Markedness in Word-Order Typology of English and Minangkabaunese:

What Should the EFL Learners Know About?

Jufrizal[1] and Lely Refnita[2]
[1] FBS Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail), juf_ely@yahoo.com
[2] FKIP Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, Indonesia, ✉ (e-mail), lrefnita67@yahoo.com

Abstract

Learners of a foreign language frequently face a lot of linguistic and non-linguistic learning problems and difficulties, including the EFL learners in Indonesia. The EFL learners whose native language is Minangkabaunese, for instance, may face grammatical problems dealing with phrasal and sentential constructions as the consequence of different word-order typology. In facts, there are different markedness values of word-order typology in English and those of Minangkabaunese at syntactic level of basic-grammatical construction. This paper discusses the comparison of markedness values of word-order typology of English and Minangkabaunese. Two questions as the basis of data analysis and discussion in this paper are: (i) what are the unmarked and marked word-order patterns in English and in Minangkabaunese at syntactic level?; and (ii) why do the EFL learners in West-Sumatera need to know the different markedness values? The data presented in this paper are those collected by means of a field-research and supported by a library study. The analysis is based on the relevant markedness theories developed and used in Linguistic Typology. The result of data analysis tells that the S-V-O and V-O-S are the unmarked clause constructions and the O-S-V is the marked ones in Minangkabaunese. In English, however, the unmarked clause construction is only S-V-O meanwhile the others are the marked ones. Such different grammatical properties cause specific learning problems in the EFL learning in West-Sumatera.

Keywords: markedness, word-order typology, English, Minangkabaunese, learning problems

Introduction

The cross-linguistic study on word-order typology of human languages is one of fundamental and essential works in Linguistic Typology, especially in Grammatical Typology. Typologists argue that human languages basically differ in term of word-order patterns based on the classification of grammatical domains. In relation to the word-order typology, Finegan (2004:234 – 235), among the others, states that the speakers of English and other European languages commonly assume that the normal way of constructing a sentence is to place the subject of the sentence first, then the verb, and then the direct object (if there is one). Indeed, in English, the sentence *Mary saw John*, which follows this order (shortly formulated as S-V-O), is well formed, while variations like *John Mary saw* (O-S-V) or *saw Mary John* (V-O-S) is not grammatically well formed. However, based on the cross-linguistic studies toward well forms of word-order patterns lead us to know that the normal word-order in a sentence differs considerably from language to language. In Japanese, for instance, the normal word-order of the basic clause construction is subject, direct object, and verb (S-O-V), as in (1) below.

(1) *Akiko ga   taro o   butta.*
    Akiko subject Taro object hit
    'Akiko hit Taro'

Meanwhile, in Tongan, the normal word-order of basic clause construction is V-S-O, as seen in (2).

(2) *Na?e taa?i ?e   hina ?a   vaka.*
    past hit   subject Hina object Vaka
    'Hina hit Vaka'

All speakers of the same language in practical uses of daily-life communication (see Fromkin et.al, 2011:430) can easily and naturally talk to each other and pretty much understand each other, as well. Yet, no two speakers exactly speak alike, but they relatively speak and use the language in the 'same' grammatical patterns; the patterns of constituents order in certain grammatical constructions can be assumed as highly similar if it cannot be said as exactly the same.. The word-order typology, in particular, is the study and analysis on well-formed constructions of given languages. In Linguistic Typology (as stated by Dryer in

Shopen (ed.), 2007:61), one of the primary ways in which languages differ from one another is in the order of constituent, or, as it is most commonly termed, their word-order. When people refer to the word order of a language, they often are referring specifically to the order of subject (S), object (O), and verb (V) with respect to each other, but word order, in fact, refers more generally to the order of any set of elements, either at the clause level or within phrases, such as the order of elements within a noun phrase.

Furthermore, Whaley (1997:79 – 80) says that a prominent area of study within typology deals with the order of elements in clauses and/or phrase of a certain language. In typology research, there has been particular interest in the relative ordering of subject (S), verb (V), and object (O) in natural languages. The most prevalent distribution of these three elements in a language is sometimes referred to as the "basic word-order" for that language. In other side, it is also relevant to use the term "basic constituent order" to describe the dominant linear arrangement of S, V, and O. Whaley (1997:80 – 81) also adds that in English, for example, clauses with the orders O-S-V (3a) and V-S-O (3b) are permitted. However, the orders are "special" and that SVO (3c) is typical in nature.

