

Grammatical Errors in Speaking Made by IPIEF Students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (Case Study on IPIEF Students Batch 2017)

Sri Ani Puji Setiawati*

Lecturer, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY), Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: Sri Ani Puji Setiawati

| Received: 05.03.2019 | Accepted: 18.03.2019 | Published: 30.03.2019

DOI: [0.21276/sjahss.2019.7.3.11](https://doi.org/10.21276/sjahss.2019.7.3.11)

Abstract

Original Research Article

International Program for Islamic Economics and Finance (IPIEF) of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta has a vision to become a leading international program in ASEAN by 2021. So, the IPIEF students are expected to be fluent in English both spoken and written. Therefore, in order to enhance the fluency, English is a compulsory subject should be taken by the students. The research aims to describe the form of grammatical errors made by IPIEF students batch 2017 of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta using Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The research was conducted in the English II class named Free Conversation class. The data were collected using recording technique and transcriptions were made after that. Then, the data were analyzed by error analysis and written using qualitative descriptive approach. The result of the research shows: the total errors found was 115 errors, included: 1) the most type of errors appeared in the students' speaking are misformation occurred for 44.3%; 2) The sources of errors in the students' speaking are false concept hypothesis (33%), ignorance the rule restriction (31.3%), incomplete application of rule (27%), and overgeneralization (8.7%). Based on the result of the research, it is suggested that the students pay attention on the errors and if it necessary they need to look for assistance to practice their speaking skills either from their lecturer or other friends.

Keywords: grammatical error, sources of errors, speaking, surface strategy taxonomy.

Copyright @ 2019: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use (NonCommercial, or CC-BY-NC) provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

The International Program for Islamic Economics and Finance of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (IPIEF UMY) has a vision to become a leading international program in ASEAN by 2021. To achieve the vision mentioned above, IPIEF focusses on four missions including: internationalization, academic excellence, research and community empowerment. The researcher underlines the internationalization mission since one of the point to personalize it is by using international language in its operational activities, both in learning process and other supported activities, such as seminar. The IPIEF students are expected to be able to speak in English fluently, both in spoken and written.

Speaking skill as a form of oral language skills has a very large role in daily life, both in the community and in the educational environment. In language learning, especially in speaking foreign language, students are expected to be able to speak. However, speaking orally is not easy, especially when speaking in a foreign language, such as English. Considering the issue, English becomes a compulsory subject should be

taken by the IPIEF students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (UMY).

Making errors in speaking and writing is a part of the English learning process. Many types of errors arise when students speak or write something because they do not master the English grammar well. Spillner emphasizes errors produced in the process of foreign language acquisition are thought to be caused by more or less unconscious transfer of mother tongue structures to the system of the target language. It is natural that errors found in students speaking.

Analyzing errors is needed in language learning process because some students cannot explain their problem because they do not know how to do something they have not understood. By analyzing errors, the teacher can use several inputs related to the language learning process, including students' difficulties and also information about students' grammar achievement. In addition, the teacher can determine the right method.

Hence, the researcher is interested in conducting research about verbal (speaking) error analysis made by the IPIEF students in their second semester English

class because they have just graduated from various high schools with different speaking skill level in English. The researcher thinks it is important to know the errors made by them in order to improve their speaking skill in the following semesters.

From the above discussion, the researcher conducted a research entitled “Grammatical Errors in Speaking Made By IPIEF Students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (Case Study on IPIEF Students Batch 2017). The research aims to describe the grammatical errors in conversation carried by the second semester IPIEF students of UMY.

Considering the background explained above, the researcher can conclude the research questions as follow:

- What are some grammatical errors in speaking made by IPIEF students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta?
- What are the possible sources of errors made by the second semester IPIEF students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta?

Previous Works

Research on grammatical errors actually has often been conducted, yet the object and its objectives are various. Some of them are as follows;

Titien Setyarini [1] conducted a study entitled *Common Grammatical Errors in Writing Made by the First Semester Students of English Department of IAIN Tulungagung*. In her research, Setyarini concluded that the general grammatical errors in the writing first semester students at IAIN Tulungagung was caused by misformation. While the source of the errors in students’ writing is overgeneralization, ignorance of regulatory restrictions, the application of rules and concepts of incomplete hypotheses.

Another study discusses about grammatical errors is a study conducted by Lisa Anggraini [2] entitled *Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Speaking Students of German Literature Department, State University of Malang (Based on Surface Taxonomy)*. In her research, Anggraini concluded that grammatical errors were due to several things including (1) omission, (2) addition, (3) misformation, and (4) misordering.

