Effect of Students' Term and Educational Institution on the Arising of Indonesian Morphology-Syntactical Interference in ELLT

Dwi Astuti Wahyu Nurhayati[1]
[1] *Post graduate student of Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Indonesia*

Djatmika[2]; Riyadi Santosa[2]; Tri Wiratno[2]
[2] *Promotors from Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Indonesia*
dwiastuti507@gmail.com

Abstract

This research examines the two factors which effect on the raising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It aimed at delineating the potential effect of these two factors on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference of undergraduate students majoring in English department of State Islamic Institute of Tulungagung and PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung. 213 Javanese undergraduate students were selected based on two-step purposive sampling. To collect data, the researcher used observation and questionares in which the participants answered a set of 12 open-ended questions to measure the students' term along with educational institution and Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. To analyze the data, t-test on correlation and coefficient as well as linier stepwise multiple regressions were conducted through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17. Data analysis indicated that the independent variables significantly correlated with Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. In addition, multiple regressions analysis specified different higher institution as the main contributing variable and students' term as the second one on the arising of Indonesian interference. It also showed that students of English departments of state Islamic institution of Tulungagung got higher scores on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference than those of PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung. The reason may refer to the supporting environment that is higher language exposure. The results highlighted the longer the students' term they have, the lower score on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference they produce.

Keywords: students' term, Indonesian interference, Morphology-syntactical, ELLT

A. Introduction

Interference as language transfer arising in learning foreign language cannot be avoided. As bilinguals, Indonesian people speak (i) dialect and (ii) Indonesian. Dialects are languages used by groups of societies that stay in certain areas and Javanese is one of the regional dialects (Nurhayati, 2016d). Its structure is related to ethics and politeness in Javanese community in the language perspective, especially in the semiotics one (Nurhayati, 2016f). Language transfer or interference occurs in any situation when someone does not have a native-level command of a language, as when translating from L1 into L2 or L3 (English) in English Language Learning and Teaching or ELLT (Ellis, 2008).

In line with this vision, many studies were conducted and focused on language interference. Among others were done by Suleymanov (2015), Khan & Arshad (2015), Pudin, et al. (2015), and Usha & Kadher (2016). Most of the studies observed the English syntactic and morphological errors analysis among students. Sulaymanev's research (2015) focused on the omission of phrases (NP-noun phrase and VP-verb phrase) in the sentence formation. The next was Khan & Arshad' study (2015) which was revealed that concord in auxiliaries, SVO pattern, articles, prepositions and tense are the major of syntactic error, whereas Usha & Kadher's research (2016) found affixation and compound related errors, failure to use the marker (-er) and conversion related errors. But these studies were limited on word categories and only in written assignment.

Related to the language production, recently, there were studies indicating that research in language production aimed to explain how people translate a thought into spoken, signed, or written utterance. Among others are Bock & Levelt (1994), Bock in Haskell, Thornton &Macdonald (2009), Bock &Griffin (2000), Chang, Dell, Bo ck &Griffin (2000), and Ferreira & Bock (2006). Most of them theorize about the architectural properties of the language production system research that make it possible to map thought to language (Bock & Levelt, 1994). The researchers have begun to address the role of learning in language production process. One of such researches involves the role of syntactic persistence, which refers to speakers' tendencies to use sentence structures that have been uttered or perceived in the recent past. The effects of syntactic persistence are most clearly observable when a speaker has a choice between two alternative structures, e.g., a prepositional dative (*The author gave a book to the library*) or a double-object dative (*The author gave a book to the library*). If the speaker has recently produced a prepositional dative sentence (e.g. *The man read a story to the boy*), he is more likely to utter a prepositional dative than a double-object dative (e.g., *The man read the boy a story*) which has recently been produced (Bock in Haskell, Thornton &Macdonald, 2009). Although these effects are sometimes described in terms of short-term spreading activation (e.g., Pickering & Branigan, 1998), the effects can be relatively long-lasting, and it has been suggested that they are, at least partly, due to implicit learning of past utterances, possibly in addition to a transient activation-based mechanism (Bock &Griffin, 2000; Chang, Dell, Bo ck &Griffin, 2000; Ferreira &Bock, 2006). However these studies did not concern with effects or factors which cause on the interference raising. They only focused on short term spreading activation.

