

Tracing the Attributes of Sasak in the English of Peddlers

Lalu Ari Irawan

Insitutit Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan (IKIP) Mataram,

Email: laluarirawan@ikipmataram.ac.id / ariirawanlalu@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper is aimed at depicting how attributes of Sasak was transmitted in the English of local peddlers within the Sasak-speaking community. This study adapted attribute as a suggested term by Irawan (2017) to mention features and characteristic representing Sasak, which covered linguistic and cultural representations conveying fourteen items in each representation – considered essential for people who attempt to acquire a foreign language. Thus, the appearances of the Sasak language (SL) attributes were discussed based on two fundamental assumptions, i.e. interference (Ellis, 2008) and conceptualization (Sharifian, 2007). Hence, based on the framework, this study investigated chunks (secondary data) taken from two studies by Suadiyatno (2011; 2014) observing the English of peddlers in two tourism sites in Lombok, i.e. Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island. Results show that in terms of linguistic representation peddlers demonstrate overt and covert use of SL attributes. There were seven chunks indicated the overt use of SL attribute and seven were classified as covert, in which both categories were identified to fit ten items in linguistic representation, including independently meaningful units, preposition, pronouns, qualifiers, noun, adjective, verb, adverb, article, and tenses. Furthermore, in terms of cultural representation, this study found only belief as the only item to be transmitted into English, in which other items could not be identified due to that fact that data provided by Suadiyatno was not prepared for similar purpose as Irawan's. Based on findings, this study concludes that the English of peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air make use SL attributes (linguistic and cultural representations). Therefore, it can be stated that the English of the peddlers to some extent have demonstrated assumptions of English as an international language (EIL), in which local linguistic and culture (of Sasak) are communicated in English.

Key terms: *indigenous, spoken English, English as an international language, Sasak-speaking community, linguistic representation, cultural representation*

A. Background

Suadiyatno (2011) reports various English expressions used by the local peddlers in Kuta Beach Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara Province, Indonesia. He identifies some unique phrases attributed to Sasak language (hence: SL), or what Sharifian (2007) earlier mentions as conceptualization, spoken by the peddlers in communication with foreigners. Suadiyatno (2011) describes the state of uniqueness for its uncommonness and potentially triggering ambiguousness for the foreigners. He furthermore states that the uniqueness was also indicated by the peddlers' pronunciation, in which they exhibit difficulties in pronouncing some consonant sounds. He also notes that despite its uniqueness and ambiguousness, those expressions function in communication event with some assistance of nonverbal features, including gestures, manners, and personal behaviors. Another study

by Suadiyatno (2014), conducted in southern coast of Lombok Island, reports similar phenomenon happened, in which he extends his earlier research objective by seeking the reception of the foreigners who communicate with the peddlers. He approves that the English unique expressions function in communication after some responses he collected from foreigners who have just in contact with the peddlers. In fact, both communities observed by Suadiyatno belong to one linguistic and cultural background.

Those peddlers are Sasak, the native people (also refers to native language) of Lombok Island, who speak SL as their mother tongue (L1), while it should be understood that most of Sasak people are fluently and actively using Indonesian language (hence: IL) in daily communication as their second language (L2). Viewing bilingual as the nature of Sasak-speaking community, it is therefore reasonable to assume that some communication features may be addressed to both languages, in which Irawan (2017) states that IL serves a more complex function than SL in some ways, including grammatical and orthography.

Thus, by

employing the two measures proposed by Irawan (2017), i.e. linguistic and cultural representations, this current study tries to investigate Suadiyatno's findings by using twenty-eight items of two-dimensional parameters regarding the use of SL and/or IL. Moreover, Irawan (2017) also asserts that Sasak is the only source of cultural representation affecting Sasak people in communication, in which he mentions Sasak-speaking community as bilingual-monoculture society.

Moreover, it is important to highlight the socio-cultural context of the observed sites by Suadiyatno. Both sites are located in or considered as part of Lombok Island, which is known recently as one of the most developing tourist destinations in Indonesia. Regarding the spread of English throughout Sasak-speaking communities, Irawan (2017) states that English has been viewed as very important to support local tourism industry. Meanwhile, it is also important to consider the facts that the local people are bilingual-monocultural society (Irawan, 2017). This linguistic-cultural background eventually has significant impact towards the variety of English used by the local people, including the peddlers.

English communication skill became essential qualification for them to do their businesses.

For this inquiry, this study comes with two research questions to be further investigated, as follows.

1. What items of linguistic representations of Sasak language are transmitted in the English of peddlers in Gili Air Island and Kuta Beach?
2. What items of cultural representations of Sasak-speaking community are transmitted in the English of peddlers in Gili Air Island and Kuta Beach?

According to Irawan (2017), the linguistic representation of SL and IL includes fourteen items, i.e. independently meaningful units, prepositions, pronouns, qualifiers, coordinators, conjunctions, articles, noun, adjective, verb, sentence (tense), phoneme, and pronunciation (phonetic contrast). In cultural representations, he mentions fourteen items, i.e. body language, gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, movement, body posture, vocal volume, personal space, perception about physical contact, talking (initiating topic) and

listening (attentiveness), acceptable and unacceptable behaviors, determination of status, religious values, and beliefs. He highlights that comprehension on those twenty-eight items may improve communicative competence of novice-adult EFL learners, which is in line with Shumin's (2002: pp. 206-208) suggestion regarding the essential aspect of speaking ability as a part of communicative competence for adult learners.

