

*Journal of*  
*Second and Multiple Language Acquisition*  
**JSMULA**

2016, March Vol 4 Issue 1 ISSN: 2147-9747

Editor-in-chief  
**Mehmet ÖZCAN**  
Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, TURKEY  
[mehozcan20@gmail.com](mailto:mehozcan20@gmail.com)  
[mozcan@mehmetakif.edu.tr](mailto:mozcan@mehmetakif.edu.tr)

#### Editorial Board

**Enas Abdullah HAMMAD** - Al-Aqsa University- PALESTINIAN  
**Ferit Kılıçkaya** – Mehmet Akif Ersoy University- TURKEY  
**Luciano Romito**- University of Calabria, ITALY  
**Mustafa Şevik** – Mehmet Akif Ersoy University- TURKEY  
**Serafin M. Coronel-Molina**, Indiana University Bloomington, USA  
**Zahra Amirian**- University of Isfahan, IRAN

#### Reviewers for this issue (Alphabetically)

**Collin Jerome**- University of Malaysia Sarawak  
**Ferit Kılıçkaya** – Mehmet Akif Ersoy University  
**Mehmet Özcan** - Mehmet Akif Ersoy University  
**Michael Ndemanu** - Ball State University  
**Mustafa Şevik** - Mehmet Akif Ersoy University  
**Viviana Quintero**- University of Michigan

#### Table of Contents

##### ARTICLES

<i>Reimagining Local Languages as Cosmopolitan Languages</i> .....	1-23
Mathew Bumbalough, Serafin M. Coronel-Molina	
<i>Translation strategies of research terms in textbook research methods for business</i> .....	24-38
Joko Srijono	
<i>Interlanguage and L1 Interference in L2 Speech Production: A study of Iban Native Speakers Learning Malay as a Second Language: A Critique</i> .....	39-52
Boluwaji Oshodi	

## Reimagining Local Languages as Cosmopolitan Languages

Mathew BUMBALOUGH<sup>1</sup>

*Indiana University Bloomington, USA*

Serafin M. CORONEL-MOLINA<sup>2</sup>

*Indiana University Bloomington, USA*

Received: 18.12.2015  
Published: 30.03.2016

### Abstract

Don Osborn (2014), claims that the local and global labels used to describe languages in Africa are problematic at best, and ignore the social and cultural ways in which languages go beyond the boundaries of modern day nation-states. In the article, we explore issues of academic ideologies surrounding the use of local and global labels used by researchers and theorists in the sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, educational linguistics, and linguistic anthropology fields to explore the role of language in social groups (eg: Albó, 1999; Baker, 1992; 1997; Gardner, 1985 in McGroarty, 1996; Richards et al 1992). While current literature and ideologies make use of the terms local and global when describing languages around the world, there is a disconnect between researchers on what the two terms mean and on how they are used when describing languages that on the surface appear similar; insofar as far as number of speakers and cross-border usage. In order to show this disconnect, we conducted a critical analysis (Fairclough, 1992) of the literature surrounding the local label (eg: Yaqub Vawda, A., & Anthony Patrinos, H., 1999; Bühmann, D., & Trudell, B., 2008; Ramanathan, V., 2005; Tembe, J., & Norton, B., 2008), using our results to reimagine what the 'local' label could/should become. Be doing so, we envision a way past the local/global dichotomy to understand what truly makes a language 'global' in current times, emphasizing the significance of cosmopolitanism (Hannerz, 1990) and the role it has played in bringing 'local' languages into the 'global' arena.

**Keywords:** local languages, global and cosmopolitan languages, sociolinguistics, critical analysis of literature

### 1. Introduction

Don Osborn's (September 3, 2014) in his blog *Beyond Niamey* claims to have a problem with the term local that is used to describe languages in much of Africa, saying that "As a term, "local language" implies a low rank of importance relative to "official language" or "language of wider

---

<sup>1</sup> Bio: Mathew Bumbalough is a Ph.D. candidate in Literacy, Culture, and Language Education at Indiana University. A former graduate of IU, he also holds a MEd in LCLE. He formerly served as a Korean translator/interpreter for the US Army, an English language program coordinator for the Seoul Metropolitan Office of Education, and an English teacher in a Japanese middle school. He is currently working as an Associate Instructor at IU through the Student Academic Center. His research interests include World Englishes, defense issues in language education, and cross-cultural communication. E-mail: [mnbumbal@umail.iu.edu](mailto:mnbumbal@umail.iu.edu)

<sup>2</sup> Bio: Associate Professor of Language Education in the Department of Literacy, Culture and Language Education at Indiana University's School of Education. His research interests include revitalization of Indigenous languages, the politics of language, language regimes, language attitudes and ideologies, minority languages and technology, language maintenance and shift, language contact phenomena, translingualism, multilingualism and bilingual education, Indigenous literacies in the Americas, and issues of language, culture, and identity in the Andes and beyond. Email: [scoronel@indiana.edu](mailto:scoronel@indiana.edu)

communication,” when for some languages and/or in some contexts such a hierarchy of importance would be inappropriate.” It is true that the languages used in Africa span many countries and are spoken more widely than, for example, French (which is used a medium of instruction in many schools and for purposes of governance). However, we were curious as to why a local language is still sometimes in academic circles described differently than a global language when the languages on the surface appear similar, such as a language which goes across as many borders as a Europhone language. In fact, we believe that with increasing global migration it is difficult to tell anymore which languages are local and which are global. The current mash-up of countries and cities composed of global travelers calls then for a redefining of the term local that describes how languages are breaking out of the local mold.

Overall, the term local in regard to language has been constructed to mean a language that has less economic capital than a global language, something that is problematic since this ideology is highly subjective to individual interpretation. Mahboob and Paltridge (2013) call this delineation a ‘hegemonic practice’ (in their example comparing Pakistani local languages vs. English) meaning English is given more linguistic power than the local languages. They furthermore explain that this practice seeks to make English a means of national development, but in reality succeeds only in maintaining power structures at the expense of the local language (p. 2). Bloomaert and Rampton (2012) make mention of this ‘ideology of language’ that came about as a result of colonialization by the Western world, with English, German, Spanish, and French being used to create empires which in their prime touched nearly every country in the world (p. 3). From these perspectives, it is easy to see that language is in fact an ideology, a social construct which is nearly always defined in terms of global (colonizer) and local (colonized).

In the post-colonial world then, the significance of continuing in this socially constructed (and subjective) theory creates a dichotomy between languages with and those without economic means. Global languages are pushed to the forefront of policy decision, and local languages are left to the side. Our analysis explores the dynamics of language, power, and ideology, showing how power and ideology particularly have structured everyday social interaction in languages used in local contexts and virtual spaces. To analyze the use of local when describing language, we draw heavily on thematic analysis to describe the role of speakers of local language communities who are sometimes marginalized in academia. We will also suggest that in current time, these communities are gaining a global footprint that empowers the speakers with a space to engage those who are outside the community and become cosmopolitan. What we mean by cosmopolitan then is reimagining the term ‘local’ in such a way that takes into consideration culture, diversity, and the ability to move between linguistic groups (Hannerz, 1990).

In the following sections, we analyze ideological constructs of the terms, local and global, discussing the nuances between local and global languages, and then presenting our methods, critical analysis of the literature available, and our findings and implications for language in the digital age.

### 1.1. *Theoretical Framework*

In order to analyze the current literature that uses the term ‘local languages’, we felt it best to approach it thematically. This allows us to tease out how each author/researcher uses the term in context, and provides a way to frame the various definitions that at the surface may appear very different. Our theoretical approach to critical analysis of the literature is modeled after Fairclough’s (1992) framework of discourse analysis that helps to analyze this myth of a local language. To make use of this framework, the first item we address is finding the social problem; in this case, the deficit approach to local languages. While a problem-based approach such as this might be controversial in some regard, the authors believe that it helps to shed light on whom or what is being marginalized when describing a language as local. Furthermore, the practice of calling a language local might not be a problem for some and indeed could take a non-deficit approach. However, it is clear from the ideologies in current research that this is not usually the case. Secondly, we ask: What obstacles are apparent and need to be tackled? There is power within academic discourse, power that researchers have when they assume a position on a topic that creates obstacles to those who are not in power. Thirdly, we determined if defining a language as ‘local’ in the way we found it in current research is actually a problem. In short, is there an ideology that contributes to an unbalanced relationship between “power and domination” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 126). We take the position that current definitions of local languages place these languages in a hierarchy of power, a power that often ignores one reality and uses its own and therefore does need to be challenged. Fourthly, there are several ways of defining a global language (as a language of commerce and a language which is spoken around the world), but even several so-called local languages are now spoken in diaspora communities as immigration and emigration increase. Indeed, it is hard not to hear a ‘local’ language when traveling to any major city in the US or around the world. Lastly, we must think reflexively about our own position in talking about this problem. Is this, as Fairclough describes, an effective critique of current studies in sociolinguistics, or is it “compromised through its own positioning in academic practices” (p. 127)? In other words, does this really contribute to balancing the position of power the global languages have over local languages? We feel that it does, but understand that there is a shift in defining local languages as scholars become more socially aware.

Another way we theorized our paper was by looking at the current definitions as a form of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1977), or the continual struggle to recognize (usually unintentionally) a global language as one holding more power than the local. Current definitions hold much authoritative power in communicating what terms are accepted and there is a continual struggle as the vertical (academic) struggles with the horizontal (speakers of so-called local languages). Each group resists the other and establishes rules which each must maintain if they are to be welcome in their groups. An example of this would be to examine French medium instruction in Mali that is being pushed by political groups, while the local language, Bambara, is spoken more widely and used in daily conversation through the efforts of grassroots movements (top-down vs. bottom-up). The post-colonial influence of French

(seen as a global language) then competes with Bambara (the local language) as supporters of each group decry the other for holding back the population from further growth. The myth of the local language being insufficient to educate the people of Mali resides then in the post-colonial status of the country and is in flux as the speakers of Bambara still struggle to gain recognition of their language as able to compete on the same level of French. Where then do we turn to changing the paradigm of 'local'? If we do not describe a language as local, then how do we describe it?

### 1.2. *Language Attitudes and Ideologies*

Having discussed the theoretical framework we use to structure our arguments, we now turn to a brief discussion of language attitudes and ideologies, and the differences and similarities between them. These are an important factor that can have a profound influence on individual, community and societal language use patterns, and on decisions (either conscious or unconscious) of language shift or maintenance. But what exactly constitutes a language attitude, and what an ideology? As Baker (1992) notes, the difference in terms is “partly about different traditions in research, theory, and expression” (p. 14): while research on language attitudes tends to be embedded within the field of social psychology (Edwards 1994, p. 97), studies of language ideology are often linked with sociology and anthropology (cf. Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity 1998, p. 4-5, 11-20).

Gardner identifies an attitude as “an underlying psychological predisposition to act or evaluate behavior in a certain way” (Gardner 1985; in McGroarty 1996, p. 5). By extension, then, language attitudes have been defined as “[t]he attitudes which speakers of different languages or language varieties have towards each other’s languages or to their own language.[...] Attitudes towards a language may also show what people feel about the speakers of that language” (Richards et al. 1992, p. 199). (For a comprehensible treatment of language attitudes, see Coronel-Molina, 2014).

Ideologies, in contrast, tend to refer to broader systems of beliefs, norms, or values. Silverstein delineates language ideology as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (1979, p. 193; in Schieffelin, Woolard and Kroskrity 1998, p. 4). Furthermore, discussions of language ideology often draw explicit attention to dimensions of power and identity:

[I]deologies of language are not about language alone. Rather, they envision and enact ties of language to identity, to aesthetics, to morality and to epistemology. Through such linkages, they underpin not only linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group, as well as such fundamental social institutions as religious ritual, child socialization, gender relations, the nation-state, schooling, and law. (Woolard 1998, p. 3)

In fact, as Woolard notes, the definitions of the term “ideology” itself are incredibly multivariate, ranging from a general definition emphasizing either consciousness, subjective representations, beliefs and ideas on the one hand (5) or practical behavior, not necessarily conscious or deliberate at all on the other (6); to a response to or reflection of “the experience[s] or interests of a particular social position ... [and thus] a direct link to inhabitable positions

of power[; that is] ... ideas, discourse, or signifying practices in the service of the struggle to acquire or maintain power” (6-7); to, finally, a tool for “distortion, illusion, error, mystification or rationalization” with the intended purpose of defending or obtaining power (7). Thus, once we try to narrow the field of vision by specifying “language ideologies,” we still have quite a number of perspectives from which this might be defined.

In the end, it is difficult to differentiate between a language ideology and a language attitude, as the two concepts are so closely intertwined and may, depending on who is doing the defining, even overlap to the point of being indistinguishable. Ideologies are easily manifested as attitudes, while attitudes factor into ideologies. And given the unconscious power that both wield in the formation of societies, the attitudes and ideologies that a person or community buys into will also ultimately affect how they define their identities, ethnically and linguistically, locally and nationally. This is because, as Silverstein (1985, p. 220, cited in Woolard 1998: 12) argues, language use is teleological — that is, language is an action with a social purpose — and thus the people who use it have specific ideas about the meaning, function and value of their language. Understanding those meanings, functions and values is an important first step for understanding language loss or maintenance in a specific language community, and for the first tentative steps in language planning to maintain or revitalize a language.

But what significance does this discussion of ideologies and attitudes have for the current linguistic situation of local languages? As noted previously, dominant languages and all local languages worldwide have historically exhibited the workings of language ideologies, manifesting not only power relations but also attitudes regarding sociocultural identities and expectations through their diglossic and multiglossic relationships. Global languages have always been the dominant, high-status, and official language, exerting their domination over all local languages. In this situation, the local languages, which are restricted to lower-order spheres, are generally stigmatized by the average dominant language-speaking population.

### 1.3. *Language Attitudes and Ideologies in the Andes*

The notion of local languages is related to language attitudes, stigma, loyalty and ideologies. The concept of linguistic culture, in particular language ideologies, is very relevant to a discussion of local languages in the Andes and beyond. Linguistic culture is

“the set of behaviours, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religio-historical circumstances associated with a particular language. That is, the beliefs (one might even use the term myths) that a speech community has about language (and this includes literacy) in general and its language in particular (from which it usually derives its attitudes towards other languages) are part of the social conditions that affect the maintenance and transmission of its language.” (Schiffman, 1996, p. 5)

The attitudes, beliefs and ideologies a group holds towards a language — that is, elements of its linguistic culture — will have an impact on what they

are willing or able to do in terms of recognizing “local languages” as “cosmopolitan languages”, the approach they take towards that endeavor, and how they are perceived by others in the process.

In the Andes, as in many other contexts around the world, speakers of the so called local languages, a language like Quechua for example, often tend to internalize these negative attitudes and may begin not using the language in many social situations to avoid the stigma attached to speaking it (Cerrón-Palomino 1989, p. 27). In fact, López goes so far as to call it “linguistic asphyxia,” in which many native Quechua speakers prefer to speak Spanish, however poorly, rather than Quechua, even at the risk of appearing “mentally retarded” because of their poor command of Spanish (1990, p. 105). This is especially notable in cases where Quechua speakers migrate to urban areas looking to better their lives, and often find that they are actively discriminated against and made to feel ashamed if they cannot communicate in Spanish (See Albó 1999, p. 42; Marr 1998, p. 103-131; Cerrón-Palomino 1989, p. 24, 27; King 2000, p. 73). In fact, language attitudes can often have an impact on either language shift or maintenance regardless of the presence or absence of other factors, making this a very powerful component of the linguistic equation. Linguistic prejudice by the dominant, Spanish-speaking class is a very influential factor in language shift, and one that many Indigenous speakers confront in a notorious way when they migrate from their rural homes to large urban areas.

