Analysis on English Speaking Performance: Exploring Students' Errors and The Causes

Dayat

IKIP PGRI Pontianak, Pontianak, Indonesia
E-mail: littledyt@gmail.com

Abstract. This study was aimed to analyze students' errors and the causes during speaking performance by twenty-nine fourth semester English students of in IKIP PGRI Pontianak who had low speaking performance. In collecting the data, video recordings were used to find errors and frequencies, while, focus group interview investigating factors of speaking errors. The data were analyzedby identifying the errors, grouping and tabulating into category codes. To analyze the interview, 1) listening to talking data, 2) shaping talking data, 3) communicating talking data with an interpretative intent, 4) reproducing or (re)constructing data, and building data credibility. The findings showed speaking errors with five categories: 28% of incorrect omissions, 26% of unnecessary words, 24% of misused forms, 19% of confused forms, and 3% of misplaced forms. Furthermore, other findings mostly included the causes of errors that influenced them in speaking were interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, learning context, and communication strategies.

Keywords**:** Speaking; Performance; Errors; Causes

I. INTRODUCTION

It is no doubt that speaking is one of the most aspects of language learning [1]. Tuan and Mai also strengthen that many language learners find it difficult to express themselves in spoken language in the target language [1]. Thus, it is to simply say that to speak a learned language is believed to be difficult.Consequently, the researcher considers that there might be a lot of different elements of errors that learners might make during the spoken production. Hossain and Uddin briefly justify that to learn English, a learner has to go through a complex process of committing errors [2]. The results are pronunciation, grammar, articles, auxiliaries, prepositions, and possible reasons behind the errors in written and spoken. To the researcher's final point of view, many learners might also then create errors in producing English especially in speaking.

Related to the case of errors, Ellis [3] defines that errors reflect gaps in a learners' knowledge, they occur because the learner does not know what is correct. While, mistakes reflect occasional lapses in performance; they occur because, in particular, instance, the learner is unable to perform what he or she knows. Considering the errors themselves, it is also assumed that many factors might affect learners to create errors. Tuan and Mai [1] point out that there were many factors affecting students speaking performance such as topical knowledge, listening ability, motivation to speak, teachers' feedback during speaking activities, confidence, the pressure to perform well, and time for preparation.

As an intrinsic complex task, it is one of the most different abilities to acquire accuracy and fluency in spoken English. Speaking varies between native speakers (NS) who think and speak in the language used and non-native speakers (NNS) who think in their own native language. Evidently, learning English as a second or foreign language is not at all an easy task as it is an artificial process [2].

To assist the students to overcome problems in speaking, it is necessary for the lecturer to figure out the causes that affect their speaking performance. Tuan and Mai [1] say that students' speaking performance can be affected by the factors that come from performance conditions (time pressure, planning, the standard of performance and amount of support), affective factors (such as motivation, confidence, and anxiety), listening ability and feedback during speaking activities.

Regardless to say, the researcher is interested in conductingthis study concerning the spoken production conducted by fourth Semester English Students of IKIP-PGRI Pontianak.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

To get accurate data, the researcher employed appropriate methodology and instrument to achieve the objectives. The main objective of this recent study is to find out the errors committed by the fourth-semester students of English Education Program of IKIP-PGRI Pontianak. Along with these, this also concerns to find out the causes of those errors.

There were 29 students selected based on the consideration both the Speaking Lecturer and the researcher. Those students had low on speaking performance. However, the intention of this study actually helps them to improve their speaking.

In attaining the data, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. Video recording was applied to gain

speaking errors. In applying this, the researcher instructed the students to speak with free topic. During the performance, the researcher recorded students' performance.Then, the researcher replayed the record while identifying, coding, and tabulating the errors. The last is calculating in order to find the percentage of the errors, by using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{n_1}{\sum N} \times 100\%$$

To analyze the interview, the researcher transcripted the record to find out the causes of speaking errors. In this case, the researcher conducted some phases: 1) listening to talking data, 2) shaping talking data, 3) communicating talking data with an interpretative intent, 4) reproducing or (re)constructing data, and building data credibility [4]. Those steps were presented by Widodo on how to have good interview data transcription (ibid). Listening to talking datameans organizing and analyzing talking or verbal data is doing thetranscribing,which involves close observation of data through carefully repeated and attentive listening. To easily retrieve the data and allow for tidily organized data management, it needs to shape talking data starting to provide data identity (e.g., data code and number, data collection date, involved participants, data collection methods). Based on ethical concern, the researcher assigned a pseudonym to the participant's name (ibid.).

The next step was communicating talking data. It means detailing and interpreting them in a methodologically sound manner. This involves how much detail talking data should be transcribed (ibid). A naturalism approach of transcription was applied. It was because transcription shows the complexity of the transcription process, maintain representation or authenticity of lived experiences, and modulate the interpretation of transcription data at a given delicacy level [4].