Another line of research was focused on the effects of English language proficiency academic anxiety, rewards and motivation on student achievement. Among

others are Barnek (1996), Cassie (2012), and Chemiron (2015). Barnek's research (1996) revealed that the rewards effect undermines intrinsic motivation and results in the slower acquisition of skill and more errors in learning process for the disabilities students. Cassie's study (2012) that examined the relationship between anxiety, student achievement, self-concept and self-efficacy for students with and without disabilities revealed that mindfulness mediation, metacognition, coping, teacher involvement, and test question order are anxiety reduction strategies. However these studies are conducted in elementary students and based on disabilities students. Then Nurhayati's researches were focused on improving students' English proficiency by creating activities and using interesting media in order to increase their motivation. Then Chemiron's research (2015) revealed that there was positive correlation between English and Physics using gendered patterns but there was no significant influence of English language proficiency in academic performance in Physics at the national examination. Furthermore, there was no different in the English proficiency between the male and female students at national examination. This research did not explore why there was no significance different performance between male and female students. Most of the studies were limited on motivation and reward among disability learners in elementary schools and they did not discuss about the English proficiency in higher educational institutions which were based on longer term. It can be said that there has not been a study which investigates the input or the effects of students' term and different educational institution to measure on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

The above mentioned phenomena become an important consideration for any educational institution such as state Islamic institute of Tulungagung and PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung which run English departments to explore how students' term can affect on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. In addition, what is vital importance of different educational institution on it would be how students construct sentences using foreign language which is influenced by L1 and L2 and convert them into English (L3) utterances; and this will include students' term in exploring the grammatical competence as well. Grammatical competence and supporting factors such as longer term and educational institution have possibly been tied since Canale & Swain's model of communicative competence (Murcia, Dornyei & Turrel, 1995, p. 145).

This study, therefore, aimed at identifying the correlation between students' term, their contributed variants, and different educational institutions as independent variables and the arising Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference as dependent variables. Then the following questions can be raised for the study:

1. Is there any significant relationship between independent variables including students' term, and educational institutions, and dependent variable i.e. Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference?
2. To what extent, if any, do independent variables including students' term and educational institutions contribute to Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference?

B. Literature Review

Javanese as a dialect is used from generation to generation in a society in Indonesia. Using dialect is a part of speaking and it is defined as a process of using verbal and non verbal symbols in any contexts (Nurhayati, 2016c). This dialect is used to conduct communication. Meanwhile, Indonesian language is a member of the Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian language family. It is a standardized dialect of Malay which had been used as a *lingua franca* in the Indonesian archipelago for centuries, and which achieved the status of an official language with the declaration of independence of Indonesia from the Netherlands in 1945 (Thompson, 2014). The two languages are very similar in their sound system, grammar, and vocabulary. Indonesian is the statutory national language of Indonesia where it is spoken by close to 23 million people. It is a second language for another 140 million people. Most Indonesians are bilingual, and many are proficient, to varying degrees, in three or four languages. They learn at least one of the country's many local languages at home, and later learn Indonesian in school. Generally, Indonesian tends to be used in larger urban areas, while local languages are more widely used in small towns and rural areas.

Instead of having a mother tongue (Javanese) and Indonesian as L2, Indonesian people also learn English as foreign language. English has become a compulsory subject for Indonesian students since elementary school level. Yet, with the implementation of 2013 Curriculum since 2013, English is no longer taught formally in elementary school. Instead, it will be as a compulsory subject in Junior High School. Today, the concept of learning, as it is understood, has been greatly influenced by the psychological study of learning process, and as a result it is much more widely interpreted than has been customary in popular uses of the term (Stern, 1991, p.18). The psychological concept of learning goes far beyond learning directly from a teacher or learning through study or practice. It includes the learning of skills or the acquisition of interest, social, values, or social roles, and changes in personality. Indonesian people learn foreign languages and this causes language transfer.

