

## THE ANALYSIS OF PLURALIZATION ERRORS OF COOKING VIDEOS

**Tescya Revelin Grisella, Gregorius Subanti, Hilaria Janariani**

1<sup>st</sup> [tescya.grisella@gmail.com](mailto:tescya.grisella@gmail.com), 2<sup>nd</sup> [gregorius\\_subanti@polteq.ac.id](mailto:gregorius_subanti@polteq.ac.id), 3<sup>rd</sup> [Hillaryjana03@gmail.com](mailto:Hillaryjana03@gmail.com)  
1,2,3 Polytechnic of Tonggak Equator

### ABSTRACT

Communication is the process of delivering messages that involves six elements: source, receiver, message, context, channel, noise, and effect. Communication involves six key elements: source, receiver, message, context, channel, noise, and effect. One type of noise is poor grammar, particularly pluralization errors. This study aimed to identify pluralization errors in cooking videos through error analysis and determine their proportions. Data was collected from the recipe descriptions of YouTube channels Devina Hermawan and Diana Home Kitchen (Indonesia), The Kampung Vegan and Nanyang Kitchen (Malaysia), and Dinched and The Meatmen Channel (Singapore). A qualitative content analysis method was used, with error analysis by Dulay, Burt, & Krashen (1982) and pluralization theory by Kasmini and Kadarmo (2017) as the basis. Results showed that omission errors were the highest at 63% (231 errors), followed by misinformation at 23% (84 errors). Addition errors, including simple addition, regularization, and double marking, were 12%, 1%, and 1%, with 43, 4, and 3 errors, respectively. These errors stem from inconsistent application of pluralization rules and a bilingual environment. count the words.

**Keywords:** *Noise, Pluralization, Error Analysis.*

### INTRODUCTION

Communication is the process of transferring messages and meaning. Louis Allen, as cited in Singh (2021), described communication as a bridge of meaning involving telling, listening, and understanding. DeVito (2016) outlined six elements of communication: source, receiver, message, context, channel, noise, and effect. Noise, which interferes with message reception, includes physical, physiological, psychological, and semantic types. According to Singh (2021), barriers to effective communication include mechanical, organizational, semantic, and personal barriers. Physical noise can occur in various media, including electronic media, where written communication errors, such as poor grammar, are prevalent.

Poor grammar indicates errors in language output, as noted by Dulay, Burt, & Krashen (1982). Error analysis helps identify these errors, which are common among non-native English speakers. Brown (2000), as cited in Fitri (2017), defines error analysis as examining non-native speakers' language acquisition errors. These errors can be categorized into omission, addition, misinformation, and misordering.

YouTube, a popular video-sharing platform, serves as a communication channel. Users share content, including cooking tutorials, and often use YouTube descriptions to provide detailed recipes. To obtain a more varied range of errors in pluralization, this study examines YouTube channels from Southeast Asia, including Devina Hermawan and Diana Home Kitchen (Indonesia), The Kampung Vegan and Nanyang Kitchen (Malaysia), and Dinched and The Meatmen Channel (Singapore). The research aims to analyze and address pluralization errors in these cooking videos. Based on the explanation above, the problems of this study are:

1. What are the types of pluralization errors identified through error analysis of cooking videos?

2. What are the proportions (frequency and percentage) of pluralization errors identified through error analysis of cooking videos?

The scope of this research focused on analyzing pluralization errors identified through error analysis, including omission, addition, misformation, and misordering within recipes from selected YouTube channels in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore, as mentioned in the YouTube video descriptions.

The purposes of this study are:

1. To find out the types of pluralization errors identified through error analysis of cooking videos.
2. To find out the proportions (frequency and percentage) of pluralization errors identified through error analysis of cooking videos.

The writers hope the results of this study serve as references and data for future research, presented in descriptive writing. Also, this study provides insights for language learners on pluralization errors, serves as a reference for understanding error analysis in countable and uncountable nouns, and helps readers write recipes correctly using these nouns.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The qualitative approach and descriptive method are being utilized for this study to analyze text data such as recipes in YouTube descriptions. This study was conducted from January 2024 to July 2024 using the description in each chosen YouTube video without any specific research locations during the examination. This is because the research data was taken directly from the content analysis of the selected YouTube channels.

