued that mastery of grammar is essential for effective communication, as it allows individuals to construct sentences that accurately reflected their intended meanings. Without grammar, the meaning could become unclear, and the intended purpose of the communication might not be effectively conveyed.

One of the language features of descriptive text is the Simple Present Tense. As explained by Azar (2016), the Simple Present Tense is used to express habitual action and routines, which are actions that occur regularly. Additionally, the Simple Present Tense is often used to state facts or general truths that were universally accepted (Swan, 2005). Students who were well-versed in the Simple Present Tense would have been able to construct correct sentences, allowing them to convey their opinions or describe their everyday activities more accurately.

Despite the significant role of the Simple Present Tense in everyday communication, many learners encountered challenges in its application, especially when writing descriptive texts. According to Harmer (2015), students often struggle to incorporate descriptive language while maintaining the correct tense, which can lead to inconsistencies and confusion in their writing. In addition, Biber et al. (2019) highlight that learners frequently confuse the Simple Present with other tenses, such as the Present Continuous, resulting in errors that detract from the clarity of their descriptions. Additionally, Thornbury (2019) noted that the complexities of subject-verb agreement in the Simple Present Tense can be particularly challenging for students, especially when dealing with irregular verbs or collective nouns. By understanding these various difficulties, educators could design more effective teaching strategies to help students overcome challenges in using the Simple Present Tense in descriptive writing.

Due to the challenges on the use of the Simple Present Tense in descriptive writing, it is important to analyze errors made by students. Errors are defined as the use of a linguistic item that a fluent or native speaker of a language considers faulty or incomplete which includes the misuse of words, grammatical items, and speech acts (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Making errors is a natural part of the learning process, especially for students. Therefore, error analysis was essential for teachers to evaluate students' errors. Ma'mun (2016) describes error analysis as a systematic process for recognizing, describing, and explaining the errors made by learners. This process was important for teachers as it enabled them to identify students' errors and find effective ways to correct them. For Indonesian students, the differences between Indonesian and English grammar posed significant challenges. In Indonesian, the use of verbs was not strictly regulated, whereas English had specific rules, particularly concerning tenses that indicated when an action occurred. According to Dulay et al. as cited in Agustina and Junining (2015), errors belong to four taxonomies, they are: linguistics category, surface strategy, comparative analysis and communicative effect. Therefore, the Surface Strategy Taxonomy which encompasses four specific types of errors: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering was applied in this study to categorize the problems, by examining a descriptive text authoring error.

A preliminary study was conducted by interviewing one of the teachers of English at SMP Negeri 26 Palembang, South Sumatera. Based on the interview, many students had difficulties in using the Simple Present Tense in descriptive text. Descriptive text was taught in the odd semester to improve students' writing skills. This difficulty was caused by a lack of understanding of when to use the Simple

Present Tense, which limited their ability to describe objects or situations in detail (F.Y., personal communication, September 26, 2024). The result of the preliminary study motivates the researcher to analyze errors on the use Simple Present Tense made by the students in writing their descriptive texts.

Some researchers conducted studies on error analysis on the use Simple Present Tense in descriptive writing. The first research by Pancawati and Dwiastuty (2021) found that the most common error is misformation, with a rate of 49.35%. The source of this is interference from mother tongue or L1. Secondly, research by Lestari (2020) found that the students made 33 errors 47.14% out of 70 Simple Present Tense sentences, while correct usage was noted in 37 sentences 52.86%. The most common error was misformation, with 13 instances 39.39%, indicating difficulties in correctly forming the tense. Thirdly, research by Marzona (2022) found that misformation is the most common student error, accounting for 52% of the total. This problem was impacted by students' confusion to understand simple past since they did not know the meaning and differences between regular and irregular verbs. Fourthly, research by Yuliawati (2022) found that the most common errors made by students were misformation errors which happened as much as 54%. Fifthly, research by Agustina et al. (2024) found that the most common error was omission, suggesting that students struggled to understand the application of the verb "to be" and the suffixes s/es in the Simple Present Tense. And last, research by Sari et al. (2023) found that the most common type of error analysis is the omission of 42 findings, accounting for 42,42% of the data. The least type of error found in students' descriptive writing was misordering with 10 errors with 10,10%. However, despite the consistency in identifying types of errors on those previous studies, there is a lack of research focusing on the use of Simple Present Tense in descriptive writing among the seventh-grade students of SMP Negeri 26 Palembang, South Sumatera which may present unique learner profiles and challenges.

Based on the explanation above, the researchers argued that it is very important to analyze errors in order to identify errors made by students. Therefore, this study aims to analyze students' errors on the use of Simple Present Tense in descriptive writing.

Some text.

