

# SYNTACTICAL ERROR ANALYSIS OF EFL LEARNER IN CONVERSATION CLASS AT ENGLISH LITERATURE STUDY PROGRAM

## *ANALISIS KESALAHAN SINTAKSIS PEMBELAJAR BAHASA INGGRIS SEBAGAI BAHASA ASING PADA KELAS PERCAKAPAN DI PROGRAM STUDI SASTRA INGGRIS*

**Heri Kuswoyo<sup>a\*</sup>, Laila Ulsi Qodriani <sup>b\*</sup>, Khairunnisa<sup>c\*</sup>**

<sup>a,b,c</sup>Faculty of Arts and Education, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia

<sup>a,b,c</sup>Jalan Zainal Abidin Pagar Alam No. 9—11, Bandarlampung, Indonesia

Telephone (0721) 702022, Fax (0721) 702022

E-mail: hery@teknokrat.ac.id

Article accepted: November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2019; revised: September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2020; approved: November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Permalink/DOI: 10.29255/aksara.v33i2.479.341—356.

### **Abstract**

The learner's syntactical error analyses have long been interested in the second and foreign language researchers. This study aimed at investigating the syntactical error types, the form of error, and the frequencies of these errors that occurred in the sixth-semester student presentation on the conversation class at the English Literature Study Program in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. To achieve the objectives, the data were collected from the learner's transcribed speech. The sampling of non-probability was used to select the classroom and participant's characteristics. These data were collected by video recording, non-participant observation techniques, and documents. To classify the learner's syntactical errors, Politzer & Ramirez's (1973) syntactical errors taxonomy was adopted. Further, the qualitative method was applied in this study. Based on the result of the analysis, there were 64 syntactical errors uttered by the learner. The results of the analysis were then categorized into three forms: phrases, clauses, and sentences. The results of this study showed that the learner often made the syntactical error in the form of sentences. That was 32 errors (50%). Furthermore, the study found that the amount of confusion was the most commonly uttered as the type of error (26,56%). The learner often got confused to make the right use between the number and the subject mentioned. Thus, the findings indicated that even though the learner considered as the best; yet the learner still possibly made some errors. Therefore, lecturers or instructors should raise the students' syntactical error awareness. So that it could improve the student' speaking skills in their level of English.

**Keywords:** error analysis, syntactical error, conversation class, speaking skills

### **Abstrak**

*Analisis kesalahan sintaksis siswa telah lama menjadi hal yang menarik bagi peneliti bahasa kedua dan asing. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki jenis kesalahan sintaksis, bentuk kesalahan, dan frekuensi kesalahan tersebut pada presentasi siswa semester enam pada kelas percakapan di Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. Untuk mencapai tujuannya, data dikumpulkan dari presentasi siswa yang telah ditranskripsikan. Sampling non-probabilitas diterapkan untuk memilih karakteristik kelas dan partisipan. Data tersebut dikumpulkan dengan menggunakan teknik perekaman video, pengamatan non-partisipan, dan dokumen. Untuk mengklasifikasikan kesalahan sintaksis mahasiswa, taksonomi kesalahan sintaksis Politzer dan Ramirez (1973) diadopsi. Lebih lanjut, metode kualitatif diterapkan dalam*

penelitian ini. Berdasarkan hasil analisis, terdapat 64 kesalahan sintaksis yang ditemukan pada presentasi siswa. Hasil analisis kemudian dikategorikan dalam tiga bentuk, yakni frase, klausa, dan kalimat. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa siswa sering membuat kesalahan sintaksis dalam bentuk kalimat, yakni 32 kesalahan (50%). Lebih jauh, penelitian ini menemukan bahwa 'number of confusion' merupakan jenis kesalahan yang sering diujarkan, yakni 26,56%. Pembelajar sering mengalami kebingungan dalam menggunakan antara nomor dan subjek yang disebutkan. Dengan demikian, temuan menunjukkan bahwa meskipun mahasiswa dianggap yang terbaik masih membuat beberapa kesalahan. Oleh karena itu, dosen atau instruktur harus meningkatkan kesadaran kesalahan sintaksis mahasiswa sehingga hal ini dapat meningkatkan keterampilan berbicara siswa di tingkat bahasa Inggris mereka.

**Kata kunci:** analisis kesalahan, kesalahan sintaksis, kelas percakapan, keterampilan berbicara

**How to cite:** Kuswoyo, H., Qodriani, L.U., & Khairunnisa. (2021). Syntactical Error Analysis of EFL Learner in Conversation Class at English Literature Study Program. *Aksara*, 33(2), 341—356. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29255/aksara.v33i2.479.341—356>.

## INTRODUCTION

Generally, English is widely used by many people and many countries for various purposes in the world. One of them is as a purpose of communication (Eng, Luyue, & Lim, 2020; Kuswoyo & Susardi, 2017; Hervina, 2014; Kuswoyo & Wahyudin, 2017). Further, some studies have found that as an international language, English becomes a compulsory subject that must be learned from school to university contexts (Asih, Asrianto, & Murwantoro, 2020; (Eng, Luyue, & Lim, 2020). A large and growing body of literature has investigated the main goal of learning English as a foreign and second language is a communicative competence (Phettongkam, 2017; Ruminar, 2018; Simbolon, 2015). In other words, among the four skills (e.g., writing, reading, listening, and speaking skills), language learning, speaking for students is one of the language skills that must be mastered (Helmanda, Safura, & Suriadi, 2018). Therefore, to develop students' competence in English, one of the subjects provided is *speaking* or *conversation*, which is taught for sharpening students' skills in English communication (Kardiansyah & Qodriani, 2018).

