



Stylistic Error Analysis and Written Composition among Grade 12 Students: Basis for a Proposed Intervention Program, "Integrated Writing Enhancement Program: Addressing Lexical, Structural, and Discourse-level Writing Errors"

Gaverell M. Carial¹, Analisa T. Amada, EdD, LPT²

¹Department of Education Region XII, Division of South Cotabato, Norala National High School, Philippines

²Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, Inc., Philippines

Email: gaverell.carial@deped.gov.ph

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the level of stylistic errors in the written compositions of Grade 12 students in the Municipality of Norala, specifically those enrolled under the Special Science Curriculum (SSC), using a quantitative descriptive survey design and stratified random sampling involving 150 respondents. Data were gathered using a researcher-made stylistic error checklist and analyzed using descriptive statistics. The findings revealed that students exhibited a high level of writing difficulties across all identified areas, namely word choice errors, sentence structure errors, redundancy, formality issues, cohesion errors, tone inconsistency, and clarity issues. The study concluded that grade 12 students exhibited a high level of stylistic errors in their written compositions. The analysis further shows that these errors are widespread and systematic, reflecting persistent gaps in students' academic writing competence and their ability to effectively communicate ideas in written form. Overall, the study highlights the need for targeted instructional support to address these recurring weaknesses. Based on these findings, an intervention program was developed to enhance students' writing skills and address the identified stylistic weaknesses for School Year 2026-2027, aiming to improve their writing proficiency and academic performance.

Keywords

educational management, stylistic error analysis, written composition, writing proficiency, intervention program, descriptive survey, Philippines

1. Introduction

Grade 12 students commonly committed stylistic errors in writing, including grammar, sentence structure, vocabulary, and clarity. Limited research has examined the causes of these errors and their relationship to teaching strategies. Thus, this study aimed to identify common stylistic errors and



develop an intervention program to improve students' writing performance (Darmayanti et al., 2022; Han & Sari, 2024; Pasaribu, 2021).

Students' stylistic errors were influenced by limited vocabulary, weak grammar, lack of practice, ineffective teaching strategies, and limited exposure to different writing genres. Identifying these factors is essential for improving students' writing performance (Booth Olson et al., 2023; Masruddin & Nasriandi, 2022; Yan, 2023; Banquerigo & Quines, 2024).

Writing difficulties, particularly in grammar, organization, and clarity, remain common among students worldwide. Examining these errors supports the development of effective strategies to improve writing skills and educational outcomes (Chang et al., 2021; Graham et al., 2023; Shengyao et al., 2024).

Locally, Grade 12 students also faced writing difficulties, particularly in expressing ideas clearly due to limited practice and support. This highlights the need for local studies and targeted interventions to improve students' writing performance (Divina, 2025; Quines, 2024; Ramos, 2021).

1.1 Research Objectives

This study aimed to determine the level of stylistic errors in the written compositions of Grade 12 students in the Municipality of Norala and to develop an intervention program for the School Year 2026-2027. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. To determine the level of stylistic errors in the written compositions of Grade 12 students in terms of the following:

Word Choice Errors

Sentence Structure Errors,

Redundancy,

Formality Issues,

Cohesion Errors,

Tone Inconsistency, and

Clarity Issues.

2. Based on the findings of the analysis, an intervention program can be developed.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

This study was anchored on the Process Writing Theory (Flower & Hayes, 1981), Error Analysis Theory (Corder, 1975), Interlanguage Theory (Selinker, 2015), and Social Constructivist Theory (Vygotsky, 1978, as cited in Palincsar, 2012). These theories explained that students' stylistic errors resulted from limited revision, developing language competence, and gaps in writing skills, while emphasizing the role of guided instruction, feedback, and collaborative learning. Together, they provided the foundation for identifying writing errors and developing an intervention program to improve Grade 12 students' writing performance.



2. Methodology

This chapter presents the research methodology employed in the study. It discusses the research design, research locale, population and sample, research instruments used to measure the variables of interest, data collection procedures, statistical tools utilized for data analysis, and the ethical considerations.

