Native and Target Language Influence on Students' Interlanguage Speech

Putu Dika Pratiwi [1, *], Ni Luh Putu Sri Adnyani [2], I Nyoman Adi Jaya Putra [3]

[123] *English Language Education, Post Graduate Program, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*

e-mail: putupratiwiwinaba@gmail.com, niluhputusriadnyani@gmail.com adijayaputra@undiksha.ac.id

Abstract --*Literature confirms that various errors made by Indonesian learners of English as a foreign language are challenging phenomenon which needs our concern. The errors found are both in speech and composition production, which portray the effectiveness of language learning. Students language that belongs neither native nor target language is called interlanguage (IL). The focus of this study is to present the empirical results of the investigation on the IL features of students' speech production. It aims to describe the types and aspects of the native language (NL) and target language (TL) influences and to explain the possible causes of IL production. The data were in the form of 144 ill-formed utterances. In gathering the data, the students were given a guided picture with the topic 'Last Holiday'. The students' speech was video recorded. The ill-formed utterances were collected, identified, described, and explained. The result of the study shows that both of their NL and TL influenced the students' interlanguage production at the syntactical level.*

Keywords: ***Interlanguage; native language; target language; speech***

Abstrak--Hasil penelitian terkini menunjukkan bahwa berbagai kesalahan berbahasa yang dilakukan oleh pelajar bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa asing di Indonesia adalah fenomena yang penting untuk dikaji. Kesalahan ditemukan dalam keterampilan berbicara maupun menulis. Kesalahan berbahasa tersebut menggambarkan efektivitas pembelajaran bahasa asing yang telah dilaksanakan. Produksi bahasa pebelajar yang tidak bisa dikategorikan sebagai bahasa pertama (bahasa Indonesia) ataupun bahasa target (bahasa Inggris) disebut *interlanguage* (IL). Adapun fokus dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menyajikan temuan empiris dari IL dalam keterampilan berbicar. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mendeskripsikan jenis dan aspek pengaruh bahasa pertama (NL) dan bahasa target (TL) serta untuk menjelaskan penyebab terjadinya IL. Adapun data yang dikumpulkan dalam bentuk 144 ujaran yang mengandung kesalahan. Dalam pengumpulkan data, para pebelajar diberi rangkaian gambar dengan topik *Last Holiday*. Ujaran pebelajar direkam dengan video. Ujaran yang mengandung kesalahan diidentifikasi, dikelompokkan, dideskripsikan, dan dijelaskan. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa NL dan TL memengaruhi produksi *interlanguage* pebelajar pada level sintaksis.

1. Introduction

Errors experienced by Indonesian learners of English as a foreign language is a challenging topic to be discussed. The errors made by the students can be both in speech and writing. The utterances that the learners create can be observed as neither those of the native language (Indonesian) or the target language (English). Indonesian may produce: (1) 'I like study English'; (2) 'My hobby playing football'; (3) 'The boy who are visit our campus'; (4) 'He go to the home'; (5) 'I gave the flower with the girl'; and (6) 'I watch *sendratari* the other day'. These examples contain linguistic elements of Indonesian and English. The sentences produced by students, which cannot be classified as a native language (NL) or target language in Second Language Acquisition is called Interlanguage (IL) (Selinker, 1972).

Interlanguage (IL) is the process of learning a second language (L2) where learners create a system that the language they produce is influenced by both their mother tongue and their target language (Hosseini & Sangani, 2015). Yule (1983) defines IL as a system that the second language (L2) learners have, which contains two features from the first language (L1) and L2 plus are some that are independent of the L1 and L2. From the definition, it can be implied that IL is a hybrid system that combines both L1 and L2 inside the system. Therefore, the product or output is influenced by both languages.

Interlanguage or transition language processes cannot be parted from the process of target language acquisition (Huang, 2009). It has an important role in the learners' process of learning. The importance of interlanguage pragmatics competency is that it allows the students to act in the target language in context (Ravesh Mahmoudi & Tabrizi Heidari, 2017; Sykes & Cohen, 2018). Erroneous sentences are indicated as one of the most observable phenomena found in Indonesian EFL Learners (Faisal, Mulya, & Samsyul, 2016; Fauziati, 2017; Halimi, 2008; Mardiono, 2003).

Fauziati (2017) confirmed that interlanguage had been an interesting topic to be observed, which is proven by so many researches that have conducted in this field. The studies concerned with the influence on NL and TL on interlanguage carried on in French, Spanish, Thai, Malay, Ghanam, Yemeni, and Persian language background (Fauziati, 2017). Ciesielkiewicz and Márquez (2015) conducted a study about identifying the main features of interlanguage and classify the errors produced by Spanish students of Bachillerato in ESL in their composition. The result of the study showed that students face errors in their writing, especially in the choice of vocabulary. It also showed that students face confusion and overgeneralization of English rules.

Aziez (2016) conducted a study on interlanguage in Islamic boarding schools. This study described the phonological, lexical, and syntactic forms of English students' interlanguage. The data were obtained from students' conversations, interviews, and reading aloud. The results of the study showed that there were several aspects in students' interlanguage, namely: (1) phonological transfers, (2) lexical transfers, (3) syntactic transfers, (4) phonological overgeneralizations, (5) lexical overgeneralizations, and (6) syntactic overgeneralizations.