Habibullah [3] in his research entitled *An Error Analysis on Grammatical Structure of the Students Thesis of Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University in Jakarta Academic year 2010* suggested that the type of errors most commonly found in students theses is negligene and the source of errors is the learning strategy of the target language. In conclusion, the students who have graduated from university still make mistakes in their thesis.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Emphasizing the grammatical errors made by IPIEF students of UMY, the following will explain some theories related to the analysis of grammatical errors in speaking;

Error Analysis

Error analysis is the identification, description and explanation of errors that occur both in oral and written form. Brown [4], states errors analysis is the study of students’ errors that can be observed, analyzed, and classified to reveal something of the system operating within the students.

Error analysis is used to show the students’ problem. Moreover, it gives information to teacher about the process of acquiring a foreign language made by students. Corder in Richard [5], said that there are three significant errors of the students. First, errors can tell the teacher about the students’ progress and how far the students can apply the teacher’s method. Secondly, they tell the researcher how actually language is learned; therefore researcher through errors discover strategies applied in acquiring a language. The last, errors can serve as a good feedback to learners for self-adjustment, hence they will not make the same errors again.

Concept of Grammatical Error

The word grammar has several meanings and there is no universally accepted definition. Different experts define the term grammar differently. There is no fixed definition of grammar.

Helen [6], states that grammar is essentially about the system and patterns human use to select and combine words. Grammar meant as certain rules and guidance to put words together as sentence and make a good writing. So, the sentences will be logic and grammatical.

According to Yulianti in Arifin [7], grammatical errors are defined as noticeable deviation which are considered ungrammatical or break any grammar rules. The grammar rule as what has been used in school or what we called as Standard English.

Dulay *et al.* [8], said that errors are the flawed side of learner speech or writing. People cannot learn language without first systematically committing errors.

In addition, Dulay *et al.* [8] presented the most useful and commonly used bases for the descriptive classification of errors into four taxonomies, namely linguistic category taxonomy, surface strategy taxonomy, comparative taxonomy, and communicative effect taxonomy. However, in this research, the researcher uses only one category, surface strategy taxonomy because the one that deals mainly with the structure. Surface strategy taxonomy highlights the way

surface structures are altered. The surface strategy elements of a language are altered in specific and systematic ways. Among the common errors are:

- **Omission Errors**

Omission should be distinguished from ellipsis and zero, which are allowed by the grammar (indeed are powerful grammatical resources). Omission errors are characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. Language learners omit grammatical morphemes much more frequently than content words.

e.g.: She give me a gift on my birthday.

In the example above, the subject (she) is 3rd singular person. In the simple present tense rule, if the subject is 3rd singular person, the verb should be attached s/es. So, the correct sentence is:

She *gives* me a gift on my birthday.

- **Addition Errors**

Addition is the opposite of omission. Addition errors are characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance. Three types of addition errors are:

- **Double Marking**

Double marking is a subtype of the addition errors. It is defined as the failure to delete certain item which are required in some linguistic constructions but not in others. E.g.: She didn't went back. In the simple past form, the statement sentence should attached past verb (-ed). However, in negative sentence, after attaching negative construction, the verb should be verb base. It should be: She *didn't go* back.

- **Regularization**

Regularization is the second subtype of addition errors that typically apply to the class of linguistic items, such as the class of the main verbs or the class of nouns. In this case the regular marker is used in place of an irregular one as in eated for *ate*, childs for *children*.

- **Simple Addition**

Simple addition is another subtype of addition errors. If an addition error is not double marking or regularization, it is called as simple addition.

- **Misformation Errors**

Misformation errors are characterized by the use of the wrong form of morpheme or structure. The types of errors are:

- **Archi form**

Archi-form, which they call 'misselection', is the selection of one member of a class of a form represents others in a class, for example, the out of the

set this/these/those/that: *that* as in *that dog* and *that dogs*.

- **Alternating form**

Another of subtype that Dulay and his friends assign to the category of misformation is what they call alternating forms, which they define as fairly free alternation of various members of class with each other. E.g.: I seen her yesterday. The past verb form of verb "see" is "saw", not "seen". Then it should be *I saw her yesterday*.

- **Misordering Errors**

Misordering errors are characterized by the incorrect placement of a morpheme or groups of morphemes in an utterance. E.g.: What Dedi is doing? Interrogative sentence pattern should be begun by question word, which is followed by to be, subject and verb. So, it should be: *What is Dedi doing?* Misordering errors occur systematically for both second and first learners in construction that have already been acquired.

