

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the findings and discussion as the answer to the research questions of the study. The writer divides the chapter into three parts. The first part discusses the types of lexical errors produced by the high proficiency learners. The second part discusses the types of lexical errors produced by the low proficiency learners. Lastly, the third part discusses similarities or differences on the types of lexical errors produced by the high and the low proficiency learners.

4.1 The Types of Lexical Errors in the High Proficiency Learners' Production

This part presents the writer's analysis of lexical error production by high proficiency students in their writings. Out of 19 types of lexical errors proposed by James (2013) and supported by Hemchua and Schmitt (2006) as the guidance of this study, the learners produced nine types of lexical errors: semantically determined word selection, wrong term of near-synonym, suffix, calque, statistically weighted preference, omission, overinclusion, consonant-based, and arbitrary combination. From all errors, the most frequent types to occur is semantically determined word selection and wrong term of near-synonym with six occurrences. Meanwhile, the error types that were not found were prefix, vowel-based, borrowing, coinage, misselection, misordering, blend, hyponym for superonym, superonym for hyponym, and inappropriate co-hyponym.

In the following section, the writer reviews some of the examples of lexical error types that are produced by the high proficiency students. The order of the types discussed is according to the occurrence of each type from more to least frequent.

4.1.1 Semantically Determined Word Selection Type

This type is classified as a sub-type of collocational errors, under the major type of semantic error. Semantically determined word selection was produced when the learners chose the words that are not semantically relevant to the context of the sentence. Below are some examples of this error type in the high proficiency learners' production:

- **“The book has a light blue paperback cover ordained with floral patterns.” (1.1.1.1.)**

The learner chose the wrong word which is not even related to the context in the sentence. The highlighted word here means 'to invest or grant ministerial or priestly

authority in someone'. Therefore, it should be 'decorated', or the learner could just omit the word 'ordained' from the sentence.

- **“For instance, my bed is located behind my study desk, so when I look behind, I will get distracted and tempted to lay down.” (1.7.2.1.)**

Verb 'lay' actually means to lay/put something down (*membaringkan*); meanwhile, the learner here intended to say to 'lie' down on her bed (*berbaring*). She was confused with these two words and ended up choosing the wrong word which was semantically determined choice for the context.

4.1.2 Wrong Term of Near-Synonym Type

This type is classified under confusion of sense relations sub-type, which is the part of semantic error. Wrong term of near-synonym occurred when the students chose the synonyms of the words they intended to say that were actually inappropriate or not suitable for the context of their sentence. Below are the sentences that contain the wrong term of near synonym in the high proficiency learners' production:

- **“But now, I also give attention to the moral of the story and each character's unique characteristics.” (1.1.1.2.)**

'But' is used as a linking word between clauses and cannot be used in the beginning of a sentence. Thus, it should be a conjunctive adverb 'however' instead. 'But' and 'however' basically have the same meaning but their functions in a sentence are different to each other; therefore, it is considered the wrong term of near-synonym.

- **“During night time, the light on my desk that can change into different hues from warm to cool light keeps me companied while I study.” (1.5.2.2.)**

'Keeps me companied' actually means being there to keep someone from feeling lonely; meanwhile, for this context the learner meant to say that her light accompanied her during her studying. Thus, it was supposed to be 'keep accompanying me' as it was included as the near-synonym of 'companied'.

4.1.3 Suffix Type

This type is classified as one of formal misselection sub-types, which is a part of formal error. Suffix type occurred when the learners wrote the wrong suffix in the words they intended to say. Below are some examples of suffix errors produced by the high proficiency learners:

- **“I still remember clearly that the building has bright red poles that support the enormous orange roof with two curving sides that decorated with typical Chinese ornaments.” (1.7.1.2.)**

It should be ‘curved’ because it is the past participle of ‘curve’ that carries the passive meaning since it is used to describe the sides. The learner put the wrong suffix (‘curving’) in this sentence.

