

**AN ANALYSIS OF DERIVATIVE WORDS USAGE IN THE STUDENTS'
POST-TEST SHORT ESSAY IN IC PROGRAM OF
STATE UNIVERSITY OF SURABAYA**

Atika Febriahati
092084007

English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya
email: atika_febriahati@yahoo.com

Dosen Pembimbing:
Prof. Dr. Hj. Lies Amin Lestari, M.A, M.Pd.

English Department, Faculty of Language and Art, State University of Surabaya

Abstrak

Penggunaan kata derivatif sangat penting karena makna kata bergantung pada kesesuaiannya. Pada realitanya, penguasaan kata derivatif masih belum bisa dicapai secara maksimal pada level perguruan tinggi, sehingga mahasiswa masih membuat beberapa kesalahan dalam karangannya. Pada dasarnya, konsep kata derivatif dalam bahasa Inggris berbeda dengan bahasa Indonesia. Hal ini menyebabkan mahasiswa Indonesia menemui kesulitan untuk menguasai kata derivatif, termasuk mahasiswa jurusan Bahasa Inggris. Berdasarkan masalah tersebut, studi ini dirancang untuk mendeskripsikan bagaimana mahasiswa jurusan Bahasa Inggris di UNESA menggunakan kata derivatif dalam karangannya. Studi ini termasuk dalam studi deskriptif kualitatif dan penelitian dokumenter dengan menggunakan karangan mahasiswa dalam *post-test* program IC. Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan dalam studi ini adalah *post-test* dan ceklist. Ada tiga langkah dalam menganalisis data, mengidentifikasi kesalahan, mengklasifikasi kesalahan, dan mengidentifikasi penyebab kesalahan. Setelah melalui tahap analisis berdasarkan *surface strategy taxonomy*, hasil menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa menemui kesulitan dalam menyusun kata derivatif.

Abstract

Derivative words usage is imperative since the meaning of words depend on its conformity. The reality in Indonesian college brings a phenomenon where the goal of acquiring derivative words itself does not come true so that the students produce errors in their composition. Basically, the concept of derivative words in English is different from that of Bahasa Indonesia. That is why it is difficult for Indonesian students, including university students of English major, to acquire derivative words. Dealing with the problem, this study was designed to describe the students of English Department in UNESA use derivative words in their composition. By employing the concept of descriptive qualitative study and documentary research, this study used the students' composition produced in the writing test after they finished the IC Program. The instruments of this study were post-test short essay and check list. There were three steps in analyzing the data, identification of errors, classification of errors, and identifications of the cause of errors. Having analyzed the errors based on the surface strategy taxonomy, the results showed that the students found difficulties on constructing derivative words.

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, a demand to communicate becomes an important matter. The growth of information in this globalization era generates such demand in society. Good, proper, effective, and efficient communication ability then becomes an absolute demand. Therefore, language skills become absolute matters that must be mastered, especially for academics, so that they would not only become the viewer, but also become part of the time progress in that information growth.

Using language correctly is not an easy thing since there is a set of rules that must be followed called grammar. English has certain rules that should be fully considered by the second language students. For all speakers or writers, understanding the meaning of words will help them choose the proper words. To choose the proper words and know the word meaning area, all speakers or writers need to open and master the thesaurus of a language. Only English that has complete thesaurus (Parera, 2004). Therefore, after knowing the complexity of English as the second language in Indonesia, the

students need to know more about the elements inside it.

Grammar is essential when learning a language since it is the basis structure in order to master the language. Grammar is conventionally seen as the study of the syntax and morphology of sentences. It is the study of linguistic chains and slot (Thornbury, 1999). Without grammar, writers could not write English properly. Sometimes the sentence produced can be difficult, confusing and even annoying, therefore it is extremely important for students to study grammar. Writers use grammar to put sentences together and communicate with others written or orally. It is English grammar that will allow us to be a better communicator, listener, thinker, reader and writer. Having a knowledgeable understanding of grammar will let us have a potentially rewarding career in many fields of work (Folega, 2007). It is also strengthened by an idea that it is obvious when teaching grammar out of context is likely to lead to misunderstanding (Thornbury, 1999).

Regarding to the significance of English language acquisition, English Department students are hoped to have that good ability in mastering English for both oral and written. That goal is also in the same line with the goal of IC (Intensive Course) program held by English Department of State University of Surabaya. IC program is arranged to help the freshmen in the first semester reach English language skills in intermediate group by passing the communicative-integrative approach course based on the competence intensively. That intensive course presents speaking, listening, reading and writing skill integratedly.

Without underestimating the other three skills (speaking, listening and reading), writing is the most important skill and hard to be mastered. That requirement leads to a reality that writing activity at school, basically, has not reached the target. Fundamentally, one way to look at writing is to see it as marks on a page or a screen, a coherent arrangement of words, clauses, and sentences, structured according to a system of rules (Hyland, 2003). Conceptualizing second language writing in this way directs attention to writing as a product and encourages a focus on a formal text units or grammatical features of texts. In writing there is a process. A process approach asks students to consider the procedure of putting together a good piece of work (Harmer, 2007). Good piece of work means that students need to use proper elements of writing included the grammatical features.

The ability to use the appropriate form of a word in a given grammatical context is essential for developing grammatically suitable language (Schmitt & Zimmerman, 2002). For example, students need to produce precise when an adjective is required but precision in a context requiring a noun. Without this ability, students must

either use only the form of the word they know or substitute another word that fits the grammatical frame. What does knowledge of a word like precise imply for knowledge of a related word, such as precision? If a learner can use one appropriately, can the teacher or researcher assume that the learner knows the other as well? Those questions would be answered by taking a look at the students' compositions directly. In analyzing a composition, there is one point that must be counted. The point is in shaping and constructing language for expression and effect there is a requirement to improve vocabulary precision and impact (Rigby, 2009).

Research on second language vocabulary acquisition has not addressed the problems directly, but current views of vocabulary knowledge suggest the complexity of the problems by positing vocabulary knowledge as multi-componential, including knowledge of a word's spelling, meaning, collocations, register traits, and grammatical and morphological characteristics (Nation (2010) as cited in Rigby (2009). As far as possible, students need to be aware of rules. In this case, the usage of derivative words is imperative since the meaning of words will change if there is an addition to it. The point of awareness will avoid students' mistake in producing misunderstanding by the readers towards the students' writing.

The problems arise when writers are dealing with morphologically complex words. For example, *employee* can be analyzed as being composed of the verb *employ* and the ending *-ee*, the adjective *unhappy* can be analyzed as being derived from the adjective *happy* by the attachment of the element *un-*. A writer can thus decompose complex words into their smallest meaningful units. These units are called morphemes. Under the umbrella of morphemes, there is derivative word. Admitting the complexity of derivative words, it would be seen so difficult for Indonesian students to acquire it without any good method. It happens since in Indonesian language there is no such kind of complexity just like in English language. Indonesian language belongs to agglutinative group. As a member of agglutinative group, all the grammatical concepts are being put or added to the base forms to create new meaning (Chaer, 2003). In Indonesian language, a writer can use *senang* for *happy* and *tidak senang* for *unhappy*, *sopan* for *polite* and *tidak sopan* for *impolite*. The writer just needs to add *tidak* to show the antonym in Indonesian language, while in English we have grammar to rule it that is adding prefixes. Moreover the prefixes are different though in the equivalence to Indonesian language is just the same (*tidak*). That problem becomes severe when the students are not trained to master the usage and how to form derivational words.

Eventually, it could be concluded that English Department students' word choice profile, in this case is derivative words, is one of measurement that has been required in a form of knowledge mastery as what the department required after they graduate from the university. Therefore, this study is aimed to identify whether the students use derivative words correctly or not in their composition and to identify the students' common errors in their composition.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study was a descriptive qualitative study where the study was designed to describe the observed phenomena with words rather than with numbers. Johnson and Thristersen (2004:359) state that the descriptive qualitative study is a research relying primarily in the collection of qualitative data (non numerical data such as words and pictures). Qualitative research's central criteria depend on whether findings are grounded in empirical material or whether the methods are appropriately selected and applied, as well as the relevance of findings and the reflexivity of proceedings (Flick, 2009).

Based on the research questions and the objectives as stated in the previous chapter, a documentary research was employed in this study. This study belongs to a documentary analysis of the data or text which was derived from the students' compositions. The documents were the 2012 batch of English Department students' post-test short essay in IC program of State University of Surabaya. This study was intended to analyze the students' derivative words profile.

Subject of the Research

In this study, the students' post-test short essays of batch 2012 in IC program were the data. The IC program was conducted in the first semester of the English Department in State University of Surabaya. The data were the students' derivative words profile in their composition. The choice was under the consideration that the students were already in the last period of IC Program which were introduced by particular derivative words. Besides, the choice was also considered to the IC students, because the aim of this study was to know the significance of learning grammar along IC Program.

This study used the idea of purposive random sampling. The data were 30 subjects under three classifications, elementary group, pre-intermediate group, and intermediate group. Each of classification consists of 10 subjects. The data were chosen randomly without considering the class the students come from. The purpose of choosing the data based on the group was to gain the analysis result of the errors in using the derivative words

in each group. Eventually, this study provided the common errors analysis in using derivative words done by the students from those three groups.

Research Instruments

The instruments of this study were post-test short essays and check lists. The first instrument in this study was post-test which was used to obtain the data from the students. The students were asked to write essays minimum 200 words. The topic that has been determined by the lecturer is about their personality, the target they have reached in IC, and plans in English Department. In doing the post-test short essay, the students were given chances to finish their essay in 30 minutes.

Second, there were two check lists used in this study to analyze the data. Those lists have important role to classify the types of errors and identify the causes of errors made by the students in their post-test short essay. The forms of checklist are based on Dulay theory of types of errors and James (1998) as cited by Sattayatham and Somchoen (2004:4) theory of the causes of errors.

Data Collection Technique

In this study, the data were taken from batch of 2012 of the English Department in State University of Surabaya or the IC Program. The post-test was held at the end of IC Program, on Thursday, December 27, 2012. The students' compositions were in the form of short essay with determined topic. In the post-test, the students were asked to write a short essay to describe themselves, their present English ability, and plans for their study at English Department of UNESA. They were asked to finish that composition in 30 minutes with 200 words limit.

After getting the students' compositions, the lecturers analyzed and classified them into three groups. In post-test, there are two raters. Those compositions that answered little bit of the task, with unstructured ideas, and so many mistakes in using dictions as well as grammar so that the ideas were hard to understand were classified in elementary group. Those compositions that answered the task incompletely, with structured ideas but there were some mistakes in using dictions as well as grammar so that the ideas were incompletely understood were classified in pre-intermediate group. The last, those compositions that answered the task directly, with structured ideas which were supported by using proper dictions as well as grammar were classified in intermediate group. After getting the result of general analysis, they were analyzed in term of derivative words usage. Then, the results of the errors on constructing derivative words were presented by using two checklists as presented on Table 3.1 and Table 3.2 for each group. The last, in this study there would be presented the

conclusion based on the analysis result.

