CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN

FORUM KOMUNIKASI ILMIAH DAN EKSPRESI KREATIF ILMU PENDIDIKAN

CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN
Forum Komunikasi Ilmiah dan Ekspresi Kreatif Ilmu Pendidikan

Terbit dua kali setahun pada bulan April dan Oktober
Terbit pertama kali April 1999

Penyunting menerima artikel yang belum pernah diterbitkan di media cetak yang lainnya. Syarat-syarat, format dan aturan tata tulis artikel dapat diperiksa pada *Petunjuk bagi Penulis* di sampul belakang dalam jurnal ini. Artikel yang masuk akan ditelaah oleh Tim Penyunting dan Mitra Bestari untuk dinilai kelayakannya. Tim akan melakukan perubahan tata letak dan tata bahasa yang diperlukan tanpa mengubah maksud dan isinya.

Petunjuk Penulisan Cakrawala Pendidikan

1. Artikel belum pernah diterbitkan di media cetak yang lainnya.
2. Artikel diketik dengan memperhatikan aturan tentang penggunaan tanda baca dan ejaan yang baik dan benar sesuai *Pedoman Umum Ejaan Bahasa Indonesia yang Disempurnakan (Depdikbud, 1987)*
3. Pengetikan Artikel dalam format Microsoft Word, ukuran kertas A4, spasi 1.5, jenis huruf *Times New Roman*; ukuran huruf 12. Dengan jumlah halaman; 10 – 20 halaman.
4. Artikel yang dimuat dalam Jurnal ini meliputi tulisan tentang hasil penelitian, gagasan konseptual, kajian dan aplikasi teori, tinjauan kepustakaan, dan tinjauan buku baru.
5. Artikel ditulis dalam bentuk esai, disertai judul sub bab (heading) masing-masing bagian, kecuali bagian pendahuluan yang disajikan tanpa judul sub bab. Peringkat judul sub bab dinyatakan dengan jenis huruf yang berbeda, letaknya rata tepi kiri halaman, dan tidak menggunakan nomor angka, sebagai berikut:

   PERINGKAT 1 (HURUF BESAR SEMUA TEBAL, RATA TEPI KIRI)
   Peringkat 2 (Huruf Besar-kecil Tebal, Rata Tepi Kiri)
   Peringkat 3 (*Huruf Besar-kecil Tebal, Miring, Rata Tepi Kiri*)

6. Artikel konseptual meliputi; (a) judul, (b) nama penulis, (c) abstrak dalam bahasa Indonesia dan Inggris (maksimal 200 kata), (d) kata kunci, (e) identitas penulis (tanpa gelar akademik), (f) pendahuluan yang berisi latar belakang dan tujuan atau ruang lingkup tulisan, (g) isi/pembahasan (terbagi atas sub-sub judul), (h) penutup, dan (i) daftar rujukan. Artikel hasil penelitian disajikan dengan sistematika: (a) judul, (b) nama-nama peneliti, (c) abstrak dalam bahasa Indonesia dan Inggris (maksimal 200 kata), (d) kata kunci, (e) identitas penulis (tanpa gelar akademik), (f) pendahuluan yang berisi pembahasan kepustakaan dan tujuan penelitian, (g) metode, (h) hasil, (i) pembahasan (j) kesimpulan dan saran, dan (k) daftar rujukan.
7. Daftar rujukan disajikan mengikuti tata cara seperti contoh berikut dan diurutkan secara alfabetis dan kronologis.

