

TEACHING TAG QUESTIONS IN SIMPLE PRESENT TENSE TO THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS THROUGH ERROR ANALYSIS

Lilian¹, Mawardin M. Said², Mukrim³

Abstract

This experimental research aimed at proving whether Tag Questions in Simple Present Tense can be taught through Error Analysis or not. The populations of this research were the eighth students at SMP Negeri 1 Kulawi. The sample research was taken by using cluster random sampling technique. Data were collected through observation and tests. The result of observation was analyzed descriptively. Its result indicated that teacher depended too much on textbook whereas the students were passive in learning. The tests were analyzed statistically. The result of the t-counted is 2.031. By using two-tailed level of significance is 0.05 and 58 degree of freedom (30+ 30- 2) with the critical value of the t-table is 2.003. It proves that the value of t-counted is greater than the value of t-table. Thus, tag questions in simple present tense can be taught through error analysis.

Keywords: Tag Questions; Tag Questions; Simple Present Tense; Error Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Grammar is one of language components in English language. It should be taught to the students. It is a set of rules for making sentences. The sentences must be written and produced grammatically, so readers and listeners can understand their meanings. It means that we can use the language in correct form both in spoken and written form. We can determine whether it be constructed and understood well or not after learning it. Pachler (1999: 94) states that language would be chaotic without grammar. After learning it, we can modify words systematically to enhance and to sharpen the expression of meaning.

Tag questions are sentences or phrases used by people for asking information and agreements or disagreements from others. They consist of pronouns and auxiliary verbs and

¹ Email: Lilian.lanto@yahoo.com

² Email: Mawardinmsaid@yahoo.com

³ Email: Urhy_211@yahoo.com

both of them will be placed at the end of sentences. Mas'ud (2005: 124) defines that tag questions are sentences or statements which used to give statement or information to other. He then asks the other to agree or disagree with his statement. In addition, Azar (1992: 196) states, "I (the speaker) use a tag question because I expect you (the listener) to agree with me. I give my idea while asking a question at the same time." The meaning of tag questions can be understood by hearing the speaker's intonation. Murphy (2001: 102) explains, "The meaning of a question tag depends on how you say. If your voice *goes down*, you aren't really asking a question; you are only inviting the listener to agree with you. But if the voice *goes up*, it is a real question."

Constructing tag questions in simple present tense was difficult material to the students. It was caused by the students should identify auxiliary in the provided statement and put it in the tag. The simple present tense in verbal sentences is not consisting auxiliary. In this case, they are difficult in identifying it. The simple present tense itself is used in thinking about habitual action and general truth. Theses activities are not only used now but also past, present, and future time. Junaida (2011: 422) state that simple present tense is used when we deliver an activity or situation done regularly and general truth.

In fact, the eighth grade students at SMP Negeri 1 Kulawi did not know in constructing them. The writer got so many errors in their sentences. For instance, they wrote "*they go to school, will they? And they write a letter, does she?*" After looking at both examples above, the writer found two errors in each question. Pronouns and auxiliaries in tags were wrong. The correct answers were "*they go to school, don't they? And she writes a letter, doesn't she?*"

Error analysis is one of technique used by the teacher in teaching grammar. Corder (1987: 34) states that analyzing errors is dealing with grammar of target language. In applying it, the teacher studies, identifies, classifies the student's fault by examining its part and giving solution. The error analysis has three advantages. First, by analyzing errors, the teachers will be able to know and give solution about the students' errors. Second, the teacher can know how far the students' goal has progressed. Consequently, it reminds them to learn. Third, the teacher can regard the making of errors as a device to the students to be more serious in studying. That is why she applied this technique in her research. There are three advantages of error analysis which expressed by Corder (1987: 10).

First to the teacher, in that they tell him, if he undertakes a systematic analysis, how far toward the goal the learner has progressed and, consequently, what reminds for him to learn. Second, they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is

learnt or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learners is employing in his discovery of the language. Third (they are indispensable to the learner himself, because we can regard the making errors as a device the learner uses in order to learn.

The writer formulated her problem statement in following question *Can tag questions in simple present tense be taught through error analysis to the eighth students at SMP Negeri 1 Kulawi?* It was formulated since the students confused in constructing tag questions in simple present tense.

METHODOLOGY

The writer applied true experimental research. There were two classes in this research, namely experimental and control class. Latief (2013: 94) states that the writer should random selection of the samples into experimental and control group. It is done to ensure the equivalence of groups. The writer conducted her research based on the research design proposed by Best (1981: 70).

