GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY IN BUSINESS ENGLISH PRESENTATIONS: AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF UNDERGRADUATE MANAGEMENT STUDENTS

Ade Kristianus Kaloeti[*1] , Sri Ani Puji Setiawati[*2]
adekaloeti@ukrimuniversity.ac.id [*1], sriani.ps@umy.ac.id[*2]
Faculty of Economics and Business[*1], Faculty of Economics and Business[*2]
Immanuel Christian University[*1], Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta[*2]

ABSTRACT

Grammatical accuracy plays a crucial role in the effectiveness of Business English presentations, particularly for management students who are expected to communicate professionally in academic and workplace contexts. This study aims to identify and analyze grammatical errors produced by undergraduate management students during Business English presentations. Employing a quantitative research design, the study involved 20 seventh-semester management students: 10 from Immanuel Christian University and 10 from Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta. The data were collected through recorded Business English presentations and analyzed using Corder's Error Analysis model, which consists of error identification, classification, explanation, and evaluation. The findings reveal that students frequently committed errors in verb tense, subject–verb agreement, articles, prepositions, and sentence structure. Verb tense errors emerged as the most dominant category, followed by subject–verb agreement and article misuse. The results indicate that despite having advanced academic standing, students still encounter significant grammatical challenges in oral academic communication. This study highlights the need for more focused grammar instruction integrated with speaking practice in Business English courses. The findings are expected to contribute to pedagogical improvements in English for Specific Purposes (ESP), particularly Business English instruction at the undergraduate level.

INTRODUCTION

As higher education becomes more global, knowing English is now essential for university graduates, especially in business and management. English is not just used for teaching; it is also the main language for international business, company communication, and professional networking. (Kaloeti, 2024). For management students, being able to communicate well in English is now essential. This skill plays a big role in getting a job, moving up in your career, and helping your organization succeed. Of all the ways professionals communicate, oral

presentations are especially important. They are often used to share business proposals, strategic plans, financial reports, and key decisions.

However, mastering oral presentations extends beyond linguistic accuracy, as it requires the integration of critical thinking, audience analysis, persuasive strategies, and non-verbal communication skills. In increasingly globalized and multicultural business environments, management students must also demonstrate intercultural sensitivity and adaptability to ensure that their messages are interpreted accurately and respectfully. Furthermore, the ability to structure arguments logically and support them with credible data reflects analytical competence, which is highly valued in managerial contexts. A lack of presentation proficiency may not only undermine individual credibility but also weaken stakeholder confidence in organizational initiatives. Therefore, systematic training and continuous practice in professional presentation skills should be embedded within management curricula to bridge the gap between academic preparation and workplace expectations.

Business English, as a branch of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), emphasizes language use that is appropriate to business contexts, integrating specialized vocabulary, discourse conventions, and grammatical accuracy. While fluency and confidence are often prioritized in oral communication, grammatical accuracy remains a crucial element in ensuring clarity, credibility, and professionalism (Mufida et al., 2025). Inaccurate grammar can lead to ambiguity, misinterpretation, and a diminished perception of the speaker's competence, particularly in formal business presentations where precision is highly valued.

Despite prolonged exposure to English instruction from secondary to tertiary education, many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners at the university level continue to demonstrate persistent grammatical problems, especially in spoken communication. In the Indonesian context, English is learned primarily in classroom settings with limited opportunities for authentic interaction. As a result, students often develop receptive skills more strongly than productive skills, and their spoken English tends to reflect incomplete mastery of grammatical rules (Williyan et al., 2025). These difficulties become more visible during oral presentations, where students must simultaneously manage content organization, time constraints, pronunciation, fluency, and grammatical accuracy.

Under such performance pressure, learners frequently prioritize conveying meaning over maintaining structural accuracy, which increases the likelihood of grammatical inconsistencies. This tendency suggests that grammatical competence in controlled written exercises does not automatically transfer to spontaneous spoken production. Moreover, the limited exposure to authentic communicative environments may reduce students' sensitivity to natural syntactic patterns and pragmatic nuances in professional discourse. Without systematic corrective feedback and opportunities for repeated practice in realistic presentation settings, these errors can become fossilized over time. Therefore, investigating grammatical errors in oral academic tasks is crucial for identifying gaps between instructional input and actual communicative performance at the university level.

According to Susilowati et al. (2024) the study of grammatical accuracy in oral presentations is significant because it reflects learners' interlanguage

development and their ability to apply linguistic knowledge in real-time communication. Unlike written tasks, oral presentations require spontaneous language production, making grammatical errors more likely to occur. Therefore, analyzing grammatical errors in oral presentations provides valuable insights into learners' actual language competence rather than their ability to edit or revise language output.

