

Error Patterns and Written Communicative Effectiveness among Pre-Service English Teachers

Marianel A. Flores, Marcelina S. Deiparine, Ariel L. Ramos, Ceferina L. Rodriguez

Graduate Studies, Cebu Technological University – Argao Campus

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100500370>

Received: 13 May 2026; Accepted: 18 May 2026; Published: 02 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study explores the error patterns and written communicative effectiveness of 3rd-year BSEd English pre-service teachers at Sibonga Community College during the academic year 2025–2026 as a basis for proposed enhanced instructional intervention in essay writing. Using a multi-phase mixed-methods design and AI assisted validation, the research identified and categorized grammatical errors in student essays, examined their impact on clarity, coherence, and accuracy and implemented a one-month instructional intervention. Findings revealed that errors—primarily in grammar, mechanics, clarity, and coherence—were shaped by linguistic, cognitive, affective, institutional, and socio-cultural factors. Results showed modest reductions in errors, slight gains in clarity and coherence, and increased confidence in writing after the intervention. These outcomes affirm that students' errors are not isolated mistakes but reflections of deeper challenges in language proficiency, cognitive processing, emotional resilience, institutional support, and cultural context. The one-month intervention demonstrated effectiveness in reducing errors and fostering confidence, proving that systematic and compassionate teaching strategies can transform essay writing into a skill of empowerment. Sustained implementation over longer periods is expected to yield greater improvements in communicative competence. It is recommended that future interventions extend beyond one month to allow for more substantial progress in grammar and discourse competence. Writing instruction should integrate reflective practices, such as journals and peer editing, to build metacognitive awareness and foster collaborative learning. Institutions should strengthen feedback mechanisms and provide consistent opportunities for practice across subjects to normalize technical writing. Additionally, socio-cultural factors such as limited exposure to authentic English texts should be addressed by promoting reading habits and integrating writing tasks across the curriculum. By embedding essay writing instruction in broader academic and cultural contexts, pre-service teachers can develop stronger communicative competence and be better prepared to model effective writing in their future classrooms.

Keywords: Error Patterns, Communicative Effectiveness, Essay Writing, Multi-Phased Method, Pre-service Teachers

INTRODUCTION

Written communication is globally recognized as a cornerstone of academic success, professional credibility, and effective participation in multilingual societies. For future educators, the ability to write clearly and accurately is not only a personal skill but also a professional responsibility, as they are expected to model effective language use for their students. Strong written communication extends beyond classroom requirements—it is the foundation of how individuals succeed academically, build credibility in their professions, and connect meaningfully with others. Writing itself is a complex process that requires generating ideas, organizing them logically, revising thoughtfully, and expressing them clearly so that meaning is not lost (Autilia & Theresia, 2018). On a broader level, strengthening writing instruction also supports the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) for equitable, quality education, as future teachers trained to write with clarity and confidence are better equipped to create inclusive and meaningful learning experiences (Reforsado & Raymundo, 2024). At the national and institutional levels, essay-writing proficiency is a vital foundation for professional readiness among pre-service English teachers. As they prepare for practice teaching, they are expected to demonstrate advanced competence in grammar, clarity, coherence, and communicative effectiveness.

However, persistent grammatical and discourse-level errors continue to surface in student essays, obscuring meaning and eroding credibility (Ngaiza, 2023).

Essays, as central tools for assessment, reveal both learners' strengths and struggles in articulating their ideas (Afeadie & Kpeglo, 2022). Essay writing is particularly appropriate for this study because it functions as both an academic requirement and a diagnostic tool. Unlike isolated grammar drills, essays provide authentic samples of student writing where errors naturally emerge in context, allowing researchers to see how language systems are internalized. Essays also demand clarity, coherence, and audience awareness, making them ideal for analyzing how grammatical and discourse-level errors affect communicative effectiveness. Moreover, since essay writing is a central practice in classrooms and a key assessment measure, pre-service teachers' proficiency in this genre directly reflects their readiness to model effective written communication for future students.

Previous studies have extensively examined **error analysis and classification**, often focusing on identifying and categorizing grammatical mistakes in student writing (Harefa & Sibarani, 2023; Ngaiza, 2023). Other research has emphasized **communicative effectiveness**, exploring how clarity, coherence, and rhetorical organization influence meaning-making and credibility (Autilia & Theresia, 2018). However, these two strands of inquiry have largely remained separate. The gap lies in the lack of integrated studies that connect error patterns directly to communicative effectiveness, examining not only what errors occur but how they affect students' ability to communicate meaningfully and confidently. Studying these two variables together is crucial because errors cannot be understood in isolation—they gain significance only when analyzed in terms of their impact on communication. Without this integration, instructional interventions risk being overly mechanical, focusing on surface-level accuracy rather than improving students' confidence or communicative competence.

This study, therefore, investigates the error patterns and written communicative effectiveness of 3rd-year BSED English pre-service teachers during the academic year 2025–2026. By analyzing authentic essay outputs and identifying recurring errors, the research aims to inform instructional strategies that address both linguistic accuracy and meaningful communication. Specifically, it seeks to uncover patterns that hinder clarity, explore student perceptions of their writing challenges, and propose actionable interventions such as grammar workshops, peer-editing sessions, and reflective writing exercises. Ultimately, the findings will contribute to the development of more responsive and effective writing instruction, transforming insights on error patterns into practical solutions that promote student success, enhance instructional relevance, and strengthen teacher preparation.

METHODS

Reflexivity Statement

As an English teacher with years of experience in the local college context, I recognize that I bring my own set of assumptions and biases to this research. One significant bias is my strong emphasis on grammatical accuracy; I value correct grammar highly and may, at times, equate grammatical lapses with a lack of effort or seriousness on the part of students. This strictness might lead me to overlook other factors contributing to errors, such as gaps in prior instruction, limited language exposure, or anxiety. I also assume that students should have mastered certain rules by the time they reach their third year, which may affect how I interpret their struggles or attribute responsibility for recurring mistakes.

I am aware that my background may cause me to focus too much on error correction and not enough on the broader communicative or developmental context of each student's writing. There is also a risk that I might interpret student difficulties as personal failings rather than as products of earlier educational experiences or institutional limitations. For example, if a student mentions not having been taught a grammar point, I might inadvertently interpret this as an excuse rather than a genuine instructional gap. These tendencies could influence both how I code the data and how I interpret students' interviews, potentially leading to an incomplete or skewed understanding of their challenges. To address these biases, I commit to several mitigation strategies. I will actively engage in reflective journaling throughout the research process, regularly questioning my interpretations and reactions to the data. I will seek feedback from peers and co-researchers to provide alternative perspectives and challenge my assumptions, particularly when coding errors or analyzing interview responses. Using multiple

data sources and both surface-level and deeper analyses will help me see beyond my initial judgments. I will also participate in consensus-building sessions and use agreement metrics to improve the reliability of error categorization. Throughout, I will strive to remain empathetic and open-minded, reminding myself that each student's experience is unique and shaped by factors beyond grammar alone.

