Finite Errors in the Formation of Interrogative Sentences Made by University Students

Sri Slamet[a], Joko Nurkamto[b], Soetarno Joyoatmojo[c], Wiranto[d], [a]Teacher Education- Early Childhood Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, [b]English Education of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, [c]Economics, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, [d]Informatics Study Program, Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Email: [a]ss212@ums.ac.id,ss212@student.uns.ac.id,   [b]Jokonurkamto@gmail.com, [c]strn_jo@yahoo.co.id, [d]Wiranto@staff.uns.ac.id

The present research aims to: (1) identify errors in the use of English, especially interrogative sentences, (2) describe the most dominant errors in the use of English (3) obtain overall information about the form of errors in the use of English made by students in micro-teaching in English. This research uses a descriptive qualitative method. The data was collected through observation and documentation. The population of this research consists of sixth-semester students of early childhood teacher education at UMS. The research sample was selected by using a purposive sampling technique. There are two classes involved in this research. In each class, data on errors made by students were recorded. There were four stages included in the data analysis, including identification, explanation, classification and evaluation of errors. The research results shows that omission is the second common error made by participating students with a total of 35 occurrences. Misinformation is the most common error, occurring 48 times. There were three occurrences for addition. The least error consisting of only one example is misorder.

Key words: *Interrogative sentence, article, finite, omission, misinformation, addition, misorder.*

Introduction

To let an English user or interlocutor make some errors without any correction is considered adverse in learning a language. An error may seem unimportant for some, however at the same time, it can be a serious matter for others. When using English, its language rules inevitably have to be obeyed. Therefore, the use of a language that disregards its rules will create unnatural sounds. The lack of felicity commonly found in the use of English is found in the use of various sentences that do not fit the structure of the target language. This frequently causes sentences to be difficult to understand.

For example, in creating interrogative sentences, there are often deficiencies and errors in the use of finite language that should exist in the context of certain interrogative sentences. The interrogative sentence: "*Siapa yang tahu*?" is often translated as "are you understand?" In fact, the sentence should use the finite "do" instead of d ""are." Therefore, the interrogative form of the sentence should be 'do you understand?' Another example of a fatal error appears in the translation of ""*apakah kamu suka sapi*?" Quite often, students mistakenly use the finite 'are' instead of 'do.' They tend to say "are you like a cow?" while the correct form of the question should read "do you like a cow?" These types of errors appear as students have not yet realised that the difference lies in the sentence structure of both Indonesian and English.

When students continue to make errors without correction, they will become cemented and disrupt their English use (Ananda et. al., 2017). In other explanations, syntax is defined as the study of organising words into phrases, clauses and sentences or syntactic constructs. This occurs due to the mindset of learners who are not accustomed to differentiating between the structure of the source and target language/English.

Indeed, the mastery of structures of a particular language is necessary if one wants to comprehend that language. The language form must be taught because meaning and function are expressed through form and without form, there is no communication. At present, there is no generally accepted theory regarding the relationship between language and social context.

One of the language frameworks which has created numerous efforts to embed linguistic analysis in its social context, and which will be examined by the research is *Systemic Functional Linguistics*. This theory displays the existence of three main 'context vectors,' called 'the field,' (referring to the nature of social activities, for example, Science), 'tenor (referring to actors and their relationships, for instance, close friends), and 'mode' (referring to media or language activity modes, for example, written vs. verbal communication) (Halliday, 2014).

Another potential cause is that children are more likely to try a limited rather than unlimited complementary clause since some of the meanings associated with the former may be more transparent and, thus more familiar to children than those associated with unlimited complementary clause (Owen & Leonard, 2006). In information-theoretical terms, one would expect predictability (uninformative) of finite verbs to be higher, mostly in the main rather than subordinate clause.

To estimate how predictable a finite verb is in the type of clause given, the research took a similar approach to those popular in predicting the sound characteristics of speech (Molina et. al., 2012). According to Kempen & Harbusch (2019), in language, the hierarchy of clauses is usually top-down, where the main clause is placed before the subordinate clause because generally main clauses precede subordinate clauses.

