

ERRORS MADE BY THE PRESENTERS OF THESIS PROPOSAL SEMINAR IN ENGLISH STUDY PROGRAM

Jalal Abdul Aziz

Faculty of Cultural Studies, Brawijaya University of Malang, Indonesia
jalalabdulaziz@gmail.com

Abstract: This study is aimed to find out the types of errors made by the presenters of thesis proposal seminar based on Communicative Effect Taxonomy and to find out whether or not global errors of Communicative Effect Taxonomy made by the presenters of thesis proposal seminar significantly hinder communication between the presenters and the audiences. This study used qualitative approach since the data of this study was taken from 4 students' presentations which were in the form of words rather than number and statistic. This study revealed that there were 188 errors committed by the students in which 179 and 9 erroneous utterances fall under local error and global error respectively. The local errors consist of 45 lexical errors, 93 morphological errors, and 41 syntactical errors. The global errors consist of 2 wrong order of major constituents, 1 missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors, 1 missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors, and 5 uncategorized global errors. As for the effect of global error to the audience, the writer found out that the global errors did not significantly hinder communication to the audience.

Keywords: *Error Analysis, thesis proposal seminar, Communicative Effect Taxonomy*

Abstrak: Penelitian ini dimaksudkan untuk menemukan jenis-jenis kekeliruan yang dibuat oleh para penyaji dalam seminar proposal skripsi berdasarkan *Communicative Effect Taxonomy* dan untuk menemukan apakah kekeliruan yang

dikategorikan sebagai kekeliruan global di *Communicative Effect Taxonomy* mempengaruhi komunikasi antara penyaji dan pendengar. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif karena data dalam penelitian ini dalam bentuk teks yang diambil dari presentasi 4 mahasiswa. Dalam penelitian ini terungkap bahwa ada 188 kekeliruan yang dibagi menjadi 179 kekeliruan lokal dan 9 kekeliruan global. Kekeliruan lokal terbagi menjadi 45 kekeliruan suku kata, 93 kekeliruan pembentukan kata, dan 41 kekeliruan tata kalimat. Kekeliruan global terdiri dari 2 kekeliruan konstituen, 1 kekeliruan penghilangan, kekeliruan, atau penyalahgunaan penghubung kata, dan 5 kekeliruan global yang tidak terkategori. Dalam hal pengaruh kekeliruan global terhadap pendengar, penulis menemukan bahwa kekeliruan global tidak menyebabkan terhambatnya komunikasi antara penyaji dan pendengar.

Kata Kunci: Analisis kekeliruan, seminar proposal skripsi, *Communicative Effect Taxonomy*

INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, English is a foreign language and is studied by Indonesian students from elementary school until university. Even though they have experienced a long-term process of learning, they are likely to still make errors. According to Dulay et al. (1982:138) "Errors are the flawed side of learner speech or writing". In conducting a research concerning errors, especially errors which are produced in speaking practice, the writer thinks it is important to make sure that the flaws that the speaker makes are errors not mistakes since speaking deals with nervousness. Someone tends to feel nervous speaking in front of audience and can result in producing mistakes. That is why to determine errors from mistakes is important. Corder (1974, cited in Ellis 1994, p.701) states that Error Analysis involves a set of procedures for identifying, describing, and explaining errors in learner language.

Related to this study, there are current studies which deal with error analysis. The first previous study was conducted by Sastra (2014) analyzing grammatical error on the spontaneous speech produced by students of English in 2014. The second research was conducted by Silitonga (2014) analyzing errors on story telling by participants of story telling competition in smart education center course. Irfani (2011) analyses teacher's correction strategies towards students' speaking errors.

From the previous researchers, only Silitonga (2014) who used specific method to determine errors and mistakes. In his research, he used a list of questions for the teachers to determine the participants' understanding of English Grammar and how far their preparations are. As for this research, the writer did not carry out the same thing. To determine whether the flaws were errors or mistakes, the writer asked participants to recheck the transcriptions and asked them to self-correct the flaws. The flaws participants could not be self-corrected then were considered as errors.

