

AN ANALYSIS OF LEARNERS' ORAL ERROR: A STUDY IN ONE-TO-ONE EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

by Sahril Nur

Submission date: 22-May-2022 06:51PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1841649757

File name: Learners_Errors.pdf (441.84K)

Word count: 2484

Character count: 32594



AN ANALYSIS OF LEARNERS' ORAL ERROR: A STUDY IN ONE-TO-ONE EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Sitti Syakira¹, Murni Mahmud², Sahril³
sitti.syakira@unsil.ac.id
Universitas Siliwangi

ABSTRACT

Correcting the repeated errors produced by the learners is one of the most frustrating things to do by teachers. However, it is natural for the students to commit errors while learning since it can be a sign of improving language competence and as a facilitating factor in second language learning (Atmaca, 2016). This study aims to find out the types and frequency of learners' oral error occurrence during the teaching and learning process in one-to-one EFL classroom interaction. This research applied descriptive qualitative research with case study design. Two adult learners, who had the same English proficiency level, were chosen as research participants through purposive sampling in Amsterdam Institute, an informal school applying tailor-made system in the teaching and learning process. The data were collected through observation during teaching and learning process, and analyzed based on data analysis procedures consisting of data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification. The results revealed that all types of errors proposed in this research appeared during the observation and data analysis. Grammatical error dominated the error type, and lexical error was the least error type produced by the learners. Unsolicited use of L1 is excluded from the discussion of the result finding since it is not a part of the error type studied (Lyster, 1998). Furthermore, another finding indicates that the error committed by the learners continuously appeared in the next meeting the researcher observed. Therefore, it is suggested that the teacher should provide more triggers as an attraction for the learners' intention so that they can figure out more about their errors, and engage the learners to provide themselves self-correction or self-repair by prompting them.

Keywords: Oral Corrective Feedbacks, Oral Errors, One-to-One EFL Classroom Interaction, Error Analysis.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most common abilities for those who want to grow in various domains of human endeavor is using English in oral communication. However, there are many complex activities to consider when teaching English as a foreign language. Despite exposure to the

language at various educational levels, pupils in an EFL course continue to struggle with understanding the fundamentals of English competency, especially in speaking class. Lacks of vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar knowledge drive the students to produce errors during their learning process. In addition, this might also be claimed that students' regular usage of their mother tongue contributes greatly to their problem in using English correctly. As a result, learners' errors in this situation are caused not only by their native language involvement, but also by the target language system, which means that the causes of errors could be interlingual or intralingual (Mahmoodzadeh, 2012). Regarding these contexts, it is unavoidable that learners might continue to produce errors in their endeavors to communicate in the target language. Furthermore, according to Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), one of the most unpleasant tasks for a teacher, especially a foreign-language teacher, is correcting the same errors made by students multiple times throughout the learning process.

The existence of error has been subjected for all language-teaching theories as an indicator of teaching process. It was connected to the popular theories in psychology, linguistics, and language learning at the time. Lambani and Nengome (2017) states that despite the fact that errors are presented as a detriment in the process of language learning, they might become an indicator of difficulties involved in the second language acquisition process for learners. Corder (1967), moreover, emphasizes that learner's error is a fundamental part of formative stage in their learning process. For teachers and learners, errors become such a stimulus to think about why they occur during the learning process. Errors let teachers recognize what their students comprehend and do not grasp, and with this knowledge, they may develop a more adequate notion and practice of a rule to facilitate the learners during their language learning process. Meanwhile for learners, being able to identify their errors can help them to determine learning strategies as Kamil et al. (2017) emphasize that adapting an effective and efficient learning practices can help the EFL learners to be able to adapt and manage their language acquisition. Furthermore, Strevens (1969) supports the statement that teacher should view the learners' errors as learning strategies, not as a learning problem.