Asikin (2017) conducted a study about the analysis of interlanguage in narrative writing text for the 3rd grade of high school students. This study aimed at analyzing the reason of interlanguage existed in students' writing. The results of the study showed that the interlanguage appeared in the narrative text 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.

Moreover, Fauziati (2017) conducted a study about native and target language influence on the students' interlanguage production (Indonesian EFL composition). This study aimed at describing the permeability of interlanguage. The result of the study showed that their native language and target

language influenced students' interlanguage production. The influences are in terms of lexical and syntactical level. The students borrow the native language vocabulary in English speech (i.e. Indonesian borrowings). On the other hand, the target language influenced grammar (i.e. verb tenses).

The researches in the previous studies investigated IL in one particular language skill. Moreover, studies on interlanguage that observe speech production by Indonesian learners in the vocation study program have not been carried out yet. Therefore, it is interesting to look at the interlanguage produced by the students in the area of speaking skills. The main aim of the present study is to identify, describe, explain, the nature of NL and TL influence on the IL production of Indonesian EFL learners in their speech production. The study was conducted at the DIII English study program of Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. The reason why the research was conducted in the study program was that it is a vocational study program where the focus of the program is to prepare students who are ready to work in the tourism field where they will implement the language skills acquired with international customers. Besides, the Indonesian government highly supports vocational studies to boost job creation. Thus, their English ability is highly required. By researching their IL, the researchers believed it would help both the students and teachers to recognize the errors. By realizing the errors, the students could reflect and fix the errors to help them to be more fluent in English. The teachers, on the other hand, can improve strategies applied in teaching the English language.

2. Research Method
2.1 Research Design
According to Creswell (1998), a qualitative study is a study where the researcher analyses detail information based on the real condition on the field. It can be implied that the researcher must collect the actual data and analyze them based on

the natural condition that happened in the area. Supporting Creswell's argument, Patton (1990) elaborated by stating that qualitative research is capturing real nature, producing broad, detailed information about a smaller number of people and cases.

There are some qualitative research's characteristics highlighted by Bogdan and Biklen (1992) as follows:

1. The source of data is in terms of the natural setting.
2. The researcher is a vital instrument.
3. The presentation of data is in the form of words, not numbers.
4. Qualitative researchers highlight the process, not the product.
5. The analysis of the data is in the form of inductive, which means the intension is not testing the hypothesis, but the phenomenon happens.
6. Meaning is the crucial point to be observed.

Based on both theoretical arguments and the characteristics described previously, this study is a qualitative research of SLA in a classroom context. The focuses of this study were both error analysis and IL analysis. The data was taken from the students' English speech. The present research tries to capture the real interlanguage phenomena that happen on the field, which was presented in smaller subjects and data.

2.2 Subject of the Study and Source of Data
The research subjects were 40 diploma students in the DIII English study program. The students spoke Indonesian as their NL in their daily activity. They had learned English formally for at least six years in Junior High School and Senior High School. The students used English in the class as their primary language in the learning process. The average age was 19-20 years old. The students were homogenous based on their average age and English proficiency. The objects of the study were the Native language and target language influence on students' interlanguage in their speech production.

The data was gained through speech with a topic: last holiday. The students were given a guided picture that is related to the topic. The topic and the pictures were related to the students' lessons in the hospitality industry. During the speech, the students were recorded using a video camera.

2.3 Research Instruments

The first instrument of the research was a guided picture of "last holiday" which was taken from the Pinterest application. The pictures contained the scenes of check-in and meeting an old friend. Both scenes were related to the diploma students' life; the check-in scene was included in their hospitality courses.

The second instrument of the research was a video recorder which was used to record the students' speech in delivering their story about the guided picture. The speech was transcribed, classified, and identified based on the error analysis framework by James (2014). He organised and analyze interlanguage phenomena by investigating the collected data according to its syntax and morphology. Meanwhile, based on comparative taxonomy, the data were observed from the structures of NL and TL.

James (2014) classifies three bases of error analysis which were used in this research. There are some bases where utterances and sentences could be clasified into deviant when they were: 1) appropriate but not acceptable; 2) acceptable but inappropriate, and 3) inappropriate as well as unacceptable. To conclude, the utterances and sentences were considered felicitous when they are appropriate and acceptable.

2.4 Data Collection

The technique of collecting data is a technique used to collect the data. Based on Gay, Mills, & Airasian (2006), to collect the data of the qualitative study, there are several techniques can be used, namely observation, field notes, interview, questionnaire, and examining records. In the present study, the methods used were observation, documentation, and recording.

1. Observation

In the observation stage, the researchers were observing the students who were studying in the third semester. The observation aimed at collecting information about students as much as the researchers can before collecting the data. The information helped the researchers in gaining a holistic perspective that would help the researchers to understand the context of the data later on, which in this research is the interlanguage itself.

