

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter provides conclusions, implications and suggestions in relation with the findings and discussions presented in the previous chapter. Thus, this chapter is divided into three sub-headings, namely: conclusions, implications and suggestions.

1.1. Conclusion

To achieve the purposes of this study, there are two questions that have been presented in this study. These questions are:

1. What are the common grammatical errors made by the second semester students at one public university in Jambi?
2. What are the possible causes of grammatical errors in writing made by these second semester students?

Thus, there are two conclusions that can be drawn from the findings of this study. The first conclusion is that the most common errors made by the students in the sample population is misformation of verb, followed by omission of linking verb and misordering of noun and the least errors made by the students is addition of adverb.

This conclusion is drawn from the fact that there are 326 items of errors occurring in the students' writing based on the surface strategy taxonomy. It has been found that 89 items or 27,3% of the total errors are omission, 33 items or 10,1% of the total errors are addition, 141 items or 43,3% of the total errors are misformation and 63 items or 19,3% of the total errors are misordering.

After all these four error categories are classified into 13 subcategories, it has been found that the omission of linking verb has the highest frequency. Meanwhile, in the subcategory of addition, the addition of adverb has the highest frequency. Meanwhile, in the

subcategory of misformation, the misformation of verb has the highest frequency and in the subcategory of misordering, the misordering of noun has the highest frequency.

Furthermore, the second conclusion that can be drawn to answer the second question is that the most common cause of errors for students in the sample population is the overgeneralization of grammatical rules, such as syntax and morphology, due to failure in automatically responding to particular stimulus regarding language features of the target language. Meanwhile, the second most common cause of the errors is the transfer of utterance from L1 to TL.

This conclusion is based on the fact that according to comparative strategy taxonomy, it has been found that 147 items or 87% of the total errors are of intralingual type and 22 items or 13% of the total errors are of the interlingual type as some linguistic patterns in *Bahasa Indonesia* are found in the samples.

5.2 Implications

Generally, students in the sample population are able to compose descriptive texts. They are able to deliver their ideas in writing. However, problems appear in students' ability in mastering English grammatical rules. These results imply that the students are unable to cautiously catch linguistic signals that are not present in their first language and tend to transfer linguistic patterns existing in their first language into their target language. Thus, it seems that the students will need more assistance on this specific matter from their educators and/or lecturers.

Furthermore, since the instrument used in this study was merely a single test in which the students were asked to write a descriptive text about their current favorite places, thus the errors found in the samples are mostly about the use of simple present tense and other linguistic features related to it. Therefore, deeper descriptive analysis with different types of instruments, added with interviews with the students regarding their errors, is needed before

any teaching strategy could be drawn and applied to the specific population in which this study was conducted at.

5.3 Suggestions

It is suggested for future researchers that similar study is conducted in wider research sites, that is, not just at one study program in one public university, but also by comparing the writing products of students from different universities using other writing genres such as narrative texts, reporting texts, essays, and so on. Complementary researches to find effective strategies and media for teaching writing at the university level can also be a useful extension to this study.

It is also suggested for the lecturers who teach academic writing in universities to help their students to compose good descriptive texts by giving various ways to develop their understanding in both grammatical rules of the second language and the common errors made by the students. The lecturers could provide more time for the students to discuss their writings in the classroom. In this case, the teacher will motivate the students to acquire proper linguistic features of their second language and avoid possible errors in the future.