Grammatical Errors in Using Adverbial Clauses of Reason as Modifiers in Some Indonesian Journalistic Headlines

Kukuh Prayitno Subagyo[1,*], Mochamad Nasrul Chotib[2], Herditya Wahyu Widodo[3], Ahmad Heki Sujiatmoko[4]

[1]English Department, Faculty of Letter, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang 65145, Indonesia
[2]English Department, Faculty of Letter, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang 65145, Indonesia
[3]English Department, Faculty of Letter, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang 65145, Indonesia
[4]English Department, Faculty of Letter, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang 65145, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This journal article examines the grammatical construction of some TV news headlines, highlighting the issues that arise due to their structure. The topic is still worth the analysis as most journalistic studies concentrate on printed or social media news platforms. The study employs the New Criticism approach to carefully lay out the internal relation in the headlines' structural elements. The results show that the headlines use adverbial clauses or phrases of reason before the main clauses, which inadvertently causes confusion about the subjects and the actions of the news stories. The confusion is due to the adverbial clauses' or phrases' function as appositives as they modify the subject of the main clause, thus creating ambiguity in understanding who is then performing the described actions. The study finds that these headlines are structurally complex and misleading, making them fail to convey their intended meaning. To address this issue, the article suggests rephrasing the headlines to eliminate ambiguity. Improved headline construction not only enhances communication but also ensures that potential confusion for the audience is minimized.

1. INTRODUCTION

Media outlets, be their television stations or online websites, bear the same responsibility to deliver factual and correct stories that journalism calls them as news. To be factual, the media needs to rely on their first and foremost important principles, i.e., to serve the truth (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2014). To be correct, however, the media needs to rely on each of their specific personae, known generally as the editorial team, when these personae write and produce every piece of news at a daily pace, or sometimes even hourly rate.

To mess around with the previous case involving factuality is a practice that is considered a rare occurrence in any media outlet. This is because all, or almost all, of editorial teams, understand very well their first and foremost responsibility to be constantly

reliable and always factual (Stovall, 2014), and with that, the consequence and the implication of delivering unchecked news or stories that can easily lead them to any of the illegal journalistic malpractices such as yellow journalism, propaganda, defamation, or the likes.

However, the same level of rarity cannot be applied in the second case of delivering accurate and correct news. On the one hand, producing such an accurate piece of the story reflects the high level of competence, expertise, and experience that each of the journalists has mastered. On the other hand, many media outlets may not have enough seasoned journalists at that level in their hands. This condition is reflected in a report by Rosenstiel et al. (2015), which mentioned that there was a growing concern about journalistic education not preparing for the "journalists of the future."

With that said, it becomes clear that some practices of journalism still yield an exercise that is almost always prone to human errors, especially in the way the news coverage is constructed, though not how they are intended to be delivered. Thus, our main problem in this study is that as long as news construction, even only in their headlines, involves grammar. This set of rules becomes one of the most potential elements where errors occur, albeit unintentionally made. However, even up to this point, we are totally aware that not everyone might agree with our proposed problem of analyzing the importance of grammatical errors in news headlines. Some or many experts may say that errors and mistakes are just a natural part of any language, be it used in native environments or as a secondary modality of learning.

VanPatten (1990), for example, is among those who argue that mistakes, especially in grammar, are just so common that they are not worth mentioning, much less putting them under a microscope. His article asserts that grammatical errors are a natural result of learners' processing limitations and that, more seemingly importantly, focusing on such mistakes may lead to overgeneralization.

Of course, VanPatten is not alone in his argument. Rod Ellis, a proponent of the task-based approach and language usage for communicative purposes, also speaks in the same tone as the linguist. Not only does he emphasize errors as natural facts as they appear in communication, but he also believes that focusing on these errors may cause language users to become even less communicative (Ellis, 1991). Little wonder he then continues giving a warning on the potential negative effects of focusing too much on grammatical accuracy.

The whole tapestry of the arguments could probably be summed up in the debates that center around the emergence of the communicative approach in the 70s (also known as CLT or CA) as it was first implemented in a pedagogical context and as opposed to the more traditional, the so-called, grammar translation method (GTM). Experts who are in line with CLT usually emphasize the method's flexibility, which allows the usage of different methods and materials. Qasserras (2023), for instance, explains that not only can the method enhance students' competence in communicating, it also boosts students' critical thinking, cultural awareness, learning autonomy, even some problem-solving skills, among others. These benefits are also further confirmed by (Khazratqulova & Amirkulova, 2024), who explain that CLT promotes contextual and collaborative learning since it mimics real-world scenarios, such as role-playing, to boost meaningful language communication. What can be inferred from those benefits is that the method hence stresses the successful delivery of the message over the correct formulation of the message itself.

