EXPLORING COMMON STUDENTS ERROR IN WRITING RECOUNT TEXT: A CONTENT ANALYSIS STUDY

[1]Riya Risqi Setyaningrum, [2] Fita Faridah, [3]Tiara Widyaiswara, [4]Ahmad Vicky Ferdianto
[1,2,3,4] Universitas Islam Lamongan, Lamongan, Indonesia
1 riyarisqi@unisla.ac.id*; 2 fitafaridah@unisla.ac.id ; 3 tiarawdya@unisla.ac.id
*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

The study explores common errors in the generic structure components of recount text in VII-B students at MTs Putra-Putri Lamongan using of 20 students a content analysis approach. The finding indicates the most frequent error is the lack of orientation information, which occurs in approximately 60% of texts, where the students fail to introduce who, when, or where appropriately. In approximately 15% of texts, there is partial orientation. Regarding event sequences, mistakes are standard; 50% of texts have events in the wrong order, and 45% do not use time connectives, which cause the sequence to be unclear. In the re-orientation component, 70% of students leave out the closing reflective comment, tending to finish their recount suddenly, and 10% include poor or general closings. These findings identify priority areas of instructional focus to improve student competency in recount text writing through the significance of well-defined contextual introductions, sequential logic, and reflective conclusions.

Keywords: Writing English, Recount Text, Error Analysis, Content Analysis Approach

INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental skills in learning English as a Foreign Language is writing. In writing, learners can express their thoughts, ideas, and experiences in a structured and coherent manner. Considered the most complex and challenging to master, as it requires a combination of grammar knowledge, vocabulary, organization, and the ability to convey meaning clearly (Chen et al., 2025; Jeremy Harmer, 2004; Lymer et al., 2024). It is integral to academic achievement, professional communication, and personal expression. It is a means of conveying information and a tool for critical thinking and problem-solving (Winarsih, 2016). Writing is often seen as the most complex of the four primary language skills in second or foreign language learning contexts: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Due to the cognitive and linguistic demands, it places on learners.

In English as a foreign language classroom, the students frequently struggle with writing due to limited exposure to authentic language use and a lack of confidence in their linguistic abilities. For both native and non-native speakers, writing English is challenging because it involves generating ideas, organizing them logically, and translating them into readable text (Bakla & Karakaş, 2022; Galindo et al., 2025; Li, 2024). Several EFL learners struggle with writing because they have limited exposure to English in real-life contexts, which hinders their ability to express ideas fluently and coherently.

Effective writing instruction, therefore, is essential to support students in developing their writing competence. Teachers must not only focus on the technical aspects of writing, such as grammar and vocabulary, but also on the process of writing itself, including planning, drafting, revising and editing (Leotta & Ahmad, 2025; Ning, 2024; Resmini et al., 2024). The process approach encourages students to view writing as a recursive activity, where they plan, draft, receive feedback and revise multiple times. It promotes learner autonomy and allows students to improve their writing gradually through practice and reflection. With proper guidance and practice, the students can improve their ability to produce well-organized and meaningful texts, such as recount texts, which are often used to narrate personal experiences.

Writing is crucial in helping students express their ideas, experiences, and information effectively in English. It is a system of interpersonal communication that allows the expression of ideas and information across distance and time, while also broadening students' academic perspectives (Dinsa, 2023; Novitasari & Putri, 2021), encourages students to analyze ideas, develop arguments, and evaluate content, thereby enhancing critical thinking skill (Zalani et al., 2024), enhancing students' grammar, vocabulary, and text organization skills which is essential for accurately conveying experiences or information (Fitria, 2024), encourage the students to plan, monitor, and review their written work and raises awareness of different text genres and how to adapt writing (Li & Yuan, 2022).

Among various genres taught in schools, recount text is one of the most fundamental types to help students narrate personal experiences, past events, or historical incidents. It plays an important role in developing students' ability to express events in a structured and chronological order (Aini & Indah, 2023; Istiqomah et al., 2025; Syafitri et al., 2023). Mastery of recount text enhances students' narrative writing skills and strengthens their grammar, particularly in using past tense verbs and time connectives. Despite its importance, many students still face challenges in writing recount texts.

A recount text is defined as a text that retells events or experiences that happened in the past to inform or entertain the reader. This type of text is commonly introduced at the junior and senior high school levels due to its relevance to students' daily lives and its relatively simple structure (Istiqomah et al., 2025). In addition to structure, recount texts are characterized by specific *language features*. These include the use of *past tense verbs*, as the events occurred in the past (e.g., *visited*, *watched*, *played*), *temporal conjunction***s** to show the sequence of actions (e.g., *then*, *after that*, *finally*), and *action verbs* to describe physical or mental activities performed by the subject (e.g., *ran*, *saw*, *felt*). Despite being widely taught, many students struggle to compose effective recount texts. Common problems include misusing tenses, improper sequencing of events, and poor vocabulary choices (Karlina & Kusnarti, 2024; Syafitri et al., 2023). Therefore, understanding the structure and language features of recount text is crucial for students and teachers to improve writing performance and develop clearer, more coherent narratives.

Recount texts are frequently employed in English language classrooms because they engage students in narrating real-life experiences, making writing both personally meaningful and pedagogically effective. Writing recounting texts grounded in students' experiences fosters higher involvement and investment in writing, as learners relate directly to their own stories (Maharani et al., 2025). A recount text supports the

development of grammar, vocabulary, and organizational skills. It found that the students 'difficulties were mainly 68.18% in organization, 54.54% in vocabulary, 86.37% in grammar and 72.72% in mechanics (Sartika et al., 2022). These tasks naturally guide students to use past tense, temporal connectors, and action verbs, reinforcing essential language structures.