Data Analysis Technique

In this study, there were three steps in analyzing the data. Those are: (1) identification of errors: the errors on the use of derivative words in the students' compositions were identified for each group; (2) classification of errors: the errors were classified based on surface strategy taxonomy used by Dulay (1982); (3) identification of the cause of errors: after the errors were classified, the possible causes of errors on the construction of derivative words made by the students in their essays were identified. Last, the result of students' essays was analyzed in form of words in paragraphs or essays.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

In this study, how the students used the derivative words were analyzed. The data of this study were short essays produced by the students of batch 2012 in IC program of State University of Surabaya. In presenting the data, subjects were classified into three groups, SE, SPI, and SI. SE refers to the students' compositions in elementary group, SPI refers to the students' compositions in pre-intermediate group, and SI refers to the students' compositions in intermediate group.

During the analysis, it was found that the students made some errors on constructing derivative words. In order to identify whether the students used derivative words correctly as well as to identify the common errors in the compositions, the errors were analyzed and classified based on the surface strategy taxonomy. In order to help the process of identification, a table was presented to demonstrate such errors. The errors were classified into four types i.e. error of omission, error of addition, error of misformation and error of misordering (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982). Finally, in order to complete the identification, an illustration of the cause of errors, the deviations on constructing derivative words, and the possible corrections were described in a table.

Derivative Words Usage Made by Elementary Group's Students

Ten students' derivative words profile in elementary group were analyzed on how they constructed derivative words as a part of their compositions. The analysis was done by scanning the use of suffixes and affixes based on the grammatical rule in English. Basically, the students in elementary group did not produce numerous errors on constructing derivative words. Among ten students, there were two of them who made errors on it.

An analysis on SE-2's writing found that there was an error of misformation where the student used the wrong

form of the morpheme. In the sentence "I like **writter** a short story ...", the student wrote **writter** which can be categorized as undefined in English. This is due to the fact that student supplied the wrong form of derivative word, i.e. suffix. The student used the incorrect word of "writter" which should be derived from "writing" as a noun.

The second analysis was taken from SE-5's error in producing a correct form of particular words. The error was characterized as addition errors in which there was an indication of the presence of one or more item, which should be not attached in a well-formed sentence. In the sentence "I didn't speak fluently, but I always study **pronounciation**", the student wrote **pronounciation** which can be categorized as undefined in English. The students used the incorrect word of "pronounciation" which should be derived from "pronunciation" as a noun.

Derivative Words Usage Made by Pre-Intermediate Group's Students

In term of derivative words usage, the students in pre-intermediate group also formulated incorrect words. Consequently, the ideas in their compositions were not quite understandable. At this group, students had more complex errors than those who were classified in elementary group.

The students who were classified to pre-intermediate group essentially made some errors in form of addition, omission, and misformation. Initially, SPI-1, SPI-4, SPI-5, SPI-7, SPI-9, and SPI-10 made errors of addition. For instance, in sentence "My parents said that being a teacher is a good job and I will have a **clearly** future", the students wrote **clearly** which was grammatically wrong. The students used the incorrect word of "clearly" which should be derived from "clear" as an adjective, "detailly" which should be derived from "(in) detail" as an adverb, "pronounciation" which should be derived from "pronunciation" as a noun, and "pronounciate" which should be derived from "pronounce" as a verb.

The next errors were made by SPI-2, SPI-4, SPI-8, and SPI-9. Those errors were characterized as misformation errors where the student used the wrong form of the morpheme or structure. For instance, in the sentence "I understand more about grammar, how to write correctly and how to speak **fluency** but do not ignore about politeness" the student wrote **fluency** which was grammatically wrong. It could be perceived when the students used the incorrect word of "*fluency*" which should be derived from "*fluent*" as an adjective, "*ambisious*" which should be derived from "*ambitious*" as an adjective, and "*sociality*" which should be derived from "socialization" as a noun.

Derivative Words Usage Made by Intermediate Group's Students

Overall, the derivative words usage in intermediate group were not significantly satisfying. Those who were classified into intermediate group were expected to produce proper derivative words. It came to a termination that even though they were classified in intermediate group, the students still made some errors on using derivative words. Surprisingly, the amount of the errors were more produced than the errors in elementary group. The analysis of the errors is presented on Table 4.3.

