**CHAPTER IV**

**THE FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents the research finding of data followed by the discussion that could be derived from the analysis.

1. **Descriptive of The Location of the Research**
2. The Brief Story of SMPN 5 Trenggalek

In first time, SMPN 5 Trenggalek came from technical school. In 1991, it was changed to SMPN 5 Trenggalek until righ now.

1. The Vision of SMPN 5 Trenggalek

Achievement, Skilled, Cultured, and Pious based faith

Indicators Vision:

1. Having an excellence in academic achievement
2. Having a-non academic achievements
3. It has an area of skills excellence
4. Having the advantages noble cultural values in school
5. Cultivate faith and piety for all people in the school
6. The Mission of SMPN 5 Trenggalek
7. Improving the quality of students' academic achievement by implementing active learning, inopatif, creative, effective, and fun (PAIKEM)
8. Improving the quality of non-academic achievements of students throughself-developing.
9. Improving the skills of students in the field of automotive: Las, electricity and basic motor and metalworking; Building: wood crafts, ceramics, and cement; domesticity: culinary and fashion
10. Increasing awareness of noble character in the association
11. Increasing awareness of worship according to their religion
12. The Geographical Location of SMPN 5 Trenggalek

The geographical of this research is SMPN 5 Trenggalek is:

1. West side : Dinas Pendidikan
2. East side :Jl. R.A Kartini
3. North side :Jl. R.A Kartini
4. South side : SMKN 2 Trenggalek
5. The Facilities of The School

**TABLE 4.1**

**THE LIST OF FACILITIES**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Jenis Bangunan** | **Jumlah** | **Kondisi** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| 1. | Classroom | 18 | Good |
| 2. | The headmaster office | 1 | Good |
| 3. | The principal's offic | 1 | Good |
| 4. | Staffroom | 1 | Good |
| 5. | Space administration | 1 | Good |
| 6. | Library | 1 | Good |
| 7. | Lab.IPA | 1 | Good |
| 8. | Lab. ICT | 1 | Good |
| 9. | Lab. Automotive Skills | 1 | Good |
| 10. | Lab. Building Skills | 1 | Good |
| 11. | Lab. Tata culinary skills | 1 | Good |
| 12. | Lab. Tata Skills fashion | 1 | Good |
| 13. | Field volley ball | 1 | Good |
| 14. | Basketball Field | 1 | Good |
| 15. | Field Takrow | 1 | Good |
| 16. | Warehouse | 1 | Good |
| 17. | Canteen | 3 | Good |
| 18. | UKS space | 1 | Good |
| 19. | BK space | 1 | Good |
| 20. | Bathroom/WC | 5 | Good |
| 21. | Parking student/pupil | 3 | Good |
| 22. | Cooperative | 1 | Good |

From the table above, it can be said that the SMPN 5 Trenggalek have good facilities to develop process of teaching and learning.

1. The Teachers

The total numbers of the teachers at SMPN 5 Trenggalek are 55 people.

