

**INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM PERMEABILITY IN  
STUDENTS' COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH  
SCHOOL (MAN) SURABAYA**

**THESIS**

**Submitted as Partial Fulfillment as the Requirements for the Sarjana Degree  
of English Department Faculty of Arts and Humanities**

**UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya**



**By:**

**Novita Latipah Hidayah**

**Reg. Number: A73215124**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT  
FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES  
SUNAN AMPEL STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY  
SURABAYA**

**2019**

## DECLARATION

The undersigned,

Name : Novita Latipah Hidayah

Reg. Number : A73215124

Department : English Department

Faculty : Art and Humanities

Certify that the thesis she wrote to fulfill the requirement for the degree of Sarjana Degree (S1) in English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, State Islamic University Sunan Ampel Surabaya entitled "*INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM PERMEABILITY IN STUDENTS' COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (MAN) SURABAYA* " is truly my original work. It does not incorporate any materials previously written or published by another person except those indicated in quotations and references.

Surabaya, January 21<sup>st</sup> 2019

The writer,



Novita Latipah Hidayah

A73215124

**THESIS ADVISOR'S APPROVAL**

**INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM PERMEABILITY IN STUDENTS'  
COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (MAN) SURABAYA**


By Novita Latipah Hidayah

A73215124

Approved to be examined

Surabaya, January 21<sup>st</sup> 2019

**Thesis Advisor**



**Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag**

NIP. 196909251994031002

Acknowledged by

**The Head of English Department**



**Dr. Wahyu Kusumajanti, M.Hum**

NIP. 197002051999032002

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT**

**FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES**

**SUNAN AMPEL STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY**

**SURABAYA**

**2019**

v

### THESIS EXAMINERS' APPROVAL

This thesis has been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners, English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya, on January 29<sup>th</sup> 2019.

The Dean of Arts and Humanities Faculty



H. Agus Aditoni, M.Ag

NIP. 196210921992031001

The Board of Examiners

Examiner I

Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag

NIP. 196909251994031002

Examiner II

Dr. A. Dzul-Milal, M.Pd.

NIP 196005152000031002

Examiner III

Prof. Dr.Hj. Zuliati Rohmah, M.Pd.

NIP 197303032000032001

Examiner IV

Abdulloh Ubet, M.Ag.

NIP 196605071997031003



KEMENTERIAN AGAMA  
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA  
PERPUSTAKAAN

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax.031-8413300  
E-Mail: perpus@uinsby.ac.id

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI  
KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : Novita Latifah Hidayah  
NIM : A73215124  
Fakultas/Jurusan : Adab dan Humaniora / Sastra Inggris  
E-mail address : novitalag7@gmail.com

Demi pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :

☒ Skripsi ☐ Tesis ☐ Disertasi ☐ Lain-lain (.....)

yang berjudul :

INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM PERMEABILITY IN STUDENTS'  
COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (MAN)  
SURABAYA

berserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara **fulltext** untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 10 Februari 2019

Penulis

(Novita Latifah H)  
nama terang dan tanda tangan

## ABSTRACT

Hidayah, Novita Latipah. 2019. *INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM PERMEABILITY IN STUDENTS' COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (MAN) SURABAYA*. English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities. The State Islamic University of Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Thesis Advisor : Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag

**Key Words** : *Interlanguage, First language, Target Language.*

There are two factors that influence students' interlanguage system. Those are students' first language and students' target language. This research is conducted to know about interlanguage system of students in learning target language (English). The focus is to describe the kinds of students' first language and the mastery of target language into interlanguage system, and also to know the degree both of students' first language and target language.

This study is descriptive research. The researcher used the written text from Islamic Senior High School (MAN) Surabaya Students as the data. The theory of interlanguage and the influence of first and target language is used to answer the research problems. The data of this research consist of erroneous sentences taken from composition written by the students.

In analyzing the data there are four major steps have been done, namely: identification of errors, classification, description, and explanation. To recognize the errors, the researcher has utilized the framework provided by Elis and Barkhuizen. The researcher has accumulated 103 sentences containing different type of errors and used as the data of this study. The errors accumulated, then, classified in order to find out the influence of the students' first language (Indonesian) and the mastery of target language (English) into the students' interlanguage system

The researcher gets the conclusion from this study as follows: (1) the students' interlanguage system is influenced by first language (Indonesian) and the mastery of target language (English); (2) the influence is in the level of morphology and syntax; (3) the students' first language contribute more influence compared with the mastery of target language as the percentage show.

## INTISARI

Hidayah, Novita Latipah. 2019. *INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM PERMEABILITY IN STUDENTS' COMPOSITION OF ISLAMIC SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL (MAN) SURABAYA*. Sastra Inggris. Fakultas Adab dan Humaniora. Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Pembimbing : Dr. Mohammad Kurjum, M.Ag

**Kata Kunci** : *Bahasa Antar, bahasa pertama, bahasa target.*

Ada faktor yang memengaruhi sistem antarbahasa siswa. Faktor tersebut adalah bahasa pertama siswa dan penguasaan bahasa target. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui sistem antarbahasa siswa dalam belajar bahasa target ( Bahasa Inggris). Fokus pada penelitian ini adalah untuk menjelaskan macam-macam dari pengaruh bahasa pertama dan penguasaan bahasa target yang memengaruhi sistem antarbahasa siswa, dan juga untuk mengetahui persentasi dari bahasa pertama dan bahasa target.

Pengkajian ini termasuk dalam penelitian deskriptif. Peneliti menggunakan teks tulisan siswa Madrasah Aliyah Negeri Surabaya sebagai data. Teori dari antarbahasa dan pengaruh bahasa pertama siswa dan bahasa target digunakan untuk menjawab permasalahan. Data dari penelitian ini berisi kekeliruan kalimat dari tulisan siswa.

Dalam menganalisa data, ada tiga tahap yang telah dilakukan oleh peneliti, tahap tersebut adalah: identifikasi kekeliruan, klasifikasi, deskripsi dan penjelasan. Untuk mengetahui kekeliruan tersebut, peneliti menggunakan kerangka dari Elis dan Barkhuizen. Peneliti mengakumulasi 103 kalimat yang berisi tipe kekeliruan yang berbeda dalam kalimat, dan peneliti menggunakan data tersebut untuk penelitian ini. Kekeliruan diakumulasi, kemudian diklasifikasikan untuk mengetahui pengaruh bahasa pertama siswa dan penguasaan bahasa target ke dalam antarbahasa siswa.

