



CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter consists of two parts. In first part, the writer gives conclusion of the previous chapters. The second part deals with suggestions that may be useful for the English lecturers as well as the students.

5.1 Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis is to find out to what extend the second semester student of the English Department at Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya acquire the English tenses as reflected in their narrative writing, the possible sources of errors that the student make in constructing English tenses in their narrative composition, and the possible solutions of the problem. In getting the information that the writer needed, the writer analyzed the students' work, specifically the tenses.

From the analysis, the writer found some errors in using tenses in the students' writing. The percentage of errors in Simple Past Tense was 52%, Simple Present Tense was 38%, Past Continuous Tense was 3,5%, Present Continuous Tense was 3%, Present Perfect Tense 1,3%, Past Perfect Tense was 1%, Modal 'could' was 0,6%, Modal 'will' was 0,3%, and Modal 'would' was 0,3%. There were no errors in Modal 'can'. It was obvious that a few students had weaknesses in using the Simple Past Tense and the Simple Present Tense because they made many errors in both tenses repeatedly. It meant that the students had not mastered

the Simple Past Tense well and the Simple Present Tense. The writer drew a conclusion that a certain students had not mastered the Simple Past Tense and the Simple Present Tense because there were so many overgeneralizations of the rules while most of others had already mastered it because they did fewer errors. The writer concludes that: First, the errors happened a lot in the Simple Past Tense and Simple Present Tense are because the two tenses are often used in the narrative writing (recount and fiction). Second, the regular use of the tenses caused the students confused so that the students used to mix up the tenses. Third, another cause is the students' carelessness in making the tenses.

In the Selinker's theory (1974), he states that there are five sources of errors namely Language Transfer, Transfer of Training, Strategies of Second Language Learning, Strategies of Second Language Communication, and Overgeneralization of Target Language Material. But, the writer only found four sources of errors in contributing the students' errors in their writing such as Language Transfer, Strategies of Second Language Learning, Strategies of Second Language Communication, and Overgeneralization of Target Language Material. The writer did not use one of the sources of errors namely Transfer of Training because the writer could not find out whether the errors that the students had made were as the result of the wrong training. The error which is caused by Transfer of Training could be found out in Speaking obviously but not in the data analysis. The sources of errors which were found by the writer were the biggest errors in the first place was Strategies of Second Language Learning (54,3% errors) and the second place was Overgeneralization of Target Language Material (37,1% errors),

fewer errors were Language Transfer (7% errors) and Strategies of Second Language Communication (1,6% errors).

After the writer analyzed the data, the writer provided two interpretations of the findings. The two interpretations are the students did two types of errors in general: form and function. In the form, the students had not mastered irregular verb and doubling rule that end in *-d*. In the function, the students mixed up the tenses pattern such as combining Simple Present Tense time signals for Simple Past Tense and vice versa. To overcome the problems in the form of errors, drill and exercises could be the answer. Communicative approach could be the answer to overcome errors that was based on function which was text based.

The possible solutions to overcome the form errors were drill and exercises and to overcome the function errors which were text based could be used communicative approach.

5.2 Suggestions

For the students of the English Department who have weaknesses in tenses should learn more. Do not stop learning English and improving their ability in mastering English especially tenses because it is the basic of the English four skills and the components. Read a lot text in English and practice making sentences will help students who have weaknesses in tenses. Maybe it sounds boring to read English texts and making English sentences continuously but from the students' sentences, the teacher will know the students errors. So that, the teacher can show to them their errors and ask them to correct the errors by

themselves. From that point, the students also learn how to check and correct the sentences they have made. By learning tenses more, it is expected that the students master the tenses well so that no errors are found. No errors are a signal that the students have a strength basic so for the rest will be easy to make them expert in English. It is important to have a strength basic because later on when the students are graduate some of them will be a teacher. A teacher is a role model for the student. If a teacher does not have strength basic in her major which is English, the result is his or her students' ability in English is unqualified.

For the teachers who teach English especially writing, if there are some students who have not mastered what they teach, does not give up. It does not mean that they are fail. This thesis can considered as an evaluation to know the students' weaknesses. From the weaknesses can be find out a method or ways which will be taken next to overcome the problem and improve the students ability. This is the purpose of an error analysis.

Future research related to the error analysis of students' writing should be focused on different areas of grammar. Wider and larger subjects might help to confirm the findings of this research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (Fourth Edition)*. Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall Regents.

Celce-Murcia, Mariane & Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1999. *The Grammar Book (An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course Second Edition)*. USA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Devine, J., Carrell, Patricia L., & Eskey, David E. (Eds.). 1987. *Research in Reading in English as a Second Language*. Washington D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Dulay, Heidi & Burt, Marina & Krashen, Stephen. 1982. *LANGUAGE TWO*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gere, Anne Rugles. 1988. *Writing and Learning (Second Edition)*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Hornby, A.S. 1975. *A Guide to Patterns and Usage in English*. London: Oxford University Press.

-----, 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Fifth Edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

James, Carl. 1980. *Contrastive Analysis*. Singapore: Longman Group Ltd.

Melly. 1999. *A Study of Incorrect Use of "to-be" in Simple Present and Present Progressive Tenses Found in the Second Semester Students' Writing Work at the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, FKIP.

Procter, Paul. 1978. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Selinker, Larry & Richards, Jack C. (Ed). 1974. Interlanguage. *ERROR ANALYSIS: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman.

Sutrisno, Mary. 1998. *Error Analysis of Tenses Encountered in Structure Test of the Second Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, FKIP.

Vivian, Charles H. & Jackson, Bernetta M. 1961. *ENGLISH COMPOSITION*. New York: Harper & Row.

Weigle, Sara Cushing. 2002. *Assessing Writing*. UK: Cambridge University Press.