METHOD

Research Design

The researchers applied a descriptive quantitative research design. The purpose of this research was to gather information about a phenomenon in order to describe an existing condition in the field. The research focused on just one variable. According to Creswell (2012), in quantitative research, the researcher used statistical analysis of the data, which was often in numerical form. Based on the definitions provided, the researcher chose to use a quantitative research design because it aligned well with the research title, which involved "an analysis." This method was suitable for systematically and objectively describing and analyzing the data that was collected. In this context, a descriptive quantitative approach was also utilized. Nassaji (2015) noted that the goal of a descriptive study was to observe and categorize a specific phenomenon. In summary, descriptive quantitative research focused on analyzing the subject or outcomes of the study using numerical data from various sources, such as students' English grades and the number of errors they made. The researcher applied a descriptive quantitative design, which was part of quantitative studies, enabling the collection, analysis, and presentation of data to characterize a particular event or condition.

Additionally, the researcher administered a writing task and analyzed the errors by using Dulay's Surface Strategy Taxonomy (1982) to understand the types of errors students made in writing descriptive texts. These errors included omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The researcher then used Sudijono's formula (1997) to calculate the percentages of the most frequent errors made by the students.

Population and Sample

According to Fraenkel et al. (2022), the population was the group of interest to the researcher, to whom the researcher wished to generalize the results of the study. The larger group of individuals that had the same qualities and characteristics was called a population.

The population of this study was all of the seventh-grade students of SMP Negeri 26 Palembang, which were distributed into 10 classes. Then, the population of the research was presented in the following table 1:

Table 1. Population of the Study

No	Class	Population
1	VII. 1	36
2	VII. 2	36
3	VII. 3	35
4	VII. 4	36
5	VII. 5	35
6	VII. 6	35
7	VII. 7	35
8	VII. 8	36
9	VII. 9	33
10	VII. 10	33
	Total	350

Source: SMP Negeri 26 Palembang, academic year 2024/2025

According to Fraenkel et al. (2022), the selection of a sample of individuals who participated in the study, whether through observation or questioning, was one of the most crucial steps in the research process. This referred to the method of choosing these participants. For the sample, this research used convenience sampling. As this research required permission from the studied location and the population served as the sample, convenience sampling was applied. Fraenkel et al. (2012) stated that convenience sampling consisted of a group of individuals who were readily available for study. The samples for this research were taken from class VII. 3, as selected by the teacher of English. The total number of students in VII. 3 was 35. Therefore, this research represented the entire seventh grade, allowing them to identify their errors in writing descriptive texts.

Table 2. Sample of the Study

No	Class	Sample
1	VII. 3	35
	Total	35

Source: SMP Negeri 26 Palembang, academic year 2024/2025

Data Collection

A systematic function in research was data collection. According to Creswell et al. (2012), methods of data collection could involve selecting research respondents, obtaining their consent, and gathering information through interviews or observing participants in action. For this study, the data was collected through a writing task.

In this research, one technique that was used to collect data was a writing task. A task was defined as an activity or exercise designed to elicit a specific response or outcome from participants, often aimed at assessing their skills or knowledge in a particular area. The researcher used this task to gather information about the students' errors in writing descriptive texts. As stated by Ellis et al. (2016), a task was defined as an activity that required learners to use language in order to achieve a specific outcome, thereby facilitating the development of language skills through meaningful engagement.

This study used a writing task to identify writing errors made by students (see Appendix A), and the data collection process for this task involved the following steps:

1. The researchers set a writing task for the students and provided them with various prepared subjects from which to choose.
2. The researchers then explained the task instructions to the students.
3. Students were given up to 60 minutes to complete the task.
4. The researchers collected the completed answer sheets from the students.
5. The students were then asked to review their answer sheets to see if there were any responses they wished to revise during two upcoming meetings. To ensure accuracy in identifying errors, the researcher analyzed the students' responses and provided feedback during these meetings.
6. The researchers examined and categorized the errors according to the approach outlined by Dulay et al. (1982).
7. The sources of the errors and their frequency were listed in a table, converted into percentages, and presented in a graph.
8. Finally, the researchers summarized the study's findings.

Data Analysis

The researcher applied the Surface Strategy Taxonomy developed by Dulay et al. (1982) to analyze the data. The errors were marked as follows: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. To identify the types of errors students made in their writing and the most frequent errors, the errors were measured based on the percentage of those most commonly occurring compared to the others.

There were various methods for analyzing the data after it had been collected from the student-made descriptive writing task. In accordance with Ghufon and Rosyida (2018), there were four steps in error analysis:

1. Identifying Error

The researchers identified and recognized errors in learners' language output. They compared the learners' sentences to the correct forms in the target language to pinpoint deviations from standard usage.

