Error analysis on auxiliary verbs do/ does, have/ has, and had

¹Veni Nella Syahputri, ²Meta Keumala, ³Zahratul Idami

¹Political and Social Science Faculty, Teuku Umar University, Meulaboh, 23651, Indonesia.
²Insan Qurani Islamic Senior High School, 23361, Aceh Besar, Indonesia
³Department of English Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, Institute Agama Islam Negeri Langsa, 24411, Langsa, Indonesia
Corresponding author: venninellasyahputri@utu.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Error analysis is considered as a significant part in second and foreign language teaching. It helps teachers in understanding the better approaches for instructing by giving the input on the errors produced by students because students can learn from their errors. This study aimed at analyzing the errors produced by students in using do/does, have/has, and had. The methodology employed in this study was qualitative design. The population in this study was 149 students from all study programs. During the data collection, random sampling was utilized and there were 19 female students and 19 male students involved as the sample of this study. The instrument of this study was the instrument of this research adapted from Harald (2011). Later, the data were analyzed using Taxonomic Analysis. The result of the test showed that from the 38 students as the sample, 12 students were in high level of error, 8 students were in the level of fair, and 18 students were considered in the low level of error. These errors are assumed due to the interference of students' first language structure to English.

1. Introduction

In the time of globalization, world improvement is progressively powerful in every sector, including in Indonesia. The most engaged language then is English. English is the most usually communicated language of the world, and it is additionally the first language spoken by more than 400 millions individuals all through the world, which makes English as a global language. Dominating English is additionally significant in Indonesia, despite the fact that English is an unknown dialect in Indonesia. It is instructed in all degrees of education: elementary school, middle school, senior sec-

ondary school, and college level (Yoestara et al., 2020). Certain individuals even decide to enter English Language Instruction program or courses. In learning English, there are four language abilities that should be mastered: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. These skills later are considered vital and supporting towards one another. Writing is indeed troublesome, and being a good writer needs innumerable expertise as it has numerous correlation with reading ability as well (Ismail & Fata, 2021; Williams, 2008). Additionally, Norrish (1983) characterizes writing as the language ability with which the local speakers has more issues with, and one which is least mastered. This is a strong reason that makes writing is seen as the hardest skill to acquire. This situation becomes even harder when the teaching and learning process is not carried out in physical classroom (Syahputri et al., 2020).

Students in their writing frequently make a few mistakes, including when they need to adapt on clear structure. It could happen regarding the fact that the students do not focus on the writing components such as syntax and structure itself only; but it incorporates the substance, association, jargon, language, and mechanics (Al-Zoubi, 2018; Chen, 2006; James, 1998). These components are not just significant in elucidating ideas that we normally use in our day to day routines, yet additionally in each sort of writing.

There are many sorts of classification to understand the students' error, one of them is Surface Strategy Taxonomy. Surface technique scientific classification by Dulay et al. (1982). This taxonomy features the manner in which the erros are produced from the formation stances. The normal mistakes in this taxonomy procedure are omission, addition, misinformation, and misordering. Students might miss morpheme or vital word or add pointless item in their paragraph when writing (Al-Jarf, 2000).

In addition, Suhartoyo et al. (2021) exposed students' barrier in online Writing class. Among all the problems that the students faced, one of them is students low motivation. Thus, studies mentioned the importance of providing essential instruction to develop students' Writing motivation (Suhartoyo et al, 2021), increase students' Writing achievement (Hafidz, 2021), and develop students' academic vocabulary (Lailiyah & Setiyaningsih, 2021).

Error analysis is a development to unveil the learning results achieved by students in making interlanguage structure recorded as a speaking and writing which bridges the relationship between the errors made in target language and and source language (Marza & Hafizd, 2013). Errors are viewed to be an absolute process in language learning as they can be recorded during speaking and writing. Fang and Xue-Mei (2007) express error analysis as a study and evaluation of students misleading performance in a language production.

Erdogan (2005) portrayed that errors analysis deals with the students' cognitive performance in seeing or coding the data or information they get from the objective language. Thus, a fundamental point of convergence of errors analysis is considered significance in foreign language teaching and learning process. Error analysis focuses on the syntatic analysis in students' interlanguage system. Briefly, it can be generally clarified that errors analysis is an action to identify, classify and describe the errors made by students in speaking or writing and it is performed to obtain information on fundamental difficulties in learning a certain language (Sadiah & Royani, 2019).

Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) grouped errors into two classes. They are interlingual errors brought about by the native language impedance, and intralingual errors which happen during the learning system of the second language at organize when they have not genuinely secured information about the target language. To begin with, it is interlingual errors. Interlingual move is essential focal point for language students. Interlingual errors might occur at different levels, for example, at the level of phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexica-semantic parts of the source language into the

goal language (Erdogan, 2005; Ananda et al., 2014). We can deduce that these kind of mistakes are affected by the essential language which interfere with target language learning. in production this type of errors, the students will interpret word by word conversational verbalizations and the syntactic guidelines of the students' initial language into the subsequent language. The other one is intralingual errors. Intralingual mistakes result from unfinished or incomplete learning of the objective language. They may be achieved by the effect of one objective language thing upon another (James, 1998). For instance, students try to use two tense markers all the while in one sentence since they have not mastered the language at this point. To put it simpler, intralingual errors happen because students speculate about the correctness of the language on their knowledge basis—which is still incomplete and lacking.

Thus, on the basis of the above problem description, the researchers interested in investigating the students' errors in the use of do/ does, have/ has, and had at Insan Qurani Islamic Senior High School, Aceh Besar, Indonesia. There are two kinds of importance that can be profited from this study. Theoretically, the result of this study is expected to help the other researchers acquire information on the similar hypotheses, and perhaps they can take on further exploration in a the similar discipline. It is also expected that this study can deliver another hypothesis in regards to the analysis of student errors in teaching and learning process. Ideally this study is expected to be helpful for teachers by understanding the students' syntactic errors. Teachers will then focus favoring the subject that students mostly make errors on. The authors hope that this study can help the teachers in enriching their teaching skill so the students can comprehend the of auxiliaries especily *Do/ Does, Have/ Has,* and *Had.*

Concerning about the limitation of time, this study only focused on the analysis of Do/ Does, Have/ Has, and Had found on the students' mistakes. Besides, the paragraph writing was also diminished into sentence writing alone. Indeed, this study focus on the students' errors produced in their surface grammar. However, this study does not focus on the causes of the students making errors because of factors from inside of the students or outside, which mean, the researcher does not explain any further analysis on other entailing variables.

2. Method

The method of the research is qualiative where researchers focused on describing students' difficulties in using auxiliary verbs "do, does, has, have, and had".The subject of this study was the students in the first grade of Insan Qurani Islamic Senior High School which is located in Sub-district of Sukamakmur, Aceh Besar district, and the object of this study was the errors found in their written English test. The population of this research was all of students in first grade of the senior high school which consists of 149 students from all study programs. The researchers gave all students chances to be the subjet of the research by randomizing all of them to be selected. The students were chosen randomly in which there were no criteria in choosing the participant. Thus, the researchers randomized the students from all classes in grade X. In this study, the researchers selected the samples by doing lottery method. Since the lottery method is quite burdensome if it is done by hand, lottery method is calculated by using Microsoft Excel in order to save time, more effective and efficient. There were 19

male and 19 female students with total 38 students who were then chosen to be the subjects of the research. In line with this, Creswell (2013) explains that a slight variation of probability sampling is to use the simple random sampling procedure.

Moreover, the researchers use a grammar test as the instrument of this research. The test was compiled by the researchers based on a worksheet composed by Harald (2011). The researchers adapted twenty sentences in which the students were asked to choose the correct auxiliary for each sentence including do, does, have, has, and had. Four sentences were provided for each auxiliary so the total was 20 sentences. The analysis of the research was done by first, collecting the data from the student (the result of students' work). Second, calculating the result of the existing students' work. Third, analyzing the data by using Taxonomic Analysis. This analysis focuses on grammatical structure of using auxiliary verbs (do, does, has, and have). The analysis of the data was based on the identificantion of errors as proposed by Dulay et. al (1982). In calculating the number of errors and the frequency of errors, Walizer and Wiener's (1990, p. 96) statistical calculation to display the error percentage was employed. Then, the researchers classifies the students' error based on the levels as proposed by Arikunto (2010) where >75% is considered as high, 60-75% is fair, <60% is low. Lastly, drawing conclusion where the researchers analyze the causes of the students' error in term of using the auxiliary verb (do, does, has and have).

