ERROR ANALYSIS ON THE STUDENTS WRITING OF COMPLAINING LETTER AT FIFTH SEMESTER OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING DEPARTMENT OF UNISDA LAMONGAN

Buyun Khulel Islamic University of Darul 'Ulum Lamongan buyunkhulel@yahoo.co.id

ABSTRACT: This study presents the analysis of errors made by the students of fifth semester of English Language Teaching Department of UNISDA Lamongan in writing complaining letter based on the surface structure. The researcher uses descriptive qualitative as the research design of this study. In analyzing the data, the researcher follows some steps, they are: (1) coding the errors made by the students, (2) classifying the errors the students made, (3) discussing and summarize the findings. The researcher found that the level of grammatical accuracy in writing complaining letter was 71%. Then, the level of grammatical inaccuracy in writing complaining letter was 29%. The highest level of error was omission (51 errors or 48%). The second level of error was misinformation (24 errors or 23%). The third level of error was addition (16 errors or 15%). The last level of error was misordering (15 errors or 14%).

Keywords: Error Analysis, Writing, Complaining Letter

INTRODUCTION

For recent years, writing has been considered as a productive skill in English Language Teaching. But, there are many errors sometimes made by the students during their writing process. Therefore, the teachers need to classify the errors the students made then sanalyze them. Based on their analysis, the teachers will do some improvements in their teaching process to minimize the errors made by the students.

Based on explanation above, the researcher was eager to: (1) know the errors made by the students of fifth semester of English Language Teaching Department of UNISDA Lamongan in writing complaining letter based on the surface structure and (2) find as well as classify the errors made by the students of fifth semester of English Language Teaching Department of UNISDA Lamongan in writing complaining letter based on the surface structure.

Corder (1973) describe that mistakes are deviation due to performance factors such as memory limited (e.g. mistake in the sequence of tenses and agreement in long sentence), spelling, pronunciation, fatigue emotional strains, physical states – such as tiredness and psychological condition such as strong emotion. in relation to kinds of errors. According to Dulay (as cited in Ali, 2005) emphasized the ways the surface structure is lathered: learner's may omit necessary ones, malformation items, or disordered them. Those errors may be in the form of omission, addition, misinformation, and disordering. Omission is characterized by the absence of an item that appears in well formed utterance. Addition is characterized by the presence of an item while must not appear in a well formed utterance. Misinformation is characterized by the use or the wrong form the morpheme or structure. Misordering is characterized by the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morpheme in an utterance.

METHOD

This study uses descriptive qualitative as the research design. According to Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012), certain kinds of research questions can best be answered by observing how people act or how things look. Agreed with that argument, in this study the researcher used observation as the technique.

This study aimed to identify errors made by the students of fifth semester of English Language Teaching Department UNISDA Lamongan in writing complaining letter based on the surface structure. The researcher used the classification of errors based on surface structure by Dulay.

The data consisted of complaining letters from 36 the students of fifth semester English Language Teaching Department of UNISDA Lamongan. The data were written of complaining letter done by the students. From those 36 the students written of complaining letters, the researcher found 327 sentences.

In this study, the instrument was the researcher himself as the key human instrument. In collecting the data, the researcher chose some sentences containing some errors made by the students of fifth semester of English Language Teaching Department UNISDA Lamongan in writing complaining letter based on the surface structure. As guidance in this study, the researcher used table (as cited by Permadi and Prayogo, 2012) as follow in classifying the data.

No	Sentences	0	Mf	Α	Mr
1	It make me understand	\checkmark			
2	I had never do before		\checkmark		
3	Because in the morning I don't have on time				
4	I get reasonable money for my need daily				
	Total Frequency				

Table 1. The Classification of Errors based on Surface Structure

Notes:

O: Omission Mf: Misformation

A: Addition Mr: Misordering

Table 2. The Distribution of Omission Error (Sample of Data Collection)

No	Sentences	Types of Omission Errors								
		-sP	Ar	V	Oj	-sS	Р	Ot	-ed	Av
1	I think that my opinion									
2	I have many visitor									
	Frequency	1		1						

Notes:

-sP: 's' for plural nouns Ar: Articles V: Verb or to be Oj: Object -sS: 's' for third person singular P: Preposition

Ot: 'other' to referring the previous information -ed: 'ed' to performing past verb Av: Adverb

Edulitics 2015

No	Sentences	Г	Types of Misinformation Errors					
		V	Ps	SP	TB	Р	Α	Μ
1	I try to production a handicraft	\checkmark						
2	Study can teach our many thing							
Frequency			1					
Notes:								
V: Verb		Prepositi	on					
Ps: Part of Speech		Articles						

M: Modal

Table 3. The Distribution of Misinformation Error (Sample of Data Collection)

Table 4. The Distr	ibution of Additior	error (Sample	of Data Collection)

No	Sentences	Туре	Types of Addition Errors			
		-sN	IW	Α	-sS	
1	The salary is reasonable					
2	My suggestions is select the good way					
Frequency		1			1	

Notes:

TB: to be

-sN: 's' to modify noun IW: Improper Words

SP: Singular and Plural

A: Articles -sS: 's' to singular noun

The data were taken from the students' task to write complaining letter in Writing IV subject consisting of 327 sentences. The researcher first read and analyzes those complaining letters. During reading and analyzing process, the researcher makes a list to identifying some errors made by the students. To help the researcher in analyzing the specific error, the researcher divided omission (table 2), misinformation (table 3), and addition (table 4) in different tables. The researcher did not make a table for misordering error because it could be explained only by single explanation (as cited in Permadi and Proyogo, 2012).

