An Analysis on Students' Erroneous Sentence Found in Descriptive Text

Sijono[1], Thomas Joni Verwanto Aristo[2]

STKIP Persada Khatulistiwa Sintang[1,2], Indonesia
Correspondence: Sijono, STKIP Persada Khatulistiwa Sintang, Indonesia. e-mail: sijonostg4@gmail.com

Abstract

The problems of this research were the students tended to use the Indonesian language structure when translating. This research aimed to identify and describe the students' errors in the form of interlingual and intralingual. The qualitative research design was used to analyze the data. There were 70 samples of students' written tasks which were taken from three state senior high schools and three private senior high schools in Sintang city. The finding showed that there were two major aspects influenced the learners made errors when transferring the first language to the target language. The errors caused by the students' first language are interlingual while the errors caused by the structure of the target language are called intralingual. To identify the interlingual, the researchers used two subcategories. The most error in interlingual was caused by the L1 structure. Meanwhile, the researchers used four subcategories to identify intralingual. The most error in intralingual happened because of the learners' limited knowledge of the target language. Based on these findings, Teachers can solve the problems by providing explicit and implicit corrective feedback, introducing the grammar system of both Indonesian and English when teaching grammar.

Keywords: Interlingual, intralingual, descriptive text

1. Introduction

One of the activities that is difficult for students to learn in English is writing. Writing can make a student creative and can also make students reluctant to learn English. This can be caused by several things, based on the observation results the researchers found students had difficulty writing English sentences due to differences in grammar. Writing in English is a complex process for English as foreign language learners. It is not surprising that errors in writing are found as an unavoidable part of the students' writing task.

There are two main sources of errors, Brown (as cited in Seitova, 2016) states that there are two main sources of errors, namely, interlingual errors and intralingual errors. Interlingual (Interference) errors are those errors that are traceable to first language interference. These are attributable to negative interlingual transfer. The errors might be found in all students' writing tasks. The errors in students' writing tasks could be happened due to the interference of Bahasa Indonesia's structure. Most students tended to use the Indonesian language structure

when translating. Besides, there are some aspects in English that *Bahasa* does not have such as the use of "be" (am, is, are) in a non-verbal sentence or a verbal sentence. For example *I very happy..., I am go to school...*, in this case, most students do not know how to use "BE" properly. The other errors made by the students were the students wrote a false word order in their sentences and also misuse the tenses for the existing sentences. In other words, students' made an error due to the aspects of the target language.

Based on the phenomenon in the field, the researchers would like to find the source of errors in the students' writing descriptive text, so the researchers wanted to take research upon the students' writing task focused on the interlingual errors and intralingual errors in descriptive text written by SMA students in Sintang. This research aims to identify and describe the students' errors in the form of interlingual errors and intralingual errors. This research also intended to attract the teacher's attention to the situation of students because it is very important to determine the corrective steps and the right solution upon the students' errors in writing.

To analyze the errors, someone needs to know the difference between errors and mistakes. It is important to do to avoid misperception of both. According to Corder in (Ellis, 1994) "an error takes place when the deviation arises as a result of lack of knowledge. It represents a lack of competence". He stated that "a mistake occurs when learners fail to perform their competence. It means that errors are something that we cannot correct; it is something that we need to analyze and understand before we take an action to correct it. Meanwhile, mistakes can be corrected because the students have already learned the knowledge. According to Corderin (Ellis 1994) mistakes as defined above should not be included in an error analysis. One should instead focus on the errors that students make.

Richard (1974) suggested conducting error analysis (EA) to identify the students' writing errors. Error analysis can help the teachers to identify the sources and kinds of the errors. According to Touchie (1986) in writing the target language or in writing cativities, interlingual and intralingual have been considered as two major sources of learners' errors. James (1998) stated "Error Analysis (EA) is a systematic investigation that examines linguistic ignorance". Besides, error analysis explores linguistic points that are not known by students and to know how students try to overcome their ignorance (James 1998). Bootchuy (2008) argues that a systematic investigation includes the steps of observing, analyzing, and classifying deviations of second language rules and then revealing the system operated by students.

The first step in Error Analysis (EA) requires the determination of elements in the sample of learner language which deviate from the target language in some ways. For this purpose, distinction should be made between error and mistake. According to James (as cited in Tiensawangchai, 2014) errors cannot be self-corrected until further relevant (to that error) input (implicit or explicit) has been provided and converted into intake by the learner. In other words, errors require further relevant learning to take place before they can be self-corrected. This means that students should be given certain forms of input, which may include a reading practice, writing practice, or a grammar lesson. Whereas, according to Fauziati (2009: 139)

the mistakes are deviations due to performance factors such as memory limitation, fatigue and emotional strain. They are typically irregular and can be readily corrected by the learners themselves when their attention is drawn to them.