In the Indonesian context, English as a

Foreign Language (*hereafter* EFL) has also been learned by students since they were in elementary school. Things what makes differences in all level of education, students in higher learning institutions need to be trained to become efficient or self-efficacy learners who are competent and effective (Mat, Qodriani, & Kardiansyah, 2019). It includes language learning. It is not only for learning English, Japanese, Chinese, or many other languages, learning a foreign language must have difficulty found by the learners, especially about grammar. (Widianingsih & Gulö, 2016) pointed out that one of the difficulties that students face in the process of learning English and other languages at a different level was learning grammatical rules. However, to communicate appropriately and effectively, it is highly required for students to have correct grammatical knowledge (Mahbub, 2019). It is because 'Grammar is the core foundation of someone's English qualities both written and oral, especially in speaking' (Asih, Asrianto, & Murwantoro, 2020, p.65—67)

Recently, several authors (Habibullah, 2010; Jiménez Catalán, 1996; Taura, Patterns, & Countries, 1997) have proposed various ways of discussing grammar. Grammar is the bridge

of language. The language that is generally divided into spoken and written cannot be denied that it has its uniqueness, such as by and to whom they are produced, or in which situation they are used, which must have its structure to carry the true meaning in communication. Thus, every language both spoken and written cannot be separated from grammar or structure. According to Bayram (2015), “aiming to achieve authentic communicative competence, it would be unnatural if L2 teaching professionals refused to investigate its grammar or exclude how language is naturally used by its speakers in everyday life”(p.895). It means that disregarding structural rule and only attaining communication can naturally create a possibility of making errors in EFL learners. It may be started from the errors of word choosing, and then becoming phrase, clause, and finally every sentence. Some studies (Alamin & Ahmed, 2012; Faisyal, 2015; Jayasundara & Premarathna, 2011; Ngangbam, 2016) proved that syntax, dealing with the sentence structure, becomes the most dominant difficulty in linguistic subjects made by EFL learners.

Concerning the previous discussion, the present writers identified the syntactical error issues that the learners often faced in their conversation classes at the English Literature Study Program in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia, Lampung. Therefore, this study is conducted. In learning English as their foreign language, the EFL learners used are from conversation class. They took the syntax subject in the previous semester. In other words, they did not only get the knowledge of grammar from the first to the fifth semester, but they were also enriched by the syntax study in the fourth semester.

This study was conducted since grammatical error analysis was becoming a vital factor in improving the students' speaking

skills in their level of English. To identify the syntactical errors produced by EFL learners at the English Literature Study Program in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia, Lampung, this study adopted the theory proposed by (Politzer & Ramirez, 1973). The research questions of this study, therefore, are to investigate the syntactical errors made by an EFL learner in a non-fiction book presentation, to identify the form of errors, and to examine the most syntactical error used by an EFL learner in a non-fiction book presentation.

There is a large volume of published studies examining the syntactical errors in both written and oral texts. For written texts, studies on grammatical errors, especially syntax have been discussed mostly in basic language skill of writing. Most of the studies (Faisyal, 2015; Karahan, 2011; Mohammed, Mohammed, & AbdalHussein, 2015; Puspitasari, 2013) focused on written errors made by EFL learners.

An early study was put forward by Karahan (2011). This study found error types of prepositions, articles, plural morpheme “s”, SV Agreement, parts of speech, verb form, verb tense, missing verb, gerunds and infinitives, word-order, quantifiers and intensifiers, passive voice, pronouns and possessive, comparatives and superlatives, other types of errors, however, prepositions and articles were the two most commonly made error types by the ELT students taking the proficiency exam. This might be because students focus more on meaning rather than form when they write in the target language, and they tend to omit prepositions and articles.

In another study, Puspitasari (2013) investigated grammatical errors made by The second-semester students in writing subject at Yogyakarta State University. By using Politzer and Ramirez's theory in Dulay et al. (1982) found that there were 165 (85.94%) errors in the syntax area. This study adapted the theory

used in this research to analyze the syntactic error made by EFL learners.

In subsequent work, Mohammed et al. (2015) discussed syntactical and morphological errors finding in preliminary proposal drafts for a final year thesis collected from 15 students. This qualitative study using the theory of Dulay et al. (1982) found that the highest number of errors was preposition. Also, the subject of analysis relates to this study which is an advanced EFL learner.

The last is Faisyal (2015). This study found that the students made more errors in syntax rather than in morphology which was taken from 14 students' writing within six months. This qualitative research also showed that the biggest number of errors happened because they overgeneralized all grammatical forms which actually should be changed or modified.

Meanwhile, much research on oral texts (Asih, Asrianto, & Murwantoro, 2020; Helminda, Safura, & Suriadi, 2018; Hervina, 2014; Phettongkam, 2017; Ruminar, 2018; Zanoria & Oliva, 2019) has been done. The first study was reported by Hervina (2014). In her qualitative study, she examined the EFL learners' grammatical errors at the English department in STKIP Abdi Pendidikan Payakumbuh, Indonesia. Grammatical error type, the percentage, and the factor that influences the EFL learner's grammatical errors were investigated. The results of the study reported that the EFL learners made quite often grammatical errors in using the verb groups. The results also indicated that the learners still got confused even though they had learned before.

Next, Phettongkam (2017) studied grammatical errors in spoken English of undergraduate Thai learners in a communicative business English course. This study aimed to identify the types and frequency of grammatical errors. To identify them, the surface structure

taxonomy was applied. The findings showed that the most error type found was omission errors. Then, it was followed by misinformation, addition, and mis ordering. Meanwhile, plural form, article, and verb form were the three most occurring errors.