The object of this study was collected by using a non-probability purposive sampling method. According to Cresswell & Creswell (2018), purposive sampling implies that the objectives, intent, and major idea of a proposal or study have already been established in the beginning. The object of this study is several videos from each Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore YouTube channel. The primary data in this research are taken directly from the recipes found in Devina Hermawan, Diana Home Kitchen, The Kampung Vegan, Nanyang Kitchen, Dinched, and The Meatmen Channel's YouTube descriptions. For secondary data, the writer collected from internet sources and literature related to error analysis and pluralization errors.

The data collected is observed through validation and reliability. Furthermore, the data used four steps as the technique of data analysis, which are data reduction, coding, classification, and data display.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this research was to identify the types of pluralization errors that frequently occur in the YouTube video descriptions of the following channels: Devina Hermawan, Diana Home Kitchen, The Kampung Vegan, Nanyang Kitchen, Dinched, and The Meatmen Channel. In total, 48 recipes were chosen. The findings of this research revealed a total of 365 pluralization errors, which included 231 omission errors, 50 addition errors (comprising three double markings, four regularization, and 43 simple addition errors), and 84 misformation errors specifically in alternating forms. Additionally, the results and relevant information were presented in a table format, accompanied by

explanations for correcting each error. The objects of this study were the recipes showcased in the YouTube descriptions of the following channels: Devina Hermawan, Diana Home Kitchen, The Kampung Vegan, Nanyang Kitchen, Dinched, and The Meatmen Channel.

A recipe typically contains nouns with varying quantities depending on its requirements. In English, specific rules distinguish between singular and plural nouns. Through the analysis of recipes obtained from six YouTube channels, which are the focus of this research, it was found that consistently applying these pluralization rules can be difficult for non-native speakers. This is particularly challenging in the context of detailed recipe descriptions where accuracy is crucial. The presence of pluralization errors can affect the clarity and professionalism of the content, potentially impacting viewer comprehension. These errors manifest in various forms, such as omission, addition, and misformation of plural nouns. In this section, the writer presented the types of pluralization errors based on the surface strategy taxonomy, linking these findings to the broader issue of pluralization errors in bilingual recipe descriptions.

#### The Data of Omission Errors

Following Dulay et al. omission errors are characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. Furthermore, involves the lack of a form or grammar that should be present in a sentence. Dulay outlined two kinds of omission of grammatical morphemes, which are short plural “s” and long plural “-es”. In 48 recipes, the writer identified omission errors as the most frequent error, consisting of 231 instances. The most frequent error is the omission of the “-s” plural marker in plural quantifiers such as “pc”. The omission errors involve four types of errors, as outlined below:

Omission of the plural marker “s” or “es” for quantifiers such as “pc”, “clove”, “stalk”, etc. For example:

Error: 2 clove garlic

Correction: 2 cloves (of) garlic

Table 1. Omission of the plural marker “s” or “es” for quantifiers such as “pc”, “clove”, “stalk”.

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	1IND19A	5-6 <u>clove</u> garlic	5-6 <u>cloves</u> (of) garlic	The suffix “s” should be added as a plural marker to the word “clove” because in the recipe, the word “clove” specifies multiple units of an uncountable noun and serves as a quantifier.
2	4MYS20A	6 <u>pc</u> ginger	6 <u>pcs</u> (of) ginger	The suffix “s” should be added as a plural marker to the word “pc” (short for “piece”) because in the recipe, the word “pc” specifies multiple units of an uncountable noun and serves as a quantifier.

Omission of plural marker “s” or “es” for plural countable nouns. For example:

Error: 2 tomato

Correction: 2 tomatoes

Table 2. Omission of plural marker “s” or “es” for plural countable nouns

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	2IND20D	20g or 1½ <u>tablespoon</u> of sugar	20g or 1½ <u>tablespoons</u> of sugar	The suffix “s” should be added as a plural marker to the word “tablespoon” because in the recipe, the word “tablespoon” specifies multiple units of a countable noun and serves as a quantifier.
2	6SGP20B	25 dried <u>mushroom</u> (soaked and sliced)	25 dried <u>mushrooms</u> (soaked and sliced)	The suffix “s” should be added as a plural marker to the word “mushroom” because “25 g” specifies multiple units of a countable noun.

