



International Journal in Applied Linguistics of Parahikma



ISSN: 614-364X (Print) & 2774-6682 (online)

Journal homepage: <https://journal.parahikma.ac.id/ijalparahikma/>

An Analysis of ESL Negation by Indonesian Learners of English

Ikhsan

ikhsan@student.unimelb.edu.au

University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

To cite this article (APA 7th):

Ikhsan. (2021). An analysis of ESL negation by Indonesian learners of English. *International Journal in Applied Linguistics of Parahikma*, 3(1), 16-33.

<https://journal.parahikma.ac.id/ijalparahikma/article/view/135>

Abstract

It is widely assumed that constructing negation in an L2 is often quite affected by the syntactic features of the speakers' mother tongue. This study therefore set out to assess the English negation construction, particularly in the context of Indonesian learners of English in Sulawesi-Barat. Data for this study were collected using an interview to investigate the pattern of negation construction and the L1 influences related to the construction. For the purpose of analysis, the data transcription was carried out on the completion of the interview and segmented into AS-Unit. Results suggest that the participants mostly constructed negation in the form of auxiliary + not + phrase in their second language. The second major finding was that there are transfers from the students' L1 in constructing negation in their L2. The example of English negation which might be not representative enough make an overall conclusion about English negation construction extremely difficult.

Keywords: Negation; transfer; syntactic features

Introduction

Second language Acquisition (SLA) has a pivotal role in describing learners' interlanguage development. The discipline could lead to an analysis of the complicated influence that contributes to the acquisition of the target language (Ortega, 2013). SLA has emerged as an autonomous discipline by the end of 20th century (Larsen-Freeman, 1991). The early concentration of SLA was on the transfer of syntactic and phonological features from one language to another (Huebner, 1991). However, the nature of SLA could be very complicated because the scholars investigating the target language acquisition come from diverse academic disciplines which adopt different theory and methods (Saville-Troike, 2005).

Literature Review

SLA and learners' development

In the context of SLA, development is viewed as a mechanism and progression related to the ability to use language that might change over time (Ortega, 2013). There are several factors that need to be addressed to comprehend the process that occurs in SLA fully. Saville-Troike (2015) advocate the view that L2 acquisition is frequently determined by informal exposure, classrooms' formal instruction, and the involvement of L2 learners. To emphasize, the learners' improvement might be affected by the range of intentions that L2 learners have (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 2014). Taken together, these motives affect learners' development significantly in the target language.

Negation and functional form analysis

Negation is the syntactical feature of the language which expresses the reverse of the truth of any provided sentences and characterized by reducing the activation with regard to positive construction (Tettamanti et al., 2008). The negative markers and message are integrated into a single expressive unit (Mayo et al., 2004). Furthermore, the linguistic pattern of negation was often prototype and item-based (Eskildsen, 2012). In term of L2 acquisition, the syntactic negation indicates distinctive development with the first language (Meisel, 1997). Therefore, sometimes the similarity between the first and second language is not likely supportive of the L2 construction (Ortega, 2013).

In term of negative constructions in English, the patterns are likely post-verbally in which the word 'not' is added following the auxiliary verbs (Ortega, 2013). Previous studies have documented the complicated process of the negative acquisition that L2 learners might encounter (Mazzon, 2014). In addition, the evidence found in the input seems to affect the construction of English negation (Cameron-Faulkner et al., 2007). The articulation of utterance associated with information structure is found closely related to the development of negation rather than to the syntactical structure (Bernini, 2000). However, Bellugi (as cited in Mezzon, 2014) argued that children perform parallel structure in term of negation acquisition, but the similarities decrease in the stage.

An essential aspect to analyze in functional form is the accuracy. Historically, research investigating proficiency of second language learners has focused on accuracy, along with the complexity and fluency (Housen & Kuiken, 2009). Commenting on the accuracy, Skehan (as cited in Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005) argue that the concept related to L2 production which meets the criteria of the L2 rule system. The accuracy shows that the L2 learners have control in terms of the

target language elements which have been fully internalized. Therefore, the accuracy shows the level of linguistic information which has been internalized in L2 learners.

