Certificate

awarded to:

AGUS SARIPUDIN

as:

PRESENTER

in appreciation of attending

THE 1ˢᵗ SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY LEARNING AND EDUCATION INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE 2014

"Improving the Quality of Education for Strengthening the Global Competitiveness:

A Response to Current Curriculum"

on May 16ᵗʰ -18ᵗʰ, 2014 in the Aryaduta Hotel & Convention Center, Palembang, South-Sumatera, Indonesia

Chair of FORKOM,

Dean of FKIP Sriwijaya University,

Chair of the Committee,

Prof. Dr. M. Furqon H., M.Pd.

Sofendi, M.A., Ph.D.

Prof. Dr. Zulkardi, M.I.Komp., M.Sc.

PROCEEDINGS

The 1st Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference (SULE-IC) 2014 held by FKIP Unsri in Collaboration with Communication Forum for Indonesian State FKIP Deans

Improving the Quality of Education to Strengthen the Global Competitiveness: A Response to the Current Curriculum

Presented by :

Palembang, May 16-18, 2014

Chief Editor: Hartono

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Sriwijaya University
South Sumatra - Indonesia

PROCEEDINGS

The 1st Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference (SULE-IC) 2014 held by FKIP Unsri in Collaboration with Communication Forum for Indonesian State FKIP Deans, 16—18 May, 2014

Held by:

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University and in Collaboration with Communication Forum for Indonesian State FKIP Deans

9 786027 037809

Process editing of all the articles in proceeding was conducted by the editor board of the 1st Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference.

PROCEEDINGS

The 1st Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference (SULE-IC) 2014 held by FKIP Unsri in Collaboration with Communication Forum for Indonesian State FKIP Deans, 16—18 May, 2014

This Paper has been presented at The 1st Sriwijaya University Learning and Education International Conference "Improving the Quality of Education to Strengthen the Global Competitiveness: A Respond to the Current Curriculum"

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Sriwijaya University
Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia
2014

Science Education

classroom. The students can discover and explore their own knowledge, from the process of asking their friends who act as a model (with native Lampung ethnic background), then doing a reflection together to the achievement of the learning process that has been done. In addition, the teachers can immediately proceed to implement the authentic assessment. The space to carry out theauthentic assessment with this strategy is very much to do.

CONCLUSION

Contextual learning strategies conducted in Lampung language subjects is only one of many strategies that can be done by the teacher. Contextual learning gives a space to the material that is so close to be learned by the students. Moreover, it is implemented in multiethnic areas. It really helps to achieve the Lampung language learning objectives either in elementary or secondary education that is the student is able to communicate using both the Lampung language dialects A and O. The components of inquiry, constructivism, questioning, modeling, learning community, reflection, and the authentic assessment which actually is done integratedly in the delivery of teaching materials. Because of this is a strategy, the teacher definitely can vary the learning steps that can be done in such a way which is much more optimized in order to achieve the learning objectives.

REFERENCES

Agustina, Eka Sofia. (2004). Penerapan Pendekatan Kontekstual dalam Pembelajaran Kosakata Bahasa Lampung. Bandung: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Depdikbud. (1996). Kurikulum Muatan Lokal Pendidikan Dasar. Lampung: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Depdiknas. (2001). Kebijaksanaan Umum Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Depdiknas. (2002). Pendekatan Kontekstual. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Depdiknas. (2003). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 Tentang Sistem PendidikanNasional.Jakarta:Cipta Jaya.

Kasuma, dkk. (2010). Contextual Teaching and Learning. Sebuah Panduan Awal Dalam Pengembangan PBM. Yogyakarta: Rahayasa.

Sukmadinata, Nana Saodih. (2004). Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran Kompetensi. Bandung:Remaja Rosdakarya.

This paper has been presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education-International Conference 2014. Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16 – 18, 2014.

