

Original Article

An Error Analysis of ESL College Students' Research Abstracts in Academic Writing

Marnelle Baguhin ^{1,*}

Received: 11 August 2025; Revised: 02 October 2025;
Accepted: 11 November 2025; Published: 01 December 2025

Abstract

This study examined the linguistic challenges encountered by college students in writing research abstracts in English, focusing on mechanical, omission, addition, substitution, and permutation errors. A quantitative error analysis was conducted on 100 research abstracts from students across various academic disciplines. Findings revealed that mechanical errors were most frequent, particularly in punctuation, followed by capitalization and spelling. Syntactic omissions were the most common omission errors, while lexical additions dominated addition errors. Substitution errors were primarily lexical, and permutation errors occurred mostly at the syntactic level. These results indicate that students struggle predominantly with sentence structure, appropriate word choice, and grammatical accuracy, which affect the clarity and academic tone of their abstracts. The study suggests the need for targeted interventions such as task-based writing activities, explicit corrective feedback, and guided practice to enhance the academic writing proficiency of ESL learners.

¹ Basic Education
Department-Senior
High School Unit,
University of the
Immaculate
Conception, Davao,
Philippines
* Correspondence:
mbaguhin@uic.edu.ph

Volume 1, Issue 1,
December 2025

Similarity Index: 0%

Keywords: academic writing, error analysis, grammatical errors, linguistic challenges, research abstracts, ESL learners

1. Introduction

The challenges faced by English as a Second Language (ESL) writers, particularly at the college level, are vast and multifaceted. Among these challenges, the inability to effectively write research abstracts stands out. This is often attributed to the complexity of academic writing conventions, the use of precise language, and the need for coherent structure. The ability to craft well-structured abstracts is critical not only for academic success but also for global academic collaboration, making it an essential skill for students in higher education.

Globally, the linguistic challenges faced by ESL students in academic writing, particularly in crafting research abstracts, have been a significant area of concern. According to the EF English Proficiency Index 2022, non-native English-speaking countries, including Argentina, Indonesia, and Brazil, consistently report lower proficiency levels in writing, especially among students at the tertiary level. In Argentina, for instance, a study by the National Institute of Educational Studies and Research highlighted that 43% of university students struggled with academic writing in English, specifically in tasks like summarizing research findings in abstracts. This issue is not isolated, as several Asian countries, including Indonesia and Thailand, have also raised alarms over their students' struggles with academic writing in English. The challenge lies not just in language fluency but also in understanding academic norms and expectations, making the ability to write research abstracts effectively an area that requires urgent intervention.

In the Philippines, the issue of ESL students' struggles with academic writing has been widely documented. A 2020 study by the Philippine Business for Education (PBE) revealed that 78% of Filipino students in higher education institutions face difficulties in academic writing, especially in research papers and abstracts. This challenge is compounded by an evolving education system that, despite efforts to improve language proficiency through programs like the K-12 curriculum, continues to struggle with delivering adequate support for students to master academic writing in English. This has resulted in students lacking the necessary skills to meet academic standards in their research outputs. Such difficulties hinder their academic progress and their ability to participate in global academic discourse.

Despite the growing body of research on ESL academic writing, few studies focus specifically on the error analysis of research abstracts among college students, particularly in the Philippine context. Existing studies have primarily concentrated on broader language skills such as speaking, reading, and general writing. There is a distinct gap in exploring the specific linguistic challenges in academic writing at the college level, with an emphasis on research abstracts, which play a crucial role in the academic success of students. Moreover, while many studies have investigated error correction and task-based approaches, there remains a need to evaluate their effectiveness in the context of ESL academic writing in the Philippines.

