

**ERROR RECOGNITION WITH REASON TEST TO ENHANCE  
GRAMMAR CAPABILITY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM  
STUDENTS IN UNIVERSITAS ISLAM MAJAPAHIT MOJOKERTO**

**Alfia Rif'atus Saida**

Mojokerto, Jawa Timur, Indonesia

[alfiaaruphia@gmail.com](mailto:alfiaaruphia@gmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Drs. Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya, M. A.**

Universitas Udayana, Indonesia

[putrayadnya@yahoo.com](mailto:putrayadnya@yahoo.com)

**Dr. Ni Luh Ketut Mas Indrawati, TEFL., M. A.**

Universitas Udayana, Indonesia

[masindrawati@yahoo.com](mailto:masindrawati@yahoo.com)

**Abstract**

This study aims to answer the problems on the factors that influence the students in comprehending English grammar and analyzing on the implementation of error recognition with reason test in teaching and learning process can improve English grammar comprehension of students of Educational Study Program of Universitas Islam Majapahit Mojokerto qualitatively and quantitatively. The implementation of ERWRT had improved students' English grammar comprehending that can be seen through the comparison of the results of pre-treatment which shows that on pre-treatment out of 35 students, there were 11 got the score below 55 as the Passing Grade. Result of column 3 showed that all students got the score above passing grade. The result of C4 Cycle I showed that out of 29 students, only 1 student failed. The result of C4 in cycle II showed that all students succeed. The average of C3 in cycle II escalated from 97.9 to 100. The average of C4 escalated from 77 to 97. In cycle I, there were six grammatical errors. Those were (1) Subject and verb disagreement, (2) using preposition, (3) error in using articles, (4) error in forming passive voice, (5) error in using to be, and (6) using multiple verbs. In non-grammatical errors, there were wrong spelling, wrong diction, and no answer. On cycle II, grammatical and non-grammatical errors still can be found as in cycle I except error in using articles. New errors in cycle II was numbers and noun disagreement. The improvement of grammar comprehension had shown that ERWRT can be used to improve grammar comprehension and writing skills.

**Key words:** *improvement, comprehension, grammar, ERWRT*

## **1. Introduction**

Teaching English in Indonesian elementary and secondary schools still emphasize memorization rather than comprehension. It is rarely helpful in preparing students to communicate using English socially and academically. The inability of the students in using English apparently seems when they study in university or undergraduate level. They are lack of diction choices and unableness in using appropriate English tenses or sentences.

This fact makes the educators or teachers apprehensive since English teaching and learning has already been implemented since secondary schools, even it was conducted from the level of elementary schools. This condition also appears clearly when the students take standardized tests such as TOEFL (Test of English as Foreign Language), IELTS (International English Language Test System) and TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) using multiple-choice and essay test types.

Those above tests use multiple-choice questions, in which learners tend to guess the correct answer without having understanding theoretically for that choice. The high speculation level in determining the correct answer becomes the weakness in multiple-choice questions. This also evidently appears in essay test, namely the students' diction choices are still less appropriate to the context intended.

Besides, another study which needs to be carried out is the lack of teachers' attention to the evaluation process that is key to improve methods and approaches to enhance student achievement. According to Brown (2004: 4), evaluation is an ongoing process that covers many broader domains. When the student questions, comments, or tries to a new word in a language, the teacher should provide an evaluation as students' task. Learning evaluation is an important part of a curriculum, even though in the curriculum scope, it is in the final series. It plays an important role to determine the success of the learning process undertaken today and is going to affect the next learning process.

Lastly, the higher education institutions are expected to be able to provide contribution in resulting high-competence prospective teachers in their respective fields. Majapahit Islamic University Mojokerto is one of the private universities in Mojokerto regency which has English Language Program (ELP) that educate prospective teachers who will give favorable contribution in teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia. In fact, the condition of teaching English there is very worrying. The students' understanding of English in Structure II is extremely inadequate. In the students' final grade of second semester, there are 11 classes with 387 students and the minimum score required in that English language study program is 55. There are 246 students who achieve the minimum completion score and there are 141 students who do not achieve the minimum completion English grammar properly. Therefore, it needs to be reviewed again through a proper evaluation in order to overcome the problems.