2. Documentation

In this research, documentation result helped the researchers to interpret the information which was gained. Here, the researchers tried to cover the context of the field. The documentation was in forms of video.

3. Recording

The recording section here defined as the speech recording process while the students were doing their speeches. The record aimed at helping the researcher gained the data in forms of video. The video helped the researcher in classifying the ill-formed sentences produced by the students in their speech.

2.5 Data Analysis

The data of the speech production was gained through a guided speech with a topic: last holiday. The students were given picture storytelling that related to the topic. The reason for the use of picture storytelling was that the students would have guidance in composing their speech. The topic and the picture provided also related to the students' lessons in hospitality. The students were allowed to use free patterns of utterance they had learned and acquired for their communication purposes (Fauziati, 2017). After five minutes of preparation, the students performed speech in front of the class for about 5 minutes. The speech was then recorded using a camera.

The researcher needs to point out how the data is analyzed (Ariyanti, 2016). After gaining the data of the data then being analyzed using The

Data Analysis Spiral, which is proposed by Creswell (1998).

    1. Data managing

In the first step, the researcher organizes the videos as the result of students' speeches recording by using the techniques of collecting the data into folders. The collection of utterances then became the source of data for the students' speech production.

2. Reading and memoing

In the second stage, the researcher reads and made memos related to the direct observation and transcribe the data of the videotape.

    3. Describing, classifying, and interpreting

In the third stage, the researcher described the data in detail and clearly. In this stage, the researcher classifies the data based on the researcher's purposes in this research. The interpretation of the data also carried out in this stage. Last, the data is presented, described, and explained.

3. Finding and Discussion
3.1 Finding

On students' speech production, the students' native language (NL) took a significant influence on the utterances they produced. The native language influenced students' speech production on how they translated their language from the native language to the target language. They tended to take their native language pattern to speak in English. It influenced how students organized the structure of the language based on the pattern. In the present research, the researcher found out that there are several categories of NL influence on students' speech production that occurred, namely verb tenses, to-infinitive, the use of vocabulary, missing article, passive voice, plurality, and missing possessive marker.

One of the NL influences found in the students' speech is the use of verb tenses. The examples of the influence in verb tenses can be seen in examples (1) to (13).

(1) Then, the bell boy <u>bring</u> all his luggage.
(2) And then, the bell boy <u>help</u> to arrange the luggage to the room.
(3) After that the bell boy <u>explain</u> a little bit about the room to the boy.
(4) And the <u>man call</u> his friend in their city to share about the place in the city.
(5) <u>His friend tell</u> about the famous market in the city.
(6) He <u>is meeting</u> the firend.
(7) They <u>are going</u> to have some drink.
(8) The <u>men are going</u> to the hotels.

In examples (1) to (5), the students applied to infinitive verb, such as 'bring', 'help', 'explain', 'call', and 'tell'. The topic of the speech given was 'last holiday", in which students were required to describe past events. Therefore, the students' utterances should contain the past verbs such as 'brought', 'helped', 'explained', 'called', and 'told'. In examples (6) to (8), the students used 'to be' in their speech. However, the 'to be' used, indicating events that happen in the present time. When past experienced is being told, the 'to be' shall be in the past form. In this case, they needed to use 'was' and 'were'.

    Some possibilities cause the verb tenses error in the students' IL production. First, the students do not adequately master the grammar pattern in the target language. The students are still having difficulties in coping with the changes in verbs in English. In Indonesian, it is not required to change verb forms in expressing events that happen in the present, past, or future. Colloquial Indonesian is mostly an isolating language where there is no inflectional morphology to indicate grammatical relationships (Adnyani, Beratha, Pastika, and Suparwa, 2018; Soriente 2014). Therefore, students are not used to verb changes. For them, a verb can express meaning without considering the time of speaking, for instance, the use of verb *pergi* 'go' which can be seen in the following examples.

(9)   *Aku pergi sekarang* 'I am going now'

(10) *Aku **pergi** besok* 'Iwill go tomorrow'
(11) *Aku **pergi** kemarin* 'I went yesterday'

The Indonesian sentences in examples (9) to (11) show three different events, which happen in the present time, past, and future. The illustrations show there are no changes applied to the verb *pergi*. In English, on the other hand, the students must be aware of the rules of the changing of verb form based on the speakers' time of speaking. It can be concluded that the students still bound to the use of a verb in their L1. Thus, the students did not use the appropriate form of verbs in the utterances they produced.

Another possibility that may cause the student's errors in their speech is anxiety. Krashen (1982) states that the variables are influencing the success of speaking skills in acquiring L2 that can be summarized into motivation, anxiety, and self-esteem. Speaking ability, as has been mentioned in works of literature, is considered as one of the most critical four skills as well as the most important skill as the reflection of the speaker's ability (Ur, 1996; Akmal, 2018). The thought of English is essential for the identity of the students making the students feel anxious in producing the utterances. Even if they are aware of the changing forms of verbs rule in English, they chose to play safe by using the verbs they knew already.