Peneliti mendapatkan kesimpulan dari penelitian ini sebagai berikut, (1) Sistem antarbahasa siswa dipengaruhi oleh bahasa pertama dan penguasaan bahasa target siswa, (2) Pengaruhnya ada pada level morfologi dan sintaksis. (3). Pengaruh dari bahasa pertama siswa lebih dominan daripada penguasaan bahasa target siswa yang ditunjukkan dengan persentase.







2.5	Error Analysis (EA).....	18
2.6	Possible Causes of Errors .....	19
<b>CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD .....</b>		<b>21</b>
3.1	Research Approach.....	21
3.2	Data Collection.....	21
3.2.1	Data and Data Sources .....	21
3.2.2	Instruments .....	22
3.2.3	Techniques of Data Collection.....	22
3.3	Data Analysis.....	24
<b>Chapter IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>		<b>26</b>
4.1	Findings .....	26
4.1.1	The Influence of the Students' First Language into the Students' Interlanguage System.....	26
4.2.1	The Students' Mastery of the Target Language in the Students' Interlanguage System.....	37
4.2	Discussion .....	48
<b>CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION .....</b>		<b>53</b>
5.1	Conclusion.....	53
5.2	Suggestion .....	54
<b>REFERENCES</b>		
<b>APPENDICES</b>		

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background of Study

People need language to communicate with other. They speak in different language based on the situation. Wardaugh (2006:1) language is what the society speak. For the nonnative speaker, learning English becomes ceaseless process. For those who learn foreign language, they should through certain process. The process of learning foreign language is in SLA (Second Language Acquisition) areas. The learning can happen in a foreign or a second language setting, can be guided or untutored. After finishing acquisition of one's mother tongue, the learners will learn another language (second, third, foreign), it was called SLA (Ellis and Barkhuizen 2005:3). The investigation of how second languages are found out is a piece of the more extensive investigation of language and language conduct. Actually, a noteworthy target of second language procurement examine is the assurance of semantic imperatives on the arrangement of second language punctuations. Not only concern on the process of acquisition, SLA also concern on their product. (Selinker, 1997; Saville-Troike, 2006; Tarone, 2006). The sudden advancement in SLA considers which occurred in the late 1960s was the aftereffect of various variables, which together plotted to intrigue scientists in how a L2 was obtained specifically, in naturalistic environment. These components were: (1) past work in first language securing, (2) hypothetical clash because of contending perspectives of how language

is obtained, and (3) a developing frustration with contemporary ways to deal with the educating of a L2.( Ellis,1992: 1-2). However, foreign language learning commonly different from Second Language Acquisition which the former deals to the learning of a nonnative language in the habitat of one's native language (e.g German speakers learn English in German). This is generally done in classroom learning. Meanwhile, in Second language, the learning is happen in the environment where the language is spoken (e.g German learn English in the United Kingdom). (Gass, Selinker,2001:5). The rise of the mistakes in taking students' etymology procedure called interlanguage. Interlanguage happens when the students' etymology framework impact the primary language semantics framework language and target.

Since the first interlanguage conception by Selinker in 1972, the methods of interlanguage study have encountered an arrangement of reformulations to elude the 'comparative fallacy' of target language comparisons (Bley-Vroman, 1983). This move has provoked the elective term, 'student language', the oral and composed language by second language students' (Ellis and Barkhuizen, 2005). They trust that an interlanguage is set apart by dynamicity, systematicity, porousness and fossilization. Systematicity of interlanguage is blunders that are persevering in highlight and pronouncement. Interlanguage is likewise porous against animosity of native language phonetic framework and target dialect semantic framework. At the point when penetrability lost, Fossilize can strikes the Learners' framework.

a second language learning process. This multilingual perspective regards the manners by which this hypothesis is formed. Therefore, Selinker gripes about not having any "hybrid" units with Interlanguage units (... ) as far as language is concerned. Recognizable pieces of proof" (1992: 223).. The student's goal is to know and endeavor to create the language in complete accordance with the student's native language and the target language. There is an association between the two dialect frameworks. Although they have certain highlights. In this association, the student's native language; at the end of the day, the other language is "elements of a second or other language". Though "b

a second language learning process. This multilingual perspective regards the manners by which this hypothesis is formed. Therefore, Selinker gripes about not having any "hybrid" units with Interlanguage units (... ) as far as language is concerned. "Recognizable pieces of proof" (1992: 223).. The student's goal is to know and endeavor to create the language in complete accordance with the student's native language and the target language. There is an association between the two dialect frameworks. Although they have certain highlights. In this association, the student's native language; at the end of the day, the other language is "elements of a second or other language". Though "b

language, at that point systematicity should mean the nearness of an inner consistency in the etymological tenets which make the interlanguage. Like every single characteristic language interlanguage contains a composed arrangement of standards and essential components (i.e. linguistic classifications, lexical things, phonological units, and so forth.) as students effectively and efficiently build their own dialect frameworks. Students ceaselessly make, test, and refine their speculations about the new language they are learning. In this manner, interlanguage is a standard administered, free framework worth concentrate in its own privilege (Brown, 2000; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Lightbown & Spada, 2006).

Up to this point there have been developing quantities of concentrates on interlanguage with different levels of training, student's ages, and dialect foundation. The aftereffects of the examinations have organized an understanding that interlanguage has been highlighted by being orderly, porous, dynamic, and variable (Selinker, 1997; Saville-Troike, 2006). With regards to systematicity, Ellis (1992, :123) urges that "interlanguage that student has worked at each phase of advancement as a framework that is inside reliable". Interlanguage needs to contain an arrangement of organized guidelines and essential phonetic components and not the irregular likenesses gathering. Saville-Troike confirms that at improvement's specific point or stage, the interlanguage is set by standards which form the student's inner sentence structure. These guidelines are can be found by breaking down the dialect utilized by the student around then" (2006:41). Although interlanguage is systematic, differences in context produce different patterns of language use (Saville-Troike

2006:41). From the explanation of the characteristics above, permeability is a character that researcher is interested in conducting to analyze.

