Error Analysis in Short Dialogue Using Future Tense

Silvia N. P. Erito

Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika

Abstract

Error analysis plays an important role in investigating errors in the acquisition of a second or foreign language. This error analysis is part of the investigation into the process of learning English. The research aimed of this study is to analyze the types of errors made by the students of SMAN 2 Semarang on writing future tense sentences in a short dialogue. In this research, the researchers will discuss the types of interlingual errors. Qualitative descriptive methods used to find the types of errors that made by the students. The data was gathered through written task in the form of students' writing short dialogue in English using future tense. The Findings showed that the researchers found a non-contrastive analysis which was divided into 4 such as, over-generalization, ignorance of rules restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and hypothesized false concepts. As a result of student work, based on the frequency of each aspect of error the highest-level error found is hypothesized false concepts. So that students still do not fully understand the topic and context discussed in the future tense sentence. Therefore, students must continue to learn to understand the rules of sentence structure and the teacher also develops more teaching methods so that students can easily understand the material.

Keywords: Error Analysis, Students' Writing, Future Tense.

1.   INTRODUCTION

The future tense is one of the tenses in English grammar, which talks about an action or event that will occur in the future. It is included in grammar or structure in language component which tells about activities in the future. Grammar is also taught at the SMA/MA level in class X as part of the English Language and Literature subject (Specialization). The students in class X learned three types of future tense: simple future tense, future continuous tense, and future perfect tense.

There are some reasons why the research had done in class X of Senior High School students. First reason, they had got some materials in future tense structures. They had some difficulties to create the sentences consistently using future. They still had an anxiety when they try to do some exercises in future structures. All in all, from the cases, it showed that many students had difficulties in constructing sentences using the future tense formula, therefore the researcher will reveal the students' error in writing future tense.

This study also focuses on the students' mistakes when writing future tense sentences in a short dialogue. In writing dialogues, sometimes students need to correct things. It is given to students to find out how far they understand using the future tense in writing short dialogues and what types of errors students make in writing short dialogues. From the problems above, the researcher want to find the difficulties experienced by students and identify the types of errors made by students

---

*Corresponding Author : silviananda.putrierito@gmail.com

60

so that in the future, they will be used as evaluation material for teachers and future researchers and add to the scientific repertoire of types of errors.

2.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Errors or errors in language learning are interpreted as gaps in the knowledge of someone who learns the language because the learner does not know the proper language rules (Ellis, 1997, 2009a, 2009b; Siregar et al., 2022; Sompong, 2014). The main problem is between the primary language (L1) and the second language (2). In this case, Indonesian and English have contrasting differences (Ellis, 1997; Fitria, 2020b). According to (Fitria, 2020c; Kaweera, 2013; Muftah & Rafic-Galea, 2013; Pasaribu, 2021; Sahrul Hafiz & Wijaya, 2023), difficulties for English learners occur when students receive and learn English for writing simultaneously, so students often make mistakes as an unavoidable part of the learning. Fitria, (2020a) and Pasaribu (2021) assumed that the lack of understanding of the rules or norms of L2 in grammar and diction might lead to errors in writing. From that case, we can infer that those students must understand grammar to write in English. Next, (Sari et al., 2019) say that errors occur due to the assumptions of learners who think the L2 and L1 forms are the same (interlingual error) and the negative change of the item into the target language (intralingual error).

Many previous studies have been conducted to reveal common mistakes by students in EFL writing. Karim et al. (2018) explored errors in EFL writing classes in Bangladesh. They indicated that the students made mistakes related to grammar, misinformation, clutter, and over-generalization. (Fitria, 2020b) conducted the writing errors in using simple future tense by university students in Surakarta. She revealed that most students made errors using sentence structure, punctuation, and spelling. Fitria (2019) conducted students' analysis errors using the simple present tense. The result showed that the students committed an error because they were transferring the grammar rules of their mother tongue to the English language.

In this research, the researcher will discuss the types of interlingual errors. The previous studies by (Sari et al., 2019) found that ignorance of rule restriction was the most frequent error made by students, which occurred at 32.7%. This study is based on a non-contrastive analysis approach which analyzes intralingual errors. Ellis (2009b) says non-contrastive analysis includes:

1. Over-generalization
   Over-generalization occurs when language learners are burdened with two sets of linguistic or syntactical rules, thus causing them to make mistakes(Permatasari et al., 2018).
2. Ignorance of rule restrictions
   In this error, the learner needs to pay attention to the limitations of sentence structure. Applying incomplete sentence structures can factor in failing to develop a complete system. It is inversely proportional to over-generalization, which is using an excessive rule.
3. Incomplete application of rules
   The error in incomplete rules is that students must consistently apply writing rules.
4. False concepts hypothesized
   This error occurs due to the wrong learner concluding a topic.

