MAPPING GRAMMATICAL ERRORS IN SPEECH PRODUCTION OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR STUDENTS: A CASE STUDY

Maraden Marcellino

Atma Jaya Catholic University, Indonesia

Abstract

Acquiring a foreign language requires a student to master the two elements of language, vocabulary and grammar, and the four language skills, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Within each skill, these two language elements play a considerably essential role since they are seen as the very core aspects of language learning and that they are regarded inherent in each of these skills. Thus, vocabulary and grammatical aspects cannot be separated from the four language skills in language acquisition as without any one of which each skill is never acquired.

Since the implementation of communicative approach in 1984 to the application of the competency-based language teaching in Indonesia, English programs at high schools have been meaning or message based rather than language usage or form oriented. As a result, grammar learning has been significantly kept aside if not totally ignored in class interactions, and that communication success becomes the main target in instructional objectives.

This study attempts to map grammatical errors the students make in their speech productions. It employs an interview technique for data collection by recording the conversations of twenty respondents - - junior and senior students - - on a selected issue of a particular topic and transcribing them in the form of written transcripts which are then to be analyzed from a grammatical perspective with the reference of grammar books. Those violating the grammatical norms will be considered as grammatical errors. It has been found out that learners' grammatical errors are derived from two major causes - - translating concepts of L1 into L2 and their approximative system. This study concludes that the communicative classrooms which utilize the competency-based language teaching bring about a positive impact upon grammar learning. This research is significant as it gives a great contribution to structure and speaking class teachers, students, as well as to the department for policy making.

Direct all correspondence to:
maraden.marcellino@atmajaya.ac.id
The English Department, School of Teacher Training and Education, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia, Jalan Jendral Sudirman No. 51, Jakarta Selatan, 12930

INTRODUCTION

Since the independence of the country from the Dutch colonialism in 1945, English has been chosen as the first foreign language in Indonesia. It means that English is not used as a medium of communication nor instruction at any level in the community, but has to be taught as a mandatory subject at junior and senior high schools until 1990s. The objective of teaching English in Indonesia then has undergone several changes back and forth from grammar study to active acquisition and to passive understanding and now back to oral communication (Dardjowidjojo, 1997).

Right after the independence, the Indonesian government could not specify the method to be used but continued the teaching method left by the Dutch – the Grammar Translation Method as it was quite popular at the time. Textbooks such as Abdurachman's *English Grammar*, Tobing's *Practical Exercises*, and de Maar and Pino's *English Passages for Translation* were widely used at senior high schools (Dardjowidjojo, 2000).

The availability of the grant from the Ford Foundation in 1953 for the establishment of a two-year training program after senior high schools, widely known as The Standard Training Course (STC), in Yogyakarta, Central Java, and Bukit Tinggi, Central Sumatra, opened the gate for the popular Oral Approach. The government, afterwards, officially adopted this approach which then led to the publications of two series of English textbooks – *English for the SLTP* and *English for the SLTA* for junior and senior high school learners respectively (Nababan, 1982, 1988). These two series are regarded as the embryo for what was then known as "the 1975 Curriculum" covering the four major language skills – listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Realizing that the objective for the oral production was not realistic, the government selected only the reading comprehension as the main goal. No official textbooks were published for this reading approach (Dardjowidjojo, 1997).

New trends in linguistic always affect language teaching. The shift of the philosophical belief from empiricism to nativism or cognitivism in the late 1950s and the influence of considering the sociolinguistic aspects in the use of language in communication determine the teaching pendulum in language teaching pedagogy in Indonesia. As language was then viewed as a social phenomenon, language experts began to look at language more from

language use than language usage (Widdowson, 1978). In the area of applied linguistics, applied linguists prefer to adopt Hymes' concept of competence than that of Chomsky's (Dardjowidjojo, 1997). Accordingly, the Communicative Approach was introduced to replace the Oral Approach which had been dominant in the country since 1950s. Later it culminated in the change of curriculum from the Oral Approach 1975 Curriculum to the Communicative 1984 curriculum.

However, the 1984 curriculum, in its implementation and application, could not escape from the philosophical ground of structuralism although it was called communicative. The points of departure in the guidelines of the curriculum were still very structural and the textbooks resulting from the curriculum were also structurally oriented. (see Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1988). Despite the fact that the curriculum did not provide a clear explanation on how to accommodate the pragmatic aspects into the teaching material, many of the textbooks were "misguided" and treated pragmatics as a separate topic which was, then, presented in chapters rather than being incorporated in the four major language skills (Purwo, 1990). Although the four skills remained as the targets of learning, the order was changed as the Ministry realized that English was not a language for oral use for the majority of Indonesians. The new order became reading, listening, speaking, and writing (see Dardjowidjojo, 2000).