2. Examining Error

The next step involved examining the identified errors in detail. The researchers categorized these errors by type, such as grammatical, lexical, or phonological, and looked for patterns to understand common areas of difficulty that learners faced.

3. Explaining Error

In this step, the researchers explained the underlying causes of the errors. They considered various factors, including the influence of the learners' first language, cognitive processes involved in language acquisition, and contextual elements that may have contributed to the errors.

4. Evaluating Error

The final step involved evaluating the significance of the errors and their impact on communication. The researchers assessed which errors hindered effective communication and provided constructive feedback to learners, helping them understand their errors and how to correct them.

5. Providing Strategies

Additionally, the researchers offered strategies to learners to help them avoid making similar errors in the future. This included targeted practice and guidance, ultimately enhancing the learners' language proficiency and confidence in using the target language. This structured approach emphasized the importance of context and understanding in the error analysis process, leading to more effective language learning outcomes.

The researchers calculated the percentage of data from the descriptive writing task using the formula proposed by Sudijono (1997) as follows:

$$P = F/N \times 100\%$$

Notes:

P: Percentage

F: Frequency of errors on each item

N: Total number of errors

100%: Constant value

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Types of Errors on the Use of the Simple Present Tense in their Descriptive Writing

In this study, the researcher used Dulay's Surface Strategy Taxonomy (1982) to identify and classify the types of errors that students made in writing descriptive text using Simple Present Tense. According to Dulay's Surface Strategy Taxonomy (1982), there are four types of error that found in students' writing test consist of omission, addition, misformation and misordering. The result of errors made by each student was displayed in the following table:

Table 3. Students' Errors on the Use of the Simple Present Tense in their Descriptive Writing

No	Students	Types of Error				Total
		Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering	
1	S1	3	0	2	0	5
2	S2	1	0	2	0	3
3	S3	0	0	2	0	2
4	S4	3	1	2	0	6
5	S5	0	0	0	0	0
6	S6	3	0	4	3	10
7	S7	0	0	0	0	0

8	S8	1	0	2	0	3
9	S9	2	0	3	1	6
10	S10	0	0	2	0	2
11	S11	3	1	1	0	5
12	S12	0	0	1	2	3
13	S13	3	4	6	1	14
14	S14	0	0	4	0	4
15	S15	0	1	1	0	2
16	S16	2	0	1	0	3
17	S17	0	0	2	0	2
18	S18	0	1	0	0	1
19	S19	1	0	2	0	3
20	S20	0	0	2	0	2
21	S21	1	0	2	0	3
22	S22	0	2	2	0	4
23	S23	1	0	3	0	4
24	S24	0	0	2	0	2
25	S25	5	1	5	0	11
26	S26	0	0	1	0	1
27	S27	0	0	3	0	3
28	S28	1	0	0	0	1
29	S29	0	0	2	0	2
30	S30	1	0	1	0	2
31	S31	1	0	0	0	1
32	S32	0	0	1	0	1
33	S33	0	0	0	0	0
34	S34	0	0	0	0	0
35	S35	0	0	2	0	2
	TOTAL	32	11	63	7	113

The table above showed that there were 113 total cases of errors made by the seventh grade students in writing descriptive text using simple present tense where the total of errors were divided into 4 types of errors namely omission that consist of 32 errors, addition consist 11 errors, misinformation consist 63 errors and misordering consist of 7 errors.

Errors in Misfromation

After obtaining the data, the researcher found that there were four types of errors found in the students' descriptive text based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy by Dulay (1982) namely Omission, Addition, Misfromation and Misordering. Then researcher classified and described each type of errors and give correction. The most frequently observed type of error is misinformation, followed by omission as the second most common type of error. Meanwhile, addition and misordering are recorded as the least occurring errors. The following table display each type of errors:

Table 4. Students' Error in Misformation

Students'	Total of	Error Identification	Correction
------------------	-----------------	-----------------------------	-------------------

