

THE ABILITY TO CORRECT WRITING ERRORS IN ADDITIONAL WORD AND PARTICLES IN DISCUSSION IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

¹Siti Mariati, ²Ika Mustika

^{1,2}Indonesian Language Education, IKIP siliwangi, E-mail: sitimariate@gmail.com

Article Info

Received : 12-01-2020

Revised : 18-02-2020

Accepted : 28-02-2020

Abstract

This study aims to determine the ability to correct affix word and particle writing errors in students' discourse which is obtained by correcting the affixed word and particle writing errors in the discourse. Writing affixed words is limited to writing di- and ke- prefixes, while particle writing is limited to writing per and pun. This study uses a descriptive method because it aims to describe the ability of students to correct errors in writing affix words and particles in discourse by junior high school students. The research sample was 24 junior high school students who were taken randomly from 246 students. To obtain data on the ability to correct writing errors with affix words and particles, it can be seen from the accuracy of writing affix words and particles obtained from the research instrument in the form of a discourse test in which the writing in-, ke-, and also in it is writing that is not following spelling. The results showed that the overall percentage of correcting the writing error of affix words reached 77.86%. For the aspect of correcting the writing error of the prefix, the percentage was 79.76%, while for the accuracy of correcting the writing error of the prefix, the percentage was 64.58%.

Keywords: Student, Discourse, Error Discourse

1. INTRODUCTION

Language has rules that must be applied in language activities. To establish the rules of the language, we must first understand the rules that apply in the language. These rules include spelling. As with other languages, Indonesian has a predefined spelling. The improved spelling has been in place since 1972, but we still encounter errors in its usage. This does not need to happen if language speakers have understood the application of the rules correctly, especially in writing. [1] In applying language rules, there are still many errors in their use such as affixed words and particles in sentences. This is often found in student writing, giving rise to problems that must be resolved and require resolution. It is in the security of the language.[2]–[6]

Indonesian as the official language in the Republic of Indonesia continues to grow and develop towards its perfection. This is following its dynamic nature. By looking at these characteristics, language users must follow the following the prescribed rules, because these rules are the reference for language users in communicating both orally and in writing. Mistakes that occur with affixes and particles that often are di / di-, to / ke-, per / per- and also / even / even that are not following their function. In this case, students are still in one form of di, too, to, and also which should be written separately from the basic form and di-, ke-, per-, and which should be written in series with the form.[7]–[11]

2. METHOD

A. Population and Sample

Population The population is all research subjects. In this study, the population was junior high school students consisting of 246 people, **Samples** The sample is a portion of the population which is the answer that represents the population. Surakhmad (1981 152) states, "The sample can represent or reflect the population". In this study, the authors determined the sample by referring to



the opinion of Arikunto (1992: 107) which states, For just cancer-cancer, if the subject is less than a hundred, it is better to take all of them so that the research is a population study. Furthermore, if the number of subjects is large it can be taken 10-15% or 20-25% or more'. Based on the above opinion, the number of research samples was 24 people who were taken randomly.

B. Research Instruments

In order to obtain the expected data, tools are needed that can properly capture data. This is in accordance with the opinion of Arikunto (1990: 121) which states "After the researcher knows exactly what will be studied and where the data is obtained, then the step that is immediately taken is to determine with what data can be collected. Data is absolutely essential in a study. Without data, research conclusions will be vague and unclear. The data obtained depends on the data collection tool or instrument used. In this study, the data collection tool used was a quantitative test by correcting errors in writing affixed words and particles in discourse. Discourse has been provided in advance, while students rewrite the discourse by paying attention to the writing of the appropriate affix words and particles according to the perfected spelling.

C. Data Processing

Organization Data processing organization is the steps that play an important role in research activities because it makes it easier for writers to analyze data.

TABLE 1 Ability Assessment Guidelines

| Percentage Ability | Ability Category Correcting errors |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| 0% - 30 % | Kurang sekali |
| 31% - 40 % | Kurang |
| 41% - 60% | Sedang |
| 61% - 80% | Baik |
| 81% - 100% | Baik sekali |

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After analyzing the students' writing, errors, and accuracy of writing affix words and particles were found. Furthermore, students' writing errors were described by analyzing the discourse tests that had been done. Then the data on the accuracy of writing affix words from student particles were tabulated into a table to see the frequency of their ability to correct affix word writing errors and particles in the discourse. The formulas used to find the frequency of accuracy of writing affixed words and particles are:

$$\% = \frac{n}{m} \times 100$$

Information

n = number of words with the correct affix the correct number of particles

m = number of affix words used the number of particles used

The following shows the tabulation of the percentage of accuracy in correcting the writing errors of affixed words and particles.