In this study, the writer is interested in analyzing errors found on the eighth semester students of English Study Program at one of State Universities in East Java, Indonesia. The error analysis in this research focuses on Communicative Effect Taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982). This taxonomy focuses on the effect the errors have on the listener or reader. Dulay et al. (1982:189) argue "Errors that affect the overall organization of the sentence hinder successful communication, while errors that affect a single element of the sentence usually do not hinder communication". This taxonomy divides error into global and local. Global errors are the errors that affect overall sentence organization significantly hinder communication (Dulay, Burt, Krashen, 1982:191). Global errors consist of systematic types of errors such as wrong order of major constituents, missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors; missing cues to signal obligatory exceptions to pervasive syntactic rules; regularization of pervasive syntactic rules to exceptions. Local Errors are errors that affect single elements (constituents) in a sentence do not usually alter communication significantly (Dulay et al. 1982, p.191). For example, the omission of "s" in sentence "She read a book" does not

significantly alter meaning and communication. The listener or reader can understand the intended meaning without any difficulty.

Since the classification of local errors is not described well in Dulay's *Language Two*, the writer referred to Hendrickson's (1976:3-4) journal entitled "*Error Analysis and Selective Correction in the Adult ESL Classroom: An Experiment*" to classify the local errors. The classifications were Lexical, Morphological, and Syntactic. The lexical subcategory covered misused or omitted nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. The morphological subcategory referred to misuse or omission of any bound morpheme. Syntactic subcategory included misused or omitted determiners, modals, qualifiers, prepositions, conjunctions, subordinators, sentence connectors, question words, and certain otherwise uncategorized syntactic classes (e.g., there is, it is).

The writer chooses eighth semester students of English Study Program at Faculty of Cultural Studies at one of State Universities in East Java, Indonesia as the subject of the study. The eighth semester students are chosen because as mentioned above, eighth semester students are expected to master English and are likely to make less error. Meanwhile, most of them are in the middle of writing their thesis. Thus, the writer chooses some of the students who are taking thesis and are going to present thesis proposal in semester eight this year. Thesis proposal presentation is chosen because from the writer's observation, students likely still make errors in presenting their proposals.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

In conducting this study, the writer used qualitative research approach. Qualitative approach was best used to conduct this study because according to Ary et al. (2002:425), qualitative research deals with the data in the form of words rather than number and statistic as in this study the data was taken from students' presentations which were in the form of words.

In this research, the writer classified the errors found in eighth semester students' speech in presenting thesis proposal based on Communicative Effect Taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982).

Data Source

The data of this research were the utterances of the presenters which contained errors in the thesis proposal seminar by the eighth semester students of English Study Program of Faculty of Cultural Studies at one of State Universities in East Java, Indonesia. Thesis proposal seminar is a seminar in which students present their thesis proposals in front of audience to get feedbacks for better researches. Thesis proposal is the first seminar of three seminars students need to pass to finish their studies. The three seminars are thesis proposal seminar, result seminar and the last is comprehension seminar.

Data Collection

There are some phases done in collecting the data as follows.

1. The writer asked the participants whether they were willing or not to be part of this research by giving them consent forms.
2. The writer attended the participants' thesis proposal seminar and recorded the presentations.
3. The writer transcribed the recorded presentations by listening to the audio to make written form or transcript. The writer also asked a peer checker to recheck the transcripts to make sure that the transcripts were accurate.
4. The writer asked the presenters to recheck the transcripts to determine errors and mistakes. The writer listed the utterances containing errors the presenters cannot self-correct. The utterances containing errors will be used as the data of this research.
5. The writer asked two audiences from each seminar to be interviewed concerning their comprehension to the presentations. They were asked whether or not global errors which were found significantly hinder or alter communication. The result of the interview was used to answer the second problem of the study.

Data Analysis

Following Dulay et al. (1982), there are four criteria for descriptive classification of errors: Linguistic Taxonomy, Surface Strategy Taxonomy, Comparative Analysis Taxonomy, and Communicative Effect Taxonomy. For this research, the writer used Communicative Effect Taxonomy to classify the errors found.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the Communicative Effect Taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al. (1982) the writer found some findings and described the result of the analysis from local and global error. The writer found there are 188 erroneous utterances committed by the students in which 179 and 9 erroneous utterances fall under local error and global error respectively. The local errors consist of 45 lexical errors, 93 morphological errors, and 41 syntactical errors. The global errors consist of 2 wrong order of major constituents, 1 missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors, 1 missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors, and 5 uncategorized global errors. Some of the erroneous utterances are presented and discussed below.

