



SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' COMMON ERRORS IN PRACTICAL RESEARCH 1 IN THE SCHOOLS DIVISION OF LAGUNA

Alica Ann A. Yasto

ABSTRACT

Senior high school students are expected to conduct a research study aligned with the track and strand they are pursuing. This is required under the Department of Education Senior High School curriculum and is a prerequisite to graduation. In this study, common errors in Practical Research 1 manuscripts in terms of content, organization, formality, objectivity, language used, vocabulary, and referencing were identified. The sources of these errors were also determined based on the teachers' and students' perspectives. This study was carried out to determine if there is a significant relationship between the common errors and the sources.

A mixed-method research design, particularly explanatory research, was employed in this study. Quantitative data was obtained to determine the common errors where the learners' manuscripts were evaluated using a rubric and a researcher-made checklist. Similarly, survey questionnaires were distributed to the teachers and students to determine the sources of errors.

A total of 44 schools from the Schools Division of Laguna participated in the study, and purposive sampling was done to identify the respondents. The results of the study revealed that the common errors of the students in their PR 1 manuscripts are: lack of comprehensive information on the problem due to an insufficient number of sources; the texts generally lack transitional devices and logical sequencing; repetitive, misspelled, ambiguous, informal, subjective words and phrases; poor grammar and sentence structure; contracted words and utilization of the third-person point of view; and missing citations in references or bibliography, non-paraphrased citations, or inappropriate citations.

While for the sources of these errors, the absence of a research manual, students' attitude towards writing research, and their exposure to qualitative studies were causes for carelessness. Lack of exposure to a second language was found to contribute to the first language interference in manuscript writing, and errors in translation were due to the easy access of students to translation tools available on the internet. However, the sources of errors were found to have no significant relationship with most of the common errors in manuscript writing. Nevertheless, based on the thematic analysis, qualitative findings support the quantitative data regarding the common errors and their sources.

KEYWORDS: Practical Research 1, Common Errors, Sources of Errors, Explanatory Research

INTRODUCTION

"The use of thesis-writing is to train the mind, or to prove that the mind has been trained; the former purpose is, I trust, promoted, the evidence of the latter is scanty and occasional."

Clifford Allbutt

Academic excellence can be achieved if one has good English language competence. Effective writing skills that are grounded in a cognitive domain have to be developed among the students per se. Of the four areas of communication, writing is one of the indispensable skills that reflect an individual's proficiency with language, idea formation, and abstraction. It fosters one's ability to explain and refine ideas conveyed to others for vivid and understandable communication. However, because English is not the learners' first language, errors may arise in their writing, as stipulated in the study of Maspuhah, 2019. [1]

Apparently, in the academic arena, high school students, in particular, have to undergo practical research writing that aims to develop their critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Students' viewpoints of writing may be difficult and even feared as they seek to put ideas on paper while mastering writing norms

such as spelling, citation style, and grammar. Over the years, it has been clear that students lack the abilities required to be good communicators, especially in writing. For many, it is seen as a difficult skill to acquire in English because it is a complex process of producing, organizing, and refining thoughts on a piece of paper.

On the other hand, writing a thesis or research study is a critical component of any higher education program. Before pursuing any degree at a university, students must get a passing grade in a thesis writing course. A thesis is a final output that students must produce after the completion of multiple main courses and English classes (Malimas and Samson, 2017). [2]

Pursuant to Republic Act (RA) 10533, also known as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013, the Department of Education declared the implementation of the Senior High School (SHS) program for the School Year 2016-2017. Research is one of the learning areas included in the new curriculum where Grade 11 and 12 learners are expected to conduct and write research studies aligned with their chosen track and strand. However, as



mentioned earlier, most of the students lack writing skills that are congruent with the findings from the different studies conducted.

Furthermore, the students' lack of knowledge of formal research writing slows down the whole process. Crafting and developing strategies, activities, and learning environments is beneficial for students' research writing engagement. Therefore, the utilization of effective writing strategies through program and research writing processes may improve students' research interests and be beneficial to all parties involved in the research writing process (Rodriguez, 2017). [3]

In light of this, the researcher aimed to identify the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 and the sources of those errors based on the students' and teachers' perspectives.

Thesis writing is a critical component of the higher education program, similarly, it is also a part of the Department of Education Senior High School curriculum and a requirement for graduation. Senior high school students are expected to come up with research studies aligned with the track and strand they are enrolled in. Despite student's background knowledge about their topics, errors were still observed. In this study, common errors in Practical Research 1 manuscript in terms of contents, organization, formality and objectivity, language used, vocabulary and referencing were identified.

Researchers claimed that errors in content were due to absence of verified sources and guide while doing their write ups. Both studies of Roxas (2020) [4] and Pablo and Lasaten (2018) [5] focused on the writing difficulties of Senior high school students on writing academic essays. Their study participants were similar with that of the researcher but of different analyzed written output, the researcher focused specifically on the common errors in Practical Research 1 of Senior High School students in the Schools Division of Laguna.