Another study is described in Helminda, Safura, & Suriadi (2018). The purpose of this study was to investigate the types of grammatical errors in students' speaking performances. Besides, this study also investigated the factors that cause the grammatical errors faced by English department students in speaking subjects. The ten students of the English department were used as the sample of this study. The results of this qualitative study revealed that four grammatical error types were identified (e. g misinformation, mis order, omission, and overgeneralization. The findings also showed that two main factors caused grammatical errors in speaking. They were interlingua and intralingual transfers.

In a study by Zanoria & Oliva (2019), entitled *syntactical error analysis on Oral classroom discourse* discussed the syntactical error frequency and the linguistic reasons for these occurrences. The error analysis approach was applied in this study. The results of this study showed that four syntactical errors found such as omission, addition, selection, and ordering. In line with Helminda, Safura, & Suriadi (2018), the intralingual and interlingual factors became the common cause of errors.

A very similar study was conducted by Asih, Asrianto, & Murwantoro, (2020). They analyzed the grammatical errors in speaking made by 6 Graduate students in one of the university contexts. The findings found that most students made a grammatical error in misinformation.

Although extensive research has been carried out on syntactical error analysis on both written and spoken texts, no single study exists

which adequately covers the form of errors (e.g form of the phrase, clause, and sentence). Most studies in the field of syntactical error or grammatical error analysis have only focused on types and frequency that mostly used. Furthermore, there are only a few studies in the literature that discuss a speech on English literature subject. Thus, it becomes the curiosity of the present writers to use conversation competence.

## METHOD

This study was conducted by a qualitative method to investigate the EFL learner's syntactical error, the form of errors, and their frequency used in conversation class. The present writers used this method because it could provide rich and detailed results (Macdonald, Headlam, & Centre for Local Economic Strategies, 2008).

In an attempt to select the classroom and the participant's characteristics, the sampling of non-probability was applied. This sampling procedure shows that the organizers of the inquiry purposively choose the particular units of the universe for constituting a sample (Khotari, 2004, p. 59). The characteristics were then divided into two: (1) characteristics to select the classroom, and (2) characteristics to select participants. In terms of selecting the classroom, there were three characteristics (e.g lecturing period, lecturer's competence, and the number of learners). Meanwhile, in terms of selecting a participant, the highest GPA, and the best score from a previous conversation class become the characteristics.

Data were obtained from a female learner's non-fiction book presentation in conversation class at the English Literature Study Program in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia. The data were collected through video recording and non-participant observation. The video was then transcribed and entered into the database.

Five steps were taken in collecting data. They were (1) recording video of a learner's speech without participating in the class activity, (2) asking the learners for related files such as PowerPoint slide and paper of book report, (3) transcribing the recorded video, (4) cross checking the lost utterances from recorded video and documents, and (5) listening to the whole utterances from the recorded video while checking the full transcription at the same time.

In analyzing the data, three steps applied. They were (1) separating all utterances of transcribed speech into line in a table, (2) identifying the forms of the error made by the learner; phrase or clause or sentence, and (3) identifying which types of syntactical error they were by referring to the theory of (Politzer & Ramirez, 1973).

The last, presenting the results of the error were made in three forms: phrase, clause, and sentence. Then, they were elaborated on the basis of the theory of syntactical errors by (Politzer & Ramirez, 1973).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section elaborates on the findings of syntactical errors made by an EFL learner in a presentation with a duration of 12 min 14 seconds. The data were analyzed based on the theory of (Politzer & Ramirez, 1973). The data put in this section include all errors of syntax on a learner's speech discussing a nonfiction book report. In presenting the data, the present writers made them in three forms; phrase, clause, and sentence.

Table 1. presents the results of the error analysis and the frequencies of these errors on the sixth-semester student presentation in the conversation class at the English Literature Study Program in Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia in detail.

**Table 1 The Description of Grammatical Error**

Forms of Error	Total Numbers	Types of Error
1. Form of Phrase	26 errors (40,63%)	a. Number confusion b. Use of pronoun c. Use of preposition d. Word order e. Some transformation of passive
Form of Clause	6 errors (9,37%)	a. Omission of verb b. Agreement of subject and verb c. Verb-and-verb construction d. Some transformation of passive
Form of Sentence	32 errors (50%)	a. Number confusion b. Use of pronoun c. Use of preposition d. Omission of verb e. Use of progressive tense f. Agreement of subject and verb g. Verb-and-verb construction h. Some transformation of Negative
<b>Total</b>	<b>64 (100%)</b>	

After analyzing and elaborating the data in each type of error, Table 1 shows that in the form of the phrase 26 errors were found (40,63%). Furthermore, then in form of the clause was found only 6 errors (9,37%), and in the form of the sentence was found 32 errors (50%). Meanwhile, the description of error type is presented as follows:

**Table 2 The Description of Error Types**

No.	Types of error	Total number
1.	Number confusion	17 (26,6%)
2.	Use of pronoun	5 (7,8 %)
3.	Use of preposition	6 (9,3%)
4.	Omission of verb	6 (9,3%)
5.	Use of progressive tense	1 (1,6%)
6.	Agreement of S V	7 (10,9%)
7.	Verb and Verb construction	15 (23,4%)
8.	Word order	2 (3,2%)
9.	Some transformation of passive	4 (6,3%)
10.	Some transformation of negative	1(1,6%)
<b>Total</b>		<b>64 (100%)</b>

Table 2 illustrates that from 15 types of syntactical errors proposed by Politzer & Ramirez (1973), there were 10 types of errors that the learner made. They were Number Confusion, Use of Pronouns, Use of Prepositions, Omission of Verb, Use of Progressive Tense, Agreement of Subject and Verb, Verb-and-Verb Construction, Word Order, Some Transformations of Passive and Negative.

