

GRAMMATICAL ERROR ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH SENTENCES PRODUCED BY ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDENTS AT THE STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF NORTH SUMATRA: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY

Dhea Salsabila¹, Nasywa Faira², Tiara Sani³
dheasalsabila105@gmail.com¹, fairanasywa@gmail.com², tiarasanisinaga@gmail.com³
Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze grammatical errors in English sentences produced by English Education students at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra by applying error analysis and contrastive analysis approaches. This research uses a descriptive qualitative method, with data consisting of 20 English sentences written by students. The data were analyzed to identify, classify, and explain the types of grammatical errors as well as their possible causes. The findings reveal that the most frequent errors include subject–verb agreement, verb tense, auxiliary usage, plural forms, article use, prepositions, and word order. From the perspective of error analysis, the errors are categorized into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering, indicating that learners' errors are systematic and reflect their interlanguage development. Meanwhile, contrastive analysis shows that many of these errors are influenced by structural differences between Indonesian and English, particularly in areas where Indonesian lacks tense marking, subject–verb agreement, articles, and copula verbs. However, some errors are also caused by intralingual factors such as overgeneralization and incomplete understanding of grammatical rules. Therefore, this study highlights the importance of integrating error analysis and contrastive analysis to better understand learners' difficulties and to improve English teaching strategies, especially for prospective English teachers.

Keywords: Grammatical Errors, Error Analysis, Contrastive Analysis, EFL Learners, English Education Students.

INTRODUCTION

English has become a global lingua franca and plays a crucial role in academic, professional, and intercultural communication worldwide. As a result, English studies have gained significant importance in higher education, particularly in countries where English is taught as a foreign language (EFL). However, despite years of formal instruction, many learners still struggle to produce grammatically accurate sentences. This issue has become a major concern in second language acquisition research at an international level, as grammatical competence remains one of the most challenging aspects of English learning (Ellis, 1997). Errors in learners' language production are not merely failures but reflect the developmental stages of language acquisition and the complexity of learning a second language system (Corder, 1975).

At the national level, English learning in Indonesia faces additional challenges due to structural differences between Bahasa Indonesia and English. Indonesian learners often experience difficulties related to tense usage, subject–verb agreement, and sentence structure, which do not exist in the same form in their first language. These differences often lead to language interference, which significantly contributes to grammatical errors. Previous studies have shown that Indonesian EFL learners frequently produce errors due to first language transfer and incomplete understanding of target language rules (Corder, 1975). This issue becomes more critical when it occurs among university students, particularly those majoring in English Education, who are expected to achieve higher

proficiency and become future educators.

Error analysis has been widely recognized as a key approach in understanding learners' difficulties in second language acquisition. It focuses on identifying, describing, and explaining learners' errors to reveal underlying learning processes. According to S. P. Corder (1975), errors are systematic and provide evidence of learners' interlanguage development, reflecting their current level of linguistic competence. Furthermore, error analysis enables educators to evaluate teaching effectiveness and develop appropriate pedagogical strategies. In applied linguistics, error analysis is closely related to contrastive analysis, which compares the structures of the first language (L1) and the target language (L2) to predict potential learning difficulties (Lado, 1957).

Contrastive analysis plays a crucial role in identifying the sources of errors, particularly those caused by language transfer. It has been widely acknowledged that many learner errors originate from differences between L1 and L2 systems, especially in grammar and syntax. As highlighted in applied linguistics research, contrastive analysis and error analysis are complementary approaches that help explain both the forms and causes of learner errors (Corder, 1975).

Therefore, integrating these two approaches provides a more comprehensive understanding of learners' language performance. Several empirical studies have examined grammatical errors in EFL contexts. For instance, research in second language acquisition has demonstrated that learners' errors are influenced by both interlingual factors (L1 interference) and intralingual factors (overgeneralization and incomplete rule learning) (Ellis, 1997). Additionally, previous studies have shown that even advanced learners, including university students, continue to make systematic grammatical errors, indicating that higher exposure to English does not necessarily eliminate errors. However, most existing studies tend to focus either on error classification or contrastive analysis separately, rather than integrating both approaches in a specific institutional context.

