

## PRODUCTION OF RELATIVE CLAUSES BY ENGLISH LEARNERS IN KAMPUNG INGGRIS PARE KEDIRI

Wawan Novianto<sup>1</sup>, Suhandano<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Gadjah Mada University

Yogyakarta – Indonesia

[wawan.novianto26@gmail.com](mailto:wawan.novianto26@gmail.com), [suhandano@ugm.ac.id](mailto:suhandano@ugm.ac.id)

### Abstract

This study aims to describe relative clauses produced by English Learners in Kampung Inggris Pare Kediri. The description of relative clauses produced is to know the kind of relative clauses English learners can and cannot produce. Data was obtained from learners' essay in IELTS simulation test part writing. Result says that English Learners can only produce relative clauses which relativize H as subject with 85.7% of percentage, as object with 8.5%, and as adverb with 5.8% of percentage. RCs whose H position is in possessive, object of preposition, and indirect object do not appear in the data. While for relational relative clause, cleft relative clause is also not produced by learners. Further, error analysis says that the errors learners produce are divided into six types: 1) error in using relativizer, 2) producing unneeded relative clauses, 3) The absence of relative pronouns, 4) Error in using verb in relative clause, and 5) Error in H-V agreement. 53.4%

**Keywords:** production of language, relative clauses, error analysis, Kampung Inggris

### Introduction

Indonesia is a state that has business with English. As a developing country, English is one of foreign languages that should be mastered first. The business with English can be seen in many aspects of life two of which are education and work. In education, the need for English is increasingly high. This can be seen by the presence of both foreign and domestic government policies that require to include a certificate of English language skills to continue study in higher education level. The minimum score of English proficiency also increases every time. For example, the minimum TOEFL score required by the Australian government for master's programs in 2013 was 500. It increased for the next three years to 525<sup>1</sup>. Likewise in the aspect of work, in the past few decades, most companies in Indonesia also required to include an English language proficiency certificate for job applicants to be accepted in the company. This encourage Indonesian people to learn English. Responding to this situation, English language learning

institutions in Indonesia emerged, both such institutions for early age and adults.

One of the largest and most well-known English language learning institutions in Indonesia is Kampung Inggris, a village consisting of 174 English language courses<sup>2</sup>. Kampung Inggris located in the Tulungrejo and Pelem village, Pare, Kediri, East Java originated from a small institutions founded by Mr. Kalend Osen named BEC (Basic English Course) which was founded in 1977. A few years later the institutions became many other institutions founded by its alumni. These institutions are spread throughout Tulungrejo and Pelem village which eventually form a community that uses English in their daily lives. Not only learners and teachers, villagers, even street vendors also use English to communicate. Such environmental conditions greatly support in the process of mastering English and make it a prominent destination for English learners in Indonesia to learn English.

Everyone who learns L2 must face difficulties in learning process since it is not

<sup>1</sup> Comparison of AAS 2003 and 2016 brochures

<sup>2</sup> Amount of institutions registered to FKB in February 2019. The amount may change every time.

the first language they acquire. It can be seen from the errors in the language constituent they produced (Ellis, 1997). Those errors are caused by many things one of which is L1 transfer (Ellis: 1997; Bennui: 2008; Budiarti: 2013; Pradjarto: 2015). Such errors are usually found in the smallest to the largest language constituent that are phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and discourse. One of the aspects of syntax that becomes problem for L2 learner is the production of relative clause. This happens because each language has its own strategies in making relative clause (Keenan and Comrie: 1977; Berg and Klingeman: 1986).

Relative clause (written as RC forward) like “*the student whom Makiko assisted was Hans*” are complex sentences that include embedding (using that, who, which), and movement of a noun phrase from within the embedded clause (in this case, the student). Indonesian learners who learn English have limitations and often make mistakes in the formation of relative clauses. Bahasa Indonesia, in relativizing, has limitations compared to English. English has many relativizers like *who, whom, which*, and other *wh* questions (Huddleston et al, 2002:1033) which each of these has different function but Bahasa Indonesia has only *yang* to relativize noun phrase in all H positions (Kridalaksana, 2008: 125). This also becomes an obstacle for adult learners whose L1 is Bahasa Indonesia in learning English such the misuse of relativizer as *\*the company who trade car has been increased the tax revenue for government itself*.