A study that might be most relevant with this paper is conducted by Grüter et al., (2010) which investigate relative scope in the context of negation and disjunction. Using two experiments that involve English speaking learners and Japanese-speaking learners, the study found that there was full L1 transfer in the negative constructions. In term of Indonesian learners of English, the negative constructions used by the learners are in the form of pre-verbal negators (Palfreyman, 2019). A study conducted by (Zen, 2018) revealed that there was a negative transfer from L1 in constructing English negation in the Indonesian context. Bear in mind that the L2 development of negative constructions might be slowed down if the rules of the first language are not incongruent with the L2 (Ortega, 2013).

Research question

I became interested in analyzing function-form analysis, particularly negation, after remembering my students at secondary school who have some difficulties in constructing negation in a verb-phrases, which has inflection or modal verb. Therefore, I propose two research questions.

1. How do Indonesian learners of English construct English Negation?
2. Is there any transfer from L1, *Bahasa Indonesia*, in constructing the English negation?

This paper aimed to analyze the negative constructions of Indonesian learners of English. In addition, this paper also investigated the transfer process that might occur in constructing the negation. The first section of this paper reviewed some studies related to SLA, learners' development in general, function form analysis and its phenomenon. The second section then went on to the method used to investigate the negation construction, which involved students from two universities in Indonesia. The third section concerned the results, then followed by discussion. The final section gave a brief summary and critique of the findings.

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were the university students in South Sulawesi and West Sulawesi Province, Indonesia. The first respondent, Yayan, was an undergraduate student majoring Management at a University in South Sulawesi. His first language is *Bahasa Indonesia*. He learnt English in the subject of his course without any additional activities outside the classroom. Drawing on his TOEFL certificate, he is categorized as a low-level learner. The second participant, Imam, was the undergraduate student majoring Economy at a university in West Sulawesi. His first language was *Bahasa Indonesia*, but he also used local language when speaking with the local community. At his university, Imam learnt English as an elective subject for his course. In addition, he joined an English club meeting to practice his speaking ability. Based on TOEFL certificate that the participant has, he was categorized in B1 level and positioned as high proficiency learner in this study.

Instrument

Drawing on the method used by Gennari & MacDonald (2009), data for this study were collected using pictures followed by some questions. The images related to a dirty beach and social media.

Following each picture, there are four main questions which used as guidance by the participants to respond to the topic. I chose these two pictures because, in my view, the dirty beach is an issue commonly found in the respondents' hometown. In addition, social media could be one of the general and exciting topics that might lead the participants to convey the information flexibly.

Data collection procedure

The data were collected using interview which provides two pictures and some questions related to the provided topic. The Interview session was conducted through a virtual meeting using 'zoom' application. Prior to data collection, the participant received an explanation of the project. After that, the researcher showed two pictures, followed by eight main questions in total. The participants were asked to comment on the images based on the questions provided in the instrument. However, there were some additional questions to elicit more information from the interviewees during the conversation. The two respondents had 10 minutes to prepare their answers. From the recording, the first respondent completed the questions within 8 minutes. The second respondent spent around 10 minutes to answer the two topics.

Analytical procedure

On the completion of the interview, the data transcription was carried out. Once the data were extracted, it was first necessary to segment the data into AS- unit (Foster et al., 2000). The level three of application is used in the analysis of transcription. Following the segmentation, I analysed the specific feature to measure the accuracy in using English negation by calculating negative words appeared on the extract. The accuracy then measured by using Target Like Analysis (TLU) proposed firstly by Brown (as cited in Schumann, 1987), by identifying correct suppliance and number of obligatory context and over-suppliance. Following this step, it was necessary to explain the accuracy rate and incorrect uses by the learners to reveal the L1 transfer that might occur in this investigation.

