MILIK PERPUSTAKAAN
UNIVERSITAS JEMBER

AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' COMPOSITION TAKING WRITING I COURSE USING SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY AT THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF FKIP THE UNIVERSITY JEMBER 1997/1998 ACADEMIC YEAR

THESIS

Presented as One of the Requirements to Get the Award of
Undergraduate Degree of the English Program Language and Arts
Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
the University of Jember

Asal : Hadiah Pembelian
Terima Tgl : 28 OCT 2000
No. Induk : 10231 29/2000
Klass 828 SUP e

BY :

Supatmo Efendy
9202107063

FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF JEMBER
2000

MOTTO

اِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِيُسْرًا (الانسراح ٩٣:٥)

Every hardship is followed by ease (Al-Inshirah 94:5)
(adapted from Mahmud Y. Zayid)

وَكُلُّ صَغِيْرٍ وَكَبِيْرٍمُّسْتَطَرٌ (القمر :٥٣)

Every action small or great is noted down (Al-Qamar:53)
(adapted from Mahmud Y. Zayid)

People become well-known because of their writing (Gumuk Kid)

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to :

1. my father, mother, sisters, brothers;
2. all my lecturers;
3. my charming fellow citizen, Teater Tiang FKIP;
4. my dramaturgists; kang Eko Suwargono, Ki Agung Lombok Sakti Cahyo Nugroho;
5. my alma mater.

AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' COMPOSITION TAKING
WRITING I COURSE USING SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY AT
THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF FKIP
THE UNIVERSITY OF JEMBER
1997/1998 ACADEMIC YEAR

THESIS

Proposed to fulfill one of the requirements to obtain undergraduate degree at The English Program, Language and Arts Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education theUniversity of Jember

NAME : SUPATMO EFENDY
NIM : 9202107063
LEVEL : 1992
BIRTHPLACE : SAMPANG
BIRTH YEAR : 28TH DECEMBER 1973
DEPARTMENT : LANGUAGE AND ARTS
PROGRAM : ENGLISH

APPROVED

CONSULTANT I

Drs. H. M. Sjakir Hadie Ks. MSA
NIP. 130 325 916

CONSULTANT II

Drs. Budi Setyono,MA
NIP. 132 086 412

APPROVAL

This thesis is approved and received by the examiners' team of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education The University of Jember

Examined on : 5th August 2000
Place : Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
the University of Jember

The committee

The Chairwoman

Dra. Zakiyah Tasnim, MA
NIP.131 658 394

The Secretary

Drs. Budi Setyono, MA
NIP. 131 877 579

The members :

1. Drs. H. M. Sjakir Hadie Ks., MSA
NIP. 130 325 912 (.....)

2. Drs. M. Sulthon Masyhud, MPd
NIP. 130 937 190 (.....)

On Behalf of The Dean

Drs. Djoko Suhud
NIP. 130 355 407

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I do thank my God because of finishing this thesis. Then there are several people whose contribution to this thesis would like to acknowledge. I am very grateful to:

1. my first consultant who gives useful comments and generous help on parts of this thesis;
2. my second consultant who reads and criticizes all draft of the present thesis and her tireless dedication to the preparation of the manuscript of this thesis;
3. I am much indebted to the Dean who gives permission conducting the research at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education;
4. I am extremely grateful to students who take Writing I at the English Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education University of Jember 1997/1998 academic year;
5. and last but not least, to my dad, mum, and friends who give great support to finish this thesis.

I do hope that this thesis will be invaluable finding in developing and refining teaching learning in language teaching. So the teaching English as foreign language in Indonesia will be more perfect in the future. And I do hope some research findings in this thesis will be further investigation by another researcher.

Jember, August 2000 the writer

MILIK PERPUSTAKAAN
UNIVERSITAS JEMBER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

TITLE i
MOTTO ii
DEDICATION iii
CONSULTANTS' APPROVAL iv
APPROVAL OF EXAMINERS' TEAM v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS vii
LIST OF TABLE ix
ABSTRACT x

CHAPTER I : INTRODUCTION
1.1Background of the Study 1
1.2 Problem Formulation 4
1.2.1 Main Problem 5
1.2.2 Specific Problem 5
1.3 Operational Definition 6
1.3.1 Error Analysis 6
1.3.2 Composition Writing 6
1.3.3 Surface Strategy Taxonomy.....6
1.3.4 Writing I at the English Department 7
1.4 Objective of the Study 7
1.4.1 Main Objective 7
1.4.2 Specific Objective 7
1.5 Significance of the Study 8
1.5.1 For FKIP University of Jember 8
1.5.2 For English Students 8
1.5.3 For Writing I Lecturer 8
1.5.4 For Other Researchers 8

