AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF NOUN PHRASE STRUCTURE BY THE FIFTH SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION

Dino Arlia Kusuma*, Sujoko, Hefi Sulistyowati
English Education Study Program
Sebelas Maret University Surakarta

Email: dinoarlia_kusuma@ymail.com

Abstract: This research was carried in the fifth semester students of English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Sebelas Maret University in academic year 2012/2013 which aimed at: 1) finding out the types of errors which are performed by fifth semester students of English Education Department in constructing noun phrase; and 2) finding out the sources of errors which fifth semester students of English Education perform in making noun phrases. The method used in this research is error analysis which is based on four major steps: 1) Identifying data of errors; 2) classifying errors based on its type; 3) analyzing data of errors based on its sources; and 4) describing frequency errors in percentage. The data were taken by conducting a writing-essay test involving students' ability in constructing noun phrases. The writer found that omission errors was the most-often type of error performed by students.

Keywords: error analysis, noun phrase, surface strategy

The final goal of learning English is to have good communication in passive or active skills of English language. According to Widdowson (1978:1), learning language is purposed to utilize four language skills of learners by conducting several activities in classrooms that involve teacher and learners as the participants.

However, acquiring a foreign language does not mean transferring new abilities of languages as Widdowson (1978: 74) states that learners do not accept new skills of language in language learning, but they will only learn of how to confess their ideas with other expressions which are different with their native ones.

From those statements above, it can be concluded that learning language is activities which involve students' language skills to be utilized by transferring the knowledge of its system, pronunciation and vocabulary. The transferred materials which include grammar, pronunciation, vocabularies, semantic use, and sociolinguistic aspects of foreign language must have differences and also similarities with learner's native language. When they come in similar, students will easily understand English language. On the other hand, the differences between English and learners' native language invite difficulties in learning language. Then, the differences might cause errors.

Lennon (1991:11) states that an error is a linguistic form or combination of forms which in the same context and under similar conditions of production would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speakers' counterpart. It means that error is the condition in which learners failed to produce right form as the native speakers do. This is as the result of the differences

between source and target language system. For example, the differences between Indonesian and English appear in the construction of noun phrases. Frank (1972:120) says that noun phrase is the structure of the head and its modifiers. In English there are many rules to obey in constructing noun phrases, like the rule of post and pre modifiers or the sequence of modifiers.

In English the head of noun phrase comes after the modifier. *E.g "A good book or a beautiful woman".* From the example, it can be seen that the nouns "*book* and *woman*" work as the head of noun phrase following the adjectives "*a good* and *a beautiful*". This is because the rule of constructing noun phrase says that the head of noun phrase must come after its modifier in that situation.

Those examples above cannot be translated into Indonesian to the sentences "*Sebuah bagus buku*" and "*seorang cantik wanita*". This is because Indonesian obeys the rule that is in the opposite of English. The head of noun phrase precedes its modifier. Therefore, the correct Indonesian form must be "*Sebuah buku bagus* or *seorang wanita cantik*".

Because of the difference, students might perform errors in constructing English noun phrases. Analyzing errors performed by students can give advantages for language teachers and the students. This is because errors represent students' strategies in acquiring second language. Thus, through error analysis, teachers can see problems happening in his teaching and they can re-manage their teaching to solve the problem as Brown (1972:166) said "The fact that learners do make errors and that these errors can be observed, analyzed and classified to reveal something of the system operating within the learner, led to a surge of learners' errors, called error analysis".

This research was purposed to find out types of error in constructing noun phrase performed by fifth semester students of English Education Department and to find out the sources of errors performed by fifth semester students of English Education Department in making noun phrase and last, the writer intended to find the concrete reasons why they performed errors.

The data of errors were classified based on surface strategy taxonomy including addition error, omission error, misordering error, and misformation error. That was accordance with Brown (1972:150) who stated "Errors as errors of addition, errors of omission, errors of substitutions, and errors of ordering". And for analyzing sources of error, the writer based them on three aspects, namely Interlingual, intralingual and context learning sources of error.

RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the writer used error analysis as the method of study to investigate the possible errors performed by the fifth semester students of English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Sebelas Maret University in academic year 2012/2013. The research was held in 6 months, September 2012 until February 2013.

There are 97 students in the fifth semester as the population of the research. The writer only took 30 students as the sample by conducting random sampling.