Interference, language transfer, and cross-linguistic interference are also known as interlingual errors. Chelli (2013) defined that interlingual errors are the result of language transfer, which is caused by learner's first language. When the students use their L1 linguistic knowledge to help them translating the target language it could result the errors that call interlingual errors (Richard 1974). According to Corder (1974) interlingual errors are errors attributed to the native language. These kinds of errors occur when the learners' habits (patterns, systems, or rules) interfere or prevent them from acquiring the patterns and rules of the target language. Al-Khresheh (2010) suggested that interlingual error is committed by literal translation.

1. Transfer Error: error caused by interference from mother tongue. A student who has not known the rules of target language will use the same rules as he obtained in his native language.
2. Mother tongue Interference: errors are produced in the learners' attempt to discover the structure of the target language rather than transferring models of their first language.
3. Literal Translation: errors happen because a student translates his first language sentence or idiomatic expression in to the target language word by word.

According to Abusaeedi, dkk (2014) Intralingual errors refer to the difficulty of the target language learning, it occurs when the learners have difficulties in using the target language. Intralingual errors include: overgeneralization, simplification, communication-based and induced error (Keshavarz, 2003). Interference from the student's own language is not the only reason for committing errors. Students may make errors in the target language, since they do not know the target language very well; they have difficulties in using it. Richard (1974) states, intralingual interference refer to items produced by learner, which reflect not the structure of mother tongue, but generalization based on partial exposure of the target language. Brown (1980) said that it has been found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interlingual transfer, but once that learner has begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more transfer generalization within the target language is manifested. Richard (as cited in Khansir, 2012) classifies the intralingual errors into four categories including over generalization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of the rules, and false concept hypothesized or semantic errors.

1. Overgeneralization, covering instances where the learners create a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structure of the target language; the example of forming plural by adding "s" to even irregular plurals, also generalizing the "-ed" past form.
2. Ignorance of rule restriction, occurring as a result of failure to observe the restrictions or existing structures; the learner of the second language does not obey the structure of the target language. In this type of error, the learner fails to observe the restrictions of existing

structures. Some rule restriction errors may be accounted for in terms of analogy and may result from the role learning of rules.

3. Incomplete application of rules, arising when the learners fail to fully develop a certain structure required producing acceptable sentences; this type error occurs when the student fails to learn the more complex types of structure because he finds that he can achieve communication by using relatively simple rules. For example: *how you say it in English?* In this case, the student uses statement form in the question. He omits the auxiliary *do* where it is necessarily placed before the subject.

4. False concepts hypothesized, deriving from faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language. Learners' faulty understanding of distinctions of target language items leads to false concept hypothesized.

2. Method

In analyzing the data, the researchers used qualitative research design. The method was used to investigate the types of errors, the frequency of errors in the form of interlingual errors and intralingual errors in writing descriptive text written by SMA students in Sintang. According to Berg (2001) Qualitative researcher properly seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings. Researchers used qualitative techniques to analyze students' errors. The qualitative data in this research was the students' worksheet of writing a descriptive text.

2.1 Participants

The participants of this research were 70 students of three state senior high schools and three private senior high schools in Sintang city. The samples of this research were 70 samples of students' written tasks.

2.2 Data Collection

2.2.2 Instrument of collecting data

The data was taken from the teacher's documents or taken directly from the students. The data of this research were in the form of the students' erroneous sentences found in the students' written text. The sentences were taken from 70 pieces of students' written tasks in the form of descriptive text.

2.2.2 Techniques for collecting data

The determination of the subject and object of the research used purposive sampling; the number of samples was adjusted to the research needs.

2.3 Data Analysis

The researchers conducted the data analysis through some steps. In the first step, the researchers read some theories related to the study. In this step, the researchers read some books and articles to strengthen the researchers' ideas and knowledge. The next step was field observation; in this step, the researchers analyzed research needs and research locations. After

the observation, the researchers conducted research preparation. In this stage, the researchers did some discussion to design the research purpose, scope, theoretical review, method and time. The next step was data collection; the researchers used purposive sampling to collect the data. Then, the researchers conducted the data analysis; the steps of the data analysis for the interlingual errors were modified from Na-ngam (2005) and Bennui (2008). The coding pattern for the intralingual errors has been modified from Richard (1971, 1974). Meanwhile, Each sub-category was modified from the study conducted by Bootchuy (2008) and Ampornratana (2009). This step was divided into some stages. In the first stage, the researchers coded each item based on errors made by students. The researchers conducted the decoding process to find out the meaning of the code. Then the researchers categorized the students' errors. Next, the researchers calculated the number of errors in each type of error source to find out the most frequent type of error source made by the students. In the last step, the researchers concluded the research form the biggest average number of the calculation. The last step was reporting and publishing the result.

