

THE CONSTRAINTS OF CROSS-LINGUISTIC TRANSFER ON BIPA LEARNING

R. Yudi Permadi¹, Riki Nasrullah¹ and Iwan Koswara²

¹Faculty of Cultural Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jl. Raya Bandung-Sumedang KM. 21 Jatinangor

²Faculty of Communication Science, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jl. Raya Bandung-Sumedang KM. 21 Jatinangor

E-mail: r.permadi@unpad.ac.id; rikinasrullah5@gmail.com;

ABSTRACT. One of the interesting issues regarding the BIPA learning process is how the similarities and differences of the source and target languages (Indonesian language) are related to students' understanding of the Indonesian language. This study is related to what is known as a cross-linguistic transfer. This paper reviews theoretically cross-linguistic transfer in learning in BIPA (Indonesian Language for Foreign Speakers). This study employed the descriptive-qualitative method. A qualitative method was used to describe the patterns of similarity between Indonesian language as the target language and the learner's native language in BIPA learning using a cross-linguistic transfer approach. The result of the study revealed that the discussion about cross-linguistic transfer in the process of learning the Indonesian language for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) was not a monolithic matter. The similarities and differences in word forms and word meanings were closely related to how quickly speakers of other languages learned the target language.

Key words: *cross-linguistic transfer; linguistics; BIPA; Indonesian language; learning*

KENDALA TRANSFER LINTAS-LINGUISTIK DALAM PEMBELAJARAN BIPA

ABSTRAK. Hal menarik yang bisa diangkat dalam kaitannya dengan proses pembelajaran BIPA adalah bagaimana kaitan antara kesamaan dan perbedaan bahasa asal dan bahasa sasaran (dalam hal ini bahasa Indonesia) dengan tingkat pemahaman pemelajar terhadap bahasa Indonesia. Kajian seperti ini bisa dikaitkan dengan apa yang disebut sebagai cross-linguistik transfer (transfer lintas linguistik). Tulisan ini mengangkat hubungan antara cross-linguistic transfer pada proses pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia bagi penutur asing ditinjau dari segi teoretis. Penelitian ini berancangan metode deskriptif-kualitatif. Dalam penelitian ini, metode kualitatif digunakan untuk memaparkan bentuk-bentuk pola kedekatan bahasa Indonesia sebagai bahasa sasaran dalam pembelajaran BIPA dengan bahasa asal pemelajar dengan menggunakan pendekatan cross-linguistic transfer. Penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa: pembahasan seputar cross-linguistik transfer pada proses pembelajaran bahasa Indonesia bagi Penutur Asing (BIPA) bukanlah suatu hal yang monolitik, persamaan dan perbedaan bentuk kata dan arti kata memiliki hubungan yang sangat relevan dengan seberapa cepat bahasa sasaran (dalam hal ini bahasa Indonesia) dapat dipelajari oleh penutur bahasa lain.

Kata kunci: *Cross-Linguistic Transfer; linguistik; BIPA; bahasa Indonesia; pembelajaran*

INTRODUCTION

In various dimensions, the Indonesian language has now become an international language. In the perspective of language teaching, the Indonesian language is now studied as one of the lessons in Indonesian schools and learned by many people in the world (foreigners) for various purposes. The Indonesian language learned by those people is known as the Indonesian language for Foreign Speakers (BIPA). The BIPA learning process is implemented in Indonesia, but it can also be implemented in other countries with BIPA program organizing institutions.

BIPA is still not very well established as one of the scientific fields. It is fairly reasonable because BIPA is still relatively new. BIPA learning started intensified around the 2000s by the Language Development and Fostering Agency, the institution responsible for the language learning process. The

intensification of BIPA learning is inseparable from Indonesian language politics, the internationalization of the Indonesian language.

As a new scientific field, BIPA has developed quite significantly. It can be seen from the increasing number of BIPA program organizers within and outside Indonesia. The BIPA program has been carried out by formal institutions, such as universities and colleges, and non-formal institutions, such as course institutions, and so on. This linguistic phenomenon does not only occur in Indonesia but also abroad. Many institutions organize teaching, training, and Indonesian language courses. For example, in Italy, several institutions and universities provide BIPA programs, including the *Instituto Universitario Orientale* Napoli, the IsMEO/IsAo Scientific Institute in Rome and Milano, the Instituto per l'Oriente Cultural Institute in Rome, CELSO (Centro Lombardia Studi Orientele) in Genova,

and the Vatican's Religious Institute, and Pontificia Universita Gregoriana (Rivai & Nimmanupap, 1998). Significant developments also occur in the Asian region, especially in Southeast Asia. For example, Thailand has several universities which provide BIPA programs, such as Chulalongkorn University, Mahidol University, Prince Songkhlanakkharin University, and Ramkhamhaeng University (Nimmanupap, 1998). The number of universities and BIPA course institutions gradually increases within and outside Indonesia. There are at least 179 BIPA organizers in 48 countries, which is predicted to continue to grow (Maryani, 2011).