Study on the appearances of first language (L1) attributes in second and/or foreign language acquisition has been widely investigated, including study about its interferences towards target language in English language teaching. Ellis (2008) explains L1 transfer as notion of interference as the source of errors in using a foreign language. Hence, the fact that SL and English come from two different language groups may drive an assumption that the local people should suffer a great challenge to acquire the foreign language. In a study by VanPatten and Benati (2010: p. 135), the attribute of Spanish and Italian in terms of having null subject pronoun causes ambiguity in learning English, which has no such property. In the current study, this cross-linguistic reference is later viewed as covert use of linguistic representation. Yet, largely different to English, SL native speakers might find a greater challenge than learners in VanPatten and Benati's report. Besides suggesting a positive impact (i.e. facilitation), Ellis (2008) also notes three negative impact of L1 use, i.e. errors, over use, and avoidance.

This study is in attempt to apply Irawan's formulation to investigate the English of the peddlers in Gili Air Island and Kuta Beach who are members of Sasak-speaking community with restriction to see the attributes of SL in their English utterances, which are further viewed as interference (of linguistic representation) and influence of conceptualization (of cultural representation).

B. Objectives

By studying data from the two previous studies using Irawan's two-dimensional measures, this study is expected to achieve some objectives, as follows:

1. Identifying items of linguistic representation of Sasak language and Indonesian language transmitted in the English of the peddlers.
2. Identifying items of cultural representations of Sasak transmitted in the English of the peddlers.

This study may give a more comprehensive view of how EIL is growing naturally among Sasak-speaking community. By answering the questions, this study may supply insights of how the EIL assumption is demonstrated by the local peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island.

C. Method

This study is designed as qualitative descriptive employing documentary research towards transcriptions of speech events between peddlers and foreigners collected in studies by Suadiyatno (2011; 2014). In the next stage, data are processed by using checklists of linguistic and cultural representations as suggested by Irawan (2017). Hence, data is reduced, classified and displayed, and given reflexive comment as part of drawing

conclusion stage. Eighteen turn-takings between local peddlers and foreigners are taken as data in this study, which are further analyzed using two instruments as suggested by Irawan (linguistic and cultural representations).

D. Results and Discussion

By employing the two types of checklists proposed by Irawan, this study figures the appearances of linguistic and cultural items in the English of peddlers in Gili Air and Kuta Beach.

1. Linguistic representation

In the English of local peddlers observed by Suadiyatno, there are some evidence of the use of SL attributes in the English. Hence, the manners of using of items of linguistic representation of both languages are classified into two types, i.e. overt and covert.

a. Overt

Overt manner of using SL attributes refers to a state when peddlers use or apply linguistic representation of SL in their English explicitly. This manner is easily identified through linguistic features used in utterances, including the use present participle and gerund, declarative-question form, modal verb, countable and uncountable noun, preposition, and adverb of count.

1) Looking-looking

In an utterance (1.b), a peddler demonstrated the use of reduplication, as in “looking-looking” (have a look). This feature is found in SL (*begitaq-gitaq*). Reduplication is simply associated to SL attribute, which is not found in English. This feature often appears in communication using SL. Therefore, it can be understand why the local peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air used this attribute in his English, as in a conversation took place in front of a restaurant between a peddler and female foreigner. The peddler began with a greeting and end up with an offering to have a look on the goods he was selling by saying “looking-looking”. Repeating the word “looking” may be best understood as an activity of looking slightly with not too serious intention. It is common to see the peddlers in the beach invited any foreigners they met to have a look on their stuffs. In their utterance, the words “looking-looking” emerged. The word “looking” certainly belongs to English. But, repeating the same words (reduplication) in English subsequently would be meaningless or at least would have different implication. It was immediately influenced by In-SL attribute, i.e. reduplication of word. In this sense, “looking-looking” decodes the word “*ngengat-ngengat*” (to have a look) from SL repertory. The use of “looking-looking” indicates a phenomenon of transmitted linguistic representation caused a grammatical interference in the English of the local peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island. Using the expression in SL is highly acceptable, especially in dyadic conversation. In this sense, the peddler made use “reduplication” as

a feature of morphology as part of linguistic representation of SL and/or IL, in which word can be repeated to form a different word (with different meaning from its root), in this case a verb (with –ING). Thoir et al. (1986: pp. 278-292) identify three morphological processes of reduplication in SL, i.e. type of the root (lexicon, affixed-word, and affixed- compound word), word class (noun, pronoun, numeral, verb, adjective, adverb of manner, marker, adverb of time, and question words), and way of reduplicating root (complete and partial). Based on the given categories, peddler (1.b) applies verb with complete reduplication of SL into English.

In other occasion, a peddler uttered a sentence using modal (can) followed by a verb with –ING (bargaining) to attract a foreigner to buy his goods (2.a). The peddler created a grammatically incorrect English

sentence by placing an –ING verb after a modal. This error might be addressed to SL attributes; in which modal “can” is translated as “*bau*”

(SL). In SL, it is common to place a verb with affix (which may have parallel function with –ING), as in “*beregaq*”. In this sense, SL attributes

allow the use of present participle after a word that functions as modal in English, in which SL and IL do not have a modal feature in its structure. This is a negative interference towards the English of the peddler in terms of structure, which is stated as error in the process of acquisition (Ellis, 2008).

