MEDIA No.12/2016 USantara

MENGKAJI MEDIA SOSIAL YOSAI IFIAN WANAJEMEN KOMUNIKASI BISNIS DI ERA GLOBAL, A. Yani Surachduan | NILAI IDEAL KOMPPTENSI PEDAGOGIK GURU, Nani Nur'aeni | ERROR PEMBIAYAAN PENDIDIKAN TERHADAP MUTU SEKOLAH MENENGAH KEJURUAN DI KOTA SUKABUNJI, M. Andriana Gaffar | STUDI KEBIJAKAN PUBLIK PENDIDIKAN ISLAM, Ahmad Khori | NANAJEMEN PEMBINANA GURU MISMATCH PADA MADRASAH TSANAWIYAH DI KOTA BANDHUNG, Z. Arifin Sanus | IMPLEMENTASI MANAJEMEN STRATEGIK DALAM PENGELOLAAN HUTAN BERSAMA MASYARAKAT MENJADIKAN HUTAN LESTARI DAN SIAGA BENCANA, ROSKANISLAM, ETEP ROHANA | PENGEMBANGAN KURIKULUM MUATAN LOKAL BERBASIS PENDIDI-KAN JEEP ROHANA |



12 / 2016 ISSN 1978-6824

MEDIA Nusantara

: Rektor Universitas Islam Nusantara

PENASIHAT : Wakil Rektor I Wakil Rektor II Wakil Rektor III

Ir. H. Rubi Robana, M.Sc.

JAWAR : Ketua Lembaga Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat

: Prof. Dr. H. Achmad Sanusi, SH., MPA. (UNINUS) Prof. Dr. H. Lili Rasjidi, L.LM. (UNPAD) MITRA BESTARI

Prof. H. Abdurahman Mas'ud, PhD. (Balitbang Kemenag RI)

Prof. Dr. H. Dedi Mulyasana, M.Pd (UNINUS) Prof. Dr. H. E. Mulyasa, M.Pd (UNINUS)

Dr. H. Mamat Burhanudin (UIN Syarif Hidayatullah)
Dr. H. Masykuri Bakri,M.Si. (UNISMA)

: Dr. Hj. Rosmaladewi, M.Si.

WKL PIM. REDAKSI: Dr. Yosal Iriantara, M.MPd.

PENYUNTING AHLI : Dr. H. Didin Wahidin, M.Pd.

Dr. H. Suhendra Yusuf, MA. Dr. Hj. Ikka Kartika A.Fauzi, M.Pd.

Dr. H. HJ. Imas Rosidawati, MH. Dr. H. Yoyo Kartoyo, M.M.Pd. Dr. H. N. Hanafiah, M.M.Pd.

Wahdi Suardi, M.Si.

Dr. H. Husen Syaiful Insan, M.M.Pd. : Akhmad Yani, S.Sos. Agus Mulyanto, M.Pd. Hamdani, M.Pd.

Zubaedah Wiji Lestari, M.Pd.

H. Gatot Yusuf Effendy, MM.: Andriana Gaffar, M.M.Pd.

ARTISTIK : Sjualbun Iljas, S.Sos.

PRA PRODUKSI : Tim Kreatif Fakultas Ilmu Komunikasi Uninus

ALAMAT REDAKSI : Jl. Soekarno Hatta no. 530

Bandung 40286

TLP & FAX : (022) 7509656 - (022) 7509656

Mengk

Manaje

Pengar Mutu S

Studi E

Manaie

Penger

Pendid

Daftar [si



	Mengkaji Media Sosial:	
	Yosal Iriantara	. 1
•	Manajemen Komunikasi Bisnis Di Era Global :	
	A. Yani Surachman	15
	Nilai Ideal Kompetensi Pedagogik Guru:	10
	Nani Nur'aeni	31
	Error Analysis In Second Language Acquisition:	31
	Lina Tri Astuty Beru Sembiring	47
•	Pengaruh Manajemen Pembiayaan Pendidikan Terhadap Mutu Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan Di Kota Sukabumi	
	Muhammad Andriana Gaffar	55
•	Studi Kebijakan Publik Pendidikan Islam : Ahmad Khori	75
	Manajemen Pembinaan Guru Mismatch Pada Madrasah Tsanawiyah Di Kota Bandung :	/5
	Z. Arifin Sanusi	97
•	Implementasi Manajemen Strategik Dalam Pengelolaan	
	Hutan Bersama Masyarakat Menjadikan Hutan Lestari	
	Dan Siaga Bencana:	
	Okke Rosmaladewi & Rubi Robana	115
•	Pengembangan Kurikulum Muatan Lokal Berbasis	
	Pendidikan Islam:	
	Etep Rohana	131

ERROR ANALYSIS IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Lina Tri Astuty Beru Sembiring *)

Abstract

For many years, studies on learners errors in second language aquisition have became highly valued. This issue related to the language teaching and learning process where teachers, researchers and level book suriters give much attention on it. Error analysis is one of the major topic that has important contributions to the variety of SLA areas. It is become significant for the insights its provides into the strategies employed in second language acquisition, and in turn into the process of language learning in general. Error analysis also provides a methodological aspects for investigating learners' second language acquisition and constitutes an appropriate starting point for the investigation. In this carticis, the writer will focus on examining the detail of error analysis in teach language aquisition. In berviving, some definitions, taxonomies, procedures and also criticism toward is will be discussed. The researcher will also examined recent research related to the use of error analysis. It is boped that this paper will be preader including teachers, researchers and learners in understanding the term of error analysis beter.