- **“These roughen soles assisted me when I enacted coupés, assemblies, and glissades.” (1.2.1.3.)**

It should be ‘rough’ since ‘roughen’ is the verb form. It is considered a suffix error because the learner chose the verb form which has a different suffix with the correct term that must be in adjective form.

4.1.4 Calque Type

This type is classified as one of misinformation sub-types, which is the part of formal error. Calque type was produced when the learners literally translated the word from their first language into the target language which caused error as the translated word is not suitable or inappropriate for the context. In this study, the learners’ first language is *Bahasa Indonesia*, while the target language is English. Below are some examples of calque type found in the high proficiency learners’ writings:

- **“My grandfather inherited his house to my aunt after he passed away.” (1.6.1..1.)**

The learner presumably mistook ‘*mewariskan*’ with ‘*mewarisi*’ then literally translated it into ‘inherited’. It should be ‘passed down’, as his aunt is actually the one who ‘inherited’ the house from his grandfather.

- **“Though many became frail and dusty with age, I still treasure them.” (1.3.1.5.)**

The learner literally translated ‘*seiring usia*’ into ‘with age’ which is incorrect in the TL; thus, it should be ‘because of’ as she refers to the photo album that is getting old as the time goes by.

4.1.5 Statistically Weighted Preference Type

This type is classified as a sub-type of collocational errors, which is under the major type of semantic error. Statistically weighted preference was produced when the learners chose words or phrases that are structurally and/or semantically correct in TL but there were other referred words or phrases that were more preferred and more common to say. Below

are some examples of statistically weighted preference that the high proficiency learners produced in their writings:

- **“Other than that, I still keep a photo album collection because I like to be able to touch, see, sometimes smell, and flip through the pages of my albums.” (1.3.1.3.)**

It is not totally wrong, but it should be enough and understandable for the learner to only write ‘... I like to touch, see, sometimes smell, and flip...’. The new form of the sentence after omitting ‘to be able’ is more preferred in the target language.

- **“The National Concert Hall in Taipei is the most memorable place to me.” (1.7.1.1.)**

It should be ‘for’ as it is the more preferred preposition for ‘memorable place’.

4.1.6 Omission Type

This type is classified as a sub-type under distortions, which is the part of formal error. Omission was produced when the learners omitted one item of the word and made it a new word that was not in the incorrect form and did not exist in the target language. Below are some examples of omission type produced by the high proficiency learners:

- **“I feel very happy everytime I go to my aunt’s house to visit my grandmother and my aunt’s family, or for family gatherings.” (1.6.1.3.)**

The correct form is ‘every time’; the student here omitted the space (‘everytime’) that caused the omission.

- **“Everytime I look at my character figurine, I can’t help but feel sentimental because it reminds me of the hard work I put in and the joy of making the figurine” (1.5.1.2.)**

The correct form is ‘every time’; the student here omitted the space (‘everytime’) that caused the omission.

4.1.7 Overinclusion Type

This type is classified as a sub-type under distortion error, which is the part of formal error. Overinclusion was produced when the learners added more items into the words intended to say. Below is the example of overinclusion type that the high proficiency students produced:

- **“One of my prized possessions is my photo album collection.” (1.3.1.1.)**

It should be ‘prize’ as it is the correct adjective form; meanwhile, ‘prized’ is a false form and does not exist in the target language. Past participles are often used as

adjective forms, and thus the learner used the same structure to the word 'prized' which caused overinclusion.

4.1.8 Consonant-based Type

This type is categorized as a sub-type of formal misselection, which is the part of formal error. Consonant-based was produced when the learners made errors in writing a consonant of a word they meant to write. Below is the example of consonant-based error the students produced:

- **"Another thing is that the lightning in my bedroom is bad." (1.7.2.2.)**

The learner here meant to talk about the bad 'lighting' in her room, but she mistook it to 'lightning' since the two words have a similar writing and some phonemes in common.