- **Source of Errors**

According to Richards [9] the sources in studying a language might be derived from the inference of the learners' mother tongue and the general characteristics of the rule learning. The errors that are caused by the general characteristics of the rule learning are also called the intralanguage errors. Whereas, the errors caused by the interference of the learners' mother tongue are called the interlanguage errors. Richards [9] also classifies intralingual errors into four categories:

- **Overgeneralization**

Overgeneralization deals with deviant structures produced by the learners by using their previously acquired rule when they construct a new form of sentences. For example, the result of defiant structure in the sentence "*She take a bar of chocolate*" in influenced by "*I take a bar of chocolate*". The omission of the third person -s in the verb *take* showed that over-generalization occurs in the sense that learners regard as all personal pronouns have the same zero verbal ending in the present tense. They do not notice that the third singular person ends with -s/-es for the present tense verb.

- **Ignorance of the rule restrictions**

The second cause is still related to over-generalization. In this case, learners disobey the restrictions of existing structures, so that, the application of rules to contexts where they do not apply. According to Richards, ignorance of the rules restriction is the learners' failure to observe the restriction of existing structures. For example: *Both Tika is beautiful and Adinda is beautiful girl*. The correct form is *Both Tika and Adinda are beautiful girls*.

- **Incomplete applications of rules**

It is described as the occurrence of deviancy structure represents the degree of development of the rules required to produce acceptable utterances. For example: the creation of a question “*How long it takes?*”. Here, the learners omit the auxiliary *does* to form a question. The correct form is “*How long does it take?*”. Therefore, the learners do not complete the rules in applying them to produce acceptable sentences.

- **False concept hypothesis**

They may not know the distinctive function of certain structures of the target language. For example: the form *was* may be interpreted as a marker of the past tense. Therefore, *was* may be used as a past marker. Used together with the *verb + -ed*, this produces such sentence as *He was watched horror movie* as the interpretation of the form for past action.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this research, the researcher used a qualitative research design. This type of research does not apply detailed arithmetic calculation or statistic. Specifically, the approach used in conducting the research was descriptive research.

This research was conducted in department of International Program for Islamics Economics and Finance of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (IPIEF UMY). The subject of the research was IPIEF students batch 2017 especially A class. The students of A class convinced as selected students. So, the errors they made were truly errors, not mistakes. The source data was the video recording of the students’ final examination (Spoken test) in English II (Free Conversation Class).

Table-1: Types of Grammatical Errors and Its Frequency of Occurrences

| NO | Types of Grammatical Errors | Grammar Aspects | Frequency | Error Total |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | Omission | a. Preposition | 4 | 35 |
| | | b. Modal | 2 | |
| | | c. To infinitive | 2 | |
| | | d. Possessive pronoun | 1 | |
| | | e. 3rd person singular verb | 8 | |
| | | f. Plural marker | 2 | |
| | | g. To be in nominal sentence | 10 | |
| | | h. To be as Auxiliary verb | 3 | |
| | | i. Subject | 2 | |
| | | j. Subordinator | 1 | |
| | | 2 | Addition | |
| b. To be | 10 | | | |
| c. Indonesian words | 2 | | | |
| d. Verb | 1 | | | |
| e. Article | 1 | | | |
| f. Subordinator | 1 | | | |
| g. Pronoun | 3 | | | |
| h. Modal | 1 | | | |
| 3 | Misformation | a. To be | 1 | 51 |
| | | b. Pronoun | 1 | |
| | | c. Tense | 21 | |
| | | d. Proposition | 2 | |
| | | e. To infinitive | 3 | |
| | | f. Verb | 3 | |
| | | g. Adjective | 6 | |
| | | h. Ordinal number | 1 | |
| | | h. Possessive pronoun | 2 | |
| | | i. Verb after modal | 8 | |
| | | j. Adverb | 1 | |
| | | k. Comparative | 2 | |
| | | 4 | Misordering | |
| c. Noun clause | 2 | | | |
| d. Subject | 1 | | | |
| e. Noun phrase | 1 | | | |
| f. Comparative | 1 | | | |
| 5 | | Total | 115 | 115 |

Since the data source was students' video recording of their spoken test, the researcher made the transcription of the videos. Then, the researcher used document analysis as the technique of data collection. The analysis in this research concerns on grammatical errors found in the transcription of the videos. The analysis is based on surface strategy taxonomy.

