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ABSTRACT
This study was aimed to analyze (1) the error categories on students’ Indonesian-English noun phrase translation, and (2) the sources of errors made by the students. This study was conducted in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FTTE), Mataram University. There were 118 English students in the fifth semester divided into six classes as population. From the population of this study, it was taken one class (class C regular) with 22 students as the sample by applying cluster random sampling with a qualitative descriptive method. This study used error classification proposed by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) comprising misordering, misformation, omission, and addition. The instruments which were used were a test and questionnaire, and they were submitted in form of documentation. In the test, the researcher used 15 Indonesian noun phrases based on a text to be translated into the English noun phrases. Meanwhile, data from open-ended questionnaires was used to obtain the sources of errors made by the students. Data from documentation was used to find out the error categories and sources of errors in students’ translation. They were calculated in percentage afterward. From the error analysis, it was concluded that 117 items (47%) were translated correctly, and 133 items (53%) were translated incorrectly. These 133 incorrect items were found 143 errors in three categories of errors namely the incorrect use of determiners with 10 errors (10%), the incorrect use of adjectives with 58 errors (40%), and the incorrect use of nouns with 71 errors (50%). Based on these three categories of errors, there were 149 errors found, and they were classified into four types of errors, namely misordering with 54 errors (36%), misformation with 41 errors (28%), omission with 40 errors (27%), and addition with 14 errors (9%). Meanwhile, the sources of errors were mostly dominated by intralingual errors with 278 errors (68%) and followed by interlingual errors with 131 (32%).
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ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis (1) kategori kesalahan terjemahan frase nomina bahasa Indonesia-Inggris, dan (2) sumber kesalahan yang dilakukan mahasiswa. Penelitian ini dilakukan di Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (FKIP) Universitas Mataram. Ada 118 mahasiswa bahasa Inggris di semester lima yang terbagi dalam enam kelas sebagai populasi. Dari populasi ini, diperoleh satu kelas (kelas C reguler) berjumlah 22 mahasiswa sebagai sampel acak kelompok dengan metode deskriptif kualitatif. Penelitian ini menggunakan klasifikasi kesalahan yang diusulkan oleh Dulay, Burt, dan Krashen (1982) yang terdiri dari kesalahan urutan kata, kesalahan bentuk kata, kesalahan penghilangan, dan kesalahan penambahan. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah tes dan kuesioner, dan dikumpulkan dalam bentuk dokumentasi. Dalam pengujian tersebut, peneliti menggunakan 15 frasa nomina bahasa Indonesia berdasarkan teks yang diterjemahkan ke dalam frase nomina bahasa Inggris. Sementara itu, data kuesioner terbuka-tertutup digunakan untuk mendapatkan sumber kesalahan yang dilakukan mahasiswa. Data dari dokumentasi digunakan untuk mengetahui kategori kesalahan dan sumber kesalahan dalam terjemahan mahasiswa. Kemudian dihitung dalam bentuk persentase. Dari analisis kesalahan, disimpulkan bahwa 117 item (47%) diterjemahkan dengan benar, dan 133 item (53%) diterjemahkan dengan tidak benar. 133 item yang salah ditemukan 143 kesalahan dalam tiga kategori kesalahan yaitu penggunaan determinator yang salah 10 kesalahan (10%), penggunaan kata sifat yang salah 58 kesalahan (40%), dan penggunaan kata benda yang salah 71 kesalahan (50%). Berdasarkan tiga kategori kesalahan ini, ditemukan 149 kesalahan, dan dikelompokkan menjadi empat jenis kesalahan, yaitu kesalahan urutan kata 54 kesalahan (36%), kesalahan bentuk kata 41 kesalahan (28%), kesalahan penghilangan 40 kesalahan (27%), dan kesalahan penambahan 14 kesalahan (9%). Sementara itu, sumber kesalahan didominasi oleh kesalahan intralingual dengan 278 kesalahan (68%) dan diikuti oleh kesalahan interlingual dengan 131 (32%).

