

DISTINGUISH ERRORS IN STUDENTS FINAL ORAL TEST OF PHONOLOGY CLASS

Wuri Syaputri

English Department of STKIP Muhammadiyah Pringsewu

Email: wurisyaputri@gmail.com

Abstract

The objectives of the study were finding the types of errors were made by the students in the final oral test and the causes of the errors. The method was using descriptive approach which concern in descriptive qualitative technique. The data collection method was using observation and interview. The steps of the data analysis were recording the student's spoken, transcribing, eliminating, identifying, composite report. The result showed that the students gaps of the score because of three errors. They were pre systematic, systematic and post systematic errors. Those errors were affected by three causes. They were interference, intralingual and developmental.

Keywords: *Errors, Oral Test, Phonology*

1. INTRODUCTION

Consistency in language learning is not easy to apply in language learning. Learners should increase their language knowledge while learning in order to master some aspect in language learning. When a learner could grab the language aspect, they could complete their knowledge. When the learner gets gaps between language achievement and language practice, it might be called by error or mistake in learning.

Native speakers are normally capable of recognizing and correcting such mistakes, which are not the result of a deficiency in competence but the result of some sort of breakdown in the process of

production. Corder in Larsen (1992) claims that a mistake is a random performance slip caused by fatigue, excitement, etc. and therefore can be readily self-corrected.

An error was a noticeable deviation, reflecting the competence of the student. It was a systematic deviation made by the student who has not yet mastered the rules of the target language. The students could not self correct an error because it was a product reflective of his or her current stage of L2 development, or underlying competence (Larsen, 1992). Error analysis was the study of kind and quantity of error that occurs, particularly in the fields of applied linguistics. These

errors could be divided into three sub-categories: overgeneralization, incomplete rule application, and the hypothesizing of false concepts, reflected a student's competence at a certain stage and thereby differed from student to student. Selinker (1992) in (Ho, 2003) states that errors were indispensable to students since the making of errors could be regarded as 'a device the student uses in order to learn.' Thus, error was a proof that the student was learning. The error was the route that the student must pass to achieve the target language.

Many factors influence the target language pronunciation of the students when they try to make the correct pronunciation in their conversation. Locality, social surrounding, early influence and some individual problems affected student's pronunciation. Pronunciation plays an important role. It is one of the elements that link the four skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing. In order to communicate well in foreign language, students should know how to pronounce correctly. Pronunciation has close relative with how a person speak. Speaking is an oral matter and need full understanding phoneme to produce the right

pronunciation which has meaning and sense of context in the text.

According to Selinker (1972) the only observable data from meaningful performance situations we can establish as relevant to interlingual identifications are: (1) utterances in the student's native language produced by the student; (2) Interlanguage utterances produced by the student; and (3) Target language utterances produces by native speakers of that target language. These three sets of utterances are the base of second language student research that observable. Based on these utterances were identical with spoken form of the students' language learning.

The researcher illustrated four previous studies. They come from various countries and institutions. They are Barzegar (2013), Sawalmeh (2013), Khansir (2012) and Eslami et.al. (2014) that conducted about Error analysis in the students' language learning. Majority of them found that the errors come from the students language learning process.

An error was a noticeable deviation, reflecting the competence of the learner. It was a systematic deviation made by the learner who has not yet mastered the rules of the target language. The learner

could not self-correct an error because it was a product reflective of his or her current stage of L2 development, or underlying competence (Larsen, 1992). Error analysis was the study of kind and quantity of error that occurs, particularly in the fields of applied linguistics. These errors could be divided into three sub-categories: overgeneralization, incomplete rule application, and the hypothesizing of false concepts, reflected a learner's competence at a certain stage and thereby differed from learner to learner. Selinker (1992) in (Ho, 2003) stated that errors were indispensable to learners since the making of errors could be regarded as 'a device the learner used in order to learn.' Thus, error was a proof that the student was learning. The error was the route that the student must pass to achieve the target language.

Based on the explanation above the researcher concludes that error was the process of student's language achievement and incomplete process. When the students passed the errors, it means that the students' progress in target language improved. So, the error usually happened to the students in learning English.

According to Corder (1974) as cited in Ellis (1994), there were three types of errors. They were presystematic, systematic, and postsystematic. These errors types explained as follow:

Presystematic errors

This error occurred when the learner was unaware of the existence of a particular rule in the target language. These happened in random situation. The learner could not give any account of why a particular form was chosen.

Systematic errors

Occurred when the learner had discovered a rule but it was the wrong one. The learner was unable to correct the errors but could explain the mistaken rule used and type.

Postsystematic errors

Occured when the learner known the correct target language rule but used it inconsistently (makes a mistake) the learner could explain the target-language rule that was normally used.

There were several causes of errors comes from some expert. This research choose one of them and choosing a statement from Richard. According to Richards (1971b) as cited in Ellis (1994) distinguishes three causes of errors. They were:

Interference errors

Occurred as a result of the use of elements from one language while speaking another.

Intralingual errors

It was reflect the general characteristics of rule learning such as faulty generalization.

Developmental errors

Occurred when the learner attempts to build up hypotheses about the target language on the basis of limited experience.

All in all, there were three causes of errors according to Richards (1971b) as cited in Ellis (Ellis, 1994). They were interference, intralingual and developmental. Those causes happened when the speaker unaware import another language to target language. Because of the speaker unawareness, it could be give some misunderstand information to the hearer. In the other hand, the error could happened because of the speaker generalization when learning English. Usually, it is happened in the word pronunciation. The generalization in pronouncing some phoneme in a lexeme is making the developmental hypothesis about wrong hypothesis because of unawareness. In short, these causes are

like a circle and rotate their position as long as the error still occurs.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This study observed about an analysis of students error in oral test, phonology class. The purpose of this study was to find out pronunciation error made by the fifth semester's students. Based on the definitions above, qualitative research assumed that all knowledge was relative and tends to be an effort to generate descriptions and situational interpretations of phenomena that the researcher could offer colleagues, students, and others for modifying their own understandings of phenomena.

In this study there will use five steps of the data analysis that adopted from Louis, Lawrence, & Keith, (2007). They are recording the students spoken, transcribing the students spoken, eliminating redundancy of the students spoken, identifying the students transcription, and composite summary of the research.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher already took the sample of the data then analyzed the data according to the steps of the data

analysis. The result of the data analysis explained the result based on the problem formulations. They were (1) What errors were made by the students in the final oral test? (2) What are the causes of the errors?. The data was taken from the fifth semesters of phonology class. The samples were eight students. They were taken as the sample because of the research needed. This research needed the students that got imbalance score between the students written score and oral score. The result was manipulating the data and theories together with believed comparative. The comparative of the data was using Oxford dictionary. In Oxford dictionary was using some phonological symbol based on International Phonological Alphabet (IPA).

In this study, the error identification taken from Corder (1974) theory as cited in Ellis (1994). Corder stated that there were three types of error. These were pre-systematic, systematic, and post-systematic. This theory would be combined with existing data and manipulate as the result below.

Pre-systematic Error

Corder (1974) as cited in Ellis (1994) stated that this error type happened when

the learner was un-control them self while speaking. The students believed that their speaking is good and correct. So, when the students try to speak, they were not feeling that they were wrong. The listener only could listen without any correction. In this error type found eight words with repetition. They were 'Valley, the, green, opened, beautiful, concept, waterboom, recreation,'. From these data it could conclude that, the students unaware that they were wrong although somebody points them out. Because the student did not know why it was wrong and how gave the correction.

Systematic Error

This error occurs when the students achieve the rule of the knowledge but it was the wrong one. The students could unable to correct the errors but they could explain the mistake rule used. According to the fact, the students always do the repetition searched the correction. In these types, the correction could come from themselves or the lecturer. When the students felt failure to search their selves' correction, they asked to the lecturer ho to speak well because the students were aware that they were wrong. For example the student spoke the word 'help'. The proper phonological

utterance should be / help/. Reality the student got the correction from the lecturer not only once. The student did this error in many times. The first time the student mentioned by / helep/ in many times. Then it continued by the lecturer mention by proper phonological utterance of wording 'help'. The spontaneous, the student follow the lecturer utterance.

Based on the fact, the student felt difficult when the lecturer made the instruction to follow the proper phonological utterance. It was many times instruction to made the student aware that her/his phonological utterances were not in proper rule. The first time correction, the student made many time wording repetition 'help, help, help'. It was indicated that the student memorized the word in order gave ne word foundation of wording 'help'. At the second time while the student made the error with the same wording, he/she keep silent for few second and try to remember the wording. The third and so forth, the student made the correction by themselves. This could be the next error type was post systematic error.

Post-Systematic Error

This error occurs when the students know the correct target language but they used the rules inconsistently. Sometimes correct, and sometimes wrong. Based on the discussion before, the third times after the student got the correction from the lecturer, the student became aware by themselves that she/he was wrong in utterance the word. Automatically, the student made themselves correction when they did error pronunciation in the same wording of the word.

Furthermore this error happened in the student wording of the word 'recreation'. The student utterance of this word was stop for the first syllable 'rec'. after that, the student took a look to the lecturer and smile. This moment indicate that the student was not believe (loss of confidence) to continue his /her utterance. Implicitly, the student asked how to make the phonological utterance of a word. Then, after smiling, the student continued by his/ her wrong wording of a word that she/he believe that it was wrong by pronounced / rɪkri eɪs n/. from this wrong wording, the lecturer know the student mean and gave the correction by / rekri eɪʃən/ and followed by the student.