Previous studies on ESL academic writing highlight a variety of linguistic challenges that students face, ranging from grammar and syntax errors to issues with

academic tone and structure. Research by Wang et al. (2020) pointed to high frequencies of grammatical mistakes, such as subject-verb agreement and tense usage, in research abstracts written by non-native speakers. Similarly, a study by Li and Wang (2019) emphasized that Chinese university students often had difficulty maintaining cohesion and clarity in academic abstracts. However, there is limited literature exploring how task-based approaches can specifically address these issues in the context of Philippine college students. Studies in the Asian context, such as those by Koh et al. (2018) and Sundari (2019), have suggested that task-based approaches hold promise in improving academic writing but have not been extensively tested in the realm of research abstracts.

This study addresses the gap in understanding linguistic errors in research abstracts among college-level ESL students in the Philippines. By analyzing common mechanical, omission, addition, substitution, and permutation errors, the study provides practical and theoretical insights for improving students' writing proficiency. Enhancing these skills is essential not only for academic success but also for enabling students to communicate effectively in global academic contexts. Addressing these challenges is critical, as it directly influences the quality of education and future opportunities for ESL learners in the Philippines.

2. Methodology

2.1 Design

The research design follows a quantitative approach centered on error analysis. In this phase, linguistic errors in research abstracts written by college students are systematically identified and quantified, with particular emphasis on determining the frequency and types of errors. Content analysis is employed to allow a detailed examination of common error patterns, providing a clear overview of the students' linguistic challenges in academic writing. This method ensures a structured and objective assessment of errors across various categories, including mechanical, omission, addition, substitution, and permutation errors.

2.2 Participants

For this study, the research was conducted using a quantitative approach focused on error analysis. A total of 100 research abstracts from undergraduate students across various disciplines were analyzed to identify and quantify common linguistic errors in research writing. The abstracts, written in English, represented students from Nursing, Radiologic Technology, Education, Computing Studies, Medical Technology, Social Work, Hotel Management, Business Management, Criminology, and Biology, all from selected institutions in Iligan City. The error analysis concentrated on the frequency and types of errors, including grammatical mistakes, punctuation errors, and issues with cohesion and clarity. This approach

provided a clear, statistical overview of the most common linguistic challenges encountered by students when writing academic abstracts.

2.3 Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed using a quantitative approach to address the research questions. The analysis involved 100 research abstracts from college students across various disciplines. The collected data were systematically categorized using Corder's (1967) framework for error analysis, which includes the stages of error collection, classification, identification, disclosure, and evaluation. Errors were classified into five major types: substitution, omission, addition, permutation, and mechanics. These categories were further examined to identify specific areas where students encountered difficulties, including lexical, morphological, and syntactical errors. Statistical measures, such as frequency, were used to quantify the most common errors in the students' abstracts.

2.4 Instrument

A Research Abstract Error Analysis Checklist was developed as the primary instrument to collect data on the linguistic challenges faced by students. This checklist was designed to categorize errors in research abstracts written by college students and included predefined categories based on Corder's (1967) framework of error analysis, namely substitution, omission, addition, permutation, and mechanics. It also incorporated specific linguistic aspects such as grammar, morphology, syntax, punctuation, and cohesion. The checklist was used to systematically review and quantify errors in 100 research abstracts, with errors classified and tallied according to their frequency in each category. Statistical analysis was then applied to determine which types of errors were most prevalent among the student respondents.

2.5 Data Collection

A total of 100 research abstracts written in English by college students from a selected institution in Iligan City were collected for analysis. These abstracts, submitted during the school year 2023–2024, represented students from diverse academic disciplines, including Nursing, Radiologic Technology, Education, and others. A detailed rubric based on Corder's (1967) framework was used to categorize and identify errors under substitution, omission, addition, permutation, and mechanics at lexical, syntactic, and morphological levels. Data from the abstracts were manually reviewed and logged into a database for frequency analysis, providing a statistical overview of common linguistic challenges faced by the students.

