An Error Analysis of Communicative Effect Taxonomy in Students' Writing Descriptive Text at the Tenth Grader Students

Afore Tahir Harefa[1], Berlin Sibarani[2]

[1]Universitas Nias, Indonesia

[2]Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

Abstract— This paper presents an error analysis of communicative effect taxonomy in students' writing of descriptive text at the tenth grader of Senior High School. The study focuses on understanding the types and sources of errors made by students, with a particular emphasis on local and global errors within the communicative effect taxonomy. The research employs a qualitative method, involving data collection through tests and interviews. The study takes place at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua, and the participants are 20 students from class X IPA 1. The findings reveal a total of 77 errors, with local errors constituting 57.14% and global errors 42.85%. Local errors include articles, auxiliary, noun and verb inflection, and quantifier errors. The most prevalent type of error is related to noun and verb inflection. Intralingual sources are identified as the predominant cause of errors, followed by interlingual, context of learning, and communication strategy sources. The analysis sheds light on the patterns and frequencies of errors, providing insights into students' challenges in writing descriptive texts. The results suggest that students face difficulties in grammar aspects, particularly in using articles and inflections. Intralingual factors, such as insufficient knowledge about grammar rules, play a significant role in students' errors. The study concludes with recommendations for teachers to enhance grammar teaching strategies, considering the identified error patterns and sources, to improve students' writing proficiency.

Keywords— communicative effect taxonomy, descriptive text, error analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

In the realm of English language learning, students often grapple with errors that impede their proficiency in various language skills, particularly in writing. An error refers to mistakes or inaccuracies made by students in the process of learning the English language. These errors may hinder the students' ability to demonstrate proficiency in various language skills, with a particular emphasis on writing. The term error implies deviations from the correct or desired use of language, encompassing grammatical, syntactical, lexical, or other linguistic aspects.

An error is a sure sign that learner has not mastered the code of the target language (Rahayu, 2011). It means that

an error indicates a lack of mastery in the target language's linguistic rules or code. Error is also defined as a result of lack of knowledge (Prasetianto & Mahardika, 2020). It means an error stems from a deficiency in knowledge, leading to inaccuracies or mistakes in language usage. In addition, an error is defined as a divergence from the norms of the target language (Ilham et al. 2022). It means that an error in the context of language learning is identified when there is a departure or deviation from the accepted standards and rules of the language being studied.

One of the observable errors that students make in English language learning is writing. Writing is the process of expressing thoughts, ideas, or information through the

creation of text using a system of visually recognizable symbols, such as letters or characters. Writing is some steps of mental action of inventing, organizing, reviewing, editing, and revising ideas into words by writer's own style with specific purpose (Autilia & Theresia, 2018). Writing is also defined as the stage of transforming an idea into words on paper (Susilawati, 2017). In addition, writing is defined as a means to reformulate and record knowledge as well as develop ideas (Ghufron & Ermawati, 2018).

One of the results of writing skills is being able to write descriptive text. A descriptive text is a genre of writing that vividly portrays and conveys sensory details, characteristics, or features of a subject, person, place, or event to create a clear and immersive mental image for the reader. Descriptive text is usually used in daily life such as, describing place to someone new, describing a person, or describing thing (Yenita et al. 2014). Descriptive text also provides details about something, such as people, animals, thing, person, and place with a clear explanation (Mayekti et al. 2022). In addition, descriptive text is one of the texts that can help students to improve their ideas into a text (Indah, 2022).

When creating descriptive text, it is essential for a learner to ensure that each sentence in the paragraphs is clear and grammatically correct to facilitate readers' comprehension. To write well-structured sentences, students need a comprehensive understanding of grammatical aspects, particularly in relation to word usage, as this understanding enables them to recognize the function of each element in an English sentence.

Concerning the 2013 curriculum syllabus at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua, it outlines that teaching writing is a requirement for students. The fundamental competency entails students being able to create descriptive texts, both orally and in writing, that are concise and straightforward, covering topics related to people, things, and places. This should involve considering social functions, text structures, and linguistic features accurately and in the appropriate context.