Kata Kunci: Analisis Kesalahan, Frasa Nomina, Terjemahan
Introduction

Error frequently occurs on the second language learners at the levels of education in Indonesia. The difference between language system in Indonesian as the first language and the one in English as the target language has been continuously investigated by the linguists in language learning. In Indonesia, a number of previous studies show that the knowledge of grammar taught in a second language learning, especially in English learning, the structures of English noun phrase are the most problematic for the students. It is also found that the students get difficulties to translate their first language (Indonesian) into the second language (English). The less understanding of the order of attributive adjective premodifiers in every second language may happen due to the different language system in their first language, so that their inability to use the correct order in the English noun phrase tends to make them confused in their translation. Besides, the use of determiners and nouns may also be confusing the students. For instance, determiner and noun should agree in number, and the wrong use of word form or word in textual meaning can be considered to be different meaning and changes the word category in the target language. The missing words and addition of words in target language may also affect the literal meaning of the whole text.

The current study is important since it is seen as the students’ capability to translate Indonesian into English referring to the English noun phrase structures. As the second language learners, they should be able to master the second language well, especially in the English noun phrase structures. This is important and has become a demand for the students in English academic writing at a higher level as the university. As Swierzbin (2014) stated that it is important for the English learners to know about nouns, but is more important to know about the noun phrases for creating a more specific meaning than only noun itself. Furthermore, the noun phrase can also be used to convey precise information in a quick and concise way, so that, by the noun phrase, the writing does not seem wordy in every sentence created.
This study aims to reveal error categories in the English noun phrases as students’ product in translating Indonesian noun phrases. The errors categories in this study include the incorrect use of determiners, adjectives and nouns by identifying and classifying those errors into four types of errors in surface strategy taxonomy proposed by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) namely, misordering, misformation, omission, and addition. This study also aims to reveal the sources of errors made by the students. Errors occurred due to the interferences of mother tongue which is known as interlingual errors (Richards, et al, 2002).

Review of Related Literature

In spite of the fact that error analysis proposed by Corder seemed to be outdated in the 1960s, it had become a useful linguistic approach in recent researchers to identify the types of errors on the second language learners. In fact, there had been many researchers conducted their research by using error analysis to identify the students’ errors. It was also used by a teacher as a monitoring device to assess his students more objectively (Norrish, 1995).

Error and mistake are two different concepts. Corder (cited in Krisetiyawati, 2010) defined mistake is an error of performance which is unsystematic and due to physical states, memory lapses and all sort of psychological factors such as tiredness. The mistake has a tendency to be unsystematic and refers to the performance error which does not reflect the language knowledge. Error, on the other hand, is systematic and refers to the competence error determining the level of language knowledge.

It has been acknowledged that error analysis proposed by Corder (1967) is a useful approach for the teachers and researchers to identify the errors in students’ written production. In fact, Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) classified the errors into four types comprising linguistics taxonomy, surface strategy taxonomy, comparative taxonomy, and communicative effect taxonomy. Although the error classification is too general to identify and classify the students’ errors, this is still useful to
investigate three categories of errors, namely the incorrect use of determiners, the incorrect use of adjectives, and the incorrect use of nouns based on the textual meaning, in the case of students’ Indonesian-English noun phrase translation. Error classification used in this study focuses on four types of errors, namely omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. According to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), misordering errors are characterized by the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphems in an utterance.

\[ \text{e.g.:} \ 'I \ do \ not \ know \ who \ are \ you.' (X) \]
\[ \quad \ 'I \ do \ not \ know \ who \ you \ are.' (✓) \]

Misformation errors are characterized by the use of the wrong form of the morphemes or structure.

\[ \text{e.g.:} \ 'she \ coocks \ in \ the \ kitchen \ now.' (X) \]
\[ \quad \ 'she \ cooks \ in \ the \ kitchen \ now.' (✓) \]

Omission errors are characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance.

\[ \text{e.g.:} \ He \ watching \ television \ (omission \ on \ to \ be: \ is/was) \]

Addition errors are characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance.

\[ \text{e.g.:} \ she \ swimed \ yesterday \ (X), \ but \ she \ swam \ yesterday. (✓) \]
\[ \quad she \ has \ two \ knifes \ (X), \ but \ she \ has \ two \ knives. (✓) \]

The errors may not be avoidable for every learner of EFL. Richards, et al (2002) stated that there are two sources of errors, namely interlingual errors and intralingual errors. Interlingual errors are the errors caused by the interference of native language (mother language) of the learners. Meanwhile, the intralingual errors occur when learners do not master well the language learned or they lack target language knowledge.

Intralingual errors is distinguished into four types:

1. Overgeneralization, in which the errors arise when the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of other structures in the target language.
2. *Ignorance of Rule Restrictions*, in which the errors involve the application of rules to contexts where they do not apply. The learners of the second language do not obey the structure of the target language.