From the statement above, it can be concluded that there are four errors in non-contractive analysis: over-generalization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and hypothesized false concepts(Permatasari et al., 2018). The

researchers focused on analyzing the types of errors using the theory of Ellis, 2009b) as a basis for determining the types of errors written by students in short dialogues using the future tense.

In some cases, the majority of the students writing English sentences do not realize that they have just translated the sentences from Indonesian to English. The students do not realize when they commit the error because it occurs unconsciously. The students perceived that their work is well-done translated, but in fact, many errors occur in their work. Therefore, the researchers need to anticipate certain common types of errors as evaluation tools to re-correct their error writing, especially in the use of future tense whereas grammatical tenses play an important role to deliver the meaning of the sentences. This research gives additional insight to clarify types of error in non-contrastive analysis approach which analyzes intralingual errors.

3. METHODS

This study used a qualitative descriptive method. Alwasilah (2012) argued that one of the aims of qualitative method is to acquire descriptive data. The qualitative method means that research data described through the words not in number description. This method was employed to observe problems accurately and systematically regarding the nature and facts of a research object (Mahmud, 2011). The method used to collect the data in the form of written task in writing short dialogue using future tense.

The research instrument results were from student worksheets and observation during the learning process. The research subjects were taken from the work of 18 groups of X MIPA 1 student groups. One group contained two students. So, there were 36 students, consisting of 15 male students and 21 female students. The reason why the researchers used the subjects because they have already taught to write a dialogue using future tense and to measure how far they understand to write short dialogue in English using future tense. The researchers analyzed short, future-tense dialogue sentences composed by students by using thematic analysis from Ellis theory (Ellis, 2009b).

In gathering the data the researchers do some procedures, they are: 1) the researchers prepared students' assignment to make short dialogue using future tense, 2) the researchers explained the instructions to the students and decide time to submit the task, 3) the researchers collect the students' writing short dialogue using future tense, 4) the researcher analyze the errors, 5) the researcher write the result.

4. RESULTS

This research was carried out through online learning, and the research subjects were students in tenth grade from one of the public schools in Semarang, totaling 36 students and divided into 18 groups. The research object was the students' written assignments after carrying out future tense learning. The results obtained after the researchers analyzed 18 student writings which can be interpreted in Table 1.

Table 1. Types, Amounts and Percentages of Students' Error

No.	Types *Error*	Total *Error*	Precentage
1.	*Over-generalization*	12	26%
2.	*Ignorance of rule restrictions*	2	4%
3.	*Incomplete application of rules*	10	21%
4.	*False concepts hypothesized*	23	49%
Total		47	100%

Table 1 shows that hypothesized false concepts are the errors most often made by students. The second most error is over-generalization of 12 times. They were followed by incomplete application of rules and ignorance of rule restrictions.

Over-generalization

This error occurs because many English learners feel burdened with linguistic or syntactical rules. For example, in the simple present tense, the verb must be added s, es, or -ies at the end of the word when the subject is he/she/it. This rule is sometimes overused in other tenses.

This study found that students made 12 over-generalizations which can be described in Table 2.

Table 2. Error Table in Over-generalization

No.	Over-generalizations Error	Sample Sentences	Correctness
1.	Generalization of modal	1. How about we **will** give Mrs. Dayu a memento? 2. How about we **will** go to our teacher? 3. When **can** we go to Miss Ita's house?	1. How about we give Mrs. Dayu a memento? 2. How about we go to our teacher? 3. When we go to Miss Ita's house?
2.	Generalization of the plural noun	1. …. Ilham and Elsa met in the parking area to discuss their **plans** for Saturday morning.	1. …. Ilham and Elsa met in the parking area to discuss their **plans** for Saturday morning.
3.	Generalization of preposition	1. This is about **to** class increase.	1. This is about class increase.
4.	Generalization of auxiliary verb	1. What time are we gonna **be** there? 2. What time **do** we go to his house?	1. What time are we gonna there? 2. What time we go to his house?
5.	Generalization of adverb	1. Okay. See you **there later**.	1. There are double adverb. Use either there or later.

Table 2 shows some of the over-generalization errors that occur in students' future tense dialogues. The error often happened in the modal's generalization, in which students always add the capital "will" to unnecessary questions. From the

results of the researchers' observations, students assume that in this future tense material, all sentences must use "will." Then, the generalization of auxiliary verbs is an error that often occurs in students. They add auxiliary verbs such as be and do into sentences that are not necessary.

