

INTERLINGUAL AND INTRALINGUAL ERRORS IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT MADE BY JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Andini Puji Pratiwi

Akademi Kesehatan Dinas Provinsi Riau Pematang Reba Rengat Riau

Email: andini.pujipratiwi@yahoo.com

Mobile Phone: 085211329229

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini berkenaan dengan tipe tipe kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual yang dibuat oleh siswa SMP dan SMA dalam menulis teks naratif. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah sebagai berikut: (1) memaparkan jenis kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual di SMP dan SMA, (2) mendeskripsikan frekuensi kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual di SMP dan SMA, dan (3) memaparkan persamaan dan perbedaan dari kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual di SMP dan SMA. Subyek penelitian ini terdiri 35 siswa SMP kelas sembilan dan 35 siswa SMA sekolah kelas X di Pekanbaru, Riau. Data dikumpulkan lewat dokumentasi dan dianalisis secara deskriptif dengan menggunakan metode analisis kesalahan berbahasa. Temuan penelitian ini menunjukkan: (1) jenis kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual dibuat oleh SMP dan SMA dibagi menjadi 2 tingkat, mereka tingkat morfologi dan tingkat sintaksis; (2) frekuensi kesalahan interlingual oleh siswa SMP adalah 27,82% dan siswa SMA 14,04%. Frekuensi kesalahan kesalahan intralingual oleh siswa SMP 72,17% dan siswa SMA 85,96%; dan (3) Kesamaan kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual ditemukan di SMP dan SMA ada 2 jenis di tingkat morfologi dan 2 jenis di tingkat sintaksis. Perbedaan kesalahan interlingual dan intralingual ditemukan di SMP dan SMA adalah satu pada tingkat morfologi dan 11 jenis di tingkat sintaksis.

Kata Kunci: *analisis kesalahan, kesalahan interlingual, kesalahan intralingual, teks naratif*

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the interference of L1 (Indonesian) into L2 (English) and the errors that occur due to the influence of TL (target language). The focus of the study is on the errors committed by these EFL learners in writing narrative text and emphasized on interlingual and intralingual errors. The objectives of the study are to investigate the errors committed by these EFL learners in order to find out; (1) the types of interlingual and intralingual errors in Junior High School and Senior High School, (2) frequencies of interlingual and intralingual errors in Junior High School and Senior High School, and (3) similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors in Junior High School and Senior High School. To achieve these objectives, writing test was utilized in this study. The subjects of the study comprised 35 of ninth graders and 35 tenth graders in Pekanbaru, Riau. The findings of the study suggest: (1) The types of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior

High school and Senior High School divided into 2 levels, they are morphological level and syntactical level; (2) the frequency of interlingual errors in Junior High School 27,82% and 14,04% in Senior High School. The frequency of intralingual errors in Junior High School 72,17% and 85,96% in Senior High School; and (3) The similarities of interlingual and intralingual errors found in Junior High School and Senior High School are 2 types in morphological level and 2 types in syntactical level. The differences of interlingual and intralingual errors found in Junior High School and Senior High School are 1 type in morphological level and 11 types in syntactical level.

Keywords: *error analysis, interlingual error, intralingual error, narrative text*

INTRODUCTION

Writing is the most difficult skill because it requires demonstration of the control of a number of variables simultaneously, namely the content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation spelling, etc. Writing is a skill which gives the students experience in written language. Caswell and Mahler (2004: 3) defined that writing is a vehicle for communication and a skill mandated in all aspects of life. From that statement, the role of writing is as important as the other skill. Writing almost used in all aspect of life. People almost every day write something in their life. They use it to communicate in a written form. And writing as a process of putting idea down on paper to transform thoughts into words, to sharp main ideas, and to give structure and coherence organization into the writing. For the students, writing in English is hard for them to apply, when they write about something, they use different structure spelling, pronunciation, vocabulary, and word formation and so on. Meanwhile, Brown (2000) stated that human learning is fundamentally a process that involves the making mistakes. Error and mistake are something normal in language learning process. Errors should not be viewed as something undesirable or something to be avoided as they give feedback to language researchers and language teachers.

There are many aspects that cause the learners of English as a foreign language make errors. Brown (1980: 160) said that the learners' errors in the second language result from the learner's assumption that the second language forms are similar to the native language (interlingual errors) and the negative transfer of items within the target language (intralingual errors). The aim of this paper is to identify and describe students make errors in interlingual and intralingual. It is also intended to draw teacher's attention on the situation of our students because it is necessary to determine the areas that require remedy in order to think of appropriate solutions.