Considering the reasons mentioned above, researcher suggests a considerably new method to improve students' grammar capability called Error Recognition with Reason Test. It is a test which is developed from Error Recognition test which generally used in standardized test by adding two columns on the right. These columns use for writing the correct answers and its reasons. By using this method, students are expected to not only guessing the correct answers but also really know and comprehend the correct answer. Besides, it is also expected to improve students' writing skills by mentioning the reason for choosing the answer. This method is considered as a new method. Even so, this method is proven to be effective and worth a try.

This study aims to give positive contribution and appropriate information dealing with test implementation type which can improve the learners' ability in understanding English grammar, especially through the error recognition design with reason test. This test design is error recognition test development that is frequently used in standardized tests such as TOEFL, IELTS, and TOEIC.

## **2. Research Method**

The approach used in this research is action research approach with Classroom Action Research method (CAR). Classroom Action Research is a research activity that aims to solve problems in cyclical learning. In each cycle there are four stages: planning, action, acting, observation, and reflection (Arikunto, 2006: 16).

Following are explanations of the four activities. Firstly, in planning step, the researcher arranged learning tools and instruments that were used in the research. Secondly, in implementing step, the researcher started the meeting with pre-test to know the students grammar understanding. After getting the result, researcher was focused on materials which students are lacking on. The learning process used grammar translation method (Yule, 2006:165). The third step is observing which was conducted during the implementing step. The observation was focused on the material delivery and students' feedback and done by researcher and collaborating lecturer. The fourth step is reflecting in which the researcher and collaborating lecturer discussed learning evaluation in the cycle. The reflecting result becomes a basis for improvement in the next cycle, if it is still needed.

The relevance of grammar translation method with this research is the students are expected to learn grammar with the ability to use the language. Through classroom action research, the grammar translation method will be applied to provide a logical explanation of English grammar in analyzing grammatical errors in test questions.

According to Heaton (1990: 79), multiple choice questions are basically just to test the acquisition of vocabulary. However, this test is also good for grammar and listening and reading. According to Sharpe (2000: 357), the error recognition test is the type of test used in the TOEFL test in Section 2 of Written Expression which is a matter of questions 16 to 40. The point is that in question 16-40 each sentence has four words or the underlined phrase. The four underlined words or phrases are marked with choices A, B, C, and D. Identify a single underlined word or phrase that must be changed so that the sentence becomes true.

According to Sharpe (2000: 77), the scope of error recognition test in written expression in TOEFL is a sentence pattern that examines fifteen problems in English grammar, namely problems in (1) main verbs, (2) pronouns, (3) nouns, (4) adjectives, (5) comparative, (6) prepositions, (7) conjunctions, (8) adverbial, (9) point of view, (10) agreement (subject and verb), (11) verbal statement, (12) sentences and clauses, (13) parallel structures, (14) repetitions, and (15) word selection. Based on the weakness of recognition test error which is one form of multiple choice questions that have a high speculative element, then the researcher designs error recognition with reason test which is used to measure the comprehension level of the student's English language by adding column 4 for correct answer and column 5 for theoretical reason.

Instruments used in this research are as follows:

1) Observation Sheet

The observation sheet is used to record student behavior in the learning process.

2) Questions Sheet

Questions sheet is a student worksheet used to measure the level of students' grammar understanding. The questionnaire containing the ten numbers of the questions is given to the students at the stage of action. The test takers have to write down their choice on which choices that is correct in column 3. They also have to write down the correct answer in column 4 and state the reason in column 5 why their choices, in column 3, are wrong. Researcher will be able to check their grammar by examine their sentences in column 5.

