Evaluating Genre-Based Instruction through Error Analysis: Insights from Vocational Students' Procedure Texts

Anni Alvionita Simanjuntak[1*], **Rika Wahyuni Tambunan** [2]

[1] Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta, Indonesia
[2] Administrasi Server dan Jaringan Komputer, Akademi Komunitas Negeri Putra Sang Fajar Blitar, Indonesia

annialvionita@upnvj.ac.id[1], rikawah@akb.ac.id[2]
Correspondence: annialvionita@upnvj.ac.id[1]

ABSTRAK

Latar Belakang. Menulis teks prosedur dalam bahasa Inggris adalah keterampilan penting bagi siswa vokasi, terutama yang belajar di program berbasis praktik. Teks prosedur digunakan di tempat kerja untuk memberikan instruksi atau menjelaskan langkah-langkah dengan jelas dan tepat. Pendekatan Berbasis Genre (*Genre-Based Approach*/GBA) sering digunakan untuk membantu siswa menulis lebih baik dengan cara mengajarkan struktur dan tujuan dari berbagai jenis teks. Banyak penelitian menunjukkan bahwa GBA membantu siswa menyusun teks dengan baik, namun belum banyak yang meneliti kesalahan bahasa yang masih dibuat siswa setelah belajar dengan pendekatan ini.
Metode. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain deskriptif kualitatif untuk menganalisis kesalahan dalam 30 teks prosedur yang ditulis oleh mahasiswa Program Studi Penyuntingan Audio-Visual di AKN Putra Sang Fajar Blitar. Teks-teks ini dikumpulkan setelah siswa menyelesaikan dua siklus pembelajaran dengan GBA. Kesalahan dianalisis menggunakan Taksonomi Strategi Permukaan (*Surface Strategy Taxonomy*), dengan fokus pada empat jenis kesalahan: penghilangan (*omission*), penambahan (*addition*), pembentukan salah (*misformation*), dan urutan salah (misordering). Data dianalisis dan dikodekan oleh dua penilai, serta didukung dengan catatan pengajar dan umpan balik dari siswa.
Hasil. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa sebagian besar siswa sudah bisa mengikuti struktur yang benar dalam menulis teks prosedur. Namun, masih banyak yang membuat kesalahan bahasa. Jenis kesalahan yang paling sering muncul adalah misformation (bentuk kata yang salah) dan omission (kata yang hilang). Kesalahan ini sering memengaruhi kejelasan dan makna instruksi yang ditulis. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa meskipun GBA membantu dalam pengorganisasian teks, pendekatan ini belum cukup untuk meningkatkan tata bahasa dan ketepatan kalimat.
Kesimpulan. Pendekatan Berbasis Genre membantu siswa memahami cara menyusun tulisan, tetapi perlu dikombinasikan dengan perhatian lebih pada tata bahasa dan penggunaan bahasa. Guru perlu memberikan latihan tata bahasa dan umpan balik yang rinci terhadap kesalahan siswa. Kombinasi ini dapat membantu siswa vokasi menulis teks yang lebih jelas dan benar untuk keperluan komunikasi di dunia kerja.

Kata Kunci
Instruksi Berbasis Genre; Analisis Kesalahan; Teks Prosedur; Siswa Vokasi; Taksonomi Strategi Permukaan