The anxiety of the learners is also confirmed by Tuan & Mai (2015). They emphasize some speaking problems carried out by L2 learners, such as inhibition, lack of topic knowledge, low participation, and the use of mother tongue. The anxiety is also one of the factors that create impediment, where the lack of vocabulary comes as a result. The inhibition proves that learners are afraid of making mistakes and being judged by the audience (Leong & Ahmadi, 2017). The audience here means the classmates/partners in learning L2. The finding in this present study also emphasizes the statement of Littlewood (2007), who believes that a language classroom easily creates anxiety for the learners.

The third possibility is the students think that meaning is more important than form. In producing utterances, learners' focus is mostly on the meaning rather than form (Hymes, 1972; Sauvignon, 1983; Nunan, 1989). The students did not care about the form of the verbs they use. They assumed that it is enough for them to be understood by meaning. For instance:

(12) Their friends gives information about the best supermarket around the hotel.
(13) The guests meets his friends.
(14) The guests meet the friend.

In examples (12), (13), and (14), the utterances contains inappropriate use of verbs. In those examples, the subjects are plural; the context of the story was in the past. Therefore past verb forms should be applied. In this case, the students used incorrect grammar. The errors in the use of verb tenses were found as the most frequent IL errors carried out by L2 learners (Ciesielkiewicz & Marquez, 2015; Na-Pukhet and Normah,2015; Solano et al., 2014; Watcharapuyang and Usaha, 2012).

The next errors found in the students' speech is the use of infinitive, as can be seen in examples (15) to (17).

(15) His friend want to take him to visiting some place
(16) His friend invite him to visited harbor
(17) They are going to the receptionist to booking the room.

Data (15) to (17) show that there were incorrect forms of a to-infinitive. The wrong types can be seen in the use of 'to visiting', 'to visited', and 'to booking'. The correct forms are 'to visit' and 'to book'. It is because the word 'to' should be followed by verb I. They belong to '*to infinitive*' form. The incorrect form of those verbs in examples (15) to (17) can be said as an influence from the NL grammatical pattern.

Indonesian does not have an infinitive pattern. The students overgeneralize that a verb can be used to form utterances and can deliver meaning. The students may assume that all verbs have the same function as in Indonesian. Thus, the students face confusion to use 'to infinitive' in forming a speech, whether it should be followed present, past verb, participle, or verb-ing. Indonesian examples wherein English to infinitive is required can be seen in examples (17) to (18).

(18) *Dia sedang ke pasar **untuk beli** ikan* 'She is going to the market to buy fish'
(19) *Dia pulang **untuk ambil** kunci kantor* 'She went home to get the office key'
(20) *Dia akan berhenti bekerja **untuk menjaga** anaknya* 'He is going to quit his job to take care of his child'

In examples (18) to (20), there are no changes in verbs, even though the three events happen at different times. It can be confirmed then that when students are not aware that the word 'to' should be followed by a present verb, it may be related to the verb change in English that does not exist in Indonesian. Therefore the students just apply any verbs after 'to'. Thus, it shows that in forming sentences, the students are still influenced by their NL grammatical patterns. It can be concluded that their Indonesian grammar knowledge affects how they create a speech production.

The next interlanguage speech is found in the use of vocabulary as can be seen in examples (21),(22), and (23).

(21) The guest get rest in the room
(22) He is take a call to his friend
(23) His friend go house after visiting hotel

In data (20) 'The guest get rest in the room**'** , (21) 'He is take a call to his friend', and His friend go house after visiting hotel'. These utterances show that there were some misused of a verb where the speaker said 'get rest', 'take a call', and 'go home' instead of 'take a rest', 'make a call',

and 'to go home'. The utterances reflect that there is NL influence on the students' speech production.

The phrases 'take a rest', 'make a call', and 'to go home' are examples of phrasal verbs. Thus, the structure of both utterances cannot be separated or replaced, or the phrases become meaningless. It shows that there was a lack of knowledge performed by the students about phrasal verbs.

There are several possible reasons for the students to misuse the vocabulary. First, the students thought that would be fine if they replaced 'take' and 'make' because they think that the English patterns are the same as the Indonesian. In Indonesian, the word *beristirahat* and *menelepon* which have the meaning of 'to take a rest' and 'to make a call' can be used in several contexts. Thus, the students thought that the word 'get' and 'take' could be used in the context of resting and calling. They felt that if several Indonesian vocabularies can be used in a different context, so does English. Second, the students purely did not know about the rule of the phrasal verb.

Second, because the context of speech was retelling the story, the tense used supposed to be in the form of past tense. The correct verbs should be used are 'took' and 'made' so the phrasal verbs will be 'took a rest' and 'made a call'. But, the utterances reflected the present situation by using present verb. In the context, both statements are syntactically incorrect. There are three possible reasons why the students produced such statements. Firstly, because they purely did not know about the theory of past tense in English since in Indonesian there is no such rule of tenses which is changing verbs alongside the changing adverbs of time. Secondly, there was a poor English vocabulary acquired by the students. A lack of fluency can cause poor vocabulary. This condition made the students only used what the vocabulary they had, without considering the rules of the target language yet. Thirdly, the students possibly were nervous. The data was taken by recording the voice of the students, as the classroom situation full of other students in the background. This setting probably made the

students anxious and lost their acquisition of vocabulary in English.