**TABLE 4.2**

**THE NUMBER OF TEACHERS OF SMPN 5 TRENGGALEK**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Name** | **Job** | **Subject** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| 1. | Suryanto, S.Pd., M.Pd | Headmaster | - |
| 2. | Dra. Heni Tri Siswati | Teacher | Social studies |
| 3. | Darat, S.Pd | Teacher | Guidance of counseling |
| 4. | Drs. Agus Wahono | Teacher | Building techniques |
| 5. | Eko Heri Suprihatin, S.Pd | Teacher | Mathematics |
| 6. | Drs. Prayitno | Teacher | Mathematics |
| 7. | Dyah Kusumaningtyas, S.Pd | Teacher | Indonesian |
| 8. | A.Endang Widayati, S.Pd | Teacher | Social studies |
| 9. | Suparmi, S.Pd | Teacher | Social studies |
| 10. | Winartin, S.Pd | Teacher | Indonesian |
| 11. | Suparti,S.Pd | Teacher | Civics education |
| 12. | Jemirin, S.Pd | Teacher | Mathematics |
| 13. | Drs. Hery Suseno | Teacher | Building techniques |
| 14. | Suyoto, S.Pd | Teacher | Civics education |
| 15. | Sutarji, S.Pd | Teacher | Civics education |
| 16. | Siti Sholihatun, S.Pd.I | Teacher | Islamic religious education |
| 17. | Katmiati | Teacher | Household skills |
| 18. | Sringatin, S.Pd | Teacher | Indonesian |
| 19. | Endah Yuharmiati, S,Pd | Teacher | Guidance of counseling |
| 20. | Supriyanto, S.Pd | Teacher | Social studies |
| 21. | Marzuki, S.Pd | Teacher | Physical education and health |
| 22. | Dra. Harsasi Agus Dwiana | Teacher | Indonesian |
| 23. | Suratman, S,Pd | Teacher | Building techniques |
| 24. | Dra. Suciati | Teacher | Fashion skills |
| 25. | Asri Setyowati, S.Pd | Teacher | Culinary skills |
| 26. | Puguh Purwanto, S.Pd | Teacher | Natural sciences |
| 27. | Joko Santoro, S.Pd | Teacher | Automotive engineering |
| 28. | Sugeng Riyanto, S.Pd | Teacher | Natural sciences |
| 29. | Tutik Purnomo R.,S.Pd | Teacher | Fashion skills |
| 30. | Drs. Eko Trio Juma K. | Teacher | Automotive engineering |
| 31. | Puji Lestari, S.Pd | Teacher | Culinary skills |
| 32. | Tri Winarsih, S.Pd | Teacher | English |
| 33. | Slamet Hariadi, S.Pd | Teacher | English |
| 34. | Imbang Winarni, S.Pd | Teacher | Natural sciences |
| 35. | A.Wardoyo, S.Pd | Teacher | Automotive engineering |
| 36. | Dyah Sabekti, S.Pd | Teacher | Natural sciences |
| 37. | Siti Komariyah, S.Pd | Teacher | English |
| 38. | Minta Karyawati, S.Pd | Teacher | Vernicular |
| 39. | Suprapti, S.Pd | Teacher | English |
| 40. | Siswoyo, S.Pd | Teacher | Art and culture |
| 41. | Agus Sudarto, S.Pd | Teacher | Natural sciences |
| 42. | Anggraini, S.Pd | Teacher | Art and culture |
| 43. | Hajar Rohmah, S.Pd | Teacher | Mathematics |
| 44. | Cipto Utomo,S.Pd | Teacher | Automotive engineering |
| 45. | Mattobi’i, S.Pd | Teacher | Guidance of counseling |
| 46. | Ibud Sri Budi, S.Pd | Teacher | Fashion skills |
| 47. | Dewi Muslihah, S.Pd | Teacher | Mathematics |
| 48. | Nuris Pangesti, S. Pd | Teacher | Guidance of counseling |
| 49. | Purwo Bagus Wijanarko, S.Kom | Teacher | Information and technology skills |
| 50. | Mimin Sukristiana, S.Th | Teacher | Christian religious education |
| 51. | M. Ida Rosali, S.Th | Teacher | Chatolic religious education |
| 52. | Erik Agustina, S.Pd | Teacher | English |
| 53. | Sri Utami, S.Pd | Teacher | Indonesian |
| 54. | Hery Wahyudi D.,S.T | Teacher | Building techniques |
| 55. | Nurhikmawati | Teacher | Indonesian |

1. The Students

The total numbers of the students at SMPN 5 Trenggalek are 717 that consist of 396 male and 321 females.

**TABLE 4.3**

**THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS OF SMPN 5 TRENGGALEK**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Class** | **Gender** | | **Total** |
| **Male** | **female** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. | VII-A | 16 | 18 | 34 |
| 2. | VII-B | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 3. | VII-C | 17 | 17 | 34 |
| 4. | VII-D | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 5. | VII-E | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 6. | VII-F | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 7. | VII-G | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 8. | VIII-A | 21 | 19 | 40 |
| 9. | VIII-B | 19 | 22 | 41 |
| 10. | VIII-C | 20 | 21 | 41 |
| 11. | VIII-D | 18 | 22 | 40 |
| 12. | VIII-E | 21 | 19 | 40 |
| 13. | VIII-F | 20 | 20 | 40 |
| 14. | IX-A | 26 | 14 | 40 |
| 15. | IX-B | 27 | 12 | 39 |
| 16. | IX-C | 25 | 14 | 39 |
| 17. | IX-D | 26 | 14 | 40 |
| 18. | IX-E | 24 | 16 | 40 |
| 19. | IX-F | 26 | 13 | 39 |
| **Total** | | **396** | **321** | **717** |

Based on the table above, it can be said that the majority of students at SMPN 5 Trenggalek is male. It can be seen from the total number of male 396 students and female is 321 students.

