



A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching & Literature

ISSN 1414-3320 (Print), ISSN 2502-4914 (Online)

Vol. 17 No. 2; December 2017

Copyright © Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

**Indonesian University Students' Common Mistakes when Formulating
Interrogative Sentences with 'Wh-questions'**

Rentauli Mariah Silalahi

English Department, Institut Teknologi Del, Toba Samosir, Indonesia

email: rentaulisilalahi@gmail.com

Received: 17-07-2016

Accepted: 19-07-2017

Published: 13-12-2017

Indonesian University Students' Common Mistakes when Formulating Interrogative Sentences with 'Wh-questions'

Rentauli Mariah Silalahi

rentaulisilalahi@gmail.com

English Department, Institut Teknologi Del, Toba Samosir, Indonesia

Abstract: This study investigated the most common mistakes university students made when formulating interrogative sentences using the 'Wh-questions: Who, What, Whom, Which, Whose.' The research was initiated by the researcher's curiosity when finding out that students in IIE university (pseudonym) frequently made mistakes when trying to ask questions using the 'Wh-question' in almost every occasion; either in classrooms or in general lectures. The research which was conducted using descriptive qualitative method involving 60 university students as direct participants, who received some treatments found out that students' most common mistakes were about choosing the right 'Wh-question' to form the question and to place every component that built the question in a correct order and the other mistakes were related to the right use of article, demonstrative, verb, an auxiliary verb, while little problem was related to a problem with diction and ability to make meaningful sentence. The study also found out that the IIE students made more mistakes than ever anticipated by Swan (1980) and that there was a close inseparable connection among all grammatical issues when composing any sentence in English.

Key words: question words/ wh-questions, errors, mistakes, interrogative sentences

Abstrak: Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan tujuan untuk mengetahui kesalahan yang sangat sering dilakukan oleh mahasiswa ketika mereka menulis kalimat tanya dengan menggunakan kata tanya bahasa Inggris yang diawali dengan 'Wh'. Adapun kata tanya yang dipilih untuk penelitian ini adalah kata 'Who/Siapa, What/Apa, Whom/Kepada

atau Dengan Siapa, Which/Yang mana, Whose/Milik siapa.' Yang mendasari penelitian ini adalah temuan peneliti dimana ditemukan bahwa sejumlah besar mahasiswa di Universitas IIE (nama samaran) sangat sering melakukan kesalahan dalam mengucapkan atau menuliskan kalimat tanya dengan menggunakan kata tanya baik di dalam kesempatan belajar di dalam kelas ataupun pada saat kuliah umum. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif deskriptif dengan melibatkan 60 mahasiswa/i sebagai peserta dalam penelitian ini yang memperoleh beberapa tahap perlakuan. Dari hasil penelitian ini dapat ditarik beberapa kesimpulan diantaranya mahasiswa/i di Universitas IIE sering melakukan kesalahan dalam memilih kata tanya yang tepat dan menempatkan setiap komponen dalam kalimat tanya itu dengan benar sehingga berfungsi sebagai kalimat tanya, dan kesalahan lainnya adalah berkaitan dengan tata bahasa Inggris yang lain seperti penggunaan artikel, kata demonstratif, kata kerja, kata kerja bantu, pemilihan kosa kata yang tepat, dan membentuk kalimat yang memiliki makna. Kesimpulan lain yang dapat ditarik dari penelitian ini adalah bahwa mahasiswa/i melakukan lebih banyak kesalahan daripada yang pernah diteliti oleh Swan (1980) dan bahwa dalam membentuk sebuah kalimat di dalam bahasa Inggris semua komponen dalam tata bahasa Inggris sangatlah berkaitan.

Kata kunci: kata tanya, kesalahan, kesilapan, kalimat tanya

INTRODUCTION

Question words are very important words in every kind of language especially English because conversation develops into a longer conversation and may even into a very meaningful communication with the combination of question words in it. Every class, no matter learning what subject, needs the ability to form and address interrogative sentence correctly either with 'yes-no question' or 'Wh-question'. The ability to use question words is a life skill compulsory to know for a real social life anywhere.

Lee (2015) stated that questioning had the greatest impact on how students think in an English classroom which eventually would develop higher order thinking skills. If a teacher asked a question to students in which the response would be giving information about general knowledge, showing comprehension, and practicing an application, the question was categorized into lower-order questions. Meanwhile, if the teacher asked a question in which the response would need the skills for analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, then the question was categorized as a higher-order question. Qian

(2014) who called questions formed with question words as referential questions also agreed that these kinds of questions could draw students' attention and stimulate their English learning potential. On his research, Qian claimed that English classroom talk activity where the teacher involved students for comprehensive discussion using questions could probably be a solution to help students improve their abilities in the application of question words for meaningful communication.

