

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this second chapter, the writer provides related studies of Common Error in the Use of Sentence Structure. Furthermore, the two related studies which have similar topic with the writer's are also provided in this chapter.

2.1 Review of Related Theories

In the review of related theories, the writer presents theories about Common Error in the Use of Sentence Structure, which will assist the writer to analyze the data. The writer divides this sub chapter into three (3) sections. The first one is Sentence Structure, the second one Error, and the third one is Common Error on the Use of Sentence Structure. The main theory for this study is Ho (2005) about Common Problem with the Sentence Construction or Structure which supported by Hogan (2012) and the error theories by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982), Johanna Klassen (1991), and Gonzales and Elijah (1979).

2.1.1 Sentence Structure

In creating the essays, people need to construct some paragraphs. A paragraph contains several sentences. Through sentences, people can deliver their ideas and opinion. Therefore, sentences are needed to construct the essay. According to Richards and Schmidt (2010) the definition of sentence is:

Sentence is the largest unit of grammatical organization within which parts of speech (e.g. nouns, verbs, adverbs) and grammatical classes (e.g. word, phrase, clause) are said to function. In English a sentence normally contains one independent clause with a finite verb.

(p.522)

There are three (3) kinds of sentence: simple sentence, compound sentence and complex sentence.

Simple sentence is a sentence that has one clause and consists of a subject and a verb. Compound sentence is sentence that consists of two clauses linked by coordinating conjunction such as, “and”, “but”, “or”, “yet”. Complex sentence consists of one main clause and one or more subordinate clause. The subordinate clause cannot stand by itself; it should be linked to the main clause.

(Ho, 2005, p. 70)

According to Ho (2005) there are three (3) kinds of subordinate clauses in complex sentence: noun clause, relative clause and adverbial clause.

Noun clause has several functions in sentence. It can function as subject, verb, and complement. Relative clause is a clause that acts as an adjectival clause describing or giving additional information about the noun. Adverbial clause functions as an adverb, since it is dependent clause it should be linked to main clause with subordinating conjunction.

(pp. 71-73)

2.1.2 Error

Generally, most of the learner will make errors in learning or acquiring their first or second language. Errors are the part of learning language. Making errors is a part of learning, yet it cannot be avoided by the learner. There are several definitions about error. According to Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982), as cited in Mishra (2005) errors are considered as deviation. They say:

“Errors are the flawed side of learner speech or writing. They are those parts of conversation or composition that deviate from some selected norm or mature language performance” (p.138).

According to Klassen (1991), as cited in Mishra (2005) errors are also seen as deviation. She says:

“I shall define an error as “a form or structure that a native speaker deems unacceptable because of its inappropriate use” (FORUM: Jan. 1991).

Errors have been grouped into several types from the different point of view of the researchers, such as errors based on language skills and errors based on language components and language areas. Each of them will be explained below.

2.1.2.1 Types of Errors

There are several types of errors. According to Gonzales and Elijah (1979), as cited in Mishra (2005) categories of errors can be based on language skills. Errors can be found in the four skills; however, they focus on the types of errors in writing which are illogical, logical interference and other errors.

According to Dulay et al (1989), as cited in Mishra (2005) errors can be classified based on the language components and language areas. These areas consisted of phonological, syntactic, morphological, semantic, lexical and stylistic. They say:

Language components include phonology (pronunciation), syntax and morphology (grammar), semantic and lexicon (meaning and vocabulary), and style. Constituents include the elements that comprise each language component. For example, within syntax one may ask whether the error is in the main or subordinate clause, and within a clause, which constituent is affected, e.g. the noun phrase, the auxiliary, the verb phrase, the preposition, the adverb, the adjective, and so forth. (pp. 146-147)

In this study, the writer will analyze errors that related to the syntax. It is related to the use of sentence structure in writing.

2.1.3 Problem with Sentence Construction or Structure

Ho (2005) states there are eight (8) common errors in students' writing : Dangling Modifier, Squinting Modifier, Jumbled-up or Illogical Sentence, Incomplete or Fragmented Sentence, Run-on Sentence (Fused Sentence),

Inappropriate Coordinating Conjunction, Inappropriate Subordinating Conjunction, and Misordering or Inversion of Subject-Verb. Each of them will be explained below.