Prior to the disappointment of the previous curriculum, the Minister revised the 1984 Curriculum to the 1994 Curriculum. Although the guideline was still communicatively oriented, the official term used for the new curriculum is not *komunikatif* but *kebermaknaan* or "meaningfulness". However, the basic concept underlying this curriculum has been misinterpreted, if not misconceptualized, by curriculum designers, textbook writers, classroom teachers, and practitioners. This can easily be understood from the absence of formal discussions or presentations of grammatical items in classroom interactions. Accordingly, grammar learning is no longer explicitly put into practice but is incorporated in reading. The misunderstanding of the newly proposed approach in fact has also been the problem among language experts.

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES OF GRAMMAR LEARNING
IN THE COMMUNICATIVE CLASSROOM

There have been very few studies thoroughly investigating the effects of communicative classroom practice on developing students' grammatical competence in real classroom settings. Hatch (1978), for example, surveyed only the vertical constructions by using the discourse as a kind of scaffold for what they intended to communicate and then learned how to produce the

same constructions horizontally. Lightbrown (1983) observed the progressive –*ing* to Grade 5 learners of French, and Meisel (1983) noted the accuracy in the use of word order rule. Ellis (1984) examined the wh-questions only to a group of 13 ESL learners. In more recent studies, Ellis (1992) researched the level of acquisition of verb-end in the communicative speech of 15 adult L2 German over a six-month period of training. Weinert (1987) and Eubank (1987) investigated negation to adult learners of L2 German. Van Patten (1990) probed clitic pronouns in L2 Spanish; Day and Shapson (1991) analyzed French conditional sentences in hypothetical situations. White (1991) looked into the placement of adverbs of frequency and of manner by French learners of L2 English. Spada and Lightbrown (1993) studied the effects of instruction on question formation – wh and yes/no. of the conducted research, it can be deduced that there have been a number of researches investigating the effects of form-focused instruction in naturalistic language classrooms; hence, their investigations were limited to a particular grammatical item.

Various research findings have been discussed and presented in a number of journals, and that the findings yield some controversial issues. Dulay and Burt (1973), Krashen (1982), Prabhu (1987), and Beretta (1989) argue that grammar learning or instruction has to be abandoned in favor of creating opportunities for natural language use. They affirm that there is enough evidence to claim that communication is sufficient for the acquisition of full grammatical competence as the quality of classroom communication is thought to be rich in opportunities for the development of grammatical acquisition. They further assert that learners may achieve higher levels of competence if they experience the type of communication they hypothesize in language learning (Ellis, 1997). On a somewhat different track, Krashen (1985) claims that when learners receive comprehensible input, they are able to acquire grammatical feature next in the acquisition order. The same is true for a number of studies suggesting that grammar instruction does not make much of a difference. It has been found that instructed learners generally do not manifest a different order of acquisition of grammatical features from naturalistic learners (Makino 1980, Pica 1983). Other studies conducted by Schumann (1979) and Pienemann (1984) have shown that efforts to teach learners specific grammatical features do not always result in their being acquired. Still other studies conducted by Lightbrown (1983), among others, indicate that grammatical instruction results in pseudo-learning in that learners use the structure taught but overgeneralize it and finally drop it when they are taught another similar structure later. In line with this argument, many language teachers are all too well aware that the acquisition of high levels of grammatical competence is likely to be problematic for most

learners no matter what kind of instruction is on offer (Ellis, 1997). In sum, proponents who advocate the zero option on grammar teaching contend that participating in natural communication is sufficient for the acquisition of grammatical competence to take place.

Other studies, however, challenge the zero option or position on grammar teaching as they dispute it on its theoretical grounds. A number of researches, such as Stevick (1980) and Sharwood Smith (1981), have presented a counter argument that the explicit knowledge typically resulting from formal grammatical instruction can convert, through practice, into the implicit knowledge required for the natural language use in communication. In a more recent study, Sharwood Smith (1986) even further doubts the effectiveness of communication as a basis for grammar acquisition. He points out that input can be relevant to learners in two different senses – one is for interpreting meaning and the other for learning. He affirms that input for comprehending a massage may not be the same input required for building grammatical knowledge. Therefore, he suggests that simplified input may assist comprehension but may deprive the learners of useful structural information about the target grammar.

Reiss (1985) noticed that successful language learners focus on grammatical form and that A grade college learners of foreign languages in the United States were more likely to pay attention to form than B grade students. In Canada a number of recent studies suggest that grammar teaching can have positive effects even on learners' unplanned output. These studies have examined the role of form-focused instruction in the context of immersion education or intensive communicative language teaching and at the end of the program learners can produce functional meanings of grammatical forms systematically taught in materials designed to encourage communication (Ellis, 1997).