Needless to say, such a benefit from the method is not without its toll. Comparing GMT and CLT in the EFL context, Nisha (2024) admits that even though CLT seems to be

"more realistic and advantageous" as a method, the GMT still proves to have "positive attributes." The point in her argument can be circumstantially inferred from CLT's disadvantages. Xu (2023) mentions that some of these "inevitable drawbacks" may include often the much sparse scale of utility, very (if not too) high requirements for teachers to employ the method, and or some negative impacts on students' personalities. In giving the full review on CLT, Qasserras (2023) again adds that the criticisms often raise concerns over the method's lack of "explicit grammar and vocabulary instruction," often minimal preparation for any formal writing practices, and, as previously inferred, its (too much) emphasis on the learners' fluency over accuracy.

Yet, on the same topic but on the other side of the coin are the proponents of exactly the opposite idea that puts much stress on investigating grammar mistakes. Curzan (2015) is among those who argue that grammar is an important part of communication and that mistakes make it hard for people to understand correctly. Of the more important note, according to her, is the understanding that grammar should never be translated as blindly following a set of rules but rather as effectively using language in different contexts since professional situations most likely govern different sets of grammar compared to others, more relaxed atmospheres. On the same note but comes in almost a decade later, Bobodzhanova and Mamleeva (2022) still argue that grammar is still necessary since incorrect usage could often hinder or obscure meaning, make powerful ideas vague, or even distort the user's image.

From this point, the importance of analyzing grammatical errors can pose such a magnitude, especially when corrupted grammar is inherent in any form of public speaking and is intended to address the large, even very large, audiences such as that in journalism. Within this gigantic scope of readers and/or readerships, all types of consequential effects, from humorous to scandalous, can easily manifest, especially with the help of nowadays various internet platforms to spread or discuss such errors.

Eversull (2016) collects several examples of public-to-business documents of many types, with various types of grammatical errors. Many of these errors do make up for the strong term "embarrassing" in the title as she concludes, "those unfortunate souls whose mistakes get passed around on the internet until thousands of people are laughing…" before she continues calling those mistakes "some of the best grammar gaffes this year [2016]." The world-famous English media outlet, BBC, also published a similar article as they collected various mistakes and misspellings in one of their 2019 stories. The news shows typographical mistakes such as from the then President Trump's tweet to a spelling error committed by even one of the most respected journalistic outlets, The New York Times. In the same spirit as Eversull and BBC, Malone (2022) also captures some of what he called "cringe and hilarious corrections" when some major media outlets did create grammatical errors, meaning these 'hilarious errors' must somehow manage to slip their professional curation.

Nevertheless, our present study is not the first to be put into scholarly articles. Beede and Mulnix (2017) presented their scholarly article that investigates error rates, especially in spelling and grammar, in news stories and how these mistakes affect the media's credibility. A year later, Appelman and Schmierbach (2018) revealed that grammatical errors in news stories may lower credibility, quality, and informativeness. However, a high frequency of error occurrence is needed for such a negative impact on any media outlet.

Also, for a more national context, Adiyadmo, Rahmat, and Dewanti (2019) conducted a similar analysis on a local media outlet. Their paper explores mistakes such as spelling, grammar, ambiguous constructions, or meanings that appear on the main pages of local-

scope media, Jambi Express. Furthermore, for more recent journalistic studies, both Holtrup et al. (2024) and (Feng, 2024) perform analysis on the effect of media headlines on their readers. The former stresses perceived accuracy and trust in media outlets, the latter on how the framing of media headlines may affect the users' responses such as liking, commenting, or even sharing the news stories.

Yet, all the previous studies mentioned above have one thing in common, if we may further argue: they all concentrate on written or printed papers and or other formats, such as news in social media posts, instead of ones broadcast by TV stations. Therefore, this research aims at broadcasted TV news to further study grammatical errors in the news. Again and for some, analyzing and scrutinizing grammar mistakes may look like such a trivial activity for some experts. However, we also believe that no experts or linguists will be able to deny the importance of such analysis examination, especially when the parties making the mistakes are the ones bearing the power of addressing multitudes of readerships. It is within this belief that we present our study's topic, i.e., how and what kinds of errors the TV headlines made during their broadcast time.

