universitas
bandar lampung
SOLUTION FOR PRESENT AND FUTURE

In Cooperation With

JNU

BURAPHA UNIVERSITY

INDONESIA

INDIA

THAILAND

SHINAWATRA UNIVERSITY

NIE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
SINGAPORE

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

THAILAND

SINGAPORE

MALAYSIA

2nd ICEL 2014

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

20, 21, 22 MAY 2014

Bandar Lampung University, Indonesia

PROCEEDINGS

Hosted by
Teacher Training and Education Faculty (FKIP),
English Education Study Program, Bandar Lampung University (UBL)

PROCEEDINGS

THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION AND LANGUAGE

2nd ICEL 2014

20 -22 MAY 2013

Organized by:
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP),
English Education Study Program of Bandar Lampung University
Zainal Abidin Pagar Alam street No.89 Labuhan Ratu, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
Phone: +62 721 36 666 25, Fax: +62 721 701 467
www.ubl.ac.id

PREFACE

The activities of the International Conference are in line and very appropriate with the vision and mission of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) to promote training and education as well as research in these areas.

On behalf of the Second International Conference of Education and Language (2nd ICEL 2014) organizing committee, we are very pleased with the very good responses especially from the keynote speakers and from the participants. It is noteworthy to point out that about 80 technical papers were received for this conference

The participants of the conference come from many well known universities, among others: University of Wollongong, NSW Australia, International Islamic University Malaysia, Kyoto University (Temple University (Osaka), Japan - Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India - West Visayas State University College of Agriculture and Forestry, Lambunao, Iloilo, Philipine - Bahcesehir University, Istanbul, Turkey - The Higher Institute of Modern Languages, Tunisia - University of Baku, Azerbaijan - Sarhad University, KPK, Pakistan - Medical Sciences English Language Teacher Foundation Program, Ministry of Health, Oman - Faculty School of Arts and Sciences, Banga, Aklan Philippines - Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, - Pelita Harapan University, Jakarta - STIBA Saraswati Denpasar, Bali - University of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta - Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta - Sriwijaya University, Palembang - Islamic University of Malang - IAIN Raden Fatah Palembang - Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia - Universitas Haluoleo Kendari - State Islamic University of Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung - Tadulako University, Central Sulawesi - Sanata Dharma University - Lampung University and Open University,

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the International Advisory Board members, sponsors and also to all keynote speakers and all participants. I am also grateful to all organizing committee and all of the reviewers who contribute to the high standard of the conference. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Rector of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) who gives us endless support to these activities, so that the conference can be administrated on time.

Bandar Lampung, 20 May 2014

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M
2nd lCEL 2014 Chairman

PROCEEDINGS

The Second International Conference on
Education and Language (2ⁿᵈ ICEL 2014)
BANDAR LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
May 20,21,22 2014

STEERING COMMITTEE

Executive Advisors

Dr. Ir. M. Yusuf S. Barusman, MBA
Prof. Dr. Khomsahrial Romli, M.Si
Dr. Lintje Anna Marpaung, S.H.,M.H
Drs. Thontowie, M.S
Dr. Andala Rama Putra Barusman, S.E., M.A.Ec
Mustafa Usman, Ph.D

Chairman

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M

Co-Chairman

Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M

Secretary

Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A

Treasurer

Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M

Managing Committee Team

Drs. Harpain, M.A.T., M.M
Helta Anggia, S.Pd., M.A
Tissa Zadya, S.E., M.M
Yanuarius Y. Dharmawan, S.S., M.Hum
R. Nadia R.P Dalimunthe, S.S., M.Hum
Bery Salatar, S.Pd
Kartini Adam, S.E
Nazil Chupra Hakim, S.Pd
Miryanti Feralia, S.Pd

Table Of Content

THE ANALYSIS OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCE ERRORS PATTERN IN WRITING SENTENCES OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMA NEGERI 5 BANDAR LAMPUNG