The growing interest of foreigners in learning the Indonesian language impacts the need to increase the quantity of BIPA teachers. This condition must be balanced with the generalization of the quality of the teachers so that the BIPA teaching process can be carried out professionally. For BIPA teachers, experience is an 'organic fertilizer' that can improve the professionalism of BIPA teachers. In other words, the more experience in teaching BIPA, the more attractive the way to teach BIPA to BIPA students. BIPA teachers are expected to have qualified competencies as professional BIPA teachers. One of the important things that support improving the quality of BIPA learning is the creativity of teachers in teaching, which is applied to the BIPA teaching method.

The purpose of learning the Indonesian language for foreign speakers is to make the learners communicate with native Indonesian speakers without any significant difficulties. This is in line with what was expressed by Piątkowska (Piątkowska, 2015) that learning to speak another language means taking a role in a community that transcends cultural and linguistic boundaries.

In reality, some BIPA students who have passed a certain level and have been declared quite capable of using the Indonesian language (especially speaking and listening) often experience various communication problems, especially when dealing with people outside the BIPA class. The majority are still often confused and do not understand what people are talking about outside the classroom or in public places. The language used by most people is usually different from the standard Indonesian language taught in BIPA classes. What makes it even more difficult is that the interlocutors of BIPA students outside the classroom often use the Indonesian language in certain regional dialects. They can only understand a few words precisely the same as the standard Indonesian language.

A foreign language is understood as a language mastered by linguists generally through formal education and socioculturally it is not considered

their language (Hayakawa et al., 2016; Maluch et al., 2015). In this context, the interesting question would be: Can the Indonesian language be categorized as a foreign language? Who has the right to place Indonesian as a foreign language? How is the development of the number of foreign students studying Indonesian? Has the number of students each year increased, or has it decreased? What are the determining factors that influence the number of Indonesian language learners each year on whether it is increasing or decreasing?

BIPA teaching aims to give students can use Indonesian for various purposes: such as tourism, politics, social, culture, education, and so on. In this context, students expect to use the Indonesian language as a language of communication and interaction, both oral and written, based on their objectives. Therefore, the BIPA teaching process would not run optimally if it ignored the sociocultural aspects of the target language (Indonesian) community.

One of the interesting issues regarding the BIPA learning process is how the similarities and differences of the source and target languages (in this case Indonesian language) are related to students' understanding of the Indonesian language. This study is related to what is known as a cross-linguistic transfer.

For at least a century, the cross-linguistic transfer has been an important topic of discussion in applied linguistics studies, second language acquisition, and language teaching (Nsengiyumva, Oriikiriza, & Nakijoba 2021). However, in the last half-century, the importance of learning a second language has been reevaluated several times.

There are other studies about Cross-linguistic Transfer that have been carried out. For instance, Shirley Huang and Pui Fong Kan (2021) examined the relation of bilingual children's development of past tense marking in their second language (L2) with their knowledge of temporal marking in their first language (L1). This study investigated whether Cantonese-English bilingual children's knowledge of aspect markers in Cantonese (L1), along with external and internal factors, predicts their past tense marking in English (L2). Furthermore, Rose Stamp, Rama Novogrodsky, and Sabrin Shaban-Rabah (2021) studied and compared the production of simple sentences in three languages (Palestinian Arabic, Modern Standard Arabic, and Israeli Sign Language [ISL]) and three language modalities (spoken, writing, and signs) by deaf and hearing students in Arabic-speaking communities.