Results

The first set of questions aimed to explore the construction of English negation in the context of Indonesian learners of English. Based on the segmentation of data using AS-Unit level 3, there are 52 AS-units appear in the low proficiency learner and 81 AS-Units for the high proficiency learner. Following this segmentation, a simple statistical TLU analysis was used to measure the accuracy of the negative constructions demonstrated by the two participants with the formula as follows:

$$\frac{\text{Number of correct suppliance}}{\text{Number of obligatory contexts} + \text{number of over-suppliance}}$$

The tables below illustrate the result of TLU analysis of the two respondents.

Table 1

Low proficiency Learner

| Category | Aux + Not + Phrase | Negative affix |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Correct suppliance | 13 | 2 |
| Obligatory context | 14 | 2 |
| Over-suppliance | 1 | 0 |
| TLU | 0.8 | 1 |

Table 2
High Proficiency Learner

| Category | Aux + Not + Phrase | Negative affix |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Correct suppliance | 16 | 2 |
| Obligatory context | 21 | 2 |
| Over- suppliance | 5 | 0 |
| TLU | 0.6 | 1 |

Table 1 and 2 compares the form of English negation of two learners and summary statistics for the accuracy for the specific feature related to negation. In general, the two respondents used the English negation in two forms. These are *auxiliary + not + phrase*, for instance: *the rules will not be useful* and negative affix, such as *unclean*. As shown in the two tables, the first respondent produced more obligatory context for English negation, 14, compared to the second respondent with 21 obligatory contexts. Among the two types, the two respondents mostly use *auxiliary + not + phrase*.

As can be seen from the table, there is a slight difference in the index of *auxiliary + not + phrase* with 0.8 and 0.6 respectively. In addition, the two learners show a similar index in the negative affix. What is interesting in the data is that the low proficiency learner gained higher index, particularly on *auxiliary + not + phrase* form, compared to high proficiency learner, but he did not express a variety of negation in his sentences. The low proficiency learner used mostly the negation form in simple present form (*do not care* [line 6, “don’t throw” line 39, transcript 1]). In addition, the lower-level learner frequently used the similar verb *care*, 5 out of 16 correct suppliance in his responses.

Despite the lower index compared to low proficiency learner, the high proficiency learner could demonstrate a wide range of English negation in *auxiliary + not + phrase* form (*will not be useful* [line 19, transcript 2]), (*I haven’t gone* [line 23, transcript 2]). In addition, the learner could express the negation both in the nominal sentence (*It is not useful* [line 81]) and verbal sentence (*we don’t do* [line 60, transcript 2]). Despite the variation of negation, the two learners did not show sufficient examples in negative affix. The two learners used the negative affix twice (*so, indirectly* [line 59, and 87, transcript 2]), and (*unclean environment* [line 7 and 31, transcript 1]).

In the aspect of incorrect suppliance, there are more errors made by high proficiency learner compared to low proficiency one. The higher-level learner made an error in using the correct auxiliary verb (*it’s not help*, [line 78, transcript 2]). Based on the function of word *help* as an ordinary verb, the auxiliary should use *does* instead of *is*. The similar error was also shown by lower-level learner as in (*they don’t brave*, [line 52, transcript 1]). Due to the word ‘*brave*’ which is classified as an adjective, the correct auxiliary verb used in this sentence should be ‘*are*’. In general terms, the two learners made some errors related to using accurate auxiliary verbs following the rules in nominal or verbal sentences.

Interestingly, there was an inappropriate use of English negation based on the context of the sentences. For example, lower-level learner used the simple past context to respond a general context question that should be answered in simple present tense context (*I didn’t read that information*, [line 68, transcript 1]). To emphasize, in the following sentences commenting on the same question, the low proficiency learner used simple present tense, which is not in line with the sentence on the line 40. The similar error in term of using negation based on appropriate context was also demonstrated by the higher-level learner. When the participant wanted to describe an event in the past, he chose present auxiliary verb instead of the past form (*I don’t realize my time*,

[line 51, transcript 2]). This means, in several sentences, both learners might use the English negation without considering the context of tense in the sentences.