In addition, to building data credibility, the researcher user member check. It means the participants provided feedback on the accuracy of how talking data had been presented and interpreted.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Concerning the findings from video recording on speaking performance, the data were analysed from the result of speaking, it means the student when performing made several errors even he or she did the similar things. The findings show the errors can classify into some categories, they were misused forms, incorrect omissions, misplaced words, unnecessary words, and confusing words. Determining those categories was by constructing from three theories [3]-[5]-[6]. The result of video recording shows the total number of the finding errors is 348 of 29 students. The findings show that there are 98 errors of incorrect omissions, 89 errors of unnecessary words, 84 errors of misused forms, 66 errors of confused words, and 11 errors of misplaced words, or see the Table I for further detail.

Table I
Speaking Errors

No	Error Categories	Number of Errors	Percentage
	Misused forms	84	24%
	Incorrect omissions	98	28%
	Misplaced words	11	3%
	Unnecessary words	89	26%
	Confused words	66	19%

The speaking errors on misused forms were identified by a number of aspects, tenses as the most misusage, preposition, pronouns, S+verb agreement, word choice, singular & plural nouns, infinitive/gerund, articles, clause, and grammar choice. Here are the examples:

− I'm studying in IKIP since 2014 (tense error: I have studied in IKIP since 2014).
− She have a boy (S+Verbagreement: She has a boy).
− She comes from Ketapang (S+Verbagreement: She comes from Ketapang)
− She have short hair (S+Verbagreement: She has short hair).
− At December (Preposition: In December).
− In Sanggau at eighth of July (Preposition: In Sanggau on the eighth of July).
− There is much assignment (Singular and Plural: There are many assignments).
− A second child (Singular and Plural: A second child).
Those aspects are specified in Table II.

Table II
Speaking Errors on Misused Forms

No	Aspects	Number of Errors	Percentage
1	tenses	40	48%
2	preposition	7	8%
3	pronouns	2	2%
4	S+verb agreement	14	17%
5	word choice	2	2%
6	singular & plural nouns	6	7%
7	infinitive/gerund	4	5%
8	articles	3	4%
9	clause	2	2%
10	grammar choice	4	5%

Concerning speaking errors on incorrect omissions, the researcher classified into some smaller categories, article, singular & plural nouns, infinitive, clauses, conjunctions, prepositions, and to be. It means that the students omitted the use of those categories when speaking. The highest errors of this were that the students were weak in the use of articles, they usually omitted some articles, for

instances the use of *the,* and *a/an*. As for speaking lecturer, of course, it was challenging because most students (98 errors) were still low being aware of the use of categories. Table III provides the record of the categories.

Table III
Speaking Errors on Incorrect Omission

No	Types	Number of errors	Percentage
	Incorrect Omission		
1	Articles	31	32%
2	Singular & Plural Nouns	22	22%
3	Infinitive	3	3%
4	Clause	5	5%
5	Conjunction	3	3%
6	prepositions	7	7%
7	To be	27	28%

Based on the table of identification of Incorrect Omission, there were four highest contributions of incorrect omission errors to students. They were an article, to be, singular/plural, and preposition. Some examples of the four highest contribution errors. These were some examples of the error identifications regarding the category of Incorrect Omissions.

– About <u>newest</u> activity (article omission: About the newest activity).
– She is <u>good girl</u> (article omission: She is a good girl)
– <u>His son five</u> years old (Be omission: His son is five years old)
– <u>She always beside</u> me (Be omission: She is always beside me).
– English is one of <u>language</u> (Plural omission: English is one of the languages)
– Many <u>advantages</u> (Plural omission: Many advantages).
– <u>Listen to</u> music (Preposition omission: Listen to music).
– For <u>students IKIP PGRI Pontianak</u> (Preposition omission: For students of IKIP PGRI Pontianak).
– <u>Why the reason I love</u> (clause error: The reason I love/Why I love).

Some students also used unnecessary words when speaking. For instances:
– She is short <u>and then</u> fat(She is short and fat).
– She is <u>so very</u> naughty (She is very naughty or She is so naughty).

Another speaking error committed by the students was also identification of incorrect omissions. This case, the researcher identified some smaller categories of misplaced words in which the students had made mistakes, especially on arranging words into a good sentence (word order) and using some adverbs, e.g.:
– The brother <u>now</u> is junior high school (adverb: The brother is junior high school now)
– I like <u>so much</u> Real Madrid (adverb: I like Real Madrid so much)

– <u>Leader careless</u> (Word Order: Careless leader)
– <u>Club football</u> (Word Order: Football club)

The errors were specified in the following table:

Table IV
Speaking Errors on Misplaced Words

No	Types	Number of Errors	percentage
	Misplace Words		
1	Word Orders	5	45%
2	Adverbs	6	55%

Next, speaking errors on unnecessary words. It means when speaking, the students sometimes used unnecessary words, for example, conjunction, it was dominant errors found when the students speaking. Furthermore, article, singular & plural, preposition, redundant, infinitive, pronoun, to be, incomplete phrases, and clause were also identified.

