



## **Error Analysis on Classroom Language Made by Pre-service Teachers of English Education Program UNP**

**Mir-atul Aufa<sup>1</sup> and Hermawati Syarif<sup>2</sup>**

English Department

Faculty of Languages and Arts

State University of Padang

email: [aufanosuke@gmail.com](mailto:aufanosuke@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

This study aimed to analyse the errors on pre-service teachers' classroom language while having field practice in senior high schools. The analysis was conducted by adapting James (1998) Target Modification Taxonomy. Classroom language including the simple instructions and the questions given by pre-service teachers. The participants of this research are five pre-service teachers from four different schools. This study was descriptive qualitative research. The instrumentation of this research were observation, document and interview. The study analyzed pre-service teachers' classroom language by categorizing the errors into types followed by the causes of each error. Some problems related to pre-service teachers' classroom language were also found. The problems found hindered the optimal use of classroom language. The findings of the research showed that there were grammatical and lexical errors occurred. The grammatical errors were omission (50%), overinclusion (21.73%), misselection (8.70%) and misplacement (4.34%). Some ellipsis (15.21%) were also detected.

**Keywords:** Classroom Language, Pre-service Teachers, Error Analysis

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

Pre-service teachers are expected to create an environment where students can learn communicatively and achieve communicative skill. To achieve those goals, an input from an effective language is needed where teacher is also one of the main sources. Selcuk (2015) states that one of teacher's role is to give language exposure to the natural use of language by enabling students to listen reasonably. In other words, students acquire the language by listening to the language a lot, especially language that is performed by teachers. To avoid the misunderstanding and negative impressions of the language, teachers should bring fluent and accurate language in the classroom, especially classroom language.

Classroom language is filled with routines which are closely related to everyday classroom activities. According to Dalton-Puffer (2007) the concept of classroom language refers to the language that is used in some current situations in the classroom that need interpersonal language. Classroom language is classified into 8 categories : simple instructions, spontaneous situation, the language of

<sup>1</sup> English ELTSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on March 2020

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



social interaction, pair and group work assisting language, the questions, language for audio-visual aids, error-correction language and evaluation (Salaberri, 1998). Therefore, it is considered as one of the main language exposure. In other words, classroom language helps students' acquisition of the language in many ways. As part of students' language exposure, the classroom language should meet the four strands (1) meaning focused input (listening and reading), (2) meaning focused output (speaking and writing), (3) language focused learning (attention to language features), (4) fluency development including working with known material (Nations, 2003).

Regardless of the importance of linguistically correct language, the errors made by pre-service teachers are still found within the classroom language. Not all teachers realize the significance of correct classroom language for students' learning process. In terms of the errors, Corder (1981) explained that those are systematic ones that occur in a second language. The appearance of errors is probably coming from the failed acquisition of an additional language.

Even though CLT method proposes that meaning exceeds forms, it does not mean that grammar is less important. In fact, teachers should teach grammar within contexts and through communication tasks. The errors in spoken language are probably due to the nature of speech. In this case, Brown (2007) stated that spoken colloquial English does not impose the use of complete sentences which is grammatically correct and the notion of utterances is more appropriate to use for describing spoken discourse. Thanh (2015) also addressed that grammar in spoken language is less rigid and more flexible than writing. As the result, people often do not pay much attention to the sentences, structures or words. Some errors could also appear in lexical level. Llach (2007) defined lexical error as the wrong use of a lexical item in particular context that is different with what the native speakers would say in the similar circumstances.

However, in this case, due to the condition which pre-service teachers are in as foreign language speakers, the deviation of English language is considered as an error. Some errors might be considered as linguistic deviant including ambivalence, dissonance, ellipsis, idiom, incoherence, incongruence and redundancy (James, 1998). Most of these types refer to damage the message rather than form. These are also oriented towards improvement of style and rhetoric which are intended to guide English native speakers rather than learners of English as second or foreign language. Therefore, ellipsis can be considered as an error as the speaker might not recognize the correct structure of the utterance, especially, for second and foreign language learners.

To promote students' language acquisition, the classroom language is supposed to be maximized in order to expose students with real communicative language. However, in real classroom situation, teachers still face problems which probably caused by several factors. Lap and Thy (2017) revealed some challenges faced by EFL teachers in maximizing the classroom interaction which are summarized into three major themes : physical factors, learner-related factors and teacher-related factors.

