

AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' GRAMMATICAL ERRORS AND THE STRATEGIES TO COPE WITH THEIR ERRORS

Suci Ambarwati

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,

English Education Department,

University of Islam Malang

21701073015@unisma.ac.id

Abstract: This article aims to describe the kinds of grammatical errors, to discover the sources of the errors, and to find out the strategies in grammatical errors. This study applied a descriptive qualitative research design. The subject was 28 students' of the second-semester students of the English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of the University of Islam Malang. The instruments of this study were students' descriptive text and also use the questionnaires by Pawlak (2018). From the data, the total grammatical errors made by the students were 76 items, with 33 items or 43.4% omission errors, 21 items or 27.6% addition errors, 15 items or 19.7% misinformation errors, and misordering 7 item or 9.2% misordering errors. Moreover, the grammatical errors made by the students were caused by intralingual errors with 69 items, and interlingual with 7 items. It also could be seen that metacognitive and cognitive strategies are the most grammatical strategies that are used by the students, then followed by social strategies and affective strategies become the lowest strategies. To sum up, the student's still lack of knowledge about grammar rules and mostly the errors are caused by intralingual factors. The suggestions from the researcher for the next researchers are to work more on the solutions of the sources of the errors made by the students and to find out the Grammar learning strategies that are appropriate for the students.

Key Words : Error Analysis, Types of Grammatical Errors, Sources of Errors, Descriptive Text, and Grammar Learning Strategie

INTRODUCTION

An error is something that is often found in students' writing. Errors in writing are an unavoidable aspect of English writing for English Foreign Learner (EFL) students since English writing is a difficult process for EFL students. It's because a student should be able to create concepts, organize a text's structure, construct words, phrases, and paragraphs, and apply proper mechanics like punctuation and connections all at the same time. According to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), in their study, the term 'errors' refers to parts of a conversation or a composition that deviate from a selected norm's advanced language output. People cannot learn a language without making errors regularly.

It cannot be separated from the discussion of error analysis when discussing errors made by students. Error analysis is the process of observing, analyzing, and classifying departures from the rules of a second language and subsequently revealing the systems used by the learner. This is known as 'error analysis'. (Brown, 1980). It means that error analysis is necessary to have a better understanding of students' English ability profiles.

Many students made errors in their text, Agustina (2016) stated that grammatical errors are the most common errors in students' writing, including errors in omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. According to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's (1982) theory, error sentences can be divided into four categories: omission, addition, misordering, and misformation. The absence of an item or morpheme that must appear in a well-formed utterance is known as omission (Dulay *et al.*, 1982). Furthermore, an omission occurs when students fail to write the appropriate items that must appear in the sentence, addition error was applying unnecessary items in a sentence is a form, misformation error was the use of the incorrect form of the morpheme or structure. Some of the students are wrong in using "be" (am, is, and are), wrong in using an auxiliary verb (has/have) and an object pronoun and misordering errors were the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance.

The concept of grammar was conducted by Ur (1991), who stated that grammar is the process of producing meaning from a group of words and it describes how language works. When students make errors in writing a text, of course there is a source for the errors made. Therefore, the researcher also analyzed the sources of errors made by students in writing descriptive texts based on Richard's (1974) theory. According to Richard's, there are 2 types of errors, namely intralingual and interlingual. Intralingual errors include overgeneralization, inadequate rule execution, and an inability to recognize the proper application of rules under specific conditions. While Interlingual errors are errors caused by the L1 rules that native languages have when they want to produce a language target (Richard, 1974).

English grammar is very complex, so it makes many students confused about understanding and using it. Many students face grammar problems when studying for language learning. It is in line with Brown (1980), learners will face greater challenges as they advance in their language learning, such as in pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, and other aspects of the language. Grammar is one of the things that makes it difficult for students to learn a language. Knowing the right strategy can help students more easily learn the language. This is also supported by Thornbury (1999), who noted that the selection of an appropriate strategy has also been proven to ensure success in future language learning because it aids in the effective learning of a language.