Common difficulties include organizing events logically, applying correct grammatical structures, especially the simple past tense, and using appropriate vocabulary to describe experiences (Anistasya, 2022; Demneri, 2024). These challenges often result in written texts that lack clarity, coherence, and accuracy. Understanding those common errors is essential for teachers and curriculum designers to provide effective instruction and feedback. One of the most frequently cited categories of errors in students' writing is grammatical errors, particularly in tenses (Fatmawaty et al., 2025; Nanning et al., 2020; Nguyen Thi, 2020). Tense confusion is widespread among EFL learners, who struggle to distinguish between simple past, present perfect, and past continuous tenses. The difference between the Indonesian and English structures influences the grammatical error for EFL learners (Aini, 2018). Another major issue in student writing is subject-verb agreement. This error typically stems from students translating directly from their first language, where such rules may differ. The students exhibited various types of subject-verb agreement errors, with misinformation being the most frequent (Mayasari & Sari, 2024; Sirait, 2022). It caused almost all students not to understand the subject-verb agreement rules and apply them in writing English.

In addition to grammar, spelling and punctuation errors are also widely observed. Incorrect punctuation can severely affect the clarity and meaning of written texts. Learners of English as a Foreign Language often struggle to use punctuation marks correctly, particularly when applying capital letters, commas, and full stops. Furthermore, spelling mistakes are widespread, with omission errors occurring most frequently, followed by errors involving substitution, transposition, and insertion (Putri, 2024; Raheem & Ghafar, 2024). Such surface-level mistakes, though often considered less serious than grammatical errors, still negatively impact the overall quality of students' writing.

Word choice and vocabulary limitation are other areas of concern regarding standard errors in writing English. Learners often select inappropriate words due to limited vocabulary or word meaning and context misunderstandings. At Can Tho University, Vietnam, where the participants had a basic knowledge of English vocabulary, they found it challenging to choose the right words in their academic writing (Dewi et al., 2025; Thuy et al., 2022). However, when vocabulary is limited, individuals may struggle to express their thoughts accurately or persuasively. In academic or professional settings, limited vocabulary may affect one's ability to engage with complex topics fully, interpret nuanced ideas, or present arguments effectively. Moreover, inadequate word choice can lead to misunderstandings. If the wrong word is used, even unintentionally, it may change the meaning of a sentence or create confusion for the audience.

The standard error explained above is a part of error analysis that often happens in students' writing in English. Error analysis plays a vital role in language education, particularly in the context of second and foreign language learning. As students attempt to master a new language, they inevitably produce errors, especially in productive skills such as writing. In viewing this error as failures, linguists and educators have come to

recognize them as valuable indicators of learners' progress and understanding—the systematic study of these errors is commonly referred to as error analysis. Teachers and researchers can identify recurring patterns, diagnose underlying causes, and refine teaching methods to better support student learning. The concept of error analysis was first formalized by Stephen Pit Corder (Corder, 1967), who argued that learner errors are not random but reflect a transitional state of language development known as inter-language. This idea revolutionizes language teaching by emphasizing that errors could offer insights into learners' thought processes and stages of development (Ahmed & Bidin, 2016; Yang & Shadiev, 2019).

Exploring common errors through systematic error analysis is proven to be pedagogically invaluable. Analyzing learner errors highlights what students have not yet mastered and reveals the strategies they use during language acquisition (Corder, 1967). Unlike most previous studies, which were either concerned with quantitative identification of error types or had a limited interest in overall grammatical and vocabulary errors, the current research takes a closer qualitative content analysis approach to uncover specific and contextual error patterns in writing recount texts. It allows for exploration of the nuances and variations of error that may be overlooked in quantitative studies or more superficial analysis. This study pushes error analysis one step ahead by integrating several established frameworks, i.e., linguistic categories (syntax, morphology, grammar), surface strategy taxonomy (omission, addition, misformation, misordering), and communicative effect taxonomy. Such multi-dimensional classification allows for a more insightful description of error features and their consequences on meaning in recount texts. By working exclusively with recount texts, this study bridges a gap where many earlier error analyses overlook genre-specific features. This focus allows for close scrutiny of students' challenges with recount text features like orientation, sequence of events, and re-orientation, which are critical to competent recount writing. The close content analysis results form the basis for practical, evidence-based proposals specific to teachers and curriculum designers for improving recount text writing instruction. This practical focus is concerned not just with description but with workable solutions to resolve the identified common errors effectively. Altogether, the novelty of this research lies in its systematic qualitative content analysis combined with multi-dimensional error classification, contextualized explanations, and genre-based analysis, bridging the gap between descriptive error detection and pedagogical implementation in recount texts.

Exploring common errors through systematic error analysis is proven to be pedagogically invaluable. Analyzing learner errors highlights what students have not yet mastered and reveals the strategies they use during language acquisition (Corder, 1967). Unlike most previous studies, which were either concerned with quantitative identification of error types or had a limited interest in overall grammatical and vocabulary errors, the current research takes a closer qualitative content analysis approach to uncover specific and contextual error patterns in writing recount texts. It allows for exploration of the nuances and variations of error that may be overlooked in quantitative studies or more superficial analysis. This study pushes error analysis one step ahead by integrating several established frameworks, i.e., linguistic categories (syntax, morphology, grammar), surface strategy taxonomy (omission, addition, misformation, misordering), and communicative effect taxonomy. Such multi-dimensional classification allows for a more insightful description of error features and

their consequences on meaning in recount texts. By working exclusively with recount texts, this study bridges a gap where many earlier error analyses overlook genre-specific features. This focus allows for close scrutiny of students' challenges with recount text features like orientation, sequence of events, and re-orientation, which are critical to competent recount writing. The close content analysis results form the basis for practical, evidence-based proposals specific to teachers and curriculum designers for improving recount text writing instruction. This practical focus is concerned not just with description but with workable solutions to resolve the identified common errors effectively. Altogether, the novelty of this research lies in its systematic qualitative content analysis combined with multi-dimensional error classification, contextualized explanations, and genre-based analysis, bridging the gap between descriptive error detection and pedagogical implementation in recount texts.

