

UNVEILING GRAMMATICAL AND UNGRAMMATICAL CLAUSES IN ENGLISH WRITING PROFICIENCY TEST SIMULATIONS AMONG INDONESIAN SCHOLARSHIP AWARDEES

Muhammad Adi Pratama, Aris Munandar

Department of Language and Literature

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada

Sleman, Indonesia

muhammadadipratama@mail.ugm.ac.id

Abstract

Indonesian learners of English generated ungrammaticalities in International English Language Testing System (IELTS) writing simulations. Deciphering the scores based on the test's official descriptors is also intricate. These two problems hinder self-evaluations and improvements. Hence, this study examined grammatical and ungrammatical clauses based on subject-verb (S + V) structures in IELTS writing performances completed by Indonesia's *Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan* (LPDP) Affirmation Scholarship awardees during test simulations and the ratios of these two types of clauses according to the simulation score variation. To do so, we did archival research by obtaining data from teachers' documents. Initially, a qualitative method was employed to identify the clauses as either grammatical or ungrammatical. This was followed by a quantitative method to discover the clauses' numbers, including their proportions via an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test. The results showed that the grammatical clauses exhibit diverse structures, influenced by the test requirements and participants' needs to express their ideas. Conversely, the ungrammatical clauses stem from the writers' limited English proficiency and test pressures. The grammatical clauses outnumber the ungrammatical ones by approximately threefold. The lower proportions of ungrammatical clauses correlate with the lower scores. However, the higher proportions of grammatical clauses do not necessarily equate to the higher scores. The statistical correlation between the clause proportions and score variation is confirmed. This study ultimately enhances learning, evaluation, and improvement of the test skill, as well as understanding the descriptors and aiding the score prediction for learners and educators.

Keywords – grammaticality, ungrammaticality, clauses, IELTS writing

Introduction

Writing is the most difficult skill for ESL and EFL learners (Richards et al., 2002, pp. 303-304). The difficulty level increases in the examination situations (Al-Khresheh, 2016). In Indonesia, English is a foreign language rather than a second language (Lauder, 2008, pp. 9-20). Consequently, Indonesian learners of English also face the same problem.

There is demand for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) Academic in Indonesia, driven by Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP) Affirmation Scholarship

requirements. This scholarship, for bachelor's degree graduates from affirmation areas facing financial issues who pursue master's degrees, provides an IELTS preparation course at universities such as Universitas Gadjah Mada (LPDP, 2023b). The course simulation assessment shows deficiencies in grammar, including the subject-verb structure (S + V), which is challenging for EFL and ESL learners (Surina and Kamaruzaman, 2009, p. 190).

Compared to English, the Indonesian language has some different grammatical features in terms of S + V structure. Below are some examples:

Table 1. Different Grammatical Features Between English and the Indonesian Language

no	English	no	Indonesian
1	“The couple I invited to dinner were two hours late.” (Azar, 2003, p. 345)	1	“ <i>Dia seorang ahli yang menjalankan mesin itu.</i> ” (Editorial Team, 2008, p. 21)
2	“He drinks two cups of coffee before he goes to work.” (Azar, 2003, p. 5)	2	“ <i>Dia menuturkan Kemenhub akan meningkatkan jumlah angkutan darat maupun laut untuk mudik gratis di Lebaran tahun depan.</i> ” (Detiknews, 2023)

English requires couplas, while the Indonesian language does not. In English sentence number 1, the verb ‘be’ “were” as the copula connects the subject “The couple” and the adverb “two hours late.” In Indonesian sentence number 1, no copula is needed to connect the subject “*Dia*” and the complement “*seorang ahli*”. English also requires subject-verb agreement, while Indonesian does not. In English sentence number 2, the singular subject “He” needs the singular verb “drinks”. In Indonesian number 2, “*Dia*” uses the verb “*menuturkan*”, which does not indicate singularity or plurality.

Many participants produced sentences with poor grammar, resulting in low simulation scores. Unlike listening and reading assessments using score charts based on correct answers, IELTS writing assessments rely on narrative-based descriptors (IELTS, 2016a, 2016b). This can confuse and demotivate the awardees, hindering their self-evaluations and self-improvements. Purwanti (2015) supports this, noting the difficulty of self-assessing writing grammar quality.

In light of these concerns, our study examined grammatical and ungrammatical clauses based on the S + V structures produced by LPDP awardees in IELTS writing simulations and then analyzed the clauses’ distribution across the scores adopting the listening and reading

assessment approach. To ensure the second goal, we investigated whether there were significant differences between the clauses’ ratios and scores. Therefore, our research questions are:

1. What are the LPDP Affirmation Scholarship awardees’ grammatical and ungrammatical clauses in their IELTS writing simulations?
2. What are the grammatical and ungrammatical clauses’ ratios corresponding to the score variation?
3. Are there any significant differences between the clauses’ ratios based on the score variation?

This study applies a clause’s fundamental structure (Eastwood, 2002, pp. 2, 318). The example is “His paintings were not selling.” which has the subject “His paintings” as a noun phrase, and the verb “were not selling.” as a verb phrase. Eastwood further categorized clauses into main clauses and subclauses. Subclauses serve as integral components of larger sentence structures, attaching to the main clauses. Subclauses fall into five types: relative clauses, conditional clauses, noun clauses, adverbial clauses, and participle clauses (2002, pp. 171-173, 317-345). Clause formations require subject-verb agreement (SVA), emphasizing grammatical match between subjects and verbs (Eastwood, 2002, p. 191), for instance, singular subjects require

singular verbs, and plural subjects need plural verbs (Azar, 2002, pp. 83-92).

