NUANCE IN SIMPLE AND PAST TENSE PATTERNS BY INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Lalu Suhirman
Universiy of Cenderawasih
Jl. Sentani, Abepura, Jayapura, Papua
Email: lalusuhermanmpd@gmail.com

Abstract
This article aims to identify the differences between Indonesian and English in constructing *affirmative, negative, and interrogative* sentences in simple present and present progressive, and simple past and past progressive tenses. This research is descriptive qualitative design. The 40 first semester students of STIKOM Jayapura was selected as research subject. The result indicated that Contrastive Analysis was the systematic study of a pair of languages with a view to identifying their differences and similarities with the assumption the different elements between the native (Indonesian) and the target (English) language caused learning problems, while similar elements did not cause any problems. Contrastive analysis hypothesis is criticized for not all problems predicted by contrastive analysis always appear to be difficult for the students. Errors that do turn up are not predicted by contrastive analysis, but if errors cannot be identified through Contrastive Analysis, it will be suggested using Error Analysis.

Key-words: Contrastive Analysis, tenses, affirmative, negative, interrogative

1. INTRODUCTION

Contrastive analysis (CA) is the systematic study of a pair of languages with a view to identifying their structural differences and similarities between Indonesian and English grammar dealing with the assumptions that the similarities facilitate learning while differences cause problems. Through CA, problems can be predicted and considered for the development of teaching and learning second language of foreign language. However, not all problems predicted by CA always appear to be difficult for the students.

CA is the systematic study of a pair of languages with a view to identifying their structural differences and similarities. CA was extensively used in the 1960s and early 1970s as a method of explaining why some features of a target language were more difficult to acquire than others (Revers 1983). CA proponents came to advocate that L2 instructional materials could be prepared more efficiently by comparing two languages and, in the process, predict learners' behaviors and difficulties.

Some researchers even believed that when similarities and differences between an L1 and an L2 were taken into account, pedagogy could be more effective and useful. Such arguments gave birth to the basic ideas of CA. The theoretical foundations for what became

known as the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis were formulated in Lado's *Linguistics Across Cultures* (1957). He describes a system of CA which lays down how to carry out rigorous steps-by-step comparison of the L1 and the L2 in terms of their phonology, grammar, writing systems, and culture (Cook, 1994:10).

In second or foreign language acquisition, Indonesian learners get a lot of problems and errors. Those happened due to experiences in learning L1 transferred in the target language. In this case, learners use linguistics devices in L1 can affect the structure of SL/FL which has different elements. Lado, 1957 declared,"…those elements that are similar to this native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult. Where two languages were similar, positive transfer would occur; where they were different, negative transfer, or interference, would result," (in Cook, 1994:11).

English is one of the main foreign languages in Indonesia which has been taught for ages and in all unit levels of educational institutions. English becomes compulsory subject starting from secondary schools up to university. Recently, English is started to be taught at the elementary school level by the goal to introduce it earlier to young learners for preparing them to the complex of its linguistics elements.

In Indonesia, English can be as a second language or as a foreign language. It might be as a second language for learners who were born and living in town social environment because they use Indonesian as their mother tongue, while, it becomes a foreign language for those who have their own mother tongue (ethnic language) and they just learn Indonesian officially at school. Event though, it is admitted that English is much more attracted for Indonesian students to learn it, but on the other side, they also declare that English is still very difficult to accomplish. In fact, only a few of the graduations from senior high schools or even universities can speak or master English well.

What make Indonesian learners difficult to accomplish or master English? The writer assumes that there are two factors affect learners learning English, such as linguistics and non-linguistics factors. Linguistics factors include the differences of Indonesian and English which cover their phonology, grammar, syntax, semantic, writing systems, and culture (language culture). Therefore, non-linguistics problems consist of learner's motivation, school learning facility, English teacher's qualification, environment, or parents' encouragement.