A study by Nadia (2024) analyzed the students' grammatical errors in recount text writing at SMP Islam Al-Azhar 48 Samarinda. The finding showed that students commonly made several types of errors in their recount texts, such as omitted words, incorrect verb tenses, subject-verb disagreement, misuse of singular and plural forms, unnecessary words, incorrect word forms, improper word order, comma splices, sentence fragments, and mistakes involving prepositions, conjunctions, and articles. These findings highlight the need for more focused instructional support, especially in strengthening students' understanding of grammar and sentence construction (Nadia, 2024).

Another study conducted by Sopian Saori & Sugianto (2023) about the analysis of students' writing ability in recount text of the first-year students of MA NW Nabi' Nubu' Kekait. There were three students (12%) got below 60 and categorized as poor. 10 students (40%) got 61-70 categorized poor. Nine students (36%) got 71-80 categorized average, and three students (12%) categorized very good. These results suggest that students still require substantial improvement in their recount writing skills and that additional instructional support is needed to enhance their overall writing competence (Saori & Sugianto, 2023).

The new one study conducted by Fakihatun and Handayani (2025) entitled "An Analysis of Students Grammatical Error in Writing Recount Text by The Eight Grade Students of SMP N 1 Kemusu 223/2024". The findings of this study indicate that two types of errors appeared in the students' writing. Addition errors were the most frequent, occurring 103 times (64%), followed by omission errors, which occurred 57 times (36%). Overall, the results show that addition errors were the most dominant type found in the students' written texts. These findings suggest that students require targeted guidance to reduce grammatical mistakes, particularly those related to unnecessary additions in their writing (Fakihatun & Handayani, 2025).

Some previous research has focused on the students' writing performance and grammatical errors in recount texts. Previous research has identified common mistakes in verb tenses, subject–verb disagreement, omissions, additions, and other sentence-level errors in students' writing (Fakihatun & Handayani, 2025; Nadia, 2024)Other studies have explained the students' overall writing competence, documenting that most students fall into poor or average categories, conditions that call for an increase in instructional support (Saori & Sugianto, 2023).

Nevertheless, a number of gaps exist in the literature reviewed. First, most of the studies offer only quantitative descriptions of errors or writing scores but do not

examine in depth specific error patterns, contextual causes, or effects on clarity and coherence in recount texts. Second, previous studies are often limited to general grammar errors and do not take into consideration those related specifically to genre, such as structure and language features specific to the recount genre, for example, orientation, sequence of events, and re-orientation. Third, there is limited integration of content-based error analysis with pedagogical implications, thus giving teachers little guidance on how to address these errors systematically in class.

Given the above considerations, this research paper investigates typical student errors in writing recount texts, with special attention to generic structure, by using a qualitative content analysis research design. This study, therefore, tries to link the structural and linguistic inaccuracies of students' narratives to a greater depth of understanding of the problems learners have in order to be able to give some practical recommendations for enhancement in the process of teaching writing. This study should ultimately bridge the gap between descriptive error identification and pedagogical application, which will support teachers in helping the students produce coherent, accurate, and well-structured recount texts at MTs Putra-Putri Lamongan, East Java.

METHOD
Research Design
This study employs a **qualitative content analysis design**, suitable for systematically describing and interpreting textual data to identify patterns of students' errors in recount texts. Content analysis allows for an objective, systematic, and replicable examination of students' writing to uncover common grammatical and structural mistakes within the generic structure of recount texts, including orientation, event sequencing, and re-orientation components.

A qualitative content analysis design is a research method widely recognized for its effectiveness in systematically describing and interpreting textual data (Noor & Chaerani, 2022). Qualitative content analysis enables researchers to identify and analyze patterns, themes, and categories within qualitative data, such as students' written texts, methodically and transparently (Spelman, 2025; White & Marsh, 2006). This approach is particularly appropriate for exploring students' errors in recount texts because it allows a detailed examination of the texts to uncover both explicit and implicit language form and structure mistakes.

Content analysis offers an objective and systematic framework for analyzing texts. It means that the process follows clearly defined steps that can be replicated by other researchers, improving reliability and validity. Through coding and categorizing, researchers can quantify the frequency of error types and discover recurring issues while also interpreting their significance in language teaching and learning (Corral-Robles et al., 2021).

In this study, content analysis focuses on the generic structure components of recount texts: Orientation, event sequencing, and re-orientation. The orientation introduces essential background information such as who was involved, when, and where the events occurred. Event sequencing involves presenting experiences in logical or chronological order, often supported by temporal connectives (e.g., "first," "then," "after that"). Re-orientation usually provides closure or reflection on the narrated events. Conducting content analysis on these components helps systematically identify common grammatical and structural errors students make, such as omission of details in orientation, misordering of events, or lack of reflective closing.

Moreover, qualitative content analysis is highly suited for this kind of research because it provides numerical summaries of error frequencies and enables the exploration of contextual factors affecting these errors—such as linguistic interference or limited competence in English narration conventions—as supported by traditional error analysis frameworks.

