

Exploring Grammatical Errors in a BIPA Learner's Indonesian and English Paragraph Writing

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i5.3251>

*Zelagustina, Rahmat Nasrullah, Faridawati^{abc} 

¹²³Universitas Muhammadiyah Kendari, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: zelagustina.22213028@umkendari.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Grammatical accuracy is important in second-language writing because it supports clear and meaningful communication. This study aims to explore grammatical errors in a BIPA learner's Indonesian and English paragraph writing and examine whether particular error categories recur in subsequent writing. A descriptive qualitative single-case study design was employed using Error Analysis. The participant was a 22-year-old beginner-level BIPA learner in the second semester who had studied BIPA for two semesters. Data were collected from two descriptive paragraph writing tasks. Indonesian errors were analyzed based on Setyawati and Rohmadi, while English errors were classified using Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The findings identified Sentence Structure as the most frequent category in Indonesian and Misformation in English. Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb Construction, and Incorrect Use of Preposition recurred in Indonesian, while Misformation and Omission recurred in English. The study provides an in-depth description of recurring grammatical difficulties in an individual BIPA learner's writing.

Keywords: Grammatical Errors, BIPA Learner, Error Analysis, Paragraph Writing, Writing Tasks

Article History:

Received 30th August 2026

Accepted 26th September 2026

Published 04th October 2026



INTRODUCTION

Global interest in learning Indonesian has continued to grow along with Indonesia's increasing international role and efforts to promote its language and culture. The Indonesian government supports this development through the Bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing (BIPA) program, which provides Indonesian language instruction for foreign learners. In higher education, BIPA programs help international students develop linguistic and communicative competence for academic and everyday interactions. BIPA programs also bring together learners from diverse linguistic backgrounds, creating a multilingual environment in which learners may encounter challenges when acquiring and using Indonesian. Written production provides an important context for examining these difficulties because learners must organize ideas while applying the grammatical rules of the target language. Therefore, examining grammatical errors in BIPA learners' writing can provide more specific evidence of the grammatical difficulties that emerge during language production.

Writing is regarded as one of the most difficult abilities in learning a second or foreign language since students must precisely apply their linguistic knowledge while organizing their thoughts. Writing in a foreign language incorporates procedural, linguistic, and rhetorical knowledge, according to Jiang & Kalyuga (2022). For sentences to be constructed and meaning to be communicated clearly, grammatical competence is crucial. While Lutfiyah et al. (2025) discovered that grammatical knowledge enhances clarity, coherence, and overall writing quality, Rijt and Coppen (2021) stress that grammar offers a conceptual basis for meaningful and coherent writing. For BIPA learners, grammatical mastery can be challenging because Indonesian has linguistic characteristics, including affixation and sentence structures, that may require learners to develop grammatical knowledge that differs from the systems

they have previously acquired. These differences may become visible in written production when learners construct sentences and organize ideas in Indonesian. Consequently, grammatical error analysis can provide useful evidence of the specific areas of grammar that remain difficult for an individual learner.

Examining Indonesian and English writing within the same learner is meaningful because it provides a broader description of grammatical production across two target-language contexts. Since Indonesian and English differ in their grammatical structures and conventions, analyzing the two languages separately can reveal language-specific patterns of grammatical difficulty in the learner's writing. Grammatical errors are an important source of information in second-language learning because they can reveal forms that learners have not yet fully mastered. Error Analysis provides a systematic approach to identifying, classifying, and interpreting such errors (Ellis, 2008). Rather than treating errors simply as incorrect forms, Error Analysis enables researchers to examine patterns in learner production and identify areas of grammatical difficulty. Because Indonesian and English have different grammatical systems, the present study uses different analytical frameworks for the participant's Indonesian and English writing. Indonesian grammatical errors are analyzed using the classification of Indonesian language errors proposed by (Setyawati & Rohmadi, 2010), while English grammatical errors are analyzed using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by (Dulay et al., 1982). The Surface Strategy Taxonomy classifies errors according to the ways learners modify the target form, namely Omission, Addition, Misformation, and Misordering. The use of separate frameworks allows grammatical errors to be interpreted according to the characteristics and norms of each target language rather than applying one classification indiscriminately to both languages.