Fangky Adetia
Universitas Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

Corresponding email: adetia.fangky@gmail.com

Abstract

Making errors is expected to lead to some improvements in future learning. The general purpose of this research is to find out the students' errors in using conditional sentences in writing sentence.This study uses descriptive qualitative research. The data, which were retrieved from students' conditional sentence writing. A class of eleventh grade students (Class XI IPA 3) science class of SMA N 5 Bandar Lampung. Data analysis discovered that most of the students still made all of the four error types under the heading of surface strategy taxonomy.The error types that were identified in the students' conditional sentence writing were ranked for the surface strategy taxonomy, errors in misformation amount to 166 errors (54.07%), omission 74 errors (28.46%), addition 18 errors (6.94%), and misordering only 1 errors (0.38%). For each type of the conditional, type one got omission 46 errors (17,76%), misformation 19 errors (7.33%), addition 7 errors (2.7%), misorderin 1 error (0.38%), on type two got misformation 62 errors (23.93%), addition 11 errors (4.24%), and omission 10 errors(3.86%), on type three misformation 85 errors (32.81%), and omission 18 errors(6.94%). These figures suggest that teachers should take necessary instructional steps (for example through a series of extensive and intensive practices on grammar) as a follow-up to improve students' grammar competence, without leaving the importance of spontaneity and overall meaning in writing.

Keywords: error analysis, grammatical errors, conditional sentence, writing.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the important patterns in English language is 'conditional sentence'. It has been used to refer to a number of sentence types. Sometimes it is used as an assumption concept that encompasses all instances of delaying a sentence. Sometimes it is used interchangeably with a particular kind of sentence deferment. In this case the Indonesian students should study the conditional sentence because this sentence is related to the implicit meaning on three types of conditional. (amstrong et al 2013:10).

In this case the Indonesian students should study the conditional sentence because this sentence is related to the implicit meaning on three types of conditional. During this study the students made some error in mastering this pattern. Students who are studying the conditional sentences for the first time should ignore and concentrate on the basic forms. (Hariyono et al 340:1).

Making errors is expected to lead to some improvements in future learning. In this case, in order to deal with students' weaknesses in writing skill, teachers are suggested to help their students by conducting error analysis

After knowing students' errors teachers are able to take best method to improve their instruction and try to find out the solution in teaching English Especially in using conditional sentence type I, II and II. We know the students still make errors. Therefore the writer is interested to investigate the students' errors in using conditional sentence type I, II and III in writing.

2. CONDITIONAL SENTENCE IN SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY

Grammar is theory of a language, of how language is put together and how it works. Having known the definition of grammar, it is not hard for us to understand why grammar is useful and important. Without knowing the grammar of a language, one cannot be said to have learned the language. Wignall *at al*. (1999; 4)

Thomson and Martinet (1995: 197) say that conditional sentence has two parts are "if"–clause and main clause. They also state that conditional sentence has three kinds or types; in which each kind contains a different pair of tenses in some variations.

According to Azzar (1999) A conditional sentence consists of "if" clause (which present condition) and a result clause. In conditional sentences "if" clause is put before main clause in order a sentence as a question's sentence. There are three types of conditional sentences.Real conditional is commonly called type I. It describes about imagination according to the fact. Unreal conditional / type II describes just imagination or impossible happen. Conditional type III describes.

Dulay *et al*. (1982:150) defines surface strategy taxonomy as a classification of language errors based on how the surface structures are altered. This taxonomy includes the following error types, they are Omission are characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. Addition errors are the opposite of omission; they are characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well formed utterance. Misformation errors are characterized by the use of the wrong form of a morpheme or structure. While in omission errors the item is not supplied at all, in misformation errors the learner supplies something. Misordering refers to the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance.

Error analysis serves two functions: *theoretical* and *practical*. In theoretical function, error analysis is to describe the learner's knowledge of the target language at any particular moment in his learning career in order to relate this knowledge to the teaching to which he has been exposed. The theoretical aspect of error analysis is part of methodology of investigating the language learning process (Corder, 1981:45).

3. METHOD

Descriptive qualitative method—a research method that simply looks with intense accuracy at the phenomena of the moment and describes precisely what has been observed (Leedy, 1974:79)—is selected as the most suitable one for describing the phenomenon under investigation. Variable is a characteristic or attribute of individual or an organization that (a) can be measured or observed by the researcher and that (b) varies among individuals or organizations studied (Creswell 2012:630).

Population is group of elements or cases, whether individuals object, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the result of the research (Mcmillan1996:85). The subject of this research was eleventh grade of SMA N 5 Bandar Lampung. The number of population is 280 students in eight classes consists of two majors, science (IPA) and Social (IPS). The subject of this research was eleventh grade of SMA N 5 Bandar Lampung. The sample was taken by using a purposive sampling technique because the writer would see the result base on the students' middle average score. The class had middle average score was XI IPA 3 consist of the 33 participants.

A single data collection technique, i.e. writing task, was applied to elicit students' grammatical errors. The students were assigned to write a conditional sentence that should contain approximately 30 numbers question, in 90 minutes. Their writings would be analyzed for errors on the basis of *surface strategy taxonomies*, with focus on tenses and parts of speech.