In this case, language transfer is also known as L1 interference, linguistic interference, or cross linguistic influence. It is one of the phenomena which arise when students learn a foreign language and it occurs in any situation when someone does not have a native-level command of a language, as when translating from L1 into L2 or L3 in ELLT (Ellis, 2008). Interference can be defined in this article as consistent influence from the grammar of one language of a learner or speaker of a bilingual to the other, resulting in linguistic development that is quantitatively and or qualitatively different from that of a monolingual speaker. Interference can consist of acceleration, delay, or transfer which is the use of a grammatical element of one language in another (Austin, 2009, p.448).

Interference as influence of one grammar language could arise in teaching learning process. It is well known that in a large number of settings including Indonesia that teaching English is associated with using grammar correctly. This is because it is the core element of language teaching and must be attained by foreign language learners. However, the notion of grammar itself is complicated to conceptualize. Once, it was regarded as 'the science of language' in its broadest understanding. In contrast, it can also, in its narrowest sense, be defined as the combination of words to form phrases and sentences. Although linguists find this definition 'oversimplified' they

maintain that "it is good starting point (and an easy way to explain the term to young learners)". Morphology is intimately related to syntax. For everything that is larger than a word is the domain of syntax. Thus within morphology one considers the structure of words only, and everything else is left to syntax. The first thing to note is that words come in different classes.

Morpho-syntax is a strong relationship between morphology (how words are formed) and syntax (the arrangement and the structure of a sentence). Both syntax and morphology are traditionally called grammar and in more technical terms morpho-syntax (Van Valin, 2001). The notions of morphology and syntax emerge as two components of grammar. In this case, morphology can be understood as the study of structure and formation of words, and syntax as the study of rules to combine word into phrases and phrases into sentences. Syntax and morphology are more important in second language or third language acquisition because students' performances are monitored and evaluated, especially in conducting interaction between students and lecturers based on morphological-syntactical knowledge.

Morphological errors or interferences may be considered as those which are resulted from misapplication of the morphological rules in the formation of words. Some linguists maintain that morphological errors indicate the learners' miscomprehension of the meaning and function of morphemes and morphological rules (Ur, 2009). This type of errors may include such errors as omission of plural nouns, lack of subject-verb agreement, the adjective-noun agreement, verb tense or form, article or other errors. On the other hand, syntactical errors are those disobey the phrase structure rules and, in this way, violate the formation of grammatically correct sentences (Fowler, 2009). These errors can be exemplified as word order, ungrammatical sentence constructions resulted from faulty use of verbs, prepositions, articles, and relative clauses in sentences. These types of errors have attracted the attention of great number of researchers. Their research, more or less, found similar types of morphological and syntactical errors from such sources as L1 (mother tongue) and L2 interference and inconsistency of the rules in target language. Morpho-syntactic level words are divided into two categories, namely lexical and grammatical. Lexical category is open class of words as it allows more new words to come in while grammatical category is regarded as closed class as it allows no addition or very little change. Noun and verbs belongs to open word class and my focus of study is mainly upon verbs (Van Valin, 2001).