   Anderson, D.W., Vault, V.D., dan Dickson, C.E. 1993. *Problem and Prospects for the Decades*
   Ahead: Competency Based Teacher Education. Barkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co.
   Huda, N. 1991. *Penulisan Laporan Penelitian untuk Jurnal.* Makalah disajikan dalam Loka
   Karya Penelitian Tingkat Dasar bagi Dosen PTN dan PTS di Malang Angkatan XIV, Pusat Penelitian IKIP MALANG, Malang, 12 Juli.
   Prawoto, 1998. *Pengaruh Pengirformasian Tujuan Pembelajaran dalam Modul terhadap Hasil*
   Belajar Siswa SD PAMONG Kelas Jauh. Tesis tidak diterbitkan. Malang: FPS IKIP MALANG.
   Russel, T. 1993. An Alternative Conception: Representing Representation. Dalam P.J. Nlack & A. Lucas (Eds.) *Children's Informal Ideas in Science* (hlm. 62-84). London:Routledge.
   Sihombing, U. 2003. *Pendataan Pendidikan Berbasis Masyarakat.* http://www.puskur.or.id.Diakses pada 21 April 2006.
   Zainuddin, M.H. 1999. Meningkatkan Mutu Profesi Keguruan Indonesia. *Cakrawala Pendidikan.* 1 (1):45-52.

8. Pengiriman Artikel via email ke hudaferi@gmail.com paling lambat 3 bulan sebelum bulan penerbitan.

CAKRAWALA PENDIDIKAN

Forum Komunikasi Ilmiah dan Ekspresi Kreatif Ilmu Pendidikan

Volume 26, Nomor 2, Oktober 2022

Daftar Isi

LINGUISTIC ERRORS ON THE COMPOSITIONS MADE BY SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF UNIPA KAMPUS BLITAR

Dessy Ayu Ardini
dessyardini@gmail.com
Universitas PGRI Adi Buana Kampus Blitar

Abstrak: Kesalahan siswa dapat terjadi dalam berbicara dan menulis. Namun, penulis berfokus pada kesalahan dalam menulis karena menulis lebih merupakan upaya sadar daripada berbicara. Mengingat fakta-fakta yang dikemukakan di atas, perlu dilakukan penyelidikan terhadap kesalahan linguistik tulisan. Oleh karena itu, penelitian deskriptif kualitatif ini mencoba mengidentifikasi dan mengklasifikasikan kesalahan linguistik yang dilakukan oleh mahasiswa tahun pertama Jurusan Bahasa Inggris UNIPA Kampus Blitar. Untuk mengetahui kesalahan frekuensi yang mereka buat. Dalam penelitian ini penulis mengambil mahasiswa tahun pertama karena mahasiswa dipilih secara purposive hanya mahasiswa yang sudah lulus karangan saja yang diambil sebagai subjek penelitian ini. Instrumen yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah komposisi, yang diberikan kepada mahasiswa tahun pertama Jurusan Bahasa Inggris UNIPA Kampus Blitar. Ada 25 komposisi yang dihasilkan oleh mahasiswa. Secara teknis, data kesalahan berdasarkan strategi permukaan dikumpulkan dari masing-masing komposisi dengan melakukan prosedur sebagai berikut. Pertama, setiap komposisi dibaca secara menyeluruh, akurat, dan kritis untuk mengidentifikasi kesalahan. Setelah itu, kesalahan yang teridentifikasi sebelumnya ditulis ulang dalam daftar korpus data terpisah untuk analisis lebih lanjut. Peneliti melakukan penulisan ulang komposisi dalam bentuk kata, frase dan kalimat agar sesuai dengan penggunaan standar. Berikut hasil analisisnya; terdapat 219 kesalahan yang ditemukan oleh peneliti; terdapat kesalahan penghilangan, kesalahan penjumlahan, kesalahan pembentukan, kesalahan pengodean. Untuk kesalahan omission terdapat 50 (22,83%), 28 (12,79%) adalah kesalahan penambahan, 132 (60,27%) adalah kesalahan salah bentuk dan 9 (4,11%) adalah kesalahan pengurutan. Dan untuk kategori linguistik terdapat 30 kesalahan pengucapan (13,70%), kata sandang tak tentu 5 kesalahan (2,28%), kasus posesif 2 kesalahan (0,91%), kesalahan tenses 79 (36,07%), 16 kesalahan konjungsi (7,31%), 25 kesalahan preposisi (11,42%), 4 kesalahan kata kerja (1,83%), 18 kesalahan kosakata atau diksi (8,22), 17 kesalahan menjadi (7,76%), 6 kesalahan aturan jamak (2,74%)), 17 kesalahan susunan kata (7.76). Jadi total jumlah semua kesalahan yang ditemukan adalah 219 kesalahan. Berdasarkan Surface Strategy, error misformation taksonomi merupakan jenis error yang paling dominan. Ada 132 kesalahan (60,27%). Dan untuk kesalahan tenses linguistik yang paling dominan adalah kesalahan 79 (36,07%). Mendapatkan data dari hasil otentik di atas, dapat diambil beberapa kesimpulan atau interpretasi bahwa pembelajar masih mendapatkan beberapa masalah dalam belajar bahasa Inggris.

