

AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF THE NARRATIVE WRITTEN TEXTS OF THE FIRST YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 1 YOGYAKARTA IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2012/2013

Oktaviani, Sugirin

Applied Linguistic PPs UNY, Yogyakarta State University

oktaviani_ega@yahoo.com, psugirin12@gmail.com

Abstract

This research study aims at describing the kinds and the causal factors of errors made by the first year students of SMAN 1 Yogyakarta in writing narrative texts. The research was a case study which used a qualitative approach. The data were obtained from 32 students' written texts and in-depth interviews. The data were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative descriptive techniques. The results are: (1) four categories of errors were found in the students' written texts, consisting of (a) seven kinds of omission errors; (b) three kinds of addition errors; (c) six kinds of selection errors; (d) 18 errors in the form of misordering errors. Furthermore, from 396 errors found, 2 errors were global errors. (2) selection errors occur most frequently (52.7%) followed by omission errors (25.2%), addition errors (17.9%), and misordering errors (4.0%). (3) two kinds of direct factors found, namely negative interlanguage transfers and negative intralingual transfer (4) the three sources of indirect factors causing the students to make errors in their writing are: students' low interest, feedback on the students' writing results, and low frequency of the writing instruction.

Keywords: writing skill, error, error analysis, kinds of errors, causal factors

ANALISIS KESALAHAN DALAM TEKS NARASI SISWA KELAS 1 SMAN 1 YOGYAKARTA TAHUN PEMBELAJARAN 2012/2013

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan jenis-jenis dan penyebab-penyebab kesalahan dalam menulis teks narasi pada siswa kelas 1 SMAN 1 Yogyakarta. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian studi kasus dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif. Data penelitian diperoleh dari 32 teks hasil karangan siswa dan wawancara mendalam dengan siswa. Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan teknik deskriptif kuantitatif dan deskriptif kualitatif. Hasil penelitian adalah sebagai berikut. (1) empat kategori errors ditemukan pada hasil tulisan siswa, yang meliputi: (a) tujuh jenis omission errors; (b) tiga jenis addition errors; (c) enam jenis selection errors; (d) delapan belas misordering errors. Selain itu, dari 396 kesalahan yang ditemukan, 2 di antaranya merupakan global errors. (2) selection errors memiliki frekuensi tertinggi (52.7%), diikuti omission errors (25.2%), kemudian addition errors (17.9%), dan misordering errors (4.0%). (3) dua jenis direct factors yang menyebabkan kesalahan di dalam menulis, yakni (a) negative interlingual transfer dan negative intralingual transfer. (4) tiga macam sumber dari indirect factors yang menyebabkan kesalahan di dalam menulis, yakni: rendahnya minat siswa terhadap bahasa Inggris, tidak adanya feedback mengenai hasil tulisan siswa, dan kurangnya frekuensi pembelajaran menulis.

Kata Kunci: keterampilan menulis, kesalahan, analisis kesalahan, jenis-jenis kesalahan, faktor-faktor penyebab kesalahan

INTRODUCTION

The demand of good writing skill in the modern world obligates the students to be good writers both in their native language and in English as an international language. Writing as one of the English skills plays an important role in some areas of education; whether it is for a language arts, social studies, science, or math class, students are expected to use their “CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency)” to report on their understanding of the materials they are studying and to share in print their reasoning processes, experiences, feelings, reactions, and beliefs (Lems, Miller and Soro, 2010, p.194).

Since writing becomes more and more closely connected to academic success, it is important for the teachers to provide the students with a good writing skill to make them be ready to compete in the modern era. It is useful as well as significant since a good writing skill crucially determines the ability to communicate ideas and information effectively.

Nevertheless, teaching English writing to the non-native students is always not an easy task for most of the English teachers. Writing not only requires the formal English, but also the ability to communicate ideas and information to the readers. This statement is supported by SIL international (1999, p.1). It stated that writing is the productive skill in the written mode. It is more complicated and often seems to be the hardest of the skills, even for native speakers of a language, since it involves not only a graphic representation of speech, but also the development and presentation of thoughts in a structured way.

In the process of teaching writing, the teachers are used to apply some methods and techniques to make the writing enjoyable and easier for the students. Nevertheless, as writing is a complex skill, there are many possible sources of problems may faced by the students in learning this skill. Therefore, before determining the method or technique that can be applied in the process of teaching writing, it seems significant as well as useful for the teachers to recognize their students' problems first. Knowing about the students' writing problems or difficulties will help the teacher to determine what should be taught or explained more to the students, furthermore, it will make them easier to determine the appropriate method

or technique to be applied in the process of teaching writing.

