

## ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDENTS' GRAMMATICAL ERRORS IN SYNCHRONOUS ONLINE LEARNING PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION: *Do Postgraduate Students Speak Grammatically?*

Septri Haryanti<sup>1</sup>

English Education Postgraduate Program

University of Bengkulu

Indonesia

[septri.haryanti93@gmail.com](mailto:septri.haryanti93@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

In speaking, language learners were expected to have two very important communicative competencies: fluency and accuracy, particularly in educational contexts, including academic presentation and discussion. The present study examined English grammatical errors in English as a Foreign Language students in synchronous online learning presentations and discussions. The participants in this study were second-year students in the postgraduate program at the English study program of Bengkulu University. The data were obtained during their presentation and discussion about the predetermined material via the Zoom platform. The Zoom meetings were recorded and transcribed to identify grammatical errors. The surface structure taxonomy was adopted to examine utterance errors, categorized into four types: misformation, misordering, addition, and omission. The Linguistics classification approach was also utilized to display in-depth data about the grammatical errors. According to the findings, omission was the most common type of grammatical error indicated, followed by addition, misformation, and misordering. Interestingly, in linguistics categorizations, the errors were identified in word form and verb form as the most common errors students commit in their online presentations and discussions, followed by subject-verb agreement and plural forms. The study suggested that students' grammatical errors were likely due to carelessness, as they were expected to be familiar with these grammar concepts. Conversely, no grammatical mistakes were detected in the use of prepositions, articles, tenses, and questions during the presentation and discussion by postgraduate students. This indicates that the graduate students did not have problems with these aspects of English grammar.

**Keywords:** English as a Foreign Language Students, Grammatical Errors, Oral Presentation, Discussion, Synchronous

### Introduction

#### *Background of The Problem*

In the Indonesian context, English is an international language that students from junior high school to the university must learn. Students should be proficient in four key areas of English. These abilities include listening, writing, reading, and speaking. Speaking is one of the most complex skills for students to develop. The main objective of every second language learner is to achieve communicative competence. In speaking a student is required to possess both fluency and accuracy in communication, especially in an academic context such as academic presentation and discussion. Grammar is the foundation of a person's English abilities, written and oral, particularly in

speaking. However, many students with a second language or foreign language learners are only focused on fluency in communication in English. Posing such a communicative competence, both fluency and accuracy is very challenging for a second language or foreign language speaker of English. Brown (2007) states that grammar and lexis constitute the most difficult aspect of a language in which students struggle.

Students' habits of speaking English with correct grammatical structures can help them develop their thinking process logically and with correct structural utterances when speaking English (Helmanda et al., 2018). However, students often struggle to produce accurate grammatical in speaking English in oral

communication. Grammatical errors occur frequently because people do not always know how to use proper structures in English (Lumban Batu et al., 2018). Students frequently make errors while practicing English, such as misordering, misformation, and other types of errors. According to (Saad & Sawalmeh, 2014), omission accounted for most errors followed by misformation, addition, and misordering identified in students' speaking activities. In addition, grammatical errors in speaking are classified into several categories, including omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. These errors are also frequently made by English department graduate students. Despite having studied English for more than four years, they frequently made grammatical errors when speaking. In the Indonesian context, in an English EFL classroom presentation and discussion of graduate students at Bengkulu University, for instance, students still make grammatical errors in presenting their academic material in the classroom. Thus, an error analysis is needed to be conducted in this situation.

Since its introduction in the 1970s, error analysis in second language acquisition has become increasingly popular because of the benefits it provides to language practitioners. It is assumed that error analysis is an alternative method for distinguishing learners' first and second languages. According to Corder (1983) understanding learners' errors can help language educators provide a picture of the learners' linguistic development. It has the potential to lead to the creation of more effective language-learning materials in future language-teaching and learning activities. In line with this, Muhamad et al (2013) state that the analysis of grammatical errors has become an essential consideration in the process of language acquisition. Thus, the error analysis of the grammatical structure of English is crucial to improving second and

foreign-language learners' performance in the English language.