It was a classic story that the students always made errors or mistakes when trying to formulate a sentence and even worse when trying to formulate an interrogative sentence. Students were always mixed up about the difference between forming a statement and a question, while it was obviously different in the order of where the auxiliary verb was placed. The worst problem was when students made a wrong choice in picking up what question word was suitable for a certain purpose. For example, students generally mixed up to use either 'Who' or 'Whom' for formulating a question that required an object as the answer.

For a learning purpose and avoiding misconception, the difference between mistake and error should firstly be made clear Coder (as cited in Ma'mun, 2016) differentiated between error and mistake, i.e: "Whereas a mistake is a random performance slip caused by fatigue, excitement, etc, and therefore can be readily self-corrected, an error is a systematic deviation made by learners Who have not yet mastered the rules of the L2" (p.100). Students normally made errors when they produced a sentence either in spoken or written language. Khansir & Ilkhani (2016) who were very interested in error study had done some series of researches towards students in India and Iran and found the errors were quite repeated with different participants. The errors were mostly about syntactic errors including Auxiliary verbs, Passive voice, Indirect Forms, Prepositions, Tag Questions, Relative Pronouns, Wh-questions, and Tenses. These errors are actually very common to all students whose native languages are not English as also found in this study yet in this study, those errors became mistakes because the speakers had actually learned the norms and knew the norms but tended to fall into slips when they were speaking.

Ferris (2014) argued that students whose native language was other than English would find difficulties in understanding the use of articles and prepositions and therefore needed more attention because these students tended to make more errors when fixing sentences. The most probable cause of students' difficulty to understand was the absence of articles and

prepositions in their mother tongue. That was the biggest case happening to Chinese students learning English because there was no such article in Chinese (Shi, 2015) and the absence of Tenses in Chinese (Deng, 2015) made the students more confused when trying to speak in English. Kartika (2016), on her research also found that the most common error made by Indonesian students on writing was the overgeneralization of article. Kartika claimed that it happened because of the interference of the students' native language. Dullay (as cited in Ma'mun, 2016) was convinced that making errors while learning was part of a learning process that should not be deemed but used wisely by any educators to collect data and help students learn what they were stumbled with.

There had been several researches about finding the most common errors made by Indonesian students and all were about the same as the previously mentioned errors. Aziz (2014) who did a research to know the most common errors made by presenters on a seminar presentation, found it not very different from the previously found errors through the errors did not stop the audience to understand the speaker. Despite all errors made by the presenters including lexical, morphological, and syntactical errors, Aziz claimed that the seminar participants could still understand the messages delivered. However, there could be some factors that caused any speakers ended up making errors in their language.

Kumar (2016) revealed that Indian students also tended to make the same errors like Indonesian students for the use of inappropriate question word, missing verbs and wrong word order. Eventually, Kumar strongly suggested for schools to use songs in the English classrooms because he claimed that songs are easier than speech because songs are highly appealing, motivating, memorable, and staying longer in the students' minds. Because of those reasons, Kumar believed songs are the right media to help students formulating interrogative sentences correctly.

Norrish (1983, as cited in Perdana, 2016) stated that there were three causes for a student to make an error: carelessness, first language interference, and translation. Being careless may be influenced by someone's inherited behavior or nature and is hard to overcome. Therefore, students who undergo a learning process should be taught to be careful when producing a language either for writing or speaking. Being aware of what is said or written is also an indication of a learning process to be careful because, for instance, if someone can repeat his speech to be correct, it means he has been listening to what he said and being careful. Nur and Elsaid (2012), Ma'mun (2016), and Sugeng

(2016) did a research separately and claimed that students' errors happened because of the students' first language interference in which the students still mixed their own language rules to the English which was very much different especially in linguistic features. Direct translation from one's language to English may not be appropriate because of some English grammatical rules and word choice. Grammar plays an important role in creating a quality mutual understanding between a speaker or writer and a listener or a reader. Khansir & Pakdel (2016) strongly believed that the way words were put together correctly in relation to grammar would be able to impress people, but words which were wrongly chosen would sound meaningless though ordered with a correct grammar. Therefore, students' ability to understand vocabulary and to know a wide range of it would be very crucial. One proposed way to enrich students' vocabulary was by doing a conversion (Sahib, 2016). Sahib claimed that by doing a conversion; changing a one-word form into another part of speech, students would be easier to develop their vocabulary and understand the meaning as well.

With a comprehensive exploration of errors usually made by students whose native language was other than English, and knowing the difference between mistake and error, a scope was given to this study by focusing on a mistake. Actually, knowing that there was still very limited study conducted in learning about a mistake, this would be an opportunity to raise the issue of mistake that may happen to all English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. The terminology 'mistake' was considered the most appropriate term for this study because the students were tested about certain grammatical rules they had already learned. This study was conducted in one of the universities in Indonesia, named IIE University (pseudonym). This study was aimed at finding answers to the following question: *What are the common mistakes students make when formulating interrogative sentences using 'Who, What, Whom, Which and Whose' in IIE University?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Question words

In their research, Youn & Meng (2015) differentiated the syntactic difference between English and Mandarin to help learners of Mandarin. From the research, it could be concluded that interrogative sentences in English had a very different format to Mandarin in which for the first one required subject-auxiliary verb inversion.

