

**STUDENTS' WRITING PROFICIENCY: THE TYPES OF ERRORS
EXHIBITED BY STUDENTS IN THE ENGLISH COMPOSITION AT THE
THIRD YEAR OF THE ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT OF
UNIVERSITY OF PASIR PENGARAIAN**

M. Syafi'i. S, Jonri Kasdi, Khairunnas Syafi'i

ABSTRACT

This research tried to investigate three major research problems, namely: (1) the types of morphological errors based on the scope of Linguistic Category Taxonomy (LCT), (2) the types of syntactical errors based on the scope of Linguistic category Taxonomy (LCT) and (3) the types of both morphological and syntactical errors based on the scope of Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST). There were merely 25 (30 %) of compositions were checked as the sample of 30 compositions done by the respondents. Pertaining to the performance of students in writing, especially in terms of morphology, the errors were dominated by the taxonomy of mis-formation (79 errors =75.23 %). On the other hand, in term of syntax, the errors were also dominated by the taxonomy of mis-formation (123 errors = 77.40 %).Based on the results of the research depicted above, therefore, the researcher suggests, especially to the teachers of writing to intensify the applications of peer collaborative writing, peer collaborative learning, and peer correction in ESL/EFL Writing class. Having those activities, it facilitates and enables the student writers to learn from faster student writers. Besides, it familiarizes students with tolerant and appreciative manners. Consequently, the intricate problems of writings such as limited knowledge of grammar, un-fluent and unclear ideas expressed or stated which were caused by the lack of vocabulary mastery (inadequate knowledge of vocabulary, idioms, word forms) can be minimized.

Key Words: Linguistic category Taxonomy, morphological and syntactical errors

A. Introduction

There are many ways that can be done by the teachers of English in order to get to know the students' language ability, one of which is to assess students' language ability— providing students with both spoken and written assessments. Consequently, the teacher knows the aspects of students' language mastery in which it is still poor and needs improvements. Based on the analysis done by the teacher toward the errors made

by the students, of course he can reveal the aspects of students' errors, such as the backgrounds of errors, the causes of errors, and the varieties of errors. So that, the analysis in such a way, can be used as a guide for a further teaching focus. In reference to the error analysis, Ellis (1986:296) defines it as a procedure used by both researchers and teachers. It involves collecting samples of learners' language, identifying the errors in sample, describing the errors, classifying them according to their hypothesized causes, and evaluating their seriousness.

Corder (1981:10) states that at least, there are three significant advantages of error analysis by both teacher and students in classroom activities. The first is that for the teacher as an instigator of linguistic activities. The error tells him if he undertakes a systematic analysis—how far toward the goal the learner has progressed and, consequently, what remains him to learn. Second, they provide the researcher with evidence of how language is learnt and acquired, what strategies and procedures the learner is employing in his discovery of language. Third, they are indispensable to the learner himself, because we can regard the making of errors as a device the learner uses in order to learn.

There are many previous researchers who discussed about teaching writing, but the problems which are not yet discussed in the previous researchers will be discussed in this research. This research will be focused on the errors produced by students in their classroom writing performances based on the scope of Linguistic Category Taxonomy and Surface Strategy Taxonomy, namely morphology and syntax. In the term of morphology, the students were evaluated to employ a certain kinds of items, such as (1) indefinite article errors, (2) Possessive case errors, (3) second person singular verb errors, (4) simple past tense errors, (5) Past participle errors, and (6) comparative adjective/adverb errors. While in term of syntax, the students were evaluated to employ the terms, such as (1) noun phrase errors, (2) verb phrase errors, (3) verb and verb construction errors, and (4) word order errors. Furthermore, the errors made by the students in Linguistic Category Taxonomy were measured by using the frame of Surface Strategy Taxonomy—(1) omission, (2) addition, (3) mis-formation, and (4) mis-ordering.

B. Aims of Research Questions

Since this research is focused on students' writing proficiency—in employing both Linguistic Category Taxonomy and Surface Strategy Taxonomy errors, the research questions can be formulated in the following research questions:

1. What types of morphological errors are made by the students based on Linguistic Category Taxonomy?
2. What types of syntactical errors are made by the students based on Linguistic Category Taxonomy?
3. On what types of errors both morphological and syntactical errors are made by the students based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy?

C. Method

The method used in this research was descriptive method. It was a kind of method involving the collection of data for the purpose of describing existing condition.