Dominique Savio Nsengiyumva, Celestino Oriikiriza, and Sarah Nakijoba (2021) discussed

Cross-linguistic Transfer (CLT) and language proficiency in multilingual teaching in general and highlighted a sample of CLT in Burundi. CLT exists at all levels of linguistics. Meanwhile, Nsengiyumva, Oriikiriza, and Nakijoba (2021) focused on providing examples of phonological (including phonetic), lexical and semantic, and syntactic transfers. Furthermore, Lallier and Carreiras (2018) observed behavioral and neuroimaging evidence of the alphabet writing system showing that early bilingualism modulates reading development. In particular, Lallier and Carreiras (2018) showed that cross-language variation and cross-language transfer influence bilingual reading strategies and their cognitive foundations. The study also emphasized that the impact of bilingualism on literacy acquisition depends on the specific combination of languages studied. It does not manifest itself similarly across bilingual populations.

Most of the research on Cross-linguistic Transfer is dominated by studies whose main topics are bilingualism and multilingualism. In general, research on cross-linguistic transfer has not been done much to analyze the Indonesian language for Foreign Speakers (BIPA). Therefore, this study tries to fill the gap by investigating the cross-linguistic transfer in the Indonesian language learning process for foreign speakers by reviewing the theoretical aspect.

METHOD

This research was conducted by considering two approaches: theoretical and methodological approaches. Theoretically, the approach used in this study was a cross-linguistic transfer approach. The cross-linguistic transfer effect became a controversial topic of discussion in applied linguistics for a century. In the 1950s, the cross-linguistic transfer effect (abbreviated CLTE) was considered an essential factor in second language learning and teaching theories. Then, in the 1960s, the people lending support to this theory declined due to the emergence of the notion that language learner errors are not considered evidence of linguistic transfer anymore. Still, they are included as a 'creative construction process.'

Methodologically, this research used descriptive-qualitative research. The overall data obtained were not judged to be true or false but presented based on the linguistic facts obtained. The use of this method was following what was conveyed by Sudaryanto (2015) that the data obtained in descriptive-qualitative research was from the author's observation without judging whether or not the data were right or wrong.

This study conducted three stages: providing data, analyzing data, and presenting the results of data analysis. The data were gathered using the

listening method (Sudaryanto, 2015). Furthermore, several techniques were used to obtain the data, including tapping and note-taking techniques. In this study, a qualitative method was employed to describe the forms of proximity patterns of Indonesian as the target language in BIPA learning with the learner's native language using a cross-linguistic transfer approach.

The data analysis was conducted in two ways: (a) formulation using ordinary words, including the use of technical terminology, and (b) formulation using signs or symbols. In other words, the analysis results were presented by combining informal and formal methods (Sudaryanto 2015). The informal presentation method was used to show the analysis results using descriptions or ordinary words. Meanwhile, the formal presentation method is related to signs and symbols. The implementation of the two methods was assisted by a technique referring to a combination of two methods: words and signs or symbols.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cross-Linguistic Transfer in BIPA Learning

For at least a century, cross-Linguistic Transfer has been an important topic of discussion in the study of applied linguistics, second language acquisition, and language teaching. However, language researchers reevaluated the importance of second language learning in the last half-century.

The cross-linguistic transfer effect has been the main topic of discussion in applied linguistics for a century. In the 1950s, the cross-linguistic transfer effect (abbreviated CLTE) was often seen as the most important factor in second language learning and teaching theories. Then, in the 1960s, the supporters of this theory declined it due to the emergence of the notion that language learner errors were no longer seen as evidence of linguistic transfer. Still, it is instead considered as a 'creative construction process.'

Analysis of language errors in a prescriptive framework in the 1960s and 1970s has shown that several types of language errors are common in the second language of any native speaker. The CLTE researchers considered a general pattern between second and first language acquisition from these findings. The similarity in various aspects between first and second language acquisition has primarily led to this idea being dismissed as declining. Some researchers deny the existence of language transfer in favor of universalist explanations.

Researchers have used various terminology to refer to cross-linguistic influence phenomena:

language mixing, linguistic disorder, language transfer, and the role of mother tongue and its influence.

In the 1950s, cross-linguistic transfer was often seen as the most important factor in second language learning and teaching theories. Then, in the 1960s, the supporters of the theory declined it due to the emergence that language learner errors were not seen as evidence of linguistic transfer but rather as a 'creative construction process.' Analysis of language errors in prescriptive frameworks in the 1960s and 1970s has shown that several types of errors are common in the second language of speakers of any native language. From these findings, the researchers of cross-linguistic transfer considered a general pattern between second and first language mastery. The similarity in various aspects between first and second language acquisition has primarily led to this idea being dismissed as declining. Some researchers deny the existence of language transfer in favor of universalist explanations.