In this small paper, the writer is interested in identifying the learners' difficulties and errors in composing simple and past tense sentences through CA. The writer tries to investigate the differences and the similarities of the linguistic devices or elements of both languages, Indonesian and English, especially focusing on the pattern structure of simple and past tenses. The simple and past tenses include the pattern structure of simple present and simple present progressive tenses, simple past and past progressive tenses, and each of which, will be analyzed the discrimination and equality elements of affirmative, negative, and interrogative sentences.

Again, this paper is aimed to give a clear example of how compare the pattern of simple and past tenses in English and Indonesian by using CA. Further, this paper is also aimed to give a clear understanding about how Indonesian differs from English in the sense of its language features. This paper mainly deals with the similarities and dissimilarities of the two languages, Indonesian and English, in case, especially learners are expected to grasp the

significance of these simple and past tense structures. Lado, 1964 (in Cook, 1984:11) states that similar linguistic elements of the two languages deliver positive advantages for learners.

The problem of this paper is focused and limited to the construction of simple and past tense pattern sentences of Indonesian and English. The simple and past tenses include the pattern structure of simple present and simple present progressive tenses, simple past and past progressive tenses, and each of which, will be analyzed the discrimination and similarity elements of affirmative, negative, and interrogative sentences.

To make the discussion more accurate and appropriate, it might be better to formulate a few problems in questions forms. The questions are:

1. Are there any differences in constructing *affirmative* sentences between Indonesian and English (especially in forming simple present and present progressive, and simple past and past progressive tenses)?
2. Are there any differences in constructing *negative* sentences between Indonesian and English (especially in forming simple present and present progressive, and simple past and past progressive tenses)?
3. Are there any differences in constructing *interrogative* sentences between Indonesian and English (especially in forming simple present and present progressive, and simple past and past progressive tenses)?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1 Definition of Contrastive Analysis

CA is the study and comparison of two languages, learners' target language and learners' native language. This is done by looking at all elements of linguistic device similarities and differences of the second or foreign languages. Seaton (1982:115) prefers using term "contrastive linguistic" and defined it as the scientific description of the similarities and differences between two or more languages and the problems the speaker of one language will have in learning another. Applicable in the preparation of course books, tests, and translation. Further, he shows the beginning of a systematic comparison of language was a treatise on the inflectional ending verbs in Sankrit, Greek, Latin, Persian and Germanic, published in 1816.

Stephen verifies that the basic idea of CA is that errors are seen as a highly negative aspect of the second language learning process. This is because CA, based on the ideas of behaviorism, sees errors as misbehaviors. On this view, the presence of errors could lead to long-term and permanent types of problems for the second language learner. In the basic behaviorist view, errors need to be stamped out as quickly as possible before they became an established routine or behavior. Likewise, errors were seen as being a main difference between first language and second language acquisition processes. The main purpose of CA was to develop a technique which would allow teachers to somehow deal with errors, eradicating them (Stephen, 2010).

CA is a way of comparing learners L1 and L2 to analyze possible difficulties that the learners might encounter in L2 learning situation. CA assumes that when learners try to learn L2, the patterns and rules of L1 cause main difficulties to their L2 learning. The main difficulties are found based on the linguistic structure comparison of two languages.

Therefore, L2 teachers can have better understanding of students' different types of learning difficulties caused by their different linguistic backgrounds (Selinker, 2008).

Freeman and Long state that researchers from the 1940s to 1960s conducted CA, systematically comparing two languages. They were motivated by the prospect of being able to identify points of similarity and difference between particular native languages (NLs) and target languages (TLs), believing that a more effective pedagogy would result would result when these were taken into consideration. Charles Fries, one of the leading applied linguists, started in this way: "the most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner", (Freeman and Long 1991:52).

The earliest second language acquisition studies of the seventies for caused to a great extent on the plausibility of the notion of transfer, particularly negative transfer or interference from what was learned in the first language, (Rivers, 1983:158). The most difficult areas of the L2 (second or target language) are those that differ most from the L1 (first or native language); 'those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult (Lado in Cook, 1994:11).