ABSTRACT

Backgrounds. Writing procedure texts in English is an important skill for vocational students, especially those in practice-based programs. These texts are used in workplaces to give instructions or explain steps clearly and accurately. The Genre-Based Approach (GBA) is often used to help students write better by teaching them the structure and purpose of different types of texts. While many studies have shown that GBA helps students organize their writing, few have looked closely at the language mistakes students still make after learning with this method.
Methods. This study used a qualitative descriptive design to analyze the errors in 30 procedure texts written by students in the Audio-Visual Editing program at AKN Putra Sang Fajar Blitar. These texts were collected after students completed two cycles of learning with the GBA. The errors were analyzed using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy, focusing on four categories: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The data were checked and coded by two raters, and additional data from teacher notes and student feedback were used to support the findings.
Results. The results showed that most students could follow the correct structure of a procedure text. However, many still made language mistakes. The most common errors were misformation (wrong word forms) and omission (missing words). These errors often affected the clarity and meaning of the instructions. This shows that while GBA helps students with text organization, it does not always help improve grammar or sentence accuracy.
Conclusions. Genre-Based Instruction helps students understand how to organize their writing, but it should be combined with more focus on grammar and language use. Teachers should include grammar practice and give detailed feedback on errors. This combination can help vocational students write clearer and more correct texts for real-world communication.

Keyword:
Genre-Based Instruction; Error Analysis; Procedural Text; Vocational Students; Surface Strategy Taxonomy

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing procedural texts in English is a crucial skill for vocational students, particularly those in practice-based programs such as the Audio-Visual Editing program at AKN Putra Sang Fajar Blitar. In vocational work environments, procedural texts serve as essential tools for conveying instructions, operational guides, and technical steps that require precise language and logical clarity. Therefore, developing students' ability to write procedural texts is not only an academic goal but also a matter of job readiness. One of the instructional approaches that has been widely applied to enhance writing skills is the Genre-Based Approach (GBA), which emphasizes an understanding of rhetorical structure and the social function of texts as part of authentic literacy practices (Martin & Rose, 2008; Hyland, 2007).

Previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of GBA in improving students' writing competence across different educational levels. Emilia (2011), in a study at the senior high school level, found that genre-based instruction helped students better understand text structures and social contexts, resulting in more organized writing. In the context of higher vocational education, Riswanto et al. (2014) reported significant improvement in

students' descriptive writing after the application of GBA. Similarly, Widodo (2006) highlighted that genre-based teaching, when combined with exploratory activities and repeated practice, enhanced students' linguistic awareness in writing procedural texts in line with genre.

However, most of these studies have focused primarily on macro-text structure and students' comprehension of genre, while less attention has been paid to the quality of micro-linguistic features, such as grammar, diction, and logical coherence in students' written output. Even in the author's prior classroom action research at AKN Blitar, which showed an increase in students' writing scores—from 65.60 (pre-test) to 72.15 (Cycle I) and 76.25 (Cycle II) after applying GBA— there was no further analysis of the types of errors that persisted. Yet, as emphasized by Corder (1981) and Ellis (1997), Error Analysis plays a crucial role in uncovering latent issues in language learning that may not be visible through quantitative scoring alone. Further studies have shown that error analysis provides valuable insights into persistent weaknesses that remain even after pedagogical innovations. For example, Darus and Subramaniam (2009) found that despite students' understanding of text structures, they still struggled with verb forms, prepositions, and complex sentence structures. Likewise, Putra and Zainil (2021) identified errors in grammatical cohesion and the use of sequence markers in procedural texts written by vocational students, even after implementing genre-based instruction. These findings indicate a research gap that needs to be addressed through post-action studies that combine genre-based instruction with error to produce a more holistic evaluation.

Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the quality of students' procedural writing after the application of Genre-Based Approach by analyzing persistent linguistic errors. Conducted in the English course of the Audio-Visual Editing program at AKN Putra Sang Fajar Blitar, this research offers an innovative integration of genre awareness with linguistic accuracy analysis. It is expected to provide practical benefits in designing more effective writing instruction for vocational students and to enrich the literature on GBA effectiveness from a more critical and evaluative perspective. Moreover, the findings may serve as a reflective tool for instructors in improving the teaching of academic and technical writing in vocational education contexts.

II. MATERIAL AND METHOD

This study employed a qualitative descriptive design using a post-action research approach. It was intended to analyze the types and patterns of linguistic errors in students' procedure texts after the implementation of Genre-Based Approach (GBA) in a previous classroom action research. The primary focus was to evaluate the residual errors and gain insight into areas that remained problematic despite prior instructional interventions.