B53-487

SYNTACTIC ERRORS IN THE THESES WRITTEN BY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Agus Saripudin
Sriwijaya University
E-mail: sarifoddin12@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study investigated syntactic errors existing in the theses written by undergraduate students of the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teachers Training and Education, University of Sriwijaya. It was aimed at revealing the types and causes of the errors. Twenty-four theses written in 2010 were chosen as the source of the data. The data analysis procedure included error identification, description, classification, and explanation. The error classification was conducted using the linguistic and surface strategy taxonomies as proposed by Dulay et al (1982). The results showed that the syntactic errors in the theses included various frase and clause errors, and these errors were in the form of omission, addition, misformation, misordering, and substitution. Furthermore, two major causes of the errors were inferred and interpreted as interlingual transfer and intralingual transfer. Some errors were also interpreted as having multiple sources rather than mere single sources. This study finally suggests that teachers conduct instructional remedies with a stronger emphasis on the most recurring interlingual and intralingual errors and encourage students to develop a better attitude towards using grammar in academic and scientific writing while at the same time applying a more risk-taking style in learning English.

Keywords: error analysis, syntactic errors, thesis writing.

INTRODUCTION

English is taught in Indonesia as a foreign language and as thought by many, this is not really good news for teachers and students in the country. The reason is that such a status makes it difficult for most of Indonesian students to learn and use English. As an evidence, even university students still make basic grammatical errors despite the long period of time they spent for studying the language (Mardijono, 2003:68).

A linguistic error, as most researchers agree, is a form or structure deviated from the standard norm. Corder in Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005:56) defines an error as a "breach of the rule of the code". However, a question has often been raised on whether the criteria for judging an error is grammaticality or acceptability. Responding this, Lennon in Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005:56) states that an error is:

a linguistic form or combination of forms, which in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native ...

counterparts

... in this definition an error is ... norm and which will never b ... investigations into errors hav ... and classified in terms of ... syntactical errors. Errors are ... utterances are mosidified, y ... and in terms of how they are ... 1982; Badawi, 2012). The ... simple past verb, misordering ... of pronoun....

Among errors of the lin ... errors, and sentence errors. J ... larger than the word, that is, ... consist of those in noun phras ... and preposition phrase (PP). ... involve entire phrases coming ... combination of clauses into lar ... Mardijono (2003) investigated ... these proposals. He found a la ... in Politzer and Ramirez's clas ... errors (78.81%) were more dor ... the syntactic error subtypes, n ... and the dominant morphologic ... and modal auxiliaries, which ... Mardijono recommended that ... attempt to prevent the same er ... Hasyim (2002) investi ... reported a number of ... information of a ... subject-verb agr ... describe how ... according to ... absence of a finite v ... the classroom and focus ...

This paper has been presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education-International Conference, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16-18, 2014.

B54-488

... counterparts

In this definition an error is viewed as any form or structure which deviates from the target language norm and which will never be produced by the native speakers under the same situation and condition. Investigations into errors have yielded various types and sources of error. Errors have been described and classified in terms of linguistic categories. This results in phonological, morphological, and syntactical errors. Errors are also described and classified in terms of the ways the target language utterances are mofidified, yielding error types of addition, omission, misformation, and misordering; and in terms of how they are replaced, resulting in error types of misselection or substitution (Dulay et al 1982; Badawi, 2012). The examples are: omission of suffix - ing, addition of -es, misformation of simple past verb, misordering/misplacement of adverb, substitution of simple verb, and misselection of pronoun.

Among errors of the linguistic category are syntactic errors which include frase errors, clause errors, and sentence errors. James (1998) suggests that syntactic errors are "errors that affect texts larger than the word, that is, phrase, clause, sentence and utimately paragraph. Phrase structure errors consist of those in noun phrase (NP), verb phrase (VP), adjective phrase (AjP), adverb phrase (AvP), and preposition phrase (PP). Clause errors involve how phrases operate in clauses. Clause errors involve entire phrases coming into the structure of clauses. Sentence errors "involve the selection and combination of clauses into larger units."

Marjono (2003) investigated errors to reveal the types and frequencies of errors occurring in student thesis proposals. He found a large number of morphological and syntactical errors classified according to Politzer and Romirez's classification based on the linguistic category. He revealed that syntactic errors (78.81%) were more dominant than morphological errors (21.19%) in terms of frequency. Of all the syntactic error subtypes, noun phrase errors (relating to number) were the most dominant errors and the dominant morphological errors were errors in the basic verb form after infinitival particle to and modal auxiliaries, which involved the addition of inflectional suffixes of –s, -ed, and –ing. Marjono recommended that teachers focus more on grammatical problems found in his study and attempt to prevent the same errors from occurring in the future.