2.1.3.1 Dangling Modifier

Ho (2005) states that Dangling Modifier occurs when the sentence is not clearly stated what is being modified. In other words, the subject or the doer in the sentences is omitted or the word does not appear in the sentence. Ho (p. 73) provides an example below:

Incorrect: Having got all the support of the students, the project was launched.
Correct: Having got all the support of the students, the principal launched the project.

The first sentence is incorrect, because ‘Having got all this support of the students’ is a participial phrase expressing action but ‘the project’ is not the doer of the action (the subject of the main clause): ‘the project’ cannot get the support of ‘the students’. As the doer of the action expressed in the participial phrase has not been clearly stated, the participial phrase is termed a Dangling Modifier.

The second sentence is correct because the doer of the action, that is the subject of the main clause, is stated: ‘the principal’. Logically, he is the person who must be doing the action expressed in the participial phrase ‘Having got all the support of students’. The last sentence, therefore, does not have a ‘Dangling Modifier’.

2.1.3.2 Squinting Modifier

Ho (2005) states Squinting modifier occurs when the phrase has been split up unnecessarily so it is not clear what words are being modified. Ho (p. 73) provides an example below:

Incorrect: The problem has been brought up to the discipline master of the notorious students in class.
Correct: The problem of the notorious student in class has been brought up to the discipline master.

The first sentence is incorrect because the nominal phrase ‘the problem of notorious student in class’ is broken up, at different points within the sentence, into two separate phrases ‘the problem’ and ‘of the notorious student in class’, it is not clear what the word modified ‘the problem’ is. The second sentence is correct because the subject of the sentence is ‘the problem of the notorious student in class’ which has been ‘brought up to the discipline master’. It is stated clearly that ‘of the notorious student in class’ modified the word ‘the problem’.

2.1.3.3 Jumbled-up or Illogical Sentence

Ho (2005) states that Jumbled-up or Illogical Sentence is sentence that has illogical or jumbled-up ordering of clause. The clause is linked by coordinating conjunction with another clause. In order to make the sentence become logical or make sense, Ho (p.74) stated that the sentence which is linked by the coordinating conjunction needs to be re-ordered or re-arranged. Ho (p. 74) provides several examples below:

Incorrect: The child went to see the doctor so the child had a bad stomachache.

Correct: The child had a bad stomachache so s/he (the child) went to see the doctor.

The first sentence is incorrect because it seems like the child had a bad stomach after the child went to the doctor. It is not logical. The second sentence is correct because the consequence of the child having a bad stomachache is his or her going ‘to see the doctor’. Thus, the clause ‘s/he (the child) went to see the doctor’ is linked to the initial clause ‘the child has a bad stomachache’ after the use of the conjunction ‘so’.

Another example is:

Incorrect: The class was very weak in English as the teacher conducted remedial classes.

Correct: The teacher conducted remedial classes as the class was very weak in English.

The first sentence is incorrect because the meaning of the sentence becomes to have a class weak in English as a result of a teacher’s remedial classes. While the second sentence is correct because the reason why ‘the teacher

conducted remedial classes’ is given in the clause ‘the class was very weak in English’ which must follow the initial clause with the use of conjunction ‘as’.

2.1.3.4 Incomplete or Fragmented Sentence

Ho (2005) states that Incomplete or Fragmented sentence is a subordinate clause that stands by its own. Remember, subordinate clause cannot stand by its own, subordinate clause considered as dependent clause. The subordinate clause should be linked to the main clause. Ho (p. 74-75) provides several examples below:

Incorrect: Although she was sick. She went to the concert to support her classmate.

Correct: Although she was sick, she went to the concert to support her classmate.

The first sentence is incorrect because ‘Although she was sick’ is a subordinate clause and cannot stand on its own. It needs to be linked to the main clause ‘she went to the concert to support her classmates’ to form a complete complex sentence. That’s why the second sentence is correct because it is linked to the main clause.