2) Declarative-question

It is common to have a declarative sentence used as a question in SL. It is common to hear a Sasak native speaker to indicate a question by the tone (phonology) of the sentence end, not always by its structure as commonly known in English (e.g. a sentence begins with W/H question words or auxiliary/modal/to be). This is also found in the English of peddler (1.b).

P: “...So, maybe looking-looking the sarong for lying on the beach, my friend?”

To offer his goods, the peddler prefers using a question than a persuasive statement. Yet, statement is also accepted in SL. This kind of utterance is addressed as colloquial. In this sense, the peddler adopted L1 attributes (sentence mode) into English. This phenomenon is marked as transfer in foreign language acquisition (Ellis, 2008).

3) Can bargaining

In one occasion, a peddler offered souvenirs by mentioning the price to a female foreigner he met near the beach. The lady refused to talk further since she was not interested to buy anything. After getting negative response, the peddler further pursued the lady by inviting the lady to bid

the price (3.c).

Peddler (3.c) produced a grammatically incorrect sentence “You can bargaining...” On the right column is displayed the possible intention

that might be inferred from the utterance, i.e. offering someone opportunity to bargain a price. The sentence is grammatically incorrect by the presence of a present participle (verb+ING) after a modal “can”, in

which a modal should precede an infinitive verb. Taking into account that no modality in SL, the native speaker of Sasak would perceive “can” simply as an adjective, which conveys the same literal meaning with the word “*bau*” (able to). After the word “*bau*”, it is acceptable to place a verb with affix, i.e. “*beregaq*” (bargaining). The word “*regaq*” is modified with prefix “*be-*” in order to compose a grammatical correct sentence in SL (gerund). Dismissing the prefix “*be-*” from the word “*beregaq*” may lead to different meaning in SL. The peddler apparently grabbed this attribute unconsciously from his linguistic repertory within the process of composing an English sentence. The peddler, therefore, is assumed to use the morphemic processing in SL (*be-regaq*) and meaning of modal “can” as his references in placing the word “bargaining” after the modal. Moreover, there was strong indication of SL attribute based on the use of present participle (viewed as gerund) in “bargaining”. Therefore, this can

be the source of error demonstrated by the peddler in his sentence (3.c).

Based on this fact, it can be assumed that the peddler’s English incorrect sentence was stimulated by his SL morpho-semantic patterns. Suadiyatno (2011) in his report marks this incorrectness merely as an error without suggesting the source of the problem.

4) Countable and uncountable

Misusing proper quantifier also something frequently emerges in the English of the local people. Instead of using much when mentioning money, the local peddler used many in his speech. This phenomenon was arisen when a peddler had made a deal price with a foreigner (4). The lady took two necklaces and took out an amount of money from her purse. The lady said that she had no exact amount of money in her purse.

Peddler did not use proper English quantifier for money, in which instead of using ‘much’ he used ‘many’ (4.b and 4.d).

In composing a sentence, local peddlers in Kuta often demonstrated indication of interference by SL sentence pattern. In both of his sentences above, the peddler did not use any auxiliary verb to complete his sentences. Lack of this feature in his SL seems becoming the source of this error. The earlier sentence (4.b), the peddler seemed to make a sentence influenced by SL composition, as in “*pirean kepeng’m*” (*pirean*: what nominal; *kepeng*: money; ‘*m*’: compound form of you in SL). Meanwhile, the next sentence (4.d) might imply two intentions rooted in SL concept, i.e. “*Pire ke ansul’m?*” (*pire*: how much; *ke*: pronoun I; *ansul*: change; ‘*m*’: compound form of you in SL); or, “*pire pengansul’m*” (*pire*: how much; *pengansul*: change; ‘*m*’: compound form of you in SL). The given notations above generate an assumption that the local people also use the attributes of SL in producing English sentences. It can be concluded that the absence of countable and uncountable in the grammatical concept of SL triggers the error in differentiating the use of “many” and “much” in the English of the local peddlers. The absence of this concept in SL attribute in the current study seems to be related to the case found by Van Patten and Benati (2010), in which the peddler is interfered by deficit of equivalent or parallel feature in SL, i.e. countable-uncountable noun.

5) In the swimming pool

English has many features of preposition to refer certain position of certain thing(s) to other(s). On other hand, SL has very limited features of preposition, i.e. *leq* or *kun*. These two words share the same meaning, but use by different dialect groups across Lombok. So, it is interesting to see how the local people use varied prepositions in English, as in a conversation between man who worked as a guard with a foreigner in a small home stay in Gili Air Island. The person used ‘in’ as a preposition instead of using preposition ‘round’ to mention a particular location nearby a swimming pool. His sentence (5.d) has caused confusion to the foreigner (5.e).

The foreigner was surprised when the hotel guard told him that his bike was in the swimming pool. He was wondering how his bike could be in a swimming pool. He finally realized that the guard man used incorrect preposition. He supposed to say “I saw your bike around the swimming pool”. By using “in” instead of “around” or “near”, the man had confuse the guest. As an SL native speaker, the guard man only used one preposition, i.e. *leq*. This feature is used to mention location (of place).