(3)   a. *Beans, I hate*.
      b. *Believe you me*.
      c. *Seymour sliced the salami*.

The "special" word-order as in (3a) and (3b) need additional grammatical items and contextual features to understand and to use them. Such types of grammatical constructions are referred to the *marked constructions*, the term used in markedness theory.

Based on the cross-linguistic studies on the word-order typology, it can be summarized that there are six possible logically orders of words (constituents) of clauses in human languages as the following ones (the data are quoted from Whaley, 1997:81).

S – O – V : *Taro ga inu o mita*   (Japanese)
          Taro Sub dog Obj saw
          'Taro saw the dog'

S – V – O : *Umugore arasoma igitabo*   (Kinyarwanda, Rwanda)
          woman   3S-read   book
          'The woman is reading a book'

V – S – O : *Bara   Elohim et   ha- shamayim*   (Biblical Hebrew)
          created God   Obj ART-heaven
          'God created the heavens'

V – O – S : *Manasa lamba amin-'ny savony ny lehilahy*   (Malagasy)
          washes clothes with- the soap   the man
          'The man washes clothes with the soap'

O – V – S : *Toto yahosiye   kamara*   (Hixkaryana, Brazil)
          man it-grabbed-him jaguar
          'The jaguar grabbed the man'

O – S – V : *pako   xua u'u*   (Urubu, Brazil)
          banana John he-ate
          'John ate banana'

According to Whaley (1997), most (probably all) languages have more than one way to order S, V, and O as the basic clause constructions. In languages with fairly rigid constituent order, certain variations are clearly employed for specific functions in constructing a discourse. In relation to this, Thomson (in Whaley, 1997:97) mentions that in English when O-S-V ("*beans, I like*") arises, it is clear that this order should not be taken as basic to the language because it is used in a very restricted context (not in natural use). For many languages, however, two (or more) word orders may occur frequently and not seem to have any unique discourse function. It depends on the grammatical-properties of the given languages. Whaley (1997) states as well that the primary split in language types is rooted in whether constituent order is primarily sensitive to pragmatic considerations (flexible order) or syntactic considerations (fixed order). Even in many languages in which multiple orders for constituent arise, it is still often possible to determine a basic order using several diagnostic. Therefore, the label "flexible order" must be reserved for cases in which two or more patterns arise where it is not possible to make a principled determination of what is basic. The basic word-order in sentential level can be assigned based on syntactic-semantic considerations as far as the relevant properties are not dominantly involved into pragmatic ones (see also Moravcsik, 2013:201 – 206).

In the studies of Linguistic Typology, there are three typological tests to determine the basic word-order typology of human languages, namely frequency, markedness, and pragmatically neutral contexts (see Whaley, 1997:100 – 102). The markedness is one of typological test based on markedness theory which is

linguistically needed in addition to the frequency and pragmatically neutral context tests. According to Whaley (1997) (and see also the similar ideas in Croft (1993), Lambrecht (1996), Croft in Shibatani and Bynon (eds.), 1999), Dixon (2010)), the basic constituent order of a language typically occurs in utterances that have the least formal marking. This is true on all levels of grammar – phonology, morphology, and syntax. Markedness serves well as an indicator of the basic patterns in language.

In addition to the application of markedness theory to assign word-order typology in typological studies, markedness theory has been applied by linguist in broader aspects of linguistic studies. Danler (2006), for instance, studied the morpho-syntactic markedness in Italian from the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The grammatical constructions analyzed were focusing through cleft sentences, focusing through passive constructions with the specification of the agent, the marked realization of actants, and the specification of circumstantials. The results of analysis inform that the grammatical constructions in the texts can be classified into un-marked and marked constructions based on morpho-syntactic markedness.

Bale, Gagnon, and Khanjian (2011) studied the relationship between morphological and semantic markedness. It was limited to the case of plural morphology focusing on the exploration of two possible connections between the diagnostics for morphological and semantic markedness. Based on the data analysis, it was found that the negative correlation is not only theoretically consistent with the semantic literature. As a result, the morphological diagnostics lend support to the view that plural features are interpreted as augmenting functions. This finding is both interesting and challenging for having another kind of grammatical markedness in other language as it is studied in Minangkabaunese.