According to James (2013), errors could be classified into two different ways, namely, the surface structure taxonomy and the linguistic description of errors. The concept of surface structure taxonomy error by of (Dulay et al., 1982) provides a top-down outline of grammatical errors and is based on the idea that errors can occur in precise and comprehensive ways because of shifts in surface structure. Grammatical errors can be identified by one of the four major ways in which learners modify the target form according to the surface structure taxonomy. The four primary types of grammatical errors are as follows: omission, addition, misinformation, and misordering.

English grammatical errors are classified based on where they occur in the target language system. Errors are initially classified according to the level of language at which they occur: phonological, grammatical, or lexical (James, 2013). Moreover, Phetthongkam (2017) explains that once the level of errors has been defined, they can be classified as a verb form, preposition, article, plurality, tense, pronoun, question, and word form to represent the most common types of errors committed by students. Saad & Sawalmeh (2014) argue that attempting to correct errors in this classification generally requires good understanding because, without it, learners might indeed fail even to provide adjustments to errors they made. It might sum up that correcting the errors based on linguistics description taxonomy needs in-depth knowledge of English linguistics.

### *Review of Related Literature*

For educational purposes, research studies on error analysis in the genre of written and spoken English have been widely conducted over the years. The studies were conducted in various first-language

backgrounds to represent various student populations, from secondary school to undergraduate and postgraduate levels. An initially assumed selection of the previously mentioned research studies conducted in Indonesia and many other countries will be presented.

Eng et al. (2020) conducted a study on grammatical errors in IELTS essays written by 16 participants, which were analyzed and interpreted using Error Analysis. These participants were divided into two groups to determine the types of grammatical errors they made: International Chinese (IC) students from China and Malaysian Chinese (MC) students. The researcher then used the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, Creative Construction Hypothesis, and Interlanguage Theory to compare the types and frequency of these grammatical errors between the two groups. Based on the study's findings, the most common types of grammatical errors were omission, misformation, misuse, repetition, vocabulary, structure, coherence/cohesion, expression, and misordering. Surprisingly, the findings revealed that IC participants made more grammatical mistakes than MC participants.

In addition, Asih et al. (2020) also conducted an error analysis study titled Grammatical Errors in Speaking made by Ahmad Dahlan University graduate students. The researcher used a qualitative research approach to investigate grammatical errors in speaking. This study used observation, interviews, and document analysis. According to the findings of this study, most students made grammatical errors in misformation and used incorrect tenses in their sentences. The researcher also asked the participant why grammatical errors continued to occur while speaking. The result revealed that the students only focus on vocabulary since they assumed that the most important thing is vocabulary in speaking.

Ting et al. (2010) investigated grammatical errors in 126 oral dialogues between 42 college students. This study looked at five common grammar errors made by speakers: prepositions, questions, articles, nouns of plural forms, subject-verb agreement, and tense. Furthermore, using surface structure taxonomy, this study discovered that misformation and omission were the most common methods of changing the target forms.

Muhamad et al. (2013) also investigated grammatical errors made by students during oral presentations. Their study, which included 32 oral presentations, revealed that misinformation contributed the highest percentage of errors. Moreover, omission and addition were also identified, with verb form, word form, and article errors being the most frequently made by students.

Phettongkam (2017) also researched grammatical errors in spoken English. The researcher investigated the grammatical errors in spoken English of undergraduate Thai students enrolled in a communicative business English course. The research project's primary goals are to identify the types and frequency of grammatical errors. The collected data were analyzed using the surface structure taxonomy to obtain a general overview. The linguistic description approach to error was also used to present the findings in greater detail. According to the findings, omission errors accounted for more than half of the total errors committed by the students in the selected sample population, followed by misinformation, addition, and misordering. According to the linguistic categorization of errors, the three most common errors were plural form, article, and verb form. The findings of the error analysis will be useful in developing second-language lessons and curricula.

The other study on the grammatical error in speaking was also conducted by

Damaiyanti (2021) where in this study, the researcher examined students' speaking performances at the English department of IAIN Takengon. The study discovered five types of grammatical errors in their speaking: omission, over-regulation, misformation, misordering, and addition. The most common grammatical errors made by students were omission, over-generalization, misformation, misordering, and addition. According to her, the grammatical errors made by students were caused by intralingual factors such as omission, overgeneralization, and misformation. Misordering and addition, such as overusing prepositions and incorrect word order, were interlingual factors based on first language transfer. The last cause was the anxiety-inducing monotony of the learning environment in which they used the first language-based communication strategies.

