

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A. RELATED THEORIES

This study deals with phonemic interference of the Dayak Ngaju language into English made by some Dayak students in Malang, Jawa Timur.

In order to have a better understanding of the study, the writer considers that it is important to give a brief description about the English consonant phonemes, the Dayak Ngaju consonant phonemes, phonemic interference in language learning, general phonemic interferences done by the Dayak Ngaju people in speaking/producing a second language (L₂) and related studies about phonemic interference.

2.1 The English Consonant Phonemes

This study concerns phonemic interference of English consonant phoneme and the use of symbols for transcribing English consonant phoneme by Ladefoged (1975:24).

Symbols for transcribing English consonants phonemes:

Table 2.1 English Consonant Phonemes

p	Voiceless bilabial	pie
t	Voiceless alveolar	tie
k	Voiceless velar	key
b	Voiced bilabial	buy

d	Voiced alveolar	die
g	Voiced velar	guy
m	Voiced bilabial	my
n	Voiced alveolar	nigh
ŋ	Voiced velar	gang
f	Voiceless alveolar	fee
v	Voiced alveolar	vas
θ	Voiceless dental	thigh
ð	Voiced dental	thy
s	Voiceless alveolar	see
z	Voiced alveolar	razor
ʃ	Voiceless alveolar	she
ʒ	Voiced alveolar	vision
l	Voiced lateral	lie
w	Voiced semivowel	why
r	Voiced alveolar	ray
j	Voiced palatal	yes
h	Voiceless glottal	high
tʃ	Voiceless palato alveolar	church
dʒ	Voiced palato alveolar	judge

2.2 The Dayak Ngaju Consonant Phonemes

Clearly, the writer also adds phonemes in Dayak Ngaju Language.

There are 18 consonants phonemes in Dayak Ngaju Language and the use of symbols for transcribing Dayak Ngaju Language phonemes by Usop (1976:17).

Symbols for transcribing Dayak Ngaju phonemes:

Table 2.2 Dayak Ngaju Consonant Phonemes

CONSONANTS	INITIAL	MEDIAL	FINAL
/b/	bewei “only”	haban “sick”	sabap “because”
/p/	pusit “breakdown”	lampang “float”	sirap “roof”
/t/	terau “scarce”	Utut “knee”	imbit “to bring”
/u/	urun “nose”	munduk “sit”	tambusu “the youngest”
/e/	eka “place”	manepak “to kick”	laleme “mattress”
/k/	kuman “to eat”	tukep “near”	petak “earth”
/l/	likut “back”	galuh “diamond”	tagal “because”
/s/	silu “nail”	pusa “cat”	palus “come in”

/h/	huang “on”	mihup “drink”	kesah “story”
/r/	rantep “close together”	kurik “small”	mamander “to tell”
/m/	male “yesterday”	umai “mother”	hamalem “evening”
/n/	nuhu “to”	manuk “chicken”	kalunen “human being”
/c/	cara “manner”	macam “sort”	- -
/j/	jukung “boat”	laju “fast”	- -
/y/	-	keya “also”	- -
/w/	wadi “salted fish”	bawi “female”	- -
/d/	derau “to break”	andi “younger brother/sister”	- -
/g/	gitan “to be seen”	bagawi “to work”	- -

2.3 Phonemic Interferences in Language Learning

Each language which exists throughout the world has its own patterns and rules, so each member of the community should speak according to his/her language rules. When the people in the community get in touch with a new language, some problem may arise, since they should adapt to the second language in this case English, which are different from their native language.

According to Keraf (1980:21) the phonemic interference will happen if there is an interference of the language, which has in a phoneme system to other language, for example, there is less phoneme differentiation, there is more phonemes differentiation, and there is a change of sounds.

Interference was the result of what was called proactive inhibition. This concerned with the way in which previous learning prevents or inhibits learning of new habits. In seconds language (L_2) works, where the first and second language share a meaning but express it in different ways, an error is likely to arise in the second language L_2 because the learner will transfer the realization device from his first language into the second.

The rules in each language are intended to make it easy for its people to produce sentences in good order both in written and in oral; that is why when the people learn a new language they will find out that it is not easy to speak in the new language, since there are some element which are different between the two languages. The greater the differences between the L_1 or the mother tongue and the L_2 the greater the difficulties will be, and this is what might cause problems

for Dayak students in speaking in L₂. According to Fries the problem arise because of the features of the L₁, which influence the L₂. He says that:

Learning a second language therefore constitutes a very different task from learning the first language. The basic problem arises not out of any essential difficulty in the features of the new language them selves but primarily out of the special 'set ' created by the first language habits (Fries 1957: 32).

Dayak students as foreign language learners of English also face the same problems as other foreign language learners, since Dayak Ngaju patterns are different from those of English. The evidence of taking the L₁ elements into spoken English they form show that the L₁ features influence the learners in spoken English.

