CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with some discussion of the types of grammatical errors and the sources of the errors.

A. Discussion of The Types of Grammatical Errors

Davydova (1977: 9 - 10) and Corder (1967: pp. 160 - 170) has distributed grammatical errors into *omission, addition, misformation (substitutive),* and *word order.* Begun with the basis, researcher had discovered various kinds of grammatical errors in the writing of XI IPS grade students of MAN Kunir which were, then, also distributed the same way into those four types of errors. The quality of each type of error was diverse. Some were majority, some were minority.

As one of the objectives of this study which was to uncover common grammatical errors made by XI IPS grade students of MAN Kunir Blitar, the findings of the errors found were, then, described or exposed orderly, from those which most frequently occurred to the most rarely occurred.

1. Types of Grammatical Errors

   Types of grammatical errors found were classified based and on the division proposed by Davydova and Corder.

a. Omission (49.3 %)

201 times of occurrences showed that omission was the most frequent type of errors which was made by the XI IPS grade students of MAN Kunir. This omission error consisted of various grammatical aspects. The findings also showed that omission of *3rd person singular verb* and *to be in nominal sentence* had been the biggest contributor in making the error of omission which were then ranked first and second in the most common errors (look at Table 4.6.). Omission of *preposition* and *article* also played pretty much role in this type of error. In simple, from the most frequent to the rare, grammar aspects found that related to this omission error were omission of *3rd person singular verb, to be in nominal sentences, preposition, article, plural marker, subject, to be as auxiliary, verb (no verb), possessive pronoun,* and *subordinator.*

b. Misformation (29.4 %)

Error of misformation was ranked two for its quantity which was 120 occurrences. From the analysis, it was found that this type of errors had many distributions (17 aspects of grammar error), and that distribution was what made this misformation error seemed to be much. It, then, could be concluded that actually each type of error didn't play significant role to the whole total of errors. From the most to the least, the aspects of grammar error in misformation error found in the students' writing were *tense, verb form, preposition, possessive pronoun construction, derivational affixes, pronoun, passive construction, gerund, plural-*

singular form, verb after modal, infinitive, to be, verb change construction, comparative degree, negative form, subordinator and *quantifier.*

c. Addition (12.0 %)

Total of this error is 49. The aspects of grammatical error in addition error which were found in the students writing were *article, to be, possessive marker, pronoun, preposition, plural maker, subordinator,* and *repetition.* If it was seen separately, each aspect of this error was categorized into minority because the number of occurrence of each aspect was few.

d. Misorder (9.3 %)

38 errors might seem few if it was compared to the number of the whole errors. However, this error consisted only of two aspects of grammatical error, misorder of *noun phrase* and *object.* Misorder of *noun phrase* itself was ranked third in the most common error (look at Table 4.6.).

B. Discussion of The Sources of The Errors

This study also tried to find out the sources of the errors made by the XI IPS grade students of MAN Kunir in their writing from the perspective of intralingual error. The intralingual errors were defined by Richards (1997: 6) as the errors that don't reflect the structure of the mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language. That was the basis idea for the researcher in identifying and classifying any possible sources of errors. The researcher had

uncovered the various kinds of errors and as the second objective of the research, the researcher then defined the sources of those errors. Thus, same with what Richards did in Rahayu (2006: 29), the researcher distinguished the sources of intralingual error, from the most to the least, into:

a. Incomplete Application of Rules

Rahayu (2006: 31) explained that this error occurs when the learner do not use all rules. In this study, the researcher discovered 162 errors which were caused by the incomplete application of rules made by the XI IPS grade students of MAN Kunir in their writing.

b. Ignorance of Rule Restriction

Again, Rahayu (2006: 30) described that it involves a failure to perceive the restriction of existing structures when rules are extended to other context. For example, the students wrote *Monkey likes they.* "They" is a pronoun and it's correct if it was used as *a subject.* However in this context, the "they" was functioned as object which meant the students had ignored the rule restriction of the pronoun. In this study, it was discovered that 99 errors came from the ignorance of rule restriction.

c. Overgeneralization

This occurs when the learners composed an utterance based on particular exposure of target language (Rahayu, 2006: 29). There were 92 errors which came from this overgeneralization.

d. False Concept Hypothesis

These errors were derived from faulty knowledge of target language distinction or inaccurate ideas about language rules. It was found that 55 errors made by the XI IPS grade students of MAN Kunir came from the false concept hypothesis.