Other studies supporting the form-focused instruction include, among others, research conducted by Harley (1989), White (1991), Spada and Lightbrown (1993) as well as Lyster (1994). Harley (1989), for instance, found that eight weeks of instruction on functional grammar materials resulted in significant improvement, on the part of French immersion students, in their accuracy with which two verb tenses were used in a written composition. White (1991) investigated the effects of instruction on the placement of frequency and manner adverbs. It was found that the instructed learners showed significantly greater gains in accuracy in a number of manipulative tasks in comparison to control groups. Spada and Lightbrown (1993) also studied the effects of instruction on question formation – wh and yes/no – and that the experimental group demonstrated a substantial gain in accuracy in all the given tasks – a cartoon task, a preference task, and an oral

communication task. Lyster (1994) analyzed the effects of some 60 hours of functional-analytic instruction on the ability of Grade 8 French immersion students to use a number of linguistic forms in accordance with the sociolinguistic norms of the target language. He found that the experimental groups outperformed the control groups in a written as well as oral production test and in a multiple choice test.

Of the two polarized beliefs, some studies have provided evidence that neither is absolutely justified. It has been argued that form-focused instruction has an effect on accuracy in planned but not in unplanned production. Schumann (1978) found that the accuracy of one adult learner's English negatives improved significantly in an imitation test after instruction, but did not improve at all in his spontaneous speech. The same thing is true for Kaida's (1987) research on the acquisition of the ditransitive and phrasal verb constructions. She concluded that formal instruction seemed to have had very little effect on spontaneous production, but it was beneficial for controlled performance (as in Ellis, 1997, p. 58). Other researchers have also measured learning outcomes in different ways. In some cases, a formal grammar test has been employed, such as a multiple-choice grammar test or grammaticality judgement task, and in other cases, spontaneous language use has been elicited, such as performing various communicative tasks, in order to investigate learners' use of specific features. It is assumed that form-focused instruction will show a positive effect in the case of grammar tests but not in natural production – a distinction that some theorists of L2 acquisition, such as Krashen with his Monitor Model, have predicted.

Learning from the previous research, this study intends to investigate the extent to which the competency-based approach currently implemented at schools can set the students free of making grammatical mistakes in their oral use of the target language (TL) in various contexts and situations. It will specifically identify types of students' grammatical errors in their speech productions of a given topic. This study is significant as it will give a great contribution to structure and speaking class teachers, students, as well as to the department for policy making. In order to comprehensively reveal factors affecting the success or failure of the competency-based approach currently adopted at schools, a brief account of teaching English using the communicative approach in Indonesian contexts is discussed.

THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH AND
ITS CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES IN INDONESIA

When American linguists were deeply concerned with the development of a new method later known as the Oral Approach which then became the Aural-Oral Approach and was finally renamed as the Audio-

lingual Approach, their European counterparts had also been thinking of finding a new way to teach a foreign language (Dardjowidjojo, 1993). The establishment of the Council of Europe in 1949 was for this very purpose. For some reasons, however, the Council was not effective until 1970 when it started its activities with some significance. It was from the linguists such as Wilkins, van Ek, Cadlin, and Widdowson that new ideas were emerged which later became the seed of the Communicative Approach (Dardjowidjojo, 1993).

The first, and most significant, result of the Council is a change of perspective, shifting the emphasis from form to meaning. Wilkins (1972, 1976, 1979) introduced a new concept which he called *notion* although he did not provide an explicit definition for the term, but affirmed that *notion* was a semantic element in language. Meanwhile, Johnson and Morrow (1981) considered *notion* as an equivalent to *concept*.

Wilkins classifies notional categories into two groups: (a) the semantic-grammatical category and (b) the communicative function category. The first category is semantic in nature but intertwined with the grammatical functions. The second category differs from the first in three ways. First, communicative functions do not have unique grammatical realizations. Therefore, a communicative function can be realized in various grammatical forms. Second, a communicative function does not have a unique situational existence. It means that when a particular communicative function is used, it cannot be predicted in general terms. Lastly, a communicative function is bound to the expressions indicating the speaker's attitude and intention (Wilkins, 1979).

As Johnson and Morrow (1981) assert that the difference between a notion and function cannot easily be detected, it can be argued that when an expression states a speaker's intention, it must be a function and not a notion. The different understanding of *notion* then leads to the misconception among language experts of the fundamental concept underlying the Communicative Approach. For Wilkins, it is obvious that *function* is a part of *notion*, but for van Ek, one of the pioneers in the Council of Europe, *notion* only represents the semantic-grammatical categories and defers from *function*.

Another controversial issue or misconception (misunderstanding) of the theoretical or philosophical ground of the Communicative Approach is the belief that this approach is synonymous with the notional-functional syllabus (Dardjowidjojo, 1993). For Candlin and Breen, as Stern (1984) points out, a syllabus does not only contain teaching materials, topics, or areas to be included, but it must also cover methodology. Perhaps they contend that a syllabus contains notions and functions and that it must also

include methodology (Breen, 1984; Candlin, 1984). On the other hand, Widdowson and Brumfit believe that a syllabus cannot be applied at the notional level, and it must not cover methodology. They further argue that notions and functions do not automatically bring about a communicative methodology (Widdowson, 1984).

