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Abstract

This study is an initial investigation into the incidence of interference from an L1, in this case Indonesian, in English student writing. The method of investigation is an error analysis of Indonesian student writing, with the individual case study subject’s errors subject to comparison for validation purposes with a larger body of comparable data in order to determine the likelihood of an error being caused by transfer from L1 to L2. The study begins with an overview of the historical background of error analysis and interference issues, followed by a sample error analysis in a case study context. The result into this investigation of errors is significant in bringing to light the impact on English student writing of the differences between the explicit nature of English versus the indirect nature at various levels of Indonesian. Indirectness greatly affects the use of determiners and pronouns as well as being a major factor in the extensive erroneous use of the verb “to be”. Not only did this error analysis highlight possible areas of interference between Indonesian and English, but it also brought to light the pedagogical—and, therefore, student—confusion occurring when grammatical nomenclature is used to describe linguistic features between languages which may not, in fact, possess corresponding cognitive realities.
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Chapter One: Diachronic and Synchronic Description of Error Analysis as a Basis for Contrastive Analysis of Indonesian Student Interlanguage

The perceived validity and value of what has been termed "error analysis" has ebbed and waned over the years since it was first used to describe the various activities, whether linguistic, pedagogical, psychological or sociolinguistic in nature, that have borne the name. The unfortunate connotations that affect our receptivity to error and its possible benefits arise from the implication that there has somehow been a "willful or inadvertent breach of rules which ought to have been known" (Corder 19). However, just as any mother knows (or usually tries to know!) the difference between a child's willful act of disobedience and an unintentional accident or mistake, so native English speakers--especially teachers--must realize that an ESL student's idiosyncrasies usually exist precisely because the 'rules' of English are not known, or, if known, are somehow left unactivated in language production. These idiosyncrasies, goofs, deviations (Dulay and Burt 121) from an arbitrarily accepted norm of "correct" English composition are the general object of this study.

A scholarly study of this kind is beneficial on at least two levels. For an ESL instructor, the primary benefit of any study, whether clinical, experimental or other, is in its applicability and ability to facilitate practical methodology. The second benefit of informed inquiry is the elucidation of sound theoretical constructs which represent the facets of reality that the second language teacher and student must address in and through the methodological framework. This exercise is based on an assumption about the value of learning as conscious knowledge and its corollary assumption that "we learn by
consciously attending to form, by reading or listening to explanations of rules (deductive), figuring out rules (inductive), and by having our errors corrected” (Krashen 99).

Specifically, an understanding of the nature of any category of learner errors is necessary before a systematic means of resisting erroneous production and the fossilization of such can be found (Corder 1; Nemser 57). Of course, for an instructor “searching for causes is only the first step” (North 36) in the undertaking, since “seasoned practitioners recognize in variation a useful complexity, extracting from it information about the language habits of the writer--dialect habits or sophistication” (North 48).

Language itself is a dynamic phenomenon, an open system, and, as such, no one schema or research methodology exists to account for all the linguistic, cognitive and pragmatic variables in a learner's “dialect” or “interlanguage system”. Since the ideal schema is not available, I have chosen to restrict my study to a view of interference issues from a primarily linguistic or “formalist” point of view, preceded by an historical perspective of the linguistic, experimental and clinical roots of interference issues. In order to fulfill my practitioner-oriented goal of making an initial inquiry into the incidence of L1 transfer for Indonesian student writers in particular, this investigation of interference issues is illustrated by a sample error analysis of an Indonesian student in a case study context.

Although my goal is to be primarily practitioner-oriented, I take my cue from the scholarly tradition of seeking knowledge through a description of opposing points of view of the empirical world, both past and present (North). In order to better understand the nature of learner errors it is first necessary to understand the theoretical history of error
analysis. This mode of inquiry, "provides a way to harness the inevitable disagreement, a framework within which the intellectual energy inherent in [the] opposition [of seemingly mutually exclusive theories and empirical evidence] can be used to work toward a narrative" (North 77). If the same person is comfortable with and competent in both theory and application, explains Enkvist, "communication problems take care of themselves. But there seem to be few such people" (23). Perhaps this is because, as he suggests, there is usually a "difference in the temperament and approach required of a good theorist and a good practitioner...[since] increasing the power of a theory tends to raise its concepts and arguments to higher levels of abstraction" (23).

On a more pragmatic level, of course, one does not normally equate teachers with being "producers of knowledge" simply because the best teachers are usually too busy to write. The result is that much practitioner research appears to be "anecdotal rather than generalized, and outside authority based knowledge. Usually empirical researchers follow practitioners to determine the validity of 'Practitioner lore'" (North 2). However, knowledge is both gained and transmitted by various methods and procedures, so that by acknowledging the inadequacies of the empirical method, we can justify the validity of other forms of knowledge. This includes practitioner knowledge which is somewhat like the state of motherhood in that, without always being able to give reasons "why", more often than not, "mother knows best".

In this way, armed with sufficient theoretical knowledge to be able to articulate a rationale for the use of error analysis in teaching, the composition instructor as "error analyst investigates the error (to discover how a student arrived at a mistake) and then
applies these insights (to help the student move further toward the target form)” (Kroll and Schaffer 244). The practicality of this approach has not always been obvious, however, at least to those concerned more with theory than with a daily dose of composition papers to attend to.

Polemics in the opposition to the concept of error analysis began at the end of the 1960’s, before which time learning theory and methodology had been based on the prevailing theories derived from experimental research in behavioral psychology. In this latter context language learning was seen as the result of stimulus-response habit patterns whereby acquiring a new language was synonymous with acquiring new habits. According to this mechanist perspective, learner errors were caused by linguistic interference from the maternal or L1 language on the L2 or target language. This interference was presumed to be due to the mechanisms of habitual repetition at all levels of language production: phonological, lexical, and morpho-syntactic. Non-behaviorists announced that the ultimate conclusion to draw from this was that the language habits of the first language had to be unlearned in order to make way for those of the target language (Dulay and Burt 99). This false tautology had the effect of throwing into doubt the validity of any of the other claims made by behavioral linguists concerning native language interference.

Yet, until this time, language learning research had concentrated on contrastive analyses of different languages. The strong hypothesis in contrastive analysis held that it was possible not only to explain learner errors but even to predict them based on a comparison of L1 and L2 structures. However, in addition to the “ultimate conclusion”
problem mentioned above, several other problems surfaced with this approach to the explanation of error. For example, different analyses tended to yield different predictions, with the predictions themselves being ambiguous. Also, the fact that concurrent studies in linguistics showed linguistic structures to be interdependent weakened the claims of predictive accuracy (Nemser 59). In other words, not enough was known about the co-occurrence restrictions of any single unit structure in language to be able to categorically define and predict the context in which it could prove an obstacle to L2 proficiency.

A modified, or “weak” version of the contrastive hypothesis stated that it could at least account for learner behavior, yet immediately several challenges arose. The primary challenge was the difficulty of being able to ascertain any single reason for an error. For example, a contrastive analysis could quite easily determine that a writer’s omitting the -s in the 3rd person singular present form of verbs may be an interference problem if the verb system in the student’s language does not represent number, as is the case in Indonesian. However, such an “explanation”, or even a differential diagnosis of developmental immaturity (since this particular phenomenon is also seen in the developmental stages of English-speaking children) is insufficient for practical purposes since it does not explain the strategies such a writer may be employing. These strategies could, perhaps, stem from direct transfer of learning from the maternal language (L1) to the target language (L2), or simply be an overgeneralization of L2 verb structure; i.e., along the lines of I eat, you eat, they eat = he/she eat*. Or the problem could stem from confusion arising from the fact that an /-s/ marks verbs as singular, but it also marks
nouns as plural (Kroll and Schaffer 244-245). Due to the prevalence of such “challenges”, contrastive hypotheses alone appeared to be insufficient not only in predicting but also in accounting for learner behavior, as far as the theorists were concerned.

The presuppositions of behavioral psychology that the environment was the sole stimulus for language response was modified in particular by the development and growth of cognitive psychology. This new approach in psychology was instrumental in identifying the use of different learning strategies, goals, and problem-solving procedures in the production of interlanguage and L2 errors. In addition to the individualized learning procedures revealed by clinical case studies, there was a concurrent development in linguistics of formalized conceptualizations of the “deep” structure rules that generated “surface” structure language. The resultant combination, then, of Chomskyan linguistics and cognitive psychology apparently began to find parallels between L1 and L2 development (Corder; Richards; Faerch).

On the one hand, cognitive psychology derived its own research methodologies based on the presupposition that responses are affected by the particular point of view of the receiver of the stimulus as well as by the environment. On the other hand, however, its methodologies were also based on clinical case studies of error analyses which appeared to show that certain types of errors are common to virtually all L2 learners. These findings seemed to indicate the existence of universal processes in language acquisition as well as to the existence of developmental strategies similar to those observed in children learning their maternal language (Dulay and Burt; Wode; Ravem).
For example, developmental similarities have apparently been documented in the evolution of negative patterns and relative clauses in L1 and L2 learners (Odlin 21). Some have even asserted the predictability of the order of acquisition of transitional or intermediate stages as well as of more "mature forms" in both first and second language acquisition (Krashen 99). Due to its perceived roots in the limited conceptual framework of behavioral psychology, the conclusion for many at this time was that contrastive analysis and the concept of language transfer was a dead-end street for those interested in understanding and dealing with learner errors.

Moreover, traditional experimental research was also negatively targeted due to "its strict rules for research designs that avoid threats to internal and external validity, its complex statistical treatments and its history of major flaws which rendered so many of its results either assailable or uninterpretable, provid[ing] a poor starting place for teacher research." (Belanger 18). The fact is that the purpose of a theory is to propose a hypothesis first in order for an investigator to know what to look for. Moreover, in the case of linguistic artefacts, any theory cannot be truly, objectively "scientific" precisely because it deals with cultural and not natural products. However, a theory, especially when "it does not deal with empirical reality but with an artefact, can also be a model which no concrete object wholly exemplifies; that is, the concrete examples show a predominant characteristic that place it in this or that category of the hypothetical model" (Brooke-Rose 14, 15). Yet, in linguistic analysis, literary criticism or even science it is impossible [to look] at any object without some preconceived notion of what we are looking at and for. In literature, for example, we know that what we are reading is a
novel, not a play, etc." (---15). In error analysis, we know that what we are looking at is an imperfect text whose anomalies of usage may very well be due to interference or even transfer from the L1.

Yet were all of these ideas alternately proving and disproving the existence of language transfer really mutually exclusive? Eventually, the limitations of each of the various modes of inquiry into the issues, and the knowledge gained thereby, have been acknowledged by researchers, scholars and practitioners alike. The restrictions inherent in the methodologies of experimental, clinical and formalist theories are significant in their ability to respectively reveal, add to, or explain a single variable of the complex procedure of language usage, both oral and written.