Local Errors

There are three subcategories for local errors, namely, Lexical, Morphological, and Syntactical errors.

Lexical Errors

The writer found 45 lexical errors in the eight semester students' presentations in the thesis seminar proposal. Lexical errors covered misused or omitted nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. One the errors is presented and discussed below.

Table 1 lexical errors found in students' presentations in the thesis proposal seminar

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
Here I would present my seminar proposal entitled "The Characteristic Concepts of Magic Realism's Element in Queen of the Sparrows Short Story"	Here I would present my proposal seminar entitled "The Characteristic Concepts of Magic Realism's Element in Queen of the Sparrows Short Story"

The first error was made by the first presenter. It is stated "*Here I would present my seminar proposal entitled 'The Characteristic Concepts of Magic Realism's Element in Queen of the Sparrows Short Story'*". It should be "*Here I would present my proposal seminar entitled 'The Characteristic Concepts of Magic Realism's Element in Queen of the Sparrows Short Story'*". The presenter maintained his first language system in producing the phrase "seminar proposal". In English, the modifier is put before the head while in Bahasa Indonesia is the opposite. The correct phrase should be "*proposal seminar*".

Morphological Errors

The writer found 93 errors fall under morphological errors. Morphological errors referred to misuse or omission of any bound morpheme. One of the errors is presented and discussed below.

Table 2 Morphological errors found in students' presentations in the thesis proposal seminar

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
In the narrative style magic realism happen when the characters of the story is first built as a normal life then continues to extraordinary life with some reason.	In the narrative style magic realism happens when the characters of the story is first built as a normal life then continues to extraordinary life with some reasons.

The erroneous utterance above was made by the first presenter. The presenter violated the subject-verb agreement rule. It occurred recursively. In English, a singular subject (*she, he*) takes a singular verb (*is, runs*), whereas a plural subject takes a plural verb. In the utterance above, the subject “*magic realism*” is singular so, the following verb should be singular. Therefore, the utterance should be “*In the narrative style, magic realism happens when the characters of the story is first built as a normal life then continues to extraordinary life with some reasons.*”.

Syntactical Errors

The writer found 38 syntactical errors produced by the presenters. Syntactical errors included misused or omitted determiners, modals, qualifiers, prepositions, conjunctions, subordinators, sentence connectors, question words, and certain otherwise uncategorized syntactic classes (e.g., *there is, it is*). One of the errors is described and discussed below.

Table 3 Syntactical errors found in students’ presentations in the thesis proposal seminar

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
Short story is short and brief fictional narrative prose. It’s shorter from novel.	Short story is short and brief fictional narrative prose. It’s shorter than novel.

The use of preposition “*from*” is incorrect in the utterance above. Since it is a comparative degree sentence, the correct preposition should be “*than*”. It seems that the presenter maintained his first language system. In Bahasa Indonesia, to show comparison it uses “*lebih ... dari ...*”. The writer translated the word “*dari*” word for word into “*from*”.

Global Errors

From six global error classifications proposed by Dulay et al. (1982), the writer only found three categories namely, missing cues to signal obligatory exceptions to pervasive syntactic rules; missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors; and missing cues to signal obligatory exceptions to pervasive syntactic rules. In addition, the writer found

some errors considered hinder communication but do not belong to any Dulay’s global error classification. The writer also found errors that were considered as global errors by the expert. The writer then classified those errors as uncategorized global errors. All those errors are presented and discussed below.

Wrong Order of Major Constituents

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
Defocalization I use because in my opinion every story, every narrative prose use their point of view of narrator.	I use defocalization because in my opinion every story, every narrative prose uses point of view of the narrator.

In the utterance on the table above, the presenter violated the SVO order. The presenter maintained his first language system in producing English. In Bahasa Indonesia, it is common to put object before predicate (eg. *“Buku ini saya bawa”*). However, In English, native speakers are persistent to maintain the SVO order.

Table 4 Missing, Wrong, or Misplaced Sentence Connector

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
I said not only western people but modern people.	I said not only western people but also modern people.