Furthermore, another study on grammatical errors in EFL learners' oral communication was conducted by Najla & Fatimah (2020). This study focused on students' grammatical errors from the recording of the interviews conducted by the researchers to get the data. The participants of this study were second years students majoring in English at Universitas Negeri Padang. Politzer and Ramirez's Linguistic Category Classification was used to analyze the data in this study. The findings revealed that simple past tense errors were the most common grammatical errors in EFL learners' speaking. They claimed that the causes of EFL learners' errors in intralingual transfer were incomplete rule application, ignoring co-occurrences, overgeneralization, and exploiting redundancy. These errors causes were according to James's theory.

The other study on grammatical errors was also conducted by Kamlasi (2019) . He examined the grammatical errors in spoken English based on the

classifications of errors that refer to theories proposed by Dulay et al. (1982). The participants of this study were 25 students of the English education study program of Timor University. The results of data analyses revealed that omission presented the most dominant errors committed by students followed by addition and misformation, while misordering was found as the lowest. In addition, the data revealed that verb was the category with the highest errors in the linguistic category followed by preposition, pronouns, conjunction, article, singular/plural and negation categories presented the same percentage for each category. The lowest error in the linguistic category was word order. According to this study, students frequently use verb-ing rather than verb-1 in spoken English. They are highly susceptible to unconsciously adding and removing any linguistic category when they speak.

### *The Rationale for the Study and Research Questions*

As already discussed above, studies on EFL learners' grammatical errors in oral communication have been conducted by many other researchers, such as the study conducted by Eng et al. (2020) . However, this study examined the grammatical errors in written production. Where there will be differences between the written and spoken production of a language. In written production, a student has the opportunity and time to think and revise the language structure before writing it. On the other hand, in spoken production, a speaker produces the utterances directly without having time and opportunity to revise the language grammar. Thus, it assumed that the types and the patterns of grammatical errors between written and spoken language would reveal a significant difference. Thus, this previous study will examine and analyze the oral presentation of EFL learners.

In addition, the study by Muhamad et al. (2013) and Phetongkam (2017) revealed the different grammatical error types and patterns as those studies were carried out under the differences of L1 language background. The findings of the study by Muhamad et al. (2013) showed that misformation was the most common error. Moreover, linguistic aspects presented the verb form, word form, and article as the most common errors committed by students. On the other hand, in Phetongkam (2017) omission was the most frequent error produced by students in the surface structure taxonomy. While in, linguistics categorization errors, it was not similar to the study by Muhamad et al. (2013), where it was found plural form, article, and verb form were the most common errors. Therefore, it might be concluded that the different L1 language backgrounds will result in different error patterns and types, where in this study the L1 language background of the participant will be different from those in the previous studies.

Moreover, the study by Damaiyanti (2021), by Najla & Fatimah [OBJ], and by Kamlasi [OBJ] analyzed and examined the grammatical errors of EFL students at the undergraduate level. Therefore, this study was intended to examine the grammatical errors committed by postgraduate students. It is assumed that postgraduate students have a better understanding of the grammatical structure of English since they have learned more and longer about the grammar of English. Moreover, in this study, the participants were postgraduate students in the English department of Bengkulu University who are in their final years, and most of them are English teachers in schools. It predicted the result of the study will be different from the previous studies above. As the guidelines in this study, the specific research questions addressed in this session are:

1. What are the types of grammatical errors committed by EFL students in synchronous online learning presentations and discussion sections based on the surface structure taxonomy and linguistics description approach?
2. What are the types of grammatical errors committed by EFL students in synchronous online learning presentations and discussion sections based on the surface structure taxonomy and linguistics description approach?

### Methodology

This study used descriptive qualitative methods to analyze the students' presentations and discussions in the synchronous online learning environment. According to Miles et al. (2014), a qualitative approach investigates the issue in its natural setting. Students' words and utterances provided the data during the presentation and discussion section. It investigated the grammatical errors made by postgraduate English Language Education students at the University of Bengkulu.

