

Triangulating “Possible Englishes” at Lexical and Syntactical Levels Used in Indonesian EFL Pre-Service Teachers’ Written Narratives*

Joseph Ernest Mambu

Satya Wacana Christian University, Indonesia

This paper is aimed at capturing some fingerprints of possible Englishes at lexical and syntactical levels by Indonesian speakers. 16 written narratives of four male and four female pre-service teachers were selected in this study. Three American colleagues and the researcher intersubjectively identified and triangulated possible Englishes in the narratives of personal experiences of these pre-service teachers during their teaching practicum. The analyses show that the Standard English was deviated when Indonesian expressions were re-phrased (or are implied to have been stated) in English words/phrases/sentences which may inevitably still sound nonnative or erroneous for the American speakers. Despite the Americans’ conformity to their Standard English, the researcher contends that deviations from the American English are not to always be viewed negatively as being linguistically inferior. Rather, EFL educators are to explore how English nonnative speakers, especially those from Indonesia, use various possible Englishes and how these educators address the Englishes.

Key words: possible Englishes, errors, intersubjectivity, lexical, and syntactical levels

* This is an edited and enhanced version of a paper presented at the 6th Asia TEFL International Conference in Sanur, Bali, 1-3 August 2008.

INTRODUCTION

The orthodoxy of using the English used by native speakers in Inner Circle countries such as the United States or England has been pervasive in TEFL in Expanding Circle countries worldwide (McKay, 2002) including Indonesia. Indonesian pre-service EFL teachers today are facing the dilemma of either being stigmatized for not using “more standard” Englishes or using their creatively personal English language that highlights their linguistic “flavors”. These flavors are indeed complex with these teachers’ (1) exposure to Standard English, (2) regional vernaculars, (3) interlanguage (e.g., L1 influence, overgeneralization, simplification, and fossilization; see Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 75), among others. Quite offensive to non-standard varieties of English is the notion of “interlanguage”, coined by Selinker (1972), which puts English nonnative speakers, no matter how advanced their English proficiency level, at a disadvantage as “failed native speakers” (O’Keeffe, McCarthy, & Carter, 2007, p. 30) who are prone to produce errors and do not sound native-like. Ever since then it has been the impetus for error analysis, in particular, and research in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), in general, with the Standard English being the only ultimate norm.

In the spirit of documenting systematically possible Englishes used by some Indonesians, two main aspects will be reviewed below: (1) various constructs of Englishes and (2) second/foreign language teachers’ or researchers’ common practices of delving into language learners’ errors and native-nonnative “intersubjectivity.” The latter is a concept elucidated by Larsen-Freeman (2003, p. 45) that allows both English native and nonnative speakers to negotiate meanings.

FROM WORLD ENGLISHES TO POSSIBLE ENGLISHES

In my earlier review of language pedagogy trends since the call for “Error Analysis” by Pit Corder (1975) for applied linguistic research in 1970s to the

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the 1990s and early 2000s (Savignon, 1991, 2003), the issue of foreign language (especially EFL) learners' personal identities comes to the fore (Mambu, 2006). Conspicuously absent in the traditional error analyses since Corder's era up to recently are language learners' identities beyond that of being nonnative speakers of a target language (usually English). With this paradigm, the language used by the native speakers is regarded as the most authentic, authoritative and ideal model for language learners. Emphasizing the CLT curriculum, Savignon (1997, 2003) argues for personalized English language use. In a similar vein, the current trend of English as an International Language paradigm (McKay, 2002) acknowledges English varieties outside *Inner Circle* countries (e.g., U.S.A., Canada, England, or Australia). With an ever-increasing number of English speakers in the *Outer Circles* (former British colonies such as Malaysia, Singapore, and India) and *Expanding Circles* (e.g., China, Thailand, and Indonesia), it is no longer relevant and fair to measure learners' communicative competence on the basis of whether or not they are native-like (Savignon, 2003; Yano, 2003). Furthermore, Bhatia (2003) argues that instead of sticking to *mono-norms* (*native English*), language teaching should promote *multi-norms* (*World Englishes*). Agreeing with Bhatia, Savignon (2003) disputes the term "target" language commonly used by Corder (1975) because it limits the language being learned in a monolithic sense, e.g., orientating English to English used in Inner Circle countries only (p. 58).

One of the most current trends, nevertheless, is the introduction of the concept of *Global Englishes* by Pennycook (2007) who problematizes the multi-norms propagated by the now established concept of World Englishes. From his observation, multi-norms of Englishes have become the continuation of the mono-norm ascertained by Inner Circle countries. This is due to a tendency popularized by the proponents of multi-norms to find certain standards for an English variety, usually categorized as a largely monolithic English depending on its nation, e.g., Singaporean English, Indian English, Brunei English, or even Indonesian English. Some standards in each of these Englishes bear some resemblance to those in Inner Circle countries. This

implies that even if some deviated forms are tolerably used in each of the Englishes, on the whole the Englishes keep adhering to the Standard English. In turn, the newly standardized Englishes will restrict, rather than liberate, the proliferation of infinitely possible Englishes regardless of the names of countries. By this stance, Pennycook(2007) believes in “transnationality” (beyond nationality). As he submits,

[n]otions of the transcultural, transnational, and translocal present a way of thinking about flow, flux and fixity.... [R]ather than using localizing strategies by which people are considered to exist culturally in a specific location, a more useful image is one of *travel*, with its emphasis on movement, encounter, and change.... (p. 44, italics original)

From Pennycook’s (2007) observation, therefore, Englishes are not to be restrictedly understood as given (or static) entities which are solely associated with specific locations (e.g., Malaysian English or Indonesian English). Rather, as people are exposed to various encounters from the media or they travel across countries, they are likely to have a variety of Englishes at their disposal. Furthermore, not only do some Englishes have similarities to other Englishes, but also these Englishes vary from nation to nation, from region to region, from person to person, and from one time to another time (even when they are produced by exactly the same person). Thus, Englishes are much more varied than the restrictions imposed by nationwide Englishes as made sense of by proponents of World Englishes. By implication, Englishes can be personally or idiosyncratically expressed.

This implication leads me to question the term Global Englishes, which I find problematic. Although Pennycook (2007) distinguishes them from World Englishes, laypeople will think that “World” and “Global” refer to a similar thing. Besides that, Hip-hop cultures, which Pennycook stems his analysis of Global Englishes from, are indeed global phenomena in the world today. However, the Englishes are not always global or universal across cultures. In fact, some traces of local languages which are mixed with English are quite culture-specific. The use of “lah” such as in “Come on lah” or “let’s go lah”

(p. 108) are typically Malaysian, and proponents of World Englishes will rightly claim that “lah” mixed with English is typical of Malaysian English.