4.1.9 Arbitrary Combination Type

This error type is one of collocational error sub-types, which is the part of semantic error. Arbitrary combination error occurred when the learners did not write the words or phrases in their correct combination forms. Below is the example of arbitrary combinations that the high proficiency learners produced in their writing:

- **The pointe boxes were made from tightly packed layers of paper and fabric glued together, so they were rigid and sturdy. (1.2.1.1.)**

It should be 'pointe-shoes' as the name of the shoes (pointe-shoes) is a combination and has to be written completely. The learner here referred to the shoes; thus, 'pointe-shoes boxes' was required.

4.2 The Types of Lexical Errors in the Low Proficiency Learners' Production

This part presents the writer's analysis of lexical error production by low proficiency students in their writings. Out of 19 types of lexical errors proposed by James (2013) as the guidance of this study, the learners produced eight types of lexical errors: wrong term of near-synonym, calque, statistically weighted preference, inappropriate co-hyponym, suffix, hyponym for superonym, semantically determined word selection, and arbitrary combination. From all errors, wrong term of near-synonym was the most frequent type to occur with 23 occurrences. Meanwhile, the error types that were not found were prefix, vowel-based,

consonant-based, borrowing, coinage, omission, overinclusion, misselection, misordering, blend, and superonym for hyponym.

In the following section, the writer reviews some of the examples of lexical error types produced by the low proficiency students. The order of the types discussed is according to the occurrence of each type from more to least frequent.

4.2.1 Wrong Term of Near-Synonym Type

This type is classified under confusion of sense relations sub-type, which is the part of semantic error. Wrong term of near-synonym occurred when the students chose the synonyms of the words they intended to say that are actually inappropriate or not suitable for the context of their sentence. Below are the sentences that contain the wrong term of near synonym produced by the high proficiency learners:

- **“So, I was very happy to live with grandfather.” (2.9.1.2.)**

It should be a conjunctive adverb, such as ‘therefore/thus/hence’, because ‘so’ is a conjunction and cannot be used in the beginning of a sentence. Although they basically have the same meaning, their functions in sentence structure are different.

- **“I put my plants, paintings, dolls, and kpop merch there so now my room is my most favorite place to do my university duties.” (2.1.2.2.)**

‘Merch’ is an informal and shortened form of ‘merchandise’. It should be written in the formal form, ‘merchandise’, since it is an academic writing.

4.2.2 Calque

This type is classified as one of misinformation sub-types, which is the part of formal error. Calque type was produced when the learners literally translated the word from their first language into the target language (TL) which caused error as the translated word was not suitable or inappropriate for the context. In this study, the learners’ first language is *Bahasa Indonesia*, while the target language is English. Below are some examples of calque type found in the low proficiency learners’ writing:

- **By this, we could save much more time and expenses yet also, we could increase our stamina. (2.8.1.1.)**

The learner literally translated it from ‘*dengan ini*’ to ‘by this’ which is incorrect to use in this context. Therefore, it should be ‘by doing so’ or ‘by choosing those alternatives’

as the writer refers to traveling by the public transports or by foot can save more time and expenses.

- **“Even though my Aunt’s house is not a big house me and my family always find a way to have fun right there like playing with my younger cousin they were about 3 and 8 years old children, and we also spend time by watching a movies together.” (2.5.1.2.)**

The learner literally translated ‘*saya dan keluarga saya*’ into ‘me and my family’ which is structurally misordered in the target language. The correct phrase is ‘my family and I’ as it should be in the form of subjective pronouns.

4.2.3 Statistically Weighted Preference Type

This type is classified as a sub-type of collocational errors, which is under the major type of semantic error. Statistically weighted preference was produced when the learners chose words or phrases that were structurally and/or semantically correct in TL; however, there were other referred words or phrases that were more preferred and more common to say. Below are some examples of statistically weighted preference that the low proficiency learners produced in their writings:

- **“Even though my Aunt’s house is not a big house me and my family always find a way to have fun right there like playing with my younger cousin they were about 3 and 8 years old children, and we also spend time by watching a movies together.” (2.5.1.3.)**

‘Right there’ is usually used to emphasize that something/someone is exactly or clearly there in a particular direction. Thus, it is not really appropriate to use in this context as the learner only told that they can still have fun in the house. Using only ‘there’ in this sentence should be enough and more preferred since the learner did not intend to emphasize or urge a direction toward the location.