Albó considers this issue from the perspective of language loyalty in situations of language contact and bilingualism or multilingualism. Speakers in this situation are said to have high language loyalty to the language or dialect they choose to speak, and low loyalty to the other language. He further notes that very often, at least in the case of Bolivia, speakers who have the option of speaking two or more languages opt for the dominant language, Spanish, over their mother tongue, even if they are not fully proficient in Spanish. On the other hand, monolingual speakers may show low language loyalty by refusing the opportunity for their children to receive bilingual education, preferring them to learn only in Spanish (1999, p. 66-68). This low language loyalty is also demonstrated by the Bolivians mentioned earlier who migrate to Argentina and then attend or send their children to special schools to help them lose their Quechua accent.

Carpenter found a similar phenomenon in Otavalo, Ecuador, especially among the rural poor. They wanted their children to be educated in Spanish on the premise that they already knew Quichua, and felt that bilingual education was nothing more than an attempt to exclude them from the advantages and social mobility made possible by knowing Spanish. Interestingly, the urban wealthy *otavaleños* want their children to maintain their knowledge of Quichua, “since it is now becoming an important element in their ethnic identity.” (1983, p. 103). With their rise in social standing, the symbolic value of their language has also apparently risen for them. As this and other examples (King 2000, Cotacachi 1997, Carpenter 1983, Haboud 1998 show attitudinal variation in Ecuador, for one, and likely in other Andean countries as well, may be more socioeconomically than regionally based.

On the other hand, Cotacachi's (1997) Ecuadorian study highlights the complexity of intercultural interactions and the competing influences each linguistic population can have on the other. Her data reveals linguistic prejudice in elementary schools by Spanish speaking teachers and principals, at the same time that it seems to indicate acceptance of the language by other Spanish speakers. Among the Spanish speakers in Cotacachi's study who oppose bilingual intercultural education (BIE), some of the most revealing reasons given for their opposition are the fact that it is a backward language, that it is useless in daily life, and that it has no grammar or an inadequate lexicon. Such opinions are also often expressed by Spanish speakers in Peru (Marr 1998, p. 156) and Bolivia (cf. Albó 1999, p. 64), and very likely in the other Andean countries as well. This not only clearly indicates their negative valuation of the language, but also their misconceptions of a language they do not understand.

In contrast, according to Cotacachi, the Spanish speakers who support BIE generally also claim to value the Indigenous cultural heritage and want to promote it. Of course, she does not indicate whether this means promoting it among the mestizo population throughout Ecuador, or only among the Indigenous Quichua speaking populations, a detail that could prove key in the long-term survival of Quechua. In addition, since this information is based on self-reporting by the interviewees, it is difficult to ascertain the veracity of the respondents, since it is well known that often respondents will give an answer that they think the interviewer wants to hear. More pertinent would be knowledge of how these same interviewees behaved in their daily lives in interactions with Quichua speakers.

It is also important to bear in mind that the specific social, cultural, historical and geographical milieus of different countries — and even different cities and towns within countries — are so different that the results of migration to or from any of them can be significantly different. This means that there can be regional variations in attitudes, often with highland dwellers tending to be more positive towards Quechua than coastal dwellers. For example, Lima, the capital of Peru, is a coastal city, and the population of Quechua speakers there has traditionally been low there, ever since the seventeenth century (Cerrón-Palomino 1990, p. 339-340, 1997, p. 56). Hence, it developed into a criollo center of power that was relatively free of Quechua influences more or less from the beginning (despite the presence of Quechua in regions such as Yauyos and Pacaraos). Given that at first there was less contact between Indigenous and Spanish in that region, perhaps this made it easier for the Lima residents to ignore, so to speak, the very existence of Quechua, socially and politically. Thus, in large metropolitan areas such as Lima and other large coastal cities, Quechua has come to be overtly devalued by the dominant society. In these areas, very often Quechua speakers hold an equally low opinion of their own language, evidence of the linguistic shame referred to earlier. Essentially, the language has lost — or is in the process of losing — its symbolic value for these speakers, and thus the pragmatic values that inhere in knowing Spanish become more important than the symbolic ones of speaking Quechua (see, for example, Marr 1998, p. 187).

Having said this, there are also regions in Peru where Quechua is strong, such as in the highlands and rural areas, and linguistic shame may not play a significant role in language shift. Based on her work in the Puno highlands in the 1980s, Hornberger opines that often it seems that Quechua speakers in these areas may pay more attention to acquiring Spanish or becoming bilingual than to maintaining their own language, not because they do not value it, but “rather because there is not a high level of consciousness about [the need to preserve Quechua] nor the slightest suspicion that it might be threatened” (1988, p. 81). King’s more recent work in two Saraguro communities in Ecuador seems to support this conclusion as well. In the more rural of the two communities, the members are not as consciously concerned with maintaining Quechua as in the more urban community. This could be either because they do not perceive it as threatened, or because it is not significant to them that it might be threatened. The more urban of the two communities, however, is aware of the danger and is attempting to take steps to revitalize Quichua there (King 2000). (For detailed information about language ideology in Peru, see Coronel-Molina, 2015).

Similarly, both Quito and La Paz, the capital cities of Ecuador and Bolivia respectively, are highland cities — Quito in the heart of Quechua speaking territory, and La Paz in Aymara speaking territory, but with considerable presence of Quechua speaking populations due to internal migration (Albó 1999, p. 42) — so the criollos in these areas have always been surrounded by the language and could not ignore or repress its presence, although history shows that they have not always easily accepted it either. Thus it may be that in cases of shift in these cities also, linguistic shame may not be a strong factor, although it cannot be completely discounted.

Haboud, for her part, offers evidence of resistance on the part of Spanish-speaking mestizos in Ecuador to the acceptance of Quichua as part of their cultural heritage. In the survey she carried out, 100% of the mestizos interviewed identified Spanish as the main language spoken in Ecuador. Although 68% also mentioned Quichua, these same participants characterized Quichua and other Indigenous languages as “dialects without grammar,” while several others indicated that there was no difference between Quichua, “‘otras lenguas’, ‘las lenguas de los indios’ or ‘eso que hablan los indios’.” Haboud also found out that numerous mestizos did not consider either Indigenous languages or the Indigenous communities to be part of contemporary Ecuadorian linguistic and cultural identity, but rather, a symbol of the ancient past (Haboud 1998, p. 175, see also Hornberger & Coronel-Molina, 2004, p. 15). Such attitudes on the part of criollos and mestizos, when acted upon in their dealings with Indigenous people in any city in Ecuador (or any Andean country, for that matter), cannot help but to have an impact on the latter’s self-image and attitude towards their own language.

These examples illustrate the effect that linguistic prejudice on the part of the dominant Spanish-speaking society can have on the linguistic minorities. However, it is not the case, as we have illustrated, that all Spanish speakers hold a negative attitude towards Quechua. If recent events in Ecuador are any indication, quite possibly a large majority of the Spanish-speaking

population of that country is sympathetic towards the Quichua population, if not specifically towards their language. In the Indigenous uprising which attempted to overthrow the president (2000), the Indigenous leader of the uprising, Antonio Vargas, gave his speech declaring the presidential overthrow in Quichua. While undoubtedly all present did not understand his words, the simple fact that he presented it in Quichua with no negative feedback from the crowd would seem to indicate a high degree of acceptance of the language, at least as a symbolic tool. This is also reflected in the example from Carpenter's work cited above, in King's observations of the symbolic use of Quichua among the Lagunas Saraguros in Ecuador (2000, p. 88-93), and in the celebration of a special Mass in Quechua attended by a huge multitude of Peruvians in the Cathedral of Lima in 1996 (Cerrón-Palomino 1997, p. 64).

In addition, Howard-Malverde points out that despite general trends in the shift from Quechua to Spanish, there are specific exceptions. For instance, she cites cases where the language has shifted from Spanish to Quechua in some areas of the Andes, as well as from Aymara to Quechua (cf. Howard-Malverde 1995).

These various examples demonstrate that it is difficult to generalize the attitudes of Spanish speakers, although anecdotal evidence points towards a strong prejudice against Quechua by Spanish speakers, and even by the migrating Quechua speakers themselves, especially in the coastal cities. There is a strong tendency on the part of migrant Quechua speakers in urban settings, especially in Lima, Peru, to hide the fact that they know Quechua, as noted previously, and to restrict its use to jokes and vulgarisms, and intimate domains out of the public sphere (cf. Marr 1998, p. 71-77).

King also found the use of Quichua for joking to be true in both the Lagunas and Tambopamba communities of Saraguro Quichua speakers with whom she spent several months. King postulates that this use of Quichua in a bilingual situation could serve a kind of "humor" marking function; even if a speech event is taking place in Spanish, when a speaker switches to Quichua, everyone recognizes that their statement is meant to be taken humorously and not seriously (2000, p. 83-84; 119-121). Contrary to what Marr found regarding general attitude toward the language, however, speakers in these communities were not ashamed of their language. They simply considered Spanish to be the language of the larger public domain, without feeling that this meant they had to abandon their use of Quichua.

While these scenarios in no way reflect the full range of influences and conditions surrounding language use in the three principal Andean countries, it at least offers a partial explanation for how and why differences in language use and policy may develop differently in different areas. It needs little imagination to think of ways that other social and demographic factors may differentially influence maintenance or loss of Quechua upon migration to each of these cities — for example, the effect that might be exerted by seasonal versus permanent or voluntary versus involuntary migration.

As all these examples show, it is difficult to definitively determine what the attitudes and ideologies are towards the Quechua language on the part of

Quechua speakers themselves as well as speakers of other languages within these countries, since wide-ranging language attitude and ideologies surveys are difficult to carry out. Such surveys are an important first step in establishing a baseline measure of the status of Quechua in the eyes of the various members of society. Furthermore, understanding the varying attitudes that speakers hold toward their own and other dialects of Quechua, as well as towards Spanish, can also help to elucidate how each speech community constructs its identity in the face of the national identity and other regional identities, a topic we discuss in detail in the following paragraphs. The knowledge gleaned from a comprehensive language attitude and ideology ethnographic carried out by Howard's (2006) ethnographic study in the Andean countries constitute a tremendous contribution and guidance for designing and implementing effective language plans for maintenance and revitalization within diverse ethnic/cultural groups.

As a matter of fact, the so-called local languages are not only local but also global according to certain contexts and situations. In other words, these local languages are also present at regional, national and transnational levels as well as in global, cosmopolitan and virtual spaces. (For more information about the presence of local/Indigenous languages in social media and virtual spaces, see Coronel-Molina, 2013; Hinton & Hale, 2001; Jones, 2015; Dyson, Grant & Hendriks (2015); among others).

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Data sources

Since our interest lies in the academic interpretations of what local means, we have selected several extracts from well-cited academic sources that define the differences, similarities, and ideological impacts of the local/global definitions of languages. We found that it was important to go back more than fifteen years to show how these terms have morphed and how consensus between what the terms mean depends mostly upon the audience for which the work is written. While we found many sources to choose from, we sampled 10 extracts that we believe best models overall constructions of local languages.

To illustrate the statement above, we include below a list of some of the negative attitudes, myths and ideologies towards the so-called local languages vis-à-vis global languages. For instance, it was sometimes common to hear people say the following about local languages in our data collection:

- are primitive and uncivilized
- are spoken by savages
- are languages without a grammar
- are not good for modern times
- are untranslatable and non-logical languages
- have limited vocabulary to express abstract ideas and thoughts
- are ancient languages (belong to the past)
- are spoken only by old folks
- are just oral languages without a writing system
- are difficult to teach and learn
- belong to some isolated tribes living in remote and distant areas
- are just "local" languages and they are not "global" at all
- are spoken by poor, backward, ignorant and dirty Indians

- are going to disappear soon anyway / why save them?
- are good just to make jokes or talk about simple things
- English, Spanish, French, German, Chinese, etc. are superior languages than local languages

In terms of local languages in general, asymmetrical power relations, negative language attitudes and ideologies, language discrimination or linguistic shame, competing sociolinguistic and cultural capitals, social condemnation, and even worse, linguistic self-condemnation have been and still are constants in many contexts, at the expense of local languages and cultures. These geo-sociolinguistic and sociocultural phenomena have contributed significantly to keeping local languages in a diglossic and even multiglossic situation. In addition, historical, social, political, economic, educational, and technological factors continue to force local language speakers to linguistic displacement or language shift; that is, to abandoning their linguistic and cultural practices in order to assimilate into mainstream society by acquiring and learning another powerful language.

## 2.2. *Data Analysis*

We gathered texts from multiple media sources and wrote memos around how the author(s) constructed their notions of local languages both within the text and related to which audience they were writing for. While the following is our interpretation of the data, we realize that we must represent our findings in such a way to foster dialogue between scholars as well as being rational and logical. Throughout the analysis, we engaged in several analytical iterations, annotating and collaborating over the course of several months while we sought to reimagine what 'local' in literatures on local language mean today.

## 3. Findings

We present our findings around two patterns we found in defining local languages: 1) the discursive characterizations of local languages (how they are defined); and 2) the critical characterizations of local languages (how they are compared to 'other' languages/cultures). First, we show how local languages have been defined within the last 15 years, providing extracts from the past few years in literature that has been used within fields of sociolinguistics, applied linguistics, educational linguistics, and linguistic anthropology.

### 3.1. *The discursive characterizations of local languages*

During our data collection, we took note of how various researchers, authors, scholars, and policy makers defined local languages; presented here via 5 extracts from published works that have been well cited by others. We also made sure to contextualize the author(s) discussions within the larger framework of the article, book, or monograph. We also took note of which words were used to define local as we feel that within a text-based form the language conveys nuances to the reader that may affect them one way or another. What immediately stood out was that the scholars all defined local languages within the context of global languages, either implicitly or within

the greater context of the work. What was also interesting is that most of the authors in this section (4 out of 5) specifically mention economics or education in relation to local languages; that is, local languages lack the nuances needed to survive on the global market.

We introduce these definitions by using extracts, presenting how the scholars convey their definitions as something with which the academic community at large has agreed upon.

*Extract 1 (Yaqub Vawda, A., & Anthony Patrinos, H., 1999):*

About 22% of the world's population are identified as speakers of local languages—a language which is spoken by one or a few minority groups in a country and which is not the language of social and economic mobility in that country. (p. 287)

In Extract 1, the authors present a paper that covers the efficacy of local language education in Senegal and Guatemala, two countries that do not share linguistic roots but which the authors make similar claims. The authors first provide a percentage to describe the number of speakers of local languages, making it seem as though the groups that do speak a local language are few and far between. When reading the extract, and the rest of the article, the sentence implies that this percentage is spread out around the world and does not take proportionality into consideration. Also of interest is their use of the dash when further defining local language, using the determiner 'which' twice in order to further define the word. This in conjunction with the percentage allows the authors to expand the definition of local language perhaps beyond the number and focus more on the implications of what it means to speak in a local language; being in a minority and not having the chance for upward social or economic mobility. Also interesting about extracts 1 and 4 is that they both examine economics in conjunction with local languages, tying the two together and implying that a local language will equate with being economically disadvantaged. As well, the two extracts seem to be at odds as both have different claims about the numbers in terms of population and local languages, with Extract 4 claiming that the local can outnumber the global in some respects, but Extract 1 claiming that they are always in a minority. However, this can be explained by the context in which they are writing; the whole world and local languages and local languages in two countries.

While Extract 1 focused on education overall, their definition of local only focused on the economic and social. Moving away from the economic, we also found that the local in local language was defined in terms of education as well and as seen in the next two extracts.