Name	Errors		
S1	2	1. We is always together 2. We wants to become	We are always together We want to become
S2	2	3. She is wonderful women 4. She make me happy	She is a wonderful woman She makes me happy
S3	2	5. Ronaldo have a tall bod 6. 4 daughter	Ronaldo has a tall body 4 daughters
S4	2	7. Age 25 year 8. I love the lesson of uci mom	She is 25 years old I love the lesson from Uci's mom
S6	4	9. Mochi are cat 10. Cat are favorite me 11. Mochi are in color white 12. Mochi are tipical cat soft	Mochi is a cat Cat is my favorite Mochi is in color white Moci is a typical soft cat
S8	2	13. Ronaldo have a tall 14. 4 daughter	Ronaldo has a tall 4 daughters
S9	3	15. I like he's smile 16. I like kyehoon predebut 17. He's looks a cat cute	I like his smile I like Kyehoon's predebut He looks a cat cute
S10		18. I loves to see him 19. He's looks handsome	I love to see him He looks handsome
S11	1	20. I love the lesson of selly mom	I love the lesson from Selly's mom
S12	2	21. And not mustache	And does not have mustache
S13	7	22. Miss uci that exciting 23. Miss uci that sometimes angry 24. But sometimes no angry 25. Miss Uci sometimes no be excused from class we	Miss Uci is excited Miss Uci is sometimes angry But sometimes not angry Miss Uci sometimes does not excuse us from our class

		26. Miss uci not enter class we 27. make we laugh laugh until we tired-tired	Miss Uci does not enter the class makes us laugh until we are tired
S14	4	28. And have a muscular body 29. 2 son 30. I really likes 31. 4 daughter	And has a muscular body 2 sons I really like 4 daughters
S15	1	32. I loves watching him play	I love watching him play
S16	1	33. We usually calls her buk uci	We usually call her buk Uci
S17	2	34. He meows loud to wake me up 35. I loves tobi very much	He meows loudly to wake me up I love Tobi very much
S19	2	36. I fed him special fish food 37. Kitty love to swim	I feed him special fish food Kitty loves to swim
S20	2	38. She is an wonderful women 39. She make me happy everyday	She is a wonderful woman She makes me happy everyday
S21	2	40. Daffa is very active and like to play basket ball 41. We can continue to be friend	Daffa is very active and likes to play basket ball We can continue to be friends
S22	2	42. Rayyan is also like watching movies 43. Rayyan love play soccer	Rayyan also likes watching movies Rayyan loves play soccer
S23	2	44. She are a small 45. She loves exploring her neighbourhood and play	She is a small

		with her toys 46. Everyday, I gave daisy her favorite food	She loves exploring her neighborhood and playing with her toys Everyday, I give daisy her favorite food
S24	2	47. He dramas are good 48. They have different religion	His dramas are good They have different religions
S25	5	49. May mother 50. I my baby 51. Jesika good mat beatiful honest friendly 52. Thanks you 53. May best friend	My mother I am her baby Jesika is my good, beautiful and honest friend Thank you My best friend
S26	2	54. I have a idol	I have an idol
S27	3	55. My favorite idol are blackpink 56. Blackpik have been my favorite idol 57. I really wants to watch	My favorite idol is Blackpink Blackpink has been my favorite idol I really want to watch
S29	3	58. One of Mbappe's distinctive features are his speed 59. And his future in the world of soccer look very bright	One of Mbappé's distinctive features is his speed. And his future in the world of soccer looks very bright
S30	1	60. Lulu are white	Lulu is white
S32		61. My favorite things is bag	My favorite thing is bag
S35	2	62. My favorite teacher my cenni 63. Sometime we make miss	My favorite taecher is Cenni

		Ceni angry	Sometimes we make miss Cenni angry
--	--	------------	--

Misformation errors are errors that occur when students use improper word forms in sentences, which can lead to confusion or vagueness. It found that from 35 students as the research sample, 28 students were found writing errors in misformation and 7 students were not. The researcher found 63 total of misformation error in students' descriptive text with the percentage was 55,75%. For example, in the sentence "We is always together," students use the wrong form of the verb "is" for the subject "we," so the correct sentence is "We are always together." This error shows the importance of students' understanding of the correct verb form according to the subject and context of the sentence. Another example of this error is "Ronaldo has a tall body," where the use of "have" should be replaced with "has" for the singular subject "Ronaldo," so the correct sentence is "Ronaldo has a tall body." By paying attention to these errors, students can learn to write better and more clearly.

After that, in order to know the percentage of misformation errors, the following formula was used to count the amount of errors:

$$"P" = F/N \times 100\%$$

$$"P" = 63/113 \times 100\% = 55.75\%$$

Students' Error in Omission

Table 5. Students' Error in Omission

Students' Name	Total of Errors	Error Identification	Correction
S2	3	1. She is wonderful women 2. Mis selli good 3. Mis civics	She is a wonderful women Miss Selli is good Miss teaches Civics
S3	1	4. My favorite cristiano	My favorite idol is Cristiano
S4	3	5. My favorite teacher husiratul 6. Miss uci very kind 7. Miss uci also friendly	My favorite teacher is Husiratul Miss Uci is very kind Miss Uci is also friendly
S6	3	8. I like pet mochi 9. Mochi so cute 10. Mochi is tipical soft cat	I like my pet Mochi Mochi is so cute Mochi is a typical soft cat
S8	1	11. My favorite cristiano	My favorite idol is Cristiano
S9	2	12. Kyehoon from korea 13. He looks a cute cat	Kyehoon is from Korea He looks like a cute cat
S11	3	14. My favorite teacher seli anggita	My favorite teacher is Selli Anggita