In doing error analysis, the writer based on these four following steps: (1) Identifying the data of errors. In this step the writer identified all of noun phrases performed by students. The writer also did

the data coding. For example: The data code E 13.5 means the fifth noun phrase of worksheet number 13 from writing-essay test. (2) Classifying errors based on types of errors. In this step, the writer classified errors based on surface strategy taxonomy. (3) Analyzing errors based on sources of errors. The writer analyzed the source of errors which students performed based on the result of the interview and decided which source influenced the students to make errors. (4) Describing the percentage of the data of errors. The writer also showed the percentage of the data of errors.

The data were not only analyzed by quantitative method as above, but also in qualitative way to distinguish between errors and mistake and also to find the sources of errors by conducting an interview.

In order to work on it, the writer used interactive model of analysis which involved collecting the data, reducing the data, and presenting the data and drawing conclusion (Miles and Huberman, 1992: 95). The writer used these following steps: (1) Collecting the data. In this research, the writer collected two kinds of data, namely the errors data and the interview data. The first data or the errors data were taken by conducting a writing-essay test to students. They were asked to write essays which topic had been determined by the writer. The writing test was aimed at getting noun phrases from their writing works. Thus, the second data or the interview data were taken by conducting interview with those students. Interview was aimed to get information whether students made errors or mistakes and to find the causes of their errors. The question of interview made based on the sources of errors (Context learning, Intralingual and Interlingual sources of errors). It means that each question represented each source of errors. (2) Reducing the data. In this step, the writer chose the data that can be used to find the source of errors that students made. (3) Presenting the data. In this research, the writer presented the data in form of description, percentage and also table. The writer also did the data coding. For example: I/B/13.5 means that the data from worksheet number 13 on its fifth noun phrase which belonged to interlingual source category (B) and were taken from interview (I). (4) Drawing conclusion. In this research, after having the data analyzed and presented, the writer made the conclusion about his research finding.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Based on the research finding, the writer found some data which proved that errors in constructing noun phrases are still performed by fifth year students of English Education Department. From 30 worksheets which were the sample of this research, 1034 noun phrases were listed. Thus, from 1034 noun phrases, the writer found 110 incorrectly-ordered noun phrases and 84 of them were categorized as errors. It means that students still face difficulties in constructing noun phrases.

Based on surface strategy taxonomy, errors which students performed in constructing noun phrases can be classified as follows: For addition, there were 2 (2,38 %) errors in double marking, 4 (4,76%) errors in regularization, and 9 (10.72 %) errors in simple addition. For omission, the writer found 33 (39.28 %) errors. For misformation, there were 16(19.04%) error in regularization, 4 (4.7%) errors in archi-form, and 7(8.33%) errors in alternating

form. For misordering, the writer found 9 (10.71%) errors.

The differences between native and target language do open chances for errors to be existed. This is in accordance with Lado's statement (1957:23). He states "In the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease all difficulties in foreign language learning". In his statement, there is the word "comparison". It means that students have to compare their native language and the target language system. If they can do the comparison, it means that students already understand about the differences between both two languages. As the result, they can apply new system of language they get in correct order to avoid an error.

On the other hand, if students fail to compare those two languages systems due to their lack of knowledge about one of those language systems, generally in the target one, errors will appear in their language use. This phenomenon will always appear in learning second language.

Errors which students performed were also caused by several factors which happened in their learning process as the sources of their errors. The different systems of both target and source language were the main factor of the existence of errors in their construction of noun phrase. Students mainly generated the system of English language with their native language, Indonesian language. They used Indonesian system of language and point of view to construct English noun phrases. It was proved by the percentage of interlingual source of errors which reached 40 errors or 47.61% out of 84 errors. In deciding which errors were included in this source of error, the writer analyzed them through the result of the interview. Students who performed

errors because of this source generally brought their native language behavior. E,g : "*a media*" (E 18.16) The student who made this noun phrase stated that he do did not know the "media" is plural. He was influenced by Indonesian language system which says that media is singular; it was proved by his statement in interview "*di Indonesia media tunggal mas, saya kira jamaknya di inggris medias*" (I/B/18.6).

The rest or 44 errors (52.39%) were caused by intralingual source. A lot of errors occurred in this source because students' lack of knowledge about English system in noun phrase. Based on Richards (1984:6), it is stated that Intralingual interference refers to items produced by the learner which do not reflect the structure of mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language. Richards (1984:8) also states that students' modality of source language may cause overlapping in students' process of language acquisition. In this research, the writer also found the fact that students made errors from this source. E.g: *we can see many television channel have shows*….(E 11.12). This incorrectly-ordered noun phrase was included into intralingual source of errors because there was no student's knowledge about the requirement of present participle if the relative pronoun was omitted. "*kan itu artinya stasiun televisi yang mempunyai acara…*" (I/C/11.12).