In English grammar books, noun phrase like *company* should be relativized with *which* since it is categorized as non-person noun. Bahasa Indonesia does not differentiate such a noun that the learners whose L1 is Bahasa Indonesia sometimes have obstacles in producing such RC.

A study of English centered on the analysis of constituent produced by English learners has been carried out, but the study generally examines language that does not

focus on a specific lingual unit. As an example, Nurmayanti’s (2012) study which examined the acquisition of English as a second language at the Briton International School, examined the acquisition of English at the level of words until sentences as well as supporting factors for the acquisition. Some studies found by the researcher may focus on one lingual unit, but they are not in the context of English learners whose L1 is Indonesian. One of such studies is Suharsono (2015) in his research on the acquisition of relative clauses in learners at the mid-level BIPA program revealed some errors caused by difficulties faced by BIPA learners in acquiring Bahasa Indonesia RC. In line with Suharsono, Sari et al. (2017) also examined BIPA learners and observed errors in the use of RC to look for the difficulties faced by the learners. In the field of contrastive analysis, RC has also become widely discussed studies. Dalilan and Mulyono (2004) describe comparative RC of English and Indonesian. In the study, three differences were found in terms of relativization strategies, functions, and characteristics of relativizers. Another study on RC in the field of contrastive analysis was also carried out by Alla (2008). Four equations and nine differences in the RC of Arabic and Indonesian were found which caused difficulties for Indonesian speakers who learned Arabic viceversa in terms of relativity.

From previous studies outlined above, researches on lingual unit that focuses on English RCs in the context of Indonesian learners who learn English has not been made. Dalilan and Mulyono (2004) have indeed examined the English RCs, but it was only in contrastive studies. For this reason, this recent study examines the production of English RCs by Indonesian learners. The purposes of this study are (1) to describe what types of RCs Kampung Inggris learners can and cannot produce; (2) to outline the types of error of RCs produced by Kampung Inggris learners. So that the study is expected to give advantages both theoretically and practically. Theoretically it is expected to provide

repertoire of linguistics knowledge regarding language production and practically is expected to provide inputs to learners. For the teachers, this study is expected to provide inputs in the form of errors overview in writing so that later can produce an appropriate learning strategies to improve the quality of writing produced by English learners in Indonesia.

Relative clause which becomes the topic of this study is the type of independent clause since this clause does not have the potential to stand alone or become a perfect sentence (Cook, 1969: 73). Huddleston et al. (2002: 1033) divided English RCs into two categories: formal and relational RCs. The formal type is the type of RC which is based on the usage of (1) who, which, whom, and other *wh* questions; (2) subordinator *that*; and (3) *gap* structure or emptying structure which means the loss of a constituent in RC structure. While relational type is RC which is differentiated based on the relationship of relative structure with its relativized structure. This relationship is seen with the external element of syntactic structure. Relational type RC has four subtypes: (1) integrated, (2) supplementary, (3) cleft, (4) fused, an RC that cannot be separated from its H/ antecedent, because the clause is integrated with the antecedent.

RC of Bahasa Indonesia in linguistic structural studies is a boundary clause that begins with *yang* (Kridalaksana, 2008: 125) and it functions to describe a noun or noun phrase contained in main clause (DeCapua, 2008: 319). In the RC, word *yang* is determinant of the relativized element. In Bahasa Indonesia, between H and RC are associated with the word *yang*. The word *yang* is called relativizer or relative pronoun that is very productive to form a relative construction so that the RC is equated with that word (Hobgin and Song, 2007: 205).

Every language has what Keenan and Comrie (1977) called as *accessibility hierarchy* which then followed up by Berg and Klingeman (1986) that English can relativize two more other positions, indirect

object and object of preposition, other than subject, direct object, and possessive. While Indonesian can only relativize subject, direct object, indirect object, and possessive. This *accessibility hierarchy* makes those languages have different strategies in relativity.

## Methodology

### 1. Subjects

A total of 72 adult English learners participated in this study. Participants in this study are those who learn IELTS in Kampung Inggris, Pare, Kediri, East Java. The learners from three institutions named TEST ES, English Studio, and Global English were taken for the sample representing 174 institutions registered to Forum Kampung Bahasa, an official organization that holds all affiliated institutions in Kampung Inggris. Those institutions were chosen as they have much focus on teaching IELTS. This study used judgment sampling in which the participants were judged by the researcher since this study needs learners in advanced level. IELTS learners were those who passed a placement test or those who were assumed holding band 5 (IELTS scoring system) and had studied various English programs from basic to advanced level.

