

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Identification of Error

The data, 30 descriptive texts, were produced by the subject of the study (see appendix). It was found out that several errors made by the subject of the study on the use of present tense. The sentences were well-formed and ill-formed. Moreover, there were found some sentences which contained more than one type of errors. The data were identified by marking and underlying the sentences which indicate errors and subsequently transcribed them. Then the errors were identified per sentences.

4.2 Classification of the error

After identifying the errors, the writer classified them into their types. They indicated to which types the errors belong. The classifications of error are based on Dulay's theory (1982:150) "Surface Strategy Taxonomy" in which the errors are analyzed into error of omission, error of addition, error of misformation, and error of misordering.

To know which type of errors belong to, the identified data were compared the original forms made by the subject of the study with the reconstruction of those form. From the data collected, the writer found four types of error in

descriptive composition. They are omission, addition, misformation and misordering. The errors type will be shown below:

4.2.1 Error of Omission

4.2.1.1 Omission of ending –s or –es for third person singular verb in present tense

He live in Keboharan village (subject 1)

He lives in Keboharan village

In the first sentence, the subject of the study said that he live in Keboharan village. In the present tense rule, it was an incorrect sentence because the subject of the study failed to attach –s in ending of the third person singular verb. It should be ‘He lives in Keboharan village’. Because of the missing of –s in ending of verb, based on the Dulay’s theory, it is classified into error of omission.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study generalizes the use of all subjects in the present tense rule. In the present tense rule, for the third person singular subject (he, she, it) the verb end in –s or –es. The subject of the study may not know about the rule before. Furthermore, the subject of the study makes a deviant structure on the basic of his experience of other structure in the target language. Based on Richard’s theory, it is categorized into over-generalization cause.

In this context, it is the error of omission of ending –s in the verb of the third person singular subject. The other cause is that the subject of the study fails to learn the more complex types of structure because the subject of the study can achieve quite efficient communication without the need for mastering more than

the elementary rules of question usage. The subject of the study is faulty comprehending of using the third person singular subject in the present tense rule. Based on the explanation above, it is incomplete application of rule.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that there is an error which was found in the sentence ‘He live in Keboharan village’. It is an omission error of ending –s or –es for third person singular verb in the present tense. There were two causes that subject of the study made an error. They were over-generalization and incomplete application of rule.

4.2.1.2 Omission of to be

His hair black (subject 1)

His hair is black

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that his hair black. In the present tense rule, it was incorrect because there was not to be in the sentence. It should be ‘His hair is black’. Because of the missing to be (is) in the sentence, based on the Dulay’s theory, it is classified into an error of omission.

The cause of the error is incomplete application of rule. The subject of the study’s error are derived from the faulty comprehend of using auxiliary be in the nominal sentence in the present tense rule. The subject of the study considers that his sentence is correct. In the present tense rule, his construction sentence is incorrect. Because it needs auxiliary be to link the subject and the object.

The other cause of the error is that the subject of the study translates from the first language to the second language. In the first language ‘Indonesia’, the construction of the sentence is different from English as the second language. In constructing sentence by using Indonesia language, there is not auxiliary as

English. In this context, the subject of the study may not know about the rule before. Thus, the subject of the study makes an incorrect sentence construction in simple present tense. Based on the Richard's theory, it can be categorized into over-generalization cause.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the subject of the study makes an error in constructing a sentence 'His hair black'. It is the omission error of auxiliary be as verb in the present tense. The reasons for the error to take place are incomplete application rule and over-generalization cause.

4.2.1.3 Omission of ending –ing in gerund after 'like' verb

He like help somebody (subject 2)

He likes helping somebody

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that he like help somebody. In the present tense rule, it was incorrect because it failed to attach –s in ending of the third person singular verb and ending –ing in gerund. It should be 'He likes helping somebody'. Because of the missing of –s in ending of verb and ending –ing in gerund rule, based on the Dulay's theory, it is classified into error of omission.

The cause of error is that the subject of the study generalizes the use of all subjects in the present tense rule. It is a simple present tense. In the present tense rule, for the third person singular subject, the verb must be ended by attaching –s or –es. The right form is 'He likes'. The subject of the study may nothet know about the rule before. Furthermore, the subject of the study makes a deviant

structure on his basic experience of other structure in the target language. Therefore, it is categorized into over-generalization cause.