Ungrammatical clauses can result from errors and mistakes. Errors encompass grammatical arrangements unlikely to be produced by native speakers (Lennon, 1991, p. 182), while mistakes represent sporadic deviations wherein learners intermittently produce incorrect forms (Norris cited in Hasyim, 2002, p. 45). Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982, p. 150) identified four types of ungrammaticalities: 'omission', 'addition', 'misformation', and 'misordering'.

In general, scholars have investigated ESL and/or EFL learners' ungrammaticalities, with a particular focus on clauses, this research's formal object. Studies by Almahameed and Alajalein (2021), Handayani et al. (2019), Maftukhin (2023), Murad and Khalil (2015), and Nair and Hui (2018) highlighted challenges faced by learners across various educational levels. Investigations done by Dinamika and Hanafiah (2019), Talosa and Maguddayao (2018), and Zulfiah (2020) even emphasized the prevalent absence of verbs within clauses. Additionally, research by Alahmadi (2019), Gayo and Widodo (2018), Mbau et al. (2014), and Ougan and Valle (2022) discovered that subjects and verbs were the most common problems, especially in academic writing contexts comparable to IELTS, which aligns with our study's context. Meanwhile, Arham and Ariana (2020), Pouladian et al. (2017), and Tikupasang et al. (2022) identified verbs as the main cause of imperfections in IELTS writing. Moreover, Nartiningrum et al. (2021) highlighted the significance of the 'grammatical range and accuracy' dimension in writing performance deficiencies in this proficiency test, underscoring the relevance of our research.

The mentioned previous research generally investigates ungrammaticalities in English writing, including IELTS. This study examines grammatical and ungrammatical clauses in IELTS writing

and their distribution across the scores, offering a novelty. The results would be beneficial for understanding why the scores vary, interpreting the writing descriptors, and facilitating learning evaluations and improvements.

Methodology

We employed mixed methods: a qualitative descriptive method to investigate the clauses' constructions (Bergmann et al., 2007, p. 671), and then a quantitative method examining the clauses' ratios based on the score variation.

Research Design

Archival research was performed by accessing data from the teachers' program documents of the writing performances. Notably, they are associated with the language center at Universitas Gadjah Mada and specialize in teaching IELTS. The archive consists of 120 performances, but 10 were left out due to incomplete files. The writers' identities were excluded to comply with ethical standards (Podesva & Sharma, 2013, p. 14) and to prevent identification.

Research Subject

Before data collection, we determined and aimed to investigate the qualitative and quantitative data: the clauses structured as S + V which are either grammatical or ungrammatical, and the clauses' figures per writing performance, respectively.

Data Collection

The clauses were withdrawn from IELTS writing simulations by 35 LPDP Affirmation Scholarship awardees from Universitas Gadjah Mada's 2022 batch 2, reflecting their latest proficiency, with minimal changes in the test scheme since 2005 (Manhattan Review, 2024). Before the program, they had an IELTS band score of 6 but had not reached 6.5 as required by the scholarship (LPDP, 2023a) and most universities' master's programs. Each simulation includes two tasks to adhere to official test standards: a 150-

word descriptive report in 20 minutes and a 250-word personal view in 40 minutes (IELTS, *Academic Writing*, n.d.). There were five sets of questions.

Instruments

The specified teachers' documents were downloaded from Google Drive. The data was then initially analyzed qualitatively with Microsoft Word software. For analyzing the data quantitatively, IBM SPSS Statistics software was employed.

Analysis Techniques

After obtaining the qualitative data, syntactic analysis was involved to investigate the clauses' constructions (Bergmann et al., 2007, p. 671). It functions to determine whether the clauses grammatical or ungrammatical.

The quantitative data were grouped according to the writing performance scores. They were then compared from one score group to another.

Procedure

The qualitative analysis identified grammatical clauses using Eastwood's (2002) and Azar's (2002) theories. The clauses with ungrammaticalities in the S + V structure and/or illogical answer or question contextualization were ungrammatical and categorized by Dulay et al. (1982) classification.

The quantitative analysis used the mentioned software to determine the proportions of grammatical and ungrammatical clauses based on the score variation. The software also performed a

one-way ANOVA to examine significant differences between the clauses' proportions and score variation, a prevalent method in syntactical investigations (Pouladian et al., 2017; Talosa & Maguddayao, 2018). The test's significance value (Sig. Value) was set at 0.05, a standard threshold in social science studies, including linguistics (Cantos Gómez, 2002; Hardjanto, 2016). Two hypotheses were established as follows:

- H₀: If Sig. Value > 0.05, the average percentages of grammatical clauses for the different scores are the same.
- H_a: If Sig. Value < 0.05, the average percentages of grammatical clauses for the different scores are different.

Codification

Each writing performance is coded as 'WP' followed by a number corresponding to the participant list, then a hyphen and consecutive clause numbers, with task 2 continuing from task 1. The entire code is in bold. For example, **WP2-9** denotes writing performance 2's clause 9.

Findings and Discussion

Findings of Grammatical Clauses

The clauses were detected as grammatical using Eastwood's theory on clauses and types (2002) and Azar's SVA definition (2002), presented in Table 1 and Table 2. They exhibit clauses with singular subjects and verbs, and those with plural subjects and verbs, respectively. The S + V elements are printed in bold and the patterns are included.