Based on this review, a significant research gap can be identified. There is still limited research that simultaneously applies error analysis and contrastive analysis to examine grammatical errors produced by English Education students, particularly in the context of the State Islamic University of North Sumatra. Moreover, studies that focus specifically on prospective English teachers remain underexplored, despite their crucial role in future language education.

From a disciplinary perspective, this study is situated within the field of applied linguistics, particularly in second language acquisition (SLA), error analysis, and contrastive linguistics. It also intersects with English language teaching (ELT), as the findings are expected to contribute to improving pedagogical practices. This interdisciplinary positioning highlights the relevance of the study in both theoretical and practical domains.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze grammatical errors found in English sentences produced by English Education students at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra and to examine these errors through a contrastive analysis approach. By identifying the types and sources of errors, this study is expected to provide insights into learners' language development and contribute to more effective English teaching strategies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

a. Error Analysis

Error Analysis (EA) is one of the main approaches in second language acquisition used to identify, classify, and interpret learners' deviations from target-language norms. Corder argued that learner errors are not merely failures, but evidence of an active learning process and of the learner's current stage of linguistic development (Corder, 1967). In other words, errors can show what learners already know, what they are still testing, and which parts of the target language remain unstable. This makes error analysis highly relevant for research on student-produced English sentences, especially in EFL contexts where learners often construct language through approximation and trial.

Error analysis is also useful because it helps researchers move beyond simply listing wrong forms. Richards distinguished between errors caused by first-language influence and those caused by the learner's developing knowledge of the target language, such as overgeneralization or incomplete rule application (Richards, 1971). In this sense, error analysis is pedagogically important: it can reveal recurring grammatical problems and help lecturers design more focused instruction. For a study involving English Education students, this framework is especially important because these students are not only language learners but also future English teachers who are expected to produce relatively accurate written English.

b. Interlanguage and Learner Language Development

The concept of interlanguage strengthens the logic of error analysis. Selinker explained that learners build a transitional linguistic system that is neither fully their first language nor fully the target language (Selinker, 1972). This system is systematic, but it is also unstable and shaped by transfer, learning strategies, communication strategies, and incomplete mastery of target-language rules. Because of that, learner sentences often contain patterned grammatical deviations rather than random mistakes.

For the present research, interlanguage is useful because it explains why English Education students may still produce incorrect English sentences even after years of study. Their errors can be viewed as evidence of an interlanguage system still influenced by Indonesian structure and by unresolved grammatical learning issues. Thus, grammatical errors in student sentences should be interpreted not simply as carelessness, but as data that reflect how English grammar is being processed and internalized.

c. Contrastive Analysis

Contrastive Analysis (CA) compares the structures of the first language and the target language in order to identify possible learning difficulties. Lado's contrastive view proposed that areas of difference between two languages are often the points where learners experience the greatest problems (Lado, 1957). In the case of Indonesian learners of English, contrastive analysis is particularly relevant because Indonesian and English differ in several grammatical features, including tense marking, subject-verb agreement, article use, and some sentence-order patterns.

A contrastive perspective is especially appropriate for this study because the title explicitly frames the research as "a contrastive study." This means the analysis should not stop at identifying the errors; it should also explain how those errors may be linked to differences between Indonesian and English. Uktolseja, Sujaja, and Matinahoru's contrastive study found that English and Indonesian differ across several sentence types, and these structural differences can lead learners to produce erroneous forms when they rely

too heavily on Indonesian patterns while writing English (Uktolseja et al., 2019). This provides a direct conceptual bridge between grammatical error analysis and cross-linguistic comparison.

d. English Education Students as the Research Context

English Education students occupy a distinctive position in English studies because they are trained not only to learn English but also to teach it. That role raises expectations regarding grammatical awareness, sentence formation, and language accuracy. However, previous research in Indonesian university settings shows that even English-major or English Education students still produce recurring grammatical errors in paragraph writing, essays, posters, and other academic tasks. These findings suggest that increased exposure to English does not automatically eliminate persistent errors, especially when learners continue to struggle with forms not strongly represented in Indonesian grammar.