- **“The iPad color is silver that makes it looks more manly.” (2.7.1.1.)**

‘More manly’ is not entirely wrong in terms of structure. However, the comparative form of manly is ‘manlier’, so it is more preferred to use.

4.2.4 Inappropriate Co-Hyponym Type

This type is categorized as one of confusion of sense relations sub-types, under the semantic error. Inappropriate co-hyponym type occurred when the learners chose the

incorrect co-hyponym between the hyponyms that did not imply the meaning they wished to express. Below are some examples of this type that the low proficiency students produced:

- **“Even the streets are packed with snack shops and street foods that produces mouthwatering scents lingering around everywhere I go.” (2.8.1.3.)**

‘Scents’ are usually used to imply the pleasant smells of flower and perfume; meanwhile, its co-hyponym ‘aroma’ is normally used to identify the smells of foods. Therefore, the use of ‘scents’ in this sentence is inappropriate.

- **“Around my grandfather's house the situation is very quiet and there are no crowds.” (2.9.1.1.)**

It should be ‘ambience/atmosphere/surrounding’, since the learner talked about the usual state of the environment around his grandfather’s house. ‘Situation’ is rather occasional; thus, it is not really appropriate to use in the sentence.

4.2.5 Suffix Type

This type is classified as one of formal misselection sub-types, which is a part of formal error. Suffix type occurred when the learners write the wrong suffix in the words they intended to say. Below is the example of suffix errors that the low proficiency learners produced in their writings:

- **“And hopefully when I have become successful in the future I will renovation the my Aunt’s house.” (2.5.1.5.)**

It was supposed to be in the form of a verb which is ‘renovate’. ‘Renovation’ is the noun form which has a different suffix with its verb form.

4.2.6 Hyponym for Superonym

This error type is classified under confusion of sense relation types, which is a part of semantic error. Hyponym for superonym occurred because the learners chose a term that was too specific when the general term was required in the writing. Below is the example of hyponym for superonym that the low proficiency learners produced in their writings:

- **“To illustrate, we talked about the funny incidents that happened during class or discussing the answers to the exercises given because we are already comfortable opening up to one another.” (2.7.2.2)**

'Incident' actually means an unusual or unpleasant event which mostly causes damage. Thus, it is inappropriate to use in this context. The learner should have used a more general term instead, which is 'funny things.'

2.4.7 Semantically Determined Word Selection Type

This type is classified as a sub-type of collocational errors, under the major type of semantic error. Semantically determined word selection was produced when the learners chose words that were not semantically relevant to the context of the sentence. Below is the example of this error type that the low proficiency learners produced in their writings:

- **"Gabriella was very patient to do an explanation and give several examples until I was able to understand the context of the materials." (2.7.2.3.)**

The correct verb for 'an explanation' here is 'to give'. 'To do' is inappropriate and semantically determined to use for the context.

2.4.8 Arbitrary Combination

This error type is one of collocational error sub-types, which is the part of semantic error. Arbitrary combination error occurred when the learners did not write the words or phrases in their correct combination forms. Below is the example of arbitrary combinations that the low proficiency learners produced in their writing:

- **"Even though my bedroom is not big nor small, it is still my favourite place to go to during online classes and to work on assignments." (2.4.2.3.)**

The correct combination to use is either 'neither..nor..' or 'not..or..'

4.3 Comparison of High and Low Proficiency Learners' Lexical Error Production

The following table will show the comparison of lexical error type occurrences in high and low proficiency learners' production.

Table 4.1.