Table 2. Samples of Grammatical Clauses with Singular Subjects and Verbs

Source	Singular Subjects + Singular Verbs
WP66.3	"Overall, it is clear that ..." pronoun + verb
WP38.41	"To sump up briefly, I strongly believe that ..." pronoun + adverb + verb
WP4.33	"... a negative development that will lead to many negative effect." pronoun + auxiliary verb + ordinary verb + preposition

WP4.6	<p>“The harvesting stage consists of 2 ways such as conventional way by manpower and modern technology.”</p> <hr/> <p>determiner + noun modifier + head noun + verb-s + preposition</p>
WP111.32	<p>“More importantly, training curriculum is often made by adjusting ...”</p> <hr/> <p>noun modifier + head noun + ordinary verb + adverb + ordinary verb</p>

Five findings illustrate the grammatical clauses. They feature various structures of singular subjects and verbs, depicted in Table 2.

WP66.3 represents one of the simple structures. The subject is the singular third-person pronoun “It”, while the subsequent verb “is” grammatically corresponds to the singular form of the subject. The subject serves as a placeholder for the abstract concept of clarity. These two words form a main clause, followed by a subclause indicated by the conjunction “that”.

A similar subject was identified in **WP38.41** as the singular first-person pronoun “I”. It is commonly used in task 2, which typically prompts personal reflections on the given topic. The adverb “strongly” enhances the verb “believe”, signifying the depth of belief. Together, they both form the verb phrase. Similar to the previous sample, these components constitute a main clause, followed by a subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction “that”.

Unlike the prior samples, verb structure in **WP4.33** includes the auxiliary verb “will”, the main verb “lead”, and the preposition “to”. the last two words form a phrasal verb. These three elements form a verb phrase linked to the noun phrase “a negative development”. However, the subject is the relative pronoun “that”, introducing a relative clause. Alongside its main clause, contextualized by the answer, this clause’s subject elaborates on a

consumerist lifestyle prevalent among individuals purchasing new products to merely try them, despite lacking actual necessity.

In contrast, subject in **WP4.6** is a noun phrase. Comprising three elements, it begins with the determiner “the”, followed by the noun “harvesting”, modifying the head noun “stage” to denote the action of harvesting within the stage. The verb phrase consists of the singular form of the ‘-s’ verb “consists” and the preposition “of”, forming a phrasal verb. Contextualized by the question, this independent clause elaborates on one specific harvesting stage.

Verb phrase in **WP111.32** is a complex one, with the auxiliary verb “is” agreeing grammatically with the subject. The adverb “often” modifies the ordinary verb “made”, indicating frequency. Together, they form a passive construction. The subject comprises the noun “training” to modify the head noun “curriculum” specifying its type. All these three constituents form a noun phrase. This S + V constitutes a main clause, followed by the noun clause. In the answer context, the training curriculum is tailored to align with potentials in the surroundings, ensuring familiarity among experts and effective addressing of targeted concerns.

Table 3. Samples of Grammatical Clauses with Plural Subjects and Verbs

Source	Plural Subjects + Plural Verbs
WP66.28	“... that their lives now are better and ...” determiner + noun-s + verb
WP111.50	“... because most training centres are located in developed country.” determiner + noun modifier + head noun-s + auxiliary verb + ordinary verb
WP4.8	After that, the harvested sugar canes are crushed into a juice form determiner + adjective + noun modifier + head noun + auxiliary verb + ordinary verb
WP38.8	“... in which the wages of development underwent a significant drop and ...” determiner + modifier noun-s + preposition + head noun + verb
WP66.48	“... there are several benefits fro people ...” expletive “there” + verb + determiner + noun-s

Five findings also elucidate the grammatical clauses with plural subjects and verbs. They feature diverse structures as well, as shown in Table 3.

WP66.28 is among the simple structures. The subject has two words forming a noun phrase: the determiner “their” indicates possession by the ‘-s’ plural noun “lives”. The verb “are” agrees grammatically with the subject. They are all structured within a noun clause, signified by the preceding conjunction “that”. Based on the answer context, along with its main clause, this noun clause pertains to a group of individuals hesitant to pursue professional since they commonly assert their current life circumstances as satisfactory.

More intricate than the prior example, subject in **WP111.50** comprises a noun phrase with the head noun “centres”. The determiner “most” specifies the centers’ quantity or extent, while “training” describes the centers’ type. As the subject is plural, the verb phrase incorporates the plural auxiliary verb “are” with the ordinary verb “located”, forming a passive verb. All these constituents collectively form an adverbial clause, as indicated by the conjunction “because” preceding the subject. Alongside its main clause, this S +

V structure elucidates why training centers are predominantly situated in developed nations, given the context of the answer, resulting in a deficit of human resources in developing countries.

Subject in **WP4.8** is particularly complex. It consists of the determiner “the”, adjective “harvested”, and noun “sugar”, which specifies, characterizes, and modifies the plural head noun “sugar”, respectively. Similar to the previous sample, the verb phrase is a plural passive structure. The auxiliary verb “are” combines with the ordinary verb “crushed”. These two phrases constitute a main clause, with a relative clause. In alignment with the question context, numerous sugar canes are harvested following the growth phase for the purpose of being crushed to form juice.

