

## **2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter discusses some theories which from that the writer uses to analyze the data. Moreover, it is divided into the concept of errors, the description of morphology and syntax, error taxonomies and review of related studies.

### **2.1. The Concept of errors**

Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) defined errors as parts of conversation or compositions that deviate from some selected norm of mature language performance. Then, they explained further that errors, based on the source, can be classified into errors that are caused by factors such as fatigue and inattention, and errors that are caused by lack of knowledge of the rules of the language (ibid, p. 130). Those two error types are called by Chomsky as competence errors and performance errors.

Furthermore, Corder also made a distinction of errors based on the same concept as Chomsky's. As written by James (1998), Corder associated "errors with failures of competence and mistakes with failure of performance". In this point, Ellis (1997) noted, Corder has explained that the resulting of errors are from lack of knowledge of the language, while mistakes are resulted from a failure to utilize a known system correctly. In other words, the learner who makes an error cannot do self-correction since he or she still does not have any knowledge to construct the correct form, even he or she does not know where the error is located. This condition happens continuously until he or she finds the knowledge about how to perform the correct one. However, learner who does a mistake is able to make a correction to their faultiness directly since he or she already knows about the norm of his or her language performance.

As this study focuses only on the errors performed in students' English compositions and pays no attention to the cause of them, the writer does not make a distinction between errors and mistakes or competence and performance errors.

Any error in this study is defined as an instance of language that deviates from Standard English Grammar.

## **2. 2. The Description about Morphology and Syntax**

Grammar, traditionally, has been discussed in term of morphology and syntax. Morphology is a part of grammar that handling word structure; while syntax is handling structure larger than the word (phrases, clauses, sentences, and even cohesion). In order to make the distinction between morphology and syntax easier to be understood, the writer discusses both of them separately.

### **2. 2. 1 Morphology**

Morphology as stated above is a part of grammar that handling word structure. In studying Morphology, the writer discusses the definition of morphology, concept of morpheme and word construction based on morphological process.

#### **2.2.1.1 Definition of Morphology**

Morphology, in more specific definition, is the system of rules and categories involved in word formation and interpretation (O’Grady and Guzman, 1997, p. 132). From the statement we might know that word is not the smallest element in language, there is another important element in word that is called morphemes. According to O’Grady and Guzman (1997) morphemes are the smallest unit of language that carries meaning and function that become the most important element in word construction. For this, the writer also may adopt the definition of Morphology that is stated by Yule (1986) as ‘a branch of linguistics, which study about morpheme or the smallest unit of language components that carries meaning and function.

#### **2.2.1.2 Morpheme**

Morphemes, as discussed before, are the smallest units of language that carries meaning and function. In this, morphemes become the most important elements in word formation.

In English, even some words consists of a single morpheme, such as *teach*, *student*, *map*, etc, many words consist of more than a morpheme; it can be two, three or even four. For example, the word *students* that carries two morphemes, student (carries the meaning ‘learner’) and {-s} (function as plural maker).

In addition, based on the ability in constructing the word, morphemes can be divided into free and bound morphemes. Free morpheme is a kind of morpheme that does not need to be attached to other morphemes in constructing a word since it can be a word by itself. It is divided based on content, which consists of part of speech, and function, which consists of preposition, conjunction, and article. For example, the morpheme *student* is free since it can stand alone to create a word, and based on part of speech, it is categorized as a noun. On the other hand, Bound morphemes are a kind of morpheme that must be attached to free morphemes in constructing a word. For example, {-s} as plural maker, is bound morpheme since it is needed to attach to free morphemes to carry a clear meaning of word.

Furthermore, talking about morpheme, it does not always have an invariant form (O’Grady and Guzman, 1997, p.133). It is possible that morpheme has more than one variant in order to carry the same meaning and function. For example, *an English teacher* and *a student*, both *an* and *a* express English indefiniteness. However, the form *a* used before any words beginning with consonant and the form *an*, before words beginning with a vowel. The variant of morpheme forms are called allomorphs.

### **2.2.1.3 Words Structures in Morphological Process**

Morphologically, there are some processes in order to construct a word, but in this study, the writer limits the discussion of the process of words construction to affixation and internal change.