Another buzz term in ESL/EFL contexts – English as an International Language – shares a similar problem to that of Global or World Englishes. Seidlhofer (2004) contends that the term is “misleading” as it “suggests that there is one clearly distinguishable, codified, and unitary variety called *International English*, which is certainly not the case” (p. 210, italics original). She hence makes a case for “English as a lingua franca”, with one of the specific characteristics being the pursuit of intelligible use of English by nonnative speakers of English with other nonnative speakers as in “ASEAN” or the “Association of South East Asian Nations” (p. 221). The issue of intelligibility, however, remains knotty.

When personal expressions through the use of Englishes are at stake, then English(es) as a world or a global or an international language or lingua franca may not always be relevant. To illustrate, in a culture where readers hold the ultimate responsibility of making sense of a writer’s intention(s), imposing intelligibility may be burdensome for writers (cf. Hinds, 1987). In such a culture, it is normal for writers to convey their intentions in a cryptic way. This leads me to contend that we need to explore the construct of “possible Englishes”, which I borrow from Pennycook (2004, p. 340), that accommodates any kinds of Englishes irrespective of their degrees of intelligibility.

The exploration of possible Englishes challenge the common practices in which speakers whose first language (L1) is not English have unfairly been judged by English native speakers who position themselves as always more linguistically superior than nonnative speakers of English. A great deal of SLA researchers who are English native speakers have set up a research paradigm for error analyses of English used by nonnative speakers at phonological, morphological, syntactical, or even discourse/pragmatic levels (see for example some classic textbooks in the SLA field by Ellis, 1994; his current plenary session in 2008 on teacher’s written corrective feedback; Gass & Selinker, 2001 who distinguish L1 influence from “developmental” factors that account for errors made by English nonnative speakers; and

Lightbown & Spada, 1999, to name but a few). However, nonnative speakers’ personal expressions in any possible Englishes should be paid more attention to by English native and nonnative educators alike.

Despite personal English use, it is likely to find similar and systematic use of Englishes across selves (or individuals), e.g., dropping the third person present tense “s” as in *she look*, omitting definite and indefinite articles, etc. by speakers whose L1 is not English but use English as a lingua franca (ELF) to communicate with each other (Seidlhofer, 2004). Responding to the issue of ELF, O’Keeffe, McCarthy, and Carter (2007) acknowledge that “the evidence so far as to what exactly ELF is is rather scant”. Hence, they call for applied linguists’ attention to “describe many ‘ELFs’ to get anywhere near an accurate picture of the global uses of English” (p. 29) apart from those in European contexts (e.g., in Finland and Austria; see Mauranen, 2003 and Seidlhofer, 2004 respectively).

The issue of tracing possible Englishes within and across Indonesian speakers is therefore worth pursuing. Such Englishes may be either personal (or idiosyncratic) or used more widely (globally) by multiple speakers in Indonesia or elsewhere in the world. In particular, it is significant to address the notion of intersubjectivity which attempts to triangulate and make sense of nonnative speakers’ possible Englishes in the Indonesian context.

ERRORS AND POSSIBLE ENGLISHES VIEWED FROM THE INTERSUBJECTIVITY PERSPECTIVE

Originally, the notion of intersubjectivity implies the degree to which a language teacher is able to demonstrate a thorough understanding of a certain grammatical point and to be aware of his/her students’ thought processes that account for their confusion on that grammatical point (Larsen-Freeman, 2003, p. 45). Intersubjectivity requires two subjects at work: the foreign language teacher (who is supposed to be knowledgeable about grammar and his/her students’ grammar) and the students (whose foreign language grammar, as

reflected in their questions to the teacher or in a written form, is still evolving). More precisely, intersubjectivity necessitates that the teacher sees “where a student is coming from” or “[establishes] just what it is that the student is trying to express, and why” and then “supply an acceptable linguistic formulation” to be noticed by the student (pp. 76, 132). In Lin’s study (as cited in Larsen-Freeman, 2003, p. 76) it was found that her Hong Kong students noticeably underused *it* compared with native English speakers. A student’s sentence “A lot of graduate students are difficult to find job from 1997-1998” could be corrected by rewriting it as “It was difficult for graduate students to find jobs from 1997-1998”.

Intersubjectivity in Larsen-Freeman’s (2003) sense, however, is still Inner-Circle biased. Larsen-Freeman argues that learners’ errors should be “interpreted as showing development rather than deficiency” (p. 126). The question is: development from what to what? Very often the illusion of such a developmental process requires that shifts be from no or very limited English to native-like English. Stigmatized as less deficient than native (or native-like) speakers of English in Outer (let alone Inner) Circle countries, EFL students may have a disadvantaged identity as “losers.”

A critical view on language teaching (cf. Phillipson’s (1992) discussion on linguistic imperialism, Pennycook’s (2001) critical applied linguistics, and Pennycook’s (2007) transgressive applied linguistics) has challenged favoring only the Standard English. This view has been empirically concretized in one of Pennycook’s current studies. During his teaching practicum observation in an ESL class conducted in a church room in the outskirts of Sydney, with 10 intermediate level students, the majority being under twenty and Korean, Pennycook (2004) observed Liz’s teaching a lesson focusing on practical language on how learners could ask for electrician’s or plumber’s assistance if there was something wrong with fuse or sink. After the teaching session, Pennycook asked Liz why she accepted “close the tap” and “open the tap” which are non-standard English forms of “turn off the tap” and “turn on the tap”. Pennycook in his reflection then argues that “open and close may indeed be the best term to teach.” We may also wonder whether students’ “open” and

“close” are due to L1 interference, an overgeneralization, or an acceptable variant of “possible Englishes of Sydney” (p. 340). With these questions in mind, Pennycook’s reflection may fit in the concept of intersubjectivity from a critical outlook. Inclusive of this reflection is how readers (or audiences) assume more responsibility in making sense of Englishes (cf. Hinds, 1987).

Thus, the present study focuses on finding possible Englishes in written narratives through the exploration of intersubjectivity (i.e., between three American speakers and eight Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers, mediated by me who also attempted to decode the pre-service teachers’ messages which may have been considered vague or erroneous by the Americans). More specifically, this study investigates what linguistic aspects (at lexical and syntactical levels) in the written narratives are considered erroneous or problematic by the Americans and how these Americans demonstrate their intersubjectivity to correct or make sense of pre-service teachers’ errors – from the more to the less typical. From my intersubjective perspective as a nonnative English speaker, I will view how the errors *are* possible Englishes that (1) are shared across speakers, which probably represent Englishes globally used by people in countries other than Indonesia, or (2) culture-specific, or (3) idiosyncratically personal.