In line with the grammatical category, morpho-syntactic property is central to understanding the organization of a language's inflectional paradigms. A morpho-syntactic property is a property which serves to distinguish phrases of the same category according to the different ways in which they participate in syntactic relationship such as agreement and government. It is assumed that morphpo-syntactic property takes the form of a pairing of a morpho-syntactic feature with one of its permissible values such as verb form, voice, tense, preteritum, mood, number, person, genitive, and agreement (Stump, 2003, p.39; Arronof & Fudeman, 2005). Morpho-syntactic properties can also be defined as morphological analysis or morphological process. It is the process in which the language user combines one morpheme with another in order to form a word or a process of combining two morphemes in finding a new word (Yule in Nurhayati, 2015a; 2016b). These processes include inflectional and

derivational word formation. Then the types of inflectional consist of 7 items, namely (a) number, (b) person, (c) gender & noun class, (d) case, (e) tense and aspect, (f) voice, and (g) mood & modality (Lieber, 2009, p. 88-121). She explains further about the inflection types. The first is *number*, which may be the most familiar inflectional category for speakers of English. In English, nouns can be marked as singular and plural. The second is *person*. Speakers of Indo-european languages such as Latin and German know that verbs in those languages are marked for the inflectional category of person; that is, verbs exhibit different endings depending on whether the subject of the sentence is the speaker. The third is *grammatical gender nouns* which are divided into two or more classes with which other elements in sentence, such as article and adjective, are associated with. Then noun falls into classes based on whether they denote humans, animals, or inanimate objects with certain shapes. The fourth is *case* which is another grammatical category that may affect noun (or whole or noun phrase). Nouns are distinguished on the basis of how they are deployed in sentences, whether they function as subject, direct object, indirect object, location, time, instrument, or object of preposition. The fifth is *tense and aspect* which are inflectional categories that usually pertain to verb, both have to do with time, but in different ways. Aspect is another inflectional category that may be marked on verbs. The sixth is *voice* which is a category of inflection that allows different noun phrase to be focused in sentence. In the active voice in a sentence with an agent and patient, the agent is focused by the virtue of being the subject of the sentence but in the passive voice the patient is the subject of the sentence, and it gets the focus. The seventh is m*ood & modality*. The inflectional categories of mood and modality have to do with a range of distinctions that include signaling the kind of speech act in which a verb is deployed. Speech acts are classically defined as things we can do with words for example, making a statement, asking questions, or giving a command for languages usually have three moods: declarative for making ordinary statement, interrogative for asking questions, and imperative for giving commands.

C. Research Methodology

This study which aimed at delineating the potential effect of two factors on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference took 213 Javanese undergraduate students majoring in English Education programs of State Islamic Institute of Tulungagung and PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung as the objects the study who were selected based on two-step purposive sampling (Ary et al, 2010. p.156). The researcher asked the participants to answer a set of 12 open-ended questions to measure the students' term, educational institution, and Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. Statistics analysis with multiple linier regressions (Sutopo, 2006, p. 81) was used to answer the research's questions.

The effect of independent variables toward dependent variables are tested using *confidence interval* 95% or $\alpha = 5\%$. Statistic analysis of this study which is proposed includes some tests.

T-test is used to examine the effect of independent variable partially through dependent variable, whether the influence is significant or not (Priyatno, 2013, p.50). Using t-test, the test was done through tolerant errors $(\alpha) = 0,05$.

F test or regression coefficient simultaneously is used to examine the influence of independent variable simultaneously toward dependent variable, whether the effect is

significant or not (Priyatno, 2013: 48). Using F test, the test is done toward to tolerant errors (α) = 0,05.

Coeffecient analysis (R^2) is used to examine the percentage of the effect value of independent variable simultaneously towards dependent variables. The value of R2 is known by consulting *model summary table of Adjusted R Square column.* R^2 has range between 0 and 1 (0<R^2<1), where the higher of R2 value of a regression which is the better value will be. It means that all of the independent variable could simultaneously explain the independent variable.

D. Findings and Discussion

The findings of this study show that the effect of input (National exam, and students' term) toward Indonesian morphology and syntactical interferences which occurred in ELLT in state Islamic Institute of Tulungagung and PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung and were tested using multiple regressions linier as displayed in 4.1, while the complete calculation can be seen in attactment1.