Another error is the generalization of the plural noun, such as adding the suffix –s to a verb with a plural subject. This addition only applies to a single issue in the simple present tense. It was generalizing prepositions with adding the preposition to is an error that also occurs. The researchers often look at student writings by using addition during online learning and when doing assignments. Finally, the generalization of adverbs is that students duplicate adverbs with the same meaning.

The results are different with Permatasari et al. (2018) who discussed that the most common errors are misorderings and misinformation.

Table 3. Ignorance of Rules Restriction

No.	*Ignorance of Rules Restrictions Error*	Examples	Corrections
1.	The use of incorrect to be	1. ….and the teacher **are** also off teaching.	1. ….and the teacher **is** also off teaching.
2.	The use of capitalization	1. So, what are we going to do on **saturday** morning?	1. So, what are we going to do on **Saturday** morning?

Table 3 shows errors in inappropriate to-be and capitalization often occurring in student dialogue sentences. Incorrect to be what happened was the students used to be, which was supposed to be for plural subjects but was used for singular subjects or vice versa. Then, the capitalization errors occurred because the students had to pay attention to words that should start with a capital letter, such as day names, people's names, and words at the beginning of sentences.

Incomplete Application of Rules

In this study, incomplete application rules occurred in 21%. This error happened when students could not fully develop sentence structure, resulting in this error.

Table 3.

No.	*Incomplete Application of Rules Error*	Examples	Corrections
1.	Omission of preposition	1. …..teacher is busy Saturday morning or not?	1. …..teacher is busy **on** Saturday morning or not?
2.	Omission of inversion	1. What we will give to Mrs. Dayu? 2. What time you will come to her house?	1. What will we give to Mrs. Dayu? 2. What time will you come to her house?
3.	Omission of verb, punctuation and typo	1. How Saturday we go to mis Hana	1. How if Saturday we go to miss Hana?

The researchers found that the most errors were omission of inversion. It is related to the previous research (Fitria, 2020b; Pasaribu, 2021; Sahrul Hafiz & Wijaya, 2023). This sentence was complete, but the error needed to be included. Modals should be placed before the subject when making interrogative sentences in the future tense. Nevertheless, what happened is that students always put the capital would after the subject. For example, "What time will you come to her house?" the correct sentence is "What time will you come to her house?". Then the omission preposition explained that many students needed to remember prepositions or prepositions before adverbs. The example above could still be understood in meaning, but the sentence had to be correct grammatically because it needed to be completed.

Third, the errors that occurred were omissions of verbs, punctuation, and typo. The researchers found several students' writings that did not complete the verb in the sentence "how Saturday we go to mis Hana." Punctuation or punctuation is ignored. Typo or typo occurs several times, and most of the typo is an incomplete word; for example, the word should be "miss," but it only says "mis." These findings had the same results with Permatasari et al. (2018) revealing about error omission in preposition.

False Concepts Hypothesized

No.	*False Concepts Hypothesized Error*	Examples	Corrections
1.	Fail to choose the subject	1. Insyaallah **it's** not busy, I've asked the teacher.	1. Insyaallah **she's/he's** not busy, I've asked the teacher.
2.	Fail to choose pronoun and verb	1. It has been a long time since we met Mrs. Fairuz, I want to **met him.**	1. It has been a long time since we met Mrs. Fairuz, I want to **meet her.**
		2. …but Mrs. Triya said if **he** was home in the afternoon.	2. …but Mrs. Triya said if s**he** was home in the afternoon.
3.	Fail to choose right term	1. We have to **determine** the right time to go there.	1. We have to **decide** the right time to go there.
4.	Wrong verb	1. I think he will **has** a breakfast with his family at that time.	1. I think he will **have** a breakfast with his family at that time.
		2. ….the sky looks dark and **looked** like it is going to rain.	2. ….the sky looks dark and **looks** like it is going to rain.

False concepts are hypothesized to be the most errors that occur. This error could occur because the students had correctly determined or understood a topic. The most significant error was the failure to choose pronouns and verbs. Students made mistakes in pronouncing personal pronouns, as in the sentence "It had been a long time since we met Mrs. X, I want to meet him." the correct sentence is "It has been a long time since we met Mrs. X, I want to meet her." According to the researchers' observations, this error occurred because students did not master changing pronouns and could not distinguish between male and female pronouns. The second error that often occurred was the wrong verb. In the example sentence "I

think he will have a breakfast with his family at that time.", it should be "I think he will have a breakfast with his family at that time." in this sentence, students assume that if the subject he used the verb has.

