INTERLINGUAL AND INTRALINGUAL ERRORS OF WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT MADE BY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

MANUSCRIPT PUBLICATION

Presented to Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for Thesis Program in English Department of Post Graduate Programs of Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta

Written by:
Andini Puji Pratiwi
S200130044

GRADUATE PROGRAM OF LANGUAGE STUDY MUHAMMADIYAH UNIVERSITY OF SURAKARTA 2015
INTERLINGUAL AND INTRALINGUAL ERRORS OF WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT WRITTEN BY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

MANUSCRIPT PUBLICATION

Submitted to Fulfll One of the Requirements for the Completion of Post Graduate Degree in Language Study Program

Written by
ANDINI PUJI PRATIWI
S200130044

The Manuscript Publication has been approved by Advisors
Surakarta, 1 December 2015

Advisor I
 Prof. Endang Fauziati. M.Hum

Advisor II
Muamaroh. PHd
Abstract

The present study investigates the interference of L1 (Indonesian) into L2 (English) and the errors that occur due to the influence of TL (target language). The focus of the study is on the errors committed by these EFL learners in writing narrative text and emphasized on interlingual and intralingual errors. The objectives of the study are to investigate the errors committed by these EFL learners in order to find out; (1) the types of interlingual and intralingual errors in Junior High School and Senior High School, (2) frequencies of interlingual and intralingual errors in Junior High School and Senior High School, and (3) similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors in Junior High School and Senior High School. To achieve these objectives, writing test was utilized in this study. The subjects of the study comprised 30 ninth grade school and 30 tenth grade school in Pekanbaru, Riau. The findings of the study suggest: (1) The types of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High school and Senior High School divided into 2 levels, they are morphological level and syntactical level.(2) the frequent of interlingual errors in Junior High School 27,82% and 14,04% in Senior High School. The frequent of of intralingual errors in Junior High School 72,17% and 85,96% in Senior High School, and (3) The similarities of interlingual and intralingual errors found in Junior High School and Senior High School are 2 types in morphological level and 2 types in syntactical level. The differences of interlingual and intralingual errors found in Junior High School and Senior High School are 1 type in morphological level and 11 types in syntactical level.
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1. Introduction

Writing is the most difficult one because it requires demonstrating the control of a number of variables simultaneously; they are control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation spelling, etc. Writing is a skill which gives the students experience in written language. Caswell and Mahler (2004: 3) defined that writing is a vehicle for communication and a skill mandated in all aspects of life. From that statement, the role of writing is as important as the other skill. Writing almost used in all aspect of life. People almost every day write something in their life. They use it to communicate in a written form. And writing as a process of putting idea down on paper to transform thoughts into words, to sharp main ideas, and to give structure and coherence organization into the writing. For the students, writing in English is hard for them to apply, when they write about something, they use different structure spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, and word formation and so on. Meanwhile, Brown (2000) stated that human learning is fundamentally a process that involves the making mistakes. Error and mistake are something normal in language learning process. Error should not be viewed as something undesirable or something to be avoided. Because, by student’s error, a language researcher and a language teacher will get a feedback. It is a key to correct student’s error when they construct a sentence in their new language system.

There are many aspects that cause the learners of English as a foreign language make errors. Brown (1980: 160) said that the learners’ errors in the second language result from the learner’s assumption that the second language forms are similar to the native language (interlingual errors) and the negative transfer of items within the target language (intralingual errors). The aim of this paper is to identify and describe students make errors in interlingual and intralingual. It is also intended to draw teacher’s attention on the situation of our students because it is necessary to determine the areas that require remedy in order to think of appropriate solutions.
2. Theory

2.1 Concept of Error

In order to analyze learners’ errors in a proper perspective, it is crucial to make a distinction between mistake and error. To distinguish between these two concepts, Ellis (1997) suggests two ways: the first one is to check the consistency of the learner’s performance. If he sometimes uses the correct form and sometimes the wrong one, it is a mistake. However, if he always uses it incorrectly, it is an error. According to Brown (2000), a mistake refers to a performance error in that it is, a failure to utilize a known system correctly while, an error is a noticeable deviation from adult grammar of a native speaker reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learner.