2. METHOD

To conduct the analysis, the researchers employ the close-reading method to look well closely at all the ambiguous headlines. This reading approach is similar to that which is commonly employed by new critics in order to break down, look deeper, and then thoroughly relate how each of the existing structural units in the said sentence establishes their internal connection in order to convey or deliver its intended meaning or its main idea (Abrams, 1999). Abrams (1999, p. 201) continues citing the long-established practice of the French School of Arts as he mentions the "explication de texte," which also means stressing, scrutinizing, and or analyzing all kinds of relevant information that can bring us to the full understanding of any given words or passages. In the same manner, we try to 'explicate' the headlines of some of the news productions as they were broadcast to the public.

The reason we only profoundly examine the headlines of some news is that much of the body of the respective stories, i.e., the broadcast news, is clear and contains no extra polarization, be they journalistically speaking or linguistically. In fact, this matter is what we call for previously as "unique challenges" because in TV-news format, all audiences or viewers can still easily grasp the message of the news as they have both auditory and visual means to understand the message. The only news part that stays long, at least during the time of news delivery, is the very titles or headlines of the news, which are usually given in static text captions.

This unique format is what gives us reason enough to go into the trouble of analyzing some of the headlines of TV news deliveries since the audience may indeed capture the correct message, but they still - albeit unknowingly - read the wrong captions, at least grammatically wrong headlines. However, due to the unique nature of data, we owe some more explanation regarding our data-collecting method.

We admit that time and coincidence are two of the most important factors contributing to this study's selected design. This is because any of us, as the researchers, could not admit that we had spent hours and hours in front of our televisions only to observe and capture any of the slightest errors in the population of headline news within the corpus of all TV stations' media programs.

Instead, in any of our relaxing mornings or evenings, some of us were lucky enough to happen to watch the news program. By such coincidence, our grammarian instinct was roaring up as we noticed the confusing headlines that were aired for about a minute or two during their respective broadcasts. As we said, we were lucky to have our smartphones and managed to capture the headlines, save them as screenshots, and now use them as the main data for our study. Thus, we ask for our readers' understanding when their sharp eyes acknowledge any presence of miscellaneous stuff, such as part of a wall clock, TV cables, or the like, when they see the images.

3. RESULTS

This section presents some snapshots taken from television when the news was made on air. Readers need to exercise some level of pardoning as some images may not be well captured, though they are nonetheless still easy to perceive.

The images are presented in no specific order of importance:

Fig. 1. *Dinilai Sebar Hoaks, Menko Luhut Akan Audit LSM*
(Alleged for Spreading Hoaxes, Minister Luhut Will Audit [the said] NGO's)

The above image was captured on 15 November 2021. It was aired by Kompas TV station during its Sapa Indonesia Malam News Broadcast. The news is about an Indonesian minister who was about to give sanctions to non-government organizations allegedly proven to do any misconduct.

Fig. 2. *Terserang Hama, Petani Panen Cabai Lebih Awal*
(Invaded by Pests, Farmers Harvested Chilies Prematurely)

Figure 2 was a screenshot on 21 June 2022. It was part of Metro TV's program called Newsline Update. The main topic of the news is to tell of an event of premature harvest which needed to be done due to pests' problem.

Fig. 3. *Bila Lalai, Kemenhub Akan Sanksi Berat Pihak Bandara*
(If Slacking, the Ministry of Transportation Will Give Heavy Sanction to Airport [Managements])

The picture in Figure 3 was created during the program Sapa Indonesia Malam News Broadcast which was aired by Kompas TV on 4 May 2023. The main story centers around the Indonesian Ministry of Transportation, which was about to give severe punishment to certain airports had the latter been proven to be negligent.

Fig. 4. *Hilang Dicuri, Pengemudi Ojol Dapat Motor dari Presiden*
(Stolen, the Ojol Driver Got His Motor from the President)

Figure 4 is a screen image that was captured on 15 February 2022 during the broadcast of Sapa Indonesia Malam News on Kompas TV station. The news is a local crime event that tells the story of a person who received a substitute for his stolen motorbike, and the benefactor was none other than the very President of Indonesia himself.

