**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. **Background**

English is one of the important subjects in educational curriculum. In Indonesia, English is taught as a mandatory subject at schools ranging from elementary level to tertiary level. Teaching and learning process has become the main features to determine the success of students’ English proficiency in which students have to gain the four major skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing.As one of the productive skills, writing also has been taught at school and university to build the students’ English competence. The ability to write effectively in English is becoming increasingly important in our global community as communication across language becomes even more essential. Good English writing competence is widely recognized as an important skill for educational, business and personal reasons. Writing is a complex process which demands cognitive analysis and linguistic synthesis. It is even harder to learn to write in a foreign language, and it takes considerable time and effort to become a skillful writer.

To master English writing, we need to study the grammatical aspect of it. We need to know grammar, semantics, syntax, literature. As one of language elements, grammar is the first point that must be known for students because it is important in order not to make mistakes or errors. Harmer (1998: 1) defines grammar as the rules which words change their forms and are combined into sentences. The simple definition by Jeremy may become the first consideration to start a writing in a more thinkable thought as words changing and combining frequently occur in the process of writing. However, some students at the higher level still have lack of grammatical awareness when they do a writing. Harnawati (2004) in her research of grammatical errors in writing finds that the students of Senior High School make many kinds of errors in writing paragraph in which the most frequently errors occurred are misformation of words. Of this case, an error analysis is needed to cover the problems that the students actually face in writing.

Corder (1967) states the usefulness of error analysis in three respects: to the researcher or linguist, to the language teacher, and to the learner himself. While analysis of learners’errors provides insights into the nature of language, especially into the innate nature of the learner’s system, they provide even more insights into the process of language teaching and learning. As such, concrete conclusions may usually be drawn from the results of the analyses regarding how a second or foreign language can be more effectively taught and learned, or how existing methods of teaching and learning can be improved.

In deciding what should be the linguistic input to language teaching materials, it should be certainly examined and seek an explanation for the errors that are typically made by different group of students. From what it has been seen it is clear that the explanations will prove to be partly contrastive and partly non-contrastive between first language (L1) and second language (L2). The fact that error may be caused both by contrastive differences and by the structure of the target language itself means that it is impossible to base the content of language teaching entirely on the result s of contrast. Even if it were possible to make wholly accurate predictions of contrastive difficulties, we should not have predicted all the difficulties that a learner faces. The structure of the second language itself has to provide much of the content of language teaching. It cannot be assumed that non-contrastive aspects of the language will look after themselves. This probably accounts for the fact that anyone who has taught English to students from different language backgrounds has found that there are many aspects of the structure of English which are almost universally difficult for learners of English as a second language (Wilkins 1972: 204). Therefore, errors are also useful in assessing teaching materials. For example, in Chiang’s (1981) view of the English Composition course of the NTNU English Department, the high frequencies of errors found in the compositions may indicate the insufficiency for the students to master the written component of the language. The career-oriented motivation of the population of subjects being investigated is different from that of any other population of English majors on other campuses. As such, better command of written English appears more important to them than to other English majors on the other college campuses who may or may not enter into the TEFL profession (1981:205).

From the brief explanation above, the researcher would like to conduct a research on lexicogrammatical error analysis in writing a narrative paragraph. Although some researchers have given some obvious research findings in term of error analysis, the researcher here is about to find deep explanation of lexicogrammatical aspect that can cause errors.

1. **Problem Statement**

Referring to the background above, the writer formulated the research questions as follows:

1. What range of lexicogrammatical error types are mostly made by the students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in narrative writing?
2. What are the possible sources of errors made by the students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in narrative writing?
3. **The Objective of the Research**

Based on the research questions above, this research is conducted to find out:

1. The range of lexicogrammatical error types which are mostly made by the students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in narrative writing.
2. The possible sources of errors made by the students of English Department of Muhammadiyah University of Makassar in narrative writing.
3. **The significance of the Research**

Academically, this research is expected to be significant for the field of Teaching English as Foreign Language particularly in teaching grammar and writing. It is expected that the findings of this study inform teaching professionals of the levels, nature, sources, and prevalence of learner errors and equip them with the key ingredients needed for the design of appropriate remedial instructional materials. Furthermore, an error taxonomy like from this researchis expected to help syllabus designers, curriculum writers, as well as EFL teachers to anticipate and diagnose learning problems, so that they will be more adept at identifying appropriate teaching strategies, designing quality error correction materials, and planning Second Language Acquisition (SLA) educational program the result of this research can be meaningful contribution for EFL teachers as a feedback to find out the suitable methods so that teacher can concentrate on the materials in which most learners make errors, and to improve their technique in teaching by preparing appropriate materials. Practically, the result of this research can give positive input for students especially for students of English Department inMuhammadiyah University of Makassar. It is expected to give information in what aspects of grammar which are difficult for them so that they can minimize or avoid making error, and to improve their ability in writing.

1. **The Scope of the Research**

This research was accentuated on lexicogrammatical errors made by the forth semester students of English Department at Muhammadiyah University of Makassarin writing narrative paragraphs.

The errors on lexicogrammar in students’ writing were categorized into: Morphological level, Lexical level, Syntactic Level, and Discourse level. Then, the lexicogrammatical errors were subcategorized into: Morphological level (inappropriate selection of affixes, overuse of affixes), Lexical level (inaccurate directionality, synonym confusion, vocabulary compensation, synforms) Syntactic level (*pseudotough movement, misuse of conjunctions, duplicated comparatives or superlatives, misordering of constituent in indirect questions, In-prepositional phrases, independent clauses as objects or subjects, be + ed, pseudopassives and undergeneration of passives, omission of subjects, existensial structures, misuse of prepositions, verb form selection, misuse of relative clauses, incorrect order of adverbials or adverbs, serial verb constructions, inappropriate case selection, punctuation problems, transitivity pattern confusion, be + base form, omission of copulas, concord problems, word class confusion, calquing)* Discourse level (*periphrasic-topic constructions, use of ‘it’ as discourse* deixis) (Chan, 2010).

**CHAPTER II**

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

This chapter highlights some research findings and pertinent ideas that are closely related to the terms of error analysis, lexicogrammarand narrative writing.

1. **Previous Related Research Findings**

Some researchers have conducted studies that focus on students writing and errors they made. Their findings are as contribution to increase English teaching, mainly writing subject, as follows:

1. Chan (2010) carries out a research study on “Investigation Into the Written Errors of Hongkong Cantonese ESL Learners.” This research examined common lexicogrammatical problems found in Cantonese English as a second language (ESL) learners’ written English output. She found a range of lexicogrammatical error types among Hong Kong Cantonese ESL learners, such as errors from the lexical level; errors from the syntactic level and; errors from the discourse level. The results of the study have potential for enhancing our understanding of the interlanguage grammar of learners and the nature, sources, and prevalence of learner problems. The results also have promising pedagogical implications, as they inform teachers of the levels, nature, sources, prevalence, and gravity or learner errors and equip them with the key ingredients needed for the design of appropriate remedial instructional materials.
2. Crompton (2011) in his research “Article Errors in the English Writing of Advanced L1 Arabic Learners: The Role of Transfer” describes an enquiry into article system errors in a corpus of English writing by tertiary-level L1 Arabic speakers. Frequencies of articles were compared with those in native English and non-native English speaker corpora. It was found that the commonest errors involve mis-use of the definite article for generic reference. It was suggested that even for learners of English with mother-tongues which have an article system, such as Arabic, L1 transfer may be a problem and as such could be usefully addressed in language instruction.
3. Henry and Roseberry (2007) in his research “Language Errors in the Genre-based Writing of Advanced Academic ESL Students” try to test some research studies which suggest that lexical knowledge plays a greater role than grammar in the acquisition of native-like fluency. It was found that the majority of errors were errors of usage, not grammar, and that there was a relationship between the types of errors and the move-strategy. The researcher concluded that, at the academic level, raising students’ awareness of usage types and patterns with relation to genre moves is far more crucial than instruction in grammar.
4. Alroe(2011) in his research entitle “Error Correction of L2 Students’ Texts – Theory, Evidence and Pedagogy” indicates that comprehensive error correction of written work can be done economically by simple underlining, and is effective if students write a substantial amount and correct their errors. Further, he stated that correction can be integrated with content comment. The study also shows that focused correction may be limited in scope but powerful in effect.
5. Yahya (2009) in his research “Error Analysis on Usage of Tenses” finds out that (1) the kinds of errors made by the students on usage of tenses consist of errors on omission, errors selection, and errors on addition; (2) the types of errors made by the students on usage of tenses were intalingual and intralingual errors, and (3) the causes of errors were interference of the learners’ mother tongue, overgeneralization, false concept hypothesis, and ignorance of rule restriction.

From some previous related studies above the researcher can draw conclusion that the students still have low ability in writing English composition. There are some errors made in writing but they might not realize them. Thus, error analysis must be done in order to identify and classify students’ error particularly in writing. Furthermore, what makes this research different from others is that the preliminary intension of these studies tries to investigate the students’ errors based on grammar in which syntax and morphology are included. Moreover, this research attempts to discover the students’ errors based on the lexicogrammar which is not only about syntax and morphology but also lexical and discourse level.

1. **Some Pertinent Ideas**
	* + 1. **Concept of Error**
	1. *Definition of Error*

The following definitions of error are derived from several views:

Richard and Schmidt (2002: 184) state that error is (in the speech or writing of a second or foreign language learner) the use of a linguistic item in a way which a fluent or native speaker of the language regards as showing faulty or incomplete learning.

**Brown (2000: 165) states that error is noticeable grammar from the adult grammar of native speaker, reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learners.**

According to Corder (Cited in Lin Ho, 2005: 14) errors are typically produced by people who do not yet fully command some institutionalized language system and the errors themselves are competence errors. True errors are markers of the learners’ competence. He also classifies the errors in items of differences between the learners’ utterance and reconstructed version. In this way, errors fall into four categories:

1. Omission of some required element;
2. Addition of some unnecessary element;
3. Selection of an incorrect element
4. Misordering of the element.

Crystal (1987) states that error is a term used in psycholinguistics referring to mistakes in spontaneous speaking or writing attributable to a malfunctioning new muscular command from brain.

According to Richard (1992), a learner makes a mistake when writing or speaking are due to lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness or some other aspects of performance. Mistakes can be self-corrected when attention is called. Whereas, an error is the use of linguistic item in a way that a fluent or native speaker of the language regards it as showing faulty or incomplete learning. in other words, it occurs because the learner does not know what is correct, and thus it cannot be self-corrected.

According to Ellis (1997:19), error analysis is a systematic explanation of errors made by learners or written production on the target language. It means that error analysis is concerned with the explanation of the occurrence error and the production of written expression differs from that of native speaker or target language norm.

A distinction is sometimes made between an error, which results from incomplete knowledge, and a mistake made by a learner when writing or speaking which is caused by lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness, or some other aspect of performance. Errors are sometimes classified according to vocabulary (lexical error), pronunciation (phonological error), grammar (syntactic error), misunderstanding of a speaker’s intention or meaning (interpretive error), production of the wrong communicative effect, example through the faulty use of a speech act or one of the rules of speaking (pragmatic error).

Various definitions of error have been presented by expert. Basically those definitions contain the same meaning while the difference lies only on the ways they formulate them. That is why the researcher only puts forward two definitions of error in this research. These two definitions are adequate to reveal the errors showing up in the written texts. The two definitions are (1) error is a systematic deviation, when a learner has not learnt something and consistently gets it wrong, and (2) errors are systematic deviations from the norms of the language being learned. It seems that the phrase ‘systematic deviation’ in these definitions is a key word which can be interpreted as the deviation which happens repeatedly.

Further, it is necessary to differentiate between error and mistake. Error is a systematic deviation when a learner has not learnt something consistently gets it wrong. Whereas, a mistake also a deviation of the norms of the language but is not systematic. It means that the use of the norms of the language is sometimes true and sometimes wrong. Norrish (1983: 8 in Adu 2012:11) says that a mistake is an inconsistent deviation that is sometimes the learner ‘gets it right’ but sometimes wrong. So, it can be concluded that a mistake is made by a learner because he/she does not apply the rules that actually he/she knows, in other words, a mistake is a non systematic deviation from the norms of the language.

1. *The kinds of Error*

Beside the problem of definition, the classification of the kinds of error also draws a lot of attention from researchers. Burt and Kiparsky (1974: 73) distinguish between global errors and local errors, “a global error is one which involves the overall structure of a sentence and a local error is one which affects a particular constituent”. According to Brown (2000) global errors hinder communication. They prevent the message from being comprehended as in the example below: *\*I like bus but my mother said so not that we must be late for school*. On the other hand, local errors do not prevent the message from being understood because there is usually a minor violation of one segment of a sentence that allows the hearer to guess the intended meaning as follows: *\*If I hear from her, I would let you know*. On the global level, kinds of error are classified by Corder (1973: 277) into four main categories: error of omission where some elements are omitted which should be present; errors of addition where some elements are present which should not be there; errors of selection where the wrong item has been chosen in place or the right one; and errors of ordering where the elements presented are correct but wrongly sequenced. This superficial classification of errors is only a starting point for systematic analysis.