In the 1950s the behaviourist learning theory described language as habit formation and explained why second or foreign language learners made errors. According to that theory, old habits hinder or facilitate new habits. There was the danger of errors becoming habits if they were tolerated so, they should be avoided. According to the cognitive approach, the making of errors is inevitable and a necessary part of learning. Chomsky (1998) confirmed that errors are unavoidable and a necessary part of learning. They are visible proof that learning is taking place. Thus, Corder (2000) proposed that not only language learners necessarily produce errors when communicating in a foreign language, but these errors, if studied systematically can provide insight into how languages are learnt. He also agrees that studying students' errors of usage has immediate practical application for language teachers. Candling (2001) considered EA as the monitoring and analysis of learners language. Error analysis can be used to determine

what a learner still needs to be taught. It provides necessary information about what is lacking in his or her competence. Weireech (1991) also considered learners' errors to be of particular importance because making errors is a device the learners use in order to learn. According to him EA is a valuable aid to identify and explain difficulties faced by learners. He goes on to say that EA serves as a reliable feedback to the design of a remedial teaching method. Conducting error analysis is therefore one of the best ways to describe and explain errors committed by L2 learners. This kind of analysis can reveal the sources of these errors and the causes of their frequent occurrence. Once the sources and causes are revealed, it is possible to determine the remedy, as well as the emphasis and sequence of future instructions.

Indonesia is a countries where English is taught as a foreign language. As a result, learners commit serious errors due to the interference (interlingual transfer) from their L1 and the negative transfer of items within the target language (intralingual errors).

There have been many relevant studies conducted previously. Abisamra (2003) in her error analyses study of Arab English learners found that 35.9% of errors were of Interlingual errors while 64.1% were Intralingual. They found that the highest percentage of transfer errors was in semantics & lexis, and as for the highest percentage of developmental errors, it was, by far, in substance (mainly spelling). Other studies by George (1972, Richards (1971), and Brudhiprabha (1972) also found that only one-third of the second language learners' errors can be attributed to native language transfer.

Al-Khresheh (2010) stated that interlingual errors committed by the result of word-for-word translation (literal translation) from Arabic, namely standard Arabic (SA) and non-standard Arabic (NSA) structures. In a study conducted by Pebrianti, Nitiasih, Dambayana (2013), they found that there were total 749 errors committed by the students in their writing. The type of error that most frequently occurred in student writings was intralingual error with 445 occurrences or 59.42%. Meanwhile interlingual error was 304 occurrences or 40.58%. The causes of students errors were mostly their limited experience about the target language as they were in the process of mastering English and they were not familiar with sentence structures of English so that they preferred to use their mother tongue in constructing the sentences.

In a study conducted by Chelli (2013), she found that the students' errors in the using of preposition and article can be identify into interlingual and intralingual errors. The result can be seen that 79.15% of the errors made in preposition and 72.85% in articles are caused by negative transfer of the Arabic language. 20,85% in the use of prepositions and 27,15% in the use of articles are due to overgeneralization and false concepts hypothesized mainly because of lack of practice.

Generally, in reviewing some studies conducted sources of the grammatical errors on intralingual, interlingual, context of learning and communication strategies factors. Wicaksono (2014) stated that the highest percentage of the cause of errors made by the students is in interlingual transfer in which there were 85 % students answered that the sources of the errors are from their mother tongue transfer. The students were influenced by the grammatical structure of native language (Indonesia) in making sentence in English. It is suggested that the English teachers not translated the part of the sentences one by one as it caused the students get confused and make the errors.

In conclusion, this study differs from previous studies as it aims to describe intralingual and interlingual errors and its implementation. Therefore, it may offer plausible explanations of the occurrence of interlingual and intralingual errors based essentially on Contrastive Analysis (CA). Unlike other studies which have been conducted earlier that focused on the effects of intralingual interference, performance errors, and overgeneralization errors in the acquisition of English, the present study focuses mainly on interlingual and intralingual errors.

Furthermore, this study could be considered novel for two main reasons. First, the findings of this study can be implications for teaching methodology. The second one, the findings also may lead to recommendations that will improve the level of EFL teaching-learning process in beginner and intermediate students in Pekanbaru.