The topic on classroom language has been done before in many scope of problems. Menon (1993) titled A Study of the Classroom Language of English

Teacher. This study found that there are some differences between in-service and pre-service teachers' classroom language. The differences are found in organizing, directing, correcting, and summarizing the lessons. Based in this research, in-service teachers were found more proficient than the pre-service teachers. Therefore, experience is a variable that influences verbal behaviour among language teachers. Another study conducted by Sari (2016). This study investigated the problems faced by ICT teacher of SMP N 2 Semarang in using English as classroom language. The study focused on the errors appeared while using the classroom language. Some problems are found in ICT teacher classroom language which are vocabulary, fluency, pronunciation, and grammar.

On the other hand, Tiarina (2014) conducted an error analysis on student teacher spoken language including the classroom language used in microteaching class at English Language Teaching Program of UNP. The study mainly focused on student teachers' grammar errors in performing the spoken language. It indicates that students do not aware with the use –s ending in plural forms and possessive adjectives, and verb constructions. Even though the studies mentioned above had investigated on classroom language by teachers and student-teachers, there has not been any researcher who studied the pre-service teachers' errors in using the classroom language during the field practice. Therefore, this present study fills this gap by analyzing the errors committed by pre-service teachers' using the classroom language.

Those phenomena indicate that pre-service teachers' classroom needs a further study including the analysis that can be taken as an input and evaluation. Accordingly all over the statements above the researcher motivates to research with the title "*Error Analysis on Classroom Language Made by Pre-service Teachers of English Education Program UNP*".

## **B. RESEARCH METHOD**

This research is to analyze the errors on classroom language made by pre-service teachers and some problems that hinder the optimal use of classroom language in teaching English. The design of this research is descriptive research. The aim of using descriptive research is to find out the types of pre-service teachers' classroom language grammatical and lexical errors and some problems that are related to students, teachers and physical environment.

In collecting the data the researcher did an observation with an audio recorder as tools. Interview was also conducted. Audio recording allow the researcher to record and replay sound of an event. The audio is purposed to help the researcher observed and identified the pre-service teachers' classroom language in the teaching and learning process. The audio recording of the observation was transcribed. In this case, the transcription helped the researcher to see the pre-service teachers' classroom language and categorized it into two categories : simple instructions and questions. Then, the researcher analyzed the classroom language of the pre-service teachers based on the transcription of classroom language. Next, the researcher did an interview to find out the problems faced by pre-service teachers in maximizing the use of classroom language in the teaching and learning process. The interview recording was also transcribed.

In analyzing the data, there were some techniques used. First, the researcher identified the errors. The identification of errors was proceed involving a comparison between sample sentences and native speakers' sentences in the same context. Then, description of errors was carried out. This step used Target Modification Taxonomy. The errors found in pre-service teachers were labeled into several types of grammatical errors which are : omission, overinclusion, misselection, misplacement, blends and ellipsis. The errors then were explained to find the common ones. Next step, the researcher identified the problems.

## C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Research Finding

#### a. Pre-service Teachers' Classroom Language Errors

The findings of the first research question which is about the profile on pre-service teachers' classroom language. There are 135 classroom language found in total from 5 pre-service teachers. The amount of classroom language is relatively low. Some errors were also found. There were 54 erros ocured in pre-service teachers' classroom language both grammatically and lexically.

The second problem is to analyze pre-service teachers' errors in classroom language. The errors are categorized into grammatical and lexical errors. In grammatical errors with the total of 46 errors , there were five types found : omission, overinclusion, misselection, misplacement and ellipsis. As for blends, there was no error found in this type. The most errors were ocured in omission that take 50% of the total errors followed by overinclusion 21.73%, ellipsis 15.21%, misselection 8.70% and misplacement 4.34%. The lexical errors were classified into five different types : omission/incompletion, redundancy, wrong word choice, word formation and literal translation. There were 8 lexical errors found.

Thus, the type of classroom language errors that mostly ocured were omissions. The table below indicates the types of classroom language errors made by pre-service teachers:

	PST1	PST2	PST3	PST4	PST5	Total	Percentage
Omission	5	6	1	9	1	23	50%
Overinclusion	2	-	3	5	-	10	21.73%
Misselection	-	-	2	2	-	4	8.70%
Misplacement	-	-	1	1	-	2	4.34%
Blends	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ellipsis	-	3	2	-	2	7	15.21%
Total of Errors	46						

*Table 4. Types of Pre-service Teahers' Grammatical Errors*

#### 1) Omission

Omission is a type of errors where an item does not appear and violates the structure or grammar. Most errors were found in this category with the total of 23 (50%) errors. The analysis showed that the errors ocured in various kinds includingnng auxiliary system, articles, noun and verb inflections, pronoun,

preposition and imperative to. For example, in auxiliary system, the error occurred due to the omitted “be” of an utterance like “we (are) gonna learn about procedure text”.