METHOD

Participants

Data of eight (out of 18) ED-SWCU student (pre-service) teachers who had completed their teaching practicum were analyzed in the present study. Four male and four female students’ paper-based TOEFL prediction scores by the time of data collection were above 500. For the sake of anonymity, the male students are coded M1, M2, M3 and M4 and the female students F1, F2, F3, and F4. All other names (of schools, teachers, lecturers, and friends) in their stories are also pseudonyms. As far as I know, M2’s and M3’s TOEFL

scores were above 600. M3 was one of the best graduates. M4 used to live in the United States for some time as his father worked there. While the four female pre-service teachers, M1 and M4 are Javanese by ethnicity, M2 and M3 are Indonesian-born Chinese. They were in their early twenties and were in their final year in the SWCU undergraduate program of TEFL. All of them had just completed their teaching practicum course in some secondary schools in Salatiga.

Based on the stories, it becomes apparent that they taught in four schools: “W” School (done by F3); “X” School (M1 and M4); “Y” School (F1, M2, and M3); and “Z” School (F2 and F4).

Triangulation of data was made possible by the assistance of three American colleagues teaching in ED-SWCU: (1) AT (a B.A. holder, in his mid-thirties), (2) RK (an M.A. holder, in her fifties), and Vic (an M.A. holder, in his late twenties). The lengths of stay in Indonesia vary from more than 20 years (RK), seven years (AT), to three years (Vic) – as of August 2008. They are all competent Indonesian speakers too.

Procedure

16 narratives (eight “good” and eight “bad” stories) were elicited from eight students last January 2007. I asked each of the students to write their “good” and “bad” personal experiences during the teaching practicum s/he had just completed on a piece paper with time limit (maximum of 45 minutes). Each narrative was supposed to be written in at least 300 words in English. It turned out that the total number of words was 6,931 (with an average of 433.175 words per narrative per person). I said to the pre-service teachers, however, that they could switch to Indonesian in their writing when they found it too difficult to express an idea in English.

The data was then triangulated by AT, RK, and Vic. I asked them to identify any English expressions (in words, phrases, or sentences) in the pre-service teachers’ (photocopied) narratives that sounded Indonesian and to suggest their preferred English versions. There was no time limitation for

them to comment on the essays but they were returned in two weeks.

Categories of my colleagues’ comments were then determined inductively during the analysis as I did not assign them to use a particular written feedback strategy (as explained by Ellis, 2008, for instance) beforehand. Two main types of feedback were identified during the analysis: direct and indirect. Whenever my American colleague crossed out, underlined or circled a word (e.g., a preposition, a noun, or an adjective), there was a problem of “word choice” indirectly indicated. If more than one word was underlined, circled, and directly commented verbally (or corrected), I regarded them as either phrases or sentences deemed problematic by my American colleagues.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The written narratives, on the whole, revolve around highly contextualized experiences during the teaching practicum in a variety of Indonesian schools. In such settings, interactions in Indonesian (with fellow pre-service teachers, mentors from local schools, and students) were pervasive. In their narratives, therefore, the pre-service teachers often alluded to the Indonesian speeches of these people which were then re-animated either in Indonesian¹ (i.e., code-switching) or Englishes.

The typicality of Englishes was determined by looking at the frequency of errors in each linguistic aspect across pre-service teachers’ narrative essays, as triangulated by the three Americans.

Quantitative Analyses

Quantitatively, American readers varied in tolerating errors. On the whole, AT paid considerably more attention to accuracy or conformity to the

¹ As the focus is on Englishes, Indonesian words or phrases are not included in the analysis except a pre-service teacher embedded both English and Indonesian expressions referring to the same thing (e.g., see Table 17).

standard American English than RK and Vic did in all narratives. Vic had the least comments and hence looked the most lenient in judging the teachers' English grammaticality. He did correct or comment on some grammatical inaccuracies that were too noticeable for him as an English native speaker but as long as the teachers could get their meaning across, Vic usually skipped such errors (see Tables 1 and 2). Furthermore, unlike AT who crossed out less preferable expressions and directly changed them to more English-sounding ones, RK's comments were more indirect, i.e., using more underlines and circles without always changing the teachers' expressions (see examples of comments in Tables 10 and 11, among others).

TABLE 1
Number of Comments in the Male Pre-service Teachers' Narratives (of "Good" and "Bad" Experiences) as Identified by the Three American Raters

	M1's as rated by			M2's as rated by			M3's as rated by			M4's as rated by		
	Vic	RK	AT	Vic	RK	AT	Vic	RK	AT	Vic	RK	AT
Missing words	9	27	38	1	7	11	1	10	22	0	1	13
Word choice	18	41	74	12	45	59	15	20	47	3	9	18
Phrasal/ syntactical style and accuracy	16	33	44	12	17	23	15	11	15	2	6	6
Total	43	101	156	25	69	93	31	41	84	5	16	37

TABLE 2
Number of Comments in the Female Pre-service Teachers' Narratives (of "Good" and "Bad" Experiences) as Identified by the Three American Raters

	F1's as rated by			F2's as rated by			F3's as rated by			F4's as rated by		
	Vic	RK	AT	Vic	RK	AT	Vic	RK	AT	Vic	RK	AT
Missing words	1	7	25	4	6	29	1	10	16	1	10	27
Word choice	21	27	45	14	32	58	16	30	46	10	25	59
Phrasal/ syntactical style and accuracy	20	29	30	9	21	32	8	22	31	19	19	30
Total	42	63	100	27	59	119	25	62	93	30	54	116

The quantitative measure of confidence in determining Englishes other

than the standard was continued by triangulating the three Americans’ comments (Tables 3 and 4). Samples of pre-service teachers’ language problems are said to have been “triangulated” when at least two Americans noticed the same problematic samples by (in)directly commenting on them. As we have noticed in Tables 1 and 2, there were big discrepancies of numbers of comments across the three Americans. Hence, it could be expected that their agreements with each other were not very strong after their comments’ being triangulated (Table 5) because the open-ended instrument in this study were at the Americans’ discretion (Table 6). As mentioned earlier in the research procedure, difficulty was partly due to different perceptions concerning errors. AT was on the whole more focused on word choices whereas RK used more indirect approaches (usually underlines without directly correcting the language) to commenting the teachers’ phrases or syntactical constructions (cf. Table 11, for instance, where RK underlined not only the verbs not in past tense forms but also their subjects).