Mallia (2017) [6], Siddiqui (2020) [7], Ahmed (2019) [8] and Roxas (2020) [4] confirmed that the organization of ideas was one of the challenging areas or writing. Students were weak at constructing introductory paragraphs, writing chronologically (Asfah, 2019) [9] and the ideas presented were difficult to follow and lacks connectives as revealed by the findings of Pablo and Lasaten (2018). Likewise, in this study, students were found to lack logical sequence of ideas in their PR 1 manuscripts. Common challenges faced by students were associated to wrong choice of words (Divsar, 2017; Tarigan 2019) [10] [11], sentence structure, spelling (Nair and Hui 2018) [12], word class (Nanning et.al, 2020) [13] and redundancy (Jali, 2021) [14]. Due to limited background on academic jargons, senior high school students had difficulty in expressing their ideas (Roxas, 2020) [4]. These findings contrasted with the claims of Pablo and Lasaten (2018) [5] were students writing quality in terms of vocabulary was good to average despite problems of some in appropriate use of words. Low language proficiency may affect the quality of the paper, specifically in terms of sentence structure and grammar (Pablo and Lasaten, 2018; Amiri and Puteh 2017) [5] [15]. These findings were consistent with the findings of this research where

it was found out that students had frequent grammatical errors and poor sentence structure.

Common errors in terms of referencing were insufficient details, inconsistent referencing style, incomplete bibliography, not using citations (Rivkin, 2020; Amiri and Puteh, 2017; Pablo and Lasaten, 2018) [16] [15] [5] and students tend to just copy and paste other's work (Muzata and Banja, 2019) [18]. This was similar to the findings of this study, students lacked citation and bibliography in most of the chapters of their PR 1 manuscript.

Several factors influence students' writing difficulties, and these factors could be the sources of common errors in their written outputs. The identified factors influencing students' writing difficulties from the previously cited studies, specifically in the study of Tarigan et. al (2019) [19], mainly revolved in the aspects of carelessness, first language interference, and translation. This led the researcher to identify and evaluate the sources of the common errors of senior high school students in writing their Practical Research 1 manuscript based on the teachers' and students' perspectives.

Due to lack of basic knowledge, they write their essays immediately without organizing their ideas. In the study of Almatarneh et.al (2018) [20], the avoidance strategy practiced by students led to more difficulties they encounter when writing. According to Gagalang (2020) [21] failure to acknowledge the significance of pre and post writing stages of writing contributes to students' writing deficiencies. Carelessness was one of the sources of students' error in writing that should be given attention. Some students were not concerned about the quality of their works due to lack of motivation in writing. In this study, it was found out that carelessness significantly affects students' output in terms of language and organization.

First language interference is inevitable, and these findings recommends that students should be exposed to a variety of writing strategies and guidelines to enhance their writing skills (Abdullah et.al, 2019) [22]. Langga and Alico (2020) [23] and Saleth et.al (2021) [24] claimed that lack of familiarity and mastery of English language led students to commit errors in language translation. Errors in translation led to inconsistencies in the meaning of texts (Napu and Hasan, 2019) [25]. Correspondingly, based on the results of this study, students relied on using Google translate that led to poor translation of text.

METHODOLOGY

The mixed-method research design particularly the explanatory research was employed in this study. Explanatory research is an approach that investigates why something happens from insufficient data. It may help get a deeper grasp of a subject, determine how or why a certain phenomenon is happening, and anticipate potential events (George and Merkus, 2022) [26].

The quantitative data were obtained to determine the common errors of the Senior High School in Practical Research 1 where the learners' manuscripts were evaluated using a rubric and a researcher-made checklist. Likewise, survey questionnaires were distributed to the teachers and students to determine the



sources of errors. Furthermore, it was followed by the gathering of the qualitative data through interviews to determine the teachers' and students' views regarding the common errors found from the PR1 manuscripts and their sources as perceived by the participants.

There was a total of 44 Senior High Schools in the Division of Laguna that took part in this research. A purposive sampling technique was employed to know the respondents. Purposive Sampling is a non-scientific sampling design that is based on selecting individuals as samples according to the purposes of the researcher as his controls (Calmorin, 2010) as cited by (Cahyati, 2019). [27]

Quantitatively, the data gathered were statistically treated through weighted mean and standard deviation, and Pearson product-moment correlation.

Weighted mean and standard deviation were used to compute for the common errors of the students in Practical Research 1 and the sources for errors from the students and teachers' perspectives. Sakkir, et al. (2020) [28] in their study used mean and standard deviation measure the effectiveness of English "Shock Day" approach to the university students.

Pearson product-moment correlation was used to statistically determine if there is a relationship between the students' common errors in PR1 and the sources of errors from the students and teachers' perspectives. Asyura (2020) [29] used Pearson product-moment correlation to present the relationship between self-confidence and students' speaking performance, whether there is correlation between students' self-confidence and their speaking performance or not.

While in the qualitative phase, based on the transcribed interviews, the researcher deduced noteworthy remarks from the responses of the participants. The researcher interpreted the gathered responses to answer the study's central question. In all, more than two hundred (200) sentences were extrapolated from the original transcriptions. The researcher scraped and deleted certain repetitive concepts or comments expressed by the same individual to reduce the quantity. Following the reduction procedure, the interview transcriptions yielded one hundred twenty-six (126) relevant statements. These remarks were categorized based on their idea similarity. The researcher identified twelve (12) emerging core themes from this group. These topics were organized chronologically as they came from the researcher's assessment.

To explain the horizontalization component of the data analysis, the researcher provided relevant statements from the participants' responses to the planned in-depth interviews. In order to make the findings credible, phrases and direct quotations from the participants' answers were included into the presentation. The researcher made meaning of the participants' replies to address the central questions of the study.