Furthermore, knowing about the kinds of errors made by the students is always not enough to help the students with their problems of writing. Since errors can be caused by many factors, it is crucial to find out as well as describe what the factors are.

James (1998, p.180) stated that errors made by the students can be caused by both interlingual transfer or mother tongue interference and intralingual transfer or a negative transfer of items within the target language. He believed that the interference from the students' mother tongue is not the sole for making errors.

Based on the above statements proposed by James, it is believed that the causal factors of errors that were made by the students can be caused by both interlingual and intralingual transfer. This statement is supported by Lightbown & Spada in Jodai (2012, p.336). They argued that the first language is not the single influence on second language learning. The students from disparate language backgrounds tend to make similar errors in learning one target language, even the first language students often make the same errors.

The results of the discussion with the English teachers at SMA Negeri 1 Yogyakarta show that particularly for the first year students of senior high school, writing is still the most difficult skill to be learned. The teachers assume that it is because the students had just left junior high schools and find a greater demand of writing, in this case, more complex vocabularies, grammar and types of English text. Furthermore, among the types of text, narrative becomes the most difficult text to be produced by most of the students.

The above statements were also supported by the results of the interview with the first year students. They stated that among the English skills, writing becomes the most difficult skill to be learned. From thirteen students that were interviewed, only four of them like writing, while the rest stated that they prefer telling a story to writing it down, since in the process of telling a story, they do not need to consider much about grammar, word choices, etc. Moreover, in relation to the narrative text, the students stated that they know all the elements of narrative text, namely orientation, complication, resolution and coda (optional) as well as their sequences. In the other words, the

students do not have any problems about how to construct the narrative texts. The problems they faced were mostly about the tenses that applied in narrative texts. In the other words, the students still get difficulties in constructing grammatical sentences in English. These phenomena motivate the researcher to find out where the problems lie. Therefore, this research attempts to find the kinds of errors made by the students in writing narrative texts as well as their causal factors. Furthermore, this research is highly expected can give valuable information to both the teachers and the students. To the teachers, it can inform them about the kinds of errors made by the students in writing narrative texts, so they can help the students with those errors. Moreover, for the students, it can give useful information about their weaknesses or problems in writing, especially in writing narrative texts, so they can try to find solutions to overcome their problems.

METHOD

This study was a case study by using a qualitative approach. It is aimed at finding out the kinds of errors in students' narrative written texts. In the process, percentages are used that show the degrees of the kinds of errors in students' narrative writing. The study was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Yogyakarta. Techniques used in collecting data were testing and in depth interview. Two instruments were used in the research, namely a test and guideline for unstructured interview. Furthermore, techniques used to validate the data were triangulation and to make the data reliable, the researcher applied inter-rater reliability which is suggested by Denzin and Lincoln in Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2007, p.48) as one of the ways to make the data reliable.

In the process of analyzing the data obtained from the students' written texts, the researcher applied some steps. Firstly, the researcher checked and read the students' works carefully. All the incorrect sentences found in the students' written texts were underlined. Secondly, she compared the sentences made by the students with what should be the normal or correct in English. Thirdly, she marked the incorrect sentences by underlining them. The correct sentences were left out. Fourthly, she classified the students' errors into four categories, namely omission of some required elements, addition of some unnecessary or

incorrect elements, selection of the incorrect elements, and misordering of elements.

Furthermore, five sequences of activities are applied in analyzing the data obtained from the results of the in depth interview. Firstly, the researcher interviewed the students intensively based on the errors they made. It aims at finding out the detail information about the students' problems in writing as well as the causal factors. Secondly, she focused and simplified the complex and large data found. Thirdly, in the process of focusing, the researcher selected the interview answers. The answers which were extremely relevant to the research became the research data. Fourthly, she simplified the complicated answers found to make them easily comprehend. And the last, she drew a conclusion based on the results.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Seven types of omission error were found. The first is plural form. This kind of error occurs when the students missing-s to describe plural noun, or they had no idea about making the plural of some words. For example, (1) one of her *wing* was broken. The word *wing* in the previous sentence should be written in plural form, since in English, the phrase 'one of' is followed by plural noun. (2) Cinderella's step mother spread *a lot of seed* on the kitchen. In the previous sentence, the student left the-s off plural nouns. The word *seed* in the sentence should be written in plural form, since the phrase *a lot of* should be followed by plural noun. The second is omission of to be. This kind of error occurs when the students leave out to be in which it should be applied. For example, 'the prince sure that she was his mate'. In the previous example, the students left out to be before the word *sure*. The third is omission of article. This kind of error occurs when an article is not used before a noun. For example, 'the man was in field'. In the previous sentence, the student left out the article before the word *field*. The fourth is omission of preposition. This kind of error occurs when the students leave out the preposition in which it was required. For example, 'the blue fish *listened* the fisherman's dialog'. In the previous example, the student left out preposition after the word *listened*. In English, the word *listen/listened* should be followed by preposition *to*. The fifth is omission of word. This kind of error occurs when the students leave out a/some words in the sentences. For example in sentence 'the hare