Therefore, the researcher wants to conduct a research to analyze students' grammatical errors and also their strategies to cope with the errors. Based on the research problems, the purpose of this study is to describe the kinds of grammatical errors made by the students in writing descriptive text, to discover the sources of the errors made by the students in writing descriptive text, and to find out the strategies in grammatical errors used by the students to cope their grammatical errors.

METHOD

A descriptive qualitative research design is the research method used in this research. Qualitative research is a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem (Creswell, 2009). The researcher used a qualitative research design because the research was not dealing with statistical analysis. It means that the result of qualitative research is framed by using words or statements rather than numbers.

This research was conducted at the University of Islam Malang, which is located at Jl. Mayjen Haryono 193, Malang. The focus of this study was on the second-semester students in the English Department in the academic year 2020/2021. There were five classes of second-semester students. The researcher chose 28 Students from the class to be the participants. The researcher used purposive sampling to find the subject. The researcher considered some criteria that were appropriate for the study.

In this study, the researcher used students' descriptive text and also questionnaires by pawlak (2018). The human instrument is recognized in the qualitative approach that the researcher acted as the key instrument who built up theories related to the research subject because the qualitative study did not examine a certain hypothesis. Hence, the result is related to the researcher's interpretation. While the questionnaires was adopted by Pawlak (2018), using a 5-Likert scale questionnaires, which consisted of always (5), often (4), sometimes (3), seldom (2), and never (1). The researcher adopted the questionnaires without changing any questions in the questionnaire, also commonly called the adopting instrument (questionnaire).

To analyze the students' grammatical errors, the researcher used the procedures proposed by Ellis (1997), which were to identify errors, describe the errors, and explain the errors (calculate the errors). The descriptive analysis was used to examine the data. In analyzing the data, first, the researcher identified the

students' descriptive text and then classified the errors made by the students based on Dulay's theory (1982), which was an omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. After getting the students' text, the researcher identified and described the grammatical errors that had been found. Identifying was based on analyzing the sentences that contained grammatical errors. Having done so, the types of grammatical errors that consisted of omission, addition, misformation, and misordering of grammar were classified. The next step was to describe the procedure. Furthermore, explaining referred to determining the frequency of errors for each type of error. Every sentence that could have more than one error was subjected to the calculation. Having done so, the researcher calculated the students' grammatical errors to conclude. Therefore, the researcher used the following formula from Sugiyono (2015) to verify the frequency of the grammatical errors in the students' descriptive texts.

Distributing the questionnaires to the students was done by the researcher to answer the third research question. The questionnaires used in this study were closed-type questionnaires. The answer to the questionnaire was determined. The students were given five options from which to choose (always, usually, sometimes, seldom, never). When the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the students, she set aside a day for them to respond to the questions. The questionnaires were distributed in the form of *Google forms*. The researcher analyzed the questionnaire with the following formula, used by Sugiyono (2015).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The data from students' descriptive texts were analyzed, underlined, and identified that contained grammatical errors. From 28 students' descriptive texts, there were 76 grammatical errors found. According to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's classification theory (1982), the researcher found that the students made grammatical errors of all types, including omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The number of errors in each category made by the students' can be seen as below:

Table 1. The Number of Errors in Each Category Made by the Students

Types of errors	Number of Errors	Per-centage
Omission	33	43.4%
Addition	21	27.6%
Misinformation	15	19.7%
Misordering	7	9.2%
Total	76	99.9%

Table 1 showed the omission errors was the highest errors made by the students with the total of errors was 33 items or 43.4%. Then followed by Addition errors which consisted of 21 items or 27.6% become the second highest errors made by the students in writing descriptive text. The next errors made by the students are misfromation errors which consisted of 15 items or 19.7%. This made misinformation errors become the second lowest errors made by the students. The lowest errors made by the students in writing descriptive text were misordering errors which consisted of 7 items or 9.2% errors.