Meanwhile, to mention position of certain things, such as “on”, “in”, “beyond”, etc., the local people mention the position after the preposition, such as *leq atas* (up) to mention “on”, *leq bawaq* (down) to mention “under”, *leq dalem* (inside) to mention “in”, etc. Most of local people recognize “in” to serve the same function as *leq*. It is assumed that the ‘deficit’ of equivalent or parallel feature becomes the source of incorrect use of preposition in the English of the peddler.

6) Buy us one one

It can be assumed that most of the local peddlers in Kuta and Gili Air start their business only by knowing literal meanings of words. Many of their utterances indicate that what they perceive as communicating are word organizing with very limited effort to grammar. In some occasions, the peddlers around Kuta Beach and Gili Air demonstrated their attempt to merely put words in sequence based on their understanding of meaning conveyed by each word, as in “Buy us one one...”. This assumption was proven after analyzing English of a peddler in Kuta Beach. To say “one each”, one of the peddlers said “one one” when asking a foreigner to buy some more goods from his friends (6.a).

The peddler translated SL feature “*sekeq sekeq*” (one each) into English, i.e. “one one”. It is obvious that the peddler do not understand equivalent meaning of his intention which he commonly expresses in SL. In the last sentence, he further confirmed the assumption by explaining his intention using more sentences with same reference, when he said,

P: “...buy he, he, and he one one. Ok”.

The implied meaning from his SL repertory would be best translated as “Buy one from each of us” and “You buy one to each of us”. In this sense, SL attribute emerged as a reference for the peddler in composing a sentence in English. By the end, through a meaning negotiation, the foreigner may grasp the implied meaning. The use of “one one” to refer “one from each” shows how the peddler mixes the code by transmitting SL morphological process ‘reduplication’ into English, which is only viewed as error in Ellis (2008). In EIL perspective, this utterance has accommodated the local linguistic feature, which is acceptable (see McKay, 2012).

7) Pronunciation

Suadiyatno (2014: pp. 304-305) mentioned SL attributes that influenced peddlers in pronouncing words in English. He found that four consonant sounds were influenced by SL, i.e. [f], [v], [θ] and [ð]. He further explains that [f] and [v], which are classified as fricative labiodentals, are pronounced as [p], with an exception to some words (very, every, even) in which [v] is pronounced as [b]. Meanwhile, consonant sounds [θ] and [ð], which are classified as dental fricative, are pronounced as [t] and [d]. While ‘-th’ in a final syllable is pronounced as [t] and ‘-th-’ in the middle is pronounced as [d] (see in appendix part B).

Based on Suadiyatno’s finding above, it can be inferred that SL has much fewer consonant sounds compared to English, or at least do not share some of consonants with English. A study by Bappeda of Nusa Tenggara Barat (2005: p. 21) mentions that SL has only nineteen consonant voices. Meanwhile, besides having 17 consonants, English has diagraphs, including /zh/, /ch/, /sh/, /th/, and /th/ (Tadmor, 2007: p. 304), which has much alike realization with consonant voices.

b. Covert

By analyzing the English of the local peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island, this study found that the attributes of SL was not only explicitly used by the peddlers in their English expressions. To some extent, they also demonstrate the covert use of SL attributes.

1) Missing to be

Deficit is something unavoidable between SL to English. “To be” is one example of deficit of linguistic feature. Since no feature serves as “to be” in the SL and BI, many peddlers often omit this feature in their sentence in English. In a conversation (1.b), the peddler does not place a to-be “am” after a pronoun as in “I living here”. He just put words in a sequence in an attempt to express something in English. This case also emerged when a peddler asked his buyer about the nominal of money she would hand over, in order to make him sure the change he needed to prepare (see 4.b).

P : How many your money?

In his question, the peddler did not use any “be” to create correct sentence in English. Sentence in SL conveying the same message confirmed the influenced composition of English made by the peddler, as in “*pire kepeng’m?*” (*pire*: how much; *kepeng*: money; ‘*m*’: compound form of possessive your). By viewing the SL composition, the source of the error becomes obvious, i.e. the absence of “be” in SL. In this respect, placing the words in a sequence without to be (or modal and auxiliary verbs) demonstrated by the local peddler is something likely triggered by the deficit of those features in the SL linguistic system.

2) Missing modal

Similar case like the missing “to be” in previous section, missing “modal” verb emerges in the English of the local peddler. It happened when the peddler asked a question to a foreigner (who bought something to him) about the amount of money he should give back after receiving payment. In his sentence, the peddler

did not use any modal, in which he did not complete the sentence with an object for the transitive verb (see 4.d).

P : How many I change?

The sentence of the peddler above does not contain any modal verb necessarily used in creating a grammatical correct interrogative sentence. In SL, the expression would be sound like, “*pire ke ansul'm?*” (*pire*: how much; *ke*: I; *ansul*: change money; ‘*m*’: compound form of you ‘*kamu*’). In English, the sentence is better decoded as “How much should I give you the change?” The absence of modal verb in SL is assumed triggering the error in the sentence. In short, this attribute has influenced the construction of the peddler’s sentence.

3) Missing auxiliary verb

Not different with to be and modal, auxiliary verb also emerges as deficit in the existing linguistic repertory of the local people in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island, which makes them often to omit it in their English. The example of missing auxiliary verb can be seen in a conversation between a peddler who was selling young coconut at the beach and a foreigner. He invited the foreigner to choose which kind of coconut he wanted, green or yellow (7.a). The peddler composed a question without placing auxiliary “do” in the beginning of his interrogative sentence.