On the other hand, their brain was stimulated by the rush adrenalin of finishing their speech. Anxiety is often correlated with the feeling of fear (Javed, et al. 2013). This condition probably made the students randomly picked the vocabulary that popped up in their minds while doing the speech.

The first and the second, possibilities towards the finding have proven that the inhibition proposed by Tuan & Mai (2015) took a great place in the IL production of the learners. Those two possibilities are also confirmed that there is anxiety occurred when the students produced the speech (Krashen, 1982).

Another interlanguage production that was influenced by NL is the missing article as can be seen in examples (24) to (26).

(24) He walk to <u>front office</u>
(25) He came to <u>hotel</u>
(26) John want to invite his friend to <u>restaurant.</u>

Data (24), (25), and (26) showing that there were some incorrect patterns of utterances delivered by the speakers. Those incorrect patterns can be seen from the missing article of the utterances. The utterances in data (24) to (26) missed the article "the" before noun 'front office', 'hotel', and 'restaurant'. It reflects on the students' NL influences on their speech production.

There are two possible causes of the utterances; firstly it is because the students' grammar mastery is not enriched yet. In Indonesian, the students are taught about articles that exist in a sentence or utterance to form a communicative utterance or sentence. As in English, there are some such articles patterns exist in Indonesian, namely:

sebuah = a/an for things
seekor = a/an for animals
nya = the for noun

In English, whenever an article followed by a word that begins with vocal letters, then the article used must be 'an'. If it is followed by a word that begins with consonant letters, the article used must be 'a'. The least, if a specific word has been mentioned before, the article used referring the word is 'the' and the rule applied for public places, cities, and countries. The use of articles in Indonesian does not contain specific rules as in English as what has been explained. Besides, in colloquial Indonesian, articles are commonly ommited.

For the foreign language learners, the possibility of the students still following their first language patterns is high. The result of the pre-observation supports that the students often communicate using Indonesian outside the classroom setting. The habit of using their L1 patterns still strongly exists and was reflected in their utterances. Those utterances do not reflect the use of articles. The students were confused. They know the use of articles in the L1 is without the existence of specific rules like in English. That is why when the students are asked to make the TL utterance; the students faced confusion with forming utterance. As the anxiety-filled the air when they produced the utterances, students chose not to insert any kind of articles in their utterances.

Secondly, the ill-formed utterances were caused by the students' lack of fluency. In this context, the students probably have been familiar with the usage of articles in English. But, they did not master it yet. The hesitancy appeared when they started producing utterances. The condition was the students have known the article usage; they wanted to use the rules in producing utterances; but because of their lack of mastery about the rules which was the reflection of lack of fluency as well, they decided not to apply the rules in their utterances.

Interlanguage speech produced by the students is also available in a passive voice.

(27) and the man <u>are</u> taken for office
(28) the luggage <u>was bring</u> to the guest's room

(29) then, the key <u>are given</u> to the guest

Data (27), (28), and (29) with utterance 'the man <u>are</u> taken for office', 'the luggage <u>was bring</u> to the guest's room', and 'then, the key <u>are given</u> to the guest' were syntactically incorrect. In the utterances, the students have a wrong 'to be' to form a passive voice pattern. The word 'are' should be replaced with 'was'. The to be 'was' supposed to be omitted and replaced it by the verb 2, which is 'brought'. Here, the utterances can be seen as the product of the students' incorrect use of to be.

The possible cause of this incorrect utterance is due to the lack of students' understanding of the passive voice. In Indonesian, the students are taught about passive voice patterns. However, in their NL pattern, there was no 'to be' to form a speech considering the subject. Sometimes, it makes students easily not aware of the 'to be' and make mistakes because they may forget about the 'to be' for specific subjects. Thus, the students thought that they could use the 'to be' for all the items. As an addition, the not existed form of plural words also influences the utterance production.

As we can see in data (27) that before the usage of "are", there was spoken the word 'man' which means one man. The students probably had understood already that in English, if you want to put 'are' as the 'to be', you must place a plural subject beforehand. The plural form of 'man' is 'men' which seemed was not a concern of the student. The NL of the student took a prominent part here, wherein Indonesian syntax; the plural form of a noun is said twice. For instance: *laki* which means 'man' becomes *laki-laki* or *wanita* which means 'woman' becomes *wanita-wanita*. The plural pattern of the students' NL shows us that there is no plural inflection in Indonesian. The concept made the students who were not fluent yet in their TL assumed that the word 'man' probably meant plural. It is the reason why the students put 'are' as the 'to be' in this utterance since they did not recognize the plurality rule in English. This unrecognizable pattern of plurality simply influenced the students to produce the misused of 'to be' in their utterance.

Interlanguage production is also observed in the use of plurality. Data (30) to (31) shows how the students use plural forms in their speech.