The other cause is that the subject of the study fails to complete in constructing the sentence. It is caused the subject of the study says that ‘He like help somebody’, it is an incorrect sentence. The subject of the study should use gerund after ‘like’ verb in present tense. However, the subject of the study does not complete the rules. In the present tense rule, the third person singular subject, the verb must be ended by attaching –s or –es. Furthermore, in gerund, the subject of the study also fails to attach –ing after ‘like’ verb. It should be attached –ing of the verb used as a noun. Therefore, the error takes place because the subject of the study makes incomplete application rule.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that the subject of the study makes an omission error of ending –s in the third person singular subject in the present tense sentence and omission error of attaching –ing of the verb used as a noun in gerund. Those errors may be caused by over-generalization or incomplete application of rule.

4.2.1.4 Omission of the auxiliary does or do in negative form

She **not** like cat (subject 6)

She **does not** like cat

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that she not like cat. In the present tense rule, it was incorrect because it, in negative form, needed auxiliary does because the subject was a third person singular. It should be ‘She

does not like cat'. Because of the missing of the auxiliary does in the negative sentence, based on the Dulay's theory, it is classified into error of omission.

The cause of the error is incomplete application of rule. The subject of the study's errors are derived from the faulty comprehend of using auxiliary 'does' in the negative sentence in present tense rule. The subject of the study considers that his sentence is correct. However, the construction of sentence is incorrect. It is different from Indonesia language sentence. In Indonesia language, there is not auxiliary do or does to make a negative sentence. Thus, it is categorized into incomplete application of rule.

Based on the explanation above, the sentence is incorrect. It is an omission error of the auxiliary does or do in constructing negative sentence. The subject of the study fails to complete the auxiliary does or do in constructing a negative sentence. Thus, based on Richard's theory, the cause of the error is an incomplete application of rule.

4.2.1.5 Omission of indefinite article 'a'

I have best friend (subject 21)

I have a best friend

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that I have best friend. In the present tense rule, it was ill-formed because it needed an indefinite article 'a' in the sentence because the object was a singular count noun. Thus, it should be 'I have a best friend'. Because of the missing of the indefinite article 'a' in the sentence, based on the Dulay's theory, it is classified into error of omission.

The cause of error is derived from the subject of the studies' faulty to comprehend of using indefinite article 'a'. The subject of the study considers that his sentence is correct. Actually the sentence construction is incorrect. It is used before a singular noun beginning with a consonant. Based on Richard's theory, it is categorized into an incomplete application of rule.

Based on the explanation above, the writer found an omission error of indefinite article 'a' in the sentence. It was expected that the cause of the error is an incomplete application of rule. That is caused by the subject of the study fails to complete the indefinite article 'a'.

4.2.1.6 Omission of preposition 'in'

His address is Kwangen, Junwangi (subject 9)

His address is **in** Kwangen, Junwangi

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that his address is Kwangen, Junwangi. In the present tense rule, it was ill-formed because it needed a preposition 'in'. This sentence stated an address. It referred to a place. It should be 'His address is in Kwangen, Junwangi'. Because of the missing of preposition 'in', based on the Dulay's theory, it is classified into an error of omission.

The cause of error is derived from the subject of the study fails to complete the sentence into well-formed. The subject of the study considers that his sentence is correct. The sentence construction is incorrect. It needs preposition 'in' because Kwangen, Junwangi is a name of a village in Krian. The preposition 'in' is a connective word that shows the relationship between the nouns following

it. It indicates relationship of place. Based on Richard's theory, it is categorized into an incomplete application of rule.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that in this sentence, 'His address is Kwangen, Junwangi', there is an omission error of preposition 'in'. That is caused by the sentence tells about a name of place. Based on Richard's theory, the cause of the error is an incomplete application of rule.

4.2.1.7 Omission of surrogate subject

In funny for me (subject 21)

She is funny for me

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that in funny for me. The construction of sentence, it was ill-formed because it needed a subject in the sentence. It should be 'She is funny for me'. Because of the missing of surrogate subject, based on the Dulay's theory, it is classified into error of omission.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study does not complete the sentence by omitting the subject. The construction of sentence, a subject is needed. Therefore, it can be categorized into an incomplete application of rule.

Based on the explanation above, there is an omission of subject in the sentence. It is caused by the subject of the study does not complete the sentence by omitting the subject. Thus, based on Richard's theory, it can be categorized into an incomplete application of rule.

4.2.1.8 Omission of ending –ed in passive verb

He is usually call Rafly (subject 3)

He is usually **called** Rafly

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that he is usually call Rafly. In the present tense rule, it was incorrect because it failed to attach –ed in ending of the passive sentence. The verb must be in past participle. It should be ‘He is usually called Rafly’. Because of the missing of –ed in ending of the past participle verb, based on the Dulay’s theory, it is classified into an error of omission.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study fails to complete ending –ed in past participle in the passive sentence rule. The subject of the study does not apply the rule completely. The pattern of passive sentence is be + past participle. Thus, based on Richard’s theory it can be categorized into an incomplete application of rule.