Furthermore, during the triangulating process, when at least two Americans who commented on the same problematic sample viewed it differently – as a word or as a sentence lacking in grammaticality, for instance – I would categorize it under “phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy”, not under “word choice”. This may have accounted for the fact that there were more problems of the former than the latter in the cohort of female teachers (compare Tables 3 and 4). This phenomenon also occurred following the triangulation: a sharp decrease from an average of 31.08 prior to the triangulation to 15.75 comments per person after triangulation for the word choice and a relatively slighter decline (19.585 to 15.5) in terms of the phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy, with only a very small gap between the word choice (15.75) and the phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy (15.5) after the triangulation (see Table 5).

Calculations on the disparities and agreements of average numbers of comments prior to and following the triangulation suggest another interpretation (Table 6). In the present data, the Americans for the most part agreed on the phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy, followed by the word choice, and the missing words.

TABLE 3
Triangulated Numbers of Comments in Male Teachers' Narratives

	M1	M2	M3	M4	Average
Missing words	4	5	4	2	3.75
Word choice	22	23	12	7	16.00
Phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy	23	13	4	3	10.75
Total	49	41	20	12	30.50

TABLE 4
Triangulated Numbers of Comments in Female Teachers' Narratives

	F1	F2	F3	F4	Average
Missing words	1	5	2	9	4.25
Word choice	13	25	16	9	15.75
Phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy	21	19	25	16	20.25
Total	35	49	43	34	40.25

TABLE 5
Average Numbers of Comments in Both Male and Female Pre-service Teachers' Narratives before and after Triangulation

	Before the triangulation		After the triangulation	
	Per person	Per narrative	Per person	Per narrative
Missing words	11.9600	5.9800	4.1250	2.0625
Word choice	31.0800	15.5400	15.7500	7.8750
Phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy	19.5850	9.7925	15.5000	7.7500
Total	62.4150	31.2075	35.3750	17.6250

TABLE 6
The Disparities and Agreements of Average Numbers of Comments before and after the Triangulation (in Percentages)

	Disparities (%)	Agreement (%)
Missing words	65.5100	34.4900
Word choice	49.3240	50.6760
Phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy	20.8577	79.1423

The quantitative tendency of the Americans' paying more attention to grammaticality and lexical choices, however, is still a part of the bigger picture. Despite varying degrees of agreement in each of the linguistic

aspects (phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy, word choice, and missing words), the agreements are to be further investigated within the types of errors (see Table 7). Nonetheless, this is not an easy task. To illustrate, lacking in past tense forms are viewed from either problems of word choice or phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy (Tables 10 and 11). In addition, missing articles constituted 34.38% or 11 occurrences (12.5% for “a” and 21.88% for “the”) of all the triangulated problems of missing words (32 occurrences). These numbers do not include more occurrences of missing articles as identified by AT alone (e.g., see Tables 8 and 9).² More fruitful than quantification of error types in the current study is attending to some representative lexical and syntactical forms considered either problematic by the Americans or possible Englishes by me.

TABLE 7
Types of Errors as Triangulated by the Three Americans

Missing words	Word choice	Phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy
Articles	Preposition	Word order
“a”	Conjunction	Vague/idiosyncratic expressions (especially those with “teaching” as the focus)
“the”	Auxiliary verb	Wordiness
Preposition	Plural/singular forms	Grammatical errors (e.g., lacking in past tense forms and inappropriate plural/singular forms)
To-infinitive	Spelling error	
Conjunction	Interjection	
Auxiliary verb	Relative pronoun	

² Furthermore, we have yet to know whether the number of slips (missing the article “the” or “a”) in the current data are statistically significant compared to that of the right uses of “the” or “a” according to the Standard English (cf. a critique of error analysis by Gass & Selinker, 2001, p. 80). Further research can be devoted to comparing those which conform to the Standard English and those which do not in the same narrative essays (cf. “centripetal” versus “centrifugal” forces – the “centralizing” force of the “correct language” versus the forces that degrade “official languages” – in Bakhtin’s [1981, pp. 263-273] notion of “heteroglossia”).

Content word after “teaching”	Content word Verbs (especially past tense forms) Adjectives Nouns (especially the word “teaching”) Adverbs
----------------------------------	--

Qualitative Analysis 1: More Typical Errors or Possible Englishes

Articles

The problem of missing articles such as “the” and “an” (both in the triangulated data or by AT alone; see Tables 8 and 9) occurred in seven and six teachers’ essays respectively, which indicated that this problem was typical across almost all the pre-service teachers in my corpus.

TABLE 8
Missing Words: Articles “the”

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)	Quantitatively confirmed by & frequency
1	F3	2: (a) B-21: <u>answer</u> <u>^exercises</u> ; (b) B-41: <u>In</u> <u>^language laboratory</u>	(a) AT: doing ^the exercises; RK: ^; (b) AT: ^the language lab; RK: ^	--
2	F4	1: G-28: So, <u>^next</u> <u>month</u> in December;	AT: ^the next month; RK: The following month;	--
3	M1	3: (a) G-39: <u>in ^OSIS</u> <u>activity</u> ; (b) G-41: together <u>in ^café</u> ; (c) G- 44: we <u>enjoyed ^</u> <u>teaching learning</u> process	(a) AT: from ^the OSIS activity; RK: in ^the OSIS; (b) AT: in ^the café; RK: ^; Vic: the; (c) AT: ^the; RK: ^the	AT (13 times)
4	M3	1: B-19 <u>in ^multimedia</u> <u>room</u>	AT: ^the; RK: ^	AT (twice)
5	M2	1: G-8: We didn’t realize <u>that ^time</u> was passing by so quickly	--	AT

6	M4	1: G-18: the best experience <u>in</u> [^] ED of Satya Wacana	--	AT
7	F1	2 (one sample only/o.s.o.): G-18: relate <u>with</u> [^] students' background knowledge	--	AT

This is a note for reading this and other similar tables. Take number 3 for example. According to the triangulated comments (by at least two Americans), M1 did not supply articles “the” three times: in the 39th, 41st, and 44th sentences of the story of his good (G) experience. AT, however, identified 13 times of missing “the” in M1’s narratives. For number 6, only AT spotted two missing “thes” in F1’s narratives but only one sample is presented in the table (See Appendix). AT’s contributions were significant considering that overall he made more comments than RK and Vic.