(30) They are going to buy <u>some suitcase.</u>
(31) His friend tell about <u>some place</u>
(32) He meet the friend, and his friend tell about <u>some interesting destination</u>, like traditional market, restaurant, and harbor.
(33) I will tell you about <u>this pictures.</u>

Data (30) to (33) showed that the students make some incorrect utterances syntactically. It can be seen from the use of some words that show the students miss to put the plural marker 's/es' after the word. The words such as 'suitcase', 'place', 'destination', 'facility' should be added by plural marker such as 'suitcases', 'places', 'destinations', and 'facilities'.

There are two possible causes due to their NL influence on students' speech production based on the utterances found. First of all, it is because Indonesian has no rules about plurality as English does, which after preceding by the plural determiner the word should be added by plural mark such as 's/es'. In Indonesian syntax, the plural form of a noun is said twice. For instance: *laki* which means 'man' becomes *laki-laki* or *wanita*, which means 'woman' becomes *wanita-wanita*. The plural pattern of the students' NL shows us that there is no inflection in Indonesian plural form. In this case, the obvious differences made the students easily forget to add the plural marker beside the confusion to use the correct patterns. In this context or any other similar contexts, the students are often confused by the use of their NL pattern or TL pattern. As a result, the students missed putting their plural markers to form certain utterances. Second, as can be seen in data (33), the students made an error in the use of demonstrative word. In Indonesian, there are only two kinds of demonstrative words, namely *ini* and *itu* which mean 'this/these' and 'that/those'. As can be understood, the two demonstrative words of Indonesian are used for both singular and plural forms. Unlike the Indonesian, the English

demonstrative words are meant to demonstrate singular and plural form individually based on the context. This confusion possibly leads the ill-formed utterances as presented above produced in the students' speech.

The next IL production is the missing of the possessive marker as presented in example (34) to (36).

(34) Take the <u>guest property.</u>
(35) <u>He handed the guest luggage.</u>
(36) <u>He shake his friend hands</u>

The utterances in data (34) to (36) were syntactically incorrect. The utterance did not include the possessive marker when it was spoken. It can be seen that the utterance supposed to mean containing something that belongs to someone (possession), which is the word 'property'. However, the students did not include that mark in their speech production. The correct form of speech should be 'take the <u>guest's property'.</u> The students form their speech due to their NL's influence.

The possible cause is due to the lack of understanding of possession concept in English. It made the students NL took part in forming the speech. In Indonesian, when something belongs to someone, the speech is formed without any markers. For instance: *Buku itu milik Ayu* which means that 'the book is Ayu's'. As can be seen from the example, there is no possessive marker attached in the utterance. The misconception of the rule made the students forget to add the possessive marker in their TL utterances.

3.2 Target Language Influence on Students' Speech Production

Target language (TL) also took a big part in students' speech production as much as the NL does, which has its pattern and structure. In delivering a speech, the influence of the target language can affect the grammar and pattern to form a speech.

In the students' interlanguage production, the students tend to overgeneralize the use of 'to be'. How 'to be ' is used by the students are presented in examples (37) to (43).

(37) This is a man who <u>are</u> visit our hotel
(38) They <u>was</u> to meet to introduce himself
(39) And after that he <u>is</u> take a call to his friend to meet him at the restaurant.
(40) After they <u>are</u> makes reservation
(41) the man <u>were</u> check in for ask about his reservation
(42) After they <u>are</u> makes reservation
(43) the man <u>were</u> check in for ask about his reservation

Data (37) to (43) showed that the forms of speech were incorrect syntactically. It can be seen that students used to be to form a speech although they have to use content verb to form speech. This action belongs to the overgeneralization of 'to be'. The 'to be' such as 'are, was, is, and were' should be omitted. It reflects on students TL influences on students' speech production

Another interlanguage production in which the students' speech is influenced by the target language is the use of articles. The use of articles where is not necessary or wrong use of articles is presented in data (44) to (48).

(44) Then, he check in <u>a</u> receptionist and the receptionist give a key
(45) After that, the bell boy show <u>a</u> room
(46) the receptionist give <u>a</u> room key for the guest
(47) After that, the bell boy show <u>a</u> room

Data (44) to (47) showed that the utterances contain inappropriate use of articles. Data (44) until (47) use the article 'a' in the speech. The context here has already known by both speakers since the speakers have stated certain words (room and key) in the first place of their speeches. Thus, the articles are supposed to be replaced by the article 'the". In English, when someone refers to

something that has been known by both speakers, it should use the article 'the' before thing.

The possible cause is due to the lack of students' understanding of the use of article in forming a speech. In English, some articles can be used to form a speech. The students face great confusion to choose the appropriate article to be used in their speech. Or, the students were overgeneralizing the use of the article. The students have a lack understanding of the rules of an article in English, which results in them to overgeneralize their knowledge in it. They thought that the essence of the articles was all the same, without realizing that specific rules must be looked into before using them. As a result, students choose the inappropriate article in forming their speech.

Interlanguage is also observed in the use of preposition.

(48) The officer give the key <u>with</u> the man.
(49) The man <u>at</u> front of the hotel

Data (48) and (49) showed the incorrectness of syntax due to the use of the preposition. The proposition 'with' should be replaced with 'to". Meanwhile, the preposition of 'at' should be replaced by 'in'. In this case, the students' TL influenced their speech production.