The use of contrastive analysis in the analysis of transfer has been validated by describing the learner as a "generator of generalizations" (Corder 7) whose approximative or interlanguage system is simply, "much richer in linguistic, pedagogic and social significance than previously expected" (Richards 15). Further longitudinal studies in both L1 and L2 development are needed to be able to definitively ascertain the degree to which a learner hypothesizes about the relationship between L1 and L2 rules. Such studies are also needed to understand at what stage systematic introduction of learning modalities and strategies can aid the development of procedures that harness the learner's own strategies--of which little is definitively known beyond the fact that they are, "probably culture-bound and motivation-oriented" (Richards 16).
Error Analysis in Written Versus Oral Language Production

Prior to this point in the discussion of the theoretical background of error analysis, no distinction has been made between oral and written language production. In fact, error analysis was initially developed as a means of studying errors in spoken performance (Bartholomae 259). However, it is obvious that writing can present "interference" of a type never found in speech...[it may] be caused by interference from the act of writing itself: from the difficulty of moving a pen across a page quickly enough to keep up with the words in the writer's mind, or from the difficulty of recalling and producing the conventions that are necessary for producing print rather than speech...spelling, orthography, punctuation, capitalization, etc." (Bartholomae 253). "Both modes," writes Kaplan, "are dependent upon the same grammar and the same lexicon.... [They are] interrelated but cannot be viewed as extensions of each other" (Revisited 16), to which the above-mentioned sites for error can attest.

Despite these reservations regarding the ability to conclusively define an individual's learning strategies, errors are now viewed as a "window" looking in on the strategies and stages of language development in the learner (Kroll and Schaffer 243). Examples of observable strategies include the simplification of the language system (especially syntax). A possible combination of strategies would produce, for example, a learner dictum that might read, "all verbs are either transitive or intransitive in English", plus "the progressive aspect is always signaled by a form ending in /-ing/", resulting in the following common anomaly, "I am hearing him" (Richards 39). Another common strategy for a language learner is the avoidance of difficult forms which could result in the
excessive use, for example, of simple sentences and coordinate rather than subordinate clauses (Richards 39). Cue-copying is a third strategy which results in spelling pronunciation/pronunciation spelling such as that produced by Malay (Indonesian and Malaysian)-speaking students when they write “lenght” for “length”. Cognate pronunciation is also common among these students, with “analysis” being written “analyses.” The strategy of hypercorrection may also account for a large number of errors, as does holophase learning which produces such phrases as “one and half-an-hour” for “an hour and a half or/ one and a half hours.”

Error analysis, therefore, affords a picture of the state of interlanguage possessed by the learner; that which is most readily accessible in his/her learning environment. Rather than the interlanguage being viewed as a “corpus of error”, acceptance of it often avoids the necessity of interrupting the communication process for the sake of the learning process. The form of a particular interlanguage helps to define whether or not “a feature is to be considered a deviancy or a mistake, a marker of transitional or terminal competence, the result of interference, simplification, overgeneralization, collocation extension, collocation innovation, register-range extension, or to the transfer of training” (Richards 89).
Chapter Two: Introduction to Case Study Methodology and Error Analysis

Typology

In seeking to understand the nature of Malay-speaking, and in particular Indonesian, student interlanguage, I use an informal database comprised of original and modeled compositions, as well as summaries or retellings of others' works. This extended database provides a foil for the case study analysis of data concerning one particular writer's errors, an aid in determining the likelihood of a true incidence of L1 transfer. However, there are disadvantages to using material such as summaries, including the fact that error may have occurred in either or both the interpretation of the original document and in the student's expression of that interpretation. Also, certain students are more likely to try to use holophrastically complete phrases or sentences from the original text, thus obscuring a valid appraisal of his/her comprehension of the material. This particular occurrence will also affect the distribution of errors, thus calling into question the accuracy of quantifying idiosyncrasies in such clinical case studies (Corder 39).

Furthermore, while often “researchers have intuitions that it is unprofitable to compare expository with narrative texts or to compare narrowly field-defined texts with more broadly speculative texts” (Kaplan Revisited 18), such a judgment really depends on the goals for undertaking such a comparison. This is pointed out by Johnson, who claims that very often both naturalistic data and elicited information are gathered to provide different perspectives on the same issue and that the discovery of which “aspects of the case and its natural environment are relevant to the goals of the study requires that
the research design be flexible...a case study is further developed as the study progresses” (86-89). The case study approach is common in much L1 and L2 research precisely because of its flexibility with regard to strict mechanical criteria, its ability to simultaneously encompass several dimensions, to describe phenomena including data from longitudinal studies, and to “discover systematic connections among experiences, behavior and relevant features of the context” (Johnson 84).

**Error Analysis Procedures**

With these constraints in mind, it is necessary to identify where the transfer occurs. The first step is to recognize the idiosyncrasy with the theoretical assumption being that all sentences are idiosyncratic until we can show otherwise. The only form of covert idiosyncrasy that we can uncover without direct access to the writer for verification of intended meaning is the sentence that appears well formed but lacks sense in the context. On the other hand, if the sentence is overtly idiosyncratic, it may or may not be possible to reconstruct the intended meaning in either L1 or L2. The criteria for judging whether or not a sentence is only superficially correct is to determine the referential appropriateness of the text: in other words, the truth value and referential boundaries of what the student is writing. It is also necessary to determine the social appropriateness or the style and register of the text.

The generalized distribution of errors could be tabulated as shown on the following page:
Chart 1: Sample Error Distribution Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors of:</th>
<th>omission</th>
<th>addition</th>
<th>selection(variation)</th>
<th>ordering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>phonological/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morphological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(spelling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun as adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexico-semantic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faerch 80; Dulay and Burt 108; Corder 36).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntax:

Subordinate clauses:

Relative clauses:

Adjective clauses:

Noun Clauses:

Adverb Clauses:

Conditional Clauses:

The next step in identifying instances of transfer is contrastive in nature as it calls for an accounting of the problem using a bilingual description wherever the L1 and L2 are described in the formal terms of a common set of categories and
relations. The difficulty in determining the nature of the error and its origin is that there is not necessarily any overlap between the above grammatical and other categories in English and in the L2 which, in the context of this particular study, is Bahasa Indonesia. What may be expressed by syntax in one language may be expressed as a lexical (vocabulary) item in another (Richards 12), as is often the case in Indonesian. It is also evident that the rules violated by the various types of errors cannot all function in the same way, with acquisition rather than formal language learning being necessary in order to process and produce contextual well-formedness at certain points. The relative difficulty of a structure may also be influenced by factors such as sentence length, processing time required, derivational complexity, types of embedding, the number of transformations needed, as well as semantic complexity.

The categorization of errors having been made, the following step is to attempt to categorize them according to error type:

1. Interference-like “goofs” are those which appear to stem either from the transfer of learning (strategies) or the transfer of training (cultural educational processes) from L1 to L2. Positive transfer occurs when that training facilitates L2 learning as is the case with true cognates at the lexical learning level (for example, analysis (English) / analisis (Indonesian)), or the successful training transfer of study methods from the home environment.

2. If a language anomaly cannot be unambiguously identified as being caused by interference, it may be ascribed to the development stage of the learner. As alluded to in
Chapter One, similar tendencies appear to be evident in the language development processes and stages of L1 children and L2 learners. For example, various telegraphic or reductionist strategies are recorded by Jain (190). Some of these strategies are identical to those described under L1 interference errors due to incomplete input; i.e., overgeneralization and simplification. This leads to possibility number...

3...Ambiguity. At the risk of belaboring the point, it simply is not possible at times to clearly identify the category to which an error belongs.

4. Then again, there is always the possibility that an error is simply unique. This occurs when no other explanation is possible and the error seems anomalous even within the context of the entire database; it must be accepted as a personal idiosyncrasy.

The final step in an error analysis combines methodological strategies by its psycholinguistic nature in that the theoretical objective is to describe how and what the learner has learned in the L2. This description is required in order to attain the pedagogical objective, which, naturally, is to enable the learner to learn more efficiently (Corder Chapter 2).

Factors Favoring L1 Interference

Assuming then, that at least some errors have been caused by L1 interference, what is useful to know about this phenomenon? Certain features other than the concepts of relative language difficulty and distance have been identified as facilitating language transfer (Kellerman; Jordens; Odlin). The degree of markedness of an item can also be an influence. An example of this in English is the weak marking of the 3rd person singular verb in the simple present (the “-s omission”), leading speakers of languages with no such
person markings to “overgeneralize” and regularize the English system by introducing a zero morpheme. The compatibility of underlying logical structures may also facilitate the transfer of an L1 form into an L2 context (Odlin 43-47).

The third factor in favor of transfer is that there may actually have been either no input, or insufficient input of L2 for the student to demonstrate sufficient competency even with his/her capacity to use problem-solving strategies. The resultant wholesale transfer of an L1 lexical, syntactic or other item is termed “blind” transfer. In somewhat related instances, “short-sightedness” describes insufficient L2 data input for the learner whose first priority is communication rather than adequacy of expression (Faerch; Jordens; Kean; Sajavaara). Also, as has been noted, acquisition or natural input is often necessary because the semantic, pragmatic and sociolinguistic rules governing certain language behavior can only be approximated (Sajavaara 70).

The lack of sufficient input may, in addition, be characterized by the overgeneralization of a rule. For example, the simple past tense form in English is marked by /-ed/; therefore, the learner will use that form when the “historical present” should be employed in a narrative where past time is indicated lexically or rhetorically through the sequential ordering of information. The ignorance of rule restrictions is yet another common phenomenon which may result in an incorrect simplification or application of the rules, or in an incorrect analogy. An example of this would be the use of a certain preposition with semantically similar types of verbs or adjectives: for example, interested in / want to > interested to.
It is also possible for the learner to have an insufficient capacity of recovery despite adequate L2 input and learning (Sajavaara 71). In this case, the learner's declarative knowledge (subconscious, implicit and informal or explicit, conscious and formal) is adequate, but his procedural knowledge may be hampered by the involuntary activation of a highly frequent L1 element (Krashen; Faerch and Kasper 80). On the other hand, procedural knowledge may be hindered by unfavorable physical, social or psychological conditions such as fatigue, distractions, or anxiety. (Kohn 25)

Finally, it has been discovered that interference may even at times be intentional in order to foreground informational priorities of the speaker, or as a form of code-switching for the purpose of social identification (Dulay and Burt 104).

The end result of an identification of transfer errors (or interference-like goofs) is that studies estimate anywhere from 30-70% of learner errors are actually caused by linguistic interference (qtd. in Dulay and Burt 105). That there is, in fact, transfer, is no longer disputed. What is, however, less certain is its unambiguous identification, predictability and range of occurrence (Kean 80). The crucial problem, of course, remains in the ambiguity of the relationship between what is observed and the underlying processes, with the possibility that a single error could be attributed to more than one process (Kohn 31). Learner specific attitudes and motivation, the role of L1 as a filter in processing input, and the potential for transfer are only inferable from the language products at hand. According to Kohn (32), the test to decide whether or not an anomaly is the result of transfer is the presence or absence of ambiguity. In this context, transfer would be assumed to be the underlying process if no other processes could possibly
explain the pattern. However, as we shall see in Chapter Three, this distinction is hardly a simple matter.
Chapter Three: Data Analysis

Part 1. Introduction

In Error Analysis: Perspectives on 2nd Language Acquisition, Jack C. Richards lists categories of errors he considers intra-lingual or developmental in nature. By the former, he means those errors “which affect the general characteristics of rule learning, such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules, and failure to learn conditions under which rules apply” (174); i.e., errors common amongst all those attempting to learn English as a second language due to the nature of the language itself. Developmental errors, he asserts, are those which “illustrate the learner attempting to build up hypotheses” (174) and are thus due to the cognitive nature of the learning/acquisition process itself.