Those students who were classified in intermediate group made some errors in form of addition, omission, and misformation. SI-2 and SI-6 made errors of omission. Those errors were characterized as omission errors where there was an indication of the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed sentence. It could be established in the sentence "Actually I want to be a great **lecture** as same as my IC **lecture**". The student wrote **lecture** which was grammatically wrong. The students used the incorrect word of "lecture" which should be derived from "lecturer" as a noun and in another error of "pronounce" which should be derived from "pronunciation" as a noun.

The last error was made by SI-7. The error was characterized as misformation error where the student used the wrong form of the morpheme. In the sentence "I am not **confidence** in my class because..." the students supplied the wrong form of derivative word i.e. suffix. The students used the incorrect word of "confidence" which should be derived from "confident" as an adjective.

Discussion

Based on the results, it is found that the college students still find difficulties on constructing derivative words. The first research question is clearly answered by the fact that the students do not use derivative words correctly in their composition. Errors, basically, cannot be ignored since people cannot learn language without first systematically committing errors (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982). The ability to use the appropriate form of a word in a given grammatical context is essential for developing grammatically suitable language (Schmitt & Zimmerman, 2002). Without this ability, students must either use only the form of the word they know or substitute another word that fits the grammatical frame. It is in line with an idea that in a composition there is a requirement to improve vocabulary precision and impact (Rigby, 2009).

Referring to the second research question, it is found that the students make errors of omission, errors of addition, and errors of misformation based on surface strategy taxonomy (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982). In committing errors of omission, there is an absence of an

item that must appear in a well-formed structure. The students might forget or even do not know the rule that they have to add whether prefix or suffix to the base form. Another error that commonly appears is error of addition. This error is the opposite of omission, there is a presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance. The students might forget or even do not know the rule that they do not have to add whether prefix or suffix to the base form. The last error that appears in the students' composition is misformation error. The students use the wrong form of the morpheme or structure.

On how the students produce those three errors are, theoretically, influenced by some grounds. The grounds could vary among the students. In this study, on how the students can produce those errors are classified into intralingual errors. Those errors are caused by the target language itself. The problems appear when the students are confused in applying the rule and got stuck with the strategy how to use it (James, 1998 in Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007). The grounds of error are misanalysis, incomplete rule application, and overgeneralization.

Referring to the idea of misanalysis, the student might have had consideration to the word choice they pick up for his composition, though they naturally fail to grasp information about the use of correct derivative word and then subsequently apply it in their composition (Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007). As a result, it hinders the student to have sufficient vocabulary in order to develop the ideas properly in the composition. The second influence on how the students produce wrong derivative words is incomplete rule application. In this case, dealing with the use of derivative word in the student's composition, it frequently occurs when the student only view some words could be combined freely in the sentence (Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007). Beside those two influences, the students also do overgeneralization. The students create the deviant structure on the basis of their experience of other structures in the target language (Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007). The students overgeneralize the real function and formed derivative words in a sentence, whereas the rule of forming derivative words is different from one to another.

The study also reveals that the students in elementary group produce less errors than those who are in higher groups, pre-intermediate and intermediate group. The elementary group, two students do misanalysis and incomplete rule application on constructing their derivative words. The more errors on constructing derivative words are made by seven students in pre-intermediate group by committing overgeneralization, misanalysis, and incomplete rule application. Then, three students in intermediate groups commit incomplete rule

application and misanalysis.

Regarding to the same cause of errors on constructing derivative words from the three groups in IC program and as what is presented in Table 4.1., 4.2., and 4.3., it could be perceived that the errors made by the elementary group students are less than the other two higher groups, pre-intermediate and intermediate group. At first it seems queer, since elementary group students are those who could not reach the target of the composition requirements. Basically, most of the elementary group students use some proper derivative words in a sentence. Then, the case of why they are classified as elementary group was caused by another elements in scoring their compositions. The IC program team of English Department of UNESA arrange some criteria in scoring the students' composition. Those whose compositions answer little bit of the task, with unstructured ideas, and so many mistakes in using dictions as well as grammar so that the ideas are hard to understand are classified in elementary group. Looking up the result of the students' composition in elementary group, they are not able to address the assignment task though they implement the proper derivative words. Eventually, it is acceptable though they construct proper derivative words but they are classified in elementary group.

