



Error Analysis Performed by Tour and Travel Business Students as a Tour Guide

Eka Anastasia Wijaya¹, I Gede Astawa²

eka-anastasia@akpar-denpasar.ac.id

^{1,2}Denpasar Tourism Academy

Received: 2024-07-08 Accepted: 2024-12-31

DOI: 10.2456/ideas.v12i2.5245

Abstract

Error as an inseparable part of English teaching and learning should be considered as a positive thing, since it could help in improving the teaching and learning process. Therefore, this study was conducted to analyze the error performed by the tour and travel business students in English class in the form of simulation. Framed within a qualitative design, this research used error classification theory by Thornbury. The findings showed that there are 5 lexical errors (11%), 35 grammar errors (78%), and 8 discourse errors (18%) performed by the students as a tour guide. It implied that lexical error is the least type of error and grammar error is the major type of error performed by the students. Further, the error performed by the students caused by two major sources. The first source is interference from the native language and the second source is intralingual and developmental factors.

Keywords: *error, tour and travel business, tour guide*

Introduction

An error might occur as an inseparable part of the teaching and learning process. Yusnitasari and Suwartono (2020) added that errors are inseparable in the learning process, including learning new languages. Errors made by learners can influence the teaching and learning process. In this case, the educator could improve the teaching process from the errors made by the learners. It is supported by Saputri (2017) who states that information obtained from analyzing the learners' errors could improve the teaching and learning process. It is because the errors performed indicate the learners' progress. Thus, it could be said that the learners could learn as well as improve their learning process.

In this study, the tour and travel business learners as the subject also made errors in the learning process. The preliminary observation indicated that tour and travel business students in Akademi Pariwisata Denpasar often performed errors during English class, especially in practice as a tour guide. Whereas, a good communication skill in English is the core skill needed in tourism (Anam & Rachmadian, 2020; Saragih et al., 2022). Muziatun and Jusuf (2020) added that tour guides should master English as a compulsory language, especially for those in the tourism sector. Further, a study from Afdal, Iswanto, and Mayasari (2022) supported that language plays an important role in promoting tourist destinations and the information conveyed in grammatically incorrect will not impress the visitors.

In line with that, Ratminingsih, Suardana, and Martin (2018) and Wangi and Nudiya (2020) stated that language and tour guides cannot be separated because it plays an important role in communicating and serving tourists. Moreover, Gani and Damayanti (2018) found that the English ability of local guides is an important element in the hospitality industry. Besides, the tour guide should be able to explain and inform the destination, especially in providing information to the tourists (Rini & Firdaus, 2022). Therefore, a tour guide needs to have a good language skill to give the best service to the tourists.

The connection between having good English communication skills and the errors performed by the learners as a tour guide reflected that as an important thing. Hence, the researchers were inspired to conduct a study about the error performed by the learners as a tour guide. This study also derives from the previous related studies about errors performed by tourist guides such as Fitriani and Zulkarnain (2019), Muziatun and Jusuf (2020), Wangi and Nudiya (2020), Yusnitasari and Suwartono (2020), and Sari, Budasi, Adnyani, and Suwastini (2021). Those studies found that grammatical errors and pronunciation errors are the most problematic errors performed by tour guides.

From the similar studies mentioned above, it could be summed up that most of the studies discussed grammatical or pronunciation errors. However, studies about errors performed by learners as tour guide apart from grammatical and pronunciation errors for their speech or speaking skill is still a rare thing. Therefore, this study was conducted to analyze the errors made by tour and travel business learners in their English simulations as tour guides as well as to know the causes of errors. In line with that, this study is important to be conducted to help the learners overcome the errors performed and to help the lecturers improve the teaching and learning process.

Method Design

This study employs a qualitative design to analyze the data based on the conditions in the field. It is the same with the nature of qualitative design, which analyzes detailed information based on the real condition (Creswell, 1998). The focus of this study was the error analysis based on the theory from Thornbury (2000). Further, the data were obtained from the students' utterances in the simulation as a tour guide in English class. Thus, this study tries to show and analyze the error phenomena that happen in the context of tour guide students.