Thomson & Martinet (1986) explained the use of each 'Wh-question' with examples that really could help any English learner learned English easily, especially for the case of 'Who' and 'Whom' which might interchangeably be used to ask for an object of a verb. It was the position of the verb or auxiliary verb that determined the function of the question word 'Who.' For instance, if 'Who' is asking for a subject, the formula will be 'Who saw you?' Meanwhile if 'Who' is asking for an object of a verb the formula will be 'Who did you see?'

Qian (2015) in his research, emphasized the importance of the presence of question words in English classrooms to motivate learners to talk more and be communicative instead of only using displaying questions which may not encourage students to think and talk longer because they simply answered with 'Yes' or 'No.'

B. Common mistakes when formulating interrogative sentences with question words

Swan (1980, pp. 512-513), in his book, elaborated some typical mistakes students made when formulating interrogative sentences. Among them were mistakes with the use of 'Wh-question'. The typical mistakes were:

1. Placing subject after the main verb and not after the auxiliary verb.
e.g. *When was made your reservation? (incorrect)*
When was your reservation made? (correct)

It was a very common mistake for Indonesian students to directly apply the rule of their first language when formulating a question in English where a subject was immediately followed by a verb and with no auxiliary verb before a subject as the auxiliary verb was not found in their first language. For example, in Bahasa Indonesia, someone might say "*Dimana kamu tinggal?*" The question word is "*Dimana*" and the subject is "*kamu*" and the verb is "*tinggal*." But, in English, the translation of that interrogative sentence should be "Where do you live?" It means, in English, the subject "you" should come after the auxiliary verb "do." The same happened to the example above where the speaker put subject "your reservation" after the main verb "made." The example was actually a passive interrogative sentence but it even became very clear that the subject should have come after auxiliary verb. The subject "your reservation" should have been placed in between the auxiliary verb and the main verb.

It could be acceptable for a question word in English to be directly followed by a verb, yet it was only for a question requiring an answer positioned as the subject of a sentence or a full sentence as an answer.

Example 1:

Question: Who came to the party?

Answer: Alice <came to the party>. (The answer “Alice” is the subject of the sentence.)

Example 2:

Question: What happened last night?

Answer: A hurricane destroyed the city last night. (The answer “A hurricane destroyed the city” is a complete sentence.)

2. Missing auxiliary verb

Examples:

Why you are laughing? (incorrect)

Why are you laughing? (correct)

The example above was interesting because the speaker seemed to be aware of the rule for using an auxiliary in his question yet he misplaced it. The auxiliary verb should have come after the question word ‘Why.’ There was a tendency for Indonesian students to immediately put an auxiliary after a subject. It was like an automatic rule in their mind to attach the pair auxiliary verb for any subject like ‘I am’, ‘She is’, ‘They are’, ‘You are’, and ‘We are.’ The examples for that kind of mistake are in sentences like “I am live in Bandung,” “They are go to school every day.”

3. Using auxiliary verb when not needed after special Wh-question: ‘Who/What.’

Examples:

a) *Who did leave the door open?* (incorrect)

Who left the door opened? (correct)

b) *What did happen?* (incorrect)

What happened? (correct)

Those two examples indicated redundancies where the auxiliary verbs were actually not necessary. These mistakes might happen after the students knew the grammatical rule for using auxiliary verb to build a question word. But, they were not aware of the simple rule for formulating a question requiring an answer in a subject position or a full sentence as an answer. This kind of question should have the form of "Question word + Verb?"

METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive research which used qualitative data for describing the study in details. The data collected were the students' English written language which was produced in the examination. The student participants were those who had just finished a unit course learning about composing questions in English using the 'Wh-questions.' The descriptive qualitative research was the most appropriate method to reveal the process happening during the research. It was also in congruence to what Wolcott (as cited in Maxwell, 1992, p. 286) said that 'description is the foundation upon which qualitative research is built.' This study tried to find out the students' misconception about the rules in formulating interrogative sentences. All problems appeared in the students' interrogative sentences were considered mistakes because the students had actually been taught the norms of the 'Wh-questions' and the students had been able to produce questions in the practices sessions correctly. Therefore, the students should have understood the rules.

This method is desired in this study because this study is aimed to straightly find out what common mistakes Indonesian students usually made when formulating interrogative sentences using 'Question Words.' Though considered as a very simple method, the descriptive qualitative method worked well for answering this study research question as Sandelowski (2000) claimed that this method was the exact tool to use to find out a phenomenon for 'What' of an event and this method as Kothari (2004) claimed could portray accurately the characteristics of the mistakes made by the particular 60 students using interrogative sentences as the instruments for collecting data.