### Errors in Form of Phrase

According to Miller (2013), a phrase is a group of interrelated words. This means that words are grouped into phrases and that groupings typically bring together heads and their modifiers. For example, in *the large dog*, the word *dog* is the head, and *the* and *large* are its modifier. Then, it found 26 errors (40,63%) of syntax in the form of the phrase in a learner's speech. Those were included as follows:

**Table 3 Number Confusion**

Datum.	Utterances
5	..... definitions from <b>some expertise</b> or definitions based on our understanding.
8	..... in <b>other country</b> through <b>literature work; prose, drama and poetry</b> .

Both errors in datum 5 and 8 deal with the confusion between the number of the nouns mentioned and the use of determiners. 'Some' is used either for indefinite plural nouns or indefinite uncountable nouns, meanwhile 'other' is used as an adjective and must be followed by plural nouns. Therefore, the noun 'expertise' in datum 5 must be ended by -s because the noun indicates plural. Next, the same case as determiner 'some', 'other' as adjective must be followed by a plural noun, thus, the noun 'country' was automatically ended by -ies to make it grammatical. Another error produced by the learner in datum 8 was still the confusion between the number of nouns mentioned and the preceding noun. Since she uttered 'literature

work' which indicates a singular countable noun and the following nouns with more than one in number, then she made an error in number confusion. It must be parallel so that the noun 'work' must be ended by *s*.

In other words, the phrase 'some expertise' should be 'some expertise', the 'other country' should be 'other countries', and 'literature work' should be 'literature works' on purpose to avoid errors in number confusion.

**Tabel 5 Use of Pronouns**

Datum.	Utterances
21	She also write about a study of philosophical background and and 2 translations of Urdu poem <b>she</b> has collections of....

In this form of error, the learner made 2 errors in one line. They were uses of pronouns 'she' instead of 'he'. The preceding data showed the appropriate uses of pronoun such as 'He grow up in England ....' (line 21) and 'He also write ....' (line 23). The doer of the activity was a male and the learner could say the proper pronoun twice. But, the error happened when the learner said different pronouns for the subject described which was still the same. Therefore, the subject mentioned in datum 21 should be the same. As a result, the pronoun 'she' as the subject in datum 21 should be 'He' because 'He' is for M.A.R Habib.

**Tabel 4 Use of Prepositions**

Datum.	Utterances
25	..... when I faced my examination in literary criticism and it's <b>discuss about</b> reader response.
38	..... not cover all the chapter inside the book because the book is too thick and I just sum up some quotations and <b>some conclusion every part</b> of this book.

Datum 25 shows the confusion of the preposition 'about' after the verb 'discuss'. It is not necessary to use 'about' there because we

can directly say something as an object after we say 'discuss'. Thus, 'discuss' as a mono-transitive verb is followed by a direct object, and not necessary to use prepositions as long as the thing is only one because it will be different if 'discuss' is followed by two things as objects. If so, the use of prepositions is needed. For example, 'I want to discuss something with you'. In conclusion, the learner made the error of prepositional phrase usage in datum 25 which should be 'it discusses reader response'.

On the other hand, datum 38 indicates the omission of the preposition between the phrases 'some conclusion' and 'every part'. There must be a preposition before 'every part' because it indicates the specific location of things mentioned. This confusion of preposition particularly happens when an indication of location or direction is involved. Therefore, the appropriate preposition indicates the location for 'every part' is 'in'. To sum up, the learner should say 'some conclusion **in** every part' to show the clear or specific location of things mentioned.

**Tabel 6 Word Order**

Datum.	Utterances
20	Beside this book, he also write about <b>3 history of literary criticism in other editions</b> .
31	..... and the <b>condition unfair</b> for woman.

Error in datum 20 happened because of the confusion between the main noun and the modifier of the noun. The learner said '3 history of literary criticism' first while it was the modifier of the main noun 'other editions'. We can take a look at the first prepositional phrase 'beside this book' in which this actually could bridge the next utterance to still focus on the book, not the content of the book. Thus, the 'other editions' became the main discussion or the main noun phrase the learner should say first on purpose to make it in order. In other

words, the correct order for datum 20 is ‘3 other editions of history of literary criticism’.

Datum 31 is quite different from the previous one in which there is no use of preposition to describe the noun and its adjective modifier. Therefore, it was a simple order when we want to say something as a noun with its following adjective. The learner should say the adjective first, after that the noun is followed. To sum up the ‘**unfair condition**’ is the correct order instead of saying “condition unfair”.

Meanwhile, in datum 53, the adjective phrase as a modifier of the noun was “that stated in that book”. We can omit the relative pronoun “that” to change the adjective clause to the adjective phrase. It is also without changing the meaning in the passive. In conclusion, the learner should say “849 pages started from part 1 until part 8 with 29 chapter itself” based on datum 15, and should say “.... 3 part of region; French feminist, American feminist, and British feminist **stated in that book.**” based on datum 53.

**Tabel 7 Some Transformations of Passive**

Datum.	Utterances
15	... <b>849 pages start from</b> part 1 until part 8 with 29 chapter itself.
53	Actually, feminist criticism come from <b>3 part of region; French feminist, American feminist, and British feminist</b> that stated in that book.

Both data above are the errors of saying passive as a modifier of a noun. Instead of saying the structural passive, the learner uttered incomplete category for the adjective phrase in each datum. It means there was no *–be* before “start” or a final *–ed* for “start” in datum 15. That also happened in datum 53 of which there was no *–be* after the relative pronoun “that”. Therefore, both data are about reducing relative pronouns to be adjective phrases.