All of the above figures from the TV shows clearly show similar grammatical construction, i.e., the usage of adverbial clauses of reason to explain or modify the main clause. All headlines put the adverbial clauses in shortened form, most likely to save space while retaining most of the meaning intended to be delivered to the audience.

Unfortunately, by formulating the sentences this way, the grammatical construction makes verbal clauses look like appositive clauses or now inhibits the same function of appositives in the sentences. Because the function of appositive is to explain or modify the subject or noun of the main clause or none other than the main clause, this is where grammatical errors or confusion start to arise.

What is apparent, at least grammatically, from Figures 1 to 4 above is that all the headlines are embedded with ambiguity in their ideas' propositions. This double-entry can be elicited by formulating the question of "Who is actually doing what?" or in the same way as asking, "Which agent is actually receiving or committing the action stated in the predicate?".

It is this grammatical ambiguity that becomes the main concern of this article. Again, the underlying argument of importance is that regardless of what the headlines want to actually convey to their audiences, or even the fact that some of the audiences may actually really understand what the ideas are - despite the obvious grammar mistakes, we believe in that old proposition that a mistake is a mistake, and we should better avoid it or correct it to be able to perform much better in any of our professional duties.

5. DISCUSSION

To quote from the image, the headline in Figure 1 says, "*Dinilai Sebar Hoaks, Menko Luhut Akan Audit LSM*." This complex sentence puts its supporting phrase, or reduced clause, before its main clause. Converting the construction into English while trying to maintain as close as possible of its structure, the sentence will roughly look as "Alleged for spreading hoaxes, Minister Luhut will audit [the said] NGOs''. When read either in a rush or at a glance, the sentence seems to have nothing erroneous or even contain any convoluting idea. Its intended meaning, but not the structural one, is indeed clear and can be rephrased as such that the said Minister will conduct auditing action on all NGOs proven to have or had spread any unclaimed facts or misleading stories.

The original headline in Figure 1 uses an adverbial clause of reason that explains why the Minister needs to conduct such an audit. The problem is that the main clause of the headline is constructed within active voice as the complete version of the headline will read as "*Dinilai Sebar Hoaks, Menko Luhut Akan Mengaudit LSM*" or "*Dinilai Sebar Hoaks, Menko Luhut Akan (Melakukan) Audit (pada) LSM*." With such an active register in the main clause, the modifying phrase no longer serves to explain only the whole main clause, but it now explains the subject of the main clause. The reason for this confusion is the whole construction now turns to resemble that of appositive where the first part of the headline may (only) refer to the subject instead of the whole main clause.

From this point, the whole headline does create ambiguity as now it is not clear who is actually spreading the hoaxes. By the intended meaning and the main clause, it should not be possible for the Minister to spread the hoaxes as he was the one conducting the audit. However, in terms of grammatical composition, the headline suggests that the minister is the one who spreads the hoaxes, not the NGO.

To resolve this confusion, the headline can be changed into several constructions such as "*Menko Luhut Akan Audit LSM yang Dinilai Sebar Hoaks*" (Minister Luhut will Audit the NGO's Alleged for Spreading Hoaxes)*, or if the hoax-part is stressed more than the other elements, the headline should be "*Dinilai Sebar Hoaks, LSM Akan Diaudit Menko Luhut*" (Alleged for Spreading Hoaxes, NGO's Will be Audited by Minister Luhut).

A similar problem also appears in the next case of the convoluted headline in our discussion. In Figure 2, the main text is written as "*Terserang Hama, Petani Panen Cabai Lebih Awal*." To try to translate it into English while maintaining the nearest original construction, the sentence could be changed to "Invaded by Pests, Farmers Harvested Chilies Prematurely." No doubt that the intended meaning when such a headline was broadcast was to tell the audience that some farmers were forced to harvest their chilies due to the invading pests to the said crops. Then, the main clause of the headline uses the Indonesian verb "*panen*" (harvest), which makes the whole construction appear in the active register.

To rephrase the headline more completely, the whole sentence may now read as "*[Akibat] Terserang Hama, Petani Memanen Cabai Lebih Awal"* or "*[Akibat] Terserang Hama, Petani Melakukan Panen Cabai Lebih Awal"* ([Because They Were] Invaded by Pests, Farmers Harvested Chilies Prematurely). Despite the clear intention of what the headline wants to convey, the construction still suggests another level of meaning, as the opening clause, or the adverbial clause of reason, now acts as an appositive explaining the main clause has given the subject.