TABLE 2 Percentage of Accuracy in Correcting Errors in Writing Affixed Words in Discourse

| NO | CODE STUDENT | NUMBER OF WORDS USED | | ACCURACY WORD WRITING AFFIX | | TOTAL ACCURATY | SCORE |
|----|--------------|----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|-------|
| | | <i>di-</i> | <i>Ke-</i> | <i>di-</i> | <i>Ke</i> | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | 001 | 14 | 2 | 13 | 1 | 14 | 8.75 |
| 2 | 002 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 3 | 003 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 9.38 |



| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|---------------|
| 4 | 004 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 12 | 7.50 |
| 5 | 005 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 6 | 006 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 7 | 007 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 8 | 008 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 12 | 7.50 |
| 9 | 009 | 14 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 6.25 |
| 10 | 010 | 14 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 5.63 |
| 11 | 011 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 9.38 |
| 12 | 012 | 14 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 13 | 013 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 6.88 |
| 14 | 014 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 15 | 015 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 12 | 7.50 |
| 16 | 016 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 7.50 |
| 17 | 017 | 14 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 6.88 |
| 18 | 018 | 14 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 5.63 |
| 19 | 019 | 14 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 4.38 |
| 20 | 020 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 16 | 10.00 |
| 21 | 021 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 22 | 022 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 13 | 8.13 |
| 23 | 023 | 14 | 2 | 13 | 2 | 15 | 9.38 |
| 24 | 024 | 14 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 9.38 |
| SCORE | | 336 | 48 | 268 | 31 | 299 | 186.88 |
| RERATE | | | | | | | 7.79 |

In the table above, it can be seen that the percentage distribution of the ability to correct errors in writing affixed words is as follows:

a. Percentage of all affixed words written

$$Ke \% = \frac{299}{384} \times 100$$

$$= 77,86 \%$$

b. The percentage for the prefix writing aspect di-

$$\% = \frac{268}{336} \times 100$$

$$= 79,76 \%$$

c. The percentage for the prefix writing aspect ke

$$\% = \frac{31}{48} \times 100$$

$$= 64,58 \%$$

The average value of the ability to correct affix word writing errors is:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X_1}{n}$$

$$= \frac{186,88}{24}$$

$$= 7,79$$

Thus the ability to correct word writing errors with students' affix can be categorized as good. For the overall percentage, the number reached 77.86%. The average value of the ability to correct writing errors with affixes reached 7.79.

TABLE 3 Percentage of Accuracy in Correcting Errors in Writing Particles in Discourse

| NO | CODE STUDENT | NUMBER OF WORDS USED | ACCURACY WORD WRITING AFFIX | TOTAL ACCURACY | SCORE | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------|-----|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | 001 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 15 | 16 | 8.89 |
| 2 | 002 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 7.78 |
| 3 | 003 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 15 | 17 | 9.44 |
| 4 | 004 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 10.00 |
| 5 | 005 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 10.00 |
| 6 | 006 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 9.44 |
| 7 | 007 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 15 | 16 | 8.89 |
| 8 | 008 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 18 | 10.00 |
| 9 | 009 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 15 | 16 | 8.89 |
| 10 | 010 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 8.33 |
| 11 | 011 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 7.78 |
| 12 | 012 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 7.78 |
| 13 | 013 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 10 | 12 | 6.67 |
| 14 | 014 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 5.56 |
| 15 | 015 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 5.00 |
| 16 | 016 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 8.33 |
| 17 | 017 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 7.78 |
| 18 | 018 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 15 | 16 | 8.89 |
| 19 | 019 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 9.44 |
| 20 | 020 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 8.89 |
| 21 | 021 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 16 | 17 | 9.44 |
| 22 | 022 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 16 | 8.89 |
| 23 | 023 | 2 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 4.44 |
| 24 | 024 | 2 | 16 | 2 | 9 | 11 | 6.11 |
| SCORE | | | | 31 | 323 | 354 | 196.67 |
| RARATE | | | | | | | 8.19 |

In the table above, it can be seen that the percentage distribution of the ability to correct particle writing errors is as follows:

a. The percentage for the prefix writing aspect

$$Kes \% = \frac{354}{432} \times 100$$

$$= 81,94 \%$$

a. The percentage for the prefix writing aspect per

$$\% = \frac{31}{48} \times 100$$

$$= 64,58 \%$$

b. The percentage for the prefix writing aspect pun

$$\% = \frac{323}{384} \times 100$$

$$= 84,11 \%$$

The average value of the ability to correct particle writing errors is:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{X} &= \frac{\sum X_1}{n} \\ &= \frac{196,67}{24} \\ &= 8,19\end{aligned}$$

Thus the ability to correct student particle writing errors can be categorized as very good. For the overall percentage, the number reached 81.94%. The average value of the ability to correct particle writing errors was 8.19.