Errors in language learning can be divided into two groups according to their characteristics. They are systematic and unsystematic errors. The first group is that of the frequent errors of performance which Corder calls mistakes. These are due to memory lapses, physical states, such as tiredness and psychological condition such as strong emotion. Errors of this type are not systematic and can be corrected by the learners themselves. The next group of errors is that of systematic errors. This type of error is produced regularly and systematically with the same non-native features. Thus, this piece of language is logical or correct to the student, but not to the native speaker.

The systematic errors can be classified into two groups, the overt and the convert errors. This first does not present any problem at all in respect to recognize an utterance or a piece of writing as erroneous, for instance, *the girl \*go to school.* These overt errors often contain idiomsyncratic grammatical form. While covert errors are not immediately obvious as in the case of overt errors. For instance the sentence *he goes to school* contains no formal grammatical deviations and would in many contexts be perfectly acceptable. However, in a context where “just” is implied unacceptable by the native speaker.

Errors can also be classified according to their sources. They are interlanguage and intralingual errors. Interlanguage errors or sometimes called interference are those caused by interference of the learners’ mother tongue or errors which are derived from another language. An example of this type of errors can be in Indonesian – English like *there are many \*pencil*. Intralingual errors refer to items produced by the learners which do not reflect the structure of his mother tongue. This type of error seems to be common to speakers of diverse languages.

Dulay, 1982 (in Adu, 2012:12) also explains three types of errors, which belong to surface strategy taxonomy are omission, addition and misformation. To give details explanation, the researcher takes some examples as follows:

1. **Omission**

These types of errors are characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. Example: \**My friend are not coming to the party*.

In the sentence above, there is an omission of plural “s”. the plural form friend is friends. The sentence should be: *My friends are not coming to the party.*

1. **Addition**

Addition errors are characterized by the presence of an item, which must not appear in a well-formed utterance. Example: *\*The childrens are playing in the rain.* This sentence shows that the mistake is on “the childrens”. The word must be “children” because the word is already a plural noun which must not be added by ‘s’ again. The sentence should be: *The children are playing in the rain.*

1. **Misformation**

Misformation errors are characterized by the use of the wrong form of morpheme of structure. The incorrect sentence is for example: *My little brother runs \*fastly.* This sentence should be: *My brother runs fast*. The word “fast” in this sentence has function as an adverb, moreover, there is no need to add suffix –ly because it has the same form for adjective and adverb.

*c. Causes of Error*

Brown (2000:173) classifies the causes of error into two categories in term of interference: Interlingual interference and Intralingual interference. In the process of second language learning, the grammatical system of the learners mother tongue may interfere the grammatical system of the second language. The deviation which reflects the grammatical system of the mother tongue is called interference. An interference may also occur between the rule of particular construction and the rule of mother tongue or the construction of the same language. Both interferences, however, are resulted from the learning process.

Whereas Richards (in Yahya, 2009) subdivides the intralingual or developmental errors into four factors, they are:

1. Overgeneralization

According to Jakobovits quoted by Richards (1974: 174) overgeneralization or transfer is the use of previously available strategies in new situations. In second language learning some of these strategies will prove helpful in organizing the facts about the second language, but others, perhaps due to superficial similarities, will be misleading and inapplicable. Overgeneralization covers instances where the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structures in the target language.

Based on the statements above, it can be said that the cause of error in this case is not the influence of the learners’ mother tongue but it is the influence of the target language which they have already learnt. For example: *He runs \*fastly*. In this sentence, the learner produces an error because he/she generalizes that adverbs of manner must always be formed by adding suffix ‘-ly’ to the adjective.

1. Ignorance of rule restriction

This kind of error is closely related to overgeneralization. That is the learners fail to observe the restrictions of certain structures. In this case, they apply a rule in context of a sentence where actually it is not necessary. For example: *My mother \*who bought me new clothes last week*. The learner does not know that it is impossible to mention the person referred to by the relative pronoun by another pronoun as well.

1. Incomplete application of rule

This means that the learners apply a rule in the context of a sentence, although the rule is not yet complete. The students may use a statement for a question by adding a question mark at the end of the sentence. For example: *\*She is your friend?*

1. False concepts hypothesized

 False concept hypothesized refers to faulty rule learning at various levels. There is a class of interlingual errors which derived from faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language. There are sometimes due to poor gradation of teaching items. Some students get confused and cannot differentiate between *go* and *come*, *bring* and *take*, *too* and *very*. They use the present tense instead of the present continuous tense or the other way around. This might be caused by learners not paying much attention to the difference between items. They consider *too* and *very* are the same as well as *go* and *come*.

1. **Error Analysis**
	1. *Definition of Error Analysis*

Error analysis is a systematic explanation of errors made by learners or written production on the target language (Ellis, 1997: 12). It means that error analysis is concerned with the explanation of the occurrence error and the production of written expression differs from that of native speaker or target language. Richards (cited in Nirmayani, 2009: 18) states that error analysis is the study and analysis of the errors made by the second and foreign language learners. Error analysis is carried out in order to: (1) Find out how well someone knows a language, (2) Find out how a person learns a language, (3) Obtain information on common difficulties in language learning, as in teaching or in the presentation of teaching materials.

Crystal (cited in Yahya, 2009: 14) states that in language teaching and learning error analysis is a technique for identifying, classifying and systematically interpreting the unacceptable form produced by someone learning a foreign language, using any of the principle and procedures provided by linguistics.

According to Corder (1973) error analysis has two objects: one theoretical and another applied. The theoretical object serves to elucidate what and how a learner learns when he studies a second language. The applied object serves to enable the learner to learn more efficiently by exploiting our knowledge of his dialect for pedagogical purposes. The investigation of errors can be at the same time diagnostic and prognostic. It is diagnostic because it can tell u the learner’s states of the language at a given point during the learning process, prognostic because it can tell course designers to reorient language learning materials on the basis of the learners’ current problem.

* 1. *Procedures of Error Analysis*

Ellis (1994) provides the procedure for analyzing learner’s errors including the following steps:

* + 1. Collection of a sample of learner language. Most samples of learner language which have been used in EA include data collected from many speakers who are responding to the same kind of task or test. Some studies use samples from a few learners that are collected over a period of weeks, months, or even years in order to determine patterns of change in error occurrence with increasing L2 exposure and proficiency.
		2. Identification of errors. The first step in the analysis requires determination of elements in the sample of learner language which deviate from the target language in some way. Errors are distinguished into systematic errors (which result from learners’ lack of L2 knowledge) and mistakes (the results from some kind of processing failure such as lapse in memory), which he excludes from the analysis.
		3. Description of errors. For purposes of analysis, errors are usually classified according to language level (whether an error is phonological, morphological, syntactic), general linguistic category (example: auxiliary system, passive sentences, negative constructions), or more specific linguistic elements (example: articles, prepositions, verb forms).
		4. Explanation of errors. Accounting for why an error was made is the most important step in trying to understand the processes of SLA. Two of the most likely causes of L2 errors are interlingual (between languages) factors, resulting from negative transfer or interference from L1 and intralingual(within language) factors, not attributable to cross-linguistic influence. Intralingual errors are also considered developmental errors and often represent incomplete
		5. Evaluation of errors
1. **Concept of Lexicogrammar**

The term Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) first appeared in print in the 1982 volume edited by Joan Bresnan: *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations, the culmination of many years of research* (Neidle, 1988)*.* LFG differs from both transformational grammar and relational grammar in assuming a single level of syntactic structure. LFG rejects syntactic movement of constituents as the mechanism by which the surface syntactic realization of arguments is determined, and it disallows alteration of grammatical relations within the syntax. A unique constituent structure, corresponding to the superficial phrase structure tree, is postulated. This is made possible by an enriched lexical component that accounts for regularities in the possible mappings of arguments into syntactic structures. For example, the alternation in the syntactic position in which the logical object (theme argument) appears in corresponding active and passive sentences has been viewed by many linguists as fundamentally syntactic in nature, resulting, within transformational grammar, from syntactic movement of constituents. However, LFG eliminates the need for a multi-level syntactic representation by allowing for such alternations to be accomplished through regular, universally constrained, productive lexical processes that determine multiple sets of associations of arguments (such as agent, theme) with grammatical functions (such as SUBJECT, OBJECT)— considered within this framework to be primitives—which then map directly into the syntax.

This dissociation of syntactic structure from predicate argument structure(a rejection of Chomsky’s Projection Principle, in essence) is crucial to the LFG framework. The single level of syntactic representation, *constituent structure(c-structure)*, exists simultaneously with a *functional structure (f-structure)* representation that integrates the information from c-structure and from the *lexicon*. While c-structure varies somewhat across languages, the f-structure representation, which contains all necessary information for the semantic interpretation of an utterance, is claimed to be universal.

Phenomena that had been explained by the interaction of transformations are accounted for in LFG by the regular interaction of lexical processes. Bresnan (1982a) shows that some of the classic arguments for syntactic transformations do not, in fact, distinguish between a transformational and a lexical account of the regularities. In Bresnan 1982b, she argues that the lexical account of passivization is superior to the transformational approach, e.g., in explaining why passivized forms can undergo further lexical rules, such as Adjective Conversion and compounding (giving rise to such forms as “snow-covered”).

Bresnan and other contributors to Bresnan 1982a offer evidence and arguments in support of the formulation of such alternations in terms of alternative assignments of grammatical functions to arguments rather than syntactic movement. They suggest that the model has psychological validity, and is consistent with evidence about grammatical processing and acquisition. It also captures cross-linguistic generalizations about languages that have comparable alternations in the realization of arguments as grammatical functions despite the use of very different syntactic means for expressing functions like subject and object. Bresnan (1982b) suggests that the “illusion” of NP-movement in the English active/passive alternations is just an artifact of the structural encoding of object and subject through word order in English. This is in contrast with languages like Malayalam, in which word order is much freer; accordingly, passivization in Malayalam involves an apparent change in morphological case. In LFG, the different realizations of active and passive sentences in Malayalam and English follow directly from independent principles that determine how subject, object, and oblique phrases are expressed syntactically in those languages (Mohanan, 1982).

* + - 1. ***Levels of Representation***

Lexical Functional Grammar postulates three distinct but interrelated levels of representation: lexical structure, functional structure, and constituent structure, which are present simultaneously. Kaplan and Bresnan (1982) give details of the LFG formalism, which is briefly summarized below.

*1.1 Lexical Structure*

The lexical entry (or semantic form) includes information about the meaning of the lexical item, its argument structure, and the grammatical functions (e.g., subject, object, etc.) that are associated with those arguments. The verb ‘hit’, for example, has a predicate argument structure that consists of an agentive argument associated with SUBJECT and a patient or theme argument associated with the OBJECT function.

(SUB) (OBJ) <-—- lexical assignment of grammatical functions

 | |

‘hit ( agent, theme )’ <——- predicate argument structure

Grammatical functions are universal primitives within this framework, and since they are associated both with lexical items and with syntactic positions—by means of annotated phrase structure rules—they mediate between lexical and constituent structure representations. Grammatical functions play an essential role in Lexical Functional Grammar; however, they have no intrinsic significance and are situated at the interface between the lexicon and the syntax. LFG imposes the restriction of Direct Syntactic Encoding, which prevents any syntactic process from altering the initial assignment of grammatical function.

Each lexical entry consists of a pairing of arguments and grammatical functions. The principle of Function-Argument Biuniqueness requires that each argument be associated with a unique grammatical function (even if that assignment is Ø, which entails that the argument will be interpreted as a bound variable, as in ‘John ate’ where it is implied that there is something John ate), and conversely that no grammatical function may occur more than once within a predicate argument structure. An actual lexical entry for the verb ‘hit’, then, might look something like this:

*hit*, Verb

( ↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of hit} < SUB, OBJ >’

where the PRED feature has as its value some representation of the “meaning” of ‘hit’, which in this case is a two-place predicate. The variable ‘­’ in this representation refers to the lexical item under which this entry is found, here ‘hit’.

A grammatical function may, however, be directly associated with no logical argument of the predicate with which it occurs. This is the situation for the object of ‘consider’ in the sentence

John considered *her* to be a fine candidate.

where ‘her’ is the logical subject of the infinitival complement. This is indicated in the lexical entry for ‘consider’ by placement of the function OBJ outside of the angled brackets containing the arguments of the verb. So, the verb ‘consider’ would be represented as:

*consider*, Verb

 (↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of consider} < SUB, XCOMP > (OBJ)’

 (↑ OBJ ) = (↑ XCOMP SUB)

where the XCOMP is an open complement, i.e., a complement whose subject is controlled grammatically; the control equation is added (by default).