Error is defined by Corder (1967) as an inaccurate utterances made by English Second Language (ESL) learners in which they produce during their language acquisition as part of transitional competence. He emphasizes further that errors committed by foreign language learners pertain to systematic inaccurate assertion, which represent their underlying understanding of the linguistic aspects they have acquired up to a certain point. Furthermore, Gass et al. (2013) consider errors to be a red flag as they hint the information about learners' language proficiency system and their second language knowledge. Producing incorrect language pieces to convey messages whether in written or spoken while learning a language is natural to commit by the students. The teacher is responsible for searching out resources and administer a measurement to provide feedback (Erdoğan, 2005) that they can process new language rules. In addition to learning foreign language, errors committed by the learners could be seen as a sign of progress in improving language competence (Farrokh, 2011; Montrul, 2011) and as a facilitating factor in language learning (Atmaca, 2016).

Drawing conclusion about the importance of errors as valuable resources for teachers to be able to tailor activities and learning strategies to assist students facing their obstacle in the learning process, an error analysis can provide as instruction and feedback for EFL students. Error Analysis (EA) is applied linguistics discipline which discusses the performance errors of language learners. It involves the error identification committed when

writing and speaking (Lambani & Nengome, 2017). Furthermore, Richards (1973) adds that error analysis is the study discussing errors produced by the second and foreign language learners. Basically, it is a type of phonological or morphological analysis that focuses on the errors learners commit. It includes a comparison of the errors made produced in the target language to the target language itself. In addition, Richards and Sampson (1974) contend that error analysis is a crucial technique for teachers to analyze students' learning abilities in order to address the most common errors produced by students. Therefore, it is essential that errors made by learners are identified and addressed.

This study adopts four different types of oral errors that suggested by Lyster (1998): grammatical, phonological, and lexical error, and unsolicited use of native language (L1). Error in the usage of closed classes such as determination, preposition, pronouns, errors in tense and subject/verb agreement, word order, negation, question construction, and auxiliaries are examples of grammatical error. Phonological errors, in this study, focuses on consonant and vowels sound, and silent letter pronunciation. Meanwhile, lexical errors cover three main categories, which are inaccurate, imprecise, or inappropriate choices of lexical items in open classes-namely, nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives (e.g., adoption for adaptation); non-target derivations of nouns, verbs, adverbs and adjectives, involving incorrect use of prefixes and suffixes (e.g., unpolite for impolite); and inaccurate vocabulary use to represent the correct meaning or idea of the word. (e.g., sometime for sometimes). The latter one, unsolicited use of L1, is not included as error per se, so that this error type was excluded from this research. The three types of error adopted, are based on the context of the language studied by him, in this case French. Nevertheless, these types of error might be currently occurring in the other language learning classrooms.

Several studies have previously explored learners' errors using error analysis in different language and linguistics aspects. However, the fact that the studies of error analysis in ESL/EFL have been done for writing samples (Ander & Yildirim, 2010; Sampson, 2012; Fareh, 2014; Atmaca, 2016; di Gennaro, 2016; Ondrakova, 2016; Nagata et al., 2017; Satake, 2020) can be credited for two reasons: first, written ESL/EFL sample is easier to gather than the spoken data. Second, analyzing textual samples is less time-consuming and comparably simpler.

In the speaking class context, most studies only focus on grammatical error. In Turkish context, Alahmadi and Kesseiri (2013) examine error in language transfer during the speaking session committed by Saudi students. They found out six types of grammatical errors which are incorrect form of verbs, third-person pronouns, improper use of singular/plurals and regular/ irregular verbs, articles, missing verb sentence, and duplicating subject with a subject pronoun. Another study of grammatical error in speaking context was conducted by Alahmadi (2014). He involved 30 first-year university students from University of Tibah in Saudi Arabia as research participants. The result reports nine distinct sorts of grammatical error made by the participants which are verbs with incorrect form, misuse of tense, articles, singular and plurals, prepositions, and regular and irregular verbs, sentences without a verb, pronoun copy as subject, and pronouns of the third-person.