Reducing relative pronouns as an adjective clause to be adjective phrases is purposed to modify a noun without changing the meaning (Azar, 2002). For example, the adjective clause from “The boy who works at that store” in a sentence “The boy who works at that store is my brother” can be changed to be the adjective phrase by reducing the relative pronoun “who works” to be “working” without changing the meaning. However, datum 15 had an adjective phrase as a modifier of the noun “start from part 1 until part 8 with 29 chapter itself”, thus, we can directly add a final *–ed* for the first word of the phrase “start” to make the meaning passive.

### Errors in Form of Clause

An ideal clause contains a phrase referring to an action or state. “My mother bought a present” is a clause. The phrase *my mother* refers to the buyer, *bought* refers to the action and *a present* refers to what was bought. Further, a clause is a unit which as a minimum consists of a verb and its complements (Miller, 2013). Then, the present writers found 6 errors of syntax in the form of a clause in a learners speech. They were included as follows:

**Tabel 8 Omission of Verb**

Datum.	Utterances
6	<b>Why I said before because .....</b>
25	<b>Why I choose this topic because .....</b>

Those errors above were about noun clauses as subjects. It consisted of dependent and independent clauses. Either datum 6 or datum 25 was started by the dependent clause connected to the independent clause. The dependent clause “Why I said before” in datum 6 had functioned as a subject and it was directly followed by “because” as the next clause (independent). Therefore, that was an error if there was no verb between dependent and independent clauses. Dealing with datum 6, error was uttered by the learner again in datum 25. The error of omitting a verb is after the dependent “Why I choose this topic”.

“Why I said before” and “Why I choose this topic” are noun clauses. They are used as subjects of sentences. If there is a subject, there must be a verb. Then, the learner should say “Why I said before **is** because my book report is about the history of literary criticism from Plato to Present” for datum 6 and should say “Why I choose this topic **is** because this book, especially this chapter gives the big contribution” for datum 25.

**Tabel 9 Agreement of Subject and Verb**

Datum.	Utterances
8	how people lives and ....

In this type, the learner only uttered 1 error of S-V agreement. Agreement of Subject and Verb means that we have to treat the subject and the verb the same. If the subject indicates singular, then the verb must be singular and vice versa. Next, how we treat what subject is singular or what verb is for a plural subject is by looking at the final of the word (noun or verb). If it is a noun, it has a final *-s*, *-es*, *or -ies* to indicate plural. In contrast to a verb, it has a final *-s*, *-es*, *or -ies* to indicate that it is for a singular subject.

Then, the noun clause “how people lives” was not grammatically uttered. The noun “people” is not ended by *-s* but it is plural and followed by the plural verb (Azar, 2002). Therefore, the learner should omit a final *-s* in the verb “lives” to make them agree. To sum up, the clause “how people live” structurally agrees on the subject and verb instead of “how people lives”.

**Tabel 10 Verb-and-Verb Construction**

Datum.	Utterances
26	And when I am in a methodology of research class, it's discuss about feminist criticism.

The learner made 1 error in constructing the verb and verb of which she uttered a complex sentence rather than a simple one. The utterance of the complex sentence above, in fact, was ambiguous to describe who the main subject of the activity was. That error of producing constructions can be described as the embedding of a noun-and-verb construction in another noun-and-verb construction. The two noun-and-verb constructions had identical subjects. The appropriate subject for the independent clause “it's discuss about the feminist criticism” is *I*, because the doer was still the same as the dependent “when I am in a methodology of research class”.

Then, it would be structurally understood if the learner made it simple instead of the complex one. Thus, the learner should say “And I discuss the feminist criticism in a methodology of research class”. Besides, parallel to the preceding datum “... the big contribution for me when I was in five semesters and when I faced my examination in literary criticism...” using the tense of simple past to describe events in the past, the learner should consistently say next in past form also. As a result, the appropriate utterance instead of datum 26 above should be “And I discussed the feminist criticism in a methodology of research class”.

**Tabel 11 Some Transformations of Passive**

Datum.	Utterances
62	And what we need to be studied in this criticism is ..... .

The error above happens in the form of a noun clause. The learner said in passive “what we need to be studied” was the confusion in determining who the subject and the object were. Because what the learner meant was the same or identical subject— between the doer “we” and things we “did”— so the learner

was wrong to utter passive form in datum 62. In other words, the learner should utter – to infinitive instead of passive. Because there were 2 verbs above; “need” and “study” with the same subject. Therefore, the appropriate utterance for datum 62 is “And what **we need to study** in this criticism is the reader ....”

Besides, if the learner did not say “we need” in datum 62 above, it would be appropriate in using passive transformation. It because only had one subject “thing” or “what thing” to be done. Therefore, it was not confusing to determine which one was the subject. In other words, another appropriate utterance based on datum 62 is “And **what to be studied** in this criticism is the reader ....”

### Errors in Form of Sentence

To put clauses together into a sentence is like the activity consisting of main clauses and different types of subordinate clauses. Depending on what types of clauses are combined, there will be a compound sentence and complex sentences (Miller, 2013). Then, the present writers found 32 errors of syntax in the form of sentence in a learner’s speech. Those were included as follows:

number of things mentioned in the following. There were three “historical context, feminist criticism, and reader response and receptionist theory” things which indicated plural nouns. But the learner said “it’s” standing for “it is” as the subject and verb. That became the confusion in number. Therefore, the learner should say “**They are** historical context, feminist criticism, and reader response and receptionist theory”.