Omission of the determiner “some” or “the” to clarify and specify uncountable nouns. For example:

Error: Add stock.

Correction: Add the stock.

Table 3. Omission of the determiner “some” or “the” to clarify and specify uncountable nouns

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	5SGP20A	When serving, you can add <u>in salt</u> and pepper to season.	When serving, you can add <u>in some salt</u> and pepper to season.	The word “some” before “salt” serves as a determiner, specifying an indefinite quantity of the uncountable noun. The use of determiners or quantifiers (such as “some” or “the”) provides additional details and makes the instructions more specific.
2	6SGP21B	Combine light soy sauce, dark soya sauce, fish sauce <u>and water</u> in a small mixing bowl, set aside.	Combine the light soy sauce, dark soya sauce, fish sauce, <u>and some water</u> in a small mixing bowl, set aside.	The word “some” before “water” serves as a determiner, specifying an indefinite quantity of the uncountable noun. The use of determiners or quantifiers (such as “some” or “the”) provides additional details and makes the instructions more specific.

Omission of quantifiers for uncountable nouns or countable nouns that require quantifiers to specify quantity, such as green onion, lemongrass, bay leaf, etc. For example:

Error: 2 lemongrass

Correction: 2 stalks (of) lemongrass

Table 4. Omission of quantifiers for uncountable nouns or countable nouns

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		

1	3MYS21B	4 <u>kaffir</u> lime leaves	4 <u>pieces</u> (of) kaffir lime leaves	Since “onion” is singular and refers to a single unit, the correct plural form “onions” is used to indicate multiple units as specified in the recipe.
2	3MYS21B	2 <u>lemongrass</u> , pounded	2 <u>stalks</u> (of) lemongrass, pounded	The quantifier “stalks” should be added to clarify the specific quantity of uncountable nouns.

### *The Data of Addition Errors*

Addition errors are the opposite of omission errors, as specified by Dulay et al. There are three types of addition errors: double marking, regularization, and simple addition.

#### Double Marking

Double marking refers to the failure to delete redundant items in linguistics that share the same features. This error occurs frequently when multiple markers for the same grammatical category are used inappropriately, leading to redundancy. An example of a double marking in pluralization is the redundancy caused by double marking the plural marker. For instance, “2kg prawns shells” contains a redundant plural marker and should be corrected to “2kg prawn shells”. This correction removes the unnecessary repetition of the plural form, adhering to appropriate grammatical standards. In 48 recipes, the writer identified 3 errors of adding the plural marker “s” in double marking errors.

Table 5. Addition Error

No	Pluralization Errors Videos	Errors	Corrections	Explanations
1	6SGP21A	2kg <u>Prawns</u> shells	2kg (of) <u>prawn</u> shells	The double markings that occur with “prawns” and “shells” serve the same function of indicating plurality, while it is a noun phrase composed of the noun “shells” and the modifier “prawn”. Therefore, the correction is “2kg prawn shells” to eliminate the redundancy of indicating plurality.
2	6SGP21A	4 <u>slices</u> <u>Ginger slices</u> (lightly smashed)	4 <u>slices</u> (of) <u>ginger</u> (lightly smashed)	The double markings that occur with “slices” and “ginger slices” serve the same function of indicating plurality, while “4 slices” already indicate a plural form. Therefore, the correction is “4 slices (of) ginger” to eliminate the redundancy of indicating plurality.

#### Regularization

Regularization is classified under the category of addition. These errors occur when a grammatical marker that is typically applied to a linguistic item is mistakenly added to exceptional items within the same class that do not require such a marker. In English,

words have regular and irregular forms. Non-native language learners frequently apply the rules used for regular forms to irregular ones, resulting in regularization errors. For instance, the plural of “shrimp” remains unchanged as “shrimp”. In 48 recipes, the writer identified 4 errors of the addition of the plural marker “s” in regularization errors.