Data analysis was performed to find understanding of the data after following certain procedure (Setiyadi, 2002). The steps of data analysis that are maintained in this research are those proposed by Theo Van Els, *et al.* (1984: 47), as listed below:

1. Collecting the data from the students' work.
2. Identifying the errors. The errors are specified by underlining and assigning numerical codes, e.g. $\boxed{1}$ for omission errors, $\boxed{2}$ for addition errors, $\boxed{3}$ for misformation errors, and $\boxed{4}$ for misordering errors.
3. Classifying the errors to find out their frequencies. The errors are classified on the basis of *surface strategy taxonomy*, into categories of omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

Calculating the percentage of errors using the following formula:

$$\frac{Total\ part\ Errors\ (conditional\ sentences)}{Total\ all\ coditional\ sentences\ errors} \times 100$$
$$\text{(Nation, 1981: 58)}$$

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The main instrument of this research was a writing task that produced students' construct of conditional sentence. Data collection involved the eleventh-grade students of SMA 5 Bandar Lampung, XI IPA 3 Class, to construct their own sentence based on three types of conditional sentences 90 minutes. This research involved of 33 students with 30 numbers question. After students' compositions were collected and evaluated for errors, they were analyzed for grammatical errors that mostly occurred. The result from this research is 259 errors consist of omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. The result of those errors can see in the following table:

4.1. Results of students' errors based on *surface strategy taxonomy*

Table1: Surface Strategy Taxonomy

No	Types of errors	Total Errors (tenses and parts of speech)
1	Omission	74 errors
2	Addition	18 errors
3	Misformation	166 errors
4	Misordering	1 errors
	Total	259 errors

From those three errors was happen on the table, the dominant error is the misformation with the total number error was 166 errors, This happens because the students got fault to construct the right form of the conditional sentence or they had failed to select the right form of the conditional sentence. Some of students got failed to apply right form between type three and type two. The low of error of the conditional sentence is misordering with total number of error was one.

4.2. Three Type of Conditional Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy

Table 2: Surface Taxonomy

No	Type of Conditional	Kinds of Errors				
		Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering	Total
1.	Type I	46 errors	7 errors	19 errors	1 errors	73 errors
2.	Type II	10 errors	11 errors	62 errors	-	83 errors
3.	Type III	18 errors	-	85 errors	-	103 errors
	Total	**74 errors**	**18 errors**	**166 errors**	**1 errors**	**259 errors**

In type one, there are 73 errors which divided into omission, addition, missformation and misordering. Omission was the majority error had been faced on these type amound 46 errors found. Omission was the highest form because they got failed on applying the singular verb without using *-s* or *–es* after the verb. 7 errors were seen on the addition form. Misformation got amount 19 of errors. Misordering had only one error and this error is the total error had been shown on misordering form. Type two of conditional sentence was 83 errors found in this research which error should be classify as omission is 10 errors, addition is 11 errors and misformation 62 errors also no ordering in this type. Type three had 103 errors divided into two categories omission and misformation. Misformation is the most dominant errors from four kinds of error amound 85 errors. Omission has 18 errors.

From 30 numbers of the question there some question was dominant in error in omission, addition, misformation, or misordering. The question number one was the most dominant error with 15 errors this question was categorized as type one, in this type error was dominant is omission. In type one, they omitted –s on verb they were not carefully to see the type of the subject. The most dominant addition errors is type two with twenty three question number the error, and was 8 errors. The most dominant error

of type three is misformation the number question is number twenty eight with 20 errors. They failed to select the right form. They assumed that this number was using type two of the conditional. And the misordering was from type one with the number of the question was sixteen.

4.3. The Proportion (Frequency and Percentage) of Students' Errors

This part discusses about the types of errors by considering their frequency and percentage of based on the surface strategy taxonomy.

Table 3: The Frequency and Percentage of Students' Errors based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy

No	Types of errors	Percentages Errors (tenses and parts of speech)
1	Omission	28.46%
2	Addition	6.94%
3	Misformation	54.07%
4	Misordering	0.38 %
	Total	100%

Table 3 shows that the type of error that has the highest frequency based on *surface strategy taxonomy* is misformation (54.07%).Most of the students failed to construct the appropriate form. They frequently used inappropriate type three. The second place is omission. Different from misformation, the students made errors in terms of part of speech, such as when they forgot to add *to be* as a linking verb in their sentence, or when they forgot to add *-s/-es* after a to indicate that the subject is nominal in present tense context. After omission, we have addition as the third type of error with high frequency. Similar with omission, most students made errors in part of speech like they added inappropriate word or they added two verb. Misordering is the type of error witch reach the lowest frequency.