The location of this research was at Teacher Training and Education Faculty of University of Pasir Pangaraian-Rokan Hulu Regency. The sources of data of this research were elicited from the third year of the English Education Department registered in 2011/2012 Academic Year. The subjects consisted of 1 class consisting about 30 students. Considering that the sum of the subjects was not too big; therefore, the researcher took all of the subjects as the sample of the research. Besides the subjects depicted above, the writer also took some competent personnel, such as the writing lectures and the English Education Department chairman as the informants of this research.

To collect the data, this research was conducted by administering the English composition test. Before administering the test, the researcher prepared some topics of compositions that enable the subjects to explore their ideas. In reference to this, Heaton (1988:137) points out that the students should be presented with a clearly defined problem motivating them to write. The writing test should ensure students to say something and a purpose for saying based on the topics provided.

In relation to the English Composition Test, the subjects were asked to develop an essay for about one page of lined paper provided (250 to 300) words during 50 minutes. To ensure the levels of errors validity made by the subjects, the researcher

required them to proofread, improve, and edit or revise the errors they did in the first draft for about 15 minutes. Roughly, 65 minutes was allocated to develop the first and the Second draft.

To analyze the types of errors made by the students in their English compositions, the data were analyzed by using the characters of Linguistic Category Taxonomy and Surface Strategy Taxonomy (Politzer and Ramirez, 1973; in Dulay and Burt, 1982:148-9), as seen in the following table.

Table 1.
Linguistic Category Taxonomy and Surface Strategy Taxonomy

Linguistic Category Taxonomy(LCT)	Surface Strategy Taxonomy(SST)			
	Omission	Addition	Misformation	Misordering
A. Morphology				
1. Indefinite article errors				
2. Possessive case errors				
3. Second person singular verb errors				
4. Simple past tense errors				
5. Past participle errors				
6. Comparative adjective/adverb errors				
B. Syntax				
1. Noun phrase errors				
2. Verb phrase errors				
3. Verb and verb construction errors				
4. Word order errors				

All analyzed data were presented in the forms of tables together with its descriptions and percentages.

D. Findings

This part presents three types of data, namely: (1) the types of morphological errors produced by the respondents based on the scope of Linguistic Category Taxonomy

(LCT), (2) the types of syntactical errors produced by the respondents based on the scope of Linguistic category Taxonomy (LCT), and (3) the types of both morphological and syntactical errors produced by the respondents based on the scope of Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST).

The Types of Morphological Error based on LCT

As a matter of fact, there were 6 types of errors investigated in the area of morphological errors, namely: (1) indefinite article, (2) possessive case, (3) second person singular, (4) simple past tense, (5) past participle, and (6) comparative adjective and adverb errors. Therefore, to make this presentation more outstanding, let the researcher initiate his findings and itemize them consecutively:

a. Indefinite Article Errors

In reference to indefinite article errors, there were 16 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that 15.23 % of morphological errors were derived this aspect. The types of errors that the respondents produced may lie within omission, addition, misformation and misordering. However, based on the data elicited, the types of errors merely derive from omission and addition taxonomies. Roughly, there were 13 errors on the part of omission and 3 errors found on addition part.

b. Possessive Case Errors

In the aspect of possessive case, there were 5 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 4.80 % of morphological errors investigated were derived from this part. As mentioned before, the types of errors may lie within omission, addition, mis-formation, and mis-ordering. However, the data showed that the errors were derived from the parts of omission, addition, and mis-formation. In short, there was 1 error on omission, 2 errors on addition, and 2 errors on mis-formation.

c. Third person singular verb errors

In the aspect of third-person Singular verb, there were 7 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 6.70 % of morphological

errors investigated were derived from this part. As mentioned before, the types of errors may lie within omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. However, the data showed that the errors were derived merely from the parts of omission, and misformation. Roughly, there were 5 errors on omission, 2 errors on misformation.

d. Simple Past Tense Errors

In the aspect of simple past tense, there were 68 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 64.76 % of morphological errors investigated were derived from this part. As mentioned before, the types of errors may lie within omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. However, the data showed that the errors were derived merely from the parts of omission, and misformation. Roughly, there was only 1 error on omission and 67 errors produced on misformation.

e. Past Participle Errors

In the aspect of past participle, there were merely 4 errors produced by the students in their English composition test. Meaning that, 3.80 % of morphological errors investigated were derived from this part. As mentioned before, the types of errors may lie within omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. However, the data showed that the errors were derived merely from the part of misformation.

f. Comparative Adjective and Adverb Errors

In this aspect, there were 5 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 4.80 % of morphological errors investigated were derived from this part. As mentioned before, the types of errors may lie within omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. However, the data showed that the errors were derived merely from the parts of omission and misformation. In short, there was merely 1 error on omission and 4 errors on misformation.

