

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the study, research questions, objectives of the study, the significances of the study, the scope of the study, and the definition of key terms are presented in this chapter.

1.1 Background of Study

In learning and mastering English as a foreign language, writing is often considered the most challenging skill compared to reading, listening, and speaking. Despite Myles (2002) and Tillema (2012) state that writing is an essential language skill that can improve students' academic performance, Murtiana (2019) believes that writing is a difficult skill to learn since it requires a cognitive process including thinking ability as well as verbal command. Writing is considered complex since it requires several aspects: cohesiveness and coherences of paragraph or text, language structures, text function, theme or topic, genre, and context of writing (Abushihab, 2014). Moreover, writing is claimed to be the most difficult language skill to learn, for it needs a long process of learning and many practices; thus, it cannot be learned in a short period (Anom, Seken, & Suarnajaya, 2013; Choudhury, 2013). Especially for students who learn English as a foreign language, writing is considered a difficult task since it is complex, even in their first language (Al-Halawani, 2018). Undoubtedly, it is more complicated to write in a foreign language (Muslim, 2014). Murtiana (2019) adds that EFL students need to consider several aspects in generating and expressing ideas when writing in the target language by using the appropriate vocabulary, syntax, cohesive devices, and writing mechanism. Adam et al. (2015) also mention that language structure or grammar is one of the aspects that students should master in order to write properly in target language.

Incorrect grammar use may lead to confusion. Those errors may change the meaning or message in students' compositions (Nonkukhetkhong, 2013). Since it is generally accepted that writing, especially in the target language, is considered as a complex process for EFL students, interlanguage found in their composition is inevitable. However, in Ellis's (1997) defense, these interlanguage forms committed by EFL students are unique. The students are most likely to experience it at some points in their journey of learning and mastering the second language. However, the students never experience this phenomenon in L1 acquisition.

In acquiring the second language, EFL students inevitably produce interlanguage forms along the journey (Aziez, 2016). The compositions produced by the students violate the established rules of grammar in either the native language or target language (Al-Halawani, 2018). This happens when they compose sentences in the target language using their native language structures; thus, it leads to a unique sentence structure in both written and oral (Puspita, 2019). There are several factors causing students to commit interlanguage forms in their composition. Brown (1980) states that one of the factors is students' assumption in which they believe that target language structures are similar to their native language structures (Interlingual forms). Another factor is Intralingual forms which is the negative transfer of items within the target language.

Selinker, an American linguist, is the first one who proposed the concept of Interlanguage in 1971. Selinker (1972) defines Interlanguage as students' unique linguistics system that does not follow the rules established in their native language nor target language. He believes that this phenomenon is caused by this new system of language structure created by the students. This new system of language structure was created due to the learners' native language influence and their little knowledge of the target language (Selinker in Puspita 2019). Ellis (1995) and Corder (1981) agree that

these interlanguage forms committed by language learners are signs showing an improvement of their language acquisition. Ellis (1997) emphasizes that the interlanguage forms committed by the students reflect the students' language development. Corder (1981) adds that it is only temporary since the learners' language structure will improve as the learning continues. The students' lack of knowledge about pronunciation, word use, vocabulary, and structures in the target language can be addressed as Interlanguage (Corder, 1981; Ellis, 1997).

Selinker (1972) and Corder (1981) emphasize that interlanguage is a unique linguistic system created by students learning the second language. The linguistic system is called unique since the pattern does not follow either their mother tongue or the second language they are learning (Interlanguage). Then, the term interlanguage was divided into two by Brown (1980), namely interlanguage and intralanguage forms. Brown (1980) believes that interlanguage forms happen when the students' compositions are influenced by the pattern and the students' knowledge of their mother tongue or native language. Meanwhile, intralanguage forms happen when the compositions are influenced by target language being learned by the students.