The basic idea of CA is that errors are seen as a highly negative aspect of the second language learning process. This is because contrastive analysis, based on the ideas of behaviorism, sees errors as misbehaviors. On this view, the presence of errors could lead to long-term and permanent types of problems for the second language learner. In the basic behaviorist view, errors need to be stamped out as quickly as possible before they became an established routine or behavior. Likewise, errors were seen as being a main difference between first language and second language acquisition processes. The main purpose of CA was to develop a technique which would allow teachers to somehow deal with errors, eradicating them.

2.2 Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

Subsequent empirical studies of errors made by second language students led to the discovery, however, that many errors are not traceable to the structure of the first language, but are common to second language performers of different linguistic backgrounds (Krashen, 1981:64). According to Lado 1957 clarifies that the contrastive hypothesis refers to the structure of the first language affects the acquisition of the second language. The term "contrastive hypothesis" refers to the theory itself while "contrastive analysis" focuses on the method of implementation of the hypothesis. On the other hand, "contrastive analysis hypothesis" emphasizes both the theory and method simultaneously (Brown, 2007).

The contrastive analysis hypothesis has swept the field like a tidal wave, although its strong version –that it can predict most of the errors a learner will make while learning a second language –is being toned down to the claim that it can account for a great number of errors that L2 learners have actually made. Though its impact on foreign language teaching has been felt by almost all concerned, the CA claim still remains a hypothesis (Admin, 2010).

In the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis the learner's over-all behavior and certainly their linguistic behavior is controlled/determined/dominated by the L1. Therefore, the learning of the L2 is an uphill battle in which a new system needs to be built in the overriding

presence of a dominant system. Errors, for their part, arise based on the influence of the L1 on the L2. From this point of view then errors can either be prevented a priori or explained a posteriori through a careful analysis of the structural system of both the L1 and the L2 (Stephen, 2010).

Behaviorist theorists viewed language transfer as an important source of error and interference in L2 learning, because L1 'habits' were so tenacious and deeply rooted. The interlanguage theorists who followed downplayed the influence of the L1 in L2 learning, however, because of their preoccupation with identifying creative processes at work in L2 development; they pointed out that many L2 errors could not lie traced to L1 influence, and were primarily concerned with discovering patterns and developmental sequences on this creative front (Mitchell and Myles, 2001:2).

2.3 Role and Significances of CA in Foreign Language Teaching

CA is the systematic study of a pair of languages with a view to identifying. Pedagogically speaking, it has contributed a lot to the field of language learning in the sense that it has the ability to predict the areas of difficulty, that errors will take place and the tenacity (Freeman and Long, 1991:56). CA was born as a result of a rather simple assumption. Aware of the same errors appearing so regularly and methodically in the works of increasing numbers of students, language teachers gradually came to assume that they could predict what mistakes the majority of learners would make. From such mistakes, the assumption went on; teachers would be better equipped to foresee difficulties and, consequently, would become wiser in directing learning and teaching efforts (Al-Sibai, 2008).

CA provides an objective and scientific base for second language teaching. While learning a second language, if the mother tongue of the learner and the target language both has significantly similar linguistic features on all the levels of their structures, there will not be much difficulty in learning the new language in a limited time (Cook 1993, Freeman and Long 1991). Afraz & Ghaemi (2012) also state that the CA hypothesis is based on two important assumptions. *First*, it is believed that the degree of difference between the two languages under analysis corresponds to the degree of difficulty. *Second*, the degree of similarity is advocated to correspond to the degree of simplicity. Therefore, the greater the differences, the more difficult it will be for the learner to learn a second language, and obviously the more similar the languages, the simpler it will be for the learners.

For knowing the significantly similar structures in both languages (Indonesian and English), the first step to be conducted is compared and translated the both language patterns vise versa independently. After the independent analysis, to sort out the different features of the two languages, comparison of the two languages is necessary. From this analysis it is easy to make out that at different levels of structures of these two languages there are some features quite similar and some quite different. Bennuai (2008) declares that CA is based on the following assumptions: (i) the main difficulties in learning a new language are caused by interference from the first language or 'language transfer', (ii) such difficulties can be identified by CA, and (iii) teaching materials can make use of CA to eliminate the interference effects.