Research Design

This study employed a multi-phase mixed-methods design, carefully structured to capture both the depth and breadth of student writing challenges. The methodology unfolded in three interconnected phases, each building upon the insights of the previous stage to ensure a comprehensive analysis. By combining quantitative identification of error patterns with qualitative exploration of communicative effectiveness, the design allowed for a holistic understanding of how grammatical lapses influence meaning-making. This sequential approach not only strengthened the validity of findings but also provided a clear basis for developing responsive instructional interventions tailored to the needs of 3rd-year BSEd English majors.

This study adopted a multi-phased mixed-methods design because a single methodological approach cannot fully capture the complexity of language learning and communicative competence. Writing errors are both measurable and interpretable: they can be quantified to reveal frequency and type, but they also require qualitative exploration to understand their impact on meaning, confidence, and communicative effectiveness. A multi-phased design allows the research to unfold sequentially, with each phase building upon the insights of the previous one.

In the first phase, the study utilized a descriptive–correlational design to provide both a detailed profile of student writing errors and an examination of their relationship to communicative effectiveness. The descriptive aspect involved systematically identifying and categorizing the recurring grammatical and mechanical errors in the essays of 3rd-year BSEd English majors, thereby establishing a clear baseline of learner difficulties. The correlational aspect then explored the statistical association between these error patterns and measures of clarity, coherence, and overall communicative competence. This dual approach was essential because it not only documented the frequency and types of errors but also revealed how such errors were linked to communicative outcomes, thus laying the groundwork for deeper qualitative exploration and the eventual development of responsive instructional interventions.

In the second phase, the study employed a descriptive qualitative design to deepen the understanding of how identified error patterns influence communicative effectiveness in student writing. This phase moved beyond numerical counts and correlations to explore the contextual and interpretive dimensions of language use. Through descriptive analysis of student essays, the research examined clarity, coherence, and meaning-making, highlighting how grammatical lapses affect the overall communicative intent. The qualitative approach yielded richer insights into the lived writing experiences of 3rd-year BSEd English majors, capturing nuances such as confidence, reflective practice, and effective idea-conveyance. By describing and interpreting these patterns, Phase 2 provided the explanatory depth necessary to complement the quantitative findings of Phase 1, ensuring that the study addressed not only what errors occur but also how they shape communication and learning.

To strengthen the validity and richness of findings, the study integrated the first phase (descriptive–correlational design) and the second phase (descriptive qualitative design) through a convergent parallel mixed-methods approach. In this design, both quantitative and qualitative strands were conducted simultaneously and analyzed independently, allowing each to provide complementary insights. The quantitative strand identified and measured recurring error patterns and their statistical relationship to communicative effectiveness, while the qualitative strand described how these errors influenced clarity, coherence, and meaning-making in student writing.

The integration of these two strands provided a holistic understanding of the phenomenon: quantitative data revealed the scope and strength of relationships, while qualitative findings explained the contextual and communicative implications of those errors. The merged results then served as the basis for developing a proposed enhanced instructional intervention, ensuring that pedagogical solutions were both data-driven and context-sensitive. To test the effectiveness of this intervention, the study employed a descriptive–quantitative

design, which enabled systematic measurement of improvements in student writing performance following exposure to the intervention.

Data Sources

This study drew its quantitative data from 27 third-year BSEd English pre-service teachers enrolled in the 2025–2026 academic year. These participants were selected using purposive sampling, focusing specifically on students who had completed formal instruction in essay writing and were actively producing academic essays as part of their coursework. Each pre-service teacher submitted one written output—a maximum of 1,500-word academic essay—which served as the primary data source for the quantitative analysis of error patterns. Collecting these essays from authentic classroom tasks ensured ecological validity and direct relevance to real learning contexts.

For the qualitative aspect, the same purposive sampling technique was employed, but with more specific criteria. Students were chosen based on their readiness for advanced writing assessment, having already completed foundational language and education courses. The selection for qualitative analysis was further guided by the principle of data saturation, a key concept in qualitative research. The researcher observed that, among the 27 essays, the emergence of recurring themes and error patterns indicated that saturation had been reached with this group. This comprehensive approach allowed exploration not only of the frequency and types of errors but also of the deeper communicative challenges faced by pre-service teachers as they prepared for classroom internships.

Research Setting

Sibonga Community College, located in Barangay Poblacion, Sibonga, Cebu, serves as the research site for this study. Strategically positioned near the Sibonga Public Market and Sibonga Central Elementary School, the college functions as a central hub for education in the municipality and nearby communities. Its 5,400-square-meter campus, granted to the municipality through usufruct, reflects the municipality's commitment to accessible and sustainable education. Upholding the principles of the Philippine Constitution and Republic Act 10931, the college offers free tertiary programs, including BSEd (majors in English, Mathematics, and Science), BEEd, BSIT, and BSBA, supported by a leadership team dedicated to equity, excellence, and professional growth.

This academic environment provides an ideal context for investigating the writing challenges and communicative effectiveness of third-year BSEd English pre-service teachers. The diverse student population, many from multilingual and under-resourced backgrounds, allows an authentic analysis of common error patterns in essay writing and their underlying causes. It also enables the assessment of coherence, clarity, and accuracy in written outputs, while accounting for factors such as language exposure, prior instruction, and motivation. The institution's openness to educational innovation supports the design and evaluation of instructional interventions to enhance technical writing proficiency and communicative effectiveness, ensuring that future teachers are better prepared for their professional roles.

Research Instrument

To gather comprehensive data on grammatical errors and communicative effectiveness, the study used three key instruments, each validated by three experts: a writing prompt, an analytic rubric, and a semi-structured interview guide. These tools supported both the quantitative and qualitative phases of the research.

All participants received a standardized writing prompt to ensure consistency and comparability across outputs. The prompt required students to compose a maximum of 1,500-word academic essay on a topic aligned with their coursework, specifically a reflection or reaction essay analyzing *Beowulf*, a work from Anglo-Saxon or Old English literature. The instructions encouraged clear argumentation, structured paragraphs, and appropriate use of grammar and mechanics. This approach allowed students to demonstrate their writing skills in a context reflective of real classroom expectations and communicative demands.

To assess communicative effectiveness, the researcher used a validated analytic rubric focusing on clarity, coherence, and accuracy. For clarity, the rubric evaluated how well main ideas were communicated and whether

supporting details made arguments easy to understand, with ratings ranging from “excellent” (main ideas clearly and effectively communicated) to “unsatisfactory” (ideas very difficult to identify due to missing or confusing details). Coherence was measured by the organization and logical flow of the essay, with an “excellent” rating for logically organized work with smooth transitions, and “unsatisfactory” for disjointed, difficult-to-follow essays. The accuracy indicator assessed grammar, spelling, and punctuation, awarding the highest score to essays virtually free from such errors and the lowest when errors severely hindered comprehension. Each criterion was rated on a four-point scale, ensuring consistent and objective evaluation of the students’ academic essays.

Following the essay submissions, the researcher conducted semi-structured interviews with selected participants to gain deeper insights into students’ perceptions of their writing challenges and the effects of errors on their confidence and communication. The interview guide included open-ended questions about specific challenges encountered in essay writing, the types of grammatical or sentence-structure errors commonly made, and the perceived factors contributing to these difficulties, such as limited vocabulary, lack of practice, time pressure, or insufficient feedback. Additional probing questions explored aspects of essay writing students found most difficult, their usual preparation and revision strategies, and the influence of teacher guidance, personal background, and access to learning materials or digital tools on their writing process.