However, a more balanced perspective has begun to be applied in recent years. Empirical research in the 1970s and 1980s, for example, has led to new and more recent evidence of the importance of linguistic transfer in almost all language subsystems. Many studies compare language learners' phonological, morphological, syntactic, and discourse aspects towards those whose native language differs from the target language, have shown differences in language acquisition caused by cross-linguistic influences (e.g., Ringbom, 1987; Schachter & Rutherford, 1979). With the development of studies on transfer across linguistics, researchers have carried out interesting studies in this field. For example, Master (1987) and Mesthrie and Dunne (1990) compared language learners with two or three languages. They found a language structure that can be found in one language, but it cannot be found in another language (Master, 1987; Mesthrie & Dunne, 1990).

Meanwhile, Murphy (2003) and Wei (2003) provided interesting ideas about how transfer across linguistics is related to the learner's cultural, social, and individual factors in the learning process and second language use (Murphy, 2003; Wei, 2003). It can be said that the empirical research in the last decade has led to the manifestation of new linguistic transfers in all language subsystems. Thus, the linguistic evidence of the existence of cross-linguistic transfer has been increasing, and the empirical support for the importance of cross-linguistic transfer in all language subsystems is now very strong.

Researchers have used different terminologies to refer to the existence of cross-linguistic influence

phenomena such as language mixing, linguistic disorder (Garraffa et al., 2018; Lim et al., 2018), language transfer (Asimakoulas, 2018; Garcia, 2019; Pham et al., 2018; Wang, 2018), the role of mother tongue and the influence of native language (Ionescu, Popescu, & Cahill, 2016; Vannasing et al., 2016; Xhemaili, 2013). In this case, the term language transfer will be used as evidence of cross-linguistic transfer in the language learning process, especially focusing on learning the Indonesian language for Foreign Speakers (BIPA).

The discussion about cross-linguistic transfer in the Indonesian language learning process for Foreign Speakers (BIPA) is not monolithic. Of course, many factors can affect the level of mastery of the target language (Indonesian language) by BIPA students. There must be further studies related to cross-linguistic transfer in the BIPA learning process. However, it is not easy because the study of the cross-linguistic transfer itself is complex. Some literature studies have mentioned that cross-linguistic transfer has similarities with the study of language contrastive analysis.

In recent decades, the importance of language transfer in the language learning process has been reevaluated many times. The challenge to views on the importance of language transfer did not impact the history of language teaching until the late 1970s. The challenges that emerged during that period were largely in reaction to the claims made by Lado (1957) and Fries (1952) that the existence of cross-language differences in language acquisition could be determined through contrastive analysis. This notion faced serious challenges in the 1980s, and the validity of contrastive analysis appeared to be questionable. Finally, empirical research has shown that learning difficulties do not always arise from cross-linguistic differences, and contrastive analysis does not always predict the difficulties that arise. From these various studies, it can be said that contrastive studies that were previously considered a substitute for cross-linguistic transfer studies have received strong criticism from various language researchers.

Further questions about the value of contrastive analysis arise from the error classification of language learners in a study known as "error analysis" (Al-Sobhi, 2019; Curry & Chambers, 2017; Lu & Deng, 2019). At this point, we must make a distinction between accidental errors -- memory lapses, physical exhaustion, etc., errors that don't reflect a defect in language competence -- such as speakers with aphasia (Nasrullah et al., 2021), Alzheimer's, apraxia, autism (Wahyunianto et al., 2020), etc., and errors that reflect basic knowledge of the language,

such as language competence errors (Nasrullah et al., 2019). However, it is not easy to determine what the learner's error is or what is causing the language learner's error

Language learners' errors (in this case, BIPA students) have provided evidence of the complexity of the language system used by these learners. Thus, BIPA teachers and students must pay attention to three aspects. First, for the teacher, the students' mistakes can determine how far the students have made progress, what is left for the students to learn. This is one of the ways that teachers can test the competence of BIPA students regarding the nature of the language they are learning (in this case, the Indonesian language). Second, language errors are needed by the students themselves because they can use them to keep them motivated to learn. And third, language errors provide evidence to language researchers about how language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures students use in the process of learning that language.

One of the main challenges in analyzing errors in the BIPA learning process is determining what category to define as a particular error. Some learners' errors appear not due to language transfer but from other reasons or processes. Five distinct psycholinguistic processes are important for learning language (Indonesian): language transfer, learning transfer, target language communication strategies, target language learning strategies, and overgeneralization of target language linguistic material.