TABLE 9
Missing Words: Articles “a[n]”

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)	Quantitatively confirmed by & frequency
1	F2	1: G-25: she gave me <u>^suggestion</u>	AT&RK: [^] a suggestion	--
2	M2	2: (a) B-7b: <u>for</u> [^] replacement); (b) B-10: <u>burst into</u> [^] fight	(a) AT&RK: for [^] a replacement; (b) AT&RK: into [^] a fight)	--
3	F4	1: B-12 How to <u>make</u> [^] sandwich	(AT&RK: [^] a sandwich)	AT (4 times)
4	M1	8 (o.s.o.): <u>in</u> [^] office for that was office day	--	AT
5	M3	3 (o.s.o.): B-9: those <u>with</u> [^] high capability	--	AT
6	F1	1: I bussied them to respond or <u>give</u> [^] opinion	--	AT

It has been empirically documented that L1 influence such as no definite or indefinite articles may have given a reason for inappropriate usage of articles

in an L2 like English. Duskova (1983) found that Czech native speakers did not use English articles appropriately, e.g., (a) articles were missing when contexts required their use or (b) definite articles like “the” were used whereas indefinite ones like “a” were the correct one. Similarly, in Indonesian, (in)definite articles are typically omitted so even advanced English users such as those in my data pervasively also left out articles in their written English essays without interfering with readers’ comprehension (cf. also Seidlhofer, 2004).

Lacking in Past Tense Forms

Lacking in past tense forms is not exhaustively quantified here as it extends from the word choice to phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy (see Tables 10 and 11). Of more apparent descriptions are the more typical problems across essays (by six to eight teachers). Due to the limited space, the lack of past tense forms for “can” or “will” are not presented here.

TABLE 10
“To be” (is/am/are) not in Past Tense Forms

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)	Quantitatively confirmed by & frequency
1	F2	3: (a) B-13: we <u>are</u> a mess; (b) G-4: I <u>m</u> happy; (c) G-26: I <u>m</u> happy	(a) AT: were unprepared; RK: [underlined]; Vic: x; (b)&(c) AT: was; RK [underlined];	AT
2	F4	2: (a) G-29: It <u>s</u> ok!; (b) B-16 It <u>s</u> ok for me	(a) RK: It was ok; Vic: It was fine; (b) AT: it was; RK [underlined]	AT (4 times)
3	M1	2: G-44: I knew who my students <u>are</u> and they knew who I <u>am</u> and	AT: my students were and they knew who I was; RK: tense mixed	AT (5 times)
4	M2	1: B-12: our group <u>is</u> currently facing	AT: was; RK [circled]	AT
5	M4	2: (a) G-6: the third <u>is</u> more; (b) B-5: I promised myself that I <u>am</u> going	(a) AT: was; RK: tense consistency; (b) AT: was; RK: [underlined]	AT (4 times)
6	M3	4 (o.s.o.): B-26: I didn’t	--	AT

really feel that my work is
a burden

TABLE 11
Grammatical Errors Extended to the Sentence Level due to Lack in Past Tense Verbs

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)
1	F2	3: (a) B-2: <u>It's all happen</u> ; (b) B-14: <u>we need</u> to give; (c) G-11: <u>bad thing happen</u> .	(a) AT&Vic: it all happened; RK: [underlined]; (b) AT: needed; RK [underlined]; (c) AT: happened; RK [underlined]
2	F3	1: G-4: <u>we want to</u>	AT: wanted; RK: [underlined]
3	M2	1: B-8: One day I suddenly <u>remember about it and asked</u> my	AT: remembered; Vic: tense very inconsistent
4	M4	1: B-19: <u>I only have a little confidence</u>	AT: did not have much self-confidence; RK: [underlined]

The prevalence of past tense forms looks even higher than missing articles in the teachers' written narratives. The main reason for abandoning the English morphological inflections that mark past tense forms with –d, –ed, or irregular verbs is that no tenses in the Indonesian linguistic system – a similar case to Czech speakers learning English (Duskova, 1984). This is not the only reason, however. Adult African American speakers in Labov's (1972) data, who had their distinctive English vernacular, also mixed present and past tense forms in their oral narratives, e.g., “[j] and suddenly somebody is giving me a destination [k] I look in the back [l] There's *an unsavory-looking passenger* in the back of the cab who had apparently gotten into the cab while it was parked [...]” (p. 389). Just as African American English users have a strong identity regarding their English vernacular, so do Indonesian speakers using English as their own vernacular.

Inappropriate Singular or Plural Forms

Like lacking in past tense forms, slips associated with singular or plural

forms (see Table 12) vary from the word choices (e.g., in F1, F3, F4, M3, and M4) to phrasal/syntactical style and accuracy (e.g., in F2, M1, M2). There were fewer occurrences of these slips but they were produced by all eight pre-service teachers in their written narratives.

TABLE 12
Incorrect Singular or Plural Forms

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)	Quantitatively confirmed by & frequency
1	F1	2: (a) G-12: [...] give opinion to other students' <u>answer</u> ; (b) B-3: my teaching <u>aid</u>	AT&RK added –s after the nouns.	AT (6 times)
2	F2	2: (a) G-28: She kept giving my <u>suggestion</u> ; (b) G-30: never <u>gave suggestion</u> like that	(a) AT&Vic: giving me suggestions; (b) AT: <u>suggestions</u> ; RK: [underlined]	AT (7 times)
3	F3	2: (a) G-17 & (b) G-20: <u>clothe</u>	(a) & (b) AT&RK&Vic: clothes	AT (4 times)
4	F4	1: B-1: different <u>attitude</u>	AT&RK&Vic: attitudes	AT (10 times)
5	M2	1: B-3: One of my <u>most irritating experience</u> with...	AT&RK: experiences	AT (18 times)
6	M3	1: G-34: finish my <u>works</u>	AT: work; RK: count-uncount	AT (5 times)
7	M4	1: B-18: the students were the <u>one</u> who...	AT&RK: ones	AT (3 times)
8	M1	1: G-17: <u>this words</u>	AT: these words; RK: [underlined]	AT (10 times)

Most of the inappropriate plural nouns not marked with /s/ (especially those produced by F1, F2, F3, F4, and F7) confirm Young's (1991) findings. Young contends that even Chinese native speakers with high English proficiency were more likely to omit /s/ marking for English plural nouns in noun phrases without numbers. Therefore, there was a greater likelihood of marking /s/ in "two mountains" than "the mountains". The redundancy of the word "two" as an indicator of plural nouns apparently forced these highly proficient English learners to use /s/ appropriately. Such an explanation also applies to the Indonesian EFL teachers in my data. The Indonesian language

does not have morphological inflections for marking plural nouns as it reduplicates nouns (e.g., “buku-buku” for books) to indicate plurality.

Similar to the case of missing articles and abandoning past tense forms, the omission of plural markings do not interfere with understanding. The following case, however, is a little bit different.