In order to analyze the data, the author used a descriptive approach. The approach was carried out using thematic analysis. A thematic analysis is one that looks across all the data to identify the common issues that recur, and identify the main themes that summarize all the views collected. The stages

taken by the author were reading the manuscript (students' sentences), identifying themes (what mistakes could the students' sentences have), developing a coding system (identified and decided the category of the students' mistakes), and coding the data (applying the category of the students' mistakes to all data collected).

A. Instruments

This study was conducted by collecting students' sentences as the data following some steps for direct observation. The steps could also be called the procedural steps taken for complete observation. The observation was carried out following five steps. Step one was teaching 60 students about 5 question words; the function of each question word and how to formulate interrogative sentences with the 5 'Wh-questions'. The 5 question words were 'Who,' 'What,' 'Which,' 'Whose,' and 'Whom.' Step two was to ask the students to formulate an interrogative sentence for each 5 question words learned as an assignment after the learning process. Step three was to categorize the mistakes students made in formulating the questions using the question words. Step four was to collect the 60 students again and give more comprehensive lecture explaining how to use and form questions using the 5 question words by considering the mistakes they made in the assignment. Step five was to group students; in a group of 6, and ask every group to reformulate questions by giving them 12 interrogative sentences that contained a mistake in each of the twelve sentences. This final step was carried out under a test circumstance. The students' sentences both from the assignment and test became the main data for this study.

B. Participants

The participants of this study were 60 undergraduate students majoring Information System in one of the universities in Indonesia; IIE University (pseudonym). The participants were varied in English ability but their English proficiency could be categorized into low intermediate to upper intermediate.

The students' levels of proficiency were known by looking at their English grades from the first half semester which was from BC to AB. The University applied a grading system as followed and the university's English department used the grading system to do the leveling for the students' English proficiency.

Table 1:
Students' English proficiency categories

Range		Grade	Category for English proficiency
High	Low		
100	79.5	A	Advanced
<79.5	72	AB	Upper intermediate
<72	64.5	B	Intermediate
<64.5	57	BC	Low intermediate
<57	49.5	C	Pre Intermediate
<49.5	34	D	Elementary
	<34	E	Beginner

The students were sitting in their first year at the university and as this study was conducted, the students were studying in their first semester. The author was also the teacher who taught the students and did the observation.

RESULTS

The first step was to teach the 60 students about the theory of using 'Wh-question' to form an interrogative sentence. The 'Wh-question' words chosen to be focused on were 'Who, What, Which, Whose, and Whom.' The meeting lasted for two hours with two main activities; theory delivery and practice doing exercises related to the 'Wh-question' words. During the class, the lecturer gave enough explanation and allocated time for question and answer session for more clarity of the topic learned. However, there were only a few students asked questions and they were students with good English proficiency.

The second step was to ask students to write their own sentences using the 5 'Wh-questions.' Every student, in the practice session, wrote their own free sentences for each 'Wh-question' on a piece of paper and submitted the paper to the lecturer for analysis. The paper was used for a detailed analysis for categorizing any mistake students made in the interrogative sentence formulation or called developing a coding system. That was the third step. Then, in the fourth step, the students were given an intensive class to discuss more about the topic and their mistakes while doing the exercises in the previous meeting.

In the fifth step, the researcher did some work to analyze students' mistakes in their interrogative sentence formulas. On this final stage, the lecturer gave the students 12 sentences in which each sentence contained words which were not in order, therefore the sentences were not in the appropriate forms as interrogative sentences. The students' task was to rewrite the 12 sentences by rearranging the words into correct order to form interrogative sentences. It was a test given to students after all of the processes of learning and exercising and the test was to be done in groups.

A. Students' mistakes from the assignment

From the analysis conducted toward the students' assignment, it was found that 17 students could write all interrogative sentences correctly meanwhile, the other 43 students made at least one mistake in their sentence. Collected from all mistakes made by the students, the researcher categorized the mistakes into 12 categories as follows (named coding the data):

1. Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for a subject or doer.
2. Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for an object.
3. Incorrect use of auxiliary verb to meet the tense.
4. Incorrect use of verb to meet the tense.
5. Incorrect use of auxiliary verb to meet the noun or commonly known as problem with 'subject-verb agreement.
6. Meaningless question.
7. Missing auxiliary verb.
8. Problem with diction.
9. Improper use of article 'the.'
10. Improper use of demonstrative 'that.'
11. Missing articles
12. Misplaced auxiliary verb.

When contrasted to the mistake categories by Swan (1980), it was obvious that the students in this university made more mistakes than was anticipated by Swan. The mistakes students made were not only simply misplacing a component of a sentence but also more to the other simple grammatical issues such as the right use of article and demonstrative. The most interesting finding was that there were still some students who were still unable to choose the right 'Wh-question' despite being taught earlier in the classroom before the exercise took place. The table below shows the number of mistakes made by all students for each mistake category.

