

## **Grammatical Error in Speaking and Students' Perception at Ten Gradestudents of Sman 7 Bandar Lampung 2017-2018**

Apriana Wiguna

*Postgraduate Program of English Education, Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas lampung*

---

**Abstract:** *Speaking is an important skill to show one of English performance but to perform it well is still hard because many EFL learners produce many errors in their speaking regarding grammatical aspect. The data were collected by asking them to produce short story about their daily activity and memorable experience orally for 2 -5 minutes. The purpose of study are to analyze the types of grammatical errors, to know the frequency of grammatical errors which made by the students in speaking skill and the students' perception after knowing their grammatical errors in their speaking performance. This research is designed in this study was descriptive design by using quantitative approach, the population was the students of X IPA 1 class that consists of 36 students. The total of errors reaches 677 times in the students speaking consists of using simple present tense and simple past tense. The highest frequency of error is misformation which the number of percentage achieves 36%. The second frequency of error is addition which the number of percentage achieves 25%. The third frequency of error is misordering which has number 21%. The last frequency of error is omission which has low number 18%. The result of reliability of the questionnaire is 0.580 and the mean score and standard deviation of students' perception of grammatical error was 40,80 % which categorized into high.*

---

Date of Submission: 25-10-2019

Date of acceptance: 09-11-2019

---

### **I. Introduction**

Speaking in English is more complicated than speaking in a native language for a second or foreign language learner. Usually, speaking happens in a real time and spontaneously. It forces the students produce the utterances in the target language directly. Moreover, there are many aspects that must be considered in speaking, for instance grammar. Nevertheless, every language has its own grammar which makes the students feel more complicated. Thus, many EFL learners committed errors in their speaking; actually, producing errors is an unavoidable thing in learning a language (Hassan & Sawalmeh, 2013; Tomkova, 2013). However, it cannot be seen as students' failure since it can be as evidence that students are in the process of acquiring a language (Corder, 1967), for instance, the students of X IPA1 SMAN 7 Bandar Lampung. Although they have learned English, they also committed errors in their speaking, especially in grammatical aspect. Since they produce many errors, their speaking was hard to understand. Therefore, it is important to help the students reduce their errors. Furthermore, to diagnose the causes of problems, there is a systematic way called error analysis. In the field of error analysis, a number of studies have been conducted which focused on the grammatical error in speaking, There are Muhamad et. al (2013), Alahmadi (2014) and Amara (2015). The studies demonstrated how error analysis can be used to provide the information for teachers about the errors made by learners in their speaking. However, in Indonesia, there is a few error analysis studies conducted in term of speaking skill. The writer was interested in conducting error analysis study to find out the dominant grammatical errors, the causes of errors committed by the students and the students' perception of the grammatical mistake in speaking

### **II. Material and Method**

The design used in this research is descriptive design by using quantitative approach. Descriptive study is the design in the research that obtains the information focusing on current status and phenomena. They are directed toward determining the nature of situation, as it exists at the time of study. In descriptive study, there is no control or treatment as in experimental study. The population of this research is X IPA 1 of SMAN 7 Bandar Lampung academic year 2017/2018. There are 36 students who become the sample. In this class, there are 14 males and 22 females. The sampling technique used in this research is stratified random sampling. The instrument of this research is documentation of speaking test. In addition, the data collecting method is the documentation method. There are procedures to collect until analyze the data in this research. Firstly, the researcher asks the students to present their speech related to daily activities and past experienced in the past which has been assigned a week ago. Secondly, the researcher records the students speaking on test. The researcher records students speaking test from beginning until ending. Thirdly, the researcher transcribes the

students speaking test from recording. The data analysis in this are identifying the errors made by the students. Below is a simple formula to obtain the percentage of errors occur:

$$X = \frac{N}{NT} \times 100\%$$

Note:

X : percentage of errors type

N : the number of a particular type of error

Nt : the total number of all types of errors

After the errors have been identified, the next step is classifying them into their types. The errors that are made by students are classified by using surface taxonomy strategy as stated by Dulay et.al (1982). They are error of omission, addition, misformation and misordering. In addition to know the students' perception toward the grammatical error, the researcher give the questionnaire which is consisted of ten items. As stated in (Setiyadi, 2006:16) that reliability refers the consistency of the test, and how the test can measure the same subject in different time but it has the same result, then the researcher used Cronbach Alpha to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. The criteria of reliability, that is 0.80 up to 1.00 is very high

- 0,60 up to 0,79 is high
- 0,40 up to 0,59 is average
- 0,20 up to 0,39 is low
- 0,0 up to 0,19 is very low

The students are given 30 minutes to answer the questionnaire which cover 10 positive statements by responding whether they were: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree or strongly disagree with the statement. The questionnaire was analyzed based on the percentage of each answer and the researcher analyzed the questionnaire based on the Linkert scale measurement in Sugiyono (2011: 134). The total of students' response were divided to 30 (the number of the total respondents) each experimental class, then multiplied to 100% that can be seen in the following table. The result of the questionnaire is used to know the students' perception in grammatical error that they have made in speaking.

### III. Result

To know the errors that are going to be the focus in the process of identification are error in using grammatical features in speaking test. The speaking test is analyzed by using error in the use of simple past tense and simple present. The results of the students' speaking were not same. The student was asked to speak in front of the class. In addition, every student needed for about 2-3 minutes to perform. In this class, consist of 36 students. It means that the test needed 135 minutes or three hours school time. In this class the teacher gave the title about "My memorable experience" and "My daily activities", the teacher gave the title a week before the test. The teacher gave title a week before test because the teacher hoped the students can train speaking at home. After a week, the teacher asked students to speak in front of the class, the students were asked to speaking about the statement based on title. From this test the researcher found error in students speaking class. Below is the student's error in speaking test which researcher had identified:

**Table 4.1 Tabulation of Grammatical Features Error**

Aspect	Type of Errors				TOTAL
	OM	AD	MF	MO	
Simple present tense	49	80	144	56	329
Simple past tense	76	93	98	81	348
Total	125	173	242	137	677
Percentage	18%	25%	36%	21%	100%

Om = Ommision

Ad = Addition

Mf = Misformation

Mo = Misordering

**Table 4.2** Result of Reliability of statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach,s Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of items
580	585	10

Based on the table above, the researcher found that the result of reliability of the questionnaire is 580. It means that the questionnaire of this researcher has moderate reliability.

**Table 4.3** The Percentage of the students' perceptions of knowing grammatical error in speaking.

Interval Score	Category	Jigsaw Technique	
		F	%
84 -100	Very high	14	38, 89
68 – 83	high	22	61 , 11
52 – 67	moderate	0	0
36 - 51	low	0	0
20 -35	Very low	0	0
Total		36	100

Table 4.3 is about students interval scores of questionnaire and it presented that there were 14 (38,3) of the students felt strongly positive, 22 ( 61,11%) of the students felt positive and none of the students felt neutral, negative and strongly negative respectively. Furthermore, the mean score and standard deviation of the students' perception toward grammatical error in their speaking was 41,23 and 3,803

#### IV. Discussion

##### 1. Error Aspect of Grammatical Features

The error that happened in grammatical error which was made by students of X IPA1 in speaking skills is four types. They are omission, addition, misformation, andmisordering. Omission is the type of error that is characterized by the absence of item that actually needed inwell formed sentence. Addition errors are the errors that are characterized by the presence of item that mustnot appear in words formed utterance/sentence. Misformation errors are the errors that are characterized by using wrong form in morpheme and structure. Misordering errors are characterized by the incorrect placement ofmorpheme or group of morpheme in utterance.