There have been developing numbers of research on interlanguage features. The first previous research was carried out in Rhode University by Hobson (1999). The title was “*Morphology Development in the Interlanguage of English Student of Xhosa*”. The examination's motivation was to explore whether the interlanguage highlights distinguished in different investigations showed up in the learning dialect of the investigation. To follow the uttered interlanguage of Xhosa's six students advancement within a few months, he utilized a semi longitudinal research plan as a device. The information examination was principally subjective, to strategy for gathering information he additionally utilized contextual analysis approach. The aftereffect of this investigation was that students' utilized morphology from the earliest starting point of the studying procedure by remembering, understanding and morphology's inflection considered able to pass on importance in Xhosa.

The second research from Sarmedi Agus Siregar who has conducted the research in 2004 (University of North Sumatra) the title was “*Analisis Antarbahasa (Interlanguage) Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di Politeknik Negeri Medan dan Yanada English Centre Medan, Suatu Studi Kasus*”. He has researched understudies' interlanguage framework in Medan. The aftereffects of this examination were that in the understudies' interlanguage framework were discovered both interlingual and intralingual exchange , there are some overgeneralization shapes found in understudies' interlanguage framework, there were three phases in the students'





The last research has researched by Caneday (University of North Dakota, 2001) the title was “*Interlanguage Coda Production of Hmong Second Language Students of English*”. The motivation behind the researcher’s examination was to decide and perceive the syllable last consonants' creation of bunches by youngsters of Hmong (ages 9 and 12) studying English utilizing a requirement based on hypothesis. For leading her exploration, the analyst utilized Optimality Theory as a technique. She began with records the focused on coda consonants and consonant gatherings. A while later, she illustrated the assignments utilized for her investigation. At that point, she gave a profile of the subjects decided for her investigation. The last, the interpretations that were made given the detail by her. The consequences of this examination were that the English and Hmong dialect limitations conveyed in an arranged manner assenting unsurprising examples underway. The last consonants and consonant gatherings were much of the time supplanted or erased by the middle of the English speakers by Hmong, since only some of them are embraced the contention of what they have known in their local dialect with they were realizing in English.

Most studies show evidence that interlanguage is systematic, however, no one of them tried to portray the typical linguistic systems that influenced by first language and target language among the process of learning English. The present research will address this specific area by discovering Indonesian English Foreign Language learners' interlanguage system indicating the types of first language and target language that influence interlanguage linguistics system especially in senior high

school student. This present study will also describe the degree of those influences. Furthermore, there are still very few numbers of studies on Indonesian learners' of English has been done, later, the present study will be central to conduct research in this area.

## 1.2 Research Problems

The research problems are as formulated in the following questions:

1. How is the influence of students' first language into the students' interlanguage system?
2. How is the degree of students' mastery of the target language into the students' interlanguage system?

### 1.3 Research Objectives

This study is conducted to achieve the objectives below:

1. To show the degree and the types of the students' first language influence into the students' interlanguage system.
2. To show the degree and the types of the students' target language mastery into the students' interlanguage system.

## 1.4 Significance Of the Study

## 1.6 Definition of Key Terms

## 1. Interlanguage

Interlanguage is dynamic as in "the arrangement of standards which students have in their brains changes every now and again, bringing about a progression of interval syntax" (Saville-Troike 2006:41). The arrangement of interlanguage is believed to be fragmented and in a condition of transition. In this association, Ellis (1994:352) states that "these psychological language structures are seen as powerful and subject to fast change". The student's dialect framework is dynamic or approximative in nature.

## 2). Permeability

Permeability is one of the keys in language improvement which gives students' information at the stage isn't settled however is available to revision (Ellis, 2003:33). In the other word, permeability is a specific property of interlanguage which allows the penetration of first language rules and the distortion or overgeneralization of target language rules.

### 3). First language

First language is the language of the nation that somebody is conceived in or native to. (Collins dictionary). Native language or mother tongue is the first language that learned by someone. Usually, first language learned from family.



age acquisition (SLA henceforth), as indicated  
"both to the investigation of people and gathering  
g to taking in their initial one as youthful young  
g that dialect." The extra dialect is known as a s  
focus subject in SLA is interlanguage.

**uage**

age is required after the mother tongue, but,  
. It is not an important means of communication  
or a country they moved to. Usually, the choice  
dual or their plans for their future in an effort

## 2.2 Foreign Language

Second language is required after the mother tongue, but, it is one a person voluntary chooses. It is not an important means of communication with the other living in their homeland or a country they moved to. Usually, the choice is influenced by the interests of individual or their plans for their future in an effort to make use of the language acquired. (Eddy, 2011:11).

Instructing English language expects instructors to comprehend the diverse procedure or stages that the student s are experiencing to have the capacity to encourage them. As Lightbown and Spada (2006:78) clarify that "second language students don't learn language just trough impersonation and practice". These creators include that

these new sentences depend on "creating frameworks with their own developing standards and examples, not as blemished renditions of the target language". The perspective of student language as a procedure can be followed back to the late 1960's and mid 1970's when analysts and educators begin to end up more keen on the language delivered by the students, as opposed to the target or the mother language which had been the focal point of past investigations in second dialect learning (Lightbown and Spada, 2006).

Rather than CA and EA, IL isn't seen as a procedure in SLA affected by L1 or L2. At the end of the day, it is neither the arrangement of L1, nor the arrangement of L2 or TL, yet rather, as a free semantic framework that exists autonomously. IL is discovered where L2 students express the information that they as of now have in the new dialect that they are endeavoring to learn. Selinker (1972) recommends that IL, as the transitional procedures somewhere in the range of L1 and L2, is discernible in a student's language and can be investigated. He regards IL as "a dialects whose principles share qualities of two social dialects of languages, nevertheless of whether these languages themselves share rules or not" (Selinker, 1972 cited in Corder, 1981:17). According to him, the illustration of IL's concept is below





Ellis and Barkhuizen (2009 p.54-55) notice that interlanguage hypothesis have advanced extensive throughout the years however the principle premises remain generally the equivalent.

