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ABSTRACT

This study aimed at analyzing interference error caused by first language interference made by EFL students of IAIN Salatiga in their English composition. The objectives are to find out type of interference, frequency of each type, the most dominant type, and the factors contribute to language interference in EFL students’ composition. This is a descriptive-qualitative research. The data were taken through elicitation technique and documentation, and then analyzed by using theory of language interference. The findings of this study showed that EFL students made two types of interference; lexical interference and syntactical interference. Lexical interference fell into five categories: loanwords, literal translation at level of word, literal translation of L1 preposition, literal translation of L1 adverb of manner, and literal translation of L1 comparative degree of adjective. Syntactical interference also fell into five categories: the use of L1 structure in target language, the use of L1 structure in English noun phrase, literal translation in negation of verbal sentence, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence, and literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form.
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ABSTRAK


Kata kunci: campur tangan bahasa pertama, karangan bahasiswa bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing

1. INTRODUCTION

In foreign language learning, English Foreign Language (EFL) students will always encounter some difficulties/problems in mastering it. When they are learning it, they often make mistakes whether in their speaking or writing. Exactly, these problems are caused by the different systems of mother tongue and those of foreign language especially English. Foreign language learners sometimes get difficulty in mastering English. It happens because of the interference of first language into English. So, what they find difficult will depend on the degree and maturity of what they have obtained on English. There are many factors which influence the problems in learning English; one of them is because of interference of first language.

Interference is the change of language system used in other element of language which is regarded as a mistake because it deviates from the rules of language used (Chaer and Agustina, 1995: 158). Weinreich (in Napitupulu, 1994: 14), asserts interference is the deviation of language norm in usage as the effect of bilingual toward another language. The term of interference is firstly used by Weinreich to name the existence of different language system spoken by bilingual speaker in using a language. Interference happens when the speaker uses second language and ones which is interfered into second language is the first language or mother tongue.
According to Dulay et al (1982: 98) interference is the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language. Interference is the deviation of target language as a result of their familiarity with more than one language. They differentiate interference into two parts, the psychological and sociolinguistic. The psychological refers to the influence of old habits when new ones are being learned, whereas sociolinguistic refers to interactions of language when two language communities are in contact. Therefore students will find it difficult in mastering the second language due to the interference, which is influenced by old habit, familiar with mother tongue and interaction of two languages in the communities.

Every country has different language used as a mother tongue or language which is used daily. Every language has different structure or grammar, likewise Indonesian and English. Both of them have different grammar in composing a sentence. In English every action is always related to the time when it happens and the time determines the correctness of sentence based on English grammar rule. While Indonesia language whenever action happens, it doesn’t influence the correctness of sentence because it has no time difference in determining a deed.

As EFL country, Indonesia, English is learnt as the first foreign language. Learning a foreign language requires accuracy, especially when both native and foreign languages have different structure. The differentiation of structure may cause errors or mistakes in learning a foreign language. In learning a foreign language learners are usually interfered by the elements of first or native language. Interference happens most of the time, and it has a big role in foreign language learning.

This study is conducted to answer the following questions:

a. What are the types of interference in EFL students’ composition?
b. What is the frequency of each type of first language interfere in EFL students’ composition?
c. What is the most dominant type of interference error in EFL students’ composition?
d. What are the factors contributing to first language interference in EFL students’ composition?

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Solano, et al. (2014) studied about Spanish interference in EFL writing skills: A case of Ecuadorian Senior High Schools. This research focused on native language interference toward English Foreign Language writing skills of Senior High School students in Ecuador. The objects of this research are some Ecuadorian Senior High Schools. There are 351 students and 42 teachers from second year senior high school as participants of this study. The instruments for collecting date are questioners and written test. The students were asked to write a narrative passage. The result showed that most frequent first language interference are misuse of verbs, omission of personal and object pronouns, misuse of prepositions, overuse of articles, and incorrect word order.

Luo (2014) he studied about mother tongue interference in pronunciation of college English learning in China. This research focused only on the interference of mother tongue pronunciation. This study examines mispronunciation caused by a mother tongue interference of the college English learners from more than twenty provinces in China. Based on the research findings, it can be known that the result of this study showed that many Chinese college students have problem of mother tongue interference. Many of them would unintentionally confuse the phoneme [n] with [l], or [f] with [h], or the aspirated sounds with the non-aspirated ones in the course of learning English pronunciation, including some teachers who speak their hometown dialects instead of the standard Chinese. Both students and teachers might hardly avoid the mother tongue interference in learning or teaching a foreign language.