#### **2.2.1.3.1 Affixation**

Affixation is extremely common morphological process in language. In other words, it can be said as a process how bound morphemes are attached to free one. Normally, based on the place where it is placed, affix is divided into prefix

(when it attaches to the front of its base), suffix (attaches to the end of its base) and the last infixes (attach within a base).

However, some linguists also divide it based on function into inflectional and derivational affixes. Inflectional affixes, as the first one, are the process of affixation in word to indicate grammatical subclass to which it belongs. In this, inflectional process does not change the grammatical category or the type of meaning found in the word (Ibid, p.161). For example, the word *students*, that consists of the free morpheme *student* and inflectional suffix {-s} as plural maker. The word, in grammatical category, is still a noun and still carries the meaning “learner”. However, based on grammatical sub category it is included as plural noun. Moreover, according to O Grady (1997) English has 7 inflectional affixes that completely presented bellow:

- a. An inflection affix attached to noun:
  - {-s} (plural makers) such as *all students*, *many friends*.
- b. Four inflectional morphemes which are attached to verb:
  - {-s} (third person present singular) such as *studies*, *teaches*.
  - {-ing} (continuous tense) such as *writing*, *reading*.
  - {-ed} (past tense) such as *talked*, *looked*.
  - {-en}/{-ed} (past participle) such as *listened*, *written*
- c. Two inflectional morphemes which are used in adjective
  - {-er} (comparative) such as *easier*, *smaller*.
  - {-est} (superlative) such as *easiest*, *smallest*

Looking into the classification of inflectional morpheme, Yule (1986) also has the same classification as O’Grady’s, but he added a possessive maker {-’s}, as another inflectional morpheme that can be attached to noun.

On the other side, derivational morphemes are used to make new word of a different grammatical category from the stem (Yule, 1986, p.77). It creates new word by changing the base to which they are attached such as *kind* vs *unkind*, and by changing the word-class that base belongs to such as, the addition {-ful} to noun *beauty* can produce simple adjective *beautiful*. Some list of other derivational affixes would be presented bellow:

Affixes	Category Change
-able	Verb into Adj.
-(at)ion	Verb into Noun
-er	Verb into Noun
-al	Verb into Noun
-ment	Verb into Noun
-ive	Verb into Adj.
-ing	Verb into Adjective
-ment	Verb into Noun
-ize	Noun into Verb
-less	Noun into Adjective
-ity	Adj. into Noun
-ly	Adj. into Adv.

#### 2.2.1.3.2 Internal Change

Internal change is a process that substitutes one non-morphemic segment for another (O' Grady, 1997, p.141). For example, the word *teach* in simple present tense can have internal change into *taught* in the past or past participle form.

Based on the explanation about morphology and how the word is constructed morphologically, the writer decided any deviations in word performing are called as morphological errors. In this, she follows James' thought (1998) that identify morphological error as a type of grammatical errors which involves a failure to comply with the norm in supplying any part of word classes. Moreover, the discussion of morphological errors in this study covered the affixation of words and also the internal change of words.

#### 2.2.2 Syntax

Syntax is the word that originally came from Greek and literally meaning 'a setting out together' or 'arrangement'. In learning language, syntax has been stated to some definitions. According to O' Grady (1997) it is the system of rules and categories that underlies sentence formation in human language. The systems of rules in learning language can be said as structure or pattern. Thus, in more

specific definition, syntax can be said as a part of grammar that “concentrate on the structure and ordering of components within sentence” (Yule, 1986).

Related to the statement, studying syntax in further understanding is dealing with how the sentence is broken down into its constituent parts, which may consist of smaller constituent part, or the other way around. Not only that, it is also dealing with how constituents differ from each other, how each type is constructed, how they are combined each other, what order they can and also naming the different types of constituents. Based on the understanding above, studying syntax also means obeying rules in making sentences. Therefore, when a learner breaks the rules, he or she, then, is committing syntactic errors.

### **2.2.2.1 Sentence Formation**

Sentences are not formed by simply stringing words together. For this statement, O’Grady (1997) has explained that sentences have a hierarchical design in which words are grouped together into successively larger structural units. Moreover, he added, the nature of syntactic unit builds around word is called a phrase (O’Grady 1997, p. 185).