1. The Organization of SMPN 5 Trenggalek

Headmaster : Suryanto,S.Pd., M.Pd

Vice Headmaster : Suyoto, S.Pd

Curriculum Matters : 1. Cipto Utomo,S.Pd

2. Slamet Hariadi,S.Pd

Student Affairs : 1.Marzuki, S.Pd

2. Agus Endang W.,S.Pd

Affairs Public Relations : Dyah Kusumaningtyas, S.Pd

Based on the explanation above, the organization of SMPN 5 Trenggalek is simple. It can be seen from the data above, that the organization consists of 5 divisions. They are: Headmaster, vise headmaster, curriculum matter, student affairs, and affairs public relations.

1. The curriculum structure of SMPN 5 Trenggalek

To know what the materials and time allocation of each material of SMPN 5 Trenggalek, the writer provides a table as below:

**TABLE 4.4**

**THE CURRICULUM STRUCTURE OF SMPN 5 TRENGGALEK**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | Class and Time Allocation | | |
| **VII** | **VIII** | **IX** |
| A. Subject |  |  |  |
| 1. Religious Education | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2. Civics Education | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3. Indonesian | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4. English | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5. Mathematics | 4 + 1 | 4 + 1 | 4 + 1 |
| 6. Natural sciences | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 7. Social studies | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 8. Art and Cukture | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 9. Physical Education and Health | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1. Information and Technology Skills | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| B. Local Content  1. Vernacular  2. Environmental Education | 2  2 | 2  2 | 2  2 |
| C. Self-Development  1. Guidance and Counseling  2. Extracurricular :  2.1 Scout  2.2 Sports  2.2.1 Basket ball  2.2.2 Volley ball  2.2.3 Table tennis  2.3 Art  2.3.1 Art music  2.3.2 Dance  2.3.3 Drum band  2.4 Scientific Work of Youth | 2\*) | 2\*) | 2\*) |
| D. Characteristics os School Subjects  1. Skills | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| **Total** | **41** | **41** | **41** |

Explanation:

\*) Additional allocation of teaching hour

\*\*) The elective subjects

2\*\*\*)Equivalent to 2 hours of teaching

1. **Presentation of The Data**

Presentation of the data is done to reveal the result of the test that has been carried out to the subject of the research. The respondents of the research are 39 students of one class VIII-A of SMPN 5 Trenggalek. To understand well, the writer encloses the research of the test of the student’s ability in using preposition in sentences.