Previous studies have examined grammatical and language difficulties among BIPA learners, but they differ from the present study in terms of participants, data, analytical framework, and research focus. Septiana et al. (2021) investigated grammatical errors in the writing practice of beginner-level BIPA students. Their study focused on grammatical difficulties in beginner-level Indonesian writing and identified problems related to grammatical forms, including word choice, sentence structure, affixation, and word mixing. Unlike the present study, which focuses on one BIPA learner and examines two writing tasks in Indonesian and English, their study examined writing produced by beginner-level BIPA students and focused on Indonesian writing. Juliana (2022) analyzed language mistakes in descriptive texts produced by BIPA students from South Patani, Thailand. The study employed a qualitative descriptive approach supported by observation, interviews, and documentation and examined language problems in descriptive writing. Its focus was broader than the present study because it considered language mistakes in descriptive texts rather than concentrating specifically on grammatical error patterns across two writing tasks. Fiiarum and Susanto (2023) investigated Indonesian language errors in the writing of advanced BIPA learners using Corder's Error Analysis procedure. Their study classified errors at morphological, syntactic, semantic, and spelling levels and found grammatical difficulties at several linguistic levels, including phrase, clause, and sentence levels. Unlike that study, the present study focuses on one learner in a different learning context and uses Setyawati and Rohmadi (2010) classification for Indonesian grammatical errors while also examining English writing. Jannah and Khaerunnisa (2022) analyzed written language errors in scientific papers produced by BIPA level 7 learners through a descriptive qualitative error-analysis approach. Their study examined errors involving conjunctions, capitalization, punctuation, and sentence structure. Unlike that study, the present research focuses on paragraph writing and examines grammatical error patterns across two writing tasks rather than scientific writing produced by several BIPA learners. Pawoko and Asteria (2025) examined errors in the use of Indonesian language register by foreign learners through a Systematic Literature Review. Their study emphasized register use and linguistic and sociocultural considerations, whereas the present study specifically examines grammatical errors in the written production of one BIPA learner. These studies demonstrate that previous BIPA research has provided important evidence of

learner difficulties but has generally examined different learner groups, language aspects, text types, or analytical purposes.

Research on English learner writing has also identified recurring grammatical error patterns through different Error Analysis frameworks. Putri (2023) investigated grammatical errors and their sources in the written production of Indonesian learners of English. The study used Error Analysis to examine grammatical errors and considered interlingual and intralingual sources of errors. Although this provides a broader explanation of learner errors, the present study does not investigate the causes of errors; instead, it focuses on identifying, classifying, and examining observable grammatical error patterns in the learner's writing. Iswati (2025) examined the English writing of lower- and higher-achieving learners using Error Analysis and classified errors into morphological, syntactic, lexical, and functional categories. The study therefore used a broader linguistic classification than the Surface Strategy Taxonomy employed for English writing in the present research. Ismail and Wulandari (2024) analyzed grammatical errors in students' descriptive writing using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982), which categorizes errors into Omission, Addition, Misformation, and Misordering. Their study found Misformation to be the most frequent category. Farid et al. (2024) also used the Surface Strategy Taxonomy to analyze errors in students' descriptive texts and reported Misformation as a prominent error type. Meylinda (2026) similarly used the Surface Strategy Taxonomy to analyze descriptive texts written by first-semester EFL students and identified Omission, Addition, Misformation, and Misordering. While these studies are relevant to the English component of the present research because they employ the same taxonomy, they differ from the present study in participant characteristics, learning context, and research design. The present study examines an individual BIPA learner who produces paragraph writing in both Indonesian and English, rather than a group of EFL learners producing English writing only.

Although previous studies have contributed substantially to the understanding of grammatical and language errors, their focus has generally been limited to particular learner groups, target languages, text types, or single sets of written data. Previous BIPA studies have mainly examined grammatical and language errors in Indonesian writing, while studies using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy have largely focused on English writing produced by EFL learners. However, limited attention has been given to grammatical error patterns in an individual BIPA learner's writing across more than one target language and more than one writing task. Therefore, the present study examines the grammatical errors produced by one BIPA learner in Indonesian and English paragraph writing across two writing tasks, with particular attention to the recurrence and changes of error categories. Examining two writing tasks makes it possible to describe not only the types of grammatical errors found in each language but also whether particular error categories recur, change in distribution, or do not reappear in the subsequent writing task. This focus is particularly relevant to a single-case study because repeated writing samples provide a stronger descriptive basis for identifying recurring characteristics of an individual learner's written production.