2.2 Interlingual Error

Interference, language transfer, and cross-linguistic interference are also known as interlingual errors. Corder (1981) states that these kinds of errors occur when the learner's habits (patterns, systems, or rules) interfere or prevent him or her, to some extent, from acquiring the patterns and rules of the second language. Lado (1964) says Interference (negative transfer) is negative influence of the mother tongue (L1) on the performance of the target language (L2). Chelli (2013) defines that interlingual errors as being the result of language transfer, which is caused by learner's first language.

Richard (1974: 173) states that if the learners of a foreign language make mistake in the target language by effect of his mother tongue that is called as interlingual. As stated by Brown (1980: 160), most of the learners’ errors in the second language result primarily from the learner’s assumption that the second language forms are similar to the native language.

1) Transfer Error: error caused by interference from mother tongue. A student who has not known the rules of target language will use the same rules as he obtained in his native language.

2) Mother tongue Interference: errors are produced in the learners’ attempt to discover the structure of the target language rather than transferring models of their first language.

3) Literal Translation: errors happen because a student translates his first language sentence or idiomatic expression in to the target language word by word.

2.3 Intralingual Error

Interference from the student’s own language is not the only reason for committing errors. Students may make mistakes in the target language, since they do not know the target language very well, they have difficulties in using it. Richard (1974: 6) states, intralingual interference refers to items produced by learner, which reflect not the structure of mother tongue, but generalization based on partial exposure of the target language.

Brown (1980: 162) said that it has been found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interlingual transfer, but once that learner has begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more transfer generalization within the target language is manifested.

Richard (1974: 120) classifies the intralingual errors into four categories including over generalization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of the rules, and false concept hypothesized or semantic errors.

1) Overgeneralization: it happens when a learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structure in the target language. Littlewood (1984) cites the example of forming plural by adding “s” to even irregular plurals, also generalizing the “-ed” past form.

2) Ignorance of Rule Restrictions: James (1998: 63) that ignorance is specific in the sense that one is normally said to be ignorant of structure; the learner of the second
language does not obey the structure of the target language. In this type of error, the learner fails to observe the restrictions of existing structures. Some rule restriction errors may be accounted for in terms of analogy and may result from the role learning of rules.

3) Incomplete Application of the Rules: this error may occur when learner fails to apply the rules completely due to the stimulus sentence.

4) False Concept Hypothesized: learners’ faulty understanding of distinctions of target language items leads to false conceptualization. Learners’ faulty understanding of distinctions of target language items leads to false concept hypothesized.

3. Literature Review

In the 1950s the behaviourist learning theory described language as habit formation and explained why second or foreign language learners made errors. According to that theory, old habits hinder or facilitate new habits. There was the danger of errors becoming habits if they were tolerated so, they should be avoided. According to the cognitive approach, the making of errors is inevitable and a necessary part of learning. Chomsky (1998) confirmed that errors are unavoidable and a necessary part of learning. They are visible proof that learning is taking place. Thus, Corder (2000) proposed that not only language learners necessarily produce errors when communicating in a foreign language, but these errors, if studied systematically can provide insight into how languages are learnt. He also agrees that studying students’ errors of usage has immediate practical application for language teachers. Candling (2001) considered EA as the monitoring and analysis of learners language. Error analysis can be used to determine what a learner still needs to be taught. It provides necessary information about what is lacking in his or her competence. Weireech (1991) also considered learners’ errors to be of particular importance because making errors is a device the learners use in order to learn. According to him EA is a valuable aid to identify and explain difficulties faced by learners. He goes on to say that EA serves as
a reliable feedback to the design of a remedial teaching method. Conducting error analysis is therefore one of the best ways to describe and explain errors committed by L2 learners. This kind of analysis can reveal the sources of these errors and the causes of their frequent occurrence. Once the sources and causes are revealed, it is possible to determine the remedy, as well as the emphasis and sequence of future instructions.

Indonesia is a country where English is taught as a foreign language. As a result, learners commit serious errors due to the interference (interlingual transfer) from their L1 and the negative transfer of items within the target language (intralingual errors).