The last error identification in this study was confusing words. To this case, there were some students spoke unclearly. Besides, they sometimes used unclear pronouns and grammar choice. The idea they spoke was also confusing and this error was dominating in when the students speaking. It means that they could not determine the clear idea when they wanted to deliver the message to the audience. For examples:

– She is diligent from us (Idea).
– You cannot pay with a lot of money (Idea).
– Herliza is the best when <u>he</u>…(Pronoun: Herliza is the best when she ...).
– She is strong woman because of he… (Pronoun: She is strong woman because she…).
– For meet my dream (Word Choice: To make my dream).
– I think <u>it's enough for me</u> (Word Choice: It think <u>that's all I can tell you</u>).
– She is <u>same taller</u> (Grammar Choice: She is as tall as ...).
– <u>I and Yanisame in</u> Sanggau (Grammar Choice: Yani and I live in Sanggau orI live in Sanggau, and Yani does too).

Table V shows the speaking errors on confusing words.

Table V
Speaking Errors on Confusing Words

No	Types	Number of Errors	Percentage
	Confusing Words		
	Ideas	31	47%
	Pronouns	17	26%
	Word Choices	14	21%
	Grammar Choices	4	6%

The speaking errors the students had made does not mean without any factors influencing their performance. Brown [5] classifies that there are five personality factors in language learning. He also states that the personality factors

are involved in intrinsic side of affectivity, self-esteem, inhibition, risk-taking, anxiety, empathy.

Based on the students' perspectives, they generally agreed that the interlingual transfer was one of the factors that interfered their language. In this case, the researcher could briefly conclude that 13 students strongly agreed that interlingual (first language) transfer influenced by the students to make errors. It means that students significantly considered that their first language surely influenced them to make errors. It is in line with Ellis' statement [3] that the first language is one of the error sources. This is called as negative transfer.

While 16 students moderately agreed that interlingual transfer contributed errors to students. In other words, even if the students were not very sure, the students agreed that first language could have interfered them to produce errors. In short, all students agreed that first language is one of error factors.

In addition, for intralingual-transfer factor, 19 students strongly agreed that intralingual (English structures) transfer essentially caused students to make errors. The intralingual transfer is closely related to overgeneralization. The transfer (within the second or foreign language itself) is also a major factor of errors. In other words, learners who are beginners possibly make overgeneralization with the English system Brown [5]. In this case, the students strongly agreed that the difficulty of understanding and applying kinds of English structure influenced students to make errors. Other students the moderately responded that intralingual transfer contributed errors to the students. It means that the students were sure enough that this transfer caused them to create errors. Like the interlingual transfer, all students agreed that this transfer was one of the factors and this factor fundamentally interfered the students' English spoken productions.

In addition, another factor affected speaking errors was understanding English materials during the course. The learning context refers to a confusion of understanding the language which is learned (e.g in the classroom). It may be due to a teacher''s confusing explanation or unclear materials that eventually create a source of errors (ibid)[7].The recent research showed that 14 students said English materials in university level were difficult. On the other hand, other 10 students moderately agreed about the difficulties and 2 students disagreed. It can be eventually concluded that 10 students agreed that the learning system had occasionally influenced them to produce standard forms. Teaching learning experience, of course, adds more knowledge, especially speaking. Krashen [8] additionally adds that the classroom should give students the benefit of comprehensible input (comprehensible information of language knowledge). It is however, there were only 2 students disagreed that learning system caused them to make errors. It indicates that students have not succeeded in learning.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

After conducting the research, doing the analysis, and presenting the results, it can be concluded: first, the error categories which had been gathered were misused forms, incorrect omissions, misplaced words, unnecessary words, and confused words. Second, the total number of the finding errors in this study were 348 of 29 students. the errors result in 28% of incorrect omissions, 26% of unnecessary words, 24% of misused forms, 19% of confused forms, and 3% of misplaced forms. The highest frequency of the finding errors was the incorrect omissions. While the lowest one was misplaced. Third, the interview findings on the analysis and evaluation towards students' opinions related to four main questions resulted in a conclusion that they were four factors that interfered their English speaking production. They were interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, learning context, and communication strategies.

REFERENCES

[1] N.H. Tuan and T.N. Mai. "Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance at Le Thanh Hien High School."*Asian Journal of Educational Research:* vol. 3, pp. 8-23, 2015.
[2] M.D.Hossain and M.T. Uddin. "An Investigation into the Errors Committed by First Year Under Graduates in the Department of English at Jahangirnagar University." *Global Journal of Human Social Science Research.* vol. 15, pp. 1-17, Mar. 2015.
[3] R. Ellis. *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
[4] P.H. Widodo. "Methodological Considerations in InterviewData Transcription."*International Journal of Innovation in English Language,* vol. 3, pp. 101-107, 2014.
[5] H.D.Brown.*Principles of Language Teaching: Fourth Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 2000.
[6] T.J. Fitikides. *Common Mistakes in English*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2002.
[7] M.Fallahi. *Contrastive linguistics and Analysis of Errors, Vol. 1: The Grammatical Structure of English and Persian*. Tehran: Iran University Press, 1991.
[8] S.D. Krashen.*Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. First Internet Edition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Inc, 2009.