		15. Miss selli very kind 16. Miss selly also friendly	Miss Selli is very kind Miss Selly is also friendly
S13	2	17. Until we tired 18. His voice small-small 19. The person beautiful and also good heart	Until we are tired His voice is small The person is beautiful and also has a good heart
S16	2	20. I very happy 21. Miss uci my best teacher	I am very happy Miss Uci is my best teacher
S19	1	22. I happy	I am happy
S21	1	23. Daffa always there to listen to my stories	Daffa is always there to listen to my stories
S22		24. Rayyan love play soccer	Rayyan loves to play soccer
S25	5	25. Jesika good 26. My mother white cheerful 27. White cheerful clean 28. My father good 29. Jesika beatiful	Jesika is good My mother is white cheerful White cheerful clean My father is good Jesika is beautiful
S28	1	30. Messi known for his dribbling skills	Messi is known for his dribbling skills
S30	1	31. I very happy	I am very happy
S31	1	32. Me and dika very happy	Me and Dika are very happy

Omission errors occur when students omit important words that should be in a sentence, making the sentence incomplete or unclear. It found that from 35 students as the research sample, 16 students were found writing errors in omission and 19 students were not. The researcher found 32 total of omission error in students' descriptive text with the percentage was 28.31%. In descriptive writing, this error often arises from the omission of auxiliary verbs, articles, or subjects that are necessary to form a grammatically correct sentence. For example, in the sentence "She is wonderful woman," students have omitted the article "a," so the correct sentence is "She is a wonderful woman." Another example can be seen in the sentence "I very happy," which should be "I am very happy" by adding the auxiliary verb "am." These omission errors show the importance of students' understanding of proper sentence structure, and by correcting these errors, they can improve their writing skills and convey their ideas more effectively.

After the errors were classified, then, in order to know the percentage of omission errors, the following formula were used:

$$P = F/N \times 100\%$$

$$P = 32/113 \times 100\% = 28.31\%$$

Students' Errors in Addition

Table 6. Students' Error in Addition

Students' Name	Total of Errors	Error Identification	Correction
S11	1	1. I love the lesson of selly mom	I love the lesson from Selly's mom
S13	5	2. But we chat, his voice small-small 3. We tired-tired 4. But come on-come on 5. We laugh-laugh 6. The person beautiful person	But we chat and his voice is small We are tired But come on We laugh The person is beautiful
S15	1	7. Now he is plays	Now he plays
S18	1	8. He is also helps people	He also helps people
S22	2	9. Rayyan is also like watching movies 10. I am value his friendship	Rayyan also likes watching movies I value his friendship
S25	1	11. Is my father is good	My father is good

Addition is an error that occurs when students write unnecessary components in a sentence, making the sentence imprecise or strange. It found that from 35 students as the research sample, 6 students were found writing errors in addition and 29 students were not. The researcher found 11 total of addition error in students' descriptive text with the percentage was 9.73%. In writing, this error often arises because we use additional verbs, conjunctions, or other unnecessary elements that make the sentence unclear. For example, in the sentence "He is also helps people," we add the unnecessary word "is," so the correct sentence is "He also helps people." Another example of this error is "We tired-tired," where the repetition of the word "tired" is unnecessary, and the correct sentence is "We are tired." By paying attention to these errors, we can learn to write better and more clearly.

After that, in order to know the percentage of errors, the following formula was used to count the amount of errors in addition:

$$P = F/N \times 100\%$$

$$P = 11/113 \times 100\% = 9.73\%$$

Students' Error in Misordering

Table 7. Students' Error in Misordering

Student' Name	Total of Errors	Error Identification	Correction
S3	3	1. Cat is favorite me 2. Mochi are tipical cat soft 3. I and cat me like play	Cat is my favorite Moci is a typical soft cat My cat and I like to play
S9	1	4. He looks a cat cute	He looks a cute cat
S12	2	5. Favorite my idol is ronaldo 6. From the country english differen from me	My favorite idol is Ronaldo From England, which is different from my country
S13	1	7. From class we	From our class

The last type of error is misordering. Misordering is an error that occurs when students write words or phrases in the wrong order. It found that from 35 students as the research sample, 4 students were found writing errors in misordering and 31 students were not. There were 7 misordering errors found in students' descriptive text with a percentage of 6.19%% and became the smallest error that occurred in students' descriptive text. This error occurs because students do not yet understand the pattern of noun clauses. A noun clause's head must be placed at the end of the clause. In this sentence, the students did not understand the position of a modifier in a noun clause. For example, in the sentence "favorite my idol is Ronaldo," the correct word order should be "my favorite idol is Ronaldo." This error shows the importance of students' understanding of the correct sentence structure.