Data and Sources of Data

The study data are written recount texts of class VII B students of MTs Putra Putri Lamongan, a junior secondary school in Lamongan, East Java, Indonesia. MTs Putra Putri Lamongan is a school with a reputation for educating middle school students and a focus on integrating Islamic values and formal academic content. Specifically, the data include 20 recount texts composed individually by the students as part of their English language learning activities. These texts serve as the primary data source because they reflect the students' performance, common errors, and issues in composing recount texts, especially in generic textual structure features like orientation, sequencing of events, and re-orientation.

The participants are English foreign language learners who are native speakers of Indonesia. The choice of class VII B allows for close observation of early secondary school students whose writing at this stage is crucial for mastery of recount text conventions. The recount texts were collected during a typical classroom writing session under supervised conditions to allow consistency and authenticity. All the students had to generate a recount text based on a given prompt within a set time, systematically creating comparable texts for content analysis. This data source provides a comprehensive overview of common errors in recount writing under the influence of linguistic and cognitive factors, particularly in EFL learners at this stage of education.

Instrument

The main instrument used in this study was a content analysis rubric specifically designed to identify and classify common errors in students' recount texts. This rubric was developed based on established frameworks of generic structure in recount writing, focusing on three key components: Orientation, event sequencing, and re-orientation. The instrument included clear criteria for detecting structural errors such as omissions, incomplete information, misordering of events, missing temporal connectives, and weak or absent re-orientation. To ensure the validity and reliability of the instrument, it was reviewed and refined through expert validation by language teaching professional's familiar with recount text conventions and typical student errors in EFL contexts. The rubric enabled systematic coding and categorization of textual features and errors from the students' written recounts, allowing both qualitative interpretation and quantitative summarization of error frequencies. This structured instrument provided an objective and replicable tool for consistently analyzing the students' writing performances.

Data Collection Technique

The data for this study were collected by gathering written recount texts from the participants directly—students of class VII B of MTs Putra Putri Lamongan. All the students were asked to write a recount text individually based on a provided prompt based on personal experience. It was carried out in a controlled classroom setting to

ensure that all the participants completed the task independently and under the same conditions, in order to guarantee the uniformity and authenticity of the data.

The writing session was also timed to simulate a classroom environment, reflecting the students' writing ability under normal school conditions. After collecting the recount texts, the researcher anonymized each text to safeguard students' identities and prepare the data for orderly content analysis.

The use of students' written products as primary data is a conventional practice in content analysis research as it allows for the direct examination of language use, error patterns, and structural features in authentic learner production (Farhan, 2025; Spelman, 2025; White & Marsh, 2006). The method ensures that the data accurately represents students' writing problems and provides a rich source for ascertaining common errors in recount text creation.

Furthermore, the data collection process was carefully documented, including details on the writing prompt, time, and instructions given to students. This transparency renders the study more dependable and trustworthy since others can understand and possibly recreate the conditions under which data were gathered.

Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis was conducted qualitatively using **thematic content analysis** guided by the rubric categories. The process involved:

1. Coding the texts for occurrences of errors in orientation, event sequence, and re-orientation.
2. Categorizing error types based on omission, misordering, and incomplete elements.
3. Quantifying the frequency of each error type expressed as a percentage of the total texts analyzed.
4. Interpreting these findings to identify the most prevalent structural problems and examining the possible linguistic or cognitive factors contributing to these errors.

The analysis was iterative, involving repeated reviews of the data to ensure consistency and reliability.

Trustworthiness

To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, several strategies were employed:

- **Triangulation:** Multiple readings and coding sessions were conducted, and peer debriefing with language teaching experts was used to validate the coding categories and interpretations.
- **Member checking:** Preliminary findings were discussed with a subset of participants and instructors to confirm the accuracy of interpretations regarding common errors.
- **Audit trail:** Detailed documentation of the coding process and decision-making was maintained to provide transparency and replicability.
- **Thick description:** The findings were reported with detailed examples and contextual explanations to allow readers to understand the nature of the errors and the context in which they occurred.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The content analysis revealed that the students frequently made errors in the generic composition of recount texts, particularly within the orientation, event sequence, and re-orientation stages. Such structural errors had a significant effect on narrative cohesion and clarity. The most prevalent problematic area occurred in orientation, where the students omitted key contextual information about who was involved, where the events occurred, and when the events occurred. During the event sequencing stage, the majority of the texts indicated out-of-order chronological occurrences and the lack of proper utilization of time connectives such as first, then, and after that. It is proving difficult for the readers to track the timeline. There were studies using the surface strategy taxonomy (*omission, addition, misformation, misordering*) to reliably identify misordering as a dominant trend in recount writing (Amanda et al., 2024; Syafitri et al., 2023). The re-orientation aspect was usually lacking or completely missing. Where it did happen, it was typically in the nature of generic closing remarks like "I enjoy it" without reflective comment or narrative closure. This is in line with the trend noted of structural errors, especially in re-orientation, running wild, and beyond grammatical and mechanical errors.

The study analyzed recount texts written by 20 students of MTs Putra-Putri Lamongan to identify common grammatical errors and generic recount text organization. In the analysis of error sources, two significant reasons were discovered: interlingual-interference has uncovered the students employing Indonesian narration patterns that are not explicitly orienting or reflectively closing. Intralingual overgeneralization occurs due to students misapplying English narration norms due to limited grammatical knowledge. This two-source account also aligns with traditional error analysis theories, distinguishing between interlingual transfer and intralingual developmental mistakes (Salsabillah et al., 2024). The following is a table summarizing the findings of common students' mistakes in writing recount texts:

The data reflects trends frequently observed in similar research on student-written recount texts. Below is a table summarizing the findings from a content analysis study that examines common errors made by students in the generic structure of recount texts. These figures align with patterns commonly identified in comparable studies of student recount writing.