However, before considering these five processes, we must first understand one of the central ideas in psycholinguistic studies known as fossilization – linguistic concepts that have long existed in mind (Musi & Ong'onda, 2020; Tajeddin & Tabatabaiean, 2017). Linguistic phenomena that can be stored in the mind are linguistic items, rules, and subsystems that native language (NL) speakers tend to store in their interlanguage (IL), i.e., special versions made by speakers about the target language (TL). Al-Khreshah (2015) defined IL as “a separate linguistic system based on observable results resulting from the learner's efforts to produce an understanding of the rules of the target language.” The most interesting phenomenon in how interlanguage works are that items, rules, and subsystems that can be stored are the conditions for the five processes described above.

If the items, rules, and language subsystems stored in mind occur in a cross-language way resulting from the source language, this is called a language transfer process. If these items, rules, and language subsystems stored in mind can be identified in the learning procedure, this is a process known as

transfer of learning. Suppose the items, rules, and language subsystems result from a learner-identifiable approach to communicating with native speakers of the target language (Indonesian). In that case, this is called a second language communication strategy. And suppose the items, rules, and subsystems of the language result from overgeneralization of the rules of the target language. In that case, this is called the term overgeneralization of the linguistic material of the target language.

Transfer of Semantic Competence in BIPA Learning

Semantic errors produced by BIPA students in terms of sentence composition, translation, and vocabulary, can be analyzed and classified based on the following criteria: (1) errors due to language transfer, (2) errors due to transfer of learning, (3) errors due to learning strategies target language (Indonesian language), (4) errors due to the target language's communication strategy (Indonesian language), and (5) errors due to overgeneralizing the linguistic rules of the target language.

The language errors of BIPA learners can be studied based on the differences between the source language and the target language through a contrastive analysis between the two languages on problematic semantic aspects. Sometimes, however, the relationship between different types of errors and their categories is quite difficult to determine.

In addition, it is important to know the relationship between language transfer from the source language about the total number of errors and the possible consequences that will be presented. The information that can be seen from two learners of different language backgrounds should also be compared: Do they make the same mistakes? Is language transfer from the native language an obvious phenomenon for the two learners? Does the semantic transfer prove to be a semantic error made by the two students? Are there any significant quantitative or qualitative differences? i.e., types of semantic errors produced by the two learners.

Similarities and Differences of Form and Meaning of Words between Source and Target Languages

Similarities and differences in word forms and word meanings have a relevant relationship with how quickly speakers can learn the target language (Indonesian language) of other languages (Gablasova, Gablasova, & McEnery, 2017; Rothman, 2015). To prove this, students must be given a test to answer the meaning of certain Indonesian words that they probably did not know. Referring to this opinion, students should answer the words on the test items

that have spellings that are identical or at least similar to those found in the form of the source language. On the other hand, the students failed to answer the words they did not know incorrectly, and the spelling did not match any words in their mother tongue. For example, in the following, some Indonesian vocabularies have similarities in form and spelling to South African vocabularies (see table 1).

Table 1. Linguistic Similarity between Indonesian language and South African Language

Indonesian Language	South African Language
pisang	piesang
ember	emmer
handuk	handdoek
wortel	wortel
kamar	kamer
selamat	slamat
terima kasih	tramakasih
kantor	kantoor

Source: Researcher documentation (Results of interviews with BIPA learners from South Africa)

In table 1 above, there can be seen a similarity of some vocabulary between Indonesian and South African. More research is needed to find what factors make the two languages similar. Nevertheless, we can see from various literature that South Africa had experienced colonization from the Netherlands (Zed, 2017). Therefore, aspects of colonization can be expected to influence the similarities of the Indonesian and South African languages.

Furthermore, some of the similar vocabularies between Indonesian and Tagalog (Philippines) languages are shown in table 2 below.

Table 2. Linguistic Similarity between Indonesian Language and Tagalog Language

Indonesian Language	Tagalog Language
kambing	kambing
payung	payong
beli	bili
baca	basa
pendek	pandak
lembut	lambot
abu	abo
aku	ako
takut	takot
batu	bato
api	apoy
muka	mukha
putih	puti
angin	hangin

Source: Researcher documentation (Results of interviews with BIPA learners from the Philippines)

Geographically, Indonesia and the Philippines are located in Southeast Asia. Neighborly positions,

directly or not, also affect similarities in several ways, such as culture, art, and language. In addition, if studied in more depth, Indonesian and Tagalog are cognate languages, namely the Austronesian family (Arizo et al., 2020). For this reason, it is not so surprising that between Indonesian and Tagalog languages, there are many similarities in vocabulary.