Participant

The participants of this research were 13 diploma students in the D3 Tour and Travel Business study program. All students as the participants were in the third semester and consisted of 7 male students and 8 female students. In the context of this study, there are only 13 students in the third semester of D3 Tour and Travel Business in Akademi Pariwisata Denpasar. Therefore, all students were selected as the participants in this study. The participants spoke Indonesian as their first language and English is considered as foreign language in their circumstances. The level of the participants' English skill is classified into pre-intermediate based on the researchers' observations as English lecturers.

Instrument

The first research instrument used was an observation sheet. The observation sheet was used to write down the errors performed by the students in the simulation as a tour guide. The observation sheet is also used to confirm the errors found in the utterances spoken by the students. The second research instrument was an interview guide. The interview guide was in the form of open-ended questions. It was used to help the students to explain the answer in the most flexible way. Further, the researchers used the error analysis framework by Thornbury (2000) which consisted of lexical errors, grammar errors, and discourse errors. Both the instruments used were developed and validated to ensure the reliability.

Data Collecting Technique

The data were obtained from the students' performance in the simulation or role-play activity as a tour guide during the semester. In this study, the techniques used were observation and interview. In the observation process, the researchers were observing the students' utterances in the simulation performance as a tour guide in the class during the third semester. Further, the researchers conducted

informal interviews with open-ended questions about the errors performed by the students during the simulation. It was done to help the researchers in interpret and analyze the error found in the utterances spoken by the students.

Data Analysis Technique

The data collected were analyzed in several steps. The first step is error recognition. In this step, the researchers tried to understand the error performed by the students as a tour guide. The second step is error reconstruction. The researchers did reconstruction of errors into the correct ones. The third step is error classification. In the error classification, the researchers classified the error using Thornbury theory. The last step is error explanation. In the error explanation, the researchers explained the causes of the error performed by the students.

The researchers classified the error using Thornbury theory because of several reasons. Error analysis using Thornbury's error classification could be seen in various similar studies as it belongs to a well-known theory. However, a study that discusses errors performed by learners as tour guide for their speech within Thornbury's theory is still a rare thing. Therefore, this study could be a novelty in error classification analysis using Thornbury's theory.

Further, the researchers used content analysis technique to analyze the data about the students' errors as a tour guide in the class. The utterances that are considered error were discussed and corrected by the researchers. Further, the researchers used descriptive analysis technique to analyze the reasons behind the error. The researchers explained descriptively the reasons behind the error performed by the students as a tour guide.

Results

Findings

The data were collected from the students' performance in the simulation as tour guide in English class during the semester. The utterances spoken by the students as the data of this study were displayed as follows in Table 1.

Table 1. Errors Found in Students' Utterances

No.	Errors Found	The Correction
1	"Activities we do..."	"The activities that we can do..."
2	"You can view the view on side the bus."	"You can see the view outside the bus."
3	"Her name is Erland."	"His name is Erland."
4	"Before me explain about Tanah Lot, ..."	"Before I explain about Tanah Lot, ..."
5	"This is location on Tanah Lot."	"This is Tanah Lot."