The Missing Word After the Word “Teaching”

From my point of view as an Indonesian native speaker, the word “teaching” as the head of a noun phrase is not at all problematic. Activating my intersubjectivity, I contend that seven out of eight Indonesian EFL teachers in my data might have also thought the same as I think (e.g., *[me]ngajarku yang pertama* “my first teaching” is an acceptable expression, as far as my Indonesian intuition is concerned). Therefore, I speculate that none of the seven teachers felt that “teaching” as the head of a noun phrase was problematic in English. RK and particularly AT, however, considered that there was a missing word after “teaching”: “experience” (Tables 13). Corder (1967) argues that if learners do not know that a produced form is erroneous, than it is an error. It is influenced by the Indonesian way of thinking but it is still intelligible as the Americans could supply the word “experience” to make the phrase more well-formed (or at least Anglo-Saxon American-sounding).

TABLE 13
The Typical Missing Word after “Teaching”

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)	Quantitatively confirmed by & frequency
1	F4	1: B-2: my first <u>teaching</u> ^	(AT&RK: ^experience)	AT (3 times)
2	M4	2: (a) fourth <u>teaching</u> ^ (b) G-18: my first <u>teaching</u> ^ was a bad experience for me	(a) AT&RK: ^experience; (b) AT: teaching ^what?; RK: my first teaching experience was bad	AT (8 times)
3	M1	2 (o.s.o.): G-13a: to make my PPL <u>teaching</u> ^ successful	--	AT

4	M3	3 (o.s.o.): G-28: I could enjoy my <u>teaching</u> ^	--	AT
5	F1	2 (o.s.o.): B-9: This is the last <u>teaching</u> ^ and should be funtastic one	--	AT
6	F2	1: It's all happen when I prepared my second <u>teaching</u> ^	--	AT
7	F3	2 (o.s.o.): G-6: I already had a bad feeling on this <u>teaching</u> ^	--	AT

Qualitative Analysis 2: Less Typical Errors or Possible Englishes

Due to a variety of Englishes which are relatively less typical (and yet interesting) in the present data, the following categorizations help me organize them.

L1 Influence

The first set of examples is the noun phrase “computer rental” (see Table 14). From my intersubjective perspective as to account for these occurrences in advanced English learners’ (and teachers’) essays, this phrase is perhaps a newly coined prefabricated pattern that alludes to the Indonesian term “rental komputer” (a place in which people rent computers for typing, scanning, or printing purposes). I speculate that these teachers knew that “rental komputer” was too literal a translation just as “car red” for the Indonesian phrase “mobil merah”. Due to their attempt to use an L2 system (not merely L1 influence or transfer), therefore, they inverted “rental komputer” to “computer rental”.

For the Americans (AT and RK), “computer rental” is not an appropriate noun phrase in the context used by the Indonesian teachers. As a comparison, in Rundell’s (2001) Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, it is explained that “rental” in American English implies “the act of renting something such as a car or house: *Car rental is expensive in Ohio.*” (p. 1200, italics original). Based on the context described by F3 and M3, however,

“computer rental” does not refer to the act of renting a computer but the place for computer renting. SLA traditionalists such as Corder (1967) will consider this an error but even without the word “center” or “shop” or “café” (as later supplied by the intersubjective AT and RK) after the “computer rental”, this phrase has proved to be relatively intelligible, at least for these Americans whose Indonesian language competence is high.

TABLE 14
The Noun Phrase “Computer Rental”

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)
1	F3	2: (a) G-20: ... I went to the <u>computer rental</u> again; (b) G-23: ... I went to another <u>computer rental</u> .	(a) & (b) AT: ^center; RK: [underlined]
2	M3	1: B-18: asking me to accompany him to go to a <u>computer rental</u> ^ because he had to print...	AT: ^center (3 times); RK: ^shop/café

L1 influence also seemed to influence the teachers’ syntactical forms apart from noun phrases. Using the Indonesian way of thinking (or “L1 transfer” as overviewed by Gass & Selinker, 2001) that expands English expressions (i.e., “abducting” L1 norms in L2 expressions) are also exemplified (non-exhaustively) in the following constructions: (1) “to consult my lesson plan to Mrs. Dinda” (M1’s expression); (2) “reopen the stapler” (F3’s expression; cf. also Pennycook’s [2004] Sydney Englishes that tolerate the use of “open the tap” for a Standard English form “turn on the tap”); (3) F3’s “release myself from this mess”; (4) F3’s “after 15 minutes waiting”; (5) M2’s “same date with”; (6) M2’s “relate* with”; (7) F3’s “adjust with”; (8) F2’s “even she gave”; (9) “I was easy to change the ideas” (by F4; cf. Lin’s study as cited in Larson-Freeman, 2003, p. 76); (10) M1’s “Boy offered me something that I wait”; (11) F4’s “even when 5 minutes before we taught; (12) F4’s “when teaching process”, and (13) F1’s created idiom “out of border” (Table 16), among others.

“Overgeneralization of L2 Rules” Vis-à-vis “Abduction”

In the following examples (Table 15), hyphens have been creatively applied by F1 and M2 to convey their ideas. Derogatorily, these inappropriate occurrences were considered by SLA traditionalists as “developmental errors” in which learners overgeneralize certain L2 rules (Dulay & Burt, 1974; Gass & Selinker, 2001). The rule being overgeneralized here is that of a hyphenated adjective such as that in “the seven-year-old boy”. In my opinion, this is “abduction” (cf. Tannen, 2007, p. 38) of an English rule for hyphenated adjectives.

TABLE 15
Hyphens in Multi-word Adjectives in Noun Phrases

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)
1	F1	1: B-26: [...] with a <u>smiling-but-fake face</u>	AT: fake smile; RK: [underlined]
2	M2	2: (a) G-16: <u>a-hell-of-a experience</u> ; (b) B-5: <u>a not-so-bad idea</u>	(a) AT: a hell of an; RK: [underlined]; Vic: no hyphens; (b) AT: not such a bad idea; RK: such a; Vic: a bad idea

The following intelligible examples are also associated with the abductions of L2 rules (cf. “developmental errors” discussed in Gass & Selinker, 2001) that may be stigmatized as overgeneralizing or simply violating the Standard English norms. First, the word “cool” is attached with either “down” by F1 (in her expression “cool yourself down”) or “up” by M2 (in his expression “I went out to cool myself up”). Both phrasal verbs with “cool” as the main verb were intended to suggest that someone was angry and needed to remove the anger. “Cool”, according to Vic, collocates with “off” (not “down”, as it is the logical opposite of “heat up”, nor “up”). “Down”, according to Vic, goes together better with “calm”. Second, the use of preposition “on”, in view of the Americans, seems to have been overly extended to various contexts. Usually “on” is used before “days”. With this in mind, the teachers expands its use to past events (e.g., F2’s and M2’s “on my/the next teaching practicum”, F3’s “on the next day”, M1’s “on the same week”).