Comparison of lexical error type occurrences in high and low proficiency learners' production

Types of Lexical Errors	Occurrence in the Learners' Production	
	High Proficiency Learners	Low Proficiency Learners
Formal Errors		
Formal misselection		
Suffix	13.79%	2.63%
Prefix	-	-
Vowel-based	-	-
Consonant-based	3.45%	-
Misinformation		
Borrowing	-	-
Coinage	-	-
Calque	10.35%	13.16%
Distortions		
Omission	6.90%	-
Overinclusion	3.45%	-
Misselection	-	-
Misordering	-	-
Blend	-	-
Semantic Errors		
Confusion of sense-relations		
Superonym for hyponym	-	-
Hyponym for superonym	-	2.63%
Inappropriate co-hyponym	-	5.26%
Wrong term of near-synonym	20.69%	63.16%
Collocational errors		
Semantically determined word selection	20.69%	2.63%
Statistically weighted preference	13.79%	7.90%
Arbitrary combination	3.45%	2.63%

From the result above, the overall lexical errors produced by the learners are 66 errors, which consisted of 17 (25.76%) formal errors and 49 (74.24%) semantic errors. The high proficiency learners produced 11 (37.93%) formal errors and 18 (62.07%) semantic errors, whereas the low proficiency learners produced six (15.79%) formal errors and 32 (84.21%) semantic errors. Furthermore, based on variation of the types, the overall occurrence in both learner groups was 11 types, which consisted of five formal error types and six semantic error types. The high proficiency learners produced five types of formal errors and four types of

semantic errors, while the low proficiency learners produced two types of formal errors and six types of semantic errors.

Based on the results of high and low proficiency learners' lexical error production, there are several differences found in their writings. The first one was the occurrence of two major types of lexical errors. Out of 19 types of lexical errors classification, the high proficiency learners produced nine types in total, in which formal errors were more frequent (five types) than semantic errors (four types); meanwhile, the low proficiency learners produced a total of eight types, in which semantic errors were more frequent (six types) than formal errors (two types). The high proficiency learners' most varied production on formal errors was consistent with the studies by Andre and Jurianto (2015) and Saud (2018). The formal errors were mostly derived from intralingual transfer when the learners seem to have problems in determining the correct word class of lexical items, such as: 1) the inappropriate or the incorrect use of suffix to refer to the words intended; 2) the improper spelling due to omission or addition of inappropriate item to the correct words (Andre & Jurianto, 2015). On the other hand, the low proficiency learners' most varied production on semantic errors. This is presumably because semantic knowledge might be more complex to learn, as it requires sense relation and collocation (Hemchua & Schmitt, 2006). However, this finding is not in line with both of the related studies. Furthermore, this finding indicates that the high proficiency learners master more semantically-related aspects while the low proficiency learners master more formal aspects.

Next, the most frequent subtype that occurred in the two levels' writing production. The high proficiency learners produced semantically determined word selection and wrong term of near-synonym as the most frequent subtypes with a percentage of 20.69% of each type. Meanwhile, the low proficiency learners produced wrong term of near-synonym as the most frequent subtype with 63.16% of the total. These findings are consistent with the study by Hemchua and Schmitt (2006), in which wrong term of near-synonym type is the most to occur (19.54% of the total).

On the other hand, there were also the least frequent subtypes to occur in the learners' writing production. In the high proficiency learners' production, consonant-based, overinclusion, and arbitrary combination were the least frequent subtypes (3.45%). This finding is partly in line with the studies by Hemchua and Schmitt (2006), in which the least frequent type occurred is overinclusion (2.3%); Andre and Jurianto (2015), in which the least frequent type occurred is consonant-based (7 of 399 errors); while arbitrary combination is not

found in the other studies as the least frequent type to occur. On the other hand, in the low proficiency learners' production, suffix, hyponym for superonym, semantically determined word selection, and arbitrary combination were the least frequent subtypes (2.63%).