This study found that *Adjusted R-Squared* value is 0.174. Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference variables showed that English National Examination score, English subject score, institution, Students' perception on using Indonesian structure, lecturers' interference and students'term is 17.4%, while the rest is 82.6% influenced by other factors which are excluded in this study.

The F-count value of 8.425 (Ft= 0.000 < 0.05) indicates that the variables of English National Examination score, English subject score, institution, Students' perception on using Indonesian structure, lecturers' interference and students' term were significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It shows that to reduce the effect of morphological and syntactical pattern of Javanese as L1 and Indonesian as L2 in using English, it is necessary to pay attention to all those factors simultaneously.

Based on table 4.1, it could be said that the equation of multiple linier regression used in this study is as follows:

$$Y = 11.517 - 0.022 - 0.324X2 + 4.002X3 + 0.318X4 - 0.382X5 - 1.853X6 + e$$

The explanation of the equation above is as follows:
1. a = 11.517, shows that if the predictor variable or independent variable is considered as constant or assumed = 0, the contribution value of morphology-syntactical Indonesian interference is 11.517.
2. b1 = – 0.022, shows that the variable of national examination score (X1) is negative significant toward the Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. The improvement of one unit of the national examination score will reduce or decrease Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference (Y) value of 0.022 considering other variables, such as English subject score (X2), institution (X3), students' perception on using Indonesian structure (X4), lecturers' interference (X5) and students' term (X6) which are constant.
3. b2 = – 0.324, shows that the value of English subject score (X2) was negative significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. The improvement of one unit value of English subject score (X2) will reduce morphology-syntactical Indonesian interference (Y) value of 0.324 considering

other variables, such as National exam score (X1), institution (X3), questionaire score (X4), lecturers' interference (X5) and students'term (X6) which are constant.

4. b3 = 4.002, shows that institution variable (X3) was positive significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. The improvement of one unit of institution will improve Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference (Y) value of 4.002 considering other variables, such as national examination score (X1), English subject score (X2), students' perception on using Indonesian structure (X4), lecturers' interference (X5) and students' term (X6) which are constant.

5. b4 = 0.318, shows that the value of students' perception on using Indonesian structure (X4) was positive significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. The improvement of one unit of students' perception on using Indonesian structure will improve Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference (Y) value of 0.318 considering other variables, such as national examination score (X1), English subject score (X2), institution (X3), lecturers' interference (X5) and students'term (X6) which are constant.

6. b5 = -0.382, shows that variable of students' term (X5) was positive significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. The improvement of one unit of students' term will improve Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference (Y) value of -0.382 considering other variables, such as national examination score (X1), English subject score (X2), institution (X3), students' perception on using Indonesian structure (X4), and students' term (X6) which are constant.

7. b6 = – 1.853, shows that variable of students' term (X5) was positive significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. The improvement of one unit of students' term will reduce Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference (Y) value of -1.853 considering other variables, such as national examination score (X1), English subject score (X2), institution (X3), students' perception on using Indonesian structure (X4), and lecturers' interference (X5) which are constant.

Further explanation can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.1. Calculation of linier multiple regressions

No	Variable	Notation	Regression Coefficient	Error Standard
1	Constant	a	11.517	10.397
2	National Exam Score	X1	-0.022	0.102
3	English Subject Score	X2	-0.324	1.032
4	Institution	X3	4.002	1.089
5	Students' perception on using Indonesian structure	X4	0.318	0.210
6	Lecturers' interference	X5	-0.382	0.240
7	Students' term	X6	-1.853	0.298
R			0,444	
R-squared			0,197	
Adjusted R-Squared			0,174	
S.E of regression			7.48995	
Dependent Variable : Morpho-syntactical Interference (Y)				

Source: The Result Analysis of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)

The table above which shows that the value of t_{count} and the level of significant of each variable can be explained as follows:

1. The value of t_{count} variable of National exam score (X1) is -0.213 with the level significant of 0.831 > 0.05. It means that the value of national exam score is not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