Another example is:

Incorrect: They worked out all the plans for Speech Day. While they still had the energy and time. (Fragment)

Correct: They worked out all the plans for Speech Day while they still had the energy and time.

The first sentence is incorrect because ‘While they still had the energy and time’ is a subordinate clause and cannot stand on its own. It needs to be linked to the main clause ‘They worked out all the plans for Speech Day’ to form a complete complex sentence. That’s why the second sentence is correct because it is linked to the main clause.

According to Hogan (2012), a complete sentence must have subject and verb. Fragmented sentence is an incomplete sentence. It is not only a dependent clause which stands by its own, but it is also a sentence that does not have a subject, a verb, both subject and verb or a helping verb. Hogan (2012, pp. 201-202) provides several examples below:

Incorrect: Can't be my friend. (Fragment)

Correct: Tom can't be my friend.

The first sentence is incorrect because it is missing a subject. It can be revised by adding a subject. The second sentence is correct because a subject is added there. Tom is the subject of the sentence.

Incorrect: The girl in the red hood. (Fragment)

Correct: The girl in the red hood walked toward me.

The first sentence is incorrect because it does not have a verb. It can be revised by adding a verb. The second sentence is correct because a verb is added there. The verb of the sentence is 'walked'.

Incorrect: At the end of the day. (Fragment)

Correct: At the end of the day, Gina watches the sun set.

The first sentence is incorrect because it does not have any subject and verb. It can be revised by adding a subject and a verb. The second sentence is correct because there are subject and verb added there. 'Gina' is the subject and 'watches' is the verb.

Incorrect: Barry running to the door.

Correct: Barry kept running to the door.

The first sentence is incorrect because it does not have any helping verb. The *-ing* verb can be a verb if it is combined with helping verb such as (*was, were, is, are, have, had, etc.*). The second sentence is correct because there is a helping verb there.

2.1.3.5 Run-on Sentence (Fused Sentence)

Ho (2005) states that Run-on Sentence or Fused Sentence is two independent clauses which are connected to each other but there is no connecting word or punctuation to separate the clause. So, in one sentences there are two independent clauses without connecting word or punctuation. Ho (p. 75) provides several examples below:

Incorrect: I didn't know which CCA I should join I was too confused by all the options.

Correct: I didn't know which CCA I should join as I was too confused by all the options.

Correct: I didn't know which CCA I should join; I was too confused by all the options

The first sentence is incorrect and it is considered as a run-on sentence. As the clauses 'I didn't know which CCA I should join' and 'I was too confused by all the options' are independent clause. They are combined without any conjunction and/or the use of any punctuation. The second sentence is correct because it combines the two clauses with the coordinating conjunction 'as'. The third sentence is correct because it combines the two clauses with the use of a semi-colon.

Another example is:

Incorrect: They were not told of the dangers they went ahead swam in the sea on their own.

Correct: They were not told of the dangers so they went ahead and swam in the sea on their own.

The first sentence is a run-on sentence. The clauses 'They were not told of the dangers', 'they went ahead', and 'they swam in the sea on their own' are independent clause which are combined without any conjunction and/or the use of any punctuation. The second sentence is correct because it links the clauses with the use of the coordinating conjunction 'so' and 'and'.

2.1.3.6 Inappropriate Coordinating Conjunction

Ho (2005) states that inappropriate coordinating conjunction is the word that used to link co-ordinate clause with main clause is not suitable or the choice of the coordinating conjunction is incorrect. Ho (p. 76) provides several examples below:

Incorrect: I can't decide whether Mei Ling *and* Bee Leng should be the only girl to represent our class.

Correct: I can't decide whether Mei Ling *or* Bee Leng should be the only girl to represent our class.

The first sentence is incorrect because the use of conjunction and is not appropriate. Two choices posed to the speaker in deciding who the ‘only girl’ to represent the class must be represented by the use of the conjunction ‘or’ to show the alternative options available.

Another example is:

Incorrect: It was getting late *since* they continued practicing till they were satisfied.

Correct: It was getting late *but* they continued practicing till they were satisfied.