Therefore, this study aims to explore grammatical errors in a BIPA learner's Indonesian and English paragraph writing by identifying and classifying the grammatical errors found in two writing tasks. This study also aims to examine the recurrence and non-recurrence of grammatical error categories across the two writing tasks. By focusing on an individual learner and examining writing in two target languages, this study provides a descriptive account of grammatical difficulties and recurring error patterns in BIPA learner writing.

METHOD

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach with a single-case study design and an Error Analysis framework. The study focused on the grammatical errors produced by one BIPA learner in Indonesian and English descriptive paragraph writing. The single-case design allowed the researcher to examine the learner's individual grammatical error patterns across two writing tasks. Writing Task 1 served as the primary source of data,

while Writing Task 2 was used as a supporting writing task to examine whether grammatical error categories identified in the first task recurred in the learner's subsequent writing.

Respondents

The participant was a 22-year-old beginner-level BIPA learner enrolled in the second semester of a BIPA program at a private university in Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia. The participant had studied BIPA for two semesters. The participant was also able to produce written paragraphs in English. During the period between the two writing tasks, the participant continued to attend regular BIPA classes.

The participant was selected through purposive sampling based on predetermined criteria. The criteria were that the participant was actively participating in the BIPA program during the research period, had a first language other than Indonesian and English, was willing to participate in the study, and was able to produce the required written texts in Indonesian and English.

The participant's identity was kept confidential throughout the study. A participant code was used instead of the participant's real name in reporting and discussing the research findings. To protect the anonymity of the research setting, the name of the university appearing in the participant's original writing was also replaced with the pseudonym "University A."

Instruments

The primary instrument was a writing task designed to obtain the participant's descriptive paragraph writing in Indonesian and English. Two writing tasks were administered to obtain separate writing productions and to examine the recurrence of grammatical errors. In Writing Task 1, the participant was instructed to write a descriptive paragraph on the topic "My Daily Life in Kendari." In Writing Task 2, the participant was instructed to write a descriptive paragraph on the topic "My Life as an International Student." Each paragraph was expected to contain approximately 180–200 words and was completed within 40–60 minutes.

The participant was instructed to complete each writing task independently. The use of dictionaries, translation tools, artificial intelligence tools, and other external assistance was not permitted. Only the participant's initial writing was used as research data; subsequent revisions were excluded from the analysis.

The second instrument was an error analysis sheet used to record and classify the grammatical errors identified in the participant's writing. The analysis sheet contained information including the original form produced by the participant, the corrected form, the grammatical error category, and the relevant analysis. Grammatical errors in Indonesian were identified and classified based on the Indonesian language standards and the classification framework discussed by [Setyawati & Rohmadi \(2010\)](#), while grammatical errors in English were classified using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy proposed by [Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen \(1982\)](#), consisting of Omission, Addition, Misformation, and Misordering.

Procedures

The data were collected through two writing tasks administered three weeks apart. In Writing Task 1, the participant produced one descriptive paragraph in Indonesian and one descriptive paragraph in English on the topic "My Daily Life in Kendari." Three weeks later, Writing Task 2 was administered, in which the participant produced one descriptive paragraph in Indonesian and one descriptive paragraph in English on the topic "My Life as an International Student." During the three-week interval, the participant continued to attend regular BIPA classes and receive Indonesian language instruction.

For each task, the participant was required to produce approximately 180–200 words within 40–60 minutes. The participant completed the writing independently without using a dictionary, translation tools, artificial intelligence tools, or other external assistance. Only the

initial writing produced during each task was treated as research data, while subsequent revisions were not included in the analysis.