R	O ₁	X	O ₂
R	O ₃	c	O ₄

Where:

R= randomized sample

O₁= pretest of experimental class

O₂= posttest of experimental class

O₃= pretest of control class

O₄= posttest of control class

X= experimental class receives treatment

c= control class receives no treatment

The population of this research was the eighth grade students at SMP Negeri 1 Kulawi which consisting of three classes with 91 total students. The sample was taken by using cluster random sampling technique. There were two variables in her research, namely dependent and independent variable. Based on the title, she decided that the dependent variable is tag questions which influenced by error analysis. The independent one is error analysis as her technique. It influences tag questions as the dependent variable. Latief (2013: 12) states, "Independent variables and dependents variables are used in causal designs which measure the effect of independent variables to the dependent variables."

There were two research instruments, cover observation and tests. The observation is done by the writer in getting information about condition of school and the classes as the population. The tests were given twice. They covered pretest and posttest. These tests consisted of multiple choice, completion, and error tests. Those can be expressed the following table of test distribution.

Table 1: Test Distribution

Number	Type of tests	Items	Score
1	Multiple choice	10	10
2	Completion test	5	10
3	Error test	10	10
Total score		25	30

The pretest was given at the first meeting. Its purpose is measuring the student's prior knowledge before giving treatments.

After giving pretest to both of classes, the writer gave treatments to experimental class only. They were done for six times and held based on school schedule and each meeting spent 2x40 minutes. She taught tag questions in simple present tense through error analysis.

After conducting the treatments, the writer gave posttest to experimental and control class. This activity was done at the last meeting. The purpose of giving it was to prove whether tag questions in simple present tense can be taught through error analysis or not. It was known by comparing the pretest and posttest result both of classes. They were analyzed statistically.

There were four procedures of data collection computed by the writer in analyzing the gained data. First, she computed the individual score of students by using the following formula proposed by Tuckman (1978: 169):

$$\Sigma = \frac{x}{N} \times 10$$

Where:

Σ : standard score

X: raw score

N: maximum score

Second, the writer computed the mean score of the student's result in pretest and posttest. It was done to both experimental and control class. The mean score was computed by using formula proposed by Hatch and Farhady (1982: 55):

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

Where:

\bar{X} = mean score

$\sum x$ = sum of score distribution

N = student number

Third, the writer computed variance after computing the mean score of the students. Variance itself was the sum of the squared deviation scores divided by $N - 1$. It was computed by using formula proposed by Hatch & Farhady (1982: 60):

$$S = \frac{\sum (x - \bar{X})^2}{N - 1}$$

Where:

S = variance

N = student number each class

$\sum x$ = total of students' raw score

Last, the writer computed the result of the mean score and square deviation after getting the variance at the previous paragraph. It was done to know if there was a significant difference in result of pretest and posttest. She computed it by using the formula proposed by Best (1981: 278):

$$t = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(N_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (N_2 - 1)S_2^2}{N_1 + N_2 - 2} \left[\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2} \right]}}$$

Where:

t = significance between experimental and control class

M_1 = mean score of experimental class

M_2 = mean score of control class

N_1 = number of students in experimental class

N_2 = number of students in control class

S_1^2 = variance of experimental class

S_2^2 = variance of control class

RESULTS

In getting the result both experimental and control class, the writer did the four procedures as wrote in the methodology. Those were computing the individual score, the mean score, the variance, and the result of the mean score and the square deviation of the students. She computed the student's score and deviation to both of classes after getting the result of pretest and posttest. They were presented separately. First, she presented the student's score and deviation of experimental class in the table 2. In presenting them, there were four ways which done by her. Firstly, she presented the student's score in pretest (x_1). Secondly, she also presented the student's score in posttest (x_2). Both of scores were presented for knowing the student's deviation score. Thirdly, she computed the student's deviation (X_1). In that case, the student's score in posttest and the student's score in pretest were compared. Thus, the student's deviation was found. Lastly, she computed the square deviation (X_1^2). Second, she presented the student's score and deviation of control class in the table 3. In presenting it, she also applied the same ways as done in experimental one. The student's score and deviation in experimental class can be seen in the following table.