After conducting initial observations and interviews with the English language teacher at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua, the researcher identified issues with writing descriptive text. Despite the English teacher indicating that descriptive text material has been covered, the observed reality is that numerous students face challenges articulating their ideas effectively, often struggling with appropriate word choice and sentence construction. Additionally, many students frequently make grammatical errors in their English composition, particularly in writing descriptive text, which significantly impacts both the

structure of their sentences and the clarity of their communicated ideas.

Learners' errors offer insights into the language system they have acquired at a specific stage in a course, and understanding these errors is crucial. Recognizing learners' errors proves valuable for teachers, researchers, and the learners themselves, aiding teachers in assessing students' comprehension of a specific course. Error analysis is a process of examining and understanding the mistakes made by learners in their language use, particularly in the context of a specific stage in a course. It involves evaluating these errors to gain insights into the learners' grasp of the language system and is considered crucial for teachers, researchers, and learners to assess comprehension and improve language learning strategies.

Error analysis is an activity to reveal errors found in writing and speaking (Hasyim, 2022). It means Error analysis is a process that uncovers mistakes in written and spoken language. Error analysis is also a way to investigate errors in the second or foreign language acquisition (Fitria, 2018). It means that error analysis is a method used to examine mistakes in the process of acquiring a second or foreign language.

In addition, error analysis is essential for teachers to improve the quality of teaching (Agustinasari et al. 2022). It means that error analysis is crucial for teachers as it facilitates the enhancement of teaching quality by identifying and addressing students' mistakes in language learning.

In other words, in doing the error analysis, the researcher examines, analyzes, interprets, or describes students' errors in speaking or writing to gather information about common difficulties. It is crucial to categorize and describe these errors to understand both the grammatical mistakes and their underlying causes, facilitating decisions in the ongoing learning process. Based on the explanation above, the researcher was intend to do the research with the title An Error Analysis of Communicative Effect Taxonomy in Students' Writing Descriptive Text at the Tenth Grade of SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua.

II.   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The method used by researcher is qualitative method. Qualitative research is a methodological approach that seeks to understand and interpret complex phenomena through the exploration of subjective meanings, experiences, and perspectives. Qualitative method is defined as a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of speech or writing and the behavior of the people being observed (Kholalisa & Jimmie, 2022).

Qualitative method is also defined as a research approach that generates descriptive data in the form of words, human speech, and observable behavior (Nurdina et al. 2022). In addition, qualitative method is defined as a research method in describing phenomena based on the point of view of informants, finding various realities and developing a holistic understanding of a phenomenon in a particular context (Nuraeni & Pratama 2021).

In error analysis research, the researcher conducted procedures involving data collection, error identification, description, explanation, and evaluation. For data collection, tests and interviews were utilized. In identifying errors, the researcher underlined every error made by students in the test. The description of errors involved classifying them based on types, specifically focusing on the communicative effect taxonomy. Finally, in explaining errors, the researcher identified the sources based on error identification and description, highlighting the effects of the errors on the intended audience.

The study took place at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua in Silimanbanua village, Tuhemberua district, North Nias. The research data comprises the outcomes of a test focusing on errors in students' written assessments using communicative effect taxonomy. The researcher systematically examined the nature and origin of these errors. Both the data and informants were purposefully selected, aiding the researcher in comprehending the identified problem and the formulated research focus. The test was administered to 20 students in class X IPA 1 at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua, serving as the informants for the study.

The researcher employed a mixed-methods approach, using writing tests and interviews for data collection. The subsequent analysis included identification, description, explanation, and evaluation of errors in students' descriptive writing. Identification involved pinpointing deviations from the target, while description categorized errors based on content, organization, and grammar. Explanation analyzed causes, differentiating between interlingual and intralingual sources. The evaluation phase assessed the impact of errors on the audience. Information was gathered through observations, documents, and visual materials. Class X, specifically X-IPA 1 at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua, served as the research informants for the study, focusing on descriptive writing. Data collection

included a test where students composed descriptive texts on blank paper, and subsequent analysis identified prevalent error types and their sources.