Types Syntactical Errors Based on LCT

Pertaining to the research questions mentioned above, there were four types of errors investigated in this part, namely: (1) noun phrase, (2) verb phrase, (3) verb and verb construction and, (4) word order errors.

a. Noun Phrase Errors

In reference to noun phrase, there were 58 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 36.50 % of syntactical errors were derived from this part. The data elicited showed that the respondents made errors in all taxonomies referred (omission, addition, misformation, and misordering). In short, there were 11 errors on omission, 1 error on addition, 45 errors on misformation, and 1 error on misordering.

b. Verb Phrase Errors

In reference to verb phrase, there were 8 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 5.03 % of syntactical errors were derived from this part. The data elicited showed that the respondents made errors in the parts of omission, addition, and misformation. Roughly, there was 1 error on omission, 1 error on addition, and 6 errors on misformation.

c. Verb and Verb Construction Errors

In reference to verb and verb construction case, there were 88 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 55.34 % of syntactical errors were derived from this part. Based on the data elicited, this part was the most dominant in contributing the errors to syntax. It was also revealed that the respondents made errors in all taxonomies depicted above (omission, addition, misformation, and misordering). In short, there were 10 errors on omission, 4 errors on addition, 72 errors on misformation, and 2 errors on misordering.

d. Word Order Errors

In reference to word order, there were 5 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. Meaning that, 3.14 % of syntactical errors were derived from this part. The data elicited showed that the respondents merely made errors in the taxonomy of misordering. In short, there were 5 errors produced by the respondents on the taxonomy of misordering.

Types of Morphological and Syntactical Errors based on SST

As mentioned above, thus, the types of these errors should be based on surface strategy taxonomy (SST) in both morphological and syntactical aspects, such as omission, addition, misformation, and misordering. In other words, all types of errors produced by the respondents in every part of morphology and syntax should be evaluated by the criteria of omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

a. Omission

Based on the data obtained, there were 43 errors of omission on morphology and syntax. Specifically, there were 21 errors on morphology and 23 errors on syntax. Meaning that, 15.97 % of morphological and syntactical errors were derived from the taxonomy of omission.

b. Addition

Based on the data analyzed, there were 11 errors of addition on morphology and syntax. Specifically, there were 5 errors on morphology and 6 errors on syntax. Meaning that, 4.18 % of morphological and syntactical errors were derived from the taxonomy of addition.

e. Misformation

Based on the data analyzed, there were 202 errors of misformation on morphology and syntax. Specifically, there were 79 errors on morphology and 123 errors on syntax. Meaning that, 7.80 % of morphological and syntactical errors were derived from the taxonomy of misformation. This is the aspect from which the respondents produced the most crowded errors of all taxonomies investigated.

d. Misordering

Based on the data analyzed, there were 8 errors of misordering on morphology and syntax. Specifically, there was no error on morphology produced by the respondents. However, on the other hand, there were 8 errors of misordering produced by the respondents on syntax. Meaning that, 3.04 % of morphological and syntactical errors were derived from the taxonomy of misordering This is the aspect from which the respondents produced the least errors of all taxonomies investigated.

E. Discussions

Based on the research findings that have been presented in the preceding part thus, this part deals with discussions of the research findings. In relation to research findings, the discussions are presented into three parts, namely: (1) types of morphological errors based on the scope of LC.T, (2) types of syntactical errors based on the scope of L.C.T, and (3) types of morphological and syntactical errors based on the scope of SST.

Types of Morphological Errors Based on LCT

a. Indefinite Article Errors

Based on the data presented, it was outstanding that there were 16 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 15.23 %. Meaning that, 15.23 % of morphological errors were derived from this aspect. Furthermore, the types of errors produced were merely derived from the taxonomy of omission (16 errors). In other words, the respondents omitted the proper use of indefinite article (*a* and *an*) either in phrases or sentences.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department were still doubted in employing the indefinite articles in their written language. Consequently, the students made errors on this term. However, on the other band, the teacher of Writing needs to re-clarify and re-enlighten the importance and the use of indefinite article in every phrase or sentence.