3. Results

The data analysis of this research focused on the types of errors, the frequency of errors in the form of interlingual errors and intralingual errors in writing descriptive text written by SMA students in Sintang city. There were 70 samples of students' writing tasks which were taken from three state senior high schools and three private senior high schools in Sintang city. The data of the research were the students' erroneous sentences in the students' writing products in the form of descriptive text. Based on the data analysis the researchers found there was a total of 183 cases of errors. Although there were more erroneous sentences they were not included in the focus of this research.

The data of interlingual errors made by the students were divided into two subcategories. They were (1) the use of L1 structure consisted of 33 cases and (2) the omission of BE form consisted of 7 cases. The data showed that interlingual error was one of the sources of errors that distracted the students when transferring the first language to the target language. The total erroneous sentences from interlingual errors were 40 cases or 21.1%.

Table 1. The Percentage of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors

Source of errors	Cases	Percentage
Interlingual Error	40	21.9%
Intralingual Error	143	78.1%
Total	183	100%

The second source of errors included in the focus of this research was intralingual errors. The intralingual errors were divided as; (1) Overgeneralization consisted of 11 cases, (2) Ignorance of rule restriction consisted of 17, (3) Incomplete application of rules consisted of 38 cases, and (4) False concepts hypothesized consisted of 77 cases. The total number of

intralingual errors was 143 cases. The data analysis in table 1 showed that the most number of errors were obtained from intralingual errors. This research focusing on identifying and describing the sources of errors, there were two majors' sources of errors found in the students' writing products. The details of each source of the sources of the errors are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The frequency of each Interlingual and Intralingual Errors

Source of Errors	Subcategory				Total
	use of L1 structure		omission of BE form		
Interlingual Erors	33 cases (82.5%)		7 cases (17.5%)		40 cases (100%)
Source of Errors	**Subcategory**				Total
	Over	Ignorance	Incomplete	False	
Intralingual Errors	11 cases (7.7%)	17 cases (11.8%)	38 cases (26.5%)	77 cases (53.8%)	143 cases (100%)

The data in Table 2 shows that the students made more errors identified as intralingual errors. In this research, the researchers defined the errors into four subcategories. Each category was used to identify the errors made by the students. The first subcategory was overgeneralization; this subcategory was used to identify the errors that happened due the learners attempted to use his experience of other structure of the target language to translate the sentences so that resulted from a deviant structure. There were 11 cases or about 7.7% errors belonged to this subcategory. The second subcategory was ignorance of rule restriction, there were 17 cases or about 11.8% of intralingual errors happened due to the learners did not obey the structure of the target language. In other words, the learners failed to use the appropriate structures for the existing sentences. There were 38 cases or 26.5% errors in the third subcategory. It was an incomplete application of rules, this subcategory confirmed that the learners failed to learn or use more complex types of structure. In this case, the errors happened because the learners thought that they could the same rules for each of the existing sentences. The most errors in intralingual errors were identified as false concepts hypothesized. This fourth subcategory was used to identify the errors that happened due to the learners' faulty understanding of distinctions of target language items. There were 77 cases or 53.8% errors happened because of the learner's limited knowledge of the target language. The most errors made by the students identified from this subcategory were wrong word selection and wrong selection of personal pronouns.

4. Discussion

Based on the results of the data analysis, the most errors found in the students' writing tasks were classified as intralingual error. Table 2 presents the data of interlingual errors, even though the number was small compared to intralingual errors. Interlingual errors needed

to be described here because it could lead the learners to transfer error and literal translation. The data analysis showed that the comparison between interlingual and intralingual errors was not significant. The comparison was 21.9% (interlingual errors) and 78,1% (intralingual errors). However, the cases of interlingual errors reflected that the aspects of the L1 structure also influenced the students' knowledge of the target language. Total cases found in interlingual errors were 40 cases. The most errors happened because the learners influenced by the structure of their first language. 82.5% of cases happened due to the learners attempted to use the L1 structure and 17.5% cases due to the omission of 'be' form. In this research, the researchers did not emphasize the linguistic aspects possessed by descriptive text. The researchers chose the descriptive text to homogenize the object under the research. Based on the main purpose of the research, the researchers only identified and described the errors found in students writing products.