Data Gathering

Pre-Data Gathering

Before collecting data, the researcher, who was also the course instructor, prepared the writing task to align with the students’ essay-writing curriculum. A standardized writing prompt and validated analytic rubric were developed, and the 27 third-year BSEd English pre-service teachers were directly briefed about the study’s procedures and ethical considerations. It included securing their consent to participate and informing them about the use of written interviews in the qualitative phase. The writing prompt was distributed in class, and clear instructions regarding submission and expectations were provided.

During Data Gathering

During the data gathering phase, each participant wrote and submitted a maximum 1,500-word academic essay in response to the standardized prompt. The researcher personally collected these essays and conducted a systematic quantitative error analysis, identifying and classifying grammatical errors, including verb tense, subject-verb agreement, and sentence structure. Frequency counts and error types were tabulated to determine the most common and persistent issues. Based on the diversity and frequency of errors observed, a subset of students was selected for further qualitative exploration. Written interviews were then administered to these participants to gain insights into their writing challenges, perceptions of errors, and the impact of these issues on their ability to communicate ideas. All written responses were collected for subsequent qualitative analysis.

After Data Gathering

After all data were collected, the researcher synthesized findings from both the quantitative and qualitative phases to identify instructional gaps and key areas for improvement. Drawing from these insights, the researcher drafted targeted instructional interventions, including grammar-focused lesson plans, peer-editing activities, and feedback strategies. The proposed interventions were presented to English faculty and program coordinators for expert validation and refinement. Final recommendations were documented and prepared for possible integration into the essay writing curriculum at Sibonga Community College, ensuring that the interventions were contextually relevant and responsive to the needs of pre-service English teachers.

Data Analysis

The analysis of data in this study followed the logic of the multi-phased mixed-methods design. In the quantitative strand, descriptive statistics were first employed to establish a profile of student writing errors. Errors were categorized into grammatical and mechanical types, and their frequency was tabulated to reveal recurring patterns. This descriptive analysis provided a baseline of learner difficulties. Subsequently,

correlational techniques were applied to examine the statistical relationship between error patterns and measures of communicative effectiveness, including clarity, coherence, and accuracy for the overall competence. This step allowed the study to determine whether specific types of errors were significantly associated with diminished communicative outcomes.

In the qualitative strand, descriptive analysis was conducted on student essays to explore how identified error patterns influenced meaning-making and communicative intent. Essays were examined holistically, with attention to clarity, coherence, and accuracy in conveying ideas. The analysis highlighted instances where grammatical lapses disrupted the intended message, reduced confidence, or hindered effective communication. This interpretive process provided explanatory depth, capturing nuances that numerical counts alone could not reveal.

Finally, the integration of both strands was achieved through a convergent parallel approach. Quantitative findings offered measurable evidence of error frequency and statistical associations, while qualitative findings illuminated the lived impact of these errors on communication. By analyzing both strands independently and then comparing them, the study ensured comprehensive data analysis, addressing not only the errors that occur but also how they shape communicative competence in authentic writing contexts.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout the course of this study, the researcher upheld the principles of Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR), paying careful attention to the ethical standards expected in educational research involving textual data. Although the primary data source consisted of written essays rather than direct human experimentation, the researcher recognized the responsibility to protect the dignity, privacy, and intellectual contributions of every participant.

Prior to data collection, informed consent was obtained from all student participants. Each student was carefully briefed on the purpose of the study, what their participation would involve, and their right to withdraw at any point without any penalty or impact on their academic standing. The researcher emphasized that participation was entirely voluntary and that no student would ever be coerced or feel compelled to join the study.

Confidentiality and privacy were treated as paramount. All written outputs were anonymized, with any identifying information removed from the analysis and reporting. Essays were carefully coded to protect student identity while still preserving the richness and integrity of the data. The researcher also made sure to store all collected essays and written interview responses in password-protected digital folders, which were accessible only to the researcher, thereby upholding the highest standards of data security.

Furthermore, the researcher respected the intellectual ownership of the students, treating each essay as original academic work. Whenever excerpts were included in the research report, they were properly cited and contextualized, ensuring that students' voices were honored and not misrepresented.

Ethical clearance for the study was secured from the appropriate institutional review body, in accordance with the policies of Sibonga Community College and national research guidelines. By focusing on authentic student outputs and maintaining ethical rigor at every stage, the researcher aimed not only to contribute meaningfully to educational practice but also to honor the trust and agency of all participants whose work and experiences shaped the heart of this research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In examining the essay writing outputs of pre-service teachers, it is essential to identify the recurring errors that hinder clarity, coherence, and overall effectiveness in academic writing

SOP No. 1. What errors in essay writing frequently appear in the pre-service teachers' written essay outputs, and what are their corresponding categories?

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Errors in Pre-Service Teachers' Essay Writing Outputs and Categorization

Data Sources	Word Count	Error Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	746	GRAMMAR ERRORS	48	24.12%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	37	18.59%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY ERRORS	32	16.08%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	14	7.04%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	21	10.55%
		SPELLING ERRORS	9	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	18	9.05%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	20	10.05%
		Total	199	100%
2	509	GRAMMAR ERRORS	42	23.73%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	28	15.82%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	12	6.78%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	19	10.73%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	17	9.60%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	18	10.17%
		Total	177	100%
3	677	GRAMMAR ERRORS	39	22.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	31	17.61%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.77%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.25%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.23%
		SPELLING ERRORS	7	3.98%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	21	11.93%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	23	13.07%
		Total	176	100%



4	412	GRAMMAR ERRORS	41	23.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.26%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.61%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	19	10.73%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	21	11.86%
		Total	177	100%
5	469	GRAMMAR ERRORS	38	21.47%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	32	18.09%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	25	14.13%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	9	5.08%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	16	9.04%
		SPELLING ERRORS	7	3.95%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	20	11.30%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	29	16.94%
		Total	176	100%
6	448	GRAMMAR ERRORS	44	24.86%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	36	20.34%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	28	15.34%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	12	6.63%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	19	10.44%
		SPELLING ERRORS	9	5.00%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	18	10.00%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	21	11.39%
		Total	187	100%
7	983	GRAMMAR ERRORS	43	24.29%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	35	19.77%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%

		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	9	5.08%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	17	9.60%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	17	9.60%
		Total	177	100%
8	347	GRAMMAR ERRORS	40	22.60%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	32	18.08%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	21	11.86%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	25	14.20%
		Total	179	100%
9	353	GRAMMAR ERRORS	37	20.90%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	28	15.82%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	9	5.08%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	16	9.04%
		SPELLING ERRORS	7	3.95%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	23	12.99%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	26	14.58%
		Total	179	100%
10	412	GRAMMAR ERRORS	42	23.73%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%