According to the popular assumptions of the CA, the structural similarities will lead to facilitation and differences will cause interferences in the context of second/foreign language

learning situations. This is however only a prediction and a partial understanding of the problems and prospects of a second/foreign language situation (Cook 1994:11). The learner's problems are not always constrained to the predictions of a contrastive study. Teachers' competence, motivation and attitude of learners, teaching methods and instructional materials are the other variables that can significantly influence second/foreign language teaching. However, a contrastive grammar is highly useful for a motivated teacher and a learner for a more effective process of teaching and learning.

CA proponents came to advocate that L2 instructional materials could be prepared more efficiently by comparing two languages and, in the process, predict learners' behaviors and difficulties. Some researchers even believed that when similarities and differences between an L1 and an L2 were taken into account, pedagogy could be more effective and useful. Such arguments gave birth to the basic ideas of CA. The theoretical foundations for what became known as the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis were formulated in Lado's *Linguistics Across Cultures* (1957). In this book, Lado claimed that "*those elements which are similar to* [the learner's] *native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult*", (Cook 1994:11).

The pedagogical implications of contrastive analysis were strongly felt particularly with the publication of Lado (1957). Based on a detailed comparison of all the different structural systems of the two languages, teachers tried to predict where their students will have problems and where there will be no problems and, thus, the teacher will know exactly what to teach and what they do not need to teach. Materials were designed with this approach in mind and all was well until it was clear that the model did not work, not in the strong form anyway. There are several problems with the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. This view is related to behaviorism in that they both really (Stephen 2010 and Freeman and Long, 1991).

The view of L2 learning consists largely of the projection of the system of L1 on the L2. This will be successful when the two languages are the same – called positive transfer by some; it will be unsuccessful whenever the L2 fails to correspond to the L1- negative transfer. This point of view is supported by Richards and Rodgers (2001:59) that a CA of the differences between the native language and the target language, since these differences are thought to be the cause of the major difficulties the learner will be encounter.

The conventional criticisms are that many of the differences predicted by CA does not in fact turn out to be problems for the learners and vice versa, many of the learners' actual problems are not predicted (Cook, 1994:11). Rivers also controversy raged as to whether errors made by second language learners represented negative transfer (interference) from first language habits of use or were really developmental errors of a universal characters, since they often seemed similar to those made by first language, rather than as the transfer of first language habits (Rivers, 1982:158).

Chomsky has contradictory believe with the behaviorists' points in language acquisition and CA. His view of language acquisition is not a product of habit formation but rather one of rule formation. Humans are thought to possess a certain innate predisposition to induce the rules of a target language from the input to which they are exposed. Children learning English as a first language make errors similar to that of students' of English as a second language. These suggest that they have internalized rules for subject-verb agreement and past tense formation but had not yet mastered the limitations of the rules (Cook, 1994:14

and Revers and Long, 1983:158). Furthermore, such original errors indicate that the children are not simply repeating forms from the input they have encountered. SL learners commit similar 'developmental; errors apparently not due to L1 interference. After initial exposure to the target language learners form hypotheses about the nature of certain target language rules.

3. METHOD

The design of this research is descriptive qualitative design. Specifically, this study attempted to compare how the linguistic features/elements of English and Indonesian pattern structures particularly in forming affirmative, negative and interrogative sentences in simple and past tenses. In the attempt of comparing the similarity and the difference of the structure of simple and past tenses between English Indonesian. To analyze the pattern structures made by the students was analyzed using CA.

The resources of data are the sentences in simple and past tenses form made by the students of STIKOM (Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Komunikasi Muhammadiyah) Jayapura first semester. Errors found are not relevant with CA will be ignored. The data instruments used in this study are tests which include translation tests (Indonesian sentences translated in English) and cloze test. The test consists of Indonesian sentences in four tenses and each of which in affirmative, negative and interrogative sentences. The data are the sentences made by the students, dealing with the tests translated into English from Indonesian sentences. Sentences translated in English are collected as the data of this study. The data of this study are pattern sentences of affirmative, negative and interrogative in simple and past tenses will be analyzed using CA, namely, to compare Indonesian and English structure. The comparison focused on to see the similarity and the difference structure of the two languages. If errors are not illegible with the contrastive analysis will be ignored.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section discusses problems dealing with the objectives of this paper which covers sentence structure and adverbs of time or tenses of simple present and simple past. The sentence structure discusses the pattern of affirmative, negative, and interrogative, while tenses to see any verbs changes influenced by the time.