mad'. The words *mad* and *close* in the previous sentence should be preceded by verb as linking verb such as *got*. So, the sentences can become *the hare got mad*. The sixth is omission of auxiliary. For example, 'Joe still *not remembered* him'. The student applied the past form of the verb *remember* instead of applying auxiliary *did* before *not*. It seems that the students still got difficulties in producing negative sentence in English. The last one is omission of apostrophe as possessive noun marker. This kind of error occurs when the students leave out apostrophe to show that a person possesses something. For example, 'he keeps his fried fish from other *cats* disorder'. In the previous example, an apostrophe should be added after plural noun *cats*, meanwhile, in the previous sentence, the student left out the apostrophe off as possessive noun marker.

Three types of addition error were found. The first is regularization. According to Dulay, Burt and Krashen in James (1998, p.107), this type of error involves overlooking exceptions and spreading rules to domains where they do not apply. For example, 'he *leaved* Jane'. In the previous example, the student generalized the *ed-marker* for all verbs. The second is redundancy. It occurs when the students repeat a word or idea which has the same meaning as the previous usage. In the other words, the word or idea just restates what has already been said. For example, 'the fairy told her to go home before twelve midnight'. The sentence in the previous example contains a redundant word *twelve*. It is redundant since the word *twelve o'clock* and the word *midnight* have the same meaning, therefore the student didn't need to put the word *twelve* before the word *midnight*. The third is simple addition. In relation to this type of error, two kinds of error were found, namely simple addition of to be, for example, (1) *it was* happen when I was in Junior high school. In the previous sentence, instead of applying the verb in the past form, the student applied to be in the past form namely *was* before verb to indicate an event that occur in the past. Another type of simple addition is simple addition of preposition. For example, 'They met *with* a wolf'. In the previous sentence, the student applied preposition *with* after the word *met*. It seems that the sentence is a direct literal translation from Indonesian to English. The expression 'They met *with* a wolf' derives from Indonesian design, namely bertemu (met) dengan (with).

Six types of selection error were found. The first is misselection of word. It occurs when the students select the incorrect words in the sentences. For example, 'the monster liked to eat a *small* girl like me'. The word *small* in the previous example is wrongly assumed to be synonymous with *little* and to have the same distribution. The second is misselection of word class. It occurs when the students fail to select the forms of words. In this case, the students still got difficulties in distinguishing between the forms of words as well as their constructions in the sentence. For example, 'her daughter was very *beauty*'. The form of the word *beauty* is a noun, while what the student was going to tell the readers was about the beauty of the king's daughter, so the word form that should be used to describe a noun in the previous sentence is the adjective of the word *beauty*, namely *beautiful*. The third is misselection of preposition. It occurs when the students fail to select the kind of the preposition when it was required. For example, (1) The duck was different *with* the other, and (2) He saw his reflection same *with* a beautiful swan. The expression *different with* simply derives from Indonesian words berbeda (different) dengan (with) and the expression *same with* derives from Indonesian words sama (same) dengan (with). In English, the word *different* should be followed by preposition *from*, while the word *same* should be followed by *as*. The fourth is misselection of article. It occurs when the students put an inappropriate article before a noun. For example, 'One day, *the* prince from another kingdom held a party'. The article *the* before the word *prince* in the previous example is not appropriate, since the word *prince* is never mentioned in the previous time. The fifth is incorrect use of verb form. It occurs when the students fail to apply the verb into the past tense. For example, 'his rat *help* him'. The word *help* in the sentence should be changed into *helped*. Furthermore, beside the errors which were related to the past form of verb, some other common errors which were related to the use of verb were also found. (1) *to + infinitive*. For example, 'the woman asked her son *to brought* some food for his father'. (2) *modal + infinitive*. For example, "You *can borrowed...*" and (3) *preposition + gerund*. For example, "...I will count you *by stepped* on your head." The last is the incorrect use of to be. Two cases of errors were found in relation to the incorrect use of to be. First, the students failed to format the past form of to be *is* and *are*. The