*Extract 2 (Dutcher, N., 2001):*

Approximately 1.38 billion people are speakers of local languages, languages that may not be used for formal education because they are as yet unwritten or are deemed unsuitable for other reasons. (p. 6)

In Extract 2, Dutcher writes for the Center for Applied Linguistics, being funded by the Ford Foundation with the overall tone of the paper suggesting that countries are not making use of local language education. As well, this

paper supports the Education for All movement through the UN. Similar to Extract 1, Extract 2 starts with figures for showing how many speakers of local languages there are in the world. Here, the author makes use of a number rather than a percentage, specifically mentioning ‘people’. We see this as trying more to personify the total number of local language speakers, rather than a percentage which can be more obfuscating. In the second part of the sentence, the author makes use of the passive voice, ‘are deemed’, as a way of showing that the author is not the one deeming the language not useful for education, but rather some outside entity. The definition in this case goes against what the author argues for in the rest of the paper, and indeed the author finds that local languages are in fact useful for education. The definition in the large context then harkens toward a socially constructed definition of local language that the author is trying to get away from; a social construction largely used by politicians and education policy makers.

Linking local languages to education is a theme we noticed in several data sources, as we further show in Extract 3 below.

*Extract 3 (Kosonen, K., 2005):*

Local language is a language (a) without a written form; (b) for which language development is not yet complete; or (c) that is otherwise not considered suitable for education, for example, due to its low status or small number of speakers (CAL 2001; Robinson 1999; Vawda & Patrinos 1999; Walter 2004). In minority settings, the local language is usually the first language of the given ethnolinguistic minority group. (p. 133)

In Extract 3, the author is writing for the Asia-Pacific Programme of Education for All, similar to the audience for Extract 2, but in the Asian-Pacific context. It directly addresses the policy makers and advocates for using local languages in education, while acknowledging the difficulties in doing so. The definition comes from the appendix, offering the author’s understanding of what a local language is in the context of the article. Here, the author lists several agreed upon definitions of a local language, borrowing from Vawda and Patrinos in Extract 1 as well as two others. By using others to define local language, the author is removing the onus of defining the words himself, and instead providing agreed upon constructions of local languages. This is important in that it shows several rhetorical constructions of local language, each taking a different aspect of the power structures involved in defining what a local language is. Defining a local language as a language without written form implies that the language would be unsuitable for education (relating directly to definition c), despite there being several local languages that have in fact created written form for their language. The second definition creates a direct dichotomy between the West and the rest of the world, implying that a language is not developed unless it holds as much power as a Western language. The third definition is similar to Extract 2, in that the small number of speakers makes it difficult for the policy makers to provide local language education, showing again the unequal power structure between the government and the people it governs. As with Extract 1, the author links ‘minority’ with local language, suggesting that even countries with a large number of speakers of a non-Western

language are always outnumbered by speakers of a global language, or the official language.

While these definitions are similar in most aspects, it is interesting to examine a more recent definition of local languages, showing how the term is becoming more critical in recent years. Extract 4 provides an example of how the local is defined against the global.

*Extract 4 (Grinevald, C., 2006):*

Similarly, a number of labels are used to refer to Language B, such as minority language, indigenous language, mother tongue, or heritage language. The term 'local language' is more neutral and captures the fact that language use is tied to a particular geography, and that a speaker community generally sees the need or desire to use this language within a given region. The respective terms 'majority' and 'minority' for Languages A and B are not always accurate; speakers of Language B may be numerically greater but in a disadvantaged social or economic position which makes the use of the language of wider communication attractive. (p. 318)

Extract 4 comes from an encyclopedia of languages around the world, also covering issues surrounding language loss in a variety of communities. In this excerpt, the author first labels the languages as A (global) and B (local), putting them in a hierarchy that suggests one comes before the other. Even though this was most likely unintentional, it shows how easy it is to subconsciously create power structures that put one entity over another. While the other terms (minority, Indigenous, heritage, etc.) are used, the author is implying that they are not-neutral in their meaning; although the use of passive voice does not imply who is using it. In fact, the use of the term 'minority' is perhaps more correct in this extract than in Extract 1. In the next sentence, the author offers the term 'local language' in reference to Language B as it is more neutral in its meaning. However, the definition of 'geography' and 'region' are ambiguous and suggests to us the idea that they are bound by physical geographical realities, not existing outside of them as a global language would. In the final sentence, the author explains that 'majority' and 'minority' might not always work to describe global and local languages respectively, but rather the social and economic realities. By tying in the definition of local languages to economy and society, the author is specifically saying that a local language is defined by power structures, i.e. those with and those without.

In most of the extracts that we chose, the authors refer the definition of local language back to economic and social realities of the language, a reality that is troubled as some of the local languages might be more global than a global language (going across more geographical boundaries) while at the same time holding less economic capital.

*Extract 5 (Bühmann, D., & Trudell, B., 2008):*

Local language- refers to the language spoken in the homes and marketplaces of a community, as distinguished from a regional, national or international language. (p. 6)

In Extract 5, the authors are writing for UNESCO, advocating for the introduction of local languages within educational systems. The definition is

found in the introduction, allowing the reader to know what their construction of a local language is before delving into the text. The authors are rewriting the definition here in the context of locality rather than globality. For example, while the past definitions of local language rely on economic realities in relation to the global, the authors are reconstructing that paradigm into the economic realities of the local. The authors are then repositioning the power of the local language back into the hands, so to speak, of the people the definition directly effects, not making mention of education policy makers. In this case, the definition of local language is broader, and could refer to the local language of a sports bar in Brooklyn or a small village of Quechua speakers in the Andes. While this might not be the intent of the authors, the definition is constructed more ambiguously than past definitions. In fact, there is no mention of the word 'global' or any derivative thereof, but rather the authors use 'regional, national, or international' in describing languages.

Overall, the authors of these extracts, with the exception of Extract 5, present notions of local language that are similar to one another, and frequently cite the same sources in constructing the discursive definitions of local language in opposition to the global. However, Extract 5, the most recent Extract we provide, offers a new(er) way of constructing local languages, an important point we discuss in the next section.

### 3.2. *Critical characterizations of local languages*

During our data collection and analysis, we noticed two distinct themes in the various author's construction of local languages; simply defining what a local language is (the discursive), and those definitions which constructed local languages compared to something else, usually the global (a critical or social definition). Similar to the prior section, we present 5 extracts here which address local languages critically; that is those definitions which seek to disrupt or re-imagine what it means to be a speaker of a local language. We see the difference in the two as being local language defined by policy (top-down) and local language being defined through the lens of the speakers (bottom-up). Also similar to prior section, we made sure to contextualize the author(s) discussions within the larger framework of the article, book, or monograph. What stood out most to us from these particular extracts is mention of the political or colonial realities in defining local languages (4 out of 5) while only 2 mentioned economics.

#### *Extract 6 (Wallraff, B., 2000):*

...Over the same decade the number of speakers of Chinese in the United States grew by 98 percent. Today approximately 2.4 million Chinese-speakers live in America, and more than four out of five of them prefer to speak Chinese at home... How can all of this, simultaneously, be true? How can it be that English is conquering the globe if it can't even hold its own in parts of our traditionally English-speaking country? (para. 4)

Extract 6 comes from the Atlantic Monthly, a magazine and one of the first non-academic (not a book or journal) we explored. Here, the author tackles the idea of English as a global language. Similar to previous extracts, the author first provides statistics, in this case very specific ones which show the increase of Chinese speakers in the US. As well, the author provides further

information that shows these speakers (4 out of 5) prefer to speak Chinese at home rather than English. Grammatically the author relies on the active voice, stating these facts as not subject to scrutiny. Also, rather than specifically stating a definition of local language, the author instead challenges the inherent power behind the world 'global' instead, ending the excerpt with rhetorical questions, with the answers being obvious if one reads the article.

This was by no means one of the first articles that sought to disrupt the notion of what it means to be a speaker of a global or local language, but it is unique in that it comes from a source that most might not consider academic and therefore less powerful than a peer-reviewed article from an A-level journal. However, several other sources show others redefining what a local language is in regard to the speaker's reality, as Extract 7 shows.

*Extract 7 (Thondhlana, J., 2002):*

On the question of the status and usage of indigenous languages versus those of an ex-colonial language, arguments have been put forward for maintaining the exclusive official status and usage of the ex-colonial language. Sure and Webb (2000) observe that, although the use of colonial languages in education has led to serious problems, it has also brought with it "enormous advantages such as access to knowledge, creativity and entertainment of the entire western world, as well as global trade and commerce." (p. 35)

In Extract 7, the author is writing for a conference in Canada, directly addressing the linguistic and educational situation in Zimbabwe with, what the author calls, Indigenous languages. Here, the author directly refers to the power structure involved with the colonizer and the colonized, framing the construction within the context of the paper as a fallacy held by policy makers. The use of the passive voice in the second half of the first sentence suggests a hesitance to name those who are arguing for an ex-colonial language being used for education, despite the overall tone of the paper blaming both the colonizers and current political establishments. In the second sentence, the author provides a direct quote, providing evidence that the power structure in Indigenous languages and ex-colonial languages is embedded in current political structures, with the decision to use the ex-colonial languages as necessary to compete in education (implicit) and economics (explicit).

While the author attempts to debunk these notions of Indigenous languages later on, this excerpt is unique from the rest in that it is the only one that addresses economics. Moving on, Excerpt 8 more directly disrupts the notion of policy making in regard to local and global languages.

*Extract 8 (Ramanathan, V., 2005):*

Regardless of how scholars are positioned in the debate, much of the research seems to draw from and is connected to issues in implicit and explicit English language policies – state-wide, nation-wide, and institutional – and ways in which they impact a variety of teaching and learning contexts. Such views, while valuable, can be seen to run the risk of rendering language policies around English and local vernaculars as abstract entities partially formulated behind closed doors, and formalised in documents without paying much heed to local realities. (p. 89)

In Extract 8, the author is writing for the Current Issues in Language Planning, focusing on disrupting power structures in educational policy in a general context. Rather than use local languages, the author reframes the word languages to ‘vernacular’ earlier on. This is similar to Extract 5 in that the definition becomes more ambiguous as a result, and is able to be used in multiple contexts for many languages. What is noticeable right away is the author’s reliance on the passive voice for much of the extract, positioning ‘scholars’ and ‘views’ as something being acted upon rather than acting. This suggests an understanding that the views, and the scholars that hold them, contribute to the power struggle between the local and the global and policies that ignore what the author sees as the true, objective, reality of the speakers. So, much like Extract 6, the author here is trying to reframe local within the context of the global by challenging what global really means and whether or not it really is beneficial for speakers of a local vernacular. Extract 8 is a call then for scholars to examine how they view language policy that affects local vernaculars, all the while implicitly asking the same rhetorical questions as Extract 6. Extract 9 moves forward and examines further education and policy in regard to local languages.

*Extract 9 (Roy-Campbell, Z. M., 2006):*

The colonial legacy has rendered African languages impotent in many African countries. Birgit Brock-Utne (2000) points to the invalidation of African languages by viewing them as handicaps rather than as resources.... This is manifested most clearly in the fact that most African countries continue to use the former colonial language as the primary language of formal education. (p. 2)

We took Extract 9 from a keynote address to the University of Syracuse for an annual conference on African Linguistics. The author examines the effect globalization has had on African languages and shows how they are spreading around the globe through travel and the internet. The author does not describe the languages of Africa as local; in fact, throughout the entire address, local languages are not mentioned and instead the author simply calls them ‘African languages’ (although the author mentions ‘Indigenous languages’). The author first states in active voice that the reasoning African languages are not used in education is because of the colonial past of African countries, explicitly stating the power dynamics involved in creating language policy. This extract also brings us back to Osborn’s (2014) struggle to understand the labeling of local and global languages, when the only true difference he (and this author) sees is that it is socially constructed based on economics and education. The author here uses the subordinate conjunction ‘rather than’ what they feel is a misconception about African languages. This helps to transition into what the author sees as another fallacy of the colonial language conundrum: most countries continue to use the colonial language without regard to the local, a problematic in which political policy ignores the speaker.

Moving onward, Extract 10 further covers the political aspects of using politics rather than local reality in defining what they call ‘mother-tongue’ languages.

*Extract 10 (Tembe, J., & Norton, B., 2008):*

Tembe and Norton assume that mother-tongue policies have been imposed for political rather than sociolinguistic or demographic reasons (Muthwii, 2002). In addition, parents want their children to master the official language, or the language of wider communication (LWC), early in the education process (Bergmann, 1996), and there is a common, though mistaken, belief that African languages are not equipped to deal with scientific and technical concepts (Obanya, 1995; Prah, 2008) (p. 2).

In Extract 10, the authors approach the issue of local languages used in Ugandan education in *The Canadian Modern Language Review*. While they do use the term 'local languages' within the paper, it is used in smart quotes through most of the paper, suggesting that what is defined as a 'local language' in Uganda is at times ambiguous as well as a misnomer. The extract we chose here, rather than providing a simple definition of 'local languages' seeks to critically engage the reader in what the authors perceive as misconceptions about African languages (used in Extract 8 as well). The authors explicitly state their position at first, saying that what is defined as a 'local language' is politically driven rather than based on the needs of the speaker of that particular African Language. However, they also point out that the speakers themselves, parents in this case, wish for their children to learn the official language (usually a colonial language) in order for their children to have a better economic advantage. Lastly, they address a misconception that African languages are not equipped to deal with education, but rather it is the policies in place that prohibit them from competing with the colonial languages.

Overall, we found the authors in the extracts to challenge or reimagine what the 'local' in local languages really mean, often in conflict with the global and reimagining that as well. While it was brought up only once, we feel that there is something missing from the critical characterization of local language: the effect of the current era with advances in technology and world travel on reimagining what it means to be a speaker of a 'local' language. Therefore, we discuss some of the implications for what this would look like in our reimagining of local languages.

### 3.3. *Cosmopolitanism and the Digital Age*

Our analysis of the ideologies in the academic literature on local languages shows that it is quite common to use 'local' as a way of showing deficiency, and further suggests that global languages are those languages that are better equipped to carry out a wider variety of actions, from the academic to the economic. Even the critical characterization of local languages, while seeking to reimagine the 'local', cannot ignore the overwhelming political nature of the term, and the impact of the global on local communities. For better or worse, speakers of all languages see the ability to communicate in a global language as both modern and leading the speaker toward greater economic trajectory. As a result, when we (and scholars in general) hear a language described as global we assume that it has a certain power, a structure that we (the authors) feel is social constructed and politically maintained in addition to being polarizing and dichotomizing. The issue we see then is that current exploration of local languages maintain a deficit

approach, and the local languages themselves are not afforded the opportunity to compete on the global market and are marginalized, whether that is the intent or not. Without a doubt, much of what drives research in the field is the maintenance of a certain standard which scholars strive to uphold. Certainly standards have their place, but it requires much introspection and reflexivity to determine if these standards are costing users of a local language the ability to compete against them. Thusly, a global language would then be seen as a standard that a local group should strive to obtain in order to participate in the world at large. While this kind of participation is important, there are many sociolinguistic realities which policy makers, scholars, and others ignore when describing a language as local; labeling the language as holding less value than the global, creating a myth that is hard to escape. One example is the use of Indigenous languages in the Americas. While one might think it is only possible to find these languages spoken in specific countries, it is in fact easy to find these speakers around the globe from South Korea to the UK.

