



THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND-YEAR STUDENTS OF SMKN 1 PEKANBARU IN IDENTIFYING PARTS OF SPEECH

Kukuh Andika¹, Supriusman², M Syarfi³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia

Email:¹andika.kukuh0208@gmail.com,²supriusman@lecturer.unri.ac.id,³m.syarfi@lecturer.unri.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine the ability of second-year students at SMKN 1 Pekanbaru in analyzing parts of speech. The total population was 432 students. Through the use of cluster random sampling, one class consisting of 36 students was chosen as the sample. The instrument used in this research was a written test with 40 questions, divided into eight categories of parts of speech: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition, pronoun, and interjection. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the students have a good level of skill in identifying parts of speech, as shown by the average score of 87.43, which is classified as "Good." The highest performance was in identifying nouns, with an average score of 91.11, indicating strong understanding in that area. On the contrary, the lowest score was found in the verb section, with an average of 80.56, which is also categorized as "Good."

Keywords: Ability, Identifying, Parts of Speech

KEMAMPUAN SISWA TAHUN KEDUA SMKN 1 PEKANBARU DALAM MENGIDENTIFIKASI KELAS KATA

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji kemampuan siswa tahun kedua di SMKN 1 Pekanbaru dalam menganalisis parts of speech. Jumlah populasi dalam penelitian ini adalah 432 siswa. Melalui teknik cluster random sampling, satu kelas yang terdiri dari 36 siswa dipilih sebagai sampel. Instrumen yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah tes tertulis yang berisi 40 pertanyaan, yang dibagi ke dalam delapan kategori parts of speech: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition, pronoun, dan interjection. Berdasarkan temuan, dapat disimpulkan bahwa siswa memiliki tingkat kemampuan yang baik dalam mengidentifikasi parts of speech, sebagaimana ditunjukkan oleh nilai rata-rata sebesar 87,43 yang diklasifikasikan sebagai "Baik." Kinerja tertinggi terlihat pada kategori noun dengan nilai rata-rata 91,11, yang menunjukkan pemahaman yang kuat dalam aspek tersebut. Sebaliknya, skor terendah ditemukan pada bagian verb, dengan nilai rata-rata 80,56, yang juga termasuk dalam kategori "Baik."

Kata Kunci: Kemampuan, Identifikasi, Kelas Kata

Submitted	Accepted	Published
May 30 th 2025	June 3 th 2025	June 8 th 2025

Citation	:	Andika et al. (2025). THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND-YEAR STUDENTS OF SMKN 1 PEKANBARU IN IDENTIFYING PARTS OF SPEECH. <i>JOEEI (Journal of English Educational Issues)</i> , 1(1), 119-130.
----------	---	---

INTRODUCTION

According to Schachter and Shopen (2007), the term "Parts of Speech" (hereafter PoS) refers to the



conventional classification system for the core categories of words, or lexemes, in a given language. These word classes serve as the foundational elements of grammatical structure. Richard (2002) explains that words are classified based on the functions they perform within a sentence, such as serving as nouns or verbs. Accordingly, a word's syntactic function determines its part of speech, which underlies the rationale for its grammatical categorization (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Parts of speech are traditionally grouped into eight main classes: adjectives, adverbs, conjunctions, interjections, nouns, pronouns, prepositions, and verbs. A solid command of the parts of speech is a cornerstone of grammatical competence for English learners. Mardhatillah (2020) observes that students who understand how each word class functions write more fluently and convey meaning more clearly to their readers. Conversely, a limited grasp of these categories can undermine all four language skills listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Similarly, Khaisaeng and Dennis (2017) report that although their students enjoyed English lessons, they were often baffled by the very word classes they had been taught, a confusion that slowed their progress. Several factors make word-class identification demanding. Decree of the Minister of Education and Culture No. 56 of 2022, which outlines guidelines for implementing the curriculum in the context of learning recovery, known as 'Kurikulum Merdeka.' This decree serves as a complement to the existing curriculum framework (Nugraheni & Siswanti, 2022). Besides, significant changes have been introduced in the Merdeka curriculum, the researcher decided to conduct research entitled 'The Ability of The Second-Year Students' of SMKN 1 Pekanbaru in Identifying Parts of Speech'.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Nouns

Nouns are a central grammatical category in English, functioning primarily to name people, objects, places, events, or abstract concepts. As Huddleston and Pullum (2002) explain, nouns serve as the heads of noun phrases and typically combine with determiners, adjectives, and prepositional phrases to form more complex syntactic units. They fulfill core grammatical functions, most notably as subjects, objects, and complements, making them integral to clause structure.