Another explanation for the notion of abduction (cf. Larsen-Freeman, 2003, pp. 84-85 and Tannen, 2007) extends to idioms at phrasal and syntactical forms. First, M4 may have heard some expressions using the idiom “give* me the creeps” in the United States where he spent his adolescence. But when there were not many inputs produced by American people who used the idiom whose most appropriate use was to be inductively inferred by M4 (see Table 16), M4 might have abducted its use for his storytelling purpose. This abduction was deemed a little bit inappropriate by AT who preferred “makes me grind my teeth” in the context to “gives me the creep”. Furthermore, even if M4’s personalized idiom is to be considered a developmental error, such a stigma may undermine the potentially creative capacity of language users in making puns or playing with words. In fact, F4’s travel and stay in the U.S.A. affirm Pennycook’s (2007) understanding that movement and encounter (p. 44) in a foreign country may account for idiom borrowing.

TABLE 16
English Idioms by Two Indonesian Teachers

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)
1	M4	1: B-5: Imagining it <u>gives me the creeps</u> [...]	AT: makes me grind my teeth; gives me the creeps → for people you are very uncomfortable to be around like child molesters, rapists, etc.
2	F1	1: B-32: I felt that her question were <u>out of border</u>	AT: inappropriate; RK: out of bounds; Vic: across the line/not appropriate

Philosophical-sounding Expressions

Apart from the transfer-developmental divide regarding errors, the traditional SLA research has yet to take into account the strategic uses of philosophical-sounding forms by nonnative speakers of English to communicate their meanings in a personalized way. The philosophical tendency may occur

when a teacher's expressed theme is idiosyncratically cryptic and yet it is philosophical-sounding. "The tiring of difference day" in Table 17 has no Indonesian equivalence; neither does it overgeneralize English grammatical rules. The theme was successfully (and intersubjectively) made sense of by Vic who suggested that it might be simplified by "with a tiring day of personal differences". We may say, therefore, that Vic assumed a bigger responsibility as a reader than his two American counterparts (cf. Hinds, 1987).

Other philosophical-sounding expressions "not in the same principle" (ketidaksepahaman)", which was contrasted to "misunderstanding (kesalahpahaman)", were demonstrated by M1 in L2 and L1 consecutively. Unlike the phrase "the tiring of difference day", the Indonesian words "ketidaksepahaman" and "kesalahpahaman" facilitate readers who understand both English and Indonesian.

TABLE 17
Philosophical Tendency Considered Problematic by the Three Americans

Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)
M1	4: (a) B-title: <u>The tiring of difference day</u> ; (b) B-53: <u>The tiring of difference day</u> ; (c) B-7: In Bahasa Indonesia, there is a slight different between 'not in the same principle' (ketidaksepahaman) and misunderstanding (kesalahpahaman); (d) B-8: When I did my PPL in "X" School Salatiga, I experienced difference by being 'not in the same principle'	(a) AT: [wavy line + ?]; RK: [underlined]; (b) AT: [wavy line + ?] RK: [underlined]; Vic: with a tiring day of personal differences; (c) & (d) AT: in → of [not of the same principle]

Literary-sounding Expressions

The literary-sounding expressions may mark someone's identity. Comparing literary and non-literary genres, Tannen (2007) comes up with a thesis that mundane everyday (non-literary) speeches may contain some poetic aspects by making use of details in the forms of "repetition and variation" (p. 148).

Variations in an epiphany, for instance, comprise “words with literary connotations”, which may evoke an emotional response from an audience. As an English user from Indonesia, M1 also had the novelist-like capacity (see Table 18). Unfortunately, the Americans seemed to have failed to appreciate M1’s personalized writing style. The repeated short sentence “said I”, which is even formally or literarily acceptable in English, was corrected by the three Americans to “I said”, whose style was probably too plain for M1 and me. In fact, the clause “said I” is another extended use of abducted L2 rule of clausal inversion.

The next set of examples which emphasized visual imageries were also regarded as problematic. “Shonning” and “shinning” as isolated words per se are indeed errors (as they should have been “shining”). From the context where these erroneous words were used, however, M1 intended to enhance the story’s vividness by describing the characters’ expressions. The descriptions, due to time limitation, were not very lucid yet; nevertheless, as far as the context is concerned, readers should continue conjuring up images regardless of the elusively short descriptions. For instance, what was meant by “I saw Prakoso shonning plain eyes” in the eleventh sentence was M1’s contrasting his determination to socialize with students and his friends’ (including Prakoso’s) idleness regarding socialization.

The last pair of expressions (“producing hells” and “kind of heck”) was similarly considered awkward or too vague by the Americans. Similar to the previous case of “shonning” and “shinning”, the degree of intersubjectivity by the Americans to expressions of annoyance was probably at the lowest. Intertextually, in essence, there was a cohesive link between “hells” in the first sentence and “kind of heck” in the fifty-first sentence as they alluded to the overall annoyance M1 had with his mentor at school (“guru pamong”).

With regard to literary tendency, it seems to me that the Americans were more focused on phrasal and sentential idiomaticity than the intricacy of potential meanings possibly inferred from adjacent and distant sentences in the overall story. This leads us to the necessity of addressing the issue of discourse, which is to be pursued in another study (e.g., Mambu, forthcoming).

TABLE 18
Literarily Descriptive Expressions

No.	Pre-service teachers	Frequency – story type – sentence numbers – examples	Triangulated by (& corrections/comments)
1	M1	5: (a) B-11 & (b) B-38: <u>said I</u> ; (c) G-11: I saw Prakoso <u>shonning plain eyes</u> and...; (d) B-1: difference has been <u>producing hells</u> ; (e) B-51: <u>kind of heck</u> ; (f) B-31: Her eyebrows went down with <u>a scary eyes shinning unhappy look</u>	(a) AT&Vic: I said; RK [underlined]; (b) AT&Vic: I said ; (c) AT&Vic ?; RK: [circled]; (d) AT: [wavy line + ?]; RK [underlined]; (e) AT&RK&Vic: ?; (f) AT&Vic ?; RK: “shinning” circled – spelling error.
2	F2	1: B-21: We started our lesson by <u>sweat running trough</u> our face and body	AT: pouring down; RK: sp; Vic: down

CONCLUSION

A bulk of research on errors in SLA has been critiqued by the CLT and Pennycook's (2007) Critical [Transgressive] Applied Linguistics. These critical schools of thought agree that foreign language learners' personal identities take priority over the Standard English mono-norm which has become the yardstick against which the appropriateness of other Englishes are measured and stigmatized. A more amiable approach is to establish a mutual understanding between speakers of different Englishes (e.g., Americans and Indonesian users of English) through intersubjectivity. Unlike the Inner-Circle-biased intersubjectivity (cf. my earlier critical review on Larsen-Freeman's [2003] treatment of the notion), my understanding of intersubjectivity attempts to mitigate the marginalizing effects of the standard norm of (American) English toward Indonesian speakers learning English. In fact, the three Americans in the current study have, in varying degrees, (unintentionally or subconsciously) established their linguistic superiority as English users whose standard English is to be identified with by the Indonesians.