If we now turn to the transfer aspect of the L1, the data of two learners show a different result. The transfer might be clearly seen in the high proficiency learner. Take the construction of a complex sentence, for example. The learner seems to omit the copula *be* in the adjective clause of the sentence (*I see few applications that not useful*, [line 77, transcript 2]). Despite the omission in the complex sentence, the high proficiency learner formed a correct nominal sentence using the copula *be* (*I think it's not useful for me*, [line 79, transcript 2]). For the low proficiency learner, his negative construction seemed to still meet the L2 rules. There is likely no omission of the auxiliary verb as what the high proficiency learner demonstrated. This result is almost certainly due to syntactic features in the respondent's mother tongue, *Bahasa Indonesia*, which does not have auxiliary verb as in L2 system.

Together, these results provide valuable insight into how Indonesian learners of English construct the English negation. The two learners produce more negation on *auxiliary + not + phrase* noun compared to other types of negation. However, there are still several errors in term of the accuracy of verb agreement and the appropriate use of the context.

Discussion

The first question in this study sought to determine the construction of English negation in the context of Indonesian learners of English. The current study found that the most negative constructions were in the form of *auxiliary + not + phrase*. There is a similarity between the position of negative words expressed by the respondents and those described by Meisel (1997), who identify that negative words are mostly placed next to the finite verbs. This result is also in agreement with Schumann's (1987) finding which showed more aspects of negative construction in the form of *auxiliary + not + phrase* demonstrated by the participants compared to another form of English negation. Furthermore, in the syntactic level, the construction of negation in modern English is mostly attached to the auxiliary verb (Mazzon, 2014).

In a study investigating typology the negative constructions, the negative auxiliary was placed as second most used in these constructions (Dahl, 1979). In the context of the clause structure of English, the negation was mostly found in the verb phrase (Ouhalla, 1990). However, in term of Indonesian learners of English, the pattern of ESL negation 'not' should be approached not only in the syntactic role but also the semantic and pragmatic analysis (Kusmanto & Pulungan, 2003). In addition, the acquisition in L1 seems to be complicated that the errors in L2 could not be ascribed from the mother tongue (Eisouh, 2011). In general, the study found a tendency for Indonesian learners of English to use more negative constructions in the form of *auxiliary + not + phrase* in constructing negation in English.

The second question in this research was whether any transfer from L1, *Bahasa Indonesia*, occur in the negative constructions of English. The result of this study indicates that there was a transfer from L1 to the L2, particularly the English negation demonstrated by the high proficiency high learner. This study confirms that negative construction is associated with the mother tongue (Grüter et al., 2010; Zen, 2018). With this in mind, the acquisition of negation demonstrated by L2 learners would proceed through the different sequence from the development in first language (Meisel, 1997).

The respondents might also be in the restructuring process of the interlanguage system. Cancino et al., (as cited in Ortega, 2013) revealed a process of restructuring from the pre-verbal

system to post-verbal in English. During the process, simplification and overgeneralization occur. Given the fact that the respondents' first language was pre-verbal pattern (Palfreyman, 2019), it seems possible that the negative constructions of the two learners might be affected by the syntactic feature in the participants' L1 which is relatively different with the rule system in the target language.

The data on the transcription also reveal an omission of the copula *be* in a complex sentence, which occurs in the interlanguage process of the two respondents. The omission of copula *be* might related to language transfer and simplification (Matsumoto, 1991). In addition, in a ZISA investigation, the L2 learners did not construct a similar type of negation consistently (Meisel, 1997). In term of the participants' constructions, the reason for the omission is not clear, but it might have something to do with the syntactic feature in learners' L1 which does not recognize the use of auxiliary verb or the classification of verb based on the tense-aspect.

However, these results were not very encouraging. With a small sample of English negation, caution must be applied, as the findings might not be representative enough for Indonesian learners of English. In addition, there should be other forms of negative constructions to appear and analyzed in this study. Given the fact that the English negation might be challenging to elicit, there is inadequate data related to the negative words demonstrated by the two learners.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has identified that Indonesian learners of English involved in this research used mostly the form *auxiliary + not + phrase* to construct English negation. In terms of the accuracy, both learners demonstrate error particularly on syntactical rules of the language such as putting auxiliary verb *do* in a nominal sentence. The second significant finding was that the transfer from L1 appears in the process of construction. It could be seen from the omission of the copula *be* which is required to form a complex sentence. This approach will be fruitful in expanding our understanding of how the second language learners construct English negation, particularly in the context of Indonesian learners of English. A limitation of this study that the example of English negation might be not representative enough in term of English negation. A further study could assess more English negation demonstrated by English learners by designing an instrument that could elicit more data related to negation.