## 2) Overinclusion

This type is characterized by the appearance of an item which is not supposed to be in a well-formed utterance. There were 10 (21.73%) errors found in this type including plural form (-s), be, third person singular (-s) and preposition. The plural form (-s) was added in utterance “Take a note and pay attention to the detail informations”. The word “information” is a non-countable noun, therefore, adding -s is not necessary.

## 3) Misselection

In this type, the errors occurred due to the misconception of rules due to the learners' difficulties to choose the correct structure or morpheme. There were 4 (8.70%) total of errors including preposition and plural form. The errors in preposition appeared as the speakers face “Are you ready for (to) study now?”. In this case, there are two possibilities that might be used to produce grammatically correct question either by adding gerund (-ing) in word “study” or changing preposition “for” with “to”. However, using for + gerund for word “study” is uncommonly used.

## 4) Misplacement

The errors of this category is characterized by the incorrect placement of morpheme of group of morpheme. There were 2 (4.34%) errors found as misplacement which are in form of questions. The example of this error is “*What do you know the fact about them?*” which is supposed to be “What fact do you know about them?”. The incorrect placement of noun head and auxiliary in question is considered as error.

## 5) Ellipsis

Ellipsis is omission of elements normally part of a structure due to the immediate situation. There are six ellipses (15.21) found in three different pre-service teachers which mostly are identified in utterance “Finish?”. As what have been discussed above, this utterance alone is categorized as an omission due to the omitted past participle (-ed). However, the omitted auxiliary “have” and subject “you” are considered as ellipses.

Some lexical errors were also found including omission/oncompletion, redundancy, wrong word choice, word formation and literal translation. The omitted word was found in utterance “Now, let's back to our lesson”. The word “go” was supposed to be placed before “back” to make a complete phrasal verb. Redundancy occurred due to the addition of unnecessary words which could lead to misunderstanding, for example “Do you know that when you eat noodles and fish contains of preservative?”. The speaker intended to blend two different clauses, however it turned out to be a confusing question. Therefore, some parts of it should be removed which already holds the intended idea of it : “Do you know that ~~when you eat~~ noodles and fish contain preservative?”.

After analyzing the types of grammatical error, the causes of errors were analyzed by using Brown's theory (1990) which is categorized into four : interlingual, intralingual, learning context and communication strategy.

	PST1	PST2	PST3	PST4	PST5	Total	Percentage
Interlingual	2	3	2	2	1	10	18.51%
Intralingual	7	6	9	13	2	37	68.51%
Learning Context	-	-	1	2	-	3	5.55%
Communication Strategy	-	-	-	4	-	4	7.40%

*Table 4. Causes of Pre-service Teachers' Grammatical Errors*

Intralingual transfer causes the errors after the learners acquiring some new system of the English language. In this case, intralingual transfer mainly caused the omission of some grammatical elements, for example “Now, let’s read descriptive text”. interlingual caused the errors resulting from the transfer of linguistic system of the learner’s native language to the foreign language. The error can be found in the form of question “Where you can find the answer?” instead of “Where can you find the answer?”.

Another cause is learning context which caused the appearance of some errors as the learners might have gotten wrong information of some specific rules. Learning context often caused the wrong selection of prepositions like “You need to pay attention ~~with~~(to)”. The last cause is communicative strategy. This cause usually affects the lexical elements especially causing funny and unnatural sentence, for example “Is it correct or not number 3 is A?”.

#### **b. Problems Faced by Pre-service Teachers**

The data analysis and findings showed that all the pre-service teachers used classroom language in their teaching performance. However, the total of classroom language used in classroom is relatively low. Especially, there was one specific pre-service teachers who almost did not use any kind of classroom language, except two. Therefore, the interview was conducted with open-ended questions. The interview was also meant to check pre-service teachers’ errors by showing them their teaching performance with some errors.

In general, the result gives an overview of problems which are categorized into three major theme : students, physical and learning conditions, and teachers related. The questions given were open-ended questions which depends on each pre-service teacher’s answers. Some pre-service teachers deliberately explained the problems, but almost all of them realized that they have not optimized the use of classroom language..