1. A student's interlanguage comprises principally of verifiable semantic information (i.e there is no familiarity with the standard that include an interlanguage).
2. A student's interlanguage learning establishes a framework in a similar sense that a local speaker's sentence structure is a framework. The frameworks represents the regularities that are obvious in the student's utilization of the L2.
3. A student's interlanguage is porous (i.e in light of the fact that it is deficient and unstable, it is effortlessly entered by new phonetic structures got both remotely from info and inside trough such process as over-speculation).
4. A student's interlanguage is transitional. The students rebuilds his or her interlanguage sentence structure after some time. In this manner advancement includes the student going through a progression of stages.
5. A student's interlanguage is variable. At any one phase of advancement the student will utilize diverse structures for the equivalent linguistic structure. This fluctuation might be arbitrary to some degree yet it is to a great extent efficient as in it is conceivable to distinguish the probabilities with which the diverse structures will happen as per such factors as the recipient and the accessibility of time to design expressions.

6. A student's interlanguage is the result of the general learning techniques. One such technique is L1 exchange yet different procedures are intralingual ( for instance, methodologies, for example, over speculation and disentanglement).

7. A student may enhance his or her interlanguage by methods for correspondence techniques (for instance, summarize or ask for help) to adjust for holes in or trouble in getting to L2 learning while at the same time performing.

8. A student's interlanguage may fossilize (I. e the student may quit creating and in this manner neglect to accomplish a full local speaker language structure).

## 2.4 Development Sequence of Interlanguage

The idea of interlanguage and student dialect not just perceives mistake that are worthy piece of the procedure, it expects to dissect and portray these blunders and to comprehend the variables that take the student starting with one phase then onto the next. Lightbown and Spada (2006) clarify that as a rule this is finished by utilizing the diverse procedures that student develop mental punctuations of the L2. As these sentence structures are temporary heuristic developments, the standard can be viewed as speculation.

Corder (1967) clarifies that the student starts not with his own L1, but rather with an exceptionally disentangled adaptation of it, or, in other words, were, a memory of one of the beginning periods of L1 learning. This 'stripped down' or essential framework gives the student murmur first theories – a few etymologists guarantee that it might be widespread – that will be, that these are the guidelines that are fundamental

all things considered. The students at that point develop starting from the stripped shape to more noteworthy intricacy. Along these lines the dialect building process continues. The student practices and attempts dialects shapes, which enable him to travel through interlanguage rectifying murmur mistakes and developing right types of dialect.

Lightbown and Spada (2006) additionally clarify that the psychological advancement of grown-up or youthful Second dialect students, as opposed to that of youngsters, is steadier and it will depend incredibly on the person. They additionally clarify that grown-up second dialect students know about the structure of another language, and despite the fact that the primary dialect may contrast from student to student, there are numerous formative groupings that are comparative in the creating interlanguage of students from various foundations. The kinds of blunders that students make can be sign of the succession in their lanhuage improvement. A students exchange components of his first language to the target language, and this, obviously, rather than aiding, sometimes it may meddle in them learning of target dialect (Norrish, 1983). So at that point, the blunders that are made by the students of an outside language could be utilized as proof of the phonetic association of the student's native language.

Norrish (1983) recognizes diverse sorts of odd dialect conduct: the blunder, the missteps and the pass. The blunder is "an orderly deviation, when a student has not mastered something and reliably fails to understand the situation" (Norrish, 1983 p.7) He clarifies that when kids are procuring their very own dialect, they reliably make a similar mistake. He additionally clarifies that conflicting deviation called a mix-up. At

some point the student "hits the nail on the head" however now and then they commit an error and utilized the wrong shape. At long last there is another kind of wrong use which is neither oversight nor a blunder and transpire whenever. This is a slip by, which might be because of absence of focus, shortness of memory, weariness, and so forth.

## 2.5 Error Analysis (EA)

The protest of blunder examination is to methodically find and portray various types of mistakes made by students of a dialect with an end goal to see how students process second dialect information (Lightbown and Spada, 2006). Corder (1974) commits a qualification among mistakes and errors. Blunders emerge due to holes in the students' L2 learning, and mix-ups happen on account of the trouble of handling shapes that are not yet completely aced.

Error Analysis (EA) is characterized by Ellis and Barkhuizen (2009:51) as "an arrangement of systems for recognizing, depicting, and clarifying student mistakes. Ellis discloses that as indicated by Corder (1967), student errors are huge in three different ways:

- They fill in as instructive reason by demonstrating instructors what students have realized, and what they have not yet aced;
- They fill an examination need by giving proof about how dialects are found out;
- They benefit a learning reason by going about as gadgets by which students and can find the standards of the objective dialect; for instance, by acquiring criticism on their mistakes.



5. Blends (I. e. Mistakes that mirror the student's vulnerability about which of two structures is required). Another author, Cowan (2008:42) identifies the following for sources of grammatical errors made by L2 learners.

- Performance errors

Some ungrammatical sentences delivered by English students might be caused by similar variables that add to blunders made by local speakers of English; these are called execution mistakes to show that the blunder isn't because of the speaker's numbness of the linguistic standards. Rather, it is a handling botch that happens while a dialect student or local speaker is in the demonstration of talking or composing.

- Imperfect Learning

Regularly English students just have not disguised a standard and additionally the limitations that apply to the standard. An extensive number of the recorded mistakes made with basic and middle of the road capability are an impression of flawed learning.

- Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization occurs when a learner applies a grammar rule to forms that do not take it. With the end-ed ending, students use is with irregular verbs ( e.g make-maked, eat-eated, etc).



## CHAPTER III

The necessary procedures of doing great research are presented in this chapter.

<sup>3</sup>Those are research approach, data collection, data and data source, instruments, the techniques of data collection, and the techniques of data analysis.

### 3.1 Research Approach

Qualitative research used in this research. Mooney et.al (2001:1) qualitative methods are also effective in identifying intangible factors, such as social norms, socioeconomic status, gender roles, ethnicity, and religion, whose role in the research issue may not be readily apparent. The researcher used qualitative method because the data were in words form that written by the tenth grade students. The researcher collected, identified, classified, described and drew the data.

### 3.2 Data Collection

### 3.2.1 Data and Data Sources

The data of this study were the texts that are written by tenth grades students of an acceleration class of MAN Surabaya. They are collected and the data are used to analyze. The researcher gave instructions to students to write in English. The students may write in descriptive text or recount text.

The source of data were collected from a class of tenth grade students of MAN Surabaya. All students have studied English and their native language is Indonesian. Their average age is 16- 17 years. They were equivalent in terms of age, language background, nationality, and level of education.