After the writing data were collected, the researcher examined the participant's texts to identify grammatical errors. The identification of errors was based on the grammatical standards of the respective target languages. Errors in Indonesian writing were examined according to Indonesian grammatical rules, while errors in English writing were examined according to English grammatical rules. Each identified error was then classified according to the predetermined categories for the respective language.

Writing Task 1 was treated as the primary source of data for identifying the participant's grammatical error patterns. Writing Task 2 served as a supporting task. The error categories identified in Task 1 were traced in Task 2 to determine whether particular grammatical errors recurred in the participant's subsequent writing. Thus, Task 2 was used to provide additional evidence regarding the recurrence of error categories rather than to measure improvement or compare the participant's writing performance across the two tasks.

To ensure the credibility of the analysis, the researcher discussed the identified errors and their classifications with a second rater who had knowledge of Indonesian and English grammar. The discussion was conducted to validate the identification and classification of the errors. Any differences or uncertainties regarding the classification were discussed and resolved through agreement. The validated classifications were then used for the final analysis.

Data Analysis

The data analysis involved identifying, classifying, describing, and interpreting the grammatical errors found in the participant's writing. First, the researcher read and examined the four writing texts to identify grammatical errors in both Indonesian and English. Writing Task 1 was treated as the primary source for identifying and categorizing grammatical errors, while Writing Task 2 was used as supporting data to examine whether the identified error categories recurred across the two writing tasks. Second, each identified error was recorded in the error analysis sheet and classified according to the predetermined classification framework. Indonesian errors were classified using the relevant Indonesian grammatical categories based on [Setyawati and Rohmadi \(2010\)](#), while English errors were classified using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982). Third, the frequency of each error category was calculated to indicate how many times a particular type of grammatical error occurred in each writing task. The percentage was calculated to show the proportion of each error category relative to the total number of grammatical errors identified in the respective writing task. The percentage was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage} = (\text{Frequency of a particular error category} / \text{Total number of grammatical errors}) \times 100$$

The frequencies and percentages were used descriptively to present the distribution of grammatical errors and to support the qualitative analysis. They were not used for statistical testing or generalization. Finally, Writing Task 2 was examined as a supporting source to trace the recurrence of the grammatical error categories identified in Writing Task 1. The analysis focused on identifying which error categories reappeared in Task 2 and which did not reappear. The analysis did not interpret differences in the number of errors between the two tasks as evidence of grammatical improvement because the tasks involved different topics and the participant continued regular BIPA instruction during the three-week interval. The final findings were based on the validated error classifications and were presented through descriptive explanations, frequencies, percentages, and representative examples of the participant's grammatical errors.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study identified grammatical errors in the Indonesian and English writings of a BIPA learner. Writing Task 1 served as the primary data source for identifying and classifying

grammatical errors, while Writing Task 2 was used as supporting data to examine whether the error categories identified in the first writing task recurred in subsequent writing. The findings are presented separately for Indonesian and English writing.

Grammatical Errors in Indonesian Paragraph Writing

Indonesian Writing 1

The analysis of Indonesian Writing 1 identified 14 grammatical error occurrences. To avoid overlapping classifications, closely related errors were grouped into broader categories. The errors were classified into seven categories: Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb Construction, Incorrect Use of Preposition, Redundancy, Incorrect Use of Conjunction, Repetition, and Incorrect Word/Phrase Order. Sentence Structure was the most frequently identified category, with five occurrences (35.71%), followed by Phrase and Verb Construction with three occurrences (21.43%). Incorrect Use of Preposition occurred twice (14.29%), while the remaining categories each occurred once (7.14%).

Table 1. Distribution of Grammatical Errors in Indonesian Writing 1

Error Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sentence Structure	5	35.71
Phrase and Verb Construction	3	21.43
Incorrect Use of Preposition	2	14.29
Redundancy	1	7.14
Incorrect Use of Conjunction	1	7.14
Repetition	1	7.14
Incorrect Word/Phrase Order	1	7.14
Total	14	100.00

The Sentence Structure category involved incomplete or unclear sentence structures and omitted sentence elements. Two representative examples were:

Perkenalkan. nama saya. Syl, berasal dari Madagaskar.

The appropriate form is:

Perkenalkan, nama saya Syl. Saya berasal dari Madagaskar.