Table 6. Errors of Addition

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	5SGP19A	30g dried <u>shrimps</u> , pounded	30g (of) dried <u>shrimp</u> , pounded	The addition of the 's' plural marker should be omitted because according to the regularization rule, “shrimp” is among the irregular nouns where the plural form remains unchanged as “shrimp”.
2	5SGP20B	50g Dried <u>Shrimps</u>	50g (of) Dried <u>Shrimp</u>	The addition of the 's' plural marker should be omitted because according to the regularization rule, “shrimp” is among the irregular nouns where the plural form remains unchanged as “shrimp”.

#### Simple Addition

A simple addition error is distinct from errors that involve double marking or regularization. It is not characterized by specific features but includes all addition errors where inappropriate items are used in an otherwise correct sentence. According to Dulay, simple additions do not have specific features distinguishing them from all addition errors, as they involve using an item that should not appear in a well-formed utterance. For example, in the sentence, “Add one tomatoes” when it should be “Add one tomato”. This instance illustrates a simple addition error, as the plural form “tomatoes” is inappropriately used instead of the singular “tomato”. In 48 recipes, the writer identified 43 simple addition errors. These include 21 instances involving the unnecessary addition of “pc” or “pcs” quantifiers to countable nouns that can already be quantified directly with a number. The remaining 22 errors consisted of adding plural markers “s” or “es” incorrectly to singular nouns.

Table 7. Errors consisted of adding plural markers “s” or “es”

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	1IND19A	2 <u>pc eggs</u>	2 <u>eggs</u>	The addition of the “pc” quantifier should be omitted because the quantity indicates a whole countable noun, not a part of a whole.
2	6SGP21B	10 <u>pcs Prawns</u> (deveined and deshelled)	10 <u>prawns</u> (deveined and deshelled)	The addition of the “pcs” quantifier should be omitted because the quantity indicates a whole countable noun, not a part of a whole.

### *The Data of Misformation Errors*

#### Regularization / Overregularization

Regularization is an item in which a regular marker is used an irregular one, such as runned for ran or geesees for geese. In an analysis of 48 recipes, the writer did not identify any instances of misformation errors resulting from regularization.

#### Archi-forms

Archi-forms errors occur when one member of a group of linguistic forms is chosen to represent the entire category. This tendency frequently arises during second language acquisition, where learners may select a single representative to stand for all forms in a class. Examples involving demonstrative adjectives like “this”, “that”, “these”, and “those” illustrate archi-forms errors, such as using “that tables”, “this students”, “these book”, and “those table”. According to the rule, “that/this” should be followed by the singular form, whereas “these/those” should be followed by the plural form. In an analysis of 48 recipes, the writer did not identify any instances of misformation errors resulting from archi-forms.

#### Alternating forms

Alternating forms errors are marked with an error in the proper selection of words. In terms of pluralization, this includes using the plural form for singular or vice versa, such as “three potato” when it should be “three potatoes”. In 48 recipes, the writer identified 84 alternating form errors. The alternating forms involve six types of errors, as outlined below.

Omitting the “pc” or “pcs” quantifiers and adding plural markers to countable nouns.

For example:

Error: 2 pc curly red chili

Correction: 2 curly red chilies

Table 8. Omitting the “pc” or “pcs” quantifiers and adding plural markers to countable nouns

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Error s		
1	1IND19B	12 <u>pc</u> curly red <u>chili</u>	12 red <u>chilies</u>	The misformation of pluralization occurs because the plural marker should be applied to countable nouns. Additionally, the addition of the “pc” quantifier should be omitted because it indicates a whole countable noun, not a part of a whole.
2	4MYS19A	5 <u>pc</u> shiitake <u>mush</u> <u>room</u>	5 shiitake <u>mushrooms</u>	The misformation of pluralization occurs because the plural marker should be applied to countable nouns. Additionally, the addition of the “pc” quantifier should be omitted because it indicates a whole

countable noun, not a  
part of a whole.