3) Questionnaire

The questionnaire is an instrument containing the questions asked to the students to obtain data about the difficulties they experienced in understanding English grammar.

Data collection method used in this research is direct observation. Researchers make observations and look directly to the location of research to obtain data. According to Sudaryanto (1993: 133), this method can be aligned with observation method. Steps in collecting data are as follows:

- 1) Observing the chosen class and lecturer for about 1 month.
- 2) Observing and recording teaching technique used and students' liveliness in learning process.
- 3) Asking students to answer the questions sheet.
- 4) Asking any obstacles faced by the students.

According Sudaryanto (1993: 6), data analysis is an attempt researchers directly handle the problems contained in the data. The method of analysis is the way taken by researchers to understand the problem of understanding English grammar which becomes the object of research. Data analysis method used in this research is quantitative and qualitative method. According to Cohen et al (2007: 461), the quantitative method is a method that uses numerical analysis, while the qualitative method is the organization and explanation of data related to situations, patterns, themes, categories and habits.

Test result was analyzed as follows:

For columns 3 and 4 (on the test paper) it's 1 poin for correct answers and 0 for wrong answers. To analyze the test results and grammar understanding of English students done the following things:

- 1) Counting students' score

- For columns 3 and 4 it's 1 for correct answers and 0 for wrong answers.
- For language learning and studies:

x 100%

Formula:

Total of correct answers

$$X = \frac{\text{Total of correct answers}}{\text{Questions Total}}$$

Questions Total

2) Average of all students' scores:

$$x = \frac{\sum X}{n}$$

Information:

x : average

$\sum$  : total

X : student's score

n : total students

The data collected in column 5 are then analyzed qualitatively in the field of linguistics. The study of qualitative data is presented in descriptive interpretative.

### **3. Findings and Discussion**

#### **3.1 Cycle I**

##### **3.1.1 Pre-Action**

The observation of pre-action stage which was held for the class IV K in Structure IV course on Friday was to know the participation and understanding level of students English grammar. At this stage, there were 35 students at class before the Error Recognition with Reason Test (ERWRT) was applied. Then, the researcher became an observer and wrote the observation result on prepared-observation sheets.

From the observation sheets above, it can be outlined that<sup>x</sup> 100% the lesson materials presented by the lecturer were handled well and it was accordance with the teaching material presented. The students' behavior level was impoverished. It could be seen from the students sitting behind the class, talking by themselves and only answering the questions asked by their lecturer. The students' attitude in responding to lecturers' explanations and their desire to ask if they did not understand the lesson presented and interaction among students was scanty since there were active students and some of them were less active in

listening to lecturer's explanations. The lecturer's attitude in correcting students' grammar errors and students' attitude in correcting their English grammar errors were good. The students' attitude in carrying out the tasks from the lecturers were still not satisfactory, it could be seen from the students who did not finish the homework given and finally, the lecturers gave them more time to finish it before it was discussed at class. Students were able to express their arguments for their answer choices, but its accuracy were not easy to measure as the answers were not written on the sheet and only spoken together so it was difficult to measure each student ability.

In this phase, Error Recognition test was used. It is commonly used in Test of English as Foreign Language (TOEFL). The error recognition test was used by lecturer to see the subjects which had not been understood by students after completing Structure I-III course. The questions were taken from *Advance Grammar in Use* by Martin Hewings. Then, ten questions were tested and contained topics (1) singular verbs; (2) uncountable nouns; (3) preposition for; (4) reflexive pronoun; (5) embedded question: question word+ subject + verb; (6) subject + auxiliary verb (negative)+either); (7) subject+ verb + complement + modifier; (8) the other is an adjective when it appears before a noun and cannot be plural; (9) use simple past with the past perfect for activities that happened not once; and (10) have been agrees with the plural between the subject and the agreement between subject and verb.

After answers' sheets from the students were checked, it showed that 11 students' scores were below 55 at the pre-action activities, which means they did not reach the minimum score of Minimum Completion Standards (PASSING GRADE) prescribed by the Study Program.