Meanwhile, clause in **WP38.8** was identified as a relative clause, introduced by the relative pronoun phrase “in which”. Like the prior sample, the subject’s noun phrase comprises four words. The determiner “the” specifies the plural head noun “wages”, referring to those mentioned in the question context. The preposition “of” and noun modifier “development” specifies the nature of the

wages. The verb is “underwent” known as a past form. Together with the main clause, this relative clause elucidates that development wages in the UK experienced a decrease over the specified period, as contextualized by the question.

Clause in **WP66.48** begins with the expletive “there”, followed by the plural verb “are”. Then, there is a noun phrase containing the determiner “several”, indicating multiple items of the plural noun “benefits”. This phrase serves as the subject complement. This S + V is part of a main clause with its subclauses. In the answer’s context, this clause outlines

multiple benefits attainable by those taking risks and adapting to unfamiliar circumstances.

Findings of Ungrammatical Clauses

All kinds of ungrammaticalities theorized by Dulay et al. (1982) were detected within the clauses. The method explaining the discoveries is similar to the ones elaborating the grammatical ones. Not all elements in each clause are grammatically incorrect except those with underlines. If necessary, they are suggested with the corrections enclosed in square brackets.

Table 4. Samples of Ungrammatical Clauses

Source	‘omission’
WP111.39	“Therefore, working in the same country ... not only <u>make</u> [makes] them experts in tackling problems, but ...” noun + adverb + adverb + verb-s
WP66.26	“On one hand, [a] plethora of individuals hesitate to try new experience on their live either professional job or personal lives, ...” determiner + noun modifier + preposition + head noun-s + verb
Source	‘addition’
WP38.14	“... in which Canada <u>have</u> generated salary around 4,3% in 2005 and ...” noun + verb
WP66.12	“ The developer also will ... then <u>adding</u> [add] several public facilities, such as school, playground, shops, and medical canter.” determiner + noun + auxiliary verb + ordinary verb
Source	‘misformation’
WP38.30	“... in which every one [everyone] who ... will get punishment like paying a lot of money.” pronoun + auxiliary verb + ordinary verb
WP4.29	“Furthermore, this <u>phenomena</u> [phenomenon] will lead to consumerism life style.” determiner + noun + auxiliary verb + ordinary verb + preposition
Source	‘misordering’
WP4.34	“ Consuming many products might be not [not be] a good idea.” head noun + quantifier + noun-s + auxiliary verb + adverb + ordinary verb
Source	More than one type of ungrammaticality
WP4.18	“... the reason why <u>is this happen</u> [happens] ...” pronoun + verb-s
WP111.12	“Nevertheless, [the consumption of] some products <u>consumptions</u> increased significantly in 2018.” determiner + head noun + preposition + determiner + noun-s modifier + verb + adverb

In Table 4, each sample exhibits its own unique pattern of ungrammaticality, with some samples displaying multiple types of ungrammaticality.

In the ‘omission’ category, sample **WP111.39** features the singular subject “working”, a gerund functioning as a noun. Following the other components, the verb “make” is suggested to be conjugated with ‘-s’ to grammatically agree with the subject. This suffix’s absence might be a basic grammatical mistake because of forgetfulness. This S + V structure forms an independent clause, elucidating in the given answer context that individuals trained and working in the same country can be experts contributing to the development.

The next sample is **WP66.6**, involving a subject formed by a noun phrase. It is proposed to require a determiner “a” before the noun modifier “plethora”, which is followed by the preposition “of”. This modifier describes a large number of the plural head noun “individuals”. It is thought that the related participant did not know this knowledge yet, so it is an error. The preposition “of” connects this modifier to the plural head noun “individuals”. All these elements form a main clause with its subclauses. Further contextualized by the answer, this main clause describes that many individuals are hesitant to explore new career-related opportunities.

The next two samples fall under the ‘addition’ classification. The first, **WP38.14**, appears as a relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun phrase “in which”. The constituent “have” is recommended for removal because it lacks grammatical agreement with the singular subject “Canada”, leaving “generated” as the sole verb. This consideration suggests a mistake. According to the question’s context, there was an increase in salary in Canada in the given years.

WP66.12 is the second sample. It is the second independent clause in a sentence. The subject formed by a noun phrase with the first constituent, the determiner “the”, specifying the second element, the singular noun “developer”, is grammatically correct. However, the verb “add” should occur without the suffix “-ing” since the auxiliary verb “will” indicates a future event. This discrepancy may be attributed to a mistake. Given the question context, this clause elucidates that the developer of a town’s industrial area development plan will add some new buildings.

WP38.30 is the first sample in the ‘misformation’ classification. A revision is suggested to the subject “every one”, referring to each individual item or person within a group. It contradicts the answer context. Instead, it should be “everyone” as a pronoun, referring to all people in a group collectively without exception. This discrepancy is likely a mistake, considering that the proposed pronoun is commonly used in English. The verb phrase with the auxiliary verb “will” and the ordinary verb “get” is grammatically correct. This S + V structure is part of a relative clause, indicated by the relative pronoun phrase “in which”. In conjunction with the other clauses, this relative clause describes people’s consequences when fined for disobeying the government’s rule of prohibiting personal car usage based on the answer context.