The possible cause is due to the lack of students' grammar, especially on the preposition. In English, there is a rule to use an appropriate preposition. Prepositions can be to tell place, year, etc. However, some should be paired well such as 'in front of' it should be with a preposition 'in'. In this case, students face confusion to define which preposition should be suitable for the word. As a result, students pair them incorrectly.

Overgeneralization use of the article 'the' is also found in the students' speech.

(50) the guest came to a place for <u>the</u> holiday
(51) the man bring <u>the his</u> friend into the hotel
(52) the man and his friend visited some <u>the</u> places

Utterances (50), (51) and (52) were incorrect in syntax. The utterances should omit the article 'the' after the word. It is because after preposition for it should be followed by 'noun'. The word 'the' is not a noun; therefore, it should be omitted. This incorrect form can be caused by the influence of students' TL on their production.
The possible cause is due to the lack of students' grammar, especially in using the article. In English, there is a rule for using a preposition. Notably, the preposition 'for' should be followed by a noun, and the article does not follow it. That's why the utterances are incorrect.

It can be concluded that their TL influences those incorrect forms above in forming a speech. It is in line with a study conducted by Fauzati (2017) that found out that TL grammar influence on students' production. That's why some students make mistakes with their grammar and use inappropriate choice to form a speech.

3.2. Discussion

The present study has proved an empirical study towards NL and TL influence on the students' speech production. Once, Selinker (1997), Ellis & Barkhuizen (2005), Gass and Selinker (2008), and Saville-Troike (2012) have discussed a theory about interlanguage which emphasized that L2 learners can recreate some utterances/sentences which are belonged to neither NL nor TL but influenced by them. The present study has been successfully proved the theory.

In line with the finding of Choroleeva (2009), Watcharapunyawong and Usaha (2013), Solano et al. (2014), Pudin et al. (2015), Owu-Ewie & Lomotey (2016), and Fauziati (2017), the study found that if not on the composition, the NL has found to be significantly influenced the speech production of the students but only in the grammatical aspect. The result of the study does not show any lexical aspect of interlanguage that the students produced. The researcher believes that the students' level of English caused this. Since the subjects of the research were vocational college students, the level of their English must have been

enhanced quite enough for not being interfered with by the NL and TL lexical aspect in their interlanguage production.

Corresponding to Falhasiri et al. (2011), Qaid (2011), Kaweera (2013), Na-Pukhet and Normah's (2015), and Fauziati (2017), the present research also proved that TL also took a significant influence on the students' interlanguage production at the grammatical aspect. Again, the lexical aspect had not been found due to the students' English level circumstances.

The data of the present study shows that most NL influence occurred on verb tenses, particularly the use of verb 1, 2, and 3. Meanwhile, most TL influence occurred on the use of 'to be' and the use of the article. It infers that grammar and becomes the most significant obstacle the Indonesian EFL learners faced in learning English. The similar empirical was shown by Kaweera (2013) and Na-Phuket (2015). They found their NL and TL influenced the students' interlanguage in English composition.

The NL influence on the students' IL commonly occurred on the verb tenses. The data shows us that the use of English verbs was a significant learning difficulty faced by the students. The students confused how and when to use those verbs. They did not use the form of verbs correctly. It might happen because Indonesian does not have tenses. It is in line with Fauziati (2017) who found out that the verb tenses are the significant errors that occurred in the students' composition production. Bardovi-Harlig (2000) also stated that it is common for EFL learners to make mistakes, especially Indonesian students because tenses in English are considered as one of the most complicated grammatical aspects faced mostly by EFL learners.

4. Conclusion

Several lines can be drawn from the present study. First, the study strengthens the previous empirical findings that both NL and TL influence the students' IL production. The ownership of the two languages (Indonesian and English) caused the influence. The students wanted to express ideas in English. However, lacking grammar competence in their TL and their shared knowledge about their NL influenced IL production. Second, the significant influence of their NL was in the use of verb tenses. It implies a condition where students tend to rely on the knowledge of their NL. Besides, it shows their limited understanding of the tenses system in English as their TL. Third, the major influence of their TL was the use of 'to be', and the use of an article that shows mastery in their TL grammar. Fourth, the non- existence of the lexical errors found in the students' IL production. This might happened due to the students' mastery in the context. As has been explained, the subjects of the study were vocational students who concern about the hotelier and tourism. Since it is a case study, the conclusions drawn are not intended for generalization.

References

Adnyani, N. L. P. S., Beratha, N. L. S., Pastika, I. W., and Suparwa, I. N. (2018). The Development of verbal morphology and word order in an Indonesian-German bilingual child: A case study. *Topics in Linguistics,* vol.19, no.1, pp.33-53.

Afiana, D., Fauziati, E., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). Permeability of Students' Interlanguage: A Case Study on Indonesian Students Learning English as a Foreign language. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, Volume 8, Issue 11*.

Akmal. (2018). The Effect of Role-Play Method in English Speaking Skill. *Journal of Science and Social Research.*I (1): 48-52.