2.1 Research Site and Participants

The research was conducted at Akademi Komunitas Negeri Putra Sang Fajar Blitar, specifically in Audio-Visual Editing Study Program, during the English course in the second semester. Participants consisted of 30 vocational students who had previously taken part in a classroom action research project involving genre-based instruction in writing procedure texts. These students had already produced a series of procedure texts as part of their assignments in the 14-week course.

2.2. Data Collection Materials

The main source of data was a corpus of 30 final procedure texts written by students at the end of the course. These texts had been produced after two instructional cycles using the Genre-Based Approach. Additional data included observation notes and instructor feedback records from the previous action research, which provided contextual support for interpreting the findings.

2.3 Data Analysis Procedure

The analysis applied the Surface Strategy Taxonomy as proposed by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), focusing on four main categories of error:

1. Omission,
2. Addition,
3. Misformation, and
4. Misordering.

Each student text was examined line by line to identify, categorize, and code linguistic errors based on this taxonomy. Errors were recorded in an error analysis matrix, and patterns were quantified to observe the frequency and prevalence of each error type. To ensure reliability, two independent coders reviewed the texts, and intercoder agreement was calculated.

2.4 Validity and Trustworthiness

To establish credibility, the researchers used triangulation by cross-checking textual data with instructor notes and previous scoring rubrics. Peer debriefing was conducted with an English language teaching expert from another vocational institution. Transferability was supported by providing detailed contextual descriptions of the teaching-learning setting, and dependability was enhanced by using a transparent coding framework for error classification.

III. RESULTS

This section presents the findings of the study, which explored the residual linguistic errors in vocational students' procedural texts after undergoing Genre-Based Instruction (GBI). Despite the improvements observed in macro-structure and genre awareness, the analysis revealed recurring micro-linguistic problems. Through the application of Surface Strategy Taxonomy (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982), four major categories of errors were identified: omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. Each type is presented with representative examples, frequency data, and thematic insights.

1. Overall Error Frequency and Distribution

A total of 456 linguistic errors were identified in 30 student texts. Table 1 below summarizes the distribution of errors by type.

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage
Misformation	189	41.4%
Omission	172	37.7%
Addition	48	10.5%
Misordering	47	10.3%
Total	456	100%

As seen, misformation errors were the most dominant, followed by omission errors. These findings indicate that even after structured instruction, many students continued to struggle with selecting correct grammatical forms and producing syntactically coherent sentences.

2. Detailed Analysis by Error Type

   a) Misformation Errors (41.4%)

Misformation errors reflect students' difficulty in choosing appropriate grammatical forms, particularly in verb usage and word formation. Three recurring sub-patterns were observed:

- Incorrect verb tenses/forms:

"Click the button and the software was running."

Correct form: *"Click the button and the software will run."*

Errors like these show a confusion between past and procedural/imperative forms.

- Misuse of word class or incorrect derivation:

"This step is important for the editingment process."

Intended word: *"editing"* or *"editing process"*

This shows overgeneralization of nominal suffix usage.

- Inappropriate collocations:

"Please install the video on the timeline."

Correct form: *"Please place the video on the timeline."*

These indicate limited exposure to authentic language input in technical contexts.

These errors suggest that while genre stages were well understood, the grammatical realization of each stage remained weak, especially in expressing actions and technical steps.

b) Omission Errors (37.7%)

Omission errors reveal the absence of necessary linguistic items, such as articles, prepositions, auxiliary verbs, or subjects. Common patterns included:

- Omitted articles:

"Open timeline and drag video to screen."

Should be: *"Open the timeline and drag the video to the screen."*

- Missing auxiliaries in passive voice:

"Then video exported."