Word order in Indonesian is generally similar to word order in English: subject–verb-object (S-V-O). The basic order for Indonesian sentence is; Subject, Verb, Object or Adjective or Adverb. In syntactical term, simply uses the definition of S = NP.VP. A short hand way of saying that pattern is; a sentence consists of Noun Phrase and Verb Phrase. Furthermore, the order can be put in various ways, e.g. a sentence may come from NP.VP, or NP.NP, or NP.AP or NP.PP. In English, the order strictly lies on S = NP.VP (sometimes VP with to be or linking verb).

English verb tenses are particularly difficult for Indonesian English language learners because verbs in Indonesian are not marked for tense (no verbs changes). These are conveyed through context, auxiliary (aspect) markers, or temporal adverbs while Indonesian does not know auxiliary or helping verbs. In English, learners may over-use temporal adverb markers, have difficulty with auxiliaries, or having difficulty choosing the correct tense construction. Indonesian commonly use original verb in constructing a sentence and it does not have any

influence to tense (time) and the changes of subjects (single or plural, first person or third person singular or plural), especially in simple present tense.

4.1. Affirmative Sentences

Let's see the affirmative or positive sentences in simple present and simple past tense that the students made from translating Indonesian sentences into English (see appendix A, table 1 and 2). We can see the difference and the similarity of those two languages.

Based on those sentences, it can be compared the Indonesian and English construction in simple present tense pattern in affirmative sentences. In general the constructions of Indonesian and English (sentence 1 to 6 table 1) in simple present are equal, but it must be a problem for Indonesian learners when they translate Indonesian into English. Sentence 3 to 6 table 1, they translated in English, e.g.: *(3) My mother go to the garden every day, (4) I happy today, (5) we in the class now, and (6) Hasan a student.* It is clear that, the students omitted suffix *es* for *goes* in sentence 3, while sentence 4, 5, and 6 (table 1) do not have verbs, learners avoid using verbs (auxiliary verbs am, are, is) that should be in those sentences.

It is obvious that Indonesian does not know verb inflection caused by the third person singular as in sentence 3, *go* becomes *goes.* It is also similar with sentence 4,5, and 6, because Indonesian does not know auxiliary verbs or helping verbs, that is why, when learners create sentences they just transfer their language structure. In this different linguistics elements, it is suggested to the English teacher to explain intensively and give learners exercise repeatedly. Learners can learn from different native language and target language elements to avoid making errors of the target language.

The construction of affirmative simple past sentences are also the same as affirmative simple sentences. The Indonesian seems that does not know verbs exchange in simple past because Indonesian doesn't have tenses (adverbs of time that can change verbs. Indonesian actually has adverbs of time, such as simple present tense: *sekarang* (now), *hari ini* (today), *setiap hari* (everyday), *setiap sore* (every afternoon), and so forth, and simple past: *kemarin* (yesterday), *tadi pagi* (this morning), *tadi malam* (last night), *dua hari yang lalu* (two days ago), etc. see sentences 1 to 6 on table 2, the English sentences in simple past form were the result of transferring Indonesian into English. Even though the sentences completed with past tense adverbs of time but the verbs used in to infinitive or simple verbs (sentences 1, 2, and 3), while verbs (auxiliary verbs) are omitted.

Generally construction or word order in simple past sentences are similar both Indonesian and English languages, but what makes it's different is the changes verbs. English has verb exchange which is depending the tense or adverbs of time, such as *eat, drink, go* for simple tense becomes *ate, drank, went* for past tense. The same as the use of to be: *am, is*, and *are* for simple tense becomes *was* (for am and is) and *were* for simple past tenses. The avoidance of using verbs past tense in sentence 1 to 3 (table 2) because the Indonesian as the learners' native language does not know verb changes, and also for sentences 4 to 6, it is due to Indonesian doesn't have to be or helping verbs to describe adjectives, nouns, or adverbs.