TABLE 4 Percentage of Correcting Errors in Writing Prepositions in Discourse

| NO | CODE STUDENT | NUMBER OF WORDS USED | ACCURACY WORD WRITING AFFIX | TOTAL ACCURACY | SCORE | NO | CODE STUDENT |
|------------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| | | di | ke | di | ke | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | 001 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| 2 | 002 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| 3 | 003 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 8.75 |
| 4 | 004 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 6.25 |
| 5 | 005 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6.25 |
| 6 | 006 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 8.75 |
| 7 | 007 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7.5 |
| 8 | 008 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7.5 |
| 9 | 009 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | 010 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6.25 |
| 11 | 011 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 12 | 012 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| 13 | 013 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 8.75 |
| 14 | 014 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| 15 | 015 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 8.75 |
| 16 | 016 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 7.5 |
| 17 | 017 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 8.75 |
| 18 | 018 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 7.5 |
| 19 | 019 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| 20 | 020 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 21 | 021 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2.5 |
| 22 | 022 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 7.5 |
| 23 | 023 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 8.75 |
| 24 | 024 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 8.75 |
| JUMLAH | | | | 105 | 35 | 140 | 175 |
| RATA-RATA | | | | | | 7.29 | |

In the table above, it can be seen that the percentage distribution corrects the writing error of the prepositions as follows:

- The percentage of all prepositions written

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Kes \%} &= \frac{140}{192} \times 100 \\ &= 72,92 \% \end{aligned}$$

b. The percentage of all prepositions writtendi

$$\begin{aligned} \% &= \frac{105}{144} \times 100 \\ &= 72,92 \% \end{aligned}$$

c. The percentage of all prepositions written ke :

$$\begin{aligned} \% &= \frac{35}{48} \times 100 \\ &= 72,92\% \end{aligned}$$

The average value of the ability to correct prepositional writing errors is:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X} &= \frac{\sum X_1}{n} \\ &= \frac{175}{24} \\ &= 7,29 \end{aligned}$$

Thus the ability to correct students' writing errors of prepositions can be categorized as good.

For the overall percentage, the amount reaches 72.92%. The average value of the ability to correct prepositional errors was 7.29.

4. CONCLUSION

The ability of junior high school students to correct writing errors with affix in discourse is categorized as good because after being examined the overall percentage reaches 77.86%. Whereas for the prefix writing aspect the percentage is 79.76%, and for the prefix writing aspect the percentage is 64.58%, In correcting writing errors, particles in discourse are categorized as very good, because after being studied, the overall percentage is 81.94%. Where for the particle writing aspect the percentage was 64.58%, and for the particle writing aspect the percentage was 84.11% as well as correcting the error of writing prepositions in, into discourse it was categorized as good because after being studied the overall percentage reached 81.94%. Where for the preposition writing aspect the percentage was 72.92% and for the preposition writing aspect the percentage was 72.92%.

REFERENCE

- [1] J. Scientia, "STUDY ABOUT THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENT ILLNESS IN JUNIOR HIGH," vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 24–32, 2019.
- [2] C. N. Rachmi, M. Li, and L. Alison Baur, "Overweight and obesity in Indonesia: prevalence and risk factors—a literature review," *Public Health*. 2017.
- [3] "BAHASA, KEKUASAAN, DAN RESISTANSINYA: STUDI TENTANG NAMA-NAMA BADAN USAHA DI DAERAH ISTIMEWA YOGYAKARTA," *Humaniora*, 2014.
- [4] J. Cohen, "English as an International Language in Asia : Implications for Language Education," *J. Asiat.*, 2017.
- [5] B. Andi-Pallawa and A. Fiptar Abdi Alam, "A Comparative Analysis between English and Indonesian Phonological Systems," *Int. J. English Lang. Educ.*, 2013.
- [6] A. Kilgariff, S. Reddy, J. Pomikálek, and P. V. S. Avinesh, "A corpus factory for many languages," in *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2010*, 2010.
- [7] E. A. Moravcsik, "The Distribution of Case," in *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, 2012.
- [8] T. H. Mintz, "The Segmentation of Sub-Lexical Morphemes in English-Learning 15-Month-Olds," *Front. Psychol.*, 2013.
- [9] N. P. Himmelmann, "Asymmetries in the prosodic phrasing of function words: Another look at the suffixing preference," *Language (Baltim.)*, 2014.
- [10] B. Rapp, S. Fischer-Baum, and M. Miozzo, "Modality and Morphology: What We Write May Not Be What We Say," *Psychol. Sci.*, 2015.
- [11] F. Damonte, "The mirror principle and the order of verbal extensions: Evidence from Pular,"