Hojati (2013) indicated that Iranian EFL students with advance level of English proficiency exhibit some linguistic errors, particularly those pertaining to grammar and pronunciation. In addition, according to Tarawneh and Almomani (2013), the majority of Jordanian EFL students are unable to speak the language effectively, despite the fact that

many of them have acquired a substantial amount of grammatical knowledge and vocabulary. Al-Tamari (2019), moreover, examines the error types and classifications of speaking produced by first-year university students in Saudi. He categorizes the error into two types, which are pronunciation errors and grammatical errors. Meanwhile, in Indonesian context, Sari (2018) in her study found out 12 kinds of grammatical errors dominated by numbers. In Lumban Batu's et al. (2018) study, they found past tense as the dominated grammatical errors. The purpose of this study was, however, not to weight in either or for against the need focus of certain form of errors or error analysis in language learning classroom. Rather, it is necessary to take account not only grammatical errors, but also other error forms of linguistics aspects to enrich the theories.

METHOD

This research applied descriptive qualitative method with case study design which lies on participants' viewpoints and holistic analysis on what are described in the viewpoint (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2008). It was undertaken in an informal institution called Amsterdam Institute. This informal school has some English program such as General English, English for Professional, In-Company Training, TOEFL and IELTS. English for Professional, consisting of adult learners and conducted using tailor made system in which the teacher taught the learners based on their needs in one-to-one classroom, was chosen to fulfill the criteria of the research. The teaching and learning process can be done anywhere and anytime based on the agreement of the teacher and learners.

Two learners were chosen purposively as the research subjects. They were, afterward, identified as learner 1 (L1) and learner 2 (L2). They were, moreover, purposively chosen due to three reasons: (1) they had the same English proficiency level; (2) they had the same numbers of meeting; and (3) they had been taught with the same material before the research was conducted.

An observation was conducted during teaching and learning process to collect the data using audio recorder. It was conducted in two one-to-one classes and each class consisted of three meetings with 8 hours 38 minutes of audio recording in total. The data gathered were analyzed through the interactive model proposed by Miles et al. (2014). This analysis consists of four steps, which are data reduction in which the data were selected and coded based on the adopted theory, data display where the data were displayed in the form of excerpts, conclusion drawing and verification which dealt with concluding or interpreting the displayed data referring to the theory, and as the final part of this step, the conclusion was confirmed through verification.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This finding analysis combines data from the first and second learner taught differently in each one-to-one class interaction. It results in a total of 158 error occurrences, each of which was caused by a student turn that contained at least one error coded as grammatical, lexical, and phonological error, and unsolicited use of L1. This findings embody the number and percentage of error found during the data analysis shown in the following table.

Table 1: Number and Percentage of Error/Mistake

| Type of Error | 1st Learner's Error | 2nd Learner's Error | Total | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | Number | Percentage |
| Grammatical | 55 | 28 | 83 | 52.5 |
| Phonological | 10 | 13 | 23 | 14.6 |
| Lexical | 6 | 8 | 14 | 8.9 |
| Unsolicited use of L1 | 26 | 12 | 38 | 24.1 |
| Total | 97 | 61 | 158 | 100 |

Table 1 displays the error/mistake types in the whole database of the first and the second learner: 52.5% are grammar dominated with subject/verb agreement, 14.6% are lexical, in which inappropriate choices of lexical items appeared most, 8.9% are phonological, and 24.1 % are unsolicited uses of L1. The latest one, unsolicited use of L1 is excluded from the finding discussion since it is, basically, not included as error type. The first learner produced 97 (61.3%) errors, and 61 (38.7%) were produced by the second learner of which grammatical error dominated their error. In addition, the findings above are displayed in the following form of excerpts.