Learner Strategies

The following are some examples of the learner strategies he describes, taken from my extended database:

simplification:

lexico-semantic: “...the first group learned [studied] several subjects...”

adjective clause: “...the erosional boundary which representing...”

(simplification of 2 rules; i.e., AdjCl: “which represents” + reduced AdjCl: “representing” = “which representing”)

collocation extension/innovation:

lexico-semantic: “...shooting the fire [spraying/dousing the fire with a hose = extension] and setting the backup by fogging technique” [innovation].
preposition:  in 1992  > “in the* next year” [next year]
             in the airplane  > “in* the same flight” [on the same flight]
             in Java  > “in* Borneo Island” [on Borneo Island]

register range extension:

lexico-semantic: “bigger power” [greater power]

“makes the car move from...” [causes the car to move]

cue-copying:

lexico-semantic: “I tried marijuana until I got fly” (pronunciation spelling)

“You’ll see what’s going on surround us in different environments”

(cognate and/or pronunciation spelling).

hypercorrection:

noun as adjective: “...at Hening[’s] apartment” (crossed out the ‘-’ s’).

subject/verb agreement: “...there is* possibilities” (crossed out ‘are’).

overgeneralization:

of the rule that a specific noun requires a definite article - extended to include a head

noun modified by a proper name; e.g.,

“The D sandstone is a subsurface member” (no prior mention).
Part 2. Indonesian Case Study Data Analysis

1. Spelling Errors

Mina Shaughnessy writes that orthographic (spelling) and semantic (vocabulary) contexts differ from grammatical ones in that spelling ability "grows slowly out of different encounters with words (phonological encounter), the look of words on paper (visual), the feel of words as the hand moves to form them in writing (kinesthetic) and the meanings of words as they take their place in the contexts of sentences (semantic)" (161). While this seems to be an oversimplification of the language learning experience within which I believe that correct grammatical and rhetorical ability is also a matter of time, exposure and experience, it is at the phonological and morphological levels that sensory perceptions seem most obvious, as exemplified by the following:

progadation* (3X) = kinesthetic slip
seperated*/devided*/save*[safe] = pronunciation spelling
horisontal* = L1 interference
continue* reflectors = word form; i.e., derivational difficulty
brakes* (noun) for breaks (verb) = homophones = intralingual and/or pronunciation spelling problem

These errors fit neatly into the categories of causes discussed by Shaughnessy concerning the spelling system itself; i.e., the difference between spoken and spelled English; and "ignorance of the rules that work" (175). She also points out that "not only do we have homophones, but [also] the large number of correctly spelled words that are simply wrong [for their semantic and/or grammatical contexts]" (175). Of course, this is
precisely the difficulty, not only for L2 students, but also for those using computer spell-check systems - a word may be correctly spelled, and yet also be incoherent in the grammatical or semantic context in which it is being used. Most of the spelling anomalies in this case study data come under this category of spelling/vocabulary difficulties peculiar to an L2 learner who is obviously writing what he thinks he hears being said and ends up with homophones (or “next-of-kin-phones”?!?) due to a lack of “experience with written words [without which] it is impossible to absorb the sound-letter correspondences that govern written English spelling” (Shaughnessy 172).

As noted in Chapter One, interference occurs also from “the act of writing itself, from the difficulty of moving a pen across the paper quickly enough to keep up with the words in the writer’s mind” (Bartholomae 259). Such is the case with the following example of inversion in writing “largely” for “largely”, or in the omission of sounds/letters in “progadation” for “progradation”. Errors such as “...how to coup [cope] with …,” are likely not to be intralingual or developmental errors, but are probably due to “faulty memory for the looks and haptic feel of [a word]” (Shaughnessy 172).

2. Lexico-Semantic (Vocabulary) Errors

There are some fairly obvious L1 spelling transfer errors (“horisontal”, “analisis”), but the most striking “spelling” errors, upon closer examination, are actually not spelling errors at all, but lexico-semantic errors falling into one of two categories:

1. incorrect word forms (probably due to insufficient knowledge of formal (i.e., grammatical) variants of a lexeme; for example:

   “evolute” (evolve);  “creatures evolution” (creationist)

   22
2.1. wholesale lexical transfer from L1; for example:

"wearing" (using) < pakai (wear/use)

"several ten miles per hour" < sepuluhan mil per jam

2.2. mixed strategy transfer

"ask apologize" (apologize) < minta maaf (lit. ask apology)

What, then, were originally labeled lexico-semantic, noun as adjective, verb as adjective, or certain "spelling" errors in my initial classification of errors, Shaughnessy identifies as vocabulary errors. This category covers that which began on the surface as noun, verb or adjective identification problems but were found to be rooted primarily in difficulty with derivational forms. This difficulty is compounded for non-native English speakers by an unfamiliarity with the syntactic functions which leads to an inappropriate choice of forms. This in itself is a developmental problem that affects native and 2nd language speakers alike although the manifestation of errors may differ as they employ innovative strategies on word forms. For example, the verbal form used as an adjective in "continue* reflectors" (4X), or the noun form as an adverb in "...expected to perform safety*".

Derivational difficulties actually go beyond the boundaries of individual morphemes or words when the student is unaware of a more compact, idiomatic or conventional form or phrase. Such is the case with the following idiosyncratic innovations:

"make a good possibility" (indicate the possibility of)

"to form a good porosity [a porous formation] in the rock"
"cornering" (turning the corner)

"reversely" (conversely)

"madness" (anger)

Certain other vocabulary items could conceivably be developmental problems due to intralingual complexities; for example:

got (have) vs. get (into) in "...will get help longer" (...will take longer in getting help)

"because sometimes they got an accident" (get into accidents)

This leads to the category of incorrect register range usage where the writer typically substitutes a low register vocabulary item (usually known spoken vocabulary) for the correct higher (more formal) register unknown or inactivated vocabulary item; for example:

"makes the car move from" (causes the car to move)

"active safety is a system" (includes/or comprises a system)

3. **Noun Phrase Errors**

1. Noun as Adjective errors:

1.1 Use of possessive /-'s/ instead of NP: adj:N + HN; for example:

   "car's* safety" (car safety)

   "brake's* pedal" (brake pedal)

   "car's* wheels" (car wheels)

1.2. omission - lack of possessive /-'s/ + HN; for example:

   "at Hening_ apartment"
"based on Sonnenberg's work"

These problems with possessives are typical of the same types of anomalies heard when English-speaking children are learning their mother tongue; therefore they are to be considered a marker of transitional competency and developmental in origin.

2.1.1. Use of NP instead of 'of' phrase; for example:

"the accident possibility" (the possibility of having an accident/accidents)

1.2. Use of possessive NP instead of 'of' phrase; for example:

"a God's miracle" (a miracle of God)

2.2. Lack of agreement with the use of plural indefinite pronouns; for example:

1. "all of the situation_" / "all of the safety device_"

2. "different kind_ of truck"

While Richards (185,186) categorizes all problems in the use of 'of' phrases as being intralingual/developmental in origin, and their categorization as belonging to problems with prepositions, there is a clear correspondence between the pattern of use in the English all + plural phrases and the directly corresponding phrase type in Indonesian; for example:

Forms which mean all [members] of:

kedua (both (of))

keseribu (all 1000 (of)) + nya/orang itu/etc. (sing.proN or NP)

ketiga (all 3 (of))
Consequently, while the exact origin of errors in the use of plural pronouns may be open to debate, this is clearly an area where the student would benefit from explicit and possibly contrastive instruction.

3.1. Inconsistent use of the singular noun for collective / generic plural nouns; for example:

"...no transition species [correct, but then uses] between ape_ and human being_.”

"car suspensions”

"meant to recreate crime [crimes]”

The domain of the noun system in English provides one of the most fertile areas for student error which may or may not produce severe interpretation problems for the reader, depending on the particular concept involved. The sememes of determinateness/indeterminateness; definiteness/indefiniteness; singular/plural/collective; abstract/concrete; foreground/background all come into play in the cultural determination of naming an object, concept or thing. Since these concepts are indicated in part in English by the use or non-use of a ‘definite’ or ‘indefinite’ article, article use is included in a surface structure examination of text.

4. Determiner Errors

1. singular noun minus article for generic plural (10X)

2. singular noun plus incorrect use of article for generic plural (4X)

3. plural + indefinite article for generic singular: e.g. “as a good Moslems”

4. S + ‘is’ + pl.N (instead of sing.N): e.g. “there is possibilities”
There are three parameters along which any linguistic utterance can be examined; i.e., form, or formal features, function and meaning. From the smallest unit of discourse to the text itself, these three foci are fundamental to the definition of a text as well as to establishing the criteria necessary for macrostructural analyses. Form is the overt morpho-syntactic structure and is determined by an “intratextual description of text cohesion” (Enkvist 24-26). At the “micro “level”, form is exemplified by the use of correct morphological structures; for example, /-s/ (3rd person singular). At the “macro” or discourse level, cohesive devices (articles, demonstrative pronouns, transition words and phrases) and style markers signal correct forms. Functional factors also work at both levels in that both writer and reader make judgments concerning the pragmatic impact of the text on communication, as well as the appropriate use of structures to fulfill linguistic functions within the text. However, a text “ typically extends beyond the range of structural relations...but texts cohere; so cohesion within a text - texture - depends on something other than the structure [of the clause or sentence]” (Halliday 7). The semantic meaning of a unit or text of discourse is the basis in text linguistics without which there can be no coherence. A text must be “coherent with respect to the context of the situation and, therefore, consistent in register, as well as consistent with respect to itself, and therefore, cohesive” (Halliday 23).
Semantic meaning itself can be formed through explicit denotation or implicit connotation. One way to achieve semantic coherence is through the system of reference in a language. In English, certain terms of reference, such as demonstrative pronouns, can be used both as exophora and endophora; i.e., to refer to a situation outside of the context itself (exophora), and that which refers to preceding (anaphora) or subsequent (cataphora) text. Unfortunately for the ESL learner, problems with reference are preceded and overshadowed by the fore-mentioned difficulties with the nominal system in general.

1. Where so-called demonstrative (indefinite) pronouns function as a determiner, demonstrative pronoun error is due to error in count/non-count distinctions:

1.1 "Those stuff..."

or Noun agreement error:

1.2 "If those flight schedule is not..."

2. In a multiple clause sentence, second mention 'it' is either unnecessary, sometimes due to inappropriate foregrounding of the topic as in the following:

2.1 "Those stuff, once I tried it..."

or shows noun agreement error:

2.2 "Thank you for giving me those rumballs; I eat it..."

In the case study in question, 'it' seems to be the anaphoric pronoun of choice, used almost exclusively in the beginning stages of language production. Subsequently, the learner switches to the use of various other pronouns, demonstrating that he is attempting to come to terms with the system of English itself, on its own terms; for example:
Developmental progress:

4-8-92: “Those stuff, once I tried it...we used to rent video cassettes and enjoy it together.”

10-22-92: “I like those love songs just because its melodies.”

1-17-93 “If I had known that you bought this, I wouldn’t buy one for...”