The first sentence is incorrect because the use of conjunction since is not appropriate. The sentence wants to show the contrasting contexts. That is why the second sentence is correct because the contrasting contexts realized in the two clauses ‘It was getting late’ and ‘they continued practicing... satisfied’ must be combined by the conjunction of contrast ‘but’.

2.1.3.7 Inappropriate Subordinating Conjunction

Ho (2005) states that Inappropriate Subordinating Conjunction is the word that used to link subordinate clause with main clause is not suitable or the choice of the coordinating conjunction is incorrect. Ho (p. 76) provides several examples below:

Incorrect: They did not inform her of the outcome *unless* they did not want to disappoint her.

Correct: They did not inform her of the outcome *as* they did not want to disappoint her.

The first sentence is incorrect because the word ‘*unless*’ is used as an exception. The second sentence is correct because the subordinate clause provides the reason or the cause for the action in the main clause, that is, not informing her; hence, the subordinating conjunction ‘as’ is required to link ‘they did not inform her of the outcome’ to ‘they did not want to disappoint her’.

Another example is:

Incorrect: You will definitely not win the medal *if* you train hard for the match daily.

Correct: You will definitely not win the medal *unless* you train hard for the match

daily.

The first sentence is incorrect because the use of subordinating conjunction 'if' is not appropriate. The meaning of the sentence becomes if you train hard for the match you will not win the medal. The meaning of the sentence becomes weird. The second sentence is correct because the subordinating conjunction 'unless' is used to refer to an exception to what one is saying, the need to 'train hard for the match daily'.

2.1.3.8 Misordering or Inversion of Subject-Verb

Ho (2005) states Misordering or Inversion of Subject-Verb happens when the location of subject and verb is not suitable with the inversion in English. In English there are some formats for a sentence. For example, indirect question, direct question and etc. Misordering happens when the format incorrect or different from the format in English. To this Ho (p. 77) provides several examples below:

In a direct question format, the verb comes before subject:

Why are we taught this?

V S

The sentence considers as misordering if the format is inverted.

Why we are taught this?

S V

In an indirect question format as where there is a question embedded in another question, the subject comes before a verb:

Do you know why we are taught this?

S V

The sentence considers as misordering if the format is inverted.

Do you know why are we taught this?

V S

The indirect question format is also evident in statements where a question is embedded:

Now I don't know why we are taught this.

S V

If the subject does not come before a verb in an indirect question format, there is a misordering or inversion of the subject and verb:

Now I don't know why are we taught this.

V S

These theories provided in chapter 2 will be used by the writer as guideline to analyze the common error on the use of sentence structure made by the students. Next, the writer is going to discuss another sub section of chapter 2 which is the review of related studies.

2.2 Review of Related Studies

In order to support her studies, the writer presents two related studies which are related to her study, which is the common error on the use of sentence structure. The two previous studies were conducted by Ananda et al (2014) and Ampornratana (2009).

2.2.1 A Study of Error Analysis from Students' Sentence in Writing (Ananda et al, 2014)

Ananda et al (2014) study was done to find out the answer of two (2) research questions: (1) What types of sentence errors do the first grade students of SMAN 11 Banda Aceh mostly make in their writing in English {EFL}? (2) What is the most frequent sentence error made by first grade students of SMA 11 Banda Aceh in their writing in English {EFL}? In order to answer their research question, Ananda et al used theories types of sentence errors from Oshima and Hogue (1991) who categorize error into four (4) types: Fragmented Sentences, Run-On, Choppy Sentences, and Stringy Sentences.

In Ananda et al study, the participants were forty-four (44) first graders at SMAN 11 Banda Aceh chosen by random sampling. Ananda et al used this sampling procedure based on Creswell's recommendation (2003, p. 156). Creswell (2003, p. 156) says "with randomization, a representative sample from a population provides the ability to generalize to a larger population."

From their findings, the most grammatical errors that appeared in students writing were fragment, run-on and choppy sentences. There were 299 errors that

occurred in students writing. The most frequent error that appears was fragmented sentence. There were 222 fragment errors, there were 70 run-on errors, and there were 7 choppy sentence errors.