Phrases, basically, consist of two parts, head and specifier. Head is a part of phrases that reserved for the word around which the phrases are built. It can be a noun, verb, adjective, adverb, and also preposition. On the other hand, specifier, helps to make more precise the meaning of the head that typically marks a phrase boundary. It can be determiner, qualifier, degree, etc. For example, the phrase *my school*, is a noun phrase where a singular noun *school* as a head and determiner *my* as a specifier. Furthermore, more complex phrases are built with complements. These elements which have already formed as phrase or phrases provide the information about entities and locations whose existence are implied by the meaning of the head, and syntactically, are attached to the right of the head of the head in English Phrase. For example, preposition phrase *of language in* a noun phrase: *the study of language*, which provide the information about noun *study*.

In order to ensure about the appropriate positions of specifier, head and complement in phrase structure, there is a phrase structure rules that stipulate

those positions in the various types of phrase. According to the basic of the rule, noun phrase may consist of determiner, noun and preposition phrase as a complement; the second rule verb phrase may consist of qualifier, verb and noun phrase; while the third, adjective phrase may consist of degree, adjective and preposition phrase; the last rule, prepositional phrase, is able to consist of degree, preposition and noun phrase (Ibid, p.189). If we summarized, they can be written as:

NP (Det) N (PP) ...  
 VP (Qual) V (NP) ...  
 AP (Deg) A (PP) ...  
 PP (Deg) P (NP) ...

Those four phrases structure rules are only the basic concept in analysing phrase. However, we are also possible to analyse sentence by using the rules since according to Yule (1986), phrase structure rules are able to generate a large number of sentences with similar structures.

Stated also by Yule (1986), the basic sentence in English has to contain of NP (noun phrase) and VP (verb phrase). Noun Phrase here can be noun (*chair, student, newspaper, etc.*), Property noun (*Indonesia, Mrs. Lily, George etc.*), Pronoun (*he, she, it, you, we, they, etc.*), or the combination of article (*a, an, the*), (adjective phrase (*beautiful, very ugly, etc.*)), and Noun. In addition, VP must contain with V and NP, but it is possible to add preposition phrase, which consist of preposition and NP. Talking about verb in a verb phrase, it can be a main verb (*teach, learn, read, etc.*) or the combination of auxiliary (*be, may, will, etc.*) and main verb.

### 2. 3. Error Taxonomies

Error taxonomies are the way how the researchers classify the learners' errors. In this study, the writer has limited to use descriptive taxonomies, which "classify errors to some observable surface feature without concern on the cause or the source of them" (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982, p. 145). Moreover, she prefers to use two different decriptive taxonomies, which are "linguistics category taxonomies" and "surface strategy taxonomy" in order to find errors that the third year students in Ta'miriyah produced in their compositions. In this, linguistics

category is a guideline to classify the errors, while surface strategy taxonomy is used to describe errors that are produced by the students.

### 2.3.1 Linguistics Category Taxonomy

Linguistics category taxonomies classify errors according to either or both the language component (phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and lexicon, and discourse) or the particular linguistic constituent the error affects (ibid, p.146). On the other hand, it carries out the classification of errors in term of where the errors is located in the overall system of the TL based on the linguistics item which is affected by the error. In this study, the linguistics component is limited to morphology and syntax, the discussions of which are traditionally explained in grammar level. Moreover, as a guideline to classify errors that are found in Ta'miriyah student's compositions, the writer follows Politzer and Ramires' category, that is called as a fairly traditional descriptive taxonomy. As quoted by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982, p.147) Politzer and Ramires categorized errors "as an aid in presenting the data rather than to create a basis for extensive speculation concerning the sources for the errors". Based on that reason, errors in this category were categorized "along fairly traditional line" that includes morphology and syntax, which then, were divided according to different part of speech or part of sentence. In addition, based on Politzer and Ramires' previous research which studied 120 Mexican-American children learning English in the United States, errors are classified into:

Linguistic Category and Error types	Example of Error
<p>A. MORPHOLOGY</p> <p>1. Indefinite Article Incorrect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A used for an before vowel</li> <li>• An used for a</li> </ul> <p>2. Possessive Case Incorrect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of 's</li> </ul> <p>3. Third Person Singular Verb Incorrect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to attach -s</li> <li>• Wrong attachment of -s</li> </ul>	<p><u>A ant</u></p> <p><u>An little ant</u></p> <p>the <u>man feet</u></p> <p>The bird <u>help</u> man</p> <p>The apple fall <u>downs</u></p>