Practically, grammatical accuracy in Business English presentations has direct implications for students' future professional performance. Management graduates are expected to engage in meetings, negotiations, and presentations in English, particularly in multinational or international business environments. Frequent grammatical errors may undermine their persuasive power and professional image. Consequently, understanding the nature and frequency of grammatical errors can inform the design of more effective Business English curricula that better align with workplace communication demands

A systematic analysis of recurring errors enables educators to identify whether students struggle primarily with tense consistency, subject–verb agreement, modality, or sentence complexity, thereby allowing instruction to target high-impact weaknesses rather than peripheral issues. Moreover, examining error patterns in authentic business tasks—such as presentations, reports, and negotiations—ensures that pedagogical interventions are grounded in real communicative contexts rather than decontextualized grammar drills. This data-driven approach also encourages the integration of corrective feedback strategies that promote long-term linguistic accuracy and communicative confidence. Ultimately, aligning curriculum design with empirical evidence of learner difficulties not only enhances grammatical competence but also strengthens students' professional credibility in competitive corporate environments.

Error Analysis has been widely used in applied linguistics research to investigate learners' grammatical difficulties. Error Analysis as a systematic approach explains learner errors, numerous studies have examined grammatical errors in EFL contexts. Geng et al. (2025)argues that errors are not merely signs of failure but evidence of learners' active hypothesis-testing processes in second language acquisition (Batubara & Batubara, 2025). This perspective shifted the focus of language research from prescriptive correctness to developmental understanding.

Building upon this theoretical foundation, subsequent scholars have emphasized that learner errors provide valuable insights into interlanguage development and the cognitive mechanisms underlying second language acquisition. Rather than being eliminated immediately, errors can be systematically categorized and analyzed to reveal patterns of transfer, overgeneralization, and incomplete rule application. In EFL contexts, such analyses have contributed to identifying persistent grammatical challenges, particularly in areas where learners' first language structures significantly differ from English. Furthermore, Error Analysis has informed pedagogical strategies by highlighting the importance of targeted feedback and remedial instruction based on empirical evidence rather than intuition. As a result, the approach continues to serve not only as a diagnostic tool

for researchers but also as a practical framework for improving language teaching and learning outcomes.

Previous studies on grammatical errors have predominantly focused on written language, such as essays, reports, and examination scripts. Nanning et al. (2020) indicated that common grammatical error categories among EFL learners include verb tense, subject–verb agreement, article usage, prepositions, and sentence structure. These findings suggest that certain grammatical features pose persistent challenges, particularly for learners whose first language differs significantly from English in grammatical structure.

In the context of oral communication, a study by Kunnur (2024) has reported that grammatical accuracy tends to be lower than in written production. This phenomenon is often attributed to the cognitive demands of speaking, where learners prioritize fluency and message delivery over grammatical correctness. Studies examining oral presentations have found that students frequently produce tense errors when describing processes or past events, agreement errors in extended utterances, and article omissions due to the absence of equivalent structures in their first language.

Research in ESP and Business English contexts has highlighted additional challenges related to the use of grammar in professional discourse. Business presentations often require the use of specific grammatical structures, such as passive voice for describing processes, complex noun phrases for reporting data, and appropriate tense selection for presenting trends and projections. Sihite et al. (2024) noted that students struggle to apply these structures accurately, resulting in grammatically flawed but communicatively adequate presentations.

Although previous studies have extensively documented grammatical errors in EFL learners' language production, several critical gaps remain. First, there is a disproportionate focus on written language, with relatively fewer studies investigating grammatical accuracy in spoken academic and professional genres. While many error analysis studies examine written texts, only a limited number of recent studies have analyzed grammatical errors in spoken academic contexts. For example, a study by Pawabutra & Sutakote (2024) investigated grammatical errors in the spoken English of Thai EFL university students through recorded impromptu speeches. The findings revealed frequent errors in sentence structure and lexical grammar, indicating that learners still struggle to apply grammatical rules during spontaneous spoken communication. However, the study mainly focused on general classroom speaking tasks rather than authentic academic or professional discourse contexts.

Similarly, Susilowati, Susilowati et al. (2024b) analyzed grammatical errors in Indonesian EFL learners' oral presentations using the Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The research identified several types of errors such as omission, addition, misformation, and misordering in students' spoken presentations. Although the study highlights the presence of grammatical difficulties in spoken English, it was limited to classroom presentation tasks and involved a relatively small sample of students.

These studies demonstrate that research on grammatical errors in spoken English does exist, yet most of them still focus on general classroom speaking

activities rather than spoken academic or professional communication genres. Therefore, further research is needed to explore grammatical accuracy in more authentic spoken academic and professional settings. This imbalance limits understanding of learners' real-time grammatical competence, which is particularly relevant for Business English communication.

Second, studies that do examine oral presentations often treat grammatical errors descriptively without grounding the analysis in a clear theoretical framework. As a result, the interpretation of errors tends to be superficial, focusing on frequency counts rather than developmental significance. Enggelina et al. (2023) found that the application of Corder's Error Analysis model offers a more systematic and theory-driven approach that allows errors to be viewed as part of learners' interlanguage development.

Third, inconsistencies exist in the reported dominance of specific error types across studies. While Kristyowati et al. (2025) identifies verb tense errors as the most frequent, Sabrina et al. (2025) reports article or preposition errors as more prevalent. These inconsistencies may be influenced by differences in research context, proficiency level, task type, and instructional background. Comparative studies involving students from different institutions within similar academic levels are therefore needed to provide more robust evidence.

