



Students' Grammatical Errors Analysis in Writing Manual Procedure Text: A Study on SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar

Amelia Putri Perdana¹, Dian Safitri²

¹²English Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Art

ameliaputriperdana2912@gmail.com

Article History

Submitted: 2022-09-17

Accepted: 2022-10-11

Published: 2022-10-11

Keywords:

Grammatical Errors,
Procedure Text,
Manual Procedure
Text

Abstract

This study aimed to find out grammatical errors and to reveal the most frequent grammatical error in writing manual procedure text. The population of this study was the eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar. The sample of this study was the eleven graders of AKL 1 and AKL 2. The sample was taken using purposive random sampling technique. The number of sample in this research was 42 students. The researcher used descriptive research design. The data were collected through a test. The finding was based on an analysis of the researcher and a rater. The rater was an English teacher of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar. After collecting the finding from the researcher and the rater, the researcher counted mean percentage of each grammatical error occurrence. According to likert scale, the interpretation of each grammatical error in writing manual procedure text was categorized as excellent, very good, good, and average. The final result showed that determiner error's mean was 46,80% (average), noun error's mean was 14,28% (good), verb error's mean was 12,25% (good), conjunction error's mean was 9,30% (very good), preposition error's mean was 8,21% (very good), subject-verb agreement error's mean was 7,15% (very good), and pronoun error's mean was 2,15% (excellent). So, determiner error's mean was the most frequent grammatical error in writing manual procedure text committed by eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar academic year 2021/2022.

©2022 The Author(s) Publish by Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris FBS UNP. This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

How to Cite: Perdana, Safitri. (2022). Students' Grammatical Errors Analysis in Writing Manual Procedure Text: A Study on SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 11. (3): pp. 288-294, DOI: [10.24036/jelt.v11i3.119368](https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v11i3.119368)

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the language activities that can lead us to do an active and productive activity at the same time. It was supported by Marr & English (2019) who said that all language works are active and productive. Procedure text is one of the writing genres. According to Oshima (2005) in Dirgeyasa (2016), a procedure text is a written text which shows the instructions or the way how to do something.

There are two types of procedure text, which are manual and recipe; manual procedure text explains the sequence of steps of how to use technologies correctly,

for example, ‘How to Use the Computer’; recipe procedure text explains the sequence of steps of how to cook food or drink, for example, ‘How to Make a Sandwich’ (Knapp & Watkins, 2005).

The researcher has done a teaching experience in SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar at eleven graders academic year 2021/2022. Manual procedure text is taught to eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar. However, the researcher found the phenomenon that students still have grammatical errors in writing manual procedure text. Based on the researcher’s survey of eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar, most students said that they made grammatical errors because they had difficulties to change their daily Bahasa Indonesia (their mother tongue) to be the correct English grammatical structure that made them to have lack of accuracy. So, that’s why they are often to make grammatical errors such as subject-verb agreement, pronouns, etc. In fact, this reason was also found in the previous study by Atashian & Al-Bahri (2018) that stated that the main obstacle ESL students face in their writing is because of the differences between their mother tongue and second language systems which aren’t used in their mother tongue system.

As Atashian & Al-Bahri (2018) said that grammar is an essential aspect of any good piece of writing. Then, Farooq, et al (2012) claimed that ESL students face errors in grammar which is considered as the most difficult field in writing. Most previous studies only analyzed the *recipe* procedure text type. In fact, there is the other type of procedure text which is manual procedure text. There were some examples of the previous studies that were still only about recipe procedure text: (1) ‘Developing Healthy Recipe Instagram Account as Teaching Media of Procedure Text’ written by Musono & Ulya (2021); (2) ‘The Text Genres of the Recipe and the Menu in the Teaching of English’ written by Hendrice, Estelle (2020); (3) ‘Cooking Recipe Analysis based on Sequences of Distributed Representation on Procedure Texts and Associated Images’ written by Ninomiya & Ozaki (2020). So, the researcher continued to analyze the other type of procedure text which was manual procedure text that had not been found in the previous study yet. Besides that, manual procedure text has higher demands than recipe procedure text. It was supported by Barwick (1999) who said that manual procedure text, for example how to use a video recorder which is appropriate to give information to the more advanced group than a recipe procedure text. So, manual procedure text is actually more challenging for students.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research used a descriptive research design. The population was eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar academic year 2021/2022. Eleven graders consisted of 9 classes that were 283 students totally. The sampling technique used in this research was purposive sampling. The researcher took the sample from two accounting major classes of eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar which are AKL 1 and AKL 2. The researcher took the sample of 15% from the population. So, the total sample was 42 students. The researcher took the data of students’ errors in writing manual procedure text by using a test as a high-reliability instrument. The researcher asked students to make a manual procedure text. The students were given 45 minutes to write a manual procedure text at least 100 words. Then, at the top of