##### 2. The Frequencies of Grammatical Features Error

Based on the data that has been analyzed by students, the highest frequency of errors happened in applying grammatical made by students in speaking skill is misinformation which reaches 36% from the totalof errors. Misformation errors are the errors that are characterized by the use of wrong form in morphemeand structure. The abundance of misformation errors can be caused by the minimum knowledge about thepattern of such structure in language. Because of the lack of knowledge about the structure, the students mayuse the structure as they are able without paying attention to the right rule. For example the tense pattern,actually the rule or the pattern of tense must be understood by the one before he/she utters the utterances.Based on the data that has been identified, the students often made error in the case of using regularverb marker in the simple past. The sentence is in the simple past.Azhar (1989;24) states in her book that simple past tense is a tense indicates that an activity andsituation began and ended at a particular time in the past. In applying simple past tense rule, the studentsshould know that the verb used in simple past tense is verb 2. Verb 2 can be divided in two types; they areregular and irregular verb. The regular verb is the verb has such characteristic. The characteristic of regularverb is marked by the addition of "d/ed". However, the students often use verb 1 form to express the event inpast time. In applying that rule, students often misuse the marker, so "the verb" or "to be" or "modal" can beconsidered as false construction. The second highest frequencies of grammatical errors that are made by students in speaking class areaddition which reaches 25% from the total of errors. Addition errors are the errors that are characterized by the presence of item that must not appear in well-formed utterance/sentence.

According to the data, the students often add "to be" that is actually is not needed in well-formed sentence. The example of this error is "it is can think". In this case the student adds is before modal that is much forbidden. The other error can be seen in this example "they isstill have pure mind". In this case the student adds "is after the subject that is not allowed in simple present. To be (is, am, are) is not used in simple present tense of verbal.The third highest frequency of grammatical errors made by students based on the data that has beenidentified is the errors of misordering which reaches 21% from the total of errors. Misordering errors are characterized by the incorrect placement of morpheme or group of morpheme in a utterance or sentence. Based on the data that has been identified by the researcher, the students ever make the inplacement of such in constructing sentence. The example taken from the data "Who i'am". In that sentence, the student makes in incorrect form, because that sentence is interrogative sentence the student should utter such as "who am I".The

least grammatical error made by the students of second semester in speaking class is the error of Omission which reaches 18% from the total of errors. Omission errors are the errors that are characterized by the absence of item that actually needed in well formed sentence. The abundance of omission errors can be caused by the minimum knowledge about the right structure in English. Because of the lack of knowledge about the structure, the students may lose the structure, as they are able without paying attention to the right role. For example, the tense pattern, actually the rule or the pattern of tense must be understood by the one before he/she makes sentence. Based on data that has been identified, the students often make error in the use of "to be" to make sentence in simple present tense, many of them still omit "to be" to compose the sentence in explaining nominal sentence. It may be caused by the lack of knowledge or bad memorizing of "to be" in simple present tense. On the other hand, sometimes in simple present uses s/es; unless the students omit "s/es" to construct verbal sentence particularly in the third singular person or singular noun.

## V. Conclusion

In the conclusion, the researcher presents that students made error in omission, addition, misinformation, and misordering. Omission is characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in the well formed utterance. Addition is an opponent of omission which is defined as characterized by the presence of an item, which must not appear in the well formed utterance. Misinformation is characterized by the use of wrong form of the structure. Misordering is characterized by the incorrect placement of group in an utterance. In addition, the students' error is suitable as stated by Dulay. The total of errors reach 677 times in the students speaking consists of using simple present tense and simple past tense. The highest frequency of error is misinformation which the number of percentage achieves 36%. The second frequency of error is addition which the number of percentage achieves 25%. The third frequency of error is misordering which has number 21%. The last frequency of error is omission which has low number 18%. From the result of the questionnaire, it was found that the students' perception toward the grammatical error of their speaking showed the positive perception. The conclusion has been presented by the researcher.