There are two (2) differences between Ananda et al study and the writer's study. First is Ananda et al used theory from Oshima and Hogue (1991) who classified four types of errors: fragment, run-on, choppy sentences, and stringy sentences. In contrast, the writer uses theory from Ho (2005) who classified 8 types of errors: Dangling Modifier, Squinting Modifier, Jumbled-up or Illogical sentence, Incomplete or Fragmented Sentence, Run-on Sentence (Fused Sentence), Inappropriate Coordinating Conjunction, Inappropriate Subordinating Conjunction, and Misordering or Inversion of Subject-Verb. Second, Ananda et al focused on the drafts which were written by the first grade students of SMA 11 Banda Aceh in their writing in English while the writer will focus on the drafts which will be written by the students from English Department. The similarity is both study focus on common error on the use of sentence structure.

The study was done by Ananda et al in order to analyze the most common error on the use of sentence structure that students made in Writing English. In Ananda et al finding, it showed that the most common error that occurred was fragment. Then, it inspires the writer to do further study to find out the common types of error that students of Written English 4B class made in their writing. The writer wants to know whether fragment will also be the most common one or not.

2.2.2 The Error Analysis on English Composition: A Case Study of Year 6 Students in St. Stephen's International School (Ampornratana, 2009)

Ampornratana (2009) study was done to find out the answer of three (3) research questions: (1) What are the most frequent errors that year 6 students made in English Composition? (2) What are the different types of errors that year 6 students made in English composition? (3) To what extent do year 6 students transfer Thai into their English writing? In order to answer her research questions, Ampornratana (2009) used the theory from Richard (1971) who classified two kinds of errors: Interference errors (fragment, run-on sentence, and word order

errors), Intralingual and Development error (incorrect use of conjunction, subject/object repetition).

In Ampornratana (2009) study, there were 37 students of year 6 coming from two classes studying at St. Stephen's International School in the academic year 2008. The researcher has purposively selected this sample group because this sample group has experienced writing English for 5 years. There were 148 written composition tasks of the 37 students collected every week for a month. There were also 37 more written tasks from the students' SAT tests. In total there were 185 (148+37) compositions. After collecting the data, the data would be analyzed by the researcher and two English native speakers who were two classrooms' teacher of year 6 students. Error would be classified and identified to find out the error that occurred in writing task and the data was presented by using percentages.

From Ampornratana (2009) findings, there were one thousand five hundred and ninety (1519) errors found in students' writing. The total errors showed that the first four high frequency errors were (1) incorrect verb and verb construction 20.34% (2) incorrect use of preposition 16.46% (3) word - by - word translation 15.40% and (4) incorrect use of agreement 15.01% respectively. In interference errors, the first three frequency errors students made were word - by - word translation (59.54%), determiner errors (16.79%) and fragments (12.98%) respectively.

There are two (2) differences between Ampornratana's (2009) study and the writer's study. First is Ampornratana (2009) used theory from Richard (1971) who classified two kinds of errors: Interference errors (fragment, run-on sentence, and word order errors), Intralingual and Development error (incorrect use of conjunction, subject/object repetition). In contrast, the writer uses theory from Caroline (2005) who classified 8 types of errors: Dangling Modifier, Squinting Modifier, Jumbled-up or Illogical sentence, Incomplete or Fragmented Sentence, Run-on Sentence (Fused Sentence), Inappropriate Coordinating Conjunction, Inappropriate Subordinating Conjunction, and Misordering or Inversion of Subject-Verb. Second, Ampornratana (2009) focused on the drafts which were written by the 6 year students St. Stephen's International School in their writing in

English while the writer will focus on the drafts which will be written by the students from English Department. The similarity is both study want to see what are the most frequent errors that made by the students.

The study was done by Ampornratana (2009) in order to analyze the most frequent error that occurred in students' English composition. In Ampornratana finding, fragment was not the most frequent errors that occurred in students' English composition. It is different from Ananda et al studies, the finding showed that fragmented sentence was the most common error that occurred in students' draft. There were 222 fragmented out of 299 errors in Ananda et al study. On the other hand, there were 12.98% fragmented sentences in Ampornratana's study. Then, it inspires the writer to do further research to find out what are the common errors that students of Written English 4B made in their writing.