example of this kind can be seen in sentence (1) they *are* very arrogant and (2) his name *is* kancil. In the first sentence, the student failed to make the past form of to be are in the sentence. To be *are* in the sentence should be changed into *were*, since the story told about the past event. As well as the first sentence, in the second sentence the student failed to change to be *is* into the past form, namely *was*. The second is the students failed to apply the plural form of to be. For example, 'my friend and I *was* asked...' In the previous example, the student succeeded in formatting *to be* into the past form, but they failed to make it in the plural form.

The last category of error is misordering error. This type of error occurs when the students fail to arrange the words into the right order. For example, 'my mother had some *tofu fried*'. The arrangement of the sentence in the previous example is Indonesian formation; the students carried out word-for-word translations of native language surface structures. It can be seen in the phrase *tofu fried*, in which the modifier word is put after the modified word.

After classifying into categories, the errors were localized based on their complexities. The locations were local and global errors. Based on the results of the data collection, from 396 errors made by the students, 2 errors were global errors. In short, it can be stated that the errors made by the students often do not significantly hinder communication. In the other words, most of the errors they made affect only a single constituent in the sentence.

Furthermore, in relation to the causal factors, the errors found were caused by both direct and indirect factors. Direct factors were the factors which are related to the linguistics components; on the other hand, indirect factors were the factors which are beyond the linguistic component. Based on the results of the data collection, the direct factors can be categorized within two domains, namely interlingual transfer and intralingual transfer.

Richard (1992, p.187) defined interlingual transfer as being the result of language transfer, which is caused by the student's native language. Based on the result of data the collection, interlingual transfer can be broken down into several parts.

First is copulative verb. This cause occurs because the foreign language is very different from the native language of the students in accordance with the copulative verbs. The

students tend to miss the copulative verbs in the sentences. A sentence of the native language '*Pangeran yakin bahwa dia adalah belahan jiwanya*' is to be equated with a sentence of the foreign language '*the prince sure that she was his mate*'.

Second is adverb interference. This cause appears when the adverb patterns of native language (Indonesian) are transferred into foreign language (English). The example of this kind can be seen in sentence '*With an innocent, a little bird...*'. In the previous example, the students applied the expression *with an innocent* instead of *innocently*. It seems that the expression derives from Indonesian design, namely *dengan* (with) *tanpa curiga* (innocent).

Third is article interference. This cause happens because of an inexistence of the article in native language of the students. The example of this kind can be seen in sentence '*the man was in field*'. In the previous sentence, the student left out the article before the word field.

Fourth is preposition interference. As well as the adverb interference, this cause also appears when the patterns of native language (Indonesian) are transferred into foreign language (English). For example, in sentence '*the blue fish listened the...*'. In the previous example, the student left out preposition after the word *listened*, since in his native language, preposition is not needed after the word *listen/listened*. Meanwhile, in English, it is needed.

Fifth is word order interference. This cause emerges when the composition of word order, particularly noun phrase and adjectival phrase, of the foreign language is different from the native language. In the native language, the modifier word should be put after the modified word. On the contrary, in the foreign language, modifier word should be put before the modified word. For example, '*my mother had some tofu fried*'. The arrangement of the sentence in the previous example is Indonesian formation. It can be seen in the phrase *tofu fried*; the modifier word is put after the modified word. The sentences in above example show that the students carried out word-for-word translations of native language surface structures.

The last one is tense form interference. This cause emerges because the native language of the students does not have verb tense. Therefore, some of the students tend to use the same verb tenses in all sentences. Three examples are given, they are: (1) his rat *help*

him by hide inside his hat chef (2) The prince go to the Prode'o castle, and (3) The princess transform into her real shape, and live happily ever after.

On the other hand, intralingual errors result from the faulty or partial learning of the target language rather than language transfer. They may be caused by the influence of one target language item upon another. For example, in creating sentence in the past form, the students use both to be and verb in the past form at the same time, since they have not mastered the rules of the language yet. Based on the results of the data collection, intralingual transfer can be broken down into several parts.

First is misanalysis. It occurs when the students have formed a hunch or hypothesis concerning a target language item which then they put into practice. For example, 'one of her wing was broken. The word *wing* in the sentence should be written in plural form, since in English, the phrase 'one of' is followed by plural noun. Meanwhile, in this case, the student had assumption that the word 'one' should be followed by a singular noun, since 'one' in English means singular.