After collecting the data, the researcher analyzed them using some steps, they were: (1) coding some errors made by the students, (2) classifying the data to find out the frequency, and (3) discussing and summarizing the findings.

The percentage of the errors was counted with the following formula (as cited in Permadi and Prayogo, 2012):

$$The precentage = \frac{Frequency (F)}{Total of Occurences} \times 100\%$$

FINDINGS

Those 36 complaining letters consist of 327 sentences. After coding and analysing each of the sentences, the researcher finds out that 232 out of 327 sentences are grammatically correct based on surface structure. It means that the level of grammatical accuracy in those complaining letters is 71%.

From the data, the researcher also tabulates the grammatical errors based on the surface structure. The researcher finds out that 95 out of 327 sentences are grammatically ill-formed. It means the level of grammatical inaccuracy is 29%. The frequency of each type of errors can be described in the Table 5 (as cited in Permadi and Prayogo, 2012)

No	Types of errors	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Omission	51	48
2	Misinformation	24	23
3	Addition	16	15
4	Misordering	15	14
	Total	106	100

 Table 5. The Frequency of Each Type of Errors (Based on Surface Structure)

The table shows that there are 106 types of errors found in 95 sentences. The students made the highest level of error in omission which is 51 errors or 48% of the total occurrences. The second level of error that the students made is misinformation which is 24 errors or 23% of the total occurrences. The third level of error that the students made is addition which is 16 errors or 15% of the total occurrences. The last type of error that the students made is misordering which is 15 errors or 14% of the total occurrences.

DISCUSSIONS

As the researcher has explained above, the highest level of error occurred in the complaining letters is omission with 51 (48%) out of 106 of the total occurrences. The highest distribution of omission errors is occurred in the omission of the 's' for plural nouns. For example, the student tends to omit -s inflection in the sentence *I will there were some* **problem**. The word **problem** must be in the plural form instead of singular one.

Then, the second level of error made by the students is misinformation error with 24 (23%) out of 106 of the total occurrences. The highest distribution is occurred in the use of part of speech form. For example the sentence *the salary* **are** good enough for me. The to be *are* must be changed by *is* in correlation with singular subject.

The third level of error made by the students is addition error with 16 (15%) out of 106 of the total occurrences. The highest distribution is occurred in the use of improper word form. For example the sentence I must can teach every day. The modal can should be changed by be able to because there are no two modal in a series.

The last type of error made by the students is misordering error with 15 (14%) out of 106 of the total occurrences. Here, the researcher does not distribute misordering error into different types since the tendency of the writer to make this error is done with the same reason. The reason is again because of the writer L1 interference (as cited in Permadi and Prayogo, 2012). For example *Teacher is a work glorious*. The words *work glorious* directly translated into English without considering the English grammar rules.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

From discussions above, the researcher found the level of accuracy in complaining letter written by the students was 71% based on 232 out of 327 sentences. The researcher found 106 types of errors in 95 sentences. The levels of errors were divided into omission with 51 errors, misinformation with 24 errors, addition with 16 errors, and misordering with 15 errors.

The suggestions of this study are directed to:

a. Lecturers and Students

It is suggested that the lectures can improve their teaching process on grammatical understanding by analyzing the errors that the students made. The lectures are able to know the errors and then anticipate them in order not to occur again. Then, for the students, this study can be used as a reference in understanding their grammatical competence.

b. Other Researchers

The researcher realizes that this study is too limited. This study needs more improvements. There are some aspects that can be analyzed deeper. So, by reading this study, other researchers are hoped get little bit knowledge. Then this study can be used as their reference in their next researches.

REFERENCES

Ali, Madekhan. 2005. Error Analysis Handout. Unpublished.

Brown, H. D. 2001. Teaching by Principles. New York: Addision Wesley Longman Inc.

- Corder, S.P. 1973. The Significance of Learners Errors in Jack, C. Richard (ed.), Error Analysis: *Perspective on second Language Acquisition*. Longman.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Norman E. Wallen, and Helen H. Hyun. 2012. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.

Permadi, M. B. and Johannes, A. P. 2012. *Grammatical Accuracy in the Promotion Media of Tourism in Batu-East Java*. Malang.