Reference

- Bernini, G. (2000). Negative items and negation strategies in nonnative Italian. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(3), 399–440. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100003053>
- Cameron-Faulkner, T., Lieven, E., & Theakston, A. (2007). What part of no do children not understand? A usage-based account of multiword negation. *Journal of Child Language*, 34(2), 251–282. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000906007884>
- Eisouh, Z. S. (2011). Negation errors in English by University of Jordan students. *Reading Improvement*, 48(3), 139–154.
<https://link.gale.com/apps/pub/0FCS/AONE?u=unimelb&sid=AONE>
- Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language*. OUP Oxford
- Eskildsen, S. W. (2012). L2 negation constructions at work. *Language Learning*, 62(2), 335–372. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00698.x>
- Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken discourse: A unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, 21(3), 354–375. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/21.3.354>
- Gennari, S. P., & MacDonald, M. C. (2009). Acquisition of negation and quantification: Insight from adult production and comprehension. *Language Acquisition*.
<https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327817la1302-5>
- Grüter, T., Lieberman, M., & Gualmini, A. (2010). Acquiring the scope of disjunction and negation in L2: A bidirectional study of learners of Japanese and English. *Language Acquisition*, 17(3), 127–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2010.497403>
- Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 461–473. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp048>
- Huebner, T. (1991). Second language acquisition: Litmus test for Linguistic theory?. In C. A. Huebner Thom, Ferguson (Eds.), *Crosscurrents in Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theories* (pp. 3-16). John Benjamin Publishing.
- Jürgen M. Meisel University. (1997). The acquisition of the syntax of negation in French and German: Contrasting first and second language. *Second Language Research*, 3(1997), 227–263. <https://doi.org/10.1191%2F026765897666180760>
- Kusmanto, J., & Pulungan, A. H. (2003). the acquisition of English negation “No” and “Not”: evidences from an Indonesian child in non-native parents bilingual program. *A Biannual Publication on the Study of Language and Literature*, 5(1), 57–66.

- <https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.5.1.57-66>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587466>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (2014). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Routledge.
- Matsumoto, K. (1991). *An issei Japanese American's interlanguage: Negation, time reference, and topicalization*. 13(2). <https://jalt-publications.org/sites/default/files/pdf-article/jj-13.2-art3.pdf>
- Mayo, R., Schul, Y., & Burnstein, E. (2004). "I am not guilty" vs "I am innocent": Successful negation may depend on the schema used for its encoding. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(4), 433–449. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2003.07.008>
- Mazzon, G. (2014). *A history of English negation*. Routledge.
- Ortega, L. (2013). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Routledge.
- Östen, D. (1979). Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics*, 17(1–2), 79–106. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1979.17.1-2.79>
- Ouhalla, J. (1990). Sentential negation, relativised minimality and the aspectual status of auxiliaries. *Linguistic Review*, 7(2), 183–231. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.1990.7.2.183>
- Palfreyman, N. (2019). *Variation in Indonesian sign language: A typological and sociolinguistic analysis*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Saville-Troike, M. (2005). *Introducing second language acquisition* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Schumann, J. H. (1987). The expression of temporality in basilectal speech. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 9(1), 21–41. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100006495>
- Tettamanti, M., Manenti, R., Della Rosa, P. A., Falini, A., Perani, D., Cappa, S. F., & Moro, A. (2008). Negation in the brain: Modulating action representations. *NeuroImage*, 43(2), 358–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.08.004>
- Zen, E. L. (2018). A preliminary evidence of transfer in the acquisition of sentential negation of English in multilingual Indonesian children in school contexts. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 24(3), 155–167. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2403-12>

Appendix 1: Background Information

Questions:

1. What is your first language?
2. How long have you been learning English?
3. How do you learn English in University?
4. How often do you use English?
5. Do you have any English proficiency certificate? If yes could you please tell me the score?