3. *Incomplete Application of Rules*, in which the learners’ errors are derived from the faulty comprehension of distinction in the target language involving a failure to fully develop a structure. Some second language (English) learners tend to apply for declarative word order in questions in place of interrogative word order, as in *you are a student?*

4. *False Concept Hypothesized*, in which the errors arise when the learner does not fully comprehend, for example, a distinction “present tense” as in “*a teacher is teach today* and *a teacher teaches today.*”

Noun phrase is the structure of the head and its modifiers (Frank, cited in Kusuma, 2013). It has a more specific meaning with the existence of modifiers than only noun itself. According to Sujana (2014:3), modifiers can affect the meanings of other words in some ways. He added that nouns can be modified by adjectives, articles, determiners, participles, and infinitives. Kies (2016) differentiated determiners into three different zones namely, pre determiner, central determiner, and post determiner.

According to Gómez (2009:14), some dependents may precede the head and others may follow it. The position of determiners is usually filled by a determiner proper (e.g. *this dog*) but might also be filled by a genitive noun phrase (e.g. the *dog’s bed*).

Modifiers can act as a specifier of NPs and serve as premodifiers and postmodifiers. However, postmodifiers here will not be discussed further in this discussion.

Quirk, et al (cited in Gómez, 2009) further subclassify premodifiers from the furthest to the closest to the head noun as follows:

**Table 1: The Order of Premodifier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>Provenance</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Denominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small, big</td>
<td>old, young</td>
<td>black, red</td>
<td>disturbing, closed</td>
<td>Spanish, English</td>
<td>air, Paris</td>
<td>personal, human</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, Kingsbury and Wellman’s cline (cited in Gómez, 2009:40) categorize a universal hierarchy of adjectival ordering restrictions filled in premodifiers as follows:

**Determiner > subject comment > size > age > shape > color > nationality/origin > material compound > element noun**

To make this clear, this can be seen in the following diagram:

![Diagram 1](image)

In English, these stacked adjectives (*beautiful, big, old, and white*) have to be in word order. They can be filled with other adjectives as long as they are in the same right order. However, it is always in the same right order. According to Ansell (2000), the position of attributive adjectives indicating *age* may be altered to change the emphasis.

eg.:  
- a new, efficient method  
- an efficient, new method

In the first example, the adjective *new* is emphasized. In the second example, the adjective *efficient* is emphasized.

The next category that can modify the head noun is present participle and past participle. The present participle is a verb by adding –*ing* to the verb, such as *interest-interesting, sing-singing, develop-developing, etc.* For example; *a developing country* (NP), can be transferred into *a country that develops.*

![Diagram 2](image)
Similarly, the past participle can also function as a modifier for the head noun. This is marked by adding –ed/d for the regular verbs, and some irregular verbs which are not added with –ed/d. For example; the planned test (NP)

\[
\text{The } -\text{ed/d Participle } \text{planned test}
\]

In addition, the participle modifiers can also be preceded by stacked adjectives:

\[
\text{The } [\text{evaluating}] \text{beautiful } [\text{size}] \text{big} \text{[age] old } [\text{color}] \text{white } [\text{passive}] \text{decorated house}
\]

Since the function of participles (present and past) is to modify a noun, participles can also be called as participle adjectives. Besides, genitive modifiers can also act as premodifiers like adjectives and nouns modifiers. According to Rosenbach (cited in Gómez, 2009), there are three gradience between genitive and noun modifiers from a semantic perspective, whose use varies according to three semantic features, namely, restrictiveness, animacy, and referentiality of the dependent elements:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
\text{s-Genitive Modifier} & \text{Noun Modifiers} \\
(Laura’s brother) & (television screen) \\
\hline
\text{Restrictiveness} & + & + \\
\text{Animacy} & + & - \\
\text{Referentiality} & + & - \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Table 2: Gradience between s-Genitive and Noun Modifiers, (Rosenbach, 2007)
Based on table 2, Rosenbach remarks that genitive modifiers prone to denote animate being (e.g. Laura’s brother), and noun modifiers tend to be inanimate, such as locative (e.g. London airport), temporal (e.g. tomorrow morning) or common nouns (e.g. television screen).

Besides, the nouns can also modify the head noun and filled in the premodifiers. This will have a singular specific modifier and provide additional information of NP.