If the “inherent” features for an English reader of the concept being referred to are not clear in the writer’s mind, then the anaphoric use of markers of co-reference (such as same, also, other, and such, etc.) and cross-reference (personal pronouns, definite articles, demonstratives (deictics), implicatory vocabulary) are going to be unclear as well (Leech and Short 244). The subject’s instinctive choice of ‘it’ in referring to a previously mentioned topic, may well be due to its closer phonetic similarity to the Indonesian pronoun itu which is used for the same general function even though it does not carry all of the distinctive connotations that cause English speakers to discriminate between ‘this’ and ‘that’. The fact that there is no distinction in Indonesian between ‘this’ and ‘that’ highlights the fundamental problem in conceptualizing a different universe of discourse. In dealing with the area of the noun (Chafe 96), the writer must come to understand that certain nouns are universally unique (the moon, the sky) and that for “a certain group of speakers there are well-known, uniquely salient objects that are referred to by a definite noun” (Dardjowidjojo 28). For American speakers, there is the President, for example, and for Indonesians, Bapak Presiden. In a classroom situation, for example, the blackboard is used where “the speaker must assume that the listener knows the identity of the referent, even where the concept... has not been mentioned before” (→). Such
extra-linguistic environments are relatively obvious both to teachers and students. It is in the context of the linguistic environment, however, that ambiguity and misuse of referents most often occurs. Prior mention is one linguistic environment where a discourse referent is established only if the verb in the first mention is non-generic. For example, “once there was a widow who owned a cow” establishes a later referent “the cow”, whereas “Once there was a widow who was fond of cows” does not establishes a subsequent referent “the cow” (Dardjowidjojo 28). The truth value of the proposition is also a determining factor in establishing reference, as is the random nature or otherwise of a verb. For example, “I’m looking for a friend” could refer to the act of searching for a known person, or it could refer to trying to find a new friend. Likewise, the presence of a modal in the predicate verb and not in the subsequent clause prohibits the establishment of a discourse referent. For example, one cannot say “Bill can make a kite, the kite has a long string” (28). Another linguistic environment influencing the definiteness or indefiniteness of a noun is that of entailment or presupposition which refers to the fact that there are “objects which entail the existence of obligatory parts...[or] innate properties” (29). In Indonesian, there is a sense of possessive rather than purely anaphoric relationship, for example, once an object has been introduced (37) which leads to anomalies such as that created by the subject in “English is my first course I’ve taken”.

It is at this level that factors such as geographic location, cultural awareness and time span are most likely to affect coherence from the interlocutor’s point of view. Dardjowidjojo cites an example of confusion occurring when a person speaks of a house
supported by poles by saying "The poles are made of teak" to a person from an area where the houses are built on the ground (-29). "What poles?" would most likely be the response.

There is also a relationship between definite versus indefinite and given versus new information. Indefiniteness is not to be confused with genericness, however. A noun is not necessarily generic in and of itself, but has genericness attributed to it according to the nature of the verb in the clause in which it is found. Here Dardjowidjojo gives the following example: Comparing "A dog stepped on my toes" with "A dog likes bones", the non-generic status of the first "dog" is due to the non-generic status of the verb "step". On the other hand, the second "dog" is generic precisely because of the genericness of the verbal context of "like" (-30).

The difficulty in all this for the Indonesian writer is that in "Indonesian, a generic verb prohibits not only the presence of a classifier but also that of a plural noun...and converts a non-generic verb in the embedded sentence to generic" (-30-31). While in English it may be true that "the generic or non-generic nature of a noun is automatically determined by the verb to which the noun is attached", in Indonesian the opposite may also be true (qtd. in Dardjowidjojo). For Indonesians, "once the nature of the verb is determined, or once the context is clear, there is no need for us to be explicit in what we say"(-38). There is no need, for example, to use a plural form to express a plural concept when the plurality of the concept is universal knowledge (animals such as elephants have two ears, four legs, etc.).
Loveday (36) asserts that "it is well-known that social forces impinge on the pronominal and verbal systems", and inexpliciteness or indirectness is one such force. Indirectness is a rather vague concept used by Kaplan, for example, in his famous 1966 "doodles" article to describe the rhetorical organizational patterns of Asian writing. Sociolinguistic factors play a role in the Indonesian propensity to avoid giving direct orders; asking direct questions that openly refer to the interlocutor's responsibility in a course of action; or even in simply addressing another person. Among women, for example, it is considered impolite and abrupt to address one another using a personal pronoun - even in referring to themselves women will use their given names or status title rather than a pronoun. Among men, the same holds true except for younger men of equal age and/or status who tend nowdays to use kamu (you) and saya (I/me).

This phenomenon of indirectness is evident not only in the nominal/pronominal system but also in the "preponderous use of passive sentences in Indonesian" (Dardjowidjojo 38). This leads us to an investigation of verbal difficulties for the Indonesian writer and, in particular, the misunderstandings that are rampant in the use or misuse of the "passive" in general and the 'be' copulate in particular. Indonesian (as well as Malay) writers are notable for their heavy use of the "be" verb in English, reflecting, it appears, the Indonesian use of the passive in order to foreground information.

One principle of perceptual organization is that of figure and ground, or the "sorting of information conveyed by linguistic means [i.e., linguistic categories such as
aspect, mode, definiteness and animacy along with the broader dimensions of clause, sentence and discourse] into greater or lesser degrees of salience” (Wallace 216, 217). In this context, “foregrounding” refers to the function of highlighting information according to the speaker/writer’s priorities, while “backgrounding” is the term given to the linguistic realizations denoting less important information. While sociolinguistic motives may be a factor in determining the saliency of linguistic forms and their functions, the opposite may also be evident. If it is true, as posited by E. Whorf, that to a certain extent “language actually determines a speaker’s perceptions of reality and in this way perpetuates cultural differences” (qtd. in Loveday 36), then the use of the active/passive voice in English may be a case in point. It could be that the foregrounding of agency has perpetuated monolingual English professors’ insistence that writing in the passive voice is not “active” enough since it highlights the verb rather than the agent or one who performs the action.

In fact, Indonesian could be seen as actually being more “active” - or at least action-oriented - than English, even if not “active” in the grammatical sense to which English speakers are accustomed. One function of the voice system in Indonesian is referential in nature, serving to foreground events, indicating both the anteriority of events and which events actually advance a narrative. While English is S V O or accusative in case-marking, Indonesian tends to be S O V or V S O or ergative in case-marking although “Malay [Bahasa Indonesia/Bahasa Malay] is not ergative in the sense in which the word is usually used, but which cannot be said to be simply active - passive” (Hopper 233). According to Hopper, “the discourse function of the Malay “passive” is
quite different from that associated with passives in western languages, where passive is primarily a way of suppressing the agent of the transitive verb and secondarily denotes some kind of topic shift...in Malay classical narrative the “passive” contrasts with the active as foregrounding to backgrounding” (Hopper 230). The Malay “passive” is used for events that are perfective, active, foregrounded and realis (-228). In languages that do not have “elaborate tense [time indicator] systems [such as English possesses], actual morphological indicators are supplemented by adverbs and other more lexicalized markers [as is the case in Indonesian]. The foreground-background distinction may be shown in ways other than the morphology; i.e., syntax S V > V S where the verb becomes the location of new narrative advancing information [as with Indonesian]” (Hopper 239).

Not only does the “passive” in Indonesian serve to foreground information by highlighting it in the predicate (the subject being highly presuppositional), but it also denotes discrete, measured events commonly associated with punctual verbs and the perfective aspect of verbs. This perfectivity “reflects emotional involvement in, belief in, desire for, the action of the verb” (Rafferty 74). In Indonesian, the non-main clause (relative, object of prepositions, and complements of verbs) uses the active verb forms much more frequently than the “passive” form since its function is that of supporting, not asserting, an event; describing an activity as ongoing, incomplete; and, when a nominal (i.e. gerund or infinitive) is required, as complements of stem and di- (“passive”) verbs (--70-71). In contrast, the di-verb (i.e. “passive” in Indonesian) is a main verb which asserts an event (of the past, present or future), and occurs almost exclusively in main clauses, and with transitive verbs. Word order may be V A O when the object is new information,
or O V A when the object is old information (~71). This classical Malay order is significant as it is the same as the contemporary order used in communication today to emphasize or to show strong emotional involvement in an event/activity or state.

In English, on the other hand, passives are found predominantly in background text. According to one study by Hopper and Thompson, 12% of backgrounded English clauses are in the passive, versus only 4% use of the passive in foregrounded clauses (Wallace 210). Other statistics show that passives in English are used 30% more frequently with modals (especially can, could and may) than without; 27% of active clauses have inanimate subjects versus 81% of passive clauses (~211). However, in Austronesian languages such as Indonesian, the “passive” voice or “non-actor-focus” occurs when some entity other than the actor is the subject, especially when the other entity is definite. As Wallace writes in Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics, “Passive considerations are preferred due especially to the function of the ‘voice’ or ‘focus’ systems in indicating definiteness or indefiniteness of a goal. Because of the greater salience of definite entities in discourse, the [Malay] “passives” or “non-actor-focus” tends to occur in foregrounded positions of [Malay] texts while the “actor” focus (active voice used when the subject is actor/agent or experiencer and when the goal is indefinite) tends to occur in backgrounded positions” (211). Two examples of this taken from the “control group” data appear as follows:

“The Riau development fair is scheduled to be closed [to close] on August 29.”

“2% was abstain [abstained] from voting.”
In contrast to English, then, these languages are more goal- rather than agent-oriented. This should underscore the previously mentioned difficulty of a lack of synonymous categorizations of grammatical forms between languages and the attendant danger of "teaching" grammatical forms - in this case the English "passive" - without awareness of and attention to the real semantic distribution and function of the form at both the sentence and discourse levels. Indonesian students may well hypothesize that use of the verb "to be", as it is the verbal mark of the passive in English, is the semantic equivalent of the use of the di-verb (or the ter- or ber- verbs - "middle voice" - in Indonesian which are also translated by English "be ______ed"). They may, therefore, overgeneralize its use in ways that appear illogical or even bizarre to the English reader.

5. Errors with Verbs

1. Use of "Be"

1.1. Addition of simple form of copula "be"

1.1.1. After auxiliary/modal verbs:

Will: "...desire will be appear".

Won't: "...marriage won't be collapse...won't be survive..."

Can: "...can be survive..."

Is?: "Is your codependent personality be the main reason why...?"

Is: "The period ending is always be on a Sunday."

The inappropriate addition of "be" is a category that is not mentioned by Richards in his list of developmental errors. Indeed it seems to be one of the most obviously L1
influenced errors marking Indonesian student writing. The inconsistent but very noticeable use of “be” could be rooted in the tense-aspect system as mentioned in the preceding section, or, as in the case of the first two examples in 1.1. above, the use of “be” could be a translation of the ‘ter-root’ verb, also translated in English by “be”, which denotes that the subject has accidentally come into the state described by the verb.

