CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

In learning foreign language, English cannot be separated from the term Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Nunan (1999: 1) says that, SLA refers to "the ways in which any learner, child or adult learns a second or foreign language". The term second in SLA, based on this definition seems transparent. In this context 'second' can refer to any language that is learned subsequent to the mother tongue or native language. The word second in this term intended to contras with foreign. The definition also explains that the acquisition process may take either in tutored or untutored environment, whether one is learning it naturally as a result of living a country where it is spoken, or learning it in classroom through instruction.

In foreign language learning, the students are supposed to master the language skill, either communicative competence in spoken or written competence in English texts. One of the objectives of English teaching to the English learners was to develop their communicative competence. Writing is one skill that must be mastered by the students. When mastering it, the students will be able to communicate with other through several kinds of genre-based writing such as descriptive, recount, narrative, procedure and report. Mastering it will help them to procedure articles and compositins, to do exams, to make letters, and soon.

As it is generally accepted that writing in English is a complex process for English as a foreign language learners (EFL), it is not surprising that errors in writing are found as an unavoidable part of EFL student writing. Ellis (1997) notes fossilization of learners' grammar does not occur in first language (L1) acquisition, but it is unique in second language (L2) acquisition.

Due to the difficulty the L2 writers encounter when they carry the burden of acquiring English and learning to write simultaneously (Hyland, 2003), students often commit errors occurring as an inevitable part of EFL student writing. Also it is found that EFL writing is generally shorter, less cohesive and fluent, and contains more errors (Hyland, 2003; Ferris, 2002). According to Reid (1993), errors caused from other variables apart from first language interference are generally influenced by overgeneralization and the level of difficulty. It seems that this sort of undesirable consistency can frustrate both students and teachers. Similar to other EFL students, Indonesian student writers have the same problems. In a classroom, errors found in written English are apparent among college students. One significant explanation is the differences of the two languages; *Bahasa Indonesia* and English. The differences are found in morphology (e.g., verb, noun), lexis (e.g., word choice, pronoun,), syntax (e.g., sentence structure), mechanics (e.g., punctuation) as well as article and noun endings (e.g., plural/ possessive).

Another major problem found in an English writing by students is the negative transference of the mother tongue (L1), into the target language (L2). When producing English writing, they have the cognitive process in *Bahasa*

Indonesia and usually employ direct translation from *Bahasa Indonesia* to English. As a result, it is generally found that typical Indonesia students who have been studying English for many years cannot write a short paragraph without making serious grammatical errors (Wongsbhindu, 1997).

Consequently, many different analysis procedures have been introduced which analyze errors from a specific point of view. Errors can be classified based on different taxonomies. Surface Strategy Taxonomy and Comparative taxonomy are two major linguistic taxonomies for classifying errors. The current study analyzes errors according to comparative taxonomy. To find the source of errors made by L2 learners, taxonomy of a different nature i.e Comparative Taxonomy is needed. The classification of errors in a comparative taxonomy is based on comparisons between the structure of L2 errors and certain other types of construction. This taxonomy includes 3 error categories: developmental, interlingual, and ambiguous. Developmental errors are similar to those made by children learning the target language as their first language. For example, *dog eat it* made by an Indonesian learner in learning English. Interlingual errors are similar in structure to a semantically equivalent phrase or sentence in the learners' native language as *the man skinny* produced by an Indonesian speaker. Ambiguous errors are those that could be classified equally well as developmental or interlingual as *I no have a car*. Other errors are those which do not belong to any of previous categories. For example: *She do hungry*.

Corder (1992) also makes distinction between overt and covert errors. "An overt error is easy to identify, because there is a clear deviation in form.

A covert error occurs in utterances that are superficially well formed but which do not mean what the learner intended them to mean." Another division that is widely agreed on is that interlingual errors and intralingual errors believed by linguists. An error that results from language transfer, which is caused by the learner's native language, is called interlingual errors. Then intralingual errors refer to those produced in using the target language in own terms. They result from faulty or partial learning of the target language, rather than from language transfer.

Based on the phenomenon in the students' error in writing Narrative. The researcher also found the evident of intralingual and interlingual errors in the students' writing narrative text, since they were not able to produce adequate writing assignment even in their other tongue. This condition happens in Junior High School, Vocation High School and also University students. They ever make an error in their writing such as interlingual errors and intralingual errors. They take the *Bahasa Indonesia* structure to the English. For the example:

1. Interlingual errors

a. "I am hearing you" *word* honorific jackai.

b. "Hurray *in here* many fruit to in eat".

c. "*why you* to chase the old man?"

