

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN INDONESIAN AND ENGLISH DECLARATIVE SENTENCES

Hanif Nurcholish Adiantika

Department of English Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Cirebon
hanifadianika@gmail.com

doi: 10.35706/eltinf.v3i1.3695

To cite this article: Adiantika, H. N. (2020). Contrastive analysis between Indonesian and English declarative sentences. *ELT in Focus*, 3(1), 15-25, doi: 10.35706/eltinf.v3i1.3695

Abstract

The issue of English acquisition in Indonesian context where English is taught as a foreign language has been circulating for years. The presents study aims at contrasting two languages as, Indonesian language as the Source Language (SL) and English as the Target Language (TL). Participants were chosen purposively and generated 10 students of Senior High School. Data were collected through written test. The researcher provides 21 Indonesian declarative sentences as the main instrument. The result of this research was initiated qualitatively. The findings of the study indicate that the similarities of declarative sentence patterns between Indonesia and English language revealed in three categories. They are transitive, bitransitive, and intransitive. Furthermore, the differences are indicated by four categories, those are nominal, adjectival, prepositional, and numeral category. The presents study suggests to initiate the study of contrastive analysis in different languages to obtain deeper understanding and horizon about the language.

Keywords: *contrastive analysis, declarative sentences*

INTRODUCTION

As most foreign or second language (ESL / EFL) language teachers will prove, and as classroom studies show, the influence of the first language (subsequent L1) is evidently or delicately proven in the second language class (later L2) (Sheen, 1996; Spada and Yasuyo, 2010; Spada et al. 2005; Al-khresheh, 2015). However, for scholars or researchers the difficulty is to disguise the interlingual effect of the influence of cognitive, developmental, and other specific variables in the acquisition process. This carefully articulated approach is, of course, initially received because it provides a step-by-step framework for how inter-language capacity can be conducted.

Inside the circumstance of communication to speak to each other, human have the capacity to produce sounds that indicate certain meanings. In another word, the sentence that human utters

whether express a statement, question, command or exclamation depends on the speaker's mood. As Sneddon (1996) states that there four moods identified here are statements, questions, imperatives, and exclamations. Therefore, both speaker and hearer must understand what they actually speak and hear. In addition, concrete fact indicates that the non-native speaker (NSS) still deal with obstructions in learning new language because they commonly transfer their native language habit to the new language (Target Language) (Lightbown & Nina, 2006). It is commonly caused by intervention of the first language system with the second language system (Brown, 2000; Lightbown & Nina, 2006; Al-Khresheh, 2013).

Learning other language requires efforts since there must be some differences with own language instead similarities. That fact leads to concrete obstacles in the

teaching materials of that language, including phonological, lexical, and grammatical materials. In this case, is inside the context of declarative sentences. However, there is a tendency that learners will tend to transfer the foreign language to their own language, as Lado (1957) as cited in Fisiak (1981; 1990) that individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture.

Whereas every language has its own rules, so that fact cause errors occur among the learners (Floranti & Adiantika, Al-Jarf, 2000; Al-Khresheh, 2010, 2011, 2016; Al-Ta'ani, 1986; Elewa, 2004; Faghih, 1997; Gilquin and Magali, 2008; Kharma, 1983; Kharma and Ali, 1989). Moreover, it is good idea to contrast the material which stands for declarative sentences between the languages to investigate their differences (Mattar, 1999; Chao, 2003; Al-khresheh, 2015). Al-Khresheh (2013) delineates that the most efficient materials are those that based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learners.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher tries to reveal a contrastive analysis of the two languages, Indonesian and English especially on the declarative sentence in order to avoid confusion of both speaker and hearer inside the context of sentence transformation. Regarding to the limitation of the problem of this study, this study is limited to the subject matter in analyzing declarative sentence between Indonesian and English language. The researcher compares the pattern of declarative sentence in both languages.

Concerning the limitation of the problem of this study that is to analyze declarative sentence in two languages by comparing the patterns, this study is seeking answers to the following research question: What are the differences and similarities between Indonesian and

English declarative sentences based on Contrastive Analysis?