Kata kunci: kesalahan linguistik, komposisi

Abstract: Students errors may occur in speaking and writing. But, the writer focuses on the errors on writing because writing is more conscious effort than speaking. Considering the facts stated above, it needs to do investigation on the linguistic error in writing. That's why, this descriptive qualitative reseach tries to identify and classify linguistic error which is made by second years students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar. To know the frequency error they made. In this study the writer takes the second years students because the students were selected purposively only the students who already passed the compositions were taken as subject of this study. The instrument used in this research is composition, which is given to second years students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar. There are 25 compositions produced by the students. Technically, the data of errors based on the surface strategy are collected from each composition by conducting the following procedures. Firstly, each composition is read thoroughly, accurately, and critically to identify the errors. Afterward, the previous identified errors are rewritten in the separate list of data corpus for further analysis. The researcher does rewriting the composition in the form of words, phrases and sentences to make it conform to standard usage. The following is the result of the analysis; there were 219 errors found by researcher; there are omission errors, addition error, misformation error, misodering error. For omission error there were 50 (22.83%), 28 (12.79%) were errors of addition, 132 (60.27%) were errors misformation and 9 (4.11%) were errors of ordering. And For Linguistic category there were 30 errors in pronunciation (13.70%), 5 errors of indefinite article (2.28%), 2 errors of possessive case (0.91%), errors of tenses is 79 (36.07%), 16 errors in conjunction (7.31%), 25 errors of preposition (11.42%), 4 errors of verb (1.83%), 18 errors of vocab or diction (8.22), 17 errors of to be (7.76%), 6 errors of plural rule (2.74%), 17 errors of word order (7.76). So the total numbers of all errors were 219 errors found. Based on Surface Strategy taxonomy misformation error was most dominant type of errors. There were 132 errors (60.27%). And for linguistic error tenses is most dominant error 79 (36.07%). Getting the data from the authentic result above, it can be taken some conclusion or interpretation that, the learners still get some problems in learning English.

Keywords : linguistic errors, composition

INTRODUCTION

Recently English has developed into the top of language communication in the world and it is used for all countries to make their relation more smoothly. Like other countries, now Indonesia start to used and put this to every level of education, from kindergarten to university. And as a second foreign language, it surely faced very complex problem for new English learner in linguistic, such as morphology and syntactical error. Lado (1974) says that the students who come in contact with a foreign language will face some features that are quite easy and also very difficult. If they get difficulties, it seems reasonable that students find difficulties and make errors frequently. Dulay, at al, (1982) said that error is the noticeable deviation form of the native speaker.

In learning English, there are four language skills, which must be mastered by the language learners. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing. According to the writer, writing is the most difficult subject because not only good grammar and vocabulary that must be master well by the learners but they must also be able to express their idea into correct sentences.

Students errors may occur in speaking and writing. But, the writer focuses on the errors on writing because writing is more conscious effort than speaking. Indriati (1984) in her thesis states that students often make syntactically right but lexically wrong sentence. It means that students usually make sentences right in structure but wrong in lexical meaning. This fact shows that the students have difficulties in using words appropriately.

By considering the importance of error in teaching and learning writing, the writer tries to identify, to classify and to analyze the linguistic errors in composition based on surface strategy taxonomy made by second years students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar.

Error Analysis

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 study of learners' errors, called error analysis (Brown, 1980: 166).