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Results

The results of the study can be described as follows. First, students' difficulties in understanding auxiliary verbs *do, does, have, has* and *had* are devided into two parts, male and female students. The data is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. The error analysis results

No	Students' Code	Gender	Errors in Auxiliaries					Total Error	Total Correct Answers	Students' Score
			do	*does*	*have*	*has*	*had*			
1	AM	Male	1	1	2	2	2	8	12	60
2	ARL	Male	2	1	1	2	3	9	11	55
3	FZI	Male	1	0	2	1	4	8	12	60
4	HH	Male	0	0	2	1	3	6	14	70
5	HD	Male	0	1	1	1	2	5	15	75
6	MHA	Male	1	1	2	1	3	8	12	60
7	MIA	Male	2	1	1	2	2	8	12	60
8	MKA	Male	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	85
9	MPM	Male	1	0	2	2	2	7	13	65
10	MMT	Male	0	0	1	1	1	3	17	85
11	MA	Male	1	1	0	0	2	4	16	80

12	MHF	Male	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	85
13	MZU	Male	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	95
14	NI	Male	0	1	2	1	3	7	13	65
15	RAF	Male	1	1	2	2	3	9	11	55
16	RZF	Male	1	1	0	0	2	4	16	80
17	TSR	Male	1	2	1	1	3	8	12	60
18	TMS	Male	1	0	2	2	2	7	13	65
19	YAP	Male	1	1	1	1	1	5	15	75
20	AAB	Female	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	85
21	AN	Female	1	1	2	2	3	9	11	55
22	AU	Female	1	1	0	0	2	4	16	80
23	HS	Female	1	2	1	1	3	8	12	60
24	NA	Female	2	1	1	1	4	9	11	55
25	NI	Female	1	1	1	1	2	6	14	70
26	NE	Female	0	0	1	1	2	4	16	80
27	NS	Female	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	90
28	NR	Female	0	0	1	1	2	4	16	80
29	NM	Female	0	1	2	1	3	7	13	65
30	NW	Female	1	1	2	2	3	9	11	55
31	NIK	Female	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	85
32	NIS	Female	1	0	2	2	2	7	13	65
33	QA	Female	1	1	1	1	1	5	15	75
34	RA	Female	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	100
35	RM	Female	1	0	0	1	2	2	18	90
36	RN	Female	1	2	1	2	3	9	11	55
37	SN	Female	1	0	2	2	2	7	13	65
38	SH	Female	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	95
	TOTAL ERRORS		26	23	39	43	83	214		
	Total Errors (Male Std)		14	12	22	22	43	113		
	Total Errors (Female Std)		12	11	17	21	40	101		
	Percentage of Errors		12%	10%	18%	20%	39%	100%		

Second, it can be seen from the table that total errors of male students are 113 while the female students are 101. It is clear that male students produce higher mistakes than female. In detail, male students make 14 errors in using auxiliary *do*, 12 in auxiliary *does*, 22 in auxiliary have, 22 in auxiliary *has*, and 43 in auxiliary *had*. In addition, female students make 12 errors in auxiliary *do*, 11 errors in auxiliary *does*, 17 errors in auxiliary *have*, 21 errors in auxiliary *has*, and 40 errors in auxiliary had. So, the percetage of errors are: 12% in the use of auxiliary 'do', 10% in auxiliary 'does', 18% in auxiliary 'have', 20% in auxiliary 'has', and 39% in auxiliary 'had'. Furthermore, to see the interval score of the students, Table 2 is provided.

Table 2 - Score Interval of Male and Female Students

No.	*Score Interval*	*Male*	*Female*
1	55-60	7	5
2	65-70	4	4
3	75-80	4	4
4	85-90	3	4
5	95-100	1	2
	TOTAL	19	19

Table 2 shows that there are five range of scores as the interval of the students' achievement. The first range is score 55-60 where there are 7 male students and 5 female students in this row. Second, 65-70 has the same number which is 4 per each. Third, range 75-80 where there are also the same total students per each as the previous range. Fourth, range 85-90 where there are 3 male students and 4 female students. Finally, range 95-100 where there are only one male student and 2 female students who get these scores.