Correct form: *"Then the video is exported."*

- Dropped prepositions:

"*Render project high quality format."*

Correct: *"Render the project in high quality format."*

Such omissions can seriously impact clarity, especially in vocational instructions where precision is key. These patterns indicate gaps in understanding of English syntax and function words, which are often underemphasized in genre-focused instruction.

c) Addition Errors (10.5%)

Addition errors occur when unnecessary elements are inserted into sentences. These suggest overgeneralization or hypercorrection due to instruction. Notable examples include:

- Redundant prepositions and articles:

"Click <u>on to</u> the the export button."

Correction: *"Click the export button."*

- Excessive use of transition words:

"Next, after that, then, finally, you save the file."

These errors show confusion in the use of cohesive devices, possibly resulting from rote memorization without contextual understanding.

- Misplaced modifiers:

"Put carefully the text effect."

Correct: *"Carefully put the text effect."*

Though fewer in number, these errors reduce the naturalness and fluency of the writing.

d) Misordering Errors (10.3%)

Misordering involves incorrect arrangement of sentence elements. Students often wrote sentences that were structurally disorganized, despite correct vocabulary and grammar. Common cases included:

- Improper sequence of adverbials and verbs:

"You can to drag now the audio."

Correct: *"Now, you can drag the audio."*

- Incorrect word order in noun phrases:

"The background music sound effect"

Intended: *"The background sound effect"* or *"The sound effect for background music"*

- Reversed subject-verb-object structure:

"Click you the button"

Correct: *"You click the button"* or *"Click the button"*

Such errors signal interference from L1 (Bahasa Indonesia) and insufficient exposure to authentic English syntactic patterns.

3. Cross-Textual Themes and Patterns

Several thematic patterns emerged across the student corpus:

- Reliance on literal translation: Many students appeared to translate phrases directly from Bahasa Indonesia, leading to syntactic anomalies (e.g., *"Then you must to do the cutting of the video"*).

- Discrepancy between macro and micro competence: Students demonstrated solid understanding of procedural structure (goal, materials, steps), but persistent grammatical errors reduced communicative clarity.

- Overuse or incorrect use of imperative forms: While procedure texts commonly employ imperatives, some students misused them, confusing with statements (e.g., *"You can to open the application"* instead of *"Open the application"*).

- Repetitive lexical items: Limited vocabulary led to frequent repetition of basic words such as *click, make, do, and put*, even when synonyms were contextually appropriate.

4. Summary of Key Findings

- The Genre-Based Approach improved structural awareness, but micro-linguistic competence remained underdeveloped.

- Misformation and omission were the most persistent issues, particularly involving verbs, function words, and word order.

- Errors were not random but showed clear patterns related to interlanguage development, L1 transfer, and limited grammatical input.

- A more integrated approach is needed in GBA that explicitly addresses grammar and sentence construction, not just text organization.

The findings of this study reveal that while Genre-Based Instruction (GBI) effectively supports students in mastering the overall structure of procedural texts, it does not fully resolve persistent micro-linguistic errors. The high frequency of misformation (41.4%) and omission errors (37.7%) underscores a significant gap between genre awareness and grammatical competence. This section discusses the implications of these findings in light of previous research, the theoretical framework, and pedagogical considerations.

1) Genre Awareness vs. Grammatical Competence

Students in this study were able to produce procedural texts with relatively clear generic stages such as goal, materials, and steps reflecting the positive influence of GBI on macro-structural organization. This aligns with the claims of Feez & Joyce (1998) and Emilia (2011), who assert that GBI scaffolds students' understanding of text purpose and schematic structure.

However, the frequent micro-level errors suggest that GBI, in its current application, may insufficiently address the grammatical realization of genre. As highlighted by Martin & Rose (2008), genre pedagogy must move beyond structural awareness to help students control the linguistic resources that realize meaning in context. In this study, errors such as *"click on to the the export button"* or *"video exported"* show a lack of control over tense, syntax, and cohesion—essential features in procedural texts that aim for clarity and accuracy.