The original construction does not establish an appropriate grammatical relationship among the sentence elements. Another example was:

Mahasiswa Internasional di A.

which can be revised as:

Saya adalah mahasiswa internasional di A.

The original expression is a noun phrase without an explicit predicate.

Phrase and Verb Construction occurred three times. Two representative examples were:

pergi ke kampus menggunakan kaki

which can be revised as:

pergi ke kampus dengan berjalan kaki.

The original phrase does not appropriately express the intended manner of movement.

Another example was:

mencuci baju, belajar dan pergi main basket di lapangan

which can be revised as:

mencuci baju, belajar, dan bermain basket di lapangan.

The construction *pergi main basket* is not appropriately formed for the intended activity.

Incorrect Use of Preposition occurred twice. Two representative examples were:

kampus kami dekat di asrama saya

which can be revised as:

kampus kami dekat dengan asrama saya.

In this context, *dengan* is appropriate for expressing a relationship of proximity. Another example was:

membantu dosen saya ke fakultas

which can be revised as:

membantu dosen saya di fakultas.

The preposition *di* is appropriate because the expression refers to a location.

One Redundancy error was identified in:

Saya biasanya bangun pukul jam 5 pagi setiap hari.

A possible revision is:

Saya biasanya bangun pukul 5 pagi setiap hari.

The simultaneous use of *pukul* and *jam* creates unnecessary repetition in the time expression.

One Incorrect Use of Conjunction error was identified in:

Karena setelah kelas sore saya membantu...

The sentence can be revised as:

Setelah kelas sore, saya membantu...

In this context, *setelah* is sufficient to express the intended temporal relationship.

One Repetition error was identified in:

Hari minggu saya saya libur.

The sentence can be revised as:

Hari Minggu saya libur.

The second occurrence of *saya* is unnecessary.

One Incorrect Word/Phrase Order error was identified in:

bertemu sangat orang baik

A possible revision is:

bertemu banyak orang baik.

The original construction places the words in an inappropriate order for the intended meaning.

Indonesian Writing 2

The analysis of Indonesian Writing 2 identified **three grammatical error occurrences**. The errors were classified into three categories: Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb Construction, and Incorrect Use of Preposition. Each category occurred once, accounting for 33.33% of the identified grammatical errors.

Table 2. Distribution of Grammatical Errors in Indonesian Writing 2

Error Classification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Sentence Structure	1	33.33
Phrase and Verb Construction	1	33.33
Incorrect Use of Preposition	1	33.33
Total	3	100.00

The Sentence Structure category involved an unclear sentence structure resulting from an omitted sentence element. One representative example was:

Karena berada dekat dengan asrama saya, saya biasanya berjalan kaki.

A possible revision is:

Karena kampus berada dekat dengan asrama saya, saya biasanya berjalan kaki ke kampus.

The original subordinate clause does not explicitly state the subject associated with *berada*.

The Phrase and Verb Construction category occurred once in:

...bermain basket bola...

which can be revised as:

...bermain bola basket...

The original phrase does not follow the appropriate word combination in Indonesian.

One Incorrect Use of Preposition was identified in:

...pergi di negara lain.

which can be revised as:

...pergi ke negara lain.

The preposition *ke* is appropriate for expressing movement toward a destination.

Grammatical Errors in English Paragraph Writing

English Writing 1

The analysis of English Writing 1 identified 20 grammatical error occurrences after mechanical errors were excluded. The errors were classified using [Dulay et al. \(1982\)](#) Surface Strategy Taxonomy. Misformation was the most frequently identified category, followed by Omission and Addition. No Misordering errors were identified.

Table 3. Distribution of Grammatical Errors in English Writing 1

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Misformation	10	50.00
Omission	7	35.00
Addition	3	15.00
Misordering	0	0.00
Total	20	100.00

Misformation was the most frequently identified error type, with 10 occurrences (50.00%). Two representative examples were:

the lecture is friendly

which can be revised as:

the lecturers are friendly.

The learner used *lecture* instead of *lecturers* to refer to people who teach. Another example was:

I am in campus.

which can be revised as:

I am on campus.