6	“Activities in the Tanah Lot are...”	“The activities that we can do in Tanah Lot are...”
7	“Enjoy the sense and the sunrise.”	“Enjoy the sunrise!”
8	“Thank you for you coming Tanah Lot.”	“Thank you for your visit to Tanah Lot.”
9	“So you guys, the time, enjoy Tanah Lot is over.”	“It’s already the time to go the next destination.”
10	“I want to ask for you.”	“I want to ask something.”
11	“This is snake for you.”	“This is snack for you.”
12	“This your number room.”	“This is your room number.”
13	“Enjoy for tonight.”	“Have a good time tonight.”
14	“I want to check out my guest.”	“I would like to check-out.”
15	“What your name?”	“What’s your name?”
16	“It was-it’s very good.”	“It’s very good!”
17	“Your baggage is two, all right?”	“You have two luggages, right?”
18	“We going to Manggarai.”	“We are heading to Manggarai.”
19	“Before you bring to the next destination...”	“Before you go to the next destination...”
20	“You have also be careful.”	“You have to be careful.”
21	A: “Do you have question?” B: “I want to question.”	A: “Do you want to ask something?” B: “I have a question.”
22	“Thank you very much for joining me.”	“Thank you for having me.”
23	“Where do you from?”	“Where do you come from?”
24	“It is fun?”	“Is it fun?”
25	“That’s all explain of Mirror Stone Cave.”	“That’s all the explanation about Mirror Stone Cave.”
26	“I hope you like my service.”	“I hope you satisfied with my service.”
27	“Before we hotel, do you want to buy snack for the bus, maybe?”	“Before we go to the hotel, do you want to buy some snacks?”
28	“I want to check in my guest.”	“I would like to check in under the name of my guest.”
29	“You room number is one, two, and three (123).”	“Your room number is 123.”
30	“Today, the last your trip.”	“Today is our last day.”
31	“Be careful your way home.”	“Be careful on your way home.”

32	“Please follow me go to harbour.”	“Please follow me to go to the harbour.”
33	“This is Esha and this is Ersi.”	“Let me introduce my partners, Ms. Esha and Ms. Ersi.”
34	“The part time of tour guide.”	“Now, it is the tour guide’s time to explain about Mirror Stone Cave.”
35	“Because the dialogue is gone.”	“That’s all for the explanation about Mirror Stone Cave.”
36	“It’s so early morning.”	“It’s already morning. It’s time to check-out from the hotel.”
37	“Don’t light up your smoke up there.”	“You are not allowed to smoke there.”
38	“I enjoy together my friend.”	“I’m having a good time with my friend.”
39	“...already prepare about your lunch.”	“Your lunch is already prepared by the restaurant.”
40	“What activision can be in Pink Beach?”	“What we can do in Pink Beach?”
41	“The stone and the sun make a shadow.”	“It is called as Mirror Stone Cave because there is a shadow on the stone as the reflection of the sunlight.”
42	“You can enjoy the cave.”	“Have a good time inside the cave.”
43	“I’ll give you 20 minutes inside the cave.”	“You have 20 minutes to enjoy the view inside the cave.”
44	“Like I tell you before.”	“As I told you before, ...”
45	“Are you ready now?”	“Are you ready to go?”

Table 1 displays the total amount of 45 errors found in the utterances spoken by the students as a tour guide in the simulation. It also displays the correction of the errors done by the researchers. The researchers also displayed the error classification in Table 2 based on Thornbury’s error classification.

Table 2. Error Classification by Thornbury

No.	Errors Found in Students' Utterances	Error Classification by Thornbury (2000)		
		Lexical Error	Grammar Error	Discourse Error
1	"Activities we do..."		√	
2	"You can view the view on side the bus."	√	√	
3	"Her name is Erland."	√		
4	"Before me explain about Tanah Lot, ..."		√	
5	"This is location on Tanah Lot."		√	
6	"Activities in the Tanah Lot are..."		√	
7	"Enjoy the sense and the sunrise."	√		√
8	"Thank you for you coming Tanah Lot."		√	
9	"So you guys, the time, enjoy Tanah Lot is over."		√	
10	"I want to ask for you."		√	
11	"This is snake for you."	√		
12	"This your number room."		√	
13	"Enjoy for tonight."		√	
14	"I want to check out my guest."		√	
15	"What your name?"		√	
16	"It was-it's very good."		√	
17	"Your baggage is two, all right?"		√	
18	"We going to Manggarai."		√	
19	"Before you bring to the next destination."			√
20	"You have also been careful."		√	
21	A: "Do you have question?"		√	