1.1.2. After adverb of Time (always, still):
   “I always be ready to hear it”.
   “I always be alone in the crowd”.

1.1.3. Simplification of two idiomatic expressions:
   to fall in love + to be in love > “to be fall in love”

1.2. Addition of the -ing form of “be” after “still”, or the idea of “still”:
   “I’m still being an agnostic”
   “They’re still being a stranger each other”

   In this case (1.2) the use of ‘being’ represents a strategy of overgeneralization occurring when /-ing/ has been presented as the “continuous tense” included in the semantic content of “still”, plus the misunderstanding or lack of knowledge that stative verbs cannot be “continuous”.

1.3. Omission of inflected form of the copula + verbal adjective (past participle) or adjective:
   “I ___ ashamed…”
   “I ___ always trying whenever I ___ near…”
"After you ___ legally divorced..."

"I ___ never worried about my future."

Richards (183) gives the instance of the omission of inflected "be" + verb stem + -ed as example of developmental error, but does not elaborate on whether or not the "be" omission + ADJ: pp/adj is part of the same phenomenon. In identifying the grammatical entity after the "be" omission as that of Adjective (in function), it may be valid to hypothesize that this error type has occurred due to the student’s ignorance of, or more likely misunderstanding of, the fact that the /-ed/ verb form functions as an adjective and, therefore, requires a verb linking the modifier to the subject. The above-mentioned errors, however, point to the possibility that this student may, consciously or unconsciously, be aware of the adjectival function of the /-ed/ verb form. In his reaction to this function, he thus writes using typical Indonesian form in omitting the copula before forms that are obviously structurally adjectival or functionally so. Note that the Indonesian sentence is composed of a predicate plus, optionally, a subject and that the predicate does not contain a verb, if, in English, the verb would be the copula; for example:

*Saya orang Amerika*

I person American (I’m an American)

*Orangnya sudah tua*

The man already old. (The man is already old.)

*Saya dua hari di Surabaya*

I two days in Surabaya. (I was in Surabaya (for) two days.)
Yang bisa Bahasa Indonesia itu adik saya
(The one) who speaks Bahasa Indonesia my sister/brother.

(My sister/brother is the one who speaks Bahasa Indonesia.) (Wolff 128)

1.4. Omission of infinitive of copula

For example: “I don’t want you ___ interested in...”

In Richards’ categorization of intralingual/developmental errors he includes only examples of inflected forms of the copula - no examples are given of the use or omission of the infinitive form of “Be”. By contrasting the above example with other examples below of the verb “to want”, it is possible to see how the use of the infinitive per se seems to pose no serious difficulty, as long as it is not followed by a stative adjective/past participle. For example:

with ‘want’: “Very often I wanted to call...although I could do whatever I wanted to do...They didn’t care about whatever we wanted to do as long as...I don’t want to be a person who...”

without ‘want’: “I began to read...I used to spar...I don’t know how to treat... my parents and my sisters encourage me to date...”.

Since use of the passive in Indonesian also implies volition while the stative is non-committal on this point (Wolff 187), it may be possible to account for this anomaly as coming from interference due to the use of the stative adjective as would be a factor in Indonesian.

1.5. Developmental Errors

1.5.1. Be + verb stem for verb stem: e.g. “is varies” (varies)
1.5.2. Be omitted before verb stem + /ed/ (past participle): e.g.

“that system not limited

“that technology developed in the early ’70’s.

or/ + -ing(present participle): e.g.

“will still going”

1.5.3. omission of “Be” in the present perfect passive: e.g.

“The brain has already damaged.”

While the first instance of incorrect “be” addition is clearly a developmental error, according to Richards (182,183) and, therefore, common to virtually all L2 learners, the other idiosyncratic sentences are not as obvious. For example, 1.5.2 is a stative adjective, while 1.5.3 is an incomplete English passive form; however, both seem to depict efforts on the part of the learner to use these forms according to their functions in English rather than in Indonesian.

1.6. Confusion between “is” and “do” auxiliaries:

1.6.1. in Questions; for example:

“Do you interested in me mainly because..., my point is, if you are interested in me mainly because...” = overgeneralization of “do”

1.6.2. in Negatives; for example:

“I don’t want to be a person who don’t aware of what goes on...”

“I was not allowed myself to...”

1.7. Confusion between is/has; for example:
"...are interpreted as a platform carbonate which is developed around the reef body."

While Richards discusses errors in the distribution of tense forms, he does not give any examples of the use of ‘Be’ instead of ‘have’ + /-ed/. It could be that this falls into the same general category of developmental errors, or this may be another example of confusion arising from interference from the L1; i.e., the concept in Indonesian of foregrounding definiteness, the result of an action and non-actor-focus by using the ‘di-verb’ ("passive") form.

2. /-s/ omission:

e.g.: “If he see_ just one fault in you...”

The (in-)famous /-s/ omission is abundantly evident from the corpus of both the case study subject and the control group. It is acknowledged as a developmental error by Richards and is explained as being an overgeneralization due to the presence of all of the other grammatical persons having a zero morpheme. Errors in the opposite direction may be due to a strategy of hypercorrection leading to overgeneralization of the 3rd person singular morpheme (Richards 174).

Teaching error is also often involved in generating this particular error as there is a need for explicit instruction clarifying the distinction between the functions of /-/s/ inflection in the noun and verb forms; i.e., the fact that an /-s/ marks the 3rd person verb as single, while the ‘-s/-es’ marks a noun as plural. There is also a need to develop a
strategy for deciding when to use the /-s/ form of the verb. Such a pedagogical strategy includes prior teaching of pertinent information such as “recognition” of sentence parts; subject and predicate; and the tense forming system (Shaughnessy 137-152).

This so-called /-s/ omission problem is, in fact, wider reaching than first appears, as the following examples demonstrate:

2.2. metathesis: e.g.: “That’s explain...”

2.3. addition in past time to the “dummy” subject demonstrative pronoun: e.g.:

“It’s just took me a while...”

2.4. addition to main verb following an auxiliary: e.g.:

“...will regulates...”

As can be seen by these examples, the /-s/ problem includes addition as well as omission errors, with the above-mentioned sentences providing examples of the learner’s strategy of hypercorrection.

3. Tense (Time) Confusion:

The major difficulty with the representation of time in English is that the equivalent perceptions may not even exist in another language. In the case of Indonesian, there are no morphological time indicators at all, with time being indicated lexically through the use of time adverbs, or through extra-contextual or implicit reference. For this reason, it is all the more important for the English teacher to be aware of the fact that the so-called tense system in English does not possess a nomenclature that accurately describes the reality of the verbal system in English; i.e., tense does not necessarily equal time, and aspect plays as important a role as time in the correct conceptualization and,
therefore, usage of the English verbal system. The problems with conceptualization of the parameters of the verb are abundantly evident in the following categories of intralingual and developmental errors:

3.1.1. omission of inflected ‘have’ when using the present perfect; e.g.:
   “...usually have [had] that experience since High School.”

2. use of inflected form after auxiliary verb; e.g.:
   “...will regulates...” “...must has sense...”

3. use of simple present for present perfect after auxiliary; e.g.:
   “I couldn’t [have] afford[-ed] all those analyses without their help.”

4. use of present perfect for past perfect; e.g.:
   “I simply haven’t [hadn’t] found one who impressed me until I met...”

5. use of present perfect for simple past or past continuous:
   “I’ve already felt that I missed...” (I was feeling that or / I felt like)

3.2.1. use of /-ed/ for simple present; e.g.:
   “I apologized if I offended...” = this could possibly be an instance of overgeneralization due to the presence of the /-ed/ in the conditional clause.

3.2.2. omission of /-ed/ in the simple past; e.g.:
   “They broaden___ my horizon.”

3.2.3. substitution of /s/ for /ed/ in simple past; e.g.:
   “That’s [was] a voluntary job that was...”

4.1. omission of inflected forms to signal time after adverbs of time; e.g.:
   “Next time we [will] excel...”
2. omission of inflected form after conditional; e.g.:

“It would be better if we involve...”

Both of the above patterns (4.1 and 4.2) are characteristic of Indonesian forms used in similar contexts; therefore, one could hypothesize the existence here of L1 interference.

5. Inconsistent application of rule restrictions:

5.1. with causal verbs; e.g.:

“I didn’t let myself to express that...” followed by “They never let their partner see...”

“...cannot help to make the patient getting better.”

“...help reducing...” but “makes our car swaying.” and “...caused our car driving...”

5.2. with use of both ability and logical function modals, especially when a combination is used; e.g.:

“You don’t know how much longer can he/she will live.”

Here, ‘can’ = ability, ‘will’=future, but they cannot be combined in the same sentence. The two functions can only be manifested together if the periphrastic modal ‘be able to’ is used; i.e., “...how much longer he/she will be able to live.”

6. subject/verb agreement:

While this is commonly considered to be a developmental error, the difficulty with agreement of the subject and the verb is at least exacerbated by the fact that, in addition to a lack of gender or time markers, there is no morphological person marker in Indonesian, with plurality presupposed where appropriate.

7. vocabulary and verb difficulties:
7.1. problem pairs; e.g.:

‘loose’ for ‘lose’ - “I never loose my self-control.”

7.2. ignorance of rule restrictions or derivational forms; e.g.:

“I never felt worry about myself.”

“I apologies...I apologized if I offended you...”

7.3. incomplete application of rules; e.g.:

“This phenomenon is showed...” This example shows that the subject knows to use the simple past “tense” but is either ignorant or forgetful of the correct (irregular) form.

6. Gerunds and Infinitives (Verbal forms with noun or adjectival function):

The almost complete confusion in the use of gerunds/participles/infinitives probably has its roots in several causes:

1. pedagogical confusion: Gerunds, with their “empirically observable -ing’s, are objectively different from abstract nominalizations of the discover/discovery; translate/translation; report/report types and, therefore, are not usually taught together with verbal nouns” (Williams 29). This leads to confusion since, although gerunds/infinitives and abstract nouns may be structurally different, they are functionally the same.

2. These forms (verbal nouns with a different form from their verbal roots) do not exist in Indonesian. While verbs may be used in some cases as complements of the predicate, in many instances the concept cannot be translated as such; e.g.: wait for someone to do; avoid doing; can’t help doing; consider doing; deny doing; suggest doing (Wolff 146).
Instead, the English infinitive/gerund is sometimes translated by an active, sometimes by a passive verb, depending on the meaning; e.g.:

_Sepeda yang buatnya begitu susah sekali diperbaiki._

[A] bicycle (that) made like that [is] difficult very to be fixed.

(It is very difficult to fix a bike like that.)

_Tidak ada yang lebih gampang daripada memperbaiki sepeda._

neg. there is that more easy than to fix (active) [a] bike.

(There is nothing easier than to fix a bike.)

The focus here is on whether the interlocutor is interested in the thing being done (the resultant state) or on the action itself. In teaching the use of gerunds/infinitives, it is helpful to point out this difference in mental perspectives and to contrast it with the English focus of interest in the use of these forms as elaborated on by Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman in _The Grammar Book: An ESL Teacher’s Course_ (433-447). They speak of a semantic criteria in determining the use of the infinitive as opposed to the gerund in a context (i.e. as complement of a verb) calling for the use of one or the other form. In other contexts, it is important to highlight the function of the gerund/infinitive as being that of a noun (i.e., subject or object function), and the participle (i.e. /-ing/ form also) as having an adjectival or adverbial function.