Based on the explanation above, it is incorrect because it fails to attach –ed in ending of the passive sentence. The verb must be in past participle. It is classified into error of omission. The cause of the error is the subject of the study fails to complete ending –ed in past participle in the passive sentence rule. The subject of the study does not apply the rule completely. Therefore, the cause of the error is an incomplete application of rule.

4.2.2 Error of Addition

4.2.2.1 Double marking of to be and verb

He **is go** to school by bicycle (subject 1)

He goes to school by bicycle

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that he is go to school by bicycle. In the present tense rule, it was ill-formed because there were two items marked for the same feature (present tense), is and go. It should be 'He goes to school by bicycle'. Because of the adding of auxiliary, based on the Dulay's theory, type of addition error is classified into double marking.

There are two marks in the sentence. It is an error of addition. The cause of the error is that the subject of the study's faulty to comprehend the distinction of these marks. The form 'is' may be interpreted as a marker of the present tense. In the present tense rule, 'is' is a present state in nominal sentence; 'verb (go)' is a present action. It can be concluded that the cause of the error is false concept hypothesize.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that there is double marking in addition error in the sentence. That is caused that the subject of the study fails to comprehend the distinction of these marks. Thus, the cause of the error is false concept hypothesize.

4.2.2.2 Simple addition of article 'a' before adjective

He is a very good, smart, patient, etc. (subject 8)

He is very good, smart, patient, etc.

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that he is a very good, smart, patient, etc. In an adjective phrase, it was incorrect because there was an article 'a' before adjectives. It should be 'He is very good, smart, patient, etc'.

Because of the adding of article ‘a’, based on the Dulay’s theory, type of addition error is classified into simple addition.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study failed to comprehend the use of article ‘a’ in an adjective phrase. There might be article ‘a’ interpreted as someone. But in this context, article ‘a’ should not be placed before adjective. It was an ungrammatical sentence. Based on Richard’s theory, it was categorized into a false concept hypothesize.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that there is a simple addition error in the sentence. That is caused by the subject of the study fails to comprehend the distinction of using article ‘a’ and adjective phrase. Thus, the cause of the error is false concept hypothesizes.

4.2.3 Error of Misformation

4.2.3.1 Regularization error of plural nouns

He too have two strong **foot**

He also has two strong **feet**

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that he too have two strong foot. In the sentence, it was incorrect because the foot here was regularization of plural. So, it was not added by –s. It should be ‘He also has two strong feet’. Because of the wrong formatting of plural, based on the Dulay’s theory, a type of misformation error is classified into regularization error.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study made an over-regularization of plural noun. In plural rule, 'foot' was exceptional plural. In this context, the subject of the study violated the limitation of plural noun. The rule restriction errors might result from the rote learning of rules. Thus, the cause of the error is ignorance of rule restriction.

Based on the explanation above, the sentence was an incorrect sentence. It was regularization error of plural noun. In plural rule, 'foot' was exceptional plural. It's caused by the subject of the study violated the limitation of plural noun. Therefore, the cause of the error is an ignorance of rule restriction.

4.2.3.2 Alternating Form Error in comparative degree

His tall is **more short** from me

He is **shorter** than me

In the first sentences, the subject of the study said that his tall is more short from me. In comparative degree, it was incorrect because short is one syllable. So, the comparative degree was ended by -er. It should be 'He is shorter than me'. Because of the wrong formatting of comparative degree, based on the Dulay's theory, type of misformation error is classified into alternating form.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study translated from Indonesia sentence to English sentence construction. The word 'more' was qualifier of adjective. He did not apply the comparative degree. As a result, the cause of the error is over-generalization.

Based on the explanation above, the sentence was an ungrammatical sentence. It was a misformation error in comparative degree. In comparative

degree, if an adverb or an adjective consisted of one syllable, the comparative degree was ended by –er. It's caused by the subject of the study translated from Indonesia sentence to English sentence construction. Therefore, the cause of the error is over-generalization.