The significances of the present study are portrayed into two major ways. *Theoretically*, the study is expected to support the existing theory on the same area. *Practically*, the findings of this study are expected to be useful for English learners in acquiring second language especially English is a second language or Target Language (TL).

The goal of contrastive analysis is to predict linguistic difficulties experienced during the acquisition of second language (Mihalache, 2004, 28). Lado (1957) suggest that difficulties in acquiring a new (second) language are derived from the difference between the new language and the native (first) language of a language learner. In this regard, errors potentially made by learners of a second language are predicted from intervention by the native language.

Contrastive analysis is one of the methods that can be used for helping people who learn other language in finding some differences and similarities between source language and target language that usually led to some difficulties in learning process encountered by the learners. As Fisiak (1981) roughly defines that contrastive analysis is a sub discipline of linguistics that deals with the comparison of two or more languages in order to determine both the differences and similarities that hold between them.

Zabrocki as cited in Fisiak (1990) asserts that those contrastive studies are assumed to be a part of applied linguistics and should direct the comparison of two languages toward some specific non-linguistic purpose, such as inference error. It is also in line with the definition found in a glossary of applied linguistics by James (1980) which delineates that contrastive analysis makes comparison between L_x (source language) and L_y (target language).

Most contrastive linguist have either explicitly or implicitly made use of translation a means of establishing cross-linguistic relationships and in his book on

contrastive analysis, James (1980) reaches the conclusion that translation is the best basis of comparison. As the result, technique of translation equivalence is going to be used in this study. Furthermore, by the time learners learn foreign language, they consciously or not would make such translating the message from target language to native language or vice versa. The process must be happened naturally to get comprehension about messages. In this case, the data from the students show their understanding about the sentence that they should convert into target language.

Thus, the researcher uses translation equivalence in analyzing the data, since it is considered as TCs for grammatical studies. James (1980) explains translation equivalence to the best TC for CA, provided it embraces both semantic and pragmatic equivalence.

In this study, the present researcher just put an emphasis on the declarative sentence. Declarative sentence are used to convey information or to make/form

statements. As Sneddon (1996) delineates statements are used when we give information, express and opinion and so on. Statements are sometimes said to be in the declarative mood. They state a fact or an argument. They consist of a subject and a predicate. The subject may be a simple subject or a compound subject. The subject is placed in front of the verb. In the other words, in a declarative sentence the subject and predicate have a normal word order. The sentence ends with a period which is commonly called a full stop in British English, in writing and a drop in pitch in speech. It may take the passive and negative form. In most English declarative sentences, the noun phrase that precedes the verb is the subject, and one that immediately follows the verb is a direct object.

The pattern of declarative sentences in Indonesian language based on Wahya & Wagiati (2011) in their Modul Pemahaman Wacana Bahasa Indonesia is as described in the following table:

Table 1. *The pattern of declarative sentence in Indonesian language*

| Pattern | Example | Types |
|----------|--|---|
| SP | Ayahnya / guru SMA S P (kata benda) | Nominal |
| SP | Gambar itu / bagus S P (kata sifat) | Adjectival |
| SP | Peserta penataran ini / empat puluh orang S P (kata bilangan) | Numeral |
| SP | Dia / didalam mobil S P (kata depan) | Prepositional |
| SP | Anaknya / sedang tidur S P | Verba Intransitive/Intransitive Sentence |
| SPO | Mereka / sedang menyusun / karangan ilmiah S P O | Verbal Mono Transitive/Mono Transitive Sentence |
| SPO pel. | Dia / mengirim / saya / surat S P O pel. | |
| SPO ket. | Dia / memasukan / pakaian / kedalam lemari S P O ket. | Verba Biransitive/Bitransitive Sentence |
| SPO pel. | Dia / memilih / SBY / sebagai presiden S P O pel. | |

In the English Syntax for beginners, Sujatna (2007) explains that there are major clause patterns that indicate declarative sentence patterns, they are as follow:

Table 2. *The pattern of English declarative sentences*

| Pattern | Examples | Types |
|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| S V C | She is a singer S V Cs (noun phrase) | Nominal |
| S V C | She is clever S V Cs (adj. phrase) | Adjectival |
| S V C | He is the third S V CS (noun phrase) | Numeral |
| S V Adverbial | Sheila was at home S V adverbial | Prepositional |
| S V | He snores S V | Verba Intransitive |
| S V O | They bought a new car S V O/noun phrase | Mono Transitive Verb Clause |
| S V Oi Od | They gave Amelia a golden globe S V O indirect O direct | |
| S V O Adverbial | The doctor kept him in bed S V O adverbial | Bitransitive Verb Clause |
| S V O Co | We consider John a leader S V O Co | Complex Intransitive Verb clause |

With regard to contrastive analysis, numerous study of different language pairs have already been carried out, in particular focusing on learners of English. First study was from Duskova (1969). He investigated Czech learners of English in terms of various lexical and syntactical errors. The second study was carried out by Light and Warshawsky (1974). They examined Russian learners of English (and French learners to some extent) on their improper usage of syntax as well semantics. The third study was conducted by Guilford (1998). He specifically explored the difficulties of French learners of English in various aspects, from lexical and syntactical to idiosyncratic. The fourth study was initiated by Mohamed et al. (2004) targeted grammatical errors of Chinese learners in English. Among these studies, commonly observed syntactic error types made by non-native English learners include subject-verb disagreement, noun-number disagreement, and misuse of determiners.

This part has presented relevant literature review and previous related research report. The present study has similarities with the previous studies in

terms of syntactical errors made by non-native English learners (Mohamed et al., 2004; Guilford, 1998; Light and Warshawsky, 1974; Duskova, 1969). Non-native English learners commonly deal with the concrete obstruction in form of syntactical errors rather than other linguistic aspects. This obstruction potentially occurs because of the concrete existence of differences between the new language (target language) and the native language (source language) as stated by Lado (1957). The studies are also in line with the present study which is investigated by the researcher since this study puts an emphasis on the syntactic error in declarative sentence made by Indonesian learners as non-native English learners. This study also initiates contrastive analysis in order to figure out both the differences and similarities between Indonesian declarative sentence and English declarative sentence.

METHOD

With regard to the objective of this study; that is to describe the differences and similarities of declarative sentences in the

two languages (English and Indonesian language) by using contrastive analysis, a qualitative research method applied in the present study in terms of its natural setting and its circumstance as interpretive research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Dunne, Pryor, & Yates, 2005: 50). Alwasilah (2011: 54) states that qualitative method allows researcher to figure out a phenomenon in detail define subject's behavior towards the research and enable the researcher to interact with the subject intimately. This study was conducted in one of Senior High School in Bandung. The selection was based on accessibility in terms of permission and location. The population was chosen purposively and generated ten learners as the concrete samples. Purposive sampling is a fundamental technique as it is stated by Maxwell (1996: 69) and Baxter and Jack

(2008) that one of the goals in purposeful sampling is to capture the heterogeneity in the population.

The instrument of this study was written test. Twenty one Indonesian declarative sentences were made (Source Language) represented each pattern or category of declarative sentences used as the test item. Then, the students were asked to translate the sentences into English language (Target Language). These sentences were the representatives from each declarative sentence pattern with three sentences for each category. There were seven categories provided as described in the previous chapter, they were: Transitive, Bitransitive, Intransitive, Nominal, Adjectival, Prepositional, and Numeral category; exactly there are twenty one sentences, three sentences of each category as described below:

Table 3. *The list of declarative sentences*

| No. | Category | Pattern | Sentences |
|-----|---------------|-----------------|--|
| 1. | Transitive | SPO (A) SPOC | 1. Robert makan sandwich setiap hari. 2. Saya membeli sebuah kamus minggu lalu. 3. Tadi malam dia minum susu. |
| 2. | Bitransitive | SPOO | 1. Pak Toni mengajari kami bahasa Inggris tahun lalu. 2. Minggu lalu, dia membelikan saya buku. 3. Paman mengirim kami uang kemarin. |
| 3. | Intransitive | SPA SPCA | 1. Guru-guru pergi ke Jakarta tahun lalu. 2. Harry berjalan ke stasiun kemarin. 3. Minggu lalu, Susi bermain di taman. |
| 4. | Nominal | SC | 1. Dia seorang dokter. 2. Ayahnya seorang guru. 3. Dia adalah guru saya. |
| 5. | Adjectival | SC | 1. Anak laki-laki itu tampan. 2. Tes itu sulit sekali 3. Rumah kami sangat bersih. |
| 6. | Prepositional | SC | 1. Buku ini untukmu. 2. Teman kelasku dari Cirebon. 3. Buku ini tentang kesehatan. |
| 7. | Numeral | SC | 1. Tasnya lima. 2. Panjangnya 5 meter. 3. Harga buku itu 15 ribu rupiah |