7. **Prepositions**

Prepositions cause some of the greatest conceptual problems among many, since the area of prepositions, along with the nominal/pronominal and verbal aspect systems, contains the most obvious contrast differences in cognitive perception for Indonesian
writers. This can be seen in the fact, for example, that some English verbs refer to motion whereas the Indonesian equivalent may refer to location, as in the following:

_Bapak sudah datang di Surabaya_

(lit.) Father has already come in/at Surabaya

_Bapak datang ke Surabaya tiap hari Minggu._

(lit.) Father comes to Surabaya every Sunday.

Other noteworthy differences include the fact that one preposition in Indonesian may be translated by several in English; i.e. the concepts of space, area and/or time that are inherent in the use of these prepositions may not even exist in the mind of the Indonesian speaker/writer:

di = at, in, on when _di_ refers to Location in general; however if referring to metaphorical space, the Indonesian will use _antara_ (lit. ‘between’); _dalam_ (lit. ‘inside’); or _atas_ (lit. ‘above’).

_pada_ = at, in, on when the reference is Time

The “problem list” further includes the following:

dengan [lit. ‘with’]: _Berbeda dengan yang aslinya_ (Different from the original)

lit. Different with the original.

atas (lit. ‘above’ when referring to space but also ‘of’ or ‘for’ in other contexts):

_Terimah kasih atas datangnya_ (Thank you for coming)

_Bangga atas kemampuannya_ (Proud of his ability)

menurut: _Menurut pendapat saya_ (In/According to my opinion) (Wolff 148,149).
8. Noun Clauses

1. Some noun clause difficulties appear to be due to an incomplete understanding of the nature (form and function) of verbs in English; for example:

   1.1. confusion between a Cl₁ verb + that + subjunctive as opposed to Cl₁ verb + infinitive:

   "I would suggest __ you to have..."

   "I’m sorry for I caused you __ felt that way.”

   1.2. confusion between form/function of gerunds vs. simple or infinitive forms:

   "I’m happy because study__ abroad is beyond my wildest dream.”

   "I can’t imagine to live without...”

   1.2. omission of relative pronoun ‘that’ or phrase ‘the fact that’;

   "...this is interpreted base__ on [the fact that]...”

   1.3. omission of Cl² verb or possibly copulative omission:

   "...to the hopeless patient who __ in a coma condition.”

   This particular pattern is identical to that found in Indonesian in the same context; therefore, a strategy of L1 transfer could be hypothesized.

   1.4. Semantic as well as grammatical difficulties with parallel structure:

   "The important factors [include/are] not only the driver and car performance but also the [skill of ] the mechanics.”

   This example demonstrates how parallel structure refers not exclusively to the formal structure of the unit of discourse but also to the underlying “semantic edifice”.

   Also, the problem with symmetrical constructions, according to Shaughnessy (55), is that
“the boundaries of symmetry are moveable. Common sites for broken construction include verbs (modal and simple forms); lists; ‘that’ clauses; not only...but also; [and] structures of comparison”. This is primarily a developmental problem but due also to lack of experience in consolidating sentence parts rather than whole sentences.

A view of subordination of information as seen, for example, in noun clauses, highlights a common developmental error in the use of parallel structures. The subject in this case study had difficulty producing this concept in several different kinds of structures; for example:

1. NP: “...because of a degeneration processes, a serious illness, or injured after an accident.”

2. VP: “...certainly he is still breathing and his heart _ still beating...he can open and blinking his eyes.”

3. AdvCl: “He knows how to operate the tripod and how to focusing the camera.”

However, the strategies - and reasons for such strategies - employed here may have more to do with the subject being an ESL learner than a diagnosis of developmental difficulties would imply. The specific problems stem more from the previously mentioned lack of knowledge of variants of a lexical form; i.e., ‘injured’ (for injury), or ‘Be’ verb omission (e.g. in “his heart _ still beating”). Yet another strategy appears to deployed in the following examples:

4. “Maybe I become an atheist, a Christian, or still being a Muslim.”
"Being" makes sense here if you consider the concept of continuous and current ("now") identity, together with the ignorance of, or failure to activate, the rule that existential verbs do not appear in continuous form.

9. Adjective Clauses

1. the most common AdjCl error seems to be one of 2 variations of consolidation or simplification errors:

   1.1. "...rally event takes a longer time;__ varies from..."

   Here the writer is probably trying to synthesize the 2 adjective clause forms he has been taught; i.e.,

   1.2. 1. which + inflected verb > "...takes a longer time, which varies from..."

   2. absence of ‘which’ + -ing form (i.e., reduced AdjCl) > “longer time, varying from...”

   “I'm sure there are a lot of people ____ like that hobby.”

1.2. A peculiar error type occurs when the relative pronoun is used to introduce the AdjCl in that a personal pronoun is inserted as well. This appears to be in response to the semantic subject that is implied in English:

   “Enclosing are some pictures that we were taken...”

   “...unwealthy family who one of their family members _ in a coma.”

3. Some apparent subject/verb agreement problems could, in fact, be identified as problems with the clause; i.e., not understanding that the relative pronoun functions as a
subject carrying the number and gender reference of the noun that the AdjCl is modifying; e.g.: “There are many sports which is based on speed...”

10. Adverb Clauses

The two AdvCl problems identified in the case study reflect similar difficulties as those found while examining adjective clauses:

1. “Hope you won’t feel depressed after you reading it.”

This sentence exhibits the same strategy of simplification used in AdjCl, where the subject combines both grammatical alternatives and comes up with his own innovative AdvCl; i.e.,

1. “...after you read it.” +

2. “...after reading it.” = “...after you reading it.”

2. “...in mountain when [where] he was hiding...”

This error is most likely a “slip” as the writer attempts to become more familiar with common adverbs and inadvertently replaces one ‘wh-’ word for the other.

11. Conditional Clauses

Developmental problems due to intralingual difficulties within the system of English conditionals, especially the hypothetical conditional, characterize the subject’s conditional clauses. This problem is, however, at least exacerbated even if not unambiguously caused by the fact that Indonesian conditional clauses have no
morphological markings and, therefore, do not carry a similar concept of real versus unreal/hypothetical conditionals; for example:

1. confusion about if/when to use /-ed/; i.e., confusion with the concept of hypothetical vs. future "reality":

   e.g.: "I don't mind if you wanted to be..." (I wouldn't mind if you wanted or/ I don’t mind if you want...)
   e.g.: "Everything would be easier once you become..." (Everything would be easier once you became or/ Everything will be easier once you become....)
   e.g.: "It would be more representative if both the questions and answers are [were] in their own language."

12. Rhetorical Structure

   The subject shows remarkable progress in the writing of substantial and correctly used details, first in his paragraph structure and later in fairly long (several page) essays, letters, scientific and other texts. This progression occurred within the space of 6-8 months, seeming to show the effects of internal motivation and the wisdom of choosing topics, or allowing the students to choose topics with which they are already familiar or which motivate them to learn and use new vocabulary, grammatical structures and/or writing formats.

   For advanced ESL writers such as this, having the student outline his own writing (after having previously been taught both outlining skills and general paragraph structure) helps the writer see what is missing or misplaced. For example, in the description of two
opposing views of “origins” (scientific creationism vs. scientific evolution), an early paragraph, the writer would have been able to identify his lack of parallel details in the body of the paragraph, and, therefore, the lack of logic in his conclusion.

It is often easier to teach these editing skills rather than out-of-context grammar skills, which often assume proficiency in and knowledge of the language that the student is yet far from achieving.

Text: There are two theories explain the origin of human beings. The first is the Creatures Evolution which explains that god make human beings. Based on this theory, human beings not evolute, so human beings exist not from another thing. On the other hand, the second theory, called the Evolution theory explain that human beings originated from certain kinds of ape which then evoluted into human being. The second theory has weakness point because until now we have no evidence about the transition species between apes and human being which is called “missing link”. Although the second theory has disadvantage I still believe in this theory because the scientist has strong evidence that evolution exist in every species.

For a writer attempting material such as this, where he may need vocabulary that is unfamiliar to express his knowledge and opinions, discussion may have been helpful in eliciting the needed vocabulary and practicing the necessary structures.

If the Indonesian university-level writing texts I have examined, such as those by Gorys Keraf, are any indication of what is being taught or expected of students in Indonesian schools, then the logic and structure of an English paragraph per se should
pose no mystery to an Indonesian ESL writer. He/she simply (!) needs the tools (vocabulary, morpho-syntactic structure, cohesive devices) and lots of practice to make the transition. In other words, the concepts of compare/contrast, descriptive, narrative, and other paragraph/essay forms are made familiar to the modern university student, if they are taught. It appears, however, that writing per se does not receive explicit instruction for students in disciplines other than *sastra* (language arts). Another significant disadvantage for the Indonesian ESL writer seems to come more from sociological rather than purely linguistic differences. Indonesians tend not to be fluent writers, even in their own language, due to a lack of value placed upon reading and writing in general. This state of affairs is further exacerbated by the censorship suppressing critical “political” writing (and, therefore, thinking) in particular. This could be due to the influence of a long history as an oral culture. Or it could also be the result of the differences inherent in an authoritarian social structure resulting in the de-emphasis placed upon critical thinking skills. In such a society, questions and value judgments are discouraged, while the authority of the speaker resides in his/her social status rather than on (to the western mind) more objective (achievement/knowledge-based) merits. For individuals - especially students - from such a background, it is easy to see how problems would arise, for instance, in writing the type of comparison/contrast paragraph above, when the student is not accustomed to having his own views validated, much less to having to defend them on paper by comparing one set of beliefs with another.
Part 3. Conclusions

Judging by the results of this error analysis, the areas of greatest quantifiable difficulty for this Indonesian student appear to lie not at the discourse level per se, but rather at the word and phrase level. This finding corresponds with the results presented in one study in the Spring 1990 TESOL Quarterly showing the average distribution of errors at the following 3 levels:

- word errors in L1 62% L2 59%
- phrase errors in L1 28% L2 26%
- all other levels in L1 9% L2 15% (Hall 52)

This same study found that the specific areas within the structure of English that were “more facilitative of indeterminacy than others” were prepositions, articles and verb inflections (Jain 205). This corresponds to identical assertions in Hall (55), and is corroborated by my findings in general, although there are certain aspects of these broad areas that cause more difficulty than others. In the context of this particular case study, it would appear that the most salient idiosyncrasies of Indonesian student writing emanate in the cognitive/cultural differences in the foregrounding of information. This is highlighted in particular by the distinctive use of the “be” verb, apparently due to interference from Indonesian which uses the passive (translated as be + verb stem + -ed in English) to foreground action (ultimately for sociological reasons).

While the results from this study make it possible to concur with Jain that “these errors are not [necessarily] uniquely traceable to interference from the L1 system...[with] the apparent copious opposition between rules and arbitrariness manifested in the surface
structure of [the] English [language] itself largely contributing to error productivity" (Jain 205), it is equally obvious that "along with other factors, L1 features may also contribute to indeterminacy" and interference in the processing as well as production of coherent English composition.

Part 4. Analysis of Error Analysis Methodology and Format

In The Study of Error, Bartholomae concedes that "what a reader finds depends to a large degree on [his/] her assumptions about the writer's intentions. Any systematic attempt to chart a learner's errors is clouded by the difficulty of assigning intention through textual analysis...The analyst begins, then, by interpreting - a text, not by describing features on a page. And interpretation is less than an exact science" (259). A fundamental part of the interpretation of a text, however, is through its surface structures and errors thereof. Consecutive interpretation must also be made in order to determine the grammatical categories into which a particular error ought to be assigned.