In the last explanation, the researcher presents some suggestion for the teacher can give treatment to the students towards their errors. The students' treatment can be made as a focus of developing students' weakness which can be seen from the tabulation of errors. The weakest aspect their capability in using simple present and past tenses can be more sensitive to the aspect error which occur the most. The teacher should be more sensitive to the error made by students; and the teacher should give explanation as feedback for them. They have known errors they made. The students should learn from their mistakes; and they should not do the same mistake. The students should pay attention on the error, and if it is necessary, they should look for more information or explanation from the teachers of reviewing related book. The other researchers are suggested use better method to collect the data of their research. He/she should present the findings better and systematically, so that it can be understood well and have more benefit to the reader. Furthermore, the other researcher is also suggested not only focus on simple tenses in his/her research. He/she should add other aspect of that need analyzed. Moreover, the other researchers can identify the other error better than the researcher did.

## Reference

- [1]. Ancker, William, Errors and Corrective feedback: up dated theory and ideas rooms practice vol.34 no.4, October 2000.
- [2]. Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy; Second Edition. New York: Longman.
- [3]. Celce, Marianne Murcia, Teaching English as a Second or a Foreign Language second edition, Oxford: Heinle & Heinle Publishers, 1991.
- [4]. Dulay, Heidi. C. 1982. Language Two. New York: Oxford University Press. Ellis, Rodd. 1986. Understanding Second Language Acquisition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [5]. Erdogan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 1(2), 261–270.
- [6]. ERIC DIGEST. <http://www.ericdigest.org/pre-923/speaking.htm>.
- [7]. Hassan, M., & Sawalmeh, M. (2013). Error Analysis of Written English Essays: The case of Students of the Preparatory Year Program in Saudi Arabia. English for Specific Purposes World, 14(40), 1–17.
- [8]. Hojati, A. (2013). An Investigation of Errors in the Oral Performance of Advanced-level Iranian EFL Students, 4(4), 171–180.
- [9]. Holtgraves, T. (2008). Handbook of communication competence. In G. Rickheit & H. Strohner (Eds.), Handbooks of applied linguistics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Linh, V. T. N. (2013). Grammatical Errors Made By English Major Students At Haiphong Private University When Speaking English And The Solutions. Haiphong Private University.
- [10]. Schramfer Azar, Betty. 1989. Understanding and Using Grammar Second Edition, Edisi Inggris-Indonesia. Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara
- [11]. Richards, J and Renandya, A. 2002. Methodology in Language Teaching. New York: Cambridge. University Press.
- [12]. Setiyadi, A.G.B 2006. Metode Penelitian Untuk Pengajaran bahasa Asing, Yogyakarta : Graha Ilmu.
- [13]. Shohamy, E. 1985. A Practical Handbook in Language Testing for the second language Teacher
- [14]. Sugiono, 2011. Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D. Bandung: Alfabeta
- [15]. Muhamad, A. J., Shah, M. I. A., Ibrahim, E. H. E., Sarudin, I., Malik, F. A., & Ghani, R. A. (2013). Oral Presentation Errors of Malaysian Students in an English for Academic Purposes Course. World Applied Sciences Journal, 21(Special Issue), 19–27.
- [16]. Mustafa, F., Mulya, K., & Bahri Ys, S. (2016). Errors in EFL writing by junior high students in Indonesia. International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 6(6), 1–14.

- [17]. Saad, M. A. H., & Sawalmeh, M. H. M. (2014). Error Analysis in Role-play Presentations among Less Proficient L2 Malaysian Learners. *International Journal of English Education*, 3(3), 170-181.
- [18]. Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge Introductions to Language and Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [19]. Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to teach speaking*. New York: Pearson Longman. Grammatical Errors: An Analysis in Speaking Produced by EFL Undergraduate Students by Safrida HG, Usman Kasim 80Tomkova, G. (2013). *Error Correction in Spoken Practice*. Masaryk: Masaryk University.
- [20]. Wee, R., Sim, J., & Jusoff, K. (2010). Verb-form errors in EAP writing. *Educational Research and Review Journal*, 5(1), 16–23.

Apriana Wiguna" Grammatical Error in Speaking and Students' Perception at Ten Gradestudents of Sman 7 Bandar Lampung 2017-2018" *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)* , vol. 9, no. 6, 2019, pp. 49-53.