2. Verbs

Verbs represent the most dynamic part of speech, functioning as the core of predicate structures in English. According to Crystal (2004), verbs are central to expressing actions, processes, or states of being, and are characterized by their ability to inflect for tense, aspect, mood, and voice. Verbs can function in various complementation patterns, such as transitive, intransitive, ditransitive, and copular constructions, each with specific syntactic and semantic constraints.

3. Adjectives

Adjectives serve the primary function of modifying nouns by providing descriptive or classificatory



information. As noted by Biber, Conrad, and Leech (2002), adjectives typically occur in attributive positions (before the noun) or predicative positions (after linking verbs). They contribute to the semantic richness of noun phrases and often reflect qualities such as color, size, evaluation, or origin.

4. Adverbs

Adverbs function to modify verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, or entire clauses, contributing to the semantic elaboration of events and actions. According to Biber et al. (2002), adverbs fall into several functional categories, including circumstance adverbs (e.g., quickly, yesterday), stance adverbs (e.g., fortunately, clearly), and linking adverbs (e.g., however, therefore). This diversity allows adverbs to play both syntactic and discourse roles in textual cohesion and clarity.

5. Conjunctions

Conjunctions are functional words that connect linguistic units such as words, phrases, or clauses. Greenbaum and Quirk (2000) classify conjunctions into coordinators (e.g., and, but, or) and subordinators (e.g., because, although, since), each serving distinct syntactic roles. Coordinating conjunctions link elements of equal grammatical rank, while subordinating conjunctions introduce dependent clauses, signaling logical relationships such as cause, contrast, or condition.

6. Prepositions

Prepositions introduce prepositional phrases and express relationships of location, time, cause, and other abstract connections between entities. Huddleston and Pullum (2002) describe prepositions as heads of prepositional phrases that take noun phrases as complements (e.g., in the room, after the meeting). They function to link arguments and adjuncts to the verb phrase, thereby enriching clause meaning.

7. Pronouns

Pronouns replace noun phrases and maintain textual cohesion by avoiding unnecessary repetition. According to Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999), English pronouns encode distinctions of person (first, second, third), number (singular, plural), gender, and case (subjective, objective, possessive). These distinctions help establish referential clarity and coherence across sentences and paragraphs.

8. Determiners

Determiners are grammatical elements that precede nouns and specify their reference in terms of definiteness, quantity, or possession. Quirk et al. (2002) emphasize that determiners form a closed lexical class, including articles (the, a), demonstratives (this, those), possessives (my, their), quantifiers (some, many), and numerals (two, several). These elements are essential in forming well-structured noun phrases.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research design is used as a descriptive quantitative approach. This is descriptive quantitative research. This research looked at the student's ability in identifying parts of speech of 8 variables which are:



noun, verb, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition, pronoun, and determiner by the second-year students of SMKN 1 Pekanbaru. This research was conducted at SMKN 1 Pekanbaru. The research was held from February 2025 and completed in May 2025.

The population of this research is the students of the second year from SMKN 1 Pekanbaru. The total population is 432 students. In this research, the writer used a cluster random sampling method to choose the class that would be studied. Sugiyono (2017) explains that cluster sampling involves selecting groups within a population to act as the sample. Fraenkel (2000) also states that cluster sampling involves choosing groups (or clusters) rather than individuals. This means the whole population is first divided into smaller groups, and then one group is chosen at random. To select the class, the researcher used a lottery system. Three pieces of paper were prepared—one with the word “Sample” written on it, and two left blank. Each class leader from the three available classes was asked to pick one paper. The class whose leader picked the paper marked “Sample” was chosen to take part in the research. The class that had been chosen was XI Hospitably Major with 36 students.