### *The Subject of the Research*

The research subjects were 16 students who attended two different meetings. The classes were held online using the Zoom platform, with synchronous online learning presentations and discussions. The grammatical errors made by students in synchronous online learning presentations and discussion sections were the object of the study. The grammatical errors were analyzed by using the Error Analysis Method (EAM) based on the Surface Structure Taxonomy and Linguistic Description Approach.

### *Data Collecting Techniques*

The data of this study were taken from synchronous EFL online learning presentations and discussions. During the data collection, the online learning presentation and discussion sections were recorded, the utterances composed in the video recording were transcribed, and the grammatical errors in the utterances were also analyzed and classified employing four different types of Surface Structure Taxonomy and Linguistic Categorizations.

The researcher was the primary data collector in this study, as the instrument the researcher used field notes, a checklist of grammatical errors classification, and tables. Following categorization, the utterances were displayed to provide elaboration of grammatical errors committed by students during the online learning presentation and discussions. To prove and to get maintain the accuracy of the result of analyzing the grammatical errors and their classification in the findings, a comparison with the previous related studies and the theory of English grammatical was conducted. This elaboration process interactively connects the data display with the data collection, tabulation, data condensation, and conclusion drawing to ensure that the conclusion drawn represents the actual condition of the subject of the study.

### *Data Analyzing Techniques*

The grammatical errors committed by EFL students will be analyzed using Politzer and Ramirez's theory of surface structure taxonomy and linguistic category classification.

Table 1 Grammatical Errors based on Surface Structure Taxonomy

Category	Example of Error	Correct form
Misformation	He give me flowers yesterday	He gave me flowers yesterday
Misordering	He will inform you morning tomorrow	He will inform you tomorrow morning
Addition	They can swims	They can swim
Omission	They * our classmates	They are our classmates

Table.2 Grammatical Errors based on Linguistic Categorization

	Misformat ion	Misorderi ng	Additio n	Omission
Subject Verb Agreement				
Plural form				
Article				
Verb form				
Preposition				
Tense				
Word form				
Pronoun				
Question				

## **Finding and Discussion**

### *Finding*

The following section presents the findings from the error analysis of EFL students in the synchronous online learning presentation and discussion section. The presentation and discussion section were recorded and transcribed, with the symbol \* used to indicate errors and the symbol ^ to represent missing elements in the spoken language. The first section presented the findings based on the surface structure taxonomy. Continuing to

follow that, the errors were presented and for linguistic description.  
discussed in the context of the framework

Grammatical Errors based on Surface Structure Taxonomy  
Table.3 Types of Grammatical Errors, frequencies and the percentages based on Surface Structure Taxonomy

Categories	Total Erros	Percentage (%)
Misformation	19	24.05 %
Misordering	8	10.12%
Addition	21	26.59%
Omission	31	39.24%
Total number of errors	79	100%

From Table 3 above it can be seen that EFL students at the postgraduate level still make errors in some aspects of English grammar in online presentations and discussions. The most frequent error was omission with 39.24% of the data

errors found. The second error was found in misinformation categories with a percentage of 24.05% followed by addition error of 26.59%. The last error was found in the misordering category with a percentage of 10.12%.

Linguistic description of errors  
Table 4 Types of Grammatical Errors, frequencies, and percentages  
Based on Linguistic Categorization errors

	Misformation	Misordering	Addition	Omission	Frequency	Percentage
SVA	3	-	1	4	8	10.13%
Plural form	-	-	-	6	6	7.6%
Article	-	-	-	-	-	-
Verb form	9	-	4	11	24	30.37%
Preposition	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tense	-	-	-	-	-	-
Word form	7	8	16	6	37	46.84%
Pronoun	-	-	-	-	-	-
Question	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sentence Fragment	-	-	-	4	4	5.06%
TOTAL	19	8	21	31	79	100%

Table.5 Examples of Grammatical Errors According to Linguistic Categorization errors

Types of Errors	Misformation	Misordering	Addition	Omission
SVA	<u>This is*</u> the steps of designing classroom language test	-	We will starts <u>*the presentation</u> now	The presenter want <sup>^</sup> to answer the question from audients
Plural form	-	-	-	Today, there will be three group <sup>^</sup> who will be the presenter <sup>^</sup>
Article	-	-	-	-
Verb form	Your group did not <u>explained*</u> about that previously.	-	... the first group who will <u>be</u> present about ...	That <sup>^</sup> the explanation from our group
Preposition	-	-	-	-
Tense	-	-	-	-
Word form	The time is your <sup>^</sup>	How <u>you can*</u> explain to the students about...	We will <u>to*</u> have three questions for the first session.	That <sup>^</sup> all from me
Pronoun	-	-	-	-
Question	-	-	-	-
Sentence Fragment				- I want to <sup>^</sup> - I will <sup>^</sup>