Because this study focuses on students at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra, the theoretical framework also supports a local institutional reading: the learners under investigation are advanced EFL users, but they still operate within a multilingual and Indonesian-dominant environment. As a result, their English sentence production is likely to reflect both developing grammatical competence and ongoing L1 influence. This makes English Education students an important population for error and contrastive analysis research.

Empirical Review

A number of previous studies are relevant to the present research. First, Nurlaily (2022) examined errors made by English Language Education Department students in English paragraph writing. The study found grammatical errors in nouns, pronouns, verbs, articles, prepositions, and subject–verb agreement, with article errors being the most dominant among the grammatical features analyzed. This study is relevant because it focuses on English Education students and shows that grammatical weaknesses remain visible even at the university level. However, it emphasizes paragraph-writing products and does not primarily frame the findings through Indonesian–English contrastive analysis.

Second, Khansa and Sutrisno (2019) investigated grammatical errors in posters created by Indonesian university students in Yogyakarta. They identified 201 errors from 97 posters using Surface Strategy Taxonomy combined with linguistic categories. This study is useful because it confirms that grammatical inaccuracies appear even in short public texts produced by university students. Still, its focus is broader university output rather than English Education students specifically, and it does not center the analysis on sentence production in relation to Indonesian interference.

Third, Puspita (2021) analyzed Indonesian grammatical interference in students' English compositions and found that L1 influence significantly contributed to grammatical interference at morphological and syntactic levels. This study is highly relevant because it directly links English errors to Indonesian transfer, which aligns with the contrastive dimension of the present research. Nevertheless, the study centers on interference in compositions generally, whereas the current research is narrower in focusing on English sentences produced by English Education students and in combining error identification with sentence-level contrastive explanation.

Fourth, Subekti (2018) analyzed errors in complex sentences written by Indonesian students from an English Education department. The study focused on adjective clauses, noun clauses, adverb clauses, and multiple-clause structures, showing that complex sentence production remained problematic even for learners in an English Education setting. This

research is closely aligned with the current study because it examines English Education students and highlights persistent grammatical difficulty in advanced structures. However, it concentrates on complex sentences only, while the present mini research can include a wider range of English sentence errors gathered from student data.

Fifth, Rahmani (2023) investigated morpho-syntactic errors in compositions written by English Language Education undergraduates at Universitas Tanjungpura. The study reported large numbers of syntactic and morphological errors and recommended targeted instructional intervention and cross-linguistic awareness. This study is especially important for the present research because it supports the view that undergraduate English majors still face recurring sentence-level problems and that pedagogical responses should be informed by patterns of learner error. However, the setting differs institutionally, and the present study contributes a more specific context by focusing on English Education students at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra.

A more locally relevant comparison comes from Nuraini (2019), who analyzed grammatical errors made by students of the English Department at Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara (UISU), Medan. The study used Surface Strategy Taxonomy to classify errors in writing-class assignments. This is important because it shows that students in North Sumatra also produce systematic grammatical errors in university writing. Even so, the institutional context is different from UIN Sumatera Utara, and the current study adds value by examining sentence data specifically from English Education students at the target university named in the title.