In analyzing the data, translation method, precisely translation equivalence, were carried out as the TCs for grammatical studies. As discussed in the previous chapter, translation equivalence was

considered as the best TC for CA, in view of it embraced both semantic and pragmatic equivalence. This technique was initiated since it can reveal the errors made by learners as one of phenomenon of language

interference or language transfer emerged, exactly, in the level of syntax, constructing the sentence.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

There are ten students as the sample of this research; they have translated the Indonesian declarative sentences belong to the Source Language (SL) into English declarative sentences as the manifestation of the Target Language (TL). The researcher would like to observe and explain their answers based on the categories along with describing the errors they made. The complete explanations are as follow:

1. Transitive

SL: Robert makan sandwich setiap hari.

TL: Robert eats sandwich every day.

For this sentence regarding the patterns, all of the students' answers are correct. There are 8 students who translated the sentence as the pattern SPO (A) and two students who placed the adverbial of time (everyday) in front of the subject which is acceptable in both languages. However, there are some errors made by students in the usage of appropriate verb according to the tense used (present tense), subject-verb agreement, spelling of word, and wrong word.

SL: Saya membeli sebuah kamus minggu lalu.

TL: I bought a dictionary last week.

There are 6 students who translated the sentence based on the pattern SPO (A) and 3 students placed the adverbial of time in front of the subject, which is still acceptable. And one student translated the sentence by adding copula verb between the subject and verb. Generally, according to the pattern, the students answers are mostly correct, but there are some errors in the usage of appropriate verb for past tense in this case, diction, spelling of words.

SL: Tadi malam dia minum susu.

TL: Last night he/she drank milk.

In translating the sentence, there are 6 students who translated the sentence in the correct pattern that is (A) SPO. But

there are some students who used wrong verb for the sentence. And there are two students who put copula verb between the subject and verb. Then, two other students used prepositional *about* to replace the verb required. The last four students translated the sentence incorrectly. Besides, there are errors made by students in using correct verb for the past tense, diction, using the article of *a*, and wrong word choice.

For this category, generally, the students are correct in conducting the English declarative sentence as the manifestation of the compared both languages. From the explanation aforementioned, it shows indication that there is a positive transfer of students. There are only 10 wrong sentences from the total 30 sentences in transitive category.

2. Bitransitive

SL: Pak Toni mengajari kami bahasa Inggris tahun lalu.

TL: Mr. Toni taught us English last year.

Regarding to the pattern SPOO, there are 6 students who applied that pattern in translating the sentence, although there are errors found in choosing verb for simple past tense, the usage of object pronoun, word order, and spelling. Two students put the direct object between the subjects and predicate which is grammatically incorrect. One student did not have verb in his sentence (S?OO(A)). The other one translated the sentence incompletely who put only the subject.

SL: Minggu lalu dia membelikan saya buku.

TL: Last week he bought me a book.

In translating the sentence, there are 9 students used the same pattern of A (SPOO), but one student translated the sentence incompletely. The errors found in using the verb for tense used (past tense), using article, diction, object pronouns, relative pronouns, and wrong word.

SL: Paman mengirim kami uang kemarin.

TL: Uncle sent us money yesterday.

In translating the sentence, there are 8 students used the same patterns A

(SPOO). In contrast, two students had no direct object in their sentence. Hence, the students made errors in using appropriate verb according to tense used, object pronouns, using article, and wrong word.