Any other grammatical information associated with a lexical item will also be encoded in the semantic form. The name ‘Mary’, for example, comes with the grammatical information about gender and number features (expressed here using ‘–’ to indicate the unmarked value of the feature in the Jakobsonian sense; cf. Neidle 1988), which may also be expressed by equations:

*Mary*, Noun

 (↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of ‘Mary’}’

 (↑ NUM ) = –PL

 (↑ GEND) = +FEM

These equations are referred to as constituting equations because the information contained in them will be incorporated into any f-structure that contains this semantic form. It is also possible have constraint equations in a lexical entry; in such a case the f-structure would only be well-formed ifthe equation holds, but the information expressed by the equation would not be added to the functional structure. Verb agreement in English may be accomplished in this way, by associating a constraint equation with a form like ‘speaks’ (contributed by a redundancy rule added to all forms that have the same inflectional ending):

*speaks*, Verb

 (↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of ‘speak’} <SUB>’

 (↑ SUB NUM ) =c –PL

A sentence like ‘They speaks’ would be ill-formed since the constraint equation is not satisfied.

*Lexical redundancy* rules relate alternate pairings of arguments to grammatical functions. So, for example, passivization may involve suppression of the first argument (associated with SUB inthe active form) and realization of the second argument (the OBJ in the active) as SUB; the morphological form associated with this operation is the participial form of the verb.

(i) (SUB) —> Ø

(ii) (OBJ) —> (SUB)

Notice that Function-Argument Biuniqueness ensures that part (ii) of the passivization rule is contingent upon part (i); there can be only one subject.

The output of that lexical redundancy rule on the previous lexical form given for ‘hit’ would be:

Ø (SUB)

| |

‘ hit ( agent, theme ) ‘

However, the rule applies quite generally to lexical items having the appropriate grammatical functions. Notice that the rule would apply as well to grammatical functions contained within control equations, so the passivized version of ‘consider’ would be:

*consider*, Verb

 (↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of consider} <Ø , XCOMP > (SUB) ‘

 (↑SUB ) = ( ­ XCOMP SUB)

Some support for formulation of such rules in terms of grammatical functions rather thanstructural configuration comes from the contrast illustrated by the following two sentences, distinguished by the fact that ‘a doctor’ is an OBJECT in the first but is a NOMINAL COMPLEMENT in the second. Only the first may be subject to passivization.

John hit a doctor. A doctor was hit.

John became a doctor. \*A doctor was become.

While the configuration of the post-verbal NP in both cases may be the same, it is the difference in grammatical function that accounts for the contrast with respect to passivization.

*1.2 Constituent Structure*

Constituent structure encodes linear order, hierarchical groupings, and syntactic categories of constituents, and is the input to the phonological component of the grammar. Language-specificannotations of phrase structure rules identify the grammatical functions that may occur in specificsyntactic positions. Examples of phrase structure rules for English:

S ——>NP VP VP——>V NP

 (↑ SUB) =↓ ↑=↓ ↑=↓ (↑ OBJ) =↓

The arrows are variables; ‘↑’ is to be instantiated by the node immediately dominating the constituent under which the arrow is placed, and ‘↓’ by that node itself. So, the first equation for the rule on the left states that the NP under which the equation is written is the SUB of the S that dominates it. The ‘↑=↓’ equation beneath VP indicates that the features of that node are shared with the higher node. This is the default assignment to phrasal heads, which share information with the dominating phrasal node. These equations are used to construct the f-structure representations described in 1.3.

It should be noted that the equations illustrated here are in the form in which LFG phrase structure rules were written in 1982. Similar associations of grammatical functions could be made with phrase structure rules conforming to current versions of X’-theory.

The terminal nodes of the tree are lexical items. The Lexical Integrity Hypothesis requires that fully formed lexical items are inserted into the syntax. A rule like Affix-hopping would be disallowed. Syntactic rules are prohibited from moving any element into or out of lexical categories.

*1.3 Functional Structure*

Structural and lexical information is integrated and unified within functional structure (f-structure),which consists of hierarchically organized attribute-value matrices. A straightforward algorithm for transferring information from c-structure to f-structure is presented in Kaplan and Bresnan1982. When the lexical items that occupy the terminal nodes of the tree are inserted into f-structure, the information contained in the lexical entry (including relevant equations) is retrieved and included in the f-structure. It is in this way that lexical information is combined with the structural information available from the c-structure tree.

So, the f-structure corresponding to the sentence ‘John hit Bill’—constructed from the c-structure representation generated by the phrase structure rules illustrated in 1.2 and the lexical information from the entry for ‘hit’ discussed in 1.1—would include the following information:

SUB [ PRED ‘John’ ]

PRED ‘hit <SUB , OBJ >’

OBJ [ PRED ‘Bill’ ]

The validity of the f-structure representation is ensured by a number of well-formedness conditions.

1. ***Well-formedness Conditions on Functional Structure***

The following basic well-formedness conditions, which have counterparts in other frameworks, apply to f-structures.

*2.1 Coherence*

Coherence requires that every meaningful semantic form be a grammatical function mentioned in the predicate argument structure (or in a constituting equation) of a predicate in its clause. This prevents extraneous material from appearing.

2.2 *Completeness*

An f-structure is ill-formed if it does not contain values for the grammatical functions that are subcategorized by the predicate. The following sentence, for example, lacks a value for the SUB, and is therefore incomplete:

\* Speaks.

*2.3 Consistency*

Consistency, also known as functional uniqueness, requires that each attribute in the matrix have a unique value. So, for example, if an f-structure contained a matrix with the following:

GEND + FEM

GEND – FEM

the f-structure would be inconsistent.

Notice that this common sense principle can also be used to guarantee the complementary distribution of elements that may fulfill a single grammatical function. This kind of complementary distribution has motivated many syntactic movement analyses, such as clitic-movement. In French, for example, both a full NP object appearing post-verbally and a pre-verbal direct object clitic may be associated with the OBJECT function. Thus, both of the following are grammatical:

Jean le voit.

John him sees

‘John sees him’

Jean voitl’homme.

John sees the man

‘John sees the man’

However, the following is ungrammatical without a pause before the final NP:

\* Jean le voit l’homme.

John him sees the man

While this distribution could be accounted for by a movement analysis there is a straightforward account of these facts without movement. As discussed in Grimshaw 1982, the object function is associated with the pre-verbal clitic and with the post-verbal NP, both of which are optionally included in the phrase structure expansion of VP.

If either a direct object clitic or full NP occurs with a verb that does not subcategorize for an object, then the f-structure is incoherent. If a lexical item like ‘voit’ requires an object, then either the clitic or the full NP must be present; otherwise the sentence will be incomplete. However, if both are present with ‘voit’, then the f-structure is inconsistent because the value of the OBJECT’s PRED would not be unique. Many phenomena for which arguments of functional equivalence and distributional complementarity have been used to argue for syntactic movement (not only NP movementbut also V-movement, for example) could be analyzed in similar fashion.

*2.4 Semantic Coherence*

All semantic forms that are not semantically empty (i.e., that are not dummy elements) must be linked to the logical argument of another lexical form—in order to be coherently interpreted.

1. ***Control and Complementation***

Among the universal set of grammatical functions are complements and adjuncts. Complements are an essential part of the argument structure (part of the subcategorization frame), while adjuncts provide additional information and are interpreted by association with some other subcategorized argument. Adjuncts are not required for grammaticality, while omission of a complement results in an ill-formed sentence. Adjuncts have greater mobility than complements and are often set off by pauses. The following contrasts illustrate this:

**Complement** John didn’t sound ashamed of himself.

\*John didn’t sound.

\*John, ashamed of himself, didn’t sound.

**Adjunct** John looked down, ashamed of himself.

John looked down.

John, ashamed of himself, looked down.

Complements and adjuncts may either be closed, i.e., semantically complete, containing within them all the elements required for logical interpretation of the predicate, or open, lacking a subject argument, which is then controlled by another argument in the sentence. Open complements maybe phrases of any lexical category (AP, NP, VP, PP) and so the abbreviation XCOMP is used to designate that set of complements. The same is true for open adjuncts, and the abbreviation XADJ is used.

Open complements predicate something of either the subject or the object of the main predicate with which they occur; this relation is expressed by a control equation (which can be filled in by a lexical redundancy rule on the basis of the argument structure provided), as illustrated here:

consider, Verb

 (↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of consider} < SUB, XCOMP > (OBJ)’

 (↑OBJ ) = ( ­ XCOMP SUB)

This control equation sets the object of the main predicate equal to the subject of the XCOMP. This is indicated formally by either coindexing the two f-structures that are set equal, or by drawing an arrow from one to the other. Consider the sentence:

Mary considers John boring.

SUB PRED ‘Mary’

NUM –PL

GEND +FEM

PERS 3rd

PRED ‘consider <SUB, XCOMP> (OBJ)’

TENSE –PAST

OBJ PRED ‘John’

NUM –PL

GEND –FEM

PERS 3rd *i*

XCOMP SUB [ ]*i*

PRED ‘boring <SUB>’

This notation indicates that the two coindexed f-structures are identical in all respects. This relation of f-structure identity is referred to as grammatical or functional control. It is important to note that the subject of XCOMP is not present in c-structure. It is introduced into f-structure only through the lexical information contained in the entry for ‘consider’. A similar analysis applies to the lexical entry for the verbs ‘seem’ and ‘want’, which involve subject control over the complement:

*seem*, Verb

( ↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of ‘seem’} < XCOMP > (SUB) ‘

(↑SUB ) = (↑XCOMP SUB)

*want*, Verb

( ↑ PRED) = ‘{meaning of ‘want’} < SUB, VCOMP > ‘

( ↑SUB ) = (↑XCOMP SUB)

Thus, LFG grammatical control structures include some constructions that would be analyzed inrecent Chomskyan frameworks as involving exceptional case marking, NP-movement, and controlled PRO. In each instance, the constituents that are postulated to be structurally present in LFG are those which are observable and which pass the syntactic constituency tests for the grammatical function assigned to them. So, for example, in the sentence ‘John considered her to bea fine candidate’, ‘her’ is an object; it bears object case; it passivizes; it behaves syntactically like an object. Its semantic role as a subject argument of the following complement is not encoded in constituent structure in LFG. The kind of structural adjustments that are required in Chomskyan frameworks to compensate for the mismatches between surface syntactic constituency and the underlying argument structure (projected into d-structure) are not required in LFG, since the link between argument structure and c-structure is mediated by grammatical functions and since control properties are functionally rather than structurally encoded.

The analysis of open complements extends naturally to open adjuncts, although there isgreater freedom in the argument that may serve as the controller, since this is not lexically determined; the subject of the adjunct may be set equal to a grammatical function from among those that are acceptable adjunct controllers in a given language. Closed complements contain all arguments required for interpretation, as in the following sentence, where the closed sentential complement is italicized:

Mary thought *that it might rain*.

Such closed sentential complements may contain a phonetically null subject in f-structure(equivalent to PRO) that is then subject to principles of anaphoric control for interpretation. The interpretation of PRO is subject to many of the same constraints that hold for interpretation of lexical pronouns, and is freer than in the case of grammatical control.

1. ***Long-Distance Dependencies and Scrambling***

To account for the kind of long-distance dependencies that are traditionally analyzed by wh-movement, the 1982 version of LFG utilizes constituent control. The basic idea is that syntactic identity is established between the element that appears outside the clause and the position left empty within the clause. Long-distance associations are composed of local binding relations that are established (Kaplan and Bresnan, 1982). Unlike cases of grammatical control—where control information from thelexicon is used to construct functional structure representations of the controlled arguments—constituent control is not lexically determined and involves empty nodes that are syntacticallypresent. The presence of this type of syntactic gap is associated with well-known processingeffects and phonological effects (relating to contraction), unlike alternative assignments ofarguments to grammatical functions as found in the passive construction, e.g., for which no null cstructureis postulated in LFG.

Rules that change the order of syntactic constituents without modifying their grammatical functions are handled as operations on c-structure rules. Thus, “scrambling” rules are treated as rules that affect c-structure but not f-structure.

**5. *Case***

*5.1 What Case Is and Is Not in LFG*

Within the LFG framework, “case” is not invoked to account for the distribution of lexically filled NP’s, as it is in recent Chomskyan frameworks. The distribution of arguments that may be subject to grammatical or anaphoric control is handled in LFG by the theory of control, in terms of grammatical functions rather than syntactic positions. Similarly, while case is used in the Chomskyan framework to trigger movement (as in the passive construction, where the d-structure object cannot remain in that position without causing a violation because lexical forms can only occur in case marked positions and past participles do not assign case), in LFG such alternations are determined by the mapping from argument structure to grammatical functions.

The term ‘case’ is used in LFG in the more traditional sense, to describe the use of inflection to encode syntactic relations. Case is most easily observed and studied in languages that have rich case morphology, and in such languages, the claim that the existence of lexically empty subjects oftenseless clauses correlates with their caselessness has not been validated. As has been shown form any such languages, these empty elements can bear case.

