

An Analysis of Grammatical Errors Recount Text Written by Malahayati University Students

Hamida Nur Rahmawati ^{1✉}, Desy Awal Mar'an ²

¹ Universitas Malahayati, Lampung, Indonesia

² Universitas Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia

✉ email: hamida@malahayati.ac.id

Received:

June 15, 2025

Revised:

June 20, 2025

Accepted:

July 1, 2025

Published:

July 15, 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examined grammatical errors in recount texts written by 20 Management students at Malahayati University. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, the analysis focused on vocabulary, mechanics, organization, grammar, and content. The results showed that while some students demonstrated good writing ability, many struggled, particularly with grammar and mechanics. Weaknesses were evident in verb tense usage, subject-verb agreement, and sentence structure, as well as in punctuation and capitalization. Differences in vocabulary and organization scores indicated varying levels of skill in word choice and text structuring. The findings highlight the need for targeted instructional strategies, especially grammar-focused lessons, explicit training in mechanics, and individualized support for vocabulary building and organizational skills. Identifying recurring error patterns allows for more effective teaching interventions aimed at improving students' proficiency in recount writing.

Keywords: *Grammatical Errors; Recount Texts; Methods of Analysis.*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a fundamental skill for academic and effective communication in today's globalized world (Brown, 2007). However, students at Malahayati University face that-challenges in creating clear, accurate, and effective written work. This research purpose to explore the common typing errors indicated by Malahayati University Students. The researchers will identifying underlying causes and ultimately contribute to the development of more effective writing teaching strategies. Writing skill is very important for university students, allows them to convey effective ideas, engage in critical thinking, and successful in pursuing their education (Nation, 2009). But, there are some factor that limited language exposure, insufficient writing practice, and inadequate reciprocity can hinder student's writing skill (Hyland, 2003). By conducting this research against specific errors made by Malahayati Students, this research purpose to gain a deeper understanding of their writing challenges and identify areas for improvement.

Effective communication it is not only about grammatical accuracy but also the ability to deliver meaning in clear, coherent, and contextually appropriate manner (Canale & Swain, 1980). Recount text is about developing communicative competence with provide structure by the students to tell about the past events (Derewianka, 1990).

By focusing on past tense usage, recount text can make expand their vocabulary that related with time and event, and increase their fluency by express their experience (Celce-Murcia & Olstain,2000). This research will explore the significant about recount text in language learning, examining their contribution to specific linguistic skills and their role in communicative competence.

This research grammatical error in writing has often focused on linguistic features (Ellis,1994). In the context of recount text, where the students required manage temporal sequences and personal perspective. This research argues that need for further investigation how contextual factors, such as the complexity of the narrated event or the intimacy learning by that topic, contribute to grammatical errors in recount writing (Swain, 1985). By examining these contextual influences, we can gain a more comprehensive understanding of the challenges learners how to face and develop more targeted pedagogical interventions (Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H, 1991).

Grammatical is a crucial aspect of effective communication, particularly in written narratives Chomsky, 1965). Recount text provide a valuable context for learners to practice using past tenses and other grammatical structures. However, learners often struggle with various grammatical errors when constructing these narratives. These research purposes identify grammatical errors in recount texts written by Malahayati University Students, focusing on grammatical errors recount text written. There are 25 students from Management Major that participated in this research. This research will offer a clearer understanding of the specific grammatical areas requiring attention in instruction..

METHOD

This research method used qualitative. The purpose of this research is to analyze grammatical errors in recount text written by students Malahayati University. Qualitative research is deemed appropriate as it allows for an in-depth exploration of the nature and patterns of errors. This approach involves research question and data collecting procedure. A qualitative method is appropriate for this research as it allows for an in-depth exploration of the nature, types, and patterns of grammatical errors, providing descriptive data that goes beyond mere quantification. The purpose of this approach to understand the underlying reasons for error occurrence and their potential impact on meaning construction within the specific context of recount writing.