In order to analyze learners' errors in a proper perspective, it is crucial to make a distinction between mistake and error. To distinguish between these two concepts, Ellis (1997) suggests two ways: the first one is to check the consistency of the learner's performance. If he sometimes uses the correct form and sometimes the wrong one, it is a mistake. However, if he always uses it incorrectly, it is an error. According to Brown (2000), a mistake refers to a performance error in that it is, a failure to utilize a known system correctly while, an error is a noticeable deviation from adult grammar of a native speaker reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learner.

Interference, language transfer, and cross-linguistic interference are also known as interlingual errors. Corder (1981) stated that these kinds of errors occur when the learner's habits (patterns, systems, or rules) interfere or prevent him or her, to some extent, from acquiring the patterns and rules of the second language. Lado (1964) said Interference (negative transfer) is negative influence of the mother tongue (L1) on the performance of the target language (L2). Chelli (2013) defined that interlingual errors as being the result of language transfer, which is caused by learner's first language.

Richard (1974: 173) states if the learners of a foreign language make mistake in the target language by effect of his mother tongue that is called as interlingual. As stated by Brown (1980: 160), most of the learners' errors in the second language result primarily from the learner's assumption that the second language forms are similar to the native language.

According to Allen and Corder (1974), Interlingual errors caused of transfer error. Touchie (1986) suggested that interlingual errors caused mainly by mother tongue interference. While Al- Khresheh (2010) suggested that interlingual errors are committed by literal translation as follows: (1) Transfer Error: error caused by interference from mother tongue. A student who has not known the rules of target language will use the same rules as he obtained in his native language; (2) Mother tongue Interference: errors are produced in the learners' attempt to discover the structure of the target language rather than transferring models of their first language; and (3) Literal Translation: errors happens because a student translates his first language sentence or idiomatic expression in to the target language word by word.

Interference from the student's own language is not the only reason for committing errors. Students may make mistake in the target language, since they do not know the target language very well, they have difficulties in using it. Richard (1974: 6) states, intralingual interference refers to items produced by learner, which reflect not the structure of mother tongue, but generalization based on partial exposure of the target language.

Brown (1980: 162) said that it has been found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interlingual transfer, but once that learner has begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more transfer generalization within the target language is manifested.

Richard (1974: 120) classifies the intralingual errors into four categories including over generalization, ignorance of rule restrictions, incomplete application of the rules, and false concept hypothesized or semantic errors as follows: (1) Overgeneralization: it happens when a learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structure in the target language; (2) Ignorance of Rule Restrictions: James (1998: 63) that ignorance is specific in the sense that one is normally said to be ignorant of structure; the learner of the second language does not obey the structure of the target language. In this type of error, the learner fails to observe the

restrictions of existing structures. Some rule restriction errors may be accounted for in terms of analogy and may result from the role learning of rules; (3) Incomplete Application of the Rules: this error may occur when learner fails to apply the rules completely due to the stimulus sentence; and (4) False Concept Hypothesized: learners' faulty understanding of distinctions of target language items leads to false conceptualization. Learners' faulty understanding of distinctions of target language items leads to false concept hypothesized.

RESEARCH METHOD

A quantitative descriptive method was used to investigate the types, frequency, similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors in writing narrative text made by Junior High School and Senior High School. The subjects of this study were the third grade in SMP N 4 Pekanbaru and the first grade in SMA Plus Pekanbaru. The researcher took the data in the IX 1 class, the total number of students is 30 students which consist of 12 boys and 18 girls and the researcher take the data in the X 1 class, the total number of students is 30 students which consist of 11 boys and 19 girls. The data sources were 70 students' English composition written productions by the third grade students of SMP Negeri 4 Pekanbaru and the first grade students of SMA Plus Pekanbaru in academic 2014/2015.

The data are in the form of erroneous sentences taken from students' compositions. The procedure in collecting data is as follows: (1) the researcher distributed the papers to all students; (2) they had to make composition in form of narrative text writing; (3) the students were ordered to compose the narrative text writing. The text should consist minimally three paragraphs and it has at least 150 words. The writing task was chosen as the instrument of the research since it requires the students to organize their own idea and express in their own words. Then the researcher asked the students to write a narrative text telling story that they know; (4) when the students finished their writing, the papers were collected and then the writer analyzed them. The technique of data analysis used in this research is descriptive qualitative, using error analysis as a frame work.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The data of interlingual and intralingual errors are presented in two head categories, morphological level and syntactical level. Interlingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School are in turn divided into 6 subcategories and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School are in turn divided into 13 subcategories. The types of interlingual errors made by Junior High school are: (1) wrong word spelling, (2) omission of auxiliary past tense (did) in negative sentences, (3) omission of BE (was/were) in nominal sentences, and (4) the use of L1 structures. The types of interlingual errors made by Senior High school are: (1) wrong word spelling, and (2) the use of L1 structures.