The themes were produced using Braun & Clarke's thematic analysis (2017). The participants' important statements were categorized according to their significance. Each statement's original concept was combined to become the core theme.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative

1. *What are the common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1?*

Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1

Table 1. Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1 in terms of content

Statements	W M	SD	Remarks
<i>Lack of detailed information regarding the problem</i>	3.48	1.281	Often
<i>Inadequate coverage of the problem or a topic that is too broad</i>	3.52	1.263	Often
<i>Irrelevant content</i>	2.85	1.352	Sometimes
<i>Insufficient number of sources</i>	3.90	1.179	Often
<i>Instances of plagiarism and copy and paste</i>	2.86	1.307	Sometimes

Overall Mean = 3.32 Standard Deviation = 1.339

Verbal Interpretation = Sometimes Evident

Legend

Scale	Range	Remarks	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21-5.00	Always	Very Evident
4	3.41-4.20	Often	Evident
3	2.61-3.40	Sometimes	Sometimes Evident
2	1.81- 2.60	Rarely	Rarely Evident
1	1.00-1.80	Never	Not Evident

The data revealed that the students' common errors in terms of content, which are often seen among the forty-four evaluated PR1 manuscripts are, an insufficient number of sources, which was prevalent in Chapters 1,2,3, and 4, inadequate coverage of the problem or topic that is too broad, which was frequently observed in Chapters 1, 2, and 4, and a lack of detailed information regarding the problem, that is common in Chapters 1, 2, and 4. These errors include lack of research regarding the topic due to the limited resources or access to information on the internet and school libraries because of the pandemic. As a result, the manuscripts lack relevant, up-to-date information, and the explanations for the problem are brief. For instance, there were missing sub-contents in Chapter 1 like Significance of the Problem and Definition of Terms, and the Introduction was composed of a single paragraph only, in-text citations were also not observed. Moreover, Chapter 2 often contained 2 to 4 related literatures or studies only and the students did not synthesize them. While in-text citations were not seen on Chapters 3 for the cited texts and in Chapter 2 as support to the results of the study.



Meanwhile, since chapter 2 involves the review of related literature and studies, instances of plagiarism and copy-paste were often noticed. The manuscripts contained in-text citations, but the statements were copied verbatim from the sources.

Moreover, irrelevant content is the error sometimes seen in the students' manuscripts. Research Paradigm in the form of Input, Process, Output (IPO), and Hypothesis that is meant to be tested were included in Chapter 1. While numerical data were seen on Chapter 4.

Generally, the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 in terms of content, with an overall mean of 3.32 and a standard deviation of 1.339, were verbally interpreted as sometimes evident among the evaluated manuscripts.

The findings of this study were parallel to the findings of Roxas (2020) [4], which revealed that errors in the content of SHS students' output were due to the limited amount of reliable and verified resources. Similarly, in the study of Irwandi (2019) [30], one of the external factors affecting research writing was the insufficient collection of resources available for the students in the library.

Table 2. Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1 in terms of organization

Statements	WM	SD	Remarks
Transition devices were not used or completely absent. (cohesion)	4.17	0.883	Often
No logical sequence (coherence)	3.62	0.943	Often
Ineffective introduction, inadequate support, and unsatisfactory conclusion	3.31	1.111	Sometimes
Difficulty to divide further concepts into distinct paragraphs	3.24	1.162	Sometimes
Ideas are difficult to understand	2.98	1.245	Sometimes

Overall Mean = 3.47 Standard Deviation = 1.150
Verbal Interpretation = Evident

Transition devices were not used or completely absent, and no logical sequence were the common errors often found in the students' manuscripts. The errors in cohesion were frequently observed in all the chapters of the manuscripts. Hence, the link between the sentences was not clearly conveyed due to the absence of the transitional devices. Whereas the errors in the logical sequence were repeatedly evaluated in Chapters 1, 2, 4, and 5, while sometimes in Chapter 3. Therefore, the paragraphs did not flow smoothly from one to another, which caused ambiguity in the connections among the concepts presented.

Moreover, difficulty to divide further concepts into distinct paragraphs was the error often seen in Chapter 2, while ineffective introduction, inadequate support, and unsatisfactory conclusion were prevalent in Chapters 1 and 2.

Furthermore, ideas are difficult to understand was the error that was sometimes observed in the students' PR1 manuscripts.

To sum up, the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 in terms of organization attained an overall mean score of 3.47 and a standard deviation of 1.150, which was verbally interpreted as evident among the evaluated manuscripts.

The findings of this study revealed that the absence of transition devices, logical sequence, and ideas were evident. This is comparable to the study of Mallia (2017) [6], where students find difficulties in organization and presentation of ideas. Correspondingly, students were weak at writing chronologically (Asfah, 2019) [9], and they tended to insert irrelevant ideas (Amiri and Puteh, 2017) [15].

Table 3. Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1 in terms of vocabulary or word choice

Statements	WM	SD	Remarks
Redundancy	3.07	0.917	Sometimes
Words are vague, too informal, and subjective	2.71	1.147	Sometimes
Misspelled words	2.47	0.917	Sometimes
Use of jargons, clichés, idioms, and slangs	1.79	1.029	Never
Literally translated words from Filipino to English	1.81	1.027	Rarely

Overall Mean = 2.37 Standard Deviation = 1.128
Verbal Interpretation = Rarely Evident

The data showed that redundancy, words being vague, too informal, and subjective, and misspelled words are the common errors that were sometimes seen in the students' manuscripts all throughout the chapters. The manuscripts occasionally contained words and ideas that were repeatedly mentioned within the sub-contents of each chapter. Moreover, contracted words such as "haven't", "it's", "there's", and informal phrases like "kind of", "of course", the use of 2nd person personal pronouns "you", "your", and informal transitional words such as "so", "besides" were sometimes observed in the manuscripts. Sometimes the sentences are difficult to understand because the words are vague and misspelled.