We then propose that the ‘local’ in local languages be changed into cosmopolitan language. Hannerz (1990) describes the cosmopolitan in local cultures in four parts: 1) it necessitates an understanding of relationships among many cultures; 2) embraces diversity; 3) a willingness to engage with the “Other”; and 4) a competence in dealing with other cultures (p. 239). The evidence for all four of these notions about cosmopolitanism for local languages is overwhelming but we allow that there is a scarcity of research that supports the idea of language as cosmopolitan. One way language groups have accomplished this is through the power of mass and social media in the past few decades.

One way we see this happening is through digital tools, as well as immigration/emigration. Social media has undoubtedly become a powerful tool of communication for languages that might not otherwise have access to the economic wealth of languages spoken in the West. Social networking sites such as Facebook, and YouTube, as well as Indigenous social media platforms, provide speakers of cosmopolitan languages an avenue to speak and write in their mother tongue while several grassroots efforts on part of speakers of these languages help to build communities where people can connect and share across borders. The spread and growth of digital communication, coupled with migration into larger cities and countries by the speakers have helped to create communities that impact not only those in the community, but outside as well.

The growth of these digital spaces has certainly led to these languages becoming more cosmopolitan and meeting the requirements of Hannerz’s description of cosmopolitanism. Social media, by providing a space for the speakers to connect with a wide audience, has been instrumental in helping these languages flourish and grow. The increasing use of social media and digital communication also means that these speakers are able to find others who share similar experiences. These virtual communities have been influential in redefining language in the digital space as a social practice and therefore a legitimate way of creating community.

#### 4. Conclusions

There is no doubt that the current definitions of a local vs. global languages are dichotomized, and that the 'local' really is nothing more than a myth that is still perpetuated, most times unwittingly, by those who use the term as it has been defined in their academic context. In order to show how this is done, we outlined the current ideologies as well as definitions of local languages and explored the reasoning behind them. Therefore, we are challenging scholars to engage in a deeper debate when describing a language as local, and find out if what they really mean is if the language is cosmopolitan. In an increasing age of border crossing and technological advances, we must determine if the current labels used to describe languages are still adequate to describe languages that for all intents and purposes are becoming globalized as their speakers move in to other countries, bringing the local wherever they go. Meanwhile, there are many interesting grassroots movements to use these new cosmopolitan languages in commerce and education, with some great success. In effect, viewing a language as cosmopolitan rather than local may bring a much needed balance to a field where a post-colonial lens is still used to describe languages as somehow deficient as they were not historically used as a means of commerce and academics.

We call for further studies to see if language is moving beyond the local name, to find the impact they are having as they shift to a cosmopolitan setting and practice. Therefore, we feel there is a need for more reflexivity in the field and studies that support this new view of languages that debunks the myth of a language only being local. Our research could go beyond current studies and analyze social movement and immigration/emigration to find out not just why languages are becoming cosmopolitan but how they are becoming cosmopolitan.

#### References

- Albó, X. (1999). *Iguales aunque diferentes: hacia unas políticas interculturales y lingüísticas para Bolivia*. La Paz: Ministerio de Educación, UNICEF and CIPCA.
- Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Blommaert, J., & Rampton, B. (2012). *Language and superdiversity*. MMG Working Papers, 12- 09.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (Vol. 16). Cambridge University Press.
- Bühmann, D., & Trudell, B. (2008). *Mother tongue matters: local language as a key to effective learning*. Paris; UNESCO.
- Carpenter, L. K. (1983). Social stratification and implications for bilingual education: an Ecuadorian example. In A. Miracle (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Social issues and policy implications*, 96-106. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1989). *Language policy in Peru: A historical overview*. *International Journal on the Sociology of Language* 77, 11-33.

- Cerrón-Palomino, R. (1990). Reconsideración del llamado “quechua costeño”. *Revista Andina* 8 (2), 335-386.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2015). *Language ideology, policy and planning in Peru*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2014). Monograph - Definitions and critical literature review of language attitude, choice and shift; samples of language attitude surveys. *Journal of Second and Multiple Language Acquisition*, 2(2), 25-77.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2013). New functional domains of Quechua and Aymara: Mass media and social media, in J. Tollefson (Ed.), *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. NY: Routledge.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M., & McCarty, T. L. (Eds.). (In press). *Indigenous language revitalization in the Americas*, Routledge, London, UK.
- Cotacachi, M. (1997). Attitudes of teachers, children and parents towards bilingual intercultural education. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Indigenous literacies in the Americas: Language planning from the bottom up*, 285-298. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Dutcher, N. (2001). *Expanding educational opportunity in linguistically diverse societies*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Dyson, L.E., Grant, S., Grant, S., & Hendriks, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Indigenous people and mobile technologies*. London, UK. Routledge.
- Jones, M.C. (2015), *Endangered languages and new technologies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough N, ed. 1992c. *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman
- Fairclough, N. (2001). The dialectics of discourse. *Textus*, 14(2), 231-242.
- Gardner, R.C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Grinevald, C. (2006). *Endangered languages. Concise encyclopedia of languages of the world*, 317-327.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). *Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture*. *Theory, culture and society*, 7(2), 237-251.
- Haboud, Marleen (1998). *Quichua y castellano en los Andes ecuatorianos: los efectos de un contacto prolongado*. Quito: Abya-Yala.
- Hinton, L. & Hale, K. (Eds.). (2001). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Hornberger, N.H., & Coronel-Molina, S. M. (2004). Quechua language shift, maintenance, and revitalization in the Andes: The case for language planning. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 167, 9-67.
- Hornberger, N. H. (1988). *Bilingual education and language maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua case*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Howard, R. (2007). *Por los linderos de la lengua: Ideología lingüística en los Andes*. Lima, Peru: IFEA-Fondo Editorial-IEP.
- Howard-Malverde, Rosaleen (1995). Pachamama is a Spanish word: linguistic tensión between Aymara, Quechua and Spanish in northern Potosí (Bolivia). *Anthropological Linguistics* 37 (2).
- King, K. (2000). *Language revitalization processes and prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Kosonen, K. (2005). *Education in local languages: Policy and practice in South-East Asia. Asia-Pacific programme of education for all first language first: Community-based literacy programmes for minority language contexts in Asia*. Bangkok: UNESCO Bangkok, 2005, 96.
- López, L. E. (1989). El bilingüismo de los unos y los otros: diglosia y conflicto lingüístico en el Perú. In E. Ballón-Aguirre and R. Cerrón-Palomino (Eds.), *Diglosia lingüoliterario y educación en el Perú*. Lima: CONCYTEC and GTZ.
- Mahboob, A., & Paltridge, B. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis and critical applied linguistics*. The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Marr, T. G. (1998). *The language left at Ticlio: Social and cultural perspectives in Quechua loss in Lima, Peru*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Liverpool.
- McGroarty, M. (1996). Language attitudes, motivation, and standards. In S. L. McKay and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching*. 3-46. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Osborn, Don. (2014, September 3). *The problem with calling some languages "local"*. Beyond Niamey.
- Ramanathan, V. (2005). Rethinking language planning and policy from the ground up: Refashioning institutional realities and human lives. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 6(2), 89-101.
- Richards, J. C.; Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics, 2nd ed.* Essex, UK: Longman Publishers.
- Roy-Campbell, Z. M. (2006). The state of African languages and the global language politics: Empowering African languages in the era of globalization. In: *Selected proceedings of the 36th annual conference on African linguistics* (p. 1-13). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Salawu, S., & Chibita, M. B. (2015). *Indigenous language media, language politics and democracy in Africa*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schieffelin, B. B.; Woolard, K. A., & Kroskrity, P. V. (1998). *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Tembe, J., & Norton, B. (2008). Promoting local languages in Ugandan primary schools: The community as stakeholder. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 65(1), 33-60.
- Thondhlana, J. (2002). Using Indigenous languages for teaching and learning in Zimbabwe.  
Available at: [http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILAC/ILAC\\_4.pdf](http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILAC/ILAC_4.pdf)
- Wallraff, B. (2000). What global language. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 286(5), 52-66.

- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, and P. V. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* 3-47. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yaqub Vawda, A., & Anthony Patrinos, H. (1999). Producing educational materials in local languages: costs from Guatemala and Senegal. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(4), 287-299.

## Translation strategies of research terms in textbook research methods for business

Joko Srijono<sup>1</sup>

University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta

Received: 26.08.2015  
Published: 30.03.2016

### Abstract

The study aims to analyze and describe translation strategies of research terms. It used a descriptive-qualitative approach. The data were the English and Indonesian research terms and data sources covered documents and informants (*raters*). The documents comprised the textbooks: *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach* and its translation *Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian dalam Bisnis*; and the informants were the experts in translation linguistics and research field. The data collection employed an analysis content, questionnaire, and in-depth interview. The data validity employed a data/source triangulation. The data were analyzed by an interactive model: data reduction, data display, and conclusion. The results of the study show that the translation strategies of research terms include: 1) translation by transfer or replacement, 2) translation by loanwords with spelling change, letter omission, or letter addition, 3) translation by replacement or transfer as well as loanwords with spelling change, and 4) translation by replacement or transfer as well as loanwords without spelling change.

**Keywords** strategy, translation, term, research

### 1. Introduction

An advanced and developed science and technology mostly written in English are an essential phenomenon of translation field to be researched by academicians. The translation of English text into Indonesian one in particular is greatly intended to help other academicians who are difficult to understand English texts. It is hoped, therefore, that it will be meaningful to help solve their problem with understanding the messages or meanings of them. Furthermore, the translation of the texts can mediate a transfer of advanced and developed science and technology to Indonesian people so that they will be able to adopt and adapt to the science and technology.

However, a replacement of English text into Indonesian one frequently causes a non-equivalence of meaning or message. It is greatly due to the cultural difference between English and Indonesian. More extremely, Baker (1995) states that “*the source-language word may express a concept which is totally unknown in the target language.*” Likewise, Nida (in Nababan, 2010) states as follows: *Translators are permanently faced with the problems of how to treat the cultural aspects implicit in a source text (SL) and finding the most appropriate technique of successfully conveying these aspects in the target language (TL).*

The difference explicitly causes a translator to be in a dilemmatic position. On one hand, he or she must replace a source language text with another text; on the other hand, he or she must find an equivalent meaning or message of the text in his or her translation. In other words, a translator

---

<sup>1</sup> Bio: English lecturer in the Faculty of Education at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. Contact: [zainal\\_arifin@ums.ac.id](mailto:zainal_arifin@ums.ac.id)

should not only replace a source language text with another; but also, more importantly he or she should replace a message or meaning of text with that of another text. Furthermore, Nida, Dollerup, and Lindegard (in Nababan: 2010) suggest as follows: *Translators should strive to transmit an image of the source culture to the target receptors that corresponds to the image the target culture would claim for itself.*

Likewise, a translation of English research terms in Textbook *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach* often causes a non-equivalence of meaning or message in Indonesian ones. It is the problem that makes a translator difficult to transfer a meaning or message of the term into Indonesian meaning. To solve a non-equivalence of meaning, therefore, is necessary to think about the use of various translation strategies that can produce a good or equivalent translation. The result of the study by Tuan (2011), entitled *Strategies to Translate Information Technology (IT) Terms*, shows that the translation strategies of IT terms include *direct borrowing, loan translation, literal translation, modulation, transposition, and adaptation.* In his research, entitled *Translation Strategies of the Culture-Specific Terms in the Tourism Texts "Sepotong Ubud di Yogyakarta" and "Mengirim Pulang Sang Penglingsir,"* Arifin (2013) states that the translation strategies of culture-specific terms covers *translation by cultural substitution, translation by loanwords with explanation, translation loanwords without explanation, translation by loanwords with definition, translation by loanwords and cultural substitution, and translation by loanwords and transfer.* Widyamartaya (1991) suggests that translation strategies that can be used by a translator for replacing a text into another text are described as follows: *translation by loanword, translation by loanword with spelling change, and translation by replacement or substitution.*

According to Baker (1995), those used by professional translators can be stated as follows: 1) *translation by a more general word (superordinate), 2) translation by a more neutral/less expressive word, 3) translation by cultural substitution, 4) translation by or loanword plus explanation, 5) translation by paraphrase using a related word, 6) translation by paraphrase using unrelated word, 7) translation by omission, and 8) translation by illustration.* Muis et al. (2010) stated that a process of foreign term adoption can be done as follows: 1) *adoption by spelling and pronunciation adaption, 2) adoption by spelling adaption without spelling change, 3) adoption by pronunciation adaption without spelling adaptation, and 4) adoption without spelling and pronunciation adaptation.*

## **2. Methodology**

The study used a descriptive-qualitative approach. It means the researchers analyzed and described the translation strategies of English research terms into Indonesian ones. The data were the English and Indonesian research terms and the data sources were the documents and informants (*raters*). The documents were the two textbooks: *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach* and its translation *Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian dalam Bisnis.* The informants (participants) were the experts in translation linguistics and research filed. The data collection

employed a content analysis, in-depth interview, and questionnaires. The data validity applied a data/source triangulation technique. The data were analyzed with an interactive model: data reduction, data display, and conclusion.

### 3. Findings

#### 3.1. Translation Strategy by Replacement or Transfer

A translation strategy by replacement or transfer (cultural substitution) means that the research terms are transmuted into Indonesian (see Table 1). For instance, the term *research* is replaced with *penelitian*. The term *researcher* is translated into *peneliti*. The suffix *-er* at the word refers to a 'person' who does a research. As the English nouns, the terms *interview*, *interviewer*, *interviewees*, *observation*, *introduction*, *quotation*, *appendices*, and *summary* are respectively replaced with *wawancara*, *pewawancara*, *orang yang diwawancarai*, *pengamatan*, *pendahuluan*, *kutipan*, *lampiran* and *ringkasan*.

The meanings of the terms *testability*, *replicability*, *mean* and *instrument* are respectively transferred into *dapat diuji*, *dapat ditiru*, *rata-rata hitung* and *alat ukur*. In terms of a lingual unit, however, all the terms shift to phrases in Indonesian. The terms *precision*, *test*, *measurement* and *confidence* are transmuted into *ketelitian*, *uji*, *pengukuran* and *keyakinan*. The word *acknowledgments* is transferred into *ucapan terimakasih*. The word shifts to a singular noun in Indonesian.

The phrases *basic research*, *applied research*, *action research*, *applied researcher* and *research problem* are respectively replaced with *penelitian dasar*, *penelitian terapan*, *penelitian tindakan*, *peneliti terapan* and *masalah penelitian*. The meaning of the term *testable statements* is *pernyataan yang dapat diuji*. The plural noun *statement's* shifts to a singular noun *pernyataan* in Indonesian.

The terms *t-test*, *measurement error*, and *testing effects* are respectively transmuted into *uji-t*, *kesalahan pengukuran* and *pengaruh pengujian*. There is a difference of phrase structure between English and Indonesian. It is due to the different grammatical rule. Likewise, the shift occurs at the following translations: the phrases *testing effects*, *closed questions*, *face-to-face interview*, *inkblot test*, *interrater reliability*, *leading questions*, and *loaded questions* are respectively transferred into *pengaruh pengujian*, *pertanyaan tertutup*, *wawancara tatap muka*, *uji noda tinta*, *keandalan antarpenilai*, *pertanyaan yang mengarahkan* and *pertanyaan yang bermuatan*.

With the strategy by replacement, the terms *paired comparison*, *goodness of measure*, *length of questions*, *sequencing of questions*, *cross-cultural research*, *reliability output*, and *recall dependent question* are respectively transmitted into *perbandingan berpasangan*, *ketepatan pengukuran*, *panjang pertanyaan*, *mengurutkan pertanyaan*, *penelitian lintas budaya*, *hasil keandalan*, and *pertanyaan tergantung ingatan*. Similarly, the terms *time frame*, *research report*, and *authorization letter* are replaced with *jangka waktu*, *laporan penelitian*, and *surat pengesahan*.