B: "I want to question."		
22	"Thank you very much for joining me."	√
23	"Where do you from?"	√
24	"It is fun?"	√
25	"That's all explain of Mirror Stone Cave."	√
26	"I hope you like my service."	√
27	"Before we hotel, do you want to buy snack for the bus, maybe?"	√
28	"I want to check in my guest."	√
29	"You room number is one, two, and three (123)."	√
30	"Today, the last your trip."	√
31	"Be careful your way home."	√
32	"Please follow me go to harbour."	√
33	"This is Esha and this is Ersi."	√
34	"The part time of tour guide."	√
35	"Because the dialogue is gone."	√
36	"It's so early morning."	√
37	"Don't light up your smoke up there."	√
38	"I enjoy together my friend."	√
39	"...already prepare about your lunch."	√
40	"What activation can be in Pink Beach?"	√
41	"The stone and the sun make a shadow."	√
42	"You can enjoy the cave."	√

43	“I’ll give you 20 minutes inside the cave.”	√
44	“Like I tell you before.”	√
45	“Are you ready now?”	√

Table 2 above displays a brief analysis of error classification based on Thornbury’s theory. Thornbury (2000) classified errors into lexical error, grammar error, and discourse error. The total number of errors based on the classification was summarized in Table 3 as follows.

Table 3. Summary of Error Classification

Classification	Total Amount	Percentage
Lexical Error	5 of 45	11%
Grammar Error	35 of 45	78%
Discourse Error	8 of 45	18%

From the table above, it could be concluded that grammar error is the most error performed by the students with a total amount 35 of 45 errors (78%), followed by discourse error with a total amount 8 of 45 errors (18%), and lexical error as the least error performed by the students with a total amount 5 of 45 errors (11%). Further explanation about the error analysis can be seen in the Discussion section.

Discussion

Error Classification from the Students’ Utterances

Error as an inseparable part in the learning process should be seen in a positive way. It is because error could help improving the teaching and learning process. Thus, it could be said that learning is also beneficial for both the students and the lecturers. In line with error analysis, there are various theories that could be used to analyze error in language learning. One of the theories about error comes from Thornbury. Thornbury (2000) classified the types of error into lexical error, grammar error, and discourse error.

The first error classification by Thornbury (2000) called as lexical error. Lexical error includes the mistakes in the way of words are combined. Lexical error is the least error performed by the students in the simulation as tour guide. There are 5 lexical errors performed by the students as in utterances number 2, 3, 7, 11, and 40. The students tend to use the wrong combination of chosen words in delivering their utterances.

The second classification by Thornbury (2000) called as grammar error. Grammar error includes the mistakes in the form of verb, tense, and sentence. Grammar error found in this study turns out as the major error performed by the students with total number 35 errors as in utterances number 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-18, 20-33, 37, 39-40, and 42-44. It reflected that the students mostly confused with the grammar rules that causes the grammar error itself.

The third classification by Thornbury (2000) called as discourse error. Discourse error includes the mistakes to the way of sentences are recognized and linked to make whole texts. There are 8 discourse errors performed by the students as in utterances number 7, 19, 34-36, 38, 41, and 45. Those utterances belongs to discourse error because the meaning from the utterances spoken by the students cannot be recognized and the meaning of the utterances cannot be delivered well by the students.

From the errors mentioned above, it emphasized that a good English communications is crucial. Gani and Damayanti (2018) added that local guides with good English communications have more value for their performance and quality. Further, Pakpahan (2018) stated that tourism students with good English competence are more employable. It is because tourism students are required to have good English speaking to communicate as tour guide.

In addition, the result of the informal interview conducted to the students about their English communication skill summed up that one of the reasons of their error is English is not the prime language used to communicate among Indonesian. In line with that, Istiqomah and Suprayogi (2023) stated that learning English is challenging for non-English speaking countries. Further, Yusnitasari and Suwartono (2020) argued that learning English as a foreign language is considered as a complete different language from the learners' first language. In line with that, making errors is one of the inevitable experiences that the students might experience during the learning process. It is because the difficulties and complexity faced by the students in learning a new language (Yusnitasari & Suwartono, 2020).

Causes of Error Found in Students' Utterances

Thornbury (2000) stated that error usually performed by language learners because of two major sources. The first source is interference from the native language. Further, the second source is intralingual and developmental factors. The explanation of those two major sources in line with the context of this study is described as follows.