Overall, the reviewed studies consistently show three things: grammatical errors remain common among Indonesian university learners, English Education students are not exempt from these difficulties, and Indonesian language structure often contributes to learner errors in English. The gap lies in the limited number of studies that simultaneously focus on English sentence production, English Education students, and contrastive explanation between Indonesian and English in the specific context of the State Islamic University of North Sumatra. Therefore, the present study is positioned to extend earlier work by combining error analysis with a contrastive perspective in a clearly defined institutional setting.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a descriptive qualitative method using error analysis and contrastive analysis approaches to examine grammatical errors in English sentences produced by English Education students at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra. The data consist of 15–20 English sentences collected from students, which are then analyzed to identify, classify, and interpret the types of grammatical errors. Error analysis is used to categorize the errors based on linguistic features, while contrastive analysis is applied to compare the structures of Indonesian and English in order to determine whether the errors are influenced by first language interference (Lado, 1957). According to Corder (1967), error analysis provides insight into learners' language development, as errors reflect their current stage of learning. The findings are presented descriptively to highlight common patterns of errors and their possible causes in English sentence production.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents 20 erroneous English sentences produced by English Education students. The sentences are analyzed using error analysis to identify the grammatical errors and contrastive analysis to explain how some of the errors may be influenced by differences between Indonesian and English. The analysis shows that the students' errors are largely related to verb tense, subject-verb agreement, article use, prepositions, plural forms, word order, and omission of auxiliary verbs. These findings indicate that the students still experience difficulties in applying English grammatical rules consistently, even though they are studying in an English Education program.

a. Data and Analysis

Name initials : NR
Erroneous sentence: She go to campus every day.
Correct sentence: She goes to campus every day.
Error analysis: The error is in subject-verb agreement. The subject she is a third person singular subject, so the verb in the simple present tense must take -s/-es.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, verbs do not change according to the subject. For example, dia pergi ke kampus setiap hari does not require a change in the verb form. This difference may lead students to omit the -s ending in English.
Discussion: This type of error shows strong first-language interference because Indonesian learners are not used to changing the verb based on the subject.

Name initials: SA
Erroneous sentence: I am agree with your opinion.
Correct sentence: I agree with your opinion.
Error analysis: The student incorrectly added the auxiliary am before agree. The word agree is a verb, not an adjective, so it should not be preceded by am in this sentence.
Contrastive analysis: This error may come from confusion between English adjective patterns and Indonesian sentence structure. In Indonesian, saya setuju does not clearly distinguish between adjective-like and verb-like structures in the same way English does.
Discussion: This is an addition error, where the learner adds an unnecessary auxiliary. It also suggests incomplete understanding of English word classes.

Name initials: FA
Erroneous sentence: He very smart in speaking English.
Correct sentence: He is very smart in speaking English.
Error analysis: The student omitted the auxiliary verb is. In English nominal and adjectival predicates require a form of be.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, dia sangat pintar berbicara bahasa Inggris does not require a copula. Since Indonesian commonly omits "to be," students often transfer this pattern into English.
Discussion: This is a classic omission error caused by structural differences between Indonesian and English.

Name initials: DA
Erroneous sentence: Yesterday I go to library.
Correct sentence: Yesterday I went to the library.
Error analysis: There are two errors. First, the verb go should be changed to the past form went because of the time marker yesterday. Second, the noun library should take the article the in this context.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian verbs do not change form to mark tense. Time is usually shown through adverbs such as kemarin. Also, Indonesian does not use articles like a, an, or the. These differences can cause students to produce such forms.
Discussion: This sentence shows both interlingual interference and weak mastery of English tense and article systems.

Name initials: MA
Erroneous sentence: My friend have many book.
Correct sentence: My friend has many books.
Error analysis: There are two errors: have should be has because my friend is singular, and book should be plural because it follows many.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian nouns often remain unchanged even when plural, or plurality can be understood from context. Likewise, verbs do not change according to singular or plural subjects.
Discussion: This sentence reflects difficulty with both plural marking and subject–verb agreement, two areas that are absent in Indonesian grammar.