Hasyim (2002) investigated errors in students' thesis abstracts to reveal error types and causes. He reported a number of morphological and syntactic errors which included, among others, errors of misformation of a noun with an adjective (e.g. *the success*ful of the implementation*), errors in subject-verb agreement (e.g. in *the variables which *was ...*), errors in using a question word (e.g. *to describe how far was the role of*), and errors in using an active verb form (e.g. *It *was happened*). According to Hasyim (2002:50), first language system also contributes to some typical errors like the absence of a finite verb and the vague sentence subject. Hasyim suggested teachers' practice of EA in the classroom and focus on the areas where students have difficulties and make errors.

Errors occur not only in written but also spoken English. Ting *et al.* (2010) examined gram... errors in spoken English of university students to determine types of errors and the chang... accuracy towards the end of the 14-week English for Social Purposes course. The data were col... from simulated oral interactions. The study found five common grammar errors: preposition, q... article, plural nouns, subject-verb agreement and tense, and most of the errors were in the fo... misformation and omission. Towards the end of the course, students' showed an increase in accu... In their study, Fathasiri *et al.* (2011) first identified interlingual and intralingual errors in the compositions, and then examined the explicit and implicit corrective feedback they provide... undergraduate students from different majors. The results showed that most errors were interlin... (71%); that explicit/deductive feedback reduced the frequency of interlingual erro... implicit/inductive lowered the frequency of intralingual errors.

Hosada (2007) studied the types and causes of errors in learning the English concord and for th... purpose he asked fifteen university students to take a test on concord and interviewed them after... to obtain information on the causes of the errors. The results of this study show that interlingual err... outnumber interlingual errors in the acquisition of the concord.

Previous error analyses have also found various sources of linguistic errors. They are L1 trans... TL transfer (learning strategies), communication strategies, and faulty teaching. Errors caused by t... negative transfer (interference) are called interlingual errors or or mother tongue interference err... They may adult learners conceptualize the world based on their L1 do not easily change when i... learn a new one, an L2. As a result, interlingual errors are more schematic in adult learners than in y... learners (Ellis, 1994; Hante, 2006:130). L1 interference or negative transfer from L1 is mor... especially in the beginning stage of L2 learning because the learner has no other linguistic syste... rely on to cope with their limited knowledge of TL. (Brown 2000).

Errors due to learning strategy use are called intralingual errors (e.g., Touchie, 1986:7); Ja... 1998). Intralingual errors are considered as errors independent of learners' first language. The... thout to result from learners' incompetence to successfully use L2 structures (Jiang, 2009:... Following Rechards (1974), Ziang (2009) mentions that intralingual errors include: "... generalization, incomplete application of rules, and failure to learn conditions under which ... apply" or include the subcategories of overgeneralization, ignorance of rule restrictions, inco... application of rules, and misanalysis. Intralingual errors are not different from developmental er... (p. 131). According to Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005:65), "Intralingual errors reflect the operat... learning strategies that are universal. Elliot (1983:136) suggests that intralingual errors, which... developmental in nature, result from rule misinterpretation of TL. According to James (1998:18... the learning strategies employed by learners to work out the TL rules include:

a. False analogy: assuming that the new item behaves like an old one (a kin... overgeneralization), e.g. *child* → **childs.*

b. Misanalysis, e.g., as... *plants and *its name...*

c. Incomplete rule app... subject and verb like...

d. Exploiting redundanc...

e. Overlooking co-occu...

f. System simplification, ...

However, as suggested by ... the omission of −s in *Ma...* simplification? Troike (201... interlingual or intralingual ... English L2. It is difficult to ... developmental process (also ... utterances. (Troike 2012:42) ... Errors as a result of faulty te... Explanation, definition or u... presentation of structures an... as a result of wrong material ...