In the error analysis, errors are attributable to all possible sources, not just those resulting from negative language. Brown states that:

> " Errors-overt manifestations of learners' systems-arise from several possible general sources: interlingual errors of interference from the native language, intralingual errors within the target language, the sociolinguistic context of communication, psycholinguistic or cognitive strategies, and no doubt countless affective variables" (Brown, 1980:166).

To Error Analysis, error is an evidence of a language learning process. It is considered a natural phenomenon that must occur as learning a first or second language takes place, before grammar rules are completely internalized. Further, Dulay et. al (1982:141) states that error analysis has succeeded in elevating special status of research object, curriculum guide, and indicator of learning stage.

The main purpose of traditional error analysis, as explained by Sridhar (in Baradja, 1990), is to get feedback for textbook writing and teaching technique improvement. By showing the learners errors, Error Analysis helps the teachers in:

a. determining teaching materials hierarchy;

b. determining emphases in explanation and exercises;
c. preparing a program for remedial teaching;
d. choosing the appropriate points to evaluate students language mastery.

In spite of its significance, Error Analysis, however, has at least three major conceptual weaknesses (Dulay et.al, 1982: 141). They are:

a. the confusion of error description of errors with error explanation (the process and product aspects of error analysis);
b. the lack of precision and specificity in the definition of error categories;
c. the in appropriate use of simplistic classifications to explain learner's errors.

Error Type

It is hard to classify errors precisely. Every analyst has own approach. Considering the obstacles in categorizing and classifying errors, in this study, the writer limits his study to linguistic category and surface strategy taxonomy

1. Linguistic Category

Phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics and lexon and discourses are components of language. In this study, the writer will not deal with the whole of this category since he would like to focus on errors, which belong to morphological and syntactic errors only.

2. Surface Strategy Taxonomy

This category highlights the ways surface structures are altered. It concerns the identification of cognitive processes that underlie the learner's reconstruction of the new language. Students' errors are considered to base on some logic, not only because of laziness or slopping thinking. The types of errors, which belong to Surface Strategy Taxonomy, are: error of omission, error of addition, misformation and misordering.

Writing Skill

In the teaching learning process, language skill is divided into listening, speaking, reading and writing. In each of the four skills, we have linguistic units and system in the realism of vocabulary, phonology, morphology and syntax. Language learners need learn these components so that they can recognize and produce grammatically correct sentences.

Writing is difficult task because it requires special skills in the production. The special skills are in the choice of words, the use of structure, mechanics of writing and rhetoric.

To be able to choose the right words means that you must have a large number of vocabularies in which you know what all the words mean and how they should be used. The writer can tell the reader clearly and exactly without wasting words. Willis (1985) suggests us to write what we mean concisely, precisely and directly which means that a

writer has to avoid wordiness in writing by using accurate diction or terminology rather than long wordiness sentence.

Besides using the right diction, to write well also means to avoid making mistakes in grammar. However, grammar is problem for many people. As a set of rules, grammar tells us what is correct and what is incorrect about using certain words. In other word, grammar provides common patters of rules for everyone to follow and assures than people will understand each other.

Mechanical correctness is another essential requirement to effective communicative in writing. For example, the correct punctuation may clarify the idea expressed in the composition.

Besides language problem, learners also face rhetorical problems. In writing, a learner must know how to organize words and patterns to fulfill a given rhetorical aim. Rhetoric implies the organization of both form and content to meet a particular rhetorical aim, such as persuading a friend to take a certain action (Smith, 1974). Corbet (1977) stated rhetorig is the art of effective communication; it is a skill that enables us to make wise choice of the means to achieve desired end. According to Oshima and Hogue (1981), English rhetoric is different from the rhetoric of another language. Therefore, to write well in English, one must learn not only the rules of English grammar but also the principles of English

rhetoric. Learning the principle of English rhetoric is just like learning the rules in grammar; firstly the learner must study them then practicing them.

Schaefer (1975) stated that the basic principles of English rhetoric cover: paragraph development, unity and coherence. Paragraph development means the development of one main idea into a group of related sentences. The number of sentences is important and the paragraph should be long enough to develop the main idea clearly. By unity is meant the discussion of main idea in a paragraph is easy to read and understand because the ideas are connected by the use of appropriate transitional signals and there is an orderly development of the ideas.

