CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, statements of the problem, purpose of the study, the significance of the study, the scope of the study, and operational definition.

1.1. Background of the Study

In foreign language learning, writing is often assumed as the most challenging skill to acquire compared to other skills such as listening, speaking, and reading. It is primarily because writing requires a cognitive process that includes thinking ability and verbal command (Murtiana, 2019). Foreign language learners have to consider multiple writing aspects in generating ideas and expressing ideas by using the correct forms of the target language such as vocabulary, syntax, cohesive devices, and writing mechanics (Murtiana, 2019). Writing is not an easy task, neither in the mother tongue nor in a foreign language (Al-Halawani, 2018). As it is generally accepted that writing in English is a complex process for English as a foreign language learner, it is not surprising that writing errors are found as an unavoidable part of EFL student writing. Ellis (1997) notes fossilization of learners' grammar does not occur in first language acquisition but is unique in second language acquisition.

Many mistakes and errors are made when learners write or translate into foreign languages (Al-Halawani, 2018). These errors violate the established rules of grammar and thus are regarded as incorrect. It has been widely claimed that in composing the English sentence, the learners use their native language structure. Thus it produces error sentences in English. Since interlanguage increases in EFL teaching, making errors are commonly happened both in oral and written text. Many aspects cause the learners of English as a foreign language make errors. Brown (1980) said that the learners' errors in the second

language result from learners' assumption that the second language forms are similar to the native language (interlingual errors). Another is the negative transfer of items within the target language called intralingual errors.

Selinker proposed the term interlanguage in 1972. It refers to the student's linguistics system, which is different from the student's mother tongue or first language and target language. Interlanguage in learning English is a pivotal study that should be discussed (Fauziati, 2011). Selinker (1972) as the first linguist to propose the term interlanguage defined it as the features of language learners' first language and second language. Interlanguage students certainly make mistakes or errors (Tiarina, 2017). Making a mistake in learning a foreign language is a common thing. It also happens in acquiring the first language or mother tongue. Ellis (1997) defines the error as a reflection of a learner's language, and it occurs because the learner does not know the correct of language. Lack of language knowledge such as pronunciation, accents, words use, vocabulary, and structure can be addressed to the students because their interlanguage occurred.

Selinker (1972) argues fossilizations is also a part of interlanguage. The fossilizations contain phonological, morphological, and syntactic features in the speech of second-language speakers. They are different from the target language rules even after years of instruction and exposure to the target language. According to Manzolim and Gumpal (2015), errors occur because of the students' interference of L1 affected their English grammar constructions. Errors can help the students be more aware of the confusion they have made, which shows that they go through a developmental process (Kil, 2003). Therefore, students' composition errors still exist even though the students have learned English as a foreign language since they were in the fourth grade of Elementary School. Research results confirmed that EFL students of Senior High School, Vocational High School, Freshmen, and Postgraduate still made errors in their speech or

composition (Asikin, 2017; Fauziati, 2017; Kusumawardani & Adnyani; 2020; Maheswari, Adnyani, & Suwastini, 2020; Pratiwi, Adnyani, & Putra, 2020; Sari, Santosa, & Suwastini, 2020; Suwastini, Wiraningsih, & Adnyani, 2020).

Foreign language learners experience interlanguage almost in all levels of education, including college students. The proficiency in a variety of foreign language is the fundamental prerequisite for successful communication, for example, in the tourism industry. Similarly, mutual benefits understanding among students involved in several exchange programs universities. Intercultural contacts contribute to the development of intercultural communication. Adnyani (2011) agreed that one of the crucial aspects that determine cross-cultural communication's success is being conscious of cultural differences and language is a critical aspect of culture. Therefore, students of the tourism industry should be aware of the cultural differences and the linguistic features that they would apply in their language skills. One of the essential skills in the tourism industry is the ability to write English text. Therefore, the interlanguage and intralanguage forms in students' composition should be avoided.

Fauziati (2017) identified 264 ill-formed sentences elicited from students' English free compositions. This study reveals that interlanguage is influenced by the native language and the target language. The influence is in both lexical and syntactical levels. The dominant native language influence was on vocabulary (i.e. Indonesian borrowings), and the target language influence was on grammar (i.e. verb tenses). The native language influence had a little lower frequency compared with that of the target language. A study conducted by Darussalam (2013) shows that students' learning strategies result in interlanguage errors. Asikin (2017) studies the analysis of interlanguage produced by third-grade high school students in narrative text. This study revealed that the students' interlanguage production is in the form of a passive sentence, choosing incorrect verb

agreement, choosing the wrong auxiliary, making the unparalleled sentence, and translating sentence word by word. Thus, the errors produced by EFL learners due to the processing of learning or acquiring a target language (Al-Khresheh, 2015).