3.2. Discussion

This research was conducted to investigate the students' problems in using auxiliary verbs 'do', 'does', 'have', 'has', and 'had'. The researcher focuses on grammar to analyze the test result. The researchers differentiate the errors based on the auxiliary verbs 'do' and 'does' in the simple present tense, 'have' and 'has' in the present perfect tense, and 'had' in the past perfect tense. To begin with, as an auxiliary verb *do* and *does* are used with other verbs to form emphatic, interrogative, negative and shortened verb forms. The 'do' auxiliary usually use in simple form of the verb (the infinitive without to). It is used only in the simple present tense (do or does). And the use of 'do' and 'does' in simple present tense is in question and negative forms, for example in the sentence, "She *does* not do her homework every evening" and "*Do* I know you?" The result of the study shows that the errors in the use of auxiliary do and does are the lowest. Mostly, the students were confused in using the correct auxiliary verbs for third person singular. This is in line with the results of the study carried out by Nugroho (2014) that the students face problems in using auxiliary verbs 'do' and 'does', because the student cannot recognize appropriate auxiliary verb for personal pronoun. In fact, the students face problems in using auxiliary verbs 'do' and 'does', because the student cannot recognize appropriate auxiliary verb for personal pronoun.

Similar case also found in the use of auxiliary verbs *have*, *has* and *had* where students, both male and female, made many errors in using them. The researchers found that male students made more errors than female students. The students were confused by the subject of the sentence whether it is singular or plural, so that in the present perfect tense, most students chose the auxiliary *have*. In more complicated case, some students even chose auxiliary *does* where it should be used in the simple present tense. In this situation, the students were conclosed by the adverb of time which were not clearly mentioned in the sentences.

There have been studies on the role of first language to second language acquisition (Odlin, 1989 as cited in Susanti, 2019). It is "a popular belief that second language is strongly influenced by the learner's first language (Ellis, 1985 as cited in Susanti, 2019). It ispossiblybecause many learners carry first language rules in their effort to learn the present perfect, which may partly contribute to learners' difficulties. Learners' difficulties may likely caused by the following factors: a) the Indonesian language expresses the English perfect with and without the aspect *sudah*; b) in certain present perfect meaning, i.e. resultative past, the use of *sudah* is compulsory. In other meaning, it is not obligatory; c) The definite adverbial of time such as on Wednesday, yesterday, last year are never used with the present perfect in English. In Indonesian, those definite adverbials of time can be used comfortably in the *sudah* + verb construction, which is equivalent to the present perfect.

Quirk, et al. (1972) for instance, states that the present perfect indicates a period of time stretching backwards into some earlier time. It is the past with 'current relevance'. McCoard (1978) claims that English perfect has frequently been placed in the category of aspect, partly because of the persistent connection between the perfect and meanings of completion or result. He further asserts that these meanings of completion and result are not actually intrinsic to perfect, rather they come from an interaction with other elements of the linguistic and general pragmatic concepts. Concerning the function of present perfect, the defining purpose of perfect in English, according to McCoard (1978), is to indicate the pastness of the condition(s) encoded in the lexical verb, as well as a specific application, relevancy, or significance of said prior event(s) to the context of encoding.

As Susanti (2019) states that analyzing the present perfect in English to the present perfect in Indonesian may uncover semantic discrepancies. Maybe it was the contrast between high perfective discourse markers in English and a weaker one in Indonesian. It is really a comparative of English meanings that appear to be detailed and complex with Indonesian meanings that appear to be simpler. The present perfect, as opposed to the simple past tense, is frequently stated as referring to past with current relevance, or past containing the present, when connecting different languages that may not having a similar interpretation.

4. Conclusion

After analyzing the data of the research, it can be concluded that some students still made errors in determining the auxiliary verbs in the sentences. Some of them were confused with 'do' and 'does' in related with singular and plural terms, meanwhile some others were difficult to determine the use of 'have', 'has', and 'had' in the sentences of present perfect tense and past perfect tense. The result of the test showed that from the 38 students as the sample, 12 students were in high level of error, 8 students were in the level of fair, and 18 students were considered in the low level of error. These errors are assumed due to the interference of students' first language structure to English.