Appendix 2: The interview instrument



Do you know why there are many rubbishes there?

What could we do to keep beach clean?

What kind of prohibition should government publish?

What behaviours contribute to this issue?



People think that using social media could waste our time. What do you think?

Why people tend to show tension in social media?

Do you think it is better to delete the social media application in our phone?

What do you usually tend to avoid in social media?

Appendix 3: The AS-Units

Low Proficiency Learner

| | |
|----|---|
| 1 | A: Take a look at picture here. Do you know what is it about? |
| 2 | B: {Aaa } that is { aaa }, beach |
| 3 | B: {and there are, there is} there are more many rubbish in there |
| 4 | Excellent, a beach which you could find a lot of rubbish here. Do you know, why there are many rubbishes there? |
| 5 | B: {Hmm} Maybe because {hmm} |
| 6 | B: some people do not care about the environment |
| 7 | B: and many people who don't understand how the impact will be like unclean environmental pollution |
| 8 | My second question is what could we do to keep beach clean? |
| | B: {Hmm} Maybe we have to provide the enough trash and garbage bins on the beach |
| 9 | B: This is to prevent that people littering |
| 10 | B: conducting reclamation by planting mangrove forest along the coast |
| 11 | B: May be like that |
| 12 | B: Hmm Maybe we have to change the people mind |
| 13 | B: so they will care about the environment |
| 14 | What kind of mind do you mean here? |
| 15 | B: {Like that} like we have to do socialisation |
| 16 | B: {like everyone} everyone should know {should know } about the tree art, reduce and recycling |
| 17 | B: how to manage the trash like that |
| 18 | So, What kind of prohibition should government issue? |
| 19 | B: May be prohibited from littering |
| 20 | B: and if there will be given several sanction |
| 21 | B: May be just like that |
| 22 | What people do that should be given sanction to them? |
| 23 | B: Because { Hmm, because if } |
| 24 | B: if the government already provide the trash bag |

| | |
|----|--|
| 25 | B: and in that area have a lot enough trash and garbage |
| 26 | B: And some people they don't care about that |
| 27 | B: { we have to, hmm, hmm } the government should give them { them } the sanction |
| 28 | Last question What behaviour contribute to this issue, I mean the people attitude that make this happen? |
| 29 | B: It's too bad |
| 30 | B: because {they don't} they really don't care about the environment |
| 31 | B: they really don't care about what the impact will be the cause unclean environment pollution |
| 32 | B: I just want to say |
| 33 | B: maybe we have {to do solution} to do the socialisation |
| 34 | B: some people in there, the application of tree art system {of} like use, reuse and recycle is one of the waste management solution in addition to process wasting into compose or utilising waste {hmm } waste as source of electricity |
| 35 | Aside of the socialisation, what should you tell people to avoid the issue? |
| 36 | B: Maybe we have to say like { hmmm, wait, wait, wait } |
| 37 | B: maybe just say that { that } please keep clean in {in} this area |
| 38 | B: maybe we have to say |
| 39 | B: Don't throw garbage and don't throw away any trash |
| 40 | B: May be just like that |
| 41 | B: We have to give some conversation to people |
| 42 | B: if the people don't care about our conversation :: so we may be we have to like do another attraction |
| 43 | Ok. Take a look at the second picture. What is it ? |
| 44 | B: That is social media |
| 45 | My first question, People think that using social media could waste our time. What do you think? |
| 46 | B: May be, in my opinion, yes of course |
| 47 | B: Because by playing social media :: we will forget about the time |
| 48 | B: seems like :: what I feel two months ago |
| 49 | Oke, well The second question why people tend to show conflict in social media? |
| 50 | B: Maybe {hmm} based on psychologically { based on psychologically } as far as I know |