Then, Wei (2019) studied and analyzed the syntactic markedness as a stylistic feature in Great Gatsby. As the result of study, Wei concludes that the syntactic feature can only become salient beyond surface-level considerations of phrase structure and grammatical categories in any stylistic analysis of literary works. This study implies that the markedness value analysis is also relevant to study the relationship between grammatical constructions and stylistic features in literary works. It is also certain to say in this relation that markedness analysis may works in grammatical and stylistic constructions, as well.

Morpho-syntactic markedness and discourse structure relation is another form of relevant study particularly searched by Fox (1987). The study explored the interaction between discourse structure and morpho-syntactic markedness value. The result of data analysis tells that the marked member of some morpho-syntactic oppositions tend to be associated with the beginning of discourse units. The principle is supported by with data on word-order inversion in Tagalog and with data on anaphora in English. It is stated as the suggestion that viewing discourse as composed of hierarchically arranged functional units, rather than as string of clauses, strengthens the hypotheses concerning with the relationships between discourse and grammar. Therefore, the markedness analysis works for grammatical and discourse levels of language uses.

A markedness analysis was also executed by Culicover and Nowak (2002). The study was about the interactions between language change, language acquisition, markedness, and computational complexity of mappings between grammatical representations. By means of computational simulation of language change, they state that markedness can produce 'gaps' in the distribution of combinations of linguistic features. They argue that one contributor to markedness in this sense is the degree of the transparency of the mapping between superficial syntactic structure and conceptual structure. Based on the data analysis, they develop a rough measure of complexity that takes into account the extent to which the syntactic structure involves stretching and twisting of the relations that hold in conceptual structure, and they also show how it gives the right results in a number of specific cases.

Coming back to markedness in word-order typology, in English, as illustrated by Whaley (1997:102), the constructions (4a) and (4b) can be used to see the markedness values of the basic clause word-order.

(4a) *I like beans*.

(4b) *Beans, I like*.

These two sentences differ with respect to their intonation contour. The neutral intonation – a slowly falling pitch that drops more sharply at the very end of the utterance – is used in (4a). Meanwhile, (4b) begins with a short intense pitch (due to the heavy stress on *beans*) that is followed by a brief pause and then the same neutral intonation that is found in (4a). Because (4b) has extra phonological materials "added". It is said to be a ***marked construction***. Thus, a clause with S-V-O word-order is the basic clause construction and it is the *unmarked* one in English. The clause with O-S-V or V-O-S is not basic one and it is assigned as *marked construction* in this language.

Even though the markedness theory was originally developed and used to the phonological systems of language, this theory has been adopted and adapted by both structuralists and generativists in different ways. In linguistic typology, markedness has been becoming important tool for typologists because it provides a means to directly link formal (structural) linguistic properties across languages. The essential notion of markedness in typology is the fact of asymmetrical or unequal grammatical properties of otherwise linguistic elements – inflections, words in word classes and even syntactic constructions in syntax. Markedness test, in

this sense, is one main criteria used in determining the basic order of a basic clause construction in order to assign the word-order typology of the language being learnt. In the application of markedness analysis, the word-order typology of grammatical constructions at morphosyantactic level of languages, such as in English and in Minangkabaunese may be possibly assigned and compared.

Based on previous typological studies on Minangkabaunese, it has been already claimed that the local language has the grammatical properties dealing with word-order typology as: (i) basic grammatical constructions with the word order S-V-O with the variation V-O-S and O-S-V; (ii) the word order S-V-O is the highest degree of acceptability for formal language and commonly used by young-educated speakers; (iii) the word-order V-O-S is acceptable in old-stylistic constructions; and (iv) the O-S-V word order, however, is the order of topicalization constructions in which pragmatic values are functionally dominant. English, in other side, is typologically assigned as a fixed S-V-O language. Therefore, there are differences of markedness values of word-order typology between English and Minangkabaunese at syntactic level of basic-grammatical construction. Learners of a foreign language frequently face a lot of linguistic and non-linguistic learning problems and difficulties, including the EFL learners in Indonesia. The EFL learners whose native language is Minangkabaunese, for instance, may face grammatical problems dealing with phrasal and sentential constructions as the consequence of different word-order typology. The different markedness values of the two languages may cause academic and practical learning problems faced by EFL learners in West-Sumatera.