*5.2 Syntactic Case Assignment*

In LFG syntactic case is associated with either a specific grammatical function or syntactic configuration, and a morphological form that comes from the lexicon with the compatible case inflection is required in that slot. Case marked forms are generated in the lexicon (according to the regularities appropriate for the morphological class to which a given word belongs) and lexical entries include information about case features. It is in f-structure that appropriate use of case forms is ensured; if the morphological form inserted into c-structure is inconsistent with the case features assigned to the NP, then the corresponding f-structure will be ill-formed.

*5.3 Case as a Reflex of Structural and Grammatical Relations*

In languages that have rich case systems, overt case marking can provide evidence of grammaticalrelationships. Neidle(1988) argued that case marking in Russian providesevidence for the distinction between grammatical control and anaphoric control. In instances ofgrammatical control, the controlled NP shows identity in case with the controller. This can beshown by looking at the case marking of adjuncts that necessarily agree in case with the controlledelement, since adjuncts exhibit case agreement with the noun they modify

*5.4 Case Alternations and Case Feature Decomposition*

Neidle (1988) presents an analysis of Russian case alternations that uses an analytical decomposition of case into case features (in the Jakobsonian tradition). She argues the same features that are relevant to morphological case syncretism are relevant to syntactic case assignment. Case alternations such as the Nominative/Dative alternation in subject position and the Accusative/Genitive alternation found on post-verbal NP’s in Russian (giving rise to the so-called Genitive of Negation) are accounted for by assignment of partially specified feature matrices, where the alternation in case can be attributed to the difference in the value of a single case feature. These basic case features may, in fact, be related to the features into which grammatical functions are decomposed within Lexical Mapping Theory.

1. **Lexicogrammar in Syntactic Level**
	* + 1. *Conjunction*

Conjunctions are words which link two clauses in one sentence (Cory, 1999). A conjunction is a word which connects two words or clauses or sentences and shows the relation between them (englishleap.com).  They are used to avoid making the text seem like bullet points and to make the text flow.

Examples:

Jai saw a dog on the road. He decided to adopt the dog. Jai brought the dog home.

= Jai saw a dog on the road **and** decided to adopt the dog, **so** he brought the dog home.

Here ‘**and’**and **‘so’**are conjunctions which are used to join the sentences and show the relation between them.

There are three main categories of conjunctions that are explained below.

* + - * + **Coordinating Conjunctions**

These conjunctions are used to link or join two words or phrases that are equally important and complete in terms of grammar when compared with each other. That is to say, the sentences or words do not depend on anything to give themselves meaning.

There are seven main coordinating conjunctions, they are:

**F**or, **A**nd, **N**or, **B**ut, **O**r, **Y**et, **S**oon

As being seen, these conjunctions are arranged in this way to provide the mnemonic acronym of **FANBOYS** so that it is easier to remember them. These conjunctions are always placed between the two clauses or words that they are joining.  The following are some examples of the coordinating conjunctions:

Chris does not want tea. Chris does not want coffee.

= Chris does not want tea **or**coffee.

Here, we see how **‘or’**was used to combine the two words and make a cohesive sentence using them.  Also, notice how the **‘or’** is between the two words.

I scored 60% in the exams this year. Anita scored 7% more than me this year.

= I scored 60% in the exams **but** Anita scored 7% more than me this year.

Here we see that **‘but’** was used in the middle to combine and show the relation between the two sentences that were both equally important and cohesive by themselves.

* + - * + **Subordinating Conjunctions**

These conjunctions are used to join an independent and complete clause with a dependent clause that relies on the main clause for meaning and relevance. The dependent clause cannot exist on its own as a sentence and often does not make sense without the main clause. The subordinating conjunction always comes before the dependent clause but the dependent clause itself can be placed either ahead of or following the independent clause:

= Since they had misbehaved, the boys were given one week suspensions from school.

Here, we see the dependent clause is ‘they had misbehaved’ which is not a valid sentence by itself. The independent main clause is ‘the boys were given one week suspensions from school’. They are joined by the subordinating conjunction **‘since’**.

= He was fond of playing basketball **because** it was his father’s favourite game.

In this sentence, **because** is the subordinating conjunction as it introduces the dependent clause ‘it was his father’s favourite game’

The main clause in this sentence is ‘he was fond of playing basketball’ as it is the sentence which can be said independently and still be grammatically correct.

Other subordinating conjunctions are although, as, before, once, though, until, whether, etc.

* + - * + **Correlative Conjunctions**

Correlative Conjunctions are simply pairs of conjunctions used in a sentence to join different words or groups of words in a sentence together.  Correlative Conjunctions are generally not used to link sentences themselves, instead they link two or more words of equal importance within the sentence itself.  Some of the more commonly used correlative conjunctions are:

= Both the shoes **and** the dress were completely overpriced.

This is an example of using the correlative conjunctions **‘both/and’**in a sentence. As being see in this sentence, the ‘shoes’ and the ‘dress’ were equally important elements that needed to be given the same importance.

= They should **either** change their strategy **or** just forfeit the game.

The **‘either/or’**conjunctions are used to suggest a choice between two options. Here the choice being suggested is between - ‘change their strategy’ or ‘forfeit the game’.

= Just as she loves hiking **so**she enjoys travelling as well.

The correlative conjunctions **‘just as/so’**are used to link two phrases that have a similar theme or are referring to a similar thing together. This conjunction is used to show the correspondence between two phrases or words.

= He **neither** helps around the house **nor**does he look for a job.

**‘Neither/nor’**are conjunctions that are used to deny or negate words and phrases. In the case of ‘**neither**’, it gives two options that are both negated. ‘**Nor**’ is the negative form of ‘or’.

= Not only does he play the lead guitar**but**he is also the band’s songwriter.

The correlative conjunctions **‘not only/but’**are used to show an additional and important element in the sentence that is used to indicate excess when combined with the first element.   For instance, in this sentence the fact that he is a guitarist and a song writer are equally important but when shown together, they indicate an excess of talent in the person.

= It doesn’t matter **whether** the roses are fresh **or** if they are drooping, just buy them.

**‘Whether/or’**is used as a conjunction to show two different options in the sentence.  The conjunction can be used both in a manner of negation and confirmation.

* + - 1. *Indirect questions*

**Indirect questions** are a little more formal and polite. We use them when talking to a person we don’t know very well, or in professional situations, and their form is a little different (espressoenglish.net). "Normal" yes / no and information ("Wh'") questions follow the word-order rules presented in recent Hints. There are
other English question forms that follow different rules,
however. They're called indirect questions (Oliver, 2007)

There are two types of indirect questions. One occurs in reported (indirect) speech when one person tells what another person has said.

Three things happen in reported-speech questions:

* + - 1. The word order is like statement word order, not like "normal" question word order.
			2. The verb tense in the question may be changed (if the main verb in the sentence is a past tense).
			3. Verbs like "asked" are used to introduce reported (indirect) questions.

Examples:

He said, "Where's Bob?" ---> He asked where Bob was.

Did he ask, "Where's Bob?" ---> Did he ask where Bob was?.

He said, "Where does Bob live?"---> He asked where Bob lived.

Did he say, "Where does Bob live?"--->Did he ask where Bob lived?

He said, "Where has Bob gone?" --->He asked where Bob had gone.

Did he say, "Where has Bob gone?"--->Did he ask where Bob had gone?

He said, "How long has Bob been away?"--->He asked how long Bob had been away.

Did he say, "How long has Bob been away?"--->Did he ask how long Bob had been away?

He said, "Is Bob at home?"---> He asked if Bob was at home.

Did he say, "Is Bob at home?"---> Did he ask if Bob was at home?

He said, "Have they seen Bob?"---> He asked if they had seen Bob.

Did he say, "Have they seen Bob?"---> Did he ask if they had seen Bob?

He said, "Will Bob be at home soon?"---> He asked if Bob would be at home soon.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

  The questions inside statements and questions above do not use normal
word order for questions. Instead, they use the word order for statements:

This: He asked where Bob **was**

Not this: \*He asked where **was** Bob

This: He asked how long Bob **hadbeen** away.

Not this: \*He asked how long **had** Bob**been** away.

The change in verb tenses when the main verb is past:

He said, "Where's (**is**) Bob?" ---> He asked where Bob was.

He said, "Where **does** Bob live?" --->He asked where Bob **lived**.

He said, "**Will** Bob **be** at home soon?"--->He asked if Bob **would be** at home soon.

When the tense in the reported question (or statement) is present, it's sometimes confusing to change the tense. When this happens, the present-tense verb (in the reported question or statement) is often not changed:

He said, "Where's (**is**) Bob?" ---> He asked where Bob **is**.

He said, "Where **does** Bob **live**?" --->He asked where Bob **lives**.

He said, "How old **is** Bob?" ---> He asked how old Bob **is**.

He said, "How's (**is**) Bob doing?" --->He asked how Bob **is**doing.

For reported yes / no questions, **if** is used to introduce the question. Reported yes/no questions may also be introduced by **whether (or not)**:

He said, "Is Bob at home?"--->He asked **if** Bob was at home/He asked **whether** Bob was at home/He asked **whether or not** Bob was at home/He asked **whether** Bob was at home **or not**

He said, "Will Bob be at home soon?"--->He asked **if** Bob would be at home soon/He asked **whether** Bob would be at home soon/He asked **whether or not** Bob would be at home soon./He asked **whether**Bob would be at home soon**or not**.

There may also be other changes in reported questions. One common change is with pronouns:

He said, "Do **you** know Bob?" --->He asked if **I** knew (know) Bob/He asked if **we** knew (know) Bob.

He said, "Does Bob get along with **you**?" --->He asked if Bob was (is) friendly with **me**/He asked if if Bob was (is) friendly with **us**.

* + - 1. *Existential structure*

The term ‘existential sentence’ is used to refer to a specialized or non-canonical construction which expresses a proposition about the existence or the presence of someone or something (Heusinger, Maienborn and Portner, 2011). Here are some illustrations:

a. There is one even prime number.

b. One even prime number exists.

c. There stood in the corner an empty coat rack and umbrella stand.

The sentence in (a) is considered existential because it is specialized (insofar as it has an expletive subject, whose distribution is highly restricted in English) and entails nothing other than the existence of one even prime number. In contrast, (b) will not be considered existential for the purposes of this article because, even though it entails nothing other than the existence of one even prime number, there is nothing specialized about its syntax: it has the canonical subject-predicate structure used in English. Finally, (c), though closely related to the construction in (a), differs from it in syntactic details, in its use in discourse, and in the fact that, thanks to the verb, it entails something more than mere existence or presence.

Examples of existential sentence:

* + - * + There has been a meeting.
				+ There is space in the closet.
				+ Yes, there are mangoes
				+ There was a child in the garden.
				+ There are many ﬂights until midnight.
			1. *Preposition*

The preposition is classified as a part of speech in traditional grammar, however, prepositions as well as conjunction differ from other parts of speech in that (1) each is composed of a small class of words that have no formal characteristics ending; (2) each signals syntactic structures that function as one of the other parts of speech (Frank, 1972). The types of preposition:

TIME

On, At, In (one point of time).

Example: I saw him **on** Saturday (**On** used with a day of the week)

Since, By, From – to, For, During, In or Within (Extended time. Starting at one point and ending at another)

Example: I have not seen him **since** Monday

Before, After (Sequence of time. Events that follow one another)

Example: I will see you **after** Wednesday

PLACE – POSITION AND DIRECTION

In, Inside, On, At (The point itself)

Example: Put the dishes **on** the table

Over, above, Lower, Under, Underneath, Beneath, Below (Higher or lower than a point)

Example: He lives on the floor **above** us

Near, Next to, Alongside, Beside, Between, Opposite (Neighboring the point)

Example: He sat **beside** his wife during the party

To – from, toward(s), in(to) – out of, Up – down, Around, Through, Past, As far as (Direction. Movement in regard to a point)

Example:

He always walks **to** school **from** his home

You can drive **through** that town in an hour

We’ll walk only **as far as** the old schoolhouse. Then we’ll turn back.

* + - 1. *Relative clauses*

A relative clause is a subordinate clause that modifies a noun or a noun phrase

Example: The **man** **who is smoking**is the murderer

The noun **the man** is modified by the relative clause ***who is smoking***.

Relative clauses give essential information to define or identify the person or thing we are talking about.

Relative clauses are used to provide extra information. This information can either:

* Define something (defining clause)

Example: The girl who is standing there is a world champion in karate.

* Provide unnecessary, but interesting information (non-defining clause).
Example: Michael Jackson, who was a famous singer, died of an overdose.

Relative clauses can be introduced by:

1. A relative pronoun: who, whom, which, that, whose.
Example: The man **who** is standing there is a famous writer
2. A relative adverb: where, why and when.
Example: The restaurant **where** I have dinner is nice
3. None of them.
Example: The man I met is extremely wealthy
	* + 1. *Case selection*

## Definition

Nouns and pronouns in English are said to display *case* according to their function in the sentence. They can be subjective or nominative (which means they act as the subject of independent or dependent clauses), possessive (which means they show possession of something else), or objective (which means they function as the recipient of action or are the object of a preposition).