1. Grammatical Error

Grammar is one of the fundamental elements in English. This study found out most types of grammatical error mentioned by Lyster (1998), which are preposition, pronouns, errors in tense and subject/verb agreement, auxiliaries, and pronoun that he does not mention in his study. However, one of the most frequent errors/mistakes made by the learners was the subject and verb agreement. This type of grammatical error was mostly committed by the first learner. However, this finding has different result from Lumban Batu's et al. (2018) in which subject/verb agreement is the least grammatical error type committed by the learners. The term "subject-verb agreement" refers to the relationship of the sentence structure between the agreeing component of subject and predicate (Eberhard, 1999). Understanding how speakers and listeners come up with subject-verb agreement is a crucial

component of any theory of how grammar works. The following excerpts show the example of it.

Excerpt 1

- L₁ : KFC, **She like it**, kalau KFC.
 (KFC, she like it. If it's KFC)
 T : Oh, **she likes KFC**

Learner 1 (L₁), April 25, 2018

According to Lyster (1998) retrieving and implementing system-driven rules of grammar require more complicated cognitive processes than retrieving other items of error. The first excerpt displays the form of system driven-rules of grammar that is not applied in Indonesian, the adding -s' for singular subject. The learner, in this case, missed in constructing the singular verb, "like" where she should have added "-s" after "like". This error also appears in the study conducted by Al-Tamari (2019). He asserts that the removal of the third person -s', in contrast, is an intralingualistic error that is not related with Arabic. Forming verb by adding -s' for a singular subject in the simple present can be challenging for learners, particularly beginners. Students have a tendency to generalize the usage of the verb without '-s' even when the subject is not the third-person singular. In their research on language-related error analysis, Briceño and Klein (2018) conclude that this error may stem from the EFL learners' familiarity with the verb, but they are unable to distinguish it consistently. In addition, this type of error conformed the SLA study indicating that '-s' inflectional ending comes last (Brown, 1973; Larsen-Freeman, 1975; Hakuta, 1976).

Distinctively, subject-verb agreement continued to occur on another occasion. Different from the excerpt above of which errors are the plural verb for singular subject, in excerpt below, the subject "it" does not agree with the verb "have". In spite of using plural subject, the learner used singular subject "it".

Excerpt 2

- L₂ : Yeah. **It have** different meaning?
 T : Yeah, **they have different meaning**.

Learner 2 (L₂), April 21, 2018

Typically, the operations that take place during grammatical encoding occur swiftly and unconsciously. In other words, speakers typically focus on their message meaning rather than its grammatical form, particularly whether subject nouns and verbs agree. With this reason, even though the learners were taught about the material previously, when speaking, they tended to make the same mistake, still.

Another category of grammatical error that Lyster (1998) does not mention in his study is pronoun. Although this type only happens once during all the observation conducted, the researcher takes account of it as the distinguishing category of the earlier one mentioned by him. The excerpt below display the example.

Excerpt 3

- L₁ : No, but.. yes he is tall than me, because **I height** ... Ms. O (teacher's initial name)?
 T : No, 'I' *itu saya, kalau kepunyaan?*

- (No, I means *saya*, how about possession?)
L₁ : Hmm
T : Tinggi ku? Like I *saya*, *mama* ku, my mother
(My height? Like I *saya*, *mamaku*, my mother)
L₁ : Oh my height.
T : Yes.
L₁ : .. my height is one hundred forty five.

Learner 1 (L₁), May 11, 2018

In excerpt 3, the learner wrongly used "I" as possession in which she should have used "My". This grammatical error category can be attributed to the interference of pronoun use in Indonesian. Formally, in Indonesian, "saya" can be utilized both as subjective and possessive pronoun. Meanwhile, English literally has different form and function of their utilization. Alahmadi and Kesseiri (2013), Nesreen S Alahmadi (2014), Sari (2018), and Al-Tamari (2019) include this error category of grammatical error as intralingual errors. Intralingual error is "error which reflects the general characteristics of rule learning, such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules, and failure to learn conditions under which rules apply". (J. Richards, 1971, p. 173)