Name initials; RA
Erroneous sentence: I very like this movie.
Correct sentence: I really like this movie. / I like this movie very much.
Error analysis: The placement of very is incorrect. In English, very usually modifies adjectives or adverbs, not verbs directly.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, saya sangat suka film ini is acceptable, and sangat can directly intensify the verb-like expression suka. This pattern may be transferred into English.
Discussion: This error shows literal translation from Indonesian into English.

Name initials: ZA
Erroneous sentence: There is many students in the class.
Correct sentence: There are many students in the class.
Error analysis: The error is in the use of is instead of are. Since students is plural, the correct form is there are.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian does not require agreement between existential markers and the noun that follows. For example, ada banyak siswa di kelas uses one form regardless of number.
Discussion: This is another example of difficulty with number agreement in English.

Name initials: NA
Erroneous sentence: She can sings very well.
Correct sentence: She can sing very well.
Error analysis: After a modal verb like can, the base form of the verb must be used. Therefore, sings should be sing.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian modal-like expressions do not affect the verb form in the same way English does, so students may not automatically recognize the rule that modals must be followed by a bare infinitive.
Discussion: This is an overgeneralization error, because the student may think third person singular always requires -s.

Name initials: LA
Erroneous sentence: I don't know where is he.
Correct sentence: I don't know where he is.
Error analysis: The word order in the embedded clause is wrong. In indirect questions, English uses statement word order, not interrogative word order.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian often preserves flexible word order in reported questions, and learners may also confuse direct and indirect question patterns.
Discussion: This is a word order error that shows incomplete mastery of clause structure.

Name initials: CA
Erroneous sentence: The teacher gave an advice to us.
Correct sentence: The teacher gave us advice. / The teacher gave some advice to us.
Error analysis: The noun advice is uncountable, so it cannot take the article an.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, nouns equivalent to advice may not be categorized in the same countable/uncountable way, so students may treat all nouns as countable in English.
Discussion: This error suggests that learners still struggle with noun countability, a frequent issue in EFL learning.

Name initials: AR
Erroneous sentence: I am study in the library now.
Correct sentence: I am studying in the library now.
Error analysis: The student used the auxiliary am correctly but failed to use the -ing form. The present continuous tense requires be + verb-ing.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian does not mark progressive aspect morphologically in the same way English does. It may use sedang, but the main verb itself does not change form.
Discussion: This is an incomplete application of tense structure.

Name initials: MF
Erroneous sentence: She explained me about the lesson.
Correct sentence: She explained the lesson to me.
Error analysis: The verb explain does not normally take an indirect object directly in this structure. The correct pattern is explain something to someone.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, dia menjelaskan saya pelajaran itu may be influenced by direct transfer from local learner patterns, although the more natural Indonesian form is dia menjelaskan pelajaran itu kepada saya. Learners may simplify the structure in English.
Discussion: This is a verb pattern error rather than a pure tense or agreement problem.

Name initials: RA
Erroneous sentence: My mother is cook in the kitchen.
Correct sentence: My mother is cooking in the kitchen. / My mother cooks in the kitchen.
Error analysis: The sentence mixes a form of be with a base verb. If the intended meaning is present continuous, the verb should be cooking.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian does not require verb inflection for progressive meaning, so students may understand the meaning but fail to produce the correct English form.
Discussion: This shows confusion in forming the present continuous tense.

Name initials: FA
Erroneous sentence: The students discussed about the material.
Correct sentence: The students discussed the material.
Error analysis: The preposition about is unnecessary because discuss is a transitive verb and can take a direct object.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, berdiskusi tentang materi commonly uses a preposition-like form equivalent to about. Students may transfer this pattern into English.
Discussion: This is an addition error caused by L1 transfer.

Name initials: DA
Erroneous sentence: I have two sister and one brother.
Correct sentence: I have two sisters and one brother.
Error analysis: The noun sister should be plural because it follows the number two.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian nouns do not always change form after numbers. For example, dua saudara perempuan does not require plural inflection on the noun.
Discussion: This is a common plural omission error influenced by Indonesian nominal structure.