##### **1) Students-related Problems**

Based on the data analysis, the problems are mostly students related which are students’ English proficiency and management. Regarding students’ English proficiency, all samples agree that this brings a significant impact on their classroom language. Even when they try to utilize some basic instructions, students still have difficulties to understand. As the result, pre-service teacher

tends to use Bahasa as it will be more effective and convenient for both teacher and students :

*PST 5 said that “There are only some students with good English. Therefore, I tend to use Bahasa ..”*

However, there was one specific pre-service teacher who almost did not use any classroom language. There were only two questions were given “Finish?” and “So far so good?”. Therefore, researcher asked some additional questions regarding this issue. According to PST 5, the absence of classroom language in her teaching performance is mainly due to the students' circumstances. In this case, almost all classes that she taught were hard to control. Therefore, using Bahasa Indonesia seemed as a better option.

*PST 5 said that “Some students are difficult to deal with. Sometimes, I give them some tasks, but they do not finish it ... There are only few of them who are pretty good. They might not understand what I wanna say, therefore I choosed to use Bahasa instead”*

## **2) Physical Environment Problems**

Some problems are closely related with the physical and learning condition in classroom such as classroom temperature, students' seat arrangement, and hour lesson of English subject.

*PST 3 said that, “ ... The windows in our school are quite huge, so in the afternoon the temperature is raising. This affects students' concentration ... So, Bahasa Indonesia is more involved in this situation”*

## **3) Teachers' Related Problems**

When the pre-service teachers could not maximize the use of classroom language, some issues were closely related with themselves. Some pre-service teachers (PST 3 and PST 5) found the problems as the classroom situation is quite different with the situation that they practiced in during micro teaching class. While in micro teaching class, pre-service teachers were provided with the scaled down teaching in which every aspects of classroom is not exactly as in real situation. Therefore, pre-service teachers can not fully apply every skill and knowledge that they ave practiced, likewise classroom language..

*PST 3 said that “The situation at school and microteaching class is defferent. So, the classroom language is often used in the first 15 minutes of the lesson”*

## **D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

This research focused on the error analysis of the pre-service teachers' classroom language of English Language Teaching Program UNP. The errors were omissions (50%), overinclusion (21.73%), ellipsis (15.21%), misselection (8.70%) and misplacement (4.34%). The causes of error in line with its type are intralingual (68.51%), interlingual (18.51%), communication strategy (7.40%) and learning context (5.55%). Some lexical errors were also found which were categorized into omission/incompletion, redundancy, wrong word choice, word formation and literal translation.

There were also some problems found that hinder pre-service teachers' optimal use of classroom language. The problems were classified into three : students-related problems, physical and learning condition problems and teachers-related problems. The most challenging ones are those related with the students, especially, students' English proficiency. Due to students' difficulties in understanding English including the classroom language, teachers tend to use Bahasa Indonesia to make teaching and classroom activities more efficient and effective.

Based on the findings and the conclusion of the research, there are several suggestions offered. First, the classroom language needs to be discussed briefly in micro teaching or any related courses. Then, the researcher also hope that pre-service teachers can utilize the classroom language more optimally despite the whole obstacles that might be challenging.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc
- Corder, S.P. (1981). *Error and an Interlanguage*. London: Oxford University
- Dalton-Puffer, Christine, 2007. *Discourse in Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Classroom*. Masterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in Language Learning and Use : Exploring Error Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Lap, T. Q., & Thy, H. V. U. (2017). EFL Teachers' Challenges in Maximizing Classroom Interaction. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 695–709. <https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v5n4p695>
- Llach. M. P. (2007). Lexical Errors in young EFL learners : How do they relate to proficiency measures? *Interlinguistica*, 17, 63-73
- Menon, D. (1993). A Study of the Classroom Language of English Teachers. *The English Teacher*, XXII(October), 1–12.
- Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, 5(2) pp. 1-8, Retrieved June 17, 2013 from: <http://www.victoria.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/publications/paul-nation/2003-Role-of-L1-Asian-EFL.pdf>
- Salaberri, S. (1995). *Handbooks for the English Classroom : Classroom Language*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Sari, H. I. (2016). Errors in Using English as Classroom Language Committed by the ICT Teacher of SMP Negeri 2 Semarang. *Edulite*, 1(1), 41–56.



- Selcuk, Koran. (2015). The Role of Teachers in Developing Learners' Speaking Skill. 6th International Visible Conference on Educational Studies and Applied Linguistics, 400-416
- Thanh, N. C (2015), The Differences between Spoken and Written Grammar in English, in Comparison with Vietnamese, *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal*, 11, 138- 153.
- Tiarina, Y. (2014). Grammar Errors Made by Micro Teaching Students: A Case at English Department of UNP. *SELT*, 508–511.