This showed that the level of understanding of English grammar was still low since there were 30% students whose scores did not meet PASSING GRADE. The ten questions discussed in this phase were previously given as homework and were submitted before being discussed in class. The weakness of giving this task was that the lecturer could not guarantee that the task was finished by the students themselves.



The pre-action result also showed that the understanding level cannot be measured properly because the answers to the questions are only spoken and these results cannot be used as a reference in measuring the understanding level of students in understanding English grammar. This is said because the answers to the questions of this multiple choice form cannot fully reflect the understanding level of students as they still have a high speculation aspect.

To find out the factors that influence students in understanding English grammar, students were given questionnaires with open questions (as seen in research instruments) to be filled based on their experiences while learning English. Based on the results of 32 questionnaires collected from students there were five factors that influenced the understanding level of students' English grammar. Furthermore, the five factors were divided into two factors, internal and external factors. The first, there were three internal factors, (1) the lack of language practice activities conducted directly with native speakers and limited time in reviewing teaching materials given by lecturers; (2) the lack of mastery of English vocabulary and changes in verbs that were very confusing especially in tenses; (3) the lack of self-confidence for fear of making mistakes when communicating and awareness and efforts to learn about the importance of English. The second, there were two external factors, (1) the lack of facilities prepared by the university such as language laboratories and (2) the presentation of teaching materials by lecturers were imperfect.

After obtaining pre-action discussion result, discussion about the implementation preparation of cycle I was held with the lecturer of Structure IV. From discussion result, it was decided to carry out the first cycle on Friday, February 22, 2013 by giving 10 questions to be tested in the early test and final test. The questions tested and discussed covers some topics, such as (1) simple present tense use for the present time with stative (linking) verbs); (2) past perfect use for events that occurred earlier in the past; (3) simple past use for a specific time in the past; (4) reflexive pronoun use; (5) uncountable noun use; (6) gerund (verb + ing) use after preposition; (7) possessive adjective use before gerund; (8)

agreement of verbs between the main sentence and the clause; (9) the form of the affirmative agreement rule; and (10) gerund use.

### **3.1.2 Action**

The first cycle was held on Friday, September 6, 2019 started with the initial test applying ERWRT test. There were 29 students attending the first cycle from 35 students. The initial test was carried out for 20 minutes. After the time was over, the question sheets were collected for review. Then, the learning activity was done and in this activity the researcher observed the action implementation, noted the things that supported the assessment. After the learning activities ended, the final test was held for 25 minutes, and its results were made to compare students' understanding. The first cycle result consisted of three parts, namely the results of first cycle observations, the first cycle test result and the first cycle reflection.

The initial and final test result conducted on students after referring to the test answer key showed that the students' English grammar understanding increased. It was analyzed based on the mistakes made by the students in choosing answer option in column 3, the correct answer in column 4, and the written-theoretical reasons in column 5. The wrong answer option in column 3 and the correct answer in column 4 consists of four possibilities namely: (1) correct option -correct answer; (2) correct option-wrong answer; (3) wrong option-correct answer and (4) wrong option - wrong answer. Each correct answer in column 3 was scored 1 and the wrong one was 0, as well as the answer in column 4, the correct answer scored 1 and the wrong answer was 0. The reason in column 5 was analyzed based on two aspects, namely content and grammar. The initial test activities were carried out for 20 minutes and the final test activities were 25 minutes.

From the score list of the first cycle which was attended by 29 students, the initial test results of column 3, there were 3 students who reached a score of 80 and 26 students achieved a score of 100. In column 4 there was 1 student who obtained 50; 9 students received a score of 70; 9 students received a score of 80; 8

students achieved a score of 90; and 2 students achieved a score of 100. This showed that based on the initial test results, there was one student who reached a score below PASSING GRADE, it was 55.