On the other hand, literally translated words from Filipino to English were rarely evaluated, while the use of jargon, clichés, idioms, and slang was never seen among the forty-four manuscripts.

Overall, the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 in terms of vocabulary or word choice attained a total mean score of 2.37 and a standard deviation



of 1.128, which was verbally interpreted as rarely evident in the students' manuscript.

Results of the study by Amiri and Puteh (2017) [15] and Jali (2021) [14] claimed that one of the common errors committed by students was the practice of redundancy in writing, which is similar to the findings of this study. On the other hand, the findings of Pablo and Lasaten (2018) [5] revealed that incorrect usage of words is the predominant problem of senior high school students in writing, which contrasts with the findings of this study where redundancy was the most common error of students in writing in terms of vocabulary.

Table 4. Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1 in terms of language used

Statements	WM	SD	Remarks
Poor sentences constructions	3.59	1.047	Often
Frequent errors on grammar	3.67	0.983	Often
Unclear meaning of statements.	2.91	1.167	Sometimes
Complicated statements	2.95	1.178	Sometimes
Major errors even in the simple structures	2.85	1.305	Sometimes

Overall Mean = 3.19 Standard Deviation = 1.195
Verbal Interpretation = Sometimes Evident

Among the forty-four evaluated students' PR1 manuscripts, poor sentence construction and frequent errors in grammar were the common errors that were often noted in terms of language used. Both errors were dominant in Chapters 1 to 5. These are errors in subject verb-agreement, run-on sentences, and inconsistency in verb tenses.

Additionally, complicated statements, unclear meaning of statements, and major errors, even in simple structures, were the errors sometimes seen in the students' manuscripts.

In general, the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 in terms of language used were sometimes evident among the evaluated students' PR1 manuscripts, which attained a mean score of 3.19 and a standard deviation of 1.195.

One of the most difficult aspects of writing is the expression of precise ideas and selecting the appropriate language to use (Ratnawati et al. 2018) [31]. Difficulty in grammar and poor sentence structure are two of the problems affecting the students' writing ability (Noraviana, 2018) [32]. This claim supplements the finding of this study where SHS students commit frequent errors in grammar and poor sentence construction. Likewise, in the study of Pablo and Lasaten (2018), it was revealed that most of the students have poor sentence construction ability.

Table 5. Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1 in terms of formality and objectivity

Statements	WM	SD	Remarks
Use of third-person pronouns	3.78	1.632	Often
Words are contracted	2.41	1.299	Sometimes
Use of Colloquial words, jargons, slangs	1.84	1.185	Rarely
Often use of rhetorical questions and emotive language.	1.50	1.012	Never
Opinionated/ subjective presentation of concepts.	1.74	1.111	Never

Overall Mean = 2.25 Standard Deviation = 1.359
Verbal Interpretation = Rarely Evident

The data revealed that the evaluated students' PR 1 manuscripts often used the third-person point of view all throughout the chapters. This may be inferred that the third person point of view was the one prescribed to be used rather than the first-person, which can be used in qualitative research to reflect the intent of the researcher to give voice to the opinions of the participants (Given, 2022). The reason for this was explained in the qualitative results of this study.

Moreover, words are contracted, such as "aren't", "can't," "haven't," "it's", and "there's," which are the errors sometimes noticed all throughout the chapters. On the other hand, the use of colloquial words, jargon, and slang was rarely evaluated, and the use of rhetorical questions, emotive language, and opinionated/subjective presentation of concepts was never observed in the students' manuscripts.

Overall, the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 in terms of formality and objectivity attained a mean score of 2.25 and a standard deviation of 1.359, which was verbally interpreted as rarely evident among the evaluated students' manuscripts.

Formality is achieved through a combination of features and favors terminologies most respected in different fields (Liardet et.al 2019) [33], while to achieve objectivity, all information that is not evidence-based should be excluded (Mallia, 2017) [6]. In qualitative research reports, researchers favor first-person style to give voice to participants' opinions (Given, 2022).



Table 6. Common errors of the Senior High School Students in Practical Research 1 in terms of referencing

Statements	WM	SD	Remarks
No citations	3.71	1.198	Often
Improper way of citation	3.60	1.249	Often
Unnecessary citations	3.31	1.426	Sometimes
Citations are not paraphrased	3.84	1.102	Often
Missing citations in references/bibliography	4.08	1.122	Often

Overall Mean = 3.71 Standard Deviation = 1.249
Verbal Interpretation = Evident

The data revealed that the common errors in terms of referencing, which were often seen in the students' manuscripts, were missing citations in references/bibliography and citations were not paraphrased, which were prevalent in Chapters 1-4. The students' manuscripts contained cited statements relevant to their studies, but they were not reworded and were not seen in the references page. Others had no bibliography at all. No citations were found, and improper citation methods were also frequently evaluated in Chapters 1, 3, and 4. The errors consist of the inclusions of cited texts that were not referenced while the other referenced texts were cited incorrectly, like "According to (Celeste, 2010)", "(hafeez 2014, Indiana: and Achievement 2014)", "Oye et. al. (2012)", and a link like https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=advantages+of+buying+online+thesis&oq=advan#d=gs_qabs&t=1652148883053&u=%23p%3DN9SJX5TRXMJ.

Moreover, unnecessary citations were often noticed in Chapters 3 and 4. This error is made up of cited statements that have nothing to do with the study and citations that are too old.

Generally, the common errors of the senior high school students in Practical Research 1 in terms of referencing were evident among the evaluated manuscripts, with a total mean score of 3.71 and a standard deviation of 1.249.