5. Conclusions

This research confirmed that the learners of the second language made errors because of some aspects. The finding showed that the aspects that more influenced the learners made errors when transferring the first language to the target language were identified as two major aspects. The two major aspects were the aspect of their first language and the target language. The aspects that caused the errors then identified as interlingual errors and intralingual errors. The errors caused by the students' first language are interlingual. While the errors caused by the structure of the target language are called intralingual errors. To identify the interlingual errors the researchers used two subcategories. They were the use of the L1 structure and the omission of BE form. The most error in interlingual errors was caused by the L1 structure. Meanwhile, the researchers used four subcategories to identify intralingual errors. They are an overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restriction, incomplete application of rules and false concepts hypothesized. As a result, the researchers found errors in each of the subcategories. The most error in intralingual errors happened because of the learner's limited knowledge of the target language.

Based on these findings, the researchers suggest; teachers can solve problems by providing explicit and implicit corrective feedback on student writing products. Introducing the grammar system of both Indonesian and English is very important when teaching grammar. Besides, teachers should provide more translation exercises to make students familiar with the target language.

References

Abusaeedi R, Asghar, Faezeh B.(2014). *A quantitative analysis of Iranian EFL learners' sources of written errors*. International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 4(1): 31-42.

Al- Khresheh, M.H. (2010). *Interlingual Interference in English Language Word Order structure of Jordanian EFL Learners*. Proceedings of the European Journal of Social SciencesVolume 16, Number 1.

Ampornratana C. (2009). *The Error Analysis on English Composition: A Case Study of Year 6 Students in St. Stephen's International School* [Master of Arts Independent Study in English for Specific Purposes]. Bangkok, The GraduateSchool, Kasetsart University;

Berg, Bruce.L.(2001) *Qualitative Research Method for the Social Sciences*: Boston. Pearson Education Company.

Bennui P. (2008). *A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students*. Malaysian Journal of ELT Research.; 4(4): 72-102.

Bootchuy T. (2008). *An analysis of errors in academic English writing by a group of first-year Thai graduates majoring in English* [Master Thesis in English for Specific Purposes]. Bangkok: The Graduate School, Kasetsart University.

Chelli, Saliha. (2013). *Interlingual and Intralingua Errors in the Use of Preposition and Articles.*As retrieved from http://dspace.univ biskra.dz:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/3571/1/Interlingual%20or%20Intralingal 20Errors%20in%20the%20Use%20of%20 Preposition.pdf

Corder SP. (1974). *Error analysis: Perspectiveson second language acquisition*. London: Longman.

Fauziati, Endang. (2009). *Readings on Applied Linguistics*: A Handbook for Language Teacher and Teacher Researcher. Surakarta: Era PustakaUtama.

James C. (1998). *Error in language learning and use*. NewYork: Addison Wesley Longman..

Keshavarz, M. H. (2003). Error Analysis and Contrastive Analysis in Translation and Learner Translation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khansir, A.A. (2012). Error Analysis and Second Language Acquisition.*Theory and Practice in Language Studies. 2(5) 1027-1032*

Na-Ngam S. (2005). *Common grammatical errors in foundation English I writtenassignments of Prince of Songkla University student with high and low English entrance examination scores.* [Master Thesis in Applied Linguistics]. Songkla: The Graduate School, Prince of Songkla University.

Richards JC (1971)."*A non-contrastive approach to error analysis*." English Language Teaching. 25 (3): 85-94.

Richard JC. *Error Analysis: Perspectiveon Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman Group Ltd. 1974.

Seitova, Meruyert. (2016). Error Analysis of written production: The case of 6th grade students of Kazakhstani school. *Procedia-Social behavioral science.232(287-293)*

Solano, Paola Alexandra Cabrera. (2014). *Spanish Interference in EFL Writing skills: A case of Ecuadorian Senior High Schools*. Canadian Center of Science and Education.Vol. 7 No. 7.

Tiensawangchai, Tanom. (2014). Types of Grammar Errors Found In Thai EFL Students' Bussiness Writing. *International Journal of art & sciences. 07(02) 545-555*

Touchie HY. (1986). *Second language learning errors: Their types, causes, and treatment*. JALT Journal. 8(1): 75-80.