The final test results showed in column 3, all students achieved a score of 100. Column 4 showed there were 7 students reached a score of 90; and 22 students achieved a score of 100. This showed that based on the final test results there was no student obtaining a score below the minimum completeness criteria. The average score of column 3 on the initial test results was 97.9 increasing to 100 in the final test results. The average score of column 4 in the initial test results was 80, increasing to 97.5 in the final test results. Furthermore, the scores reached by students in the initial test and final test were both the scores in column 3 and 4 and the average scores of column 3 and 4. The explanation through the graph was separated into three parts, namely the initial test score, final test score and average score initial test and final test so that it could be seen in detail the increase in understanding of English grammar.

Then, the mistakes in reason column (column 5) were analyzed from the linguistic aspects, which consisted of two dimensions, namely content and grammar with three possible answers: (1) False Content-False Grammar (FC-FG); (2) Correct Content-Incorrect Grammar (CC-IG); and (3) Correct answer-Correct Grammar (CA-CG). The next grammatical errors were seen from errors based on patterns (verbs, pronouns, nouns, adjectives) or styles (parallel structure, agreement). Besides, there are also three non-grammatical errors, such as Spelling Error (SE), Dictation Error (DE) and not giving answers (NGA).

The type of NGA error in cycle I from ten questions done by 29 students, on the initial test of NGA error was found in 14 question numbers and reduced to 1 question number in the final test results. This shows that there is an increase in understanding of English grammar of students by starting to try to write down their answers in column 5 and use test-time wisely.

Furthermore, the results of the type of errors in column 5 are sorted per number of questions to find out which subjects need to get attention in the next teaching and learning process. In addition, it can also be seen that an increase in understanding

of English grammar of students through the number of errors both grammatical and non-grammatical errors in the initial test and final test. This needs to be carried out so that the teaching and learning process becomes more communicative and effective.

### **3.1.3 Reflection**

The results of the first cycle showed an increase in understanding of students English grammar which can be seen from the comparison of the results between the initial tests and final tests. The lowest scores of the initial tests C3 and C4 are 80 and 50, that rise to 100 and 90 in the final test results. The mean initial C3 and C4 tests were 97.9 and 80, increasing to 100 and 97.5 in the final test results. From the results of the first cycle of the learning aspects it can be concluded that all students have exceeded the score of 55 as the **PASSING GRADE** score. However, from the linguistic aspects, it is still necessary to carry out the second cycle because the results of the first cycle show there are six grammatical errors, as well as non-grammatical errors, namely SE, DE and NGA. From the six grammatical errors written in column 5, the disagreement of subjects and verbs is a type of error that is often made by students.

## **3.2 Cycle II**

### **3.2.1 Pre-Action**

After obtaining the results of the first cycle which shows there are six grammatical errors, especially Subject and Verb Disagreement which are mostly made by students, as well as non-grammatical errors (SE, DE and NGA), it is necessary to carry out cycle II. Therefore, a discussion was held with lecturers to discuss the preparation for the implementation of the second cycle. From the results of the discussion it was decided to carry out the second cycle on Friday, October 4th, 2019 by giving 10 questions to be tested in the initial test and final test. The subjects needs to be concerned and repeated in the discussion is the agreement between subject and verb. Repeating this subject is done by giving three questions to the material to be tested. In the discussion, teaching materials

were prepared, reviewing the subjects that needed to be re-taught and reproducing the test questions. The questions tested cover the subject (1) infinite use; (2) the use of verb 1 + complement pronoun + infinitive; (3) the use of subject pronoun after verb be; (4) subject and verb agreement; (5) the use of past perfect for the past action that happened first; (6) and (7) are agreement of subject and verb; (8) the use of past progressive/past continuous (was /were+(verb+ing); (9) the correct sequence in the sentence subject /verb / complement / modifier; and (10) the correct sequence of modifiers in the sentence, modifier of place + modifier of time.