Except for the [possessive forms](http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/possessives.htm) (usually formed by the addition of an apostrophe and the letter *s*), nouns do not change form in English. (This is one of the few ways in which English is easier than other languages.) Pronouns, however, do change form when they change case; these changes are most clearly illustrated among the personal pronouns. The chart below illustrates the different forms among the cases.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **Subjective** | **Possessive** | **Objective** |
| **Nouns** |
| **Singular** |
|  | frog | frog's | frog |
|   | Mary | Mary's | Mary |
| **Plural** |
|  | frogs | frogs' | frogs |
|  | witches | witches' | witches |
| **Personal Pronouns** |
| **Singular** |
| *1st person* | I | my, mine | me |
| *2nd person* | you | your, yours | you |
| *3rd person* | hesheit | hisher, hersits | himherit |
| **Plural** |
| *1st person* | we | our, ours | us |
| *2nd person* | you | your, yours | you |
| *3rd person* | they | their, theirs | them |
| **Relative and interrogative pronouns** |
|  | who | whose | whom |
|  | whoever |   | whomever |
|  | which/that/what |   | which/that/what |
| **Indefinite pronouns** |
|  | everybody | everybody's | everybody |
|  |  |  |  |

##

* + - 1. *Calquing*

Calquing is a major type of contact-induced linguistic transfer as it occurs between two languages which are in direct contact with[ each other. Calquing and may also be known as replication (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 95). Calquing is "the transfer of lexical or grammatical meaning from a model language into areplica language whereby the latter replicates a formal expression typically via translation (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 327). There are two subtypes: lexical and grammatical calquing. [Borrowing](http://www.personal.uni-jena.de/~mu65qev/wikolin/index.php?title=Borrowing) and lexical calquing are often confused with each other, however, both terms describe two similar but different phenomena in linguistics. (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 95 and Atkinson 1999: 254-255)

**Lexical Calquing**

Lexical calquing, which is also known as loan translation, uses single words or phrases which are already existent in the target language and allocates new meaning and/or structure to them. This way concepts from the model language enter into the target language. Lexical calques are lexemes of the target language which have taken on the new meaning (in addition to their old meaning). Consider these three examples:

(1) This road is very busy. (Standard English)

(2) DieseStraßeistsehrbelebt. (Standard German)

(3) DieseStraßeistsehrbeschäftigt. (Namibian German)

The English (1) expression cannot be translated adequately into German since the Standard German equivalent for busy (i.e. beschäftigt) is not acceptable in this context. Instead, speakers of Standard German use *belebt* which is equivalent to English *animate* or *alive*. However, because of a loan translation the third example is acceptable for speakers of Namibian German, since *beschäftigt* has taken on the additional meaning of English busy and/or Afrikaans beesig (Riehl, C.M. (2009: 33).

Nouns are most often affected by calquing while loan translations of other linguistic categories are rare (cf. Back, E. 1935: 5).

Lexical calquing can be either a new combination expressing a new concept (cf. Brack, E. 1935: 7) or it can solely be a broadening of a meaning. In this case the model lexeme functions like a template for an equivalent lexeme in the target language which takes on a new aspect of meaning that was present in the model lexeme but not in the target lexeme.

The range of lexical items which may be included in lexical calquing comprises single lexemes as well as whole phrases. For example: Charles Darwin’s *Struggle for Life* finds its counterpart in the German loan translation *Kampf ums Dasein* (Back, E. 1935: 8). This replica is clearly related to its English model, as this combination was not used before in German. Often, a number of languages is involved in the process of calquing. Some loan translations became internationally well known terms. Observe the English term *skyscraper* which is *Wolkenkratzer* in German (with *Wolken* meaning *clouds* and *kratzer* which is equivalent to *scraper*), skyskraber in Danish, racleur de ciel in French, and skrebnicaneba in Russian (cf. Back, E. 1935: 20 as well as Aikhenvald, A.Y. & R.M.V. Dixon 2006: 178). Similarly, Latin *medium aevum* became *Middle Ages* in English, *Mittelalter* in German and *moyenâge* in French (cf. Back, E. 1935: 29). Furthermore, apart from simple expressions sometimes complete metaphors may be translated into the target language. This is known as *Reihenbildung*.

# Grammatical Calquing

# Grammatical calquing is also referred to as *structural borrowing* (cf. Winford, D. 2003), *pattern transfer* or *indirect diffusion* (cf. Heath, J. 1978 and Aikhenvald, A.Y. 2002) and *grammatical replication* (cf. Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2003, 2005 and Gast, V. & J. van der Auwera forthcoming).

# Similar to lexical calquing, grammatical calquing is a process whereby a grammatical structure of a model language is replicated into a target language. (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 49).

A simple example for grammatical calquing is the way the grammatical constructions “entweder – oder” and “weder – noch” (equivalent to “either – or” and “neither – nor” in English) which are commonly used in Standard German. However, Swiss Germans say “oder – oder” and “no – no”, which clearly are loan translations from French “ou – ou” and “ni – ni” (cf. Nau, N. 1995: 94). In this case, not merely content words such as nouns or verbs were translated, but function words which shape the grammar of the target language. Therefore, a new grammatical structure has been created. This is the decisive difference between grammatical and lexical caqluing (cf. Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 49). Furthermore, grammatical calquing can affect the syntax of a language as well.

Grammatical calquing underlies a development which can be described as follows: From a lexeme to a grammatical pattern, from concrete meaning contents to less concrete ones (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 57-58). Minor use patterns might develop into major use patterns (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2006: 51). Heine and Kuteva divide grammatical calquing into four stages (from “0” to “III”) to a fully-fletched grammatical category:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 | - only lexical use |
| I | - minor use pattern = grammatical function appears in particular contexts |
| II | - major use pattern = usage in more contexts; regular association with grammatical function |
| III | - functional category = obligatory marker of the grammatical function |
|  | (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2005: 54). |

They provide a good example, too, which illustrates this process. The German future marker “werden” (English equivalent *to become*) occurs as a major use pattern in Germanic languages (i.e. it is a possible way to refer to the future, but not obligatory). However, in the Swedish, which is a Baltic-Finnic language, it occurs only as a minor use pattern. Consequently, German, which grammaticalised this kind of referring to the future most among the European languages, might have provided the model for replication (Heine, B. & T. Kuteva 2005: 54).

1. **Narrative Writing**
	1. *Definition of Narrative Writing*

Though narrative writing is the most commonly used form of writing, hardly any of us know much about it. This research gives an overall insight into narrative writing. Narrative writing is nothing but story telling – fictional or non-fictional. Out of all the forms of writing, this genre is the most widely written as well as read, since it is very easy to narrate one’s experiences or to relate to someone else. Narrative writing is used for writing plays, movie scripts, personal essays as well as biographies, but their basic purpose remains the same – entertaining the readers. There are some views of what is narrative writing according to linguists.

Narrative writing focuses on telling a story. This may mean telling a fictional story — one that is made up — or it may mean telling a real-life story in such a way that the author follows a plot structure (Cavallari: 2013). According to Buckner (2010: 5) narrative writing is referred to as story writing, a story can be told or written, long or short, true or made up. The primary purpose of narrative writing is to describe an experience, event, or sequence of events in the form of a story (quoted from [www.thewritingsite.org/resources/prompts/narrative.asp](http://www.thewritingsite.org/resources/prompts/narrative.asp)).

Narrative writing can also take the form of an essay, in which the author will use a personal story to prove a point or state an argument. The forms of narrative writing vary greatly because it is largely a creative endeavor; novels, short stories, poems, blog posts, and essays can all take the form of a narrative, and while the form of the writing may change, the function of telling a story remains the same.

* 1. *Types of Narrative Writing*

Writing stories in narrative writing can be realistic or fantasy, however a piece of narrative writing is a work of art, carefully crafted by the author to provide entertainment for the reader. Written narratives require much more thought, the information must be presented in an organized manner with a central idea, a plotline, vivid description, and some type of culminating event. Written narratives require a strong structure and essential elements that are unique to this type of writing. For this reason, students need explicit instruction in how to create a narrative composition. In fact, all narratives are not the same.

According to Buckner (2010) there are at least three types of narrative writing that students will need to encounter:

* + - 1. Personal Experience Narrative

This kind of narrative focuses on the experience of the writer rather than the characters in the story. The personal experience narrative might be organized chronologically as the incident is told as a series of events that move through time. *Sunshine Home* by Eve Bunting is an example of a narrative that moves chronologically. The personal experience narrative might also be organized categorically. When organized in this manner, there are numerous personal experiences that support one overall theme or big idea. Cynthia Rylant’s book, *When I Was Young in the Mountains,* is organized in this way. In this simple picture book, Rylant related varied experiences that she has has in the mountains with her grandparents. The overall “feel” or big idea of the book is that she enjoyed her time in mountains. Her writing appears more reflective and circular than event driven. *The House on Mango Street* by Sandra Cisneros contains numerous personal experience narratives that are organized categorically. Whether organized chronologically or categorically, the personal experience narrative relates something that is important to the writer and something that the writer wants to share with others. The feelings and emotions of the writer and vivid language are essential components of the personal experience narrative.

* + - 1. Imaginative Narrative

This type of writing, in its simplest form, is structured in a problem/solution format. Using this structure, the main character encounters problems that he or she tries to solve through numerous attempts throughout the story. In the end, the problem is solved and the character is a type of “hero”. In some instances, there is resolution rather than solution to the problem as the main character becomes resigned to the situation. *Heat Wave* by Helen Ketterman and *A Bad Case of Stripes* by David Shannon are both examples of the problem/solution format.

A more sophisticated variety of imaginative narrative involves an “intriguing or challenging adventure.” Instead of encountering and attempting to solve one particular problem, the main character deals with a “situation”, which can either be problematic or increasingly unrealistic or imaginative. Throughout the story, the main character/characters must either overcome a series of obstacles or experience increasing intensity of the situation. The movie *Pirates of the Carribean* is an example of an intriguing adventure with obstacles or challenges that must be overcome. Most adventurous movies and stories/books fit into this category and are popular with students. The book *Meanwhile Back at the Ranch* by Trinka Hakes Noble is an example of an intriguing adventure with increasing intensity as Rancher Hick’s wife gets richer and richer as he experiences boredom in town. Another example of the increasing intensity variety is the book *The Principal from the Black Lagoon* by Mike Thaler. In this story, a young boy sits and waits to go into the principal’s office to receive punishment for an infraction. As he waits, he imagines increasingly bizarre punishments that he could receive (e.g. “she turns some kids into coat racks”). Whether the imaginative narrative is structured in a problem/solution format or as an intriguing adventure, strong characters and setting, as well as vivid language are essential components of the writing. This type of writing also incorporates humor, suspense and tension, or drama into the story.

Maya Pillai (2011) in her article at [www.buzzle.com](http://www.buzzle.com) also assumes types of narrative writing as personal and imaginative. However, she believes there is another type or the third type called biographical. Unlike a personal narrative, a biography is a non-fictional account of someone else’s life. The writer describes this person (subject) through his eyes. This kind of narrative depends entirely on the events that have taken place in the subject’s life, along with actions, quotes and even images. The subject can be someone in the writer’s present or past life, or a public figure. The writer might also include why he chose that particular person as a subject and how he/she made a significance in his life.

1. *Elements of Narrative Writing*
2. Plot and Conflict

Narratives relate a series of events that happened (in the past, as a memory), are happening (in the present), or will happen (in the future). As with descriptive writing, we should always use vivid language, but instead of focusing on a special moment in time as you would when writing a descriptive paragraph, a narrative has movement and direction. There is usually a conflict of some kind. Some common types of conflict include:

* + conflict between one person and another person or between groups
	+ conflict between a person and nature
	+ conflict between an individual and the society in which she or he lives

As a narrative writer, people can choose the events that they want to tell to the audience, and they also have the power to decide what order in which to tell these events. Selection and order are two powerful writer’s tools.

Narratives also have special types or organization and structure.