Verily, it is understandable that writing cannot be separated from the language use in any case because writing activity is the activity to apply and reflect any language use conventions, especially the standardized language use.

b. Possessive Case Errors

Based on the data presented, it was outstanding that there were 5 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 4.80 %. Meaning that, 4.80 % of morphological errors were derived from this aspect. Furthermore, the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (1 error), addition (2 errors), and misformation (2 errors). In other words, the

respondents omitted, added, and misformed the proper use of possessions either in phrases or sentences of their written language.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not know how to employ the possessions in any written language. Consequently, the students made errors on this term. However, on the other hand, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, reenlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, the possessive cases should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

c. Third Person Singular Verb Errors

Based on the data presented, it was outstandingly seen that there were 7 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 6.70 %. Meaning that, 6.70 % of morphological errors were derived from this aspect. Furthermore, the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (5 errors), and misformation (2 errors). In other words, the respondents omitted, and misformed the proper use of the second person singular verbs in sentences of their written language.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not have enough prior knowledge to employ the third person singular verbs in their written language. Consequently, the students made errors on this term. However, on the other hand, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, re-enlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

d. Simple Past Tense Errors

Based on the data presented, it was outstandingly seen that there were 68 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 64.76 %. Meaning that, 64.76 % of morphological errors were derived from this aspect. Furthermore, the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (1 error), and misformation (67 errors). In other words, the respondents

omitted, and misformed the proper use of the simple past tense in sentences of their written language.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not have enough prior knowledge or even did not aware of how to employ the correct forms of simple past tense in their written language. Consequently, the students made crowded errors on this term. However, on the other hand, it is understandable since the grammatical structures of L1 and L2 are different, thus, language interference such interlingual errors may exist. Therefore, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, re-enlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

e. Past Participle Errors

Based on the data presented, it was outstanding that there were merely 4 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 3.80 %. Meaning that, 3.80 % of morphological errors were derived from this aspect. This aspect is the lowest error that the respondents produced of all aspects evaluated in morphology. Furthermore, the types of errors produced were merely derived from the taxonomy of misformation (4 errors). In other words, the respondents mis-formed the proper use of past participle forms in sentences of their written language.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not know how to employ the correct past participle forms in their written language. Consequently, the students made some errors on this term. Therefore, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, re-enlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

f. Comparative Adjective and Adverb Errors

Based on the data presented, it was outstandingly seen that there were 5 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this

aspect was 4.80 %. Meaning that, 4.80 % of morphological errors were derived from this aspect. Furthermore, the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (1 error) and mis-formation (4 errors). In other words, the respondents omitted and misformed the proper use of comparative adjectives and adverbs in some sentences of their written language.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department still encountered the difficulties in employing the correct comparative adjective and adverb forms in their written language. Consequently, the students made some errors on this term. Therefore, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, re-enlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

Types of Syntactical Errors based on L.C.T

a. Noun Phrase Errors

Based on the data presented, it was clearly seen that there were 58 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 36.50 %. Meaning that, 36.50 % of syntactical errors were derived from this aspect. Thus, based on the findings, it was revealed that the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (11 errors), addition (1 error), mis-formation (45 errors), and mis-ordering (1 error). In other words, the respondents omitted, added, mis-formed, and even mis-ordered the proper use of noun phrases in sentences of their written language.

Based on the findings, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not have enough prior knowledge to construct the correct noun phrases needed. Thus, this phenomenon indicated that the respondents were lack of training toward the employment of noun phrases in their written language. Consequently, the students made some errors on this term. Therefore, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, re-enlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

b. Verb Phrase Errors

Based on the data presented, it was clearly seen that there were 8 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 5.03 %. Meaning that, 5.03 % of syntactical errors were derived from this aspect. Thus, based on the findings, it was revealed that the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (1 error), addition (1 error), and misformation (6 errors). In other words, the respondents omitted, added, and misformed the proper use of verb phrases in sentences of their written language.