Table 1: Translation Strategy by Replacement or Transfer (Cultural Substitution)

No	Source Language (English)	Target Language (Indonesian)
1.	Research	Penelitian
2.	Researcher	Peneliti
3.	Interview	Wawancara
4.	Basic research	Penelitian dasar
5.	Applied research	Penelitian terapan
6.	Observation	Pengamatan
7.	Action research	Penelitian tindakan
8.	Testability	Dapat diuji
9.	Replicability	Dapat ditiru
10.	Test	Uji
11.	<i>t</i> -test	Uji- <i>t</i>
12.	Measurement error	Kesalahan pengukuran
13.	Precision	Ketelitian
14.	Confidence	Keyakinan
15.	Quotation	Kutipan
16.	Research problem	Masalah penelitian
17.	Applied researcher	Peneliti terapan
18.	Testable statements	Pernyataan yang dapat diuji
19.	<i>F</i> test	Uji <i>F</i>
20.	Measurement	Pengukuran
21.	Instrument	Alat ukur
22.	Testing effects	Pengaruh pengujian
23.	Mean	Rata-rata hitung
24.	Summary	Ringkasan
25.	Closed questions	Pertanyaan tertutup
26.	Face-to-face interview	Wawancara tatap muka
27.	Inkblot test	Uji noda tinta
28.	Interrater reliability	Keandalan antarpemilai
29.	Leading questions	Pertanyaan yang mengarahkan
30.	Loaded questions	Pertanyaan yang bermuatan
31.	Measurement	Pengukuran
32.	Reliability	Keandalan
33.	Paired comparison	Perbandingan berpasangan
34.	Forced choice	Pilihan yang diharuskan
35.	Goodness of measure	Ketepatan pengukuran
36.	Construct	Konsep
37.	Interviewer	Pewawancara
38.	Interviewees	Orang yang diwawancarai
39.	Length of questions	Panjang pertanyaan
40.	Sequencing of questions	Mengurutkan pertanyaan
41.	Introduction	Pendahuluan
42.	Cross-cultural research	Penelitian lintas budaya
43.	Reliability	Keandalan
44.	Reliability output	Hasil keandalan

45.	Time frame	Jangka waktu
46.	Research report	Laporan penelitian
47.	Table of content	Daftar isi
48.	Title page	Halaman judul
49.	Authorization letter	Surat pengesahan
50.	Introduction	Pendahuluan
51.	Acknowledgments	Ucapan terimakasih
52.	Appendices	Lampiran
53.	Recall dependent question	Pertanyaan tergantung ingatan

Source: 'Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach karya Uma Sekaran' and its translation 'Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis'

### 3.2. Translation Strategy by Loanwords with Spelling Change, Letter Omission or Letter Addition

A translation strategy by loanwords with spelling change, letter omission, or letter addition means that the research terms are adopted by changing a spelling, omitting a letter, or adding a letter in Indonesian (see Table 2). For example, the term *quantitative* is adopted by changing its spelling into *kuantitatif*. Furthermore, the letters 'q' and 'v' respectively change into those 'k' and 'f' while the letter 'e' is omitted in its translation. The term *observation* changes into *observasi* where the suffix 'ion' changes 'si' in Indonesian.

Likewise, the term *methodology* changes into *metodologi* where the letters 'th' and 'y' respectively change into 't' and 'i' in Indonesian. The term *objectivity* changes into *objektivitas* where the letters 'c' and 'ty' change into 'k' and 'tas.' The word *hypothesis* changes into *hipotesis* where the letters 'y' and 'th' are respectively adopted into 'i' and 't.'

The terms *respondent* and *element* respectively change into *responden* dan *elemen* where the letter 't' is omitted in its translation. The word *method* changes into *metode* where the letters 'th' change into the letter 't', but the translator adds the suffix 'e' in its translation. The terms *sample*, *table* and *variable* are respectively borrowed into *sampel*, *tabel* and *variabel* where the suffixes 'ple' and 'ble' change into 'pel' dan 'bel.'

The phrase *mathematical model* changes into *model matematika* where the word *model* does not change in its translation while the letters 'the' and 'cal' change into 't' and 'ka.' The phrase *criterion variable* is adopted into *variabel kriteria* where the letters 'c' and 'ion' respectively change into 'k' and 'a.' The term *bibliographical indexes* changes into *indeks bibliografi* where the letters 'phical' change into 'fi' and the letters 'xes' change into 'ks.'

The term *internal validity* changes *validitas internal* where the letters 'ty' change into 'tas' while the word is adopted with spelling change in Indonesian. The term *external validity* changes *validitas eksternal* where the letter 'x' changes into 'ks' in its translation. The phrase *causal study* changes into *studi kausal* where the letters 'c' and 'y' respectively change into 'k' and 'i.' The term *questionnaire* changes into where the letter 'q' and 'tionnaire' change into the letter 'k' and 'sioner.' The term *variance* changes into *varians* where the letters 'ce' change into 's' in Indonesian.

Table 2: Translation Strategy by Loanwords with Spelling Change, Letter Omission or Letter Addition

No	Source Language (English)	Target Language (Indonesian)
1.	Quantitative	Kuantitatif
2.	Qualitative	Kualitatif
3.	Questionnaire	Kuesioner
4.	Observation	Observasi
5.	Deduction	Deduksi
6.	Case studies	Studi kasus
7.	Objectivity	Objektivitas
8.	Hypothesis	Hipotesis
9.	Methodology	Metodologi
10.	Sample	Sampel
11.	Respondent	Responden
12.	Statistics	Statistik
13.	Method	Metode
14.	Hypothetico-deductive method	Metode hipotesis-deduktif
15.	Interpretation of data	Interpretasi data
16.	Mathematical model	Model matematika
17.	Bibliographical indexes	Indeks bibliografi
18.	Variables	Variabel
19.	Theory	Teori
20.	Secondary data	Data sekunder
21.	Primary data	Data primer
22.	Moderating variable	Variabel moderator
23.	Directional and nondirectional hypotheses	Hipotesis direksional dan nondireksional
24.	Null and alternate hypotheses	Hipotesis nol dan alternatif
25.	Statistical analysis	Analisis statistik
26.	Absenteeism variable	Variabel absensi
27.	Criterion variable	Variabel kriteria
28.	Predictor variable	Variabel prediktor
29.	Table	Tabel
30.	Discussion	Diskusi
31.	Exploratory study	Studi eksploratif
32.	Descriptive study	Studi deskriptif
33.	Case study analysis	Analisis studi kasus
34.	Causal study	Studi kausal
35.	Correlational study	Studi korelasi
36.	Minimal interference	Intervensi minimal
37.	Moderate interference	Intervensi moderat
38.	Analysis unit	Unit analisis
39.	Cross-sectional study	Studi <i>cross-sectional</i>
40.	Longitudinal study	Studi longitudinal
41.	Randomization	Randomisasi

42.	Internal validity	Validitas internal
43.	External validity	Validitas eksternal
44.	Statistical regression	Regresi statistik
45.	Response	Respon
46.	Blocking factor	Faktor blok
47.	Factorial design	Desain faktorial
48.	Covariance analysis	Analisis kovarians
49.	Category scale	Skala kategori
50.	Comparative scale	Skala komparatif
51.	Comparative study	Studi komparatif
52.	Dichotomous study	Studi dikotonomos
53.	Discriminant validity	Validitas diskriminan
54.	Dynamic panel	Panel dinamis
55.	Element	Elemen
56.	Exogeneous variable	Variable eksogen
57.	Graphic rating scale	Skala peringkat grafik
58.	Inferential statistics	Statistic inferential
59.	Likert scale	Skala Likert
60.	Nominal scale	Skala nominal
61.	Ordinal scale	Skala ordinal
62.	Interval scale	Skala interval
63.	Ratio scale	Skala rasio
64.	Category scale	Skala kategori
65.	Validity	Validitas
66.	Dichotomous scale	Skala dikotomi
67.	Semantic differential scale	Skala diferensial semantik
68.	Staple scale	Skala stapel
69.	Consensus scale	Skala konsensus
70.	Comparative scale	Skala komparatif
71.	Construct	Konsep
72.	Item analysis	Analisis item
73.	Convergent validity	Validity konvergen
74.	Predictive validity	Validitas prediktif
75.	Sources of data	Sumber data
76.	Questionnaire	Kuesioner
77.	Classification data	Data klasifikasi
78.	Observational surveys	Survei observasional
79.	Population	Populasi
80.	Subject	Subjek
81.	Categorization	Kategorisasi
82.	Correlation coefficient	Koefisien korelasi
83.	References	Referensi
84.	Literature survey	Survei literatur
85.	Table	Tabel
86.	Analytical study	Studi analitis
87.	Analysis Of Variants (ANOVA)	Analisis Varians
88.	Controlled variable	Variabel yang dikontrol

89.	Electronic questionnaire	Kuesioner elektronik
90.	Standard deviation	Standar deviasi
91.	Variance	Varians

Source: 'Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach karya Uma Sekaran' and its translation 'Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis'

### 3.3. Translation Strategy by Replacement as well as Loanwords with Spelling Change

With the strategy by replacement as well as loanwords with spelling change, the translator replaces the research terms and changes their spellings in Indonesian (see Table 3). For example, the term *theory formulation* is translated and adopted into *perumusan teori*. The word *formulation* is transferred into *perumusan* while *theory* is borrowed by changing its spelling into *teori*. The term *generalizability* is replaced with *dapat digeneralisasi*. The translator transmutes it by borrowing the root word *general* in Indonesian. The term *research design* is translated and adopted into *desain penelitian*. The translator transfers the word *research* into *penelitian* while the word *design* is adopted with spelling change: 'ig' into 'ai.'

The term *problem identification* is transmuted into *identifikasi masalah*. The word *identification* changes its spelling: 'cation' into 'kasi.' The terms *independent variable* and *dependent variable* are adopted and translated into *variabel bebas* and *variabel terikat*. The meanings of the words *independent* and *dependent* are respectively *bebas* and *terikat* while the *variable* is borrowed into *variabel*. The word *value* in the phrase *critical value* is translated into *nilai* while the word *critical* is adopted into *kritis*. The term *sample size* is translated and adopted into *ukuran sampel*. Furthermore, the meaning of the word *sample* is adopted in its translation: *sampel*.

The term *field experiment* is replaced with *eksperimen lapangan*. The meaning of the word *field* is *lapangan* while the word *experiment* is borrowed into *eksperimen*. The term *randomized block design* is adopted and translated into *desain blok acak*. Furthermore, the word *block* is adopted into *blok*. The term *problem-solving technique* is translated into *teknik pemecahan masalah*. The word *technique* is adopted by changing its spelling into *teknik*. The term *greater probability* is replaced with *probabilitas lebih besar*. The word *greater* means *lebih besar* while *probability* is adopted by changing its spelling into *probabilitas*.

The terms *itemized rating scale* and *balanced rating scale* means *skala peringkat terperinci* and *skala peringkat berimbang*. The word *scale* is borrowed into *skala*. The terms *attitudinal factors* and *behavioral factors* respectively means *faktor sikap* and *faktor perilaku*. The word *factors* is adopted into *faktor*. The phrase *secondary sources* means *sumber data sekunder*. The word *secondary* is borrowed into *sekunder*.

Table 3. Translation Strategy by Replacement as well as Loanwords with Spelling Change

No	Source Language (English)	Target Language (Indonesian)
1.	Preliminary information gathering	Pengumpulan informasi awal
2.	Theory formulation	Perumusan teori
3.	Theoretical base	Dasar teori
4.	Generalizability	Dapat digeneralisasi
5.	Research design	Desain penelitian
6.	Theoretical framework	Kerangka teoritis
7.	Problem identification	Identifikasi masalah
8.	Unstructured and structured interviews	Wawancara terstruktur dan tidak struktur
9.	Cassette recording	Rekaman kaset
10.	Literature review	Tinjauan literature
11.	Referencing electronic sources	Referensi sumber elektronik
12.	Dependent variable	Variabel terikat
13.	Independent variable	Variabel bebas
14.	Intervening variable	Variabel antara
15.	Research process model	Model proses penelitian
16.	Testable hypothesis	Hipotesis yang dapat diuji
17.	Applied research projects	Proyek penelitian terapan
18.	Hypotheses development	Penyusunan hipotesis
19.	Statement of hypotheses	Pernyataan hipotesis
20.	Hypothesis testing	Pengujian hipotesis
21.	Statistical test	Uji statistik
22.	Critical value	Nilai kritis
23.	Significance level	Tingkat signifikansi
24.	Elements of research design	Unsur-unsur desain penelitian
25.	Scientific research design	Desain penelitian ilmiah
26.	Problem-solving technique	Teknik pemecahan masalah
27.	Review of the purpose of the study	Tinjauan tujuan studi
28.	Explorative research	Penelitian eksploratif
29.	Causal study	Studi kausal
30.	Correlational study	Studi korelasi
31.	Sample size	Ukuran sampel
32.	Excessive interference	Intervensi berlebih
33.	Field study	Studi lapangan
34.	Field experiment	Eksperimen lapangan
35.	Contaminating exogeneous or “nuisance” variables	Variable “pengganggu” yang mencemari
36.	Quasi-experimental design	Desain eksperimen semu
37.	True-experimental design	Desain eksperimen murni
38.	Confounding variables	Variable pencemar
39.	Instrumentation effects	Pengaruh instrumentasi
40.	Selection bias effects	Pengaruh bias seleksi
41.	Laws of probability	Hukum probabilitas
42.	Low scores	Skor rendah
43.	Greater probability	Probabilitas lebih besar
44.	Pretest	Prates
45.	Posttest	Pascates
46.	Short questionnaires	Kuesioner singkat
47.	Confounding factor	Faktor pengacau
48.	Double-blind studies	Studi buta ganda
49.	Completely randomized design	Desain yang sepenuhnya acak
50.	Randomized block design	Desain blok acak