2. Phonological Error

The next type error that produced by the learner was phonological error. English programs and teachers do not prioritize pronunciation in their curricula and classroom activities, despite the fact that pronunciation is frequently a priority for students' learning activities (A. Brown, 1992; Willing, 1978; Fraser, 2000; Yates, 2001). This frequently leads the learners commit error during their language learning. According to study conducted on SLA, adult learners experience challenges acquiring L2 sound patterns at the level of a native speaker (Birdsong & Molis, 2001). In this study, learners mostly mispronounced certain consonant sound error. The following excerpt show the errors committed by learner 1 and 2.

Excerpt 4

- L₂ : No. Actually, my parents ee mem .. *membiarkan kami* to choose what we want, and they know I **love /lef/** fashion.
(No. Actually, my parents ee mem .. let us choose what we want, and they know I **love /lef/** fashion).
T : I **love /lef/** or I **love /lʌv/?**
L₂ : I love /lʌv/

Learner 2 (L₂), April 21, 2018

Excerpt 5

- L₁ : Oh, my husband is friendly and he loves **laugh /laug/**
T : Okay, **masih ingat bu, 'g' ketemu 'h' dibaca?**
(Okay, **do you still remember, mam, 'g' followed with 'h', we read it?**)
L₁ : Itu yang /la:f/?

(That's /lɑ:f/?)
T : Yes.

Learner 1 (L₁), May 11, 2018

According to Richards (1974), the occurrence of errors, especially in pronouncing a word, is caused by three main factors. First is the involvement of language element use while using another language during the interaction. The second factor is intra-linguistic errors, which represent the common merits of rule learning, such as incorrect generalization, inadequate utilization of rules, and failure to understand the circumstances under which rules are applied. Third is the occurrence of developmental errors when the learner seeks to construct predictions about the target language relying limited experience they have. Looking at the two excerpts above, this phonological error frequently occurs due to the first factor. This finding is in line with what Ramasari (2017) found in her research. She claims that the sound among /s/ and /z/, /f/ and /v/, or /e/ and /æ/ is difficult to pronounce by the students. Al-Tamari (2019) also claims that due the inexistence of these sounds in Arabic, this phonological error type can be regarded as native language interference. Students are in need of learning and practicing these sounds for correct word pronunciation. Therefore, EFL learners were unaware that their first language influenced their accents or dialects when speaking in general communication. In addition, Burgos et al. (2014), in the context of phonology acquisition in Spanish learners of Dutch, adds that this occurrence of errors is caused by the interference from the native language in acquiring the pronunciation of L2, which is in this study focus on English as foreign language. It has been demonstrated that acquiring pronunciation in practice is not simply reducible to quantity of accurate input (Broth & Lundell, 2013).

3. Lexical Error

Researchers and educators agree that the learning of lexical knowledge is essential to the acquisition of a second or foreign language. (Read & Chapelle, 2001). Lexical errors do not only play an important role in the process of acquiring vocabulary in L2, but are also among the most common type of errors made by the learners. This type of error appeared 14 times during the teaching and learning process in both classes observed. The following excerpt is one of the examples occurred.

Excerpt 6

L₁ : He is tall, and he is big than me. I think his **tall** 180 (*satu delapan puluh*).
(One hundred and eighty)
T : *Okay, jadi kalau kita mau bilang tingginya, tall itu kata sifat.*
(Okay, so if we want to say his height .. **tall is adjective**)
L₁ : *Iya betul*
(That's right)

Learner 1 (L₁), May 11, 2018

Excerpt 6 reflects the first type of lexical error proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The learner did not acknowledge that tall is an adjective, and it cannot be put after possessive adjective "his". The teacher's sentence "tall is adjective" was to trigger the learner finding the correct form of the word, but unfortunately, the learner did not respond as it was expected. The teacher supplied the learner with information that the word "tall" is not an adjective. It

was implied that learner was expected to change the word class "tall" into a noun "height".