Dilmaç (2017) argues that the above phenomenon raises various questions. The questions include how errors exist and why students ask those types of questions. This research paper will answer the above problems, especially the problem of using finite English in teaching English for early childhood. According to Ayu & Maharani (2018), syntax errors contained in these paragraphs are localised errors, which affect an element of a sentence but usually do not significantly interfere with communication. Lexical accessibility is prone to online fluctuations under the influence of priming and visual cueing – conditions leading to pre-activation of lexical items and to construction of sentences that afford early placement of pre-activated items (Hwang & Kaiser, 2015). The extra word, e.g. an "easy" clause-initial optional complementiser such as the subordinating conjunction that lengthens the interval available for planning the difficult fragment, thus lowers the average (per-word) processing load leading up to the fragment (Frank et. al., 2016). This can be understood because in order to express various meanings in English sentences, several rules, for instance finite or tense markers, must be added to certain verbs.

Errors made by students in an interrogative sentence can be confusing for the recipient. The present research aims to identify errors in the use of English especially in the use of interrogative sentences and describe the most dominant errors made by students in micro-teaching in English. The significance of this research consists of: (1) academically contributing to the study of language, particularly about language error analysis. This can enrich our view about the essence of language, (2) from the practical perspective, the results can be used by teachers   in formulating teaching and learning strategies. Meanwhile, for policymakers, the results can be used as a scientific discourse that can be used as a foothold in determining the curriculum used in the Department.

Methodology

This research consists of a descriptive qualitative study which systematically explains the facts. Meanwhile, according to Suryabrata (1992: 18), qualitative research aims to systematically, and accurately capture the facts and properties of a particular situation or event. In addition, according to Sutopo (2002), this type of research leads to a detailed description of the actual condition in the field of study. In this paper, the researcher describes various finite errors in interrogative sentences.

The data source used as the object of research is sixth-semester students in the Department of Teacher Education - Early Childhood Education (PG PAUD) UMS. The Department was chosen because the problem arose in this location. The data collection was carried out using ppurposive ssampling technique. It was based on the number of samples and sample criteria according to the following considerations: 1. Diversity of types of errors 2. availability of resources for assessment, both human resources, time and costs. Data was taken from the sixth-semester students of Early Childhood Teacher Education Study Program at UMS. In this case, students are assumed to have the opportunity to become instructors in micro-teaching in English.

In collecting data, the instruments used were direct observation and documentation. The observations made were passively and carried out by both teachers and students during micro-teaching in English. During this observation period, the authors recorded teaching activities so that the events that occurred during the activity do not escape from recording and these activities can be revisited at any time. Documentation is in the form of field notes and teaching recordings.

Data Analysis

The data collected was analysed with qualitative analysis so that a systematic description was obtained of the issues raised. Some of the steps taken in the analysis consist of identification, explanation, and classification of errors, followed by evaluation (Ellis, 1980). There are several forms of errors analysed such as the use of articles, concord (suitability of subject and predicate), and finite (tense marker). The qualitative analysis was also aimed at finding the percentage of errors made by respondents, which were further elaborated through interpretation. The interpretation was completed to give an idea of errors in the use of finite English by students. The research targets include identifying errors in English use describe the most dominant errors in using English, and obtain an overall portrait of the form of errors made by students in micro-teaching in English.

Results

Several findings emerged from the present research regarding the use of English in sentences. In the following section, the findings will be elaborated more clearly. According to the Surface Strategy Taxonomy, the forms of errors in the use of finite in interrogative sentences are as follows: omission, misinformation, addition and misordering.

1) **Omission**. This is a type of error marked by the absence of certain semantic characteristics in a sentence. This type of error is the second most common error made by participants in the formation of interrogative sentences,   with a total of 35 occurrences. Based on observations of the teaching process during micro-teaching in English, most students said "What the picture?" "What colour the apple?" "What the purpose of handphone?", and so on. However, if you look closely, these sentences do not use finite.. The question should be "What picture is it?" "What colour is the apple?," "What is the purpose of a handphone?" etc. As for affirmative sentences, the omission error ranked as second. The total number of sentences of this type were 25. Variation of the error is seen in the following examples: "O.k. Let's hamdallah? Together," "O.k. all smart, applause ...,'" "The students took the piece of puzzle in the flats according to the place.".