The different proportion also came from the three types of conditional sentence. In each types has the dominant error. The proportion of the each type of the conditional will be describing below:

Table 4. Proposition Types of Conditional Sentence Base on Surface Strategy Taxonomy

No	Type	Kind of Errors				
		Omission	Addition	Misformation	Addition	Total
1	Type I	17.76 %	2.70%	7.33%	0.38%	26.37%
2	Type II	3.86%	4.24%	23.93%	-	32.03%
3	Type III	6.94%	-	32.81%	-	39.75%
Total		**28.46%**	**6.94%**	**54.07%**	**0.38%**	**100%**

Conditional type three got the highest percentage from those two kinds of conditional. This conditional has 39.77% error divided into two categories misformation and omission. In misformation error the percentages is 32.81 % and 6.94% for the omission. Then the type two has 32.05 percent total of error will be divided into omission 3.86%, addition 4.24% and misformation is 23.93%. Type one has complete error because it has four kind of surface strategy taxonomy. This type has 26.37 percent of error with divided into omission 17.76%, addition 2.70%, misformation 7.33% addition 0.38%.

Misformation is the highest error in this research with percentage 54.07% this error is really common in this research every type has this kind of error. This error will be classified as 7.33% in type one, 23.93% in type two and 32.81% in type three. Omission has 28.46%from the total three types of conditional each conditional 17.76% of type one, 3.36% of type two and 6.94% of type three. Addition error has 6.94 error with divided into two type, they are type one with 2.70% and type two 4.94%. for the omission only has 0.38 error from type one.

5. DISCUSSION

In conducting this research, five steps proposed by Sridar (1978: 222) in Komariah (2010: 25) were applied to analyze the errors: a) collecting the data, b) identifying the errors, c) classifying the errors into error types, d) giving statement of relative frequency of error types, and e) identifying the areas of difficulty in the target language. After collecting the data from the students' writing task, the errors were identified and classified based on *surface strategy taxonomy* (omission, addition, misformation, and misordering). After classifying the types of errors, their frequencies were calculated.

Based on the results, it is revealed that the highest frequency of errors made by the students based on *surface strategy taxonomy* is in terms of misformation, 166 (54.07%), followed by omission with 74 errors (28.46%), addition with 18 errors (6.94%) and misordering with only 1 errors (0.38%).

From three types of the conditional the result type one had 73 errors with 26. 37% which divided into omission 46 errors with 17.76%, addition 7 errors with 2.70%, misformation 19 errors with 7.33%, and misordering only I error with 0.38%. the most common error in type one was omission with 73 errors with 26.37%. Then, type two of the conditional had 83 errors which divided into three categories omission 10 errors with 3.86%, addition error 11 errors with 4.24%. misformation 62 errors with 23.93%. the dominant errors of type two was misformation error with the total error 62 errors with 23.93%. type three of the conditional had 103 errors in 39.75% which divided into two categorizes omission with 18 errors in 6.94% and misformation with 85 errors in 32.81%. the commonly error in this type was misformation error.

Every type had different kind of error, in type one the common error happened on the omission because the students missed to add *–s/-es* after verb on the singular subject. They missed to add *to be* (am, is, and are) on nominal sentence. On type two the dominant error had been faced on misformation error they did not add verb two on past participle and they added *will* not *would*. On type three, miss formation was the dominant because the students added verb one or two not the verb three after *had,* and they failed on construct the right form of *would have* and inserted the verb three after that.

This fact is understandable because according to Badadu (1985:7), even though students have learned English for years, they still find difficulties to express their ideas in proper words or sentences because their knowledge about English is limited. Therefore, the students still made many errors in their constructing sentence. It is not something to regret because the error kind of the process to get better on future writing. The error will be decreasing if the English knowledge of the students' have been enough. Dulay et al. (1982:138) suggest that making errors is common since it is part of the process of learning a language and by making errors, The students are expected to do some improvement in the future.

6. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Most of the chosen students at the eleventh grade of SMA N 5 Bandar Lampung, XI IPA 3 Class, still committed all the four error types of *surface strategy taxonomy*. It means that although the students were taught English 12 hours a week, they still had problem with English grammar. In other words, they still made many errors in terms of English grammar.