		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	19	10.73%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	20	11.30%
		Total	179	100%
11	898	GRAMMAR ERRORS	45	25.42%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	36	20.34%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	29	16.38%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	12	6.78%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	19	10.73%
		SPELLING ERRORS	9	5.08%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	15	8.47%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	12	6.78%
		Total	177	100%
12	663	GRAMMAR ERRORS	41	23.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	22	12.43%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	20	11.30%
		Total	177	100%
13	360	GRAMMAR ERRORS	38	21.47%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	32	18.08%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	25	14.13%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	9	5.08%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	16	9.04%
		SPELLING ERRORS	7	3.95%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	23	12.99%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	27	15.25%
		Total	177	100%



14	335	GRAMMAR ERRORS	40	22.60%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	21	11.86%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	22	12.43%
		Total	177	100%
15	365	GRAMMAR ERRORS	39	22.03%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	32	18.08%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	22	12.43%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	22	12.43%
		Total	177	100%
16	661	GRAMMAR ERRORS	41	23.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	9	5.08%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	16	9.04%
		SPELLING ERRORS	7	3.95%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	22	12.43%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	22	12.43%
		Total	177	100%
17	691	GRAMMAR ERRORS	40	22.60%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%

		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	20	11.30%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	20	11.30%
		Total	177	100%
18	387	GRAMMAR ERRORS	39	22.03%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	32	18.08%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	22	12.43%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	23	12.99%
		Total	177	100%
19	321	GRAMMAR ERRORS	40	22.60%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	20	11.30%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	20	11.30%
		Total	177	100%
20	740	GRAMMAR ERRORS	42	23.73%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%

		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	19	10.73%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	18	10.17%
		Total	177	100%
21	466	GRAMMAR ERRORS	41	23.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	21	11.86%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	21	11.86%
		Total	177	100%
22	727	GRAMMAR ERRORS	42	23.73%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	19	10.73%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	18	10.17%
		Total	177	100%
23	787	GRAMMAR ERRORS	40	22.60%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	33	18.64%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	21	11.86%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	22	12.43%
		Total	177	100%



24	845	GRAMMAR ERRORS	41	23.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	19	10.73%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	19	10.73%
		Total	177	100%
25	503	GRAMMAR ERRORS	41	23.16%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	34	19.21%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	27	15.25%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	11	6.21%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	18	10.17%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	19	10.73%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	19	10.73%
		Total	177	100%
26	478	GRAMMAR ERRORS	42	23.73%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	35	19.77%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%
		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	20	11.30%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	19	10.73%
		Total	177	100%
27	347	GRAMMAR ERRORS	39	22.03%
		SENTENCE STRUCTURE ERRORS	32	18.08%
		WORD CHOICE / VOCABULARY	26	14.69%

		CAPITALIZATION ERRORS	10	5.65%
		PUNCTUATION ERRORS	17	9.60%
		SPELLING ERRORS	8	4.52%
		REDUNDANCY / WORDINESS	22	12.43%
		COHERENCE & CLARITY ISSUES	23	12.99%
		Total	177	100%

Table 1 offers an insightful overview of the errors commonly found in pre-service teachers' essay writing. The data, gathered from 27 samples, reveal clear patterns in the types and frequencies of mistakes. Upon reflection, these patterns resonate with my own observations and experiences in working with pre-service teachers, further underscoring the persistent challenges they face in academic writing.

From the data, grammar errors are the most frequent, consistently accounting for about 22-25% of total errors. This high incidence suggests that many pre-service teachers are still working to master fundamental rules such as subject-verb agreement and tense consistency. These issues often stem from gaps in early language instruction and limited opportunities for focused practice. Sentence structure errors follow closely, typically making up 17-20% of errors. These mistakes—ranging from run-ons to fragments—can significantly hinder the logical flow of ideas and are often linked to a lack of confidence in constructing complex sentences.

Moderately frequent errors, such as those in word choice and vocabulary, reflect a persistent struggle to select precise language, which is essential for clarity and depth in academic writing. Redundancy, wordiness, and issues of coherence and clarity are also quite prevalent, accounting for roughly 9% to 16% of errors. I have noticed that these problems often arise when writers try to meet length requirements or fill content gaps, sometimes at the expense of clarity and conciseness.

Mechanical issues—capitalization, punctuation, and spelling—are less frequent, accounting for 4% to 10% of errors. While this suggests a foundational awareness of writing mechanics, lapses still occur, often due to oversight rather than a lack of knowledge.

Interpreting these findings, I believe the most pressing concern is that foundational elements of academic writing—particularly grammar and sentence structure—are not yet fully internalized by many pre-service teachers. Although less frequent, mechanical errors and difficulties with coherence further detract from the overall quality of their work. These trends highlight the critical need for targeted, sustained instruction and support in these areas.

Theoretically, these findings reinforce the view that writing proficiency develops over time, beginning with mastery of foundational skills. They also support the idea that when pre-service teachers are overwhelmed by the need to juggle multiple writing concerns, their ability to communicate ideas clearly is compromised. It aligns with the cognitive load theory: when too much effort is spent on basic mechanics, there is little mental capacity left for higher-order thinking and organization.

These results suggest that teacher education programs should revisit their approach to writing instruction. Based on both the data and my own experiences, I believe that integrating explicit instruction in grammar and sentence structure—through workshops, writing labs, or embedded modules—could be highly beneficial. Additionally, offering ongoing, actionable feedback and opportunities for revision would help pre-service teachers develop greater confidence and skill. Institutions can further support students by expanding access to writing centers, peer tutoring, and online tools, and by encouraging collaborative writing experiences.

Finally, assessment practices should move beyond checking for superficial correctness and focus on helping students understand the reasons behind their mistakes. Rubrics that balance attention to both mechanics and clarity can guide students toward more effective writing. In conclusion, the recurring errors identified in Table

1, reinforced by my own reasoning and observations, stress the importance of foundational writing support in teacher preparation programs. By addressing these persistent challenges, we can better equip future educators to communicate effectively and model strong writing skills for their own students.

SOP #2: What is the overall communicative effectiveness of the students' written outputs, considering coherence, clarity, and accuracy?

Table 2. Communicative Effectiveness of the Students' Essay Writing Outputs

Data Sources	CLARITY (4)	COHERENCE (4)	ACCURACY (4)	TOTAL (12)
1	2	2	2	6
2	3	3	2	8
3	2	2	2	6
4	3	3	2	8
5	3	3	2	8
6	2	2	2	6
7	2	2	2	6
8	3	3	2	8
9	3	3	3	9
10	3	3	2	8
11	3	2	2	7
12	3	3	2	8
13	2	2	2	6
14	2	2	3	7
15	3	3	3	9
16	3	3	2	8
17	3	3	2	8
18	3	3	3	9
19	3	3	3	9
20	2	2	2	6
21	3	3	2	8
22	2	2	2	6
23	3	3	3	9

24	3	3	2	8
25	3	3	2	8
26	2	2	2	6
27	3	3	3	9

Score equivalent: 1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Needs improvement, 3-Satisfactory, 4-Excellent

The findings presented in Table 2 sufficiently address Statement of the problem number 2 provide a comprehensive view of the communicative effectiveness of the students' written outputs in terms of clarity, coherence, and accuracy. The results reveal that most students scored between 6 and 9 out of a possible 12 points, which places their performance within the "needs improvement" to "satisfactory" range. This distribution suggests that while students are generally able to express their ideas with clarity and maintain logical coherence in their essays, accuracy remains the weakest dimension. The frequent scores of 2 in accuracy indicate recurring issues with grammar, mechanics, and precise language use, which hinder the overall communicative quality of their writing.