Absence of citation was one of the most common errors found in the outputs evaluated in this study. This is parallel to the findings of Pablo and Lasaten (2018) [5] where most of the senior high school students' outputs use no citation. Moreover, in the evaluated papers in the study of Amiri and Puteh (2017) [15], the identified errors in the bibliography lists were insufficient details, format not followed, inconsistent referencing style, punctuation errors, and incorrect and incomplete recording of bibliographic entries. Despite being exposed to a variety of referencing styles, students still struggle with proper citation and referencing (Muzata and Banja, 2019) [18].

2. What are the sources of these writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives?

Sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives

Table 7. Sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of carelessness

Statements	Teachers' Perspective		Students' Perspective	
	M	Remarks	M	Remarks
Not interested in research writing.	4.05	Often	2.39	Rarely
Do not have enough confidence to write research.	4.09	Often	3.00	Sometimes
Not motivated to compose thesis manuscript.	4.07	Often	2.70	Sometimes
Do not have materials that guide us in writing research.	4.25	Always	2.73	Sometimes
Not exposed to sample qualitative research.	3.57	Often	2.70	Sometimes

Overall Mean = 3.35 Standard Deviation = 1.223
Verbal Interpretation = Sometimes Evident

Table 7 illustrates the sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of carelessness.

Based on the teachers' perspectives, the students always have no materials that guide them in writing research. And oftentimes, the students do not have enough confidence to write research, are not motivated to compose thesis manuscripts, are not interested in research writing, and are not exposed to sample qualitative research.

From the students' perspectives, sometimes they do not have enough confidence to write research, do not have materials that guide in writing research, are not motivated to compose thesis manuscripts, and are not exposed to sample qualitative research.



On the other hand, they are rarely not interested in research writing.

Overall, the sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of carelessness attained a total mean score of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 1.223, which was verbally interpreted as sometimes evident among the respondents.

According to Sermsook et al. (2017) [34], carelessness is one of the sources of writing errors among students. This is parallel to the findings of this study. Their study suggests that for students to be competent in writing, these factors should be given attention. The findings of Hidayati (2017) [35] complement the findings of this research; they suggest that students' low motivation and interest in writing affect the quality of their output. Similarly, the study by Pohan (2018) [36] suggests that most of the time, carelessness is related to a lack of motivation. On the other hand, lack of guidance in referencing caused the students to encounter difficulty in citing sources (Muzata and Banja, 2019) [18].

Moreover, table 8 shows the Sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of first language interference

From the teachers' perspectives, it is always that the students usually converse with other people in the Filipino language and struggle to put into words the ideas in the second language. While students frequently lack confidence in expressing themselves in English, they also struggle to write in English, and students are not exposed to the second language at home or even in school.

Moreover, from students' perspectives, they sometimes struggle to put into words the ideas in the second language, find it difficult to write in English, are not confident in expressing themselves using the English language, and they are not exposed to the second language at home or even in school.

Therefore, the data revealed that the sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of first language interference, with a mean score of 3.49 and a standard deviation of 1.177, were verbally interpreted as evident among the respondents.

Table 8. Sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of first language interference

Statements	Teachers' Perspective		Students' Perspective	
	M	Remarks	M	Remarks
<i>Conversed with other people in Filipino language.</i>	4.23	Always	3.18	Sometimes
<i>Finds it difficult to write in English.</i>	4.09	Often	2.91	Sometimes

<i>Struggles to put into words the ideas in the second language.</i>	4.23	Always	3.07	Sometimes
<i>Not confident to express using English Language.</i>	4.16	Often	2.70	Sometimes
<i>Not exposed to the second language at home or even in school.</i>	3.68	Often	2.61	Sometimes

Overall Mean = 3.49 Standard Deviation = 1.177
Verbal Interpretation = Evident

The findings of Kharisma et al. (2021) [37] are similar to the findings of this study; Chinese senior high school students encounter syntactic interference or word arrangement problems since they usually converse and write in their native language. It could be assumed that a student's first language makes it hard for them to write well in English (Singh and Maniam, 2020) [38].

Furthermore, Table 9 illustrates the sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of translations.

Table 9. Sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of translations

Statements	Teachers' Perspective		Students' Perspective	
	M	Remarks	M	Remarks
<i>Usually started writing the parts of my manuscript in Filipino.</i>	4.02	Often	3.05	Sometimes
<i>Tend to translate the words from Filipino to English literally.</i>	3.98	Often	2.93	Sometimes
<i>Translated the sentences from Filipino to English</i>	3.93	Often	2.98	Sometimes



word for word, neglecting proper sentence constructions.	3.98	Often	2.86	Sometimes
Just simply translate Filipino words or sentences to English without realizing whether the meaning has been changed or not.	4.14	Often	3.18	Sometimes
Uses Google translate or other translation applications.				

Overall Mean = 3.50 Standard Deviation = 1.105

Verbal Interpretation = Evident

From the teachers' points of view, the data showed that students often use Google Translate or other translation apps, start writing parts of the manuscript in Filipino, translate Filipino words or sentences to English without realizing whether the meaning has changed or not, tend to translate words literally, and often translate sentences from Filipino to English word for word.

From the students' perspectives, all the indicative statements discussed above with the computed mean and standard deviation presented in Table 9 were all remarked as "sometimes." "I used Google Translate or other translation apps" yielded the highest mean score." This is followed by "I usually start writing the parts of my manuscript in Filipino." On the other hand, the statement "I just simply translate Filipino words or sentences to English without realizing whether the meaning has been changed or not" received the lowest mean score.