51.	Latin square design	Desain kuadrat Latin
52.	Ambiguous questions	Pertanyaan ambigu
53.	Analytical study	Studi analitis
54.	Action research	Penelitian aksi
55.	Area sampling	Pengambilan sampling area
56.	Attitudinal factors	Faktor sikap
57.	Behavioral factors	Faktor perilaku
58.	Closed questions	Pertanyaan tertutup
59.	Cluster sampling	Pengambilan sampel klaster
60.	Complex probability sampling	Pengambilan sampel probabilitas kompleks
61.	Dichotomous study	Studi dikotonomos
62.	Discriminant validity	Validitas diskriminan
63.	Disproportionate stratified random sampling	Pengambilan sampel acak berstrata disproporsional
64.	Double-blind study	Studi buta-dobel
65.	Double-barreled questions	Pertanyaan dobel-objek
66.	Double sampling	Pengambilan sampel dobel
67.	Efficiency in sampling	Efisiensi dalam pengambilan sampel
68.	Exogeneous variable	Variable eksogen
69.	Fixed rating scale	Skala peringkat tetap
70.	Graphic rating scale	Skala peringkat grafik
71.	Hypothetico-deductive method of research	Metode penelitian hipotetis deduktif
72.	Inkblot test	Uji noda tinta
73.	Interrater reliability	Keandalan antarpemilai
74.	Itemized rating scale	Skala peringkat terperinci
75.	Leading questions	Pertanyaan yang mengarahkan
76.	Loaded questions	Pertanyaan yang bermuatan
77.	Rating scale	Skala peringkat
78.	Fixed or constant sum scale	Skala jumlah konstan atau tetap
79.	Staple scale	Skala staple
80.	Graphic rating scale	Skala peringkat grafik
81.	Paired comparison	Perbandingan berpasangan
82.	Forced choice	Pilihan yang diharuskan
83.	Content validity	Validitas isi
84.	Criterion-related validity	Validitas berdasar kriteria
85.	Itemized rating scale	Skala peringkat terperinci
86.	Balanced rating scale	Skala peringkat berimbang
87.	Faces scale	Skala wajah
88.	Multidimensional scaling	Penskalaan multidimensional
89.	Stability of measures	Stabilitas pengukuran
90.	Interitem consistency reliability	Keandalan konsistensi antar-item
91.	Split-half reliability	Keandalan belah dua
92.	Scale origin	Asal skala
93.	Data collection method	Metode pengumpulan data
94.	Sources of data	Sumber data
95.	Primary sources of data	Sumber data primer
96.	Focus group	Kelompok fokus
97.	Secondary sources	Sumber data sekunder
98.	Survey research	Penelitian survei
99.	Unbiased questions	Pertanyaan tidak bias
100.	Telephone interviews	Wawancara telepon
101.	Computer-aided survey services	Layanan survey dengan bantuan komputer
102.	Mail questionnaires	Kuesioner surat
103.	Personally administered	Kuesioner yang diberikan secara pribadi

	questionnaires	
104.	Guideline for questionnaire design	Pedoman untuk desain kuesior
105.	Open-ended versus closed questions	Pertanyaan terbuka versus tertutup
106.	Sequencing of questions	Mengurutkan pertanyaan
107.	Principles of measurement	Prinsip pengukuran
108.	Observational surveys	Survei observasional
109.	Participant-observer	Pengamat partisipan
110.	Nonparticipant-observer	Pengamat-nonpartisipan
111.	Sampling	Pengambilan sampel
112.	Probability and nonprobability sampling	Penambilan sampel cara probabilitas dan nonprobabilitas
113.	Unrestricted or simple random sampling	Pengambilan sampel acak sederhana atau tidak terbatas
114.	Restricted or complex probability sampling	Pengambilan sampel cara probabilitas kompleks atau terbatas
115.	Systematic sampling	Pengambilan sampel sistematis
116.	Stratified random sampling	Pengambilan sampel acak berstrata
117.	Cluster sampling	Pengambilan sampel klaster
118.	Single-stage and multistage cluster sampling	Pengambilan sampel klaster satu tingkat dan multistage
119.	Area sampling	Pengambilan sampel area
120.	Double sampling	Pengambilan sampel dobel
121.	Convenience sampling	Pengambilan sampel yang mudah
122.	Purposive sampling	Pengambilan sampel bertujuan
123.	Judgment sampling	Pengambilan sampel berdasarkan pertimbangan tertentu
124.	Quota sampling	Pengambilan sampel kuota
125.	Sample size	Ukuran sampel
126.	Sample data	Data sampel
127.	Coding	Mengodekan
128.	Coding the serakan co. data	Mengodekan data serakan co.
129.	Split-half reliability coefficient	Koefisien keandalan belah dua
130.	Parallel form reliability	Keandalan bentuk paralel
131.	Test-retest reliability	Keandalan tes ulang
132.	Reliability analysis	Analisis keandalan
133.	Test of significance	Uji signifikansi
134.	Multiple regression analysis	Analisis regresi berganda
135.	Research proposal	Proposal penelitian
136.	Executive summary or synopsis	Ringkasan eksekutif atau sinopsis
137.	Results of data analysis	Hasil analisis data
138.	Conclusions and recommendation	Kesimpulan dan rekomendasi
139.	Hypothesis formulated	Rumusan hipotesis
140.	Controlled variable	Variabel yang dikontrol
141.	Data mining	Penambangan data
142.	Editing data	Mengedit data
143.	Funneling technique	Teknik menyalurkan
144.	Population frame	Kerangka populasi
145.	Pretesting survey questions	Pertanyaan survei prates
146.	Recall dependent question	Pertanyaan tergantung ingatan
147.	Researcher interference	Intervensi/campur tangan peneliti
148.	Standard deviation	Standar deviasi

Source: *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach karya Uma Sekaran* and its translation *Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis*

A translation strategy by replacement as well as loanwords without spelling change means that the research terms are translated and adopted into Indonesian without their spelling change (see Table 4). For example, the term *fundamental research* means *penelitian fundamental*. The word *fundamental* is adopted without its spelling change. Likewise, the terms *data collection*, *data security*, *aggregation of data*, *interview data*, and *data warehousing* are respectively transferred and adopted into *pengumpulan data*, *penyimpanan data*, *kesatuan data*, *data wawancara*, and *penyimpanan data*. The word *data* in the phrase is borrowed without its spelling change. Also, the term *primary data sources* is transferred and borrowed into *sumber data primer*. The terms *coding the serakan co. data* and *editing data* are respectively translated and borrowed into *mengkodekan data serakan co.* and *mengedit data*. The word *coding* is translated by adding the Indonesian element (prefix + suffix: *meng - kan*) while the word *editing* is transferred by adding the Indonesian one (prefix: *meng-*). The phrase *serakan co.data* is adopted without its spelling change, although it changes its structure in Indonesian. The term *unbiased questions* is translated and borrowed into *pertanyaan tidak bias*. As a root word, the word *bias* is borrowed without its spelling change. The term *chi-square test* is translated and borrowed into *uji chi-square*. The phrase *chi-square* is borrowed without its spelling change and punctuation (-) in its translation.

Table 4. Translation Strategy by Replacement as well as Loanwords without Spelling Change

No	Source Language (English)	Target Language (Indonesian)
1.	Fundamental research	Penelitian fundamental
2.	Data collection	Pengumpulan data
3.	Chi-square test	Uji <i>chi-square</i>
4.	Data security	Penyimpanan data
5.	Data warehousing	Penyimpanan data
6.	Data warehouse	Gudang data
7.	Online Databases	Basis data online
8.	Lab experiment	Eksperimen lab
9.	Aggregation of data	Kesatuan data
10.	Selection bias effects	Pengaruh bias seleksi
11.	Area sampling	Pengambilan sampling area
12.	Criterion-related validity	Validitas berdasar criteria
13.	Data collection method	Metode pengumpulan data
14.	Sources of data	Sumber data
15.	Primary sources of data	Sumber data primer
16.	Secondary sources	Sumber data sekunder
17.	Secondary sources	Data sekunder
18.	Unbiased questions	Pertanyaan tidak bias
19.	Telephone interviews	Wawancara telepon
20.	Interview data	Data wawancara
21.	Sample data	Data sampel
22.	Coding	Mengodekan

23.	Coding the serakan co. data	Mengodekan data serakan co.
24.	Results of data analysis	Hasil analisis data
25.	Data mining	Penambangan data
26.	Editing data	Mengedit data

Source: 'Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building Approach karya Uma Sekaran' and its translation 'Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis'

#### 4. Conclusions

A replacement of a source language with another language frequently causes a non-equivalence of meaning or message. It is due to the difference of language culture between English and Indonesian, particularly. To solve the non-equivalence, therefore, is necessary to employ a variety of translation strategies for producing a good translation of the criteria: equivalent, readable, and acceptable.

The strategies used for the transfer of the research terms' meaning or message with Indonesian terms include 1) translation by transfer or replacement, 2) translation by loanwords with spelling change, letter omission, or letter addition, 3) translation by replacement or transfer as well as loanwords with spelling change, and 4) translation by replacement or transfer as well as loanwords without spelling change. However, the uses of the strategies often cause a shift of the phrase's grammatical structure and noun, i.e., plural noun to singular noun. In particular, the shift of the phrase's structure is due to the tendentious difference between English grammatical rules and Indonesian ones.

#### 5. Discussion

Based on the result of data analysis, the translation strategies of the research terms from English into Indonesian include 1) translation strategy by replacement or cultural substitution, 2) translation by loanwords with spelling change, letter omission, or letter addition, 3) translation by replacement or transfer as well as loanwords with spelling change, and 4) translation by replacement or transfer as well as loanwords without spelling change. In the translation strategy by replacement, the translator replaces the English research terms with the Indonesian ones. For example, the terms *research* and *researcher* are transferred into *penelitian* and *peneliti*. Likewise, the terms *interview*, *interviewer*, and *interviewee* are respectively replaced with *wawancara*, *pewawancara*, and *orang yang diwawancarai*. In the strategy, the English grammatical category is consistent to the Indonesian one. In other words, it does not change in Indonesian. For example, the *research* a noun is grammatically also a noun (*penelitian*) in Indonesian. It is suggested that the replacement of a foreign term or word with another term or word in a target language must keep its grammatical category if it is greatly possible (Widyamartaya, 1991).

In his results of the research, Arifin (2013) suggests that a translation strategy by replacement cultural substitution could be used to translate a culture-specific term. Similarly, Widyamartaya (1991) states that the translation of a foreign word or term could use a strategy by replacement or transfer. Baker (1995) states that in terms of a non-equivalence of a term's

meaning or message, a translator could employ a strategy by cultural substitution.

However, the translation strategy by replacement or cultural substitution can cause a shift of lingual unit from a word to phrase in Indonesian, particularly. For example, the words *mean* and *instrument* are translated into *rata-rata hitung* and *alat ukur*. The shift is due to the grammatical structure difference between English and Indonesian. For instance, the phrase *applied research* is replaced with *penelitian terapan*. Regarding the grammatical rules, the English phrase structure generally consists of 'modifier' and 'head' while the Indonesian ones generally consists of 'head' and 'modifier.'

In a translation strategy by loanwords with spelling change, letter omission, or letter addition, a translator essentially does not translate the research terms, but he adopts or borrows with spelling change, letter omission, or letter addition in Indonesian. For example, the term *quantitative* is adopted with spelling change into *kuantitatif*. Furthermore, the letters 'q' and 'v' alters into 'k' and 'f' while the letter 'e' removed. The term *observation* alters into *observasi* where the suffix 'ion' alters into 'si' in Indonesian. The term *method* is borrowed into *metode*. Furthermore, the translator replaces the letters 'th' with 't' and adds the letter 'e' at the end of the words.

The use of the strategy is relevant to Widyamartaya (1991), stating that a translator can adopt or borrow a culture-specific term or word with spelling change. Baker (1995) states that a translator can use a translation strategy by *loanwords*.

As in the strategy by replacement, however, the strategy can cause a shift of phrase structure. For example, the term *mathematical model* is adopted into *model matematika*. Regards the grammatical rules, the English phrase *mathematical model* comprises *modifier (mathematical) + head (model)* while the Indonesian phrase consists of *head (model) + modifier (matematika)*. Similarly, the strategy can cause a shift of plural noun to singular noun. For example, the plural nouns *references*, *indexes*, and *variables* are transferred into *referensi*, *indeks* and *variabel* as a noun in Indonesian.

In the translation strategy by replacement as well as loanwords with spelling change, the terms of the research terms are translated and adopted or borrowed with spelling change into Indonesian. For example, the meaning of the phrase *theory formulation* is *perumusan teori*. The word *formulation* is translated into *perumusan* while the word *theory* is adopted with spelling change into *teori*. The term *generalizability* is replaced with *dapat digeneralisasi*. The translator transferred the term by borrowing the root word *general* in Indonesian. The term *research design* is transferred into *desain penelitian*. The meaning of the word *research* is *penelitian* while the word *design* is adopted with spelling change: 'ig' into 'ai.'

However, the strategy frequently causes a shift of the phrase's grammatical structure. As stated above, it is due to a grammatical rule between English and Indonesian. For example, the phrase *field experiment* is replaced with *eksperimen lapangan*. The meaning of the word *field* is *lapangan* while the word *experiment* is borrowed into. In English, the grammatical structure of the phrase *field experiment* consists of *modifier (field) and head (experiment)* while the phrase consists of *head (eksperimen) and modifier (lapangan)* in Indonesian.

The other strategy used for the replacement of the research terms is a translation strategy by loanwords without spelling change. For example, the term *fundamental research* is replaced with *penelitian fundamental*. The word *fundamental* is borrowed without spelling change into *fundamental*. Likewise, the terms *data collection*, *data security*, *aggregation of data*, *interview data*, and *data warehousing* are respectively replaced with *pengumpulan data*, *penyimpanan data*, *kesatuan data*, *data wawancara*, and *penyimpanan data*. All of the words *data* are borrowed without spelling change into *data* in Indonesia. Also, the *primary data sources* is transferred into *sumber data primer*.

### References

- A, Zainal. (2013). Translation Strategies of Culture-Specific Terms in the Tourism Texts “Sepotong Ubud di Yogyakarta” and “Mengirim Pulang Sang Penglinsir.” *Jurnal Sastra dan Bahasa IAIN Surakarta*, 9, 22-26.
- B, Mona. (1995). *In Other Words: a course on book translation*, Routledge: London.
- M, Muhammad, et al. (2010). *Perluasan Makna Kata dan Istilah Bahasa dalam Bahasa Indonesia*, Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa Pendidikan Nasional.
- N. M.R. (2010) Penerjemahan dan Budaya Retrieved June 15, 2010 from <http://www.proz.com/translation-articles/articles/2074/1/Penerjemahan-dan-Budaya>.
- S, Uma. (2003). *Research Methods for Business: A Skill Building for Business*, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- S, Uma. (2006). *Research Methods for Business: Metodologi Penelitian untuk Bisnis*, Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- T, L. Trung. (2011). *Strategies to Translate Information Technology IT Terms*, Finland: Academic Publisher.
- W, A. (1989). *Seni Menerjemahkan*, Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

# **Interlanguage and L1 Interference in L2 Speech Production: A study of Iban Native Speakers Learning Malay as a Second Language: A Critique**

Boluwaji Oshodi<sup>1</sup>

*Adekunle Ajasin University - NIGERIA*

Received: 14.07.2015  
Published: 30.03.2016

## **Abstract**

This study critically appraised the study of Shahidi et al (2012) which examined interlanguage and interference in the speech pattern of Iban native speakers L2 Malay. It was discovered that the claims made in the study cannot be substantiated for obvious reasons which range from wrong assumptions, concept evaluation, faulty theoretical application as well as incorrect submission and generalization of facts on the acquisition of L2 sound system particularly in relation to the concepts of interference and interlanguage. This present study attempts to set the records straight first, by critically reviewing the ideas and submissions of Shahidi et al (2012) and second, by presenting and also validating the contrary version of the views and generalizations expressed by Shahidi et al (2012) in relation to the acquisition of L2 sound system with examples from cognitive as well as linguistic perspectives based on facts from existing literature on the issue.

**Keywords** interference, interlanguage, L2 acquisition, psycholinguistics, sound system

## **1. Introduction**

The issue of whether interference of L1 features constitutes a major source of error among L2 learners at every level of L2 acquisition is not in doubt based on the overwhelming evidence from previous studies on L2 acquisition (Lado 1965; Dulay & Burt 1974; James 1985; Fledge et al 1997; Author 2013) all which have shown that interference do play a major role in this regard. As observed by Author (2013), one area of L2 acquisition in which the concept of interference becomes vital and highly prominent is in the area of sound system (Phonetics and Phonology). This is because L2 learners always (in most cases) transfer the knowledge of the L1 sound system and features to the L2 context predominantly by substituting similar sounds in their L1 for the target L2 sounds. Among all the areas of L2 acquisition, the sound system (pronunciation) has been identified as one area in which most L2 learners specifically “adult learners” never achieve native-like competence. The issues of what constitute the L2 learners interlanguage grammar which eventually leads to error of pronunciation as claimed by Shahidi et al (2012) would be evaluated in this study in order to identify and justify the total misconception and wrong application of the concept in this area by Shahidi et al (2012).