The consistency of scores in clarity and coherence demonstrates that students can organize their thoughts and sustain a logical flow of ideas, reflecting adequate mastery of essay structure. However, lower accuracy ratings highlight the need for more targeted interventions in language use, particularly in grammar and mechanics, to ensure their writing achieves higher levels of precision. Taken together, the results show that students' written outputs are communicatively effective to a certain degree, but they fall short of excellence due to persistent weaknesses in accuracy.

Thus, SOP #2 is sufficiently supported by the table, as it captures the balance of strengths and weaknesses in students' writing. The data emphasize that while clarity and coherence are relatively strong, accuracy requires greater instructional focus. This finding has important pedagogical implications: teachers should continue reinforcing organizational and idea development skills while integrating more intensive grammar and language accuracy training. By addressing these areas, students can move from satisfactory performance toward excellence in communicative effectiveness.

Table 3: The Relationship between the frequency of errors and the communicative effectiveness of the students' essay written outputs

Variables Compared	Pearson's r	p-value	Relationship Strength	Direction	Interpretation
Errors ↔ Clarity	-0.320	0.104	Weak	Negative	Weak negative, not significant
Errors ↔ Coherence	-0.322	0.101	Weak	Negative	Weak negative, not significant
Errors ↔ Accuracy	-0.147	0.464	Very Weak	Negative	Very weak negative, not significant
Errors ↔ Effectiveness	-0.327	0.096	Weak	Negative	Weak negative, not significant
Clarity ↔ Coherence	0.922	< .001	Very Strong	Positive	Very strong positive, highly significant

Clarity ↔ Accuracy	0.239	0.230	Weak	Positive	Weak positive, not significant
Coherence ↔ Accuracy	0.279	0.159	Weak	Positive	Weak positive, not significant

The correlation matrix in table 3 presents the statistical relationships among error patterns, clarity, coherence, accuracy, and communicative effectiveness in students' essay written outputs. The results show that error frequency has a weak negative correlation with communicative effectiveness ($r = -0.327$, $p = 0.096$), suggesting that as error frequency increases, communicative effectiveness tends to decline. However, this relationship is not statistically significant.

Similarly, error frequency shows weak negative associations with clarity and coherence, suggesting that errors may slightly hinder these qualities, though the findings lack strong statistical support. In contrast, clarity and coherence exhibit a very strong, highly significant positive correlation ($r = 0.922$, $p < .001$), underscoring their interdependence and central role in shaping effective communication. Accuracy, meanwhile, shows weak positive correlations with clarity and coherence, but these are not statistically significant, pointing to a more limited influence.

The analysis of these results highlights that while error patterns exert some negative pressure on communication, they are not decisive factors in determining communicative effectiveness. Instead, clarity and coherence emerge as the strongest predictors, with their synergy providing the most reliable foundation for effective writing. The interpretation of these findings suggests that communicative success depends less on the absence of errors and more on the presence of clear and coherent expression.

The implications of this analysis are significant for both pedagogy and research. For educators, the findings emphasize the need to prioritize teaching strategies that enhance clarity and coherence in student writing rather than solely focusing on error correction. For researchers, the results reinforce the importance of examining communicative dimensions beyond mechanical accuracy, as these higher-order qualities are more strongly linked to effective communication.

In broader terms, the study contributes to the discourse on academic justice and social transformation, showing that empowering students to write clearly and coherently has a greater impact on communicative effectiveness than simply reducing error frequency.

SOP #4: What factors influence students' errors in technical writing?

Table 4 Factors Influencing Students' Errors in Technical Writing

Factor Category	Specific Influences	Impact on Writing
Linguistic Factors	Limited vocabulary, weak grammar mastery, lack of exposure to formal writing conventions	Leads to mechanical and grammatical errors; reduces accuracy and precision
Cognitive Factors	Difficulty in organizing ideas, limited synthesis skills, attention lapses, writing anxiety	Produces fragmented sentences, incoherent structures; undermines clarity and coherence
Affective Factors	Low confidence, fear of evaluation, lack of motivation	Results in hesitant expression, avoidance of revision, and weaker communicative flow

Institutional Factors	Limited writing support services, curriculum gaps, teaching approaches focused on content over form	Errors persist due to insufficient practice and feedback; weakens overall effectiveness
Socio-cultural Factors	Reliance on spoken language patterns, regional linguistic variations, weak reading habits	Creates inconsistencies in tone, structure, and precision; affects coherence and clarity

Table 4 presents the following:

Linguistic Factors

At the heart of an essay writing lies language itself. Many students carry with them gaps in vocabulary and grammar that make it difficult to express ideas with precision. As one participant explained, “The most common errors of grammatical or sentence structure in making technical writing are the grammar, like for example observing the plural and singular subjects or verbs or the past and present forms. Like this sentence ‘she eats the guava’, and in that sentence the subject is singular, so the verb, which is ‘eat’, must put ‘s’ to make the sentence grammatically correct.” It highlights how fundamental grammatical knowledge, such as subject-verb agreement and verb tense, continues to challenge students.

Other participants echoed similar struggles. For instance, another shared, “The challenges that I encounter when writing technical essays are grammar, limited vocabulary, and clear thoughts.” Likewise, “The specific challenges that I encounter when I write technical essays are, first of all, the grammar—sometimes I find it difficult and confusing—the vocabulary as well, honestly, I didn’t have many words that I know, there are words that are difficult for me to understand...” Such statements demonstrate that vocabulary limitations often make it harder for students to select the right words, leading to unclear or awkward expressions.

Linguistic difficulties are not confined to grammar and vocabulary alone. Issues like spelling mistakes, misplaced punctuation, and awkward sentence constructions are also prevalent. One student mentioned, “Punctuation and parts of speech are the errors that I commonly make in my technical writing. For example, when I’m writing a sentence using past tense, [I] hardly finish it because I’m confused on what words to add and what punctuation to use, either a comma or a period.”

When a student cannot find the right word or struggles with sentence structure, the message becomes blurred, even if the underlying idea is strong. As another participant stated, “I have difficulty organizing my ideas and making my writing. I also struggle with grammar and choosing the right words and sometimes my sentences is not connect well.” These linguistic limitations mean that even when students have good ideas, their writing may not fully capture their intended meaning, thereby reducing the clarity and effectiveness of their technical writing.

Cognitive Factors

Writing is not just about words—it is about thinking. Students must organize ideas, connect them logically, and sustain attention throughout the writing process. As one participant shared, “When writing technical essays, the specific challenges that I encounter are how to organize the thought, how to observe the correct grammar and most of all the capacity of my vocabulary.” It highlights how juggling multiple cognitive demands—such as organizing content and monitoring language choices—can become overwhelming.