The next sample is **WP4.29** in an independent clause. While the determiner “this” is grammatically correct in its singular form indicating specificity, the noun “phenomena” should be amended to its singular form as well, “phenomenon”. This inaccuracy may stem from a lack of awareness regarding this grammatical rule, thereby constituting an error. Both words constitute a noun phrase. The verb phrase is correctly structured with the auxiliary verb “will” and the ordinary verb as a phrasal verb “lead to”. In the given

answer's context, this clause illustrates a phenomenon wherein women tend to be enticed to try exaggeratedly advertised skincare products.

In the classification of 'misordering', sample **WP4.34** has a grammatical subject formed by a noun phrase. The head noun is "consuming" functioning as a gerund. Alongside the determiner "many", the gerund's object is the '-s' plural noun "products". In contrast, the verb phrase's order of constituents is supposed to be "might not be" rather than "might be not". Since this inaccuracy pertains to a known grammar rule, it is categorized as a mistake. Both the subject and verb form a main clause. Based on the answer context, the excessive consumption of products is deemed problematic due to its detrimental impact on the environment, resulting in increased waste.

One of the samples exhibiting multiple types of ungrammaticalities is **WP4.18**. After the conjunction "why" introducing a noun clause, the suggestion is to omit the auxiliary verb "is" because the subsequent element is the singular pronoun "this". It refers to companies' advertisement trends contextualized by the answer. This mistake is classified as 'addition'. Additionally, the following verb needs to be added with a suffix "-s", transforming it into "happens". This ungrammaticality is categorized as 'omission'. All these

mistakes occur as the writer might miss the thoroughness. According to the answer's context, the writer elucidates that product advertising solely benefits companies, reflecting a negative motive.

In the other sample, **WP111.2**, the subject "some products consumptions" is problematic. The plural noun "consumptions" is misplaced, which is classified as 'misordering'. The suffix "-s" should be omitted, which is categorized as 'addition'. Both the ungrammaticality aspects are mistakes owing to the writer's misunderstanding of the question context. There is only one kind of consumption carried out by families involving multiple products in the given year. The correct form should be "the consumption of some products", with "of some products" serving as the modifier. The verb "increased" is grammatically correct in this independent clause alongside the subject.

Numbers of Grammatical and Ungrammatical Clauses Based on Score Variation

The total number of writing performances (N) is classified by the score variation, which helps comprehend the quantities of grammatical clauses (GC) and ungrammatical clauses (UC), including their respective averages and ranges. Table 5 is a detailed breakdown.

Table 5. Numbers of Grammatical and Ungrammatical Clauses Based on Score Variation

Score	N	Numbers of GC	Numbers of UC	Average Numbers of GC	Average Numbers of UC	Ranges of GC Numbers	Ranges of UC Numbers
4	16	419	266	26	17	15 – 46	3 – 26
5	38	1,213	504	32	13	17 – 47	1 – 24
6	50	1,866	542	37	11	22 – 59	2 – 25
7	6	257	39	43	7	30 – 53	3 – 9
Total	110	3,755	1,351				
Total Average				34	12		

Overall, the total count of grammatical clauses surpasses that of ungrammatical clauses by approximately threefold. Those achieving a score of 6 represent nearly half of the total population (N) in terms of the writing performances' numbers (50 performances).

Analyzing the 3,755 grammatical clauses, the most dominant count is observed in the score of 6, totaling 1,866 clauses. For the 1,351 ungrammatical clauses, the most prevalent scores are 6 and 5, with 542 and 504 clauses, respectively. The average number of grammatical clauses peaks at 43 in the score of 7, gradually decreasing to 26 in the score of 4. Conversely, the average number of ungrammatical clauses is highest at 17 in the score of 4, decreasing to seven in the score of 7. The lowest range of grammatical clauses increases gradually from the lowest to the highest score, from 15 to 30 clauses. In

contrast, the highest range differs, with counts of 46 (score of 4), 47 (score of 5), 59 (score of 6), and 53 clauses (score of 7). The lowest ranges of ungrammatical clauses remain consistent, ranging from one to three clauses across all scores. However, the highest ranges vary, with counts of 26, 24, and 25 clauses for the scores 4 to 6, respectively. The score 7 has the lowest count, with only nine clauses.

Proportions of Grammatical Clauses

The statistical proportions focus solely on the grammatical clauses because ungrammatical ones can be inferred as previously discussed. The data includes mean, maximum (Max %), and minimum (Min %) percentages, standard deviation (Std. Dev.), standard error (Std. Error), and a 95% confidence interval for the mean in lower and upper bounds, which are explained later. Detailed results are provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Statistical Proportions of Grammatical Clauses Based on Score Variation

Score	Mean %	Max %	Min %	Std. Dev. (%)	Std. Error (%)	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound (%)	Upper Bound (%)
4	60	94	38	17.162	4.290	51.36	69.54
5	71	97	45	11.626	1.886	66.73	74.37
6	77	96	52	11.715	1.657	73.69	80.35
7	87	97	82	2.898	1.183	83.96	90.04
Total	74						

Overall, the higher scores correspond to higher mean percentages of grammatical clauses, as indicated by mean %, from the lowest to the highest score. They range from 60% to 87%. The maximum percentages (max %) show minimal variation among the scores. They are between 94% and 97%. The minimum percentages (min %), however, align closely with the score variation. The percentages increase progressively (from

38% to 52%) from the lowest to the highest score.