Ander and Yildirim (2010) categorize this error as word formation error. According to them, in this category, lexical errors refer to instances in which pupils utilize the incorrect form of a term in their utterances. For example, when a learner intended to use a noun in a statement but uses the adjective form instead. Excerpt above shows the vice versa of what Ander and Yildirim (2010) show as the example, but still has the same lexical error pattern. However, this type of lexical error did not appear on students' composition in their study. It may be because of students' reluctance to use complicated words, phrases, and sentences in their word arrangement, which may be related to their language competence.

Excerpt 7

L₂ : Oh, yeah. There in .. just **exist** in UNM

T : **Exist?** What do you mean by exist here?

L₂ : *Ada*

(There is)

T : Oh, okay. So, exist, in this context, we cannot use. So, you can say ee "Vocational education is only in Makassar. There is no in Kendari"

Learner 2 (L₂), April 21, 2018

Excerpt 8

T : Okay. So how long have you been a teacher?

L₁ : Hm *dari* 2009, 2009, **from** 2009.

T : ***Kayaknya 'from' nya lebih cocok kalau kita ganti 'sejak'.***
(Apparently, we better use "since" than "from")

L₁ : Oh..

Learner 1 (L₁), April 25, 2018

The two excerpts illustrate the third type of lexical error according to Lyster (1998) in which the learner inaccurately used the vocabulary to represent the meaning of their idea or word. However, Ander and Yildirim (2010) differentiate this type of lexical error into two, wrong word choice and literal translation error. Excerpt 7 depicts the word choice error in which the learner uses an incorrect lexical item. As a result of this error, the entire statement lacks the intended meaning. This typically occurs when a learner chooses an incorrect or inappropriate item among multiple L2 counterparts for the same word.. In excerpt 7, the learner used "exist" to describe a place location, whilst "exist" means to be real or to live. Thus, this is not appropriate to use in the context.

In excerpt 8, in spite of using "since", the learner used "from" to answer the teacher's question. Apparently, the learner had the same idea as the teacher's. However, the learner used "from" because of two possible reasons; first, the learner translated the word literally from Indonesian since in Indonesian, "from" and "since" have similar use and interpretation, and second, the learner had no idea at all about the word. This lexical error category is in line with literal translation error pattern proposed by Ander and Yildirim (2010) that is the items that are directly translated into target or second language using the actual meaning of the native or first language. In other words, learners commit errors in this category when they figuratively interpret the single meaning of a term without understanding its locution in the target language. Although it might sound sensible to a native speaker of L1, it sounds strange to a natural speaker of L2.

Based on the preceding findings and discussion, the error percentage was calculated

and discussed in order to determine the predominant type of error. In this research, from 158 errors occurred during the teaching and learning process of the two learners, grammatical error with more subcategories of subject-verb agreement happened most frequently. This is in line with Lyster (1998) said that accessing and implementing system-driven rules of grammar requires more complicated cognitive processes than retrieving other items of error. This demonstrates that this error type is one of the most challenging elements for EFL learners to master in speaking skill. Furthermore, due to the same error repetitions produced by the learners in some occasions, the teachers need more effort to provide more trigger or encouragement to reduce those errors. These error occurrences are also mostly because of their absent mind of the material learnt before. It happens with the reason that they do not have enough time to constantly study due to their profession.