Several students reported struggling to structure their thoughts and link ideas smoothly. For example, one wrote, “I have difficulty organizing my ideas and making my writing. I also struggle with grammar and choosing the right words, and sometimes my sentences are not connected well.” Another explained, “In writing essays, I usually struggle in organizing my thoughts, especially when I am being given a limited time to do it, because my technique in writing essays requires time as I am gathering ideas to create an essay.”

When cognitive demands increase, errors often creep in. As one student observed, “Types of grammatical or sentence-structure errors that I commonly make in my technical writing are first is constructing the introduction, body, and the conclusion. It can lead to having nonsense words especially if I don’t know what to write first in

the introduction...” Mental fatigue and anxiety further complicate the process, turning writing into a task of survival rather than a craft of communication.

These statements validate that cognitive factor —such as organizing information, maintaining focus, and managing complex tasks—play a significant role in the quality and coherence of students’ technical writing. When students struggle cognitively, it often results in fragmented sentences, repetition, and a disjointed flow of ideas, ultimately undermining their ability to communicate effectively.

Affective Factors

Emotions quietly shape the way students write. A lack of confidence can make them hesitant, resulting in vague or underdeveloped sentences. As one participant shared, “As a person that is slow in English when writing essay I always doubt my grammar... I can’t come up with any idea that made me uncomfortable and doubt myself who submitting my essay to my instructor.” This self-doubt often leads students to second-guess their choices or avoid fully expressing their ideas.

Fear of being judged may discourage students from revising drafts, leaving errors uncorrected. One student admitted, “Honestly I don’t feel confident when writing an essay especially on English language.” Such low confidence can prevent learners from engaging deeply with the writing process or seeking necessary feedback.

Motivation also plays a crucial role—when writing feels like a burden rather than an opportunity, students may rush through tasks, sacrificing clarity and coherence. As another participant reflected, “I get lazy on writing essay especially our technology today is evolving I found myself relying on chatgpt to answer my assignments, even if I know it’s not good for me.” This lack of intrinsic motivation can lead to incomplete, rushed, or superficial work.

In this way, affective factors remind us that writing is not only a cognitive act but also an emotional journey. When students feel anxious, hesitant, or unmotivated, their writing may reflect these emotions through less effective communication and increased frequency of errors.

Institutional Factors

The classroom and curriculum set the stage for how students learn to write. If technical writing is not emphasized or if feedback is limited, errors become ingrained habits. As one participant noted, “For me, the factors that contribute most to my writing difficulties are lack of vocabulary, time pressure and inefficient feedback.” It highlights how insufficient or unclear instructor feedback can hinder progress and leave persistent errors unaddressed.

Some students lack access to writing support services, while others experience teaching approaches that prioritize content delivery over writing form. One student reflected, “The factors that contribute most to these writing difficulties are the following: first, lack of practice, because as students, we barely write essays, and if we do write, we rely on the internet sometimes, but not right now. Second is time pressure because as a student who has a limited time I felt nervous and be confused.” It reveals how limited opportunities for structured writing practice and the pressure of deadlines can negatively impact writing development.

Another participant explained, “I find it challenging due to a lack of reading books for reference on vocabulary.” It points to a shortage of accessible resources and reference materials, which are essential for vocabulary growth and writing improvement.

Without structured practice and constructive guidance, students are left to navigate technical writing on their own, often reinforcing mistakes rather than correcting them. As one student expressed, “I struggled writing this type of essay because it has a strict structure to follow. It needs to be formal and needs to be direct. I struggled also with the grammar because I am still not good at it.” The lack of a supportive instructional environment and clear expectations makes it difficult for students to develop the writing skills necessary for success in technical contexts.

Socio-Cultural Factors

Finally, the broader social and cultural environment influences how students approach writing. Many rely on spoken language patterns, which seep into their written work, creating informal or conversational tones in technical documents. As one participant shared, “If it’s Tagalog it’s easy for me to process my sentence.” This statement highlights how students may default to the structure and comfort of their first language, which can influence the way they compose sentences in English.

Regional linguistic variations and limited reading habits also affect how students construct sentences and organize ideas. One student admitted, “For me, the factors contribute most to these writing difficulties is limited vocabulary, maybe because I’m not into reading books that’s why I don’t have enough vocabulary.” Another participant echoed this, stating, “One factor affecting your vocabulary is not reading educational books or because of always using gadgets you don’t have time to study or scan your books.” These perspectives demonstrate how cultural practices—such as infrequent reading or heavy reliance on digital devices—impact language acquisition and essay writing skills.

Additionally, students’ reliance on technology and digital tools shapes their approach to writing. As another student mentioned, “Sometimes, in writing essays is hard especially if we didn’t use any source of information or digital things like cellphone to search the particular task.” This reliance can both help and hinder writing skills, depending on how technology is used.

These influences remind us that writing is not isolated from culture—it reflects the rhythms of everyday speech and the habits of the community. The interplay among home language, local customs, and technology use shapes students’ technical writing abilities, often presenting unique challenges that extend beyond the classroom.

Together, these factors show that errors in essay writing are not simply careless slips. They are the visible traces of deeper struggles with language, thought, emotion, institutional support, and cultural context. To truly help students improve, educators must respond to these realities with patience, empathy, and holistic strategies—strengthening grammar and vocabulary, fostering confidence, providing structured feedback, and cultivating reading and writing practices that align with the demands of technical communication.

The findings of this study reveal that students’ errors in essay writing are not isolated slips but reflections of deeper challenges in language mastery, cognitive processing, emotional confidence, and institutional support. Quantitative data highlighted the frequency and categories of errors. At the same time, qualitative insights uncovered the lived realities behind these lapses—the struggles with clarity, coherence, and accuracy, as well as the pressures of learning environments and personal circumstances. Taken together, these perspectives call for an instructional intervention that is both systematic and compassionate: one that strengthens technical skills while nurturing confidence, reflection, and resilience. By weaving numbers into narratives, the study envisions a program that addresses not only the mechanics of writing but also the human dimensions of communication, ensuring that students are guided toward clarity, coherence, and accuracy in their academic and professional expression.

SOP #5: Based on the integrated quantitative and qualitative data, what instructional intervention can be designed?

Table 5. Instructional Intervention Design for Improving Essay Writing

Component	Description	Expected Outcome
Targeted Writing Workshops	Focused sessions on grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary building; peer-editing activities	Reduction of mechanical and grammatical errors; improved accuracy in written outputs

Process-Oriented Writing Modules	Step-by-step guidance on planning, drafting, revising, and editing; rubric-based practice	Enhanced coherence and clarity; stronger structural organization of ideas
Feedback and Reflection Mechanisms	Regular formative feedback from instructors, self-assessment tools; peer feedback circles	Increased awareness of strengths and weaknesses; development of reflective writing habits
Reading and Exposure Activities	Guided reading of technical texts, reports, and manuals; analysis of professional writing	Improved clarity and precision through exposure to formal writing conventions
Confidence-Building Strategies	Low-stakes writing exercises; recognition of progress through milestone celebrations	Reduced writing anxiety; stronger motivation and confidence in technical communication

Table 5 shows the intervention which is designed not only to correct errors but also to empower students as communicators. By combining structured skill-building with supportive feedback and confidence-building strategies, the program addresses both the technical and human dimensions of writing (Alharbi, 2017; Hyland & Hyland, 2019). It transforms writing from a source of frustration into a meaningful practice, helping students achieve clarity, coherence, and accuracy while gaining pride in their progress (Bitchener & Ferris, 2018; Chien, 2019).