1. We can decide to tell our story in chronological order. This means that we tell the story “in time” according to the order the events happened one after the other. Some people call this a “linear narrative” because it seems to travel in a straight line.
2. A story can also be told using a “flashback” technique. In this type of structure, events are interrupted by a memory of something that happened in the past or by an event that will happen in the future. Sometimes the story or paragraph starts right in the middle of an exciting event (a technique called “in medias res”, which is Latin) then backtracks to explain how the story got to that point. These “non-linear narratives” are difficult to build but are very interesting to read. The movie “Twelve Monkeys” is constructed this way.
3. A third way that a narrative can be constructed is by learning about a series of events or a major happening from the points of view of several characters. The story “Voices in the Park” is written this way. By looking at the perspectives of different people about a common event, readers in the audience can learn about how mysterious a simple thing can be when it is viewed by several different people at the same time.
4. Narrators

There will always be a “voice” telling the story to a reader in a narrative. Sometimes this voice has a very clear personality or even a name. At other times it is more difficult to detect who the “person” that is telling the story really is. There are types of narrators that include:

* First Person: The narrator says “I” when telling the story, as in “I want you to know that everything I tell you is true.” Anywhere But Here is written in this voice. In stories like this the narrator is a part of the events we are reading about. This type of perspective only gives us inside thoughts and views from one character. If the character is asleep during an important event, the reader only finds out about when she wakes up and someone tells her about it.
* Third Person Omniscient: Omniscient means “all seeing”. The narrator is not part of the story but describes the events that happen to all the characters, as well as their thoughts. The narrator talks about the characters as “he” and “she” instead of “I”. The Westing Game is a story like this, even though some details are kept hidden for the sake of the mystery.
* Third Person Limited Omniscient: A Limited Omniscient narrator can see all, but chooses to focus on a few things or people. In this type of perspective, the narrator is also not part of the story and can describe many events. However the story is mostly about one character’s experience. The Curses Of Third Uncle is like this. The Narrator uses the “he” and “she” pronouns, but mostly focusses on Lilian’s experiences.
1. Setting

Narratives are set in specific time and place. These setting details are usually identified at the beginning of the story in the exposition. Sometimes the setting is kept vague or poorly defined for a reason. Sometimes it is very specific with dates and real city names. The setting, along with characters, are a writer’s best opportunity to use rich descriptive language in her/his writing.

1. Characters

Characters are an important part of the story. A good plot can be spoiled by characters that are dull and unrealistic. A story usually features a main character or protagonist that the story follows. Sometimes there is a character that goes against the protagonist. This character is called an antagonist and often is the “bad guy”, but not always. In the Curses of Third Uncle, Lilian is the protagonist and Third Uncle is a villainous antagonist.

Characters are most interesting when they are three dimensional and have many sides of their personalities shown. These characters have strengths and weaknesses. They seem alive and real. They are dullest when they are one dimensional stereotypes like “the hero”, “the villain”, “the best friend”, “the know-it-all” or “the nerd”. Movies specialize in these types of characters. Students should try to create at least one well-rounded character in their stories, no matter how short the story.

**CHAPTER III**

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This chapter describes the research design, population and sample, research variable and their operational definition, instrument of research and procedure of data collection as well as technique of data analysis.

1. **Research Design**

This research was a kind of descriptive qualitative method. This research method was commonly used to reveal the prevailing phenomena. More specifically Atmowardoyo (2010: 64) states that the study can be classified as a documentary-analysis as it involves the analysis of the students’ compositions to find out the existing phenomena of grammatical errors made by the language learners.

1. **Population and Sample**
2. **Population**

This research took place at Muhammadiyah University of Makassar (Unismuh Makassar). The population of this research was the forth semester students of English Department in the academic year of 2012/2013. The total number of population was 210 students that spread in six classes.

1. **Sample**

In this research, the sample was selected by using cluster random sampling. Gay (2006:106) states that cluster sampling is more convenient when the population is very large or spread out over a wide geographic area as long as they have similar characteristics.

There were six classes of the forth semester students of English department, they were class A, B, C, D, E, and F. The researcher randomly selected the classes by drawing them, and class Cwas selected as the sample that consists of 35 students. In this case, the selected sample represents all the population because each class had similar characteristic.

1. **Instrument of the Research**

The instrument of this research wastest. The test was usedto analyze and describe the errors. In this case, the researcher gave some theme about adventure, mystery, fantasy, and traditional tales. Then, the students chose their own title that related to the themes. In this case, they wrote their own compositions at least 2 paragraphs and the numbers of wordwere200-300 words for 90 minutes, the students were also allowed to use dictionary.

1. **Procedure of Data Collection**

In collecting the data, the researcher performed the following procedures. Firstly, the researcher administered writing testto the students at two different time slots of about 90 minutes at an interval of about 1 week. Then, the researcher analyzed the students’ errors. After analyzing the errors, the researcher interpreted the possible sources of errors based on the students’ corpus.

1. **Technique of Data Analysis**

The collected data from the students’ writing was analyzed by using the procedures of the error analysis that consisted of four steps (Weber, 1981: Baradja, 1980; Huang, 2002 in Atmowardoyo, 2010: 56), they were:

1. Data collection, it is from students’ compositions;
2. Identification of errors, that is identifying any lexicogrammatical errors through the process of coding;
3. Classification of errors. The errors are classified into error types which might be grouped in accordance with the grammatical area, and the causing factors of errors;
4. A statement of error frequency. It means that calculating how often the errors appear, which is the most frequent errors are made by the students

In calculating the frequency of each error, the researcher applied the following formula:

Frequency of each error

 Total of the given error X 100%

 Total of the whole errors

By calculating the frequency of each error, the researcher identified the most frequent error made by the students.

Then, the result of the interview is analyzed to investigate the possible sources of errors.

**CHAPTER IV**

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

This chapter focuses on the findings and discussions of data analysis. In this research, the analysis of descriptive statistic was used by presenting the number of percentage of each item of error in students’ narrative compositions.

1. **Findings**
2. **The Range of Lexicogrammatical Error Types which was Mostly Made by the Students**

The data described in this research were obtained from the result of the 35 students’ narrative compositions with the optional themes about adventure, mystery, fantasy, and traditional tales. After collecting and analyzing the data, the researcher found that there were a lot of lexicogrammatical errors made by thestudents in writing narrative compositions. The errors can be seen in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Types of Error** | **Total Error** | **Percentage** |
| 1 | Syntactic level  | 688 | 92.47% |
| 2 | Lexical level | 53 | 7.12% |
| 3 | Morphological level | 2 | 0.26% |
| 4 | Discourse level | 1 | 0.13% |
| **Total** | **744** | **100%** |

Table 1. Total of Students’ Errors

Table 1 shows that the most common error of lexicogrammar made by the students in writing narrative paragraph is insyntactic level 688 (92.47%). Then the other lexicogrammar are: 2 Morphological level with percentage 0.26%, 53 lexical level 53 (7.12%), and discourse level 1 (0.13%) as shown on figure 1 below:

Figure 1. Percentage of Total of the Whole Errors

Figure 1 reveals that the most frequent errors made by the students in writing narrative composition are errors in Syntactic Level with percentage 92.47%, followed by Lexical Level 7.12%, Morphological Level 0.26%, and Discourse Level 0.13%.

 The detail findings of this research can be described as follows:

1. **Syntactic Level Errors**

 Percentage of the number of errors in syntactic level consists of: misuse of conjunction 1.45%, misordering of constituents in indirect questions 0.14%, *In*-prepositional phrase 1.01%, *be* + ed 3.33%, pseudopassives and undergeneration of passives 0.58%, omission of subjects 1.30%, existential structure 1.01%, misuse of prepositions 2.03%, verb form selection 36.28%, misuse of relative clauses 1.30%, incorrect order of adverbials or adverbs 1.30%, serial verb construction 0.72%, inappropriate case selection 2.75%, punctuation problems 6.67%, transitivity pattern confusion 1.30%, *be* + base form 3.63%, omission of copulas 7.40%, concord problems 11.32%, word class confusion 8.12%, and calquing 8.12% as shown in figure 2.

Figure 2. Percentage of Syntactic Level Errors

1. **Lexical Level Errors**

 Percentage of the number of errors in lexical level consists of: inaccurate directionality 11.32%, synonym confusion 62.24%, vocabulary compensation 16.98%, and synforms 9.43%. It can be seen in figure 3 below:

Figure 3. Percentage of Lexical Level Errors

1. **Morphological Level Errors**

Percentage of the number of errors in morphological level consists of: inappropriate selection of affixes 0% and overuse of affixes 100% can be seen shown in figure 4.

Figure 4. Percentage of Morphological Level Errors

1. **Discourse Level Errors**

Percentage of the number ofdiscourse level errors consists of: periphrastic- topic construction 0% and use of *it* as discourse deixis 100% can be seen in figure 5 as follows:

Figure 5. Percentage of Discourse Level Errors

1. **The Possible Sources of Errors Made by the Students**

The data obtained from the result of students writing task were analyzed and interpreted to elaborate the possible sources of lexicogrammatical error made by the students. After analyzing and interpreting the data, the researcher found several possible sources of errors as follows:

1. *L1 Transfer*

 A close scrutiny of the error taxonomy and the results of the interpreting phase show that L1 transfer is inevitably an important source of learner errors. One of error type identified such as calquing show how the students effortlessly wrote their sentence the same way as they wrote in their L1. Another example of lexicogrammar error found in the students’ writing composition was synonym confusion which strongly performed their L1 in deciding lexemes. The majority of the written output of the students was strongly reminiscent of the normative sentence structures in their L1. Many students tend to think in their native language first, before converting their mental output into L2 written output. Some students may process their mental output directly in the L2 but constantly retrieved their L1 repertoire when encountering difficulties or dealing with unfamiliar concepts in their production of L2 written output.

1. *Lack of Facilitation from the L1*

 A lack of comparable equivalents in students L1 may also bring about their difficulty. For many error types identified, such as concord problems, verb form selection, and case selection, the target language features did not have comparable equivalents in the students’ native language. No claims about L1 transfer could be arrived at, but the possibility of influence of a student’s previous linguistic repertoire was not to be dismissed. As being argued in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) literature, positive transfer resulting from the similarities between the target and native languages which is the facilitating influence of cognate vocabulary or any other similarities between the native and target languages (Odlin, 1989, p. 26). The subjects’ erroneous output suggests that the lack of comparable lexicogrammatical requirements in the native language may result in a lack of facilitation, which may in turn lead to add student difficulty. This was reason to believe that students difficulty might be attributed to a low level of positive transfer.

1. *Non–L1-Related Factors*

 A number of non–L1-related factors were also evident from the error taxonomy, for example lack of awareness of target language norms. Students’lack of awareness of target language norms was inevitably the most significant non–L1-related factor. Incorrect word class selection, for example, and many other errors which have been described as the results of a low level of positive transfer, may be the results of learners’ lack of awareness of target language norms and their inadequate mastery of the target language. Another non-L1 factor was misapplication of target language rules and/or overgeneralization. Undergeneration was manifested in the learners’ production of pseudopassives, where they failed to generate the full range of passive constructions in the target language. One of non-L1 factor was electional mis-hits. The use of synforms was a clear exemplar of students’ selectional mis-hits in accessing their mental lexicons. Universal processes. The developmental sequence of interrogative acquisition, where subject-verb inversion is overgeneralized to embedded questions(Larsen-Freeman &Long,1991) maybe the source of the students’ misordering of constituents in indirect questions. Their difficulties with relative clauses could be seen as resulting from developmental sequences, as guided by the accessibility hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie, 1977), with the subject position acquired earlier than the direct object position, which in turn is acquired earlier than the indirect object position, and soon. Universal developmental processes found in both L1 and L2 acquisition (Brown, 1973; Odlin, 1989) could also explain the omission of copulas. Interaction between L1- and non–L1-related factors. An error was seldom solely attributed to one single source. Non–L1-related factors often interacted in an intricate fashion with L1-related factors. Pseudopassives, for example, can be argued as an exemplification of undergeneration resulting from the reflection of the typological characteristic of topic prominence in Indonesian, the learners’ L1. Pseudotough movement structures should best be seen as the results of a complex interplay of overgeneralization (of tough movement) and L1 transfer. How L1- and non–L1-related factors interact is beyond the scope of the present study, but it is evident that L2 acquisition is a complex process with different mechanisms working in tandem with each other.

1. **DISCUSSION**

 This part presents the discussion of students’ errors in writing narrative paragraphs and the possible sources of errors. The paragraphs were analyzed into errors of lexicogrammatical category (morphological level, lexical level, syntactic level and discourse level)

1. **Analysis of Students’ Errors in Syntactic Level**
2. ***Misuse of conjunction***

 Many of these errors had correlative pairs attached to both clauses of a complex sentence. The influence of first language was evident. The errors are illustrated as follows:

1. \*She had been ill since when she had her accident long time
2. \*She never saw him again after that he left town
3. \*Though he still felt ill but he decided to go back to work

 In the sentence above, the students applied the incorrect form of conjunction. In sentence number 1and 2, the students put double conjunction which should be only single-word conjunction. In sentence number 3, the student failed to understand the English form which was different from Indonesian conjunction form.

 Errors in the three sentences above are caused by L1 transfer. Here the students transferred the Indonesian structure into their English sentence. So, the errors are called interlingual, Richards and Schmidt (2002: 267) state that interlingual error is an error which results from language transfer, that is, which is caused by the learners’ native language.