TABLE 4.5

THE SCORE OF THE STUDENTS OF CLASS VIII-A IN USING PREPOSITION

**“AT”,”IN”,”ON”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NO.** | **NAME** | **SCORE** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** |
| 1. | Aak Adang Sayekti | 54 |
| 2. | Agus Muhammad Choirul A. | 46 |
| 3. | Ahmad Nasron | 52 |
| 4. | Ajeng Ayunita P. | 50 |
| 5. | Ana Dwi Puspitasari | 48 |
| 6. | Angga Dwi Saputra | 54 |
| 7. | Bagus Dwi Riyanto | 40 |
| 8. | Bagus Dwi Sasongko | 58 |
| 9. | Bagus Nur Wahyudi | 62 |
| 10. | Bagus Sasongko Aji | 40 |
| 11. | Bimas Rio Yuliana | 74 |
| 12. | Budi Haryono | 40 |
| 13. | Choils Triani | 66 |
| 14. | Dharma Diana Diyah H | 52 |
| 15. | Dini Meilia Darmawijayanti | 48 |
| 16. | Dwi Prasiska Dewi | 54 |
| 17. | Eko yulianto | 44 |
| 18. | Erfan Prasetyo | 46 |
| 19. | Erny Mumayizah | 52 |
| 20. | Faisyah Wahyuningtyas | 54 |
| 21. | Fajar Zyahrul Anwar | 56 |
| 22. | Fauzy Dwi Masrul | 54 |
| 23. | Fianaprilla Rafionita | 48 |
| 24. | Fitri Retna Sari | 62 |
| 25. | Ibnu Mubarok | 30 |
| 26. | Ika Yunitasari Algadri | 50 |
| 27. | Ike Yuliana | 60 |
| 28. | Muhammad Fajar Hidayat | 60 |
| 29. | Muhammad Mardiana Putra | 56 |
| 30. | Nesthi Widya Palupi | 48 |
| 31. | Reda Fatmaningrum | 62 |
| 32. | Riska Dewi Nur Intansari | 58 |
| 33. | Riska Laylatun Nikmah | 42 |
| 34. | Rizqi Agung Samodra | 38 |
| 35. | Syahputra Eka Darmono | 68 |
| 36. | Tika Alifatul Habibah | 50 |
| 37. | Tri Hananing Tyas | 50 |
| 38. | Wahyu Isprantoro | 52 |
| 39. | Yanna Rantika Sari | 54 |
| 40. | Zaki Nur Afandi | 56 |

After giving the score to the result of the test, the writer counted the errors made by the students. The table below is the data of error made by the students of class VIII-A in using preposition *“at”, “in”, and “on”* in students.

1. **Findings**

The findings of this study are based on some facts found in the data. They cover the identification of errors, classification of errors, and tabulating of errors.

1. Identification of Errors

This chapter leads the researcher to explain about the result of her study. This attempt is to answer research questions as stated in Chapter I, especially concerning to the student’s errors in using preposition *at, in, and on*. The identification is done on the basis of computation on the error made by the students. The total score of frequency of errors in the study are 862 from 40 students.

The students’ errors of class VIII-An in using preposition “*at”,” in”, and “on*” is follow:

1. “At” = 289 errors
2. “In”= 255 errors
3. “On”= 318 errors
4. Classification of Errors

The classification of errors into each type of errors is conducted in accordance with Dulay’s classification, i.e. errors of omission, additions, misformation, and misordering by comparing the original sentences which are made by the students and reconstructed sentences in the target language. As stated in the data analysis in Chapter III, the classification of the students’ error in using preposition *at, in, and on* are done based on surface strategy taxonomy as follows:

1. Omission Errors

Omission Errors are identified by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. Here, they are indicated by the absence of the preposition *at, in or on* in a certain construction in which they are actually required. The errors of omission identified in the study are:

1. Omission error in using **“At”**

This type of errors is identified by the absence of preposition at. The following is the example of omission errors in using preposition *at.*

e.g The girl is standing the corner

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be:

The girl is standing at the corner

1. Omission error in using **“In”**

This type of errors is identified by the absence of preposition in and the result in an incorrect sentence construction. The following is the example of omission errors in using preposition *in.*

e.g The Eiffel tower is Paris

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be:

The Eiffel tower is in Paris

1. Omission error in using **“On”**

This type of errors is identified by the absence of preposition on and the result in an incorrect sentence construction. The following is the example of omission errors in using preposition *on.*

e.g The picture is the wall

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be:

The picture is on the wall

1. Addition Errors

Addition Errors are characterized by the presence of one or more unnecessary items in a well-formed sentence. Thus, errors in addition is indicated by the presence of preposition at, in, and on when the prepositions are not required. The addition errors identified this study are:

1. Addition error in using preposition **“At”**

The following is the example shows addition error in using

Preposition *at*

e.g They got married at this year

This sentence above is ill-formed because there is a simple addition is the presence of preposition *at.*

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be:

They got married this year

1. Addition error in using preposition **“In”**

The following is the example indicating the error of simple addition in using in

e.g My father went to Kediri in last week

The sentence above is incorrect because of the presence *in*.

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be:

My father went to Kediri last week

1. Addition error in using preposition **“On”**

The sentence below is an example indicating the error of simple addition in using preposition on

e.g The sun shines on everyday

The sentence above is incorrect because of the presence of preposition *on*.