Furthermore, the Indonesian language also has linguistic similarities with Portuguese. This can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Linguistic Similarity between Indonesian Language and Portuguese Languages

Indonesian Language	Portuguese Language
lelang	leilao
bendera	bandeira
sepatu	sapatos
keju	queijo
mentega	manteiga
tinta	tinta
jendela	janela
sabtu	sabado
boneka	boneca
pita	fitita
meja	mesa
garpu	garfo

Source: Researcher documentation (Results of interviews with BIPA learners from Portuguese)

Of the many factors, it seems that historical factors are the main factors of the similarities of Indonesian and Portuguese. In various historical studies, it has been widely discussed that Indonesia had experienced colonization under Portuguese rule. It can be understood that the similarity of language between Indonesian and Portuguese is not surprising.

Furthermore, the Indonesian language also has linguistic similarities with Arabic from Djibouti. It is not surprising that Arabic has linguistic closeness to the Indonesian language because many Indonesian language vocabularies adopt Arabic. This can be seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Linguistic Similarity between Indonesian Language and Arabic Languages

Indonesian Language	Arabic Language
asli	asli
napas	nafas
wajah	wajh
sabar	sabr
khatulistiwa	khatulistiwa
selasa	salasa
kursi	kursi

Source: Researcher documentation (Results of interviews with BIPA learners from Djibouti)

Although Indonesian and Arabic have different linguistic structures, Indonesian belong to the

Austronesian family while Arabic belongs to the Ancient Semitic family. However, since Arabic has become one of the international languages spoken by many speakers globally, Arabic has had a lot of influence on several languages in the world (Firdaus, 2011), including Indonesian. In language policy, Indonesian has absorbed a lot of vocabulary from several languages, such as English, Dutch, Portuguese, Sanskrit, and Arabic. If studied further, Arabic has a strong influence and integration over Indonesian. The religious ties embraced by most Indonesians are an essential factor in the strong influence of the Arabic language on Indonesian (Afjalurrahmansyah, 2018).

Regarding cognates across different languages, the language transfer effects can be studied more in-depth and further experiments, as seen in the example above. The transfer of language competence can explain that students will correctly guess the meaning of cognates in the Indonesian language. Thus, language transfer can facilitate acquiring the target language (in this case, the Indonesian language).

The benefit of recognizing whether or not the source and target languages are cognate for speakers of languages cognate with the Indonesian language is not only because the language has similarities in speech and spelling of the lexicon with the source language, but speakers of cognate languages may also have more time to focus on unfamiliar vocabulary that is very useful in reading comprehension.

Apart from the similarities and differences in terms of word forms, some problems occur because of the similarities and differences in the meaning of the words. These errors might occur due to overgeneralization of the semantic rules of the target language (Indonesian language), meaning the use of semantic rules that exceed normal limits.

On the other hand, some semantic differences between languages do not always cause significant difficulties in the language learning process. For example, Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin's (1965) research showed that Spanish speakers learning English seem to have some difficulties determining the two lexical meanings of a word. Thus, the differences between Spanish and English, for example, are insufficient to predict significant difficulties in learning the two languages.

CONCLUSION

The BIPA students' mistakes provided evidence of the complexity of the language system used by the learners. Thus, BIPA teachers and students should pay attention to three aspects. First, for educators, learners' mistakes can determine how far learners

have progressed, what is left for learners to learn. This is one of the ways that teachers can test BIPA students' competence about the nature of the language they are learning, in this case, the Indonesian language. Second, language errors are also essential by the learners themselves because they can be used as a medium for learners to continue being motivated to learn. Third, linguistic errors provide evidence to language researchers about how the language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner uses in the process of learning the language. Semantic errors produced by BIPA students in terms of sentence composition, translation, and vocabulary, can be analyzed and classified based on the following criteria: (1) errors due to language transfer, (2) errors due to transfer of learning, (3) errors due to learning strategies target language (Indonesian language), (4) errors due to the target language's communication strategy (Indonesian language), and (5) errors due to overgeneralizing the linguistic rules of the target language. Similarities and differences in word forms and meanings are closely related to how quickly speakers of other languages learn the target language.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to all research subjects, research staff, and who participated in this work. No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