The correct sentences should be:

1. She had been ill since she had her accident long time
2. She never saw him again after he left town
3. Though he still felt ill, he decided to go back to work
4. ***Misordering of Constituent in Indirect Questions***

 The incorrect placement of subject following operator mirrored of the order of the two constituents in a direct *wh*-question (Chan, 2010). Errors in in this term are the less common errors in the syntactic level made by the students in writing narrative composition. The researcher analyzed that this error occured very seldom because of the lack of knowledge about indirect questions. There was only one student who used indirect question in her writing composition and the output was incorrect.

The sentence is as follows:

\*He doesn’t know where were from it smell?

 In the sentence above, L1 interference was not evident, because in Indonesian, *wh*-words occurs in the same position in a sentence as a do non-question words having the same grammatical function. No reordering of subject and operator was required in an indirect *wh*-question. Inadequate mastery of the correct ordering constituents in English indirect questions was probably the main cause.

 The correct sentence should be:

He doesn’t know where the smell comes from.

1. ***In-prepositional phrase***

 These errors consisted of the preposition *in*, either used redundantly or chosen inappropriately, in an *in*-prepositional phrase (Chan, 2010). The error sentences can be seen as follows:

1. \*Do not come in here
2. \*In three years ago, I was always being called flat nose.

In the sentences above, instead of omitting the preposition, the student added *in* preposition. She still used preposition whereas it should be omitted. Here, the student failed to understand the appropriate rule of using preposition *in*.

These errors are non L1 related factors, it is overgeneralization. It occurs when the student applied the grammatical rule of the target language too widely. Ziahosseiny (1999 in Shekhzadeh 2011:161) explains that overgeneralization occurs when the learner has mastered a general rule but does not yet know all the exceptions to that rule.

 The correct construction should be:

1. Do not come here
2. Three years ago, I was always being called flat nose
3. ***Be + ed***

In these sentences, the verb *to be* coexists with the past participle (or past form) of the main verb. The errors can be seen in the sentences below:

1. \*He isalwayscried about it
2. \*It waslooked perfect

 In sentences above, the students failed in placing verb ‘be’. These sentences are active sentences, so the verb *be* in the sentence must be omitted.

 Errors in the two sentences above are caused by one of the non L1 related factors, it is overgeneralization. Richards (1974): 174) states that overgeneralization generally involves the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures. He also states in the same book and page that intralingual errors are those which reflect the general characteristic of rule learning, such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules, and failure to learn condition under which rule apply. So, it can be assumed that the causes of error in the two sentences above are intralingual.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence should be:

1. He always cries about it
2. It looked perfect
3. ***Pseudopassives and undergeneration of passives***

 In this case, the students failed to generate the full range of English passive constructions, these errors could also be seen as cases of undergeneration of the target passive (Yip, 1995). Mother tongue interference is apparent. For examples:

1. \*He can see all strange things that cannot see by normal people
2. \*We are give time to take a rest.

 In sentences above, the students failed to generate the full range of English passive. In sentence 1, the verb ‘see’ should be in past participle form ‘seen’ and preceded by auxiliary ‘been’. While in sentence 2, the student failed to apply past participle in passive voice. The verb ‘give’ should be ‘given’.

 Errors in these sentences are caused by the lack of facilitation from the L1. It is impossible to affirm the facilitating effects of positive transfer on EFL because the effects of positive transfer can only be determined through a comparison between learners of different native languages (Odlin, 1989). Therefore, the student made errors in this type as there was no passive form in Indonesian. The students had no positive transfer to make sentence in their writing composition.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. He can see all strange things that cannot be seen by normal people
2. We are given time to take a rest.
3. ***Omission of Subjects***

 This error is often associated with compound or complex sentences where both clauses shared the same subject, the subject is present in on of the clauses, the missing subject can be identified with the subject present in the other clause, or the missing subject is understood in the immediate context. The sentences are illustrated as follows:

1. \*One day, ^ lived a very poor family that consists of father, mother and their son.
2. \*Because at the time ^ is Sunday, so there are many visitors came
3. \*Suddenly, ^ emerged from the soil of the ant.

 In sentence 1 and 2, the students did not put any subject to the sentences. They omitted the subject and directly put verb as the imperative sentence rule. Sentence number 3 indicated that the student failed to recognize the correct filler of subject. The student put an adverb instead of noun, pronoun or noun phrase as the subject filler.

 The errors in students’ sentences above are mother tongue interference or L1 transfer because a co-referential noun phrase in the second clause of a sentence or in subsequent sentence of a discourse is not normally mentioned in Indonesian. A co-referential pronoun may be used, but it is not obligatory (Li and Thompson, 1981).

Based on the explanation above, the sentences should be:

1. One day, there lived a very poor family that consists of father, mother and their son.
2. Because it was Sunday, many visitors came.
3. Suddenly, the ant emerged from the soil.
4. ***Existential structure***

 Errors in this area were quite rarely made by the students in writing a narrative paragraph. The errors occurred when students failed to use ‘there’ with the appropriate auxiliary. The sentences are illustrated as follows:

1. \*There are a table with a lot of meal
2. \*There are a large family mouse
3. \*There are a beautiful green valley

 In the three sentences above, the students failed to identify existential structure. The students did not know the appropriate verb for the dummy subject *there*. The word *there* comes first, it is then followed by the simple present or past tense of *be. There* is called dummy subject because it has no meaning in itself – its function is to put the real subject in a more prominent position (Macmillan, 2008). In the sentences above, the students put *are* as the auxiliary verb instead of *is*.

 The errors in students’ sentences above are one of the non-L1 related factors, it is false concepts hypothesized. Richards (1974) states that this error derives from faulty comprehension of distinction in the target language.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. There is a table with a lot of meal
2. There is a large family mouse
3. There is a beautiful green valley
4. ***Misuse of preposition***

 In these sentences, an appropriate preposition is chosen in place of an appropriate one, a superfluous preposition is added, or a required preposition is omitted. The illustration of the errors can be seen as follows:

1. \*During he stay on the ship, Malin Kundang learned a lot about how to be a seaman
2. \*He said that he prepared about a romantic dinner with me
3. \*He often came to Nenek Nagauleng’s house for accompany her

 In sentence number 1, the student failed in using preposition as prepositional phrase. In this case the student used preposition as conjunction because the preposition *during* was followed by a clause. The students should put noun phrase only after the preposition. In sentence number 2, the student added a superfluous preposition. The preposition *about* was not necessary to be added to the sentence as the meaning was inappropriate in English. Meanwhile, in sentence 3, the student misused the preposition *for* in her writing.

 Errors in these sentences cannot be classified as L1 interference. Chan (2010) states that the uses ofEnglish prepositions are not easy to generalize and choices of prepositions are often lexically determined and idiosyncratic. Therefore, inadequate mastery of the choice and use of English preposition is probably the major cause. In this case, the possible source of errors was called incomplete application of rule. This means that the students apply the rule in the context of a sentence, although the rule is not yet complete (Richards, 1974).

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. During his voyage, Malin Kundang learned a lot about how to be a seaman
2. He said that he prepared a romantic dinner with me
3. He often came to Nenek Nagauleng’s house to accompany her
4. ***Verb form selection***

In these sentences, an –*ing* participle is used in place of a present tense verb, a past form in place of a base-form and the like. Errors in this area are the most common errors in term of syntactic level made by the students in writing narrative composition. Since narrative functions to tell about past experiences, it is normally used past tense form. Here are the illustrations of the sentences:

1. Their life styles have been changed from the poor become rich
2. She was never complaint her life and make busy other people
3. One day, mother go to town to meet Maling

 In sentence 1, the student failed to recognize the past form of the verb, she still used the simple form of verb *have*. The verb *make* in sentence 2 was also still in simple form, it should be in past form. Moreover, in sentence 3, the student failed to recognize the past form of verb *go.*

 Verbs in Indonesian do not exhibit different verb forms, so insufficient mastery of verb formation processes in English is probably a major cause. Therefore, the possible source of errors in this type was because of the lack of facilitation from the L1. Chan (2010) states that the lack of comparable lexicogrammatical requirements in the native language may result in a lack of facilitation, which may in turn lead to added learner difficulty.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences can be seen as follows:

1. Their life styles had been changed from poor to be rich
2. She never complained her life and made other people busy
3. One day, mother went to town to meet Maling
4. ***Misuse of relative clauses***

This error occurs when students failed to choose the appropriate relater or introductory word in a correct structure. Frank (1972) states that in a relative clause a full subject and predicate is changed by means of a special introductory word which has the same referent as the preceding noun or pronoun. The form and position of this introductory word subordinates the adjective clause to a main clause. Here are the examples:

1. \*…because I have to count how many crocodiles that comes
2. \*Candy went to the jungle to look for a medicine for her grandmother that was getting ill
3. \*Andi tried to continue his step and opened the door which unlocked

In sentence 1, the student put relater *that* which is superfluous for that construction. The students should not assume the sentence as a relative clause since it is not a clause. A relater is used to connect two clauses. In sentence 2, the student applied relative clause correctly to connect two clauses, however, the relater or connector was still incorrect. The relative pronoun *who* refers to person and *that* may refer to persons or things (Frank, 1972). Therefore, the student should use *who* instead of *that*  as the relater in the sentence. In sentence 3, the student omitted the auxiliary after the relater *which*.

Errors of this type are caused by one of the non-L1 related factors, it is false concept hypothesized. Richard (in Yahya 2009) states that false concept hypothesized refers to faulty rule learning at various levels. There is a class of interlingual errors which derived from faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence constructions are:

1. …because I have to count how many crocodiles comes
2. Candy went to the jungle to look for a medicine for her grandmother who was getting ill
3. Andi tried to continue his step and opened the door which was unlocked
4. ***Incorrect order of adverbials or adverbs***

Most of these errors are associated with the incorrect placement of the adverb *very*, though other adverbs, such as *too*, was also sometimes misplaced. Here are the examples:

1. \*The car which they used too didn’t work.
2. \*One day, the forest was hit by storm very powerful

In sentence 1, the student applied the wrong adverb *too* which should be *also*. T*oo* can also be used but in the end of the sentence. In sentence 2, the student misordered the adverb which should be placed preceding *storm*.

Error in this type is caused by the L1 transfer, which is mother tongue. The student translated the sentences by the interference of Indonesian language.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence should be:

1. The car which they used didn’t work too
2. One day, the forest was hit by very powerful storm
3. ***Serial verb construction***

Errors in this type occur when the sentences had two or more verbs or verb clauses juxtaposed without any intervening marker (Chan, 2010). The juxtaposed clauses in these constructions normally share the same subject. As serial verb constructions are widely acceptable in Indonesian and the structure of the erroneous English constructions mirrored that of the corresponding L1 translations, mother-tongue interference is probably a major cause. The error is illustrated in the sentence below:

\*There lived a couple are Poppy and Regweed

In the sentence above, the student put two verbs without any intervening marker, they are verb *lived* and *are*. Inadequate mastery of sentence basic construction of English was probably another cause.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence should be:

There live a couple namely Poppy and Regweed.

1. ***Inappropriate case selection***

This error occurs when students failed to apply the pronoun to refer to noun. Error in this type was present quite often in students writing composition. The errors can be seen in the sentences below:

1. \*His father made an effort and finally made her rich.
2. \*He was old and ugly. The princess didn’t like her

In sentence 1, the student put the incorrect object pronoun which refers to a man. Instead of using *him*, the student used *her* as the case selection. In sentence 2, the student also put the wrong case selection of *him* which refers to a woman.

The error occurs in the sentence above is caused by the non-L1 related factors, it is incomplete application of rule. It can be said that L1 transfer does not influence the students’ error because in Indonesian there is no case selection construction. Inadequate mastery of the distinct forms for the different cases in English was probably the major cause of the problem.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence should be:

1. His father made an effort and finally made him rich.
2. \*He was old and ugly. The princess didn’t like him
3. ***Punctuation problems***

Some of these errors are comma splices, and others are sentence fragments. The comma splices consist of independent clauses separated by commas, whereas the sentence fragments are all stand-alone subordinate clauses introduced by a subordinator such as *because,* or *but.* The sentences are illustrated below:

1. \*My campus is still the same, incidentally today is my holiday, but I chose to spend my holiday at home
2. \*He has a beautiful wife, and smart diligent son
3. \*When she was seventeen she fell in love

In sentence 1 & 2, the students put commas in the wrong place whereas there should be no commas used. In sentence 3, the student did not put comma after the first clause which should be put comma. Errors of this type are none of the L1 interference. This occurred for incomplete application of rule that means the students apply a rule in the context of a sentence, although the rule is not complete yet (Richard, in Yahya, 2009).