The construction form of the sentence should be:

The sun shines everyday

1. Misformation Errors

The errors of misformation are indicated by the use of wrong form of the morphemes or structure. The errors in misformation identified in this study are:

1. Misformation error in using preposition **“At”**

The following sentence contains misformation errors in using preposition *at*.

e.g There is dirty at your nose

The sentence above is incorrect because the use of preposition is wrong. It is due to the archi or alternating form which use the preposition *at* in the sentence.

The reconstruction from of the sentence should be:

There is a dirty on your nose

1. Misformation error in using preposition **“In”**

The following sentence contains misformation in using preposition in

e.g The telephone and door bell rang in the same time

The sentence above is incorrect because of the ill-use of preposition. It is due to the archi or alternating form which use the preposition *in* in the sentence.

The reconstruction from of the sentence should be:

The telephone and door bell rang at the same time

1. Misformation error in using preposition **“On”**

The sentence below contains misformation errors in using preposition *on*

e.g Someone is knocking on the door

The sentence above is incorrect because of the wrong use of preposition. It is due to the archi or alternating form which use the preposition *on* in the sentence

The reconstruction from of the sentence should be:

Someone is knocking at the door

1. Misordering Errors

Misordering Errors are characterized by the in connect placement of a morpheme or a group of morphemes, in this study, the misordering error identified are misplacement in using preposition *at, in, and on*.

1. Misordering errors in using preposition **“At”**

This type of error is identified by the misplacement of preposition at. The following is the example of misordering error in using preposition *at* in the sentence

e.g There is at somebody the door

The preposition at above is formed incorrectly

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be

There is somebody at the door

1. Misordering errors in using preposition **“In”**

The following sentence is the example of misordering errors in using preposition of *in* in the sentences.

e.g I learnt to drive four in weeks

The sentence above is grammatically incorrect. It is due to the misplacement of preposition in which should be placed before the word “four”

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be :

I learnt to drive in four weeks

1. Misordering errors in using preposition **“On”**

The following sentence is the example of misordering errors in using preposition of *on* in the sentences.

e.g I usually go on every Monday

The sentence above is grammatically incorrect. It is due to the misplacement of preposition on which should be placed before the word of “Monday” while the word “evening” should be placed after the word”Monday”.

The reconstruction form of the sentence should be :

I usually go on Monday evening

Based on the classification of errors above it can be concluded that the errors type in using preposition *“at”, “in”, and “on”* made by the students of class VIII-A based on surface strategy taxonomy are omission, addition, misformation, and misordering errors.

1. Tabulating of Errors

As stated in the first part of this chapter, the writer has analyzed and classified the student’s errors in using preposition at, in, and on in this sentences. This part presents to not only the result of counting the error but also give clearer description of each type of errors. For counting and tabulating the errors, the writer uses formulation of cumulative frequency distribution as below:

**P = F x 100%**

**N**

Note : P : Symbols of percentage

N : The total number of types of errors

F : Number of types of errors

The description of the tabulated errors of the students of class VIII-A students in using preposition *“at”, “in”, and “on*” is done based on surface strategy taxonomy, as shown in the following tables :