Table 4 above revealed that EFL students grammatical errors based on linguistics categorization were found in word form and verb form as the two highest percentages of errors in students' presentation and discussion sections with percentages of 46.84% and 30.37%. This percentage is followed by subject-verb agreement and plural forms. And the lowest percentage of students' errors was found in sentence fragments 5.06%. While in prepositions, articles, tenses, and questions were not found any grammatical errors during the presentation and discussion section of postgraduate students. It assumed that the students do not have problems with those grammar aspects.

### Discussion

#### Grammatical errors by students in the presentation and discussion section based on surface structure taxonomy.

##### Omission

Although the students are in postgraduate programs, they still frequently omit some words because they have not yet fully mastered the L2 system. *Example 1: I \* answer the question from student A*

From example 1 above the student omit the auxiliary "will" which is compulsory in this sentence. This type of error was the most common error in this study. It is in line with the study conducted by Phetongkam (2017). It assumed that the students were careless in speaking directly. Since theoretically, postgraduate



students can understand the concept of using verbs and auxiliaries.

#### Addition

The second most common sort of error was the addition, it occurs when students insert unnecessary words or elements into their speech.

*Example 2: I will to try to explain it briefly.*

In this study, the students committed the errors in addition category, because Bahasa Indonesia and English have different language systems. The students make the unnecessary additional word to their spoken language. As the second highest error found it is similar to the study conducted by Kamlasi (2019). In his study, it was found addition was the highest error committed by the students.

#### Misformation

This type of error occurred when the student used the incorrect form of a structure from the target language. In this study, this misinformation found as the third common error in students' presentations and discussions.

*Example 3: Because the student don't understand the instruction of the test.*

This finding is almost similar to the study by Saad & Sawelmah (2014), where their study it was found misinformation was the second most common error by the student in role-play presentations.

#### Misordering

Misordering was found as the third common error in students' presentations and discussions.

*Example 4: How we can design the ideal test for a language classroom?*

Misordering means that the word place in a sentence is not appropriate or placed in the wrong order. In this study, it was found as the lowest number of students' grammatical errors in their

presentations and discussion. It is in line with the finding of a study by Saad & Sawelmah (2014) and a study by Phetongkam (2017). In their studies, it was also found that misordering is the less common error in students' spoken English.

### **Grammatical errors by students in presentation and discussion section based on linguistics categorization.**

#### Word form errors

In the linguistic category, EFL students committed the most frequent grammatical errors in word form which were 37 instances with a percentage of 45.84%. As the highest errors, it was found the word form errors were confirmed in addition errors. The data were 16. It showed the students tended to add unnecessary elements to the word. Under misordering error, it was found 8 data. While under misformation was found 7 instances and omission was only found 6 instances. The following are examples of word form errors.

*Example 5: (Addition) - I want to make sure all the presenters are heres*

*Example 6: (Misformation) - I got the point. The presenter has explanation\* clearly.*

*Example 7: (Misordering) – It depends on how good can you\* design the test...*

*Example 8: (Omission) – for the presenters the time is your^*

Error in word form committed as the most common errors in linguistic categorization. The students often add unnecessary elements to their speech such as adding “s” in the unnecessary place. Misformation of word form error was found such as the incorrect of using a noun, for instance, “explanation”, where it was a noun. While the correct one should be a verb “explained” in past participle form. In addition, under misordering, it was also found such as in “can you”, where it should be “you can” because the sentence was not interrogative.

This study was slightly different from a study conducted by Muhamad et al (2013), in their study; it was found that grammatical error in word form was the second highest percentage of error based on linguistic categorization. Almost all of the errors in word form were confined to the category of misformation, followed by omission having only seven instances, while addition had six errors and misordering had three. On the other hand, in this present study, the errors were found under addition types as the highest frequency in word form, followed by misformation, misordering, and omission.