To carry out the research, the researcher employed a qualitative data analysis technique aimed at describing and interpreting the results of qualitative data. The analysis process followed several key procedures. Firstly, a sample of learner language was collected to discern patterns of change in error occurrence with increasing L2 exposure and proficiency. Subsequently, the identification of errors involved determining elements in the students' writing sample that deviated from the intended target. The next step, description of errors, required specifying how the forms produced by the students differed from the target form, with errors classified into global and local categories. Finally, the explanation of errors involved analyzing the causes of errors made by the students, taking into consideration the descriptions of the errors.

III.   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Findings

The data was collected from tenth-grade students at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua. After obtaining the students' descriptive text test, the researcher analyzed it using error analysis procedures. This involved identifying errors (locating errors in student writing), describing errors (categorizing errors into local and global categories based on communicative effect taxonomy), explaining errors (conducting interviews with students to understand and explain the sources of errors), and evaluating errors (assessing and potentially correcting errors). Although numerous errors were identified in the students' descriptive text, this research specifically focused on local and global errors in writing descriptive text.

Following the analysis of students' descriptive text, the researcher tabulated the errors using a table and computed the frequency of each error type. Subsequently, the researcher translated the calculated results into percentages.

Table 1. The Recapitulation of Students' Error in Communicative Effect Taxonomy (Global and Lexical Error) of Descriptive Text

No	Name	Global Error	Ar	Au	N&V.I	Qu	frequency
			Local Error				
1	A.P.G	1	1	-	3	-	5
2	C.P.G.Z	3	-	-	3	-	6
3	B.G	-	2	-	2	-	4
4	D.I.G.Z	7	-	-	-	-	7
5	E.M.G	2	1	1	-	-	4
6	I.H	1	-	-	2	-	3
7	K.G	-	1	-	1	-	2
8	M.J.G	2	2	-	3	1	8
9	M.S.G	2	-	-	-	-	2
10	M.G	-	1	-	1	-	2
11	N.H	2	1	-	1	-	4
12	R.Y.G	1	-	-	2	-	3
13	R.T.O.H	2	-	-	2	-	4
14	R.Z	2	2	-	2	-	6
15	S.P.Z	1	1	-	-	-	2
16	Si.K.Z	3	-	-	-	-	3
17	Su.K.Z	1	1	-	3	-	5
18	T.S.V.S.T	1	1	-	-	-	2
19	Y.T	-	-	-	2	-	2
20	Y.G	2	-	-	1	-	3
	SUM	33	14	1	28	1	77

Description

Ar   : article

Au   : auxiliary

N & V.I.: noun & verb inflection

Qu   : quantifier

The research findings reveal that students made a total of 77 errors. Among these, local errors, specifically article-related errors, accounted for 14 instances or 18.18%, auxiliary errors constituted 1 instance or 1.29%, noun and verb inflection errors amounted to 28 instances or 36.36%, quantifier errors were observed in 1 instance or 1.29%, and global errors were identified in 33 instances or 42.85%. The predominant type of error, both in terms of frequency and percentage, was local errors, representing 44 instances or 57.14% of the total errors.

After presenting the result of analysis of the students' error, the researcher formulated the sequence of types of errors on its high frequency and low frequency. It can be seen from the table below.