Table 2:
No. of mistakes for each mistake category

Mistake Category	No. of mistake
Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for a subject or doer.	10
Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for an object.	1
Incorrect use of auxiliary verb to meet the tense.	2
Incorrect use of verb to meet the tense.	12
Incorrect use of auxiliary to meet the noun or commonly known as problem with 'subject-verb agreement.	3
Meaningless question.	4
Missing auxiliary verb.	18
Problem of diction.	1
Improper use of article 'the.'	2
Improper use of demonstrative 'that.'	1
Missing articles	2
Misplaced auxiliary verb.	1

It could be clearly seen from the table that the top three categories in which students made mistakes were about misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for a subject or doer, incorrect use of verb to meet the tense, and missing auxiliary verb; with the last category having the most number of mistakes. The students' mistakes were rewritten on the following explanation one by one to get a clear understanding of the students' real sentences.

1. Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for a subject or doer.
 - a) Whom make you suffer like this?
 - b) Whose teaching programming for us?
 - c) Whose is teach you English?
 - d) Whom kill him?
 - e) Who I your friend name?
 - f) Whom has this pen?
 - g) Whom was accompanied you to the party last night?
 - h) Whom want to go shopping?
 - i) Whom work in department store near your home?
 - j) Whose learn English?

2. Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for an object.

Whom you talked to in the telephone last night?

3. Incorrect use of auxiliary verb to meet the tense.

- a) Whom do you do to the market last week?
- b) What have you learnt about form our lesson today?

4. Incorrect use of verb to meet the tense.

- a) Who made you feel good this whole day?
- b) Who scored a goal last night?
- c) Who take my shampoo from my bucket?
- d) Who found my laptop?
- e) Whom did you eat with last night?
- f) Whom do you talk to?
- g) Who is the man that walked with you yesterday?
- h) Who took my jacket?
- i) Who sat on the chair?
- j) Who gave this book to you?
- k) What happened in their house?
- l) Whom did Triana met yesterday in library?

5. Incorrect use of auxiliary to meet the noun or commonly known as problem with 'subject-verb agreement.

- a) Whose shoes is this?
- b) Which did your pen, the black or the red?
- c) Whose shoes is here?

6. Meaningless question.

- a) Whom did you cry yesterday?
- b) What is color of a pen?
- c) Which the one on the love?
- d) Who do you need to finish this job?

7. Missing auxiliary verb.

- a) With whom he talked at that night?
- b) With whom you go to the dinner?

- c) Whose pen on the table?
- d) Which one from your brothers the kindest one?
- e) Whose watch that you found in the bathroom this morning?
- f) Whose snack on my Tupperware table?
- g) Which of do you like, a red dress or a black dress?
- h) With whom you play the music?
- i) Which one your laptop?
- j) Who cooking in your house?
- k) Whom you go tonight to Arianna's home?
- l) Whose phone on the table?
- m) With whom you shopping tomorrow?
- n) Whose jacket on the table?
- o) Whom you go to the cafeteria?
- p) Whose hand phone in my bag?
- q) Whose book on the bunk bed?
- r) Which you like shoes or dress?

8. Problem with diction.

What make the flood in Jakarta?

9. Improper use of article 'the'.

- a) Whose cars are these?
- b) Whose pencil is this?

10. Improper use of demonstrative 'that'.

Who is the boy that crying at the corner of the class?

11. Missing article.

- a) Whose laptop falls from table?
- b) What are you doing in library at 10.00 P.M?

12. Misplaced auxiliary verb.

Whom you will go tonight?

Having finished the analysis, the research drew a conclusion that students had not yet understood the lesson taught in the classroom. Therefore, the research came to the next step. The fourth step was to collect the students again and gave them more explanation about the theory of using 'Wh-

question.’ The theory lasted for one hour with more comprehensive examples from the lecturer. The lecturer gave students another one hour for exercises in which the students were asked to write their own examples and the lecturer checked on students’ created sentences one by one. With the lecturer directly helped every weak student with their own sentences, finally, all students could understand the lesson very well.

B. Students’ mistakes from the test

The final step after all the learning processes was to group the students and give them 12 interrogative sentences that each contained a mistake. The students were asked to reformulate the interrogative sentences to be true. This was conducted under a test circumstance. The purpose of grouping the students was to enable them to have a discussion in case any of them were still confused to formulate questions using the 5 ‘Wh-question’. Every group member was motivated to help each other understand the topic better by reviewing the questions. Each group consisted of 6 students.

Although the aim of the group discussion was to minimize mistakes and to help students understand the topic better because they were reviewing the interrogative sentences together, but the expectation was not met because each group still made mistakes while trying to correct the wrong formulated questions. The twelve false interrogative sentences given to the students to be reformulated were actually designed to have similar problems as found in the second step in which students created interrogative sentences; yet with some mistakes.