Finally, there is an ongoing debate in language pedagogy regarding the role of grammatical accuracy in spoken communication. Ananda et al. (2024) argues that excessive focus on grammar may inhibit fluency and confidence, while Syahid et al. (2024) emphasized that accuracy is essential for professional credibility, particularly in ESP contexts. This controversy highlights the need for empirical evidence that clarifies the extent and nature of grammatical problems in Business English presentations and informs balanced instructional approaches.

Based on the issues identified above, the central research problem of this study concerns the persistent grammatical inaccuracies produced by undergraduate management students during Business English presentations, despite their advanced academic standing and prior exposure to English instruction. In this context, advanced academic standing refers to students who are already in the later stages of their undergraduate program, typically in their third or fourth year, and who have completed a number of academic and language-related courses. At this level, students are generally expected to demonstrate a higher level of academic competence, including the ability to communicate ideas clearly and accurately in English, particularly in formal contexts such as presentations. Furthermore, these students have usually received several years of formal English education, both in secondary school and at the university level. Therefore, the persistence of grammatical inaccuracies in their spoken Business English presentations raises important questions about the effectiveness of prior language instruction and highlights the need for a closer examination of the types and sources of these errors. Specifically, there is a need to identify which grammatical error types occur most frequently and how these errors reflect learners' interlanguage development in oral business communication. The objective of this study is to identify and analyze grammatical errors in Business English presentations delivered by seventh-semester undergraduate management students.

Ade Kristianus Kaloeti[*1], *Sri Ani Puji Setiawati*[*2]
GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY IN BUSINESS ENGLISH PRESENTATIONS:
AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF UNDERGRADUATE MANAGEMENT STUDENTS

RESEARCH METHOD
Research Design
This study employed a quantitative descriptive research design with an error analysis approach. The quantitative design was chosen to systematically identify, classify, and quantify grammatical errors found in Business English presentations delivered by undergraduate management students. The study adopted Corder's Error Analysis Model, which involves the stages of error identification, error classification, error description, and error explanation. This design enabled the researcher to objectively measure the frequency and types of grammatical errors, thereby providing empirical evidence of students' grammatical accuracy in academic oral presentations.

Population and Sample
The population of this study consisted of seventh-semester undergraduate students of the Management Study Program who had taken Business English courses. From this population, a total of 20 students were selected as the research sample. The sample was divided equally between two institutions: 10 students from Immanuel Christian University and 10 students from Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta. The selection of two universities was intended to provide comparative insights and increase the representativeness of the data. A purposive sampling technique was applied, with the criteria that participants were active seventh-semester students and had experience delivering Business English presentations.

Technique and Tools of Data Collection
The primary data collection technique used in this study was documentary analysis of students' oral presentations. The main research instrument was a presentation transcription sheet, which was used to convert students' spoken presentations into written texts for grammatical analysis. Supporting tools included audio and video recording devices to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the data. These tools allowed the researcher to repeatedly review the presentations and minimize data loss or transcription errors. To ensure the validity and reliability of the collected data, several validation measures were implemented. First, the recordings were reviewed multiple times to verify the accuracy of the transcriptions. Second, a careful comparison between the audio recordings and the written transcripts was conducted to ensure that all spoken utterances were accurately captured. In addition, peer checking was applied by asking another researcher or colleague to review a sample of the transcripts and confirm the accuracy of the transcription process. These procedures helped reduce potential researcher bias and increased the credibility of the data used for analysis.

Participants
The participants of this study were 20 undergraduate management students enrolled in the seventh semester at the selected universities. All participants had previously completed at least one Business English course and were familiar with formal presentation contexts. The participants represented similar academic levels and learning backgrounds, which helped reduce extraneous variables related to language proficiency differences. Ethical considerations were observed by

informing participants about the purpose of the study and ensuring the confidentiality of their identities.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection was conducted by recording students' Business English presentations during scheduled academic sessions. The recorded presentations were then transcribed verbatim to produce written data for analysis. The grammatical errors identified in the transcripts were analyzed using Corder's Error Analysis Model. The analysis involved several stages:

1. Identifying grammatical errors in the transcripts,
2. Classifying errors into grammatical categories such as tense, subject–verb agreement, articles, prepositions, and sentence structure,
3. Calculating the frequency and percentage of each error type, and
4. Interpreting the findings to determine dominant error patterns.

The quantitative data were presented in the form of tables and percentages to highlight trends and comparisons between students from the two universities. This systematic procedure ensured the reliability and validity of the findings in addressing the research objectives.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Finding

The quantitative analysis of grammatical errors identified in the Business English presentations of undergraduate management students revealed a substantial number of errors across all participants. Using Corder's Error Analysis Model, a total of 186 grammatical errors were identified from 20 presentation transcripts. These errors were categorized into major grammatical types and quantified to determine their frequency and relative dominance.