Having compared to the elementary group result, pre-intermediate and intermediate group students make more errors on constructing derivative words. Then, the case of why they are classified as pre-intermediate and intermediate group is caused by another elements in scoring their compositions. Looking up the result of the students' composition in pre-intermediate and intermediate group, they are more able to address the assignment task by constructing structured idea though they implement improper derivative words. The significant different is in the matter of structured idea, and it becomes the most considerable thing to be scored in classifying them into three groups.

Having completely answered the research questions, then it comes to the considerations why students in doing their post test still could not deal with difficulties on constructing derivative words. These considerations are related to the significance of IC Program in State University of Surabaya. There are two considerations toward that case. First, it comes to the idea of the IC handout usage. Basically a handout must consider the relevance to the socio-cultural environment of the students (Williams, 1983). Inside the handouts of IC program given to the students, there have been some sections about derivative words. What become the problems are the inadequate explanation to construct the words from the base form and the random examples. The inadequate explanation occur when the handout provides

some examples in adding suffixes *-er*, *-ist*, or *-ian* to form the names of jobs. The problem appear when the tasks ask the students to just add the suffixes in unfinished words such as *comed...* to be added by *-an* to become *comedian*, etc. Those tasks did not help the students to acquire how basically to form a derivative word based on the principle. It is terminated as a problem since the grammatical rules in English and Indonesian language are clearly different. Beside the inadequate explanation, there were some pages in handout that showed random examples, such as derivative words of quality using *-able*, *-ous*, and *-ive* without explanation of the words. Those random examples triggers to uncomplete understanding of derivative words construction. The students could not absorb the clear understanding how to construct a derived word.

The second cause is the learning process done in the class. Getting the information from the coordinator of IC program in UNESA that the lecturers are not asked to explain the grammar intensively, since the main task given to them is to deliver the four skills of language comprehension, listening, reading, speaking, and writing skill. Only few of the lecturers give the explanation about the grammar especially derivative words and vocabulary. For the rest, the students are asked to learn about grammar including the derivative words independently by reading the handout without the guidance from the lecturers. As a consequence, they might make errors when the rules or structures are not applied well.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

Based on the results of this study, it comes to some conclusions. They are the matter of types and causes of the errors made by the students as well as the relation to the handout and learning process. The types of errors are classified based on the surface strategy taxonomy in a form of table and explanation afterward. The errors are classified into four types. They are error of omission, error of addition, error of misformation and error of misordering (Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982). The causes of errors are misanalysis, incomplete rule application, and overgeneralization (James (1998) as cited in Sattayatham & Honsa, 2007).

Then, there are two considerations toward the case why students in IC program still cannot deal with difficulties on constructing derivative words in their post test. First, it comes to the idea of the IC handout usage that provides inadequate explanation to construct the words from the base form and the random examples. Those problems trigger the students to incomplete understanding of derivative words construction. The second cause is the learning process done in the class. The

lecturers are not asked to explain the grammar intensively, since the main task given to them is to deliver the four skills of language comprehension, listening, reading, speaking, and writing skill. Only few of the lecturers give the explanation about the grammar especially derivative words and vocabulary. For the rest, the students are asked to learn about grammar including the derivative words independently by reading the handout without the guidance from the lecturers. Consequently, they might make errors when the rules or structures were not applied well.

Suggestions

Based on the results, it is expected for those who are involved in teaching the IC Program should have innovative way in delivering or reviewing the materials, especially derivative words.