However, although with more comprehensive explanation and one to one checking on students’ work before the final test, the students still made mistake in their effort to reformulate the false interrogative sentences. The following explanation gives description and analysis about the students’ achievement for each category.

1. Mistake category 1: Misunderstanding of using the right ‘Wh-question’ to ask for a subject or doer.

Original false interrogative sentence: “*Whom did hit you last night?*”

For this interrogative sentence, only 1 group (group 10) made a mistake in their reformulated interrogative sentence. Their interrogative sentence was “*Who hitted you last night?*”

From the sentence, it could be concluded that the students in this group did not have a good understanding of verb formulas for regular and irregular verbs. They just added 't + ed' to the verb "hit" while the verb was actually an irregular verb that should remain "hit." The possible correct reformulated question could be "Who hit you last night?"

2. Mistake category 2: Misunderstanding of using the right 'Wh-question' to ask for an object.

Original false interrogative sentence: "Whose does this motorcycle belong to?"

To this second mistake category, there was also only one group making a mistake for reformulation. Group 1 reformulated the interrogative sentence into "Whose does belong this motorcycle?"

This group seemed to ignore the appropriate 'Wh-question' which was suitable to address the question. Instead of moving parts of the interrogative sentence, the group should just change the 'Wh-question' into "Whom" which was the correct one to ask for an object. Therefore, the correct question would sound "Whom does this motorcycle belong to?"

3. Mistake category 3: Incorrect use of auxiliary verb to meet the tense.

Original false interrogative sentence: "What are you know about our study?"

For this interrogative sentence, only group 5 made a mistake by forgetting to write the verb although the group had already been correct to change the auxiliary verb into 'do' which was the right auxiliary verb to help a verb. The students' reformulated interrogative sentence was "What do you about our study?" Actually, if the students were careful enough they could make it right by writing "What do you know about our study?"

4. Mistake category 4: Incorrect use of verb to meet the tense.

Original false interrogative sentence: "Who drop the water at this floor?"

Again, there was only one group did a mistake in trying to fix this interrogative sentence by writing "Who is drop the water on this floor?" Group 7 was correct to change 'at' to 'on' but the group seemed to ignore the simple rule of using "Who." The students should just simply remember that "Who" required a direct verb after it. As the action was a

'Past' so, the interrogative sentence should sound "Who dropped the water on this floor?" The researcher actually found so many similar cases with almost all students in which the students tended to ignore the feeling and use of logic when formulating a sentence. Very often, students did not use a Past verb form for a Past action. The most possible correct question could be "Who dropped the water on this floor?"

5. Mistake category 5: Incorrect use of auxiliary to meet the noun or commonly known as a problem with 'subject-verb agreement.'

Original false interrogative sentence: "*Who is your parents?*"

There were two groups made mistakes to fix the interrogative sentence. Group 9 wrote: "What is your parents?" while group 3 wrote: "Who's your parents?" Actually, both 'What' and 'Who' can be used for this interrogative statement yet with different purposes. However, the students should be aware of the noun following the auxiliary verbs. Since the noun was in plural forms; 'parents', then the auxiliary verb should be 'are.' The interrogative sentence might be reformulated into two: "Who are your parents?" and "What are your parents?" The first question asked for the names or the persons while the second question asked for the occupations of the parents.

6. Mistake category 6: Meaningless question

Original false interrogative sentence: "*What do you write this book for the homework?*"

It was very obvious that the interrogative sentence had no clear meaning and could result in misunderstanding. Similar sentences were very often found during class meetings with Indonesian students. That could happen as the result of lack of knowledge of sentence structures, vocabulary, and tenses. However, from 10 groups, only group 3 made a mistake when trying to rewrite it to make correct. Group 3 wrote it "What this book do you write for the homework?" That reformulated question was not any better than the previous one. There could be some varieties for correct reformulation as: "What did you write for the homework?" or "Did you write this book?"

7. Mistake category 7: Missing auxiliary verb.

Original false interrogative sentence: "*Whose book that you reading now?*"

Three groups (group 3,4 and 8) tried to reformulate the question by writing "Whose book is you reading now?" and group 2 reformulated it by writing "Whose book that you read now?" while group 5 reformulated it by saying "Whose book is you are reading now?"

From the students' reformulated questions, it could be understood that the students were not able to use the right auxiliary for the right pronoun. There could be a complex misunderstanding about the use of auxiliary among them. To correct the question was very simple; it was just to change the word "that" into "are." Therefore, the sentence would have sounded "Whose book are you reading now?"