The third controversy relates to the meaning of the Communicative Approach itself. It has been believed that the communicative aspect itself is an approach different from other previous approaches, specifically the Aural Approach (Drdjowidjojo, 1993). As the Aural Approach puts an emphasis on the teaching of grammatical structures while the Communicative Approach on the teaching of notions and functions, Dardjowidjojo (1993) found that many textbooks claiming to implement the Communicative Approach devoted their entire chapters to notions and functions (see Hargreaves and Fletcher, 1978; Hover, 1988; Abbs et al, 1975; Alexander, 1978; Kismadi et al, 1982 and Kismadi, 1991). These textbooks only present dialogues, pictures, maps, etc. followed by instructions to communicate.

The concept of the Communicative Approach is, however, to be properly understood in that Hymes, the inspiration of this approach, affirms that communicative competence must also include grammatical competence. It means that this approach definitely requires a grammatical knowledge for communication. What Hymes suggests is that grammatical knowledge alone is not sufficient to meet the demand of communication. There are other aspects, other than the grammatical competence, which are needed for successful communication.

In line with this argument, Wilkins, as cited by Dardjowidjojo (1993, p. 7), even made it clear that knowledge of grammar is part of the approach. What this approach intends to propose is "to change the balance of priorities by emphasizing functions and meanings through language". When related to his notional category, "semantico-grammatical", it is obvious that his concept of notion includes grammatical structures as he further asserts "… the acquisition of the grammatical system of a language remains in language learning. The grammar is the means through which linguistic creativity is ultimately achieved and an adequate knowledge of the grammar would lead to a serious limitation on the capacity for communication.' (Wilkins, 1976, p. 66). To avoid the misconception of his argument that he disregarded grammar, he reaffirmed "…the notion that an individual can develop anything other than rudimentary communicative ability without an extensive mastery of the grammatical system is absurd" (Wilkins, 1980, p. 85 as in Dardjowidjojo, 1993, p. 7).

80   Marcellino, Maraden
Mapping Grammatical Errors in Speech Production of Junior and Senior Students:
A Case Study

THE COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH:
ITS IMPACT ON GRAMMAR LEARNING

This study uses an empirical research method as it seeks information for empirical evidence. It employs an interview technique for data collection by recording conversations of twenty respondents - - junior and senior students –on a selected issue of a particular topic and transcribing them in the form of written transcripts which are then to be analyzed from a grammatical perspective with the reference of grammar books. Those violating the grammatical norms will be considered as grammatical errors.

With respect to the impact of the communicative classrooms which actually utilize the competency-based language teaching (seemingly keeping aside grammar learning in classroom settings), the majority of high school graduates who are currently university students under study are worth investigating. The investigation includes thirty-four grammatical elements, all of which are essential in the speech productions of daily conversations. Of the twenty respondents under investigation, it can be deduced that this competency-based approach brings about a positive impact upon grammar learning for the total number of errors all respondents made amount to 5,07% only during the interviews, as illustrated in the following table.

SAMPLE OF POPULATION

Respondents   : 20 students
Number of words : 2562

Matrix of Grammatical Errors and Frequency Counts

No.	Grammatical aspects	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Misuse and omission of definite and indefinite articles	9	0,35%
2.	Misuse and omission of Copula "to be"	24	0,93%
3.	Misuse and omission of Singular and Plural markers (s, -es)	12	0,46%
4.	Regular and irregular verbs (past tenses)	-	
5.	Past participle	-	
6.	Misuse and omission of Quantifiers (some,several, many, etc.)	4	0,15%
7.	Misuse of Tenses	2	0,07%
8.	Degrees of comparison-comparative and superlative degrees	-	
9.	Misuse and omission of Prepositions:		0,31%
	• of time (at, on, in)	5	
	• of place	1	
	• other meanings (for)	1	
	• unused Preposition	1	

10.	Possesive case	-	
11.	Misuse of Subject-verb agreement	1	0,03%
12.	Verb pattern	-	
13.	Omission of Modal auxiliaries (can, could, may might, shall, should, will, would)	2	0,07%
14.	Misuse and omission of Relative pronouns (who, whom, which, that)	3	0,11%
15.	Past tense markers (-ed, other markers)	-	
16.	Past participle markers (-ed, other markers)	-	
17.	Question transformation (yes-no, wh-questions), addition of –ed, omission/misordering	-	
18.	Negative tranformation; omission of aux, misordering of NEG	-	
19.	Passive transformation: omission/misformation of "be", omission of –ed	1	0,03%
20.	Misuse and omission of Verb formation (e.g. widen, enlarge, etc)	11	0,42%
21.	Word order: misplace of adj., adv. of manners-place-time	1	0,03%
22.	Passive concepts with "infinitive introduced by a conjunctive"	-	
23.	Redundancy	15	0,58%
24.	Using Bahasa Indonesia Pattern	4	0,15%
25.	Misuse of Collocation	1	0,03%
26.	Approximative System	9	0,35%
27.	Misformation of Conjunction	1	0,03%
28.	Infinitive:		0,23%
	• misuse (to + verb 1)	3	
	• omission of marker	3	
29.	Adjective Formation: misuse	3	0,11%
30.	Misuse of Ordinal Number	6	0,23%
31.	Ignorance of Idiom	1	0,03%
32.	Noun formation:		0,15%
	• missing of noun	1	
	• misformation	3	
33.	Ignorance of Expression	1	0,03%
34.	Misformation of Part of Speech	1	0,03%
	TOTAL	**130**	**5,07%**