CONCLUSION

This paper has discussed learners' errors during the teaching and learning process in One-to-one EFL classroom interaction. The result found that learner 1 committed more errors than the learner 2 although they had the same level of English proficiency. This study, moreover, discovers three main types of errors appeared during the observation, namely grammatical, phonological, and lexical error, in which grammatical error dominated the error type followed by phonological and lexical error. Subject/verb agreement appears to be the dominating grammatical error category. In phonological error, consonant sound error becomes the students' difficulties to master due to the interference of L1. As for the lexical error, the second category of lexical error mentioned by Lyster (1998) did not occur in this study. Another finding that researcher can take out from this study, is that the error made by the learners continuously appeared in the second and the third meeting observed. The teacher should provide more triggers as an attraction for the learners' intention so that they can figure out more about their errors, and engage the learners to provide themselves self-correction or self-repair by prompting them.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed Al-Tamari, E. (2019). Analyzing speaking errors made by EFL Saudi university students. *Arab World English Journal, Special Issue: The Dynamics of EFL in Saudi Arabia*, 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/efl1.5>
- Alahmadi, Nesreen S. (2014). Errors analysis: A case study of Saudi learner's English grammatical speaking errors. *Arab World English Journal*, 5(4), 84–98. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/download/62035064/Error_Analysis20200208-80914-fui6b1.pdf
- Alahmadi, Nesreen Saud, & Kesseiri, R. (2013). Language transfer and grammatical speaking errors among Saudi students. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(3), 251–265. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nesreen_Alahmadi2/publication/338793470_Language_Transfer_and_Grammatical_Speaking_Errors_among_Saudi_Students/links/5e2addb2a6fdcc70a146e8e7/Language-Transfer-and-Grammatical-Speaking-Errors-among-Saudi-Students.pdf
- Ander, S., & Yildirim, Ö. (2010). Lexical errors in elementary level EFL learners' compositions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 5299–5303.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.864>

- Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Error analysis of Turkish EFL learners: A case study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232, 234–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.007>
- Birdsong, D., & Molis, M. (2001). On the evidence for maturational constraints in second-language acquisition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 44(2), 235–249. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2750>
- Briceño, A., & Klein, A. F. (2018). Running records and first grade English learners: An analysis of language related errors. *Reading Psychology*, 39(4), 335–361. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2018.1432514>
- Broth, M., & Lundell, F. F. (2013). Napouléon's sequential heritage. Using a student error as a resource for learning and teaching pronunciation in the French foreign language classroom. *Classroom Discourse*, 4(1), 89–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2013.783498>
- Brown, A. (1992). *A survey of attitudes and teaching practices related to pronunciation teaching*. AMES WA.
- Brown, R. (1973). *A first language*. Harvard University Press.
- Burgos, P., Cucchiarini, C., van Hout, R., & Strik, H. (2014). Phonology acquisition in Spanish learners of Dutch: Error patterns in pronunciation. *Language Sciences*, 41, 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2013.08.015>
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1967.5.1-4.161>
- di Gennaro, K. (2016). Searching for differences and discovering similarities: Why international and resident second-language learners' grammatical errors cannot serve as a proxy for placement into writing courses. *Assessing Writing*, 29, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2016.05.001>
- Eberhard, K. M. (1999). The accessibility of conceptual number to the processes of subject-verb agreement in English. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 41(4), 560–578. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1999.2662>
- Erdoğan, V. (2005). Contribution of error analysis to foreign language teaching. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 1(2), 261–270. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/161018>
- Fareh, S. (2014). Macrolinguistic errors in Arab EFL learners' essays. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 923–933. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.161>
- Farrokh, P. (2011). Analysing of EFL learners' linguistics Errors: Evidence from Iranian translation trainees. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 1(6), 676–680. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.1.6.676-680>
- Fraenkel, J., & Wallen, N. . (2008). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7th

Ed.). McGraw-Hill International Edition.