Therefore, the sentence was more like a statement, not a question. However, the foreigner understood the meaning implied based on context and, therefore, he could respond properly. It can be assumed that the English of the peddler is interfered by the deficit of equivalent feature in the SL.

The assumption about deficit of auxiliary verb in the form of question is also confirmed when we look at the negative sentence of peddler in other occasion. The peddler demonstrated his lack of understanding about the use of auxiliary “do” to form a negative sentence. He used “no” to indicate a negative answer instead of “do not” to proceed the verb (8.b). If we trace back to SL attributes, we will come to a certain meaning the peddler may want to deliver, i.e. “*ndeq'k bedoe sidut*” (I do not have spoon). Implied meaning of SL given above is constructed by some components, i.e. *ndeq* means no; ‘*k*’ is compound form of subject “I”; *bedoe*: have; and *sidut*: spoon. If we use this composition to view the sentence produced by the peddler, we may come to a conclusion that the sentence indicates the perfect lexical translation of implied meaning in SL. In this respect, again, the peddler demonstrates how he puts words in sequence without any notice of necessary grammatical features in English, which is not available in the SL attributes. From here, it is possible to explain that the deficit attribute has influenced the English of the peddler.

4) Word order

English of the local people in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island also indicate error in word organization to form a sentence. The use of SL attributes may be assumed as the source of various errors in word order, which can be traced by investigating utterances of the

peddlers. For example, a peddler composed a poorly organized sentence by placing an adverb in the beginning of a sentence (9).

In English, an adverb of manner should be placed in front of an object of a sentence or after a verb in an intransitive sentence (without an object).

Since the sentence is nominal case, the adverb should be placed after “are”, which is used to replace the verb in the sentence. In this case, to be becomes the predicate of the sentence. In the case of BI, which have no feature like to be, the adverb is placed after the subject. SL has different pattern compared to BI and English. If we have a look the sentence above,

the adverb was placed in the beginning of the sentence. Placing an adverb in the beginning of a sentence is acceptable in Sasak vernacular, i.e. “*sang kamu saq belanje pertame*” (maybe you who buy first). If we break down the SL sentence, we will find these components, i.e. *sang*: maybe; *kamu*: you; *saq*: one who; *belanje*: buy; *pertame*: for the first time. If we have a look at the notation in SL, we will find a resemblance composition to the utterance delivered by the peddler. It explains the source of the word order produced by the peddler. Another evidence of poor word order can also be seen in the upcoming section about verb changes, in which a peddler began his sentence by mentioning adverb of time. In this respect, SL attribute has become the source of poor word order in the English of the peddlers.

5) Verb change

Changing verb in English is also identified as the attribute of English not found in SL. Local people in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island often used the infinitive form to talk about event or action in the past. In one occasion, a peddler met a foreigner who has stayed for quite long in Kuta Beach. He began with a greeting and telling that he happened to see the lady riding a motorbike the day before. But, he mentioned about the event by composing a sentence in a simple present tense, while he used “yesterday” to indicate the past attribute of his sentence (10.c).

If we have a look at the peddler’s sentence talking about what he saw the previous day, he picked unsuitable verb considering time of due, i.e. “see” instead of “saw”. An assumption taken from the sentence is that the peddler has very limited comprehension on grammatical feature of English, especially in this case dealing with tenses for past event. He might have very limited English repertory (including the change of verb), which might be based on his understanding on SL. Most of the local people who acquire English from the beach do not realize the verb changes or tenses in this language, while SL has no such attribute. It seems that they begin to grab English in dictionary and/or memorizing words. Therefore, based on their knowledge of SL, they just put the words into a sentence without realizing that verb in English is necessarily accommodating the time of due, completeness (of an action), etc. For that reason, it is often to hear peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island who produce grammatically incorrect sentences. By seeing the English used by the local peddler, it is reasonable to acknowledge that the attributes of SL have given impact to the English of the peddlers. At the same time, the peddler also failed to place a proper ‘second’ verb, in which he placed “use” instead of a gerund word “using” in order to create a grammatically correct sentence.

However, the foreigner was able to understand the sentence by seeing the given feedback.

6) Subject-verb concord

Subject-verb concord deals with matching particular subject to particular finite verb. This feature is unfamiliar for the local people, since they do not have it in SL. An example of this violation emerged when a peddler mentioned about his younger brother's action to a foreigner, in which he did not attach “-s” to the infinitive verb in creating simple present tense using subject of third singular person (11.a). Explaining an action dealing with his brother (third singular person), the peddler used the verb “go” instead of “goes”. It is assumed that the absence of this feature in his language repertory rooted in SL causes the violation of subject-verb concord in his English. In this respect, the unavailable (deficit) attribute within the SL can influence the local people in communicating using English.

7) Noun-pronoun concord

The second type of concord is matching choices between particular noun and particular pronoun, in terms of number, person, and gender. In a conversation between a young peddler who sells fresh coconuts and a foreigner revealed the covert use of SL attribute, which can be viewed as a violation of noun-pronoun concord, in terms of number (12.a).