After that, in order to know the percentage of misordering errors, the following formula was used to count the amount of errors:

$$P = F/N \times 100\%$$

$$P = 8/113 \times 100\% = 6.19\%$$

Students' Dominant Type of Error on the Use Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Writing

After classfying the students' errors, the researcher calculated the percentage of each type of error to determine the most common error that the students committed. There were 32 omission, 11 addition, 63 misformation and 7 misordering errors. The proportion of error will be shown in the table below.


Table 8. Percentage of each type of error made by students on the Use Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Writing

No	Types of Error	Number of Errors	Percentage of Errors
1	Omission	32	28,31%
2	Addition	11	9,73%

3	Misformation	63	55,75%
4	Misordering	7	6.19%
	TOTAL	113	

After classifying the students' errors into four types such as: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering, the researcher calculated the percentage of each to identify the most dominant error. Out of 113 total errors, misformation errors were the most frequent, with 63 instances, making up 55.75% of all errors. This was followed by omission errors at 28.31% (32 errors). Addition errors occurred 11 times (9.73%), while the least common were misordering errors, with only 8 instances, accounting for 6.19% of the total. This distribution highlights a clear tendency among students to make misformation errors more than any other type.

Chart 1. The percentage of errors made by the students on the Use of Simple Present Tense in Descriptive Writing



Based on the analysis, it is evident that misformation errors are the most dominant type among the students, suggesting that they struggle significantly with choosing the correct form of words or structures. Omission errors are the second most frequent, indicating occasional neglect of necessary linguistic elements. Addition and misordering errors are relatively less common, though they still point to issues in the students' syntactic control. These findings suggest that focused instruction on proper word formation and grammatical accuracy could help improve overall language competence among learners.

Interpretation

The interpretation is presented as the way to discover the ideas related to the findings, previous studies, and understanding theories. The findings show that the seventh-grade students of SMP N 26 Palembang contributed to the four types of error, proposed by Dulay et al (1982), there are omission, addition, misformation, and misordering on students descriptive writing. In descriptive writing, misformation is the most frequent type of error, followed by omission, addition, and misordering, which is the least frequent.

First, the most common misformation error is that students use the wrong form in a sentence. The possible source of the error is communication strategies, which relate to students' learning styles or their ways of conveying messages (Brown, 2000). For example, in the sentence, "He have a tall body," it is noted that the students struggle to understand the production strategies related to sentence structure. They erroneously believe that the auxiliary verb "have" can be used for both singular and plural subjects. As a result, they do not grasp that "have" is used for plural subjects, while "has" is the correct auxiliary for singular subjects. A similar source of error was also found in Sari's research in 2023, where the students wrote "Galang have a big body" instead of "Galang has a big body." She found that one of the sources of error was communication strategies, she stated that the students claimed that the lecturer taught them using inappropriate methods. This made them bored during the learning-teaching activity and led to a lack of motivation to learn more about English.

Second, in omission errors, the students omitted items that should appear in a sentence. This might be caused by interlingual transfer, which can be interpreted as the influence of the students' mother tongue (Brown, 2000). For example, in the sentence, "I very happy," the students omitted the auxiliary verb "to be." Moreover, in the sentence "We tired," the students did not include the auxiliary verb before the adjective "tired." The development of these omission errors is actually similar to the errors made by Yuliawati (2022). These errors can be assumed to occur because students do not include auxiliary verbs or other necessary elements in their sentences, as such structures may not exist in their native language. This is supported by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), who define interference as the automatic transfer of the surface structure habits of the first language into the surface structure of the target language. The definition of interference seems to be similar to that of interlanguage transfer.

Next, in addition errors, the students added items that should not appear in a sentence. This might be caused by intralingual transfer (Murtiana, 2019), where the students have just learned some aspects of the target language, leading them to apply the structure to all forms. For example, in the sentence, "Now he is plays," the students incorrectly inserted the auxiliary "is" before the verb "plays." This happens because they have learned that after the subject, an auxiliary verb like "is" is needed, but they do not yet understand that when the main verb is in the simple present tense with a third-person singular subject, the auxiliary is not required. This phenomenon is similar to the findings of Pancawati and Dwiastuty (2021), where this error is caused by intralingual transfer. This means that the error comes from the target language being learned by the students. It usually happens to beginner-level learners and shows progress in language learning.