4.2. Negation

Again, generally constructions of Indonesian and English negation are the same (S + NOT + V + O) for Indonesian (S + aux+ NOT + V + O) for English. There are two main

negative words in Indonesian, *tidak*and *bukan*. *Bukan* is used to negate a predicate noun: *Hasan bukan murid (dua tahun lalu)* which translated in English, *(Hasan not a student (two years ago)* instead of '*Hasan is a student'*, for simple tense and '*Hasan was not a student two years ago',* for simple past. In constructing negatives form learners transfer word *tidak* used to negate all other predicates (see appendix B, sentences table 4 and 5) and translated *not* or *no* in English. Indonesian learners may produce sentences, *'she no understand English' or 'She no in the classroom'*.

Let us look negation forms in sentences 1, 2, and 3 (table 3), in English negation for original verb predicate, it is needed auxiliary verb *do* or *does* for simple tense negation, and *did* for simple past negation (see sentences 1, 2, and 3 table 4). And so do sentences 4, 5, and 6 (table 3), they should be felt with auxiliary be (helping verb be) *am , are, is* after subject as in *(I am not, we are not , Hasan is not)* for simple tense negation and *was* and *were* in sentences 4, 5, and 6 (table 4) as in *(I was not, we were not and Hasan was not)* for simple past tense.

English verb tenses are particularly difficult for Indonesian English language learners because verbs in Indonesian are not marked for tense or number. These are conveyed through context, auxiliary (aspect) markers, or temporal adverbs. In English, learners may over-use temporal adverb markers, have difficulty with auxiliaries, or having difficulty choosing the correct tense construction. Indonesian has several copulas, but these are not actually verbs, and their use is optional and especially infrequent in short constructions. If the they master the formation of past tense verbs, it is assumed that some typical errors involving negative sentences, *"I not went to school yesterday". Or "He not played tennis yesterday".* There are additional difficulties for Indonesian English language learners with auxiliary verbs. Because English auxiliaries (am, is, are, was, were, do, does, did)   do not have a one-to-one correspondence to Indonesian, learners often confuse to use them or avoid using them altogether.

4.3. Interrogative sentences

The formation of English questions can prove challenging for Indonesian English language learners, a yes/no question has the same word order as a statement. A learner may have difficulty choosing the appropriate auxiliaries (*do, does, or did*) and be (*am, is, are, or was, were*) as these depend on tense and number and have no corresponding. *Apakah* is used as an interrogative sentence generally translated into *what*,   which in English will vary according to the verb used or kind of adverbs used (see appendix C, table 5 and 6). For *yes/no* response of questions like simple interrogative sentences 1, 2, and 3 (table 5) the question word '*what*' should be changed to *do I, do we, does my mother*, while interrogative sentences for number 4,5, and 6 should become *am I, are we, is Hasan (he).*

The formation of interrogative past tense sentences are similar with simple tense questions for yes/no response, but it is different on the auxiliaries. Let's look at sentences number 1 to 6 (table 6), all *yes/no* responses of interrogative sentences produced by Indonesian English language learners used *what* for change *apakah* in simple past form. Actually, sentences 1, 2, and 3 should use past form auxiliary verb did, for (did I, did we, did my father) and sentences 4, 5, and 6 should in past form auxiliaries was or were for (was I, were I, was Hasan (he).

In specific questions using interrogative words, some Indonesian questions follow a similar word order to English, but if the interrogative is the object of the sentence it will occur after the verb, for example: *"Kamu sedang membaca apa?"* it will be easier for Indonesian English learner to create in English, i.e., *"You are reading what?"* Also, interrogative pronouns can follow a noun or a preposition. Learners may ask questions similar to:

> *'Kamu beli apa? - 'You buy what?'* (what do you buy?)
> *'Kenapa kamu begitu senang? - 'Why you so happy?'* (Why are you so happy?)
> *'Kamu pergi kemana? - 'You go where?'* (Where do you go?)