For example:

(6a) An Indonesian history book
(6b) A book of Indonesian history

In (6a), the two modifying nouns Indonesian history act as premodifiers and precede the head noun book. In (6b), the position of premodifiers (Indonesian history) moves to the right edge of the head noun preceded by of phrase. This position acts as postmodifiers that come after the head noun. Although (6a) and (6b) form different structures, they still share the same information.

Nevertheless, there are some exceptions when premodifiers move to the position of postmodifiers. This is usually marked by to or of phrase in which it depends on the type of the head noun preceding it. Their difference seems to be either in semantics which shares different information or in syntax which forms different structures. In fact, premodifiers mostly use attributive adjectives and nouns. The prepositional phrases, especially in case of-of phrases, are also mostly used as postmodifiers.

There have been many linguists urge that the head of English NP is dominated by the noun (N). This notion is proposed by the X-Bar theory. According to Haegeman (cited in Pujiono, 2014), the common principle of noun phrases in the X-Bar theory is described in the following rules:

1. $X'' \rightarrow \text{Spec} \quad ; \quad X'$
2. $X' \rightarrow X' \quad ; \quad YP$
3. $X' \rightarrow X \quad ; \quad YP$

$X''$

Spec

$X'$

$X'$

YP (Adjunct)

$X$

YP (Complement)

Diagram 5
“X” is the maximal projection of a phrase, consisting of a specifier which is combined with X’ (top projection). X’ is the top projection, consisting of X-Bar which is combined with YP (Adjunct). X’ is the projection, consisting of X which is combined with YP (Complement).

Although this view is derived from the theory of X-Bar stating the head of NP is an N, a determiner occupies the specifier (SPR) of NP, and the complement of NP is for a prepositional phrase (PP) or a clause (Takahashi, 2004), some others urge that the head of English NP is projected by determiner (D), as proposed by Abney (1987). He stated that a noun phrase is a projection of determiner with a projection of a noun as its complement and consists of two layers whose head is occupied by a functional category called D.

(1a) \[ \text{DP} \rightarrow \text{NP} \]
(1b) \[ \text{Specifier} \rightarrow \text{N} \]

Diagram 6: DP-Hypothesis
Diagram 7: X-Bar Theory

In (1a), the head of NP is dominated by a determiner phrase (DP). Meanwhile, in (1b), it is dominated by a noun (N). Gómez (2009) stated that other fillers of NP head are pronouns, numerals, or adjectives, such as poor in the poor.

In English noun phrases, there are a number of components that can be further subclassified to form classes filling each constituent category.

Diagram 8

The structure of noun phrase in Indonesian is contradictory to the one in English. The basic distinction between the two different structures lies on
the placement of each component (determiner, premodifier, head, and postmodifier) inside the noun phrase structure.

For examples:
NP in Indonesian

(1) \[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{N} \]
\[ \text{A} \]
\[ \text{Gadis} \quad \text{cantik} \]

Compared to NP in English

(2a) \[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{Det} \]
\[ \text{The} \]
\[ \text{A} \]
\[ \text{N} \]
\[ \text{beautiful} \quad \text{girl} \]

In NP (1), the modifiers of Indonesian noun phrase come right after the head noun (gadis). In English, on the other hand, the modifiers may come before the head noun (girl) in (2a). The use of articles (the/an/a) in English plays an important role to introduce the noun following it.

There are a lot of theories of NPs discussed above, especially determiners and the order of modifiers. However, the researcher only focuses this study on the English noun phrases (determiners, adjectives, and the head nouns) based on a textual meaning.

There are many experts define translation in various ways. Catford (1978: 20) defines translation is the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) by equivalent textual material in another language (TL). Brislin (cited in Siregar, 2016) also remarks that it is a transfer of thoughts and ideas from one language (source) to another (target), whether the languages are in written or oral form; whether the languages have established orthographies or do not have such standardization or whether one or both languages are based on signs, as with sign languages of the deaf. Translating can be simply defined as transferring the message both in meaning and style from the source language (SL) into the target language (TL).
However, translating is not easy for every second language learners. According to Soemarno (cited in Krisetyawati, 2010), the first difficulty faced by a translator is the difficulty caused by the linguistic problem and the message meaning. The linguistic problems may occur in the structure comprising the word arrangement, kinds of word, or even affixation. Every language may differ one another in its own system so it causes the difficulties and misunderstanding for the translator if s/he does not know the system or structure of the source language. Besides, there are some problems in message meaning that may occur on (1) *Lexical Meaning* (the meaning out of context); (2) *Grammatical Meaning* (the meaning with the parts of the language in the wider units); (3) *Contextual Meaning* (the meaning based on the context/situation where the language is used); (4) *Textual Meaning* (meaning based on the context of a text and usually found in a discourse or a text); and (5) *Socio-Cultural Meaning* (the meaning used in social situation, and cultural background of the language users). The problems in this study focus on the word arrangement, kinds of word, and textual meaning.