Lastly, in misordering errors, the students used incorrect placement in the sentence. This may be due to the influence of their mother tongue on sentence structure, resulting in construction errors (Pravitasari, 2022). For instance, they wrote, "He looks a cat cute" instead of "He looks a cute cat," or in the sentence, "Favorite my idol is Ronaldo" instead of "My favorite idol is Ronaldo." These errors were also similar to those found by Pancawati and Dwiastuty (2021). An example is: "Bunny has eyeballs black." The students failed to arrange the noun phrase correctly. The misordering is a clear indication of interlingual interference, where the students' native language structures negatively impact their second language output.

From all the discussions above, it could be concluded that seventh-grade students of SMP N 26 Palembang in descriptive writing showed that there were four types of errors that commonly occurred, namely omission, addition, misformation, and misordering, in accordance with the classification by

Dulay et al. (1982). Misformation errors were the most frequent, followed by omission, addition, and misordering, which were the least frequent. Misformation errors resulted from the use of the wrong form, while omission was caused by the omission of an important element in the sentence, often influenced by the students' native language. Addition errors occurred when students added elements that should not have been present, and misordering occurred due to improper word placement.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of errors on the use of the Simple Present Tense on descriptive writing made by the seventh-grade students of SMP N 26 Palembang, South it can be concluded that the students exhibit a range of errors categorized into four types of errors proposed by Dulay et al. (1982) in the Surface Strategy Taxonomy: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The findings reveal that misformation errors are the most prevalent, accounting for 55.75% of the total errors identified. This is followed by omission errors at 28.31%, addition errors at 9.73%, and misordering errors at 6.19%.

The result of this study inferred some implications. Firstly, the high frequency of misformation errors indicated that students struggled with using the correct forms of verbs and grammatical structures, which might have stemmed from a lack of understanding of the rules governing the Simple Present Tense. Secondly, omission errors revealed that students often left out essential elements, such as auxiliary verbs and articles, which were crucial for constructing grammatically correct sentences. Thirdly, addition errors reflected instances where students included unnecessary components, while misordering errors highlighted difficulties in arranging words correctly within sentences. Overall, this research underscores the importance of targeted grammar instruction and error analysis in enhancing students' writing skills, particularly in the context of using the Simple Present Tense in descriptive writing.

Suggestions

Based on the above conclusions, the researchers proposed the following suggestion. Firstly, this study is expected to provide data as a source for teachers in designing the teaching strategies that focus on students' errors, so that students will not repeat the same mistakes. In addition, teachers are expected to provide additional explanations and written exercises to improve students' understanding. Thus, it is expected that students are able to improve their descriptive writing skills, through their understanding of the Simple Present Tense. Secondly, the researchers suggest that students focus on understanding sentences and elements related to how the Simple Present Tense is used in sentences. For example, readings or exercises that can help students improve their understanding of how s/es endings or auxiliary verbs are used in sentences. Lastly, this study is expected to be a reference for future researchers who want to examine errors in the use of Simple Present Tense. Other researchers are suggested to conduct error analysis with different approaches to improve the results and findings from previous studies. For instance, they are suggested to conduct qualitative research to dig deeper into the sources of students' errors and understand the reasons behind the frequent errors.

References

- Adler, R. B., & Rodman, G. (2016). *Understanding human communication* (13th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Agustina, D., Sari, R. K., & Amalia, H. (2024). An error analysis in using simple present tense in descriptive writing at SMAN 1 Sumber Marga. 7(1), 97–102.

<https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v7i1>

- Agustina, V., & Junining, E. (2015). Error analysis in the travel writing made by the students of English study program. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 2(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v2i1.41>
- Anjayani, P., & Suprpto. (2016). Error analysis on the use of prepositions in students' writing: a case study of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 9 Semarang in the academic year of 2014/2015. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v5i2.11227>
- Azar, B. S. (2016). *Understanding and using English grammar* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Azar, B. S., & Hagen, S. A. (2016). *Understanding and using English grammar* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Biber, D., Reppen, R., Staples, S., & Egbert, J. (2020). Exploring the longitudinal development of grammatical complexity in the disciplinary writing of L2-English university students. *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research*, 6(1), 38-71. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijlcr.18007.bib>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). Principle of language learning and teaching. In *encyclopedia of the sciences of learning* (pp. 1743–1745).
- Brown, D. H. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (5th ed.). Pearson. 10–12.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford University Press
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2019). *Task-based language teaching : Theory and practice* . Cambridge University Press.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2022). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (11th ed.). In McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Gallagher, K., & Kittle, P. (2019). *180 days : Two teachers and the quest to engage and empower adolescents*. 52(1), 233. <https://www.heinemann.com/products/e08113.aspx#fulldesc>