Tiarina (2017) studies interlanguage performed by students of the English literature study program. The subjects of the study were 20 English Literature students. The data of students' errors were in the form of guided writing (recount text). The study revealed that there were 15 aspects of grammar errors experienced by the students. Nurhayati (2015), studies the grammatical errors and the interlanguage of students' writing in the form of recount text. The study showed four types of students' error such, first, omission in all grammatical features' aspects (deletion of the specific participant, the omission of a verb, the omission of the past verb marker -ed and to be, the omission of a preposition, and omission of the temporal word). The second type is the addition of grammatical features such as the addition of BE on the specific participant, the addition of 'to' in the verb of material process, the addition of 'to' after the past verb, and double preposition. The third type is misinformation, like misinformation of using letter s. The last type is disordering all of the grammatical features' aspects (systematicity, permeability, language of transfer, transfer of training, and strategy of second language learning, and overgeneralization).

The previous studies reviewed have investigated interlanguage and intralanguage forms in students' composition of EFL learners in junior high school, Senior High School, Freshmen, and Postgraduate. Meanwhile, none of these studies investigates the final project written by the English for Tourism Study Program students. Choosing the students' final project as the subject of the research related to the fact that the final project is the last project the students have to write after learning English at university for approximately three years. Besides, it is also supported by their experience in the tourism industry. Thus, it is expected that the students of English for tourism is capable of English grammar. Based

on the preliminary analysis on one of the students' final projects in the academic year 2020/2021, there were found various interlanguage forms committed by the students such as the omission of –s in plural form, incorrect prepositions, and verb tense. Thus, this study needs to be conducted since the result can become a formative evaluation for teachers or lecturers in teaching English as a foreign language. Analyzing the learners' interlanguage forms is a pivotal part of language teaching, and learning due to it helps the teacher diagnose learners' problems in constructing utterances or sentences. Thus it can find a way to provide feedback. It is one of the reasons why this study worth conducting. Therefore, this study intended to analyze the interlanguage forms committed by the students of English for Tourism study program in Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

1.2. Statements of the problem

Based on the background of the study, the problem of the study can be stated as follows:

1. What are the forms of interlanguage found in students' final project?

2. What are the forms of Intralanguage found in students' final project?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

Based on the problem mention above, the objectives of the study can be formulated as follows:

1. To analyze the forms of interlanguage found in students' final project.

2. To analyze the forms of Intralanguage found in students' final project.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The results of this research are expected to give some significance for both theoretically and also practically. The details of the significance were presented below:

1.4.1 Theoretical Significance

Theoretically, the result of the presents study was expected to contribute to the theory of Interlanguage and Intralanguage proposed by Brown (1994); Corder

(1981); Selinker (1972). This also will bring the significance for Sociolinguistics and Applied Linguistics courses towards the theory of Interlanguage, Intralanguage, and Interim grammar. Interim grammar is different from the real grammar structure (Corder, 1967; Nemser, 1977; Selinker, 1972).

1.4.2 Practical Significance

The present study is expected to be fruitful for teachers, students, and other researchers regarding the forms of interlanguage and intralanguage found in students' final project. The details of the significance are explained as follows:

a. For English Teacher

The results of the present study were expected to become a formative evaluation for teachers or lecturers in teaching English as a foreign language towards the results of interlanguage and intralanguage forms committed by EFL students. Thus, this study will encourage the teachers to improve their teaching strategy, especially in teaching the correct English structure to improve students' language development. Therefore, there will be beneficial for the teachers to develop their professionalism in language teaching.

b. For Students

The result of the present study was expected to raise students' awareness of the correct structure through interlanguage and intralanguage forms on final project committed by English for Tourism Study Program in Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. Besides, this study also can be a reference for self-assessment for EFL students. Thus, this study will be beneficial to decrease students' interlanguage and intralanguage system in their writing.

c. For Other Researchers

This study will be used as a reference for other researchers to develop other studies related to the Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms found in students' writing. In this case, this study hopes to give and contribute the empirical account to help the other researchers develop the theory in the same field. The other researchers will also be more creative to examine and investigate the Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms in students' speech or writing production.

1.5 Scope of the Study

This study was limited to analyzing the final project published in the academic year 2020/2021 of English for Tourism Study Program Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. The concepts of Interlanguage forms were based on Corder's (1981) theory supported by other theories that represent the concepts of Intralanguage error adapted from Brown (1994) and Interim grammar by Selinker (1972). The concepts of Interlanguage by Corder (1981) and Intralanguage by Brown (1994) were used to guide what forms of Interlanguage and Intralanguage committed by the students of English for Tourism Study Program. Therefore, this study focused on Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms on the students' final project.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding of some terminologies, this study was completed by conceptual and operational definition, as follows:

1.6.1 Conceptual Definition

1. Interlanguage

Interlanguage is the student's linguistics system, which is different from the student's mother tongue and the target language (Selinker, 1972). It describes the type of language produced by foreign language learners who are learning a new language.

2. Intralanguage

Intralanguage error is an error produced by the students as the influence of the target language (Brown, 1994). This type of error has nothing to do with the students' native language. Richards (1971) defines Intralanguage as the developmental error in which it occurs due to the misuse of a particular rule of the target language.

1.6.2 Operational Definition

1. Interlanguage

Interlanguage in this research is defined as the students' linguistics system, which is different from the student's mother tongue language and the target language (Selinker, 1972). Students of English commit the interlanguage and intralanguage forms in their final project.

2. Intralanguage

Intralanguage in this research is defined as the students' linguistics system influenced by the target language. Students of English commit the intralanguage forms f in their final project.