The types of intralingual errors made by Junior High school are: (1) omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event, (2) the use of BE (is) in past tense, (3) omission of indefinite article (a/an), (4) the use of V₋₁ in past event, (5) omission of preposition, and (6) misselection of pronoun. The types of intralingual errors made by Senior High school are: (1) omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event, (2) omission of bound morpheme (-s/-es), (3) additional BE (is) in past tense, and (4) additional BE (were/was) before verb II, (5) omission of BE (was/were) in past event, (6) the use of V₋₁ in past event, and (7) the use of V₋₁ in past perfect event. Which follows are the description and explanation of each component.

1. Wrong Word Spelling

Spelling is writing or starting the letters and diacritics of a word. Words generally have accepted standard spellings which can vary regionally or nationally. In the sense of standard, spelling is one of the elements of orthography and a perspective element of alphabetic language. The Indonesian spelling system is written in the Latin alphabet; the spelling is phonetically precise, as the words are spelled as they sound. It is the consistency in the one-on-one relationship between sound and symbol that make reading and writing the language relatively easy and simple.

The English spelling system is an alphabet and it is one of the most irregular spelling systems in current use. The spelling of the word in the source language was often maintained, leading to such inconsistencies as using to spell both /s/, as in city, and /k/, as in coma. According to the explanation above, there are some factors which influenced students' errors in English spelling system; (1) Different pronunciation from writing (Commonly confused words) as example; complement, (2) the same sound but different of words (Homophones) as example; maskot/ mascot, (3) Pronunciation of letters in the words are confusing as example; enough /f/.

Wrong spelling is classified as morphological level. It happened when a word had been spelled in wrong way. There were some words that were frequently misspelled. It could occur when the students were confused to differentiate between their mother tongue (L1) and their target language (L2). There were some examples of misspelled, such as “*concensus*” for consensus, “*equptment*” for equipment, “*experiench*” for experience etc. The result of analysis indicates errors in this case, as follows:

- 1) IL: Prince have *karismatik*
- 2) IL: The box was full of gold *koin*
- 3) IL: her sisters *klaim* that a shoe is hers
- 4) IL: She used *aksesori* in her neck
- 5) IL: She was very *glamor*

2. Omission of Auxiliary Past Tense (did) in Negative Sentences

A negative sentence (or statement) states that something is not true or incorrect. A negative adverb has to be added in order to negate the validity of the sentence. In English, in order to claim that something is not true, you form a negative sentence by adding the word not after the first auxiliary verb in the positive sentence. If there is no auxiliary verb in the positive sentence, as in the Present Simple and Past Simple tenses, then you add one (in both these cases, the auxiliary verb did). Example of negative sentence in English: I *did not* come to school yesterday

Whereas, in Indonesian, a negative sentence can be built by adding word *not (tidak)* to a noun, an adjective, a prepositional phrase or a numeral to complement the subject. There is no verb ‘to be’ in Indonesian. For instance, negative sentence in Indonesia: “I not go to school yesterday (Saya *tidak* pergi ke sekolah kemarin)”.

Omission error of be as auxiliary past tense mean the students had neglected be as modal auxiliary in the form of negative past tense. Omitting be as negative past tense marker mean that the students neglected to put be (did) in the prior of not + V I. During analysing the data, the writer found errors in this case, as follows:

- 1) IL: *Prince not believe* about that.
- 2) IL: He *not kill* the dog
- 3) IL: He *not want* in home
- 4) IL: A fox *not kill* the cat
- 5) IL: He *not tell* her

3. Omission of BE (was/were) in Nominal Sentences

The form of the verb “to be” includes: is, am, are, be, being, has been, may be, was, and were. ‘Be’ used after some nouns to describe the person that someone will soon be or the position that they will soon have. A native English prefix formerly used in the formation of verbs: befell, becalm, bedaub. The principal use of a copula is to link the subject of a clause to the predicate. A copular verb is often considered to be part of the predicate, the remainder being called a predicate expression. A simple clause copula containing a copula is illustrated: She *was* a princess.