For the second category, generally, the students are correct in making the English declarative sentence in view of the category whose similar pattern of the two languages. There are only 7 wrong sentences constructed from the total 30 sentences. It indicates positive transfer made by the students.

3. Intransitive

SL: Guru-guru pergi ke Jakarta tahun lalu.

TL: Teachers went to Jakarta last year.

There are 6 students who translated the sentence correctly. They used verb II (went) since the sentence used past tense. And the rest of students used infinitive. Regarding to the pattern which is SPC, all of the sentences are correct, but the errors occurred in using verb for proper tense used.

SL: Harry berjalan ke stasiun kemarin.

TL: Harry walked to station yesterday.

There are 6 students used the same pattern SPCA. One student put the adverb of time before the subject (A) SPC, which is acceptable. One student translated the sentence without put the adverb of time and preposition to before the complement that made the sentence meaningless. Another two students put copula verb after and before the main verb in his sentence. However, the errors made by students in translating the sentence are in using the correct verb for past tense, and wrong word.

SL: Minggu lalu Susi bermain di taman.

TL: Last week, Susi played in the park.

There are 9 students used the pattern (A) SPC, and only one student had no complement in his sentence. The errors found in using the verb for simple past tense, using the proper preposition, diction, and spelling.

Generally, in the three sentences of intransitive category, the students are correct in conducting declarative sentences in view of category has similar pattern in the two languages. There are only 9 wrong sentences constructed from the total 30 intransitive sentences. It can be stated that positive transfer initiated among students.

4. Nominal

SL: Dia seorang dokter.

TL: He is a doctor.

There are 8 students who correctly put copula *is* after the subject, though the 5 students did not add article *a* before the noun phrase. And one student did not use the copula verb. Then one student made wrong spelling, he used 'ist' instead *is*.

SL: Ayahnya seorang guru.

TL: Her/his father is a teacher.

Based on sentence structure, there are 4 students who properly used copula *is* after the subject while 4 students did not do it. Two other students did not translate the sentence completely. They did not put the complement at all. Furthermore, they made errors in diction, and spelling.

SL: Dia adalah guru saya.

TL: He is my teacher.

There are 5 students translated the sentence correctly by adding intensive verb *is* after the subject while another 5 students did not add it as the fundamental part of the pattern.

In this category, the students made 13 wrong patterns of the sentences from the total 30 sentences. There is a tendency of negative transfer or interference occurred among the students since this category has different pattern between Indonesian and English declarative sentences.

5. Adjectival

SL: Anak laki-laki itu tampan.

TL: The boy is handsome.

For this sentence, there are 4 students translating the sentence correctly. Regarding on the sentence structure, they put intensive verb *is* after the subject. The

rest of the students made errors on the sentence pattern without adding the intensive verb.

SL: Tes itu sulit sekali.

TL: The test is very difficult.

Concerning the sentence pattern, there are 5 students who translated the sentence grammatically used intensive verb between the subject and the adjective. The rest of students did not add any intensive verb to make a perfect adjectival sentence.

SL: Rumah kami sangat bersih.

TL: Our house is very clean.

There are 6 students who translated the sentence without put copula verb between subject and adjective. And two students use copulas are instead is. Then 2 students translated the sentence grammatically correct. Besides, the errors on sentence pattern, there are errors in using possessions, subject-verb agreement, and spelling.

In the adjectival category, the students made 19 wrong patterns of the sentences from the total 30 sentences. It indicates negative transfer or interference occurred among the students since the category has different pattern between Indonesian and English declarative English.

6. Prepositional

SL: Buku ini untukmu.

TL: This book is for you.

There are 3 students translated the sentence grammatically correct. The put the proper copula is after the subject. Meanwhile, the rest of the students did not add the copula after the subject so that the sentence is grammatically incorrect.

SL: Teman kelasku dari Cirebon.

TL: My roommate is from Cirebon.

In translating the sentence, there are 2 students put copula is between the subject and the prepositional phrase consistently. The rest of students did not even add the copula is between the subject and the prepositional phrase. There are 8 students

made the errors on sentence pattern of the sentence.

SL: Buku ini tentang kesehatan.

TL: This book is about health.