- Fraser, H. (2000). *Coordinating improvements in pronunciation teaching for adult learners of English as a second language*. DETYA (ANTA Innovative Project). Retrieved from <https://helenfraser.com.au/wp-content/uploads/ANTA-REPORT-FINAL.pdf>
- Gass, S., Bahney, J., & Plonsky, L. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Hakuta, K. (1976). a Case Study of a Japanese Child Learning English As a Second Language. *Language Learning*, 26(2), 321–351. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1976.tb00280.x>
- Hojati, A. (2013). An investigation of errors in the oral performance of advanced-level Iranian EFL students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(4), 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n4p171>
- Kamil, D., Suhaimi, Hartono, R., & Vintoni, A. (2017). TEFL Students' Language Learning Strategies: The Case of One State Islamic Institute in Indonesia. *Ta'dib: Journal of Islamic Education*, 22(2), 70–76. <https://doi.org/10.19109/tjie.v22i2.1641>
- Lambani, M. N., & Nengome, Z. (2017). Selected common errors committed by third year university English students. *International Journal of Educational Sciences*, 18(1–3), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09751122.2017.1305758>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. E. (1975). The acquisition of grammatical morphemes by adult ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(4), 409–419. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585625>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, 14(2–3), 112–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668828>
- Lumban Batu, P. N. F., Puspitasari, L., Larsen, B., & Sitepu, V. T. (2018). Grammatical errors in students speaking English: An error analysis on Indonesian maritime students. *Asian EFL Journal*, 20(7), 89–93. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332330314%0AGrammatical>
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00039>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Mahmoodzadeh, M. (2012). A cross-linguistic study of prepositions in Persian and English: The effect of transfer. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4), 734–740. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.4.734-740>
- Miles, M., Huberman, M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Method Sourcebook*. Sage Publications.

- Montrul, S. (2011). Morphological errors in Spanish second language learners and heritage speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 33(2), 163–192. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263110000720>
- Nagata, R., Takamura, H., & Neubig, G. (2017). Adaptive spelling error correction models for learner English. *Procedia Computer Science*, 112, 474–483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.08.065>
- Ondrakova, J. (2016). The issue of errors in teaching foreign languages. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 217, 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.02.037>
- Ramasari, M. (2017). Students' pronunciation error made in speaking for general communication. *Linguistics, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 1(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v1i1.32>
- Read, J., & Chapelle, C. A. (2001). A framework for second language vocabulary assessment. *Language Testing*, 18(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026553220101800101>
- Richards, J. C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Error analysis: Perspective on second language acquisition* (1st ed., pp. 172–191). Taylor & Francis.
- Richards, J. C. (1973). *Error analysis*. Longman.
- Richards, J. C., & Sampson, G. (1974). The study of learner English. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Error analysis: Perspective on second language acquisition* (13th ed., pp. 3–18). Longman.
- Sampson, A. (2012). "Coded and uncoded error feedback: Effects on error frequencies in adult Colombian EFL learners' writing." *System*, 40(4), 494–504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.10.001>
- Sari, R. A. (2018). Students' grammatical error analysis in speaking. *Edukasi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 5(2), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.19109/ejpp.v5i2.2102>
- Satake, Y. (2020). How error types affect the accuracy of L2 error correction with corpus use. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 50, 100757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100757>
- Stevens, P. (1969). Two ways of looking at error-analysis. *ERIC*, 1–10. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED037714>
- Tarawneh, R. T., & Almomani, I. M. (2013). The spoken errors and mistakes committed by senior English students at Princess Alia University College. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(3), 497–502. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.3.497-502>
- Willing, K. (1978). *Learning styles in adult migrant education*. National Curriculum Centre.
- Yates, L. (2001). *Teaching pronunciation in the AMEP: Current practice and professional development*. Macquarie University Press.

AN ANALYSIS OF LEARNERS' ORAL ERROR: A STUDY IN ONE-TO-ONE EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

1%

PUBLICATIONS

%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

jurnal.unsil.ac.id

Internet Source

1%

2

www.education.mcgill.ca

Internet Source

1%

3

Roy Lyster. "Negotiation of Form, Recasts, and Explicit Correction in Relation to Error Types and Learner Repair in Immersion Classrooms", *Language Learning*, 06/1998

Publication

<1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On

AN ANALYSIS OF LEARNERS' ORAL ERROR: A STUDY IN ONE-TO-ONE EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8

PAGE 9

PAGE 10

PAGE 11

PAGE 12

PAGE 13