8. Mistake category 8: Diction

Original false interrogative sentence: "*Which one the games that you follow?*"

There was a complex problem in this interrogative sentence in which students may not aware of. It was a problem of word choice and grammar. The students seemed to consider it normal to use the word 'follow' in that sentence while it should have been changed into 'play' for a better message of the sentence itself. There were 4 groups made more mistakes in trying to fix the sentence as group 1 reformulated it to "Which one of the game do you follow?" group 2 wrote "Which one of the games you follow?" group 3 wrote "Which is the games that you follow?" and group 9 reformulated it "Which one of the games that you follow?"

The most appropriate correction should be "Which games did you play?" because a game is to play not to follow. Looking at the correction of that question brought us to analyze the positioning of the words. The original interrogative sentence did not have any auxiliary verb to help the main verb and the speaker seemed to mistakenly use 'that' instead. That was a mistake in grammar for missing auxiliary verb. So, the original sentence could have been correct if the speaker used auxiliary verb 'did' to replace 'that.' It would have sounded "Which one of the games did you play?" The past form 'did' became the most appropriate auxiliary verb because the interrogative sentence implied the action to be done in the past.

9. Mistake category 9: Improper use of article 'the.'

Original false interrogative sentence: "Whose dictionary in the chair?"

More groups made mistakes on this interrogative sentence though four of them seemed to understand that there was an excessive use of article 'the' and three groups realized there was a missing "to be." Group 2 wrote "Whose dictionary is in the chair?" group 3 wrote "Whose dictionary is this in the chair?" group 1 and 4 wrote "Whose dictionary is in the chair?" group 6 wrote "Whose dictionary on the chair?" and finally group 9 wrote "Whose dictionary in the chair?"

From those four groups, one group realized that there was a misused of preposition 'in' because for noun 'chair' which had a flat surface, the correct preposition to suit it is 'on.' Meanwhile, three groups understood that there should be a "to be" after the question word. Therefore, the most possible correction could be "Whose dictionary is on the chair?"

10. Mistake category 10: improper use of demonstrative 'that.'

Original false interrogative sentence: "Who is the girl that sitting next to Tientri?"

Two out of ten groups made mistake for the reformulation of this interrogative sentence. Both group 1 and 3 wrote it "Who is the girl that sit next to Tientri?" To fix the original sentence was actually not hard, it was just by deleting the word 'that' because there happened a reduction after combining two clauses. The first clause was "Who was the girl?" and the second clause was "The girl who was sitting next to Tientri." The combination of the two clauses may come in 2 variations:

- a) Who is the girl *that* is sitting next to Tientri? or Who was the girl *that* is sitting next to Tientri?
- b) Who is the girl sitting next to Tientri? or Who was the girl sitting next to Tientri?

The relative pronoun 'that' could safely be used in the interrogative sentence (variation 1) yet, the other relative pronoun 'Who' could also be used to replace 'that' because 'Who' is the relative pronoun for helping subject. The interrogative sentence in variation 1 could also be formed using different Tenses like Present Simple, Past Simple, Future or Perfect.

11. Mistake category 11: missing articles

Original false interrogative sentence: *"Who was student that stand next to you yesterday?"*

There were eight groups making a mistake in trying to fix this interrogative sentence. Group 1 and 6 wrote it "Who did the student stand next to you yesterday?" group 2 and 8 wrote it "Who was the student that stand next to you yesterday?" group 3 and 10 wrote it "Who was the student that stand next to you yesterday?" group 7 wrote it "Who is the student that standing next to you yesterday?" while group 9 wrote it "Who was the student stand next to you yesterday?"

There were two problems found in this interrogative sentence: article and subject-verb agreement. The word 'student' should have been preceded by article 'the' because the subject was already definite and the verb 'stand' should be made 'stood' in order to agree with the auxiliary verb 'was.' Like the interrogative sentence in point 'L', this sentence had a complex structure in which it was actually consisted of two clauses. The first one was "Who was the student?" and the second clause was "The student who stood/who was standing next to you." In order to join the two clauses, a reduction process needed to take place.

Therefore, if combined, the two clauses became "Who was the student standing next to you yesterday?" or "Who was the student who was standing next to you yesterday?"

12. Mistake category 12: misplaced auxiliary verb

Original false interrogative sentence: *"Whom the people that you met two days ago?"*

There were also many mistakes happened when students tried to reformulated this interrogative sentence. Group 1 wrote it "Whom people did you meet two days ago?" group 3 wrote "Who are the people that you met two days ago?" group 4, 5, and 7 wrote it "Who is the people that you met two days ago?" group 6 wrote it "Who did the people that you meet two days ago?" group 8 wrote it "Whom were the people that you met two days ago?" and group 9 wrote it "Whom the people you met two days ago?"

This interrogative sentence was also a complex one. However, it could be made brief by just writing "Whom/Who did you meet two days ago?" or

in other form “Who were the people you were meeting with two days ago?”