Table 1.
Students' Common Errors in Writing Recount Text

Generic Structure Component	Type of Error	Frequency (% of Texts)	Description / Example Error
Orientation	Omission of orientation elements	60 %	Students failed to introduce *who*, *when*, or *where* (e.g. "I went to the beach" without context)
	Incomplete orientation	15 %	Provided some detail but missed key contextual information
Event Sequence	Misordering events	50 %	Events did not follow logical or chronological order ("I played games" before waking up)
	Missing time connectives	45 %	Lack of *first/then/after* connectors caused timeline confusion
Re-orientation	Omitted re-orientation	70 %	No reflective closing or summary—text ended abruptly ("That's all")
	Weak or generic closing	10 %	Used brief non-reflective statements like "I enjoyed it" or "It was fun"

The table presents common errors related to the generic structure components of recount texts, focusing on three main parts: *Orientation, Even Sequence,* and *Re-Orientation*. It shows the frequency of each error type as a percentage of the texts analyzed and provides descriptions or examples for clarity.

In orientation, 60% of the orientation details were omitted. This is a kind of error when students fail to introduce context about the recount properly. They fail to mention vital information such as *who* was present and when or where the event occurred. For example, a statement like "*I visited the beach*" is not contextual since it does not mention when or why the visit was taken. This is a persistent error among students and speaks to an entrenched problem in presenting the background information needed in a recount text. The orientation is the initial part of a recount, where the writer sets the scene by providing important information such as *who*, when the activity took place, and *where*. These features are necessary because they give the reader a proper perspective of the text before advancing to the chronology of events. Leaving out these orientation features by students, the recount text often begins abruptly without sufficient background information.

For instance, the sentence "*I went to the beach*" provides a mere action but does not leave us with the important questions being answered: Who was it who went? Was the author alone or with other individuals? When did this happen-yesterday, last year, or ago? Where exactly was the beach? Was it a particular beach known to the readers? Without such details, the recount is ambiguous and fails to sufficiently engage and locate the reader.

This omission can occur due to several factors. One is a limited understanding of the generic structure of recount texts, where students may underestimate the importance of orientation or confuse it with the event sequence (Februansyah et al., 2020; Nanning et al., 2020). Another factor is linguistic difficulty; some students might know what to write but struggle to express all the necessary contextual information in English. Time constraints and lack of writing practice could also contribute to incomplete orientations.

The impact of this error extends beyond the provision of incomplete information. If orientation information is omitted, the text loses unity and coherence. Due to the lack of a proper introduction, readers can remain confused regarding the scope of the account or lose interest in continuing to read. The retelling becomes a mere list of events without an organizing framework, and its utility as a communication tool is impaired.

There was incomplete orientation in 15% of the texts. In this, students only offered partial orientation, with some facts but leaving out important ones. The orientation was there, but not fully created to allow readers to be familiar with the story's setting in clear terms. Contrary to complete disregard of orientation, this time the introduction exists, but with missing important contextual information, allowing readers to understand the setting of the recount completely. For example, a student can write, "I went to the park," saying where but not when the action occurred or with whom they went. This kind of inadequate introduction can leave an impression that the context is unclear or unfinished.

Studies on students' recount text writing often highlight a common problem with the orientation. For example, some students include only one or two elements in their orientation, such as mentioning "where" the event took place but leaving out "when" or "who" was involved. This leads to incomplete background information, making the text less clear and engaging for readers. Several factors contribute to this issue, including a limited understanding of the generic structure, challenges with language proficiency, and a stronger focus on describing events rather than setting the scene. The effects of an incomplete orientation are quite significant—it lowers the overall coherence of the narrative and makes it harder for readers to understand the story entirely. Without a proper introduction, the recount can feel sudden or loosely connected, making it difficult for readers to follow the sequence of events meaningfully.

The most common errors in the ***event sequence*** were misordering events, which happened in about 50% of the texts, and missing time connectives, found in 45%. Misordering events means that students often put events in the wrong or illogical order. For example, if a student writes "*I played games*" before "*I woke up,*" it doesn't make sense because playing games should happen after waking up, not before.

Misordering events is a common error in students' recount texts wherein the sequence of the narrated events does not follow a logical, chronological order. It is such an error which disrupts the ease and coherence of the recount, confusing readers and sabotaging understanding. Students do not recount events in the way they actually occurred over time but instead misplace or jumble up the timeline. For example, when a child says, "I played games" before "I woke up," temporal logic is violated since waking up logically precedes other actions in the morning.

The ability to sequence events correctly is fundamental in recount writing, as the genre's main purpose is to retell past experiences in the order they occurred (Istiqomah et al., 2025; Maharani et al., 2025). Chronological organization helps the reader follow the story effortlessly and understand cause-effect relationships or progression of activities (Anderson & Anderson, 2003). Thus, misordering hampers the communicative goal of recount texts.

Several factors contribute to the misordering of events: **Limited understanding of recount text conventions:** Students may lack explicit knowledge of the necessity to present events chronologically and might write events as they come to mind rather than in order (Nanning et al., 2020). **Cognitive challenges in organizing information:**

Young learners or those with underdeveloped writing strategies can find it difficult to plan a logical sequence before writing (Silaban & Tarigan, 2023). **Insufficient use of temporal connectors:** The absence or misuse of time connectives such as "first," "then," and "after that" often leads to ambiguous event relationships, making logical ordering challenging. **L1 interference:** Students may transfer narrative sequencing patterns from their native language, which sometimes do not align with English recount conventions (Februansyah et al., 2020). The implications of misordering are notable: texts become confusing or hard to follow, reducing their effectiveness and communicative quality. Readers may misinterpret events or lose engagement due to unclear progression.

