Grammar Errors Made by Micro Teaching Students: A Case at English Department of UNP

Yuli Tiarina, M.Pd
English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang

Abstract

The writer saw the problem when the writer was doing a research on applying reflective teaching to improve students' pedagogic competency in teaching practice in Micro Teaching subject. For the first and second meetings, the students were asked to comment their friend who had just finished teching practice for interactional text. It was found that most students commented on their teaching technique, media and material. None commented on their grammar error, whereas it was found many grammar errors that will lead to wrong exposure later. They are going to be teachers. They should have linguistic competence as well. Then, an error analysis is needed to see what error made most by students. It is hoped that by analyising the errror that students will know them, and it can the feedback for them. This descriptive qualitative study is to analyze what types errors most made by the subject of this study. In this errors analysis, a Target Modification Taxonomy by James (1998) is to analyze and describe the errors. The students spoken language were recorded and transcribed before analysis took place to gain the data of this error analysis study. Theory of qualitative data proposed by Ary (2010) is implemented in analyzing the data of this study. It was found that the errors made most by Micro Teaching students are misselection.

Key words/phrases: *Micro Teaching, English grammar, error analisys, target modification taxonomy*

A. Introduction

Teachers to be need to be prepared to be good language teachers. According to Brown (2001), there are four good language teaching characteristics that teachers should have in order to be good language teachers. They are technical knowledge, pedagogical skills, interpersonal skills and personal qualities. Students at English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang, for example, have been facilitated with those characteristics. For technical knowledge, the students learn linguistic system of English pnonology, grammar and discourse. They also learn speaking, writing, listening to and reading English. To have pedagogical skills, the students learn curriculum, language assestment, language teaching media, and micro teaching. Micro Teaching is of the subjects hoped can make the students trained to be teachers. Micro Teaching provides the opportunities for the students to practise teaching. They teach their friend. In this case their friends behave like junior or senior high school students.

Grammar is needed to teach because it provides comprehensibility and acceptability as it is mentioned by Swan (2002). First, the students are taught how to build and use certain structures. Knowing how to build and use certain structure makes it possible to communicate common types of meaning successfully. Without the structures, it is difficult to make comprehension sentences. Second, in some social contexts, serious deviance from native spekaers norm can hinder integration and excite prejudice – a person who speaks "badly" may not be taken seriously or may be considered uneducated or stupid.Therefore, students may want or need a higher level of grammatical correctness than is required for mere comprehensibility.

The writer is involved in a research, entitled Applying ReflectiveTteaching to Improve Students' Pedagogic Competency in Teaching Practice in Micro Teaching Subject. One of the focus of this research is to find what aspects the students reflect after they do their own teaching practice. The first step in this research is the students have other students comment on their

teaching practice. The second step is the students reflect their own teaching and write it in their journal.

After observing students taught interpersonal texts twice, it was found that most" practice teachers" got comment from their friend about teaching technique, media and material. None of the students commented on grammar error made by practice teachers, whereas it was found that many errors made by them. Similarly, when they did reflection, among 15 students only two students reflected their grammar mastery.

As mentioned before that technical knowledege, known as linguitic competence, must become students concern. Therefore it is needed to investigate what type of errors most done by the students in Micro Teaching class. The result of this study can be a good way to give feedback to the Micro Teaching students. By knowing the grammar error they made, they can learn again, improve thei grammar, and increase their language awareness. As s result , they are to go to the field to be "comprehensible and acceptable teachers".

B. Review of Related Theories

Language learners will be curious about the language they are learning (McKay, 2006), so they are willing to accept any feedback that will upgrade their language knowledge. Then they will get into the evaluation part of learning language and the students will be able to use words and phrases fluently without very much conscious thought (Harmer, 2007).

It is important to evaluate the students' oral language by showing the errors they have made rather than the right one (Ellis, 1997). Students' oral language is produced by the students naturally as the language features they have learned. Showing the error then noticing the right one will help the students to revise the students' misunderstanding about a certain language feature then their language learning could develop gradually over the time. However, to show the students' errors should be extended by the teacher as wise as possible.

Ellis (1997) defines the error as reflection of learner's knowledge and it occurs because the learner does not know the correct one. Lack of language knowledge such as pronunciation, accents, words use, vocabulary, and structure can be addressed to the students because of their error occurred. Therefore, they will learn this language knowledge gradually over the time. It means that the students will get their errors at the early moment of learning a new knowledge of a language lesson.

Corder in James (1998) has made crucial points about error analysis. He pointed out that error analysis is significant in two aspects. Error analysis tells the teacher what needs to be taught, and it tells the reseacher how learning proceeds.

James (1998) quotes Lenon's definition of an error as "a linguistic form... which in the same context... would in all likelihood not be produced by learner's *native speaker counterparts"*. James adds that an error appers only when there was no intention to commit or make it. An error can not be self-corrected. Brown (2007) says error analisys can be focused on linguistic elements.

The students or the error maker will obtain more luck from this error analysis study because they will know and realize the error they have made when they are learning a new material. Being shown the error they have made sometimes will be brought up next to their mind so that they will be aware of having the similar errors. They will be noticeable about the language features as well and it will possibly help the students to self-correct the errors they have made (Ellis, 1997).

