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This study is intended to describe the stages of interlanguage which are manifested in students’ compositions during their learning of English as a foreign language (EFL). Actually, interlanguage can be measured by using the Pienemann and Johnston’s five stages which are supposedly universal. The stages are claimed to be able to reflect all developmental sequences in IL (stage X – X+4). By applying these stages, the writer tried to describe the stages of interlanguage in the compositions which were written by pre-intermediate EF (English First) learners.

There are at least three main theories as the framework of this study. First is interlanguage which is the most important theory of this study. According to Ellis, interlanguage is the theoretical construct which underlies the attempts of SLA researchers to identify the stages of development through which L2 learners pass on their way to L2 (or near L2) proficiency. Second, the theory of the developmental sequence which describes the five stages (X – X+4). These five stages are claimed to reflect all developmental sequences in interlanguage. The third theory is the theory of second language acquisition. This is actually a very universal theory because it covers most theories regarding the acquisition of the second language, including the interlanguage theory.
In order to conduct this study, the writer analyzed the students' compositions. These compositions were taken from English First students randomly whose level was at the pre-intermediate. Those data were taken unsystematically without looking at the students' names from four EF branches and eight classes. The writer gave a topic “My favorite pet” to the students. Then, these students were asked to write compositions outside the classroom to give them a new situation to write. The students were allotted sixty minutes to write before they handed their graded compositions to the researcher. In 60 minutes, these students could write at ease, and re-check their compositions. After receiving those compositions from students, the writer then analyzed them by reading them all, highlighting the sentences / phrases, and classifying the highlighted sentences / phrases into the right stages.

After making the analysis of the interlanguage manifestation in written composition of pre-intermediate (EF) learners, the writer finally found that the five stages (stage X, X+1, X+2, X+3, and X+4) were applied in students' compositions. It means, these pre-intermediate students were able to apply those stages even though with different frequency. In fact, most of the students' compositions tended to be in the stage X, and only very few of the compositions were in the other stages (stage X+1 - X+4). This is reasonable because stages X+1 - X+4 require more complex language structure compared with the stage X. On the contrary, stage X is the simplest stage which only refers to the pattern of SVO (subject, verb, and object). The summary of those compositions can be said as follows: there was 69.4% in stage X, 3.7% in stage X+1, 10.2% in stage X+2, 12.05% in stage X+3, and 4.65% in stage X+4. The writer realizes that in fact, these students' compositions tended to be in stage X because it reflected their real stages as the pre-intermediate students who wrote the compositions.

As the summary of this study, the writer concludes with several important points. First, according to Pienemann & Johnston, interlanguage can be described by the constraints of stage X - stage X+4. Second, there is one thing to notice that the learners should not skip a stage to the next stage without knowing the previous stage in a developmental sequence (e.g. directly to X+4), because all the stages are important and related one to another. Third, the most important point of all is that interlanguage does not view errors and mistakes as failures to eliminate, in contrast it views them as the evidence of the learners' attempts in order to acquire the second language. It also views that those errors and mistake are the natural process to go through as the second language learners.
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Setelah membuat analisis manifestasi interlanguage dalam karangan tertulis siswa-siswa pre-intermediate EF, peneliti akhirnya menyimpulkan bahwa ada lima tahapan (tahap $X$, $X+1$, $X+2$, $X+3$, dan $X+4$) yang terdapat dalam karangan siswa-siswa tersebut. Hal ini berarti, siswa-siswa pre-intermediate ini dapat mengaplikasikan tahap-tahap interlanguage walaupun dalam frekwensi yang berbeda. Kesimpulan lain dari penelitian ini adalah bahwa mayoritas karangan siswa-siswa tersebut masih berada pada tahap $X$, dan hanya sedikit yang berada pada tahap lainnya (tahap $X+1$ – $X+4$). Hal ini dapat dimaklumi karena tahap-tahap $X+1$ – $X+4$ memerlukan tingkat aturan-aturan bahasa yang lebih rumit dibanding tahap $X$. Sebaliknya, tahap $X$ adalah tahapan yang paling sederhana yang hanya mengacu pada pola SVO (subject, verb, object). Peneliti kemudian meringkas karangan siswa-siswa dan menemukan bahwa ada 69.4% pada tahap $X$, 3.7% pada tahap $X+1$, 10.2% pada tahap $X+2$, 12.05% pada tahap $X+3$, dan 4.65% pada tahap $X+4$. Peneliti menyadari sepenuhnya bahwa pada dasarnya karangan siswa-siswa ini mengacu pada tahap $X$, karena tahap ini merefleksikan tahap sebenarnya dari siswa-siswa pre-intermediate.

Sebagai kesimpulan akhir dari penelitian ini, peneliti menyatakan beberapa hal penting. Pertama, menurut Pienemann & Johnston, interlanguage dapat digambarkan melalui tahap-tahap $X$ – $X+4$. Kedua, ada satu hal penting bahwa siswa-siswa diharapkan untuk tidak melampaui suatu tahap ke tahap selanjutnya dalam proses perkembangan (misalkan langsung mempelajari tahap $X+4$), karena semua tahapan adalah penting dan saling berhubungan erat. Ketiga, hal terpenting dari semuanya adalah bahwa interlanguage tidak melihat errors dan mistakes sebagai kegagalan yang harus segera dimusnahkan, sebaliknya, interlanguage melihatnya sebagai bukti atas usaha-usaha yang dikerahkan oleh siswa-siswa dalam pemerolehan bahasa kedua (L2). Interlanguage juga melihat bahwa errors dan mistakes itu adalah suatu proses yang alami yang harus dilalui oleh para pelajar bahasa kedua.
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