2.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were strictly observed throughout the study to safeguard the rights, dignity, and well-being of all participants. Approval was obtained from the institutional ethics review board prior to data collection. Participants were clearly informed about the study’s objectives, procedures, and their roles. Informed consent was obtained, emphasizing voluntary participation, the right to withdraw at any time, and assurance of confidentiality. To protect identities, research abstracts were anonymized, and personal identifiers were removed from all data. All collected data were securely stored in password-protected files accessible only to the research team. Findings were reported with transparency and accuracy, ensuring constructive presentation without stigmatization or undue criticism of participants. Care was taken to avoid psychological discomfort or bias. Data were securely stored in password-protected files, accessible only to the research team. The findings were reported honestly and objectively, ensuring transparency and accuracy. Additionally, care was taken to present the results in a way that does not stigmatize or unfairly criticize the participants, instead focusing on constructive outcomes to address the identified challenges.

3. Results and Discussion

Errors in Mechanics

Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage of mechanical errors in the research abstracts. Punctuation errors are the most common, comprising 62% (62 instances) of the total errors. Capitalization errors make up 28% (28 instances), primarily related to improper use of capital letters in proper nouns and sentence beginnings. Spelling errors, though less frequent, account for 10% (10 instances) of the total errors.

Type of Error	Frequency	Percentage
Punctuation	62	62%
Capitalization	28	28%
Spelling	10	10%
Total	100	100%

Punctuation Errors. Punctuation errors, particularly with commas, were the most frequently observed mechanical issues in the research abstracts. These errors were most prevalent in sentences with multiple clauses or ideas. For example:

Student Output: The results were consistent across all trials, however, additional testing is needed.

Corrected: The results were consistent across all trials; however, additional testing is needed.

Analysis: A semicolon is needed before "however" to separate two independent clauses. The comma creates a comma splice, which is grammatically incorrect.

Student Output: Participants were instructed to complete the survey online but some preferred paper versions.

Corrected: Participants were instructed to complete the survey online, but some preferred paper versions.

Analysis: A comma is necessary before "but" to separate the two independent clauses, ensuring clarity and proper sentence structure.

Capitalization Errors. Capitalization errors were the second most common mechanical issue, primarily related to proper nouns and the first word of sentences. For example:

Student Output: The researchers utilized an Adapted questionnaire to collect data.

Corrected: The researchers utilized an adapted questionnaire to collect data.

Analysis: The word "Adapted" should not be capitalized as it is not a proper noun. Only proper nouns, acronyms, and the first word of sentences need capitalization. In this case, "adapted" is a common adjective, not a specific title or brand, so it must remain lowercase.

Student Output: In recent studies, the researchers observed significant trends in the Data.

Corrected: In recent studies, the researchers observed significant trends in the data.

Analysis: The word "Data" is unnecessarily capitalized. It should be lowercase unless referring to a specific, formal title or concept. In this context, "data" is a general noun, and only proper nouns or specific terms should begin with a capital letter.

Spelling Errors. Spelling errors, though less frequent compared to other mechanical errors, still appeared in a small proportion of the research abstracts. These errors often involved phonetic confusion or mistyped letter sequences, reflecting typical challenges faced by ESL writers. For example:

Student Output: The expirement revealed important findings.

Corrected: The experiment revealed important findings.

Analysis: The misspelling "expirement" results from phonetic confusion. It's a common error in ESL writing where learners may confuse vowel placement.

Student Output: The reaserch methodology was outlined clearly.

Corrected: The research methodology was outlined clearly.

Analysis: "Reaserch" is a typical spelling mistake due to letter transposition. ESL writers often struggle with common word forms and the rules of spelling.

This finding supports the study of Ndlovu (2024), which emphasizes that punctuation is not merely a formal requirement but a critical tool for structuring

sentences and conveying meaning accurately. Incorrect punctuation can lead to misinterpretation, disrupt the logical flow of ideas, and create confusion for readers, highlighting why frequent punctuation errors in students' writing can significantly affect overall clarity. It also corroborates the study of Handayani (2021), who argued that capitalization errors reflect a deeper misunderstanding of formal writing conventions, including the recognition of proper nouns, sentence beginnings, and titles. Such mistakes, can undermine the professionalism and readability of academic texts, indicating that mastery of capitalization is essential for effective written communication. Additionally, this finding aligns with the study of Rahmanian and Kuperman (2019), which noted that spelling errors, although less frequent, compromise the accuracy and credibility of a text. They emphasized that consistent attention to correct spelling enhances comprehension, maintains the writer's authority, and prevents distractions that may detract from the reader's engagement with the content.