Teacher	Instruct
He walks quickly	Change
	continuo

Communication strategies an... learners do not possess the ... include strategies of: avoid... fluency, and language switc... From the literature revie... search are worth considerin... categories for classification, ... students interlanguage, for e... tense, not simple present erro... the learner's produced catego... use of basic verb, which is an ... error classification in previous ...

b. Misanalysis, e.g., assuming that *its* is plural due to the final –*s* such as in *They are carnivorous plants and *its name comes from ....*

c. Incomplete rule application (under-generalization), e.g. not applying the inversion rule for subject and verb like in *Nobody knew where was Barbie.*

d. Exploiting redundancy: omitting insignificant grammatical features like in *Martin *like tennis.*

e. Overlooking co-occurrence restrictions, e.g. when learners use the word *quick* in *quick food.*

f. System simplification, e.g. when learners substitute relative pronoun *that* for *who, whom, which.*

However, as suggested by Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) this list may pose a problem, for example, is the omission of –*s* in *Martin like tennis* a learner's strategy of exploiting redundancy or system simplification? Troike (2012) suggests that it is not always easy to determine whether an error is interlingual or intralingual in its sources. For example, omission of number and tense inflections in English L2. It is difficult to say if it is due to the absence of the system in L1 or due to the universal developmental process (also present in L1 acquisition) which results in simplified or "telegraphic" utterances. (Troike 2012:42)

Errors as a result of faulty teaching are called induced errors (Stenson in Ellis and Barkhuizen, 2005). Explanation, definition or unclear explanation from the teacher, incomplete information, or wrong presentation of structures and vocabulary can lead to errors. Richard (1974) gave an example of error as a result of wrong material presentation:

Teacher	Instruction	Students
He walks quickly	Change to continuous form	*He is walks quickly*

Communication strategies are the use of verbal mechanisms to communicate thoughts and ideas when learners do not possess the required linguistic forms (e.g. Brown 2000). Communication strategies include strategies of: avoidance, prefabricated patterns, cognitive and personality style, appeal to authority, and language switch (Hasyim 2002:46; Heydari 2012).

From the literature review, some problems in EA can be identified, and some ideas for further research are worth considering. According to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), when using the linguistic categories for classification, it is the the categories of the target language, not the categories of the students interlanguage, for example the form *come* in *she come here yesderday* is classified as past tense, not simple present error, because the target language category is simple past. Simple present is the learner's produced category. However, some researchers consider the form *come* as an error in the use of basic verb, which is another way of describing an error. Thus, there has not been uniformity in error classification in previous studies.

B54-491

Many studies in the Indonesian settings have found evidence of the Indonesian language interference. However, there are still more instances of this language's forms or structures (e.g. omission of copula) which interfere with or are negatively transferred to the target language (English), in order to have more evidence of L1 interference.

Initial observation into students' writing has discovered some unique errors such as *to analyze themselves* which looks like a result of L1 interference. The word *analisis* (from English analysis) is used as a verb and a noun in the Indonesian language. So, at first sight it is suspiciously an L1 interference. Further analysis shows that in English a number of nouns are used as verbs, such as *caution*, *rock*, and *picture*. So, that error may be attributed to an analogy from L1.

Research has investigated syntactical errors in various forms of writing. However, from the writer's literature review, it can be said that there has not been any study examining errors in undergraduate theses (skripsi).

Since Corder (1967)'s seminal paper, attitude towards errors have significantly changed. Errors are now viewed as signs of learning. Errors indicate that learners have their own developing rules and these errors are a window to see the learners' mental learning process of L2. Error analysis is still relevant today especially student teachers desire to help students improve their language performance. The present study is aimed at examining errors with the focus on the types and causes of syntactic errors. The research questions to answer are: (1) what types of syntactical errors occur in skripsi? (2) what are the sources of errors occurring in skripsi? The present study is expected to provide useful information to researchers and other students, and teachers of the syntactic errors as well, so that they can understand them better in general, and better target teaching, and thesis supervision.

METHODOLOGY

This study was a descriptive study because it described, classified, and explained the errors that had been identified. Error Analysis was used to analyze errors contained in the corpus of the 24 undergraduate theses produced by the students during the period of 2010.

The data were all the sentences containing grammatical errors found in the 24 theses. Data analysis involved: (1) identifying the errors, by determining the domain and the extent of the context, (2) describing the errors in terms of Dulay, Burt, and Krashen's Linguistic Category Taxonomy and Surface Strategy Taxonomy, (3) classifying the errors to obtain error types/categories, (4) quantifying the errors to determine their frequencies and percentages, (5) explaining the errors to determine their sources or causes. To verify the validity of the data, peer discussions on the data about grammatical errors were conducted. These discussions helped the researcher improve the identification, classification, explanation of errors.