Changing the irregular singular form to the irregular plural form and vice versa. For example:

Error: 2 pieces of bay leaf  
Correction: 2 pieces of bay leaves

Table 9. Changing the irregular singular form to the irregular plural form and vice versa

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	1IND20B	1 pc turmeric <b>leaves</b>	1 pc turmeric <b>leaf</b>	The misformation of pluralization occurs because the plural marker should be omitted, as the quantity indicates a singular form. Use "pc" to emphasize 1 piece of turmeric leaf needed.
2	1IND22B	Sauté the blended spices until fragrant, then add lemongrass, bay leaf, lime <b>leaf</b> .	Sauté the blended spices until fragrant, then add lemongrass, bay leaf, lime <b>leaves</b> .	The irregular plural form "ves" should be added as a plural marker to the word "leaf" because the ingredients list specifies "4 pcs", and the video shows the creator using more than one lime leaf.

Changing the irregular singular form to the irregular plural form, and vice versa, and adding plural marker "s" to the quantifier such as "pc", "clove", "stalk", "pack", etc. For example:

Error: 2 piece of bay leaf  
Correction: 2 pieces of bay leaves

Table 10. Changing the irregular singular form to the irregular plural form, and vice versa

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	1IND19B	3 <b>pc</b> kaffir lime <b>leaf</b>	3 <b>pcs</b> (of) kaffir lime <b>leaves</b>	The suffix "s" should be added as a plural marker to the word "pc" (short for "piece") because in the recipe, the word "pc" specifies multiple units of a countable noun and serves as a quantifier. Since "leaf" is singular and refers to a single unit, the correct plural form "leaves" is used to indicate multiple units as specified in the recipe.
2	1IND21A	6 <b>pc</b> bay <b>leaf</b>	6 <b>pcs</b> (of) bay <b>leaves</b>	The suffix "s" should be added as a plural marker to the word "pc" (short for "piece") because in the recipe, the word "pc" specifies



multiple units of a countable noun and serves as a quantifier. Since "leaf" is singular and refers to a single unit, the correct plural form "leaves" is used to indicate multiple units as specified in the recipe.

Misforming the plural marker for a phrase. For example:

Error: 2 eggs white

Correction: 2 egg whites

Table 11. Misforming the plural marker for a phrase

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	2IND20E	7 <u>eggs white</u>	7 <u>egg whites</u>	The misformation of pluralization occurs because the plural marker should be applied to "white", as "egg white" is considered a phrase.

Using an unsuitable quantifier for uncountable nouns.

Error: 2 pieces of lemongrass

Correction: 2 stalks of lemongrass

Table 12. Using an unsuitable quantifier for uncountable nouns

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	1IND19B	3 <u>pc</u> kaffir lime <u>leaf</u>	3 <u>pcs</u> (of) kaffir lime <u>leaves</u>	The suffix "s" should be added as a plural marker to the word "pc" (short for "piece") because in the recipe, the word "pc" specifies multiple units of a countable noun and serves as a quantifier..
2	1IND21A	6 <u>pc</u> bay <u>leaf</u>	6 <u>pcs</u> (of) bay <u>leaves</u>	The suffix "s" should be added as a plural marker to the word "pc" (short for "piece") because in the recipe, the word "pc" specifies multiple units of a countable noun and serves as a quantifier.

Placing the incorrect plural marker.

Error: 2 chili padis

Correction 2 chilies padi

Table 13. Placing the incorrect plural marker

No	Pluralization Errors		Corrections	Explanations
	Videos	Errors		
1	4MYS21A	3 <u>pc</u> lemongrass	3 <u>stalks</u> (of) lemongrass	The misformation of pluralization occurs because, for lemongrass, the correct quantifier is "stalk" rather than "pc". Additionally, the plural

				form “stalks” should be used to indicate multiple units as specified in the recipe.
2	4MYS21A	1 <b>pc</b> garlic	1 <b>clove</b> (of) garlic	The misformation of pluralization occurs because, for garlic, the correct quantifier is “clove” rather than “pc”.

#### *The Porportion (Frequency and Percentage) of Pluralization Errors*

Based on the analysis, the total number of errors from 48 selected videos is 365. A consistent pattern of errors is observed annually across videos from YouTube channels in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Singapore from 2018 to 2023. This pattern highlights a persistent challenge among content creators in applying proper grammar, particularly concerning the pluralization of countable and uncountable nouns. Non-native English speakers may struggle with applying plural rules consistently, particularly in the context of detailed recipe descriptions where accuracy is crucial.