Meanwhile, the error that happened in datum 52 was in contrast to datum 44. In this case, the learner said the inappropriate number of the thing mentioned after the subject and verb. Taking a final –s for “quotation” above was including confusion in number. It is because the learner did not mention how many quotations there were and what the quotations were. The learner only uttered “this is the quotations” by pointing the slide without reading it or even explaining the number of quotations? (based on the observation of the present writers in the classroom). As a result, the learner did not need to add –s for “quotation” to make it appropriate in number with the subject and the verb. To sum up, the appropriate utterance for datum 52 should be “**This is the quotation**”.

**Tabel 12 Number Confusion**

Datum.	Utterances
44	It's about historical context, feminist criticism, and reader response and receptionist theory.
52	<b>This is the quotations.</b>

This type of error was the most of the others uttered by the learner. This happened usually when singulars were used for plurals and plurals for singulars. The learner seemed to be confused or not focused on the number of things mentioned and the subjects for them.

In datum 44, the subject pronoun “it” and its verb “is” was not appropriate with the

**Tabel 12 Use of Pronouns**

Datum	Utterances
27	... for <b>the one</b> in the literature field, <b>they, we</b> have to know and understand literary work itself.
47	<b>The quotation it's</b> about the movement of the literary criticism .....

The use of pronouns became the third type of error which was mostly uttered by the learner. Based on datum 27, there were 2 cases of uttering error. First, the use of the impersonal pronoun “the one” indicating singular noun which was not appropriate with the following pronoun “we” indicating plural. As a result, the

learner should say “the ones” to refer to many people in general in the literature field. Because, the second, the following pronoun the learner said were “they” and “we”. It seemed that the learner realized that she made an error for once after she said “they”, then she continued to say “we” instead of “they” which was wrong. It means that it would be appropriate if the learner still said “they” to refer to “the ones” above indicating many people instead of “we” which the learner did not need to take a part in it. Because pronoun “we” means “I” or the learner also participates. To sum up, the learner should say “...for **the ones** in the literature field, **they** have to know and understand literary work itself”.

The error that occurred in datum 47 was the repetition of using pronouns as subjects. The learner said singular countable noun “the quotation” and pronoun “it” at the same time to describe the subject which it was needed only 1 pronoun. Considering the previous utterance in datum 46 “This is the quotation, ...,” the learner just should say the same pronoun the subject in the following utterance. As a result, the learner should say “**The quotation is about** the movement of the literary criticism...” based on datum 47.

**Tabel 13 Use of Prepositions**

Datum	Utterances
50	This history also <b>bring the literary men focus in</b> class, gender, race, nationality and religion.

The error in datum 50 included the confusion of preposition when the particular or specific thing was involved. The use of preposition “in” after the verb “focus” is not appropriate. Therefore, the learner should say “**focus on**” instead of “focus in”.

**Tabel 14 Omission of Verb**

Datum	Utterances
24	It is about 20th century and <b>my focus in chapter 26 and 27 about</b> feminist criticism and reader response ....
32	<b>This history to understand</b> woman injustice in term of ....

Datum 24 is about an error in a compound sentence. It is a sentence containing two independent clauses with a coordinator “and”. The first clause “It is about 20th century” has a complete subject and verb. But, there is no verb or omission of the verb in the next clause. There is only subject “my focus in chapter 26 and 27” without a verb before continuing to say “about feminist criticism and reader response ....”. Therefore, the learner should say “**My focus in chapter 26 and 27 are about feminist criticism and reader response ....**”. The learner should say “are” as the verb because there were 2 things “chapter 26 and 27” mentioned as the subjects. Besides, the word choice “focus” before “my” in datum 24 was inappropriate. It is because “focus” indicates verb in syntax category, not a noun as a modifier “my”. Then, the appropriate preposition for “focus” is “on”. In other words, the present writers try to make the appropriate subject and verb for the error in datum 24 become “It is about 20th century and **I focus on** feminist criticism and reader-response in chapter 26 and 27”.

The error in datum 32 was the omission of the verb before uttering the infinitival clause as the object. An infinitival clause is a form of clause started by “to infinitive” and functioned as an object. The subject “this history” indicating singular noun must be followed by the verb “is” for the singular subject. Therefore, the learner should say “**This history is to understand** woman injustice in term of ....” based on datum 32.

**Tabel 15 Use of Progressive Tense**

Datum	Utterance
40	<b>The second is considers</b> a wide range of thinkers of literary men of, and this is, this strength itself means that .....

Based on the datum above, the learner only made 1 error in using progressive tense. That was the replacement of *–ing* form by the simple form of the verb “**considers**”. Thus, the learner should take a final *–ing* because there was be “*is*” as the verb. This also includes the form of the object in a gerund. As a result, the learner should say “**The second is considering** a wide range of thinkers of literary men, .....”.

**Tabel 16 Agreement of Subject and Verb**

Datum	Utterances
16	<b>My focuses is</b> the last chapter, I'm sorry, before....
29	<b>This book also gives, tell</b> us about kind of literary criticism such as

Agreement of Subject and Verb means that we have to treat the subject and the verb the same. If the subject indicates singular then the verb must be singular and vice versa. Next, how we treat what subject is singular or what verb is for plural subject is by looking at the final of the word (noun or verb). If it is a noun, it has a final *–s*, *–es*, or *–ies* to indicate plural. In contrast to a verb, it has a final *–s*, *–es*, or *–ies* to indicate that it is for a singular subject. Then the subject “**my focuses**” in datum 16 indicated plural because it ended by *–es*. It did not agree with the verb “*is*”. Thus, the learner should omit a final *–es* to make the subject agree with the verb. As a result, the appropriate utterance on the error in datum 16 should be “**My focus is** the last chapter, ....”