2.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive survey design to collect and analyze numerical data on the stylistic errors in Grade 12 students' written compositions. Using structured tools and statistical analysis, the design ensured objective, reliable, and evidence-based findings, making it appropriate for examining students' writing performance (Lim, 2025; Almusaed et al., 2025). The quantitative descriptive survey design minimized bias through standardized evaluation, ensuring objective, reliable, and valid findings. It also provided a clear and systematic approach to identifying and describing the stylistic errors in Grade 12 students' written compositions, making it suitable for developing evidence-based interventions and recommendations (Brod et al., 2024; Fischer et al., 2023; Ghanad, 2023). The descriptive survey design allowed the researcher to observe students' writing performance without manipulating variables, providing an accurate description of common stylistic errors among Grade 12 students. The findings served as a basis for identifying areas for improvement, developing intervention programs, and enhancing teaching strategies, making the design appropriate for this study (Rana et al., 2023; Gul, 2023; Ghanad, 2023).

2.2 Locale of the Study

This study was conducted at Norala National High School in the Municipality of Norala, South Cotabato, Philippines. The school was selected as the research locale because it provided access to the target respondents, Grade 10 students, who were required under the DepEd K-12 curriculum to develop narrative writing skills. Their narrative essays served as the primary source of data for analyzing stylistic errors. The school's conducive learning environment and accessibility also supported the efficient collection of authentic writing outputs during the research period.

2.3 Research Instrument

The instrument employed in this study consisted of a pre-test and post-test, which were specifically Data were collected from the written compositions of 150 Grade 12 students after securing permission from the school administration. The compositions were analyzed using a researcher-made stylistic error checklist and scoring rubric to identify and classify errors in grammar, word choice, and sentence structure. All responses were kept confidential, encoded, and analyzed using descriptive statistics, specifically frequency and percentage, to identify students' writing needs and serve as the basis for developing an appropriate intervention program.

Data Collection

Data were collected from the written compositions of 150 Grade 12 students after securing approval from the school administration. The students completed a writing task, and their outputs were analyzed using a scoring rubric or checklist to identify stylistic errors in grammar, word choice, and sentence structure. All responses were kept confidential, encoded, and summarized according to the frequency of errors, providing the basis for designing an appropriate intervention program.

Statistical Tools

Frequency and percentage were used to analyze the occurrence and distribution of stylistic errors in the written compositions of Grade 12 students. Frequency determined the number of occurrences of



each error type, while percentage showed the proportion of each error relative to the total errors identified. These statistical tools provided a clear basis for describing and comparing the different categories of stylistic errors.

Ethical Consideration

The researcher secured the necessary approvals and complied with the ethical standards of Norala National High School. Participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and respondents' confidentiality and privacy were protected. All data were used solely for academic purposes and securely stored. The researcher upheld academic integrity by avoiding plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, deceit, and conflicts of interest while ensuring honest reporting and ethical conduct throughout the study.

3. Results and Discussion

This Chapter presents the results of the data gathered on the stylistic errors in written compositions among Grade 12 students of Norala National High School. The findings are organized and analyzed using appropriate statistical tools such as frequency and percentage to provide a clear basis for the proposed intervention program.

Level Of Stylistic Errors in The Written Compositions of Grade 12 Students

Table 1 shows that Grade 12 students commonly exhibited a high occurrence of stylistic errors, particularly in word choice, sentence structure, formality, cohesion, tone, and clarity. These findings highlight the need for targeted interventions to improve students' academic writing skills.

Table 1. Level of Stylistic Errors in the Written Compositions of Grade 12 Students (n=150)

Stylistic Error	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
Word Choice Errors	18 (12%)	70 (46.67%)	25 (16.67%)	23 (15.33%)	14 (9.33%)
Sentence Structure Errors	22 (14.67%)	57 (38%)	34 (22.67%)	26 (17.33%)	11 (7.33%)
Redundancy	24 (16%)	32 (21.33%)	60 (40%)	20 (13.33%)	14 (9.33%)
Formality Issues	25 (16.67%)	65 (43.33%)	29 (19.33%)	17 (11.33%)	14 (9.33%)
Cohesion Errors	34 (22.67%)	62 (41.33%)	21 (14%)	15 (10%)	18 (12%)
Tone Inconsistency	28 (18.67%)	63 (42%)	34 (22.67%)	15 (10%)	10 (6.67%)
Clarity Issues	18 (12%)	63 (42%)	36 (24%)	22 (14.67%)	11 (7.33%)

Discussion

This chapter delves into the interpretation of the research findings, offering a comprehensive analysis of their significance. It also compares the results with existing literature, highlighting key implications and suggesting directions for future research.