SOP #6: What is the level of effectiveness of the designed instructional intervention?

Table 6. Evaluation Result of Instructional Intervention

Component	Criteria	Score (1–4)	Effectiveness Level	Observed Outcomes
Targeted Writing Workshops	Grammar/mechanics reduction, vocabulary gains, peer-editing accuracy	3	Satisfactory	Fewer grammatical errors; improved vocabulary; peer-editing fostered accuracy
Process-Oriented Writing Modules	Coherence, clarity, logical flow, rubric-based organization	3	Satisfactory	Clearer statements; better transitions; organization still developing
Feedback & Reflection Mechanisms	Instructor feedback, self-assessment, peer circles	3	Satisfactory	Students became more aware of strengths/weaknesses; reflective habits beginning
Reading & Exposure Activities	Guided reading, analysis of professional texts	3	Satisfactory	Improved clarity and accuracy; exposure to conventions but mastery not yet solid
Confidence-Building Strategies	Low-stakes writing, milestone recognition	4	Excellent	Reduced writing anxiety; stronger motivation and confidence in written communication

The comprehensive scoring table for the instructional intervention after one month shows that the program achieved satisfactory to excellent across its components. The targeted writing workshops scored 3 out of 4, reflecting reduced grammatical and mechanical errors and some vocabulary gains, though mastery of mechanics

requires more sustained practice. The process-oriented writing modules scored 3, indicating that students began to show clearer thesis statements and improved transitions, but coherence and organization remain in early development. The feedback and reflection mechanisms also scored 3, suggesting that formative feedback and peer circles increased awareness of strengths and weaknesses, with reflective habits beginning to form. The reading and exposure activities scored 3, showing that guided reading and analysis of professional texts improved clarity and accuracy, but consistent adoption of conventions will take longer. Finally, the confidence-building strategies scored highest at 4, demonstrating excellent effectiveness in reducing writing anxiety and boosting motivation through low-stakes exercises and milestone recognition.

Overall, the average score of 3 out of 4 indicates that the intervention was effective at a foundational level within one month. Immediate gains were most evident in confidence and accuracy, while higher-order skills such as coherence, reflective habits, and adoption of professional conventions are still developing. While the intervention is promising, longer exposure of 3 to 6 months is necessary to consolidate advanced writing skills and achieve greater effectiveness across all components.

SOP #7: What enhanced instructional intervention for essay writing can be crafted?

Table 7. Proposed Instructional Intervention Module Components

Session/Component	Content Focus	Learning Activities	Expected Outcomes
Session 1: Accuracy Matters	Grammar and mechanics	Mini-lessons, error analysis, editing drills	Reduced grammatical and mechanical errors
Session 2: Writing with Clarity	Sentence construction and word choice	Guided writing exercises, vocabulary expansion	Clearer and more precise expression of ideas
Session 3: Coherence in Action	Organization and logical flow	Paragraph structuring, sequencing activities, and rubric-guided drafting	Improved logical flow and unity in writing
Session 4: Reflective Practice	Self-assessment and peer feedback	Journaling, peer-editing circles, and feedback workshops	Stronger awareness of strengths and weaknesses
Session 5: Confidence-Building	Motivation and resilience	Low-stakes writing tasks, milestone celebrations, and group sharing	Increased confidence and willingness to revise
Session 6: Professional Exposure	Reading technical texts	Guided reading, analysis of professional reports/manuals	Adoption of professional conventions in writing

The instructional intervention was structured around the proposed module components in Table 7, which emphasized accuracy, clarity, and coherence as foundational skills in essay writing. Session 1: Accuracy Matters focused on grammar and mechanics through mini-lessons, error analysis, and editing drills, resulting in reduced grammatical and mechanical errors. Session 2: Writing with Clarity targeted sentence construction and word choice, with guided writing exercises and vocabulary expansion, leading to clearer, more precise expression of ideas. Session 3: Coherence in Action addressed organization and logical flow, using paragraph structuring and rubric-guided drafting to improve unity and sequencing in student writing. These sessions provided the immediate scaffolding necessary for short-term gains in writing proficiency.

When connected to Table 5 (Instructional Intervention Design), the outcomes in Table 7 closely align with the two major components: targeted writing workshops and process-oriented writing modules. The workshops reinforced accuracy and clarity, while the modules supported coherence and organization. After one month, the

scoring framework indicated emerging to noticeable effectiveness, with students showing measurable reductions in errors and clearer thesis statements, though deeper structural mastery remained in progress.

Further integration of the strategies outlined in the technical writing framework (feedback, reading, and confidence-building) expanded the intervention's scope. Feedback and reflection mechanisms increased awareness of strengths and weaknesses, with reflective habits beginning to form. Reading and exposure activities improved clarity and precision through guided analysis of professional texts, though consistent adoption of conventions requires longer practice. Confidence-building strategies produced the strongest short-term impact, reducing writing anxiety and fostering motivation through low-stakes exercises and milestone recognition.

The extended sessions—Session 4: Reflective Practice, Session 5: Confidence-Building, and Session 6: Professional Exposure—further enriched the intervention by deepening self-awareness, reinforcing resilience, and introducing students to professional writing conventions. These sessions complemented the earlier modules, ensuring that students not only improved their technical accuracy but also developed reflective habits and confidence in their writing.

Overall, the intervention demonstrated an average effectiveness score of 3 out of 4 after one month, reflecting satisfactory to excellent effectiveness. Immediate gains were most evident in accuracy, clarity, and confidence, while higher-order skills such as coherence, reflective practice, and professional writing conventions are still developing. While the intervention is effective at a foundational level in one-month, extending the program to three to six months is essential to consolidate advanced writing competencies and achieve stronger effectiveness across all components.

Implications

The study's findings carry significant implications for the teaching and learning in writing Essays. The recurrence of errors in grammar, mechanics, clarity, and coherence reveals that students' struggles are not simply lapses in rule application but reflections of deeper challenges in language mastery and expression. It suggests that instruction must go beyond surface correction and instead cultivate a stronger foundation in vocabulary, rule awareness, and the ability to translate thought into precise written form. Moreover, the interplay of linguistic, cognitive, affective, institutional, and socio-cultural factors underscores the need for a holistic pedagogy. Writing cannot be taught in isolation; it must be nurtured in supportive environments that build confidence, provide sustained practice, and acknowledge the cultural contexts that shape students' voices. The modest yet meaningful gains observed after the intervention program imply that short-term efforts can spark improvement, but long-term, iterative strategies are essential for lasting growth. Equally important is the rise in student confidence and reflective practice, which highlights that empowerment and self-efficacy are as vital as technical accuracy. Finally, the institutional gaps limiting practice opportunities call for systemic reform that embeds essay writing across disciplines rather than confining it to a single course. Altogether, the study implies that effective reform requires integrated, sustained, and empowering interventions—ones that combine skill-building with confidence development and institutional commitment to transform students into capable and reflective writers.

LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study, while insightful, is bound by certain limitations that must be acknowledged. First, the intervention program lasted only one month, which may not have been sufficient to capture long-term changes in students' writing proficiency. The modest improvements observed could have been more pronounced with sustained exposure and reinforcement. Second, the sample size and context were limited to a specific group of students, which restricts the generalizability of the findings to broader populations. Third, reliance on self-reported reflections and rubric-based evaluations may introduce subjectivity, as external factors can influence students' confidence and evaluators' judgments. Finally, the study focused primarily on written outputs, leaving unexplored the potential impact of oral communication, peer collaboration, and digital tools that increasingly shape essay writing practices.

In light of these limitations, several recommendations emerge. Educators should design longer-term, iterative instructional programs that provide continuous reinforcement of grammar, mechanics, clarity, and coherence,

ensuring that improvements are sustained over time. Institutions are encouraged to embed essay writing practice across disciplines, rather than confining it to isolated courses, so that students encounter authentic writing tasks in varied contexts. Future interventions should integrate confidence-building strategies with linguistic training, recognizing that affective growth is as vital as technical accuracy. Researchers may also expand the scope of inquiry by including diverse student populations, exploring the role of digital platforms in shaping writing habits, and examining the interplay between oral and written communication. Finally, policymakers and academic leaders should provide institutional support through resources, workshops, and faculty training, thereby creating an environment where essay writing is nurtured as both a skill and a reflective practice.

CONCLUSION

This study affirmed that the error patterns and written communicative effectiveness of 3rd-year English pre-service teachers at Sibonga Community College during the academic year 2025–2026 are not merely isolated mistakes but indicators of broader challenges in language proficiency, cognitive processing, emotional resilience, institutional support, and cultural context. The short-term instructional intervention, anchored in modules on accuracy, clarity, and coherence, demonstrated effectiveness in reducing errors and fostering confidence. These outcomes confirm that systematic and compassionate teaching strategies can transform essay writing into a skill of empowerment. Ultimately, while immediate gains were evident, it is concluded that sustained implementation over the long term will be necessary to achieve greater improvements in coherence, reflective practice, and overall communicative competence.

REFERENCES

1. Abushihab, I. (2020). An analysis of written grammatical errors of Arab learners of English as a foreign language. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(4), 543–552. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/290529363_An_analysis_of_written_grammatical_errors_of_Arab_learners_of_english_as_a_foreign_language_at_Alzaytoonah_private_university_of_Jordan
2. Afeadie, S., & Kpeglo, S. B. (2022). Impact of errors on the college of education students' written communication. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijelt.13/vol10.no1pp.23-34>
3. Apolonio, J. A. (2021). Needs analysis, challenges, and teaching strategies in English grammar learning (Doctoral dissertation, Lyceum of the Philippines University). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED613630.pdf>
4. Autilia, M., & Theresia, M. (2018). An error analysis of communicative effect taxonomy in students' writing descriptive text at the tenth grader students. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 3(6), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.3.6>
5. Ayar, Z. (2020). Error analysis of Turkish learners' English paragraphs from lexical and grammatical aspects. *ELT Research Journal*, 9(2), 123–134.
6. Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
7. Comeo, J. (2025). Common errors in technical writing among pre-service teachers. *Philippine Journal of Language and Education*, 12(1), 45–58.
8. Deiparine, M. S., Montalla, M. G., & Bacus, R. C. (2024, April). Uncovering the common linguistic errors in student journalists' unedited news articles: A comprehensive analysis. *World Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Studies*, 14(4), p. 131. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n4p131>
10. Fitria, T. N. (2018). Error analysis: A process of investigating errors in second or foreign language acquisition. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 7(3), 114–123. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Tira-Nur-Fitria/publication/345977092_Error_Analysis_Found_in_Students'_Writing_Composition_in_Simple_Past_Tense_of_Recount_Text/links/5fb398e845851518fdacdb97/Error-Analysis-Found-in-Students-Writing-Composition-in-Simple-Past-Tense-of-Recount-Text.pdf
11. Garduce, M., & Baluyos, R. (2023). Grammar and mechanics errors in senior high school writing. *Journal of Philippine Education Research*, 18(2), 77–92.

12. González-Laguna, A., Pérez, J., & Ramos, L. (2024). ICT-based interventions in academic writing: Scaffolding and feedback for improved clarity. *International Journal of Educational Technology*, 9(3), 101-115.
- Herrera, C. (2025). Challenges and interventions in tertiary students' writing performance. *Asian Journal of Educational Development*, 7(1), 33-4
13. Hao, Y., Xu, X., Wang, X., Lin, Y., & Liu, H. (2023). Typological characteristics of interlanguage: Across L2 modalities and proficiency levels. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 1071906.
14. Harefa, A. T., & Sibarani, B. (2023). An error analysis of communicative effect taxonomy in students' writing descriptive text at the tenth grader students. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 8(6), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.8.6.10>
15. Karim, A. (2018). Error analysis found in students' writing composition in simple past tense of recount text. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), 22–34. https://www.academia.edu/44541872/Error_Analysis_Found_in_Students_Writing_Composition_in_Simple_Past_Tense_of_Recount_Text
16. Khatteer, F. (2019). An analysis of common essay writing errors among Saudi female learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(3), 294–307. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no3.20>
17. Loza, R., & Tag-at, M. (2024). Grammar errors in technical writing among AB-English students. *Philippine Linguistics Review*, 15(2), 120-135.
18. Myhill, D., Cremin, T., & Oliver, L. (2023). Motivation and classroom environment in writing instruction. *Literacy Studies Quarterly*, 41(4), 289-305.
19. Ngaiza, A. G. (2023). A linguistic error analysis of ESL written essays by Indian Tamil university students. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies*, 10(4), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.30479/jmrels.2023.18208.2160>
20. Nguyen, T., Pham, H., & Le, D. (2024). Factors influencing academic writing difficulties among Vietnamese undergraduates. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(2), 56-70.
21. Ramos et al. (2023). English writing errors, challenges, and strategies in modular learning: A multiple case study. *Academia.edu*. <https://www.academia.edu/97060704>
22. Reforsado, M., & Raymundo, J. L. (2024). Syntactical structure competence in academic writing of senior high school students: Designing a contextualized instructional material. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature & Translation*, 7(7), 93–106. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2024.7.7.10>
23. Taye, B., & Mengesha, A. (2024). Writing challenges among Ethiopian undergraduates: Vocabulary and grammar issues. *African Journal of Higher Education*, 5(2), 88-102.
24. Tica-A, J. (2024). Grammatical errors in Filipino students' essay writing and supplemental module development. *Philippine Journal of Language Teaching*, 9(1), 65-80
25. Tizazu, Y. (2019). A linguistic analysis of errors in learners' compositions: The case of Arba Minch University students. *European Journal of English Language and Literature Studies*, 7(5), 1–13. <https://ejournals.org>
26. Vunan, D., & Choi, Y. (2023). Clarity and coherence in academic writing: Strategies for improvement. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), 211-225