<p>4. Simple Past Incorrect</p> <p>a. Regular Past Tense</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of –ed</li> <li>• Adding –ed to past already formed</li> </ul> <p>b. Irregular Past Tense</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regularization by adding –ed</li> <li>• Substitution of simple non past</li> <li>• Substitution of past participle</li> </ul> <p>5. Past Participle Incorrect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of –ed</li> </ul> <p>6. Comparative Adjective/Adverb Incorrect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of more + -er</li> </ul>	<p><i>The bird <u>save</u> him</i>  <i>He <u>calleded</u></i></p> <p><i>He <u>putted</u> the cookie</i>  <i>He <u>fall</u> in the water</i>  <i>I <u>been</u> near to him</i></p> <p><i>He was <u>call</u></i></p> <p><i>He got up <u>more higher</u></i></p>
<p>B. SYNTAX</p> <p>1. Noun Phrase</p> <p>a. Determiners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of the article</li> <li>• Substitution of def. article for possessive pronoun</li> <li>• Use of possessive with the article</li> <li>• Use of wrong possessive</li> </ul> <p>b. Nominalizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simple verb used instead of –ing</li> </ul> <p>c. Number</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Substitution of singular for plural</li> <li>• Substitution of plurals for singulars</li> </ul> <p>d. Use pronouns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of the subject pronouns</li> <li>• Omission of the ‘dummy’ pronoun it</li> <li>• Omission of object pronouns</li> <li>• Subject pronoun used as redundant element</li> <li>• Alternating use of pronouns by number as well as gender</li> <li>• Use of me as subject</li> </ul> <p>e. Use preposition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of preposition</li> <li>• Misuse of preposition</li> </ul> <p>2. Verb Phrase</p> <p>a. Omission of verb</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of main verb</li> </ul>	<p><i>He no go <u>in hole</u>.</i>  <i>He falls down on <u>the head</u>.</i></p> <p><i>He put it in <u>the his room</u>.</i>  <i>The little boy hurt <u>its leg</u>.</i></p> <p><i>By <u>to cook</u> it</i></p> <p><i>He got <u>some leaf</u>.</i>  <i>He stabs him in <u>the feet</u>.</i></p> <p><i><u>(He)</u> pinch the man</i>  <i><u>Is nice to meet you</u></i></p> <p><i>I don't know <u>(it)</u> in English</i>  <i>My brother <u>he</u> goes to Mexico.</i></p> <p><i>..., so he can eat <u>it</u> (it referring to apples).</i>  <i><u>Me</u> forget it.</i></p> <p><i>He <u>comes the water</u>.</i>  <i>He fell down <u>from</u> the water.</i></p> <p><i><u>He in the water</u>.</i>  <i><u>He teacher</u>.</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of to be</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	<i>He <u>going</u> to school.</i> <i>The bird was <u>shake</u> his head</i>
b. Use of progressive tense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of be</li> <li>• Replacement of –ing</li> </ul>	<i>You <u>be</u> friends</i> <i>The apples <u>was</u> coming down.</i>
c. agreement of subject and verb <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disagreement of subject and verb</li> <li>• Disagreement of subject and number</li> <li>• Disagreement of subject and tense</li> </ul>	<i>I <u>didn't</u> know what it is.</i>  <i>I see a bird <u>got the leaf</u></i>
3. Verb and verb construction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of to in the verb and verb construction</li> <li>• Omission of to in identical subject construction</li> <li>• Attachment of past maker to dependent word</li> </ul>	<i>I <u>go play</u>.</i>  <i>He was going <u>to fell</u>.</i>  <i>The bird he was gonna to shot it</i> <i>He put inside his <u>house a little around</u>.</i>
4. Word Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repetition of the object</li> <li>• Adjectival modifier placed after noun</li> </ul>	<i>He <u>not play</u> anymore.</i>
5. Some Transformations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Negative Transformation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formation of <i>no</i> or <i>not</i> without the auxiliary <i>do</i></li> <li>• Multiple negation</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. Question Transformation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Omission of auxiliary</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. <i>There</i> Transformation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of <i>is</i> instead of <i>are</i></li> <li>• Omission of <i>there</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>d. Subordinate clause transformation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of <i>for</i> for <i>so that</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>They <u>won't have no fun</u>.</i>  <i>How the story help?</i>  <i>There <u>is</u> these hole.</i> <i><u>Is one bird</u>.</i>  <i><u>For</u> the ant could get out.</i>