From the case above, it could be concluded that the post systematic error could have happened when the student knew how to utterance the word in the proper way but he/she did not know how to tell to anyone that it was wrong. The student gave such code like smiling and stopping for a while. The student knew the proper phonological utterances, aware that it was wrong but the student did not know what the causes were.

The researcher would analyze the causes of error made by the student in phonological utterance based on Richards (1971b) as cited in Ellis (1994) there were three causes of errors. They were interference, intralingual and developmental errors. Interference error was the result of students interlanguage that influenced by another language. For example, the students mother tongue. The students pronunciation was also affected by their mother tongue because the dialect, accent and the similarities in pronouncing a word. Based on the data, it was the student wording of the word 'boom'. The student made the phonological utterance become heavy of /b/. The students reflect the tongue severe. This case always happened to the Javanese students. The other

phonological utterance of students difficulties were /ð/ and /d/. the student difficult to decrease their Javanese in mention /ð/ and /d/ too. Because, in Javanese phonological of /ð/ and /d/ was noted by severe.

Intralingual error was the result of the student generalization. The students believe that all of the English phonemes have the same pronunciation in every word. According to the data, it was happen in the word 'adjustment'. The first phoneme of this foreword actually had the proper phonological utterance by / / . But in this case, the student mentions it by /e/. it was because of the word before of 'adjustment' there were the word with the same pattern of phoneme 'a' such as in the word 'communicate', 'language' and 'understand'. The pattern of the phoneme in that word was the same form. The phoneme 'a' had proper phonological utterance by /e/. so, when the student met the word which had the same phoneme at the first syllable, the student mention it by /e/ too such like in the word 'adjustment' whereas it was wrong generalization.

Developmental error was the student's result of lack of interlanguage knowledge. The students made the

correction but they still had wrong phonological utterances. It was happened in the word 'pregnant'. It word had the proper phonological utterance by /preg.n nt/. in the case, the student mention it by the first syllable only /pre/. But at that moment spontaneously the student stop the moment for a while and re thinking the word and made the correction by /prɪg.n nt/. the student was trying to look for the best correction of this word. But, the result, the student consistently did the error phonological utterance of this word.

In short, there were three causes of errors. They were interference, intralingual and developmental errors. In the classroom interaction, the teacher and students were communicated each other. The teacher transferred his knowledge to the students. The students could do anything to develop their knowledge in the classroom. The teacher transferred his knowledge to the students in order to help the students in developing the students' knowledge.

4. CONCLUSION

There were three types of errors. They were pre-systematic errors, systematic errors and post-systematic errors. In pre-

systematic error the students un-aware that they were wrong although somebody points them out. Because the student did not know why it was wrong and how gave the correction. Systematic error happened when the students felt failure to search their selves' correction; they asked to the lecturer ho to speak well because the students were aware that they were wrong. Post systematic error could happened when the student know how to utterance the word in the proper way but he/she did not know how to tell to anyone that it was wrong. The student gave such code like smiling and stopping for a while. The student knew the proper phonological utterances, aware that it was wrong but the student did not know what the causes were.

5. REFERENCES

- Barzegar, M. (2013). Persian EFL students' error analysis. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(4), 322–334.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=3KglbyrZ5sC&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Ellis,+Rod.+19>

- 94.+The+Study+of+Second+Lang
uage+Acquisition.&ots=wDWhp
9HtV&sig=sykh8QX4ag5TM_kL
L4h8MLKXn0g
- Eslami, M., Estaji, A., & Elyasi, M. (2014). The Spelling Error Analysis of the Written Persian Essays of Russian Adult Learners of Persian. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (AJHSS)*, 2(1). Retrieved from <http://m.ajhss.org/pdfs/Vol2Issue1/The%20Spelling%20Error%20Analysis...pdf>
- Ho, C. M. L. (2003). Empowering English teachers to grapple with errors in grammar. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(3). Retrieved from http://202.200.82.45/englishonline/jxyj/iteslj/Ho_Grammar_Errors.html
- Khansir, A. A. (2012). Error analysis and second language acquisition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5), 1027–1032.
- Larsen, D. (1992). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- Louis, C., Lawrence, M., & Keith, M. (2007). Research methods in education. *New York: Routledge*.
- Sawalmeh, M. H. M. (2013). Error Analysis of Written English Essays: The case of Students of the Preparatory Year Program in Saudi Arabia. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 14, 1–17.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10(1-4), 209–232.