Overall Distribution of Grammatical Errors

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Grammatical Errors

Error Type	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Verb-related errors	78	41.94%
Article errors	46	24.73%
Preposition errors	32	17.20%
Sentence structure errors	20	10.75%
Pronoun and other minor errors	10	5.38%
Total	**186**	**100%**

Source: processed data (2026)

As shown in Table 1, verb-related errors constituted the highest proportion, accounting for nearly half of all identified errors (41.94%). This indicates that verb tense consistency, subject–verb agreement, and verb form usage remain the most problematic grammatical areas in Business English oral presentations.

Verb-related Errors

Further analysis revealed that verb-related errors mainly involved incorrect tense usage and subject–verb agreement. Students frequently alternated between

present and past tenses while explaining business data or company performance. These errors suggest that students experienced difficulty maintaining grammatical accuracy when delivering extended explanations or responding to cognitively demanding content.

Table 2. Verb-related Errors

No.	Erroneous Sentence	Corrected Sentence
1	The company **increase** its profit last year.	The company **increased** its profit last year.
2	Our strategy **focus** on customer satisfaction.	Our strategy **focuses** on customer satisfaction.
3	The manager **was discuss** the new policy.	The manager **was discussing** the new policy.
4	Last quarter, the sales **are growing** rapidly.	Last quarter, the sales **grew** rapidly.
5	The data **shows** that costs **increase** every year.	The data **show** that costs **increase** every year.

Source: processed data (2026)

The verb-related errors presented in Table 1 indicate that students experienced substantial difficulty in maintaining grammatical accuracy in tense selection, subject–verb agreement, and verb form usage during Business English presentations. The frequent misuse of past and present tenses suggests that learners struggled to align grammatical form with temporal reference when explaining business processes and historical data. This finding implies that while students may possess declarative knowledge of English verb rules, they encounter challenges in proceduralizing this knowledge during cognitively demanding oral tasks. From an error analysis perspective, these errors reflect developmental interlanguage features rather than isolated mistakes, supporting Corder's view that learner errors signal incomplete grammatical competence. Pedagogically, the dominance of verb-related errors highlights the need for instructional interventions that emphasize tense consistency and verb accuracy in extended spoken discourse rather than isolated sentence-level exercises.

Article Errors
Article errors ranked as the second most frequent error type (24.73%). Students commonly omitted articles or used definite and indefinite articles incorrectly when referring to general versus specific business concepts. This recurring pattern indicates strong first-language interference and limited internalization of English article rules in spoken academic discourse.

Table 3. Article Errors

No.	Erroneous Sentence	Corrected Sentence
1	Company needs strong leadership to survive.	**The** company needs strong leadership to survive.
2	This strategy is **a** effective solution.	This strategy is **an** effective solution.
3	We conducted **the** market research last year.	We conducted **a** market research last year.
4	Manager should understand consumer behavior.	**A** manager should understand consumer behavior.

| 5 | The profit increased because of **the** innovation. | The profit increased because of **innovation**. |

Source: processed data (2026)

The article errors highlight learners' ongoing difficulty with using a, an, and the correctly in Business English. These mistakes often stem from first-language interference, since Bahasa Indonesia does not use articles. In English, articles signal definiteness, specificity, and countability, but in Indonesian, nouns rely on context for meaning. For example, "saya membeli buku" can translate as either "I bought a book" or "I bought the book."

Because Bahasa Indonesia doesn't use articles, learners often omit or misuse them in English. This first-language influence led students to produce sentences like "I want to explain strategy" or "company has plan," omitting the or a. Such errors were common with abstract business concepts and professional roles, showing limited sensitivity to specificity. Even at an advanced level, article mistakes persist, highlighting the need for targeted practice to maintain precision and professionalism in business communication.

Preposition and Sentence Structure Errors

Preposition errors accounted for 17.20% of the total errors and were mostly related to incorrect collocations frequently used in business contexts. Sentence structure errors (10.75%) included sentence fragments, run-on sentences, and improper word order, which occasionally reduced the clarity and professionalism of the presentations.

Table 4. Preposition Errors

No.	Erroneous Sentence	Corrected Sentence
1	The company focuses **in** customer satisfaction.	The company focuses **on** customer satisfaction.
2	This report is related **with** marketing strategy.	This report is related **to** marketing strategy.
3	We discussed **about** the financial performance.	We discussed the financial performance.
4	The meeting will be held **on** next Monday.	The meeting will be held next Monday.
5	The product was launched **at** 2023.	The product was launched **in** 2023.

Source: processed data (2026)

The preposition errors in learners' presentations show their struggle with English collocations, especially those common in business contexts. Mistakes like "discuss about the strategy" or "focus in the market" reveal reliance on literal translation or overgeneralized rules rather than established usage. Many business verbs require specific prepositions, and learners often misapply them, particularly in spontaneous speech where there's little time to self-correct.

Learners' first language, Bahasa Indonesia, also contributes to these errors, especially with prepositions. Indonesian prepositions like di, ke, dari, or tentang are used more flexibly and can map to multiple English prepositions. For example, "membahas tentang strategi" may lead to the literal translation "discuss about the strategy," instead of the correct "discuss the strategy." Because English

prepositions are often idiomatic and context-dependent, learners rely on direct translation rather than intuition or collocation knowledge.