2. Intralingual errors

a. In the wood there *is* mouse deer very be lazy

b. They *are* very happy.

c. Mrs. Robin *be* ready to ride the car

The examples above described that there were any errors that created by the students. From the examples of interlingual errors, the students are written a false word order in their sentences. Then, from the intralingual sentences were written in present form for past event.

From the experience in the field, the researcher found the interlingual and intralingual interference in the students' text. So that the researcher wants to continue her research about narrative text focused on the interlingual and intralingual errors found in writing narrative texts by EFL Students in different level of schools to know if there is any significant differences of the error made by students in different levels in Lampung. In this case, the writer interests to take a research entitled "Interlingual and Intralingual Errors Found in English Narrative Text Written by EFL Students in Lampung."

B. Limitation of the Study

The research focuses on the intralingual and interlingual errors found in English narrative texts written by EFL students in Lampung. The researcher will take a class of SMP Muhammadiyah Pekalongan East Lampung, SMK Negeri 1 Pekalongan East Lampung, and Muhammadiyah University of Metro as the subject of research. The researcher takes three grade of schools to know the dominant errors of intralingual and interlingual error that found in the each grade. To analyze the data, the researcher uses error analysis based on comparative taxonomy by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982).

C. Research Problem

The writer observed that most learners of the target language assume that many grammatical and lexical rules of their native tongue are similar to the foreign language; therefore, they often transfer unconsciously those rules into structures of the foreign language.

Based on the focus of the research, the writer raises some subsidiary research questions as follow:

1. What are interlingual errors found in the SMP, SMK, and University students' narrative wtiting?

2. What are intralingual errors found in the SMP, SMK, and University students' narrative wtiting?

3. What is the frequency of interlingual and intralingual errors made by SMP, SMK, and University students?

4. What are the similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors found in the SMP, SMK, and University students' narrative writing?

D. Objective of the Study

In conducting this study, the writer has some objectives, they are as follows:

1. To classify the interlingual errors that founded in the students' narrative text of SMP, SMK, and University students.

2. To classify the intralingual errors that founded in the students' narrative text of SMP, SMK, and University students.

3. To know the frequency of interlingual and intralingual errors that founded in the students' narrative text of SMP, SMK, and University students.

4. To describe the similarities and differencies of interlingual and intralingual errors that founded in the students' narrative text of SMP, SMK, and University students.

E. Benefit of the Study

The benefit of study is divided into theoretical benefit and practical benefit, as follow:

1) Theoretical Benefit

The result of this study are in the forms of the intra and inter lingual found in the narrative text written by EFL Students in Lampung the result of the research are expected to be contributable to English learning and English teaching, for the English learners in Lampung to eliminate their native language interference in Narrative text and to help them to transfer from first language into foreign language perfectly.

2) Practical Benefit

Practically, this study on intra and inter lingual errors in Narrative text written by the EFL of Lampung has important pedagogical implication. It might be useful for;

a. Other future researchers who intend to carry out a research on errors analysis. This study might be useful for them as a review of previous work in their study.

b. The other English teachers know that this study can be used as an additional reference or literature source in their teaching action.

c. The candidate translators this study also explain translation problems into English. By reading this study they could understand that translation is not just referring to one word for one word literary.

F. Organization of the Study

The researcher organizes the divisions of this study into 5 chapters. The first chapter is Introduction. It consists of Background of the study, Limitation of the study, Research Problem, Objective of the study, Benefit of the Study, and Organization of the study.

The second chapter is review of related studies. It consists of previous studies, interlanguage that concern in the Interlingual errors and Intralingual errors, the level of errors based on the level of errors. In the level of errors, there are errors in term of phonological, morphologycal, syntactical and lexical level. The causes of interlangual error and intralingual errors, error analysis and text.

In the third chapter, there are research method, the subject of the research, the object of the research, data and data source, method of collecting the data, method of data analysis and theoretical framework.

The fourth chapter is research findings and discussion of findings. Where the researcher describes the types of errors, the frequency of error, dominant frequency of error, and sources of error and discussion the finding.

The last chapter consists of suggestion that concerns with the conclusion of the research discussion.