CHAPTER II : REVIEW OF LITERATURE
2.1 Nature of Error Analysis 9
2.2 Significance of Error Analysis.....10
2.3 Source of Language Errors 12
2.4 Types of Language Errors 12
2.5 Surface Strategy Taxonomy 13
2.5.1 Omission 14
2.5.2 Addition 15
2.5.3 Misformation 16
2.5.4 Misordering 17
2.6 Composition Writing 18

2.7 Syllabus Design of Writing I 23

CHAPTER III : RESEARCH METHOD
3.1 Research Design 25
3.2 Area Determination Method 26
3.3 Research Subject 26
3.4 Data Collection Method 27
3.4.1 Composition Writing Test 27
3.4.2 Documentation 28
3.5 Procedures of Error Analysis 29
3.5.1 Collecting Errors 29
3.5.2 Identifying Errors 30
3.5.3 Classifying and Explaining Errors 30
3.5.4 Data Analysis 31

CHAPTER IV : RESULT AND ANALYSIS
4.1 Supporting Data 33
4.1.1 Result of Documentation 33
4.2 The Main Data 33
4.2.1 Result of Collecting Errors 33
4.2.2 Result of Classifying Errors 33
4.2.3 Result of Evaluating Errors 44
4.3 Data Analysis 44
4.4 Discussion 46

CHAPTER V : CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION
5.1 Conclusion 50
5.2 Suggestion 50
5.2.1 For English Students 50
5.2.2 For the English lecturer 51

BIBLOGRAPHY
APPENDICES
1. Research Matrix
2. Written Test
3. Names of Research Subject
4. Syllabus Design of Writing I
5. Instructional Analysis of Writing I
6. The Result of Collecting Errors

LIST OF TABLES

NO	Name of Table	Page
1	The Example of Omission Errors According to Surface Strategy Taxonomy	14
2	The Example of Addition Errors According to Surface Strategy Taxonomy	16
3	The Example of Misformation Errors According to Surface Strategy Taxonomy	16
4	The Example of Misordering Errors According to Surface Strategy Taxonomy	17
5	The Procedure of Written Error Analysis	25
6	Classification of Errors of Each Indicator	32
7	The Result of Classifying Omission Errors Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy	34
8	The Result of Classifying Addition Errors Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy	37
9	The Result of Classifying Misformation Errors Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy	39
10	The Result of Classifying Misordering Errors Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy	43
11	The Total Errors of Each Category Based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy	44
12	Tabulation of Errors of each Category in Surface Strategy Taxonomy	44
13	Tabulation of Errors in the Surface Strategy Taxonomy	45
14	Result of Classification Errors of Each Indicator	46

ABSTRACT

Supatmo Efendy, August 2000, AN ERROR ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' COMPOSITION TAKING WRITING I COURSE USING SURFACE STRATEGY TAXONOMY AT THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF FKIP THE UNIVERSITY OF JEMBER 1997/1998 ACADEMIC YEAR

Thesis, English Program, Language and Arts Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education University of Jember
The consultants; (1) Drs. H. M. Sjakir Hadie Ks, MSA
(2) Drs. Budi Setyono, MA
The key words; surface strategy taxonomy, composition writing

Composition as one of the production skills is still very difficult to the learners because it is rarely used outside the classroom. The students make a number of errors in omission, addition, misformation, and misordering in their writing. This study concerned with error analysis in the surface strategy taxonomy. The research subjects were the students who took Writing I at the English Department of FKIP the University of Jember 19971998 academic year as the population of this study. The subjects were asked to write a composition in the form of a short paragraph, then their compositions were analyzed by using Ellis' outline based on the surface strategy taxonomy : omission, addition, misformation, and misordering category. The results showed that there were misformation errors 162 (43,20%), omission errors 126 (33,60%), addition errors 69 (18,40%), and misordering errors 18 (4,80%). The highest percentage was misformation errors that reach 43,20 %. It indicates that the students face difficulties in applying the correct tense marker, preposition, and auxiliary. The lowest percentage was misordering errors that reach 4,80 %. It indicates that the teaching and learning English was successful especially in creating word order in English.

Hendrickson, James, 1979, *Errors Analysis and Errors Correction in Language Teaching*, Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Johnson, Keith, 1988, *Mistake Correction*, English Language Teaching Journal, 42/2, Oxford University Press, p. 85-92.

Meras, Edmond, 1962, *A Language Teacher's Guide*, New York: Herper and Row Publisher.

Richards, J. C., 1974, *Errors Analysis Perspective: on Second Language Acquisition*, London: Longman Group Limited.

Sharma, S. K., 1988, *Error Analysis; why and how?* The English Teaching Forum, Washington: United State information Agency.

Subiyakto-Nababan, Sri Utari, 1993, *Metodologi Pengajaran Bahasa*, Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Tarigan, Henry Guntur dan Djago Tarigan, 1988, *Pengajaran Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa*, Bandung: Angkasa.

Ubol, Charas, 1981, *An Error Analysis of English Composition by Thai Students*, Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.