Name initials: SA
Erroneous sentence: He was absent because he sick.
Correct sentence: He was absent because he was sick.
Error analysis: The second clause omits the auxiliary was. In English, adjective predicates in the past require was/were.
Contrastive analysis: Indonesian does not require a linking verb in a sentence like dia sakit, so students may omit was in English.
Discussion: This is a recurring copula omission error.

Name initials: HA
Erroneous sentence: The information are very useful.
Correct sentence: The information is very useful.
Error analysis: The noun information is uncountable and therefore takes the singular verb is.
Contrastive analysis: Students may interpret information as plural because of its broad meaning, but English grammar treats it as uncountable. Indonesian does not mark such distinctions morphologically.
Discussion: This reflects difficulty with uncountable nouns and agreement.

Name initials: IA
Erroneous sentence: I am not understand this explanation.
Correct sentence: I do not understand this explanation.
Error analysis: The student used am where the auxiliary do should be used. The main verb understand in simple present negative takes do not.
Contrastive analysis: This may come from confusion between verbal and adjectival predicates, and from the fact that Indonesian negation does not require an auxiliary system comparable to English.
Discussion: This is an auxiliary selection error.

Name initials: RF
Erroneous sentence: When I was in senior high school, I am very shy.
Correct sentence: When I was in senior high school, I was very shy.
Error analysis: The sentence shifts incorrectly from past to present. Since the time frame is past, the verb should be was.
Contrastive analysis: Because Indonesian verbs do not change according to tense, learners may rely only on time expressions and overlook consistency in English verb forms.
Discussion: This is a tense consistency error.

Name initials: AA
Erroneous sentence: She always comes late because the traffic jam.
Correct sentence: She always comes late because of the traffic jam.
Error analysis: The phrase because the traffic jam is incomplete. The correct form before a noun phrase is because of.
Contrastive analysis: In Indonesian, karena macet uses one causal marker regardless of whether what follows is a clause or a noun. English distinguishes between because + clause and because of + noun phrase.
Discussion: This sentence clearly shows a contrastive difference between Indonesian and English causal constructions.

b. General Discussion

Based on the 20 sentences above, several grammatical error patterns can be identified. The most frequent errors involve subject–verb agreement, tense formation, copula omission, article use, plural forms, and misuse of auxiliaries and prepositions. These findings support the view that grammatical errors remain common even among English Education students, suggesting that formal exposure to English does not automatically guarantee full grammatical accuracy.

From the perspective of error analysis, the data show several major types of errors: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Omission appears in sentences such as

He very smart in speaking English and He was absent because he sick, where the auxiliary be is missing. Addition appears in sentences such as I am agree with your opinion and The students discussed about the material, where unnecessary elements are inserted.

Misformation occurs when students select the wrong form, as in There is many students in the class and I am not understand this explanation. Misordering is visible in I don't know where is he, where the student uses interrogative word order inside an embedded clause. These categories indicate that learners are not simply making random mistakes; rather, they are applying partial rules inconsistently.

From the perspective of contrastive analysis, many of the errors can be traced to differences between Indonesian and English. Indonesian does not require subject–verb agreement, so students may produce forms like she go or my friend have. Indonesian also does not use articles, which may explain errors such as go to library and an advice. Another major source of interference is the absence of obligatory copula verbs in Indonesian, which contributes to sentences like he very smart and he sick. Moreover, Indonesian does not inflect verbs for tense, so learners may struggle with past forms such as yesterday I go or mixed forms such as I am very shy in a past-time context.

The findings also suggest that not all errors are caused only by first-language transfer. Some errors appear to result from intralingual factors, such as overgeneralization and incomplete understanding of English rules. For example, in She can sings very well, the student may know that third person singular often takes -s, but fails to recognize that modal verbs require the base form. Similarly, I am not understand may show confusion about English auxiliary systems rather than direct transfer from Indonesian. Therefore, the data indicate that the students' errors are influenced by both interlingual and intralingual factors.