Knowing the mean can find out the standard deviation (Std. Dev.) as the distribution of mean proportions within each score group. It is also measured in percentages. The value for the score of 4 is the greatest (17.162%), indicating significant variation from the mean in grammatical clause proportions, implying greater variability and heterogeneity but

reduced precision and certainty compared to the other values. Conversely, the lowest value in the score of 7, 2.898%, signifies less variation and tighter distributions than the remaining values, yet enhanced precision and reduced uncertainties.

Establishing the standard deviation leads to knowing the standard error, abbreviated as Std. Error. It provides insights into how the estimated proportion means of grammatical clauses from each score may deviate from the true mean of a larger population. This value is expressed as a percentage as well. The largest standard error for the score of 4 suggests less precision and greater uncertainty in the sample estimate parameter, IELTS writing performances, than the other values, indicating wider confidence intervals and less convincing certainty about the true population mean representation. In contrast, the lowest standard error value, which is 1.183% in the score of 7, demonstrates that the sample data closely mirrors and clusters around the true population mean, as well as detects differences between the score groups and obtains the precise estimates easily compared to the remaining values.

Understanding means, standard deviations and standard errors is essential for formulating 95% confidence intervals, which provide realistic estimates of the population mean ranges. These intervals help prevent inference errors and enable evidence-based decision-making and result reporting. In detail, the lower and upper bounds represent the minimum and maximum percentages within the score variable ranges, respectively. According to the formulation result, the confidence interval for the mean proportion of the score of 4 spans from 51.36% (lower bound) to 69.54% (upper bound), which overlaps with the lower bound of score 5 (66.73%), and likewise, its upper limit (74.37%) intersects with the lower bound of score 6 (73.69%). However, the score of 6's upper bound (80.35%) does not

overlap with the lower bound of the score of 7 (83.96%), where the maximum percentage is 90.04%. Considering these bounds, the mean proportions between the scores 4 and 5, as well as between 5 and 6, are less likely to differ, while those between scores 6 and 7 are more likely to be dissimilar.

Proportions of Ungrammatical Clauses

As previously described, the proportions of ungrammatical clauses involve subtracting the percentage of grammatical clauses from each score's total percentage (100%). The results are in Table 6.

Table 6. Mean Proportions of Ungrammatical Clauses Based on Score Variation

Score	Mean %
4	40
5	29
6	23
7	13
Total Mean	26

Based on Table 6, it is evident that the higher scores correlate with the lower average percentages. Overall, the mean percentage across all scores is 26%. From the lowest to the highest score, the percentages are from 40% to 13%.

Correlation Between Proportions of Grammatical Clauses and Score Variation

The one-way ANOVA test showed that the resulting Sig. Value is 0.001, below the threshold of 0.05. Therefore, H_0 is rejected while H_a is accepted. Hence, the mean proportions of grammatical clauses across the different scores vary significantly, indicating the statistical validity of these differences.

Discussions

The results reveal unexpected insights. The employed theories aid in classifying clauses from the data source. The findings show a range of grammatical clause complexities, from basic to advanced,

reflecting participants' needs to express ideas and efforts to meet the test requirements. Despite the test's demand on grammatical clauses, ungrammatical clauses appear due to examination pressure, demotivation, misunderstandings, and limited English proficiency. These factors contribute to errors and mistakes, consistent with findings from the mentioned past error analyses by Arham and Ariana (2020), Pouladian et al. (2017), Tikupasang et al. (2022), and Nartiningrum et al. (2021).

Regarding the ratios of grammatical and ungrammatical clauses based on the score variation, the grammatical clauses' figures significantly dominate the entire population. In addition, the higher mean proportions correspond to the better scores. Specifically, the mean for the score of 4 is the lowest, while that for the score of 7 is the highest. Nevertheless, the higher proportions of grammatical clauses, nearly 100%, do not necessarily imply the higher scores. It could indicate the presence of lower scores.

Regarding the statistical calculation, there are two opposing perspectives. First, the score of 7 is compelling because it has the lowest standard deviation and standard error, with no overlapping proportion ranges with the lower scores, as well as indicating nearly perfect grammatical clauses. Second, similar proportions of grammatical clauses may exist between scores of 4 and 5, and 5 and 6, due to overlapping percentages and the higher values of standard deviation and standard error.

The one-way ANOVA validates this research that there are statistical differences in grammatical clause proportions based on score variation. This method offers an alternative analysis distinct from prior research by Talosa and Maguddayao (2018), which focused on gender and age variables.

There are supposedly two flaws in this study. One is the prevalence of other grammatical errors, which can reduce the score for 'grammatical range and accuracy' in areas such as object placement, infinitive phrases, and tense accuracy. Another is presumably the lower scores in other dimensions. The overall writing scores might be lower than expected when summing the scores from all dimensions to determine the band score for this writing section.

These results explain the presence of grammatical and ungrammatical clauses in all writing performances and the variation in scores. This can be achieved by identifying and comparing the ratios of grammatical and ungrammatical clauses based on the assessed scores.

Conclusion

Through the meticulous and comprehensive analysis, unveiling grammatical and ungrammatical clauses within the IELTS writing performances done by LPDP Affirmation Scholarship awardees year 2022 batch 2 at Universitas Gadjah Mada has effectively addressed the research concern. In essence, the findings of this study offer a potential solution for better comprehending the assessed scores.