2. The value of t_{count} variable of English score (X2) is -0.314 the level significant of 0.754 < 0.05. It means that the value of English subject score (X2) is significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

3. The value of t_{count} variable of institution (X3) is 3.674 with the level significant of 0.000 > 0.05. It means that the value of institutions is significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

4. The value of t_{count} variable of students' perception on using Indonesian structure (X4) is 1.513 with the level significant of 0.132 < 0.05. It means that the value of students' perception on using Indonesian structure is not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

5. The value of t_{count} variable of lecturers' interference (X5) is 1.587 with the level significant of 0.114 > 0.05. It means that the value of lecturers' interference is not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

6. The value of t_{count} variable of students' term (X6) is -6.215 with the level significant of 0.000 > 0.05. It means that the value of students' term is significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference.

Based on the calculation above, the researcher comes to some conclusions as follows:

1. National exam score was negative not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It means that it does not affect factually toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT at state Islamic institution of Tulungagung and PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung. National Examination score is not the correct parameter to evaluate the effect on arising morphology-syntactical interference and students' Javanese and Indonesian syntactical pattern in using English.

2. English subject score was negative not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It means that it does not affect factually toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT at both institutions. English subject is not become as the correct parameter.

3. The institution was positive significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It means that it affects factually toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT at both institutions. The result of computation found that English Department students of state Islamic institution of Tulungagung have higher score than those of PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung.

4. The students' perception on using Indonesian structure in ELLT was positive not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It means it does not affect factually toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT at both institutions. It shows that it is not become the correct parameter.

5. The English lecturers' competence was positive not significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It means it does not affect factually toward

Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT at both institutions. It shows that the good competence of conducting communication without any effect of Javanese or Indonesian was not affected by English lecturers' competence.

6. The students' term was negative significant toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference. It means it does not affect factually toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT at both institutions. The higher students' term of English Department have, the lower score of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference they make.

For further explanation, it can be seen in the following table.

Table 4.2. T-test result

No	Variable	Notation	t -count	Prob
1	National Exam Score	X1	-0.213	0.831
2	English Subject'Scores	X2	-0.314	0.754
3	Institution	X3	3.674	0.000
4	Students' perception on using Indonesian structure on arising Morphology-Syntactical Indonesian Interference	X4	1.513	0.132
5	English Lecturers' Competence	X5	-1.587	0.114
6	Students 'Term	X6	-6.215	0.000
Dependent Variable : Morpho-syntactical Interference (Y)				

Source: The Result Analysis of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS)

The results above show that the input factors which affect factually on the raising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT both institutions are educational institution and student's term. They also show that undergraduate students majoring in English department of State Islamic Institute of Tulungagung have higher score of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference than those of PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung as what Trowler, (2010) portraits that student engagement is related with the interaction between time, effort and other relevant resources invested by both students and their institutions and intended to optimize the student experience and to enhance the learning outcomes and students' development and the performance and the reputation of the institution.

The observation shows that most of the teaching strategies used by the lecturers are presentation and discussion and they should actively ask some questions to the students or be the model or guests in show biz programs. Furthermore, questionnaire results show that the students were assigned by the lecturers to present any interesting topics and had to be ready in classroom presentation. Then they had to find some partners and discussed their ideas in front of the class with their peers. It indicated that the classroom interaction seemed lively even though they got interfered by Indonesian structure. The more exposure in using English language, the higher score of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference they produce or create. These findings are also in line with the theory of CLIL use of interaction as a major component of both sociocultural and ecological perspective (van Lier in Devos, 2016). Gas and Selinker

(2008) state that "learning is not situated in an individual's cognition; that is, it is not an intrapsychological process, it is rather linked to social and local ecology; it is adaptive to an emergent set of resources, resources that are embodied in social interaction (p.280). Thus, the richness of a FL learning environment depends on the frequency of interactions it affords of inhabitants. Ellis (1998) argues that a powerful way to evaluate the richness of a classroom is to observe the frequency of opportunities there are for the learners to take charge of interactions. Based on this the value of a context can be evaluated by the opportunities it provides learners to use the target language in social interactions.