The use of correlative conjunction in the utterance above is incorrect. Correlative conjunction connects equal sentence elements together (eg. two nouns) and is always composed by two words. The utterance above creates ambiguity. The listener can interpret that the presenter probably said that he did not say *“not only western people”* but he said *“modern people”*. The correct utterances should be *“I said not only western people but also modern people.”*

Table 5 Missing Cues to Signal Obligatory Exceptions to Pervasive Syntactic Rules

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
Defocalization use in magic realism narrative text because this style has itowns way to see the perspective of _ narrator toward the story.	Defocalization isused in magic realism narrative text because this style has itsown way to see the perspective of the narrator toward the story.

The utterance on the table can hardly be comprehended. The presenter violated the SVO order. So, to make the utterance comprehensible, be + past participle (+by) should be inserted. Therefore, the more comprehensible sentence should be *“Defocalization is used (by the author) in magic realism narrative text because this style has its own way to see the perspective of the narrator toward the story.”*

Uncategorized Global Errors

The writer found errors which considered as global errors. However those are do not belong to any Dulay et al. (1982) classification. Thus, the writer classified those errors into uncategorized global errors. Below is one of the uncategorized global errors.

Table 6 Uncategorized Global Errors

Erroneous utterances	Corrections
It’s mean that in magical realism there are two perspectives.	It means that in magical realism there are two perspectives.

The auxiliary verb *“is”* is a small linguistic part of the sentence but changed the overall meaning of the sentences above. The auxiliary *“is”* indicates that the word *“mean”* in the sentences above can work as an adjective or noun. In Oxford dictionary, the word *“mean”* as an adjective means unkind, spiteful, or unfair. In the untturance above it can be interpreted *“It’s unfair that in magical realism there are two*

perspectives.". Thus, the utterance was considered alter the meaning of the sentence.

Since Communicative Effect Taxonomy does not only deal with errors but also the effect to the listener, the writer interviewed the audience to inquire their comprehension toward the presentations and how the global errors produced by the presenters affect audiences' comprehension. This was mainly conducted to answer the second problem of the study.

From the four participants, the writer only found significant global errors in the first presenter utterances. Therefore, the writer only interviewed two audiences who attended the first presenter's seminar.

The interview was brief. The writer pointed out the global errors to the audiences. They were asked whether the utterances were correct or not. Then they were asked to interpret the meaning. The audiences found no difficulties in interpreting the intended meaning of the utteranced considered as global errors. Perhaps, this is caused by the first language system the presenter and audiences both have. The audiences noticed that those utterances were grammatically incorrect though. They could even provide corrections.

Thus, the writer sums up that global errors made by the presenter do not significantly hinder communication to the audiences, perhaps due to the same knowledge they shared.

CONCLUSIONS

In this research, the writer used presenters' utterances of thesis proposal seminar of Faculty of Cultural Study at one of State Universities in East Java, Indonesia as the object of this research. The writer used Communicative Effect Taxonomy proposed by Dulay et al (1982) to categorize and analyze the errors.

The writer found there are 188 erroneous utterances committed by the students in which 179 and 9 erroneous utterances fall under local error and global error respectively. The local errors consist of 45 lexical errors, 93 morphological errors, and 41 syntactical errors. The global errors consist of 2 Wrong order of major constituents, 1 missing, wrong,

or misplaced sentence connectors, 1 missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors, and 5 uncategorized global errors. The writer also found that the global errors did not significantly hinder communication between the presenters and the audiences.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacob, Lucy Cheser and Razavieh, Asghar. (2002). *Introduction to Research in Education*. California: Wadsworth.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *IRAL* 4, 161-170. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service*, ED 019903.
- Dulay, H. et. al. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1976). *Error Analysis and Selective Correction in the Adult' ESI Classroom: an Experiment*. United States: ERIC.
- Irfani, B. (2011). A Study of Teacher's Correction Strategies Towards Students' Speaking Errors. *Jurnal English Education*. Vol 4, No 2 (2011)
- Sastra, L. V. (2014). *Grammatical Error Analysis on the Spontaneous Speech Produced by Students of English*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: Study Program of English, Universitas Brawijaya.
- Silitonga, S. (2014). *Error Analysis on Story Telling by Participants of Story Telling Competition in "Smart Education Center Course"*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: Study Program of English, Universitas Brawijaya.