Furthermore, the bilingual nature of the descriptions provides an interesting dynamic in the types of errors observed. The necessity to switch between languages might contribute to the frequency of errors, as content creators might inadvertently apply rules from one language to another. This can particularly lead to pluralization errors, where rules from one language do not correctly apply to the other, which can affect the clarity and quality of the content.

For instance, on Devina Hermawan's channel, recipes are consistently presented in both Indonesian and English. Through the writer's observations, it becomes clear that terms like “butir”, “buah”, “lembar”, and “siung” are translated as “pc”, resulting in numerous pluralization errors. First, there are omission errors in the phrase “5 pc shallots” (Table 4.2, no. 6), where the plural marker “s” is not added when the quantity is plural. As indicated by the original Indonesian recipe stating “5 siung bawang merah”, it is clear that the translation is done roughly without considering proper pluralization, which should be corrected to “5 pcs (of) shallots”. Regarding shallots, it is more appropriate to use a “pc” or “clove” quantifier to denote individual pieces rather than a single bulb. Another instance of the bilingual issue is seen in “2 pc eggs” (Table 4.5, no. 1) which should be corrected to “2 eggs”. This error stems from translating “butir” as “pc”, leading to simple addition errors where the quantity denotes a whole countable noun rather than a part of a whole. Moreover, such errors can also involve alternating forms, combining the omission of plural markers with the addition of “pc” where it should be omitted. For instance, “12 pc curly red chili” (Table 4.6, no. 1) from “12 buah cabe merah keriting” is a misformation of pluralization rules, where the quantifier should be omitted for whole countable nouns and the plural marker “es” applied to plural countable nouns.

In conclusion, the struggle to apply pluralization rules consistently and the bilingual environment presents ongoing challenges in maintaining grammatical accuracy. Based on the analysis, the study identified 231 omission errors, 3 double marking errors, 3 regularization errors (addition), 43 simple addition errors, and 84 alternating forms errors. The following formula was used to calculate the percentage of each error type, and the results of these calculations are shown in Table 4.7 along with the frequency to summarize the data.

$$\text{Error Percentage} = \frac{\text{number of each type of error}}{\text{total errors}} \times 100\%$$

Table 13 Frequency and Percentage of Errors

No	Type of Error	Frequency	Percentage
1	Omission	231	63%
2	(AD) Double Marking	3	1%
3	(AD) Regularization	4	1%
4	(AD) Simple Addition	43	12%
5	(MF) Regularization	0	0%
6	(MF) Archi-forms	0	0%
7	(MF) Alternating Forms	84	23%
<b>Total</b>		<b>365</b>	<b>100%</b>

The results of this analysis show that omission errors constitute the highest percentage at 63%, followed by misformation (alternating forms) at 23%, addition (simple addition) at 12%, and both addition (regularization) and addition (double marking) each accounting for 1%. On the other hand, no errors of regularization and archi-forms were found under the misformation category. This detailed breakdown provides a clear overview of the distribution of pluralization errors across different categories, highlighting areas where improvement in grammar consistency is needed.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of pluralization errors from six YouTube cooking channels between 2018 and 2023, significant insights into pluralization errors were revealed. A total of 365 pluralization errors were categorized into omission, addition, and misformation errors. Among these, the most dominant type is omission errors, specifically the omission of necessary plural markers in nouns.

These errors highlight specific areas where non-native English learners encounter difficulties in applying correct grammatical rules. The presence of these errors indicates a gap in language education, particularly in the grammar of pluralization, which affects the accuracy, credibility, and professionalism of online content. These errors can lead to confusion and inaccuracies in recipes, potentially resulting in misunderstandings about ingredient quantities and instructions. Accurate grammar is essential to ensure clarity and precision in recipes, preventing any doubts or mistakes that could arise from pluralization errors.

Furthermore, when these errors consistently appear to a large audience, they might become normalized and perceived as correct forms of pluralization. As viewers become accustomed to these mistakes, they may start perpetuating the cycle of incorrect language use. This highlights the critical role of content creators in maintaining high grammatical standards to prevent the spread of incorrect language habits. By addressing these errors, content quality can be significantly improved, thereby fostering better communication and comprehension on global platforms like YouTube.