Meanwhile, datum 29 showed that the learner realized once that she made an error in using word choice for the verb “*gives*”. Then the learner uttered “*tell*” for the second which was not in agreement. The verb “*tell*” did not

agree with the singular pronoun “*this book*”. As a result, the learner should say “**This book tells** us about kind of literary criticism such as ....”

**Tabel 17 Verb-and-Verb Construction**

Datum.	Utterance
15	For <b>the pages is consist of</b> 849 pages start from part 1 until part 8 with 29 chapter itself.
50	This history also <b>bring the literary men focus</b> in class, gender, race, nationality and religion.

The use of pronouns becomes the second type of error, which was mostly uttered by the learner. This mostly happened in constructing the verb of the simple present instead of a simple past based on the context discussed. Taking an example in datum 15, the learner said double verb “*is consist of*” for the subject “*the pages*”. Because the subject indicated plural noun by taking a look at a final *–s* for “*the pages*”, the learner can omit the verb “*be*” or add a final *–ing* for the verb “*consist*” based on datum 15. The present writers preferred to omit “*be*” and use the simple present verb “*consist*” because the context shows the characteristic of thing in general. Thus, it should be in the present form. Next, the following noun after “849” was redundancy because the learner has said it in the beginning as the subject. To sum up, the learner was better to say “**the pages consist of 849 ....**”

Datum 50 showed 2 errors in constructing the verb and verb made by the learner. First, the learner uttered the simple form of the verb “*bring*” instead of the past form. Because the preceding utterance showed the context of past events such as “*Many literary men brought and raised the movement ...*” (datum 49), then the learner should keep saying the following verb in past forms based on the context. Thus, the past form of “*bring*” became “*brought*”. Second, after the learner said the direct object “*the literary men*”, she directly uttered another verb “*focus*” which became the wrong construction.

If 2 verbs were indicating the same subject or the doer, it must be connected by “to infinitive”. As a result, the appropriate construction for datum 50 should be “This history **brought the literary men to focus ....**”

**Tabel 18 Some Transformations of Negative**

Datum	Utterance
38	Actually, this summary <b>is not cover</b> all the chapter inside the ....

This type of error was made only by the learner once in the form of the sentence. This included the formation of negative with “no” or “not” and without the appropriate auxiliary based on the subject and the following verb as predicate or the following noun as the complement. Based on datum 38, the learner uttered: “is” instead of “do/ does” to precede the verb “cover” in negative transformation. Then, this was considered by the subject “this summary” which indicated singular pronoun. Therefore, the appropriate auxiliary for the subject was “does”. To sum up, the learner should say “Actually **this summary does not cover** all the chapter inside the ....”

## CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that from 15 types of syntactical errors proposed by (Politzer & Ramirez, 1973), there were 10 types of errors that the EFL learner made. They were Number Confusion, Use of Pronouns, Use of Prepositions, Omission of Verb, Use of Progressive Tense, Agreement of Subject and Verb, Verb-and-Verb Construction, Word Order, Some Transformations of Passive and Negative.

The type of error that the learner uttered the most was number confusion (26,56%). It was indicated with occasional singulars were used for plurals and plurals for singulars. It is in line with (Politzer & Ramirez, 1973) findings.

This proves that the learner often made errors mention the things based on the number.

It seems that the learner was still confused about producing the number and things in agreement in English because of the source language. In contrast to earlier findings (Karahan, 2011), she found that prepositions and articles were the most syntactical error found.

Besides, three forms of the error made by the learner were identified. They were an error in phrases, errors in clauses, and errors in sentences. First, error in phrases contained 26 errors in total, second, error in a clause with a total of 6 errors, and the last, error in a sentence with a total of 32 errors. As a result, there were 64 syntactical errors of 66 data uttered by the learner. The number of errors (40,63%) found was more than the total number of data because there was a possibility that the learner uttered more than one error in one form.

Based on the findings, this study concluded with proof that the best learner could still make the error of speech. Yet, a speech or any form of utterance is a natural proficiency in which some people may take more consideration for the ones making an error. However, it will be different in learning a foreign language. The learners tend to make an error as often as possible. Therefore, this study hopefully becomes the standard for the lecturer to look at a phenomenon that even the best learner still made errors and the measurement to predict how others would be. Thus, the teacher or the instructor should investigate it directly in the class. Because, errors become an indicator that learning is taking place (Hourani, 2008) and English language learning and teaching will also become more important since English at the present become more globalized (Qodriani & Kardiansyah, 2018). In addition, to conclude, the findings of this study at the end could improve the student’s speaking skills in their level of English.

We gratefully acknowledge Akhyar Rido, Ph.D., Dean of Faculty of Arts and Education, Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia for his

valuable input throughout the whole process of conducting this research. We also thank Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia and LPPM Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia for the grant. This work was performed within the framework of *Program Penelitian Internal* under grant agreement No. 035/UTI/LPPM/E.1.1/VII/2020.

## REFERENCES

Alamin, A., & Ahmed, S. (2012). Syntactical and punctuation errors: An analysis of technical writing of University Students science college, Taif University, KSA. *English Language Teaching*, 5(5), 2–8. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n5p2>

Asih, S.W., Asrianto, & Murwantono, D. (2020). Grammatical errors in speaking made by graduated students of Ahmad Dahlan university. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(3), 6567–6571.