In this English sentence, the noun phrase she is the subject, the verb serves as the copula, and the prepositional phrase a princess is the predicate expression. The whole expression is a princess can be called a predicate or a verb phrase. The predicate expression accompanying the copula which was also known as the complement of the copula may take any of several possible forms: for instance, a noun or noun phrase, an adjective or adjective phrase, a prepositional phrase (as above) or another adverb or adverbial phrase expressing time or location. This is an example of negative sentence in the past tense: She *was not* ugly girl.

Whereas, in Indonesian, a simple sentence can be built by adding a noun, an adjective, a prepositional phrase or a numeral to complement the subject. There is no verb ‘to be’ in Indonesian. Example negative sentence in Indonesia: I *not go* to school yesterday (Saya *tidak* pergi ke sekolah kemarin).

Omission error of “be” past tense means the students had neglected be in the form of negative past tense. Omitting be as negative past tense marker mean that the students neglected to put be (was/were) in the prior of not + complement. The writer found errors that had been made by Junior high school students in this case, as follows:

- 1) IL: Because the prince’s heart *not good* with her.
- 2) IL: He also warned the couple *not arrogant*.
- 3) IL: The man *not wise and humble*.
- 4) IL: Finally, she *not ugly*.
- 5) IL: He remained the couple *not lie*.

4. The Use of L1 Structures

Grammatically, Indonesian is simple. It does not have patterns reflecting time, word flexion relating to subject, object, location and others. Basically, all events are expressed with the same pattern and the same words. To indicate time it uses word of time such as yesterday, tomorrow, 2 minutes ago and others. To indicate plurality just put word “*banyak*” means many or “*sedikit*” mean small number or appoint fixed number for definite plurality. For example: *Siswa kelas IX akan pergi ke bali bulan depan*.

Meanwhile, grammatically English is very complex. In English the verb “to be” (is, am, are) is completely absent in Indonesian. English has special certain rule to use adjective. For example: in English “I have a *beautiful large* house”, the sentence should be translated in Indonesian, “*Saya punya sebuah rumah besar yang cantik*”. But the student makes error to transfer L1 to L2, for example: “I have a *house big beautiful*.”

According to Pudiyono (2012: 6), the structure of Indonesian language can influence students’ English. It is like the following sentence: *Dia sangat menyukai buah-buahan*. With such grammatical pattern as the example, an Indonesian learner of English would be capable to express the idea just like in Indonesian pattern as the following: “*She very like fruits*”. Definitely, this utterance is not grammatically acceptable in English. The correct grammatical rule is the word very cannot be used to explain a verb such very loves. Very in English is used to modify an adjective.

In this case, the writer found the use of Indonesian structure in written productions. Errors are caused by language transfer. A student does not know the rules of target language uses the same rules of his native language. Based on the data, the writer found errors in this case, as follows:

- 1) IL: He *then* married Cinderella
L1: *Dia kemudian....*
- 2) IL: They *then* went to the house
L1: *Mereka kemudian...*
- 3) IL: Dewi Walangangin *yet* marry
L1: *...belum menikah*
- 4) IL: Prince *man very handsome*
L1: *...lelaki yang sangat tampan*
- 5) IL: He *man very poor*
L1: *...lelaki yang sangat miskin*

Table 1: The Comparison of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors Made by Junior High School and Senior High School Students

Types of Interlingual and intralingual Errors	Junior High school		Senior High School	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Morphological Level:				
(1) Wrong word spelling	5	15,62%	5	31,25%
(2) Omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event	25	30,12%	15	15,3%
(3) Omission of bound morpheme (-s/-es)	-	-	5	5,1%
Syntactical Level:				
(1) Omission of auxiliary past tense (did) in negative sentences	10	31,25%	-	-
(2) Omission of BE (was/were) in nominal sentences	5	15,62%	-	-
(3) The use of L1 structures.	12	37,5%	11	68,75%
(4) The use of BE (is) in past tense	20	24,09%	-	-
(5) Omission of indefinite article (a/an)	8	9,63%	-	-
(6) The use of V- ₁ in past event	20	24,09%	20	20,40%
(7) Omission of preposition	5	6,02%	-	-
(8) Misselection of pronoun	5	6,02%	-	-
(9) Additional BE (is) in past tense	-	-	13	13,26%

(10) Additional BE (were/was) before verb II	-	-	10	10,20%
(11) Omission of BE (was/were) in past event	-	-	20	20,40%
(12) The use of V ₋₁ in past perfect event	-	-	15	15,3%

From table above, there are some similarities and differences of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School students. The similarities of interlingual and intralingual errors found by researcher are as follows: wrong word spelling, the use of L1 structures, the use of V₋₁ in past event, and omission of suffix (-ed) in regular past event.