Table 2. . The Sequence of the Number of Students' and The Frequency of Students' Error in Communicative Effect Taxonomy (Global and Local Error) of Descriptive Text

No	Types of Error		Number of Students	Frequency of Error
1	Local Error	Noun & verb inflection	14	28 (36,36%)
2		Article	11	14 (18,18%)
3		Auxiliary	1	1 (1,29%)
4		Quantifier	1	1 (1,29%)
5	Global Error		16	36 (42,85%)

In the research, the researcher had conducted two times interview to get the information about the students' error and the sources of the students' error. The first interview was done to find out what does the students weaknesses in learning English. After that the researcher conducted the interview to the students by formulating and creating the questions based on the types of errors made by the students, the number and the form of the questions that should be asked to the students depended of the student's error it self. The second interview was conducted directed to the students. The second interview aimed to found the sources of the students' errors in communicative effect taxonomy (global and local error) as the second focus of the research. The researcher formulated and created the questions based on the types of errors made by the students, the number and the form of the questions that should be asked to the students depended of the student's error itself.

After conducted the interview and took the interview sheet. Furthermore the researcher analyzed it and classified it into four categories based on the sources of errors theory namely Interlingual, Intralingual, Context of Learning and Communication Strategies The researcher counted and made the recapitulation of the source of errors by using the table.

Table 3. The Recapitulation of the Source of the Students' Errors in Using Simple Past Tense of Descriptive Text

NO	NAME	SOURCE OF ERROR			
		IT	IE	CL	CS
1	A.P.G	3	-	-	-
2	C.P.G.Z	2	-	4	-
3	B.G	3	-	-	1
4	D.I.K.Z	1	3	5	-
5	E.M.G	-	3	1	-
6	I.H	-	1	-	-
7	K.G	1	-	-	-
8	M.J.G	2	3	-	2
9	M.S.G	2	-	-	-
10	M.G	-	1	1	-
11	N.H	2	-	2	-
12	R.Y.G	2	-	1	-
13	R.T.O.H	2	-	2	-
14	R.Z	2	2	2	-
15	S.P.Z	-	1	-	1
16	Si.K.Z	1	2	2	-
17	Su.K.Z	-	3	1	-

18	T.S.V.S.T	1	-	-	-
19	Y.T	1	1	-	-
20	Y.G	1	2	-	-
	SUM	26	22	21	4
	TOTAL OF SOURCE		73		

Description

IT   : Intralingual

IE   : Interlingual

CL   : Context of Learning

CS   : Communicative Strategy

Table 4. Percentage of the Sources of Students' Error

Sources of Errors	Percentage
Intralingual	35.61%
Interlingual	30.13%
Context Learning	28.76%
Communication Strategy	5.47%

From the four sources of error classified and based on the result of interview, it showed that the students were mostly influenced by intralingual source was the most source of students' error with the frequency was 26 or 35,61%. Interlingual with the frequency was 22 or 30,13%The next error was context of learning, with the total number errors was 21 or 28,76%and the last of error that the students made in their descriptive text was communication strategy, this was the lowest number of sources of errors, it was 4 or 5,47%.

To analyze students' errors in communicative effectiveness, it was crucial to identify and explain the sources of errors in their descriptive writing. This involved analyzing students' interview responses to pinpoint the types of errors and, subsequently, determining their sources. The researcher categorized these sources into four groups: interlingual, intralingual, context of learning, and communication strategies, as summarized in the table below.

Table 5. The Sequence of the Number of Students' and the Frequency of Students' Source Error in Communicative Effect Taxonomy (Global and Local Error) of Descriptive Text

No.	Source of Error	Number of Student	Frequency of Source
1	Intralingual	15	26 (35.61%)
2	Interlingual	10	22 (30.13%)
3	Contex of Leraning	10	21 (28.76%)
4	Communication of Leraning	3	4 (5.47%)

IV.   DISCUSSION

The researcher effectively addressed the outlined research objectives, which included identifying students' errors and their sources, particularly in the communicative effect taxonomy within descriptive text writing. The research findings successfully provided insights into this area. The analysis of the results revealed that the types of students' errors were categorized as local errors, constituting 44% (55% overall), and global errors, accounting for 36% (45% overall).