James (1998) proposes five classifications/types of errors. They are omission, overinclusion, misselection, misorder and blends. It is called a Target Taxonomy Modification. James had modified error classification from previuos experts, such as Dulay, Burt and Krashen in 1982. Omission is the absence of content and functions words. The example of omission is *He'll pass his exam and I'll ɸ too.* Overinclusion includes overgeneralization, double marking and simple addition. The example of overinclusion is *He doesn't know*s.* Misselection is the wrong form of a structure or morpheme. The example is *I *seen her yesterday.* Blends are the

situations where there is not just one well-defined target, but two. The learner is undecided about which of these targets he has "in mind". In this example *according to Erica* and *in Erica's opinion* seem to been blended.

C.   Data Collection, Description, and Discussion

The research instruments in this study were used to gain the answer of the research questions. In this study, the researcher used two instruments. The primary instrument used in qualitative research is the researcher herself (Ary, 2010). In fact, the researcher conducted the research, collected data until analyzed the data of the study by herself. There are three principle methods of collecting sample, they are: (1). Pencil and paper; (2). Audio recording; (3). Video recording (Ellis et al, 2005).To support the primary instrument in gaining the data, the researcher used a video recording. In this study, the researcher used the video recording because the data of this study were in the form of spoken data. Therefore, the first step done by the researcher was recording the spoken made students in Micro Teaching class. After recording the students' spoken, the researcher transcribed the recording into written transcription to ease the researcher in analyzing the students' spoken to find the type of errors. The recording perhaps eases an analysis to go back to the oral performance repeatedly. It helps to ensure that the transcription is detailed and accurate (Ellis et al, 2005).

The next step is analyzing the students' spoken through their transcription. The theory of James (1998) was used to classify the students' errors found in their spoken performance. The errors then were put in a target modification taxonomy table. They are omission, overinclusion, misselection, misordering and blends. By classifying the categories of errors, the researcher would be able to find out the what errors were made most by the students.

As suggested by Ary (2010), there are stages in analyzing qualitative data. Firstly, the researcher familiarized herself with the data. Listening and watching repeatedly is one way to be familiarized with the data because the data of this study are in the form of spoken data. To ease the researcher, she made the transcription of the recording. After being familiar with the data, the researcher organized the data so that the researcher was able to analyze the data through the next stage. Secondly, the researcher coded the students' spoken transcriptions to separate the data based on the coding. In addition, this was used to ease the researcher in analyzing the error of each student's spoken transcription. After being coded and analyzed in detail based on the theory used, the data were then coded in larger coding. The large code is the part where the students' spoken transcription put into five codes based on the errors found. Finally, the data were interpreted. The researcher used the table to explain the errors found in detail and chart to show the percentage of the error frequencies or amount.

Following analysis was based on from the most to least frequent grammar errors found. The most frequent error was misselection. It was found that 77.78% errors were misselection. The first misselection found was redundancy, leaving the grammatical features that do not contribute to the meaning of an utterance. The redudancy found was omitting –s in verbs of third person singular in *She look* beautiful today. You can say thank you whenever someone congratulate* you.* The second one was plural markers and possessive adjectives errors where most of the students leave the –s in plural markers and –'s in possessive adjective. For example these errors were found in *I want to visit some place**, *Happy birthday is one of expression**, When do you agree with *A* opinion*?. The third one is verb construction. The students failed to use the correct verb as in *Have you ever *congratulating people?.* It was also found that there was more than one errors in one sentence, as in Have you **agree or* disagree* with *some one* opinion*?, *Have you ever *ask your friend* opinion like Rebecca *do in that video?.* Most errors in selection were the absence of *–s ending* in plural forms.

Type of errors	Number of Errors	Percentage of Errors
Omission	5	11.11
Overinclusion	5	11.11
Misselection	35	77.78
Misordering	0	0
Blends	0	0
Total	45	100

The second type of error made was omission. There were five errors dealing with omission. First omission was found in *I will show you a video that ϕ related to our topic,* Have *you*ϕ *congratulated* before by your friend?, Who *has ever ϕ * congratulate* by someone?. They are errors of omission *be* in passive constructions. Second one is *He or she ϕ success in doing something*. It is an error of omission verb *be* in nonverbal sentence. The third omission was as in Anybody *have ever ϕ* this situation?. This is an omission of verb.

The third type error was overinclusions. The students used two verbs and (pro) nouns (double marking) in one sentence. It can be found in the following errors: *Let*'s +we watch this video, Let's +we discuss it, What about if you +are come, Who knows what +is the compliment means?* The student overused *–s ending* for the second person in *You need*s other help*. Finally, it was found that no misordering errors and blends were made by the students.

This finding is the same with Stemberger's in Jam (1998) finding. He recognized the four categories of error, and added some quantitative information; misselections were most frequent among blend, omission and overinclusion.

D. Conclusion and Suggestions

The result showed that misselections were made most by the students. It indicates that students do not aware with the use –s ending in plural forms and possesive adejectives, and verb constructions. It is suggested that the students should focus not only on the technique of teaching, but also on the grammar because the students will be teachers. They will model or exposure grammar to the students later. Then, This research needs expanding. For the next research, the students will be interviewed to find out what factors that make those errors.

References

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. K. 2010. Introduction to Research in Education (8 ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Brown, H Douglas. 2001. Teaching by Principles. (2nd ed). New York: Longman.

-----------------------. 2007. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (5 ed.). New York: Longman.

Ellis, R. 1997. Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. 2007. How to Teach English. Harlow: Pearson.

James, C. (1998). Errors in Language Learning and Use Exploring Error Analysis. Harlow: Longman.

McKay, P. 2006. Assessing Young Language Learners. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.