### 2. Data collection and analysis

Sentences consisting of relative clauses were taken from essays included in IELTS simulation part writing task 1 and 2 from December 10<sup>th</sup> until January 10<sup>th</sup>. Relative clause structure markers containing relative pronouns functioning as the subject, object, object of preposition, possessive, and adverb as in Azar (2001) is used as a reference in analyzing the data. The total 219 relative clauses are then classified by the position of their H and examined in deep analyzing to get the correct and incorrect relative clauses. The incorrect relative clauses are then specified to see the types of their incorrectness in error analysis.

## Findings and Discussion

### 1. Correct RC produced by Kampung Inggris learners

Relative clauses in English are classified into two types: formal and relational. As Huddleston (2002:1033) stated, formal RC is marked by the use of: (1) relative pronouns *who, which, whom, whose, where, when*, and another *wh* questions; (2) subordinator *that*; and (3) *gap* structure. Those relativizers can be used in the position of relativizing (1) subject, (2) object, (3) object of preposition, (4) possessive, and (5) adverb. These are examples of such positions.

- (1) The girl *who/ that/ Ø* won the race is happy.
- (2) The man *whom/ that/ Ø* I met teaches Chemistry.
- (3) I did not know the man to whom I spoke.  
*whom I spoke to.*
- (4) Mr. North teaches students *whose native language is not English*.
- (5) July is a month *when the weather is usually the hottest*.

(Cited from Azar, 2001: 130-138)

Type relational is divided into four subtypes: (1) integrated, (2) supplementary, (3) cleft, (4) fused with the examples in sequence as follows.

- (1) The boys *who defaced the statue* were expelled.
- (2) My father, *who retired last year*, now lives in Florida.
- (3) It was Kim *who wanted Pat as treasurer*.
- (4) *What you say* is quite right.

(Cited from Huddleston et al, 2002:1034-1036)

As can be seen in Table 1, Kampung Inggris learners can produce RCs with subject, object, and adverb as the position of H. The position of subject is the most frequent RC produced. Formal RC that mostly produced by Kampung Inggris learners is RC relativizing subject with 85.7% of percentage: 53.4% with *wh* questions, 27.5% with subordinator *that*, and 4.8% with *gap* structure. RC relativizing object contributes 8.5% of percentage with 16 data. While RC relativizing adverb is the fewest RC produced by Kampung Inggris learners with 5.8% of percentage.

Table 1.

RC produced by Kampung Inggris Learners.

H positions	Freq.	Percentage
Subject		
a. <i>Wh</i> questions	101	53.4%
b. Subordinator <i>that</i>	52	27.5%
c. <i>Gap</i> structure	9	4.8%
Object		
a. <i>Wh</i> questions	5	2.6%
b. Subordinator <i>that</i>	9	4.8%
c. <i>Gap</i> structure	2	1.1%
Adverb	11	5.8%
		189

In producing relational RC, the collected data says that learners can produce integrated, supplementary, and fused relative clauses. Integrated RCs are the most frequent RCs produced by Kampung Inggris learners. 134 RCs come out of 150 with 89.3% of percentage following by supplementary RC with 8% of percentage and 2.7% of percentage for fused RCs. The percentage of cleft RC is 0%, means that the learners do not produce such type of RC.

Table 3.  
 Relational RC.

Subtype of relational RC	Freq.	Percentage
Integrated	134	89.3%
Supplementary	12	8%
Cleft	0	0%
Fused	4	2.7%
		150

#### a. RC which is not produced

From the results outlined above, there are several types of RCs, based on the position of its H, that are not produced by learners. The RCs are (1) formal RC relativizing possessive, (2) formal RC relativizing object of preposition, and (3) formal RC relativizing indirect object. While in relational RC, cleft RC is also not produced by learners. It hypothesized there are factors why the learners do not produce such types of RCs. Nevertheless, it is not discussed in this recent study.



b. Types of error produced by Kampung Inggris Learners

One of the important things in analyzing the production of language constituent is by describing the errors made by learners. By describing then followed by identifying the errors the researcher can reveal what difficulties the learners have and how far the learners can produce such constituent (Ellis: 1997; Gass and Selinker: 2008). Kampung Inggris learners have difficulties in producing RCs. It can be seen by seeing the types of errors as follows.