Another difference between high and low proficiency learners' lexical error production is in the occurrences of the group cases as well as the percentage of each lexical error type. Among six error types found in both high and low proficiency learners' writings, there were several differences found in five error types which are explained below:

- Wrong term of near-synonym type

The high proficiency learners produced 20.69% of the total errors; meanwhile, the low proficiency learners produced more, that is 63.16% of the total errors. Based on groups of cases, the high proficiency learners produced near-synonym errors in conjunction (i.e. 1.1.1.2.); prepositions (e.g.: 1.6.2.3.); and a verb. On the other hand, the low proficiency learners produced more varied groups of cases, they are conjunctions (e.g.: 2.1.2.3.); prepositions (e.g.: 2.7.1.4.), verb (i.e. 2.1.1.2.); informal term (i.e. 2.1.2.2.), and relative pronoun (i.e. 2.1.2.5.).

- Calque type

The high proficiency learners produced 10.35%, while low proficiency learners produced 13.16% of the total. Calque in both level's production was caused by literal translation from the first language.

- Suffix type

While high proficiency produced 13.79%, the low proficiency learners produced only 2.63%. The high proficiency learners' suffix error production is grouped into two cases: same word class ('influential' >< 'influencing'; 'curved' >< 'curving') and wrong usage ('ambient' >< 'ambience'; 'roughen' >< 'rough'). Meanwhile, the low proficiency learner only produced a case of wrong usage ('renovation' >< 'renovate').

- Semantically determined word selection type

The high proficiency learners produced more errors in a total of 20.69% errors than the low proficiency learners with only 2.63% error. Out of six errors produced by the high proficiency learners, three errors were caused by confusion to distinguish the different usage of two words that are still closely related; such as, 'use >< wear' and 'lie >< lay'. Then, the other three were caused by the incorrect word selections that are not related to the context (e.g.: 1.1.1.1., 1.5.2.1, 1.6.2.4.). On the other hand, one

occurrence of this type in the low proficiency learner's production was due to the incorrect word selection (i.e. 2.7.2.3.).

- Statistically weighted preference type

The high proficiency learners produced 13.79% errors, while the low proficiency learners produced 7.90% errors. The occurrences in both groups happened because the students used different terms from the most preferred terms.

Moreover, there were also error types that are only found in one group of learners: consonant-based, overinclusion, and omission which only occurred in high proficiency learners' production; and hyponym for superonym and inappropriate co-hyponym which only occurred in the low proficiency learners' production. The types that only occurred in the high proficiency learners' production are: 1) omission was produced twice (6.90%) and was caused by the learners omitting one item of the word ('everytime' in 1.5.1.2. and 1.6.1.3.); 2) overinclusion which was produced once (3.45%) due to the addition of one item into the intended word that created an inexistent word in target language ('prized' in 1.3.1.1.); 3) consonant-based which also occurred once (3.45%) because the learner was confused in distinguishing two words with alike writing ('lighting >< lightning' in 1.7.2.2.). Meanwhile, the types that only occurred in the low proficiency learners' production were: 1) inappropriate co-hyponym, which occurred twice (5.26%) and was caused by the wrong selections of the hyponyms between the group of words ('scents' in 2.7.1.3.; 'situation' in 2.8.1.1.). 2) hyponym for superonym, which was produced once (2.63%) due to the too-specific word selection ('incidents' in 2.7.2.2.)

On the other hand, there are also similarities between the lexical error productions of high and low proficiency learners. Both high and low proficiency learners produced only one arbitrary combination error; the high proficiency learners with a percentage of 3.45% and the low proficiency learners with 2.63%. This type was also one of the least occurred error types in the both high and low proficiency learners' production.