Based on the data elucidated, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not have enough prior knowledge to construct the correct noun phrases needed. Thus, this phenomenon indicated that the respondents were lack of training or prudence toward the employment of verb phrases in their written language. Consequently, the students made some errors on this term. Therefore, the teacher of Writing needs to clarify, re-enlighten, and provide students with more intensive discussions and exercises on this term. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

c. Verb and Verb Construction Errors

Based on the data presented, it was clearly seen that there were 88 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 55.34 %. Meaning that, 55.34 % of syntactical errors were derived from this aspect. Thus, based on the findings, it was revealed that the types of errors produced were derived from the taxonomies of omission (10 errors), addition (4 errors), misformation (72 errors), and misordering (2 errors). In other words, the respondents omitted, added, misformed, and even misordered the proper use of verb and verb construction forms in their written language.

Based on the data presented, it should be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department did not have enough prior knowledge to construct the correct verb and verb construction needed. Thus, this phenomenon indicated that the respondents were not able to employ the verb and verb construction in written language. Consequently, the students made the highest frequency of errors on this term. Thus, the mastery of verb and verb construction, especially in the term of

grammar, in which it is very closely related to any types of written assignment, should be immediately reviewed as to avoid the same errors on the future. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings

d. Word Order Errors

Based on the data presented, it was clearly seen that there were 5 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. The percentage of this aspect was 3.14 %. Meaning that, 3.14 % of syntactical errors were derived from this aspect. Thus, based on the findings, it was revealed that the types of errors produced were merely derived from the taxonomy of misordering (5 errors). In other words, the respondents misordered the proper use of word order in their written language.

Based on the data presented, it should be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department had already known how to construct the correct word order needed in written expression. Even there were some errors made, however, as a matter of fact, the percentage of error was tolerable. This phenomenon indicated that the respondents were able to employ the word order in in written language. However, the mastery of word order in which it is very closely related to any types of writing should be immediately reviewed as to avoid the same errors on the future. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

Types of Morphological and Syntactical Errors Based on S.S.T

As stated above, that this part discusses about four types of errors found in students' writing performance. The investigation is merely evaluated based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST), namely: (1) omission, (2) addition, (3) misformation, and (4) misordering. Briefly, both morphological and syntactical errors should be assessed by the four taxonomies above.

Based on the data presented, it was clear that there were 21 morphological errors and 21 syntactical errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. in other words, there were 42 errors produced by the respondents on the taxonomy of omission. The percentage of this taxonomy was 13.20 %. Meaning that, 13.20 % of

morphological and syntactical errors based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy were derived from "omission. Thus, based on the findings, it can be interpreted that the respondents omitted either English morphological or syntactical conventions in which they should be properly used or employed in every written language (English composition). Consequently, these types of errors were not avoidable.

In addition, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department still encountered intricacies in employing the appropriate conventions of morphology and syntax in some written language. Roughly, the mastery of this taxonomy should be re-reviewed and focused in all linguistics classes which tend to enhance the students' writing proficiency. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings.

a. Addition

Based on the data presented, it was clear that there were 5 morphological errors and 6 syntactical errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test. In other words, there were errors produced by the respondents on the taxonomy of addition. The percentage of this taxonomy was 4.00 %. Meaning that, 4.00 % of morphological and syntactical errors based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy were derived from "addition". Thus, based on the findings, it can be interpreted that the respondents added either English morphological or syntactical conventions in which they should be properly used or employed in every written language (English composition) Consequently, these types of errors were not avoidable, even it was still tolerated. In addition, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department still encountered intricacies in employing the appropriate conventions of morphology and syntax in some written language. Roughly, the mastery of this taxonomy should be re-reviewed and focused in all linguistic classes that tend to enhance the students' writing proficiency. Finally, this aspect should be considered as an important teaching material to be elaborated in classroom settings

b. Misformation

Based on the data presented, it was clear that there were 79 morphological errors and 123 syntactical errors produced by the respondents in their English composition

test. In other words, there were 202 errors produced by the respondents on the taxonomy of misformation. The percentage of this taxonomy was 77.40 %. Meaning that, 77.40 % of morphological and syntactical errors based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy were derived from "misformation". Thus, based on the findings, it can be interpreted that the respondents misformed either English morphological or syntactical conventions in which they should be properly used or employed in every written language (English composition). Consequently, these types of errors were not avoidable. In addition, it can be inferred that most of the third year students of the English Education Department still encountered great intricacies in employing and producing the appropriate conventions of morphology and syntax in written language. Roughly, the mastery of this taxonomy should be re-reviewed and focused in all linguistics classes that tend to enhance the students' writing proficiency. Furthermore, this taxonomy is the most frequent errors where the students produced. In other words, most of the fifth semester students of the English Education Department did not have enough prior and tacit knowledge to mingle with any appropriate English morphological and syntactical conventions. Therefore, these materials should be prioritized as soon as possible in every language classroom settings.