By acknowledging the influence of Indonesian language as the teachers'

L1, their abducted English rules (cf. Tannen, 2007), and linguistic creativity at their disposal, I contend that some linguistic strategies for expressing their thoughts in narrative essays, both at the lexical and morpho-syntactical levels, have been systematically (or consistently) shared across these pre-service teachers. In spite of grammatical inaccuracies in light of the Standard English, their Englishes are possible, especially when intersubjective readers can decipher the meaning from writers’ L1 way of thinking (e.g., lack of articles, past tense forms, plural forms, and a missing word after the word “teaching”, as in Table 10-13; the culture-specific use of “computer rental” in Table 14), from an abducted L2 rule (e.g., “a smiling-but-fake face” in Table 15; an idiom “gives me the creep” in Table 16), and idiosyncratic expressions which are philosophical- or literary-sounding (see Tables 17 and 18). More specifically, Tannen’s insight on abduction has envisaged the path of SLA research to take into account L1 way of thinking and abducted L2 systems as resources for creativity – not merely as errors – in performing Englishes.

Furthermore, the degrees of typicality of errors (or possible Englishes, as I view them in a less derogatory way) in this study may suggest the following hypotheses. First, the more typical errors or possible Englishes in the present study may represent the global Englishes that also consistently occur elsewhere in the world. Second, the less typical errors or possible Englishes presented here on the one hand may range from idiosyncratically personal to culture-specific, but on the other hand may also be parts of the typical global Englishes, given that a much bigger corpus of data, especially in the Indonesian context, is available. Encompassing personal, local (culture-specific), and global Englishes, possible Englishes complement such constructs as Global Englishes, World Englishes, English as an international language and English as a lingua franca. In essence, the constructs other than possible Englishes may lack of sensitivity to the personal dimension of nonnative English speakers (particularly in Expanding Circle countries) whose expressions, no matter how cryptic or erroneous they are in view of the Standard English, are to be made intelligible and appreciated in their own right through circumspect intersubjectivity.

THE AUTHOR

Joseph Ernest Mambu is a lecturer in the Faculty of Language and Literature, Satya Wacana Christian University in Salatiga, Central Java. His current research interest covers Communicative Language Teaching and discourse analysis. His recent publications include *Setting the tone for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) implementation: A Savignonian perspective* (2006), *Addressing political “confusion syndrome” discourses: A critical applied linguistics perspective* (2008), and *Triangulating some discourse-related issues in Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers’ written narratives* (forthcoming).

Email: jos_sala3@yahoo.com

REFERENCES

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2003). Comment 2. *World Englishes*, 22(1), 69-71.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners’ errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-169.
- Corder, S. P. (1975). Applied linguistics and language teaching. In J. P. B. Allen & S. P. Corder (Eds.), *Papers in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1-15). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duskova, L. (1983). On sources of errors in foreign language learning. In B. Robinett & J. Schachter (Eds.), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and related aspects* (pp. 215-233). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Duskova, L. (1984). Similarity – An aid or hindrance in foreign language learning? *Folia Linguistica*, 18, 103-115.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2008, 1-3 August). *Investigating written corrective feedback*. Paper presented at the 6th AsiaTEFL International Conference, Sanur, Bali.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory*

- course* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: a new typology. In U. Connor & R. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In W. Labov (Ed.), *Language in the inner city* (pp. 352-396). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Boston, MA: Thomson Heinle.
- Mauranen, A. (2003). The corpus of English as lingua franca in academic settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3), 513-527.
- Mambu, J. E. (2006). Setting the tone for Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) implementation: A Savignonian perspective. *English.edu Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(2), 137-152.
- Mambu, J. E. (forthcoming). Triangulating some discourse-related issues in Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers' written narratives, *TEFLIN Journal*.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O’Keeffe, A., McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2007). *From corpus to classroom: Language use and language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pennycook, A. (2004). Critical moments in a TESOL praxicum. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 327-345). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. New York: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rundell, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English* (3rd ed.). Edinburgh Gate, Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (2), 261-277.
- Savignon, S. J. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. (2nd edition). Sydney: The McGraw Hill Companies.
- Savignon, S. J. (2003). Teaching English as communication: A global perspective *World Englishes*, 22(1), 55-66.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10,

209-231.

Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yano, Y. (2003). Comment 1. *World Englishes*, 22(1), 67-68.

Young, R. (1991). *Variation in interlanguage morphology*. New York: Peter Lang.

APPENDIX

M4's Sample Narrative of his Good Personal Experience

My fourth teaching of PPL

¹I will never forget about my PPL in “X” School. ²I once wrote about my bad experience when I was in PPL. ³It is true that I didnt really enjoy my PPL because I never liked teaching, but I cant deny that I gained a lot from PPL. ⁴My first teaching was probably the worst, but my fourth teaching would be the best.

⁵As I told you before, my first teaching was really bad. ⁶The second was probably better and the third is more or less the same. ⁷My number one fear was being the center of attention but after the third teaching, I promised myself that I will not let my nervousness and anger get the best of me. ⁸When the day came, I entered the classroom and stared the students in the eyes. ⁹I greeted them and told them that I will be teaching them so I really need their cooperation. ¹⁰The students responded positively and I was really satisfied with that. ¹¹Seeing the students reaction kind of gave me confidence.

¹²Preparation also played an important role in my fourth teaching. ¹³I had prepared well the night before I taught. ¹⁴As a result, I spoke more fluently although I was still trembling a little bit. ¹⁵To me, this is a big progress.

¹⁶Eventhough I didnt enjoy my PPL, it gave me more advantages than disadvantages, and I'm really happy with that. ¹⁷If it wasnt for PPL, I would not have any confidence at all. ¹⁸My first teaching was a bad experience for me, but my fourth was good and probably the best experience in ED of Satya Wacana.