Overall, the sources of writing errors from the teachers' and students' perspectives in terms of translations attained a mean score of 3.50 and a standard deviation of 1.105, which was verbally interpreted as evident among the respondents.

Positive transfer of first to second language contributes to the ease of the learning process, while negative transfer leads to errors that need to be corrected to fully understand the context (Valcea, 2020) [39]. Due to a lack of familiarity and mastery in both the first and second language, Filipino senior high school students have a low level of proficiency in language translation (Langga and Alico, 2020) [23]. According to Suhono et al. (2018), the use of Google Translate among students is ineffective and low quality, while the findings of Chandra and Yuyun (2018)

[40] revealed that students consult Google Translate to understand unknown vocabulary. Moreover, when students use their first language in writing initially, they come up with more ideas and are able to maximize their first language cohesive markers compared to writing in the second language (as disclosed in the study of Saleh et al., 2021). These supplements the findings of this research.

3. Is there a significant relationship between the common errors and the sources from the teachers' and students' perspective?

Table 10. Significant relationship between the common errors and the sources from the teachers' and students' perspective

Common Errors	Sources	r	Degree of Correlation	p-value	Interpretation
Content		-0.15	Low	0.3192	Not Significant
	Carelessness	0.37	Moderate	0.0425	Significant
Organization		-0.307	Low	0.1646	Not Significant
		0.326	Moderate	0.0307	Significant
Formality and objectivity		-0.0564	Low	0.7159	Not Significant
		0.1076	Low	0.4869	Not Significant
Content		-0.1711	Low	0.2667	Not Significant
	First language interference	0.1823	Low	0.2362	Not Significant
Vocabulary or word choice		-0.1994	Low	0.1942	Not Significant
		0.1728	Low	0.2619	Not Significant



Formality and objectivity	-	Low	0.14	Not Significant
	0.22		62	
	27			
Referencing	-	Low	0.46	Not Significant
	0.11		10	
	4			
Content	-	Low	0.30	Not Significant
	0.15		99	
	66			
Organization	-	Low	0.36	Not Significant
	0.13		84	
	89			
Vocabulary or word choice	-	Low	0.15	Not Significant
	0.21		76	
	68			
Language use	-	Low	0.17	Not Significant
	0.20		88	
	64			
Formality and objectivity	-	Low	0.14	Not Significant
	0.22		20	
	50			
Referencing	-	Low	0.80	Not Significant
	0.03		67	
	79			

Degree of Correlation:

± 1	Perfect
± 0.50 to ± 1	High degree
± 0.30 to ± 0.49	Moderate degree
below + .29	Low degree
0	No correlation

Table 10 presents the significant relationship between the common errors and the sources from the teachers' and students' perspective.

A Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to assess the relationship between common errors and sources of error from the students and teachers' perspective. Preliminary analyses showed the relationship to be linear with both variables normally distributed, as assessed by Shapiro-Wilk's test ($p > .05$), and there were no significant outliers among the variables.

There was a moderate negative correlation among the two common errors such as organization and language use which is correlated, $r = -0.3$, $p < 0.05$, with carelessness as one of the sources of error. There was a statistically significant relationship between organization and carelessness, similar with language use and carelessness. Thus, the null hypothesis can be rejected.

Students tend to lack logical sequence and little sense of organization in writing (Pablo and Lasaten, 2018) [5]. Correspondingly, students find it difficult to arrange words properly in a sentence as well as making use of appropriate

grammar (Noraviana, 2018). These could be attributed to the carelessness of students, they were not concerned about the quality of their write ups, and this significantly impacts their writing output (Hidayati, 2017) [35].

The remaining common errors were not observed to have any significant relationship with the sources from the teachers' and students' perspective and with a low degree of correlation. From the findings above, we can infer that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis "There is no significant relationship between the common errors and the sources from the teachers' and students' perspectives" is accepted. Thus, the alternative should be rejected which incites that there is a significant relationship.

This implies that the sources of errors have no significant relationship with most of the common errors in manuscript writing. The underlying reason behind this was the lack of a standard guide in thesis writing being utilized and followed in the different schools in the Division of Laguna. Additionally, most of the evaluated manuscripts were already checked and corrected prior to evaluation. In the absence of a standard guide, there were different perception of what is proper and acceptable in thesis writing, in this regard, the common errors vary as well as the sources depending on the students' and teachers' perspective. Hence, there is need to devise one learning material to serve as a standard guide. In the study of Irwandi (2019) [30], one of the cited external factors affecting student writing difficulty was school-related factor, the lack of materials the student can consult during the writing process.

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative findings were derived from the interviews conducted with the select Practical Research 1 teachers and students among the participants of this study. Manual coding was conducted by the researcher to form the themes of the data. The main objective of the qualitative part is to seek the views of the select participants concerning the common errors found in the PR1 manuscripts, and the teachers' and students' perspectives on sources of errors.

4. How did the participants view the errors and their sources?

The teachers viewed that common errors in content were due to students' poor and inadequate paraphrasing skills and knowledge. Unfamiliarity with the various transitional devices and their appropriate application leads to errors in sentence and paragraph organization. In terms of vocabulary or word choice, the errors were due to the students' poor vocabulary due to a lack of L2 exposure. While lack of mastery of the basic grammar lessons due to limited writing engagements was perceived as the reason for the errors in the language used, the lack of a standard writing guide affects the formality and objectivity of the manuscript. Also, the teachers claimed that referencing errors were due to an unorganized list of used references and an unfamiliarity with proper referencing practice.