The preposition *in* was incorrectly selected for the intended expression.

Omission occurred seven times (35.00%). Two representative examples were:

I am international student.

which can be revised as:

I am an international student.

The article *an* is required before the singular countable noun phrase *international student*.

Another example was:

I usually wake up 5 am.

which can be revised as:

I usually wake up at 5 a.m.

The preposition *at* is required before a specific time expression.

Addition occurred three times (15.00%). Two representative examples were:

on my foot

which can be revised as:

on foot.

The possessive determiner *my* is unnecessary in this expression. Another example was:

Every day morning.

which can be revised as:

Every morning.

The word *day* is unnecessary in the intended expression.

No Misordering errors were identified in English Writing 1.

English Writing 2

The analysis of English Writing 2 identified eight grammatical error occurrences after mechanical errors were excluded. Misformation was the most frequently identified error type, with five occurrences (62.50%), followed by Omission with three occurrences (37.50%). No Addition or Misordering errors were identified.

Table 4. Distribution of Grammatical Errors in English Writing 2

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Misformation	5	62.50
Omission	3	37.50
Addition	0	0.00
Misordering	0	0.00
Total	8	100.00

Misformation occurred five times (62.50%). Two representative examples were:

I came from Madagascar.

which can be revised as:

I come from Madagascar.

The present form *come* is appropriate for expressing a current fact. Another example was:

my classmates and lectures

which can be revised as:

my classmates and lecturers.

The noun *lecturers* is the appropriate form for referring to people who teach.

Omission occurred three times (37.50%). Two representative examples were:

...so it easy for me to go there.

which can be revised as:

...so it is easy for me to go there.

The copular verb *is* is required between the subject *it* and the adjective *easy*. Another example was:

Good friend.

which can be revised as:

Good friends.

The plural marker is required to express the intended plural meaning.

No Addition or Misordering errors were identified in English Writing 2.

Recurrence and Changes in Grammatical Error Categories Across Writing Tasks

The third research question examined whether the grammatical error categories identified in the participant's writing recurred in subsequent writing. The analysis focused on the recurrence and non-recurrence of error categories, rather than on comparing writing performance or measuring grammatical improvement.

In Indonesian writing, Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb Construction, and Incorrect Use of Preposition appeared in both writing samples. Redundancy, Incorrect Use of Conjunction, Repetition, and Incorrect Word/Phrase Order were identified in the first Indonesian writing sample but were not observed in the subsequent sample.

In English writing, Misformation and Omission appeared in both writing samples. Addition was identified in the first English writing sample but was not observed in the subsequent sample, while Misordering was not identified in either writing sample.

The recurrence of these categories indicates that certain grammatical difficulties remained observable in the participant's written production. At the same time, the non-recurrence of other categories indicates that some error patterns were not consistently present across the writing samples. These findings are interpreted descriptively and do not indicate improvement or decline in grammatical ability.

Discussion

The findings indicate that the participant experienced grammatical difficulties in both Indonesian and English written production. The errors identified in the Indonesian writing involved sentence structure, phrase and verb construction, preposition use, and other grammatical constructions. In English writing, the errors primarily involved inappropriate grammatical-form selection and omission of required grammatical elements.

In Indonesian writing, Sentence Structure was the most prominent category identified in the first writing sample. The errors included incomplete constructions and omitted sentence

elements, such as *Mahasiswa Internasional di Universitas Muhammadiyah Kendari* and *Saya ke kampus setiap hari*. These examples indicate difficulty in establishing complete grammatical relationships among sentence elements. This finding is consistent with [Fiiaurum, F. A. K., & Susanto \(2023\)](#), who reported grammatical difficulties at the phrase, clause, and sentence levels in BIPA learners' writing. [Jannah and Khaerunnisa \(2022\)](#) also identified various language errors in BIPA learners' written production.

The presence of Phrase and Verb Construction errors further indicates that the participant experienced difficulties in forming appropriate Indonesian expressions. Constructions such as *pergi ke kampus menggunakan kaki* and *pergi main basket* show that the learner could convey the intended meaning but did not always use the appropriate grammatical construction. This finding supports the view that BIPA learners may experience difficulties at several linguistic levels during the development of Indonesian written production.