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that errors occur due to several factors coming from students' native language and the target language system. If errors are caused by the interference of native, they are included into interlingual errors. Modality of students' source language system may cause the process in acquiring second language overlapped. It means that students are influenced by their

source language system in producing target language sentence.

And if errors existed due to the students' generalization of target language system, they are included into interlingual interference. Thus, what the writer found from his research about the source of errors was actually defined by Richards in his theory.

In conclusion, errors cannot be separated from language learning due to their significances. Based on Richards (1984:25), it is stated that every learner's error provides evidence of the system of the language that he is using. It means that by seeing errors and analyzing them, the development of language learning can be watched as well. This is because the teacher or the lecturer can see to what extent their students receive his explanation.

Corder also states not to see an error as the failure of language learning (1967:156). This is because an error has significance in language learning. For teachers, errors show students' progress in language learning; for students, they can learn from their errors; and for researcher errors show how language is acquired and what strategy that students use in second language acquisition.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The result of this study showed that there were a number of errors made by the fifth semester students of English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Sebelas Maret University in the academic year 2012/2013. The writer found 110 incorrectly-constructed noun phrases out of 1034 noun phrases and of these, 84 errors were found.

There were some types of errors made by students in their essays in terms of surface strategy. For addition, there were 2 (2,38 %) errors in double marking, 4 (4,76%) errors in regularization, and 9 (10.72 %) errors in simple addition. For omission, the writer found 33 (39.28 %) errors. For misformation, there were 16(19.04%) error in regularization, 4 (4.7%) errors in archi-form, and 7(8.33%) errors in alternating form. For misordering, the writer found 9 (10.71%) errors.

Based on the description above, it showed that the highest frequency of errors was omission errors (33 errors or 39.23 % of the total number of data), while the lowest was double marking errors (2 errors or 2.3% of the total number of data).

The writer also found that 40 errors or 47.61% were caused by Interlingual source or the interference of students' native speaker. Meanwhile, 44 errors (52.39%) were caused by intralingual source or students' lack of comprehension.

From the explanation above, it can be seen that the students still made some errors in constructing noun phrase. In relation to the research finding, the writer recommends some points as follows: 1) To grammar lecturers and English teachers. The most-often errors type performed by the students was omission error. It means that grammar lecturers or English teachers must pay more attention to students' understanding about every element in English noun phrase for its position, function and significance in a noun phrase. They need to check their students' understanding by giving them more chances to practice to construct noun phrases and use them into complete sentences in form of writing or oral language. They have to let their students construct noun phrases as much as and as often as possible. By doing so, the progress of students' learning noun phrases can be watched optimally. 2) To

English students. For all students who are now in effort to acquire English language, the research finding shows them the real problem happening in the real situation of second language acquisition. It shows that the students in the research performed many errors in omission type and it was caused mostly by intralingual factor in constructing English noun phrases. Considering this fact, students need to be more active in learning English. They need to understand every single element in noun phrase and its significance so that they will not omit the necessary element in noun phrase. To do this, they must be more diligent to read the material books and pay more attention to the teachers or lecturers' explanation. And the important thing is that they do need to ask their lecturers or teachers as soon as they meet problems in their learning.

They also have to take more practices in constructing noun phrases and try to be out of their comfort zone. It means that they have to try to construct noun phrases in more complex forms and ask for the correction to their teacher or lecture. By acting this way, students will find to what extent their selves understand the structure of noun phrases. 3) To other researchers. In this research, the writer only based on surface strategy taxonomy type of errors. It can be said that the writer only analyzed errors based on the structure or grammar which appears in the surface without the consideration of other factors which may involve errors in constructing noun phrases. The data in this research can also be analyzed based on other strategies, namely linguistic strategy taxonomy, comparative taxonomy or communicative effect.

BIBLIOGRAHPY

Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Priciple of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentince Hall Inc.

Corder, S.P.1967.*The significance of Learners' Errors"*. An article in *Error Analysis: Perspective on Second Language Acquisition (161)*. New York: Longman.

Frank, Marcella.1972. *Modern English*. USA: Prentince Hall.

Lennon, G., Deuchar, M,.Hoogenroad, R. 1982. *English Grammar for Today*: *A New Introduction*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Miles, Mathew. B. and Huberman, Michael. 1992. *Analisis Data Kualitatif (Terjemahan Tjejep Rohendi Rosidi)*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia..

Richard, Jack C. 1984. *Error Analysis: Perspective on Second Language Acquisition*. Essex: Longman.

Widdowson,H.G. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication.* New York: Oxford University Press