Language learners are mostly in serious problems and difficulties when they have to face and to learn the grammatical properties of the learnt language which are different from those of their native language. Such academic and psychological condition is often found in the learning of the second or a foreign language, such as in the teaching-learning processes of English as a foreign language in Indonesia. In many schools in West-Sumatera, in specific, most learners of English have had and spoken in Minangkabaunese as their first language (L1) and in bahasa Indonesia as their national language (or may be simply stated as the second language (L2). The difference of word-order typology of English and that of their L1, let say Minangkabaunese, can be claimed as one of serious problems in having good English mastery, then. In more specific cases, the different markedness values of word-order patterns of English and Minagkabaunese can be assigned as one of particular grammatical problems and difficulties faced by the EFL learners in West-Sumatera. This claim is argued since learning and understanding grammar, such as the nature of word-order pattern, is one of fundamental competence in learning a language (see Stern, 1994; Rogers in Bygate et.al. (eds.), 1994; Yip in Odlin (ed.), 1994).

Although the application of markedness theory has been enlarged to broader dimensions of linguistics (see Jufrizal and Amri, 2019), but the comparative analysis of markedness values toward word-order typology of English and Minangkabaunese in relation to learning problems and difficulties of EFL in West-Sumatera is highly supposed as a new topic of discussion. The type of study which utilizes the markedness theory in assigning markedness values of word-order typology of English and Minangkabaunese and relate to the learning problems of EFL may have valuable contributions to linguistic theories and the application to language learning in real practices. This paper, which is partially developed based on the part of research results conducted in 2019, discusses the comparison of markedness values of word-order typology in English and Minangkabaunese and how this grammatical facts contribute to EFL learning, especially in West-Sumatera. Two questions as the basis of data analysis and discussion in this paper are: (i) ***what are the unmarked and marked word-order patterns in English and in Minangkabaunese at syntactic level?***; and (ii) ***why do the EFL learners in West-Sumatera need to know the different markedness values?***

Method

This study was a descriptive-qualitative research in linguistics which was operationally conducted in 2019. In more specific type, this research was a field research partially supported by a library study. Mainly, this research was observationally executed in the main land of West-Sumatera in which the native speakers of Minangkabaunese originally live and socio-culturally develop. As the supporting method, the library study was in the form of documents studies and manuscripts quotations. The theories of language learning and data of English were resulted from the library study. The data were the various forms of clause-syntactical constructions categorized and determined as the formal-grammatical constructions in Minangkabaunese and in English. Practically, the data collection was operated as the participant observation, depth-interview, note taking, administrating questionnaires, and quoting data from written manuscripts. The instruments of the research were field-notes, observation sheets, interview guide, recording equipment, questionnaire sheets, and writing equipment. The native speakers of Minangkabaunese who were intentionally selected as informants and respondents (fifteen informants and 200 respondents participated in this study) and the manuscripts written in Minangkabaunese and in English were the sources of data. In addition, because the

researchers are all the native speakers of Minangkabaunese, they also functioned as the sources of data of Minangkabaunese. The intuitive data, however, were always systematically cross-checked and seriously consulted to the selected informants in order to get data validity and reliability. The data obtained then were orthographically transcribed and then grammatically classified into clausal-syntactical categories to decide whether the data were appropriate, sufficient, and ready to analyze. The data were systematically analyzed by using the relevant theories of formal and functional markedness as mainly described in Croft (1993), Dixon (2010) and related theories of language learning, especially those of EFL learning. The results of analysis are argumentatively described in formal and in informal ways commonly used in linguistics and in the form of descriptive-argumentative explanation.

Results and Discussion

Based on related literatures on grammatical typology, English is stated as one of nominative-accusative languages at syntactic level where the sole argument of intransitive clause (S) is grammatically treated in the same way as agent argument (A) of transitive clause, and patient argument (P) of the transitive clause is grammatically treated in different way (S = A, ≠ P). In nominative-accusative (or accusative for short) languages, the active voice is assigned as the underlying construction and its passive voice is the derived one (see Comrie, 1989; Dixon, 1994; Dixon, 2010; Artawa and Jufrizal, 2018). In relation to markedness theory, the active-voice construction is grammatically treated as the unmarked construction, while the passive is the marked ones. The unmarked construction, as it is treated in markedness theory, is the least formal and functional marked construction; it is the underlying and pragmatic-context free construction. Meanwhile, the marked construction is that with the formal and functional marked; it has additional formal marker(s) and functional contexts in meaning and uses (see Croft, 1993; Whaley, 1997; Dixon, 2010; Jufrizal and Amri, 2019) . Therefore, the following actives of English (as in 5a – 5c) are the unmarked constructions and the counterparts, the passive ones (as in 6a – 6c) are the marked constructions, then.