The researcher found the differences of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School students as follow: Omission of auxiliary past tense (did) in negative sentences, omission of BE (was/were) in nominal sentences, the use of BE (is) in past tense, omission of indefinite article (a/an), omission of preposition, and misselection of pronoun in Junior High School, it did not find in Senior high School students composition. The errors that found in Senior High School, are: Omission of bound morpheme (-s/-es), additional ‘be present (is) in past tense, additional ‘be past tense (were/was) in before verb II, omission of to be past tense (was/were) in past event, and the use of V₋₁ in past perfect event. These errors did not exist in Junior high School students composition. Some types of errors exist in Junior High School and in Senior High School are different because the students of Senior High School get more knowledge of grammar than the students of Junior High School.

Table 2: The frequent of Interlingual and Intralingual Errors Made by Junior High School and Senior High School Students

Types of Errors	Junior High School		Senior High School	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Interlingual	32	27,82%	16	14,04%
Intralingual	83	72,17%	98	85,96%

From table frequent of interlingual and intralingual errors made by Junior High School and Senior High School students above, the most frequent errors are on intralingual. It is due to overgeneralization and incomplete application of language rules.

CONCLUSION

This study confirmed that the learners make a large number of errors in most errors in Junior High School and Senior High School students is intralingual errors. The students’ errors in interlingual were influenced by the use of L1 structure in making sentence in English (literal translation). The students’ errors in intralingual were due to overgeneralization and incomplete application of rule. There might be other causes, but they are not the focus of this study. So, being aware of the causes of learners’ idiosyncrasies might indicate pedagogical practice and

determine the approach to be adopted. On these grounds, the writer suggests that the teacher can solve the problem by giving the explicit and implicit corrective feedback and remedial teaching programmed to the students.

REFERENCE

- Abisamra, N. 2003. "An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speakers' English Writings." As retrieved From <http://abisamra03.tripod.com/nada/languageacq-erroranalysis.html>
- Al- Khresheh, M. H. 2010. "Interlingual Interference in English Language Word Order Structure of Jordanian EFL Learners". *Proceedings of the European Journal of Social Sciences*-Volume 16, Number 1
- Brown, H, Douglass. 1980. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- _____. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching: Fourth edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brudhiprabha, P. 1972. *Error Analysis: a Psycholinguistic Study of Thai English Compositions*. Thesis (M.A.): McGill University
- Candling, R. B. 2001. *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Caswell, Roger. & Mahler, Brenda. 2004. *Strategies for Teaching Writing*. United States of America: ASCD (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development)
- Chelli, Saliha. 2013. "Interlingual and Intralingual Errors in the Use of Preposition and Articles". As retrieved <http://dspace.univ-biskra.dz:8080/jspui/bitstream/123456789/3571/1/Interlingual%20or%20Intralingual%20Errors%20in%20the%20Use%20of%20Preposition.pdf>
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. *Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework*. MIT OPL 15. Dept. of Linguistics, MIT.
- Corder, S. P. 1974. *Error Analysis*. In J. P. B. Allen and S. Pit Corder (eds.) *Techniques in Applied Linguistics 3*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1981. *Error and an Interlanguage*. London: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2000. *Error Analysis*. London: Longman Publisher.
- Ellis, R. 1997. *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- George, H.V. 1972. *Common Errors in Language Learning*. Rowley: Massachusetts.
- James, Carl. 1998. *Error in Language Learning and use*. London: Longman.
- Lado, R. 1964. *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach in Students' and its Implications for the Classroom*. Chapter 3 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, Jack, C. 1974. *Error Analysis: Perspective on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- _____. 1974. "A non-contrastive Approach to Error Analysis". *English Language Teaching Journal*, 25, 204-229.
- Touchie, Hanna. 1986. *Second Language Learning Errors Their Types, Causes, and Treatment*. Proceedings of the JALT Journal-Volume 8, Number 1

Weireech, S. 1991. *How to Analyze Interlanguage*. Journal of Psychology and Education. 9:113-22.

Wicaksono, Agung. 2014. "Sources of Grammatical Error: A Case Study on Intralingual, Interlingual, Context of Learning and Communication Strategies Factors." *Proceedings of the Nusantara of Research*-Volume 1, Number 2