These kind of interrogative sentences fully or totally brought into English question forms. Indonesian English language learners actually can get the usefulness of the similarities and the differences of linguistics elements encourage them to master the target language. different elements the two languages can be used by English teachers to be emphasized and to be taught repeatedly.

5. CONCLUSION
CA means the comparison of two languages by paying attention to differences and similarities between languages being compared. In teaching and learning English as second language, CA is really helpful for both the teachers and the students, because we will know the differences and similarities between mother tongue (L1) and foreign language (L2). There are several aspects of CA that can be used in the classroom. They are Phonology, Semantics, and Syntax.

The Indonesian phrases are applicable law on the DM and the English phrases is MD. Third singular person in English is clearly refers to the female (She) or male (He), while the Indonesian less clear because the mere mention of '*dia* ' men and women. The verbs and the subjects in English are changed according to tenses. Adding Auxiliaries Do, Does, and Did Not in a negative sentence depend on the subject. While in Indonesian language is only added the word '*tidak*' or '*bukan*' in negative sentences.

From the previous discussion, some conclusions can be drawn as follows: CA is the systematic study of a pair of languages with a view to identifying their differences and similarities with the assumption the different elements between the native and the target language will cause learning problems, while similar elements will not cause any problems. CA hypothesis is criticized for not all problems predicted by CA always appear to be difficult for the students. On the other hand, many errors that do turn up are not predicted by CA, but if errors cannot be identified through CA, it will be suggested using Error Analysis.

6. SUGGESTIONS
For all the teachers and the students, using CA is very useful and effective in learning foreign language. Because by using CA, we can compare between our mother tongue and foreign language that we learn. I do hope for the lecturer who teaches this lesson to pay attention more, because it is an important thing that should be known by the target language learners.

Especially for English teachers, it is suggested that they have to master, at least to know the similarities and the differences of L1 and L2. By mastering the linguistics elements, they can explain that problem faced by students and give chance for them to choose what they like.

Bioprofile

Lalu Suhirman is a lecturer at English Teaching Program of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Cenderawasih University, Papua, Indonesia. He is a Ph.D. candidate of State University of Makassar. His research interest is in the area of Lesson Study, TEFL, teachers' professionalism, applied linguistics. He can be contacted at *lalusuhermanmpd@gmail.com*

REFERENCES

Al-Sibai, M. Diana . 2008. *Contrastive Analysis and Second Language Acquisition*. Retrieved on December 31, 2012 from http://www.linguistisseminar08.wetpaint.com.

Admin. 2010. *The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis*. Retrieved on http://www. www.eric.ed.gov/.../recordDetail?acc. *January 7, 2010.*

Afraz, Shahram &, Ghaemi, Hamed. 2012. The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback of Contrastive Analysis on EFL Leaners' Acquisition of Verb Tenses. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World November 2012*, Volume: 2 Issue: 4 Article: 06 ISSN: 2146-7463

Bennuai, Pairote (2008)A Study of L1 Interference in the Writing ofThai EFL Students. *Malaysian Journal Of ELT Research*, Vol. 4, pp.72-102.www.melta.org.

Cook, Vivian. 1994. *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. England: Macmillan.

Doughty, J. Chaterine & Michael H. Long. 2005. *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Blackwell Publishing.

Freeman, L.D., Long, H.M. 1991. *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.

Ingram, David. 1989. *First Language Acquisition: Method, Description, and Explanation.* Department of Linguistics. The University of British Columbia. Columbia: Cambridge University Press 1989

Krashen, D., Stephen. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* California: Perguson Press.

Mitchell, Rosamond & Myles, Florence.2001.*Second Language Learning: Concepts and Issues.*(Ed.)..English Language Teaching in its Social Context A Reader. Edited by Christopher N. Candlin and Neil Mercer, London and New York: In Association with Macquavie University and The Open University.