In their study of interlanguage and interference in L2 speech production which examined Iban native speakers learning Malay as L2 with focus on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Bio: He is specialized in Linguistic and Cognitive theories relating to First and Second language acquisition with reference to minority languages documentation and acquisition.  
Contact: [bolu\\_oshodi@yahoo.com](mailto:bolu_oshodi@yahoo.com)

pronunciation of some Malay plosives, Shahidi et al (2012) made some generalizations about the concept of interference and interlanguage which do not reflect the true status and conceptual principles of both concepts. Their findings as well as generalizations were devoid of verifiable facts. The overall submission of the study was based on perceived assumption borne out of inadequate understanding of the concepts of interlanguage and interference which was further marred by faulty analyses which produced technically incorrect results, inadequate background information presented on the two languages in question as well as the cogent, inadequate and unverifiable linguistic background of the Iban subjects employed for the study. These issues would be examined in subsequent sections of this study.

### 1.1. *An Overview of Shaidi et al (2012)*

According to Shaidi et al (2012), Iban native speakers who are “learners” of Malay as L2 do have problems with the correct phonetic realization of the plosives [p, b, t, d k, g] not as a result of interference but as a result of interlanguage. The major claim is that by considering the Vowel Duration (VD), Closure Duration (CD) and Voice Onset Time (VOT) the Iban learners of Malay as L2 developed a kind of interlanguage grammar by producing a form of the above plosives which are not attested in either Iban or Malay. This claim which is the contentious issue to be addressed in this study is considered erroneous and would be the major focus in this study. This becomes imperative in order to show and justify the claim that the overall claim and submission of Shaidi et al (2012) is indeed a distortion of facts concerning the issues addressed in the study. For a clear explanation of the faulty theoretical application which led to this alleged erroneous claim by Shaidi et al (2012), some key issues relating to the language situation in Malaysia where both Iban and Malay are spoken as native languages (L1) would be discussed. In addition, an evaluation of the concepts of interlanguage and interference in relation to L2 acquisition of sound system, some key concepts under L2 acquisition, cognitive/psycholinguistics as well as phonetics and phonology in L2 acquisition as they affect the results of Shaidi et al (2012) study would be exhaustively examined.

### 1.2. *Malay and Iban Languages: Matters Arising*

Malay and Iban languages according to Ethnologue (2009) are both members of the Austronesian language family. While Iban is natively spoken on Borneo Island in the Eastern part of Malaysia, Malay on the hand is the official and national language of Malaysia which implies that every Malaysian child is usually encouraged to learn Malay. This fact is important because though Malay (Bahasa Malaysia: Peninsular variety) is the official and national language of Malaysia, other languages like Chinese and Tamil are also recognized and given prominence. According to Ethnologue (2009), Malay is also spoken in countries like Singapore, Brunei and Indonesia. The forms spoken in the above countries are considered variants of the peninsular variety. Most importantly, Hasmah Haji Omar (2004) identified another variety tagged Sarawak Malay which is spoken exclusively in the state of Sarawak on Borneo Island where Iban is natively spoken and it is considered to be different to a large extent from the peninsular variety

lexically, structurally and semantically. To begin with, some key issues relating to the acquisition of L2 particularly those factors that must be considered and fulfilled before a viable research can be conducted on the acquisition of a second language would be discussed and evaluated.

The above clarification brings up the first question which Shaidi et al (2012) study failed to answer being; which variety of Malay did Shahidi et al (2012) actually examine? This question becomes important because Iban is native only to the state of Sarawak where the variety of Malay spoken differs considerably from the variety spoken in the Peninsular where Shahidi et al (2012) study was conducted. This makes the results questionable because the particular variety used as the benchmark for the study was not specified. Besides, it was not made clear the exact context in which the Iban subjects learned Malay as L2 i.e. whether they learned it in Sarawak or in the Peninsular.

The age of the Iban subjects were also put at thirteen (13) and they were said to have started learning Malay at age five (5) which implies that they had learnt Malay for good eight years prior to the period of data collection. First and foremost, for a clear view of the point being stressed here, there is the need to make a distinction between learning and acquisition<sup>2</sup>. According to the CPH (Critical Period Hypothesis) of Siegler (2006), Kal (2013) and the UG (Universal Grammar<sup>3</sup>) theory Chomsky (1986), the Iban subjects were all under the age of ten (10) years and were considered to still be within the critical period<sup>4</sup>, a period where all the Language Acquisition Devices (LAD) were still highly active and functional and during this period children have the tendency to acquire any language once they receive the right input. Thus, the Iban native speakers started learning Malay as L2 as children and at this stage all the properties of UG were still very active. This brings up the second question which is; do children learn or acquire language? As previous studies such as Dulay & Burt (1974) and Haznedar (1997) have all shown, children always acquire i.e. they pick and gain the knowledge of the language of their immediate environment (which is always their L1) without receiving any form of explicit instruction unlike the case for a second language where in most cases (adults) do receive formal training through explicit instructions in order to gain the knowledge of the second language. Another important fact is that while children always attain a complete

---

<sup>2</sup> Though the term Learning and Acquisition have been used interchangeably by SLA scholars, a tiny distinction do exist between them. According to Krashen (1982) children generally acquire language while adults tend to learn. In effect, children like those used as subjects by Shahidi et al (2013) would definitely have acquired Malay as L1 and thus the term 'learners' which tends to reflect a process of receiving explicit instructions like the case for adults as used for them by Shaidi et al (2013) does not reflect the true status of the Iban subjects.

<sup>3</sup> According to Chomsky (1986) Universal Grammar (UG) is defined as a complex abstract system of grammatical knowledge bridged by an innate mental faculty that is part of the human unique biological endowment that is designed purposely for the task of language acquisition LAD (Language Acquisition Device). This language faculty is what is referred to as Universal Grammar. These innate qualities are always active in children and help them to simplify the process of language acquisition.

<sup>4</sup> According to the CPH, children under the age of ten still have the ability to "acquire" i.e. attain a complete mastery of any language as long as they receive the right input.

mastery of language since they usually acquire it, adult L2 learners usually never attain such complete mastery.

In the Malaysian context, the case is obviously straightforward. Based on the status of Malay as the national and official language, every Malaysian child who has a different native language such as Iban but who now learns Malay for eight years within the Malaysian context would definitely receive tremendous inputs in Malay. The above clarifications stand to establish the fact that the Iban children used as subjects by Shahidi et al (2012) would actually have “acquired” Malay which makes Malay a second L1<sup>5</sup> and definitely not a L2 to them as claimed by Shahidi et al (2012). Our claim here can further be substantiated based on the fact that Shaidi et al (2012) did not present a thorough linguistic and social background of the Iban subjects and particularly those of their parents in which case either of their parents could have been a native speaker of another language since inter-marriage among different ethnic groups is a common occurrence in Malaysia. If this important possibility is seriously considered it would contradict the “alleged” status (i.e. L2 learners of Malay) given to the Iban subjects by Shaidi et al (2012). This is because in such a setting where both parents speak different native languages, the particular language which children from such setting speak as native language would have to be verified, thus ignoring this important fact and basing it on assumption as done by Shaidi et al (2012) seriously casts a big doubt on the data supplied and ultimately the results produced from such data.

### 1.3. *Interlanguage and Interference in L2 Learning/Acquisition*

According to Selinker (1972), “interlanguage refers to intermediate states or intermediate grammars of a learner’s language as it moves towards the target language. It is a product of a creative process driven by inner forces and interaction, influenced by L1 and input from the target language i.e. L2”. The interlanguage has some peculiar characteristics which include frequent changes, it is also governed by some innate rules as well as the L1, and it also reduces complex grammaticality in form. Above all, it is used for a smaller range of communicative needs. The fact that the interlanguage grammar exhibits frequent changes and also reduces complex grammaticality that may arise in the L2 confirms the claim that it is usually influenced by the L1 and input from the L2.

From the above definition of interlanguage, it becomes obvious that it is a creative pattern invented by L2 learners which is usually developed from features of both the L1 and the L2. It does not usually involve features which do not occur in the languages repertoire of the L2 learner. In the area of speech sounds, and from previous studies on the acquisition of L2 sound pattern, L2 learners do not come up with sounds outside the L1 and the L2, in other words, the wrong sounds that L2 learners tend to produce would either come from the native language which would be wrongly substituted for similar L2 sounds or come from the L2 in form of wrong use due to similarity

---

<sup>5</sup> Children have the ability to acquire multiple languages provided they get the right input. Author (In Press) discovered some Ìgbò children who have Igbo parents but brought up in Yorùbá land successfully acquired both Igbo and Yorùbá simultaneously and are proficient in both languages.

in the two sounds in the L2 and in most cases the L2 learners would normally choose the sound which is more familiar to them precisely sounds which share similar phonetic characteristics with those attested in their L1. According to Flege (1986b) and Author (2013), the major cause of errors in the acquisition of sound system among L2 learners is interference. Flege (1987) observed that interference in most cases usually implies a unidirectional effect of L1 on L2. In simple terms, L2 learners tend to transfer the features of L1 to L2 sounds that share similar phonetic characteristics with such L2 sounds. Interference in this context can be defined as the influence of the stabilized<sup>6</sup> knowledge of L1 sound system which is transferred to the L2 context in the realization and pronunciation of L2 sounds and features. This would suggest that interlanguage in this area (i.e. sound system) would be made up of sounds attested in both L1 and L2 but pronounced wrongly by L2 learners in obligatory contexts predominantly through substitution. The implication of this is that interlanguage at the phonetic level would be developed from the knowledge of the sound systems of the two languages i.e. the L1 and the L2 of the learner and any sound that the L2 learner comes up with in the process of learning the L2 (in terms of wrong pronunciation) would have to be attested in either the L1 or the L2.

#### 1.4. *Discussion and Evaluation of the Faulty Analyses in Shaidi et al (2012)*

According to Shaidi *et al* (2012), the plosives [p, b, t, d k, g] are attested in both Iban and Malay languages. Using DET, CT and VOT through a voice recording, Shaidi *et al* (2012) examined the pronunciation of the above plosives in the speech production of twenty (20) Iban native speakers who were “learners” of Malay as L2. The results were analyzed with a spectrogram using the PRAAT software system (a signal processing package). Acoustic measurement were taken of VOT (Voice Onset Time) and preceding Vowel Duration and Closure Duration where it was discovered according to Shaidi *et al* (2012) that what the Iban speakers produced was neither the Iban nor the Malay version of the plosives [p, b, t, d k, g]. Shaidi *et al* (2012) concluded that “the L2 learners (Iban) were discovered to build their own phonetic system of which the realization of that system does not seem to resemble neither L1 nor L2 i.e. Malay or Iban”. Shaidi *et al* (2012) based their generalization on the study by Flege (1987) and concluded that “L2 learners had an ability to create their own phonetic system that does not belong in either the L1 or the L2”.

This statement by Shaidi *et al* (2012) was a complete misconception and misinterpretation of the claims and submission of Flege (1987). In the first instance, Flege (1987) tested the “merger hypothesis” using the principle of equivalence classification. Equivalence classification according to Flege (1987) “is a basic cognitive mechanism which permits humans to perceive constant categories in the face of the inherent sensory variability found in

---

<sup>6</sup> The term stabilization is preferred to fossilization here because it denotes the fact the L1 sound pattern and features have become an intrinsic part of the L2 learners’ language faculty due to easy access to them as well as their continuous use over time (Author 2014). Also, stabilization occurs at a particular point and it is subject to change depending on several factors which could be contextual, societal and most importantly psycho-syntactic.

the many physical exemplars which may instantiate a category”. According to Bruner *et al* (1966), Nelson (1974) and Anglin (1977), it was made clear that children and adults use somewhat different strategies to categorize word, picture, or object arrays. A classic view is that children become increasingly less reliant on sensory information as they develop cognitively. The goal of the study which was “bi-directional” was to determine *whether L2 learning affects the production of stops in L1. If the merger hypothesis is correct we would expect to see an L2 effect on L1 production in addition to the expected L1 effect on L2 production (i.e. 'interference'). This is because the single phonetic category representation used to implement ItI in L1 and L2 should have been influenced by phones in both L1 and L2 as the result of equivalence classification.* The phoneme [t] was cited as example here because it is articulated differently in French and English which are the languages of subjects employed by Flege (1997). The subjects employed by Flege were divided into six (6) groups and their linguistic backgrounds were thoroughly explained unlike Shaidi *et al* (2012) who gave only little information about the Iban native speakers employed as subjects. Flege (1997) while summarising the results of his study indicated that “adults are capable of learning to produce new phones in an L2, and of modifying their previously established patterns of articulation when producing similar L2 phones. It appears that the mechanism of equivalence classification leads them to identify acoustically different phones in L1 and L2 as belonging to the same category. This may ultimately prevent them from producing similar but now new phones authentically”. The above submission revealed that Flege (1997) did not in any way make the claim credited to him by Shaidi *et al* (2012) that “L2 learner had an ability to create their own phonetic system that does not belong either in L1 or L2”, this point is very crucial because it was the erroneous reference and claim on which the overall submission of Shaidi *et al* (2012) was based.

Furthermore, Flege (1997) result was based on “foreign language learning” and from what we know of foreign language, it is usually a language that is not spoken as a native language anywhere in the L1 context, examples include, Portuguese in Malaysia, Spanish in Nigeria etc. Since Malay and Iban belong to the same language family and are spoken as native languages within the same context (i.e. within Malaysia), Malay is definitely not a foreign language to the Iban native speakers. The phrase “phonetic system” as coined by Shaidi *et al* (2012) was misused and wrongly misconceived. It does not mean that L2 learners always produce sounds that do not occur in either their L1 or the target L2. Phonetic system in this regard would refer to inaccurate or non-assignment of suprasegmental features such as stress, tone, pitch and intonation to words, syllable and sounds in obligatory contexts by L2 learners. For example, the sound [gb] in Yorùbá is phonemically represented as /gb/ a phoneme which is not attested in English, thus, an English learner of Yorùbá would normally separate it into two by making *g* and *b* separate sounds. Such a learner would also have problems with tone marking a feature of Yorùbá which is absent in English. For example the word *Gbenga* “a name” is phonemically realized as /Gbéngà/ but would likely be pronounced as /Ġ-béngà/ by an English language native speaker where the single phoneme [gb] was separated and

the tones on the syllables were wrongly assigned, in fact, a tone was wrongly assigned to the consonant *g* (a non-syllabic consonant in Yorùbá) which was wrongly separated from the *b*. It is issues such as these that usually lead to “phonetic system” as used by Shaidi *et al* (2012). It is always a creative pattern of the L2 learner initiated by the combinatorial knowledge of the L1 and L2 phonetic features. Such “phonetic system” is what constitutes the interlanguage grammar of the L2 learner.

The result of Shaidi *et al* (2012) was very surprising and was even made more difficult to accept because the forms of the plosives that were produced by the Iban subjects were not specified in the results. Moreover, it is even more surprising that all the Iban subjects were found to have committed the exact same pronunciation error in the production of the Malay plosives. This is very unusual because different individual tends to exhibit different articulatory features as shown by previous studies on L2 acquisition of sound systems. To show the inconsistencies in the claim by Shaidi *et al* (2012) the issue would be examined from two points of view; *cognitive/psycholinguistic* and *phonetics/phonological* perspectives. We shall commence with the cognitive/psycholinguistic perspective.