RESULT AND DISCUSS

Types of Error

Phrase Errors

Syntactic errors found in th four subtypes within the ph n verb phrases, e.g., *shoul* errors in prepositional phra

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Types of Error

Phrase Errors

Syntactic errors found in the present study consisted of phrase, clause, and sentence errors. There were four subtypes within the phrase error type: errors in noun phrases, e.g., *most of *(- the) students*, errors in verb phrases, e.g., *should be use *(-d)*, errors in adjective phrases, e.g., *however *(+ it is) poor*, and errors in prepositional phrases e.g., *higher than *(- that) in control group*.

Table 1. Phrase Errors

	Linguistic Category	Surface Structure	f	%
1	**Noun phrase**		178	75.11
	1) [article + n]	1)Omission,		
	2) [n + PP]	Substitutio		
	3) [poss. adj + n]	n,		
		Addition		
	4) [descrip Adj. + n]	2)Omission,		
		Substitutio		
	5) [NP + n]	n,		
	6) [n + *that*-clause]	Misorderi		
		ng		
	7) [gerund + n/O]	3)Omission		
		4)Misorderi		
		ng		
		5)Misorderi		
		ng		
		6)Misorderi		
		ng		
		7)Omission		
2	**Verb phrase**		16	6.75
	1) [aux + infin]	1)Addition		
	2) [aux + infin]	2)Omission		
	3) [be + adv + adj]	3)Misorderi		
		ng		
	4) [aux + adv + verb]	4)Misorderi		
		ng		
	5) [adv + v]	5)Misorderi		
	6) [be + adj]	ng		
	7) [v + O +	6)Misformat		

This paper has been presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education-International Conference 2014. Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16—18, 2014.

B54-493

				f	%
		adj]	ion		
		8) [passive]	7) Addition		
		9) [tenses]	8) Omission		
			9) Misformat ion		
3	Adjective phrase 1) [however + adj 2) [adj + of-phrase]		1) Addition 2) Substitutio n	6	2.53
4	Prepositional phrase 1) [prepo + EN]		1) Omission	2	0.84

most phrase errors occurred in the attributes, rather than in the heads.

Clause and Sentence Errors.

Clause errors consisted of two subtypes: errors in noun clauses and errors in adjective clause. Noun clause errors had two subtypes: (1) wh-clause errors, for example, in *would let them know w* *they are doing *(+ something)*. (2) *that*-clause errors for example in *suggests *the teacher to try it term (suggests that the teacher tries the term)*, and (3) adjective clause errors, as in *to which new te* *(+ that) can be attached* and *Writing is a language skill, *(- which is) just as important* Whereas, sentence errors consisted of errors in the subject, for example * (+ By) analyzing the *in students' writing can be considered as one way...*, errors in the predicate, for example *The that* is) for school*, errors in the object like *He investigated ^ at Japanese University.*

Surface-Structure Erro

In terms of the surf
omission (e.g., omission
conjunction, preposition
The result *tobe usefull
We have *absolutely no
interpretation that show
ages from findings and
findings and interpretati
error was would let them
them know what they are

In this study, a dis
common error is the sam
study. Whereas, the most
other types of error in a th
theses. It was found t
error (156 or 65.82%). A
error (139 or 58.65. See
highest frequency.

Table 2.   Clause and Sentence Errors

Linguistic	Surface	f	%

This paper has been presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education-International Conference
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16-18, 2014
B54-494

	category	Structure		
5	**Noun Clause**		5	2.11
	1) *Wh*-clause	1) Addition/blen		
	2) *That*-clause	d;		
		2) Addition;		
		misformation		
6	**Adjective**		8	3.38
	Clause	1) Addition		
	1) *Which*-claus	2) omission		
	e			
	2) *That*-clause	,		
7	**Sentence**		22	9.28
	1) Sentence	1) Addition		
	subject	2) Omission		
	2) Sentence	3) Omission		
	predicate			
	3) Sentence			
	object			