Key Word: anguage aquisition, error analysis

^{*)} Letters Faculty, University of Dehasen Bengkulu, Bengkulu

INTRODUCTION

Every language learner either in first or second language must have made an error in producing or comprehending a sentence. But since L2 learners' errors are generally viewed as unwanted forms, many studies have been conducted to investigate and solve this problems. The study about learners' error has begun since 1940s together with the development of Applied linguistics science. Lado in Gass and Selinker (1983) stated that in the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease all difficulties in foreign language learning. This statement has made a conviction that a linguistic's difference can be used to predict learning difficulties which later on developed and became the base of Contrastive Analysis study. Ellis (1994:47) states that Contrastive analysis is a method that is used to predict the errors that learners make by identifying the linguistic differences between their L1 and the target language. It believes that errors occur as a result of interference of learners transfer native language habits on L2. The interference is believed to occure when the habit of the native languages is different with the target language. In other study, Fisiat (1981) claims that CA is a subdicipline of linguistics concerned with the comparison of two or more language or subsystems of language in order to determine both difficulties and similarities between them. CA then gives it most important contribution by the delimitation of Second language structure which obstruct learning.

Unfortunately, this kind of analysis is refuted by several studies. They believe that constrastive analysis is inadequate to predict the interference problems of a language learners. In 1970s, the work of Error Analysis (EA) then has been developed to supplented CA. In the beginning of its occurance, EA is known as procedures used by both researcher and teacher to collect samples of learners language, identify the error in the sample, describe the error, and also classify them based on their nature and causes. With these characteristics, EA is believed as a great tool which provides an appropriate way for investigating learner language. It also constitutes an appropriate starting point for the study of learner language and L2 acquisition.

ERROR ANALYSIS

An error is ussually defined as a deviation from the norms of the target language. Since there are some misconception regarding the term of error and

ince L2
sadies have
y about
nent of
ed that in
to ease all
a conviction
ulties which
study Ellis
to predict
ccs between
result of
se interference
fierent

ference alysis (EA) its occurance, to collect enibe the th these optopriate priate starting

f the target

what is the sample and how to collect it. There are three types of sample

hand, an authoritative interpretation involves asking the learner to say what the utterance means and by doing so to make an authoritative reconstruction. While a plausible interpretation can be obtained by reffering to the context in which the utterance was produced or by translating the sentence literally into the learner's L1.

In the process of descripting the errors, it requires an attention on the surface properties of the learners utterances. Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) use an observable, surface features of errors as the properties. While Corder (1974) describes it according to its systematicity including presystematic errors, systematic errors and postsystematic error. It is then suggested that to make the process become easier, researcher should clasified it based on its linguistics categories which closely associated with a traditional EA undertaken for pedagogic purposes. The next step is explaining the errors which concerned with establishing the source of the error. Richards (1971) distinguishes this process as, interference errors, intralingual errors and development errors. While Dulay and Burt(1974) classified it into developmental, interference and unique. The last stage in doing error analysis is Evaluating the errors. This stage involves a consideration of the effect that errors have on the person addressed. It will also involve decisions on who the addressees will be, what errors they will be asked to, and how they will be asked to judge them.

LINGUISTICS TAXONOMY OF ERRORS

An alternative to a linguistic clasification of errors is to use a surface strategy taxonomy. Dulay, Burt and Crashen 1982 state that it highlights the way surface structures are altered by some mean of operations such as omisions, additions, misinformations and also misorderings. On the other hand, Corders (1974) distinguishes three types of error according to their systematicity. They are presystematic errors, systematic errors and also postsystematic errors. Those taxonomy require researchers to have an access to the learner therefore they can get an explanations about learners' language behaviour.

As has been discussed previously, error can be defined as a deviation from the norms of the target language. In explaining this deviation, error can be devided into performance and competence. The error is what takes place when the deviations arises as a result of a lack of knowledge whereas the mistake comes up when learners fail to perform their competence. Along with many researches, it has been considered that competence error become

the central of L2 acquisition study. Richard (1974) classifies error into two categories, interlingual error and intralingual error. Intralingual error then devided into overgeneralization error, ignorance of rule restriction, incomplete application of rules and false concepts hypothesized. However, the concept of interlingual and intralingual error were a very complex notion. Schater and Murcia argue that a large number of learners' error are ambiguous with regard to source and cause. This findings of course, affected the value of EA as a tool for investigating L2 acquisition. Some of the critisms toward it will be reviewed below.