Moreover, this study reveals that the longer term the students have, the lower score of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT they produce. The observation results show that undergraduate students majoring in English department at both institutions did not have much self confidence to speak English in longer term achievement and this was caused by some factors such as the course content and the more complicated terms and vocabulary especially for linguistics subjects and teaching evaluation. The questionnaire results show that they were afraid of making mistakes, and then they prefer answering or asking in Indonesian. They thought it was difficult to understand course content and most of the lexical words or linguistics terms are difficult enough to understand and so they rephrase using their own words. This is in line with what Carroll (in El-deli, 2010) portraits that competence theory attaches more importance to the learners understanding of the structure of the foreign language than to their facility in using that structure, since it is believed that, provided the student has a proper degree of cognitive control over the structures of the language, facility will develop automatically with the use of the language in meaningful situations.

E. Conclusion

Based on the finding and discussion in this study, this researcher comes up with the following conclusions:

The findings of this study indicated that there was positive significant or significant influence of educational institution toward morphology-syntactical Indonesian interference at state Islamic institution of Tulungagung and PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung. It showed that institution affects factually toward Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in interaction of EFL both institutions. The result of computation found that English Department students of state Islamic institution of Tulungagung have higher scores than those of PGRI teacher training college of Tulungagung. This is in line with the Austin theory about student's involvement in college (1999) which says the greater the student's involvement in college, the greater the amount of the student learning and personal development will be.

The longer term the students have, the lower score of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference in ELLT they produce. This is in contrary with what Granena (2014) posts that aptitude played a role in ultimate morpho-syntactic attainment by a group of early childhood learners. In this case, competence is not the tacit knowledge of the native speaker, as originally defined by (Chomsky in El-deli, 2010), but is conscious knowledge. This theory assumes the language learning is a process of acquiring conscious control of the phonological, grammatical, and lexical patterns of a

second language, largely through study and analysis of these patterns as a body of knowledge. In this regard, Camphell (in El-deli, 2010) notes that the ability of our students to speak and understand a foreign language must, impart, depend upon our ability as teachers to provide them with the opportunity to acquire native speaker competence, that is, to provide them with the rules that will permit them to produce and interpret an infinite number of grammatical sentences they have never seen or heard in our classrooms or in the text books.

Since this study only focuses on the effect of input with five independent variables and one dependent variable on the arising of Indonesian morphology-syntactical interference with a relatively small number of respondents, further researcher is suggested to conduct a study with bigger number of respondents selected from various universities to get more comprehensible idea of parameter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arronof, M, & Fudeman, K. (2005). *What Is Morphology?* Balckwell Publishing

Arshad, U., & Kahn, F. (2015). Morphosyntactic deviation of verbs: A study of undergraduate's writings. *Asian Journal of Social & Humanities*, Vol. 4(2), 176-187.

Ary, D., Jacobs, C.L., Sorensen, C., Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education (8th Ed)*. USA: Wdsworth, Cengage Learning.

Astin, W. A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory. *Journal of College Development*, Vol. 40 (5), 518-529.

Austin, J. (2009). Delay, interference and bilingual development: The acquisition of verbal morphology in children learning Basque and Spanish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, Vol.13 (4), 447-479.

Baranek, K.L. (1996*). The effect of rewards and motivation on student achievement.* Thesis. Graduate Program of Grand Valley State University.

Bock, K. & Griffin, Z.M. (2000).The persistence of structural priming: Transient activation or implicit learning? *Journal of Experimental Psychology*: General, 129, 177-192.

Bock, K, & Levelt, W. (1994). Language production: Grammatical encoding. In M. Gemsbacher (Ed), *Handbook of psycholinguistics*. San Diego, CA: Academic press.