### **3.2.2 Action**

Cycle II was conducted on Friday, October 4, 2019. The number of students attending the second cycle was 32 out of a total of 35 students. Implementation of initial test activities was carried out for 25 minutes. After the specified time finished the question sheet was submitted. It continued with a discussion and question and answer session that discusses the subject matter of each question. In this teaching and learning process lecturers and students were getting used to using ERWRT. After completing all the questions, the final test was carried out for 25 minutes.

The results of the initial test and the final test conducted on students after referring to the test answer key indicate an increase in understanding of English grammar. Improving the understanding of grammar is seen based on the wrong choice of the wrong answer option in column 3, writing the correct answer in column 4, and writing the theoretical reasoning in column 5. Assessment of the answer choices in column 3 and writing the correct answer in column 4 are done as in the implementation in cycle I.

From the score list of the second cycle which was attended by 32 students, on the results of the initial test activities in the K3 column there were 4 students who scored 70; 15 students received a score of 80; 9 students get a score of 90; and 4 students obtained a score of 100. In column 4 there were 9 students who scored 40; 11 students received a score of 50; 6 students who get a score of 60; 4

students received a score of 70; and 2 students got 80 points. This shows that based on the results of the initial test there were twenty students who obtained a score below the minimum completeness score required, namely 55.

The results of the final test activities in column 3 there were 3 students who got a score of 90 and 29 students received a score of 100. In column 4 there was 1 student who got a score of 60; 1 student gets a score of 70; and 3 students got 80; 9 students got a score of 90; and 19 students obtained a score of 100. Based on the results of the final test it was found that no student obtained a score below the minimum completeness score. The average score of column 3 in the initial test activity was 84 and increased to 99 in the final test results. The average score of 53.5 in the initial test in column 4 increased to 94 in the final test results.

It is similar with the implementation of the first cycle, errors in column 5 (reason column) were analyzed from the linguistic aspects consisting of 2 dimensions, namely content and grammar with three possible answers: (1) False Content-Incorrect Grammar (FC-FG);(2) True Content-Incorrect Grammar (CC-IG); and (3) Right Answer-Correct Grammar (CA-CG). Further grammatical errors are seen from errors based on patterns (verbs, pronouns, nouns, adjectives) or styles (parallel structure, agreement). There are also three non-grammatical errors, namely Spelling Error (SE), Error Dictation (DE) and not giving answer (NGA).

The NGA error type in the second cycle of initial test in 10 questions performed by 32 students, it was found 30 questions with NGA errors and reduced to 8 questions in the final test results. This shows an increase in students' understanding of English grammar so they try to write answers in column 5. Beside that, they begin to be able to use the final test time better so the opportunity to not write down the answers in column 5 decreases.

Furthermore, the results of the initial test and the final test of the second cycle were analyzed based on the number of errors in column 3 and column 4 as well as the types of answers in column 5 to find out which subjects need attention in the next teaching and learning process. This needs to be done so that the teaching and learning process becomes more communicative and effective.

From the results of the answer types in column 5, the subject that should need to be more concerned for the next teaching and learning process is the use of *past perfect for the past action that happened first* (question number 5) and question number 8, namely the use *past progressive/past continuous (was/were + (verb + ing))*. From the table above, it can be seen that from the two questions can be seen the CA-CG answer shows a less significant from 4 correct answer to 9 and 5 correct answers to 8. The significant results were found in questions number 4, 6 and 7 where these questions were tested with the aim of reducing errors in verb mismatches and verbs that occur most frequently in cycle I. The final test results show an increase in the CA-CG answers from the three questions 16 to 29, 11 to 23 and 7 to 20.

Similarly in the implementation of the first cycle, then the analysis per subject is focused on the analysis of grammar errors in CC-IG to find out the types of grammatical errors that are mostly carried out by students to be used as a focus of discussion in the next teaching and learning process.