2) **Misinformation**. Misinformation is the use of the wrong form of morpheme. According to available data, this type of error is the most commonly occurring. This is evident in almost each presentation. This type of sentence error was found in as many as 48 sentences. Some examples include "Are you agree?" "Do you are finished?" and "Who you can guess it?" The sentences should be "Do you agree?", "Have you finished?", and "Can you guess?" Misformation was also found in affirmative sentences such as "Let we pray together. "Before study come on let's sing a song together," "There are mango patter you sticked it by green bean' and so forth.

3) **Addition**. Addition or double marking is an error in which a language user adds unnecessary semantic marks in a sentence. From the overall errors, this type of error rarely appears during observation. The total number of these types of errors is three. For example, "Anyone who wants to be a pilot?," "Who knows can bold this text?," and "Anyone who has seen these sky objects?" The sentences should be "Who wants to be a pilot?", "Who can bold this text?," "Who has seen these sky objects?" This type of error was also found in affirmative sentences, for example, "Let's say Basmallah together," "You will be running to take a rose in the bottle," and Let's we read together." There were 14 variations of this type of error.

4) **Misordering**. This type of error occurs due to the unity of sentences that should require standard word order rules but are not applied in that sentence. There was only one misordering error found in this research, consisting of the sentence "What this is?" The sentence should be "What is this? There were two variations of this error in the affirmative sentence, including "Banana the colour is yellow," and "Grape the colour is purple."

Discussion
Identification of English Errors Interrogative Sentences

The   present research is ongoing with the Communication Effect Taxonomy. Tarigan (2011:148) divided tthese taxonomy views and confronts errors from the perspective of their effect on the listener or reader while the focus of attention is on the difference between errors that appear to cause miscommunication and those which do not. Supiani (2018) adds the taxonomy also makes language users aware that   learners' errors are based on logic. Therefore, the research   concludes that there are four types of errors by surface strategy taxonomy. These are omission, addition, misformation and misorder. Related to the disruption of communication due to errors, syntactic errors contained in these paragraphs are categorised as local errors, which   affect an element of a sentence that usually does not significantly interfere with   communication. . The ideas can be conveyed through the interpretation of the paragraph's context. According to Surface Strategy Taxonomy, the forms of errors in the use of finite   interrogative sentences in English include omission, misinformation, addition and misordering.

Description of the Most Dominant use of English Errors

This research is consistentwith Muhsin (2016) according to which some errors occur when students do not understand English grammar. Misinformation is the use of the wrong form of a morpheme. The available data shows that this type of error is the most commonly made made by respondents. This shows that is prevalent appeared in almost all presentations as there were a total of 48 errors made by research respondents.

Addition or double marking is an error in which a language user adds unnecessary semantic characteristics into a sentence. From the overall error, this type of error rarely appears during observation. This type of error occurs a total of 3 times. This corresponds with Joan (2016), according to whom grammar at the sentence level is fundamental for the writing of compositions in the English language.

Misordering occurs due to the unity of sentences that should require standard word order rules are not applied in that sentence. These research results are consistent with Kazemian et. al, (2015) who included transcribers' ratings of transcription difficulty and naturalness of conversation as two measures of the overall perceived complexity and fluency of the conversation.

Forms of Errors Made by Students in Micro-Teaching in English

The research results agree with Moreno et. al., (2018) who wrote a detailed over-view of frequency effects in a variety of syntactic constructions. While the grammaticality of these utterances is a contentious issue, the nature of spontaneous language use in speech and its resemblance to authentic language use need to be considered (Bai et. al., 2020). This research also implies that anterior clause positions exert more time pressure on the lexical selection of suitable fillers than posterior positions. These errors were made by students because they combined the sentence pattern of both English and Indonesian.

Conclusion

This paper examines the model of teaching English in the PG PAUD of UMS through micro-teaching in English. It assessed the data from respondents through interviews, direct observation and documentation. As a result. the research found that there are numerous errors made by students. Fundamentally, the type of errors can be classified into omission, addition, misformation and misordering. Omission is considered to be the second most common error made by students in the formation of an interrogative sentence with a total of 35 cases.

Misformation is the most common type of error with a frequency of 48 cases. In turn, addition and misordering consisted of only three and one error respectively. These errors emerged as the result of a combination of the sentence patterns of both English and Indonesian applied by participating students.