c. Misordering

Based on the data presented, it was clear that there was no error found on morphology but there were 8 errors produced by the respondents in their English composition test on syntactical errors. In other words, there were merely 8 errors produced by the respondents on the taxonomy of misordering. The percentage of this taxonomy was 5.03 %. Meaning that, 5.03 % of morphological and syntactical errors that based on Surface Strategy Taxonomy were derived from "misordering". Thus, based on the findings, it can be interpreted that some of the respondents misordered the proper conventions of syntax which should be properly used or employed accurately in every written language (English composition). Consequently, these types of errors were not avoidable. In addition, it can be inferred that some of the third year students of the English Education Department still encountered a little bit intricacies in employing and producing the appropriate conventions of syntax in written language. Roughly, the

mastery of this taxonomy should be re-reviewed and focused in all linguistic classes that tend to enhance the students' writing proficiency.

F. Conclusion

The teacher of writing is the teacher of grammar. Meaning that, every mode of writing is the prototype of grammatical conventions. In other words, CLT is one of the language teaching approaches used to pursue the target of language teaching previously established. Therefore, in the setting of English for Academic purposes (EAP), it is not reasonable to blame the existence of CLT as the factor that brings the students to failure of grammatical mastery. If it is the fact, it is necessary to work more with the students toward the concept of CLT itself as to reduce the obscured comprehension. The way that can be done by the teacher of writing is to enlighten the nature of CLT in the context of language teaching.

REFERENCES

- Breiter, Carl and Marlene Scardamalia. "Does Learning to Write Have to be so Difficult?". In Freedman Aviva, et al, eds. 1983. *Learning to Write: First Language/SecondLanguage*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1980. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- 1994. *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cook, Vivian. 1991. *SecondLanguage Learning and Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Routledge, (man and Hall, INC.
- Corder, S.P. 1981. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, John W. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Crystal, David. 1985. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Cowley Road Oxford: Basil Black Well- Ltd.
- 1994. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. London: Basil Black Well- Ltd.
- D'Anelo, Frank J. 1980. *Process and Thought in Gonnposition*. Cambridge: Withrop Publishers, Inc.
- Dulay, H. et al. 1982. *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press-

- Ellis, Rod. 1986. *Understanding SecondLanguage Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraenkel, Jack. R and Norman E. Wallen. 1993. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. SecondEdition. Singafore: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Fuad, N. S. Lengkanawati. 1990. *Aspek Logika dan Aspek Linguistik dalam Keterampilan Menulis: Studi Tentang Fprofil Komposisi Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Inggris*. Unpublished Magister Thesis. Bandung: PPS IKIP Bandung.
- Gay, L.R., and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Gorman, Thomas P. "The Teaching of Composition". In Murcia, Marianne Celce and Lois Mcintosh, eds. 1979. *Teaching English as a Secondor Foreign Language*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Great Britain: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Haycraft, John. 1978. *An Introduction to English Language Teaching*. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publishers, Pte Ltd.
- Hughes, Arthur. 1989. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Juanda. 1996. *Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa Indonesia dalam Karangan Siswa Bandung International School (BIS) Kota Madia Bandung*. Unpublished Magister Thesis. Bandung: PPS IKIP Bandung.
- Langan, John. 1986. *College Writing with reading*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Littlewood, William. 1981. *Comnuinicative Language Teaching an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mailoor, Helena Emma Maria Korompis. 1992. *Analisis Kesalahan Berbahasa Murid Kelas IV SD Santo Yusuf Bandung*. Unpublished Magister Thesis. Bandung: PPS IKIP Bandung.
- McMillan, James H and Sally Schumacher. 2006. *Research in Education: Evidence – Based Inquiry*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Marquez, Ely J. "Teaching Grammar and Paragraph Structure Simultaneously". *English Teaching Forum*. July 1981. P. 14-17.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt and Mary Newton Bruder. 1976. *Teaching English as a SecondLanguage: Techniques and procedures*. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Richards, et al. 1985. *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. England: Longman Group Limited.
- Walters, Larry. 1983. "A Theoretical Model for Teaching Students to Write" *English Teaching Forum*. Vol. XXI, No 2, July 1983. P. 17-22.