### 3.2.2 Instruments

The main instrument was the researcher herself. The researcher collected, identified, classified, described and drew the conclusion by herself. The researcher played the role as the designer, data collector, data analyst, data interpreter, and reporter of the research findings (Moleong, 2001). Documentation also be carried out by the researcher. In documentation, the data were obtained from the written text from the tenth grade students.

### 3.2.3 Techniques of Data Collection

For collecting the data, the researcher used document analysis and elicitation. To produce the students' own composition, the technique that used to persuade the students is elicitation. For analyze the data in linguistic, this technique is used to stimulus local or native speakers to produce linguistic. Additionally, in learning and L2 research, the technique is used to obtain a learner's' skill better illustration or a better comprehension of interlanguage than the speech or writing that naturally occur in a study. (Richard in Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics Third Edition, 2002: 176). In gathering written materials, the researcher used documentation technique that includes several steps bellows:

- (1) The researcher gave instruction to write in English by choosing between descriptive text or recount text ;

To get the data, the researcher gave the instructions in order the objects can write the text according to what the researcher needs. The instructions are as follows:

- a). Please write recount text or descriptive text, choose one type of those types of text.
  - b). Write in your words
- (2) The researcher read one by one students' composition cautiously and objectively;
- (3) The researcher listed and make them as the data of the research. The list was done as an example below:

### Table 3.2.3 Example of Collecting Data

Types of students' influence	Students' written text	TL/NL
Influence of the Mother Tongue to the Students' interlanguage system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We can study <i>with nice</i></li> <li>- <i>Within and outside country</i></li> <li>- <i>I am home to the village</i></li> <li>- <i>I climbed</i> a dokar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>dengan baik</i></li> <li>- <i>Dalam dan laur negeri</i></li> <li>- <i>pulang</i></li> <li>- <i>naik</i></li> </ul>
Influence of the Target language into the Students' Interlanguage System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The sea is clean,we as the <i>audience</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>visitor</i></li> <li>- <i>grades</i></li> </ul>





influenced by the students' first language and target language that appeared in their arrangement.

**Effect of the Students' First Language into the Students' Interlanguage**

Students' first language framework may impede the getting of the second language into students' growing second language framework. The first language is isolated into two classifications: Morphological and syntactic level.

f that appeared in their arrangement.

**of the Students' First Language into the Student**

ts' first language framework may impedance the

into students' growing second language framev

first language is isolated into two classifications:

el.

### Use of the Students' First Language into the Student

Students' first language framework may impede the transfer of knowledge into students' growing second language framework. The first language is isolated into two classifications: *lingua franca* and *lingua franca*.

Stylistic classification	Sum of erroneous
Phonological Level	28
Incorrect interpretation from Indonesian word	16
First language switch	4





(2) first language switch, and (3) Literal interpretation that results wrong choice of word frame.

### 1) Exacting Interpretation from Indonesian word

There are situations where the understudies should pass on specific implications past their vocabulary authority. To adapt to this issue, they endeavor to influence utilization of whatever applicable earlier information they have for those undertakings. They appear to have depended on the effectively gained English vocabulary. Subsequently, a critical number of interlanguage includes the strict interpretation from Indonesian into English. For instance in Indonesia "teman sekelas" was converted into classroom companion, the right is classmate. Here are different precedents found in the understudies work:

(1) Always cries if *left mom*.

(NL) *ditinggalkan ibu*

(2) My *current* penchant for teachers.

(NL) *guru favorit*

(3) I promise *not replay with the tomorrow*.

(NL) *tidak akan mengulangnya lagi*

(4) If there is *a waste of waste*.

(NL) *Membuang-buang*

(5) Not in a *place subject*.

(NL) *Tempatnya*

(6) Just in *class while*.

(NL) *Kelas sementara*

(7) *Within and outside country.*

(NL) *Dalam dan luar negeri*

(8) Throw in *trash bucket* .

(NL) *Tempat sampah*

(9) We can study *with nice*.

(NL) *dengan baik*

(10) I *am home* to the village.

(NL) *Pulang*

(11) Some food *to give* to the animals.

(NL) *Memberi makan*

(12) I *climbed* a dokar.

(NL) *naik*

(13) My father called me *to fast* go home.

(NL) *segera*

(14) I *climb* to second floor.

(NL) *naik*

(15) My brother *run me*.

(NL) *mengejarku*

(16) An agenda in *out city*.

(NL) *luar kota*

### b) First Language switch

For students that don't have great English vocabularies will in general utilize their local dialect vocabularies if all else fails. It is all the time that students that don't comprehend the English words will utilize Indonesian words, on the grounds that by one way or another they can't discover them in the lexicon or they are now simply the way they are. When changing from English to Indonesian, the students have utilized complete substitution of Indonesian words (Tarone, 1983: 61). At the end of the day, they don't make any alteration to the words they utilize, for example, in the sentences underneath.

(1) I ever watch *Wayang* in Solo.

(2) My grandmother invited me to go up *dokar*.

(3) I go to *Warung*.

(4) I breakfast *nasi goring*.

### c) Literal Interpretation which results in wrong Choice of word Frame

For using the word from, there are many students that confused the usage of it. Their skill to apply the exact word in sentence is different. Students are frequently do not know the function of each word. For this situation, they chose the wrong kind of word. The impact of the first language appears control their erroneous in making such efficient false. They appear to be confounded in utilizing the action word type of English words. It is on the grounds that their first language framework does not give a correct control in utilizing such shape. Here the specialists discovered a few information identified with miss-choice of word frame.

(1) I *return* home after sunset.

(NL) *Pulang*

(2) *Delivered* the mother at gate.

(NL) *Diantarkan*

(3) When *my own*, without knowing the turn.

(NL) *sendirian*

(4) After *breakfast* nasi goreng.

(NL) *makan*

(5) I *motorcycle* by motor.

(NL) *naik* motor

(6) I *generally* draw colorful draw.

(NL) *biasanya*

(7) It is very *ugly marks*.

(NL) *Nilai yang jelek*

(8) To keep the beach *clean*.