In analyzing the data, the researcher used error analysis method. The error analysis was used since it fits the characteristics of the data and the nature of this research. The researcher analyzed the data by identifying the errors, classifying of errors, tabulating the errors, analyzing the errors and drawing conclusion.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

By looking the errors in the transcription of IPIEF students' spoken test, the researcher identified and classified the errors based on Dulay's errors classification namely surface strategy taxonomy. Those are omission, addition, misformation and misordering. All of the errors found and its frequency of occurrences are embraced in the table 1.

Table 1 shows that the researcher found 115 errors made by the IPIEF students that were classified into their types of grammatical errors. It shows that the students made 35 errors of omission in their writing. The omission errors consisted of various grammar aspects. The students made errors of omission of *to be in nominal sentence* 10 times. They also made error of omission of *3rd person singular verb* 8 times. Errors of omission of *preposition* made by the students is 4 times. Then, they also made errors of omission of *to be as auxiliary verb* for 3 times. Next, found that the students did not put the *subject* in their sentences for twice. The students also made errors by omit *modal, to infinitive, and plural marker* for twice each. The last, students made error of omission of *possessive pronoun* and *subordinator* that each occurred once.

Furthermore, it shows that the students made 23 errors of addition in their writing. The addition errors were contributed most by addition of *to be* which was

made by students 10 times. They also made error of addition of *preposition* 4 times. The students also made error of addition of *pronoun* 3 times. The students also made error of addition of *Indonesian words* twice. The next, it was found that the students put addition of verb, article, subordinator, and modal once for each.

Table 1 also shows that the students made 51 errors of misformation in their speaking. Error of misformation became the most error type made by the students. The students made error of misformation of *tense* 21 times. They also made errors of misformation of *verb after modal* 8 times. Errors of misformation of *adjective* also made by students for 6 times. The next, students made error of misformation of *to infinitive* and verb 3 times for each. They also made errors of misformation of *preposition, possessive pronoun* and *comparative* twice. The last types of errors of misformation found in the transcription of their spoken test were *to be, pronoun, ordinal number, and adverb* occurred once each.

The students faced difficulty in constructing well-ordered sentence structure. It was proved by the fact that the students made 6 errors of misordering. The students made errors of misordering of *noun clause* twice. In addition, the type of error found was misordering of *verb, subject, noun phrase, and comparative* once for each.

Then, to make the differentiation of the result of each type of grammatical errors seems to be clearer, the researcher also presented the types of grammatical errors in the form of percentage. In this stage the researcher used the pattern as follow:

$$\Sigma\% = \frac{F \times 100\%}{N}$$

Note:

Σ = Symbol of percentage

F = Frequency of the occurrences of each request strategy

N = Total number of request strategy

Table-2: Frequency and Percentage of Types of Grammatical Errors

| No. | Types of Grammatical Errors | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | Omission | 35 | 30.4% |
| 2 | Addition | 23 | 20% |
| 3 | Misformation | 51 | 44.3% |
| 4 | Misordering | 6 | 5.3% |
| | Total | 115 | 100% |

Table 2 was presented to show the distribution of errors found in the spoken test made by the IPIEF students batch 2017. The researcher found various types of errors which total were 115 errors. From the table as the result of tabulation, it can be seen that the IPIEF students made most error of misformation that was 52

times or 44.3%. It happened because the students used wrong form of the morphemes or structure in their speaking. The next most error made by the students was in error of omission with 35 times which means 30.4% of errors total. The students made 23 times of error of

addition or 20%. They also made 6 times of error of misordering or 5.3%.

After presenting, the classification and tabulation of types of errors, the researcher classified the errors based on their sources based on Richards' statement as in table 3 below.

Table-3: Sources of Errors and Its Frequency of Occurrences

| NO | Sources of Errors | Types of Errors | Frequency | Errors Total |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Overgeneralization | Omission of 3rd person singular verb | 8 | 10 |
| | | Omission of to be in nominal sentence | 1 | |
| | | Misformation Ordinal number | 1 | |
| 2 | Ignorance the rule restriction | Addition of Preposition | 4 | 36 |
| | | Addition of Indonesian words | 2 | |
| | | Addition of Article | 1 | |
| | | Addition of Pronoun | 3 | |
| | | Addition of Modal | 1 | |
| | | Misformation of Preposition | 2 | |
| | | Misformation of to infinitive | 3 | |
| | | Misformation of verb | 3 | |
| | | Misformation of adjective | 6 | |
| | | Misformation of Possessive pronoun | 2 | |
| | | Misformation of Verb after modal | 8 | |
| | | Misformation of adverb | 1 | |
| 3 | Incomplete application of rules | Omission of Preposition | 4 | 31 |
| | | Omission of modal | 2 | |
| | | Omission of to infinitive | 2 | |
| | | Omission of Possessive pronoun | 1 | |
| | | Omission of Plural marker | 2 | |
| | | Omission of To be in nominal sentence | 9 | |
| | | Omission of to be as Auxiliary verb | 3 | |
| | | Omission of Subject | 2 | |
| | | Omission of Subordinator | 1 | |
| | | Misordering of Verb | 1 | |
| | | Misordering of Noun clause | 2 | |
| | | Misordering of subject | 1 | |
| | | Misordering of Noun phrase | 1 | |
| | | 4 | False concept hypothesis | |
| Addition of Verb | 1 | | | |
| Addition of subordinator | 1 | | | |
| Misformation of To be | 1 | | | |
| Misformation of Pronoun | 1 | | | |
| Misformation of Tense | 21 | | | |
| Misformation of Comparative | 2 | | | |
| Misordering of Comparative | 1 | | | |
| 5 | Total | | 115 | 115 |