| | |
|----|---|
| 51 | B: if people like that usually to express frustration like that just only on social media |
| 52 | B: I think in the real life :: they don't brave to { hmm to say to } make some conflict |
| 53 | The third question. Do you think it is better to delete the social media application in our phone? |
| 54 | B: { I think } I don't think It's necessary { necessary } to delete the app on SM |
| 55 | B: but All we have to do is manage our life specially manage our time |
| 56 | B: We don't , We should |
| 57 | B: No, I want to say we do not, blame the application |
| 58 | B: but we have to change our life like time management |
| 59 | The last question What do you usually tend to avoid in social media? |
| 60 | B: May be, yes of course {may be} hoax news and the information that is not true and the truth is not known |
| 61 | B: because it can make our mind prejudice against something |
| 62 | B: may be just like that |
| 63 | What other issue that could occur by spreading the hoax |
| 64 | B: Pardon |
| 65 | What other thing that might happen when you spread hoax in social media? |
| 66 | B: I don't know what's the point |
| 67 | B: Maybe I just avoid the information |
| 68 | B: I didn't read that information |
| 69 | B: because If I read :: it will change my mind |
| 70 | B: and before that :: I will check that truth first |

High level proficiency learner

| | |
|---|--|
| 1 | A: So what is it about |
| 2 | B: { Hmmm } that beach { hmm } I see :: there are many garbage there { hhmm } |
| 3 | B: Can you zoom it |
| 4 | A : Sure |
| 5 | B: I see people there |
| 6 | In short this is like a picture rep My first Q is do you know why there are many rubbishes |
| 7 | B: { Hmm } I think { hmm } who ignore the cleanness, like my region |

| | |
|----|---|
| 8 | B: because in Indonesia, {about the beach} :: we can see in my region like :: many people ignore the role |
| 9 | B: and then just throw anywhere garbage without thinking :: what happen for next time |
| 10 | B: if they do that |
| 11 | B: yeahh it's totally bad things actually four our life |
| 12 | My second question is what could we do to keep beach clean? |
| 13 | B: { Hmm } ya, first we have to follow the rules of government |
| 14 | B: but I think it's very difficult to follow |
| 15 | B: because our society and it's about our habit actually too hmm |
| 16 | B: In Indonesia, it's only a few regions follow the rules |
| 17 | B: but in the region for example, one region { hmm } :: 60% people follow the rules |
| 18 | B: but this 40% doesn't follow the rules |
| 19 | B: and I think the rules { will not be used } will not be useful |
| 20 | So, What kind of prohibition should government issue? |
| 21 | B: {Hmm}The government have to create {hmm} implicit rule for the society like fine :: Like Singapore |
| 22 | B: the country is so clean |
| 23 | B: I haven't gone there before |
| 24 | B: but I got information from my friend :: who ever go there before {and} |
| 25 | B: but I think it is still difficult:: because in my region |
| 26 | B: I ever tell my friends, the rule :: but they don't follow the rules to pay the fine |
| 27 | B: They say why not :: It's my life |
| 28 | B: It's like the culture and habit have to be changed in each personality |
| 29 | What behaviours contribute to this issue? |
| 30 | B: Like I said before our awareness mainly society ignore about the, {about the} cleanness in our life because |
| 31 | B: If the rule is not impact to human life, for human being but also, for, {hmmm for the see} the environment in the sea |
| 32 | B: and our environment {will not will not be, what} will not benefit in our life to get healthy life |
| 33 | B: for example, hmm they throw the garbage in the sea and {our there is} |