#### Verb Form errors

The second most frequent error in the linguistics category was verb form. It was found 24 data, as the highest frequency was omission of 11 data. Misformations of verb form were found in 9 instances, and additions in verb form were found in 4 instances. The following are examples of sentences where grammatical errors of verb form were found based on linguistics categorization.

*Example 9: (Omission) - That ^ the explanation from our group*

*Example 10: (Misformation) - Your group did not explained\* about that previously.*

*Example 12: (Addition) - Maybe we can start from the first group who will be\* present about designing classroom language test.*

EFL students of the postgraduate program of Bengkulu University committed some errors in verb form, which are under the types of omission, misformation, and addition. The students omit the verb. The omission of verbs included action verbs, to be, and auxiliary verbs. For instance, in the sentence “that ^ the explanation from our group”. In that example, the student omitted “is” in the sentence. Moreover, the students also made errors in verb form under the types

of misinformation error, as the example of this type of error as the example above “Your group did not explained\* about that previously”.

From that data, it indicated the student committed the error of verb form where the verb should be in the infinitive form as the sentence was negative and used “did” after the subject. The correct form should be “explain”. Thus this data included an error in verb form based on linguistics categorization. In addition, the error verb form under addition types is shown in example 12, where in the sentence “maybe we can start from the first group who will be\* present about designing classroom language test”. The student added an unnecessary “be”, where the correct one of verb form should be “...will present...” without “be”.

In this study, errors in verb forms were found in some categories of tenses. Such as future tense, present perfect tense, and past tense. It indicated the students have problems practicing the types of the verb form. In a previous study conducted by Muhamad et al (2013), it was found grammatical errors in verb form as the highest frequency of error in linguistic categorization.

#### Subject Verb Agreement

Grammatical errors in form of subject and verb agreement were found during the presentation and discussion section in three types of grammatical errors including omission, misformation, and addition. Errors in the subject and verb agreement were found in 4 data in form of omission, 3 data in form of misformation, and only 1 error in form of addition. The following are examples of the data.

*Example 13: (Omission) - the presenter want^ to answer the questions from the audiences.*

*Example 14: (Misformation) - This is\* the steps of designing classroom language test.*

*Example 15: (Addition) - We will starts\* the presentation now.*

In example 13, the student committed error in subject and verb agreement, where it should be “wants” since the subject was “presenter” in the singular form. In addition, in example 14, “this is the steps of...”, it should be “these are the steps of...” because in the sentence, it would be discussed “the steps” in plural form. Finally, the addition was also found in students’ grammatical errors during the presentation. It was only 1 datum, as presented in the example above “we will starts ...” starts should be produced without “s” as the sentence in the future tense, where after auxiliary “will” the verb should directly in the infinitive form “start”.

It is assumed that the grammatical errors committed by students in subject-verb agreements were caused by carelessness since they have learned English for a long time and most of them are English teachers who understand the concept of subject-verb agreement. This finding is in line with a study conducted by Saad & Sawalmeh (2014), in their study, they also found grammatical errors in subject and verb agreement, the students tend to omit “s” in the verb.

#### Plural form

Six data in students’ presentations and discussions contained grammatical errors in plural form. This type of error was only found in omission types, where the students omitted the necessary elements of the language in their speech or presentation.

*Example 16: (Omission) – Today there will be three group\* who will be the presenter\**

As shown in the example above the students did not add the plural form of “group” and “presenter”. Those words should be added “s” at the end of the word to indicate the plural form.

The finding of this study indicated the students’ errors in omission form,

which is similar to the previous study conducted by Muhamad et al (2013). In their study, it was found plural form errors found in omission form. As stated in their study, this type of error was caused by L1 language interference. It also assumed the plural form error in this study might also cause by the L1 language interference as Bahasa Indonesia does not have a different pattern for singular and plural forms.

#### Sentence Fragment

The utterance seems like a sentence but linguistically it was not a sentence as it has not consisted of a subject and verb as the compulsory elements of a sentence. In the students’ presentation and discussion section, there were found 4 data that were identified as sentences fragment. The following are examples of sentences fragment.