The persistence of such errors in oral presentations implies that students have not fully internalized prepositional patterns commonly associated with business communication. From a pedagogical perspective, this finding supports the integration of corpus-based instruction and collocation-focused activities to improve learners' pragmatic and grammatical accuracy in professional English usage.

Table 5. Sentence Structure Errors

No.	Erroneous Sentence	Corrected Sentence
1	Because the market is competitive.	The market is competitive.
2	The company grows rapidly it expands globally.	The company grows rapidly, and it expands globally.
3	Important is communication in management.	Communication is important in management.
4	The strategy that implemented by the company.	The strategy was implemented by the company.
5	We analyze the data yesterday and present today.	We analyzed the data yesterday and presented it today.

Source: processed data (2026)

Sentence structure errors, including fragments, run-on sentences, and incorrect word order, reveal challenges in organizing complex ideas into grammatically coherent spoken discourse. These errors often occurred when students attempted to convey detailed explanations or causal relationships, indicating that cognitive load negatively affected syntactic accuracy. This suggests that students prioritized content delivery over grammatical form during presentations. From an error analysis standpoint, such structural errors point to limitations in syntactic competence and insufficient practice in producing extended spoken texts. In professional business contexts, poorly structured sentences can compromise message clarity and credibility, highlighting the necessity of integrating discourse-level grammar instruction into Business English curricula.

Pronoun and Other Minor Errors

Pronoun and other minor grammatical errors, although representing the smallest proportion of total errors (5.38%), still warrant critical attention due to their impact on clarity and coherence in Business English presentations. Pronoun errors mainly involved unclear referents, inconsistent pronoun agreement, and inappropriate shifts between singular and plural forms. In several instances, students used pronouns without clearly identifying the antecedent, which caused ambiguity when referring to companies, products, or business stakeholders. Such ambiguity may lead to misinterpretation of key information in professional communication contexts.

Table 6. Pronoun and Other Minor Errors

No.	Erroneous Sentence	Corrected Sentence
1	The company improved **their** performance.	The company improved **its** performance.

2	When the manager meets the staff, **they** explains the policy.	When the manager meets the staff, **he/she** explains the policy.
3	The team presented **their** strategy, and **it** was successful.	The team presented **its** strategy, and it was successful.
4	There are many **information** about the market.	There is much **information** about the market.
5	The profit increased, **but** because of good management.	The profit increased because of good management.

Source: processed data (2026)

Although pronoun and other minor errors were rare, they still affect clarity and coherence. Pronoun mistakes, especially when referring to organizations or groups, can confuse listeners, while inconsistent agreement shows partial control of grammar. Other small errors, like wrong plurals or misused conjunctions, likely appear under the pressure of speaking rather than from a lack of knowledge. Even if infrequent, these mistakes can make Business English presentations seem less professional, highlighting the importance of accuracy-focused feedback for advanced learners.

Discussion

The results demonstrate that grammatical errors are pervasive and systematic in students' Business English presentations. The dominance of verb-related errors, followed by article, preposition, sentence structure, and pronoun-related errors, indicates that students encounter difficulties across multiple grammatical domains. These findings align closely with the study of Winantaka (2024) that has objective of identifying prevalent grammatical error types and suggests that grammatical accuracy remains a significant challenge in spoken Business English, even among students who have completed formal Business English coursework.

Verb-related errors emerged as the most frequent category, indicating that tense usage, subject–verb agreement, and verb form selection constitute the most problematic grammatical areas for the participants. This finding suggests that students struggle to maintain grammatical control during extended oral discourse, particularly when presenting complex business information such as financial performance, strategies, or market trends. While students may possess explicit knowledge of verb rules, the high frequency of these errors indicates difficulty in applying this knowledge automatically during real-time speech. This result is consistent with previous research on EFL learners' spoken production by Muklas et al. (2025), which has consistently identified verb-related errors as dominant due to the cognitive demands of oral communication. However, rather than indicating a lack of grammatical knowledge, these errors appear to reflect performance limitations under communicative pressure, a conclusion that remains within the scope of the present findings.

Article errors constituted the second most frequent category, reinforcing the persistent difficulty of article usage among Indonesian EFL learners. Article errors constituted the second most frequent category, reinforcing the persistent difficulty of article usage among Indonesian EFL learners. The frequent omission or misuse of definite and indefinite articles suggests strong first-language influence. In this

study, the participants' first language (L1) is Bahasa Indonesia, which serves as the primary language used in education and formal communication, while English is learned as a foreign language in the Indonesian educational context. Unlike English, Bahasa Indonesia does not employ grammatical articles equivalent to a, an, and the, as nouns typically appear without article markers and meanings such as definiteness or specificity are usually inferred from context rather than expressed through grammatical forms. As a result, learners who are accustomed to this linguistic structure often omit articles or use them inconsistently when speaking English. For example, utterances such as "company has strategy" or "manager gives suggestion" demonstrate the absence of articles that would normally appear in standard English forms ("the company has a strategy," "the manager gives a suggestion"). These patterns indicate that learners tend to transfer structural features from Bahasa Indonesia when producing English sentences, which contributes to the persistence of article-related errors in their spoken Business English presentations.