Somchai and Sirluck (2013) studied about Thai English Foreign Language (EFL) students’ writing errors in different text types: The interference of the first language*. They focused their research on EFL students’ writing error due to first language interference. Result of this study showed that in narration genre the participants made some interferences of using verb tense, word choice, sentence
structure, article, and preposition. While in descriptive writing the participants made some errors in using article, sentence structure, words choice, singular/plural form, and subject-verb agreement. And the last in comparison writing the participants made some errors in using singular/plural form, word choice, article, subject-verb agreement, sentence structure, and preposition.

Kaweera (2013) studied about writing error: A review of interlingual and intralingual interference in EFL context. She focused her research on writing errors made by Thai EFL students. Based on the result of the research, she concluded that errors are found in students’ writing caused by both interlingual and intralingual interference. It is clearly understood that writing errors are assumed as being not only a result of the native language interference habits to the learning of second language or foreign language, but also inadequate acquisition of the target language. This is because writers depend on the structures of their own native language and transfer those structures to produce their written language.

3. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Language interference has become one of crucial discussions on language learning. Many language scholars have conducted a research on mother tongue interference. It has become one of major issues in learning a second language or foreign language since foreign language learners are highly dependable the structure of second language on the structure of first language.

There are some definitions of interference promoted by language scholars. The term of interference is firstly used by Weinrich to name the existence of different language system spoken by bilingual speaker in using a language. According to Weinrich (1968: 14) interference is the deviation of language norm in usage as the effect of bilingual toward another language.

More specifically, Weinreich says interference is defined as a deviation to the norm of both languages which occurs in the speech of a bilingual speaker. Interference appears on all language levels: phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and lexical. Numerous examples can be quoted to show how interference works. It is always present when a bilingual speaker includes elements of another
language into the one he is speaking, mostly not being aware of it. The two language systems interfere with one another on the part of the listener this is perceived as a foreign intonation or accent, a wrong inflection, an unusual word order or an unfamiliar metaphor.

According to Dulay et al (1982: 98) interference is the automatic transfer, due to habit, of the surface structure of the first language onto the surface of the target language. Interference is the deviation of target language as a result of their familiarity with more than one language. They differentiate interference into two parts, the psychological and sociolinguistic. The psychological refers to the influence of old habits when new ones are being learned, whereas sociolinguistic refers to interactions of language when two language communities are in contact. Therefore students will find it difficult in mastering the second language due to the interference, which is influenced by old habit, familiar with mother tongue and interaction of two languages in the communities.

Meanwhile, according to Hayi (1985:8) referring to Valdman’s point of view in 1966 theorized that interference is an obstacle as a result of speaker’s habits on first language (L1) in the study of language acquisition of second language (L2). Consequently, there are some transfers of negative elements from the mother tongue into the target language. In other word, the speaker uses negative elements of first language in target language or second language. Nababan (1991: 35) says interference only happens to speakers when they use second or foreign language in their speaking or writing. It can be receipted interference (the use of second language receipted by the elements of first language) and productive interference (the use of first language by using element and structure of second language), exactly when they use both languages. A person who is bilingual may be said to be one who is able to communicate, to varying extents in a second language.

While Ellis (1997: 51) refers to interference as ‘transfer’, which he says is the impact that the learner’s native language exerts over the acquisition of target language. He asserts that transfer is governed by learners’ perceptions about what is transferable and by their stage of development in target language learning. He raises the need to distinguish between errors and mistakes and makes an important
divergence between the two. He says that errors reflect gaps in the learners’ knowledge; they occur because the learners do not figure out what is right. Mistakes reflect occasional lapses in performance; they occur because, in a particular instance, the learners are unable to perform what they know.

Basically, the emergence of interference occurs to the level of bilingual interpreter especially oral interpreter, how far he or she knows and masters source of language and target language well and correctly, and how often he or she uses and changes from one language into another. It causes interference. The main factor of interference is because of the difference of grammar or structure between source of language or first language and target language or second language (Yusuf, 1994: 70).