Researchers such as Mohammed (2000; 2004) and Abisamra (2003) in her error analyses study of Arab English learners found that 35.9% of errors were of Interlingual errors while 64.1% were Intralingual. She found that the highest percentage of transfer errors was in semantics & lexis, and as for the highest percentage of developmental errors, it was, by far, in substance (mainly spelling). Other studies by George (1972), Lance (1969), Richards (1971), and Brudhiprabha (1972) also found that only one-third of the second language learners’ errors can be attributed to native language transfer.

Al-Khresheh (2010) stated that interlingual errors committed by the result of word-for-word translation (literal translation) from Arabic, namely standard Arabic (SA) and non-standard Arabic (NSA) structures.

In a study conducted by Pebrianti, Nitasih, Dambayana (2013), they found that there were total 749 errors committed by the students in their writing. The type of error that most frequently occurred in student writings was intralingual error with 445 occurrences or 59.42%. Meanwhile interlingual error was 304 occurrences or 40.58%. The causes of students errors were mostly their limited experience about the target language as they were in the process of mastering English and they were not familiar with sentence structures of English so that they preferred to use their mother tongue in constructing the sentences.
In a study conducted by Chelli (2013), she found that the students’ errors in the using of preposition and article can be identified into interlingual and intralingual errors. The result can be seen that 79.15% of the errors made in preposition and 72.85% in articles are caused by negative transfer of the Arabic language. 20.85% in the use of prepositions and 27.15% in the use of articles are due to overgeneralization and false concepts hypothesized mainly because of lack of practice.

Generally, in reviewing some studies conducted sources of the grammatical errors on intralingual, interlingual, context of learning and communication strategies factors, Wicaksono (2014) stated that the highest percentage of the cause of errors made by the students is in interlingual transfer in which there were 85% students answered that the sources of the errors are from their mother tongue transfer. The students were influenced by the grammatical structure of native language (Indonesia) in making sentence in English. It is suggested that the English teachers not translated the part of the sentences one by one as it caused the students get confused and make the errors.

In conclusion, this study differs from previous studies as it aims to describe intralingual and interlingual errors and its implementation. Therefore, it may offer plausible explanations of the occurrence of interlingual and intralingual errors based essentially on Contrastive Analysis (CA). Unlike other studies which have been conducted earlier that focused on the effects of intralingual interference, performance errors, and overgeneralization errors in the acquisition of English, the present study focuses mainly on interlingual and intralingual errors. Furthermore, this study could be considered novel for two main reasons. First, the findings of this study can be implications for teaching methodology. The second one, the findings also may lead to recommendations that will improve the level of EFL teaching-learning process in beginner and intermediate students in Pekanbaru.
4. Method and Procedure

A quantitative descriptive method was used to investigate the types, frequency, similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors in writing narrative text made by Junior High School and Senior High School.

4.1 Participants

The subjects of this study were the third grade in SMP N 4 Pekanbaru and the first grade in SMA Plus Pekanbaru. The researcher took the data in the IX 1 class, the total number of students is 30 students which consist of 12 boys and 18 girls and the researcher take the data in the X 1 class, the total number of students is 30 students which consist of 11 boys and 19 girls. The data sources were 60 students’ English composition written productions by the third grade students of SMP Negeri 4 Pekanbaru and the first grade students of SMA Plus Pekanbaru in academic 2014/2015.

4.2 Material and Procedures

The researcher distributed the papers to all students. They had to make composition in form of narrative text writing. The students were ordered to compose the narrative text writing. The text should consist minimally three paragraphs and it has at least 150 words. The writing task was chosen as the instrument of the research since it requires the students to organize their own idea and express in their own words. Then the researcher asked the students to write a narrative text telling story that they know. When the students finished their writing, the papers were collected and then the writer analyzed them. The technique used in this research is descriptive analysis.