The first source of error, which is interference from the native language, called as interlingual error or also known as transfer or interference error. A study from Sari, Budasi, Adnyani, and Suwastini (2021) also found that students' interlingual system was interfered by the students' native language. It shows that the most interlingual form produced by the students was using Indonesian Syntax

Pattern and the most intralingual form produced was simplifications. Moreover, Yusuf and Jumriana (2015) added that interlingual error is caused by the learners' native language. It is similar with the phenomenon found in this study, in which the students produce English utterances with Indonesian terms. Utami and Suprayogi (2022) added that the first language or mother tongue could influence the way to speak English for EFL learners.

The second source of error, which is intralingual and developmental factors, caused by the difficulty of the target language. Sari, Budasi, Adnyani, and Suwastini (2021) stated that students' intralingual system was interfered by the students' native language. Intralingual and developmental factors include simplification, overgeneralization, hypercorrection, faulty teaching, fossilization, avoidance, inadequate learning, and false concepts hypothesized. It is because the different background of language variety (Utami & Suprayogi, 2022).

In this study, the developmental factor that could be seen is simplification factor. Simplification factor deals with how the learners often choose simple forms and constructions instead of the more complex forms and constructions during the learning process. This error could be seen in how the students tend to use simple present tense instead of present perfect continuous. Besides, avoidance factor could also be seen as one of the causes of error in this study. Avoidance deals with difficulty in producing some syntactic structures. Because of that, the learners tend to use simpler structures. It could be seen in how the students avoid using passive voice.

The other factor as the causes of errors found in the students' utterances based on the result of interview with the participants were the limited opportunities to speak English outside the class. The result of the interview indicated that the participants only speak English in the English class as well as during the field practicum as tour guide. This condition also lead the students to lack of confidence while speak English. It is the same with the result of a study from Fitriani and Zulkarnain (2019) about common errors (pronunciation and grammar errors) in speaking performance by vocational college students. Who found that lack of confidence is the major factor that affected the students' language performance? Further, the lack of confidence itself comes from the lack of opportunities to speak English outside the class.

From the errors found, the researcher as the lecturer do some kind of error treatment. The first treatment is the researcher does not correct all the errors performed by the students in direct. It is because the frequent correction of the students' speech during their practice as a tour guide disrupts the learning process. Besides, it discourages the shy students to communicate in the target language. The second treatment is the researcher correct the errors that interfere the general

meaning of the students' speech as a tour guide. Another treatment is the researcher correct the high frequency and general errors than the less frequent error performed by the students. The last treatment is the researcher put more emphasize on correcting the errors that affecting most of the students.

Further, the researcher also emphasizes to the students that making error is the part of language learning. It is in line with a study from Wangi and Nudiya (2020) that indicated even the certified tour guides also performed pronunciation error, especially on English diphthongs. In conclusion, the researcher focused on the pedagogical focus and frequent error to avoid distraction about the focus, which is simulation and role-play as a tour guide. Further, the result of this study could be used to improve the teaching and learning process by focusing and giving adjustments in lesson plan, especially the adjustments about error treatment during the teaching and learning process.

Conclusion

Analyzing error in language learning could help both the students and the lecturers to have an improved teaching and learning process. In this study, the error performed by the students were classified based on Thornbury's theory. It consisted of lexical error with a total amount 5 of 45 errors (11%), grammar error with a total amount 35 of 45 errors (78%), and discourse error with a total amount 8 of 45 errors (18%). Lexical error performed by the students in this study could be seen in the wrong combination of chosen words in delivering the utterances. Meanwhile, grammar error as the major error performed by the students in this study could be seen in the misplacement of verb, tense, and sentence produced by the students. Lastly, the discourse error performed by the students in this study could be seen in the meaning of utterances spoken by the students that cannot be recognized.

This study also summed up that the errors performed were caused by two major sources. The first source is interference from the native language and the second source is intralingual and developmental factors. The first source of error called as interlingual error or also known as transfer or interference error. It implied that first language or mother tongue could influence the way to speak English for EFL learners. The second source of error caused by the difficulty of the target language. In other words, the error also caused of different background of language variety.