Missing time connectives (45%): Time connectives such as "first," "then," or "after" are important for indicating the order of events. When these connectors are missing, the timeline becomes confusing, and readers find it difficult to follow the sequence of activities. Time connectives, also known as temporal or sequencing markers, play a crucial role in recount texts by guiding readers through the chronological order of events. Words and phrases such as *first*, *then*, *after that*, *next*, and *finally* serve as linguistic signals that clarify the relationship between events and help maintain the logical flow of the narrative. When students omit these connectives, it becomes challenging for readers to understand the sequence and timing of the activities being recounted.

Re-orientation also consists of omitted re-orientation (70%) and weak of generic closing (10%). The implication of missing time connectives is high. Inadequate time signals render the order of the recount text ambiguous, decreasing readability and the general quality of the text. Readers might not understand the order of events, which results in confusion or disengagement. To address this issue, instructional methods need to incorporate: Direct teaching of using time connectives and utilizing them in recount texts (Aini & Indah, 2023). Guided practice exercises for inserting appropriate temporal markers in texts (Februansyah et al., 2020). Plotting stories or events using timelines requires students to articulate and record using the correct connectives—peer review workshops to determine missing or incorrect time connectives for increasing awareness.

With clear teaching and focused practice, students can improve their use of time connectives, which helps make their recount texts clearer and easier to follow. However, about 70% of students tend to leave out the re-orientation, the closing part that reflects on the experience or wraps up the story. As a result, many of their texts end suddenly, stopping right after the last event without any thoughtful conclusion or summary.

The re-orientation is the last part of a recount text, acting as the closing section where the writer shares a reflection, personal thoughts, or a summary of the events they've described. Its main goal is to give readers a sense of closure and sometimes offer a glimpse into the writer's feelings or the importance of the experience (Silaban & Tarigan, 2023). However, this study found that about 70% of students skipped the re-orientation entirely, causing their texts to end suddenly without a meaningful conclusion.

When students omit the re-orientation, their recount texts typically end immediately following the last event without any concluding remarks. For example, a recount might finish with "Then I went home" but fail to add a reflective sentence such as "It was a memorable day" or "I learned a lot from this experience." Such abrupt

endings leave the narrative feeling incomplete and reduce its communicative effectiveness because they omit the personal voice and closure expected in recount texts (Putri Rahayu, 2018). **Causes of Omitting Re-orientation:** Several factors contribute to the high frequency of omitted re-orientation in student writing**. One is the lack of knowledge about the recount text structure**. Many students are unfamiliar with the importance and function of re-orientation in recount texts. They may view recount writing as merely sequencing events without realizing that a concluding reflection or summary is required. **Limited writing experience or instruction:** Teachers may focus predominantly on the events and their order, overlooking explicit teaching about how to conclude recounts effectively (Februansyah et al., 2020). **Language proficiency and expressive ability:** Reflecting on experiences or summarising requires more advanced language skills and personal expression, which students at the MTs level may still be developing. Consequently, they may omit re-orientation to avoid complicated or unfamiliar language. **Time constraints and writing habits:** Under timed conditions or due to inadequate planning, students might rush through their writing and fail to allocate time for a proper conclusion (Amanda et al., 2024).

The absence of re-orientation weakens the overall structure and communicative value of recount texts. Omitting the last words, the narrative can read like a list or be disconnected because it no longer contains the "closing loop" that ties the writer's experience and the reader understands. Moreover, a re-orientation characteristically personalizes the recount to the writer's view, engaging the reader further by presenting a sense of the writer's standpoint, which is lost when it is omitted.

A closure or re-direction in recount texts is the concluding section where the author typically looks back on the experience or provides a reflective overview of the events recounted. However, approximately 10% of students insert a weak or generic closure—that is, their final comments are concise, simplistic, and do not contain depth or personal insight. Sentences like "I enjoyed it," or "It was fun," while they indicate some level of reflection, fail to explain why the experience was pleasant and what students have learned out of the experience. These general closures fail to provide that final, satisfying sense of closure and don't do much in terms of relating to the reader or adding real value to the recount.

In conclusion, this study shows that students often make similar mistakes when writing recount texts, especially in the key parts like orientation, sequencing events, and re-orientation. These errors make their stories harder to understand and less connected. Many students leave out important details in the orientation, so readers can't fully get the background. They also mix up the order of events or forget to use time words, which breaks the story's flow. On top of that, a lot of students don't include a proper ending that reflects on the experience, making their texts feel unfinished and less effective. These results highlight how important it is to teach students about the structure of recount texts—helping them include clear background information, arrange events in order with the right connectors, and finish with thoughtful closing statements. By working on these areas, students can create recounts that are clearer, more engaging, and easier for readers to follow.

CONCLUSION

In summary, learners committed typical errors in the overall structure of recount texts, particularly during the orientation, event sequence, and re-orientation stages. The most common issues were the absence or incompleteness of vital background information in the orientation, such as who, when, and where events occurred, that impoverished the reader's understanding of the context. In addition, the majority of students presented events in the wrong order and did not include time connectives like "first," "then," and "after that," thus causing the sequential flow to be disrupted and readers confused in following the chronology. The re-orientation, as the reflective or concluding part of the writing, was often missing or minimized to ineffective, uninspired comments that led to blunt conclusions without proper closure and personal insight.

Such structural weaknesses also significantly affected the inability of students' recount texts to be coherent, clear, and communicatively effective overall. The error analysis also revealed that errors were the result of two primary causes: interlingual interference, in which students transferred Indonesian narrative structures incompatible with English recount conventions, and intralingual overgeneralization, resulting from a lack of knowledge of grammar and incorrect application of English narration norms.