In this study, to figure out the sources of the errors, the researcher analyzes using non-statistical analysis based on the performance data. The sources of the student's grammatical errors were analyzed using Richard's (1974) and Jha's (1991) theories, which are interlingual errors and intralingual errors. The table can be seen in the table below.

Table 2. The Sources of the Errors

Types of errors	Number of Errors	Per-centage
Omission	33	Intralingual
Addition	21	Intralingual
Misinformation	15	Intralingual
Misordering	7	Interlingual
Total	76	

From the table above, the total grammatical errors made by the students were 76

errors. Intralingual errors were the main cause of the errors, with 69 items, or 90.7%, and 7 items, or 9.2% caused by interlingual errors. The researcher also using the questionnaires adopted by Pawlak (2018), and the data can be showed in the table below.

Table 3 Strategy Used by the Students

Types of Strategy	The items	1	2	3	4	5
Metacognitive	I'm always looking for better ways to learn grammar.	0%	0%	3.6%	46.4%	50%
Cognitive	Every grammar rule is something I try to grasp.	0%	0%	7.1%	64.3%	28.6%
Affective	I keep a language learning journal in which I record my thoughts on the subject.	0%	0%	28.6%	60.7%	10.7%
Social	With the help of other students, I practice grammar structures.	0%	0%	17.9%	57.1%	25%

Table 3, showed the percentages from the questionnaires adopted by Pawlak (2018). The researcher found that all the strategies used by the students are metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies. In metacognitive strategies, the item “I'm always looking for better ways to learn grammar” become the highest strategies used by the students with the total percentage was 96.4% students who chose always and usually used this strategies. While the items “Every grammar rule is something I try to grasp” become the highest strategies used in cognitive strategies with the total percentages of the students who chose always and usually used this strategy was 92.9%. Then, the items “I keep a language learning journal in which I record my thoughts on the subject” become the highest strategies used by the students in affective strategy with the total percentages was 71.4% of the students who chose always and usually. The items was “With the help of other students, I practice grammar structures” become the highest percentages from social strategy. The total percentages of the students who chose always and usually in this items was 82.1%.

Related to the findings of this study about grammatical errors, the highest

errors made by students was omission errors which consisted of 33 items. This finding in line with Vera, Heryudin and Herdiyanti (2019) who found that the most common type of error made by the students was an omission. Then, followed by addition errors which consisted of 21 items of errors and supported by the research conducted by Andansari, Sari, and Murwantono (2019), they found the fact that addition became the second error made by students with 14.90% errors.

Misinformation errors become the second lowest errors made by the students in writing descriptive text with the total of errors 15 items. This finding in contrast with study conducted by Anggraeni (2016) who found that misinformation errors became the dominant errors made by students. The lowest errors made by the students was misordering errors with the total items were 7 items. This findings in line with Hendrawaty (2018), who found that misordering become the least errors made by students in writing descriptive text with total error 6.13 %.

Based on the researcher's analysis, the cause of the students' errors was influenced by interlingual errors. The result of the analysis showed that there were 7 items in total showing interlingual errors. The errors were caused by a literal translation. Interlingual errors are influenced by a literal translation (Al-Khresheh, 2010). These errors occurred because the students translated their sentences word by word from their first language to the target language. This is different from the research conducted by Long and Hatcho (2018) conducted in Japan where they found that interlingual was the main cause of errors made by students, they found as many as 51% of responses. Moreover, many students made intralingual errors in the use of grammar. The result of the analysis showed that there were 69 items in total showing intralingual errors. The errors were caused by overgeneralized and false hypotheses. Those errors happened because the students overgeneralized the rule they learned in the target language and failed to understand the distinctions of each grammar rule based on the context so that the students had false conceptualizations about grammar. It can be inferred that intralingual errors are the most dominant errors compared to interlingual errors. This is in line with research

conducted by Angguni (2020) where it was found that there were 114 errors caused by intralingual factors.