The significance lies in its contribution to the learning and teaching of IELTS writing, with the goal of evaluating and improving the performances and achieving targeted scores. Learners, at the very least, could use the identified structures of grammatical and ungrammatical clauses from this research as valuable references and then to enhance their awareness. These insights would lead to an increase in creating more grammatical clauses and diminishing ungrammatical ones. They could also predict their own writing scores by analyzing the result of the proportions revealed in this study, thereby addressing potential misunderstandings arising from examining the descriptors. Therefore, preparation for the IELTS writing section to achieve desired scores could become

more effective. For teachers teaching Indonesian learners of IELTS writing, they could be helped to improve the syllabi, curricula, and related materials. Additionally, they would more easily assess the writing performances by integrating the descriptors with the proportions obtained from this research, maintaining a higher level of objectivity in the process.

In the meantime, the study's scope has its limitations. Primarily, considering the global uptake of IELTS, it becomes evident that only focusing on the examined writing performances may be insufficient. Therefore, it is anticipated that a broader sample encompassing performances from various institutions in Indonesia will be included for a more comprehensive analysis. Additionally, the analysis focuses solely on grammatically correct and incorrect clauses, overlooking other elements of grammar that warrant both qualitative and quantitative examination. This scrutiny of elements likely contributes to less than 25% of the overall writing score assessment, as it only pertains to one of the four dimensions of the entire score calculation, which is 'grammatical range and accuracy'. This suggests that similar investigations could be conducted across the remaining three dimensions: 'task achievement' or 'task response', 'coherence and cohesion', and 'lexical resources'.

Acknowledgement

This research was funded by Universitas Gadjah Mada under the scheme Program Rekognisi Tugas Akhir Tahun 2023 Universitas Gadjah Mada Number 2490/UN1/DITLIT/Dit-Lit/PT.01.07/2023.

Reference

Al-Khresheh, M. H. (2016). A Review Study of Error Analysis Theory. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 2(1), 49–59. <https://doi.org/10.6000/2371-1655.2016.02.05>

Alahmadi, N. (2019). A Study of Grammatical Errors of Subject Agreement in Writing Made by Saudi Learners. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 7(6), 48–59. <https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/A-Study-of-Grammatical-Errors-of-Subject-Verb-Agreement-in-Writing-Made-By-Saudi-Learners.pdf>

Almahameed, Y. S., & Alajalein, M. M. (2021). Difficulties Faced by Jordanian Undergraduate EFL Students in Writing Research Problem Statement. *International Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 14–23. <https://dx.doi.org/10.20469/ijhss.7.20002-1>

Arham, M., & Ariana, N. (2020). An Analysis of EFL Test Takers' Problem in IELTS Writing Task. *TAMADDUN: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Budaya*, 19(2), 132–140. <https://doi.org/10.33096/tamaddun.v19i2.81>

Azar, B. S. (2002). *Understanding and Using English Grammar (3rd Ed.)*. Pearson Education.

Bergmann, A., Hall, K. C., & Ross, S. M. (2007). *Language files: Materials for an introduction to language and linguistics (10th Ed.)*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

British Council. (2022). *Comprehensive Guide to English Proficiency Tests with Take IELTS*. British Council. <https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/blog/english-proficiency-test>

Cambridge English. (n.d.). *IELTS Speaking Band Descriptor* [PDF]. Cambridge English. <https://assets.cambridgeenglish.org/we-binars/ielts-speaking-band-descriptors.pdf>

Cantos Gómez, P. (2002). Do we need statistics when we have linguistics? *DELTA: Documentação de Estudos Em Lingüística Teórica e Aplicada*, 18(2), 233–271.

- <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-44502002000200003>
- Detiknews. (2023). Kemenhub Akan Tambah Kuota Mudik Gratis untuk Motor ke Sumatera Tahun Depan. Detikcom. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-6700718/kemenhub-akan-tambah-kuota-mudik-gratis-untuk-motor-ke-sumatera-tahun-depan>
- Dinamika, G. S. & Hanafiah, R. (2019). Syntactical Error Analysis on Report Text. *JOALL: Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature*, 4(2), 120–129. <https://doi.org/10.33369/joall.v4i2.7681>
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford University Press.
- Eastwood, J. (2002) *Oxford Guide to English Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- Editorial Team. (2008). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*. (2008). Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Gayo, H., & Widodo, P. (2018). An Analysis of Morphological and Syntactical Errors on the English Writing of Junior High School Indonesian Students. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 17(4), 58–70. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.17.4.4>
- Handayani, R., Ihsan D., & Mirizon, S. (2019). Interlanguage Analysis of Syntactic and Diction Errors Found in Theses Written By Magister Students. *International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching*, 3(1), 102–116. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v3i1.1713>
- Hardjanto, T. D. (2016). Hedging Through the Use of Modal Auxiliaries in English Academic Discourse. *Humaniora*, 28(1), 37–50. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.11412>
- Hasyim, S. (2002). Error Analysis in the Teaching of English. *Journal 'Kata'*, 4(1), 42–50. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/143572-EN-error-analysis-in-the-teaching-of-englis.pdf>
- Huy, N.T. (2015). Problems Affecting Learning Writing Skill of Grade 11 at Thong Linh High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 53–69. <http://www.multidisciplinaryjournals.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/PROBLEMS-AFFECTING-LEARNING-WRITING-SKILL-OF-GRADE-11.pdf>
- IELTS. (n.d.). *Academic Writing*. IELTS. <https://ielts.org/take-a-test/test-types/ielts-academic-test#Writing>
- IELTS. (n.d.). *IELTS for Study*. IELTS. <https://www.ielts.org/about-ielts/ielts-for-study>
- IELTS. (n.d.). IELTS Listening Band Score Explained. IDP IELTS Australia. <https://ielts.com.au/australia/results/ielts-band-scores/listening-band-score>
- IELTS. (n.d.). IELTS Reading Band Score Explained. IDP IELTS Australia. <https://ielts.com.au/australia/results/ielts-band-scores/reading-band-score>
- IELTS. (2016a). *Writing Band Descriptors Task 1* [PDF]. IELTS. <https://www.ielts.org/-/media/pdfs/writing-band-descriptors-task-1.ashx>
- IELTS. (2016b). *Writing Band Descriptors Task 2* [PDF]. IELTS. <https://www.ielts.org/-/media/pdfs/writing-band-descriptors-task-2.ashx>
- IELTS. (2023). *IELTS Scoring in Detail*. IELTS. <https://ielts.org/take-a-test/preparation-resources/understanding-your-score/ielts-scoring-in-detail>
- Kurniawan, I., & Seprizanna. (2016). An Analysis of Students' Ability in Using Subject-verb Agreement. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 9(2), 327–343. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ee-jtbi.v9i2.379>