Lott (1983: 256) defines interference as errors in the learner’s use of the second language or foreign language which can be traced back to the mother tongue or first language. In other word, language learners use the structure of first language in target language. According to Lott (1983: 258 -259) there are three factors that cause language interference as follows:

a. The interlingual factor. Interlingual transfer is a significant source for language learners. This concept comes from contrastive analysis of behavioristic school of learning. It stresses upon the negative interference of mother tongue as the only source of errors. The construction ‘I like to read’ is uttered as ‘I read to like’ by many Hindi speakers. In Hindi, the verb is pre-positioned while in English it is post positioned. This type of error is the result of negative transfer of first language rules to target language system.

b. The over extension of analogy. Usually, a learner has been wrong in using a vocabulary caused by the similarity of the element between first language and second language, e.g. the use of cognate words (the same form of word in two languages with different functions or meanings). The example is the using of month and moon. Indonesian learners may make a mistake by using month to say moon in the space.

c. Transfer of structure. There are two types of transfer according to Dulay et.al (1982: 101), positive transfer and negative transfer. Negative transfer refers to
those instances of transfer, which result in error because old habitual behavior is
different from the new behavior being learned. On the contrary, positive transfer
is the correct utterance, because both the first language and second language
have the same structure, while the negative transfer from the native language is
called interference.

4. RESEARCH METHOD

This is a descriptive qualitative research. It is about first language
interference made by EFL students. Denzin and Lincoln (2012: 4) give definition
about qualitative research as follow:

“Qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive,
naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative
researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense
of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.
Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of
empirical materials case study, personal experience, introspective, life
story interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts-
that describe routine and problematic moments and meaning in individuals' lives.”

The definition above means that qualitative research has focus on multi
methods that comprise an interpretive and naturalistic approach to its subject matter.
It means that those who conduct a research using qualitative method study the things
in their natural setting and try to interpret the meaning based on phenomenon people
bring. Qualitative research involves some varieties such as personal experience,
introspective, life story, interview and so on to explain about problematic moment
and meaning in individuals’ lives.

The subject of this research is English Foreign Language (EFL) students of
IAIN Salatiga. They are second semester students. The writer used technique of
random sampling. The writer took thirty students randomly, eleven boys and
nineteen girls, as the subject of this research.
The object of this research is first language interference in EFL students’ composition of State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga in the Academic Year of 2014/2015. The interference is classified into two types, namely lexical interference and syntactical interference. Then both types of interference are broken down into several kinds of interference errors based on mistakes made by students.

In this research, the data were taken from the wrong sentences because of interference made by English Foreign Language (EFL) students in their English composition. The wrong sentences were taken from students’ English composition in the form of essays or paragraphs on thirty sheets of paper. The data sources were from EFL students’ composition of Salatiga State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) in the Academic Year of 2014/2015.

Having all the data been collected, first the writer displays all the data found in English Foreign Language (EFL) students’ composition and then analyzes them by identifying and criticizing the mistakes of the interference. After that he explains and classifies the type of interference. The writer then corrects the mistake based on English rules commonly used in detail. It aims at classifying the types of interference frequently happen in learning a foreign language. The last, the writer draws conclusions.

5. RESULT
   a. Types of Interference Made by EFL Students of IAIN Salatiga

   In this research, there are two types of interference, namely, lexical interference and syntactical interference. Interference at lexical level, the writer found five categories of interference errors: loanwords, literal translation at level of word, literal translation of L1 preposition, literal translation of L1 adverbs of manner, and literal translation of L1 comparative degree of adjective. And interference at syntactical level is classified into five categories; the use of L1 structure in target language, the use of L1 structure in English noun phrase, literal translation in negation of verbal sentence, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence, and literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form.
The writer found 11 types of cognates. The followings are examples of loanword:

1) IL: We can get more *specifik* information  
   L1: *spesifik*

2) IL: Many people have different *karacter*  
   L1: *karakter*

The italic words on sentences above are loanwords. In both languages Indonesia and English, loanwords have the same meaning and pronunciation, but alphabetically different.

The next interference error made by EFL students is literal translation at level of word. In this case, the writer found 7 types of literal translation at level of word. The followings are the examples:

1) IL: We just *interaction* with ourselves  
   L1: *interaksi*

2) We can *discussion* about the material from lecturer  
   We can *discuss* about the material from lecturer

The italic words in both languages L1 and L2 have the same meaning, but the word class is different. Students just translate literally from L1 into L2.

The next is literal translation of L1 preposition. The writer found 16 interference errors. Look at the following example:

1) IL: We cannot focus *in* our study  
   L1: *di*

2) IL: It is different *with* another place  
   L1: *dengan*

The sentences above are very clear that students translate the preposition literally from first language into target language. The word ‘focus’ should be followed by ‘on’, and the word ‘different’ should be followed by ‘from’.