The findings emphasize the significance of certain teaching practices in developing students' knowledge of recount text structure. Instruction should focus on helping students introduce complete and clear orientation information, arrange events in logical sequence with appropriate temporal connectors, and add meaningful re-orientations to conclude their stories successfully. Covering such areas will improve students' writing coherence and engagement so they can produce more reader-friendly and communicatively effective recount texts.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, R. Z., & Bidin, S. J. B. (2016). The Effect of Task Based Language Teaching on Writing Skills of EFL Learners in Malaysia. Open Journal of Modern Linguistics, 06(03), 207–218. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2016.63022

Aini, N. (2018). The Grammatical Errors in the Translational Text: Indonesian-English Structure. Tell: Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal, 6(2), 55. https://doi.org/10.30651/tell.v6i2.2109

Aini, N., & Indah, R. N. (2023). Manga is Our World: The Use of Manga as Media in Teaching Writing Recount Text. English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris, 16(2), 89. https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v16i2.18162

Amanda, R., Ilma, R., & Desvitasari, D. (2024). INVESTIGATING THE DIFFICULTIES ON STUDENTS'. 7(2).

Anistasya, C. (2022). STUDENTS' DIFFICULTY IN WRITING ENGLISH: AFFECTED BY VOCABULARY SKILLS. Journal of English Education, Literature and Linguistics, 5(2), 42–47. https://doi.org/10.31540/jeell.v5i2.1521

Bakla, A., & Karakaş, A. (2022). Technology and strategy use in academic writing: Native, native-like versus non-native speakers of English. Ibérica, 44, 285–314. https://doi.org/10.17398/2340-2784.44.285

Chen, H., Rasool, U., Hu, T., & Bhattacharyya, E. (2025). Examining the beliefs of non-native English-speaking teachers and EFL students about WCF in enhancing writing skills. Acta Psychologica, 256, 105064. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105064

Corder, S. P. (1967). THE SIGNIFICANCE OF LEARNER'S ERRORS. IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5(1–4). https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161

Corral-Robles, S., Sánchez-Martín, M., & González-Gijón, G. (2021). Design and validation of a system of categories to assess the written discourse of L2 English learners. Porta Linguarum Revista Interuniversitaria de Didáctica de Las Lenguas Extranjeras, 36, 159–174. https://doi.org/10.30827/portalin.v0i36.15944

Demneri, E. (2024). Students' Difficulties in Writing in English Language. Proceedings of The International Conference on Modern Research in Education, Teaching and Learning, 3(1), 35–41. https://doi.org/10.33422/icmetl.v3i1.290

Dewi, N. P. A. C., Santosa, M. H., & Dewi, K. S. (2025). THE EFFECT OF DUOLINGO IMPLEMENTATION ON SEVENTH-GRADE STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Proficiency, 7(2), 192. https://doi.org/10.32503/proficiency.v7i2.6799

Dinsa, M. T. (2023). EFL students' writing strategies use in Ethiopia: Gender and year level. Cogent Education, 10(2), 2256207. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2256207

Fakihatun, S., & Handayani, S. (2025). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS GRAMMATICAL ERROR IN WRITING RECOUNT TEXT BY THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMP N 1 KEMUSU 2023/2024. English Research Journal : Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts and Culture, 9(2). https://doi.org/10.33061/erj.v9i2.10446

Farhan, H. N. (2025). The Impact of AI-Powered Writing Tools on Students' Writing Performance: A Content Analysis and Future Prospects. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.22893.09445

Fatmawaty, R., Faridah, F., & Damayanti, F. A. (2025). AN ERROR ANALYSIS ON THE USE OF SIMPLE PAST TENSE IN NARRATIVE TEXT MADE BY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Proficiency, 7(2), 224. https://doi.org/10.32503/proficiency.v7i2.6624

Februansyah, V., Nugraha, I., & Fajriah, Y. N. (2020). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN WRITING RECOUNT TEXTS. English Education and Applied Linguistics Journal (EEAL Journal), 3(2), 98–106. https://doi.org/10.31980/eealjournal.v3i2.1837

Fitria, T. N. (2024). Creative Writing Skills in English: Developing Student's Potential and Creativity. EBONY: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature, 4(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.37304/ebony.v4i1.10908

Galindo, M., Solorzano, T., & Neisler, J. (2025). Exploring research practices with non-native English speakers: A reflective case study. Journal of Responsible Technology, 21, 100109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrt.2025.100109

Istiqomah, D. N., Lestari, S., & Wahyuni, S. (2025). The Effect of Group Discussion to Improve the Students' Writing Skills in Recount Text. Dinamika Bahasa Dan Budaya, 20(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.35315/bb.v20i1.10022

Jeremy Harmer. (2004). How to Teach Writing. Longman.

Karlina, T., & Kusnarti, G. (2024). The Influence of Grammar and Vocabulary Mastery Towards Students' Recount Writing Text. Jurnal Inovasi Global, 2(8), 913–921. https://doi.org/10.58344/jig.v2i8.140

Leotta, P. C., & Ahmad, M. (2025). Improving Writing Skills in Academic English Through Explicit Instruction and Process Writing. International Journal of Linguistics, 17(2), 80. https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v17i2.22811

Li, M. (2024). Non-native English-speaking (NNES) students' English academic writing experiences in higher education: A meta-ethnographic qualitative synthesis. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 71, 101430. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101430

Li, M., & Yuan, R. (2022). Enhancing students' metacognitive development in higher education: A classroom-based inquiry. International Journal of Educational Research, 112, 101947. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2022.101947

Lymer, G., Lindwall, O., & Greiffenhagen, C. (2024). Student writing in higher education: From texts to practices to textual practices. Linguistics and Education, 80, 101247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2023.101247