Errors in Omission

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of omission errors in the research abstracts. Syntactic omissions are the most prevalent, accounting for 68% (68 instances) of the errors. These omissions typically involve missing essential elements such as articles, prepositions, or auxiliary verbs, which can disrupt sentence clarity and structure. Morphological omissions, making up 32% (32 instances), involve the omission of necessary morphemes such as plural markers or verb tense suffixes, which affect word forms and agreement.

Type of Error	Frequency	Percentage
Syntactic	68	68%
Morphological	32	32%
Total	100	100%

Errors in Syntactic Omissions. Syntactic omissions involve the absence of essential words or phrases, such as articles, prepositions, and auxiliaries, which disrupt sentence structure. For example:

Student Output: Government should establish clear policies for tourism management to improve industry.

Corrected: The government should establish clear policies for tourism management to improve the industry.

Analysis: The omitted articles "the" were necessary to specify "government" and "industry," ensuring grammatical accuracy and sentence clarity.

Student Output: Business leaders need strategy that aligns with market trends.

Corrected: Business leaders need a strategy that aligns with market trends.

Analysis: The omission of the article "a" disrupted sentence meaning, as "strategy" in this context requires an article to convey the intended clarity.

Errors in Morphological Omissions. Morphological omissions include the exclusion of necessary morphemes, such as pluralization markers or verb tense suffixes, which affect word forms and meaning. For example:

Student Output: The data indicate that customer preference change over time.

Corrected: The data indicate that customer preferences change over time.

Analysis: The omission of the plural morpheme "-s" in "preferences" led to subject-verb disagreement and disrupted sentence meaning.

Student Output: Corporate policy in multinational company require adaptation to local laws.

Corrected: Corporate policy in multinational companies requires adaptation to local laws.

Analysis: The verb "require" should have been singular ("requires") to agree with the singular subject "policy," and the plural noun "companies" was necessary to align with the broader context of multinational corporations.

This finding reinforces the study of Munasikin (2025), which emphasizes that syntactic omissions, such as missing articles, prepositions, or auxiliary verbs, can significantly disrupt sentence clarity and grammatical structure. Such omissions hinder the logical flow of ideas, making it difficult for readers to fully understand the intended meaning, highlighting the importance of teaching students to attend to sentence completeness. It also confirms the study of Dong and Nguyen (2024), who argued that morphological omissions, including missing plural markers or verb tense suffixes, compromise word form accuracy and grammatical agreement. These errors can obscure meaning and affect the overall cohesion of academic writing, indicating that morphological accuracy is essential for effective written communication. Additionally, this finding echoes the study of Peng et al. (2020), which noted that consistent attention to both syntactic and morphological correctness enhances text comprehensibility and maintains the writer's credibility.

Errors in Addition

Table 3 displays the frequency and percentage of addition errors in the research abstracts. Lexical additions account for the majority of errors, with 52% (52 instances). These errors often occur when unnecessary words are included that do not contribute additional meaning. Morphological additions make up 30% (30 instances), typically involving the inclusion of redundant morphemes that affect word forms. Syntactic additions, the least frequent at 18% (18 instances), involve adding unnecessary words that affect sentence structure. This distribution highlights that lexical additions are the most common type of error, with morphological and syntactic additions occurring less frequently.

Type of Error	Frequency	Percentage
Lexical	52	52.00%
Morphological	30	30.00%
Syntactic	18	18.00%
Total	100	100%

Errors in Addition at the Lexical Level. Lexical addition errors involve the unnecessary inclusion of words that do not contribute additional meaning. These often arise from a misunderstanding of word usage or overcomplicating a sentence. For example:

Student Output: This paper will discuss about the challenges in implementing e-learning strategies in developing countries.

