

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This final chapter presents the conclusion of the study and offers several suggestions. It also discusses directions for future research.

Conclusion

The main goal of the current study was to determine types of the grammatical errors the students made in writing their personal narrative essays and their sources. The following conclusions can be drawn from the present study:

1. The grammatical errors made in the students' personal narrative essays included errors in (a) verb form or tense, 50%, (b) shift in tense, 15%, (c) plurality of nouns, 7%, (d) articles, 7%, (e) adjectives or adverbs, 6%, (f) prepositions, 6%, (g) sentence construction, 4%, (h) subject-verb agreement, 3%, (i) possessive pronoun and contraction, 1%, (j) sentence coordination, 0.7%, (k) fused sentence, 0.2%, and (l), pronoun reference, 0.1%.
2. The sources of the above-mentioned grammatical errors included (a) interference from the students' native language, 15% (b) intralingual and developmental factors, 80% (c) communication strategies, 3%, and (d) context of learning, 2%. The errors caused by interference from the students' L1 included errors in phonology/orthography (1%), morphology (1%), grammar (7.5%), lexico-semantic (4.5%) and style (1%). The errors were also attributed by interlingual or developmental factors, such as overgeneralization (3%), ignorance of rule restrictions (26), false analogy (1%), hyperextension (1%), hypercorrection (44%), and faulty categorization (5%). The communication strategies causing the errors included paraphrasing (.7%), substitution (.8%), words coinage (.7%), and language switch (.8%) The last source was context of learning which was caused by the teacher, teaching materials, or the order of presentation.

The errors suggest that the students have not yet fully mastered the rules of the English language they had learnt. The errors are inevitable in any learning situation, which requires creativity such as in learning a second or foreign language such as English in this instance, in particular in the students' narrative writing. The errors

show that the students still have a lot of problems related to grammar in their attempt to express the intended meaning in English.

In conclusion, the errors made by the students in this study can be summarized below. First, errors that reflect the rules or forms might be caused by several factors:

1. They still had limited mastery in the target language, i.e. English.
2. They consciously used strategy of word-for-word translation. They switched into their native language and translated the identical forms English.
3. They tried to reduce their learning burden by relying themselves to what they had already known, i.e. their native language,
4. They used over extension of analogy but they misused vocabulary items which share semantic feature.
5. It was obvious that the students' linguistic knowledge of the target language, i.e. English was insufficient
6. The acquired English vocabulary and grammatical rules were quite limited;
7. In coping with the inherent complexity of the target language (English), they relied on what they had already known about the language (overgeneralization);
8. They incompletely applied the rules of English they had already mastered;
9. They were careless especially when writing long and complex sentences; and
10. They seemed to be forced to express meanings beyond their linguistic knowledge.

These findings provide an important source of information about the students' knowledge of English that shows what they still have to learn and which have caused them learning problems. The teachers should develop more materials aimed at facilitating the English learning. Regarding the students' native language interference, the teachers should include the comparison of native and foreign language and culture since the students based their English learning (L2) on the grounds of the previous one, i.e. Indonesian (L1).

Suggestions

The types of the grammatical errors and their sources or causes provide insights into the students' learning strategies in writing their narrative essays. Eventually, this can contribute to ongoing developments and documentations of learner's profiles and the appreciation and evaluation of discourse and linguistic practices that are reflected in the written compositions of the students. They also

provide insights how English can be more effectively used and learned and how the existing teaching methods of teaching and learning can be improved.

Regarding the grammatical errors made by the students, there are a number of important changes which need to be made. Thus the findings offer the following suggestions:

1. To improve the students' grammar mastery, the teachers should conduct a diagnostic teaching to identify the causes affecting the student abilities and prescribe requisite learning activities. The teachers may employ direct instruction and individualized practice in teaching grammar. For the direct instruction, the teachers may use student and literary examples as texts, simple sentence diagramming, sentence combining, error analysis, sentence manipulation, and sentence dictation activities. For the individualized practice, the students may do remedial grammar worksheets containing the parts of a sentence, the function of these parts (such as the parts of speech), the arrangement of words with the sentence, and word choice. Also, the students may have guided practice to help them the grammar skills and rules they have not mastered and to have their self-correction.
2. After the students have retained the grammar skills and rules, they may apply in the context of authentic writing, not in isolation, in particular their own narrative writing.

Finally, errors could therefore be analyzed to provide useful feedback in helping L2 learners acquire a certain level of linguistic or grammatical competence in the L2. At the same time, studying learner errors involves approaching learning more closely. This would enable teachers to promote appropriate teaching for their students. It is by understanding the nature of the students' language that the teachers can better explain it and handle it. Teaching an L2 demands an effort of continuous search, but it is such a passionate task that all efforts are worth it.

Recommendation for further research

It is recommended that further research be undertaken in the following areas:

1. Since many errors in tense usage are found in this study, especially in verb forms, it would be beneficial to conduct more research in these areas to find out more about the students' English writing.

2. Some future studies must consider more accurate and more varied data elicitation techniques, increased number of data and more precise categorization of errors for more generalizability and refinement of the findings. It was observed that some errors can be diagnosed with two or more causes requiring not just the evaluation of the linguistic context but also the pragmatic context of the errors.