Another type of interference error is literal translation of L1 adverbs of manner. In this case, the writer found 13 types. Look at the example below:

1) IL: Students can understand the lesson *with easy*  
   L1: *dengan mudah*
2) IL: We cannot ask question with free 
   L1: dengan bebas 

   The sentences above are very clear that students just translated literally 
   from Indonesia sentences into English sentences. In English, adverb of manner 
   consists of one word only. Thus, ‘with easy’ should be ‘easily’, and ‘with free’ 
   should be ‘freely’.

   The next type of interference error is literal translation of L1 comparative 
   degree of adjective. In this case, the writer found 17 types, for example:

   1) IL: This campus is more big than my school before 
   L1: lebih besar

   2) IL: Learning with a teacher is more easy 
   L1: lebih mudah

   The sentences above are very clear that they are results of literal 
   translation from L1 into L2. The words ‘more big’ are literal translation of ‘lebih 
   for more, and big for besar’. And the words ‘more easy’ are literal translation of 
   ‘lebih for more, and mudah for easy’. In English, comparative degree of 
   adjective which consists of one syllable only, we just need to add suffix –er to 
   the corresponding adjective.

   The second type of interference made by EFL students is syntactical 
   interference. There are five categories of interference errors existing at 
   syntactical level; the use of L1 structure in target language, the use of L1 
   structure in English noun phrase, literal translation in negation of verbal 
   sentence, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence, and literal 
   translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form.

   Interference error in the use of L1 structure in target language, the writer 
   found 23 types of error. The followings are the examples:

   1) IL: Usually I and my friends learn in the mosque 
   L1: biasanya saya dan teman saya

   2) IL: We often find language English on internet 
   L1: bahasa inggris
The sentences above seem very clear that they are results of literal translation from first language into target language. It happens since English structure is different from Indonesian structure.

Another type of interference error at syntactical level is the use of L1 structure in English noun phrase. In this case the writer found 10 errors made by EFL students. Look at the examples below:

1) IL: Teacher can give us *explanation clear* if we don’t understand
L1: *keterangan yang jelas*

2) IL: In the library I can read *book a lot*
L1: *banyak buku*

From the examples of English noun phrase in two sentences above are very clear that EFL learners used L1 structure in English noun phrase. It happens because both languages have different structure. So, some of the EFL learners who still have limited linguistic knowledge of target language were inclined to use L1 structure.

The next interference error is literal translation in negation of verbal sentence. Interference error at this level, the writer could find 19 errors made by EFL students. Look at the following examples:

1) IL: I can ask question *I not understand*
L1: *tidak paham*

2) IL: Students *not study* in the classroom
L1: *tidak belajar*

The sentences above are very clear that EFL students translated Indonesian sentences into English literally. In Indonesian, there is no auxiliary verb, so some students made mistake in making verbal sentences of negative form in English. They didn’t insert auxiliary verb *do/does* before *not*. They just translated literally.

Another type of interference error at syntactical level is literal translation in negation of nominal sentence. At this level, the writer found 17 errors made by EFL students. Look at the following examples:
1) IL: My writing not good  
L1: tidak bagus  

2) IL: Students not lazy to come to campus  
L1: tidak malas  

The sentences above are very clear that EFL students translated Indonesian sentences into English literally. In Indonesian, there is no auxiliary verb, so some students made mistake in making nominal sentences of negative form in English. They didn’t insert auxiliary verb *is, are, or am* before *not*. They just translated literally.

The last interference error at syntactical level is literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form. The writer found 22 errors made by EFL students. Look at the examples below:

1) IL: They *very nice* to me  
L1: Mereka sangat baik padaku  

2) IL: The location and facility *good*  
L1: lokasi dan fasilitas bagus  

The examples of nominal sentences of affirmative form above are very clear that EFL students seemed to translate Indonesian sentences into English literally. Since in Indonesian there is no auxiliary verb, some students made mistakes in making nominal sentences of affirmative form in English. They didn’t insert auxiliary verb *is, are, or am* before adjective, noun, or adverb. They just translated from Indonesia into English literally.

b. Frequency of Each types of Interference

There are two types of interference, lexical interference and syntactical interference. Each of interference has their own categories and frequencies. For more detail, look at the table below:

Table 1: Frequency of Each Type of Interference Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type of Interference</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lexical Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Loanword</td>
<td>We can get more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntactical Interference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>The use of L1 structure in target language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Usually I with my friends</em> learn in the mosque</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14,83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>The use of L1 structure in English noun phrase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can’t see <em>tree beautiful big</em> in campus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Literal translation in negation of verbal sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We cannot ask something we <em>not</em> understand</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12,27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Literal translation in negation of nominal sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We <em>not</em> lazy to come to campus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10,97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The students <em>also</em> friendly and diligent</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14,19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | Total                                                                                   | 155 | 100%  |
Based on the table above, it can be known that English Foreign language (EFL) students of IAIN Salatiga made mistake at lexical interference 41.29%, with the detail; loanword 7.10%, literal translation at level of word 4.51%, literal translation of L1 preposition 10.32%, literal translation of L1 adverb of manner 8.39%, and literal translation of L1 comparative degree of adjective 10.97%.