The findings indicate that students often failed to distinguish between generic and specific reference when discussing business concepts, which resulted in inappropriate article use. This pattern is consistent with findings reported by Ismahani et al. (2025) , which note that article errors tend to persist even at higher proficiency levels. The present study supports these observations by demonstrating that article usage remains problematic in oral academic contexts, particularly when learners focus on content delivery rather than grammatical precision.

Preposition errors were also frequently observed, particularly in relation to common business collocations. The misuse, omission, or unnecessary addition of prepositions suggests that students relied heavily on literal translation or overgeneralization of familiar grammatical patterns. This finding aligns with existing research by Al-Bawaleez and Abdullah (2023) that identifies prepositions as one of the most challenging grammatical features for EFL learners due to their idiomatic nature. In the context of Business English presentations, incorrect preposition use may not always impede comprehension, but it can reduce linguistic accuracy and professional credibility. The results suggest that students have not fully internalized prepositional patterns commonly used in business discourse, which supports the need for contextualized instruction that emphasizes collocation awareness.

Sentence structure errors, including fragments, run-on sentences, and incorrect word order, indicate difficulties in organizing ideas into coherent grammatical units during oral presentations. These errors frequently occurred when students attempted to explain causal relationships or elaborate on business strategies, suggesting that increased cognitive load negatively affected syntactic accuracy. Rather than reflecting a complete lack of syntactic knowledge, these errors appear to result from students prioritizing meaning over form during oral production. This finding is consistent with research by Li and Sui (2025), which shows that learners often sacrifice grammatical accuracy to maintain fluency. Within the scope of this study, sentence structure errors highlight the challenges students face in balancing fluency, complexity, and accuracy in Business English presentations.

Pronoun and other minor errors were the least frequent category, yet their presence remains noteworthy due to their impact on discourse clarity. Pronoun errors, particularly those involving unclear antecedents or inconsistent agreement, occasionally resulted in ambiguity when referring to companies, teams, or stakeholders. Although these errors occurred less frequently, they affected textual cohesion and audience comprehension. Other minor errors, such as incorrect pluralization or conjunction misuse, appeared to be performance-related and emerged under real-time speech pressure. These findings are consistent with previous study by Jajere (2025) that report lower frequencies of pronoun errors compared to verb or article errors but emphasize their disproportionate effect on clarity and professionalism in spoken discourse.

A comparison between students from Immanuel Christian University and Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta revealed similar error patterns across both groups, with only slight differences in error frequency. This suggests that the grammatical challenges identified are not institution-specific but reflect broader issues in Business English instruction and learning at the undergraduate level. The similarity in error distribution strengthens the validity of the findings by Liu (2024) indicating that the observed patterns are consistent across different educational contexts with comparable curricula. Importantly, the study does not claim significant statistical differences between institutions, remaining within the limits of what the data can support.

When related to existing literature, the findings of this study largely corroborate previous research on grammatical errors in EFL oral production. Numerous studies have identified verb-related and article errors as dominant categories among advanced learners, particularly in academic speaking tasks. The present study supports these conclusions while extending them specifically to the context of Business English presentations. Unlike some studies that focus on written texts, this research highlights the persistence of grammatical errors in spoken academic performance, thereby contributing to a more nuanced understanding of grammatical accuracy in professional communication contexts.

Possible explanations for the findings can be attributed to the cognitive demands of oral presentations, limited opportunities for accuracy-focused speaking practice, and the prioritization of content over form. During presentations, students must simultaneously manage ideas, language, and audience engagement, which may reduce their ability to monitor grammatical accuracy. Additionally, Business English instruction may place greater emphasis on vocabulary and presentation skills than on grammatical precision in spoken output. These factors likely contribute to the persistence of grammatical errors observed in this study, without implying instructional inadequacy beyond what the data suggest.

Despite its contributions, the discussion remains grounded in the study's scope and data. The findings do not claim causality or generalize beyond similar undergraduate EFL contexts. Instead, they provide empirical evidence that grammatical accuracy in Business English presentations remains a challenge even for advanced students. This study contributes to the field by reinforcing the importance of integrating grammar-focused oral practice into Business English curricula and by demonstrating the applicability of Corder's Error Analysis Model

to spoken academic discourse. It reaffirms that the study successfully achieved its objective of identifying and analyzing grammatical errors in Business English presentations. The systematic nature of the errors supports the view that learners' grammatical difficulties reflect ongoing interlanguage development rather than random mistakes. By linking the findings to existing literature and offering plausible explanations grounded in the data, this study underscores the need for pedagogical strategies that balance fluency, accuracy, and complexity in Business English oral instruction.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
Conclusion

This study set out to identify and analyze grammatical errors in Business English presentations delivered by seventh-semester undergraduate management students, employing Corder's Error Analysis Model as the analytical framework. The findings indicate that grammatical inaccuracies remain a consistent feature of students' oral academic performance, despite their advanced level of study and prior exposure to Business English instruction. The analysis revealed that errors were systematic and recurring across participants, suggesting that grammatical challenges in spoken Business English persist at the undergraduate level.