Furthermore, in the quest to identify the origins of these errors, the researcher examined and categorized students' responses from interview sheets. The analysis revealed that intralingual sources were the most prevalent cause of students' errors, comprising 26 instances or 35.61%. Interlingual sources followed with 22 occurrences or 30.13%, while the context of learning contributed 21 instances or 28.76%. Communication strategy was identified as a source as well, with a frequency of 4 instances or 5.47%.

After presenting the types and sources of errors, the researcher now aims to discuss how these findings address the research questions outlined in the initial chapter. The first research question centered on the types of errors made by students in writing descriptive text, specifically within the communicative effect taxonomy. According to the research findings, the predominant type of error identified was the local error, constituting 44 instances or 57.14%. This category comprised four elements: articles, noun and verb inflection, auxiliary usage, and quantifiers.

In examining 20 texts created by students on the topic of describing tourist attractions, errors in the use of articles were notable. Fourteen errors were observed, manifesting as inappropriate article usage, omission of necessary articles, and the simultaneous use of two articles in a single sentence (e.g., "a an"). The next prevalent error was in the use of auxiliary, with only one instance noted among the students. Noun and verb inflection errors were more frequent, occurring 28 times. Most mistakes in this category were related to the incorrect usage of noun and verb inflections, such as transforming a noun like "location" into "located" to reflect past tense.

Quantifier errors were relatively infrequent, occurring only once. This error was characterized by a mismatch between the word "few" in the text and the preceding noun, failing to properly indicate plurality. Moving on to global errors, students committed errors 33 times, often resulting from the creation of ambiguous sentences. These errors were distinct from local errors, representing instances where the sentence as a whole lacked coherence and did not involve specific local elements.

The second research question delves into the origins of errors made by students in writing descriptive text. According to the analysis findings, the researcher categorized the sources of errors based on students' responses in interviews. The predominant source of error was intralingual, constituting the majority with 26 instances or 35.61%. Following this, interlingual sources were identified with a frequency of 22 instances or 30.13%. Context of learning was also a significant source, contributing 21 instances or 28.76%, while communication strategy accounted for 4 instances or 5.47%.

In light of the information provided earlier, the researcher proposes a solution to address errors made by students in writing descriptive text within the communicative effect taxonomy. It is recommended that teachers enhance their skills and knowledge to effectively identify and incorporate appropriate components for teaching grammar in the classroom. This includes strategies, materials, and media that align with the rules of grammar, facilitating the creation of well-structured sentences. Building upon the preceding explanations, it can be asserted that students' errors and their sources are inherently connected. Intralingual, interlingual, context of learning, and communication strategies exert a definite influence on the occurrence of both global and local errors among students.

V.   CONCLUSION

In connection with the research's focus and objectives, which aimed to analyze the types and sources of errors in students' writing of descriptive text, the findings from both the worksheet and interview sheet revealed that students in grade X IPA-1 at SMA Negeri 1 Tuhemberua continue to make errors in this writing genre. The research, conducted by the study, identified a total of 86 errors in the students' descriptive texts. The prevalent types of errors included local errors, constituting 44 instances or 57.14%, which encompassed four elements: articles (14 instances or 18.18%), auxiliary (1 instance or 1.29%), noun and verb inflection (28 instances or 36.36%), and quantifier (1 instance or 1.29%). Additionally, global errors were identified with a frequency of 33 instances or 42.85%. The research findings also shed light on the primary sources of errors in students' writing of descriptive texts within the communicative effect taxonomy. Intralingual sources emerged as the most significant, contributing 26 errors or 35.61%. This source is linked to students' insufficient knowledge about grammar. Interlingual sources were the second most prevalent, with a frequency of 22 instances or 30.13%. Context of learning was another influential source, accounting for 21 instances or 28.76%, while communication strategy contributed 4 instances or 5.47%.