### **3.2.3 Reflection**

The results of the second cycle showed an increase in understanding of English grammar of students which can be seen from the comparison of the results of the initial tests and final tests. The lowest scores of the initial tests C3 and C4 were 70 and 40 increased to 90 and 60 in the final test results. The initial C3 and C4 initial test scores were 84 and 53.4 increased to 99 and 94 in the final test results. From the results of the second cycle of the learning aspects, it can be deduced that all students reached the score of 55 or the score of PASSING GRADE. From the linguistic aspect, it shows an increase in understanding, especially errors in subject and verb mismatches that occur a lot in cycle I. The percentage of errors in this cycle is 41% and decreases to 13% in cycle II. There are five same grammatical errors in the first cycle, except the Error Using Articles Other grammatical errors found in Cycle II are mismatch Amounts and Nouns.

The results of the implementation of cycles I and II show that the ERWRT is proven to improve understanding of English grammar students can also improve their writing skills as shown in column 5.

## **4. Conclusion and Suggestions**

### **4.1 Conclusion**

Based on the results of this study, it can be concluded as follows.

1) There are three internal factors and two external factors that influence the low level of understanding of students' English grammar. Its internal factors are (1) lack of language practice activities conducted directly with native speakers and limited time in reviewing teaching materials given by lecturers; (2) lack of mastery of English vocabulary and changes in verbs that are very confusing especially in tenses; and (3) lack of self-confidence in making mistakes when communicating and efforts to learn about the importance of English for their future. External factors, namely (1) lack of facilities prepared by the campus such as language laboratories that are not comparable to the number of students and (2) the delivery of teaching materials by lecturers is not good because of the unavailability of teaching modules/teaching materials.

2) The implementation of ERWRT has succeeded in improving students' English grammar abilities which can be seen from student achievement in pre-action activities, cycles I and II.

a) Comparison of pre-action results, cycle I, and II shows that in the pre-action results there were 35 students and 11 of them did not reach 55 score, namely the PASSING GRADE determined by the study program. In column 3 of cycle I and II it appears that all students meet PASSING GRADE. In column 4 in cycle I, from 29 students there is 1 student obtaining a score under PASSING GRADE. The average score of column 3 of the initial test in the first cycle is 98, increasing to 99 in the final test results. The initial test column 4, the average score is 77 increases to 97 in the final test. The average value of the initial tests of column 3 is 84 and increases to 98 in the final test. The initial test column 4 score e is 53, increasing to 92 in the final test.



b) In the first cycle six grammatical errors were found, (1) Subject and verb mismatch, (2) Error preposition use, (3) Error article use, (4) Errors in forming passive sentences, (5) The errors in to be use , and (6) Use of multiple verbs. There are three non-grammatical errors namely SE, DE and NGA. In the second cycle there were still three similar non-grammatical errors and six grammatical errors. There are five grammatical errors in the second cycle which are the same as grammatical errors in cycle I except for the use of articles. The new grammatical errors found in cycle II is the disagreement of numbers and nouns. In the second cycle the frequency of errors found in the first cycle has been greatly reduced.

c) This test can be used to improve understanding of grammar and writing skills. This test can also be integrated in analyzing grammatical errors through reading material but this test cannot be applied in improving listening and speaking skills.

d) Students' responses to the application of the ERWRT test type in helping to understand their English grammar are (1) ERWRT is very helpful in understanding English grammar because it must provide the right reasons for choice; (2) helping in selecting the right words so that the answers given are not misunderstood; (3) the spontaneous answer will be harmful; and (4) be more careful in analyzing the errors in the sentence because if the analysis is wrong then the reason given will be also wrong.

## **4.2 Suggestions**

The suggestions that can be given through this research are as follows:

- 1) Research by implementing the ERWRT evaluation model has succeeded in successfully increasing students' understanding of English grammar. Therefore, lecturers or teaching staff can develop learning evaluations through the application of the type of ERWRT test to measure students' level of understanding more precisely, especially in understanding grammar and improving writing skills. Increasing understanding of English grammar is closely related to cognitive enhancement and strengthening their competitiveness in the world of work later.