Source: *Language Two* by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982)

In looking to Politzer and Ramires' model classification, there is something should be noted that although they, basically, studied about morphological and syntactic errors, the taxonomy that they have is not purely limited to the identification and classification about those parts of grammatical errors. In fact, there are some morpho-syntactic errors such as third person

singular, simple past tense and past participle error, which by them, tshen, are classified as a part of morphological errors.

### 2. 2. 3 Surface Strategy Taxonomy

Surface strategy taxonomy is used to show the way surface structures are altered. Based on Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982, p.150) there are four main categories of errors, namely, omission, addition, misformation and misordering.

#### 1. Omission

It is characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. Based on some research, the learner omits both grammatical morpheme and content word, but the frequency in omitting grammatical morpheme is higher than the content word. According to Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982, p. 155) the omission of gramatical morphemes include noun and verb inflection (plural maker, past maker, etc.), articles (a, an, the, etc.), verb auxiliaries (am, is, are, etc.), and preposition (in, at, on, etc.). Some examples of omission are:

Error	Examples
Omission of plural maker {-s}	<i>I have a lot of <u>friend</u>.</i>
Omission of past maker {-ed}	<i>He <u>help</u> me yesterday.</i>
Omission of verb	<i><u>He</u> in the water.</i>
Omission of preposition	<i>He <u>is</u> the third class.</i>

#### 2. Addition

It is the opposite of omission, which is characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance. Some examples of addition are presented in list bellow:

Semantic feature	Error	Example of Errors
Past Tense	Past tense is marked in the auxiliary and the verb	<i>She <u>didn't</u> went/goed</i>
Present Tense	Present tense is marked in the auxiliary and verb	<i>He <u>doesn't</u> eats.</i>

Negation	Negation is marked in the auxiliary and quantifier	<i>She did not give him none</i>
Object	The object is both topicalized and expressed in the object pronoun	<i>That's the man who I saw him.</i>

Source: *Language Two* by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982)

### 3. Misformation

Misformation error is the use of the wrong form of the morpheme or structure. In this, the learner omits the correct form and supplies the other form that is incorrect. Some examples of misformation:

Linguistic item misformed	Example
Reflexive Pronoun	<i>Hisself (himself)</i>
Regular past form	<i>I falled (fell)</i>
Plural	<i>Gooses (geese) Childs (children)</i>

Source: *Language Two* by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982)

### 4. Misordering

Misordering is the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in utterance. One example of misordering showing in the sentence: *I met there some Germans* (Duskova, 1969). In this sentence, students misordered the use of adverb of place which is placed before object.

In this study, those categories above are used to describe all errors that are found. The description of the errors is done after the errors are classified into the linguistics category taxonomies. Both taxonomies are presented in the form of tables which are put in the appendix.

## 2.4 Review of Previous Studies

### 2.4.1 Study of Morphological and Syntactic Errors Produced by Six Guides in Bali by Christina (1998)

In studying about morphological and syntactic errors, Christina deals with six guides in Bali as her subject of investigation; thus, her source of data is in the form of guides' utterances or spoken language. Then, she classified the errors that

had been found based on Linguistics Category Taxonomy. In this she followed Politzer and Ramires' model taxonomy. Furthermore, based on her study, morphological errors consist of third person singular verb, simple past tense, and past participle. The second determine the error type, syntactic errors, consist of noun phrase, verb phrase, verb and verb construction, word order, passive tense and the last, auxiliaries system. Finally, in her study, she concludes errors that perform in guides' utterances are not as a signal of process anymore, it can be a slip of tongue. She also adds that they are not a failure anymore since among guides and the tourists are still able to create conversation well.

In reading Christina's study, the writer takes some learning which are useful in doing her study. The first that the writer takes is about making a limitation in morphology and syntax, which becomes a basic procedure in identifying morphology and syntactic errors. She also takes other learning which is about how to apply Politzer and Ramires' model classification in classifying errors based on linguistics category taxonomy since Christina followed the classification strictly without doing modification on it.