Then, the error failed to choose the subject. Students used the issue he/she/it incorrectly. In the example sentence "*Insyaallah* it is not busy, I have asked the teacher.", the sentence should be "*Insyaallah* she is/he is not busy, I have asked the teacher." because the object is the teacher, so the subject is he/she for the word pronouns, while it is for nouns. This result is congruent with Karim et al.'s (2018); Sari et al. (2019) research that hypothesized false concepts.

Fail to choose the proper term occurred when students used an inappropriate verb equivalent for the context of the sentence, for example, "We have to determine the right time to go there.", "We have to decide the right time to go there.", the researchers suspect. It could happen when students look for the meaning of a word from Indonesian in English through a dictionary but need help understanding whether this word fits the context of the sentence. Based on the findings, the research has new insights that students still depend on the dictionary to work on future tense questions. So, they have a lot of error analysis on hypothesized false concepts when working on the future tense.

Based on the fingdings, this research is one of contrastive analysis on students 'error in future tense which had the most significant results on hypothesized false concepts. It happens because the students like to create a spoken text in bahasa Indonesia and then translate it into English by using an online dictionary. Based on all the findings above, the research has new insights that students still depend on the dictionary to work on future tense questions. So, they have a lot of error analysis on hypothesized false concepts when working on the future tense.

6.   CONCLUSION

The result of current research have indicated that the most dominant error made by the students is hypothesized false concept from the non-contrastive analysis. It divided into 4 categories, they are: over-generalization, ignorance of rules restrictions, incomplete application of rules, and hypothesized false concepts. It happens because the students like to create a spoken text in bahasa Indonesia and then translate it into English by using an online dictionary. So, it can be said that students still do not fully understand the topic and context discussed in the future tense sentence. Therefore, students must continue to learn to understand the rules of sentence structure, and the teacher also develops teaching methods so that students can easily understand the material.

.
REFERENCES

Alwasilah, A. Chaedar. (2002). *Pokokknya Kualitatif.* Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.

Ellis, R. (1997). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009a). A typology of written corrective feedback types. ELT Journal, 63(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R. (2009b). Corrective feedback and teacher development. L2 Journal, 1(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054

Fitria, T. N. (2019). Errors in students' writing composition in present tense "my daily activity." Journal of English Language Education, 2(1), 47–62. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3527869

Fitria, T. N. (2020a). Error analysis of English abstract in international journal of economics, business, and accounting research (IJEBAR). Al-Lisan: Junral Bahasa (e-Journal) IAIN Sultan Amai Gorontalo, 5(2), 164–181.

Fitria, T. N. (2020b). Error analysis found in students' writing composition in simple past tense of recount text. ENGLISH FRANCA : Academic Journal of English Language and Education, 4(2), 141–160. https://doi.org/10.29240/ef.v4i2.1154

Fitria, T. N. (2020c). Error Analysis in Using Simple Past Tense Found in Students' Writing of Recount Text. Ahmad Dahlan Journal of English Studies, 7(1), 39. https://doi.org/10.26555/adjes.v7i1.12238

Karim, A., Mohamed, A. R., Ismail, S. A. M. M., Shahed, F. H., Rahman, M. M., & Haque, Md. H. (2018). Error analysis in EFL writing classroom. International Journal of English Linguistics, 8(4), 122–138. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n4p122

Kaweera, C. (2013). Writing error: A review of interlingual and intralingual interference in EFL context. English Language Teaching, 6(7), 9–18. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n7p9

Mahmud. (2011). Metode penelitian pendidikan. Pustaka Setia.

Muftah, M., & Rafic-Galea, S. (2013). Error analysis of present simple tense in the interlanguage of adult Arab English language learners. English Language Teaching, 6(2), 146–154. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p146

Pasaribu, A. N. (2021). A common error analysis in students' English narrative writing. Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal, 4(2), 436–445. https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v4i2.2338

Permatasari, A. D., Wijayatiningsih, T. D., & Mulyadi, D. (2018). Error analysis on EFL learners'analytical exposition writing. Surakarta English and Literature Journal, 1(1), 22–30.

Sahrul Hafiz, H., & Wijaya, Lk. (2023). Analysis of students' error In constructing passive voice. Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 7(1), 1388–1396.

Sari, N., Mu'in, F., & Yamin, M. (2019). An analysis of intralingual grammatical errors made EFL students. Lingua Educatia Journal, 1(2), 138–150.

Siregar, R. Y., Bulolo, A. Q., & Saragih, E. (2022). Grammatical error analysis in translating conditional sentences from Indonesia into English. Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan, 7(2b), 547–553. https://doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v7i2b.508

Sompong, M. (2014). Error analysis. Thammasat *Review* , *109*(2), 109–127.