Of the thirty-four grammatical elements under study, the highest percentage of grammatical errors the respondents made deals with the misuse and omission of copula "to be". This constitutes 0.93% of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. The following samples illustrate this argument:

Misuse and Omission of Copula "to be"

a. "I'm mostly use Twitter and Facebook."
b. " I think social media is so important..."
c. " It's depends..."
d. "... I'm rarely update my status..."
e. "... I'm mean more comfortable saying or expressing my opinion from that social media."
f. "... or you lazy to do something."

   Learning from the samples above, this study finds out that students still encounter difficulty in using the English copula, particularly with regard to singular-plural concord as in (b) and as with several full verbs as in (a, c, d, and e). They also miss the correct use of copula when followed by an adjective, as in (f). From these uterrences, the respondents seem to have come to the stage of what is labeled as the "approximative " system in that they have left the system of their L1 but have not yet completely acquired that of the L2. This is illustrated in (a), (c), (d), and (e) sentences. The last sample indicates a translation of an idea from L1 to L2 in which the copula "be" is missing as it is not compulsory in L1, but is obligatory in L2.

   The second highest percentage of the grammatical errors the respondents made concerns redundancy. In this case, the respondents repeat the same words or expressions in delivering their message. This type of errors reaches 0, 58 % of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. The following samples demonstrate this argument:

Redundancy

a. " I think I have blog in Japanese blog."
b. " Yes of course. It's like umm something network in the internet, cyberworld, something
 like that."
c. " Facebook, Twitter, Myspace, and Tumbler. Something like that."
d. " Beneficial, I can meet my old friend and I can chat and I can have closer relatioship with
 my friend."
e. " I know Friendster, I know about Facebook, I know Twitter."
f. " But the other, disadvantages about the social network is really really, if you have the social
 network, you really really, addicted about the Facebook or Twitter."
g. " Beneficial because we can get new people and meet new people too and like find the old
 friends, something like that."

From the above samples, it is found out that the respondents speak under time pressure in that they intend to rapidly deliver their message within a given limited amount of time allotment, but fail to do so. The failure of expressing the propositions may be due to the lack of vocabulary or time to search the appropriate term or expression for representing the idea the speakers wish to communicate. It is a common phenomenon in natural language use as illustrated in (a), (d), (e), (f), and (g).

The third rank of grammatical errors the respondents made refers to the misuse and omission of singular and plural markers. This amounts to 0.46% of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. The following samples account for this argument:

Misuse and Omission of Singular and Plural Markers

a. " Social media is a 'place' to connects peoples that in separate places."
b. " It connects us with another people like our friend abroad and family sometime."
c. "... like most of my friend use twitter to write many thing ..."
d. " Some of my relative thinks ..."
e. " Like if you want to have many friend ..."

Observing the samples above, the respondents seem not to pay a careful attention to the status of the nouns used in their speech nor do they feel aware of the explicit concepts of the referents they refer to when dealing with quantifiers and the concord related to the nouns they use when communicating their ideas. Accordingly, they use the verbs, quantifiers, and plural forms of nouns incorrectly as illustrated in (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) samples.

The fourth rank of the grammatical errors the respondents made goes to the "misuse and omission of verb formation". In this case, the respondents use the verb forms incorrectly probably due to the influence of the system of L1 in which verbs functioning as predicates in L1 do not change their forms. This type of errors represents 0, 42 % of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. The following samples explain this argument:

Misuse and Omission of Verb Formation

a. " It make me easy to connect with my friends,..."
b. " Because it help us finding information very fast..."
c. " Some of my relative thinks..."
d. "... and I can sharing with them again,..."
e. " It also beneficial for me cause I can connected with other people,..."

84   Marcellino, Maraden
Mapping Grammatical Errors in Speech Production of Junior and Senior Students:
A Case Study

e. " And maybe photos if I have an event with my friends, so I upload my photos and it rarely."

From the samples above, like the previous errors, the respondents seem to be affected by the system of L1 when forming the verbs of L2 in that it is not compulsory for them to change the verb forms in the use of L1. In the case of passive concepts, the respondent also seems to be influenced by the concept of L1 as in (e). The expression " … dapat dihubungkan dengan …" referring to a passive concept in L1 is translated into "….. can connected with" without realizing that "to be" is obligatory in the passive construction in L2.