Corrected: This paper will discuss the challenges in implementing e-learning strategies in developing countries.

Analysis: The word "about" is redundant and unnecessary. The verb "discuss" already implies the discussion of a topic, so adding "about" does not contribute to the meaning.

Student Output: The research examines the effects of advertising on consumer's behavior.

Corrected: The research examines the effects of advertising on consumer behavior.

Analysis: The possessive "'s" in "consumer's behavior" is incorrect. The noun "consumer" does not need a possessive form here; the phrase should simply be "consumer behavior."

Errors in Addition at the Morphological Level. Morphological addition errors involve the inclusion of unnecessary or incorrect morphemes, such as pluralization markers or verb tense suffixes, which affect word forms and meaning. For example:

Student Output: The company implemented strategies that helps improve customer satisfaction.

Corrected: The company implemented strategies that help improve customer satisfaction.

Analysis: The verb "helps" is incorrectly added in the plural context. The subject "strategies" is plural, so the correct verb form should be "help" without the "s."

Student Output: The government is working on policies that addresses poverty in rural areas.

Corrected: The government is working on policies that address poverty in rural areas.

Analysis: The verb "addresses" is incorrectly used in singular form. The plural subject "policies" requires the verb "address" without the "es" ending.

Errors in Addition at the Syntactic Level. Syntactic addition errors involve the unnecessary inclusion of words or phrases, such as prepositions, articles, or auxiliary verbs, that disrupt the structure and meaning of the sentence. For example:

Student Output: The research aims to explore about the correlation between sleep and academic performance.

Corrected: The research aims to explore the correlation between sleep and academic performance.

Analysis: The preposition "about" is unnecessary when the verb "explore" is used. The verb already implies the action of investigating, so "about" does not add meaning.

Student Output: The report presents findings that are relevant to the study of digital marketing strategies, and also it provides recommendations.

Corrected: The report presents findings relevant to the study of digital marketing strategies and provides recommendations.

Analysis: The phrase "and also it" is redundant. The conjunction "and" is sufficient to connect the clauses without needing the additional "also it."

This finding confirms the study of Demir (2019), which emphasizes that lexical additions, such as unnecessary words that do not contribute meaning, can disrupt sentence clarity and reduce conciseness. Such errors may burden the reader and obscure the intended message, highlighting the need for careful word choice in academic writing. It also supports the study of Ariffin et al. (2021), who argued that morphological additions, including redundant morphemes, compromise grammatical accuracy and can interfere with proper word forms. These errors may confuse tense, number, or agreement, affecting overall sentence correctness. Additionally, this finding reinforces the study of Jagaiah et al. (2020), which noted that syntactic additions, though less frequent, can negatively impact sentence structure and coherence.

Substitution Errors

Table 4 shows the distribution of substitution errors found in the research abstracts. The most common type of substitution error is lexical, accounting for 84% (84 instances) of the total errors. This suggests that students often replace words with incorrect or less appropriate ones, impacting the clarity of their writing. Syntactic substitution errors make up 10% (10 instances), which occur when words are substituted in ways that disrupt sentence structure, leading to confusion. Morphological substitution errors are the least frequent, accounting for 6% (6 instances), indicating that students sometimes mistakenly use the wrong morphemes, affecting word forms and their meanings.

Type of Error	Frequency	Percentage
Lexical	84	84.00%
Syntactic	10	10.00%
Morphological	6	6.00%
Total	100	100%

Errors in Substitution at the Lexical Level. Lexical substitution errors occur when a word is replaced by another that does not fit the intended meaning or context. This often reflects a misunderstanding of the precise meaning of academic vocabulary or the use of synonyms inappropriately.

Student Output: The study focuses on the impacts of globalization on developing countries.

Corrected: The study focuses on the effects of globalization on developing countries.