Actives (***unmarked constructions***):
(5a) *She bought the controversial book.*
(5b) *Mr. President has frequently explained it.*
(5c) *The thief killed him rudely.*
Passives (***marked constructions***):
(6a) *The controversial book was bought (by her).*
(6b) *It has been frequently explained by Mr. President.*
(6c) *He was rudely killed by the thief.*

In case of word-order typology, (modern) English has well known as a fixed S-V-O language (see Comrie, 1989; Croft, 1993; Whaley, 1997; Song, 2001; Dryer in Shopen (ed.), 2007). According to Dryer (in Shopen, 2007:68), in the S-V-O languages, which are neither verb-final nor verb-initial, the subject precedes the verb while the object follows the verb. S-V-O languages are the second most widespread word-order type among the languages in the world, more common than verb-initial, but less widespread than verb-final languages. These S-V-O languages strongly resemble the verb-initial languages rather than the verb-final languages with respect to the word-order characteristics examined. As briefly mentioned in the previous part, the formal (mainly scientific-academic) clause construction of English should be in the pattern of S-V-O; it is stated as the unmarked construction based on the markedness theory. Other patters of constituent order of English clause constructions, V-O-S, O-V-S, S-O-V, V-S-O, O-V-S, or O-S-V, are not considered as the basic grammatical constructions; they are the marked constructions. Therefore, the (7a) – (7d) are the formally and functionally unmarked constructions, while the (8a) – (8d) are those of formally and functionally marked ones in English.

(7a) *The issues have attracted villagers' negative opinions.*
(7b) *The current studies on geology made certain questions then.*
(7c) *Such comments never give solution to the real problems in society.*
(7d) *However, we have to have unquestioned items in the proposal.*
(8a) **The villagers's negative opinions, the issues made.*
(8b) **Made certain questions, the current studies on geology.*
(8c) **Never such comments the real problems in society give solution to.*
(8d) **Have to have unquestioned items in the proposal, however, we.*

Minangkabaunese, however, typologically belongs to a neutral language, a language which has the grammatical properties both as a nominative-accusative (accusative) language (S = A, ≠ P) and an ergative-absolutive (ergative) one (S = P, ≠ A) at syntactic level. In addition, as it has been stated above, this local language allows more than one word-order pattern to be assigned as the basic clause constructions (Jufrizal

and Refnita, 2019; Jufrizal and Amri, 2019). The other grammatical (morphosyntactic) properties which makes Minangkabaunese is different from English is that the Minangkabaunese is an agglutinative language, while English is morphosyntactically an inflectional language (see Comrie, 1989; Jufrizal, 2012; Jufrizal et.al., 2016). Consequently, the present or absent of affixes may have significant contributions to the degree of grammaticality degree. In the functional uses of language, in reality, pragmatic functions may also influence the grammatical constructions. Such type of grammatical properties cognitively "frame" speakers' mind of Minangkabaunese to have functional unmarked constructions in different word-order of clauses. As the result, there is an obvious difference of grammatical properties of English and Minangkabaunese dealing with markedness values of word-order typology of the two different languages.

As it has been claimed, there are three patterns of constituent orders of grammatical construction at syntactical level which may be argued as the bases for assigning word-order typology of Minangkabaunese, namely: (i) SVO; (ii) VOS; and (iii) OSV. The following data indicate that Minangkabaunese has SVO word-order typology (data from Jufrizal, 2018).

(9) *Angin mam-bao awan ujan dari lawik.*
    wind ACT-bring cloud rain from see
    'The wind brought the rainy cloud from the sea'

(10) *Ambo alah ma- nutuik malu waang kutiko itu.*
    PRO1SG PERF ACT-close shame POS2SG time that
    'I had closed your shame at that time'

(11) *Inyo ka mam-buek masalah baru, agaknyo.*
    PRO3SG FUT ACT-make problem new probably
    'He will probably make new problem'