For the lecturers, theoretically, the concern of using derivative words will be a focus that will make teaching writing in English becomes better. Therefore, by knowing the students' works, the lecturers can choose the appropriate method and technique in teaching derivative words so that the students will be able to apply them correctly in their compositions later.

For IC program coordinator team, hopefully this study's results will give such improvement in term of what the lectures should do in IC program and also the usage of the IC handout that is mostly used in the learning process. The coordinator should instruct all the lecturers who are involved in IC program to deliver complete materials. It is expected that the students will acquire all grammatical stuffs, beside the four skills in English. It will be more meaningful if the students are provided by supplementary reading materials to support their writing.

It is also expected that there will be another study to analyze the derivative words usage in other skills, such as: listening, reading, or speaking. Hopefully, by the amount of derivative words usage analysis study, it will give such a valuable contribution to English learning, especially in Indonesia where English as the second language.

REFERENCES

- Brown, H. D. (2006). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, Fifth Edition*. San Fransisco: Pearson Education Inc.
- Brown, S., & Attardo, S. (2006). *Understanding Language Structure, Interaction, and Variation: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics and Sociolinguistics for Nonspecialists*. USA: The

University of Michigan Press.

- Chaer, A. (2003). *Seputar Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Rineka Cipta.
- Coronel, S. V. (2012). *A Case Study of an English as a Foreign Language Student who Presented Difficulties on the Difference between the Simple Past and the Present Perfect Tenses - TEFL Program Portfolio* (Degree Thesis). Quito: Nova Southeastern University.
- Dodigovic, M. (2006). *Artificial Intelligence in Second Language Learing-Second Language Acquisition*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Flick, U. (2009). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research Fourth Edition Sage*. California: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Gustilo, L., & Magno, C. (2012). Learners' Errors and their Evaluation: The Case of Filipino ESL Writers. *Philippine ESL Jornal* , 8, 96-113.
- Handayani, N. (2009). *Unity in the Freshmen's Pre-Test Expository Writing in IC Program of State University of Surabaya*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, Burke and Thristersen, Larry. (2004). *Educational Research: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Approaches*. Boston (USA): Pearson Education, Inc.
- Leaver, B. L., Ehrman, M., & Shekhtman, B. (2005). *Achieving Success in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, N. N. (2002). *Motivation and attitude toward integrated instruction through technology in college-level EFL reading and writing in Taiwan (China)* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). USA: The University of Tennessee.
- McCarthy, A. C. (2002). *An Introduction to English Morphology: Words and Their Structure*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Mulia, N. (2010). *An Analysis of the Errors in the Derivational Affixes Found in the Students' Writing*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis.
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English, Third Edition*. New York: Longman.

- Parera, J. D. (2004). *Teori Semantik*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Perales Ercudero, M. D. (2012). Specifying the Construct of Academic Vocabulary: Functional and Discursive Perspective. *The Journal of Language and Linguistics Studies* , 8, 132-147.
- Plag, I. (2003). *Word-Formation in English*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rigby, P. (2009). *Teaching English: Developing as a Reflective Secondary Teacher*. London: SAGE Publication Ltd.
- Sattayatham, A., & Honsa, J. S. (2007). Medical Students' Most Frequent Errors at Mahidol University, Thailand. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly* , 9 (2), 170-189.
- Scarry, S., & Scarry, J. (2010). *The Writer's Workplace with Reading: Building College Writing Skills* (7th ed.). USA: Lyn Uhi.
- Schmitt, N., & Zimmerman, C. B. (2002). Derivative Word Forms: What Do Learners Know? *TESOL Quarterly* , 36 (2), 145-171.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to Teach Grammar*. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Williams, D. (1983). *Developing Criteria for Textbook Evaluation*. *ELT Journal* , 37 (3), 251-255.
- Zimmerman, C. B., & Schmitt, N. (2005). Lexical Questions to Guide the Teaching and Learning of Words. *The Catesol Journal* , 17 (1).