Analysis: "Impacts" is substituted for "effects," which is more appropriate in academic writing to describe the results or outcomes of an action or phenomenon.

Student Output: The results show that urbanization leads to increasing environmental issue.

Corrected: The results show that urbanization leads to increasing environmental issues.

Analysis: The substitution of "issue" for "issues" in the plural form causes the sentence to be grammatically incorrect. "Issues" refers to multiple problems, which fits better in this context.

Errors in Substitution at the Syntactic Level. Syntactic substitution errors involve replacing elements such as articles, prepositions, or conjunctions, which can disrupt the intended structure of a sentence. These errors often arise due to differences in sentence structure between English and the student's native language.

Student Output: "This study focuses on the importance of understanding the psychological of the students.

Corrected: "This study focuses on the importance of understanding the psychology of the students.

Analysis: The substitution of "psychological" for "psychology" creates a syntactic error, as "psychological" is an adjective and "psychology" is the correct noun form in this context.

Student Output: The conclusion is drawn after we discussed all the findings of the research.

Corrected: The conclusion is drawn after we have discussed all the findings of the research.

Analysis: The auxiliary verb "have" is substituted incorrectly, missing the present perfect tense, which is required to indicate that the discussion was completed before the conclusion.

Errors in Substitution at the Morphological Level. Morphological substitution errors occur when students mistakenly change the form of a word, such as tense, number, or verb agreement, which alters the meaning or grammatical correctness of the sentence.

Student Output: "The data suggest that the methodology need to be revised.

Corrected: "The data suggest that the methodology needs to be revised.

Analysis: "Need" is used incorrectly in its plural form. The singular noun "methodology" requires the singular verb "needs."

Student Output: "The findings of the research was consistent with the hypothesis.

Corrected: "The findings of the research were consistent with the hypothesis.

Analysis: "Was" is incorrectly substituted for "were." The plural subject "findings" requires the plural verb form "were."

This finding verifies the study of Ahamed and Othman (2019), which highlights that lexical substitution errors, where incorrect words replace intended ones, can distort meaning and hinder clear communication in academic writing. Such errors often lead to ambiguity and misinterpretation of ideas. It also corresponds to the study of Morales Yaguarshungo (2025), who emphasized that syntactic substitutions, though less frequent, disrupt sentence structure and affect grammatical coherence, making texts harder to follow. Additionally, this finding affirms the study of Dong and Nguyen (2024), which noted that morphological substitutions, such as incorrect verb forms or plural markers, compromise grammatical accuracy and word agreement, potentially confusing readers and affecting overall text quality.

Permutation Errors

Table 5 indicates that the highest percentage of permutation errors in research abstracts occurred in the syntactic category, accounting for 50% (50 instances). These errors involve incorrect word order that disrupts sentence structure. Lexical permutation errors were next, comprising 35% (35 instances), which include errors where words are rearranged within a phrase or sentence. The least frequent errors were morphological permutation errors, with only 15% (15 instances), typically involving changes to word forms or affix placement.

Type of Error	Count	Percentage
Syntactic	50	50%
Lexical	35	35%
Morphological	15	15%
Total	100	100%

Errors in Permutation at the Lexical Level. At the lexical level, permutation errors often occur due to the incorrect arrangement of adjectives, nouns, or other word types that lead to awkward or ungrammatical expressions. These errors may confuse the reader about the intended meaning.

Student Output: The study concludes that a significant role plays the behavior of parents in child development.

Corrected: The study concludes that the behavior of parents plays a significant role in child development.

Analysis: The arrangement of "significant role" and "plays" is incorrect. The subject "behavior of parents" must precede the verb "plays," and "significant" should modify "role."

Student Output: The research examines factors that may affect academic success on students.

Corrected: The research examines factors that may affect students' academic success.

Analysis: The words "on" and "students" are improperly placed, creating confusion. The corrected version places "students" before the possessive noun "academic success."