Maharani, R. P., Arianto, F., & Diningrat, S. W. M. (2025). DEVELOPING WORDWALL-BASED INTERACTIVE GAME MEDIA TO ENHANCE WRITING SKILLS AND MOTIVATION IN RECOUNT TEXT. Jurnal Visi Ilmu Pendidikan, 17(1), 9–27. https://doi.org/10.26418/jvip.v17i1.85438

Mayasari, I. B. Y. H., & Sari, U. (2024). Student's Writing paragraph: An Error Exploration of Using Subject-Verb Agreement. Edunesia : Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 5(2), 1175–1188. https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v5i2.938

Nadia, N. (2024). The Analysis of Students' Grammatical Errors in Recount Text Writing. Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 9(3), 257. https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v9i3.1424

Nanning, N., Saepuddin, & Munawir. (2020). An Analysis of Grammatical Error of English Students in Writing Skill. EDUVELOP, 3(2), 145–160. https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v3i2.636

Nguyen Thi, H. (2020). Common grammartical errors in English writing—A case study with second-year students of information technology at HAUI. Can Tho

University Journal of Science, Vol.11(1), 37. https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2020.005

Ning, Y. (2024). A Study of Output Vocabulary Knowledge in the English Writing Process. Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences, 9(1), 20241802. https://doi.org/10.2478/amns-2024-1802

Noor, W. N., & Chaerani, F. A. (2022). A Content Analysis of Writing Tasks in English Textbook "Think Globally Act Locally" of Junior High School. Jurnal Ilmiah Widya Borneo, 5(2), 63–71. https://doi.org/10.56266/widyaborneo.v5i2.121

Novitasari, A., & Putri, K. Y. (2021). AN ANALYSIS STUDENTS' WRITING OF USING GENERIC STRUCTURE OF HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT BY THE SECOND GRADE STUDENTS OF MAN 2 KEDIRI ACADEMIC YEAR 2019/2020. Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Proficiency, 3(2), 61. https://doi.org/10.32503/proficiency.v3i2.1923

Putri, N. A. L. (2024). Errors Found in Students' Theses: Capitalization, Punctuation, and Spelling. JETAL: Journal of English Teaching & Applied Linguistic, 5(2), 132–138. https://doi.org/10.36655/jetal.v5i2.1484

Putri Rahayu. (2018). An Analysis of Recount Text Writing Composition of Tenth Grade Senior High School Students. UNESA, 6(3), 165–176.

Raheem, B. R., & Ghafar, Z. N. (2024). Analysis of Punctuation and Spelling Errors Associated with Academic Writing among Iraqi EFL Learners. International Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 3(2), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.33422/ijsfle.v3i2.739

Resmini, S., Bhuana, G. P., Rizkiani, S., & Maulana, A. (2024). EFL Students' Strategies in the Process of Writing. IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature, 12(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i1.4729

Salsabillah, A. N., Ni'amah, A., & Kristanti, I. L. (2024). INTERLINGUAL AND INTRALINGUAL ERRORS IN DESCRIPTIVE WRITINGS. 11(1), 45–65. https://doi.org/10.32682/3r5ajc62

Saori, S., & Sugianto, S. (2023). An Analysis of Students' Writing Ability in Recount Texts. AS-SABIQUN, 5(1), 124–135. https://doi.org/10.36088/assabiqun.v5i1.2699

Sartika, D., Khairinisaak, K., & Asmara, R. (2022). THE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN WRITING RECOUNT TEXT. Journal of English Education Program, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.26418/jeep.v3i1.50496

Silaban, B., & Tarigan, N. W. P. (2023). AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS ERRORS IN WRITING RECOUNT TEXT (A Case Study in the Tenth Grade Students of SMA Free Methodist Medan). 5(1).

Sirait, L. (2022). SUBJECT-VERB AGREEMENT ERRORS IN THE NARRATIVE WRITING OF THE FIRST SEMESTER OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY. DIALEKTIKA: JURNAL BAHASA, SASTRA DAN BUDAYA, 9(1), 58–67. https://doi.org/10.33541/dia.v9i1.4023

Spelman, M. V. (2025). Cultivating virtue literacy in postgraduates: A content analysis of writing samples. International Journal of Ethics Education. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40889-025-00216-5

Syafitri, Octasary, M., Hardianti, Ratna, & Stenalt, M. H. (2023). An Investigation of Student's Problems in Writing Recount Text. Buletin Pengabdian Multidisiplin, 1(2), 93–101. https://doi.org/10.62385/budimul.v1i2.48

Thuy, N. T. T., Anh, H. P. T., Ngan, N. T. T., Vy, N. T. T., & Anh, N. T. V. (2022). DIFFICULTIES WITH WORD CHOICE IN ACADEMIC WRITING AND SOLUTIONS: A RESEARCH ON ENGLISH-MAJORED STUDENTS AT CAN THO UNIVERSITY, VIETNAM. European Journal of English Language Teaching, 7(6). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v7i6.4543

White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content Analysis: A Flexible Methodology. Library Trends, 55(1), 22–45. https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2006.0053

Winarsih, S. (2016). Encouraging Students Interest in Learning English Through Annual Program, The Election of Miss and Mister Smantiac in SMA Negeri 3 Merauke. Universitas Adi Buana, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.36456/jet.v1.n01.2016.1261

Yang, M., & Shadiev, R. (2019). Review of Research on Technologies for Language Learning and Teaching. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 07(03), 171–181. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.73014

Zalani, M., Weisi, H., & Yousofi, N. (2024). The influence of mobile-assisted critical writing instructions on EFL learners' writing skill in language institutes. Frontiers in Education, 9, 1465765. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1465765