Finally, the writers propose some suggestions as follows: the students should practice their grammar in the form of auxiliary verbs in English sentences more frequently not only in written form but also in daily conversation. In addition, they should notice and use auxiliary verbs correctly in written and spoken practices. Moreover, the teachers should find and apply more appropriate methods and strategies to teach the students about the use of auxiliary verbs in the sentences to facilitate a more interesting learning atmosphere in the classroom.

5.   References

Al-Jarf, R. (2000). Grammatical agreement errors in L1/L2 translations. *IRAL*, 38, 1-15.

Al-Zoubi, S. M. (2018). The significance of error analysis in written production: A case study of Ajloun National University students. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies,*7(4),150-159.

Ananda, R., Gani, S. A., & Sahardin, R. (2014). A study of error analysis from students' sentences in Writing. *Studies in English Language Education*, 1(2), 81-95.

Arikunto, S. (2010). Metode penelitian. *Jakarta: Rineka Cipta*.

Chen, L. (2006). The effect of the use of l1 in a multimedia tutorial on Grammar learning: An error analysis of Taiwanese beginning EFL learners' English essays. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 8(2), 76-110.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. SAGE.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two.* Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analyzing learner language.* Oxford University Press.

Erdogan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to Foreign Language teaching. *Mesin University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 1*(2), 261-270.

Fang, X., & Xue-Mei, J. (2007). Error analysis and the EFL classroom eaching. *Dalian Liaoning, 4*(9).

Hafidz, M. (2021). The graphic organizer's effect on the students' writing achievement in argumentative paragraph. EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka) : Culture, Language, and Teachingof English, 6(1), 11-17. doi:https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v6i1.5701

Harald, J. (2011). *Do/does+Have/has.* Accessed from**:** Do/does+Have/has - ESL worksheet by johnharald (eslprintables.com) on October 1, 2021.

Ismail, N. M., & Fata, I. A. (2021). Improving reading TOEFL score through note taking strategy. *Al-Ta'lim Journal*, 28(1), 46-54.

James, C. (1998). *Error in language and use.* Longman.

Lailiyah, M., & Setiyaningsih, L. A. (2021). Academic vocabulary of EFL students' Writing: A corpus-based study. *Proceedings,* 5, 28–32.

Marza, L., & Hafizd, M. (2013). Teaching writing recount text to Junior high-school students by using facebook peer-comment. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 12*(2), 25-37.

McCoard, Robert W. (1987). *The English perfect tense-choice and pragmatic inferences.* North Holland Linguistic Series.

Nugroho, A.P. (2014). The students' problem in differentiating between the use of auxiliary verb do and auxiliary verb does: A case study of the first grade of SMP N 2 Ayah academic year 2013/2014. A Thesis. English Education Program Teacher Training and Education Faculty Muhammadiyah University of Purworejo.

Norrish, J. (1983). *Language learners and their errors.* The MacMillan Press Limited.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. N., & Svartvik, J. (1972). A grammar of contemporary English (Vol. 1985). London: Longman.

Sadiah, S., & Royani, S. A. (2019). An analysis of grammatical errors in students' writing descriptive text. PROJECT, 2(6), 764-770.

Suhartoyo, E., Heriyawati, D., & Ismiatun, F. (2021). Unveiling students' writing argumentative essays barriers in online learning. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka) : Culture, Language, and Teaching of English, 6(2)*, 142-151. doi:https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v6i2.6800

Susanti, I. L. (2019). The students' difficulties in understanding the meaning of present perfect form of the second semester students of english education. *Daiwi Widya Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(1), 24-36.

Syahputri, V. N., Idami, Z., & Ismail, N. M. (2020). Online teaching and teachers' mental burdens during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Proceeding of The 3rd International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(1), 109-114).

Walizer, M. H., & Wiener, P. C. (1990). *Research method and analysis: Searching for relationship.* Harper and Row.

Williams, H. (2008). *Plagiarism.* Green Haven Press.

Yoestara, M., Putri, Z., & Ismail, N. M. (2020). School appreciation and teachers' competence: Are they correlated? *International Journal of Language Studies*, 14(3), 47-66.