References

- Afdal, T., Iswanto, J., & Mayasari, E. (2022). An analysis of the translation errors in the tourism guide book "Wonderful Riau Islands" and its impact on the visit interests of foreign tourists to the Riau islands province. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 3(1).
- Anam, M. M., & Rachmadian, A. (2020). Need analysis of English language usage for tourism university students. *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, 5(2).
- Creswel, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five tradition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Erlangga, I. P. B., Suarnajaya, I. W., & Juniarta, P. A. K. (2019). An Analysis of Grammatical Errors Made by the Seventh Grade Students of SMP Negeri 2 Sukawati in Writing Descriptive Texts in the Academic Year 2018/2019. *Language and Education Journal Undiksha (LEJU)*, 2(1), p. 19-29.
- Fitriani, N., & Zulkarnain, S. I. (2019). Vocational college students' common errors in EFL speaking performance. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(1).
- Gani, S. A., & Damayanti, C. I. (2018). The ability to speak English of the local tour guides for promoting tourism at the Aceh Tsunami Museum. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 5(2).
- Husnaini, H. (2022). Development of Self Esteem-Oriented Micro Teaching Materials for IAIN Palopo English Education Students. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 538-560.
- Husnaini, H., Iksan, M., & Wiwin, W. (2023). Students' Anxiety in Learning English Writing Skills in Senior High School Level. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 93-110.
- Ismayanti, D., Said, Y. R., Usman, N., & Nur, M. I. (2024). The Students Ability in Translating Newspaper Headlines into English A Case Study. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(1), 108-131.
- Istiqomah., & Suprayogi. (2023). Production of English consonant clusters by Indonesian EFL learners. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 4(2).
- Muziatun., Jusuf, A. T. (2020). Grammatical Errors Performed by Tourist Guides in Gorontalo City. *Indonesian EFL Journal (IEFLJ)*, 6(1), p. 73-80.
- Masruddin, M., & Nasriandi, N. (2022). Lexical and Syntactical Errors Performed by Junior High School Student in Writing Descriptive Text. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 1094-1100.
- Masruddin, Hartina, S., Arifin, M. A., & Langaji, A. (2024). Flipped learning:

- facilitating student engagement through repeated instruction and direct feedback. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2412500.
- Pakpahan, R. O. A. (2018). Improving speaking skill of tourism vocational high school students through project based learning. *RETAIN*, 6(2).
- Ratminingsih, N. M., Suardana, M., & Martin, A. A. N. Y. (2018). English for tour guide: A need analysis of a contextual-based language teaching. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 42.
- Rini, N. A., & Firdaus, L. A. (2022). Evaluation of tour guide communication in providing guiding to foreigners as tourists. *International Journal of Travel, Hospitality, and Events*, 1(3).
- Saputri, N. L. (2017). Morphological and Syntactical Error Analysis on the Students' Descriptive Composition of Private Vocational High School. *Scope: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(2), p. 174-184.
- Saragih, D., Batubara, O. P., Halawa, V. P. A., Sipayung, S. R., & Napitupulu, S. (2022). Strategies to improve speaking skill for tourism students. *AKSELERASI: Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional*, 4(1).
- Sari, P. P. N., Budasi, I. G., Adnyani, N. L. P. S., & Suwastini, N. K. A. (2021). The error analysis of interlingual and intralingual interferences of the students: A case study of tourism study program. *Lentera Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan*, 24(1).
- Thornbury, S. (2000). *How to Teach Grammar*. Charlbury: Bluestone Press.
- Utami, T. K. P., & Suprayogi. (2022). Vietnamese English accent vs American English accent: Locating the phonological variation. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, 3(2).
- Wangi, W., & Nudiya, D. A. (2020). The analysis of pronunciation error on English diphthongs made by certified tour guides. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 8(2).
- Yusnitasari, R., & Suwartono, T. (2020). Top ten most problematic grammatical items for Indonesian tertiary EFL learner writers. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 9(1).
- Yusuf, F., & Jumriana. (2015). Syntactical errors made by the students in writing thesis. *ELITE: English and Literature Journal*, 2(1).