Surface-Structure Errors

In terms of the surface structure, errors found in the present study could be classified as errors of omission (e.g., omission of article, predicate/verb, object), errors of addition (e.g., addition of a clause, conjunction, preposition), errors of misformation (e.g., misformation of the present future of *be* as in *The result *tobe usefull* (*The result will be useful*), errors of misordering (e.g., misplacement of adverb *We have *absolutely no use; period of time *longer*), and blends (*It can be seen from findings and interpretation that shows students' grammar mastery is higher;* which was an amalgam of *It can be seen from findings and interpretation that students' grammar mastery is higher* and the utterance *findings and interpretation shows that students' grammar mastery is higher.* Another 'blend' type of error was *would let them know what they are doing something* which was a combination of *would let them know what they are doing* and part of the sentence *would let them know something.*

In this study, a distinction is made between common errors and dominant errors. The most common error is the same type of error which occured in each or almost each of the 24 theses under study. Whereas, the most dominant error is a type of error which has the highest frequency of all the other types of error in a thesis, or a type of error with the highest frequency of all the other types in all the theses. It was found that the most dominant and common error in all the 24 theses was the article error (156 or 65.82%). And, it was the omission of article that had the largest proportion in the article error (139 or 58.65. See Table 3 and notice that the total number of omissions was 177, which is the highest frequency.

Table 3. Surface-Strategy Errors

Error Types	Frequency	%	No. of Theses	%
Omission	177	74.68	24	100
Addition	31	13.08	18	75
Misformation	11	4.64	7	29.17
Misordering	10	4.22	9	37.5
Substitution	8	3.38	6	25
	237	100,00		

Causes of Error

Three major sources or causes of error were inferred in this study: L1 interference, learning strategies, and communication strategies.

L1 Interference

L1 interference was observed in the omission of copula, for example in *Some examples of learning aids itself *(-are) such as visual aids*. The absence of *are* in that sentence was a result of interference from Indonesian which allows dropping a copula (linking verb) in a sentece. Another example of L1 interference can be seen in *Being a student must be creative* which is a direct or word-for-word translation from an informal Indonesian sentence *Jadi mahasiswa harus kreatif*. The correct sentence is *Being a student, we must be creative*. In the Indonesian language a sentence subyect is frequently dropped.

Use of Learning strategies

The following were learning strategies employed by the undergraduate students, which caused errors called intralingual errors:

1) False analogy, e.g. *deeper* in *explain the term deeper* [*\more deeply*]. (using *faster* in *explain the term faster* as an analogy).

2) Misanalysis, as in *The hypothesis of this study are* (*hypothesis* was assumed or analyzed as a plural form because of the final –s).

3) Incomplete rule application, as in *would let them know what they are doing something* (The rule for constructing an embedded question is not applied completely, due to the addition of an unnecessary object).

4) Exploiting redundancy, as in: *the update news* and *Indonesia school* (Learners dropped the final –d and –n which they thought did not contribute to the utterance meaning).

5) Overlooking co-occurrence restrictions, as in *comfortable situation *to learn* instead of *comfortable situation for learning* (If *comfortable situation* is not the object of to-infinitive, then the NP must restrictedly be followed only by a *for*-gerund phrase: *for learning*).

6) System simplification, e.g. the use of *that* in *that reasons*, and the use of *the* in *as the* (*that* represented *those* and *these*; *the* represented *a*)

Use of Communication strategies

The present study also found communication strategies. Two examples are *Some examples of learning aids itself such as visual aids* (a direct translation from *Beberapa contoh alat bantu belajar seperti alat bantu visual* with a missing copula). Another example *The writer gave this study with a title* (literal translation of *Penulis memberi judul penelitian ini dengan sebuah judul*). According to Dulay et al. (1982:59), word-for-word translation process may be a communication strategy of last resort.

Mixed Error Sources

In addition, some errors appeared to have more than one sources. The substitution of a nominal form for a verbal form as in *participate and analysis themselves* shows some interference from the Indonesian language which uses the English-adopted word *analisis* both as a noun and a verb. It may have also been the interference from the student's past experience of using a noun as a verb in English. Another error with a mixed source is the use of conjunction *that* in *analyze which grammar that is used*. The use of *that* may be due to over-learning, but it may also be the interference of Indonesian. In Indonesian, relative pronoun *yang* (= *that, who, whom, which*) is often placed before the verb/predicate of either a direct question or indirect/embedded question, for example *Siapa yang sedang tidur itu* (who is the person who is sleeping?) and *Beritahu saya siapa yang sedang tidur itu* (tell me who is the person who is sleeping = Tell me who is sleeping)

This study has found that it is omission error which was the most common and frequent or dominant (74.68%). The error omission was omission of article and the omission of –ing and –ed in the participle. Other types of error are actually interesting and challenging to describe and classify, but they occurred just infrequently.