Second is incomplete rule application or what is called by James (1998, p.187) as undergeneralization. It happens when the students do not apply all the rules they have learned, due to incomplete learning. In other words, they do not completely master the rules and their application, and therefore they do not implement those rules in accordance with the circumstances. For example, 'this boy called Joon' and sentence 'the farmer's farm located across the river'. Both the first and the second previous sentences obligate the use of to be. Since both of them are passive sentences, so they need to be before verbs. For the first sentence, *to be* should be put before the verb *called* and for the second one, *to be* should be put before the word *located*.

Third is ignorance rule restriction. It is closely related to the generalization of structures. In this case, the students fail to understand the restriction of existing structures. As a result, they apply the rules in all cases without paying attention to their restrictions. 'Her finger got stabbed by the needle in the castle'. In the previous sentence, the phrase *got stabbed* is wrongly assumed to be applied in the sentence. The phrase *got stabbed* is not appropriate to describe about the small stuff like

needle, so the appropriate phrase that should be applied in the sentence is the phrase *got pricked*.

The last one is overgeneralization or what is called by James (1998, p.187) as system-simplification. This cause emerges when the students tend to use their common senses and come to the generalization of certain sets of grammatical rules. It seems that they mostly use their analogies. While so doing, they are unaware of the fact that their analogies do not always work as expected. They simply apply the newly-created rules in most circumstances, which result in overgeneralization. For example, 'He leaved Jane'. The *ed*-marker in the previous example is overgeneralization. It seems that the students generalized the *ed*-marker for all verbs. It turns out to be incorrect and misleading.

The results of data analysis show that the errors made by the students in their writing were mostly caused by intralingual transfer. The results are relevant to the theory which is proposed by James (1998), in which stated that contrastive analysis is not contrastive analysis but a part of error analysis. In the other words, the errors can be caused by many factors, and interlingual is just one of the factors.

This result is also relevant to the statement that was proposed by Otte and Mlynarczyk's (2010, p.125). They argued that errors occur as application of language system learned. It can be concluded that the more the students learn a language and its rules, the more errors they may made in their writing.

In addition, beside the factors which are related to linguistics components presented above, there are also some factors which are beyond the linguistic components or what is called indirect factor. Based on the result of the interview, these causal factors can be categorized into three, namely students' low interest, feedback from the teacher, and low frequency of the writing instruction. The detail explanations of the three factors are presented below:

Students' low interest

In relation to this factor, the result of the research shows that the students with highly interest do better in their English writing than ones without any interest at all. According to the interviews with students, apparently it can be stated that the students' low interest gave a big influence on the students' success in writing. In one of the interviews, the student said that:

“ Saya tidak suka menulis dan saya tidak suka bahasa Inggris, makanya kenapa hasil tulisan saya banyak yang salah. “ (Interview’s result dated 16th May, 2013)

In the other interview the students said that:

“Saya suka nulis, tapi kalau untuk nulis bahasa Inggris tuh susah” (Interview’s result dated 30th May, 2013)

“Saya suka menulis cerita narasi, seperti diary, tapi dalam bahasa Indonesia. Kalau dalam bahasa Inggris sih nggak.” (Interview’s result dated 27th May, 2013)

Based on the results of the interview above, it is obvious that the students’ interest in writing is mostly influenced by their knowledge about English. Some of them like to write, but their lack of knowledge about English, such as lack knowledge about grammar, insufficient of vocabulary, and creativity in producing and arranging sentences in English lead them to be extremely unconfident and unenthusiastic to write in English. Moreover, such weaknesses also cause the students prefer telling their ideas to write them down. Below are the statements made by some of the students:

“Kalau punya cerita tuh lebih senang diomongin daripada ditulis, karena tidak perlu ada tata bahasanya.” (Interview’s result dated 16th May, 2013)

“Kalau punya cerita tuh lebih enak diomongin karena tidak perlu ada tata bahasanya orang bisa memahami apa yang kita ingin sampaikan walaupun dengan tata bahasa yang kurang. “ (Interview’s result dated 16th May, 2013)

Furthermore, in another case, a student stated that:

“Kalau punya cerita lebih enak ditulis. Saya emang suka nulis, Biasanya suka nge-post hasil tulisan saya ke internet.” (Interview’s result dated 16th May, 2013)

This student has a good English writing ability. It can be seen from her writing result. In her writing, she just made a very few of local errors. In conclusion, it is obvious that the students’ interest and knowledge in English give a big influence on their writing ability.