(NL) *kebersihan*

### b. Syntactical Level

This investigation additionally discovered syntactic obstruction appeared in understudies' arrangement. Indonesian structure is found in understudies' organization because of understudies communicating their thoughts. The structure of Indonesian has similitude and distinction with English, so understudies ought to be watchful in using such structure in the target language. The distinctions ought to be given finished aim with the end goal to anticipate showing up the blunders. IL framework in syntactic dimension includes the utilization of the Indonesian structure to pass on planned significance in English. The syntactic impedance incorporate as pursues: 1) utilizing Indonesian structure in noun phrase, (2) rearranged refutation, (3) utilizing Indonesian sentence form.

### 1) Utilizing Indonesian Structure in Noun Phrase

The distinctive word framework among Indonesian and English is the significant issue in making a decent English sentence for students. To express the students' work, the common way is by utilizing Indonesian form. In a phrase, students regularly utilize Indonesian form in their stages because of their fragmented ability in aching English. The word structure including an expression may jump out at be hard to comprehend but understudies may surmise that it is anything but difficult to make an expression form the equivalent as their first language sentence structure. A small batch of word that adds meaning to a word, it is called phrase. It is either a pronoun or any gathering of words that can be supplanted by a pronoun. In Indonesian and English expression (phrase), there are a few contrasts between the structures. When understudies are endeavoring to exchange the word meaning, this is the issue is regularly happens. The students' first language is still frequently affected the students. Understudies work below shows the utilizing Indonesian structure in noun phrase :

(1) *The lovers and scientists the sea.*

(NL) *Pecinta dan ilmuan laut*

(2) *Memories of time* kindergarten.

(NL) *kenangan ketika*

(3) Because of *behavior people*.

(NL) *kebiasaan manusia*

(4) I will frown *even often* cry.

(NL) *bahkan sering*

(5) *A wedding my brother.*

(NL) *pernikahan saudaraku*

(6) I *ever watch* wayang.

(NL) pernah melihat

(7) It was *night first me*.

(NL) *malam pertamaku*

(8) My father called me *to fast* go home.

(NL) *untuk segera pulang*

(9) I *already long play* in zoo.

(NL) *sudah lama bermain*

(10) I run then *fast* my brother run me.

(NL) *dengan cepat*

(11) The *holiday idul fitri*.

(NL) *liburan Idul fitri*

## 2) Rearranged refutation

Inconsistency or disavowal of something called as refutation. The way to make sentence in Indonesian is not same as in English. For both structure are different. For Indonesian, it is very common to utilize rearranged refutation. The refutation sentence

in English can't be as straightforward as in Indonesian. In this case, understudies have led a few refutation sentences as disentanglement in light of the impedance of first language, Indonesian.

(1) *I not like* drawing.

(NL) *tidak suka*

(2) My drawing *don't* good.

(NL) *tidak bagus*

(3) I like sport because *it is didn't difficult*.

(NL) *itu tidak sulit*

(4) *I not know.*

(NL) *tidak tahu*

(5) Drawing is *don't easy*.

(NL) *tidak mudah*

(6) *I not replay.*

(NL) tidak membalas

### 3) Utilizing Indonesian Sentence Form

Exacting interpretation (an interpretation word by word) is a sort of the utilization of Indonesian form in sentence. Interpretation a word-for-word can be applied in a few languages but does not work in another languages. For instance, there are a few likenesses between the two dialects, word arrange in Indonesian pursues





(NL) ketika nilai keluar,saya melihat nilai saya dan saya terkejut

(7) At the time I fell I helped within habitant.

(NL) pada saat itu saya jatuh dan ditolong oleh warga

(8) Until a lot of drivers from within and outside country sad to see it.

(NL) sampai banyak pengemudi dari dalam dan luar negeri sedih melihat itu

(9) I want to stand I forgot a shoe that doesn't make me fell.

(NL) saya akan berdiri tetapi saya lupa tidak menali sepatu saya sehingga saya jatuh

(10) I ever watch wayang in Solo.

(NL) Saya pernah melihat wayang di Solo

(11) My father called me to fast to go home.

(NL) Ayah saya memanggil saya untuk segera pulang

#### 4.2.1 The Students' Mastery of the Target Language in the Students' Interlanguage System.

In learning English, second language has likewise offered importance to understudies. It could cause understudies' interlanguage framework. "Intralingual exchange is the negative of things inside the objective dialect or put another way, the erroneous speculation of standards inside the target language" (Brown, 2000:224). The students did not produce the items from the structure of their first language. However, it is a mediation of what they are learning English. The obstruction of English in





had been impact by the objective dialect (English) as free morpheme (word) and bound morphemes (prefixes and additions).

This examination introduces a few cases which students' target language that has been impacted into interlanguage framework at lexical dimension including (1) false Friend (comparable in significance), (2) addition of article, (3) Incorrect selection of preposition, (4) incorrect selection of pronoun, and (5) oversight of – s in plural form.

### 1) False Friend (comparable in significance)

Sets of words or expressions in two dialects that sound or look comparable, yet contrast altogether in significance is called false friend. Those words or expressions are frequently mistaken for words or expressions in another language. For this situation, understudies are mistaken for utilizing the utilization of words in the objective dialect. As the model beneath:

(1) The sea is clean, we as the *audience*.

TL: *visitor*

(2) Even so *delivered* the mother at the gate.

TL: *took*

(3) At the examination, I get bad *marks*.

TL: *grades*

(4) This place is *side to* cooperatives.

TL: *next to*

(5) I helped within *habitant*.

TL: *citizen*

(6) Don't *waste* it anywhere.

TL: *Throw*

(7) I *climbed* a dokar and enjoy.

TL: *ride*

(8) The beauty of it *blocked* by the garbage.

TL: *covered*

## 2) Addition of Article

An article is a descriptor with the goal that it alters things; it is additionally characterized as a little gathering of determiner set previous the thing. Articles are typically portrayed as either unequivocal or uncertain. When the thing is particular or specific, the unequivocal article is utilized before solitary and plural things. An unequivocal article shows that its thing is a specific one (or ones) identifiable to the audience or peruse. It perhaps something that the speaker or the author has just made reference to, or it might be something interestingly indicated. The positive article in English, for both plural and singular things, is *the*. The signs that the thing is unequivocal, that it alludes to a specific individual from a gathering. Signal for A and *a* that the thing altered is inconclusive, alluding to any individual from a gathering. The

point by point use of the article is convoluted. Students have issue in utilizing a specific article frequently include the article in their sentence. This case, regularly experienced by understudies' adapting second language caused the IL framework. Target language framework in utilizing article impacts the understudies' interlanguage framework. As models beneath:

(1) even so delivered *the mother*.