Manzolim and Gumpal (2015) name native language interference as one factor influencing the unique sentence structure committed by students. In addition, Fauziati (2011) explains that interlanguage forms committed by the students in their compositions are usually caused by their inadequate knowledge of the target language, poor memory, and the way teachers conduct the second language teaching. Language teachers and lecturers should clarify these interlanguage forms; thus, the students are not led into the wrong concept of English. Moreover, these interlanguage forms can aid the students to be more aware of the confusion they have by combining the native and target language rules, showing their development in acquiring the second language (Kil, 2013). However,

from the result of studies done in Interlanguage analysis, students from various levels of education still commit interlanguage forms in both their writing and speaking (Asikin, 2017; Fauziati, 2017; Kusumawardani & Adnyani, 2020; Maheswari, Adnyani, & Suwastini, 2020; Pratiwi, Adnyani, & Putra, 2020; Sari, Santosa, & Adnyani, 2020; Suwastini, Wiraningsih, & Adnyani, 2020). Conducting interlanguage analysis is one of many actions the teachers can do to help students minimize the interlanguage forms in producing sentences (Puspita, 2019). Interlanguage analysis is conducted to discover the unique sentence structure committed by the students before deciding the appropriate treatment that can be given to the students (Maryana, 2016).

Many researchers conducted studies on interlanguage forms committed by language learners since it is important in order to help students' improvement in acquiring the target language. In 2017, Fauziati found 264 erroneous sentences in students' target language compositions. Her study revealed that Interlanguage was highly influenced by students' native language as well as the target language in syntactical and lexical levels. However, the target language more frequently influenced the students' composition rather than the students' native language. Handayani et al. (2019) studied postgraduate students' theses and found out that the ill-forms were caused by intralanguage and interlanguage in both syntactic and lexical levels. Another similar study was conducted by Sari (2016), who found transfer errors, mother tongue interference, and literal translation as the source of interlingual forms and overgeneralization as intralingual forms on students' writings. Irawati (2015) also conducted an interlanguage study, who found out that ill-forms occurred when students produced narrative text in a second language, which was influenced by their first language.

In a study conducted by Darussalam (2013), it was found that the cause of the ill-forms committed by the students was the students' learning strategies. In 2017, Asikin

analyzed interlanguage in narrative texts produced by third-grade high school students. It was found that the students mostly produced passive sentences, chose incorrect verb agreement, chose the auxiliary, made unparallel sentences, and translated the sentence from native to target language word by word. Further, Tiarina (2017) conducted an interlanguage study on students of the English literature study program. Recount texts from 20 students were analyzed, and it was revealed that the students experienced 15 aspects of interlanguage at the grammatical level. Another study was conducted by Nurhayati (2015), who analyzed grammatical errors and Interlanguage in students' recount texts. The study revealed that the students committed four types of errors. The first was an omission in all grammatical features, including deletion of the specific participant, omission of verbs, omission of past verb maker -ed and to be, omission of a preposition, and omission of a temporal word. The second type of error was the addition of grammatical features, including the addition of to be on specific participants, the addition of 'to' and double preposition. The third type of error is misformation, and the last type of error is the misorder of all grammatical features.

Those previous studies investigated and analyzed both Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms of EFL students' compositions in junior high school, Senior High School, Freshmen, and Postgraduate. However, none of those studies analyzed students' undergraduate theses, especially English Language Education students in Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. The students' theses were chosen as the data source of this present study since the theses are their final work after being exposed intensely to English for approximately 3.5 years. Another reason for choosing students' theses as the data of this study is that the students had learned English in junior and senior high school and also another intense English learning in university for 3 years. In those 3 years in university, the students were trained and had the chance to practice their writing and enhance their

grammar through several courses such as writing 1, writing 2, essay writing, basic grammar, and complex grammar. Through those practices for years in university, it was expected that English Language Education students already mastered the English grammar. On the other hand, based on preliminary analysis on one of English Language Education students' theses, various Interlanguage forms were found, such as the omission of to be (is, am, are, was, were), omission of article, and incorrect use of verb tenses. Thus, this study was needed to be conducted. This present study intended to examine and analyze theses with error analysis as the topic written by English Language Education students of Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha published in 2019 – 2021. Theses published during 2019 -2021 were chosen in order to find out the development and improvement of ELE students' English grammar from year to year. Besides, theses with error analysis as the topic were chosen in order to examine ELE students' English grammar while they examined junior and senior high school students' English grammar. This was done since the result can be used as a formative evaluation for teachers and lecturers in teaching English as a foreign language.