The verbal clauses above are morphologically marked by affix *maN-* to indicate active voice. The clause constructions as in (9) – (11) are the first type basic clause constructions with SVO word-order, in which *angin, ambo,* and *inyo* are S; *ma-oyak, mam-bao, ma-nutuik*, and *mam-buek* are V; and *kota Padang, awan ujan, malu waang,* and *masalah baru* are O. The grammatical typological analysis toward the data reveals that the SVO clause construction is one of basic clause construction in Minangkabaunese with the highest degree of acceptability. This is the word order of clause of Minangkabaunese in which the grammatical meanings are formally packaged. For most young speakers and educated people of Minangkabaunese, the SVO clause constructions are very common and highly formal. The type of grammatical meanings available in the clause construction with SVO word order is high-formal, neutral, and less indicative. These types of grammatical meanings mostly appear in formal speech events, educational-normative expressions, and for having neutral positions in delivering information. These grammatical properties tell that such grammatical constructions are typologically assigned as the formal and functional unmarked constructions.

The clause constructions in Minangkabaunese in VOS word-order as in (12) – (16) are also common in Minangkabaunese.

(12) *Man- jua tanah mamak ang yo.*
    ACT-sell land uncle POS2SG PART
    'Your uncle sold the land'

(13) *Ba- rambuih angin kancang sajak malam tadi.*
    INT-blow wind fast since night last
    'The storm has been blowing since last night'

(14) *Man-cari masalah urang tu di siko mah.*
    ACT-look for problem man ART here PART
    'That man were looking for a problem here'

(15) *Ma- niru garih nan luruih tujuan kito.*
    ACT imitate line REL straight goal POS2PL
    'Our goal is to imitate the straight line'

(16) *Ma- ukia hayalan paja tu mungkin.*
    ACT-draw imagination small child PART probably
    'The small child probably is drawing the imagination'

The constructions with VOS word-order as in (12) – (16) are grammatically accepted and commonly used by Minangkabaunese in daily communication and in stylistic uses. The construction with VOS word-order is dominant in folk-stories and in oral expressions of cultural-stylistic style. The grammatical meanings brought ("packaged") by the VOS word-order are casual-less formal and cultural-stylistic. Due to such grammatical characteristics, the constructions can be assigned as formally marked but functionally unmarked.

The clause constructions which are also common in Minangkabaunese is formulated as OSV, as in (17) – (20).

(17) *Jalan jauah lah kami tampuah; daun salai kami linduangi.*
road far ASP PRO1PL tarce; leaf a piece PRO1PL protect
'We have just tarced the far road; we have just protected a piece of leaf'

(18) *Aturan nan ado tantu kito patuh- i.*
regulation REL available of course PRO1PL follow-APL
'We of course always follow the available regulation'

(19) *Utang lamo uda baia dulu.*
debt previous elder-brother pay erlier
'Elder-brother earlier paid the old debt'

(20) *Bantuan gampo alun kami tarimo lai.*
donation earthquake ASP PRO2PL receive yet
'We have not received the earthquake donation yet'

The clause constructions with OSV word order, as in (17) – (20) are frequently used in oral-communicative interactions in Minangkbaunese. Typological analyses toward the OSV constructions in Minangkabaunese, however, prove that this type of clause cannot be grammatically assigned as the basic clause constructions; they are topicalization constructions. As clauses with OSV word order are influenced by pragmatic functions, the grammatical meanings in such constructions are more on casual, non-formal and indicative-stylistic ones. Thus, the first two types, SVO and VOS, can be assigned as the basic ones; thus, they are typologically unmarked constructions. The third pattern, OSV, is much influenced by the pragmatic functions involved in language practical uses. Such grammatical and functional properties, therefore, indicate that the grammatical constructions in O-S-V word-order in Minangkabunese can be assigned as the formal and functional marked constructions.