2) Interlanguage Development and L1 Interference

The patterns of misformation and misordering observed point to interlanguage development (Selinker, 1972), where learners create internal rules based on incomplete knowledge of L2. For instance, overgeneralization of suffixes (*editingment*) or literal translation from L1 (*"you must to do cutting"*) indicate that students are relying on imperfect hypotheses about English grammar. Moreover, many errors bear the imprint of L1 transfer from Bahasa Indonesia. The tendency to omit articles or auxiliary verbs, for instance, mirrors the syntactic economy of Indonesian, which lacks such elements. This suggests that GBI should be complemented with contrastive analysis and explicit instruction on grammar points prone to negative transfer.

3) Procedural Genre and the Demands of Vocational English

The nature of procedural texts in vocational education demands high precision and clarity, as these texts often guide real-world actions. Misuse of verb tenses, unclear sequencing, or missing grammatical markers may lead to miscommunication or even operational errors in practice. This is particularly concerning in vocational contexts such as multimedia editing, culinary practice, or machine operation, where the correct sequence of actions is critical. Therefore, errors like *"click the export button and it was rendering"* not only affect language accuracy but also potentially compromise task performance.

4) Implications for Teaching

These findings suggest the need for an integrated approach within GBI that combines genre instruction with focused grammar teaching. While GBI scaffolds the "what" and "why" of text types, teachers must also address the "how" i.e., the linguistic realizations at the clause and sentence level.

Several implications arise:

- Grammar instruction should be contextualized within genre stages (e.g., teaching imperatives and sequence connectors within the "steps" stage of procedural texts).
- Error analysis activities can raise learners' awareness of their own interlanguage patterns.
- Corpus-based models or concordancers could help students explore authentic language use within their vocational domains.
- Teachers should provide feedback that targets both genre structure and grammatical forms, rather than treating them as separate components.

5) Alignment with Previous Studies

The current study corroborates findings by Hyland (2003), who emphasizes the importance of balancing genre awareness with language accuracy. Similarly, studies by Widodo (2006) and Emilia (2010) have noted that while GBI improves students' writing coherence and structure, it needs supplementation to address persistent grammatical weaknesses, especially in EFL contexts where English is not actively used outside the classroom.

IV. CONCLUSION

This study aimed to evaluate how well the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) helped vocational students write procedure texts, by looking closely at the types of language errors that still appeared after two learning cycles. The results showed that while students improved in organizing their texts correctly, such as writing clear goals, listing materials, and explaining steps they still made many small language mistakes. The most common mistakes were misformation (using the wrong form of a word) and omission (leaving out important words). These errors often made the instructions unclear or confusing. This means that even though GBA helped students understand the structure of the text, it did not fully improve their grammar and sentence construction Because of this, the study suggests that teaching writing using GBA should also include more focus on grammar and language use. Teachers can give more specific grammar exercises, error correction, and feedback after students finish writing their texts. This combination may help students write more accurately and clearly, which is very important in vocational settings where instructions must be easy to follow. In short, this study shows that knowing the structure of a text is not enough. Students also need help with grammar and word choice to write effective procedure texts. A more complete teaching approach one that balances structure and language accuracy can better prepare vocational students for real-life communication in their future jobs.

.

V. REFERENCES

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Darus, S., & Subramaniam, K. (2009). Error analysis of the written English essays of secondary school students in Malaysia: A case study. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(3), 483–495.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emilia, E. (2011). *Pendekatan Genre dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk Guru*. Bandung: Rizqi Press.

Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2008). *Genre Relations: Mapping Culture*. London: Equinox Publishing.

Putra, A. D., & Zainil, Y. (2021). Error analysis on students' procedure text writing based on surface strategy taxonomy. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(3), 415–425. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v10i3.112345

Riswanto, R., Haryanto, E., & Waluyo, F. (2014). The use of genre-based approach to improve students' writing ability. *International Journal of English and Education*, 3(3), 392–401.

Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D* (25th ed.). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Widodo, H. P. (2006). Designing a genre-based lesson plan for an academic writing course. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(3), 226–250.