Errors on the misuse and omission of definite and indefinite articles attain the fifth rank. This constitutes 0.35 % of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. The following samples account for this argument:

Misuse and Omission of Definite and Indefinite Articles

a. "... social media is a media to connect people."
b. " I think it's a beneficial for me because for social media I can met my old friend

    in Facebook."
c. "... addicted about the Facebook or Twitter."
d. " Second, we can get closer with person or people far from us."
e. "... disadvantages about the social network is really really,..."

Learning from the samples above, this study concludes that respondent may either be influenced by L1 or their ignorance of the use of the definite article in L2. In L1 speakers normally say "media sosial merupakan suatu media ……" as translated into (a) where its article should be indefinite in L1 but can be definite in L2. The same thing is true with respect to (b) in that the respondent intends to express the idea of "Saya pikir suatu keuntungan bagi saya …" which is then translated into "I think it is a beneficial …". In this case, the respondent does not completely understand parts of speech in that "beneficial" is regarded as a noun. However, in (d) the respondent seems to use the system of L1 and directly translate the concept of "dekat dengan orang" into L2, resulting in the omission of the indefinite article "an" referring to "any" which has to be attached to the word "person". In English, when someone introduces something for the first time, the indefinite article is normally used, instead of the definite article "the".   In addition, when the subject is followed by a prepositional phrase, it is generally preceded by a definite article "the".

Thus, the above proposition is supposedly to be " …. The disadvantages about a social network is really ……."

    Before one completely masters a language, s/he has to leave the system of L1 but often times has yet mastered the system of L2. In this case, s/he has come to the stage of what is usually referred to as the "approximative system". In this study, the respondents under investigation make this kind of errors up to 0.35 percents, which is similar to errors on the misuse and omission of definite and indefinite articles. The following samples illustrate this argument.

Approximative System

a. " For me that's no harmful effect."
b. " It's like something network in the internet, cyberworld, something like that."
c. " I think social media is about that social network that you can interact with your friends

     and your family maybe in another country."
d. "..., social network is help to someone or somebody because if you have the social network

     like facebook or twitter,..."
e. " I think account in Facebook, can make you have many friend for it."
f. "..., cause I always bring Blackberry so I'm using about them."
g. "..., I think the negative effect from social network, you can to laziness person,..."

    When carefully scrutinizing all the above samples, it can be concluded that some propositions when translated into L1 do not make any sense and they are incorrect from the L2 grammatical perspective. In (f), for example, "I am using about them" is not syntactically correct nor does it have a proper meaning when translated into L1. The same thing is true with (d). The sentence "… social network is help to someone or somebody …" is incorrect grammatically in English and semantically incorrect either when translated into L1. In relation to (a), the sentence is grammatically incorrect in that the respondent used "that's" instead of "there's". In this respect, s/he was confused about the use of "there is" or "there is no …", meaning " ada ………." or "tidak ada …" when translated into L1.

    In English when a verb is followed by "to", it may have two alternatives - - the verb after "to" can either be in the "-ing" form or in the base form. Examples include "I look forward to meeting you soon." and "This study intends to map students' grammatical errors." This sort of pattern leads students to confusion and errors which represent 0, 23 percents

of the total number of words spoken during the conversations. The following demonstrate this statement:

Misuse and Omission of Infinitive (to)

a. " No, I dont like to uploading videos."
b. " Social media is a 'place' to connects peoples that in separate places."
c. "..., I dont really like upload photos or videos."
d. "..., just photos and videos that I want people see."

Looking at the samples above, it is obvious that respondents are confused about the use of infinitive in L2 which then leads them to make errors. Errors that learners make due to the complexity of the system of the target language are labeled as intralinguage errors. In sentence (a), after the verb "like" and "to", a base form is to be used instead of gerund. In sentence (b), the free morpheme –s in the word "connects" has to be deleted after the word "to". When two verbs are adjacent to each other, "to" is normally inserted. Thus, (c) is grammatically incorrect in that the respondent missed the use of "to" in his speech. With regard to (d), the respondent seemed not to acquire a particular verb pattern "Subject – Verb – Direct Object – to-infinitive. Thus, the clause "that I want people see" has to be changed into "that I want people to see".

The next type of errors also constituting 23% of the total number of words spoken during the conversations deals with the misuse of ordinal numbers. The respondents seem to mix up the concepts of ordinal with cardinal numbers as illustrated below:

Misuse of Ordinal Number

a. "... I'm on my nine semester."
b. "... in seven semester."
c. "... semester five."
d. "... I'm from semester nine."

From the illustrations above, the respondents cannot differentiate ordinal from cardinal numbers as they are confused about their numbering system. When a number functions as an adjective and attributively modifies the head word, such as in the phrase "'seven' & 'semester'", the word 'seven' is to be changed into 'seventh'. However, the number remains the same if it follows the headword it modifies, as in "Semester Seven", "Chapter Two", "Grade One", Level Three", etc. These errors are most probably made due to the respondents' confusion of the numerical system of

L2 which leads them to intralingual errors, i.e. errors which one makes due to the complexity of the system of the target language.