To collect the data, the researcher gives the test adapted on questions construction from Merdeka Curriculum textbook by Kemendikbud (2017). The researcher analyzed all the questions from every unit of that book and chose the questions which related to this research. The test was multiple choice with a total of 40 items. The students were asked to identify the underlined word. After calculating the score, the researcher classified the result by using the classification that adapted from Wati (2010).

Table 1 Classification of Score Test

No	Score Range	Categorized
1.	90 – 100	Excellent
2	80 – 89	Good
3	70 – 79	Average
4	60 – 69	Poor
5	0 - 59	Very Poor

(Brown, 2007)



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to find out the ability of the second-year students of SMK N 1 Pekanbaru in identifying parts of speech, the researcher conducted the test during the research. There are 36 students as sample in this research from one class that has been chosen after using cluster random sampling technique.

Table 1.2 Students' Ability Level in Identifying Parts of Speech

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	0	0.00%	Very Poor	87.43
2	60 – 69	0	0.00%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	6	16.67%	Average	
4	80 - 89	10	27.78%	Good	
5	90 – 100	20	55.56%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%		

Table 1.2 shows students' ability level in identifying parts of speech. 20 students (55.56%) were in excellent level. 10 students (27.33%) were in good level and 6 student (16.67%) was in average level. Overall students' ability in identifying nouns was in good level with the mean score 87.43.

Table 1.3 Students' Ability in Identifying Nouns

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	1	2.78%	Very Poor	91.11
2	60 – 69	3	8.33%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	5	13.89%	Good	
5	90 – 100	27	75.00%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%		

Table 1.3 shows students' ability in identifying nouns. 27 students (75.00%) were in excellent level. 5 students (13.89%) were in good level, 3 students (8.33%) were in poor level and 1 student (2.78%) was in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying nouns was in excellent level with the mean score 91.11.



Table 1.4 Students' Ability in Identifying Verbs

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	1	2.78%	Very Poor	80.56
2	60 – 69	9	25.00%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	13	36.11%	Good	
5	90 – 100	13	36.11%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%		

Table 1.4 shows students' ability in identifying verbs. 13 students (36.11%) were in excellent level. The same number, 13 students (36.11%), got the good level. 9 students (25.00%) were in poor level and 1 student (2.78%) was in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying verbs was in good level with the mean score 80.56.

Table 1.5 Students' Ability in Identifying Adjectives

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	2	5.56%	Very Poor	85.00
2	60 – 69	6	16.67%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	9	25.00%	Good	
5	90 – 100	19	52.78%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%		

Table 1.5 shows students' ability in identifying adjectives. 19 students (52.78%) were in excellent level. 9 students (25.00%) were in good level, 6 students (16.67%) were in poor level and 2 students (5.56%) were in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying adjectives was in good level with the mean score 85.00.

Table 1.6 Students' Ability in Identifying Adverbs

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	1	2.78%	Very Poor	88.89
2	60 – 69	4	11.11%	Poor	



3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	9	25.00%	Good	
5	90 – 100	22	61.11%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%	Good	

Table 1.6 shows students' ability in identifying adverbs. 22 students (61.11%) were in excellent level. 9 students (25.00%) were in good level, 4 students (11.11%) were in poor level and 1 student (2.78%) was in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying adverbs was in good level with the mean score 88.89.

Table 1.7 Students' Ability in Identifying Conjunctions

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	0	0.00%	Very Poor	90.00
2	60 – 69	3	8.33%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	12	33.33%	Good	
5	90 – 100	21	58.33%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%	Excellent	

Table 1.7 shows students' ability in identifying conjunctions. 21 students (58.33%) were in excellent level, 12 students (33.33%) were in good level and 3 students (8.33%) were in poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying conjunctions was in excellent level with the mean score 90.00.