Like the previous example, the headline's construction in Figure 2 creates an ambiguity that it could be the farmers who were actually invaded by the pests instead of their crops. To correct such mistake, the headline could be rewritten into "*Terserang Hama, Cabai Dipanen Lebih Awal"* (Invaded by Pests, Chilies Were Harvested Prematurely) or put the clause of reason at somewhere in the middle section of the headline to avoid confusion such as "*Petani Panen Cabai yang Terserang Hama Lebih Awal"* (Farmers Harvested Their Chilies Prematurely Due to Pest Invasion)*. Giving an adverb of quantity or number like "tens or even hundreds of acres" may also maintain or even increase the value of the news. Thus, the headline may read "*Terserang Hama, Puluhan/Ratusan Hektar Cabai Dipanen Lebih Awal"* (Invaded by Pests, Hundreds of Acres of Chilies Were Harvested Prematurely)*. This additional information can help the viewers imagine the scale of the topic, i.e., how serious was the problem that the headline was discussing.

Moving to Figure 3, a similar kind of idea's proposition and sentence construction appears in "*Bila Lalai, Kemenhub Akan Sanksi Berat Pihak Bandara*." The closest verbatim translation we could propose is that the headline says, "If slacking, the Ministry of Transportation Will Give Heavy Sanction to Airport (Management)."

Seeing in this light, the headline wants to deliver a warning to any of the airport management parties or whosoever is in charge of managing airports. This warning comes in the form of a heavy sanction or fine, and it will be administered directly by none other than the highest Indonesian authority in this matter, the Ministry of Transportation.

Yet Figure 3 is another textual proof that what we want to say is not always the same as what or how we actually say it. Here, the intended clause of reason in "*Bila lalai* or if slacking" does explain the main clause 'to give sanction' which is written in the active register. As in other previous examples, the reasonable clause inadvertently turns into an appositive that also explains the subject or the main doer of the main verb.

Needless to say, the ambivalence in meaning emerges as the whole of figure 3's headline now suggests different ideas from the unchecked grammatical formation to viz, who is actually being slacking here, is it the airport management as the complimentary agent of the main clause as, no doubt, the headline intends to say? Or is it the prime doer, the Ministry itself, who is about to give the sanction, as the construction also hints?

To resolve this unnecessary proposition, the headline has to be revised into more proper construction. One way of correcting it is to construct more direct propositions such

as "*Kemenhub Akan Sanksi Berat Pihak Bandara Yang Lalai*" or Ministry of Transportation Will Sanction Slacking Airport Management. Else, suppose the media wants to keep the original proposition by first mentioning the conditional state (i.e., the reason) of why such heavy consequence arises. In that case, they should construct in more passive registry such as "*Bila Lalai, Pihak Bandara Akan Diberi Sanksi Berat oleh Kemenhub*".

The last good example of ambiguity, that is, how grammar can actually interfere with our ideas obviously directly, if not apparently dangerously in some cases, is shown in Figure 4 from the list of our data. The headline goes like this, "*Hilang Dicuri, Pengemudi Ojol Dapat Motor dari Presiden,*" and as always, we try to propose the closest word-by-word translation to provide a bigger picture in its contained meaning. Here, the nearest one we can get is "Stolen, the Ojol Driver Got His Motor from the President."

The exact same problem here is that of the verb (predicate) in the main clause of the headline. Instead of signifying a passive activity, that verb means more in an active way, hence suggesting "*mendapat* or to get" instead of "*didapat* or be received from." Because there is a scenario of an active idea being suggested in the main sentence, the clause of reason that appears initially also becomes ambiguous: at one, it describes the whole proposition in the main clause, but at the other, it also identifies the subject, i.e. the dominant agent of the main clause as the clause of reason continues to act as appositive.

As in all the examples above, the ambiguous idea is that the headline now proposes two equally strong ideas. First, it informs its audiences that the driver gets a certain substitute from the President of Indonesia exactly because the former lost his motorbike. Nevertheless, then, the grammatical construction unwittingly proposes through the headline that it could be that what had been stolen all along is none other than the driver himself.

In order to fix such construction, the headline can be rewritten by reordering the main clause such as "*Pengemudi Ojol Dapat Motor Pengganti dari Presiden*" or if the author of the headline were to keep the very cause (reason) of the proposition at the initial part of the sentence, hence "*Hilang Dicuri, Motor Pengemudi Ojol Diganti oleh Presiden*." In such construction, at least a more fixed idea is proposed to the readers to ensure they understand who really received the motorcycle.