There are 7 students translated the sentence ungrammatically. They placed the complement (prepositional phrase) after the subject. One student used possessive 'my' for determiner 'this'. And two students translated correctly by adding copula between subject and its complement.

In this category, the students made 18 wrong patterns from the total 30 sentences. The number is significant indeed. There is a tendency of the negative transfer or interference made by the students since this category has concrete different pattern between Indonesian and English declarative sentences.

7. Numeral

SL: Tasnya lima.

TL: His/her bag are five.

There are 4 students used correct pattern of the sentence by putting intensive verb is between subject and its complement. The rest of the students did not add anything after the subject and straight to the complement.

SL: Panjangnya 5 meter.

TL: The length is 5m

Concerning the pattern, there are 4 students correctly put copula 'after' the subject in the sentence. Meanwhile, the rest of the students did not add any copula after the subject. The errors they made in making sentence include diction, the use of article 'the', and spelling.

SL: Harga buku itu 15 ribu rupiah.

TL: The book price is five thousands rupiah.

In this sentence, there are 6 students used copula 'is' between the subject and its complement where the rest students did not add it. Beside the pattern, the errors occurred in the word order, diction, spelling, and using of article a.

For the last category, the students made 16 wrong patterns from the total 30 sentences. Hence, this category indicates negative transfer or interference occurred among the students because of the different pattern between Indonesia and English declarative sentence.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

There are some patterns of declarative sentences that similar between Indonesian and English language, particularly in the category of transitive, bitransitive, and intransitive. In contrast, there is a pattern of declarative sentence exists in Indonesia while in English it does not. It is the pattern SC (Subject-Complement) where in this pattern the predicate is the complement. In addition, English has pattern of declarative sentences using verb or copula verb (verb “to be”), but it does not belong to Indonesian since Indonesian has no verb “to be”. These are the differences existed in the declarative sentence patterns in the two language through contrastive analysis.

Furthermore, based on the fact aforementioned, it is recognized that students mostly made errors in the sentence that have different pattern between Source language (SL/Indonesia) and the Target Language (TL/English) with significant number. They are in the Nominal, Adjectival, Prepositional, and Numeral sentence which SC (Subject-Complement) as the pattern in Indonesian language that considered in English language. Then, the range of errors found in bitransitive, intransitive, and transitive sentence which commonly have similar pattern in both language contrasted.

In short, the errors made by students are due to interference of the declarative sentence pattern in their mother tongue language that is different with the target language as it is stated by Lado (1957) stated that difficulty in acquiring a new (second) language are derived from the difference between the new language and the native of a language learner (mother tongue language). In this regard, errors

potentially made by learners of a second language are predicted from intervention by the native language.

In order to reduce obstructions that may deal with learners in acquiring second language, contrastive analysis is recommended. It is equivalent with Fisiak (1981) that contrastive analysis is one of the methods belong to linguistic branch that can be used for helping people who learn other language (L2) in finding some differences and similarities between Source Language (SL) and Target Language (TL) that usually led to some difficulties in learning process encountered by the learners. Here, the researcher suggests for the next research to initiate contrastive analysis in two different languages since this study deals with the contrastive analysis between Indonesian and English declarative sentence.

REFERENCES

- Alan, D. (2005). *A Glossary of Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
- Al-Jarf, R. 2000. Grammatical agreement errors in L1/L2 translations. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 38, no. 1: 1-15. DOI: 10.1515/iral.2000.38.1.1
- Al-khresheh, M, H. 2013. The misuse of word order in the writing of Jordanian EFL Learners. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- Al-khresheh, M. H. 2010. Interlingual interference in the English language word order structure of Jordanian EFL learners. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 16, no. 1: 106-113.
- Al-khresheh, M. H. 2011. An investigation of interlingual interference in the use of ‘and’ as a syntactic coordinating structure by Jordanian EFL learners. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 18, no. 3, 426-433.
- Al-khresheh, M. H. 2015. A review study of interlanguage theory. *International*

- Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature 4, no. 3, 124-131.
- Al-khresheh, M. H. 2016. A review study of error analysis theory. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research* 2: 49-59.
- Al-Ta'ani, M. H. A. 1986. An investigation of secondary school students' errors in formulating wh-questions. Unpublished MA thesis, Yarmouk University, Irbid, JO
- Alwasilah, A. C. (2011). *Pokoknya Kualitatif*. Bandung: Pustaka Jaya.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: study design and implementation for novice researcher. *The Qualitative Report*, vol. 13 (4), pp. 544-559.
- Brown, D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Fourth edition. USA: Longman.
- Chao, Y. J. 2003. Contrastive rhetoric, lexico-grammatical knowledge, writing expertise, and metacognitive knowledge: An integrated account of the development of English writing by Taiwanese students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, Auckland, NZ.
- Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. (2000). *Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research*. In Denzin N. K., Lincoln Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dunne M., Pryor J., Yates P. (2005). *Becoming a researcher: A companion to the research process*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Duskova, L. 1969. On sources of error in foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied Linguistics (IRAL)*, 7(1): 11-36.
- Elewa, A. H. 2004. Collocation and synonymy in classical Arabic: A corpus-based study. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST), University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.
- Faghih, E. 1997. A contrastive analysis of the Persian and English definite articles. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 35, no. 2: 126-237.
- Fisiak, J. (ed). (1990). *Further Insight into Contrastive Analysis*, vol. 30, (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company), p. 165
- Fisiak, J. Ed. (1981). *Contrastive Linguistics and the Language Teacher*. Oxford: Pergomon Press.
- Floranti, A. D., & Adiantika, H. N. 2019. Grammatical error performances in Indonesian EFL learners. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3 (2), 277-295.
- Gilquin, G. T., & Magali P. 2008. Too chatty: Learner academic writing and register variation. *English Text Construction* 1, no. 1: 41-61. DOI: 10.1075/etc.1.1.05gil
- Guilford, J. 1998. English learner interlanguage: what's wrong with it? *Anglophonia French Journal of English Studies*, 4:73-100.
- James, C. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. Essex: Longman.
- Kharm, N. N. 1983. *Studies in descriptive linguistics: A contrastive analysis of the use of verb forms in English and Arabic*. Heidelberg, DE: Julius Groos Verlag.
- Kharm, N. N., and Ali H. Hajjaj. 1989. Use of the mother tongue in the ESL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 27, no. 3: 223-235.
- Kharm, N. N., & Ali H. H. 1989. Use of the mother tongue in the ESL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 27, no. 3: 223-235.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across Culture: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI, US.
- Light, R. L. & Warshawsky, D. 1974. Preliminary error analysis. Russians using English. Technical report, National Institute of Education, USA.

- Lightbown, P. M., & Nina, S. 2006. How languages are learned, 5th ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press
- Mattar, H. 1999. Translation elicitation techniques and mother-tongue interference: Any significant connection? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 37, no. 4: 307-321.
- Maxwell, J. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design, An Interactive Approach*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mihalache, R. 2005. Contrastive analysis and error analysis—Implications for the teaching of English. *Language Teaching Forum* 44, no. 4: 28
- Mohamed, A. R., Goh, L., & Wan-Rose, E. (2004). English errors and Chinese learners. *Sunway College Journal*, 1:83-97.
- Nina, S., Lightbown, P. M., & White, J, L. 2005. The importance of form/meaning mappings in explicit form focused instruction. In *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition*, eds., Housen, Alex, and Michel Pierrard, 199-234. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Mouton de Gruyter
- Sheen, R. 1996. The advantage of exploiting contrastive analysis in teaching and Learning a foreign language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 34, no. 3: 183-198. DOI: 10.1515/iral.1996.34.3.183
- Sneddon, J. N. (1996). *Indonesia a Comprehensive Grammar*. UK: Routledge.
- Spada, N., & Yasuyo T. 2010. Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature: A Meta analysis. *Language Learning* 60, no. 2: 263-308. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00562.x
- Sujatna. (2007). *English Syntax for Beginners*. Bandung: Uvula Press.
- Wahya & Wagiaty. (2011). *Modul Pemahaman Wacana Bahasa*

Indonesia. Materi matrikulasi pascasarjana fakultas sastra. Bandung: Universitas Padjadjaran.