After recording each group’s mistakes and paying attention to the frequency of mistakes made by each group, it was found that each group still contributed to making mistakes when reformulating the false interrogative sentences. However, group 10 was the least to make mistakes followed by group 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, while group 1, 2, and 3 were the weakest among all because they did 4 to 5 times mistakes. The table below shows the number of mistakes each group made out of the 12 interrogative sentences given:

Table 3:
No. of mistakes made by each group

Group	No. of mistakes
1	4
2	4
3	5
4	2
5	2
6	2
7	2
8	2
9	2
10	1
Total	26

CONCLUSION

Although theoretically Swan (1980) had already researched that students Who learned English normally made three kinds of mistakes regarding the use of ‘Wh-question,’ this research found that it was more than those and more complicated since building an English sentence or interrogative sentence required inseparable knowledge of other English grammar rules from the tiniest component of ‘article’ to ‘compound complex sentence formulas.’

In conclusion regarding to the grammar related skills, there were some topics students need to be taught carefully:

1. The changing forms of verbs for regular and irregular forms;
2. How to form interrogative sentences using ‘Wh-questions;’
3. How to differentiate the use of each ‘Wh-questions;’

4. How to use auxiliary verbs to form positive and interrogative sentences;
5. How to combine two or more clauses correctly and do reductions correctly;
6. How to use verbs that are suitable to the Tenses;

Overall, the students were still careless when formulating sentences in English because they already knew the topic and they had been taught about the topic with a comprehensive explanation but still there were some mistakes. The final test to reformulate the interrogative sentences was just a repetition of similar problems students encountered in the previous assignment. So, there should be no more mistakes when students were given very similar problems. Probably, further research was worth conducted by doing an interview to the students to find out the real problems students possibly have when given such assignments and whether a test circumstance has some impacts on students' performances.

Collecting students' opinions for why they keep repeating the same mistakes although they had been grouped with other students in order to promote collaborative learning will be very interesting and valuable. It can be carried out by doing personal communication or interview to the students as participants and to the class lecturer who certainly knows better about the students' background knowledge in English and difficulties in learning the language.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, J. A. (2016). Errors Made by the Presenters of Thesis Proposal Seminar in English Study Program. *JEELS: Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 1(1).
- Deng, H. (2016). The influence of Chinese context on attrition of English tense. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 25). EDP Sciences.
- Ferris, D. R. (2015). Language power: Tutorials for writers. *CATESOL Journal*, 27, 175.
- Kartika, K. (2016). An analysis of grammatical overgeneralization in students' writings: a case study of the 2nd grade students of SMAN 1 Gunungsari Academic Year 2015/2016. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mataram).

- 176 **Celt: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature**, Volume 17, Number 2, December 2017, pp. 154 – 177
- Khansir, A. A., & Ilkhani, M. (2016). A study of written grammatical errors of Iranian EFL learners at undergraduate level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(2), 268-273.
- Khansir, A. A., & Pakdel, F. (2016). Place of Grammar in English Language Teaching. *Language in India*, 16(2), 140-149.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International.
- Kumar, G. K. (2016). Use of songs in teaching interrogatives to the drifted learners from regional medium to English: an exploratory investigation. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Translation Studied (IJELR)*, 3(2), 240-249.
- Lee, D. E. (2015). Using questions to develop students' higher-order thinking skills: a primary English teacher's beliefs and practices. (Thesis, University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong SAR).
- Ma'mun, N. (2016). The grammatical errors on the paragraph writings. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 5(1), 95-131.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1992). Understanding and Validity in Qualitative Research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 279-300.
- Nur, H. S. M., & Mohammed, A. S. E. The Current Situation of English Language at University of Khartoum: Problems and Solutions.
- Quinn, M., & Cochran, M. (2002). A guide to using qualitative research methodology. *Medicines Sans Frontier*.
- Perdana. D. P. (2016). An analysis on students' grammatical errors in writing English composition: a case study at grade XI MAN 2 Model Mataram Academic Year 2015/2016. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mataram).
- Ariyansyah, P., & Pahlega, E. (2016). *An analysis of students' grammatical errors in writing English composition: a case study at grade XI MAN 2 model Mataram Academic Year 2015/2016* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mataram).

- Qian, B. (2015). The Main Problems and Countermeasures of English Classroom Talk. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 14, p. 01003). EDP Sciences.
- Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in nursing & health*, 23(4), 334-340.
- Shi, W. (2015). Types of Chinese negative transfer to English learning and the countermeasures. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(6), 1226-1232.
- Sugeng, B. (2016). Common grammatical errors in the use of English as a foreign language: a case in students' undergraduate thesis. *LITERA*. 15(1). 111-119.
- Swan, M. (1980). *Practical English Usage* Oxford University Press.
- Thomson, A. J., Martinet, A. V., & Draycott, E. (1986). *A practical English grammar*.
- Youn, J., & Meng, W. (2015). A Discussion of the Syntax of WH Questions for Native English Speakers Acquiring Mandarin Chinese as a Second Language. *Linguistic Portfolios*, 4(1), 11.