There have been many researchers doing research on English noun phrase errors over the years. The previous studies were conducted by Kusuma (2013) and Dharma (2010) on their discussion about error analysis on the English noun phrases. Their studies show that there are a number of errors made by the students. Since the errors are the common problems for the second language learners, it is very important to investigate and diagnose in order that the teachers or researchers are able to obtain the clarity of the students’ errors in their written production.

**Method**

The study was conducted in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FTTE), Mataram University. There were 118 English students in the fifth semester divided into six classes as population. From the population of this study, it was taken one class (class C regular) with 22 students as the sample by applying cluster random sampling with a qualitative descriptive method. The instruments used are a test and questionnaire, and they were submitted in form of documentation. In the test, the researcher used 15
Indonesian noun phrases based on a text to be translated into the English noun phrases. Meanwhile, data from open-ended questionnaires was used to obtain the sources of errors made by the students. The errors were analyzed by using error analysis proposed by Corder (1967) including collecting the samples, identifying the errors, classifying the errors, and describing the errors.

**Finding and Discussion**

It was found that 80 of 330 tested items were not in the count in this finding, namely sentences (17 items), clauses (43 items), and prepositional phrases (20 items). These items were not investigated since data needed was the only English noun phrases in premodifiers. Therefore, there were 250 items which were investigated further.

1. **Error Categories and Types of English Noun Phrase Errors**

Based on the finding, it showed that 117 items (47%) were answered correctly, and 133 items (53%) were answered incorrectly.

Among the 133 incorrect answers, it was found that there were 143 errors found on students’ Indonesian-English noun phrase translation. These errors were categorized into three error categories, namely the incorrect use of determiners (D), the incorrect use of adjectives (A), and the incorrect use of nouns (N). Each error categories were classified based on four types of errors, namely misordering (MO), misformation (MF), omission (OM), and addition (AD).

**Table 3: Error Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Categories</th>
<th>Incorrect Use of Determiners</th>
<th>Incorrect Adjectives</th>
<th>Incorrect Use of Nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opinion</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 1, it showed that the incorrect use of determiners indicated 14 errors, the incorrect use of adjectives 58 errors, and the incorrect use of nouns 71 errors. The highest number was dominated by the incorrect use of nouns.
with 71 errors (50%), followed by the incorrect use of adjectives with 58 (40%), and the incorrect use of determiners with 14 (10%).

Most students were still confused about how to construct the structures of English noun phrases with the use of determiners, adjective premodifiers, and the nouns based on the textual meaning.

Categories of errors were described as follows:

1. Incorrect Use of Determiners

Based on data, there were 14 errors (10%) of the use of determiners.

For example:

   rambut pirang keriting pendek *(sample)*

   *a short curly blond hair* (data ub, test item number 11)

The incorrect determiner was shown with the addition to the *article* (*a*). This item should not appear in the well-formed utterance (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982). It should be no article since the head noun (*hair*) was an uncountable noun. The singular determiner (*a*) should be omitted in order to form correct determiner in use as in *short curly blond hair*. This was also supported by Huddleston & Pullum (2002), when a determiner combines with a countable noun, they should agree in number.

2. Incorrect Use of Adjectives

Based on data analysis in finding, there were 58 (40%) incorrect adjectives that function as a premodifier.

For example:

   seorang aktris Inggris muda cantik yang sangat *terkenal* *(sample)*

   *a young famous beautiful British actress* (data Ru, test item number 1)

In fact, this did not go in the right order since the attributive adjective was stressed on *famous* based on the textual meaning. As Kingsbury and Wellman’s cline (cited in Gómez, 2009:40) categorized a universal hierarchy of adjectival ordering restrictions filled in premodifiers. Most the order of stacked adjectives such as subject comment/ opinions (*very famous, popular, beautiful, handsome*), sizes (*large, high*) and ages (*old, young*) should go in the right order.
3. Incorrect Use of Nouns

The incorrect use of nouns covered the misspelling and order. The wrong form focused on the nouns in which it did not exist in any English dictionary. Based on this data, there were 71 errors (50%) incorrect use of nouns in Indonesian-English noun phrase translation.