Ariyanti, A. (2016). Psychological Factors Affecting EFL Students' Speaking Performance. *ASIAN TEFL, Volume 1, Issue 1*.

Asikin, N. A. (2017). The Analysis Of Interlanguage Produced By 3rd Grade High School Students in

Narrative Writing Text. *Indonesian EFL Journal, Vol. 3(1).*

Aziez, F. (2016). An Analysis of Interlanguage Performed By Students of An Islamic Boarding School in Tasikmalaya. *ELT Perspective 4(2).*

Baker, M. (1992). *In other word: A course book on translation. London and New York: Routledge.*

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). *Tense and aspect in second language acquisition: Form meaning and use.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Bogdan, Robert C. & Biklen, Sari Knopp. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Brown, H.D. (1994) *Teaching by principles: interactive language teaching methodology.* New York: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Teaching the Spoken Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choroleeva, K. (2009). Language transfer: Types of linguistics errors committed by francophone learning English as a second foreign language . *Humanizing Language Teaching*, *11* (5), 110-123.

Ciesielkiewicz, M., & Márquez, E. (2015). Error Analysis and Its Relevance to Teaching ESL Composition . *International Journal of Linguistics ISSN 1948-5425, Vol. 7, No. 5 .*

Creswell, John W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions. Thousand Oaks,* California: SAGE Publication Inc.

Ellis, R. (2006). Second Language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). Analysing learner language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fauziati, E. (2017). Native And Target languageInfluence on The Students' Interlanguage Production: A Case Of Indonesian EFL Compositions . *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol. 7 No. 1.*

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd Edition). New York: Routledge.

Gay, L. R. Mills, Geoffrey E, & Airasian, Peter. (2006). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications.* Colombus: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Hosseini, S. S., and Sangani, H. R. (2015). Studying The Pre-Intermediate Iranian EL Learners' Interlanguage And The Contribution Of Their Innate System To The Development Of Their Oral Communicative Proficiency. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences 192 (2015) 408-418.*

Huang, Q. (2009). Probe into the Internal Mechanism of Interlanguage Fossilization. *English Language Teaching*, *2*, 75–77.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). "On Communicative Competence" In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings.* Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, pp. 269-293.(Part 2).

James, C. (2014). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis: Applied linguistics and language study series.* London: Routladge.

Kaweera, C. (2003). Writing error: A review of interlingual and intralingual interference in EFL context. *English Language Teaching. 6*(7), 9-18.

Khorshidi, H. R., & Nimchahi, A. B. (2013). Motivation and Interlanguage Pragmatics in Iranian English Language Learners. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(6), 86–96. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n6p86

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Leong, L. M., and Ahmadi, S. M. (2017). An Analysis

of Factors Influencing Learners' English Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Research in English Education*

Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Mahmood, A. H., Mohammed, I., & Murad, A. (2018). Approaching the Language of the Second Language Learner : Interlanguage and the Models Before. *English*, *11*(10), 95–108. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n10p95

Na-Phuket, P.R. & Normah, B.O. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(32), 99-106.

Nunan, D. (1989). Designing Task for The Communicative Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning.* Heinle&Heinle Publishers: An International Thompson Publishing Company, Boston, Massachusetts 02116 USA

O'Grady, W., Debrovolsky, M., & Katamba, F. (2002). *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patton, Michael Quinn. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods: Second Edition.* California: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Pudin, C. S. J., Storey, J.M., Len, L.Y., Swanto, S. Din, W. A. (2015). Exploring L1 interference in the writings of Kadasandusun ESL students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(7), pp. 54-62.

Qaid, Y. A. (2011). Analysis of intralingual errors in learning English as a foreign language by Yemeni students. *Language in India, 11,*534-543.

Ravesh Mahmoudi, M., & Tabrizi Heidari, H. (2017). The Effect of Teaching Interlanguage Pragmatics on Interpretation Ability of Iranian Translation Students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *8*(3). https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.3p.44

Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Saville-Troike, M. (2012). *Introducing second language acquisition.* Cambridge: C.U.P.

Selinker, L. (1997). *Rediscovering interlanguage.* London: Longman.

Shinta, Y., Rukmini, D., & Fitriati, S. W. (2018). Children's Production of Interlanguage in Speaking English As The Foreign language. *English Education Journal*.

Soriente, A., 2014. Language development of bilingual children: A case study in the acquisition of tense and aspect in an Italian-Indonesian child. *Wacana,* vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 132-15.

Sykes, J. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics : Explicit and comprehensive. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(2), 381–402. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.9

Tahseldar, M., Kanso, S., & Sabra, Y. (2018). The Effect of Interlanguage and Arabic Verb System on Producing Present Perfect by EFL Learners. *International Journal of New Technology and Research Volume-4, Issue*.

Tuan, N., H., & Mai, T., N. (2015). Factors Affecting Students' Speaking Performance At Le Thanh Hien High School. *Asian Journal of Educational Research Volume 3, Issue 2.*

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in Language Teaching. Practice and Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watcharapunyawong, S. & Usaha, S. (2012). Thai EFL students' writing errors in different text types: The interference of first language. *English Language Teaching, 6*(1), 67-78.