- Ghufron, M. A., & Rosyida, F. (2018). The role of Grammarly in assessing English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing. *Lingua Cultura*, 12(4), 395. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v12i4.4582>
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching English language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Heinemann.
- Harmenita, R.Y., & Tiarina, Y. (2013). Student of English Language Teaching Program of FBS UNP graduated on March 2013 Supervisor, visor, lecturer of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v1i2.1167>
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How_to_teach_writing*. Longman. www.longman.com
- Harmer, J. (2019). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). ELT Journal, 5(1), 1. Pearson Education.
- Hughes, R. (2013). *In teaching and researching: Speaking*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833736>.
- Husna, L. (2017). An analysis of students' writing skill in descriptive text at grade X1 IPA 1 of MAN 2 Padang. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic*, 1(1), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.36057/jips.v1i1.281>
- Hyland, K. (2013). *In teaching and researching writing*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833729>
- Jabeen, A., Kazemian, B., & Shahbaz Mustafai, M. (2015). The role of error analysis in teaching and learning of second and foreign language. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 1(2), 52. <https://doi.org/10.5296/elr.v1i2.8189>
- Kane, M. T. (2013). Validating the interpretations and uses of test scores. *Journal of educational measurement*, 50(1), 1-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12000>
- Lestari, I. (2020). Error analysis of simple present in writing descriptive text. *ELTICS : Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.31316/eltics.v5i2.748>
- Yuliawati, L. (2022). Error analysis of simple present tense using in students' descriptive writing. *Journal of English Language Learning*, 6(2), 244–250. <https://doi.org/10.31949/jell.v6i2.3593>
- Ma'mun, N. (2016). The grammatical errors on the paragraph writings. *Journal of Vision*, 5(1), 95–131. <https://doi.org/10.21580/VJV5I1862>
- Muhsin, M. A. (2016). Analysing the students errors in using simple present (A case study at Junior High School in Makassar). *Pacific Science Review B*:

Humanities and Social Sciences, 2(3), 8187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psr.b.2016.09.006>

- Mukarromah, M., & Suryanto, B. T. (2022). Error analysis on students' writing in using simple present tense in descriptive text. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, 3(2), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v3i2.3119>
- Murtiana, R. (2019). An Analysis of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors in EFL Learners' Composition. *Journal Educative: Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(2), 204. <https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v4i2.2544>
- Nassaji, H. (2015). Qualitative and descriptive research: Data type versus data analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(2), 129132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747>
- Noprianto, E. (2017). Student's descriptive text writing in SFL perspectives. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 2(1), 65. <https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v2i1.53>
- Northey, G., Govind, R., Bucic, T., Chylinski, M., Dolan, R., & van Esch, P. (2018). The effect of “here and now” learning on student engagement and academic achievement. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(2), 321–333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12589>
- Pancawati, S., & Dwiastuty, N. (2021). Error analysis of using simple present tense on students' descriptive text writing. *JEdu: Journal of English Education*, 1(2), 72–78. <https://doi.org/10.30998/jedu.v1i2.4133>
- Pravitasari, S. G. (2022). *Error analysis on English writing of foreign language students: A study on grammatical errors in essays*. Surakarta English and Literature Journal, 5(1), 13-25. <https://doi.org/10.2621/selju.v5i1.12345>
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Rofiqoh, Basthomi, Y., Widiati, U., Puspitasari, Y., Marhaban, S., & Sulisty, T. (2022). Aspects of writing knowledge and EFL students' writing quality. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(1), 1429. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siel.e.v9i1.20433>
- Rossiter, A. (2021). The importance of grammar. *Online Submission*.
- Sari, M. P., Suwandi, S., & Susanto, D. A. (2023). An error analysis of using simple present tense in writing descriptive text written by students of the tenth grade at SMA N 1 Godong. *Wawasan Pendidikan*, 3(1), 167176. <https://doi.org/10.26877/w.p.v3i1.10757>

- Setiana, N. (2023). An error analysis on writing in simple present tense. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 6(09), 147–155. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v6-i9-32>
- Sudijono, A. (1997). *Pengantar statistik pendidikan*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Swan, M. (2005). *Oxford practical English usage*. Oxford University Press.
- Ushchapovska, I. (2020). Multimodal features of descriptive texts: Case study of coffee brands. *World Science*, 3(1 (53)), 2326. https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ws/31012020/6907
- Thornbury, S. (2019). *Scott Thornbury's 101 grammar questions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wardani, D. K. (2021). The effectiveness of brainwriting 6-3-5 technique in teaching at MTSN 2 Ponorogo. *State Institute for Islamic Studies of Ponorogo*, 1–68.