This research is using descriptive case study design. This design is suitable for investigating a case within a specific context, in this case, the grammatical errors made by Malahayati University Students in their recount writing. The descriptive nature of the study aims to provide a detailed account of the errors without manipulating any variables. The participant in this study will be students at Malahayati University students, student from Management Major. There are 25 participants in this research.

The primary data for this research will be collected from a recount text written by the participant. The participants will be asked to write a recount text based on their personal experience. The writing task will be designed to elicit a range of grammatical

structures commonly used in recounts, such as past tenses, time adverbials, conjunctions, and specific vocabulary related to events and experiences. Data analysis of grammatical errors will be conducted are an error identification and error categorization. Error identification mean that each recount text will be carefully examined to identify instances of grammatical errors. An error is defined as a deviation from the accepted grammatical rules of standard English that potentially hinders communication or deviates from native-speaker norms. The error categorization means identified errors will be categorized based on verb tense and aspect error, subject-verb error, preposition error, pronoun error, and the other relevant categories that emerge the data.

The findings of the study will be presented using descriptive to summarize the error categories. Qualitative data in the form of excerpts from student texts will be used illustrate the different types of errors and their potential impact on meaning. Participant in this study will be Malahayati University students in Management Major, and all participants will be informed about the purpose of the research and the use of their data. The findings may not be generalizable to other populations or writing genres. However, the in-depth qualitative analysis will provide valuable insight into the grammatical challenges faced by these learners and contribute to be a better understanding of error analysis in second language writing.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of student's writing scores reflect their ability to write recount texts. Based on the results of 20 student's in collect writing score of recount text from Malahayati University students, there were 2 students who got D, 7 students were got C, 2 students who get B, and 9 students who get A. The researchers score in writing recount text were based on the five aspects of writing. There are the vocabulary, mechanic, organization, grammar, and content. The result are shown in the following table:

Table 1. Score in Writing Recount Text

No	Students	Vocabulary (20)	Mechanic (5)	Organization (20)	Grammar (25)	Content (30)	Total Score (100)
1	A	15	3	15	10	20	63
2	B	15	3	15	10	25	68
3	C	18	4	18	20	25	85
4	D	20	4	18	22	25	89
5	E	20	4	18	20	25	87
6	F	20	4	18	22	30	94
7	G	20	4	18	20	25	87
8	H	20	4	18	20	20	82
9	I	15	3	15	15	15	63
10	J	15	3	15	10	15	58
11	K	15	3	15	10	15	58
12	L	20	4	18	20	25	87
13	M	15	3	18	15	25	76
14	N	15	3	15	15	15	63
15	O	15	3	15	15	15	63
16	P	20	4	20	18	25	87
17	Q	15	3	14	10	15	57
18	R	15	3	10	10	10	48
19	S	15	4	15	15	25	74
20	T	15	3	10	10	15	53

This table presents the scores of 20 students that labeled A through T across five distinct categories: vocabulary, mechanics, organization, grammar, and content. Each category has a maximum possible score, indicated in parentheses at the top of the table. The table aims to quantify the students' proficiency in written recount texts, particularly highlighting areas where grammatical errors might be prevalent. The "total score" column sums the scores from all five categories, giving an overall performance metric out of 100. Notably, the "Grammar" column is a significant focus, as it directly assesses the students' ability to construct grammatically correct sentences within their recounts.

Analyzing the data, we observe a wide range of performance across the students. Students like D, E, F, G, L, and P consistently score high, indicating strong overall command of the language, including grammar. In contrast, students like R, T, and Q score significantly lower, suggesting substantial challenges with various aspects of

writing, including grammar. The Grammar column reflects his disparity, with scores ranging from 10 to 20. It is important to note that mechanic scores are very low across the board, showing that there is a large issue with punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. The scores in the vocabulary and organization columns also show that there is a wide range of ability in the class.