The table above shows that English Foreign Language (EFL) students of IAIN Salatiga made mistake at syntactical interference 58.71%, with the detail; the use of L1 structure in target language 14.83%, the use of L1 structure in English noun phrase 6.45%, literal translation in negation of verbal sentence 12.27%, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence 10.97%, and literal translation in nominal sentence of positive form 14.19%. So, the most frequent interference error made by EFL students of IAIN Salatiga is at syntactical level in the case of literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form (14.19%).

c. The most Dominant Type of Interference Error

Based on the result of data analysis described in the table above, in can be known that EFL students of IAIN Salatiga made two types of interference, namely, lexical interference and syntactical interference. In each type of interference there are five types of interference errors. Lexical interference consists of loanword, literal translation at level of word, literal translation of L1 preposition, literal translation of L1 adverb of manner, and literal translation of L1 comparative degree of adjective. Syntactical interference consists of the use of L1 in target language, the use of L1 in English noun phrase, literal translation in negation of verbal sentence, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence, and literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form.

Based on the frequency of each type of interference error shown in the table above, there are ten types of interference errors made by EFL students of IAIN Salatiga. And the most frequent type is the use of L1 structure in target language. Thus, the most dominant type of interference error is the use of L1 structure in target language which exists in syntactical level.
d. Factor Contribute to Language Interference

There are many factors contribute to language interference. According to Weinreich (1970) in his study, there are five factors; they are speaker’s bilingualism background, disloyalty to target language, limited vocabularies of target language mastered by language learners, need of synonym, and prestige and style.

According to Lott (1983) in his research, there are three factors contribute to language interference; they are interlingual error, over extension of analogy, and transfer of structure. While according to Jianhua (2007) there are two factors of language interference; language and cultural differences and modes of thinking.

Having analyzed all the data of this research, the writer could draw the conclusion of factors contribute to language interference. Based on the data found in EFL students, and the underlying theory, the writer has assumption about factors contribute to language interference made by EFL students of IAIN Salatiga as follows:

First, some EFL students seem to still have superficial linguistic knowledge since they are still at the beginning of their study. Second, students seem to still have limited vocabulary, so they cannot distinguish between verb and noun such. Third, some students may have different modes of thinking. Many of EFL students seem to think in Indonesian style when they make English sentences, so many of them made English sentences with Indonesian structure, they used prepositions by translating literally from first language into target language, they made adverb of manner and comparative degree just by translating literally word by word, and they made English sentences by translating literally from first language into target language word by word. Fourth, students are disloyal to the rules of target language.
6. CONCLUSION

In this research, it can be seen clearly that the main factor contribute to language interference is the difference structure between Indonesia and English. Thus, first language interference always plays role in second language acquisition. Based on data analysis, it can be concluded that there are two types of interference made by EFL students; those are lexical interference and syntactical interference. Interference at lexical level falls into five categories: loanword, literal translation at level of word, literal translation of L1 preposition, literal translation of L1 adverb of manner, and literal translation of L1 comparative degree of adjective. While interference at syntactical level includes the use of L1 structure in target language, the use L1 structure in English noun phrase, literal translation in negation of verbal sentence, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence, and literal translation in nominal sentence of positive form.

Based on data analysis, it can concluded that English Foreign language (EFL) students of IAIN Salatiga made mistake at lexical interference 41.29%, with the detail; loanword 7.10%, literal translation at level of word 4.51%, literal translation of L1 preposition 10.32%, literal translation of L1 adverb of manner 8.39%, and literal translation of L1 comparative degree of adjective 10.97%. English Foreign Language (EFL) students of IAIN Salatiga made mistake at syntactical interference 58.71%, with the detail; the use of L1 structure in target language 14.83%, the use of L1 structure in English noun phrase 6.45%, literal translation in negation of verbal sentence 12.27%, literal translation in negation of nominal sentence 10.97%, and literal translation in nominal sentence of positive form 14.19%. So, the most frequent interference error made by EFL students of IAIN Salatiga is at syntactical level in the case of literal translation in nominal sentence of affirmative form (14.19%).
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