Rast, Rebekah. 2008. *Foreign Language Input Initial Processing*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Rivers, M.,Wilga. 1983. *Communicating Naturally in a Second Language: Theory and Practice in Language Teaching*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Scotton, Myers Carol. 2006. *Multiple Voices An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Australia: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Selinker, Larry . 2008.*Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course. Yew York:* Taylor & Francis.

Siaton, Brian. 1982. *A Handbook of English Language Teaching Terms an Practice*. London: The Mcmillan Press.

Stephen, V. Vlack. 2010. *Second Language Learning Theories*. Sookmyung Women's University Graduate School of TESOL. Retrieved on 02/01/2012 http://www.sLaLer 2010week3Ans.pdf. no pages).

APPENDICES

A. Affirmative Sentences

Table 1: Simple present Sentences (affirmative)

Indonesian	English
1. Saya makan roti setiap pagi	1. I eat bread every morning
2. Kami minum teh setiap sore	2. We drink tea every afternoon
3. Ibu saya pergi ke kebun setiap hari.	3. My mother go to the garden everyday.
4. Saya senang hari ini	4. I happy today
5. Kita di dalam kelas sekarang	5. We in the classroom now
6. Hasan seorang mahasiswa.	6. Hasan a student

Table 2: Simple past Sentences (affirmative)

Indonesian	English
1. Saya makan roti tadi malam	1. I eat bread last night.
2. Kami minum teh kemarin	2. We drink tea yesterday.
3. Ibu saya pergi ke kebun kemarin.	3. My mother go to the garden yesterday.
4. Saya senang dua hari yang lalu	4. I happy two days ago.
5. Kita di dalam kelas kemarin	5. We in the classroom yesterday.
6. Hasan seorang mahasiswa dua tahun yang lalu.	6. Hasan a student two years ago.

B. Negative Sentences

Table 3: simple present sentences *(negative)*

Indonesian	English
1. Saya tidak makan roti setiap pagi	1. I not eat bread every morning.
2. Kami tidak minum teh setiap sore	2. We not drink tea every afternoon.
3. Ibu saya tidak pergi ke kebun setiap Hari.	3. My mother not go to the garden every day.
4. Saya tidak senang hari ini.	4. I not happy today.
5. Kita tidak di dalam kelas sekarang.	5. We not in the classroom now.
6. Hasan bukan seorang mahasiswa.	6. Hasan not a student.

Table 4: Simple past Sentences (negative)

Indonesian	English
1. Saya tidak makan roti tadi malam.	1. I not eat bread last night.
2. Kami tidak minum teh kemarin.	2. We not drink tea yesterday.
3. Ibu saya tidak pergi ke kebun Kemarin	3. My mother not go to the garden yesterday.
4. Saya tidak senang dua hari yang Lalu.	4. I not happy two days ago.
5. Kita tidak di dalam kelas kemarin.	5. We not in the classroom yesterday.
6. Hasan bukan seorang mahasiswa Dua tahun yang lalu.	6. Hasan not a student two years ago.

C. Interrogative Sentences
Table 5: Simple present (interrogative)

Indonesian	English
1. Apakah saya makan roti setiap pagi?	1. What I eat bread every morning?
2. Apakah kami minum teh setiap Sore?	2. What we drink tea every afternoon?
3. Apakah Ibu saya pergi ke kebun setiap hari?	3. What my mother go to the garden every day?
4. Apakah saya senang hari ini?	4. What I happy today?
5. Apakah kita di dalam kelas Sekarang?.	5. What we in the classroom now?
6. Apakah Hasan seorang mahasiswa.	6. What Hasan a student?

Table 6: Simple past Sentences (interrogative)

Indonesian	English
1. Apakah saya makan roti tadi malam ?	1. What I eat bread last night?
2. Apakah kami minum teh kemarin?	2. What we drink tea yesterday?
3. Apakah ibu saya pergi ke kebun kemarin?	3. What my mother go to the garden yesterday?
4. Apakah saya senang dua hari yang lalu?	4. What I happy two days ago?
5. Apakah kita di dalam kelas kemarin?	5. What we in the classroom yesterday?
6. Apakah Hasan seorang mahasiswa dua tahun yang lalu?	6. What Hasan a student?