5. Research Finding and Discussion

The data of interlingual and intralingual errors are presented in two head categories, morphological leval and syntactical level. Interlingual errors made by Junior High
School and Senior High School are in turn divided into 6 subcategories and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School are in turn divided into 13 subcategories. The types of interlingual errors made by Junior High school are: (1) wrong word spelling, (2) omission of auxiliary past tense (did) in negative sentences, (3) omission of BE (was/were) in nominal sentences, and (4) the use of L1 structures. The types of interlingual errors made by Senior High school are: (1) wrong word spelling, and (2) the use of L1 structures.

The types of intralingual errors made by Junior High school are: (1) omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event, (2) the use of BE (is) in past tense, (3) omission of indefinite article (a/an), (4) the use of V-1 in past event, (5) omission of preposition, and (6) misselection of pronoun. The types of intralingual errors made by Senior High school are: (1) omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event, (2) omission of bound morpheme (-s/-es), (3) additional BE (is) in past tense, and (4) additional BE (were/was) before verb II, (5) omission of BE (was/were) in past event, (6) the use of V-1 in past event, and (7) the use of V-1 in past perfect event.

Table 5.1: The Comparison of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors Made by Junior High School and Senior High School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Interlingual and intralingual Errors</th>
<th>Junior High school</th>
<th>Senior High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morpological Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Wrong word spelling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15,62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30,12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Omission of bound morpheme (-s/-es)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Syntactical Level:**

| (1) Omission of auxiliary past tense (did) in negative sentences | 10 | 31,25% | - | - |
| (2) Omission of BE (was/were) in nominal sentences | 5 | 15,62% | - | - |
| (3) The use of L1 structures. | 12 | 37,5% | 11 | 68,75% |
| (4) The use of BE (is) in past tense | 20 | 24,09% | - | - |
| (5) Omission of indefinite article (a/an) | 8 | 9,63% | - | - |
| (6) The use of V-1 in past event | 20 | 24,09% | 20 | 20,40% |
| (7) Omission of preposition | 5 | 6,02% | - | - |
| (8) Misselection of pronoun | 5 | 6,02% | - | - |
| (9) Additional BE (is) in past tense | - | - | 13 | 13,26% |
| (10) Additional BE (were/was) before verb II | - | - | 10 | 10,20% |
| (11) Omission of BE (was/were) in past event | - | - | 20 | 20,40% |
| (12) The use of V-1 in past perfect event | - | - | 15 | 15,3% |
From table comparison of interlingual and intralingual above, there some similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School students. The similarities of interlingual and intralingual errors found by researcher are: wrong word spelling, the use of L1 structures, the use of V-1 in past event, and omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event.

The researcher found the differences of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School students as follow: Omission of auxiliary past tense (did) in negative sentences, omission of BE (was/were) in nominal sentences, the use of BE (is) in past tense, omission of indefinite article (a/an), omission of preposition, and misselection of pronoun in Junior High School, it did not find in Senior high School students composition. The errors that found in Senior High School, are: Omission of bound morpheme (-s/-es), additional ‘be present (is) in past tense, additional ‘be past tense (were/was) in before verb II, omission of to be past tense (was/were) in past event, and the use of V-1 in past perfect event. These errors did not find in Junior high School students composition. Some types of errors exist in Junior High School and in Senior High School are different because the students of Senior High School get more learning of grammar than the students of Junior High School.

Table 5.2: The frequent of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors Made by Junior High School and Senior High School Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Errors</th>
<th>Junior High School</th>
<th>Senior High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlingual</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intralingual</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table frequent of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School students above, the most frequent errors are on
intralingual. It are due to overgeneralization and incomplete application of language rules.

6. Conclusion

This study confirmed that the learners make a large number of errors in most errors in Junior High School and Senior High School students is intralingual errors. The students’ errors in interlingual were influenced by the use of L1 structure in making sentence in English (literal translation). The students’ errors in intralingual were due to overgeneralization and incomplete application of rule. There might be other causes, but they are not the focus of this study. So, being aware of the causes of learners’ idiosyncrasies might indicate pedagogical practice and determine the approach to be adopted. On these grounds, the writer suggest that: The teacher can solve the problem by giving the explicit and implicit corrective feedback and remedial teaching programmed to the students.
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