Analyzing students' interlanguage compositions has many benefits. Abushihab (2014) believes that by carefully analyzing students' ill-forms in the process of creating a new language system, the language acquisition process can be understood well. In addition, ill-forms in students' sentence production reveal information on strategies the students use in acquiring a language. This study also revealed the level of ELE students' competence in writing by looking at the most interlanguage and intralanguage forms committed in the theses. Thus, language teachers should pay attention to interlanguage and intralanguage forms in students' writing in order to choose more appropriate strategies to decrease and prevent students from committing the same ill-forms. It is one of the reasons why this study was worth conducting. Therefore, this study was conducted

to analyze the Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms done by English Language Education students' theses with error analysis as the topic.

1.2 Research Questions

Based on the background of the study, the research questions can be formulated as follows.

1. What are the forms of Interlanguage found in ELE students' theses?
2. What are the forms of Intralanguage found in ELE students' theses?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

Based on the research questions, two objectives can be formulated as follows.

1. To analyze the forms of Interlanguage found in ELE students' theses.
2. To analyze the forms of Intralanguage found in ELE students' theses.

1.4 Significances of the Study

The results of this study are expected to be meaningful and informative to language teachers, students, other researchers, and universities. It is also expected to provide aid in increasing the knowledge about Interlanguage and Intralanguage theories.

The followings are the theoretical and practical significances presented in detail.

1.4.1 Theoretical Significance

Theoretically, the results of this study are expected to give a contribution to the theory of Interlanguage and Intralanguage in foreign language learning. It is also expected to give significance to Interlanguage, Intralanguage, and Interim Grammar theories in Sociolinguistics and Applied Linguistics courses.

1.4.2 Practical Significance

This study is expected to be informative for teachers, students, and other researchers regarding the Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms found in students' theses.

a. For English Teachers

The finding of this study is expected to be used as formative evaluations for teachers and lecturers in teaching English, especially for English as a foreign language. Moreover, this study intends to motivate the teachers and lecturers to improve their strategies in teaching EFL students. Thus, teachers and lecturers can develop their professionalism in language teaching.

b. For Students

The finding of this study is expected to provide the students the correct structures of English language pattern through Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms on ELE students' theses. Further, the finding of this study can also be used as a self-assessment for EFL students to decrease errors in their writing.

c. For Other Researchers

The results of this study can be used as references for other researchers on similar studies related to Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms found in students' writing. Hopefully, this study can also give a contribution empirically to other researchers in developing their theory in research of the same field.

1.5 Scope of the Study

This study only focused on analyzing ELE students' theses with error analysis as the topic published in 2019 – 2021 in Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. The theory used was Interlanguage forms by Corder (1981) supported by other theories representing the concepts of Interlanguage and intralanguage adapted from Brown (1994) as well as

Interim Grammar by Selinker (1972). The concept of Interlanguage by Corder (1981) and Brown (1994) were used as guidance for what forms of Interlanguage and Intralanguage are committed by ELE students. Therefore, this study focused on the Interlanguage and Intralanguage forms on ELE students' theses.

1.6 Definition of Key Terms

Conceptual and operational definitions are explained further below in order to avoid misunderstanding some terminologies in this study.

1.6.1 Conceptual Definition

1. Interlanguage

Interlanguage is the features of students' linguistic system which is different from their native and target language (Selinker, 1972). It is a type of language system produced by language students who are learning a new language. According to Brown (1980), interlanguage is the ill-forms committed by the students since their compositions are influenced by the native language.

2. Intralanguage

Intralanguage occurs due to the misuse of a particular rule of the target language (Richards, 1971). This happens since the target language influences the students' composition while their native language has nothing to do with this ill-form (Brown, 1994).

3. Thesis

According to Paltridge & Starfield (2007), thesis is a reporting research in a such format written by students to fulfill the requirements of an academic degree. Thesis should contain purpose and significance of the study, rationale, thorough review of literature, detailed information of the research tools and procedures,

interpretation of the results in the form of conclusion as well as implications and recommendations.

1.6.2 Operational Definition

1. Interlanguage

Interlanguage in this study is the students' linguistic system which does not refer to their native nor target language. It was caused by the students' language development and was found in ELE students' theses published in 2019 - 2021.

2. Intralanguage

Intralanguage in this study is the students' linguistic system influenced by the target language found in ELE students' theses published in 2019 - 2021.

3. Thesis

In this study, the thesis used as source of data was thesis written by the students of English Language Education study program in Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. There are two criteria to choose the thesis, such as 1) the thesis should be about error analysis; and 2) the thesis was published in 2019 – 2021.