Incorrect Use of Preposition was also identified in the Indonesian writing. The recurrence of this category in the subsequent writing indicates that preposition use remained an identifiable grammatical difficulty in the participant's written production. The examples show that the learner had difficulty selecting prepositions according to the grammatical relationship intended in the sentence. Since the study focuses on one learner, this recurring pattern is interpreted as a characteristic of the participant's writing rather than a general tendency among BIPA learners.

The other Indonesian categories—Redundancy, Incorrect Use of Conjunction, Repetition, and Incorrect Word/Phrase Order—occurred only in the first writing sample. Their limited occurrence indicates that these were less frequently observed features of the participant's grammatical production. Nevertheless, their presence demonstrates that the participant's difficulties involved several aspects of Indonesian grammar.

In English writing, Misformation was the most prominent error type. Examples such as *the lecture are friendly* and *I am in campus* demonstrate inappropriate selection of grammatical forms. These errors indicate that the participant sometimes selected forms that did not correspond to the intended grammatical construction. The finding is consistent with [Ismail and Wulandari \(2024\)](#), who found Misformation to be the most frequent category in descriptive writing analyzed using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. [Farid et al. \(2024\)](#) also reported Misformation as a prominent error type in English learner writing.

Omission was another prominent category in the English writing. Examples such as *I am international student* and *I usually wake up 5 am* demonstrate the omission of grammatical elements required in English. The occurrence of Omission is consistent with previous studies that identified omission among grammatical errors in English learner writing, including [Farid et al. \(2024\)](#) and [Meylinda \(2026\)](#).

Addition was also identified in the first English writing sample, whereas Misordering was not identified. The occurrence of Addition indicates that the participant sometimes included unnecessary grammatical elements in English expressions. The absence of Misordering, however, does not indicate complete mastery of word order; it only indicates that this particular error type was not observed in the analyzed writing samples.

The use of different analytical frameworks for Indonesian and English writing was based on the grammatical characteristics of each target language. Indonesian grammatical errors were classified according to the Indonesian error classification based on [Setyawati & Rohmadi \(2010\)](#), while English errors were analyzed using [Dulay et al. \(1982\)](#) Surface Strategy Taxonomy. This approach enabled the analysis to identify grammatical problems using categories appropriate to each language rather than forcing the same classification system onto both.

Recurrence of Grammatical Error Categories

The third research question focused on the recurrence of grammatical error categories in subsequent writing. The findings show that some categories identified in the initial writing also appeared in the subsequent writing. In Indonesian, Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb

Construction, and Incorrect Use of Preposition recurred. In English, Misformation and Omission recurred.

The recurrence of these categories suggests that they were observable features of the participant's grammatical difficulties across the writing samples. In particular, the repeated occurrence of preposition-related problems in Indonesian and Misformation and Omission in English indicates that these grammatical difficulties were not limited to a single writing production.

Other categories did not recur in the subsequent writing. Redundancy, Incorrect Use of Conjunction, Repetition, and Incorrect Word/Phrase Order were not observed again in Indonesian, while Addition was not observed again in English. This does not mean that the participant had completely mastered these grammatical features. Rather, the relevant error forms were simply not observed in the subsequent writing sample.

Therefore, the findings for RQ 3 are interpreted in terms of recurrence and non-recurrence, rather than improvement. The two writing samples were not treated as pre-test and post-test measurements, and the study does not claim that the participant's grammatical ability improved between the writing samples. Instead, the subsequent writing provided additional evidence for identifying which grammatical error categories appeared repeatedly in the participant's written production.

Overall, the findings provide an in-depth description of grammatical error patterns in an individual BIPA learner's writing. The study identifies prominent grammatical difficulties in Indonesian and English writing and, through the use of multiple writing samples, provides evidence of both recurring and non-recurring error categories. This supports the value of examining more than one writing sample when exploring grammatical error patterns in an individual BIPA learner.