*Example 17: - I want to^*

*- I will^*

This finding was also found in a previous study conducted by Saad & Sawalmeh (2014). In their study, they also found errors in omission form identified as sentences fragment. It assumed this type of error occur as the students wanted to say other things or to change the idea of their speech when delivering the presentation and discussion.

#### Conclusions

In this study, the spoken errors made by postgraduate English language students during their presentations and discussion section were examined. The surface structure taxonomy-proposed framework was applied to analyze the errors. This study has also identified errors based on specific linguistic descriptions to give readers a more comprehensive picture of these grammatical errors in the oral presentation. It can be concluded that grammatical errors still occur in the presentation and discussion section by postgraduate English students.

Grammatical Errors based on Surface Structure Taxonomy were found 4 types; they are Omission, Addition, Misformation, and Misordering.

However, this study's findings showed that grammatical errors in the linguistics category were only found in some grammatical aspects. These are word form, verb form, plural forms, and subject and verb agreement.

This study has provided information that can be utilized to assist students in improving their oral presentation skills. Because academic oral presentations are more systematic, the language used can be identified and emphasized. Student error analysis can be a useful practice in increasing their awareness and, as a consequence, correcting their errors. Speaking practice sessions may also assist them in enhancing their presentation skills.

However, this study has some limitations. From those limitations, the researcher suggests further research on grammatical errors in spoken English, particularly in the presentation and discussion section of an academic context. This study only examined the performance of students' presentations and discussions within two meetings. Conducting a similar study over a longer period would collect better and larger data from the participants for example during one semester to make sure all participants are involved in the presentation and discussion. Those, it will capture their spoken grammatical English performance better.

Moreover, in this study, the researcher only analyzed the grammatical errors in students' spoken English performance by utilizing the surface structure taxonomy theory and linguistics categorization approach. For further research, it would be better to investigate the causes of grammatical errors they committed in EFL presentations and discussions.

## References

- 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.
- Azevedo, M. M., & Corder, S. P. (1983). Error Analysis and Interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, 67(1), 85. <https://doi.org/10.2307/326720>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching* (Fifth Edit). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Damaiyanti, S. (2021). Grammatical Errors Made by Students in Speaking English. *JETLe (Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning)*, 2(2), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.18860/jetle.v2i2.11945>
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Stephen, K. (1982). *EBOOK Language Two by Heidi Dula y Marin.pdf* (p. 313). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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>
- Helmanda, C. M., Safura, S., & Suriadi, E. (2018). *Universitas Abulyatama Jurnal Dedikasi Pendidikan The Grammatical Error Analysis of Studen ts ' Speaking Performance*. 8848(1), 80–88. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30601/dedikasi.v2i1.101>
- James, C. (2013). Errors in Language Learning and Use. In *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315842912>

- Kamlasi, I. (2019). Describing the Students' Grammatical Errors on Spoken English. *ELT-Lectura*, 6(1), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.31849/elt-lectura.v6i1.2289>
- Lumban Batu, P. N. F., Barasa, L. P. L., & Sitepu, V. T. (2018). Grammatical errors in students speaking English: An error analysis on Indonesian maritime students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(7), 89–93. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26714/lelsa.10.2.2020.218-233>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis* (Third Edit). Sage Publication, Inc.
- Muhamad, A. J., Ahamad Shah, M. I., Engku Ibrahim, E. H., Sarudin, I., Abdul Malik, F., & Abdul Ghani, R. (2013). Oral presentation errors of Malaysian students in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) course. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 21(SPECIAL ISSUE4), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.wasj.2013.21.s1t1.2133>
- Najla, N., & Fatimah, S. (2020). Common Grammatical Errors in Oral Communication Made by Indonesian EFL Learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 740–749. <https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v9i4.110341>
- Phettongkam, H. (2017). Grammatical Errors in Spoken English of Undergraduate Thai Learners in a Communicative Business English Course. *Language Education and Acquisition Research Network (LEARN) Journal*, 10(1), 95–118.
- Saad, M. A. H., & Sawalmeh, M. H. M. (2014). Error Analysis in Role-play Presentations among Less Proficient L2 Malaysian Learners. *International Journal of English and Education*, ISSN2(3), 346–355.
- Ting, S. H., Mahadhir, M., & Chang, S. L. (2010). Grammatical errors in spoken English of university students in oral communication course. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 10(1), 53–69.