REFERENCES

- Afjalurrahmansyah. (2018). Bahasa Arab dalam Bahasa Indonesia (Analisis Kritis terhadap Perubahan Makna Kata Serapan Bahasa Arab). *Jurnal Diwan*, 4(1), 44–57.
- Al-khresheh, M. H. (2015). A Review Study of Interlanguage Theory. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(3), 123–131. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v4n.3p.123>
- Al-Sobhi, B. M. S. (2019). The Nitty-gritty of Language Learners' Errors – Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis, and Interlanguage. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 7(3), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.7n.3p.49>
- Arizo, C. D., Palayon, A. L., Tornito, A. P. V., & Sukma, B. P. (2020). Comparative Analysis of Filipino and Indonesian Monophthongs. *Lexeme : Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 2(1), 59–70. <http://openjournal.unpam.ac.id/index.php/LJLAL>

- Asimakoulas, D. (2018). Synchrony Issues in Comics. Language Transfer and Gender-Specific Characterisation in English Translations of Greek Aristophanic Comics. *Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics*, 9(4), 350–372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21504857.2017.1355820>
- Curry, N., & Chambers, A. (2017). Questions in English and French Research Articles in Linguistics: A Corpus-Based Contrastive Analysis. *Corpus Pragmatics*, 1(4), 327–350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-017-0012-0>
- Firdaus, W. (2011). Kata-Kata Serapan Bahasa Aceh dari Bahasa Arab: Analisis Morfofonemis. *Sosiohumaniora*, 13(2), 223–234.
- Fries, C. (1952). *The Structure of English*. Harcourt, Brace, and Company.
- Gablasova, D., Gablasova, D., & McEnery, T. (2017). Collocations in Corpus-Based Language Learning Research: Identifying, Comparing, and Interpreting the Evidence. *Language Learning A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 67(1), 155–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12225>
- Garcia, G. D. (2019). Language Transfer and Positional Bias in English Stress. *Second Language Research*, 36(4), 445–474. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658319882457>
- Garraffa, M., Guasti, M. T., Marinis, T., & Morgan, G. (2018). Editorial: Language Acquisition in Diverse Linguistic, Social and Cognitive Circumstances. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 9, p. 1807). <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01807>
- Hayakawa, S., Costa, A., Foucart, A., & Keysar, B. (2016). Using a Foreign Language Changes Our Choices. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(11), 791–793. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.08.004>
- Huang, S., & Kan, P. F. (2021). Cross-linguistic transfer between aspect in Cantonese and past tense in English in Cantonese-English bilingual preschool children. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549507.2021.1981445>
- Ionescu, R. T., Popescu, M., & Cahill, A. (2016). String Kernels for Native Language Identification: Insights from Behind the Curtains. *Computational Linguistics*, 42(3), 491–525. https://doi.org/10.1162/COLI_a_00256
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Cultures Ann.* University of Michigan Press.
- Lallier, M., & Carreiras, M. (2018). Cross-Linguistic Transfer in Bilinguals Reading in Two Alphabetic Orthographies: The Grain Size Accommodation Hypothesis. *Psychon Bull Rev*, 25, 386–401.
- Lim, N., O'Reilly, M. F., Sigafos, J., & Lancioni, G. E. (2018). Understanding the Linguistic Needs of Diverse Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Some Comments on the Research Literature and Suggestions for Clinicians. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 48(8), 2890–2895. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-3532-y>
- Lu, X., & Deng, J. (2019). With the Rapid Development: A Contrastive Analysis of Lexical Bundles in Dissertation Abstracts by Chinese and L1 English Doctoral Students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 39, 21–36. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.03.008>
- Maluch, J. T., Kempert, S., Neumann, M., & Stanat, P. (2015). The Effect of Speaking a Minority Language at Home on Foreign Language Learning. *Learning and Instruction*, 36, 76–85. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2014.12.001>
- Maryani, Y. (2011). Metodologi Pengajaran BIPA. *Lokakarya Program Prasertifikasi Guru BIPA Diselenggarakan Oleh Kantor Bahasa Prov. NTB Bekerjasama Dengan APBIPA*.
- Master, P. (1987). Generic the in Scientific American. *English for Specific Purposes*, 6(3), 165–186.
- Mesthrie, R., & Dunne, T. T. (1990). Syntactic variation in language shift: the relative clause in South African Indian English. *Language Variation and Change*, 2.
- Murphy, S. (2003). Second Language Transfer during Third Language Acquisition. *TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 1–21.
- Musi, E. N., & Ong'onda, A. N. (2020). A Cross Linguistic Analysis of Fossilization in Lunyala-Kiswahili Learners as the Acquire English Language in Navakholo Subcountry, Kakamega Country. *International Journal of English and Education*, 9(2), 109–119.
- Nasrullah, R., Suganda, D., Wagiati, & Riyanto, S. (2019). Recovery Patterns and A Linguistic Therapy Model of Sundanese-Indonesian