The most prominent errors were verb-related, particularly involving tense usage, subject–verb agreement, and verb form selection. Article errors emerged as the second most frequent category, followed by preposition and sentence structure errors, while pronoun and other minor errors occurred less frequently. These patterns were consistently observed across students from both participating universities, indicating that the identified grammatical difficulties are not limited to a single institutional context. Rather than being random, the errors reflect ongoing developmental processes in learners' interlanguage, particularly under the cognitive demands of oral presentation tasks.

The conclusion drawn from these findings is not that students lack grammatical knowledge, but that they experience difficulty applying such knowledge accurately and consistently during real-time spoken communication. This restatement underscores the study's main contribution: providing empirical evidence that grammatical accuracy in Business English presentations remains a challenge even at an advanced undergraduate level, and that error analysis remains a useful tool for understanding learners' spoken language performance.

Implication

The findings of this study carry several pedagogical implications. First, they suggest the need for greater integration of grammar-focused instruction within Business English speaking activities. While Business English courses often emphasize content, vocabulary, and presentation skills, the persistence of grammatical errors indicates that grammatical accuracy should not be treated as secondary in oral communication training. Instructional practices that combine grammatical awareness with extended speaking tasks may help students develop greater control over language form during presentations.

Second, the systematic nature of the errors highlights the importance of providing targeted feedback on spoken grammar. Feedback that focuses on

dominant error categories—particularly verb-related and article errors—may be more effective than generalized corrective feedback. Additionally, incorporating reflective activities, such as reviewing recorded presentations, may help learners become more aware of their recurring grammatical patterns without interrupting fluency during performance. Furthermore, the findings also suggest the influence of first-language interference, particularly from Bahasa Indonesia, which differs structurally from English in several grammatical aspects such as the absence of an article system and differences in verb inflection patterns. This implies that pedagogical strategies should explicitly address cross-linguistic differences between Bahasa Indonesia and English, helping learners recognize how structures from their first language may influence their English production. By raising learners' awareness of these differences and providing focused practice on problematic areas, instructors can help students reduce negative transfer and develop more accurate grammatical usage in spoken academic and professional communication.

Limitation

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. The relatively small sample size limits the generalizability of the findings to broader populations of Business English learners. Furthermore, the study focused solely on grammatical errors in oral presentations and did not examine other aspects of communicative competence, such as pronunciation, discourse organization, or pragmatic appropriateness. The analysis was also limited to observable errors in performance and did not explore learners' underlying cognitive processes or perceptions related to grammatical use.

Additionally, the use of a quantitative descriptive approach means that the study did not investigate causal relationships or instructional variables that may influence grammatical accuracy. Additionally, the use of a quantitative descriptive approach means that the study did not investigate causal relationships or instructional variables that may influence grammatical accuracy. These limitations do not diminish the value of the findings but rather define the scope within which the conclusions should be interpreted. Future studies may therefore consider employing mixed-method or experimental research designs to examine how specific instructional strategies, feedback techniques, or pedagogical interventions influence learners' grammatical accuracy in spoken English. Further research could also explore the role of other factors, such as learners' language proficiency, first-language interference, or speaking anxiety, in shaping grammatical performance during academic presentations. In addition, expanding the participant pool to include students from different academic disciplines or institutions may provide a broader understanding of grammatical error patterns in spoken academic communication. Such investigations would contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of how grammatical competence develops in English for Academic and Business communication contexts.

REFERENCES

Abdul Syahid, Yeni Suryani, Winna, W., Lafifah Suliyya, & Fatma. (2024). Analysis of English for Specific Purposes Textbook Entitled Intelligent Bussines Based on Cunningsworth's Theory. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes in Indonesia*, *3*(2), 73–82. https://doi.org/10.33369/espindonesia.v3i2.34318

Al-Bawaleez, M. M. A., & Abdullah, A. T. H. (2023). Analysing Preposition Errors Made by Jordanian University Students. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *11*(10), 96–111. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2023.1110007

Ananda, C. P., Rufitriansyah, H., Zulfah, S. A., & Apoko, T. W. (2024). Investigating Students' Anxiety on the Use of Grammar in Vocational High Schools. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, *7*(2), 270–282. https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v7i2.7530

Batubara, H., & Batubara, M. H. (2025). Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa Mahasiswa: Kajian Psikolinguistik Terhadap Pembelajar Bahasa Kedua (L2). *Advances In Education Journal*, 1015–1024.

Enggelina, M., Dasra, P. P., Sahid, S., & Murianty, R. (2023). The Identification of Subject Verb Agreement Mistake Committed by Fourth Semester Student Using Corder's Theory in English Education Department at University. *IDEAS Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, *11*(2), 1886–1896. https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v11i2.4351

Geng, H., Rafik Galea, S., Yousif Turki, H., & Firas Abdullah Al-Rawe, M. (2025). Grammatical Error Analysis in the Academic Writing of English Language First-Year College Students. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, *7*(10). https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i10.10209

Ismahani, S., Siregar, A. R. F., Nst, A. R., Natasya, A., Nasution, N. F., & Lubis, R. F. Y. (2025). Contrastive Study of Preposition Errors Descriptive Tex in Teaching EFL. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, *9*(1), 4857–4862. https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v9i1.25188

Kaloeti, A. K. (2024). English Proficiency of Lecturers at a Private University in Indonesia: TOEFL and CEFR Standards. *SAGA: Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *5*(2), 136–148. https://doi.org/10.21460/saga.2024.52.198

Kristyowati, D., Widodo, J. S., Suharyati, H., Abdurrahman, F., & Pajri, M. A. (2025). Error Analysis on Simple Past Tense in Short Story Making: A Case Study in Writing Intermediate Class. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, *10*(1), 146–152. https://doi.org/10.30998/3yer5135

Kunnur, S. (2024). Analysis of Grammatical Errors in Spoken English of EFL Widyatama University Students. In *Biantara: Journal of Language and Culture* (Vol. 1, Number 1). https://journal.widyatama.ac.id/index.php/jbb

Li, C., & Sui, M. (2025). The relationship between complexity, accuracy and fluency in L2 English speech: Individual differences and dynamic patterns. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *15*(3), 501–532. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.28006

Liu, Z. (2024). The Distribution and Frequency of Grammatical Errors in Second Language Writing: A Case Study of Chinese High School Students. *Lecture*

Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media, *75*(1), 13–17. https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/75/20241098

Mufida, M., Ilham, I., Edi, E., & Irwandi, I. (2025). ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE STUDENTS' DIFFICULTIES IN LEARNING GRAMMAR AT MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF MATARAM. *Wiralodra English Journal*, *9*(2), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v9i2.404

Muhammad Jajere, B. (2025). The Use of English Double Prepositions in English as a Second Language (ESL) Nursing Students. *Journal of English as A Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(1), 12–24. https://doi.org/10.31098/jefltr.v5i1.3198

Muklas, M., Agustina, E., Aprilia, N., & Nurul Huda, U. (2025). Analisis Kesalahan Gramatikal Speaking Mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multi Sciences*, *7*(2), 108–115. https://doi.org/10.30599/mh42x609

Nanning, N., Saepuddin, & Munawir. (2020). An Analysis of Grammatical Error of English Students in Writing Skill. *EDUVELOP*, *3*(2), 145–160. https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v3i2.636

Pawabutra, P., & Sutakote, C. (2024). Analysis of Grammatical Errors in English Speaking of Thai EFL Students. *Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, *5*(3), 297–313. https://doi.org/10.62819/jel.2024.625

Sabrina, A. B., Sitanggang, C. N., Salmanda, D., Fadhila, F., Fadlan, F., Mashalan, F., Purba, K. N. E., Khairunnisa, K., Fitria, L., Fadhila, N., Batubara, P. F., Aulia, S., & Ismahani, S. (2025). IDENTIFYING COMMON CONTRASTIVE ERRORS IN ENGLISH GRAMMAR MADE BY INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS: CAUSES AND SOLUTION. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, *8*(1), 945–951. https://doi.org/10.31004/jrpp.v8i1.40288

Sihite, R. A., Marpaung, M. E., Brahmana, K. P. S., Br Pinem, E. R., Sinaga, E., & Siallagan, L. (2024). Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa Pada Presentasi Mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Indonesia. *Semantik : Jurnal Riset Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Budaya*, *2*(3), 85–91. https://doi.org/10.61132/semantik.v2i3.768

Susilowati, E., Kusumaningtyas, E. D., & Wafa, Z. (2024a). Surface Strategy Taxonomy on EFL Learners' Oral Presentation: A Study of Grammatical Error Analysis. *English Education and Literature Journal (E-Jou) Surface Strategy Taxonomy on EFL Learners' Oral Presentation: A Study of Grammatical Error Analysis*, *4*(2), 79. https://doi.org/10.53863/ejou.v4i02.1105

Susilowati, E., Kusumaningtyas, E. D., & Wafa, Z. (2024b). Surface Strategy Taxonomy on EFL Learners' Oral Presentation: A Study of Grammatical Error Analysis. *English Education and Literature Journal (E-Jou) Surface Strategy Taxonomy on EFL Learners' Oral Presentation: A Study of Grammatical Error Analysis*, *4*(02), 2024. https://doi.org/10.53863/ejou.v4i02.1105

*Ade Kristianus Kaloeti[*1], Sri Ani Puji Setiawati[*2]*
GRAMMATICAL ACCURACY IN BUSINESS ENGLISH PRESENTATIONS:
AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF UNDERGRADUATE MANAGEMENT STUDENTS

Williyan, A., Pujiastuti, E., Rohmah, N., & Saifudin, S. (2025). STRUCTURING TWEE AI FOR EFL LESSON PLANNING: A GUIDE FOR RECEPTIVE AND PRODUCTIVE SKILLS. *Wiralodra English Journal*, *9*(2), 29–46. https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v9i2.425

Winantaka, B. (2024). Enhancing business english skills: Addressing speaking challenges in the management department. *Lingua Pedagogia*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.21831/lingped.v6i1.73107