From the finding of grammar learning strategies used by the students, it can be showed that metacognitive strategy become the highest strategies used by the students. This finding in line with study conducted by Stephen and Singh (2010) they found that the students' that used metacognitive strategies had a higher score than students that used another strategies. Cognitive strategies become the second highest strategies used by students, it is in line with the study that conducted by It is in line with Nakachi (2021), who claimed that the use of GLS by students majoring in English is dominated by cognitive and metacognitive strategies, which are mostly used by students. The second lowest strategies used by the students was social strategies. This corresponds to the findings of a study conducted by Mulugeta and Bayou (2019), which states that social strategies are more commonly chosen than affective strategies. Social strategies have an average value of 3.15 while affective strategies have an average value of 3.04, which means that the average value of social strategies is higher than the average value of affective strategies. The least strategies used by the students to cope with their grammatical errors were affective strategies. This findings in contrast to research conducted by Supakorn, Feng, and Limmun (2018), which states that Thai people apply better affective strategies than social strategy in terms of self-motivation and relaxation.

All in all, the students still made errors in all types of errors related to Dulay (1982) theory which were omission, addition, misfromation and also misordering. The students still lack of knowledge about the grammatical rules in English context, this is proven by the findings that showed intralingual become the dominants sources of the errors in this study. Students have a positive response to grammatical strategies in writing toward metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, affective strategies, and social strategies.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

After identifying and analyzing grammatical errors made by the second-semester students of the English Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Universitas Islam Malang, then the researcher concluded. The students still do not understand the use of proper grammar rules. It was evidenced by the students' grammatical errors, fulfilling all types of errors based on surface strategy taxonomy theory and the intralingual error was the cause of the majority of errors in the use of grammatical rules because the students still lack the structure knowledge in the English context. The students have applied all types of strategies that are appropriate to cope with grammatical errors. For the future researchers, researchers can also examine the effect of strategy implementation on grammatical errors by using an experimental design.

REFERENCES

- Agustina, T. (2016). Error Analysis in Writing Recount Text. *Journal of Literature, Linguistics, and Language Teaching*, 3(1), 81-90.
- Al-Khresheh, M. (2010). Interlingual Interference in English Language Word Order Structure. *the European Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(1), 49-59.
- Andansari, I., Sari, O. W., & Murwantono, D. (2019). The Students' Error Analysis of Writing in Recount Text for Millennial Students. *Proceeding of the 1st STEEM*, 1, pp. 132-138. Yogyakarta.
- Anggraeni, C. W. (2016). An Error Analysis of Experiential Meaning in Students' Writing of Recount. *Transformatika*, 12(1), 84-97.
- Angguni, R. (2020). Interlingual and Intralingual Errors of Writing Descriptive Text Made by Third Semester Students of English Education Department Sarjanawiyata Tmansiwa Univesity Yogyakarta. *Journal of English Language Teaching (JELLT)*, 4(2), 75-85.

- Brown, H. (1980). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall inc.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (3rd Edition)*. California: SAGE Publication Inc.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hendrawaty, N. (2018). An Analysis on Students' Errors in Writing Sentence Patterns. *LOQUEN*, 1(11), 63-85.
- Long, R., & Hatcho, Y. (2018). The First Language's Impact on L2: Investigating Interlingual and Intralingual Errors. *English Language Teaching*, 11(11), 115-121.
- Mulugeta, F., & Bayou, Y. (2019). Grammar Learning Strategies Use of Preparatory School Students; Gender in Focus. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*, 2, 115-144.
- Nakachi, K. (2021). Grammar Learning Strategies Use by English-Major University Students: An Investigation with Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI). *Nagoya JALT Journal*, 2(1), 53-70.
- Pawlak, M. (2018). Grammar Learning Strategy Inventory (GLSI): Another Look. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 351-379.
- Richard, J. (1974). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman.
- Stephen, S. N., & Singh, X. P. (2010). Learning Grammar Autonomously Through Metacognitive Strategies: An Experiment. *Journal of NELTA*, 15(1-2), 146-150.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D (Alfabeta, Ed.)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.