The percentage and frequency of the errors (ranked from the type of error that is mostly made by the students) identified in the students' constructing conditional sentence are:

  a) based on *surface strategy taxonomy*
- Errors in misformation:166 errors or 54.07%
- Errors in omission: 74 errors or 28.46%
- Errors in addition: 18 errors or 6.94 %
- Errors in misordering: 1 errors or 0.38%

  b) *Surface strategy taxonomy* based on type of the error
- Type one: omission 46 errors (17.76%), addition 7 errors (2.70%), misfromation 19 errors (7.33%), and misorderin 1 error (0.38%).
- Type two: omission 10 errors (3.86%), addition 11 errors (4.24%), and misformation 62 errors (23.93%).
- Type three: omission 18 errors (6.94%), and misformation 85 errors (32.81%).

Type one the common error happened on the omission because the students missed to add *–s/-es* after verb on the singular subject. They missed to add *to be* (am, is, and are) on nominal sentence. On type two the dominant error had been faced on misformation error they did not add verb two on past participle and they added *will* not *would*. On type three, miss formation was the dominant because the students added verb one or two not the verb three after *had,* and they failed on construct the right form of *would have* and inserted the verb three after that..

English teachers may use the information of the types of students' errors as a guidance to evaluate the weakness or progress of students' ability in learning English, particularly in terms of constructing conditional sentence. They should take the errors into account, analyze them and provide proper correction. In order to minimize students' errors, the teacher should improve the students' knowledge of English grammar by teaching them how to construct sentences that are grammatically and semantically correct, and

by explaining the functions of the language area itself. Besides, the teacher has to set the first priority to the errors that mostly occur.

REFERENCES

[1] Armstrong, S, Mclvor G, McNeill, F. and McGuinness P. 2013. *International Evidence Review of Conditional (Suspended) Sentences.* Canbera. Canbera University press

[2] Azzar, Betty Schrampfer. 1999. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. New York:Prentice Hall Regents.Brown, H.D. 1982. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

[3] Brown, D.H. 2000. *Principles of Language learning and Teaching.Edition Fourth*. Saan Fransisco Statae University: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

[4] Corder, S.P. 1981.*Error Analysis and Interlanguage.*New York: Oxford University Press.

[5] Creswell, John W. 2012. *Educational Research*. New York: Nerbraska University.

[6] Dullay, H, Marina B. and Krashen, S. 1982. *Language Two*.New York: Oxford University Press.

[7] Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English Teaching in Indonesia. *EA Journal, 18*(1), pp. 22-30.

[8] Ellis, Rod.1986. *Understanding Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[9] Els, T.V. 1984.*Applied Linguistics and the Learning and Teaching of Foreign Languages.*Great Britain: Edward Arnold Publishers.

[10] Ellis, Ro. 1986. *Understanding Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[11] Haerazi, M.Hum.2011. *Pendekatan Pembelajaran Bahasa* .Samudera Biru. Yogyakarta.

[12] Hariyono, Rudy. 2002. *Complete English Grammar*. Surabaya: Gitamedia Press.

[13] Harmer, Jerremy.1991. *English language Study and Teaching Foreign Speakers*. New York: Longman.

[14] James, Carl.1998. *Error in Language Learning and Use: exploring error Analysis.* London and New York: Longman.

[15] Lowenberg, P. H. 1991. English as An Additional Language in Indonesia. *World Englishes,* (1), pp. 127-138.

[16] Mcmillan, James H. 1996. *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer*.Virginia: Commonwealth University.

[17] Nur, C. (2004). English Language Teaching in Indonesia: Changing Policies and Practices. In H. w. Kam & R. Y. L. Wong (Eds.), *English Language Teaching in East Asia Today: Changing Policies and Practices* (2 ed., pp. 178-186). Singapore: Eastern University Press.

[18] Oshima, A. (1991). *Writing academic English* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

[19] Phillips, Deborah.2001. *Complete Course for The TOEFL Test*. New York: Longman.

[20] Richards, J. C. And Rodger. T. S. 1986. *Approach and Method in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[21] Seidlhofer, Barbara.(2005. *English as a Lingua Franca'. In: ELT Journal* 59/4 (on-line). 6 Des. 2013. http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/59/4/339.pdf

[22] Setiyadi, B. 2006.*Metode Penelitian untuk pengajaran Bahasa Asing Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif.*Yogyakarta: Penerbit Graha Ilmu.

[23] Supono, I & Cahya, W. 2004. *Panduan Menguasai 16 Tenses*. Jakarta: Kawan Pustaka

9 772303 141001