Overall, the analysis demonstrates that English Education students still face recurring grammatical difficulties in sentence production. The combination of error analysis and contrastive analysis provides a stronger explanation than using only one approach. Error analysis helps classify and describe the form of the errors, while contrastive analysis helps explain why many of those errors occur. This makes the findings more meaningful for English teaching, especially in helping lecturers identify which grammatical areas require greater emphasis in instruction.

c. Concluding Statement for This Section

In summary, the results show that the students' grammatical errors are systematic and largely concentrated in areas where English and Indonesian differ structurally. The discussion also reveals that these errors are not only caused by first-language interference but also by incomplete mastery of English grammar itself. Therefore, both contrastive awareness and explicit grammar instruction remain important in improving the sentence production of English Education students.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to analyze grammatical errors in English sentences produced by English Education students at the State Islamic University of North Sumatra by applying error analysis and contrastive analysis approaches. The findings reveal that students still produce various types of grammatical errors, particularly in subject–verb agreement, verb tense, auxiliary usage, plural forms, article use, prepositions, and word order. These errors indicate that even at the university level, learners continue to face challenges in constructing grammatically accurate English sentences.

From the perspective of error analysis, the errors identified in this study can be categorized into omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. These patterns show that the students' errors are systematic rather than random, reflecting their current stage of interlanguage development.

Meanwhile, from the perspective of contrastive analysis, many of the errors are influenced by structural differences between Indonesian and English. The absence of tense marking, subject–verb agreement, articles, and copula verbs in Indonesian contributes significantly to the students' difficulties in English sentence production.

However, not all errors are caused by first language interference. Some errors are also the result of intralingual factors, such as overgeneralization and incomplete understanding of English grammatical rules. This indicates that students' grammatical competence is still developing and requires continuous reinforcement. Therefore, both interlingual and intralingual factors must be considered in analyzing learner errors.

In conclusion, this study highlights the importance of integrating error analysis and contrastive analysis in understanding learners' grammatical difficulties. The findings suggest that English instruction for English Education students should emphasize not only grammatical accuracy but also awareness of differences between Indonesian and English. By addressing these issues, it is expected that students can improve their ability to produce accurate and meaningful English sentences, which is essential for their future roles as English educators.

REFERENCES

- Rahmani, E. F. (2023). An error analysis of EFL undergraduate students' writing composition in Universitas Tanjungpura. *Jurnal Pendidikan Progresif*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.23960/jpp.v13.i3.202331>
- Nurlaily. (2022). An analysis of errors made by English language education department students in English paragraph writing. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.25157/jall.v6i1.6657>
- Puspita. (2021). Error analysis of Indonesian grammatical interference in students' English composition. *Buletin Poltanesa*, 22(1), 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.51967/tanesa.v22i1.466>
- Khansa, A. S., & Sutrisno, A. (2019). Grammatical errors in Indonesian university students' posters in Yogyakarta. *Lexicon*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v6i2.53153>
- Nuraini. (2019). Grammatical errors made by the students of English Department UISU year 2018 in their writing class. *KnE Social Sciences*, 534–546. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v3i19.4884>
- Uktolseja, L. J., Sujaja, H., & Matinahoru, M. F. (2019). A contrastive analysis between English and Indonesian kinds of sentences. *Indonesian Journal of English Teaching*, 8(1), 54–61. <https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2019.8.1.54-61>
- Subekti, A. S. (2018). Error analysis in complex sentences written by Indonesian students from the English education department. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2), 185–203. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v5i2.10686>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Corder, S. P. (1975). Error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 8(4), 201–218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444800002822>
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language*

- Teaching, 10(1–4), 209–232. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
- Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. *ELT Journal*, 25(3), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/25.3.204>
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(1–4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1->
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.
- 4.161