the paper, students wrote their names and class. The researcher provided 4 topics of manual procedure text as students' options, but they were also allowed to write different topic from the option. The instrument was validated by Mrs. Nofrina Eka Putri, M.Pd. who is an English lecturer at Universitas Negeri Padang. Reliability testing that was used by the researcher was rater reliability. In this research, the rater was an English School Teachers of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar. To answer research question 1, the researcher signed the grammatical errors by giving circle on students' worksheets. After that, the researcher input each grammatical error type into Ms. Excel sheet to find out each frequency. After inputting each type of grammatical error into Ms. Excel sheet, the researcher did a summation for each type of the grammatical errors. Then, the researcher continued to calculate the percentage of each grammatical error type. After that, the researcher submitted students' writing test to the rater. Then, the rater similarly continued to do an analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing manual procedure text.

Figure 3. 1 Formula of Percentage

$$X\% = \frac{X \text{ Frequency}}{\text{Total grammatical errors}} \times 100\%$$

X = grammatical error type

After both the researcher and the rater have done the data analysis of students grammatical errors in writing manual procedure text, there were two findings of each grammatical error percentage. Those were from the researcher (X1%) and the rater (X2%). To answer question 2, the researcher counted the mean of each grammatical error. The formula is:

$$X\% = \frac{X1\% + X2\%}{2}$$

X% = Grammatical error percentage

X1 = Grammatical error percentage by the researcher

X2 = Grammatical error percentage by the rater

Next, the researcher interpreted each grammatical error percentage based on the likert scale.

Table 3. 1 Likert Scale

Error Percentage	Interpretation
0-5	Excellent
6--10	Very Good
11--45	Good
46-55	Average
56-70	Fair
71-80	Poor
More than 80	Inadequate

Adapted from Hyland (2003: 243)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research Finding

The findings below show: (1) the percentage of students' grammatical errors including errors of subject-verb agreement, verb, noun, preposition, conjunction, pronoun, and determiner; (2) the most to the least frequent grammatical errors percentage; (3) the interpretation of each grammatical error percentage in writing manual procedure text.

Table 4.3 Mean Percentage of Grammatical Error Subcategory

No	Grammatical Errors	Grammatical Errors Percentage (X%)		MEAN	Likert Scale Interpretation
		X1%	X2%		
1	Determiner	47,06%	46,53%	46,80%	Average
2	Noun	13,97%	14,58%	14,28%	Good
3	Verb	12%	12,50%	12,25%	Good
4	Conjunction	9,56%	9,03%	9,30%	Very good
5	Preposition	8,09%	8,33%	8,21%	Very good
6	Subject-Verb Agreement	7,35%	6,94%	7,15%	Very good
7	Pronoun	2,21%	2,08%	2,15%	Excellent

Based on the table 4.3 above, the researcher and the rater got a total of 136 and 144 grammatical errors in students' manual procedure text writing test. In subject-verb agreement error, the researcher and the rater got 10 cases (7,35%) and 10 cases (6,94%). So, subject-verb agreement error mean is 7,15% that was categorized as *very good*. Both the researcher and the rater found subject-verb agreement errors from 10 same students. They are student 3, student 6, student 10, student 16, student 18, student 21, student 35, students 36, student 39 and student 41. All students who made subject-verb agreement errors that were found by the researcher and the rater only have 1 case.

In verb error, the researcher and the rater got 16 cases (12%) and 18 cases (12,50%). Therefore, verb error mean is 12,25%. That was categorized as *good*. The researcher and the rater found verb errors from 14 students and 16 students. 14 students are student 3, student 7, student 8, student 10, student 11, student 15, student 17, student 18, student 22, student 24, student 33, student 34, student 37, and student 41. Student 33 and student 37 have the most frequent verb error with 2 cases. The rater also found the same result of verb errors with 14 students that was found by the researcher. Then, the rater found more verb errors from student 2 with 1 case and student 42 with 1 case.