In the effort to sum up the whole analysis above, it does tell us that grammar has an integral and important role in any textual production. This text may be a piece of writing, an audio-visual one, spoken, or other types and formats, but our analysis proves that as long as there is a text to produce, grammar becomes dominant. The reason, at least one out of many, is that this seemingly boring (well, admittedly for some) set of rules does play a significant part in determining how the actual meaning is either conveyed, constructed, or both within the audiences as the recipients of the text or the message.

Grammar's importance and influence become greater when the scope or scale of this recipient gets larger. Personal or small group conversations usually carry a 'lighter' burden of risks as whatever damage occurs during the construction of meaning, such damage usually and most always refers to or applies to that person or those small group members only.

But of course, the same is not true for larger scales of audiences involving various diverse recipients, such as in any public or mass communications. Within this magnitude of audiences, the consequences of a single mistake can get much higher since any one grammatical error may change the whole perspective of its participants. At least, our analysis has shown some confusion in meaning construction when the headlines are not properly written.

To prove our analytical statement, a study by Pfister et al. (2023) shows how frequent exposure to news media and headlines, even fictitious ones, can alter critical perceptions as significant as voting behaviors and even decisions. Other research by Calvillo and Harris (2022) finds that the more the audiences are exposed to certain information, the more they believe in that information. Interestingly, the finding works in the negative sense as well; that is, the more the audiences are exposed to misinformation, the stronger they believe in that misinformation as well. In this sense, one can only imagine and infer how this "illusory truth effect" can create false ideas in the audiences' minds by making intentional or unintentional mistakes in the news content and headlines.

Back to our study, these grammatical errors in the headlines may seem trivial, but this, of course, is circumstantial evidence: just because present errors seem less important, it does not mean that much graver mistake is impossible or has the least chance to take place. On the contrary, our analysis proves that carelessly constructed headlines may alter the meaning of the sentences: it will solely depend on how much weight of importance those headlines convey to their respective audiences.

5. CONCLUSION

The news headlines are presented as issues related to their grammatical construction, which leads to confusion about the subjects and actions of the news stories. All the headlines use adverbial clauses of reason before the main clauses, making it difficult to determine the intended meaning. The primary problem is that the adverbial clauses now seem to function as appositives, modifying the subject of the main clause. This creates ambiguity in understanding who is actually performing the actions described in the headlines. The headlines are structurally complex and misleading because they do not convey the intended meaning. To clarify the message, the headlines should be rephrased to eliminate the ambiguity. Thus, the analyzed headlines share a common issue of ambiguity due to the use of adverbial clauses of reason that make it unclear who or what the action refers to. To resolve this, headlines can be rephrased to place the subject and verb in the main clause, providing clarity and reducing ambiguity. It is essential for headlines to convey the intended message accurately to ensure that readers can easily understand the news stories. Improved headlines would enhance communication and avoid potential confusion for the audience.

Ultimately, this research underscores the importance of accurately conveying the intended message in news headlines. Improved headline construction not only enhances communication but also ensures that potential confusion for the audience is minimized. This study focuses on the grammatical construction of news headlines and its impact on clarity and comprehension. The study also assumes only a certain level of language proficiency among readers. However, it may overlook other factors such as cultural context, reader demographics, and the influence of accompanying images or visuals on headline interpretation. Therefore, future researchers may conduct experiments to gauge how different audiences interpret and comprehend headlines, which could provide valuable insights. This could involve diverse demographic groups and consider factors such as education level, cultural background, and news consumption habits. Another possible area of research is designing and testing alternative headline constructions through controlled experiments that help identify optimal formats for clarity and comprehension, involving variations in sentence structure, word choice, and positioning of key elements within the headline.