CRITICISMS ON ERROR ANALYSIS

As a kind of data analysis, EA can not escape from critiques. Ellis (1994) stated that "there are weaknesses in methodological procedures, theoritical problems and limitations in scope of EA". Regarding to these weaknesses, several studies has occured to defend it. One of them is from Schater and Murcia (1977). They argue that the analysis of error has focused the attention of the investigator on the errors which lead them to exclude the other corpus from consideration. The classification of errors that are identified by the researcher is not usually proper. Macdonald Lightbound (2002) also supports this idea by stating that several researchers have pointed out the negative attitude reflected in their analysis. They only focus on finding out the learners' mistakes and ignoring the achievements. Since the main focus of EA is the errors that have been made by the learners, it often neglacted what make the learner successful. It also does not access the whole part of the learning process which make it impossible for the researcher to find out the unitary source of the error. Moreover, EA which has focused exclusively on what learners do has no way of investigating avoidance and therefore makes the investigation become limited.

RECENT STUDIES DONE ON ERROR ANALYSIS

Because of the weaknessess, there is a decresing number on the use of EA for data analysis. But currently it is showing signs that this kind of analysis will be popular again. Here are several recent researches have been done to

identify and describe learners errors. Mahdiye Barzegar in 2013 has conducted a research entitled Persian EFL students' Error analysis. This research attempts to investigate the errors made by the intermediate level students from the simin institute in Ramsar, Iran. 10 persian sentences were given to students to convert to English. The result then indicated that the majority of errors produced by these learners involved syntactico-morphological errors in the descriptive of errors, substitution in the process of errors and intralingual errors in the source of errors. Another study has been done by Ainon Jaeriah and Ismail Ahamad Shah in 2013. They conducted a research with a title Oral Presentation errors of Malaysian Students in an English for Academic course. This research aimed to find out the errors students of EAP made in their oral presentations. The subjects of the study were 32 students in an EAP class taught by one of the researcher. They were the third and the fourth year students of islamic faculty. The students then asked to present an argument related to their faculty. Their performance then assessed based on the language, content and presentation skills. From the findings, it was known that verb form, word form and article were the most frequent types of errors made by the students. Misformation accounted for the majority of the total grammatical errors identified followed by omission and additon. Muhammad Afsar kayun in 2015 wrote about error analysis and correction in oral communication in the eff context of Bangladesh. This work focused on certain factors such as defining the errors in spoken language, error analysis, the role of the teachers to correct errors and to what extent they correct and self correction in oral communication.

CONCLUSION

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that Error Analysis is a method that is used to investigate how learner acquires second language. It is a tool that provides empirical evidence for the behaviourist debates. Even there are some weaknessess on its procedure and scope, this method has made a substantial contribution to SLA research. Error Analysis in fact continues to be practised, although now it is more likely to serve as a means for investigating a specific research question than for providing a comprehensive account of learners' idiosyncratic forms. The focused of this paper on examining the detail of error analysis in second language hoped can help the readers including teachers, researchers and learners in understanding the error analysis better thus they can use it appropriately.

Referensi

Barzegar, Maho Corder, S.P. (19

Corder, S.P.(19

Dulay.C., & Bu acquisit Ellis, R. (1994).

1589 Science

> Kayun, Moh A in the e Researc Khansir.Ali A

Richard.I.C.(1

Schater, L.& C.

Referens

f the

tion

error

en

what

s is a

to be ing of

ladesh.

Barzegar, Mahdiye. (2013). Persian EFL Students' Error Analysis. Asian Journal of Social Sciences and humanities. 2(4).

Corder, S.P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors, IRAL, 5,161-170.

Corder, S.P. (1974). Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition. London: Longman

Dulay, C., & Burt, K. (1974). Error and strategies in Child Second Language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 8,129-138.

Ellis,R.(1994). The study of Second Language Aquisition.London:Oxford University Press.

Heydari,Pooneh., & M.Baghery. (2012). Error Analysis: Sources of Learners'
L2 Errors. Theory and practice in Language studies Journal 2 (8) 15831589

Jaeriah, Ainon & Jamail Ahamad Shah. (2013). Oral Presentation errors of Malaysian Students in an English for Academic course. World Applied Science Journal 21.19-27

Kayun,Moh Afsar.(2015).Error analysis and correction in oral communication in the efl context of Bangladesh.International Journal of multidiciplinary Research and development 2(3).125-129

Khansir, Ali Akbar. (2012). Error Analysis and Second language Aquisition. Theory and Practice in Language studies Journal 2 (5) 1027-1035

1 neory and Practice in Language studies Journal 2 (5) 1027-1035 Richard, J.C. (1974). Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition. London: Longman.

Schater, J., & Celce-murcia. (1977). Some Reservations concerning Error Analysis. TESOL Quarterly, 11,441-451

MEDIA Nusantara | 53