*First*, error in relativizing subject. This error has four subtypes; (a) error in using relative pronouns, (b) error in using verb in RC, (c) the absence of relative pronouns, and (d) error of H-V agreement.

*Error in using relative pronouns* seems that there are difficulties in differentiating the categories of noun whether it is person, non-person, locative, or noun with possession element. In (1) there is an error that learners sometimes use *who* to relativize non-person noun and there is no agreement for H and V.

- (1) \*The *company who trade car* has been increased the tax revenue for government itself.  
(1a) The *company which/ that trades car* has been increased the tax revenue for government itself.

RC in sentence (1) is not grammatical since *who* is used to relativize non-person noun *company*. Another problem is H-V agreement (subtype d) that V *trade* refers to singular noun. Sentence (1) could be grammatical when produced like (1a).

Learners also produce errors in relativizing noun locative like (2). Antecedent or noun as H in (2) means a place, but it stands as subject position, so the correct construction of RC must relativize subject like (2a).

- (2) \*The perspective of people state that *large stores where stand beyond the town* provide equipped needs rather than local shops have.  
(2a) The perspective of people state that *large stores which/ that stand beyond the town* provide equipped needs rather than local shops have.

The following error is misusing *whose*. This relative pronoun as in English grammar books is used for noun consisting of possession. H of RC in sentence (3) has no possessive relation and it positions as subject, so the correct relative pronoun is *who/* subordinator *that* like in (3a).

- (3) \*Undoubtedly, this appearance affects not only urban but also *rural people whose desire to purchase their needs*.  
(3a) Undoubtedly, this appearance affects not only urban but also *rural people who/ that desire to purchase their needs*.

This type of error contributes 12.5% percentage and the H-V agreement error has 33.3%, the highest percentage from all types, as seen in table 3.

*Error in using verb* is that misuse of verb infinite rather than finite. Verb infinite might be used when producing RC relativizing subject with *gap* structure. Nevertheless, in (4) below infinite verb is used for RC with relative pronoun *who*. Sentence (4) is not grammatical, it would be grammatical if produced like (4a) and (4b).

- (4) \*People *who using a car* are just to follow their lifestyle.  
(4a) People *who use a car* are just to follow their lifestyle.  
(4b) People  $\emptyset$  *using a car* are just to follow their lifestyle.

*The absence of relative pronoun* is that learners do not use relative pronoun in relativizing subject with *wh* question. Relative pronoun may be omitted but it changes the finite verb into infinite. Here sentence (5) is the error by the learners and (5a) and (5b) is the correction.

- (5) \*There are many big companies *are located in the big cities*.  
(5a) There are many big companies *which/ that are located in the big cities*.  
(5b) There are many big companies  $\emptyset$  *located in the big cities*.

*Second*, error in relativizing object. There is one error found in RC relativizing

O. The error, as in (6) below, is misuse of construction in its dependent clause. The sentence should be produced like (6a) in order to be grammatical. Learners in doing this type of error are not as frequently as error of misusing relative pronouns. It is quite less with 8.3% of percentage or 2 errors.

- (6) \*People have to pay taxes for *every car that is they owned*.  
 (6a) People have to pay taxes for *every car that they owned*.

*Third*, error in relativizing adverb. Error in this H position similarly refers to error in relativizing subject. It is the use relative pronouns for RC relativizing subject rather than relative pronouns for RC relativizing adverb when the H positions as adverb. Here the example of such error followed by the correction. Misuse of relative pronouns in RC relativizing adverb is quite often. It contributes 20.8% of percentage or 5 errors made by the learners.

- (7) \*So they will sell in *whole sales which the price will be cheaper than retail*.  
 (7a) So they will sell in *whole sales in which the price will be cheaper than retail*.

*Fourth*, unneeded RC. This error refers to the use of unneeded RC because it can be produced by using simple phrase. It belongs to (8) and (8a) for the correction below.

- (8) \*This phenomenon occurred due to this stereotype in society that people *who are well-educated* is considered to have high social class.  
 (8a) This phenomenon occurred due to this stereotype in society that *well educated people* is considered to have high social class.

As explained in table 3, three unneeded RCs are made by learners. It is 12.5% of percentage.

Table 3.  
 Types of error

Types of error	Freq.	Percentage
RC relativizing Subject		
(a) error in using relative pronouns	3	12.5%
(b) error in using verb	2	8.3%

(c) the absence of relative pronouns	2	8.3%
(d) error of H-V agreement.	8	33.3%
RC relativizing Object	1	4.2%
RC relativizing Adverb		
(a) error in using relative pronouns	5	20.8%
unneeded RC	3	12.5%
		24

## Conclusions

After analyzing the data collected, it can be concluded that formal RCs which Kampung Inggris learners can produce are those whose H in the position of subject, object, and adverbia. RC relativizing subject is the most frequent RC produced by the learners with 85.7% of percentage, followed by RC relativizing object with 8.5% of percentage, and RC relativizing adverb as the fewest RC produced with 5.8% of percentage. Integrated RC as the subtype of relational RC is produced most frequently rather than other subtypes. It contributes 89.3% of percentage, followed by fused RC and supplementary RC with 8% and 2.7% of percentage of each. Some RCs with H in the position of possessive, indirect object, and object of preposition do not appear in the data, means that learners do not produce such H position. Further, cleft RC, as a subtype of relational RC does not appear too.

There are some types of error made by Kampung Inggris learners. Learners make much errors in RC relativizing subject with total percentage 62.4%. H-V agreement is the most frequent error in RC relativizing subject with 33.3% contribution of percentage followed by error in using relative pronouns that contributes 12.5% of percentage, while error in using verb and the absence of relative pronouns contribute 8.3% of each.

The second place is error in RC relativizing adverb that has 20.8% percentage and error in RC relativizing object with 4.2% of percentage. Another error is unneeded RC that contributes 12.5% of percentage.

## References

- [1] Alla, Ahmed Saber Abd, *Klausa Relatif Bahasa Indonesia dan Klausa Relatif Bahasa Inggris, Sebuah Studi Kontrastif*: Thesis. ETD UGM, 2008.
- [2] Berg, Lidy Van Den & Klingeman, *Klausa Relatif Bahasa Indonesia dan Bahasa Muna* in *Lontara* No 34: 5-25. Ujung Pandang: Universitas Hasanuddin, 1986.
- [3] Budiarti, Any, *Interferensi Bahasa Indonesia Ke Dalam Bahasa Inggris Pada Abstrak Jurnal Ilmiah: Jurnal Bahasa dan Seni* Vol. 41. 2013.
- [4] Bennui, P, *A study of LI interference in the writing of Thai EFL students*: Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 4, 72-102, 2008.
- [5] Dalilan & Mulyono, *Klausa Relatif Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia: Analisis Kontrastif Strategi Perelatifan, Fungsi, dan Alat Perelatif*: HUMANIKA Vol. 17, 2004.
- [6] DeCapua, A, *Grammar for Teachers: A Guide to American English for Native and Non Native Speakers*, New York: Springer, 2008.
- [7] Ellis, R, *Second Language Acquisition*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [8] Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L, *Second Language Acquisition An Introductory Course (ed. 3)*, New York: NY Routledge, 2008.
- [9] Hogbin, Elizabeth & Song, Jae Jung, *The Accessibility Hierarchy in Relativisation: The Case of Eighteenth and Twentieth-Century Written English Narrative*: SKY Journal of Linguistics Vol. 20, 2007.
- [10] Huddleston, R.D & G. Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [11] Keenan, Edward L. & B. Comrie, *Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar*, Linguistic Inquiry 8:63-99, 1977 via JSTOR URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177973>
- [12] Kridalaksana, H, *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2008.
- [13] Nurmayanti, *Pemerolehan Bahasa Kedua Anak (Studi Kasus di Briton International School)*, Thesis. Yogyakarta: UGM, 2012.
- [14] Pradjarto, Sutoto, J.C, *Interferensi Gramatikal Bahasa Indonesia Ke Dalam Bahasa Inggris Dan Implikasinya Terhadap Kemampuan Produktif Pembelajar Bahasa Inggris Tingkat Pemula*, Jurnal Penelitian dan Wacana Pendidikan Vol. 9, 2015.
- [15] Sari, Anggun Melati, et al, *Penggunaan Klausa Relatif Pada Pembelajar Bipa di Unit Pelaksana Teknis (UPT) Bahasa Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta*, Jurnal Diglossia Vol. 9, 2017.
- [16] Suharsono, *Pemerolehan Klausa Relatif Pada Pemelajar Bahasa Indonesia Bagi Penutur Asing (Bipa): Kajian Bahasa-Antara*, Journal LITERA Vol.14, 2015.