Word Choice Errors (Incorrect or inappropriate vocabulary)

The findings indicate varying levels of vocabulary competence among learners, with some requiring greater support than others. Overall, the results suggest the need for continuous vocabulary enrichment to improve word choice in writing.

On the whole, the findings highlight the need to improve learners' vocabulary through contextual learning, guided writing, and increased reading exposure to enhance the quality of written expression (Banquerigo & Quines, 2024).

Researchers agree that improving learners' vocabulary requires context-rich instruction, including guided writing, extensive reading, and communicative activities. (Booth Olson et al., 2023). Overall, the literature supports a blended approach to effectively reduce word choice errors and enhance



writing skills (Masruddin & Nasriandi, 2022; Yan, 2023; Evendi et al., 2022; Gildore et al., 2023; Phung et al., 2024; Shafamarwa et al., 2024).

Sentence Structure Errors (Run-ons, fragments, awkward phrasing)

The findings reveal that sentence structure errors are the most common among learners, particularly run-on sentences, fragments, and awkward phrasing. These errors indicate limited mastery of syntactic rules, likely due to insufficient writing practice and corrective feedback.

The findings indicate that sentence structure errors are widespread among learners, highlighting the need for targeted instruction in sentence construction, grammar awareness, and writing fluency. Guided practice in correcting run-ons and fragments, along with exposure to well-structured model sentences, can improve writing accuracy, clarity, and coherence (Nunes et al., 2022; van Rijt et al., 2022; Yeadon et al., 2023).

Researchers consistently indicate that sentence structure errors are strongly linked to learners' limited syntactic awareness and insufficient practice in constructing complex sentences. Naini and Ulya (2025) and Setiawan and Surahmat (2021) emphasize that weak understanding of sentence boundaries often leads to run-ons, fragments, and unclear phrasing, affecting overall readability. These perspectives reinforce the present finding of widespread sentence structure errors among learners (Arcilla et al., 2025; Kang et al., 2024; Maamuujav, 2021).

Redundancy (Repetition of words/ideas)

The findings suggest that redundancy occurs regularly among learners, indicating a developing ability to express ideas but occasional difficulty in maintaining conciseness. As a result, their writing may appear repetitive, highlighting the need to improve conciseness and eliminate unnecessary repetition.

The results indicate that redundancy is a common issue among learners, highlighting the need for instruction in concise writing, paraphrasing, and revision strategies. Improving these skills can reduce unnecessary repetition and enhance the overall quality of learners' writing (Matsuda, 2024; Pardamean et al., 2022; Truckenmiller et al., 2021).

Researchers explain redundancy in student writing as a combined effect of limited lexical control and developing discourse organization skills. Chang et al. (2021) emphasize that repetition often occurs when learners lack paraphrasing ability and a sufficient range of vocabulary, leading to repeated reliance on familiar expressions. These perspectives align with the observed variation in learners' conciseness skills (Fu & Relyea, 2024; Long, 2022; Tambunan et al., 2022).

Formality Issues (Informal language in academic writing)

The frequent use of informal language may reflect the influence of digital communication, where conversational language is commonly practiced. This suggests that many learners still struggle to maintain the formal tone required in academic writing, highlighting the need to strengthen their understanding of academic style conventions.

The results reveal varying levels of difficulty in maintaining academic formality, with some learners frequently using informal expressions while others demonstrate better control. Overall, the findings indicate uneven proficiency in applying an appropriate academic tone, highlighting the need for continued practice in formal writing (Nunes et al., 2022; van Rijt et al., 2022; Yeadon et al., 2023).

Formality issues in learners' writing are influenced by digital language exposure and limited awareness of academic register, which aligns with the observed variability in learners' ability to maintain a formal tone (Banquerigo & Quines, 2024).



Cohesion Errors (Poor transitions and flow)

The results indicate that cohesion errors are common among learners, suggesting difficulty in maintaining smooth transitions and logical flow. This reflects limited mastery of transitional devices and organizational strategies, making cohesion a key area for improvement.

The data reveal that cohesion errors are common among learners, highlighting the need for instruction in transitional devices, paragraph organization, and logical sequencing of ideas to improve coherence (Nunes et al., 2022; van Rijt et al., 2022; Yeadon et al., 2023).

Interestingly, cohesion errors in learners' writing are generally understood as a reflection of difficulties in organizing ideas into logically connected discourse. Seddik (2023) explains that limited control over transitional devices often results in fragmented ideas and weak paragraph flow. These perspectives align with the observed prevalence of weak textual flow among learners (Matsuda, 2024; Pardamean et al., 2022; Truckenmiller et al., 2021).