TL: *by my mother*

(2) And *the Allah* has make my time being fact.

TL: *Allah*

(3) *The lovers and scientists the sea.*

TL: *The sea* lovers and scientists

(4) Not reply with *the tomorrow*.

TL: *tomorrow*

### 3) Incorrect selection of preposition

Contrasted with Indonesian, English has a more prominent number of relational words. This is clearly found in Indonesian relational word *di* showing place which can fill in as likeness a few relational words in English: on, at, in. Indonesian relational word *dengan* can fill in as a likeness English relational word with or by. Thus the understudies utilized wrong relational word in their interlanguage system, as demonstrated as follows:

- (1) The rider that are *on* Selecta.

TL: *in*

- (2) I fall *at* motorcycle.

TL: *from*

- (3) At the time *in* go to home.

TL: *on the way*

- (4) *at* the examination.

TL: *in*

#### 4) Incorrect selection of Pronoun

The students utilized various types of pronoun since they are sentence structure and vocabulary develop. There are five distinct sorts of pronoun IN English that dependent on its capacity: abstract, descriptor, possessive, objective and reflexive. The Students really not exactly tricky but rather the understudies were as yet befuddled in utilizing them. Finally, they utilized English pronoun erroneously. In other words the understudies' interlanguage framework was impacted by the target language, as in the precedents beneath:

- (1) My current penchant for teachers kindergarten school is Mrs.Ika.

Shaking hands with *him*.

TL: *her*

- (2) I just want to the washroom when accompanied *him*.



TL:

*her (Mrs. Ika)*

(3) *Me* and my family went to Selecta.

TL: *I*

### 5) Oversight of – s in Plural Form

In numerous language, plural is one of the classes of syntactic number. In English, plural morpheme is suffixed as far as possible of most things, for example, –s or –es. Students make penetrable sentences in type of oversight or expansion; for this situation students do exclusion of –s in plural frame. Students may don't comprehend the capacity of –s in plural frame that drives them to confound in using it. With the goal in their sentences they exclude –s as plural mark. Thus, the researcher discovered four sentences having exclusion –s in plural shape as pursues:

(1) a lot of *thing* to do.

TL: *things*

(2) a lot of *thing* playing game.

TL: *things*

(3) 4 *month* ago.

TL: *months*

(4) There *are* scenery was beautiful.

TL: *is*

### **b. Syntactic Level (Grammar)**

In addition of morphological level, the researcher indicates the syntactic level that influence students' interlanguage system of the target language. There are (1) Using V1 rather than V2, (2) Oversight of BE as a Verb, and (3) Using of wrong Conjunction, which pursues are the portrayal of each.

### 1) Using of V1 rather than V2

V1 (present), V2 (past), V3 (past perfect) and V-ing (ceaseless) are to order the action words. For showing the current state, V1 is used while to show the past situation uses v2. The students' wrong apply the action words regularly are found. They utilized the action words that had been learning but they apply it incorrect. This situation shows that their interlanguage framework was impacted by the target language framework.

In applying the action words or using v1 or v2, the students still confused . Here are the models:

- (1) Last night, my friend and I *do* LKTI.

TL: *did*

- (2) Every morning mother always *takes* me to the kindergarten.

TL: *took*

- (3) At the examination I *get* bad marks.

TL: *got*

- (4) After that I *get* new class.







are two factors in students' interlanguage system. Those are students' first language and students' target language. In both of them, there are two aspects that influence student's interlanguage system, morphological level and syntactical level. The researcher portrays the information taken from studentss' of MAN Surabaya thoroughly. The primary purpose of this segment is depicting interlanguage that influenced by the students' first language and the mastery of target language by watching the proof that appeared in their arrangement.

The degree of Influence of the first language into the Students' Interlanguage System shows that the degree of morphological level and syntactical level are balanced, it is 50% from 56 erroneous involves morphological level 28 erroneous and syntactic level 28. On the other hand, from 47 erroneous which involve morphological level 23 erroneous and syntactic level 24 erroneous, the degree of mastery of the target language into the Students' Interlanguage System shows the sum of degree for morphological level is 48, 9 % and for syntactical level is 51, 1%. From the degree both of students' first language and students' target language, it can be interpreted that student's first language dominates instead of the target language to the students' interlanguage system.

The first is the influence of the students' first language into the students' interlanguage system. The impact of the students' first language is isolated into two classifications: Morphological and Syntactic Level. In Morphological level, the students have delivered are as per the following: (1) exacting interpretation from

Indonesian word (There are situations where the students should pass on specific implications past their vocabulary authority. To adapt to this issue, they endeavor to influence utilization of whatever applicable earlier information they to have for those undertakings), (2) first language switch (Students have utilized complete substitution of Indonesian words when changing English into Indonesian (Tarone, 1981: 61), and (3) literal interpretation which results in wrong choice of word frame (Students are frequently do not know the function of each word. For this situation, they chose the wrong kind of word. The impact of the first language appears control their erroneous in making such efficient false). Meanwhile, in syntactical level, Indonesian structure found in students' organization because of students communicating their thoughts. Indonesian structure has similitude and distinction with English so understudies ought to be watchful in applying such structure in the target language. The syntactic impedance incorporate as pursues: 1) utilizing Indonesian structure in thing phrase (Students regularly utilize Indonesian example in their stages because of their fragmented ability in acing English. The word structure including an expression may jump out at be hard to comprehend but understudies may surmise that it is anything but difficult to make an expression structure the equivalent as their first dialect sentence structure), (2) Rearranged refutation (For Indonesian, it is very common to utilize rearranged refutation. The refutation sentence in English can't be as straightforward as in Indonesian. In this case, understudies have led a few refutation sentences as disentanglement in light of the impedance of first language, Indonesian). (3) Utilizing Indonesian sentence form (Interpretation a word-for-word can be applied in a few

languages but does not work in another languages. For instance, there are a few likenesses between the two dialects, word arrange in Indonesian pursues indistinguishable example from English (subject + verb + object)).