At this point in an analysis, categorization problems occur due to the inappropriateness of the traditional nomenclature assigned to identifying grammatical forms in English. The root of the problem lies precisely in the fact that traditional grammatical categories are based on form rather than function. Not only does this cause confusion when attempting to describe a contrastive feature when the categories may be named according to different criteria, but also when attempting to determine the type of error one is dealing with. For example, articles and demonstrative pronouns in English should be grouped together as a subset of NP structure since they both function as
determiners of the noun and are included in the formal realization of the concrete/abstract; collective/singular/plural; determinate/indeterminate; and general/particular sememes of an English noun.

Also, in traditional terms the category of the verb is narrowly restricted to tense and number and, to a lesser extent, mode, while often the most salient features are not those of time and number but of voice, aspect, and inherent determinateness distinctions as well as functional uses of verb-derived forms such as gerunds, infinitives and participles. For example, these latter are characterized as ‘verbal nouns’, so should they be classified as subsets of nouns or verbs? Additionally, should the use of a verb form in an adjective position and, therefore, function, a derivational form difficulty, be classified as a verb or an adjective error? Since derivational difficulties affect all forms of grammatical functions (i.e., nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs) I have taken my cue from Shaughnessy in describing these latter as vocabulary errors.

In making word function and not grammatical form the basis for categorizing errors, the number of categories is kept to a workable size without losing the possibility of seeing overlapping errors or those that reach beyond the boundaries of the phrase, sentence and out into the discourse context itself. In fact, this particular format did not originally include any room for analysis of discourse level structure where such would have been pertinent; i.e., paragraph and essay structure and the use of rhetorical elements of coherence and unity (use of key noun repetition, signal and transition words and phrases). This would appear to be of greater benefit when examining and/or contrasting
written material according to task type, but in this case was both unnecessary due to the writer's advanced level, and unwieldy due to the number of different kinds of texts.

Finally, while my data was roughly organized both longitudinally (in order to help define an error as being developmental rather than being caused by interference), as well as according to task type, such information proved to be of minor importance in determining the areas of possible interference in L2 writing. This information is more pertinent for the practitioner wishing to form conclusions concerning the efficacy of general teaching methods and specific tasks rather than helping to make the initial error assessment of L1 interference or other error types.

In retrospect, the disrepute that error analysis and contrastive analysis underwent during the 1960's and 1970's will appear as an insignificant ripple in the tide of thousands of years of history of contrastive language observations (qtd. in Odlin 15). The influence of L1 language habits on L2 acquisition may not be absolute, and the exact nature may be difficult to ascertain. Yet the relatively recent monolithic status of so-called empirical studies has been mitigated by a “new” understanding that, “standard [empirical, formal, clinical] views assume a closed system...where all the variables can be controlled or at least accounted for... Implicit in such studies is another...assumption, that causal relations are regular and contingent, that explanation and prediction are exactly symmetrical”(Gere 118). The positivist presuppositions in empirical studies have now been successfully challenged in favor of a paradigmatic, realist or relativist holistic approach. The result in practitioner terms is that a contrastive language analysis may not be able to explain, much less predict, all errors or even transfer errors. In fact,
the difficulty of identifying an occurrence of L1 transfer is precisely why each of the theoretical contributions discussed in Chapter 1 is necessary. It is the context of this difficulty that provides the intellectual and academic framework within which the different approaches can cohere. Rather than tout a formally linguistic, clinically psychological or culturally pragmatic schema as the one definitive description and explanation of learner error, an ideal contrastive analysis will attempt to weave together all, or as many as possible, of the grammatical and rhetorical threads that make up the interlanguage structure. As Kaplan predicts, “the future lies in the development of a research paradigm that will permit the analysis of long written texts along several lines at the same time” (Revisited 19). This study has been undertaken in an attempt to lay the foundation for such a paradigm for the benefit of both Indonesian student writers and their instructors. For now, perhaps the best possible view will look more like the underside of a woven pattern rather than the clearly defined pattern itself--but at least it's a start!
APPENDIX A

Glossary

Linguistic Abbreviations:

NP = noun phrase (+ determiner ± modifier (noun or adjective) + HN)

HN = head noun (main noun in noun phrase)

NCL = noun clause (who + clause (S + predicate))

AdjCl = adjective clause (which + clause (S + predicate), or reduced AdjCl = verb in -ing/)

AdvCl = adverb clause (adverb such as when/where/how + clause (S + predicate))

CondCl = conditional clause (If + is/were...will/would)

Cl\(^1\) = first clause in coordinate/subordinate sentence

Cl\(^2\) = second clause in coordinate/subordinate sentence

L1 = first (maternal) language

L2 = second (target) language

S = subject in clause/sentence

O = object of transitive verb

A = agent of action of verb

B.W. = beginning writer

Terms:

collocation: the distribution/abstraction established between lexical morphemes of different grammatical categories; e.g., construct/construction belong to verb/noun
grammatical categories respectively, but possess the same lexical collocation; i.e., root word. (transl. from *Dictionnaire de linguistique*, Larousse, 1973: 93.)

clinical: describing the mode of inquiry which, like empiricism, is positivist in its assumptions (i.e., accepts one correct “solution” to an issue), but remains flexible enough to accept tentative conclusions.

developmental: concerning the normal process and order of language acquisition as opposed to conscious learning.

empirical: describing a mode of study characterized by experimental design and statistical procedures whose form of observation arises from positivist presuppositions regarding the primacy of experience and the ability to quantify phenomena to determine causal order.

formalist: describing a mode of study seeking to qualify phenomena in assuming a logical causal relationship between its formal model and the real world.

interference: the transfer of lexical, morphosyntactic, rhetorical, semantic forms/functions from a learner’s maternal (or other) language to the structure of the target language.

intralingual: concerning the internal structure (forms/functions) of a given language.

register: an individual’s use of different language levels which exist according to social usage norms in that language. (transl. from *Dictionnaire de linguistique*, Larousse, 1973: 417)

sememe: a unit which is formalized (i.e., given verbal form) by a lexeme and composed of a group of semantic characteristics such as animacy/inanimacy, determinateness/indeterminateness, singular/plural/collective, etc. (adapted from *Dictionnaire de linguistique*, Larousse, 1973: 433.)
APPENDIX B
Primary Case Data

SPELLING/LEXICO-SEMANTIC:
Selection:
4-8-92, p.2: I tried marijuana until I got fly.

p.3: ...took me awhile to get used to it.

p.4: I thought that there's nothing to lose if I try.

6-14-92, p.4: ...everything will be alright.

1-7-92, p.3: I apologize for I couldn't.. he honor and respect you... ask apologize when he thinks he made a mistake and said thank you properly.

1-17-93 you'll see what's going on surround us in different environments.

Safety in the Car: several ten miles per hour.

wearing soft suspensions for their car

cornering (turning a corner)

reversely they are handled by the powerful engine.

bigger power

active safety is a systems

mountain area

caused our car diving if we make emergency stops

devided

Karate ...will be given since the karataka begins to...(from the time the karataka....)

when he brakes or neglects (breaks)

whenever he got hit by an opponent (he gets hit)
Automotive Sports: close shape circuit

rally drivers will get help longer...sometimes they got an accident...

NOUN AS ADJECTIVE:
Ommission:
4-8-92, p.6: I'm just trying to give you an idea as detail__ as I could...

p.3: I found no difficulties deal__ with them.

1-17-93, p.5: ...any kind of household's job.

7-11-93, p.1: at Hening's apartment. (He crossed out "s")

Selection:
5-2-92: I'm sorry for the size of the box and for the delay to send this.

6-14-92, p.1: So far I have no problem to see the borderline between the right and wrong things and I have no problem in controlling myself against...

Car Safety car's safety...brakes' pedal...car's wheels...our car ability and driving ability.

NOUN PHRASES:
Ommission:
4-8-92, p.2: various kind__ of friends.

....and one of them were neither a drug abuser nor a drinker but...

5-2-92, p.6: By keep____ doing good, being consistent as a Christian, apply____ what you got.

p.2: ..can't fulfill all of your present day need___... knowledge about various problem____

p.5: various kind__ of music in it..

2-31-93: If old friend__ meet they talk about...

B+ paper, p.1: ...it can release the pain of both the patient and the patient's family.

p.2: ...all the cost__ above.

p.3: ...one of your brother__, sister__ or parents in a coma.
Karate
without complain_ (complaint/complaining)

one among self-defense sport (one among many sports)

Car Safety
all of the situation_ above...all of the safety device_

...are both high performance car_ ... they have different specification_ ... because of the different kind_ of track.

Evolution
kind_ of ape_ ...into human being_

Addition:
4-8-92, p.4: All of these equipments and materials.

4-7-93
Enclosing are the materials that I promised to send it to you
Thanks again for the rumballs, I really appreciate it.

Selection:
4-8-92, p.1: ...with ideal relationship__ among each other.

p.2: I stayed away from all those stuff once I tried it.
Now and then I spent my Sat. night__ raced in the street__... but I spent most of my Saturday night__...

We are a racing fans.

p.3: There are some reason__ why...

5-30-93: I translated their respond_.

I went to the P.O.., but it was close.

B+paper, p.3: We all need time and money for our live, education, caring ___ our own health and preparing ___ our future.

ARTICLES:
4-8-92, p.2: ...among them are drinker_, drug abuser_, gigolo_...

p.3: ...I did an odd job for my father's office.
Some of my friends had bad habit__:

I began to read textbook_ in English.
Most of my friends took *an* English course as their extra-curricular activity.

p.4: I established __ karate club at... I gave karate lesson twice a week for teenager... happy because I gave positive activity to them.

Mountain hiking *is my other activities* while I was an undergrad. student.

My first contact with foreigner__...

p.5: ...beyond my wildest dream__...the recruiter announced the final result__.

As *a* good Moslems, we have to pray... actually Moslem__ are not allowed to eat pork.

I know nothing about woman...

1-17-93, p.3: Going to __ discotheque is not the thing that really entertain__ me. Discotheque__ and bar__ are not my place.

p.4: ..also in every areas/subjects.

7-20-92, p.5: there are is possibilities...*(Subject corrected above are to is)*

7-20-92, years: It's not easy to become __ Indonesian citizen (it will take many and cost a fortune because of ___ complicated bureaucracy and the bad mentality of the officer, everything would be easier...

7-23-92: If you joined the tour you would see how they process *a* beer.

10-8-92, p.2: This is *the* part of the tradition...

B+ paper, p.1: [Euthanasia]...an immoral act against *the* God will. I think that's true for *the* normal life...

We can hope *a* God's miracle will come.

Evolution ... *a* weakness point..

Summary found in *a* beer can (the beer can -2nd mention)
stop ___ progressive (-ion) of AIDS
through [a] special access program
(for) patient who can’t tolerate
Last year, [the] FBI stopped...
of the law enforcement
meant to recreate crime_

Disneyland
I heard about Disneyland... I went to the Disneyland
I like the Star Tours

**PRONOUNS:**
Addition: LCP was my first English course I’ve taken.
Selection: ...Those stuff once I tried it... we used to rent video
cassettes and enjoyed it together.