Table-4: Frequency and Percentage of Sources of Intralingual Errors

| No. | Grammar Aspects | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|---------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 | Overgeneralization | 10 | 8.7% |
| 2 | Ignorance the rule restriction | 36 | 31.3% |
| 3 | Incomplete application of rules | 31 | 27% |
| 4 | False concept hypothesis | 38 | 33% |
| | Total | 115 | 100% |

Then, the classified and tabulated sources of errors were presented in the form of percentage as in the following table 4.

Table 4 shows various source of errors found in IPIEF students' speaking seen from intralingual perspective. The source include overgeneralization, ignorance the rule restriction, incomplete application of

rules, and false concept hypothesis. The most errors sources found from the false concept hypothesis, since it happened 38 times or 33% of total errors. Followed by ignorance the rule restriction with 36 times or 31.3%, incomplete application of rules 31 times or 27%, and the overgeneralization for 10 times or 8.7%.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data mentioned and explained above, the researcher found that the most type of grammatical errors made by IPIEF students was misformation. From the total data 115, 51 of them were misformation or 44.3% of the total errors. It means that misformation was the most type of grammatical error often appears in the IPIEF students speaking. Almost half of the data gathered by the researcher was misformation.

This research also tried to find out the sources of the errors made by the IPIEF students in their speaking from the perspective of intralingual error. The researcher had uncovered the various sources of error as mentioned in previous research question. The source of errors included overgeneralization, ignorance of rules restriction, incomplete application of rules, and false concept hypothesis. Based on the data explained previously on table 3 and table 4, the most errors source made by the IPIEF students was the false concept hypothesis as many as 38 times or 33%.

Considering the explanation of the findings above, the researcher believe analyzing students' error through error analysis is important since it can give compulsory info about the learning process of the students, the students' difficulties, and also their grammar achievement.

Emphasizing the above conclusion, it is suggested that students, especially the IPIEF students of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, now have known and understood grammar errors they made. So, they should learn from their errors and if it necessary look for assistance to practice speaking in English more often. Besides, the teacher or lecturer also can give additional practice in speaking after the class. Maybe the lecturer can set the atmosphere of the practice less formal and fun. Yet, it is also necessary to consider the grammatical errors in practicing speaking skill, by seeing it from the tabulation data. Last but not least, the researcher suggested to analyze the grammatical errors of the IPIEF students after the treatment (speaking practices) in order to see whether the errors students made decreased or not.

REFERENCES

1. Titien Setyarini. Grammatical Errors in Writing Made by the First Semester Students of English Department of IAIN Tulungagung. IAIN Tulungagung. 2015.
2. Lisa Anggraini. Analisis Kesalahan Gramatika dalam Berbicara Mahasiswa Jurusan Sastra Jerman Universitas Negeri Malang (Berdasarkan Taksonomi Permukaan). Universitas Negeri Malang. 2012.
3. Habibullah. An Error Analysis on Grammatical Structures of the Students Thesis of UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta Academic Year 2010. Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. 2010.
4. Brown H. Douglas. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Prentice Hall. New Jersey. 1980.
5. Corder SP. The significance of learner's errors. IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. 1967;5(1-4):161-70.
6. Joice, Helen De Silva and Burns, Anne. Focus On Grammar. National Centre For English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University. Sydney. 1999.
7. Arifin, Zainal. Common Grammatical Errors Made by XI IPS Grade Students of MAN Kunir Blitar. State Islamic College of Tulungagung. 2012.
8. Dulay C. Heidi. Language Two. Oxford University Press. 1982.
9. Richard. Error analysis: Perspectives on second language acquisition. 1974.