When learning a foreign language, the interference of L1 upon L2 is relatively natural in that students often translate the concepts of their L1 into the target language. Accordingly, the translation may not be accurate and appropriate as L2 has its own structures. Errors of this type reach 0,15% of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. Observe the following samples.

Using Bahasa Indonesia Pattern

a. "..., I'm in semester five."
b. " Yes, little bit I know."
c. " I can connected with other people, with my friends, overseas, in other country. "
d. "It depends, but for me maybe, beneficial sih. It make me easy to connect my friends, not in

campus, but my friends not in indonesia. Yah it's entertaining.

Having learned the samples above, it is apparent that respondents translated the concepts of L1 into L2, The concept of "Saya di Semester lima." Can be grossly translated into "I am in Semester Five." The same thing is true with the concept "Ini tergantung, tetapi bagi saya mungkin .. menguntungkan sih." Which is then rendered into "It depends, but for me may be … beneficial sih."

The use of quantifiers, such as much, many, a little, a few, some, several, a number of, an amount of, etc. may confuse learners of English. These quantifiers have their own complex governing rules and that they are not normally interchangeably used. When related to an uncountable noun, the word "much" is used instead of "many". The same thing also applies to other quantifiers, such as "a little" and "a few", "an amount of " and " a number of", to mention some, in which the first goes with the mass nouns and the second with the concrete nouns. These issues lead learners of English to make 0,15% grammatical errors during the conversations as illustrated below:

Misuse and Omission of Quantifiers

a. "..., so that I dont really like to upload much photos and videos,..."
b. "..., we might get too influence about western culture,..."

From this illustration, the respondents seem to be confused of using quantifiers as their rules are complex and may lead learners of English to encounter difficulty in acquiring them. In English some nouns have dual

class memberships in that on the one hand they are count nouns, but they can be mass noun on the other hand. Some of the examples include the words "influence", "difficulty", "worry", to mention a few. Thus, with regard to (b), this sentence needs a quantifier "much" before the word "influence".

Parts of speech are another aspect that foreign learners of English have to pay a careful attention to as in forming words, a particular prefix or suffix is needed among the so many available alternatives. In many cases, the words remain the same but they belong to a different part of speech when used in different contexts and language settings. This kind of errors constitutes 0.11% of the total number of words spoken during the interviews. The following illustrate this argument:

Adjective Formation

a. "Maybe it's not really privacy yah for me."
b. " It's benefits cause I'm selling chocolate and I can sell it through Facebook."

From the samples above, it may be deduced that the respondents seem to encounter problems on English parts of speech. In (a) the word "privacy" is to be changed into "private" in that the first is a noun and the second is an adjective. In this context, the sentence needs an adjective instead of a noun. The same thing is true with (b) in that this sentences requires an adjective instead of noun. Thus, the word "benefits" is to be changed into "beneficial" functioning as a subjective complement of a dummy subject "it".

CONCLUSION

Based on the number of respondents under investigation, this study concludes that a competency-based language teaching instruction currently implemented at schools bring about a positive impact upon grammar learning for the respondents made 130 grammatical errors only reaching 5,07 % out of the total number of words (2562) spoken during the interviews. These errors fall into two basic categories all of which stem from: (a) translating the concepts of L1 into L2 and (b) approximative system.

In general when learning a foreign language, it is quite natural that a learner translates the concepts of L1 into L2. The omission of "to be", the deletion of "to" in two verbs used adjacently, the misuse of parts of speech, to mention a few, are examples of translating the concepts of L1 into L2. This may naturally happen as the basic structural framework between L1 and L2 in many cases is similar if not exactly the same both in the L1 and L2 simple affirmative constructions. Basically they consist of a subject and a

predicate in which the predicate has a verb and an object and optionally an adverb.

In the process of studying a foreign language, it is also natural if learners have left the system of their L1 but have yet mastered the system of L2 before completely acquiring the target language. At this stage, they have come to the stage of what is referred to as "approximative system". Due to the complexity of the L2 system and the lack of the mastery of the target language, learners make intra-lingual errors. Examples in this study include the misuse and omission of quantifiers, such as "many" versus "much", " a number of" versus "an amount of", "a few" versus "a little", etc., the misuse of ordinal numbers, prepositions, and word formation, to mention some.

THE AUTHOR

Marcellino earned a Ph.D. degree in Applied Linguistics Georgetown University, USA. His research interest deals with language assessment, teaching learning interactions, and language engineering.

REFERENCES

Abbs, B., A. Ayton, & I. Freebairn. (1975). *Strategies*. London: Longman.

Alexander, L.G. (1978). *Mainline beginners.* London: Longman.

Beretta, A. (1989). Attention to form or meaning? Error treatment in the Bangalore project. *TESOL Quarterly* 23, 283-303.

Breen, M. P. (1984). Process syllabus for the language classroom. In C.J. Brumfit. (Ed.), *General English Syllabus design : Curriculum and syllabus design for the general English classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Breen, M. P. & C.N. Candlin. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*. (1),2.