**Table 2: The Student's Score and Deviation
of Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Class**

Number	Student's Initial	Student's score in Pretest (x_1)	Student's score in Posttest (x_2)	Deviation (X_I)	Square Deviation (X_1^2)
1	AEA	2	8	6	36
2	AG	0.667	8	7.333	53.773
3	F	1.333	8	6.667	44.449
4	H	2.667	10	7.333	53.773
5	IF	2	8.333	6.333	40.107
6	ISc	2.667	9.667	7	49
7	ISW	1.333	9	7.667	58.783
8	JG	0.667	7.667	7	49
9	JMT	1.667	7.667	6	36
10	MA	3	8.667	5.667	32.115
11	MCV	2	8	6	36
12	N	0.333	7.333	7	49
13	NCA	0.667	8	7.333	53.773
14	R	2.333	8.667	6.334	40.119
15	RET	2	9.333	7.333	53.773
16	SF	1.333	8.333	7	49
17	SHR	0.667	8.333	7.666	58.767
18	Si	1.333	9	7.667	58.783
19	Su	2	8.667	6.667	44.449
20	SWa	2	8.333	6.333	40.107
21	SWu	1.667	8	6.333	40.107
22	VS	3	9	6	36
23	VY	1.667	8.333	6.666	44.435
24	Y	2.667	8	5.333	28.441
25	YA	1.667	8	6.333	40.107
26	Yu	1	9.333	8.333	69.439
27	YW	0.667	8	7.333	53.773
28	ZA	2.667	8	5.333	28.441
29	ZC	3	8.333	5.333	28.441
30	ZW	1.667	9.667	8	64
Total		52.336	253.666	$\Sigma X_I = 201.330$	$\Sigma X_1^2 = 1369.955$
Mean		1.744	8.455		

By looking at the result above, the writer computed the variance (S^2) of students' score in pretest and posttest by using the formula in the methodology. It was done after getting the square deviation of experimental class. The variance was 47.239. It was used to compare the difference of the two classes. Second, the writer presented the student's score and deviation in control class. It can be seen in the following table.

**Table 3: The Student's Score and Deviation
of Pretest and Posttest in Control Class**

Number	Student's Initial	Student's Score in Pretest (y_1)	Student's Score in Posttest (y_2)	Deviation (X_2)	Square Deviation (X_2^2)
1	A	1.667	7	5.333	28.441
2	D	2	5	3	9
3	DT	2.333	5.667	3.334	11.115
4	E	1.667	5.667	4	14
5	Fa	0.667	6.333	5.666	32.104
6	Fe	1	4.333	3.333	11.109
7	FH	1.667	5.667	4	16
8	Fi	2.333	6	3.667	13.447
9	Ga	1.333	4.333	3	9
10	Gi	2.333	6	3.667	13.447
11	He	2.333	5.667	3.334	11.115
12	Hn	1.667	6.667	5	25
13	JM	2.333	5	2.667	7.113
14	MD	1.667	5.333	3.666	13.439
15	Me	1.333	5.667	4.334	18.784
16	MF	1.667	6	4.333	18.775
17	Mi	1.667	5.667	4	16
18	Nf	1.667	4.333	2.666	7.108
19	NMS	2	6.333	4.333	18.775
20	Ns	3	5.333	2.333	5.443
21	Ok	3	5	2	4
22	Ol	2.333	6.333	4	16
23	RA	0.667	5.667	5	25
24	Ra	3	6.667	3.667	13.447
25	Ru	2	7	5	25
26	RK	2	5.667	3.667	13.447
27	Si	2.667	6	3.333	11.109
28	St	1.333	6.333	5	25
29	V	1.333	5	3.667	13.447
30	Vk	3.333	6	2.667	7.113
Total		58	171.667	$\sum X_2 = 113.667$	$\sum X_2^2 = 452.778$
Mean		1.933	5.722		

After looking at the computation of student's score and deviation in control class, the student's score in pretest and posttest was not difference significantly. The writer computed the variance (S^2) of students' score in pretest and posttest of control. The variance of them was 47.239. It was used to compare the difference of the two classes. She then calculated the mean score of deviation in pretest and posttest to both of classes. The mean score of deviation experimental class in pretest and posttest was 6.711 and the control one was 3.789.

After finding the variance and the mean score of deviation both of classes, the writer computed the t-counted. It was computed by using the formula proposed by Best as stated at the methodology. The t-counted was 2.031.

The writer used the level of significance 0.05 for two-tailed test by applying 58 of the degree of freedom (df) $N_1 + N_2 - 2 = 30 + 30 - 2 = 58$. She found out the value of t-table by using interpolation because df (58) is not listed on the table. The computation can be seen below.

$$\frac{a}{b} \times c$$

Where:

a= the value of the amount of the students subtract with the df (40)

b= the value of the df (60) subtract the df (40)

c= the value df (40) subtract the value of df (60)

$$a = 58 - 40 = 18$$

$$b = 60 - 40 = 20$$

$$c = 40 \longrightarrow 2.021$$

$$= 60 \longrightarrow 2.000 = 2.021 - 2.000 = 0.021$$

$$\frac{a}{b} \times c = \frac{18}{20} \times 0.021 = 0.018$$

By using 0.05 level of significance $\longrightarrow 2.021 - 0.018 = 2.003$ it meant that the value of the t-table was 2.003.