REFERENCES

[1] Agustinasari, Evi, Simanjuntak, Tiur, & Purwanto, Muhammad Bambang. (2022). A Review on Error Analysis Stages in Teaching English Structure. Pionner: Journal of Language and Literature, 14 (1), 253-268. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v14i1.1702

[2] Autilia, Rani, & Theresia, Melati. (2018). Improving Students' Writing Skill of Recount Text Through Diary Writing and Peer Editing Technique. Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang, 6, 149-157. https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/selt/article/view/100163

[3] Fitria, Tira Nur. (2018). Error Analysis Found in Students' Writing Composition of Simple Future Tense. ELS: Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies on Humanities, 1 (3), 240-251. DOI: https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v1i3.5028

[4] Ghufron, M. Ali, & Ermawati, Siti. (2018). The Strength and Weaknesses of Cooperative Learning and Problem-based Learning in EFL Writing Class: Teachers and Students' Perspectives. International Journal of Instruction, 11 (4), 657-672. https://www.e-iji.net/volumes/352-october-2018,-volume-11,-number-4

[5] Hasyim, Sunardi. (2022). Error Analysis in the Teaching of English. KATA: A Binnual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature, 4 (1), 42-50. DOI: https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.4.1.62-74

[6] Ilham, Galih Fahrizal, Rohimajaya, Nur Azmi, Novari, Ari Fajria, & Hamer, Welliam. (2022). An Analysis of Students' Error in Writing Analytical Exposition Text by Using Surface Strategy Taxonomy. The Proceedings of the English Language Teaching, Literature, and Translation, 11 (1), 167-174. https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/index.php/eltlt/article/view/1672

[7] Indah, Chindy Hanggara Rosa. (2022). The Analysis of Generic Structure of Descriptive Text Used by Students of Elementary School 1 Penambangan Probolinggo. JOURNEY: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy, 5 (1), 18-23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.33503/journey.v5i1.1790

[8] Kholalisa, Nur, & Jimmie. (2022). Lan Network Analysis in Tsanawiyah Al-kahfi Madrasah Palembang. International Journal CISTER, 1 (2), 92-95). DOI: https://doi.org/10.56481/cister.v1i02.110

[9] Mayeti, Meliana Haris, Faiza, Dinar, & Bestari, Ade Christanty Yudha. (2022). An Analysis of Writing Desctiptive Text at the Second Semester Students' English Language Teaching UNU Purwokerto. EDUCALITRA: English Education, Linguistics, and Literature Journal, 1 (1), 30-36. https://jurnal.unupurwokerto.ac.id/index.php/educalitra/article/view/46

[10] Nuraeni, Mesi, & Pratama, M. Izul Fikri. (2021). The Influence of Sinetron Shows from the Middle School Behavior Window on SMPN 1 Naringgul Student Behavior. Journal Basic Science and Technology, 10 (3), 1-8. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35335/jbst.v10i3.2109

[11] Nurdina, Ghinah, Hadeli, & Arweni. (2022). The Implementation of English Online Learning: A Case Study at Senior High School 1 Akabiluru Lima Puluh Kota District. RIELT Journal, 8 (1), 85-100. DOI: https://doi.org/10.15548/rielt.v8i1.5603

[12] Prasetianto, Mushoffan & Maharddhika, Rizkiana. (2020). Online Writing Exchange with Overseas Students: EFL Learners' Errors and Perceptions. ELITE: English and Literature Journal, 7 (1), 74-86. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24252/elite.v7i1a7

[13] Rahayu, Anik Cahyaning. (2011). Using Error Analysis in Teaching Writing Class. Parafrase: Jurnal Kajian Kebahasaan dan Kesastraan, 11 (2), 16-23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30996/parafrase.v11i02.193

[14] Susilawati, Fenti. (2017). Teaching Writing of Narrative Text through Digital Comic. Journal of English and Education, 5 (2), 103-111. http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/9939

[15] Yenita, Helvira, Tanjung, Fatimah, & Septy, Adzanil. (2014). Teaching Writing Descriptive Text by Using Collaborative Technique. 3 (5), 1-8. https://ejurnal.bunghatta.ac.id/index.php/JFKIP/article/view/2438