In addition, as a previous study which focuses on studying errors, Christina's has some similarities and differences with the writer's one. Focusing in similarities, the writer finds two kinds of similarities between them, which can be seen in the object investigation and the theory of linguistics category they use. The first similarity, Christina's and the writer's study deal with the field study of errors, which the analyses focus on morphological and syntactic errors. For the other one, they apply the same theory of Linguistics Category Taxonomy that is introduced by Politzer and Ramires' in order to classify the data. On the other hand, between Christina and the writer's study also show some differences, which are in constructing subject of investigation and source of the data, in the way they apply Politzer and Ramires' model classification, and in the process of data analysis. In choosing subject of investigation and source of the data, Christina chooses six guides in Bali as her respondents, then, she takes the data from guides' utterances, thus it is in the form of oral or spoken language. In other side, the writer chooses the third year students of Ta'miriyah Junior High School who sit in the third A class. Then, the source of the data is in the form of written taken

from 48 students' compositions. One of several reasons why the writer chooses composition is considering that learning English in junior high school is more concerned in the ability to understand the language in written form not oral one. Furthermore, the differences of both studies are also seen in the process of applying Politzer and Ramires' model classification. In this case, Christina (1998) follows that classification strictly by adding information "none" to the error types which are not found in her study. In contrast, the writer applies Politzer and Ramires' classification as a guideline in classifying the errors in linguistics category, then, she modifies it into some other linguistics classifications which are suitable in her data field. As the last difference which is in process of data analysis, Christina, in her study, focuses only in analysing the errors based on one taxonomy, which is Linguistics category taxonomy. However, the writer use two different taxonomies which are linguistics category in order to classify morphological and syntactic error types and surface strategy taxonomy in order to describe the error type. Both of those taxonomies combined together in one table that can be seen in appendix III.

From the explanation above it might be concluded that although both Christina's and the writer's study deal with the same field study, those studies are different. If we take a look at their source of data, it can be said that Christina concerns on the ability of second language learner in performing English Spoken Language in informal situation since her data taken from guide's utterances in Bali; while the writer concerns on the ability of second language learners in structuring English sentences in formal situation since her source of data is compositions written by the third years students of Ta'miriyah Junior High School. Moreover, if looking at their process of data analysis, Christina's is simpler since she focuses the analysis only on Politzer and Ramire's Linguistics classification; while the writer's is broader since she uses two taxonomies together in order to classify and describe the errors.

#### **2.2.4.2 A case Study of Syntactic Errors written by students in writing I of Petra Christian University by Nunik Lestari (2000)**

From her study, Lestari figures out the syntactic errors finds in journals which are written by 10 students of Petra Christian University in first writing class within one semester. Her study is supported by some theories which are the theory of English Syntax from Francis Bacon (1958), Greenbaum and Quirk (1990) and Baron toefl ed.7<sup>th</sup>; the theory of second language errors by Ellis and Lightbown; and Dulay's and Corder's theory on error. Moreover, from her study, Lestari finds that there are fourteen types of syntactic errors and four types of those errors commonly occur in students' journal. Those types of errors are in the term of verb, noun, preposition and tense sequence.

In addition, the writer chooses Lestari's as one of related study since from Lestari's study the writer is able to know other types of syntactic errors, which can be used in the writer's classification. Moreover, both the writer's and Lestari's study also have the similarity such as in field of the study and source of the data. In field of the study, both study deals with studying errors, which the analysis focuses on error in level of grammar. Then, as a source of data, both Christina and the writer choose written form of language.

Aside from the similarities, those two studies also have some differences. First difference is on using the theory for classifying the errors. Lestari in one side, uses Richard's Typical Intralingual and Development Errors Classification; while the writer uses the theory of Linguistics category, as proposed by Politzer and Ramire's model as a guideline in the process of classification. Furthermore, both of them also have different subject of investigation. In this case, Lestari prefers to choose 10 students in first writing class of Petra Christian University who have the same ability as the others; while the writer chooses the third year students of Ta'miriyah Junior High School who have higher ability in English than the others and sit in the third A class.

This chapter has already discussed all theories that the writer uses in her study. They really help the writer in analysing the data and drawing a conclusion on it.