On the other hand, the students perceived that the errors in content were because of a lack of awareness and knowledge of



possible resources. In terms of organization, poor background and foundation of knowledge on the use of transitional devices causes the errors. When it comes to vocabulary, the students claimed that the errors were due to their limited knowledge and unfamiliarity with different ways of enhancing vocabulary. Additionally, poor recall and mastery of basic grammar lessons produced errors in the manuscripts. While compliance with the instructions relevant to academic writing and unfamiliarity with proper referencing and lack of time are the causes of errors in terms of formality and objectivity, and referencing, respectively.

To continue, with regards to the teachers' and students' views on the sources of errors; from the teachers' perspectives, carelessness causes inefficient research writing due to lack of reference guide, first language interference was due to poor second language familiarity, and translations resulted in incomprehensible writing due to use of Google translate and verbatim translation.

Furthermore, the students viewed that carelessness happened to subject misconceptions and a lack of experience in writing research, first language interference includes being accustomed to first language use and poor second language mastery; and internet accessibility and poor writing skills are the reasons for translations as one of the sources of errors.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The common errors of the students in their PR 1 manuscripts are: lack of comprehensive information on the problem due to an insufficient number of sources; the texts generally lack transitional devices and logical sequencing; repetitive, misspelled, ambiguous, informal, subjective words and phrases; poor grammar and sentence structure; contracted words and utilization of the third-person point of view; and missing citations in references or bibliography, non-paraphrased citations, or inappropriate citations.

The sources of errors are carelessness, first-language interference, and translations.

Carelessness includes the absence of a research manual, students' attitude towards writing research, and their exposure to qualitative studies. On the other hand, first language interference involves the learners' exposure and utilization of their first language that causes writing difficulties using the second language. While translations can lead to errors, this only happens when words are translated word-for-word from Filipino to English or when translation tools due to internet access.

The remaining common errors in the content, vocabulary or word choice, formality and objectivity, and referencing, were not observed to have any significant relationship with the sources of errors from the teachers' and students' perspective, such as first language interference and translations and with a low degree of correlation. This implies that the sources of errors have no significant relationship with most of the common errors in manuscript writing. The underlying reason behind this was the lack of a standard guide in thesis writing being utilized and followed in the different schools in the Division of Laguna.

Additionally, most of the evaluated manuscripts were already checked and corrected prior to evaluation.

The qualitative findings support the quantitative data regarding the common errors. The reasons for the identified errors that were enumerated earlier were determined through the core themes that were developed from the conducted interviews. In addition, the qualitative data expound the sources of errors.

Practical Research 1 teachers are encouraged to consider the identified common errors in this study and incorporate appropriate lessons into their PR 1 discussions, which may help the students understand and avoid the common errors in writing the manuscripts.

Students will be exposed to the English language through classes that use English as the medium of instruction and encourage students to participate in class by speaking English. Hence, discouraging them from the frequent use of translation tools in their writing activities like in PR 1 is recommended.

Future researchers may consider collecting the manuscript's raw file or unchecked copy for another evaluation of the common errors. A closed group sample may be considered since they have common backgrounds in research writing to get a more comparable result.

Future researchers may do the identification of common errors per school, per district, or per cluster.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Maspufah (2019). *Grammatical Error Made by EFL Learners of STIBA Persada Bunda*
2. Pescante-Malimas, M. A., & Samson, S. C. (2017). *Linguistic Error Analysis on Students' Thesis Proposals*. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, 3(2), 193-209.
3. Rodriguez, R. (2017). *Engaging graduate students throughout the research writing process*.
4. Joshua Roxas, M. D. (2020). *Exploring Senior High School Students' Academic Writing Difficulties: Towards an Academic Writing Model*. In *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal* (Vol. 2, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3731861>
5. Pablo, J. C. I., & Lasaten, R. C. S. (2018). *Writing difficulties and quality of academic essays of senior high school students*. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4), 46-57.
6. Mallia, J. (2017). *Strategies for Developing English Academic Writing Skills*. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol8no2.1>
7. Siddiqui, K. A. (2020). *Analyzing Factors Influencing the Paragraph Organization in English Language Writing of Intermediate Students*. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 32(1).
8. Ahmed, P. H. (2019). *Major Writing Challenges Experienced by EFL Learners in Soran University*. *Journal of University of Human Development*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.21928/juhd.v5n3y2019.pp120-126>
9. Asfah, I. *An Analysis of Paragraph Writing Abilities of English Department Students UNM*. *ELT*