The word green in the sentence produced by the peddler should be derived into a noun phrase by placing article “the” before and one(s) after the word “green”. By adding the two features, it could be used as a pronoun in the given sentence. The word “one” or “ones” would also determine the following feature, which can be “is” or “are”. We could not use a single adjective “green” as a pronoun in the given context since the green refers to the color of coconut. Therefore, the two features added (‘the’ and ‘one’) would correct “green” in the sentence. The absence of “the”, one(s), and “is/are” in the sentence demonstrated violation of concord of English grammar. If we make a comparison to SL grammatical attribute, the only missing feature that is available in SL is “the”, which is an article used as a determiner for the following noun phrase (green one/ones). In SL, a feature serves a function like determiner “the” is “*saq*”, which can also be used to translate demonstrative determiners (that, this, these, those) and various forms of wh-determiners (which, whose, etc.).

2. Cultural representation: conceptualization as part of belief system

As mentioned earlier, Irawan (2017) suggests that Sasak-speaking community is viewed as bilingual-monoculture society. Therefore, only Sasak culture may determine the communication pattern of Sasak people. This study found some realizations of conceptualization of SL transmitted into English, which were identified as part of the belief system of Sasak-speaking community in both research sites being observed by Suadiyatno. The following sections are varieties of local concepts transmitted in the English of the local peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island.

a. Social deixis marker “my friend” and “my brother”

Some peddlers were chatting near a restaurant during breakfast hours. They were waiting prospect to sell something to foreigners walking out of the restaurant. Whenever a foreigner came out, every of them began to invite the foreigners to talk. After a while, talking about something regular, the peddler invited the foreigner to have a look on his

stuffs. He addressed the foreigner in a dyadic conversation by calling him as “my friend”, which is assumed to be influenced by SL attribute in the word “*batur*” (friend). Concept of “my friend” is often found in the English of the local peddlers around Kuta (1.b).

P : ...So, maybe looking-looking the sarong..., my friend?

The peddler tried to make a closer distance with his interlocutor using “my” (a possessive adjective marker) attached to “friend” (1.b). This kind expression was addressed to local feature of interaction, in which someone was accepted to use a more intimate marker to anyone (even foreigners) in order to make a good impression in the interlocutor’s mind.

In other occasion, a boy who was running a motorbike rental accosted a young foreigner walking into his business station. He addressed the foreigner by calling him as “my brother”. Similar with the use of “my friend” (1.b), the use of brother in “my brother” seems to be influenced by “*semeton*” (brother/sister) as a feature of communication in SL (13.a). Peddler used “my brother” (2.a) to open a conversation with a foreigner passing by. This can be seen as an attempt to shorten the distance between him and interlocutor. In this sense, the culture of peddlers (Sasak) had affected features being communicated by the peddlers (1.b and 13.a). According to Irawan (2017), these features are classified as part of belief system of Sasak community. A more loose intimacy is marked by “*dengan*” (people), which can be attached to particular ethnic, nationality, or other marker of identity, such as “*dengan Inggris*” (British). It is also best explained by the common idiom in Sasak community, i.e. “*ndeq’n dengan*” (*ndeq*: not; ‘*n*’: compound form of 3rd singular person *ne*; *dengan*: stranger).

b. Morning price

It is common to hear the local peddlers offering their goods by using certain unique expressions, such as morning price. This phrase is used to attract people they meet around the beach. In once occasion, a peddler insisted to make the foreigner to buy his goods. He pursued the foreigner by offering a special price as well as to indicate that the transaction would be the first one in the day (14.a). “Morning price” is related to concept of “*penggarus*” (first transaction of the day) in Sasak community. It is related with concept of fortune in business. Local peddlers in Kuta believe that they have to make a deal quickly in the morning, which later may influence their luck the rest of the day. This concept encourages them to lower the price in the morning so a transaction would occur. It is common to hear this attribute in local markets across Lombok. It is interesting how the local people convey the concept into English by integrating two words into a phrase. By considering that their business always open in the morning, it is reasonable for them saying this phrase to adduce the concept. In conclusion, a conceptual attribute of SL “*penggarus*” has been transferred in “morning price” by the local peddlers encouraged by their business motivation.

c. Friend price

Another example of a phrase emerged containing SL attribute was “friend price”. This unique expression is also implied speakers’ business intention in order to attract the foreigners. This phrase was used by a peddler offering handmade necklace and bracelet to a couple of man and woman in the beach. The peddler mentioned that he would give a special price for friends by using the phrase “friend price” in his utterance. Concept of

“friend” (SL: *batur*), as mentioned earlier, becomes the motivation of the cross-linguistic transfer of SL attribute (15.a). This phrase contains two noun words, i.e. friend and price. The word friend in English is identified as a noun, but in this phrase this word fills position of an adjective. In this sense, this phrase was constructed by ignoring the word class. Hence, in order to be able to see the cause of this phenomenon, it is necessary to look after the attribute of SL. The word friend in SL may refer to a noun and an adjective, in which both convey the same meaning (*batur*: friend). Placing this word before a noun may create idiomatic meaning, as in friend price. For Sasak people, a friend is not a stranger. Once a person is recognized as a friend, he may get special attention or treatment, including in business. As a friend, the peddler would give the best deal the buyer could get. In this sense, “friend price” can also imply the best deal a person can get because any friend will never cheat his friend, including in business. In SL, it is common to hear “*aji'n batur*”, in which *aji* refers to price; '*n*' is a possessive marker for her/his; and *batur* means friend. So, the peddler composed the phrase “friend price” by referring to the attribute conveyed in SL. In this sense, the conceptual attribute of SL has been transferred by the local peddlers in their English.