In noun error, the researcher and the rater got 19 cases (13,97%) and 21 cases (14,58%). So, noun error mean is 14, 28% that was categorized as *good*. The researcher and the rater found noun errors from 11 students and 13 students. 11 students are student 6, student 12, student 13, student 16, student 20, student 21, student 27, student 33, student 36, student 39, and student 41. Student 16 and student 33 have the most frequent noun error with 3 cases. The rater also found the same

result of noun errors with 11 students that was found by the researcher. Then the rater found more noun errors from student 22 with 1 case and student 30 with 1 case.

In preposition error, the researcher and the rater got 11 cases (8,09%) and 12 cases (8,33%). Therefore, preposition error mean is 8,21% that was categorized as *very good*. The researcher and the rater found preposition errors from 11 students and 12 students. 11 students are student 1, student 17, student 18, student 26, student 27, student 28, student 30, student 31, student 34, student 38, and student 40. The rater also found the same result of preposition errors with 11 students that was found by the researcher. Then, the rater found more preposition error from student 42 with 1 cases. All students who made preposition errors that were found by the reseacher and the rater only have 1 case.

In conjunction error, the researcher and the rater got 13 cases (9,56%) and 13 cases (9,03%). So, conjunction error mean is 9,30% that was categorized as *very good*. Both the researcher and the rater found conjunction errors from 11 same students. They are student 6, student 14, student 16, student 18, student 21, student 22, student 27, student 37, student 39, student 41, and student 42. Student 6 and student 14 have the most frequent conjunction error with 2 cases.

In pronoun error, the researcher and the rater got 3 cases (2,21%) and 3 cases (2,08%). Therefore, pronoun error mean is 2,15% that was caegorized as *excellent*. Both the researcher and the rater found pronoun errors from 2 same students. They are student 33 and student 34. Students 33 has 1 case and student 34 has 2 cases.

In determiner error, the researcher and the rater got 64 cases (47,06%) and 67 cases (46,53%). So, determiner error mean is 46,80% that was categorized as *average*. The researcher and the rater found determiner errors from 37 students and 38 students. Both the researcher and the rater found that student 12 has the most frequent determiner error with 6 cases.

Regarding to the explanation above, the grammatical error occurrences from the most to the least frequent are determiner error with mean 46,80% (average), noun error with mean 14,28% (good), verb error 12,25% (good), conjunction error with mean 9,30% (very good), preposition error with mean 8,21% (very good), subject-verb agreement error with mean 7,15% (very good), and pronoun error with mean 2,15% (excellent).

CONCLUSION

Based on the data described in the previous chapter, it is concluded that some students still make errors in subject-verb agreement, verbs, nouns, prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, and determiners. The subcategory of grammatical error that were committed by the eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar in writing manual procedure text from the most to the least frequent were determiner error with mean 46,80% (average), noun error with mean 14,28% (good), verb error with mean 12,25% (good), conjunction error with mean 9,30% (very good), preposition error with mean 8,21% (very good), subject-verb agreement error with mean 7,15% (very good), and pronoun error with mean 2,15% (excellent). So, determiner error was the most frequent grammatical error in writing manual procedure text made by eleven graders of SMK Negeri 1 Batusangkar academic year 2021/2022. So, there was not