Tone Inconsistency (Shifting tone within writing)

The frequent occurrence of tone inconsistency suggests that many learners struggle to maintain a consistent academic voice, often shifting between conversational and academic styles. This highlights the need to strengthen learners' understanding and application of appropriate academic tone.

The data indicate that tone inconsistency is a common issue among learners, highlighting the need for instruction and practice in maintaining a consistent academic voice. Reading model texts and revising tone can improve the clarity and professionalism of academic writing (Arcilla et al., 2025; Kang et al., 2024; Maamuujav, 2021).

From a broader analytical perspective, tone inconsistency in learners' writing is widely interpreted as a manifestation of incomplete mastery of academic register and difficulties in maintaining a stable writing voice. Ramos (2021) explains that shifts between formal and informal language often occur when learners have limited control over sustaining an appropriate academic tone throughout extended discourse. These perspectives align with the observed variation in learners' ability to maintain a consistent academic voice (Matsuda, 2024; Pardamean et al., 2022; Truckenmiller et al., 2021).

Clarity Issues (Ambiguous or unclear expressions)

The results show that clarity issues are common among learners, indicating difficulty in expressing ideas clearly and precisely. This can reduce the effectiveness of communication, highlighting the need to improve clarity in writing.

A considerable number of learners exhibit moderate to high levels of clarity issues, indicating occasional to persistent difficulty in expressing ideas precisely. Overall, the findings suggest varying levels of writing clarity among learners, with only a few demonstrating strong control over clear expression (Gildore et al., 2023; Phung et al., 2024; Shafamarwa et al., 2024).

The data indicate that clarity issues are common among learners, highlighting the need for instruction in clear, precise, and well-organized writing. Providing guided practice and feedback can help improve the clarity and overall quality of students' academic work (Banquerigo & Quines, 2024).

Clarity issues in learners' writing are commonly understood as a result of limited precision in language use and difficulties in organizing ideas coherently. Sholahuddin et al. (2021) explains that ambiguous expressions often stem from weak control over vocabulary selection and sentence



construction, which leads to unclear communication of ideas. (Matsuda, 2024; Pardamean et al., 2022; Truckenmiller et al., 2021).

4. Conclusion

The findings of the study reveal that learners experience a high level of writing difficulties across all identified areas, including word choice, sentence structure, redundancy, formality, cohesion, tone consistency, and clarity. These results indicate that the writing problems are widespread rather than isolated, suggesting that many learners struggle to produce writing that is accurate, coherent, concise, and appropriate for academic contexts. Furthermore, the study highlights the importance of stylistic error analysis in identifying recurring writing weaknesses. The analysis shows that learners consistently face challenges related to vocabulary use, sentence construction, organization, tone, and clarity. These are specific and recurring patterns of errors that require focused instructional support rather than general writing correction. Based on these findings, the study concludes that targeted intervention programs are necessary to improve learners' writing proficiency. Programs such as Enhancing Lexical Competence, Strengthening Sentence Structure, and other writing enhancement strategies can effectively address these recurring difficulties, leading to improved academic writing skills and overall academic performance.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Department of Education, school administrators, and curriculum planners may strengthen writing instruction by prioritizing regular and structured writing practice in the classroom. Schools may allocate sufficient time for writing activities that allow learners to consistently practice word choice, sentence construction, coherence, and clarity. Instructional strategies may also be improved through the use of explicit teaching, model-based writing, guided practice, and immediate corrective feedback to address specific writing errors. Teachers may be provided with continuous professional development training focused on effective writing pedagogy and error-based instruction.

Furthermore, school heads and English teachers may actively implement the proposed intervention programs through sustained classroom-based activities that directly target learners' writing difficulties. These interventions may be consistently monitored to ensure that progress in writing skills is properly tracked and evaluated. Teachers may integrate engaging writing activities such as journal writing, paragraph expansion tasks, peer editing, and collaborative writing exercises to strengthen student engagement.