According to Schaefer (1975), rhetoric has two aspects; organization and style, as each paragraph contains only one main idea, the paragraph in an easy should be arranged logically. In other word, they are tied together but express only one topic. Organization is important in writing for many reasons. It creates a logical sequence of ideas for the readers to follow and it makes writing easier and helps the writer to develop his idea fully.

The last part of the process of writing, after pre-writing and arrangement writing, consists of the revising not for meaning and not for correctness but for style" (Ebbit, 1978). This means we have to work over the sentences carefully to make them say in the way we want to say.

METHOD
Research Design

This study is descriptive qualitative research. Generally, the characteristic of qualitative research are: the data collected are soft data enriched with description of words, phrases and sentences, which cannot be treated with statistical procedures, the researcher is the key instrument in the data collecting and analysis process, and the results are argument and description.

Subject of Study

The subjects of the study include second year students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar. The writer takes them because the students were selected purposively only the students who already passed the compositions were taken as subject of this study. There are three classes in this grade but the writer only takes one class, which consists of 25 students and get 25 compositions.

Object of Study

The object of study is error analysis on composition made by the second year students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar.

Research Instrument

The instrument of the study is writing test (see appendixes). The test is given to the students by herself. The test was given in the form of free title. In this test, the writer does not determine the topic in order the students can compose easier.

The students make a composition of at least one hundred words. The time which allotted to compose is an hour. From the English composition made by the second year students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar, the students error can be identified, then, it will be used as data analysis.

Data Collection

The data was collected on September 12, 2022 at English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar by usisng the research instrument. Accordingly, the source of the data was the subject essay composition test. The test was administered by researcher herself. The test was held in appropriate room with the time allotment 60 minutes.

Data Analysis

The data was the errors, which were found in the sentences of the students' compositions. After the compositions had been collected, the data processing procedure was carried out. The following steps show the procedure.

The first step in the process of analysis was the identification of errors. After identifying the errors, the total number of errors made by the students was counted. Next, the writer described the errors by comparing the original sentences with the reconstructed sentences based on the correct grammar. The last step, the writer classified the data into linguistic category based surface strategy taxonomy.

Table The Classification of Errors

Linguistic category	SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY				Number	%
	Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering		
Indefinite article						
Possessive case						
Simple past tense						
Comparison						
Noun						
Gerund						
Pluralization						
Pronoun						
Preposition						
Passive voice						
Conjunction						
Preposition						
Verb						
vocab						
Word order						
Negative trans.						
Modal / to be						
Total						
Percentage						

To gain the percentage of errors, the writer calculated it by using the formula:

$$\frac{\text{Number of errors}}{\text{Total Error}} \times 100\%$$

FINDING

Based on the analysis of the students' compositions, the following results were gained. There were 219 errors found. The complete list of type of morphological and syntactic errors based on surface strategy taxonomy is presented on the table.

The errors made by the students were found that 50 (22.83%) were omission errors, 28 (12.79%) were addition errors, 132 (60.27%) were misformation errors and 9 (4.11%) were misordering errors.

From the data gained, the most common types of errors made by the second year students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar were respectively misformation errors, omission errors, addition errors, then misorder errors. So, misformation error was the most of error type made by the first year students of English Department. It means that they still confuse how to arrange a right sentence and also to choose the correct words getting low comprehension about the usage of English grammar and lack of

vocabulary are the main factor of students errors.

The second error was omission error. The students omitted grammatical morpheme more than content morpheme. The omission of grammatical morpheme is resulted from the lack of the correct use of grammar. The omission of grammatical morpheme played minor role in conveying the meaning of sentence. Furthermore, the omission of contain morpheme is resulted by the lack of vocabulary. The kinds of omission error are omission pronoun, to be, regular past tense –ed, conjunction, plural rule, progressive –ing, possessive case, preposition.