Like in many other previous studies, omission in the present study is the most common or dominant error. For example, Hasyim (2002: 82) reported a large proportion of omission errors (57.60%) consisting of omissions of inflectional (-es, -ed, -ing) and derivational (-ly) suffixes. In a study conducted by Asmarawati (2010), 61.54% was omission errors including omission of *be*, article, -ing, subject and verb, plural marker, etc. SLA studies also have found that omission is very common not only with learners learning a second language but also children learning TL as the first language. These "small errors" in morphology even often appear in the EFL writing of Ph.D. students (James, 1998: 155).

The common and dominant errors (i.e., omissions of article) found in this study can apparently be described as systematic errors, i.e. errors made as a result of the students' learning but using the wrong rules stored in their interlanguage or the students' own grammatical system. The students might have known the rules after a long period of studying but they were not used to applying these rules in speaking or writing. The errors can also be designated as post-systematic errors, i.e. lapses or mistakes due to lack of the students' concentration, tiredness, boredom, memory failure, poor health condition,

This paper has been presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education-International Conference 2014. Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16–18, 2014.

B54-497

etc – the conditions students might have experienced when they were working on their
reports.

It is difficult to distinguish errors (self correctable) from mistakes (non self-correctable) in the
present study unless the student subjects are interviewed on whether or not they can correct them. If
consistency of errros is used as the criteria for determining errrors, the problem is that consistency is
something relative—can the same error occuring twice or three times be judged as consistent?
As Corder in Xing (2007: 35) suggests, systematic errors occur after learners learn the rules but learn
the wrong ones. Post-systematic errors occur also after learners are aware of the rules, but fail to
access their knowledge, usually because of some emotional factors such as anxiety and boredom. Thus,
this type of error is similar to mistakes. As we know, students of English Teaching Study Program
have learned almost everything about the English grammar, but they might have not yet internalized
all and forgotten the necessary rules, leading to errors.

As to the sources of error, among the errors found in the present study there might be some which
resulted from another source of error, i.e., faulty teaching. It is not impossible that students' errors
were triggered by their former teachers' errors. Students might have imitated or copied consciously or
unconsciously some of the wrong utterances or sentences which were produced by their former or
present teacher.

Finally, this study has some limitations. It was not intended to separate or distinguish error from
mistakes since it is difficult to do so with the students' written language. This study is more of a case
study, since it used a small number of theses, to get a picture of the students' difficulties in applying
their grammatical knowledge. Thus, the results cannot be generalized to other groups of students.
However, this study has the research and pedagogical implications. Research on EA may have
methodologically been enriched by this study, which was more consistent in describing and classifying
errors and has discovered some unique grammatical errors. Teachers, lecturers, and thesis supervisors
are again informed of the kinds of error students persistently make in their writing so that they could
continue working out what kind of teaching and corrective strategies are available to prevent the same
and the other possible errors in the future. The thesis writers and students who are still writing their
theses are also reminded of the recurring and persistent errors from which they can learn better.

CONCLUSION

The present study has found various syntactic errors grouped into frase errors, clause, and
sentence errors. The most noticeable errors were the omission of articles in noun phrases. As to the
sources of error, a small number of errors occurred due to the interference from the students' first
language, and a much greater number was the result of learner strategies in coping with the target

language (intralingual errors)
target language itself.

Instructors and thesis sup-
conducting an error treatm
apply both direct and indi
correction. Instructors shou
and then good language le
students to first self-correc
correction.

Finally, further research r
methodology involving int

REFERENCES

Amarawati, E., (2010), "I
of RSBI Program at

Badwi, K, (2012), "An A
Study of Saudi BA
and Humanity, Vol. :

Brown, H. D., (2000), Prii

Corder, S. P., (1967), "The
Error Analysis: Pen

Dulay, H., Marina B., and

Ellot, A.B.,(1983), Error

Ellis, R. and Barkhuizen, (

Fahasiri, M., Tavakoli, M
and Implicit Corre
Analysis of Student:

Hasyim, S., (2002), "Erro

Heydari, P., dan Bagheri,
Practice in Languaj

Hadida, H.S., (2007), "Tl

This paper has been presented at Sriwijaya University Learning and Education-International Conference
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, Palembang, May 16 – 18, 2014.
B54-498

This paper has been presenti
Faculty of Teacher Training

language (intralingual errors). A number of errors showed interference from both first language and the target language itself.