- Bilingual Aphasia: A Neurolinguistic Study. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 452–462. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20243>
- Nasrullah, R., Suganda, D., Wagiaty, & Riyanto, S. (2021). Verbal-Lexical Expression of Indonesian-Speaking Persons with Broca's Aphasia. *Ilkogretim Online-Elementary Education Online*, 20(5), 692–706. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.74>
- Nimmanupap, S. (1998). Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Pembelajar Asing di Thailand. *Kongres Bahasa Indonesia VII*.
- Nsengiyumva, D. S., Oriikiriza, C., & Nakijoba, S. (2021). Cross-Linguistic Transfer and Language Proficiency in the Multilingual Education System of Burundi: What has the Existing Literature so far Discovered? *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(2), 387–399.
- Pham, G., Donovan, D., Dam, Q., & Contant, A. (2018). Learning Words and Definitions in Two Languages: What Promotes Cross-Language Transfer? *Language Learning A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 68(1), 206–233. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12274>
- Piątkowska, K. (2015). From cultural knowledge to intercultural communicative competence: changing perspectives on the role of culture in foreign language teaching. *Intercultural Education*, 26(5), 397–408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.1092674>
- Ringbom, H. (1987). *The Role of the First Language in Second Language Learning*. Multilingual Matters.
- Rivai, S. F. S., & Nimmanupap, S. (1998). Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Pembelajar Asing di Italia. *Kongres Bahasa Indonesia VII*.
- Rothman, J. (2015). Linguistic and cognitive motivations for the Typological Primacy Model (TPM) of third language (L3) transfer: Timing of acquisition and proficiency considered. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(2), 179–190. <https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1017/S136672891300059X>
- Schachter, J., & Rutherford, W. (1979). Discourse Function and Language Transfer. *Bilingualism*, 19(19), 1–12.
- Stamp, R., Novogrodsky, R., & Shaban-Rabah, S. (2021). Argument Omissions by Deaf Students in Three Languages and Three Modalities. *First Language*, 41(5), 646–670. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014272372111016200>
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Tajeddin, Z., & Tabatabaeian, M. S. (2017). Interface between Linguistic Noticing and Fossilization of Grammatical, Lexical, and Cohesive Features among Advanced EFL Learners. *Applied Research on English Language*, 6(1), 23–42. <https://doi.org/10.22108/ARE.2017.21324>
- Vannasing, P., Florea, O., González-Frankenberger, B., Tremblay, J., Paquette, N., Safi, D., Wallois, F., Lepore, F., Béland, R., Lassonde, M., & Gallagher, A. (2016). Distinct Hemispheric Specializations for Native and Non-Native Languages in One-Day-Old Newborns Identified by fNIRS. *Neuropsychologia*, 84, 63–69. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.01.038>
- Wahyunianto, D., Djatmika, & Purnanto, D. (2020). Grice's Cooperative Principles Violation in The Communication of Children with Autism. *Sosiohumaniora*, 22(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v22i1.24378>
- Wang, L. (2018). Cognitive Mechanism of Language Transfer: Brain Potential Data Analysis in English Comprehension. *NeuroQuantology*, 16(5), 369–374. <https://doi.org/10.14704/nq.2018.16.5.1300>
- Wei, L. (2003). Syntactic binding, semantic binding and explanation of crossover effects. *Foreign Languages Research*, 3, 73–78.
- Xhemaili, M. (2013). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Mother Tongue in Teaching and Learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Classes. *ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies*, 2(3), 191–195. [https://doi.org/10.0001/\(aj\).v2i3.1336](https://doi.org/10.0001/(aj).v2i3.1336)
- Zed, M. (2017). Warisan Penjajahan Belanda di Indonesia Pasca-Kolonial (Perspektif Perubahan dan Kesenambungan). *Diakronika*, 17(1), 90–103. <http://diakronika.ppj.unp.ac.id>