- Lauder, A. (2008). The Status and Function of English In Indonesia: A Review of Key Factors. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia*, 12(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.7454/mssh.v12i1.128>
- Lennon, P. (1991). Error and the Very Advanced Learner. *IRAL*, 29(1), 31–44. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1991.29.1.31>
- LPDP. (2023a). *Program Afirmasi: Beasiswa Daerah Afirmasi 2023* [PDF]. LPDP. https://lpdp.kemenkeu.go.id/storage/beasiswa/afirmasi/page/file/affirmation_page_file_1686278222.pdf
- LPDP. (2023b). *Pengayaan Bahasa*. LPDP. <https://lpdp.kemenkeu.go.id/en/awarde/pengayaan-bahasa/kebijakan/>
- Mbau, A. T., Marhum, M., & Muhsin. (2014). An Analysis on the Subject-verb Agreement Errors in Writing Paragraph Made by the Second Semester Students of English Department. *E-Journal of English Language Teaching Society*, 2(2), 1–15. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22487/j23341841.2014.v2.i2.3036>
- Murad, T. N., & Khalil, M. H. (2015). Analysis of Errors in English Writings Committed by Arab First-year College Students of EFL in Israel. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(3), 475–481. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0603.02>
- Nair, S. M., & Hui, L. L. (2018). An Analysis of Common Errors in ESL Descriptive Writing Among Chinese Private School Students in Malaysia. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(1), 28–42. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2017.61.28.42>
- Nartinigrum, N., & Nugroho, A. (2020). Online Learning Amidst Global Pandemic: EFL Students' Challenges, Suggestions, and Needed Materials. *English Franca: Academic Journal of English Language and Education*, 4(2), 115–140. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29240/ef.v4i2.1494>
- Nartinigrum, N., Rayuningtya, P., & Virgiyanti, D. F. (2021). Error Analysis of Undergraduate Students' Writing Performances: IELTS-based Activities. *Journal of Educational Management and Instruction*, 1(1), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.22515/jemin.v1i1.3446>
- Norriah, J. (1987). *Language Learning and Their Errors*. Macmillan Publisher Ltd.
- Oguan, R. M., & Valle, J. M. D. (2022). Grammatical and Mechanical Error Analysis as Tool in Writing Improvement Program for Student Journalists. *International Journal of Educational Management and Development Studies*, Vol. 3(4), 134–153. <https://doi.org/10.53378/352950>
- Podesva, R. J., & Sharma, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Research Methods in Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pouladian, N., Bagheri, M. S., & Sadighi, F. (2017). An Analysis of Errors in Writing Skill of Adult Iranian Learners Preparing for the IELTS. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(3), 85–96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n3p85>
- Purwanti, T. T. (2015). The Implementation Of Self-Assessment In Writing Class: A Case Study at STBA LIA Jakarta. *TEFLIN Journal*, 26(1), 97–116. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i1/97-116>
- Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Rusyana, Y., & Samsuri. (Eds.). (1976). *Pedoman Penulisan Tata Bahasa Indonesia* (pp. 11-23). Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

- Surina, N., & Kamaruzaman, J. (2009). A Study of Subject-Verb Agreement: From Novice Writers to Expert Writers. *International Education Studies*, 2(3), 190–194.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v2n3p190>
- Talosa, A. D., & Maguundayao, R. N. (2018). Evaluation of Second Language Learners' Syntactic Errors in ESL Writing. *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 172–181.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1244109.pdf>
- Taylor, J. R. (1997). *An Introduction of Error Analysis: The Study of Uncertainties in Physical Measurement* (2nd Ed.). University Science Books.
- Tikupasang, O., Hardiyanti, S., & Arman. (2022). EFL Student's Difficulties toward IELTS Writing Task 2. *AJEB: Amca Journal of Education and Behavioral Change*, 2(1), 29–31.
<https://doi.org/10.51773/ajeb.v2i1.141>
- Zulfiah, F. (2020). An Analysis of Syntax Errors in Descriptive Essays. *Etnolinguist*, 4(2), 160–173.
<https://doi.org/10.20473/etno.v4i2.33966>