References

1. Agyapong, B., Obuobi-Donkor, G., Burbach, L., & Wei, Y. (2022). Stress, burnout, anxiety and depression among teachers: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(17), 10706. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710706>
2. Allbright, T. N., Marsh, J. A., Kennedy, K. E., Hough, H. J., & McKibben, S. (2019). Social-emotional learning practices: Insights from outlier schools. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 12(1), 35–52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-02-2019-0020>
3. Attard, C., & Holmes, K. (2022). An exploration of teacher and student perceptions of blended learning in four secondary mathematics classrooms. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 34(4), 719–740. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13394-020-00359-2>
4. Batubara, B. M. (2021). The problems of the world of education in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute Journal*, 4(1), 450–457. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i1.1626>



5. Biswas, B., Roy, S. K., & Roy, F. (2020). Students perception of mobile learning during COVID-19 in Bangladesh: University student perspective. <https://doi.org/10.29333/aquademia/8443>
6. Cardichon, J., Darling-Hammond, L., Yang, M., Scott, C., Shields, P. M., & Burns, D. (2020). Inequitable opportunity to learn: Student access to certified and experienced teachers. Learning Policy Institute. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED603398>
7. Carroll, A., Forrest, K., Sanders-O'Connor, E., Flynn, L., Bower, J. M., Fynes-Clinton, S., & Ziaei, M. (2022). Teacher stress and burnout in Australia: Examining the role of intrapersonal and environmental factors. *Social Psychology of Education*, 25(2), 441–469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09686-7>
8. Chin, M. J., Quinn, D. M., Dhaliwal, T. K., & Lovison, V. S. (2020). Bias in the air: A nationwide exploration of teachers' implicit racial attitudes, aggregate bias, and student outcomes. *Educational Researcher*, 49(8), 566–578. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20937240>
9. Elangovan, S., Mahrous, A., & Marchini, L. (2020). Disruptions during a pandemic: Gaps identified and lessons learned. *Journal of Dental Education*, 84(11), 1270–1274. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jdd.12236>
10. Fabbro, A., Fabbro, F., Capurso, V., D'Antoni, F., & Crescentini, C. (2020). Effects of mindfulness training on school teachers' self-reported personality traits as well as stress and burnout levels. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 127(3), 515–532. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003151252090870>
11. Gamage, S. H., Ayres, J. R., & Behrend, M. B. (2022). A systematic review on Moodle usage in teaching and learning. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 9(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00323-x>
12. Heilporn, G., Lakhal, S., & B  lisle, M. (2021). An examination of teachers' strategies to foster student engagement in blended learning in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00260-3>
13. Huck, C., & Zhang, J. (2021). Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on K–12 education: A systematic literature review. *New Waves-Educational Research and Development Journal*, 24(1), 53–84. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1308731>
14. Maatuk, A. M., Elberkawi, E. K., Aljawarneh, S., Rashaideh, H., & Alharbi, H. (2022). The COVID-19 pandemic and e-learning: Challenges and opportunities from the perspective of students and instructors. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 34(1), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-021-09274-2>
15. Montacute, R., & Cullinane, C. (2021). Learning in lockdown. Sutton Trust. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED613179>
16. Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher Education for the Future*, 8(1), 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481>
17. Raes, A., Detienne, L., Windey, I., & Depaepe, F. (2020). A systematic literature review on synchronous hybrid learning. *Learning Environments Research*, 23(3), 269–290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-019-09303-z>
18. Sanusi, I. T., Oyelere, S. S., & Omidiora, J. O. (2022). Exploring teachers' preconceptions of teaching machine learning in high school. *Computers and Education Open*, 3, 100072. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2021.100072>
19. Taghizadeh, M., & Hasani Yourdshahi, Z. (2020). Integrating technology into young learners' classes. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(8), 982–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1618876>



20. Tarkar, P. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on education system. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(9), 3812–3814.
21. Turner, K., & Theilking, M. (2019). Teacher wellbeing: Its effects on teaching practice and student learning. *Issues in Educational Research*, 29(3), 938–960.
22. Vargas Rubilar, N., & Oros, L. B. (2021). Stress and burnout in teachers during times of pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 756007. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.756007>
23. Westphal, A., Kalinowski, E., Hoferichter, C. J., & Vock, M. (2022). K–12 teachers' stress and burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 920326. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.920326>
24. Yu, L., Yazici, V. O., Liu, X., Weijer, J. V. D., Cheng, Y., & Ramisa, A. (2019). Learning metrics from teachers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (pp. 2907–2916). <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019>
25. Zhu, X., & Liu, J. (2020). Education in and after COVID-19: Immediate responses and long-term visions. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 2(3), 695–699. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00126-3>