d. Go up and go down

In one occasion, a peddler pursued a foreigner to bid a price for a necklace he was selling. The lady had mentioned her price, but the peddler asked the lady to raise her bid while convincing her that he was willing to lower his price until they came with an agreed price for both sides (16.f). The complex sentence demonstrated by the peddler is another example of how a sentence in English was influenced by the attribute of SL. Concept of price negotiation belongs to Sasak community. Yet, the sentence the peddler produced to call for a higher bid from the foreigner was not properly constructed. In this sense, his sentence was generated by SL attribute. He decoded two concepts in SL, i.e. “*taekan sekediq*” (*taekan*: instruction to raise; *sekediq*: some) into “little go up”, and “*aku nurunan*” (*aku*: I; *nurunan*: lowering) into “I go down”. It is obvious that the peddler simply perceived that “go up” could be used to imply the concept of “*taekan*” (raise) a price in English. At the same time, he also perceived that “go down” could be used to imply the concept “*nurunan*” (lowering) a price in English. It explains the source of poor constructed sentences he made in the conversation. In conclusion, the English of the local people in Kuta are still influenced by the conceptualization attributed in SL.

e. Very-very

This also proves that reduplication can also be used in any word class, including adverb. The example of demonstrating the use of reduplication to adverb also emerged in the English of the local peddler. For instance, it is often to hear common expression “very- very” used in the English of the local peddler (17.b). Not only linguistically explainable, the use of expression “very-very” implies a local conceptualization in Sasak-speaking community, i.e. “*kenyanteran*” (come out terribly). This expression is often used to indicate mood of objection towards someone else’s statement or attitude. In the given context, the peddler demonstrated his objection after too low bid offered by the foreigner. Although English put this word as an adverb of manner, SL identifies the use of “very-

very” as an adjective. In this respect, it is obvious to conclude that SL attribute has influenced the English of the local people.

f. For open my business

Cross-linguistic influence in composing a complement in sentence also emerged in the English of the local people in Kuta. It seems that the local people rely on literal translation of expression in SL/In-SL and BI into their English. An example was found in a conversation between a peddler and a foreigner took place in Gili T – a small island chained to Lombok. The local people there are also Sasak. After success to attract the foreigner to have a look on stuffs he was selling, the peddler passed on a price. He further argued that the price was a best price the foreigner could get. He tried to convince the foreigner by telling this would be the first transaction he would make today by saying “for open my business” (18.a). In the conversation, the peddler closed his sentence with a complement about first transaction of the day, i.e. “for open my business.” In terms of structure, the complement was poorly constructed, since the speaker put an infinitive “open” instead of a gerund after the preposition. This complement is obviously derived from a local concept in SL “*penggarus*” (first transaction of the day). Some peddlers in Lombok celebrate every first transaction of the day with a ritual, i.e. swaying the first money they receive all over the goods. This local customs is also used as a strategy to attract a buyer (18). To find the source of error, it is better to analyze the common expression in SL, “*jari penggarus*” (*jari*: become; *penggarus*: first transaction to bring luck). In SL, the word “*penggarus*” is classified as a noun. In his utterance, the peddler seems to define this local term as “for open my business”, which is not equivalent with his real intention. Therefore, the most suitable expression in English would be “for luck”.

By referring the change of orientation towards English in Sasak-speaking community, which is encouraged by the growing tourism industry, it can also affect the orientation of English language teaching and learning within the community. Traditionally, the learning outcome aims at producing learners with resemble language skills to qualification performed by natives. The evidence of how SL attribute is used by peddlers provokes to view local representations into essential consideration. This supports McKay’s (2012: p.

29) notion on the shifting of direction within foreign language acquisition into a newer paradigm, i.e. English as an international language. Yet, the context (of tourism) has given impact towards this change.

E. Conclusion

Evidence of the use of SL attributes in the English of peddlers in Kuta Beach and Gili Air Island proof support some notions in regards to foreign language acquisition and English as international language. To some extent, the sources of error in the English of the local peddlers of Sasak-speaking community are addressed to the attributes of SL, both linguistic and cultural representations. Meanwhile, the view of EIL legitimates transmitted conceptualizations of Sasak community into English, which seems successful to accommodate the local concepts that have no equivalent or parallel features in English.