For example:

seorang musisi Irlandia tampan yang sangat terkenal (sample)

*a very handsome famous Ireland musician* (data Sr, test item number 2)

The incorrect nouns are *Irlandia* and *mucicians*. *Irish* was the correct form that showed the nationality. Meanwhile, *mucicians* should be *musician* which meant the person who played a music.

The following was the frequency of error categories with types of errors:

**Table 4: Frequency of Error Categories and Types of Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Categories</th>
<th>Types of Errors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: D: Determiners, A: Adjectives, N: Nouns

The frequency of each type of errors committed by the students showed 149 errors in total, in which they were classified into four types of errors, namely misordering (54 errors), misformation (41 errors), omission (40 errors), and addition (14 errors). Meanwhile, the frequency of each types of errors for each category was given in the following table:

**Table 5: Frequency of Each Types of Errors for Each Error Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sentences, Clauses &amp; PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>OM</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MO: Misordering, MF: Misformation; OM: Omission; AD: Addition;

2. Sources of Errors

Most errors in second language learners (English) might generally be caused by the interlingual errors and intralingual errors. Based on data obtained it was found that there were 409 errors influenced by the interlingual
errors (first language) and intralingual errors (overgeneralization, false concept hypothesized, and the incomplete rule of restrictions).

**Table 6: The Number of Sources of Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of the Errors</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>FCH</th>
<th>IRR</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual Error</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intralingual Error</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above (4.3), the most dominated errors committed by the students was influenced by their intralingual errors with 278 (68%). Meanwhile, their interlingual errors only reached 131 (32%) errors influenced by their first language (FL).

Besides that, data obtained from the open questionnaire for additional data showed that there were three types of difficulties found during working on the test, namely translation, grammar, and first language.

**Table 7: Types of Difficulties based on Data in Open Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulties</th>
<th>Responds</th>
<th>No Respond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Language</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The sources of students’ errors were described as follows:

1. **Interlingual Errors (First Language)**

The interference of mother language may affect the second language acquisition.

For example:

ildean (Ireland) was the wrong word and denoted the interference of learners’ first language (Indonesian) and should be Irish (nationality) in order to form the correct word. All these errors were caused by interference of the students’ mother tongue that affected the target language (Richards et al, 2002).

2. **Intralingual Errors**

The error reflects the knowledge of the second language learners. It means the learners do not master the target language well.

For example:
• rambut hitam lurus panjang (sample)

*a long straight black hair* (data Nd, test item number 9)

The word *hair* was one of the uncountable nouns that did not also take the indefinite article. Such this error was known as overgeneralization in which they overgeneralized the use of the indefinite article (*a*) where it was not used (Ellis, 1997).

**Conclusion and Suggestion**

From the error analysis, it was concluded that 133 items (53%) were translated incorrectly. These 133 incorrect items were found 143 errors in three categories of errors, namely the incorrect use of determiners with 14 errors (10%), the incorrect use of adjectives with 58 errors (40%), and the incorrect use of nouns with 71 errors (50%). Based on these three categories of errors, there were 149 errors found, and they were classified into four types of errors, namely misordering with 54 errors (36%), misformation with 41 errors (28%), omission with 40 errors (27%), and addition with 14 errors (9%). Meanwhile, the sources of errors were mostly dominated by intralingual errors with 278 errors (68%) and followed by interlingual errors with 131 (32%). Most students also had a difficulty to translate the Indonesian-English noun phrases in consequence of the interference of the first language and the knowledge of the second language learners.

Through this study, teachers should keep monitoring their students’ development by giving an evaluation. By understanding the students’ errors, they are able to create new teaching techniques in the second language teaching. The students should be active and keep asking about something they do not know instead of feeling afraid of making an error. They also have to read, learn, and practice a lot of words or structure in order that they are able to easily recognize and avoid the errors continuously. This study also needs further research to find it more useful for the teachers, students, and other researchers. Hence, the further researchers are expected to do further research more deeply on the learners’ errors.
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