Another thing, which might influence the degree of interference, is the environment where the learners live and communicate. The language learners who live in the environment where the language learned is used frequently may make the interferences less than those who live in the environment where the language is not frequently used, let alone when the language functions as a foreign language. It does not mean that the learners who live in the environment where the language is frequently used interferences do not exist, but it also depends on whom the learners study the language from, how much they pay attention to and aware of the language learned, since attention and awareness also hold an important role in learning a language. Lado declares that:

Attention and awareness, which are the capacity to perceive certain things, events, qualities, and effects, more clearly and consciously than others in a field, are important in language learning (Lado, 1964:73).

O' Grady and Dobrovolsky (1989:82) explained that seeking to improve L₂ teaching methodologies, some early researchers come to believe that by comparing and contrasting the learners' native language with the second language, new insight could begin into the language learning process. This approach is known as Contrastive Analysis (CA).

Once, many researchers questioned the theoretical and practical relevance of CA. They discovered that not all errors could be predicted from the source language. It needs more details research to find out the actual error than just predict it by CA. Nasr in *Types of Contrastive Analysis in Applied Linguistics* (1984:74) explained that an error analysis determines the actual problems that the learners face in learning the target language. While other comparative linguistics analysis tells us in advance what theoretical problem will face and error analysis will tell us really what mistake they actually make.

In second language acquisition O'Grady and Dobrovolsky further explained about error analysis (EA). This approach saw errors as indicators of learner' current underlying knowledge of the second language, or as clues to the hypotheses that a learner may be testing about the second language.

Errors played an important role in the study of language acquisition in general and in examine second and foreign language acquisition in particular. Researchers are interested in errors because they are believed to contain valuable information and strategies that people use to acquire a language.

Proponents of EA claim that a careful study of a large corpus of spoken and written errors committed by L₂ learners provides data that can help teachers

determine L₂ learner's development. They therefore concentrate their efforts on the description and classification of various kinds of errors with an explanation of these errors as their ultimate goal.

According to O'Grady and Dobrovolsky (1987:46) errors types research on L₂ learner's interlanguages has bristled in the identification of several types of errors. Such errors fall roughly into two categories:

- Interlingual
- Developmental

Interlingual errors are the result of L₁ interference, implying that some structures from the native language have been transferred to the second language. When L₂ errors cannot be accounted for on the basis of the first language, there are considered to be developmental, that is the result of the manner in which the language acquisition mechanisms themselves operate.

According to grammatical subsystem errors can be classified into:

- Errors of phonology
- Errors of syntax
- Errors of morphology
- Errors of semantics

Based on the description, errors can be further classified into:

- Omission: omits certain phonemes
- Addition: adds unnecessary phonemes
- Substitution: exchanges one phoneme for another
- Disordering: disordering of phoneme

2.4 General Phonemic Interference Made by Some Dayak Ngaju Students in Speaking/Producing a Second Language

The unique characteristics of the language of Dayak Ngaju speaker are referred to as the speaker's idiolect – the linguistic system found in a single speaker. In addition to these individual differences, the language of groups of people may differ from one to another by showing a regular variation of use.

The term accent refer to the speech of someone who speaks a language no natively, for example, a Dayak Ngaju person speaking English with his Dayak Ngaju accent, etc. in this sense, accent refers to phonological differences or “interference” from a different language spoken elsewhere.

The writer sees the phenomenon of phonemic interference whom often made by the Dayak Ngaju people in speaking /producing a second language L₂ in this case English language. When speaking/producing sentences in English they often-made interferences.

For examples:

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|------------------|
| - | Travel | - | pie |
| | pronounced / trʌpel / | | pronounced /pi/ |
| - | Siemens | - | key |
| | pronounced / sumΣn / | | pronounced /kΣy/ |

This eventually happen in Dayak Ngaju people when they speaking/producing sentence in English. They eventually made interferences in English because the differentiation between their mother tongue (L₁) and English (L₂), especially the Dayak Ngaju consonants to the English consonant.

B. RELATED STUDIES

2.5.1 A Study by Priantini (2002)

Some related study, which is closer to this thesis, a research, which was conducted, by Priantini (2002) about phonological error analysis of consonant phonemes produced by elementary school students at SDN Sawunggaling VIII and SD Hang Tuah 7 Surabaya in pronouncing English words. She is inspired by the theory of interference of L_1 in learning L_2 . She found out English consonant phonemes that are pronounced incorrectly by the elementary school students she chooses 30 respondents. She asked them to pronounce some English words from the list she had made. She recorded their speech and transcribed it. She was discovered that the respondents often make substitution in all position in pronouncing English words. The English consonant phonemes that are often substituted by the respondents in all positions: initial, medial and final are dental fricative, palato alveolar fricative, and palato alveolar affricate.

2.5.2 A Study by Endarto (2003)

Another related study, which is closer to this thesis, a research, which was conducted, by Endarto (2003) about the vowel qualities in English which are produced by some Javanese students of Junior High School. Regarding to the informants' mother tongue, which is Javanese, the writer transcribed the vowel qualities in English that sound similar with the one in Javanese by using Ladefoged symbol, Fromkin and Rodman for the English vowels, Uhlenbeck in Subroto for the Javanese vowels as a representation of the student's interference.

He was discovered that the informants mostly made interferences in pronounce 20 English vowels he had made. He uses British English (i.e. RP) as a standard of English vowels.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA