The Study Of "Do" Auxiliary Produced by Indonesian Students Non-English Department

Soflies Marry Bingku
Universitas Negeri Manado
Jl. Raya Tondano, Koya, Tondano Sel., Kabupaten Minahasa, Sulawesi Utara 95618
Correspondence Email: Marrybingku64@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

"Do" is one of the very important elements in English sentence. The Students learning English often make mistakes regarding the usage of this element, although English has been learnt for more than 6 years. This research intends to study about the inter language variations produced by English learners, who are learning English as one of the required subjects. Besides the researcher has tried to describe about factors, which give both negative and positive contributions to the participants in acquiring "do" auxiliary. After analyzing and discussing all of the collected data, the conclusions are written as follows: First, the inter language variations are Missing "do" auxiliary, which is appeared only in spontaneous data and missing "did" found in Recognition test. There are problems with subject-verb-agreement, "do" is replaced by "does" or vice versa. Another tendency is also the interchangeably use between "do" and "be", and "do" and "did". Second, it appears that L1 and L2 gives negative influences to the participants in their progress acquiring English. The complexity of English rules makes them unable to apply the correct rules for example by applying a trend to over-generalize the English rule. Third, the input from their informal environment including social media, movies, E-book, online games and English songs gives positive contribution to the participants in acquiring "do" auxiliary. Besides memorization and imitation play good role for this case.

Keywords: Do Auxiliary, Inter language Variations, Negative and Positive contributions

INTRODUCTION

English is one of the required subjects, that students must take during their study in a university. In order to acquire English well, they have to be able to master a certain amount of grammar and vocabulary. To master means be able to use English Grammar well. To achieve this is not an easy way, because they encounter difficulties although English has been learnt for more than 6 years. Recently there are many studies being conducted concerning the problem of how someone acquires a certain language as the second language. One of the problems related to this, is acquiring *do* as an auxiliary verb, which mainly used to help the main verb form the question and the negative sentence. Some of the sentences produced by the students are: (1) I not play guitar, (2) He not practice singing, (3) Why you not come yesterday? (4) Are you have your lunch?

Actually, these types of sentences can be understood and it does not matter, if the grammar is not suitable. However, it would be better to acquire the form, the meaning, and the standard use of English. Bygate (1987) states that: "…, it is obvious that in order to be able to speak a foreign language, it is necessary to know a certain amount

of grammar and vocabulary". In what situation is an utterance suitable or not suitable? We have to think about it. In this study, I attempt to know how Indonesian students acquire the *do* auxiliary in English. This type of auxiliary has been learnt by Indonesian learners since secondary school. It is assumed that the time is enough for them to be able to use this pattern well. But the sentences they produced are still like the examples above. Their sentences use English words, but the patterns are Indonesians (I not play guitar/*saya tidak bermain gitar*, He not practice singing/*dia tidak berlatih menyanyi*, why you not come yesterday? /*mengapa engkau tidak datang kemarin?*). It can be shown that L1 transfer plays an important role. In other words, it can be seen that students tend to apply their L1 knowledge in their L2 performance.

The objective of the Study
The objectives to be achieved are as follows:
(1) To have a description of inter language variations being produced by the students.
(2) To have a description about the factors, which give negative influences to the participant in acquiring *do* auxiliary.
(3) To analyze the factors, which give positive contribution to the participant in acquiring *I do* auxiliary.

Significance of the Study
The study contributes information which is considered useful for a number of parties, at least for the following groups of people:
(1) Teachers and students studying English, or majoring in the field of study in this case, English and other foreign language. For them, the information in this study can be used as the basis and reference dealing with their study and job. This may help them to get solution for their problems both in studying and teaching.
(2) Second language acquisition researchers. For them, the information provided in the study can be used to develop their insights and reference on conducting another related research dealing with similar topic.

Talking about second language acquisition always attracts many attentions from any language teachers and researchers. It is because as foreign language teachers we do much with this term. Second language is generally used to refer to any language other than first language. This is to respect to some countries (in African and Asian) which have more than two languages and called Multilingual Communities), (Ellis, 1994).

The term second language is sometimes used interchangeable with the term foreign language. Ellis gives distinction for these two terms. Second language refers to the language which plays an institutional and social role in the community. This language functions as a recognized means of communication among members who speak some other languages as their mother tongue (English as a second language is learnt in the United States, United Kingdom and countries in Africa such as Nigeria and Zambia).

It can be concluded that second language is used to explain a language which is used dominantly in the community where there appear some languages. On the other hand, the term foreign language takes place in settings where the language plays no major role in the community and is primarily learnt only in the classroom (for example, English learnt in France and Japan, (Ellis, 1994). It means that English is learnt only for the need of economic and social status so not for the communication.

There appear some questions about how learners learn a second language. The first question is what learners actually acquired when they try to learn L2. This question was based on the recognition that learners often fail to produce correct sentences and performed language that was deviant from target language rules, (Ellis,1994). According to Ellis, the language produced by the learners was inspected for errors and specific grammatical features.

He explains further that learner errors were the result of L1 transfer or creative construction. The presence of errors that mirrored L1 structures was taken as evidence of transfer, while the presence of errors similar to those observed in L1 acquisition was indicative of creative construction (i.e intra lingual) (1994).

Gas and Selinker noted differently: According to them, transfer is not just from the native language, but also from other language knowledge. There are some factors which are included in transfer such as misuse of target language rule and overgeneralization which reflect in avoidance strategies, over production of elements, additional attention paid to the target language resulting in more rapid learning (1992).

I agree with the mentioned ideas that is why I am interested in studying more about the acquisition of "do" auxiliary by Indonesian students learning English. It is assumed that in their process of acquiring "do" auxiliary is not just the transfer of L1 influencing him but also there are variations of factors including negative and positive influences.

As Dulay and Burt found in their research that L2 learning took place in the same way as any other kind of learning involved procedures such as imitation, repetition, and reinforcement, which enabled learners to develop "habits" of the L2, (1994). They claimed that although many errors were caused by transferring L1 habits, many more were not because learner often contributed creatively to the process of learning. They also show developmental stages in their process of L2 learning

This research attempts to look into the acquisition of "do" auxiliary by Indonesian students, who learn English as one of their subjects in the university. This study will discuss more about learner language which may be as the result of L1 transfer or may show the developmental stages or as indicative of creative construction.

It is assumed that there is actually a developmental stage in acquiring do auxiliary in English Syntax. In addition, this study will look into the features used in spontaneous situations in order to get natural data. It is good for gathering data in relation to the language use in spontaneous conversation. From the data both features and the developmental process can be indicated. Gas and Selinker (1994) stated: "The data taken by the case study is highly useful in determining developmental trends and also in interpreting various social constraints and input influencing on the learner's speech. Beside gathering data through spontaneous situations, the data were also obtained from the written grammatical test consisting of recognition and a judgment test. According to Gass and Selinker (1994) the data being taken from a judgment test belongs to intuitional data.

Perhaps, … intuitional data refer to a type of performance which one is asked about the language rather than being asked to use the language. This is often referred to as metalinguistic performance. Learners are asked about their intuition (or judgement) as to whether or not a given sentences acceptable linguistically or in particular context.

This type of test is used because it is assumed that in acquiring a language, someone has to acquire both the language itself and its usage as a communicative medium. Knowledge about language can help someone to make up his language while using it for communication. Furthermore, knowledge about language can help someone to understand and to be understood better not only in spoken but also in written language.

As example, I started to learn English grammar formally when I was at the Senior High School and I continued learning deeply at the High School. At the time I only learned the grammar but it helped me when talking to someone using English. Even in Australia, I realized that my knowledge about English grammar helped me very much to use it both in spoken and in written language. Cazden (1976) as quoted by Gass and Selinker claimed:

It is now commonplace for scholars to think about language not Only in terms of language use in everyday communicative situations, but also to examine language as an object of analysis and observation in its own right. Grammaticality judgment is one (but certainly not the only) form of metalinguistic performance, or language objectification.

RESEARCH METHOD

This section consists of explanation of research design, data collection, data analysis and interpretation. These are essential parts in this paper and they are presented below.

Research Design
This study was conducted by using qualitative methodology meaning that no data was in numbers. The data collected are in words, phrases or sentences. The data are based on the real facts that existed in or used by the participants. They were analyzed descriptively and qualitatively. Furthermore, because the researcher followed a particular setting, she was concerned with particular contexts in which English was used by the participants, so the researcher can be considered to use participant observation as one of the additional methods of collecting data.

Data collection
In order to gather data which can give information about the mentioned problems, the participants were observed informally during free conversations in week 1 and storytelling in week 2. Beside that they were asked to do grammatical test including multiple choice in week 3 and a judgement test in week 5. In this case, a case study with different tasks in short time is used.

Data Analysis
To analyze the data, the inter language analysis by Selinker (1994) was used. The techniques used in analyzing data are as follows: The spontaneous data were analyzed by checking the field notes and by transcribing the data recorded. All the mistakes were analyzed and written in the tables and compared them with the right English. The data obtained from the recognition test and the judgment test were studied and compared with the right English. After that all the data obtained were described and discussed in relation to the three research questions above.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data from the free conversation show that the Inter language (IL) features are missing "*do*". In this case "*do*" is omitted not only in the *Yes/No* questions, but also in *WH* questions and in the negative sentences. Some of the data are English like, means correct English. Maybe this is because of informal input which the participants have taken from their English class or their online activities. These sentences sound very formal. It is possible that these sentences are imitated from the sentences being spoken or practiced regularly in their English class or informal environment. Some sentences look like direct translation from nonstandard Indonesian structure:

1. *They   have feeling   happy now?*
   Mereka punya perasaan bahagia sekarang?
2. *You   not   go   there?*

Engkau   tidak   pergi kesana?

Maybe the transfer of other language can be seen clearly in the sentences above. Nonstandard Indonesian is regularly used by the participants as the medium of communication in their circumstances and it may be reflected in their utterances above. Unlike the sentences below, if they are translated into the standard Indonesian, they look very similar:

3. *You   singa song?*
   Engkau menyanyikan sebuah lagu?
4. *You   writea letter?*
   Engkau menulis sebuah surat?
5. *What   yousay?*
   Apa   yang engkau   katakan?
6. *Why   You   ask?*

   Mengapa engkau bertanya?
7. *Why you   just   want to   know?*
   Mengapa engkau masih ingin   tahu?
8. *Why you   put   it   in here?*
   Mengapa engkau letakkan itu   disini?
9. *You   not   listen to me*
   Engkau tidak mendengarkan ku
10. *I   not   go   there*
    Saya tidak   pergi   ke sana

Even though the sentences mentioned above appear very similar to the Indonesian in both the form and the meaning, we cannot claim directly that there is First Language (LI) transfer in there. It can be noted that another reason is found in relation to this issue. These Inter Language (IL) features are like the sentence types acquired by children in the age of 20-36 months as claimed by Goodluck (1991). She states that for children in this age group, Yes/No questions are signalled by intonation only. Furthermore, she states that WH questions appears with the form: WH – word- NP or

WH – word- NP- V. So, it can be seen that The IL features from Indonesian adults tend to be similar to those children in acquiring English as their first language. These patterns reflect the process of Developmental Stages, which someone tends to experience during his/her process of Language Acquisition. This idea is supported by Richard (1974):

Rather than reflecting the learner's inability to separate two languages, intra lingual and developmental errors reflect the learner's competence at a particular stage, and illustrate some of the general characteristics of language acquisition. What is implied here is that the cause of difficulty with "*do*" auxiliary might be both the LI transfer and the L2 itself. Or it can be because of the general phenomena of developmental process in acquiring "*do*" auxiliary. Richard argues that such features tend not to reflect the learner's inability to acquire an English feature, but it may reflect his ability at a particular level. It can be seen that the learners reflect his developmental stages for this feature. The developmental stages are started from "Signalling by intonation only" (Yes/No questions) and the form "WH- word- NP or WH- word- NP-V" (WH questions). It is also possible that these features are produced by other English learners who are not Indonesian. For those whose language is different from Indonesian the LI transfer towards the features above tends to be not the case. This supports the ideas from Gas and Selinker (1992), Dulay and Burt (1994) and Richard (1974).

After discussing the spontaneous data taken from free conversation, let us see the spontaneous data taken from storytelling. The participants were asked to tell a story that they have read or heard. Their sentences are (11) *He do not a poor man.* It can be seen that the participant used *"do not"* instead of *"is not"*. May be the student still remembers one of the "*do*" functions "to form negative sentence". So, he created his own rule based on his previous knowledge. It can be claimed that he hypothesized false rule concepts. The example belongs to Intra lingual errors. Richards (1974) points out: "In addition to the wide range of intra lingual errors which have to do with faulty rule learning at a various level, there is a class of developmental errors which derive from faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language. The next sentence is as clear as the English sentence (12) *"I didn't touch the jar"*. This sentence is actually directly quoted by the participant from the original story. It appears that he imitated it. Imitated is a good way but it does not seem to give much help towards this "*do*" acquisition. It can be thought that he just memorized that sentence.

Sentence (13) *He don't find oil* and (14) *He don't know that 7 years passed* are not English- like. Instead of "*doesn't*", "*don't*" is used. The participants used to use "*don't*" because this pattern tends to appear regularly in every day conversation. The learners forget the target rule which requires that the form of "*do*" for the third person singular is really different from others. In this matter, the participant has problems with the *"Subject- Verb Agreement"*. It can be concluded that the problem is due to the complexity of English itself. This shows another kind of developmental errors as Richard pointed out. It may also be that the LI knowledge influenced him too because in Indonesian language we just simply put the word "tidak" before the main verb in order to form negative sentence. We do not need to think about the appropriate auxiliary as well as its form in relation to the subject. In English we have to think not only the subject-verb agreement but also the tense of the verb. Let us see the next data. In these features the participants tried to apply their L2 knowledge:

(15)I   don't   find   oil.
Saya tidak mendapatkan minyak.
(16)He doesn't find   oil.
Dia tidak mendapatkan minyak.

Those sentences explained something happening in the past so they must use *didn't* not *don't* or *doesn't*. They reflected the over generalization feature. Sentence (17) *There are don't oil* is a bit different from other because "*don't*" is placed after" are". It is not an English sentence. There were 4 participants produced this sentence. They might think that "*don't*" means "not" that is why they simply put "*don't*" after "are". They over-generalized the English rules. Richards (1974) gives another example "he can sing", "we are hope"," it is occurring", etc. Richards points out: "Over-generalization generally involves the creation of one deviant structure in place of two regular structures". The learners have not yet applied well the appropriate rule which they have learnt. This is as the result of the distinction between the two languages they have learnt. According to him, it is also a kind of developmental error. The learners in this matter, still need time to be able to use this pattern well because in Indonesian language we simply put the words "tidak" and "bukan" to form negative sentence. Unlike English where there are more than one words or phrases to form negative sentence.

In sentence (18) *What* **O** *Ali Kogia find in there?* "*did*" is omitted. This case is like the problem in regard with sentences 5-9 above. I think to come to English-like feature, most learners might formulate such IL structure in relation to "WH question". In addition, in spoken language there is possibly a tendency to omit auxiliary verb while producing Yes/No question, WH question, or negative sentences even by a native speaker. It can be seen that it is not just experienced by Indonesian learners who are in process of learning English.

Sentences (19) *I don't believe it* and (20) *He cannot decide it* are clear. They are English sentences. These might be as the input from their informal environment which makes the learners common with these patterns. Especially the phrase "cannot" be very common for them because it always appears during the time with friends or by playing online game. It can be concluded that this pattern is easy to acquire. In relation to this issue, Long in "Handbook of Second Language Acquisition" edited by Ritchie and Bhatia (1996) states: "In addition, conversational partners may be important as facilitator and shapers of learner output and as participants in a process whereby nonnative speakers (NNSs) learn at least part of a new grammar by doing conversation".

After analyzing the spontaneous data, now the first data taken from the written grammatical test will be presented. For this need two kinds of test namely the Recognition test (multiple choice) and the Judgement test were used. The later was conducted two weeks after the former. The data derived from the multiple-choice test are presented both incorrect and correct choices.

Non-English- like	*English- like*
21. I am not go to the faculty	*34. I am not a teacher.*
22. My wife do not come from Bali.	*35. Last night he did not visit me.*

23. I am not want to go to Jakarta.	36. Where do you come from?
24.My son do not like to eat vegetabel.	37. Where does she come from?.
25. My daughter do not want to eat fish.	38. What are you doing?
26. My sister is not cook rice.	39. How do you come here?
27. Why he don't come?	40. Is he from Indonesia?
28. What are they buy last night?	41. Are you a teacher?
29. Why do you sad?	42. Did you go to the city last night?
30. Is your mother cook rice?	
31. Is she want a cup of tea?	
32. Does you know her?	
33. Are they study English?	

In the Sentences 21, 23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33 the variations of "be" appear to replace "*do, does*, and *did*". We can see that "*am, is, are* "are more common for the students. In other words, "*am, is, are*" appear to be acquired earlier than "*do, does, did*". It seems that the participants are still confused about how to use either "*be*" or "*do*". This is also a kind of developmental error. They need more time to be able to use them correctly. From these patterns we cannot find the LI transfer. The problems they faced tend to be due to the complexity of English. It means that the errors they made belong to the Intra lingual errors (Richard, 1974).

The Sentences 34, 38, 40, 41 reflect that "*be*" is really acquired earlier than "*do*". These sentences are English- like. The participants do not have problems with these patterns, because they mostly used in every day conversation.

After discussing the spontaneous data and the data taken from the recognition test, now let us see further the data taken from the judgement test. The participants were asked to tick the sentence which consists of the correct auxiliary and also, they were asked to tick the sentence with wrong auxiliary and in addition, they had to give the correct auxiliary for that.

Non- English like	English- like
43. Where is he come from	53. I am from Indonesia.
44. Does they want some coffee?	54. He doesn't want to come here.
45. Is he study English?	55. My mother doesn't come here
46 b. Because my wife don't allow me.	56. Where do you live?
47. Where does they go?	57. My teacher doesn't want to play football
48. How many hours O he need to Finish his work every day?	58. Yesterday, I didn't buy cigarettes
	59. Do you like a piece of bread?
49. Are you go to work every day ?	60. We don't like super mie.
50. At what time are your father usually go to work every day?	61. He doesn't understand what you said.
	62. They don't like it.

51. Does you always wake up early in the morning?	63a. Last night I didn't go to the city'
	64. Does your child live here?

52. What does your wife give to you	65. How many children do you have?
In your birthday last night?	66. Does your wife want to join us to the tulip
	festival?

Let us see first the Sentence 53 "I am from Indonesia". The original sentence in the test is "I do from Indonesia". It reflects that the participant knows that "*do*" is not appropriate for that sentence. This sentence supports the mentioned argument before, that "to be" seems to be acquired earlier by the participant.

The sentences 54,55, 57, 61, 64. And 66 are also target like. It can be considered that the participants are successful in producing target-like form using the "*does form*" for 3rd person singular. Their knowledge concerning this pattern shows improvement. If we look back to the sentences 22, 24, 25 etc. we can see that their knowledge about this pattern tend to still be very low. It was only in two weeks they have begun to produce the target form. It is noted that they have shown their developmental process in acquiring" Do auxiliary". This success is possibly supported by the verbs which appear in those sentences. The verbs such as want, come, understand and live tend to appear mostly in the daily life such as in songs, in online games, or in English class. It can be proved that the input from their informal environment helps them very much.

The data from this test show us also that there is still problem in deciding whether do or does is used. It can be seen clearly that the students still have difficulties in connection with Subject- Verb- Agreement. The difficulty may also be due to their L1 experience. They used to think that there is no exception putting any verbs with any pronouns like the Indonesian sentence rule. For this issue it seems that the participants still need much input both formal and informal in relation to "they" pronoun and 'verbs".

The input they received from their environment seems very useful to help them acquire English. Many sentences they produced are English like. Most of the sentences appear regularly in everyday life. Unlike sentences 52 and 56, they consist of verbs "allow" and "give" which are not often used. This is maybe the reason why the participants did not remember to replace "*don't*" with "*didn't*" and "*does*" with "*did*", It is assumed that the additional knowledge about verbs might help the participant very much in his process of "*do*" acquisition. A clear explanation about verbs is needed in order to make them aware of this pattern. *"do"* always appears with the main verb in negative and question sentence.

From all the discussion above it might be concluded that the participants knowledge about English verb should be improved so that they will be able to consider whether" do" or "be" is used in the pattern being produced. Sufficient knowledge about the English verbs is very important for them in order to achieve the target like of the "do" pattern. The reason is because "do" frequently appears in the sentences where the main verb presented. This pattern is in regard to the function of "do" as the auxiliary in the "Yes / No Question, in the WH Question, and in the Negative Question.

CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing and discussing all of the data mentioned, my conclusions in regard to these researches are as follows:

Firstly, the inter language variations found are:
(1) Missing "do" auxiliary which is found only in spontaneous data and missing" did" found in recognition test.
(2) There are problems with subject-verb agreement, "do" is replaced by "does" or vice versa.
(3) There is also a tendency to use "do" and" be" (am, is, are) interchangeably
(4) There is a tendency to use "do" instead of "did".

Secondly, the factors which give negative influence to the participant in acquiring the "do" auxiliary are as follows:
(1) There are influences both from L1 and L2.
(2) The complexity of English rules makes the students unable to apply the correct rules and there is a trend to over- generalize the English rule.
(3) The general phenomena occurring reflects the universal structure which is usually found in learning a language.

Thirdly, the factors which give positive contribution to the participant in acquiring "do" auxiliary are:
(1) The input from informal environment including every day conversations occurring with friends and the common expressions which he frequently hears from his circumstances like music or song and online games.
(2) The input from their formal learning environment (English class), including both spoken and written language practice gives positive contribution in their process of acquiring "do"
(3) Memorization and Imitation also play role in their process of acquiring "do" patterns.

It appears that the participants have developed their English well. They show their developmental process in acquiring "do" auxiliary from "zero" to "target like" though is still at the level of simple sentences. They are possibly still confused in dealing with *"be"* and *"do"* usages. So, they might need some input with regard to this issue including knowledge about English verb in general. In addition, they also possibly need to practice much English personal pronouns in order to help them to overcome the subject-verb agreement problems.

(1) It is suggested for English teachers and students to use the information in this study to develop their teaching skill and English skill.
(2) It is essential for English students to have a very good understanding of Subject-Verb- Agreement in order to be able to have a good English. Because this is one of the basic structures which must be well acquired.

REFERENCES

Gas, S., Selinker, L. (1992). Language Transfer in Language Learning. Amsterdam: John Benjamin B.V.

Goodluck, H. (1991). Language Acquisition. A Linguistic Introduction. London: Hartnolls Ltd. Bodmin.

Richard, J. C. (1974). Error Analysis. London: Longman.

Ritchie, W. C., Bhatia, T. K. (1996). Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. USA: Academic Press.

Seliger, H. W., Shohamy, E. (1989). Second Language Research Methods. Oxford University Press.