Instructors and thesis supervisors should be equipped with relevant knowledge or theories before conducting an error treatment so that it is effective and not discouraging to the students. They can apply both direct and indirect correction techniques, as well as while- and post-session or delayed correction. Instructors should encourage the students to first become risk takers, error/mistake makers, and then good language learners who achieve more in language learning. They should motivate the students to first self-correct and peer correct their errors, before taking responsibility of the teacher correction.

Finally, further research may focus on errors and mistakes and consequently are required to use methodology involving interview to ensure that the language deviations are self-correctable or not.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Asrarawati, E., (2010). "The Grammatical Errors in the Descriptive Texts Made by The Eight Graders of RSBI Program at SMPN 5 Malang" (*Unpublished Thesis*), State University of Malang.

Badawi, K, (2012), "An Analysis of Phonetic, Morphological, and syntactic Errors in English: a Case Study of Saudi BA Student at King Khalid University" *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, Vol. 2, No. 6, 536-537.

Brown, H. D., (2000), *Principles of Language Teaching*, Pearson Education, New York.

Corder, S. P., (1967), "The Significance of Learners' Errors." *IRAL* 5. Reprinted in J.C. Richards (ed.) *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman, 1974: 19-27.

Dulay, H., Marina B., and Stephen K., (1982), *Language Two*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Eliot, A.B.,(1983), *Errors in English*, Singapore University Press, Singapore.

Ellis, R. and Barkhuizen, G.P., (2005), *Analysing Learner Language*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Falhasiri, M., Tavakoli, M., Hasiri, F., and Mohammdzadeh, A., (2011), "The Effectiveness of Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback on Interlingual and Intralingual Errors: A Case of Error Analysis of Students' Compositions" *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 4, No. 3, 251-264.

Hasyim, S., (2002), "Error Analysis in the Teaching of English" *K@TA*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 42 – 50.

Heydari, P., dan Bagheri, M.S., (2012), "Error Analysis: Sources of L2 Learners' Errrors" *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 8.

Hosita, H.S., (2007), "The Second Language Acquisition of English Concord" *TEFLIN Journal*, Vol.

18, No. 1, 94–108.

James, C., (1998), *Errors in Language Learning and Use*, Longman, London.

Jiang, W., (2009), *Acquisition of Word Order in Chinese as a Foreign Language*, Walter de Gruyte Bmbh & Co, Berlin.

Mardijono, J., (2003), "Indonesian EFL Advanced Learners' Grammatical Errors" *K@ta*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 67-90.

Richards, J.C., "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis," in J.C. Richards *Error Analysis Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*, London, Longman Group Ltd, 1974, 172-188.

Savile-Troike, M., (2012), *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Touchie, H.Y., (1986), "Second Language Learning Errors: Their Types, Causes, and Treatment" *JALT Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 76-77.

Xing, D., (2007), "Error Analysis in China English Language Teaching," *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, Vo. 2, No. 2.

THE DIFFERE
STUDENT
DEMONSTRATIO
CLASS

Dedy H:
Physics Education Study I
Faculty of Tea

this research is aimed to: 1
udents taught with experim
udents' responses to the le
operiment. The research was
of Bengkulu. The concept used
obtained that class of VII.C wi
is the control class. The resear
responses. Based on the results
gin value of the experiment cl
classes, where $t_{cal} = 3.18 > t_{tal}$
the experiment classes is diffe
$t_{al} = 2.05 > t_{tab} = 2.01$ at signif
of learning results of the exper
turning method of problem sol
83.17% and 80.89% for the exp

key words: learning results,
response of stude

INTRODUCTION
In the learning of physic
process. Learning method of pr
they are given the opportunity
and is identic with the elusive
dent. In order to for an appli
dents should demonstrate the b
the matter of physics.

Observations at SMPN
usually done by the teachers
solving the given problem. Thi
experiment and student's lear
dents activity in the learning p
dents are experiment- and demo

paper has been presented at Sr
of Teacher Training and Ec