Errors in Permutation at the Syntactic Level. Syntactic permutation errors involve the arrangement of entire clauses, phrases, or sentence structures that violate standard syntactic conventions. These errors usually occur with the placement of subject-verb agreement or word groups that affect sentence clarity.

Student Output: The students conducted the experiment and the results they found were significant.

Corrected: The students conducted the experiment, and they found the results to be significant.

Analysis: The original order of the subject "the results" and the subject pronoun "they" was confusing, leading to ambiguity. The corrected sentence clarifies the action sequence.

Student Output: In the study, various variables have been analyzed and interpreted in the context of the research.

Corrected: In the study, the variables have been analyzed and interpreted in the context of the research.

Analysis: The sentence structure was jumbled, and the definite article "the" was needed before "variables" to make the sentence grammatically correct and clear.

Errors in Permutation at the Morphological Level. Morphological permutation errors generally involve issues with word order that affect verb tense, pluralization, or possessive forms. These errors can subtly change the intended meaning or disrupt the sentence's accuracy.

Student Output: "The factors affecting behavior is crucial for understanding the development."

Corrected: "The factors affecting behavior are crucial for understanding the development."

Analysis: "Is" should be changed to "are" to agree with the plural subject "factors."

Student Output: The research methodology was to examine the process of data collection which was using surveys.

Corrected: The research methodology was to examine the process of data collection, which was conducted using surveys.

Analysis: The verb "was using" was incorrectly placed, disrupting the sentence. The correct phrase is "was conducted using surveys" to maintain proper tense and clarity.

This finding validates the study of Alonzo and Leah (2025), which emphasizes that syntactic permutation errors, involving incorrect word order, disrupt sentence clarity and affect the overall readability of academic texts. Misordered words can confuse readers and obscure the intended meaning of a sentence. It also reinforces the study of Sidabutar (2021), who highlighted that lexical permutation errors, where words are rearranged within phrases or sentences, can alter semantic meaning and reduce textual cohesion. Additionally, this finding confirms the study of Isakova (2025), which noted that morphological permutation errors, though less frequent, interfere with word forms and affix placement, potentially compromising grammatical accuracy and sentence coherence.

4. Conclusion

The analysis of research abstracts written by ESL college students revealed that mechanical, omission, addition, substitution, and permutation errors are prevalent across multiple linguistic categories. Punctuation errors dominated mechanical mistakes, followed by capitalization and spelling, indicating that students struggle with adhering to formal writing conventions. Syntactic omissions were the most common omission errors, while morphological omissions also affected word form and agreement. Lexical additions were the primary type of addition error, with morphological and syntactic additions occurring less frequently, suggesting a tendency to include unnecessary words or morphemes that do not contribute meaning. Substitution errors were largely lexical, highlighting challenges in word choice, whereas permutation errors were predominantly syntactic, reflecting difficulties with sentence structure and word order. Overall, these findings indicate that ESL students face persistent challenges in mechanics, syntax, morphology, and vocabulary when writing research abstracts. Addressing these linguistic difficulties through targeted instruction, corrective feedback, and focused writing practice may enhance students' academic writing proficiency and improve the clarity, accuracy, and coherence of their research outputs.