The number of errors made by the students Class VIII-A

TABLE 4.6

THE NUMBER OF ERRORS IN USING PREPOSITION **“AT”**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Students/ Samples** | **Types of Error** | | | | **Total** |
| **Omission** | **Addition** | **Misformation** | **Misordering** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| 1. | Aak Adang Sayekti | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 2. | Agus Muhammad Choirul A. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 3. | Ahmad Nasron | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| 4. | Ajeng Ayunita P. | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 5. | Ana Dwi Puspitasari | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 6. | Angga Dwi Saputra | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 7. | Bagus Dwi Riyanto | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| 8. | Bagus Dwi Sasongko | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 9. | Bagus Nur Wahyudi | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 10. | Bagus Sasongko Aji | 3 | - | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 11. | Bimas Rio Yuliana | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 12. | Budi Haryono | 3 | - | 4 | 5 | 12 |
| 13. | Choils Triani | - | - | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 14. | Dharma Diana Diyah H | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 15. | Dini Meilia Darmawijayanti | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 16. | Dwi Prasiska Dewi | - | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 17. | Eko yulianto | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 18. | Erfan Prasetyo | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 9 |
| 19. | Erny Mumayizah | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 20. | Faisyah Wahyuningtyas | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| 21. | Fajar Zyahrul Anwar | 3 | 2 | 2 | - | 7 |
| 22. | Fauzy Dwi Masrul | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 5 |
| 23. | Fianaprilla Rafionita | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 24. | Fitri Retna Sari | - | 1 | 3 | - | 4 |
| 25. | Ibnu Mubarok | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| 26. | Ika Yunitasari Algadri | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| 27. | Ike Yuliana | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 4 |
| 28. | Muhammad Fajar Hidayat | - | - | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 29. | Muhammad Mardiana Putra | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 30. | Nesthi Widya Palupi | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 31. | Reda Fatmaningrum | 1 | 2 | 4 | - | 7 |
| 32. | Riska Dewi Nur Intansari | 1 | 3 | - | 1 | 5 |
| 33. | Riska Laylatun Nikmah | 2 | - | 3 | 4 | 9 |
| 34. | Rizqi Agung Samodra | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 |
| 35. | Syahputra Eka Darmono | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 36. | Tika Alifatul Habibah | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| 37. | Tri Hananing Tyas | 4 | 1 | - | 1 | 6 |
| 38. | Wahyu Isprantoro | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | 6 |
| 39. | Yanna Rantika Sari | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| 40. | Zaki Nur Afandi | - | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| **TOTAL** | | **70** | **61** | **83** | **75** | **289** |

Based on the table, the numbers of omission errors are 70, addition errors are 61, misformation errors are 83, and misordering errors are 75. So it can be concluded the highest frequency made by the students of class VIII-A in using preposition **“at”** is misformation errors. While, the lowest frequency is addition errors.

TABLE 4.7

THE NUMBER OF ERRORS IN USING PREPOSITION **“IN”**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Students/ Sample** | **Type of Errors** | | | | **Total** |
| **Omission** | **Addition** | **Misformation** | **Misordering** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| 1. | Aak Adang Sayekti | - | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 |
| 2. | Agus Muhammad Choirul A. | 1 | 2 | - | 4 | 7 |
| 3. | Ahmad Nasron | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 |
| 4. | Ajeng Ayunita P. | - | - | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 5. | Ana Dwi Puspitasari | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 6. | Angga Dwi Saputra | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| 7. | Bagus Dwi Riyanto | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| 8. | Bagus Dwi Sasongko | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 9. | Bagus Nur Wahyudi | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 10. | Bagus Sasongko Aji | 3 | - | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 11. | Bimas Rio Yuliana | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 12. | Budi Haryono | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 13. | Choils Triani | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 14. | Dharma Diana Diyah H | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 15. | Dini Meilia Darmawijayanti | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| 16. | Dwi Prasiska Dewi | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | 6 |
| 17. | Eko yulianto | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| 18. | Erfan Prasetyo | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| 19. | Erny Mumayizah | - | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| 20. | Faisyah Wahyuningtyas | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 21. | Fajar Zyahrul Anwar | 2 | - | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 22. | Fauzy Dwi Masrul | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | 5 |
| 23. | Fianaprilla Rafionita | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| 24. | Fitri Retna Sari | - | 1 | 1 | - | 2 |
| 25. | Ibnu Mubarok | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 26. | Ika Yunitasari Algadri | 2 | 4 | - | 3 | 9 |
| 27. | Ike Yuliana | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 4 |
| 28. | Muhammad Fajar Hidayat | 2 | 1 | 3 | - | 6 |
| 29. | Muhammad Mardiana Putra | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| 30. | Nesthi Widya Palupi | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 31. | Reda Fatmaningrum | - | 1 | 2 | - | 3 |
| 32. | Riska Dewi Nur Intansari | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 33. | Riska Laylatun Nikmah | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 34. | Rizqi Agung Samodra | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 11 |
| 35. | Syahputra Eka Darmono | 1 | 1 | - | 3 | 5 |
| 36. | Tika Alifatul Habibah | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| 37. | Tri Hananing Tyas | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 9 |
| 38. | Wahyu Isprantoro | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | 6 |
| 39. | Yanna Rantika Sari | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | 6 |
| 40. | Zaki Nur Afandi | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| **TOTAL** | | **62** | **61** | **63** | **69** | **255** |

Based on the table above, the numbers of omission errors are 62, addition errors are 61, misformation errors are 63, and misordering errors are 69. So it can be concluded the highest frequency made by the students of class VIII-A in using preposition **“in”** is misordering errors. While, the lowest frequency is addition errors.