Authors' Information
KUKUH PRAYITNO SUBAGYO is currently a lecturer at the English Department, Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang. His primary interest is analyzing grammar down to its nook and cranny. He also shows a strong interest in English pedagogy, literature, and linguistics.
Email: kukuh.prayitno.fs@um.ac.id
MOCHAMAD NASRUL CHOTIB is currently a lecturer at the English Department, Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang. His main interest is anything related to Literary Criticism. He is also a great enthusiast in media and journalism, mythologies, and creative writing.
Email: mochamad.nasrul.fs@um.ac.id
HERDITYA WAHYU WIDODO is currently a lecturer at the English Department, Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang. His main interest is English Literature. He is an avid reader and observer of cultural, modern, and ideological studies.
Email: herditya.widodo.fs@um.ac.id
AHMAD HEKI SUJIATMOKO is currently a lecturer at the English Department, Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang. His main interests are ELT, SLA, and everything in between. He is a big fanatic of learning media development and technological application in teaching.
Email: ahmad.heki.fs@um.ac.id

REFERENCES

Abrams, M. H. (1999). *"New Criticism." A Glossary of Literary Terms* (7th ed.). Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Adiyadmo, D. A., Rahmat, A., & Dewanti, R. (2019). Error Analysis in the News Texts Main Page of Jambi Ekspres Daily Newsletter. *Bahtera: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, *18*(2). https://doi.org/10.21009/BAHTERA.182.08

Appelman, A., & Schmierbach, M. (2018). Make No Mistake? Exploring Cognitive and Perceptual Effects of Grammatical Errors in News Articles. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *95*(4), 930–947. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699017736040

Beede, P., & Mulnix, M. (2017). Grammar, Spelling Error Rates Persist in Digital News. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *38*(3), 316–327. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739532917722766

Bobodzhanova, L. K., & Mamleeva, A. F. (2022). Grammatical Competence as a Key Instrument of Oral Discourse Development. In Z. Anikina (Ed.), *Integration of Engineering Education and the Humanities: Global Intercultural Perspectives* (pp. 74–83). Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-11435-9_8

Calvillo, D., & Harris, J. (2022). Exposure to Headlines as Questions Reduces Illusory Truth for Subsequent Headlines. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.1037/mac0000056

Curzan, A. (2015). *Fixing English: Prescriptivism and Language History* (Illustrated edition). Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1991). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition: Learning in the Classroom* (1st edition). Oxford, OX, UK ; Cambridge, Mass., USA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Eversull, C. (2016, 28 December). Embarrassing Grammar Errors in 2016. Retrieved 19 May, 2024, from https://www.proofreadnow.com/blog/embarrassing-grammar-errors-in-2016

Feng, G. C. (2024). Effects of Narratives and Information Valence in Digital Headlines on User Responses. *Asian Journal of Communication*, *34*(2), 156–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2024.2317308

Holtrup, S., Henke, J., Steffan, D., & Möhring, W. (2024). The Reciprocal Effects of Perceived Accuracy and Trust in News Media: A Two-Wave Online Panel Study in the Context of the 2021 German Federal Election. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *101*(1), 156–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/10776990231202692

Khazratqulova, N., & Amirkulova, N. (2024). Communicative Language Teaching Methods. *Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education*, *2*(1), 364–368.

Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2014). *The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect, Completely Updated and Revised* (3rd ed.). New York: Three Rivers Press.

Malone, E. (2022, 16 December). 18 Cringey And Hilarious Corrections From News Outlets In 2022. Retrieved 19 May, 2024, from Yahoo News website: https://www.yahoo.com/news/16-cringey-hilarious-corrections-news-130103002.html

Nisha, P. R. (2024). Comparing Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Context: A Qualitative Literature Review. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *5*(1), 40–48. https://doi.org/10.24256/foster-jelt.v5i1.159

Pfister, R., Schwarz, K. A., Holzmann, P., Reis, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Kunde, W. (2023). Headlines Win Elections: Mere Exposure to Fictitious News Media Alters Voting Behavior. *PLOS ONE*, *18*(8), e0289341. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0289341

Qasserras, L. (2023). Beyond the Words: The Art and Science of Teaching Reading Interactively. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *10*(12), 182–210. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v10i12.5110

Rosenstiel, T., Ivancin, M., Loker, K., Lacy, S., Sonderman, J., & Yaeger, K. (2015). The Needs, Attitudes and Experiences of People in Media. *American Press Institute*, 1–75.

Stovall, J. G. (2014). *Writing for the Mass Media* (9th edition). Boston: Pearson.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Input Processing and Grammar Teaching: A Critical Review of the Evidence. *Language Learning*, *40*(4), 603–624.

Xu, K. (2023). Chasing Back and Moving on—A Comprehensive Overview on Communicative Language Teaching. *The Educational Review, USA*, *7*(3), 321–324. https://doi.org/10.26855/er.2023.03.006