CONCLUSIONS

This study explored grammatical errors in the Indonesian and English paragraph writing of a BIPA learner. In Indonesian writing, the errors included Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb Construction, Incorrect Use of Preposition, Redundancy, Incorrect Use of Conjunction, Repetition, and Incorrect Word/Phrase Order, with Sentence Structure being the most prominent category. In English writing, the errors consisted of Misformation, Omission, Addition, and Misordering, with Misformation occurring most frequently, followed by Omission and Addition, while Misordering was not identified. Analysis of subsequent writing showed that some categories recurred, particularly Sentence Structure, Phrase and Verb Construction, and Incorrect Use of Preposition in Indonesian, as well as Misformation and Omission in English. Other error categories did not reappear. These findings indicate that some grammatical difficulties persisted across writing samples, whereas others were not consistent. Overall, examining multiple writing samples provides a more detailed account of recurring and non-recurring grammatical patterns in an individual BIPA learner.

REFERENCES

- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Two Language*. Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.)*. Oxford University Press
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263108080212>
- Farid, M. M., Hastini, H., & Nadrun, N. (2024). Error analysis on students' writing of descriptive text of the tenth-grade students at MA DDI Tosale. *Journal of English Language Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(1), 1-8.
<https://doi.org/00.00000/lx00000000.2024.v1.i1.pp01-08>
- Fiiarum, F. A. K., & Susanto, G. (2023). Kesalahan berbahasa Indonesia dalam tulisan pemelajar bipa tingkat mahir Indonesian. *Journal of Language Literature and Arts*, 5, 557-568. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um064v3i42023p557-568>
- Iswati, L. (2025). Grammatical errors in the English writing of lower- and higher-achieving

- learners. *Journal Corner of Education, Linguistics, and Literature*, 4(4), 429–438
<https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i4.450>
- Jannah, A. N., & Khaerunnisa, K. (2022). Analisis kesalahan berbahasa (tulis) pemelajar bipa level 7 dalam pembuatan karya ilmiah. *MARDIBASA: Jurnal Pembelajaran Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 2(2), 134–142. <https://doi.org/10.21274/jpbsi.2022.2.2.134-142>
- Jiang, D., & Kalyuga, S. (2022). Learning English as a foreign language writing skills in collaborative settings : A cognitive load perspective cognitive model of writing processes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13(June), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.932291>
- Juliana s. (2022). Analysis of language mistakes in description text works of bipa students. *Talanta conference series: Local wisdom, social, and arts*, 7(2).
<https://doi.org/10.32734/lwsa.v7i2.2072>
- Lutfiyah, L., Hardianti, H., & Firmansah, E. (2025). Students' perceptions of grammar's role in developing writing skills. *Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 6(7), 3311–3322.
- Meylinda, L. (2026). First-Semester Efl Students : A Surface Strategy Taxonomy Approach. *JEELL (Journal of English Education, Linguistics and Literature)*, 13(1), 107–117
<https://doi.org/10.32682/jeell.v13i1.134>
- Pawoko, M. W., & Asteria, P. V. (2025). Errors in the use of Indonesian language register by foreign learners in bipa learning. *Ghâncaran: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, VI, 1258–1272. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ghancaran.vi.21745>
- Putri, C. D. M. (2023). Error analysis in written production : Grammatical errors and their sources in. *Paramasastra: Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Sastra Dan Pembelajarannya*, 10(1), 57–68
<https://doi.org/10.26740/paramasastra.v10n1.p57-68>
- Rijt, J. H. M., & Coppen, P.-A. J. M. (2021). The conceptual importance of grammar Knowledge-related rationales for grammar teaching. *Pedagogical Linguistics*, 2(May), 175–199
<https://doi.org/10.1075/pl.21008.van>
- Septiana, H., Ardiyanti, W. N., & Dudek, S. (2021). Grammatical errors on bipa students (Indonesian language for foreign speakers) in writing practice for beginner level. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities (IJCAH 2021)*, 618(Ijcah), 159–162 <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211223.029>
- Setyawati, N., & Rohmadi, M. (2010). Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa Indonesia: Teori dan Praktik
<https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v3i3.2407>
- Wulandari, I. and. (2024). An analysis of grammatical errors in students' descriptive writing using surface strategy taxonomy. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Media Pembelajaran (JUNDIKMA)*, 02(01), 56–64.