Candlin, C. N. 1984. Syllabus design as a critical process. In C.J. Brumfit. (Ed.), *General English syllabus design : Curriculum and syllabus design for the general English classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Ellis, R. (1984). Can syntax be taught? A study of the effects of formal instruction on the acquisition of wh-questions by children. *Applied Linguistics* 5, 138-55.

Ellis, R. (1992). On the relationship between formal practice and second language acquisition. *Die Neuren Sprachen* 91, 131-47.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eubank, L. (1987). The acquisition of German negation by formal language learners. In B. Van Patten, T. Dvorak, & J. Lee (Eds.), *Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective*. Rowely, Mass: Newbury House.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (1993). Some controversial issues in the communicative approach presented in the 41st TEFLIN Seminar. Padang: IKIP Padang.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (1997). English policies and their classroom impact in some ASEA/Asian countries In G. Jacobs (Ed.), *Language classroom of tomorrow: Issues and responses*. Singapore: RELC.

Dardjowidjojo, S. (2000). English teaching in Indonesia. *English Australian Journal* 18, 22-29.

Day, E. & S. Shapson. (1991). Integrating formal and functional approaches to language teaching in French immersion: an experimental study. *Language Learning* 41, 25-8.

Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 1988. *Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Dulay, H. & M. Burt. (1973). Should we teach children syntax? *Language Learning* 23, 245-58.

Hargreaves, R. & M. Fletcher. (1978). *Making polite noises*. Surrex: Nelson.

Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: Classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics* 10, 331-59.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse analysis and second language acquisition in E. Hatch (Ed.). 1978. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Hover, D. (1988). *Think twice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K. & K. Morrow. 1981. *Communication in the classroom*. Essex: Longman.

Kaida, K. (1987). The effect of formal instruction on monitored and spontaneous naturalistic interlanguage performance. *TESOL Quarterly* 22, 509-15.

Kismadi, G. C., S. Soeryah, A. Moertoyo, Senduk, Anekke, A. Sulaeman. (1982). *Communicating in English: Books 1-6.* Jakarta: Indira.

Kismadi, G. (1991). *Basic 1-4*. Jakarta: Yayasan LIA.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. London: Longman.

Lightbrown. P. (1983). Exploring relationships between developmental and instructional sequences in L2 acquisition. In H. Selinger & M. Long (Eds.), *Classroom oriented research in second language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence'. *Applied Linguistics* 15, 263-87.

Makino, T. 1980. Acquisition order of English morphemes by Japanese secondary school students. *Journal of Hokkaido University Education* 30, 101-48.

Marcellino, M. (2001). "Effects of communicative classrooms in grammar learning: Another Look". Presented in the 36th RELC International Seminar, Singapore, April 22 - 25, 2001.

Meisel, J. (1983). Strategies of second language acquisition: More than one kind of simplification. In R. Andersen (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization as language acquisition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Nababan, P. W. J. (1982). Indonesia: The language situation: In R.B. Noss (Ed.). *Language Teaching Issues in Multilingual Environments in Southeast Asia*. Singapore: RELC.

Nababan, P.W.J. 1988. English language teaching profile (unpublished paper).

Pica, T. 1983. Adult acquisition of English as a second language under different conditions of exposure. *Language Learning* 33, 465-497.

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 6, 186-214.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Purwo, B. K. (1990). *Pragmatik dan pengajaran bahasa: Menyibak Kurikulum (1984)*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Reiss, M. 1985. The good language learner: another look. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 41, 511-23.

Schumann, J. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1986). Comprehension versus acquisition: two ways of processing input. *Applied Linguistics* 7, 239-56.

Spada, N. & P. Lightbrown. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 15, 205-24.

Stern, H. H. (1984). Review and discussion. In C.J. Brumfit. (Ed.), *General English syllabus design: Curriculum and syllabus design for the general English classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Stevick, E. (1980). *Teaching languages: A way and ways*. Rowely, Mass: Newbury House.

Sumardi, Muljanto. (1993). How communicative is our communicative approach? Presented in the 41st TEFLIN Seminar. Padang: IKIP Padang.

Van Patten, B. (1990). The acquisition of clitic pronouns in Spanish: Two case studies. In B. Van Patten & J. Lee (eds.). 1990. *Second language acquisition foreign language learning*. Clevedon, North Somerset: Multilingual Matters.

Weinert, R. (1987). Process in classroom second language development: the acquisition of negation in German. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Second language acquisition in context*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentince-Hall.

White, L. (1991). The verb-movement parameter in second language acquisition: some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research* 7, 133-61.

Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. 1984. Educational and pedagogic factors in syllabus Design. In C.J. Brumfit. (Ed.). *General English syllabus design: curriculum and syllabus design for the general English classroom*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Wilkins, D. A. (1972). *An investigation into the linguistic and situational content of the common core in a unit/credit system*. Strassbourg: Council of Europe, Committee for Out-of-School Education and Cultural Development.