TABLE 4.8

THE NUMBER OF ERRORS IN USING PREPOSITION **“ON”**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Students/ Sample** | **Type of Errors** | | | | **Total** |
| **Omission** | **Addition** | **Misformation** | **Misordering** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| 1. | Aak Adang Sayekti | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 2. | Agus Muhammad Choirul A. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 10 |
| 3. | Ahmad Nasron | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 4. | Ajeng Ayunita P. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| 5. | Ana Dwi Puspitasari | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 11 |
| 6. | Angga Dwi Saputra | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| 7. | Bagus Dwi Riyanto | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 8. | Bagus Dwi Sasongko | 1 | 3 | 2 | - | 6 |
| 9. | Bagus Nur Wahyudi | 3 | - | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| 10. | Bagus Sasongko Aji | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 11 |
| 11. | Bimas Rio Yuliana | - | 2 | - | - | 2 |
| 12. | Budi Haryono | 4 | 3 | - | 3 | 10 |
| 13. | Choils Triani | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| 14. | Dharma Diana Diyah H | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| 15. | Dini Meilia Darmawijayanti | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 |
| 16. | Dwi Prasiska Dewi | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| 17. | Eko yulianto | - | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 18. | Erfan Prasetyo | - | - | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 19. | Erny Mumayizah | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 20. | Faisyah Wahyuningtyas | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | 6 |
| 21. | Fajar Zyahrul Anwar | - | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| 22. | Fauzy Dwi Masrul | - | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| 23. | Fianaprilla Rafionita | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| 24. | Fitri Retna Sari | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| 25. | Ibnu Mubarok | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 11 |
| 26. | Ika Yunitasari Algadri | 2 | - | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| 27. | Ike Yuliana | - | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 28. | Muhammad Fajar Hidayat | 1 | 3 | - | 2 | 6 |
| 29. | Muhammad Mardiana Putra | - | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 30. | Nesthi Widya Palupi | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 10 |
| 31. | Reda Fatmaningrum | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| 32. | Riska Dewi Nur Intansari | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 9 |
| 33. | Riska Laylatun Nikmah | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| 34. | Rizqi Agung Samodra | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| 35. | Syahputra Eka Darmono | - | 2 | 1 | - | 3 |
| 36. | Tika Alifatul Habibah | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 7 |
| 37. | Tri Hananing Tyas | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 |
| 38. | Wahyu Isprantoro | 1 | 1 | 2 | - | 4 |
| 39. | Yanna Rantika Sari | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 9 |
| 40. | Zaki Nur Afandi | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| **TOTAL** | | **66** | **85** | **88** | **79** | **318** |

Based on the table, the numbers of omission errors are 66, addition errors are 85, misformation errors are 88, and misordering errors are 79. So it can be concluded the highest frequency made by the students of class VIII-A in using preposition **“on”** is misformation errors. While, the lowest frequency is omission errors.

Then the description of the total number of errors in the percentage made by the students class VIII-A in using preposition *“at”, “in”, and “on”* based on surface strategy taxonomy is as follows:

**TABLE 4.9**

**TYPES AND TOTAL NUMBER OF THE ERRORS MADE BY THE STUDENTS OF CLASS VIII-A SMPN 5 TRENGGALEK**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Error Type** | **Preposition** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| **1.** | **Omission** | At | **70** | **8,1%** |
|  |  | In | **62** | **7 %** |
|  |  | On | **66** | **7,7 %** |
| **2.** | **Addition** | At | **61** | **7 %** |
|  |  | In | **61** | **7 %** |
|  |  | On | **85** | **10 %** |
| **3.** | **Misformation** | At | **83** | **9,6 %** |
|  |  | In | **63** | **7 %** |
|  |  | On | **88** | **10,2%** |
| **4.** | **Misordering** | At | **75** | **8,7 %** |
|  |  | In | **69** | **8 %** |
|  |  | On | **79** | **9 %** |
| **TOTAL** | |  | **862** |  |

Based on the table, the total number of omission errors in the percentage made by the students’ class VIII-A in using preposition “at” is 8, 1 %, preposition “in” is 7 %, and preposition “on” is 7, 7 %. So it can be concluded that the highest percentage is the use of preposition “at”. While, the lowest percentage is the use of preposition “in”.