The third error was addition error. These errors were good indicators that some basic rules have been acquired, but that the refinements have not yet been made. It results from the all-too-faithful use of certain rule. In this type, the kinds of error cover addition of article, preposition, verb, regular past tense –ed, to be, and conjunction.

The fourth error was misordering error. Misordering error occurs systematically for both L1 and L2 learners in construction. Students have written disordering errors that are word for word translation.

For Linguistic category there were 30 errors in pronunciation (13.70%), 5 errors of indefinite article (2.28%), 2 errors of possessive case (0.91%), errors of tenses is 79 (36.07%), 16 errors in conjunction (7.31%), 25 errors of preposition (11.42%), 4 errors of verb (1.83%), 18 errors of vocab or diction (8.22), 17 errors of to be (7.76%), 6 errors of plural rule (2.74%), 17 errors of word order (7.76). from the data gained tenses error was the most of error type based linguistic category. It means that some of learners of English still have difficulties in apprehending English grammar.Having noticed an error, the first decision the teacher makes is whether or not to treat it at all. In order to make the decision the teacher may have recourse to factors with immediate, temporary bearing, such as the importance of the error to the current pedagogical focus of the lesson, the teacher's perception of the chance of eliciting correct performance from the students is negative feedback is given.

CONCLUSION

From the analysis the previous study, it can be taken some finale result that there are four types of errors made by the second year students of English Department of UNIPA Kampus Blitar viewed from surface strategy taxonomy. They are omission error, addition error, misformation error, and misordering error. For omission errors there were 50 (22.83%), 28 (12.79%) were errors of addition, 132 (60.27%) were errors of misformation, and 9 (4.11%) were errors of misordering. So the total numbers of all errors were 216 errors found.

The misformation error was the most dominant type of errors. There were 132 errors (60.27%). And for linguistic error tenses is most dominant error 79 (36.07%). Getting the data from the authentic result above, it can be taken some conclusion or interpretation that, the learners still get some problems in learning English.

SUGGESTION

Hopefully, this study can be used for consideration and evaluation for lecturers of writing. This study is also expected to be able to inspire lecturers to develop and to create new teaching strategy in teaching learning process. Nowadays, students tend to feel bore in learning because of a common way of teaching and no variety on it.

To prevent and to avoid this event, it task and challenge for lecturers as educator. Realizing or not, from the students errors occurrences, it can be known that the really need exercising and training more in writing in order they have a good capability in making a simple paragraph.

Beside that, this result of the study is also expected to provide a positive contribution for all educators in developing material and syllabus to gain the target language optimally.

Suggestions for the students. The researcher suggests the students to have more exercise and training in writing especially in making a simple paragraph. And develop their knowledge and skill in order to avoid the same error.

REFERENCES

Brown, H Douglash 1987. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching,* 2nd edition. New Jersey: prentice Hall, Inc.

Baradja, M.F. 1990. *Kapita Selecta Pengajaran Bahasa.* Malang: IKIP Malang

Corder, S.P. 1982. *The Significance of Learner's Errors.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. 1982. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dagher, Joseph P. 1976. *Writing a Practical Guide.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company

Dulay, Heidi, Marina Burt, and Stephent Krasher. 1982. *Language Two.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Indriati, Dian. 1994. *Morphological errors made by fourth year students of the English Department IKIP Malang.* Malang: Unpublished Sarjana Thesis.

Kraser, Stephen. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Lado, R. 1974. Cross Linguistic Across Culture. *Applied Linguistics for Language Teacher.* Ann. Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Murdibjo and Ardjiwati Murdibjo 1987. *Salah dan benar Dalam Bahasa Inggris.* Yogyakarta: PT. Hinindita

Massachusesetts: addition Wesly Publishing Company, Inc.

Smith, Michael A. Sharword. 1974. *Teaching Written Language Problems and Principles*. English Teaching Forum.

Syefriwanti MN, Novi.1998.*An Analysis of students' errors in English Composition*.

Malang: Unpublished Sarjana Thesis.

Willis, Huton and Enno Klamer. 1985. *A Brief Handbook of English*. 2nd ed. USA: Hacourt Brace Javanovich, Inc.