Azar, B. . (2002). Understanding and Using COBIT. In *Longman*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118691656.ch16>

Bayram, F. (2015). Spoken Grammar in L2 Classrooms: 'I Mean in the Corpus. *Journal of International Social Research*, 8(41), 895–895. <https://doi.org/10.17719/jISR.20154115070>

Eng, L.S., Luyue, C., & Lim, C.K. (2020). A comparison of the english grammatical errors of Chinese undergraduates from china and Malaysia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 13(1), 931–950. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13160a>

Faisyal, R. (2015). *Morphological and syntactic errors found in english composition written by the students of daarut taqwa islamic boarding school klaten*. 1–21.

Habibullah, M.M.K. (2010). *An error analysis on grammatical structures of the students' theses.pdf*.

Helmanda, C.M., Safura, S., & Suriadi, E. (2018). The Grammatical Error Analysis of Students' Speaking Performance. *Jurnal Dedikasi Pendidikan*, 2(1), 80–88.

Hervina, H. (2014). Grammatical Errors in Speaking Made by the Third Year English Department Students STKIP Abdi Pendidikan Payakumbuh. *AL-Ta Lim*, 21(3), 206. <https://doi.org/10.15548/jt.v21i3.106>

Hourani, T. M. Y. (2008). An Analysis of the Common Grammatical Errors in the English Writing made by 3 rd Secondary Male Students in the Eastern Coast of the UAE. *Institute of Education British University in Dubai*, 1–80. <https://bspace.buid.ac.ae/bitstream/1234/225/1/20050055.pdf>

Jayasundara, J. M. P. V. . &, & Premarathna, C. D. H. . (2011). A Linguistics Analysis on Errors Committed in English by Undergraduates. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 1(1), 2250–3153. [www.ijrsp.org](http://www.ijrsp.org)

Jiménez Catalán, R. (1996). Frequency and variability in errors in the use of english prepositions. *Misclánea: A Journal of English and American Studies*, 17(17), 171–188.

Karahan, P. (2011). An analysis of syntactic errors in the composition of Jordanian secondary students. *Unpublished MA Thesis*. Jordan. Yarmouk University. [https://scholar.google.com.my/scholar?q=related:EtfclldlhU0J:scholar.google.com/&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0,5#7](https://scholar.google.com.my/scholar?q=related:EtfclldlhU0J:scholar.google.com/&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5#7).

Kardiansyah, M. Y., & Qodriani, L. U. (2018). English Extracurricular and Its Role To Improve Students' English Speaking Ability. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 4(1), 60–69. <https://doi.org/10.22225/jr.4.1.522.60-69>

Khotari, C. . (2004). *Research Methodology methods and Techniques*.

Kuswoyo, Heri ; Wahyudin, A. Y. (2017). Improving Student's Listening Skill Using Task- Based Approach in EFL Classroom Setting. *Proceedings of the 4th Asia Pacific Education Conference (AECON 2017)*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aecon-17.2017.24>

Kuswoyo, H., & Susardi, S. (2017). Problems on Sfg Thematic Progression In Esl Academic Writing. *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra*. <https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v2i1.655>

Macdonald, S., Headlam, N., & Centre for Local Economic Strategies. (2008). *Research methods handbook : introductory guide to research methods for social research*.

Mahbub, M.A. (2019). Snakes and Ladders Game: an Alternative Instructional Strategy To Enhance the Learners' Grammatical Proficiency. *Aksara*, 31(1), 153. <https://doi.org/10.29255/aksara.v31i1.212.153-166>.

Mat, N.H.D.C., Qodriani, L.U., & Kardiansyah, M.Y. (2019). Malaysian and Indonesian Learners: They are Judges of How They Learn English Most Effectively in and out of Classrooms. *Teknosastik*, 14(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v14i1.81>.

Miller, J. (2013). An Introduction to English Syntax. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), 1689–1699. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>.

Mohammed, S., Mohammed, H., & AbdalHussein, F. (2015). Grammatical error analysis of Iraqi postgraduate students' academic writing. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3(6), 283–294. [www.ijern.com](http://www.ijern.com).

Ngangbam, H. (2016). an Analysis of Syntactic Errors Committed By Students of English Language Class in the Written Composition of Mutah University: a Case Study. *European Journal of English Language*, *Linguistics and Literature*, 3(1), 1–13. [www.idpublications.org](http://www.idpublications.org).

Phettongkam, H. (2017). *Grammatical Errors in Spoken English of Undergraduate Thai Leaners in a Communicative Business English Course*. 10(1), 95–118.

Politzer, R.L., & Ramirez, A.G. (1973). *American Pupils in a Bilingual School and a Monolingual School* ^.

Puspitasari, D. (2013). *Grammatical Errors Made By the Second Semester Students in Writing Ii Subject in the English Education Department of Yogyakarta State University in the*. 1–188.

Qodriani, L.U., & Kardiansyah, M.Y. (2018). Exploring Culture in Indonesia English Textbook for Secondary Education. ... *Pendidikan Indonesia*, 7(1), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v7i1.13692>.

Ruminar, H. (2018). Grammatical Errors in Esp Students' Presentation Across Proficiency Levels. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka) : Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, 3(1), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v3i1.2152>

Simbolon, M. (2015). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors on Speaking Activities. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 5(2), 71. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v5i2.368>

Taura, H., Patterns, E., Countries, F., & Taura, H. (1997). *Revival of Error Analysis-As an Effective Tool To Assess Development of Japanese ESL Learners*.

Widianingsih & Gulö. (2016). Grammatical Difficulties Encountered. *Grammatical Difficulties Encountered By Second Language Learners of English*, May, 141. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4330.3284>.

Zanoria, J.S., & Oliva, E.R.A. (2019). Syntactic Error Analysis on Oral Classroom Discourse. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Research*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.33140/jepr.01.01.03>.