| | |
|----|---|
| 34 | B: If we fish in the sea and if we eat the fish :: {it's like} it's like a contrast |
| 35 | B: { We always } there are a lot of socialisation about our health |
| 36 | B: but it have to be began from out life health how to throw the garbage, how to care our environment |
| 37 | The point is the socialisation Could you please mention one or two specific examples |
| 38 | B: Hmm like there is bad meat :: { and they want to throw } I mean the thrash can is full :: |
| 39 | B: there is not other place to throw it, So the last way the society do throw the rubbish in the sea |
| 40 | Did they throw in the right place |
| 41 | No no no |
| 42 | So, they did not do the right thing. Well take a look at the second picture. What is it? |
| 43 | B: Ouhh 'it social media |
| 44 | My first question, People think that using social media could waste our time. What do you think? |
| 45 | B: @@@ of course |
| 46 | B: SM totally waste our time specially for me during the covid 19 issue { first time } the first week |
| 47 | B: yeahh I tried to productive activity in a day, but day by day :: I fell oh my god what happen |
| 48 | B: I feel like all my life in social media but :: { I chat } I just want to communicate with my friend but only social media |
| 49 | B: It waste my time without thinking :: how long I operate my phone |
| 50 | B: I ever, in past month or last month :: I operate my phone in the morning and in the afternoon |
| 51 | B: I don't realise my time |
| 52 | B: after that :: I tried to think |
| 53 | B: If I productive :: I will get something new |
| 54 | B: but it's too difficult because I'm like only in the cage |
| 55 | B: I want to move, go out, but it's still difficult for me |
| 56 | It's common issues. My second question. Why people tend to show tension in social media? |
| 57 | B: {Hmm yaa, hmm ya} For me, Sometimes I have the intension in SM because of the critiques and bullying like that |
| 58 | B: They just want to do the good thing, but in the other side, it's bad thing |

| | |
|----|--|
| 59 | B: So indirectly, people or many people attack our emotional, emotional, our emotional morality like that |
| 60 | B: So, We don't do good things |
| 61 | B: So, I do this or not |
| 62 | B: Let me give you example |
| 63 | B: I have { I have } pity guest :: come to my house and |
| 64 | B: and I tried to cook fried rice or called <L1nasi goreng> in Indonesia |
| 65 | B: I give my guest |
| 66 | B: I'm, I'm sure that although :: I realise all my guest {one of them } :: or few of them { doesn't doesn't don't like } don't like to eat fried rice |
| 67 | B: that's only thing I have in my kitchen |
| 68 | B: I just want to give the good thing for my guest but :: that's social media |
| 69 | B: They don't know how to filter the hoax like that too |
| 70 | B: and sometimes I got information : I don't know the information is hoax or not |
| 71 | B: I just want to share the information :: because for me the information is good to share |
| 72 | B: but I got the impact from the information :: because there is like people just want to utilise the situation for themselves |
| 73 | My third question, Do you think it is better to delete the social media application in our phone? |
| 74 | B: {hmm} 50 % I don't agree |
| 75 | B: {Hmm, hmm} in the phone have to be there few application but the beneficial application for our life for example for me |
| 76 | B: {before I} Before buying cell phone {I hmm I} I think that :: what kind of couple application are download after buying it |
| 77 | B: so I got the phone :: I see few application that not useful for me like |
| 78 | B: it's not help myself |
| 79 | B: but it's like tik-tok like that for me :: that is not useful |
| 80 | B: and there is game like my friends buy the phone for gaming, for gaming |
| 81 | B: I think it's not useful for me |
| 82 | B: We can back to the first for me as my first enter |
| 83 | B: it could help me {to more} for become lazy person and don't know how to set |

| | |
|----|--|
| 84 | B: which one is good for me the application to utilise it :: and which one is not |
| 85 | My last question. What do you usually tend to avoid in social media? |
| 86 | B: Now that many people like playing game like in my region like free-fire game, mobile legend :: I always try to avoid that |
| 87 | B: because indirectly it make me become more lazy to do productive one like gathering my friends, sharing together |
| 88 | B: so { I don't like it } I don't like something that make me more lazy by using SM gaming and also hmmm about a hoax |
| 89 | B: { Ya } although all information I find in SM :: but I cannot guarantee |
| 90 | B: I see in SM is hoax :: according to me 60 % in SM is hoax |
| 91 | B: { yapp } it is about politic :: there is people only think about themselves without thinking about others |
| 92 | B: So {the} is more dangerous than { only } |
| 93 | B: I tell bad things about someone behind them because of hoax |
| 94 | B: its' not only attack my personality, but also my family and environment |
| 95 | B: so many people will see me or see someone that oh he {look} is bad guy or bad girl |
| 96 | B: wrong information make other people got impact like that she share |