The total number of addition errors in the percentage made by the students class VIII-A in using preposition “at” is 7 %, preposition “in” is 7 %, and preposition “on” is 10 %. So it can be concluded that the highest percentage is the use of preposition “on”. While, the lowest percentage is the use of preposition “at” and “in” because the total of percentage are same.

The total number of misformation errors in the percentage made by the students class VIII-A in using preposition “at” is 9, 6 %, preposition “in” is 7 %, and preposition “on” is 10, 2 %. So it can be concluded that the highest percentage is the use of preposition “on”. While, the lowest percentage is the use of preposition “in”.

The total number of misordering errors in the percentage made by the students class VIII-A in using preposition “at” is 8, 7 %, preposition “in” is 8 %, and preposition “on” is 9 %. So it can be concluded that the highest percentage is the use of preposition “on”. While, the lowest percentage is the use of preposition “in”.

Finally, the writer answers the research problem on number 4 that the students have many factors can make preposition (*at, in, and on*) errors. She concludes from the interview of students that there many factors side, they are as follows:

1. The students always get the difficulties to apply a good grammar especially preposition. After they passed on the class, they seldom study it again; they just study it when they need it. The students are expected to be able to use good English sentences, suitable meaning and appropriate grammar and structure.
2. Theoretically, they say that they have motivation to learn more about grammar especially preposition in improving English. On the other hand, practically, they are less of desire at least to support them to concern more the important of preposition. Another that, they are lazy to accustom in practice using preposition *at, in, and on*, and they are less of consciousness in learning English grammar especially preposition even it is very important to use.
3. Actually, the families are also important to encourage them in learning English but they think that the students are able to overcome their problem without families’ support. While for the concerning families, it can make sure that the students at least are able to produce the target language as well as they can. So that the students want to dig their ability in order to develop the broad knowledge in grammar features.
4. The students do not join in such English educational to support their ability in improving English but when they study of grammar they enjoy it because they can learn together. Whatever difficulties they found, it can be discussed in their class. Their environment also does not support their activity with one another does not respond well.

The finding of this study indicates the students have difficulties to use the correct preposition *(at, in, and on)*. They also indicate the students’ mastery and stage in the process of learning the target language.

1. **Discussion**

The result of data analysis shows that the students’ errors in using preposition *at, in, and on*, it can be seen that:

1. Omission errors on the use preposition of “at” is 8,1 %, it can be categorized very good
2. Omission errors on the use preposition of “in” is 7 %, it can be categorized very good
3. Omission errors on the use preposition of “on” is 7,7 %, it can be categorized very good
4. Addition errors on the use preposition of “at” is 7 %, it can be categorized very good
5. Addition errors on the use preposition of “in” is 7 %, it can be categorized very good
6. Addition errors on the use preposition of “on” is 10 %, it can be categorized very good
7. Misformation errors on the use preposition of “at” is 9,6 %, it can be categorized very good
8. Misformation errors on the use preposition of “in” is 7 %, it can be categorized very good
9. Misformation errors on the use preposition of “on” is 10,2 %, it can be categorized very good
10. Misordering errors on the use preposition of “at” is 8,7 %, it can be categorized very good
11. Misordering errors on the use preposition of “in” is 8 %, it can be categorized very good
12. Misordering errors on the use preposition of “on” is 9 %, it can be categorized very good

Based on the interval the writer uses the percentage of errors lie between 01-15%. It means that each of the students’ errors types in using preposition *at, in, and on* based on surface strategy taxonomy is in level very good. So, the writer concludes that each of the errors types made by the students class VIII-A SMPN 5 Trenggalek in using preposition *at, in, and on* in sentences is categorized very good.

****