- 2) Column 5/reason column can also be used to improve student competence through English reading material that has been compiled as a test given to students to analyze grammar errors, spelling, and diction. Errors in grammar can be used as a reference for the preparation of teaching materials and the focus of discussion in the teaching and learning process.
- 3) Further research is needed by applying other methods that can improve the ability of listening and speaking skills.

### **References**

- Amran, Y. S. Chaniago. 2002. *Kamus Lengkap Bahasa Indonesia*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
- Arifin, Zainal. 2011. *Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Arikunto, Suharsini dkk. 2006. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Arikunto, Suharsini. 2009. *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Arikunto, Suharsini. 2010. *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Bereiter, Carl. 2002. *Education and Mind in the Knowledge Age*. England: Routledge.
- Biber, Douglas. 1998. *Corpus Linguistics, Investigating Language Structure, and Use*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Douglas H. 2008. *Prinsip Pembelajaran dan Pengajaran Bahasa*, Pearson Education Inc.
- Burn, Ann. 1999. *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teacher*. Cambridge. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaer, Abdul. 2003. *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Cohen, Louis. dkk, 2007. *Research Methods in Education*. New York. Routledge.
- Dastgoshadeh, Adel., Birjandi, Parvis., Jalilzadeh, Kaveh. 2011. *Error Recognition Test as A Predictor of EFL Learners' Writing Ability*. Teheran: *International Journal of English Linguistics Volume I No. 2*
- Depdiknas. 2008. *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa.
- Djaali dan Pudji Muljono. 2008. *Pengukuran dalam Bidang Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

- Dykes, Barbara. 2007. *Grammar for Everyone, Practical Tools For Learning and Teaching Grammar*. Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.
- Ehrlich, Eugene. 2004. *Teori dan Soal Latihan English Grammar*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Elliot. John. 1991. *Action Research for Educational Change*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Feng Shi, Lu., Morozova, Natalia. 2012. *Understanding Native Russian Listeners' Error Word Recognition Test: Model-based Analysis of Phoneme Confusion*. New York: Department of Communication and Science and Disorder, Long Island University - USA
- Greenbaum, Sidney. 1996. *Oxford English Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamalik. 2001. *Criterion Referenced Evaluation*. England: Longman.
- Heaton, J. 1990. *Classroom Testing*. England: Longman.
- Hornby, A. S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Iskandar, 2009. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan dan Sosial*. Jakarta: Gaung Persada Press.
- Iskandarwassid. 2009. *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Monny, Maria O. E. 2011. *Hasil Kajian Nilai Kelas E Program Studi Bahasa Inggris Universitas PGRI Kupang – NTT. Kupang*. (unpublished)
- Muslich, Masnur. 2009. *Tata Bentuk Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian ke Arah Tatabahasa Deskriptif*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata.1997. *Pengembangan Kurikulum: Teori dan Praktik*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Nelson, G. 2010. "Description and Prescription" In : Barber, Alex., Staiton, Robert J., editors, *Concise Encyclopedia of Philosophy of Language And Linguistics*. London: University College London, UK. p. 146-150.
- Sharpe, J. Pamela, Ph. D. 2000. *How To Prepare For The TOEFL Test 9<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Jakarta: Binapura Aksara.
- Siddique, Hira. 2016. *Descriptive Grammar vs Prescriptive Grammar*. Pakistan: Allabama Iqbal Open University.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Jakarta: Indonesian Linguistics Development Project
- Sudjiono, A. 2010. *Pengantar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Radja Press.

- Sudjono, A. 2011. *Pengantar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Thobroni, Mustofa. 2011. *Belajar dan Pembelajaran: Pengembangan Wacana dan Praktik Pembelajaran dalam Pembangunan Nasional*. Jakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Verhaar, J.W.M. 1996. *Asas-Asas Linguistik Umum*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Yule, George. 2006. *The Study of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.