Feedback on the writing result

Giving feedback is one of the effective ways to help students with their writing

problems. This statement is supported by Harmer (2007, p.331). He stated that teachers should respond positively and encouragingly to the content of what the students have written. In addition, offering correction also will help the teachers to choose what and how much to focus on, based on what students need at this particular stage of their studies and on the task they have undertaken.

In relation to this factor, the result of the research shows that the feedback on the students’ writing results is one of the causal factors that may influence the students’ English writing ability. It can be seen from the following result of the interviews:

“Menurut saya, salah satu hal yang bisa membantu dalam proses menulis adalah feedback dari guru, biar tahu salahnya di mana. “ (Interview’s result dated 13th May, 2013)

In the other two interviews, the students also stated:

“Menurut saya yang memudahkan dalam menulis diantaranya diskusi dan sharing sama teman, selain itu juga feedback dari guru, biar kesalahan yang sama tidak terulang lagi di tugas-tugas menulis selanjutnya.” (Interview’s result dated 30th May, 2013)

“Tiap selesai nulis emang selalu puas dengan hasil tulisan sendiri, tapi kadang mikirnya pasti banyak yang salah, cuma ya gak tahu gimana yang benarnya.” (Interview’s result dated 30th May, 2013)

Based on the statements and the results of the interviews above, it can be concluded that feedback is such a crucial as well as an important factor that influence students’ ability in writing. Besides, it can lead the students to find out and recognize their weaknesses in writing, so they will be easier to determine which part in relation to their writing that should be emphasized and need to learn more.

Low frequency of the writing Instruction

Writing is hardly always upgraded with practice. Harmer (2004: 61) stated that one of the factors that may cause the students’ reluctance in writing is their rarity to write even in their native language. In addition, this lack of familiarity may lead the students to the lack of confidence. However, this kind of problem can be faced by building the writing habit which is

making students feel comfortable in writing English and so gaining their willing participation in more creative and extended activities. This involve choosing the right kinds of activity with appropriate levels of challenge as well as provide them with enough language and information to allow them to complete writing tasks successfully.

Referring to the above statements, it is obvious that doing a lot of practice will improve the students' ability in writing. The result of the research shows that the low frequency of writing instruction is another causal factor of many errors made the students in their writing. The following results of interview show that the students still really need a lot of writing practices to improve their writing ability.

“Menurut saya, faktor yang memudahkan dalam writing adalah lebih sering ada latihan, feedback mengenai kesalahan dalam hasil tulisan, dan bisa berdiskusi sama teman, karena bisa menstimulasi ide untuk tulisan saya.” (Interview's result dated 27th May, 2013)

Harapannya dalam proses pembelajaran menulis, kami lebih sering diberikan latihan menulis dan adanya feedback mengenai kesalahan dalam hasil tulisan. (Interview's result dated 16th May, 2013)

Referring to the above interview results, it is obvious that most of the students believe that doing a lot of writing practice will improve their writing ability and lead then to be confident writers. The more they write, the more they know their weaknesses in writing. Moreover, it also helps them to avoid producing the same errors.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the research discussed in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that: (1) Four categories of errors were found in the students' written texts, namely omission of some required elements, addition of some unnecessary or incorrect elements, selection of an incorrect elements, and misordering of elements; (2) The most common error that was made by the students was related to the selection errors, namely incorrect use of verb forms; (3) Relating to the causal factors, two factors are found, namely: (a) Direct factors consist of both interlingual and interlingual

transfer; (b) Indirect factors consist of the students' low interest, feedback on the students' written texts, and low frequency of the writing instruction.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, L, Manion, L & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education (6th ed)*. New York: Routledge.
- Corder, P. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. Baltimore. Penguin Education.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- James, C. (1998). *Error in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. London: Longman.
- Jodai, H. (2012). Error Analysis in a New Context: A comparative study of errors in general linguistics and CALL. *Iranian EFL Journal*, Vol. 8, pp.336 December 2012.
- Lems, K, Miller, L.D & Soro, T.M. (2001). *Teaching reading to English language learners*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Lightbown, P & Spada, N. (2010). *How language are learned (3th ed)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. London:Sage Publication Ltd.
- Otte, G. & Mlynarczyk, R.W. (2010). *Basic Writing*. : West Lafayette Parlor Press LLC.
- Richard, J.C, Platt, J & Platt, H. (1992). *Language teaching and applied linguistics*. Harlow: Longman Group Limited.
- Ritchie, J & Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice*. London: Sage Publication..