4.2.3.3 Archy Form of Pronoun Subject

His live in Semaji (subject 2)

He lives in Semaji

The sentence above is an incorrect sentence. 'His' is an incorrect subject. The learner uses the wrong pronoun. 'His' is a possessive pronoun. In this context, 'His' should be 'He'. It is caused by it is as the subject of the sentence. Therefore, it is categorized into misformation error called archy form.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study violates the limitation on subject in structures with his. In pronoun rule, 'his' is a possessive pronoun followed by a noun, not a verb. It should be 'He lives in Semaji'. Therefore, the rule restriction errors may result from the rote learning of rules. Thus, the cause of the error is ignorance of rule restriction.

Based on the explanation above, the sentence was an incorrect sentence. It was a misformation error of pronoun subject. In pronoun rule, 'his' is possessive pronoun followed by noun, not verb. It's caused that the subject of the study violated the limitation of pronoun subject. Therefore, the cause of the error is ignorance of rule restriction.

4.2.4 Error of Misordering

4.2.4.1 Misordering of noun phrase

Lesson favorite is math (subject 20)

Her favorite lesson is math

In the first sentence, the subject of the study said that lesson favorite is math. In a noun phrase, it was an incorrect placement because a modifier should be placed before a noun. It should be 'Her favorite lesson is math'. Because of the wrong formatting of a noun phrase, based on the Dulay's theory, type of the error is classified into misordering.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study embedded the modifier 'favorite' incorrect place. This error occurred for both the second language and the first language learners in constructions that has already acquired. The subject of the study translated the sentence from Indonesia language to English. In Indonesia language rule, the pattern of noun phrase is 'Head + Modifier'. On the contrary, the pattern of a noun phrase in English is 'Modifier + Head'. Both of them are different. Thus, based on the Richard's theory, the cause of the error is categorized into over-generalization.

Based on the explanation above, it was an incorrect placement because a modifier should be placed before a noun. It is classified into error of misordering. The cause of the error is that the subject of the study embedded the modifier 'favorite' incorrect place. The subject of the study translated the sentence from Indonesia language to English by using Indonesia language rule. Therefore, the cause of the error is over-generalization.

4.2.4.2 Misordering of noun phrase using ordinal number

He is child three in family (subject 10)

He is the third child in his family

In the first sentence, the subject of the study said that he is child three in family. In the noun phrase rule, it was an incorrect placement because a modifier should be placed before a noun. It should be 'He is the third child in his family'. Because of the wrong formatting of a noun phrase using an ordinal number, based on the Dulay's theory, type of the error is classified into misordering.

The cause of the error is that the subject of the study embedded the modifier 'three' incorrect place. This error occurred for both the second language and the first language learners in constructions that has already acquired. The subject of the study translated the sentence from Indonesia language to English by using Indonesia language rule. In Indonesia language rule, the pattern of a noun phrase is 'Head + Modifier'. On the contrary, the pattern of a noun phrase in English is 'Modifier + Head'. Both of them are different. Thus, based on the Richard's theory, it is categorized into over-generalization.

Based on the explanation above, it was an incorrect placement because a modifier should be placed before a noun. It is classified into error of misordering. The cause of the error is the subject of the study embedded the modifier 'three' incorrect place. The subject of the study translated the sentence from Indonesia language to English by using Indonesia language rule. Therefore, the cause of the error is over-generalization.

4.3 The Dominant Error

As stated in the preceding chapter, to know the dominant error to take place, the writer counted the frequency of errors. The calculation of the data can be seen on the table of recapitulation of the error above.

Table Error classification (percentage)

Error Classification	Total	Percentage of the Error (%)
Omission	194	54,19
Addition	44	12,29
Misformation	88	24,58
Misordering	32	8,94
TOTAL	358	100

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that the dominant error that found in the descriptive composition which has been made by the students is the error of omission. This error is 54,19 %. The error is the highest frequency. From thirty students, it is more than a half of them made the error in descriptive composition. It is the most frequent error that found in students' composition. They are omission of ending -s or -es for third person singular verb in present tense, omission of to be, omission of ending -ing in gerund after 'like' verb, omission of the auxiliary does or do in negative form, omission of indefinite

article 'a', omission of preposition 'in', omission of surrogate subject, omission of ending -ed in passive verb.

The second level is the error of misformation. The frequency of the error in this item is 24,58 %. In students' composition, it is found double marking and simple addition of article 'a'. The third level is the error of addition. The frequency of the error in this item is 12,29 %. The kinds of addition error that found in students' composition among are regularization of plural noun, alternating form of comparative degree, and archy form of pronoun subject.

The last level is the error of misordering. In this item, the frequency is 8,94 %. It is the most rarely found in a students' composition. This error is the most rarely found. The kinds of addition error that are found among are misordering of noun phrase and misordering of noun phrase in using ordinal number.