## SUGGESTIONS

Based on the analysis presented in this study, the following suggestions are offered for content creators, readers, and future researchers. First, content creators should maintain high grammatical standards to enhance the clarity, accuracy, and professionalism of their content and to avoid potential misunderstandings among their audience. These standards can be achieved through the utilization of language tools, peer review, and feedback.

Furthermore, it is important to ensure that ingredient quantities in videos align correctly with the written recipe, whether in singular or plural form.

Secondly, for the readers of this study, understanding grammar is crucial in language learning. Even seemingly simple matters like pluralization can pose significant challenges if applied incorrectly. The readers should more pay attention to every particular material in learning English. Therefore, it is essential to dedicate time to studying and practicing grammatical rules, especially those related to the pluralization of countable and uncountable nouns and using the correct form of singular and plural forms in sentences.

Lastly, for future researchers, there is an encouragement to explore themes similar to those addressed in this study, extending beyond recipes to investigate the effectiveness of educational strategies in addressing these challenges among non-native learners. This approach can contribute to enhancing language education programs significantly. Additionally, future research can delve into analyzing the correct rules and grammatical standards for pluralization. The writer's experience reveals a lack of comprehensive literature, theories, or journals that detail the broader applications and contexts of pluralization usage

## REFERENCES

- Alkazwini, A. A. (2016). Noun Countability; Count Nouns and Non-count Nouns, What are the Syntactic Differences Between them? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 97-100.
- Corbett, G. G. (2000). *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Fifth Edition*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. In *Theory Into Practice* (pp. 124-130).
- DeVito, J. A. (2016). *Human Communication: The Basic Course*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Faiqah, F., Nadjib, M., & Amir, A. S. (2016). Youtube Sebagai Sarana Komunikasi Bagi Komunitas Makassarvidgram. *Journal Komunikasi KAREBA*, 259.
- First, E. (2014). *EF English Proficiency Index (EF EPI)*.
- Fitri, M. A. (2018). An Error Analysis of Students' Translation from Indonesian to English in Transforming Plural Nouns at Tenth Grade of Second Semester of SMK SMTI Bandar Lampung in 2017/2018 Academic Year. *Repository UIN Raden Intan Lampung*.
- Hardani, Auliya, N. H., Andriani, H., Fardani, R. A., Ustiawaty, J., Utami, E. F., . . . Istiqomah, R. R. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: CV. Pustaka Ilmu Group Yogyakarta.
- Hewings, M., & Haines, S. (2015). *Grammar and Vocabulary for Advanced*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karo, T. B., Lumbanraja, V., & Sembiring, N. (2021). The Ability of The Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Deli Murni Bandar Baru on Using Countable and Uncountable Nouns in The Academic Year of 2020/2021. *Kairos ELT Journal*, 35.
- Kasmini, M., & Kadarmo, S. (2017). *Modul English Grammar*. Jakarta: Penerbit Cmedia.
- LeCompte, M., & Schensul, J. J. (1999). *Analyzing and Interpreting Ethnographic Data*. Walnut Creek, California: AltaMira Press.
- Ma'mun, N. (2016). The Grammatical Errors on the Paragraph Writings. *Jurnal Vision*, Volume 5 Number 1.

- Mas, S. R., & Haris, I. (2022). *Komunikasi dalam Organisasi (Teori dan Aplikasi)*. Gorontalo: UNG Press Gorontalo.
- Murphy, R. (2019). *English Grammar in Use - 5th Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panuju, R. (2018). *Pengantar Studi (Ilmu) Komunikasi sebagai Kegiatan dan Ilmu*. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- Prianto, A. (2022). *An Error Analysis of Student Procedure Text Writing of Cooking In Singular And Plural Nouns at Smppgri 6 Bandar Lampung*. Repository UIN Raden Intan Lampung.
- Schreier, M. (2011). *Qualitative Content Analysis in Practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Singh, D. C. (2021). *Business Communication*. India: Vandana Publications.
- Thomson, A., & Martinet, A. (1986). *A Practical English Grammar - 4th Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press