The second is the mastery of the Target Language (English) into the Students' Interlanguage System. The obstruction of English in understudies' interlanguage incorporates: (1) Morphological Level, and (2) Syntactic Level. There are some conditions in this level, such as: False friend, (Sets of words or expressions in two dialects that sound or look comparable, yet contrast altogether in significance is called false friend. Those words or expressions are frequently mistaken for words or expressions in another language), addition of article (An article is a descriptor with the goal that it alters things; it is additionally characterized as a little gathering of determiner set previous the thing. Articles are typically portrayed as either unequivocal or uncertain), Incorrect selection of preposition (Contrasted with Indonesian, English has a more prominent number of relational words. This is clearly found in Indonesian relational word *di* showing place which can fill in as likeness a few relational words in English: on, at, in). Incorrect selection of pronoun (The Students really not exactly tricky but rather the understudies were as yet befuddled in utilizing them. Finally, they utilized English pronoun erroneously. In other words the understudies' interlanguage framework was impacted by the target language), Oversight of – s in Plural Form (Students make penetrable sentences in type of oversight or expansion; for this situation students do exclusion of – s in plural frame. Students may don't comprehend



the capacity of – s in plural frame that drives them to confound in using it. With the goal in their sentences they exclude – s as plural mark). Furthermore, in syntactical level, There are (1) Using V1 rather than V2 (V1 (present), V2 (past), V3 (past perfect) and V-ing (ceaseless) are to order the action words. For showing the current state, V1 is used while to show the past situation uses v2. The students' wrong apply the action words regularly are found. They utilized the action words that had been learning but they apply it incorrect), (2) Oversight of BE as a Verb (The students overlooked BE as action words because of they didn't completely comprehend the principles of utilizing BE), and (3) Using wrong conjunction, which pursues are the portrayal of each (The common issues lies on what combination can be utilized to associate certain sentences and less much of the time on regardless of whether the sentence needs a combination).

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

## 5.1 Conclusion

The degree of Influence of the first language into the Students' Interlanguage System shows that the degree of morphological level and syntactical level are balanced, it is 50% from 56 erroneous involves morphological level 28 erroneous and syntactic level 28. On the other hand, from 47 erroneous which involves morphological level 23 erroneous and syntactic level 24 erroneous, the degree of mastery of the target language into the Students' Interlanguage System shows the sum of degree for morphological level is 48, 9 % and for syntactical level is 51, 1%.

[illegible]

the interlanguage system, in morphological level, the morphological impacts from the first language that the understudies have delivered are as per the following: (1) exacting interpretation from Indonesian word, (2) first language switch, and (3) literal interpretation which results in wrong choice of word frame. On the other hand, in syntactical level, the syntactic impedance incorporate as pursues: 1) utilizing Indonesian structure in noun phrase, (2) rearranged refutation, (3) utilizing Indonesian sentence form.

The second is the mastery of the Target Language (English) into the Students' Interlanguage System. The obstruction of English in students' interlanguage incorporates: (1) Morphological Level, and (2) Syntactic Level. In morphological level, This examination introduces a few cases which students' interlanguage framework was impacted by the target language (English) at lexical dimension including (1) false Friend (comparable in significance), (2) addition of article, (3) Incorrect selection of preposition (4) Incorrect selection of pronoun, and (5) oversight of – s in plural form. Meanwhile, in syntactical level, there are (1) Using V1 rather than V2, (2) Oversight of BE as a Verb, and (3) Incorrect Conjunction, which pursues are the portrayal of each.

## 5.2 Suggestion

This research is still far from the perfect, it not yet included all about interlanguage. However, by this research, at least it can provide information regarding interlanguage happened in senior high school students. Expectantly, suggestions and criticisms will come from the readers to achieve the best research in the future. The



1990. What is the logical problem of foreign  
n and Schachter. 1990. *Linguistic perspective*  
2. Cambridge: C.U.P. 41-67.

00. *Principles of language learning and te*  
w York: Longman.

Krashen.1989. *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford

01. Interlanguage Coda Production of Hmong  
f English University of North Dakota: *Maste*

inary.2018. Cambridge : Cambridge Univers

Morphological Development in the Interlang  
*Tesis*. Afrika Selatan: Linguistik, Rhodes Un

ictionary.copyright. HarperCollins Publish

1990. What is the logical problem of foreign  
n and Schachter. 1990. *Linguistic perspective*  
2. Cambridge: C.U.P. 41-67.
00. *Principles of language learning and te*  
w York: Longman.
- Krashen.1989. *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford
01. Interlanguage Coda Production of Hmong  
f English University of North Dakota: *Maste*
- inary.2018. Cambridge : Cambridge Univers
- Morphological Development in the Interlang  
*Tesis*. Afrika Selatan: Linguistik, Rhodes Un
- ictionary.copyright. HarperCollins Publish

Ellis, R. 1994. *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press

Fabricius, H. 2006. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.) Unknown press.

Gass, S.M and Selinker, L. 2000. *Second Language Acquisition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/target%20language>.

James, P. 1997. What's Wrong and What's Right-With Rubrics. *Educational Leadership*. 55 (27:72-75).

Ko, W. 2013. Interlanguage pragmatics and email communication. *Thesis*. Texas A&M University.

Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Research*. Harlow: Longman.

Lightbown, P.M and Spada, N. 2006. *How Languages are Learned* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. 1990. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C.

Martínez, P. B. & Marco, S. P. C. 2002. Input and interlanguage in the efl classroom: case study with primary school teachers. *Caí: Revista De Filología Ysuidáctica*. 2( 21): 459-474.

Moleong, L.Y. 2001. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung : PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Mooney, A. 2011. *et.al Language Society and Power* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) Oxon: Routledge Print.

Norrish, J. 1983. *Language Learners and Their Errors*. London: Macmillan Press.

4. "Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Interlanguage." In Kenneth Croft (Ed.) *Reading on Language*. 1991:119.
5. "Analisis Antar Bahasa (Interlanguage) Pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris di Politeknik Negeri Medan dan Yanada English Center." *Tesis*. Medan: Program Studi Linguistik, Universitas Sumatera Utara.
6. *An Introductory Course of Linguistic*. Surakarta: Pustaka Setia.
7. "Some Thoughts of the Nation of Communicative Competence." In H. G. W. Janich and Gabriele Kasper (Eds.) 1983:61-74.
8. "Still wrestling with 'context' in interlanguage theory." *Applied Linguistics*.20:182-198.