The result of the data analysis indicates that the t-counted is 2.031. Applying 0.05 level of significance with 58 (30+ 30- 2) degree of freedom (df). The writer finds the value of t-table is 2.003 and t-counted is 2.031.

DISCUSSION

After looking at the result of pretest to both of classes, there was no one got high score and finished the tests well. Both of classes had the same highest score were 3 but the lowest score for experimental class was 0.333 and control one was 0.667. More than a half of the students in experimental class got point zero in one or two of tests. It was happened to control one. There were 11 students got zero. Their results were very surprising. These materials have been taught to the seventh at Junior high school. In fact, they did not finish the test well.

The writer found the same problems to both of classes in pretest. First, the students confused to choose appropriate question tags by looking at the provided sentences. It was occurred in multiple choices. An example: *Rudi, Rika, and Rafli visit their uncle in Kulawi, ... a. does she? b. doesn't he? c. do you? d. don't you?* There were six students only which choosing right answer. It was *don't they*. Second, they did not know well to complete the statements by using questions tags. It was occurred in completion test. *Andy and Akbar have English books, ...?* Most of them completed it with *have they*, *does he*, and *doesn't he*. It means that they had errors in determining auxiliary and pronoun. The correct answer is *don't they*. Third, they had errors in answering *error test*. They were asked to find out and correct the error tag questions given. Most of them just corrected one of errors given or nothing. An example: *Jodi goes to the Air Panas twice a month, does it?* The correct answer was *doesn't he*. Yet, they also changed *it* into *he* without adding *not* and vice versa.

After giving pretest, the writer gave treatments to experimental class only. These treatments needed six times. She then gave posttest to both of classes. Their results were different. Percentage of the students in experimental class which got the highest score was 100%. It means that no one got low score as gotten in pretest. Related to the student's difficulties in constructing tag questions in simple present tense as wrote at previous paragraph, the students could finish the tests very well after giving treatments. The result of posttest in control class was not as high as in experimental one. It can be seen in the table 3. The percentage of the students which got high score was 6.67% and low score was 93.33%. The students did not know in constructing tag questions. It indicates that there was no a significant progress which made difference between the students' mean score in pre-test and in post-test. Based on the result of both of classes, the writer found good result after applying error analysis technique in teaching tag questions in simple present tense.

Relating to the results in the previous page, the writer concluded that teaching tag questions in simple present tense through error analysis was effective. It can be looked at by comparing the result of experimental and control class in posttest. There was also proven by comparing t_{counted} and t_{table} . The value of t_{counted} was 2.031 and t_{table} was 2.003.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

After analyzing the data, the writer draws conclusions. Tag questions in simple present tense can be taught through error analysis by applying four procedures. First, teacher explains the material to the students. Second, teacher asks the students to find out

and correct error sentences in the case about tag questions in simple present tense related to the topic. Third, teacher gives tasks to the students. Last, teacher and the students discuss the students' result together. By applying these procedures, the student's score in posttest was highest than control one. It means that there is a significant difference of student's ability in doing the test through error analysis. It also indicates that teaching tag questions in simple present tense through error analysis is effective.

Some suggestions were addressed to both the students and the teacher in teaching learning process. First, teachers should motivate the students to correct their errors by themselves. Second, teachers should make supportive atmosphere of classroom in order the students does not feel bored while teaching and learning process goes on. Third, English teacher should concentrate on his subject than other extracurricular activity or follow a strict schedule. Last, principal should facilitate at least 50 English Dictionary in library.

REFERENCES

- Azar, B.S. (1992). *Fundamental of English Grammar* (Second Edition). New Jersey: Regent/Prentice Hall, inc. Englewood Cliff.
- Best, J.W. (1981). *Research in Education*. New Jersey: Englewood Cliff.
- Corder, S.P. (1987). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hatch and Farhady. (1982). *Research Design and Statistics* (For Applied Linguistics). Los Angeles: University of California.
- Junaida, S. (2011). *Complete English Grammar*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Latief, A.M. (2013). *Research Method on Language Learning (An Introduction)*. Malang: UM Press.
- Mas'ud, F. (2005). *Essentials of English Grammar*. Yogyakarta: BPFE-Yogyakarta.
- Murphy, H. (2001). *English Grammar in Use (second edition)*. England: Cambridge University Press.
- Pachler, N. (1999). *Teaching Modern Foreign Language at Advanced Level*. New York: Routledge.
- Tuckman, B.W. (1978). *Conducting Educational Research (Second Edition)*. Jovanich. Inc