found the interpretation of each grammatical error percentage that was in the three lowest categories consisted of *fair*, *poor*, and *inadequate*.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, J. C., & Zunde, P. (2012). *Empirical Foundations of Information and Software Science IV*. Springer US.
- Amayreh, K. S., & Abdullah, A. T. (2021). Error Analysis of Conjunction in Expository Essay Writing by Jordanian Undergraduate Students Studying English as a Foreign Language (Efl) . *International Journal Of Education, Psychology And Counselling (IJEPC)* , 482-491 .
- Atashian, S., & Al-Bahri, K. (2018). Towards Arab Students' Grammatical Errors in Academic Writing & their Perceptions. *International Peer Reviewed*, 140-145.
- Baaijen, V. M., & Galbraith, D. (2018). Discovery Through Writing: Relationships with Writing Processes and Text Quality. *Cognition and Instruction*, 199-223.
- Barwick, J. (1999). *Targeting Text : Information Report, Explanation, Discussion, Upper Level*. Singapore: Green Giant Press.
- Dirgeyasa, I. W. (2016). *College Academic Writing : a Genre-Based Perspective*. Jakarta: Perpustakaan Nasional : Katalog Dalam Terbitan (KDT).
- Farooq, M. S., Uzair-Ul-Hassan , M., & Wahid , S. (2012). Opinion of Second Language Learners about Writing Difficulties in English Language. A *Research Journal of South Asian Studies* , 183-194.
- Febriyanti , R. H., & Sundari , H. (2016). Error Analysis of English Written Essay of Higher EFL Learners: A Case Study . *The Journal of English Language Studies* , 71-80.
- Fitrawati , & Safitri , D. (2021). Students' Grammatical Errors in Essay Writing: A Pedagogical Grammar Reflection . *International Journal of Language Education* , 74-88 .
- Fitto, C. L. (2006). *Grammar by Diagram: Second edition*. UK: Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency.
- Furtina, D., Fata, I. A., & Fitriasia, D. (2016). Grammatical Errors in Writing Task. *CAPEU*, 26-28.
- Galbraith, V. M. (2018). Discovery Through Writing: Relationships with Writing Processes and Text Quality. *Cognition and Instruction*, 36:3, 199-223, DOI: 10.1080/07370008.2018.1456431 , 199-223.
- Ghulamuddin , N. J., Mohari , S. K., & Ariffin , K. (2021). Discovering Writing Difficulties of Malay ESL Primary School Level Students. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*.
- Hidayatullah, M., & Nur , D. R. (2019). An Analysis of Imperative Sentence in “Uang Panai” Movie . *IJOTL-TL*, 187-198.
- Joyce, H. d., & Feez, S. (2016). *Exploring Literacies*. London: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- Khanza, M., & Nufus, T. Z. (2019). The Effect of Scaffolding toward Students' Writing Procedure Text . *ELIF*, 33-42.
- Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, Text, Grammar : Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

- Leacock, C., Chodorow, M., Gamon, M., & Tetreault, J. (2014). *Automated Grammatical Error Detection for Language Learners : Second Edition*. Toronto: Morgan & Claypool.
- Liu, M., & Xu, Y. (2013). An Investigation of Syntactic Errors in Chinese Undergraduate EFL Learners' Compositions: A Cohort Study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*.
- Marr, T., & English, F. (2019). *Rethinking TESOL in Diverse Global Settings : The Language and the Teacher in a Time of Change*. London: Greet Britain.
- Moqimipour, K., & Shahrokhi, M. (2015). The Impact of Text Genre on Iranian Intermediate EFL Students' Writing Errors: An Error Analysis Perspective. *International Education Studies, Vol. 8, No. 3*.
- Mulki R, N. M., Sahril, & Sunra , L. (2022). Analyzing the Students' Errors in Writing Procedure Text . *Journal of Excellence in English Language Education* .
- Munawir. (2020). The Kinds of Translation Error Made by the Students in Writing Abstract of the Theses and Dissertations . *SANG PENCERAH* , 58-66 .
- Munyua, J. M. (2021). *Basics of Research and Academic Writing*. Kenya: Exceller Books.
- Murshidi , G. A. (2014). Subject-Verb Agreement Grammatical Errors and Punctuation Errors in Submissions of Male UAE University Students. *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research*, 44-47.
- Nurwahida. (2018). Error Analysis in ESL Writing: A Case Study at Academic English Program at St. Michael's College, VT. *International Journal in Applied Linguistics of Parahikma, Vol 1 No 1* .
- Offredy, M., & Vickers, P. (2010). *Developing a Healthcare Research Proposal: An Interactive* . United Kingdom.
- Putri, T. K., & Saun, S. (2019). An Analysis of the Second Year Students' Ability in Writing a Procedure Text of a Recipe at SMK N 9 Padang . *Journal of English Language Teaching* .
- Rahmatika, A. (2019). The Effectiveness of Student Teams Achievement Division to Teach Writing Viewed from Students' Creativity. *International Journal of Language Education*, 46-54 .
- Ramadhan, S., Sumiharsono, R., & Mardapi, D. (2020). The Quality of Test Instruments Constructed by Teachers in Bima Regency, Indonesia: Document Analysis. *International Journal of Instruction*, 507-518.
- Safire, W. (2011). *Watching My Language*. United States: The Cobbett Corporation.
- Widayanti, T., Rustyana, N., & Haryudin, A. (2019). Students' Perception in Writing Procedure Text . *PROJECT*, 687-691.