REFERENCE

Ananda, D. R. Febriyanti, E. R. Yamin, M. & Mu'in, F. (2017). Students' Preferences toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class at the English Department of Lambung Mangkurat University Academic Year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(3), 176. /doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0703.03.

Ayu, I. D. & Maharani, D. (2018). *Mahasiswa jurusan sastra jePANG. November*, 8, 641–648.

Hwang, H. & Kaiser, E. (2015). Accessibility effects on production vary cross-linguistically : Evidence from English and Korean. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *84*, 190–204, doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2015.06.004.

Bai, Q. Bai, S. Huang, Y. Hsueh, F. H.& Wang, P. (2020). Family Incivility and Cyberbullying in Adolescence: A Moderated Mediation Model of Hopelessness and Emotional Intelligence. *Computers in Human Behavior*,14, 106315, doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106315.

Dilmaç, B. (2017). The relationship between adolescents' levels of hopelessness and cyberbullying: The role of values. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri*, *17*(4), 1119–1133, 2017, doi.org/10.12738/estp.4.0610.

Ellis, R. O. D. (1972). The Origins of Interlanguage. *Applied Linguistics*, Volume III, Issue 3, Autumn 1982, Pages 207–223, 1980, doi.org/10.1093/applin/III.3.207.

Frank, A. F. Jaeger, T. F. & Hall, M. (2016). *Speaking rationally : Uniform information density as an optimal strategy for language production Speaking Rationally : Uniform Information Density as an Optimal Strategy for Language Production. September*, 2016.

Halliday, M. A. K. & M. I. M. M. (2014) Christia, *Halliday's introduction to Functional Grammar.* Routledge.

Joan, A. P. (2016). Grammatical Errors in Written Composition of Junior Secondary School Students in Owan West Local Government Area of EDO State. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *5*(2), 61–66, doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v5-i2/2092.

Kazemian, B., Shahbaz, M., Jabeen, A. & Shahbaz, M. (2015). *The Role of Error Analysis in Teaching and Learning of Second and Foreign Language Chinese as a second language learning motivation View project Education and Linguistics Research The*

Role of Error Analysis in Teaching and Learning of Second and Foreign L. 1(2), 52–61,doi.org/10.5296/elr.v1i1.8189.

Kempen, G.& Harbusch, K. (2019). The mutual attraction between high-frequency verbs and clause types with finite verbs in early positions: corpus evidence from spoken English, Dutch, and German. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, *34*(9), 1140–1151, doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2019.1642498.

Renart, M. L., Montoya, E., Fernández, A. M., Molina, M. L., Poveda, J. A., Encinar, J. A., ... & González Ros, J. M. (2012). Contribution of ion binding affinity to ion selectivity and permeation in KcsA, a model potassium channel. Biochemistry, 51(18), 3891-3900.

Moreno, G. Aviron, S. Berg, J. S. (2018). Crous-Duran, A. Franca, S. G. de Jalón, Hartel, T. J. Mirck, A. Pantera, J. H. N. Palma, J. A., Re, G. A. Paulo, F. Sanna, C. Thenail, A. Varga, V. Viaud, & P. J. Burgess, Agroforestry systems of high nature and cultural value in Europe: provision of commercial goods and other ecosystem services. *Agroforestry Systems*, *92*(4), 877–891. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-017-0126-1.

Muhsin, M. A. (2016). Analysing   students' errors in using simple present (A case study at Junior High School in Makassar). *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences*, *2*(3), 81–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psrb.2016.09.006.

Owen, A. J. & Leonard, L. B. (2006). The production of finite and nonfinite complement clauses by children with specific language impairment and their typically developing peers. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *49*(3), 548–571, https://doi.org/10.1044/10902-4388(2006/040).

Supiani, S. (2018). An Analysis of Students' Substance Error in Writing Descriptive Texts. *VELES Voices of English Language Education Society*, *2*(1), 14–28, https://doi.org/10.29408/veles.v2i1.605.

Suryabrata, S. (1992). *Metode penelitian*. Yogyakarta: University Gadjah Mada Press.

Sutopo, H. B. (2002). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif: Dasar teori dan terapannya dalam penelitian*. Sebelas Maret University Press.

Tarigan, H. G. (1990). *Pengajaran kedwibahasaan.* Angkasa.