REFERENCES

- Al-Khasawneh, S. (2010). Writing for Academic Purposes: Problems Faced by Arab Postgraduate Students of the College of Business. In *ESP World*, Issue 2 (28), Volume 9. Retrieved from <http://www.esp.world.info> on 20 March 2013.
- Bazerman, C. (2009). Genre and Cognitive Development: Beyond Writing to Learn. In *Genre in a Changing World*. Charles Bazerman, Adair Bonini, and Debora Figueiredo (eds.) Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.
- Board of Studies, New South Wales. (1998). *English K-6 Modules*. Sydney: Board of Studies NSW 1998. Retrived from <http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au> on 30 April 2012.
- Bonvillain, N. (2003). *Language, Culture, and Communication: The Meaning of Messages*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed). White Plain, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd edition.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cali, K. & Bowen, K. n.d. The Five Features of Effective Writing. Retrieved 27 March 2013 from <http://www.learnnc.org/lp/editions/few/683>
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *IRAL*, 5 (4).
- Cresswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Darus, S. and Subramaniam. K. (2009). Error analysis of errors English-written essays made by secondary school students in Malaysia. In *European Journal of Social Sciences* – Volume 8, Number 3, 483-496.
- Depdiknas, (2004). *Kurikulum 2004: Standar Kompetensi (Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Sekolah Menengah Atas/Madrasah Aliyah)*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar. In *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1), 83-108.
- Ellis, R. (1996). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English.
- Fellowes, J. (2007). Grammar knowledge and student's writing. *Curriculum Leadership: An Electronic Journal for Leaders in Education*. 5 (24). Retrieved from [http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/grammar knowledge and students writing,19844.html](http://www.curriculum.edu.au/leader/grammar%20knowledge%20and%20students%20writing,19844.html)
- Gorbet, F. (1979). To Err is Human: Error Analysis and Child Language Acquisition. *Journal of ELT*. XXXIV, 22-28.
- Graham, S, Harris, K., and Larsen, L. (2001). Prevention and Intervention of Writing Difficulties for Students with Disabilities. In *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 16(2), 78-84. Milwaukee: The Division for Learning Disabilities of the Council for Exceptional Children.
- Harsyaf, N, & Izmi, Z. (2009). *Teaching Writing*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Hoffmann, A. (2011). Generating Ideas for Writing. Retrieved 27 March 2013 from www.iupui.edu/~uwc
- James, C. (2001). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Khansir, A. A. (2012). Error Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. In *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2(5), 1027-1035. Finland: ACADEMY PUBLISHER.
- Lee, J.F and Vanpatten, B. 1995. *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. USA: McGraw Hill.
- Li, C. (2005). A Study of Collocational Error Type in ESL/EFL College Learners' Writing. Unpublished Master Thesis. Department of Applied English, College of Applied English, Ming Chuan University.
- Lin, B. (2006). Genre-based Teaching and Vygotskian Principles in EFL: The Case of a University Writing Course. In *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol.8, No.3, Article 2.
- Lunsford, A. & Connors, R. n.d. Most Commonly Occurring Grammar Errors. Retrieved 28 March 2013 from <http://www.dartmouth.edu>
- Marzuki, S & Zaidah & Zainal. (2003). Common Errors Produced by UTM Students in Report Writing. A Research Report for Pusat Pengurusan Penyelidikan of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

Mechanics of Writing Retrieved 27 March 2013 from <http://catalogue.pearsoned.co.uk/samplechapter/0131428993>

Ministry of Education and Training. (1999). *Writing: The Ontario Curriculum*. Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Murray, D. M. (1980). Writing as process: How writing finds its own meaning. In *Eight approaches to teaching composition*, T. R. Donovan and B. W. McClelland (Eds.). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Nadell, J, McMeniman, L. & Langan, J. (2003). *Macmillan Writer, The: Rhetoric and Reader, Brief Edition*. Allyn and Bacon.

Institute of Education Sciences. (2012). *Teaching School Students to be Effective Writer*. National Center for Education Evaluation, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved 14 September 2012 from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch.

Nordquist, R. (2009). The principles of good writing. Retrieved on March 7, 2009 from <http://grammar.about.com/od/yourwriting/a/characteristics.htm>

Oshima, A, and Hogue, A. (1999). *Introduction to Academic Writing*. London: Longman.

Owl Purdue Online Writing Lab. (1995). Appropriate Language: Overview. Retrieved 27 March 2013 from <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/608/01/>

Peha, Steve. (2003). Looking for Quality in Student Writing. Retrieved 27 March 2013 from http://www.ttms.org/writing_quality/ideas.htm

Reid, J. (1990). Responding to different topic types: A quantitative analysis from a contrastive rhetoric perspective. In *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, B. Kroll (Ed.) (pp. 191-210). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. & Sampson, G.P. (1974). The Study of Learner English. In *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Ed. Jack C. Richards. London: Longman.

Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sarfraz, S. (2011). Error Analysis of the Written Essays of Pakistani Undergraduate Students: A Case Study. In *Asian Transaction on Basic & Applied Sciences*, (ATBAS ISSN: 2221-4291), 1 (03), 29-52.

Sasaki, M. & Hirose, K. (1996). Explanatory Variables for EFL Students' Expository Writing. In *Language Learning*, 46 (1), 137-174.

- Spivey, B. L. (2006). What is the Writing Process? In *Super Duper Handy Handouts*. Number 112. Retrieved 23 March 2013 from <http://www.superduperinc.com>.
- Strunk, W. (1993). Elements of Style. Retrieved 1 April 2013 from <
<http://www.bartleby.com/141/strunk5.html#13>>
- Tangpermpoon, T. (2008). Integrated Approaches to Improve Students' Writing Skills for English Major Students. In *ABAC Journal* Vol. 28, No. 2 (May-August 2008) .1-9.
- Texas Education Agency. (2012). *Personal Narrative Scoring Guide 2012*. Texas: State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR).
- The Writing Center. (2010). What is writing? Retrieved 28 March 2013 from <
<http://cssac.unc.edu/>>
- Yalden J. (1987). *Principles of Course Design for Language Teaching*. NJ: Prentice Hall International
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning. In *TESOL Quarterly*. 16(2), 195-211.