1-17-93, p.5: If I had known that you bought this, I wouldn’t buy one from...
Your rumballs are perfect, I really like it.. Thank you for giving me those rumballs. I eat it when I stay up all night and it reminds me...

10-22-92: I like those love songs just because its melodies.

5-30-93: Enclosed are some questionnaires you need (from 6 students). They have been helpful and do it seriously.

7-11-93, p.2: If those flight schedule is not convenient to you... I chose those schedule based on...

12-4-93: I cannot find the negative film you asked __. But I’m pretty sure they’re in my room... I will send them as soon as I find it.

**PREPOSITIONS:**
2-15-92: On that lunch time...
You can’t order by mail to Indonesia.

4-8-92: [my father] had to go to work in Borneo Island.

p.3: I decided to try it again in the next year.

6-22-92, p.4: I don't think she can reply your letter.

7-11-93, p.2: Both you and Don look cute and happy on the pictures.

9-29-93 ...to fly together in the same flight the end of the year.

Auto. Sports an accident at a remote area.

Safety at high speed driving (with high speed driving) we can only find them at the sport or luxury cars. (in cars)

Karate He has to come at the dojo (to the dojo). ...bowing to each other.

Summary to exact detail (in detail)

VERB

Ommission:

4-8-92, p.2: I ___ ashamed when I remember this. Both my brothers ___ more quiet than me.

p.2: ...there is more opportunity for me to get a job if I get involved in... since the work force overwhelmed by economist and other engineers.

5-2-92 The happiness they've given to me since I was a child become a fundamental thing.

...if he see just one fault in you he won't respect you and difficult to handle.

p.3: My country's income largely depend on oil, so the petroleum industry is very important and won't be collapse.

6-22-92, p.2: I ___ always happy whenever I ___ near...

p.3: ...I don't want you interested in ...

9-7-92, ...after you ___(are) legally divorced.

9-22-92, p.5: whenever you ___(are) close to...
4-11-93, p.3: At this point I ___ still optimistic.

1-17-93, p.2: I ___ really disappointed...

p.4: I ___ really surprised that...

B+ paper p.1: ...the brain has already ______ damaged.

Summary

Now he ___[has] ended his career and he have (has) to go to jail. The FDA ___[has] approved...
More than 20,000 AIDS patient ___[have] already used...
...___[were] flown to San Fransisco...but actually contain___[-ed]
...each can ___ [is] estimated to be [worth]

Evolution

...human beings ___ not evolute, so human beings ___ exist not from another thing.

Safety

That system ___ not limited the...seatbelt will ___ automatically in a lock position.
This technology ___ developed in the early ‘70’s.

Addition:

2-15-92

to be fall in love with

5-2-92, p.6: A child/teenager form a broken family can be survive and still has a good personality..

I apologized if I offended you by..

Maybe I become a Muslim, a Christian, or still being an agnostic...

p.4: ...my family ___ disappointed to me because I’m being an agnostic

6-22-92

Is your codependent personality be the main reason why...

p.4: There’s no doubt my marriage won’t be survive...

p.6: ...seems to me I always be alone in the crowd... but I never felt worry ___ about myself. I can enjoy my life, I live in peace, I___ never worried about my future.

p.7: Unfortunately we can’t predict when our desire will be appear.
Please feel free to tell me if you still have something in your mind... I always be ready to hear it.

I didn't let myself TO express that...

...and you don't know how much longer can he/she will live.

...designed in Alabama, may be will revolutionize...
...makes the jury can really read (makes [it] able to really...)

I apologize.. I want to kept my feeling...why I fall in love with...

How was your trip to the mountain going?

During this time I had... friends, among them are drinker, drug abuser...

I don't want to be a person who don't aware about what goes on... so I tried everything...except fools around with woman.

...spent my Saturday night _ raced around in the street_

although I could do whatever I wanted to do, I never loose my self-control... they didn't care about whatever we want_ to do as long as we pay the room's rent on time.

...I had my own conviction and we respect_ each other...they broaden_ my horizon_.

In that first year of my study I began to read textbook_ in English. In the past I've just read racing magazines in English. They are different but it's just took me a while to get used to it.

...Most of my friends took..., but I'm too busy..so I've never taken...

That's a voluntary job but I was happy...I used to spar every month in the tournaments...I compete_ in...

Mountain hiking is my other activities while I was an undergrad. student..

I couldn't ___ afford__ all those analyses without their help.
I don't know how to treat a woman since I've never date a girl in my life. My parents and my sisters encourage me to date a girl because usually my friends have that experience since junior or senior high school.

I simply haven't found one who impressed me until I met... the first time in my life I felt a strange feeling... I don't know why I think about...

Very often I wanted to call... but I always change my mind.

5-2-92, p.1: ...they're still being a stranger each other even though they had lived together for one or two years because they never let their partner see what kind of a man/woman they really are.

For the time being I'm still being an agnostic.

6-14-92, p.1: Islam value tend to neglected the reality I face in my daily life...

Even though I always be alone in the crowd, I feel comfortable because I go there just for listening the music... I will not be just enjoying the music, but also enjoying the time relax with...

The period ending is always be on a Sunday.

I like those moments rather than when we spend our time...

Do you interest in me mainly because...my point is, if you are interested in me mainly because...

Whomever she is she will feel lonely... when she spent her time outside home...

I can't spent my time...

Take your time in reading these since they are due back... hope you won't feel more depressed after you reading it.

...a picture of Golden (the town where I'm living) seeing from above.
8-27-92 When I left... I felt like I left my own home...I've already felt that I missed... the last two days before I left.

9-22-92 p.5: I was not allowed myself to..

10-27-92, p.6: Enclosing are all the materials I still keep...

1-31-93 Thank you for everything you've done during my visit. It was a really nice break.

p.1: I was thinking you might be spent the time with...

p.2: If that's true, that's explain...

p.3: in case we have interest to any...

B+ paper: ...cannot help to make the coma patient getting better.

p.2: The doctor team have already did their best...with the new drugs which is still in research...the drugs is special

Summary ...computer has developed a ...(can develop...)

Dove ...setting a trap to caught
He began to flew...

Disneyland Since now I'm staying in Redlands I can make my dream come true. (...have been able to make...)
Not only I took... (Not only did I go on...)

Karate He must showing respect
The more control he should has...
The karatake must has courage...must has self-control...must has nerve...
He can mastering the technique
...karatake have a rough time...
It’s better ___ keep going until [he] pass ___ out instead of asking permission for taking a rest.
...always receive ___ punishment without complain___.
...sensei talk _ or give _ [an]instruction.
Safety
...need to lightly depressed
...help reducing (help the driver reduce)
...makes our car swaying (makes our car sway)
If we are driving then suddenly we facing
...which ___ located in the car.
...will still __ [be] going.
...they will__ throw outside the car (be thrown)
When the seatbelt ___ first introduced...
...seatbelt ___[were] always fixed.
When we coming or...we facing
If we __ driving then suddenly we facing...

Auto. Sports
So the driver have to have...so the rally driver have never driven...
There are many sports which is based on speed...

Ordering:
4-8-92
If there's a race we went to the raceway to watch it.

GERUNDS/INFINITIVES/PARTICIPLES
Dove
...setting a trap to caught...
...began to flew...

Karate
It’s better __ keep going until __ pass out instead of asking
permission for taking a rest.
...self-confidence without underestimate__ other people.
...always modest without inferior feeling (feeling inferior).
...always receive punishment without complain__.

Safety
Including in this category...
...considering to buy a car...
...in case of the driver’s seat belt failed...
...our car become easier to roll over.

ADJECTIVE CLAUSES
Ommission:
5-2-92, p.7: I'm sure there are a lot of people ___like that hobby.
7-11-93, p.3: Enclosing are some pictures that we were taken during...
B+ paper, p.1: ...there’s certain conditions __which we’d better to let
someone die.
...I conclude that euthanasia can release both patient and patient's family pain, especially for  
unwealthy family who one of their family's members __ in a coma.

Auto. Sports
There are many sports which is based on speed, among them is automotive sports.
...while a rally event takes a longer time, varies from several hours...

Evolution
There are two theories explain the origin of human beings.

PARALLEL STRUCTURES
B+ paper, p.1: 
...because of a degeneration processes, a serious illness,  
or injured after an accident.

...certainly he is still breathing and his heart __ still beating.

He can open and blinking his eyes.

6-7-92, p.3: He knows how to operate the tripod and how to focusing  
the camera.

Auto. Sports  
...the important factors __not only the driver and the car  
performance but also [the skill of]the mechanics.

Safety  
...whenever we need to stop or decreasing the speed of our car...

NOUN CLAUSES
Omission:

4-8-92, p.5: My lifestyle is exactly the same as ______religious  
people.

5-2-92, p.3: I don't want my child ___ know that ...

7-20-92, p.5: There are so many people ____ abuse their authorities.

Selection:
2-15-92: ...to know how it feels like... (should be - how it feels to...  
or what it feels like to...

I would suggest you to have (that you have/get)
4-8-92: I didn't feel comfortable hang__ around doing nothing... I didn't spend my time hang__ around with ....

p.5: I'm happy because study__ abroad is beyond my wildest dream.

10-8-92, p.1: I can't answer your question until I have a chance to talk to him about why he change__ his mind.

10-21-92, p.1: I'm sorry for I caused you __ felt that way.

1-31-93, p.1: ...you didn't want to risking yourself...

I can't imagine to live without...

p.2: I encouraged you not to limited yourself in having...

7-11-92, p.2: I'm happy that you'll be .... thinking that (= G's. correction)

8-31-93, p.2: I realize that my English proficiency is very poor that makes it impossible for me to ...

B+ paper, p.1: ...someone who is in a coma condition.

...besides (the fact that) the limit between life and death is questionable...

...will do euthanasia to the hopeless patient who __ in coma condition for...

... a long period by stop giving the patient.. someone who __ in coma condition.

Karate ...a person who train_ [in] karate... sport that teach_

Dove ...and asked why didn’t he get...(why he didn’t get)

**ADVERB CLAUSES**

10-26-93: I decided to use American format because __ its simplicity so it's gonna be easier to read.

Summaries ...in Montana when (where) he was hiding...
CONDITIONAL CLAUSES

2-15-92: If I didn't reveal my feeling at that moment, maybe I could never ___had another chance.

5-2-92: Even if we live together for 1 year without marriage ____ won't help if we're pretender.

He/she was afraid that his/her partner would leave if they reveal themselves honestly.

7-20-92, p.5: I don't mind if you wanted to be....

p.6: Everything would be easier once you become...

9-7-92: Even though we ___ married in the future, you will have...

9-22-92, p.4: I don't mind if you wore...

1-31-93, p.1: You might think there's a possibility I would change my mind before we___ married or I would... as earlier as possible.

5-30-93: It would be more representative (valid) if both the questions and the answers are in their own language.

Safety

If the car overturned (overturns)...If we had (have) an accident...

University

If I being admitted to a university in U.S.A. I will be very happy. Since the university in U.S.A. is very strict, only a student who meet _ the requirements will be admitted. If I being admitted to the university....
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