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence should be:

1. My campus is still the same. Incidentally today is my holiday but I chose to spend my holiday at home
2. He has a beautiful wife and smart diligent son
3. When she was seventeen, she fell in love
4. ***Transitivity pattern confusion***

Error in this type occurs when student failed to use transitivity pattern. Here are the illustrations:

1. \*Sahri asked a question and want to asked the beautiful girl
2. \*The power of evil sent out their troops to covered heart of the life tree
3. \*We went out to looked for breakfast

In the sentences above, the students put *to* preceding the past form of the verb, such as *to asked, to covered* and *to looked for* which should not be in past form. Error in this type probably caused by the non-L1 related factors, it is overgeneralization. According to Jakobovits quoted by Richards (1974: 174) overgeneralization or transfer is the use of previously available strategies in new situations. In second language learning some of these strategies will prove helpful in organizing the facts about the second language, but others, perhaps due to superficial similarities, will be misleading and inapplicable. As the students wrote a narrative composition they assumed to use past form of the verb. However, they use past form for all verbs even for the verb after *to*.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. Sahri asked a question and want to ask the beautiful girl
2. The power of evil sent out their troops to cover heart of the life tree
3. We went out to look for breakfast
4. ***Be + base form***

In these sentences, the verb *to be* coexisted with the base form of the main verb. The students failed to apply the correct rule of *to be* in a sentence. The errors are illustrated as follows:

1. \*It was memorize in three years ago
2. \*We were try to keep our position
3. \*Grandmother told us what was happen last time to all family

In sentence 1, 2, and 3, the students put *to be* right after the main verb in present form in which the *to be* should be omitted. The errors are probably caused by the false concept hypothesized. Richards, (1974:178) states that false concepts hypothesized is an error which derives from faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language. In this case the students had acquired a particular knowledge of word class: noun, adjective, and verb in a sentence, but they did not know the distinction of using them in a sentence.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. It memorized in three years ago
2. We tried to keep our position
3. Grandmother told us what happened last time to all family
4. ***Concord problems***

Errors in this type occur when students failed to put the correct agreement between two words in a sentence. Wiley-Blackwell (2011) states that concord or agreement occurs when one element in a sentence takes on the morphosyntactic features of another element. This error was one of the most common errors occurred in students narrative writing. Here are the examples:

1. \*Andi and his friends was walking in the village
2. \*She just already know that her name is Nadia
3. \*I have many travel to another city in Indonesia
4. \*There is a rules that all creatures must find permission from Mr. Ocax

 In sentence number 1, the student failed to apply the agreement of subject and verb. The verb *was* should be *were* as the subject was in plural form (Andi and his friends). In sentence number 2, the student also failed to use the correct agreement of subject and verb. In this case, she used *know* instead of *knows* for the subject *she*. Meanwhile, in sentence 3 and 4, the student failed to apply the correct form for noun-pronoun agreement (agreement between a pronoun and its antecedent in terms of number, person, and gender). In sentence 3, the noun *travel* should be *travels* as there was quantifier *many* preceded it. In sentence 4, the noun *rules* should be *rule* as there was an article *a* preceded it.

 In relation to this, Chan (2010) states that a lack of comparable equivalents in the mother tongue, leading to a lack of positive evidence in the target language, may probably have been the cause of errors in concord problems. Therefore, the researcher found that the possible source of this error is lack of facilitation from the L1. Indonesian language structure has no marked for number, tense, or person for nouns and verbs. Besides, the students’ inadequate mastery of English structure constituent is also likely.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences can be seen as follows:

1. Andi and his friends were walking in the village
2. She just already knows that her name is Nadia
3. I have many travels to another city in Indonesia
4. There is a rule that all creatures must find permission from Mr. Ocax
5. ***Word class confusion***

 This error was one of the most common errors in syntactic level made by the students in writing narrative composition. The errors occurwhen the students failed to recognize the word class and the use in a sentence. Students’ errors in using word class are as follows:

1. \*……because they didn’t permission to Mr. Ocax
2. \*It means that she lost her memorize about things in three years ago
3. \*I think he was an athletic
4. \*It explains about the interesting of the learning experience

 In sentence number 1, the student failed to recognize the verb of the word *permission* which had to be *permit*. Meanwhile, in sentence 2, the student failed to recognize the noun of the verb *memorize* which had to be *memory*. In sentence 3 and 4 the students failed to recognize the correct use of noun. The word *athletic* is an adjective that should be altered to noun *athlete* while the word interesting is an adjective that should be altered to noun *interest*.

 The errors made by the students above are false concepts hypothesized. Richards, (1974:178) states that false concepts hypothesized is an error which derives from faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language. In this case the students had acquired a particular knowledge of word class: noun, adjective, and verb in a sentence, but they did not know the distinction of using them in a sentence.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. ……because they didn’t permit to Mr. Ocax
2. It means that she lost her memory about things in three years ago
3. I think he was an athlete
4. It explains about the interest of the learning experience
5. ***Calquing***

 A calque is a type of borrowing in which each morpheme or word is translated into the equivalent morpheme or word in another language (Richards, Platt, and Platt, 1992). The individual target language words used semantically match the individual words in the native language. Errors in this type was one of the most common error occurred in students narrative writing. Here are the examples:

1. \*He has house can protect him from wind, rain, snow and the wolf
2. \*In family mouse, lived a couple are Poppy and Ragweed
3. \*His mother vomit up sickness of her heart with direct many ways, spend hundred million Indonesian monetary unit for to make the second wife her husband pass away
4. \*At the moment family who their building begin broke, there is no composure in the house

 In sentence 1, the student failed to use the correct sentence in English form. She translated the sentences based on the Indonesian version, it can be seen from the omission of relater *which* that should be added to the sentence. In sentence 2, the student also failed to construct the correct sentence. The omission of subject was evident, furthermore the construction of *in-*prepositional phrase was misordered. In sentence 3 and 4, the students failed to construct the correct grammatical English sentence. She wrote the sentence by transferring word per word from Indonesian language into English which results in meaningless sentence.

 The error in sentences above is L1 transfer. Chan (2010) states that many learners tend to think in their native language first, before converting their mental output into target language written output. Some learners may process their mental output directly in the target langauge but constantly retrieve their L1 repertoire when encountering difficulties or dealing with unfamiliar concepts in their production of target language written output.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence can be seen as follows:

1. He has house which can protect him from wind, rain, snow and the wolf
2. In mouse family, there lived a couple called Poppy and Ragweed
3. His mother expressed her sorrow by doing many ways, she spent hundred million rupiahs to killher husband’s wife
4. At the moment, the family, whose house started to crash, had no composure in their house
5. **Analysis of Students’ Errors in Lexical Level**
6. ***Inaccurate directionality***

 Such confusion is probably the result of mother-tongue interference, as the substitution words and the target words often have substitutable L1 equivalents with no directionality differences (Chan 2010). The errors are illustrated as follows:

1. \*He will have the problem solving about the asks of the students
2. \*The girl asked him to borrow her some money immediately

 In sentence number 1, the student failed to choose the appropriate word to explain her sentence correctly. As in Indonesian the word *ask* and *question* have the same meaning, the student faced difficulties in placing them in a sentence appropriately. In sentence 2, instead of using *lend* the student used *borrow* to explain her sentence. However, in English construction *borrow* and *lend* have different directionality.

Errors in this type are caused by L1 transfer or mother-tongue. This mother-tongue problem is also called interlingual factor. Brown (2000) states that in the process of second language learning, the grammatical system of the learners mother tongue may interfere the grammatical system of the second language.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences are as follows:

1. He will have the problem solving about the questions of the students
2. The girl asked him to lend her some money immediately
3. ***Synonym confusion***

These errors show learnersdifficulties in differentiating the appropriate uses of near synonyms and the contexts in which they should be used (Chan, 2010).The errors were the most common error in lexical level made by the students in writing narrative composition. Here are the illustrations of the errors:

1. \*The ant protected from the storm because he could get into his nest under the ground
2. \*Lara beat the carpet that full of dust and dirt
3. \*A capture of a man crossed not far from where they stood at that time

 In sentence 1, the student failed to choose the correct word to explain the sentence meaning. The word *protected* should be *save* to refer to the meaning of the ant was still alive. In sentence 2, the student also failed to choose the suitable word for an action of cleaning dust from a carpet. The word *beat* should be replaced by *clap*. In sentence 3, the student failed to select the appropriate word to explain her meaning. The word *capture* should be best replaced by *figure*.

Error in this type is caused by the L1 or interlingual factors. Brown (2000) states that in the process of second language learning, the grammatical system of the learners mother tongue may interfere the grammatical system of the second language.

 Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences can be seen as follows:

1. The ant saved from the storm because he could get into his nest under the ground
2. Lara clapped the carpet that full of dust and dirt
3. A figure of a man crossed not far from where they stood at that time
4. ***Vocabulary compensation***

For this error type, the synonym relation between the substitution words and the target words holds only in the learner’s mother tongue (Chan: 2010). The substitution words (groups) and the target words (groups) have very different meanings and usage in English. The errors can be seen in the following sentences:

1. \*Hot fried that we ate didn’t feel hot because of the weather
2. \*Then, one crocodile out from the watery

 In sentence 1, the student failed to select between *taste* and *feel.* In this case, she was not able to distinguish her mother tongue word with English word. In sentence 2, the student also failed to choose the suitable word for the meaning of reveal from something. She used the word based on her mother tongue, *out*.

 The errors are probably caused by mother tongue or sometimes it is called L1 transfer. Brown (2000) states that in the process of second language learning, the grammatical system of the learners mother tongue may interfere the grammatical system of the second language.

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentences should be:

1. Hot fried that we ate didn’t taste hot because of the weather
2. Then, one crocodile turned up from the water
3. ***Synforms***

Synforms are lexical mis-hits selected because of formal resemblance to other L2 forms (Hall, 2002; Laufer, 1997). The errors occur when the students failed to put the appropriate root with the correct form. The errors are illustrated as follows:

\*The life of their child began disorder

In the sentence above, the student failed to hit the word *child* which has meaning for *childhood*. This error is caused by one of the non-L1 related factors, it is incomplete application of rule. This error occurs because the learners’ insecure knowledge of both target forms and their corresponding mis-hits.

Based on the explanation above, the sentence should be:

The life of their childhood began disorder

1. **Analysis of Students’ Errors in Morphological Level**
2. ***Inappropriate selection of affixes***

The researcher did not find the students’ errors in this area

1. **Overuse of affixes**

 Overuses of affixes were exemplars of overgeneralization, where the need for an affix in word formation had been overgeneralized. Inadequate knowledge of the word class of a stem word was probably a reason for such overgeneralization, because the students did not seem to be aware that the original stems without the unwanted affixes suffice for the meanings conveyed. The error can be seen as follows:

\*He felt so scared and thinked who was calling him

 In the sentence above, the student failed to put the appropriate past form of the verb*think*. In this case, the student had acquired knowledge of simple past tense in which the verb should be in past form. However, she assumed that all verbs can be added –*ed* in past form. Therefore, instead of using *thought* the student used *thinked***.**

Based on the explanation above, the correct sentence can be seen as follows:

He felt so scared and thought who was calling him.

1. **Analysis of Students’ Error in Discourse Level**
2. ***Periphrastic-topic construction***

The researcher did not find lexicogrammar error in this area

1. ***Use of* it *as discourse deixis***

 The errors of this type occurred when there was an inappropriate use of *it* without a clear referent, as a discourse-deictic expression to refer to a preceding or following portion of a discourse. Here is the example:

\*Suddenly, the old man was lost and made Johan unconscious in the grave it

 The sentence above indicates that L1 interference may not have been at work because the structures of the erroneous English sentence were not comparable to those of their Indonesian translation.

**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

 After conducting the research, doing the analysis, and presenting the results, the conclusion and suggestion of this study will be presented in this chapter.

1. **Conclusion**

 Based on the findings of the analysis in the previous chapter, the researcher formulates the conclusion that:

1. The range of lexicogrammatical error types mostly made by the students in narrative writing is syntactic level and followed by lexical level, morphological level and discourse level. The errors are classified as follows:

Syntactic level: *misuse of conjunction, misordering of constituents in indirect questions, in-prepositional phrase, omission of subjects, existential structure, misuse of prepositions, verb form selection, misuse of relative clauses, incorrect order of adverbials or adverbs, serial verb construction, inappropriate case selection, punctuation problems, transitivity pattern confusion, be + base form, omission of copulas, concord problems, word class confusion, and calquing*. Lexical level: *inaccurate directionality, synonym confusion, vocabulary compensation, synforms*. Morphological level: *overuse of affixes*. Discourse level: *use of ‘it’ as discourse deixis*

1. The possible sources of errors made by the students are L1 transfer, lack of facilitation of L1, and non-L1 related factors such as overgeneralization, false concept hypothesized and incomplete application of rule
2. **Suggestion**

Based on the result of the study, the researcher would like to offer some suggestions as follows:

1. Teachers should apply more attractive method to teach lexicogrammatical rules in English, particularly the syntactic level, as the results of the data show that students face difficulties in constructing sentences grammatically mostly in syntactic level.
2. Teachers should develop the teaching materials of English grammar, do not only use the given materials or the handbook. In this case, the students should be given more reference to expand their knowledge of lexicogrammar
3. After knowing the students’ difficulties in using correct grammar, teachers are expected to be able to solve the students’ problems by regularly give them more exercise to improve the students knowledge.
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