The table serves as a valuable tool for instructor to identify specific areas where students need additional support. For instance, those with low grammar scores may benefit from focused lessons on verb tenses, subject-verb agreement, and sentence structure. Similarly, low scores in vocabulary or organization could indicate a need for targeted instruction in expanding lexical resources or improving the logical flow of their writing. In the context of recount texts, this data can inform targeted interventions to help students effectively narrate past events with grammatical accuracy and clarity. The low mechanic scores also show the need for basic writing skill improvement.

Discussion

The results of this paper, which assessed 20 Malahayati University students' written recount text across five key areas (vocabulary, mechanics, organizations, grammar, and content), reveal a diverse range of writing proficiencies. as initially summarized, the distribution of final grades indicated a spread: 9 students achieved an "A," 2 students a "B," 7 students a "C," and 2 students a "D," this broad distribution suggests a heterogeneous group of learners with varying levels of competency in recount writing.

A deeper dive into the component scores, as depicted in the table, provides a more nuanced understanding of student performance. Notably, students who achieved higher overall scores (e.g., D, E, F, G, L, P) demonstrated consistent strengths across multiple categories, particularly in grammar and content. This indicates that these students not only possessed a strong grasp of grammatical rules but also effectively conveyed their recounted experiences in a coherent and engaging manner. Conversely, students with lower overall scores (e.g., R, T, Q) struggled significantly in grammar, evidenced by scores as low as 10 out of 25. This underscores the critical role of grammatical accuracy in achieving effective written communication, especially in recount texts, which necessitate clear and chronological sequencing of events.

The pervasive weakness in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling suggests a fundamental gap in students' basic writing skills (Tribble, 1996). This issue transcends individual grammatical errors and points to a broader need for targeted instruction in the foundational aspects of written English (Ferris, 2002). The variability in vocabulary and organization scores indicates that while some students effectively utilized lexical resources and structured their recounts logically, others struggled with these aspects (Grabe, 2001).

In conclusion, the data reveals that while some students have achieved a high level of proficiency in writing recounts texts, a significant portion requires targeted intervention to improve their grammatical accuracy, mechanical skills, vocabulary, and organizational abilities (Hyland, 2004). The consistently low scores in mechanics

necessitate immediate attention, as these foundational skills are crucial for effective written communication (Raimes, 1983). The findings of this study provide valuable insights for instructors at Malahayati University to their teaching strategies and provide targeted support to enhance students' writing proficiency in recount texts

CONCLUSION

This paper, "An Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Recount Texts Written by Malahayati University Students," aimed to identify and analyze grammatical errors in recount texts produced by 20 Management Major students. Through a qualitative descriptive among the participants, as evidenced by the distribution of scores across vocabulary, mechanics, organization, grammar, and content.

The researcher highlighted several key findings. Firstly, while a notable portion of students demonstrated strong overall writing skills, particularly in grammar and content, a considerable number exhibited significant challenges, especially in grammatical accuracy. Secondly, a pervasive weakness in mechanics (punctuation, capitalization, and spelling) was observed across the board, indicating a fundamental gap in basic writing skills. thirdly, variability in vocabulary and organization scores suggested differing levels of proficiency in lexical resource utilization and text structuring.

The findings underscore the necessity for targeted pedagogical interventions to address these identified weaknesses. Specifically, focused instruction on grammatical rules, verb tenses, subject verb agreement, and sentence structure is crucial for improving grammatical accuracy. Furthermore, immediate attention must be given to enhancing students' mechanical skills through explicit instruction and practice. Differentiated instruction that caters to individual student needs, such as vocabulary building exercises and strategies for improving text organization, is also recommended.

This paper provides valuable insights for lecturer at Malahayati University to refine their teaching strategies and provide targeted support to enhance students' writing proficiency in recount texts. The identification of specific error patterns and areas of weakness enables educators to develop more effective and tailored interventions, there by improved written communication skills among students.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Pearson Education ESL.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5(4), 161–170.

- Derewianka, B. (1990). *Exploring how texts work*. Primary English Teaching Association.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Grabe, W. (2001). Reading-writing relations: Theoretical perspectives and instructional practices. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 119–148.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Longman.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. Routledge.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press