Acknowledgment

Sincere appreciation is given to all peer reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions, which helped the author to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Ahamed, D. F., & Othman, D. H. (2019). Analysis and assessment of lexical errors committed by Saudi EFL University students in descriptive essay writing (A Case study of College of Science & Arts-Tanumah, King Khalid University). *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 7(6), 1-26.
- Alonzo, J., & Leah, G. A. O. R. (2025). Sentence error analysis in the writings of first-year tertiary students. *Linguarum Universe*, 2(2), 150-159. <https://ojs.linguarumuniverse.eu/index.php/jlu/article/view/54>
- Ariffin, K., Darus, N. A., Abdul Halim, N., & Awang, N. A. (2021). Analysing morphological errors in ESL graduating students' writing based on sur-face structure taxonomy. *International Journal of Modern Languages and Applied Linguistics (IJMAL)*, 5(3), 42-53. <https://ir.uitm.edu.my/id/eprint/6123/>
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- Demir, C. (2019). Writing intelligible English prose: Conciseness vs. verbosity. *Söylem Filoloji Dergisi*, 4(2), 482-505. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/soylemdergi/issue/51290/617184>
- Dong, N. M. T., & Nguyen, B. T. T. (2024). Use of the Inflectional Morpheme–s Marking Plurality and the Third-person Singular Present Tense in Vietnamese EFL Opinion Essays: Accuracy Analysis and Learner Perspectives. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 21(1). <https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v21n12024/dong.pdf>
- Education First. (2022). *EF English Proficiency Index 2022: A ranking of 111 countries and regions by English skills*. EF Education First. <https://www.ef.com/wwen/epi/>
- Handayani, H. T. (2021). *Error Analysis of Students' in Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation Marks in Writing Descriptive Text Encountered at Lintasan Imajinasi Bahasa Mahasiswa (LIBAM) of IAIN Parepare* (Doctoral dissertation, IAIN Parepare). <http://repository.iainpare.ac.id/id/eprint/2740/>
- Isakova, M. (2025). Issues of Grammar: Morphology And Syntax. *Nordic Press*, 8(0008). <https://research.nordicuniversity.org/index.php/nordic/article/view/2247>

- Jagaiah, T., Olinghouse, N. G., & Kearns, D. M. (2020). Syntactic complexity measures: Variation by genre, grade-level, students' writing abilities, and writing quality. *Reading and Writing, 33*(10), 2577-2638. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11145-020-10057-x>
- Koh, P. W., Tan, S. H., & Lim, C. P. (2018). Using task-based learning to enhance writing proficiency among ESL learners. *Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning, 6*(2), 45–52. <https://doi.org/10.24203/ajeel.v6i2.5575>
- Li, Y., & Wang, L. (2019). Challenges in academic writing among Chinese university students: An analysis of abstracts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 10*(3), 520–528. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1003.17>
- Morales Yaguarshungo, C. A. (2025). *Syntactic Error Patterns in Writing Compositions of EFL Students* (Doctoral dissertation, Ecuador: Pujilí: Universidad Técnica de Cotopaxi (UTC)). <https://repositorio.utc.edu.ec/items/b11027f5-5edd-41ad-ae0b-c1de9ebe14d8>
- Munasikin, M. (2025). Analysis of Syntactical Errors Made by EFL students in Writing Descriptive Text. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research, 5*(1), 6886-6897. <http://j-innovative.org/index.php/Innovative/article/view/17529>
- Ndlovu, L. (2024). Punctuation errors committed in creative writing by Xitsonga grade 10 learners: the case at Mafemani Circuit, Bohlabela District, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. <http://ul.netd.ac.za/handle/10386/5034>
- Peng, J., Wang, C., & Lu, X. (2020). Effect of the linguistic complexity of the input text on alignment, writing fluency, and writing accuracy in the continuation task. *Language teaching research, 24*(3), 364-381. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1362168818783341>
- Philippine Business for Education. (2020). *Higher education in the Philippines: Challenges and opportunities*. PBE. <https://www.pbed.ph/publications>
- Rahmanian, S., & Kuperman, V. (2019). Spelling errors impede recognition of correctly spelled word forms. *Scientific Studies of Reading, 23*(1), 24-36. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10888438.2017.1359274>
- Sidabutar, U. (2021). An analysis of lexical cohesion on the students' writing. *JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistic, 2*(2), 62-67. <https://jurnal.uhn.ac.id/index.php/jetal/article/view/533>
- Sundari, H. (2019). Task-based language teaching in EFL classrooms: Fostering effective writing performance. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 9*(2), 370–382. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20207>
- Wang, X., Zhang, Y., & Chen, L. (2020). An error analysis of research abstracts written by ESL students. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 10*(5), 78–86. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n5p78>
-

Author Contributions: Baguhin, M.; Study design, method conception, data collection, data analysis and manuscript writing