Another similarity is that both levels did not produce seven lexical error types, such as prefix, vowel-based, borrowing, coinage, misselection, misordering, and blend from the formal error, and superonym for hyponym from the semantic error. This result is consistent with the studies by Saud (2018), in which borrowing and blending are not produced; and Hemchua and Scmitt (2006), in which vowel-based, borrowing, and coinage are not produced. Firstly, prefix and vowel-based, which are the parts of formal misselection, did not occur in the learners' writing presumably because the learners can distinguish the words they wish to express

correctly despite the similarity in forms or patterns in the prefix and the vowel of the words. Next, the learners of both levels did not produce borrowing and coinage because possibly their vocabulary banks in TL (target language) were rich enough to neither used the words in their mother tongue directly (i.e., borrowing) nor created words that are tailored to their MT (mother tongue) also do not exist in TL (i.e., coinage). Both high and low proficiency learners also did not produce most of distortion errors, such as misselection, misordering, and blend. It might be due to the learners' knowledge to distinguish the correct spelling of the words. Lastly, the learners of the two proficiency levels did not produce terms that are too general (superonym for hyponym), which is under the semantic error. This is presumably because the learners had enough understanding to use the appropriate terms accurately to the context of their writings.

4.4 Interpretations

Based on the result above, the high proficiency learners produced more varied formal error types than semantic error types. This is possibly because the learners had more problems distinguishing the correct and appropriate form of the words they intended. This finding is consistent with the studies by Hemchua and Schmitt (2006), Andre and Jurianto (2015), and Saud (2018), in which the formal errors were more varied found in the students' writings. Meanwhile, the low proficiency learners produced more varied semantic error types. This might be due to them having more problems in expressing the words they intended as they still lack the knowledge of sense relation, collocation, connotation, and register. This finding turns out to be contrast with the findings in the related studies by Hemchua and Schmitt (2006), Andre and Jurianto (2015), and Saud (2018). Additionally, the high and the low proficiency learners turned out to be writing in the quite similar word range - 117-431 words in the high proficiency learners' production and 117-363 words in the low proficiency learners' production. Therefore, the length of their writings seems not to have a big influence in each group's error production.

Furthermore, most of the lexical errors produced by high and low proficiency learners tended to be influenced by intralingual error. James (2013) states that distortions, confusion of sense-relation, and collocational errors are caused by intralingual transfer, and the error occurrences in this study are mostly from those three types. Thus, intralingual error is the common cause of the lexical errors in this study. Both high and low proficiency learners seem to have problems in writing the correct word form by deleting (omission) and adding

(overinclusion) some of the lexical items. Moreover, they also have some difficulties distinguishing the words they intended to deliver with other words that are: 1) close or similar in meaning but different in certain usage (wrong term of near-synonym); 2) from the same group of hyponyms (inappropriate co-hyponym); or 3) too specific (hyponym for superonym). Last but not least, the learners also found it hard acknowledging: 1) the words with the exact or appropriate meaning they intended to write (semantically determined word selection); 2) the more preferred terms in general (statistically weighted preference); and 3) the correct combination of the words with arbitrary combinations. This result is also found in Andre and Jariato's study (2015).

The next point that the writer wanted to highlight is the disruption scale between formal and semantic errors in the learners' production. According to the analysis, semantic errors presumably to be more disruptive than the formal errors since the semantic aspects carry the meaning or the context of what were actually being said by the learners in their written text. Meanwhile, the formal errors were more likely understandable as the errors still have close-like forms with the correct word forms. This is based on James' measurement of deviance (2013), which states that to fulfill the acceptability the piece of a language has to refer to the right context although it is already correct in terms of grammaticality.

Another thing that the writer found important to highlight in this study is the usage of coordinating conjunctions such as 'and', 'but', and 'so' in the beginning of sentences that mostly occurred in the learners of both levels' lexical error production. This might be due to the influence of the learners' verbal communication on a daily basis. Usually, in verbal daily conversations that are casual occasions, the three conjunctions are often spoken in the beginning of sentences. This habit then influences the learners to also use the conjunctions in their writing tasks at class which are actually academic papers and thus have to be writing in formal style. The coordinating conjunctions actually have a function to connect clauses, and to use it to start a sentence can cause fragment as the usage of the conjunctions is too conversational (Fogarty, 2021).