Cassie, D. (2012). *Effects of academic anxiety on the performance of students with and without learning disabilities and how students can cope with anxiety at school*.Thesis.Graduate program of Northern Michigan University.

Chang, F., Dell, G.S., Bock. K., & Griffin, Z.M. (2000). Structural priming as implicit learning: A comparison of models of sentence production. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29, 217-229.

Chemiron, K E. (2015). *Effects of English language proficiency on performance of physics in national examination in west Pokot County in Kenya*. Thesis. Graduate Program of University of Nairobi.

Devos, J. N. (2016). *Peer interactions in new content and language integrated settings*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

El-dali.M.H. (2010). Does form-focused instruction affect l2 learners performance?: focus on grammatically judgments. *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 3, 57-99.

Ellis, R. (1998). The evaluation of communicative tasks. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), Materials development in language teaching, (217-228). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquistion*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ferreira, V.S., & Bock, K. (2006). The function of structural priming. *Language and Cognitive Process*, 23, 1011-1029.

Fowler, H.W. (2009). *Dictionary of modern English usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gas, S. M. ,& Selinker, L. (2008*). Second language acquisition: An introductory course (3rd ed.*). New York : Routledge.

Granena, G. (2014). Language aptitude and long-term achievement in early childhood L2 learners. *Applied Linguistics,* Vol.35 (4), 483-503.

Haskell, R. T., Thornton, R., & Macdonald C. M. (2009). Experience and grammatical agreement: statistical learning shapes number agreement production. *Cognition*, 114, 151-164.

Lieber, R. (2009). *Introducing morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murcia, C.M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrel, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*. Regents of the University of California, Vol. 6 (2), 5-35.

Nurhayati, D.A.W. (2015a). Morphological process and morphophonemic process of Alay variation. *Lingua*. Vol. 12, (1), 59-70.

Nurhayati, D.A.W. (2016b). Word formation processes and techniques in understanding waria slang Tulungagung. *EFL Journal*, Vol.1 (1), 59-87.

Nurhayati, D.A.W. (2016c). Phonological system of Tengger dialect in ngoko speech level. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, Vol.1 (1), 1-12.

Nurhayati, D.A.W. (2016d). Using local drama in writing and speaking: EFL learners' creative expression. *JELTL,* Vol. 1 (1), 51-77.

Nurhayati, D.A.W. (2016f). Investigating morphological process of payandra on Javanese metaphor. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics* 2016, Vol. 1 (3), 245-259.

Priyatna, D. (2013). *Analisis Korelasi Regresi dan Multivariate dengan SPSS*. Yogyakarta: Gava Media.

Pudin, et al. (2015). Exploring L1 Interference in the Writings of Kadazandusun ESL Students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 5*(1), 2015

Stern, H.H. (1999). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stump, T.G. (2003). Inflectional morphology: A theory of paradigm structure. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suleymanov, O.A.Y. (2015). The interference process at the morphological and syntactical levels. *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies,* Vol. 2(1),582-587.

Sutopo, H.B. (2002). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Dasar Teori dan Penerapannya dalam Penelitian*. Sebelas Maret University Press, Jl. Ir. Sutami 36A Surakarta.

Thompson, I. (2014). *Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia)*. http://aboutworldlanguages.com/bahasa-indonesia (Online, retrieved on 20 March, 2017).

Trowler, V. (2010). *Student engagement literature review*. Department of Educational

Research Lancaster University: The higher Education Academy.

Ur, P.M. (2009). *A course in language teaching practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Usha, P. & Kader A.N. (2016). Syntactic and morphological error analysis in English language among secondary school students of Kerala. *ISOR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, Vol.21 (2),1 , 99-103.

Van Valin, Jr. D. R. (2001). *An Introduction to syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, M. & Burden, R.L.(2000). *Psychology for language teachers*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.