Table 1.8 Students' Ability in Identifying Prepositions

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	2	5.56%	Very Poor	87.78
2	60 – 69	3	8.33%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	9	25.00%	Good	
5	90 – 100	22	61.11%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%	Good	

Table 1.8 shows students' ability in identifying prepositions. 22 students (61.11%) were in excellent level. 9 students (25.00%) were in good level, 3 student (8.33%) was in poor level and also 2 student (5.56%)



were in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying prepositions was in good level with the mean score 87.78.

Table 1.9 Students' Ability in Identifying Pronouns

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	2	5.56%	Very Poor	88.33
2	60 – 69	3	8.33%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	8	22.22%	Good	
5	90 – 100	23	63.89%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%	Good	

Table 1.9 shows students' ability in identifying pronouns. 23 students (63.89%) were in excellent level. 8 students (22.22%) were in good level, 3 students (8.33%) were in poor level and 2 students (5.56%) were in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying pronouns was in good level with the mean score 88.33

Table 1.10 Students' Ability in Identifying Determiners

No	Classification	Frequency	Percentage	Level	Mean Score
1	0 – 59	2	5.56%	Very Poor	87.78
2	60 – 69	5	13.89%	Poor	
3	70 – 79	0	0.00%	Average	
4	80 - 89	6	16.67%	Good	
5	90 – 100	23	63.89%	Excellent	
Total		36	100.00%	Good	

Table 1.10 shows students' ability in identifying determiners. 23 students (63.89%) were in excellent level. 6 students (16.67%) were in good level, 5 students (13.89%) were in poor level and 2 student (5.56%) were in very poor level. Overall students' ability in identifying determiners was in good level with the score of 87.78.

Discussion

This study aimed to examine the ability of second-year students at SMK Negeri 1 Pekanbaru to accurately identify parts of speech in English. The research involved 36 students who completed a test



consisting of 40 items, covering eight categories of parts of speech: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, conjunction, preposition, pronoun, and determiner. The primary objective was to assess the extent of students' grammatical knowledge and their ability to distinguish between these fundamental elements of English.

The findings revealed that the students achieved an overall mean score of 87.43, which falls within the "Good" classification. This outcome suggests that the majority of students possess a strong understanding of the parts of speech tested. Notably, the highest mean score was recorded in the noun section, with an average of 91.11, also classified as "Excellent." This result indicates that nouns are the most familiar category for students, likely due to their frequent use in both written and spoken language.

Conversely, the lowest mean score was observed in the verb section, where students obtained an average score of 80.56, which classified as 'Good' level. This comparatively lower performance implies that verbs, with their varied tenses and functions, may present greater challenges for learners. The disparity between the noun and verb sections highlights specific areas where pedagogical attention may be needed to ensure balanced grammatical competence across all categories.

Several factors can be identified as contributing to these results. First, students' frequent exposure to nouns in classroom instruction and daily communication may have enhanced their familiarity with this category. Second, the relatively lower performance on verbs could be attributed to the complexity of verb conjugations, tenses, and irregular forms, which typically require more explicit teaching and practice. Additionally, factors such as students' motivation, the effectiveness of instructional strategies, the quality of learning materials, and prior learning experiences may have influenced the outcomes observed in this study.

Compared to the research by Khosravizadeh and Pashmforoosh (2012), which looked at helpful methods for teaching parts of speech and viewed them as functional categories, both studies have a common interest in developing students' grammar skills. However, the present research differs by focusing primarily on students' current performance rather than on instructional methods. Both studies, nonetheless, underscore the importance of pedagogical strategies in enhancing students' understanding of parts of speech.

The study by Abrar and Thamrin (2020), which used Classroom Action Research to help students better identify parts of speech, also offers useful points for comparison. While their study emphasized the implementation of specific interventions to enhance learning outcomes, the present study is descriptive in nature, focusing on assessing students' current abilities. Both studies, however, highlight the crucial role of continuous practice and teacher-led interventions in improving grammatical knowledge.

The results can also be related to Mardhatillah's (2020) study, which looked at how students used parts of speech in descriptive texts, and to Lestari's (2020) research, which focused on how Thai students understood parts of speech. Although the present study differs in its focus on identification tasks rather than production or comprehension, it shares the common goal of exploring learners' grammatical proficiency. These studies



collectively emphasize that a solid understanding of parts of speech is fundamental to language competence in both written and spoken contexts. In conclusion, the results of this study showed that second-year students at SMK Negeri 1 Pekanbaru demonstrate a “Good” level of ability in identifying parts of speech, as reflected by their mean score of 87.43.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this study show that second-year students at SMK Negeri 1 Pekanbaru possess a good level of ability in identifying parts of speech. This is evident from their impressive mean score of 87.43, which places them in the "Good" level. The highest scores were achieved in identifying nouns, with an average score of 91.11. This indicates that students are particularly skilled at recognizing nouns. On the other hand, the lowest scores were found in the verb section, where the average score was 80.56, classified as "Good." This suggests that while students excel in identifying most parts of speech, there is slightly more room for improvement in understanding verbs. The overall performance of these students indicates that they have a solid understanding of the basic elements of grammar. It is clear that the students have been able to master the key concepts related to parts of speech. However, further study and practice may help enhance their skills, especially in areas like verbs. Overall, the students' performance is commendable, and their ability in parts of speech is a strong foundation for their English language development.

In conclusion, the findings of this research emphasize that second-year students at SMK Negeri 1 Pekanbaru are good in identifying parts of speech, especially verbs. This level of competence is crucial for their future academic progress and success in English. It is recommended that teachers continue to focus on reinforcing the students' skills in verb identification to achieve even better results.

Additionally, the results of this study can serve as a benchmark for future educational strategies. With the right guidance and practice, these students have the potential to further enhance their English language skills. The study's findings contribute valuable insights into the learning progress of students at SMK Negeri 1 Pekanbaru. Ultimately, this research highlights the importance of ongoing support and focused instruction to help students achieve their full potential.

REFERENCES

- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.).



Boston: Heinle & Heinle

Crystal, D. (2004). *Rediscover grammar* (3rd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2000). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greenbaum, S., & Quirk, R. (2000). *A student's grammar of the English language*. Harlow: Pearson Education

Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2017). *Bahasa Inggris: Buku siswa kelas XI SMA/MA/SMK/MAK*. Pusat Kurikulum dan Perbukuan, Balitbang, Kemdikbud. ISBN 978-602-427-106-0. Retrieved from <https://static.buku.kemdikbud.go.id/content/pdf/bukuteks/k13/bukusiswa/B%20Inggris%20Kelas%20XI%20BS%20press.pdf>

Khaisaeng, S., & Dennis, N. K. (2017). A Study of Parts Of Speech Used In Online Student Weekly Magazine. *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, 5(4), 43-50.

Mardhatillah, R. (2020). *An Analysis Of Students' Writing Ability On Parts Of Speech In Their Descriptive Text At Assalam Islamic Senior High School Naga Beralih Air Tiris Kampar Regency*. Retrieved from <http://repository.uin-suska.ac.id/30872/>

Nugraheni, D., & Siswanti, H. (2022). Implementasi kurikulum merdeka di sekolah penggerak SD Negeri 2 Pogung kabupaten Klaten. *Jurnal Pendidikan IPA Veteran*, 6, 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.31331/jipva.v6i1.2575>

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (2002). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Harlow: Longman.

Richards, J. C. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Third Edition, London: Pearson Education

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd ed.). Harlow, England: Pearson Education. ISBN: 978-0582368007.

Schachter, P. & Timothy, S. (2007). Parts-Of-Speech Systems. In Timothy Shopen (Ed), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description Volume I: Clause Structure*, 1–60. Cambridge: Cambridge Up.



Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Wati, P. (2010). *Students' Ability In Identifying Part Of Speech In Reading Descriptive Text At The Second Year Of Smpn 4 Rengat Regency Of Indragiri Hulu*. Retrieved from <https://repository.uin-suska.ac.id/234/>