To begin with, Shaidi *et al* (2012) results were based on acoustic measurements which actually deal with the physical and abstract properties of sounds. Garman (1996) illustrating the speech chain observes that language processing involves three levels, the linguistic which is concerned with the formulation of the message; the physiological which deals with the expression/reception of the signal carrying the message and the acoustic which is outside of, and common to, both speaker and hearer - it is the air gap that has to be bridged for the speech chain to be completed. Furthermore, Repp (1982) observed that for the hearer, speech involves searching the acoustic signal for auditorily significant properties and at the end of the whole processes is the brain capable of reconciling the considerable physical and physiological differences between events so that it can recognize and generate the same ‘message’ in different forms. Garman (1996) stressed further that in spectrographic form, some apparent segmentation i.e. the vertical boundaries between consonant and vowel segments are fairly apparent but concluded that we must however beware of assuming that these clearly define the bases of auditory processing, rather, they are apparent to us as the results of visual processing i.e. *our visual inspection of the spectrogram*. Besides, giving that speech processing is sequential over time, the fact that these apparent segments vary widely in their duration makes them unlikely candidates for initial stages of processing.

If the above observations on speech production and perception are applied to phonemes in spectrographic analysis like those examined by Shaidi *et al* (2012) where the range in duration time as a first approximation are defined in terms of a visual estimate of where the phonemic segment boundaries lie, the result would certainly produce an inadequate approach considering the complexity associated with signal processing. This is because first, speech processing cannot be carried out initially on a phoneme by phoneme basis since the rate of arrival at the ear differs and it may sometimes exceed the resolving capacity of the auditory system. Second, phoneme-sized portions of

the acoustic signal are not separated by sharp boundaries but rather interleaved with each other horizontally. Third, since a cross section through any part of the signal will usually provide information about more than one phoneme, this may force the phonemes i.e. *preceding, current and following phonemes* to the target phoneme to be cued together and finally, it is evident that there is only an indirect relationship between properties of the acoustic signal and the phonological representation which is eventually derived from it. Summarily, the results of speech perception are found in our abilities to identify the sounds and words in our language but the problem lies in knowing what goes on in the middle region of these processes

There is also the issue of acoustic variance which in most cases usually affect the production and perception of sounds. A speech sound is claimed to be acoustically variant when it exhibits distinct acoustic forms in different environments. Based on this, it would be correct to affirm that acoustic variance in speech is a common phenomenon as a result of which the problem of speech perception, at least at the level of detection becomes correspondingly complex. Garman (1996) categorized acoustic variance into three types; *probabilistic variance, individual variance* and *dynamic variance*. Probabilistic variance has to do with the inherent variability that occurs between repetitions of the same activity. For example, different utterances containing the same word or phrase by the same speaker under the same conditions normally lead to variable forms which are individually unpredictable and when they are repeated in the same utterance they are liable to cluster around common articulatory-acoustic centres. Individual variance has to do with those factors that are peculiar to individuals. For example, different speakers have individually distinct vocal tracts which lead to slightly different articulatory gestures and ultimately acoustic results. Some of the factors that trigger this include age, sex and language varieties both regional and social. Dynamic variance covers a whole range of articulatory, aerodynamics and acoustic factors which are responsible for perceptible allophonic variants and for inaudible spectral characteristics of the speech signal. One common feature of such variants is that they are always contextually dependent i.e. they arise from co-articulations, inertial forces in the aerodynamic phase and from acoustic inter-relationships.

The above discussion has clearly shown the inconsistencies in the analyses and results presented by Shadidi *et al* (2012) from the physiological and spectrographic analysis. In the first instance, what Shaidi *et al* (2012) referred to as the interlanguage forms produced by the Iban native speakers may have been influenced by other sounds that preceded and also came after the target phonemes i.e. the plosives. This was confirmed in the study based on the fact that the issue of vowel duration (both preceding and closure) was a determinant factor in the results of Shaidi *et al* (2012). If the claim that the forms produced by the Iban native speakers did not resemble either the forms in Iban or Malay, they were probably influenced by the vowels which preceded and also came after them. This claim can be corroborated by the fact that the target plosives were not examined in word final position where no vowel occurred after them. Besides, the sounds may have been affected by acoustic variances as explained in the preceding paragraph. This is because the Iban speakers may have come up with such

forms due to probabilistic variance which arose from repeating the same utterance over and over again. It could also have been due to individual variance since the Iban native speakers must have acquired the Sarawak Malay which is a regional variety of the Peninsular Malay. It might also be due to dynamic variance because of the contextual dependence of the target plosives on the other sounds around them which would definitely affect their acoustic form because of the inter-acoustic relationship between sounds in sequence. Since no particular hypothesis was tested by Shaidi *et al* (2012), the results and submission lacks verifiable facts and credence. We shall now turn to the phonetics/phonological perspective.

First and foremost, in their analysis of the pronunciation of the plosives which are attested in both languages, Shaidi *et al* (2012) failed to give the phonetic realization (place and manner of articulation) of each of the plosives as they are attested in the two languages i.e. Iban and Malay. This would have provided an insight into whether the sounds are realized similarly or differently in both languages, a point that would have validated the claim by Shaidi *et al* (2012) as regards what the Iban speakers actually produced. Another issue that was overlooked by Shaidi *et al* (2012) was the distinction between phonetic and phonemic sounds which is important to any phonetic analysis this is because while some sounds exhibit similar phonetic and phonemic characteristics others differ phonetically and phonemically. Besides, a particular phoneme may occur in two different languages but articulated differently in each of them. For example, the phoneme /t/ is attested in both French and English. However, while it is articulated as a short-lag stop with dental place of articulation in French it articulated as a long-lag stop with alveolar place of articulation in English. This distinction has shown that an English learner of French is expected to have a fundamental issue with the pronunciation of the sound /t/ in French and vice versa. This type of important distinction was completely ignored by Shaidi *et al* (2012).

Furthermore, phonetic sounds are defined as speech segments that possess distinct physical or perceptual properties. They are usually placed in [ ] (square brackets), while phonemic sounds are those that reflect the true form of pronunciation, they are usually placed in // (slanting lines). For example in Malay, [c, j, ng] are phonetic sounds but are represented phonemically as /ɟ, dʒ, ŋ/, this implies that in Malay, c, j and ng are phonetic while ɟ, dʒ, ŋ are phonemic. This is why an English L1 learner of Malay is likely to pronounce the word *cari* ‘search’ as /\*kari/ instead of /ɟfari/ this is because the sound c which is phonemically realized as /ɟ/ in Malay is always phonemically realized as [k] and not [ɟ] in English e.g. the word *cake* is pronounced as /keik/ and not /ɟeik/. Also, in Yorùbá, the letter *p* is phonetically realized as [p] but phonemically realized as /kp/. For example, the word *pupa* ‘red’ is pronounced as /kpukpa/ in Yorùbá and not /\*pupa/. This type of distinction which normally provides evidence for correct sound realization in language was completely ignored by Shaidi *et al* (2012).

The claim of Shaidi *et al* (2012) that what the Iban speakers produced does not seem to resemble the forms of the plosives in either Iban or Malay raises a fundamental question because the language in which the forms they were

alleged to have produced and attested was not specified, the question is: if what they produced could not be found in both Iban and Malay in which language could the forms then be found? Does it mean the forms they produced could not be found in any known human language? These two questions could be answered with two *possibilities* both which would still contradict and invalidate the claims of Shadi *et al* (2012), the two likely possibilities are:

- a. The Iban subjects must have been erroneously categorized as native Iban speakers whose *true native language* (i.e. L1) was not established.
- b. They must all have a language deficiency which affected their speech production and forced every one of them to produce similar forms of the plosives which could not be ascertained as existing in any known human language.

The implication of the two possibilities given above would be that the subjects employed by Shaidi *et al* (2012) for this particular study did not possess the required criteria which qualify them to be employed as subjects for the study.

Another issue that was overlooked by Shaidi *et al* (2012) had to do with the focus on the position of occurrence of the plosives [p, b, t, d, k, g] that were examined in the study. The plosives were only examined in word-initial and intervocalic positions. This was done with twelve (12) examples from Iban e.g. [pah], [api], [dak], [adi] and twelve (12) examples from Malay e.g. [pati], [tapi], [das], [padi] all which occurred in word initial and intervocalic positions. It was in these two positions that the distinction was made on the forms produced by the Iban L1 speakers which led to the conclusion on their realization as presented by Shaidi *et al* (2012). However, since both Malay and Iban have the plosives [p, b, t, d, k, g] in word final positions too, the study should also have examined their phonemic realization in word final position, below are examples:

<b>Iban:</b>		<b>Malay</b>	
<i>ngirup</i>	‘drink’	bertiup	‘blow’
<i>tandak</i>	‘dance’	bilik	‘room’
<i>pegong</i>	‘pond’	petang	‘afternoon’
<i>langit</i>	‘sky’	sakit	‘sick’

The non-consideration of the plosives in word final position as shown in the above examples in the analysis of the plosives is another big shortcoming of the results presented by Shaidi *et al* (2012). It clearly revealed that a thorough analysis of the issue addressed was not carried out which in the real sense should invalidate the results presented by Shaidi *et al* (2012) since the production of the plosives in word-final position might have affected the overall results.

From the evaluations and arguments which we have done and also put forward in this critique, some facts become clear:

- i. The concept of transfer which usually breeds interference is a major factor in the learning errors of L2 speech sounds
- ii. If similar sounds in two languages are “not” shown to exhibit different place and manner of articulatory features, then there is no basis for comparison of such sounds unless the focus is on other issues e.g. *speakers with language impairment*.
- iii. The phonetic and phonemic forms of the target sounds in both the L1 and L2 must first be identified before the issue of acoustic measurement to determine their forms in both L1 and L2 can be considered. This is because if the target forms are phonetically and phonemically similar in both the L1 and the L2 then we would expect variances from spectrographic analysis of L2 learners’ pronunciation due to inter-acoustic relationships from surrounding sounds based on visual perception on which the researcher’s analysis would be based.
- iv. Acoustic measurement of sounds are always affected by sounds that precede and also come after them, thus, a spectrographic analysis which is a visual perception of the results is never a completely reliable means of measuring speech signals i.e. speech production and perception
- v. A thorough linguistic and social background of prospective subjects must be established before data collection is carried out. This would take care of possible variables that may likely affect and also invalidate the results and generalizations of the overall submission of any language acquisition research.
- vi. Interlanguage is always developed from the combined structures of both the L1 and the target L2. In speech production in particular, it would be unusual if not impossible for a L2 learner to come up with sounds which are neither attested in his/her L1 nor the target L2 unless such a learner has the knowledge of a L3 (third language) in which case such sounds would definitely be attested in the L3.
- vii. Every feature being tested in a research has to be considered in every context of occurrence before a significant and acceptable conclusion can be drawn.
- viii. The mode of language acquisition for children is totally different from that of adults. Children usually acquire language while adults learn language and unless something unusual is wrong e.g. (language impairment) children who are exposed to a language (in form of learning) in the context where such a target language is spoken as L1 would end up acquiring such a language.

The above facts which were serious lapses observed in the study of Shaidi *et al* (2012) were identified in order to set the record straight and also give a clearer insight into the intricacies and principles associated with the acquisition/learning of sound systems in any second language particularly the vital factors that normally precede data collection and analysis in such a research.

## 2. Conclusions

The major findings revealed in this study is the justification of the claim that the major cause of error particularly errors associated with the acquisition of sound systems by L2 learners can be attributed to interference through transfer of the L1 sound features to the L2 predominantly through substitution and for sound system, interlanguage does not usually go outside the sound systems of both the L1 and the L2 unless such L2 learners have the knowledge of a L3 since learners are never likely to come up with sounds that do not exist in their language system. This study examined every possible avenue that shows the shortcomings of the results presented by Shaidi *et al* (2012) which made them questionable and unacceptable. Such very vital issues include acquisition/learning of L2 sound systems, cognitive/psycholinguistics as well as phonetics/phonological ones.

On the other hand, one notable feature of Shaidi *et al* (2012) study was the use of spectrogram for analysis which was meant to show in clear terms the acoustic processes and properties involved in the correct production and perception of sounds. However, as laudable as this idea was, other vital and pre-analytical facts and procedures were not properly carried out. Since such facts usually determine the data to be analysed the truth of the matter is that the results presented by Shaidi *et al* (2012) cannot be substantiated since incorrect data from suspicious sources influenced by some unclarified variables would definitely produce questionable outcomes and bearing in mind that the goal of language acquisition research is to produce results that can be verified based on credible sources of data from verified subjects, the sources of data have to be solid with no room for controversial variables. Shahidi *et al* (2012) study did not fulfil these vital conditions hence the attempt by this present study to set the record straight. The overall submission is that the claim of Shahidi *et al* (2012) as regards the interlanguage errors and status of Iban native speakers learning Malay as L2 with focus on the sound system cannot be substantiated particularly with the pattern of analysis (spectrographic analysis) since other vital conditions associated with such analysis which were needed to validate their claims were not fulfilled.

## References

- Anglin, J. (1977). *Word object and conceptual development*. New York, Norton.
- Bruner. J., Oliver, R. & Greentield, P. (1966). *Studies in cognitive growth*. New York: Wiley.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language, its origin nature and use*. New York: Praeger.

- Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24, 37-53.
- Ethnologue (2009). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, 2009 Sixteenth edition*. Lewis, M. Paul (Ed.), Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics International.
- Flege, J. E. (1986a). The production and perception of foreign language speech sounds. In *Human communication and its disorders. Vol. 2*, Winitz, H (Ed.), Norwood. New Jersey, Ablex Publishing.
- Flege, J. E. (1987). The production of “new” and “similar” phones in a foreign language: evidence for the effect of equivalence classification. *Journal of Phonetics*, 15, 47-65
- Flege, J. E., Frieda, E. M., & Takeshi, N. (1997). Amount of native-language (L1) use affects the pronunciation of an L2. *Journal of Phonetics* 25, 169–186
- Garman, M. (1996). *Psycholinguistics*. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics. Cambridge University press
- Hasmah, Haji, Omar (2004). *Languages of Sarawak, in the encyclopedia of Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur. Archipelago Press, Volume 9, 30-31
- Haznedar, B. (2007). The acquisition of tense-aspect in child second language English. *Second Language Research*, 23, 383-417.
- James, A. R. (1985). Phonetic transfer and phonological explanation: Some theoretical and methodological issues. In *Cross-language influence in second language acquisition* Kellennan, E., & Sharwood. M (Eds.), Oxford, Pergamon Press.
- Kral, A. (2013). Auditory critical periods: A review from system’s perspective. *Neuroscience* 247, 117-133
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. London, Pergamon.
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor, Michigan. University of Michigan.
- Nelson, K. (1974). Concept, word and sentences: Interrelationship in acquisition and development. *Psychological Review*, 81, 267-285
- Author. (2013). A cross-language study of the speech sounds in Yorùbá and Malay: Implications for second language acquisition. *Issues in Language Studies, Centre for Language Studies Universiti Malaysia Sarawak*, (2)1, 1-12.
- Author. (2014). *Morphological variability and access to universal grammar in second language acquisition*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Centre for Language Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sarawak Kota Samarahan Sarawak Malaysia.
- Author. (In Press). *Form and function of the Yorùbá HTS (High Tone Syllable) revisited: Psycholinguistic Evidence from Ìgbò second language learners of Yorùbá*. *Cuadernos de Lingüística de El Colegio de México*.
- Repp, B. H. (1982). Phonetic trading relations and context effects: new experimental evidence for a speech mode of perception. *Psycholinguistic Bulletin* 92, 81-110
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 209-231

- Shahidi, A. H. Langgau, Shirley., & Ujan, Nancy. (2012). Interlanguage and L1 interference in L2 speech production: A study of Iban Native speakers learning Malay as a second language. International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities *Elsivier Publishers* 1-6
- Siegler, R. (2006). *How children develop, exploring child develop student media tool kit & scientific American reader to accompany how children develop*. New York, Worth Publishers.