10. Divsar, H., & Heydari, R. (2017). A Corpus-based Study of EFL Learners' Errors in IELTS Essay Writing. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v6n.3p.143>
11. Widya Pasca Tarigan, Yudha Suranta P Siregar, Natalia [...]Alfian Tanjung (2019). Grammatical Errors on Students' Writing of Recount Text. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal* (2019), 10.31539/leea.v3i1.995Worldwide: *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 1-9.muz
12. Nair, S. M., & Hui, L. L. (2018). An analysis of common errors in ESL descriptive writing among Chinese private school students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2017.61.28.42>
13. Nanning, Saepudin, M. (2020). An Analysis of Grammatical Error in Writing Skill. *Eduvelop: Journal of English Education and Development* P-ISSN: 2597-713X, E-ISSN: 2597-7148, 3(2).
14. Jali, I. (2021). Analysing Grammar Errors in Malay Language Learning. *Journal of Cognitive Sciences and Human Development*, 7(1), 72-85. <https://doi.org/10.33736/jcshd.3050.2021>
15. Amiri, F., & Puteh, M. (2017). Error Analysis in Academic Writing: A Case of International Postgraduate Students in Malaysia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.4p.141>
16. Rivkin, A. (2020). Manuscript referencing errors and their impact on shaping current evidence. In *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* (Vol. 84, Issue 7). <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7846>
17. Pablo, J. C. I., & Lasaten, R. C. S. (2018). Writing difficulties and quality of academic essays of senior high school students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(4), 46-57.
18. Muzata, K. K., & Banja, M. K. (2019). Preparation of Students in Academic Referencing and Citation: The Case of School of Education Students at the University of Zambia. *Zambia Journal of Library & Information Science (ZAJLIS)*, ISSN: 2708-2695, 3(1 & 2).
19. Siregar, Y. S. P., Tarigan, N. W. P., Mawarni, C. I., Simanjuntak, C. W. B., & Tanjung, A. (2019). Grammatical Errors on Students' Writing of Recount Text. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v3i1.995>
20. Mohammad Almatarneh, A. H., Ab Rashid, R., & Yunus, K. (2018). The Academic Writing Experience of Jordanian Postgraduate Students at a University in Malaysia. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no3.17>
21. Galalang, J. L. (2020). Assessing deficiencies in composition writing: A case of Filipino college freshmen learners. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(1), 307-316.
22. Abdullah, A. N., Md. Yunus, M., Hashim, H., Sayadi, S. S. B., Seman, N. A. B., Ibrahim, Z. B., & Zakaria, N. A. A. B. (2019). Interference of first language in secondary school students. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(6 Special Issue 3), 675-681. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.F1125.0986S319>
23. Langga, P. M. M., & Alico, J. C. (2020). Students' Proficiency and Challenges in Filipino-to-English Translation: The Case of Filipino Senior High School Students in a Private Institution. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(4), 51-62.
24. Saleh, N. S., Murtaza, S. F., & Baki, N. U. (2021). A Comparative Analysis on Cohesive Markers in Essay Composition of First Language and Second Language: Direct Writing Versus Translation. *International Journal of Linguistics Studies*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijls.2021.1.2.1>
25. Napu, N. & Hasan, R. (2019). Translation problems analysis of students' academic essay. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation* 2(5), 1-11.
26. George, T and Merkus, J. (2022). Explanatory Research- Definition, Guide, and Example. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/explanatory-research/>
27. Cahyati, S. S., Parmawati, A., & Atmawidjaja, N. S. (2019). Optimizing English teaching and learning process to young learners (a Case Study in Cimahi). *Journal Of Educational Experts (JEE)*, 2(2), 107-114.
28. Sakkir, G., Zulfirman, Z., Mahmud, N., & Ahmad, J. (2020). Improving speaking ability using English" Shock Day" approach. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 3(2), 56-59
29. Asyura, F. (2020). The Relationship Between Self-Confidence Andspeaking Performa Nce Of Second Semester Students Of English Department At Unisma. *Jurnal Penelitian, Pendidikan, dan Pembelajaran*, 15(16).
30. Irwandi, Irwandi. (2019). The Problem Faced In Writing Thesis By Eighth Semester Students Of English Education Program Fkip-Umm In Academic The Students' Problems In Writing An Undergraduate Thesis: A Case Study At English Language Teaching Program Of Muhammadiyah University Of Mataram. *Linguistics And Elt Journal*. 10. 37. 10.31764/Leltj.V10i2.793
31. Ratnawati, R., Faridah, D., Anam, S., & Remaningdyah, P. (2018). Exploring Academic Writing Needs of Indonesian EFL Undergraduate Students. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(4). <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.31>
32. Novariana, H., Sumardi, & Tarjana, S. S. (2018). Senior High School Students' Problems in Writing a Preliminary Study of Implementing Writing E-Journal as Self-Assessment to Promote Students' Writing Skill. *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC)*, 2.
33. Liardét, C. L., Black, S., & Bardetta, V. S. (2019). Defining formality: Adapting to the abstract demands of academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.02.007>
34. Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2017). An Analysis of Errors in Written English Sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL Students. *English Language Teaching*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n3p101>
35. Hidayati, K. H. (2018). Teaching writing to EFL learners: An investigation of challenges confronted by Indonesian teachers. *Langkawi: Journal of The Association for Arabic and English*, 4(1), 21-31.
36. Pohan, A. E. (2018). The Student's Types Error on Writing Descriptive Text (An Analysis Study at Senior High School).



ANGLO-SAXON: *Journal of the English Language Education Study Program*, 9(1).

37. Kharisma, A. J., & Niswa, K. (2021). *Chinese Language Interference of Smart Vocational School Students in Written English*. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE*, 2(8), 1-9.
38. Singh, A. K. G., & Maniam, M. (2020). *A case study on the influence of first language syntax (L1) in writing English (L2) essays among form two secondary students*. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(7), 2914-2920.

39. Vâlcea, C. S. (2020). *First language transfer in second language acquisition as a cause for error-making in translations*. *Diacronia*, 11.

<https://doi.org/10.17684/i11a161en>

40. Chandra, S. O., & Yuyun, I. (2018). *The use of google translate in EFL essay writing*. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 228-23

Author Profile



Alica Ann A. Yasto graduated with a B.S. Broadcasting at the Laguna State University Sta. Cruz campus. She had taken units on development communication at the University of the Philippines, Los Baños. She is a licensed professional teacher with a Master's degree in education major in English and had completed academic requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy in education major in

English at the University of Perpetual Help System Dalta, Las Piñas City. She is now affiliated with the Department of Education at Barangay Longos Senior High School.