F. References

- BAPPEDA NTB & Yayasan Abdi Insani. (2005). *Standardisasi ejaan dan tata bahasa Sasak*. Mataram: authors.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irawan, Lalu Ari. (2017). *The attributes of Indigenous language and Indonesian language affecting EFL speaking course of Sasak-speaking community* (unpublished dissertation). Surabaya: Universitas Negeri Surabaya.
- Matsuda, Aya. & Patricia Firedrich. (2011). English as an International Language: A Curriculum Blueprint. *World Englishes*, 30(3), 332–344.
- McKay, Sandra L. (2012). Principles of teaching English as an international language. In Lubna Alsagoff, Sandra Lee McKay, Guangwei Hu & Willy A. Renandya (Eds.), *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Sharifian, Farzad. (2007). L1 cultural conceptualizations in L2 learning. In Farzad Sharifian & Gary B. Palmer (Eds.), *Applied cultural linguistics, implications for second language learning and intercultural communication*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Shumin Kang. (2002). Factors to considers: developing adult EFL students speaking abilities. In Richards, Jack. C. & Willy A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suadiyatno. T. (2011). *English of souvenir seller* (Unpublished master thesis). Surabaya: Postgraduate Program of the State University of Surabaya.
- Suadiyatno. T. (2014). Interferensi fonologis bahasa Sasak ke dalam bahasa Inggris. *Proceedings of Kongres Bahasa Daerah Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Barat* (pp. 301-315). Mataram: Kantor Bahasa Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Barat.
- Tadmor, Uri. (2007). Grammatical borrowing in Indonesian. In Yaron Matras and Jeanette Sakel (Eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspectives*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thoir, Nazir, Ketut Reoni, I Ketut Karyawan. (1986). *Tata bahasa Sasak*. Jakarta: Pusat Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa.
- VanPatten, Bill & Alessandro G. Benati. (2010). *Key terms in second language acquisition*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Appendix: data of the current study

A. Source: Suadivatno (2011)

- (1)ⁱ F : ...
 b P : Yes, I living here. So, maybe looking-looking the sarong for laying on the beach, my friend?
 c F : We already have one. | My friend: batur
- (2)ⁱ P So, how much you want, mama? So, you always say, "no...no..." Even bargaining. You can bargaining how much you want. No worry.
 b F :No. | You may bargain
- (3)ⁱ P :...
 b F :No.
 c P So, how much you want, mama? So, you always say, "no...no..." Even bargaining. You can bargaining how much you want. No worry.
 d F :No. | You may bargain
 e P :Okav. so eniov vour time.
- (4)^a F : Ok. Seventeen thousand five hundred rupiahs. I take two. But I don't have the exact amount.
 b c d P : How many your money? F : I have fifty thousand here. P : How many I change? | What is the nominal of your money?
 How much is your change?
- (5)^a F : "Hey. Do you see my bike"
 b P : "Blue bike Sir?"
 c F : "Yes. I parked here this morning."
 d P : "I see your bike in swimming pool."
 e F : "What. Are you sure?" | around the swimming pool
- (6)ⁱ P : Buy us one one ya!
 b F : I'm sorry. What do you mean?
 c P : You buy me one, buy he, he, and he one one. Ok. | Buy one from each of us!
 You buy one to each of us.
- (7)^a P : You like green or yellow Sir? F
 b : You choose for me. | Do you like green or yellow Sir?
- (8)^a F : Do you have a spoon?
 b P : Sorry Madam, I no have spoon. | I don't have a spoon.
- (9) P: ...Maybe you are my first customer for open my business. | You are maybe my first customer
- (10)ⁱ P : Hello Mom. How are you? F
 b : Good. How about you?
 c P : Good. Yesterday, I see you use motorbike. | I saw you riding a motorbike
 d yesterday.
 F : Yes. I went to Selong Belanak.
- (11)^a P : Yes, wait. My brother still go to shop for change. | ...My brother still goes to the shop...
 b F : Ok.

- (12)
- (13)
- (14) ¹ P : Hello my brother, you want borrow motorbike? | My brother: *semeton*
Do you want to borrow a motorbike?
- ² F : Yes. How much is it?
- ^a P : I give you **morning price**. | Morning price: *special price for the*
^b F : No, thank you. | *first transaction of the day*
- (15) P: Just choose. I give you **friend price**. | Friend price: *special price*
Don't worry. | *for a friend*
F : How much is the blue one?
- (16) ^a F : Okay, I pay eighty thousands. |
^b P : Too lower, my friend. Can you little bit up? | *Too cheap*
^c F No, eighty is good price.
^d P : Okay, my friend, I give you one hundred twenty five for one.
^e F : Eighty five. |
^f P : Come on my friend, little bit up. Okay, I do like this, you little go up and I go down. | *Raise your price more and I will lower mine.*
- (17) ¹ F : What about ten thousand for each? |
² P : Ahh, you are very-very Madam. | *terrible*
- (18) ^a P : Okay my friend, I give you two hundred fifty, really, really because I just arrived from Lombok."... "Maybe you are my first customer for open my business. | *for luck*
^b F : You know? Everyone says so.
^c P : No, really.
^d F : Everyone says, Because you are my first customer.
^e P : No, really, I swear because I just come from Lombok.

B. Source: Irawan (2017) modified from Suadivatno (2014)

(19) Contrasting Consonant Sounds in English (British) and SL

Symbol of Sound		Realization in Pronunciation	
RP (British)	SL Interfered	Words / British	SL Interfered
(a) /F/		Finish [fɪn.ɪʃ]	pi.nis
(b) /V/	/P/	View [vju:]	pju:
(c) /B/		Brother [brʌðə]	broðə
(d) /V/	/B/	Even [i:vən]	e:ben
(e) /T/		Ten [ten]	ten
(f) /θ/	/T/	Thank [θæŋk]	teng
(g) /D/		Day [deɪ]	deɪ
(h) /ð/	/D/	That [ðæt]	det
(i) /tʃ/	/C/	Church [tʃɜ:tʃ]	cec
(j) /ʃ/	/S/	Ship [ʃɪp] Measure	sɪp
(k) /ʒ/		[meʒə(r)]	me.sɜr

Source: modified from Suadivatno (2014: pp. 301-315) **RP**: Received Pronunciation (British)