The idea of marked and unmarked constructions used and developed in Linguistic Typology deal with unequal or asymmetrical constructions compared to the neutral-basic (underlying) ones. The unmarked constructions are those of formal-normal constructions and are academically brought and needed in language teaching-learning processes, including in EFL learning in West-Sumatera. Meanwhile, the marked constructions are less-formal, high stylistic, and with additional contextual features. Such constructions need pragmatic-contextual in using and in understanding; they are not intentionally and academically used in formal settings. The particular comparison of markedness values in word-order typology of English and Minangkabaunese tells that there are differences of the markedness values. Grammatical constructions in the forms of clauses and sentences in English are relatively different from those of Minangkabaunese. Linguistically, they are the nature of human languages which are both universal and specific. This is ***the first*** thing should be known and to remembered by the EFL learners in West-Sumatera, particularly those whose native language is Minangkabaunese. ***The second*** one is that grammaticality and grammatical acceptability among human languages, especially between English and Minangkabaunese, should be one of academic concerns because most EFL learners in West-Sumatera behave and think in their own cultural background. This may cause high and fossilized grammatical errors, including the negative language interference, in their academic works. ***Thirdly***, the EFL learners in Indonesia, especially in West-Sumatera, need to have and to increase their own linguistic-grammatical awareness in order that they are able to use the learnt language appropriately and communicatively, as well. ***The last one*** is that the EFL learners' understanding on marked and unmarked constructions in relation to word-order typology of their native and learnt language may increase linguistic and grammatical awareness as one way to have pedagogical and practical uses of EFL to support the professional carrier in the field.

Conclusions

It is a reasonable statement telling that linguistic theories can be adopted and adapted to be the practical uses of language teaching and learning. In this sense, linguistic studies and analyses provide the descriptive data of language to be pedagogically and practically used for the teaching learning materials. Descriptive and pedagogical grammar may work hand in hand depending on the particular levels and goals of language teaching and learning (see further related ideas in Stern, 1994; Chalker in Bygate et.al. (eds.), 1994; Westney in Odlin (ed.), 1994). In this paper, it is a proof that the comparison of markedness values of clauses based on word-order typology in English and in Minangkabaunese relates to, at least, three points of the teaching and learning of EFL in West-Sumatera. The first one is that markedness values of grammatical constructions at syntactic level focused on word-order typology vary from language to language, in this case in English and in Minangkabaunese. The unmarked construction, which can be assumed as the standard (underlying) one, in English is quiet fixed in the pattern S-V-O order. In Minangkabaunese, however, the unmarked constructions are various. If the basic-standard clauses in English formally follow the pattern formulated as S-V-O, Minangkabaunese may have S-V-O and/or V-O-S. Secondly, writing formal-academic English need to

follow the pattern of unmarked constructions, unless the sentences tend to have additional grammatical-semantic properties in using and understanding. Thirdly, it is necessary to have grammatical awareness on word-order typology of a learnt language, say English, in order to have sufficient writing ability in the foreign language. The data analysis and ideas delivered in this paper are possibly questioned and criticized scientifically by others to have further and better discussion in term of interrelationship between linguistic theories and language teaching methodologies and practices.

Acknowledgments

References

Artawa, K., and Jufrizal. (2018). *Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya*. Denpasar: Pustaka Larasan.

Bale, A., Gagnon, M., and Khanjian H. (2011). 'On the Relatioship between Morphological and Semantic Markedness: The Case of Plural Morphology' in *Morphology*. Volume 21, issue 2. Pp 197 – 221. http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/6/30/2019.

Bygate, M., Tonkyn, A., and William, E. (eds.). 1994. *Grammar and The Language Teacher*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Comrie, B. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.

Croft, W. (1993). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culicover, P. W., and Nowak, A. (2002). 'Markedness, Antisymmetry and Complexity of Constructions' in *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*. Volume 2 No. 1. John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.2.o3cul

Danler, Paul. (2006). 'Morpho-syntactic markedness in Italian from the perspective of CDA' in *Quaderns de Filologia*. Volume 11. Print ISSN 1135-416X, electronic ISSN 2444-1449. Universitat de Valencia.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finegan, E. 2004. *Language: Its Structure and Use*. Boston: Wadsworth.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., and Hyam, N. (2011). *An Introduction to Language*. Canada: Wadsworth.

Fox, B. A. (1987). 'Morpho-syntactic Markedness and Discourse Structure' in Journal of Pragmatics. Volume 11, Issue 3 pp 359 – 375. http://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90137-8

Jufrizal. (2004). 'Struktur Argumen dan Aliansi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau' (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana.

Jufrizal., Zul Amri., and Jufri. (2012). 'Keakusatifan dan Keergatifan Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik dan Linguistik Kebudayaan' (unpublished research report). Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang.

Jufrizal. (2012). *Tatabahasa Bahasa Minangkabau: Deskripsi dan Telaah Tipologi Linguistik*. Padang: UNP Press.

Jufrizal., Zul Amri., Ardi, Havid.(2016, 2017). "Kemasan Makna Gramatikal dan Makna Sosial-Budaya Bahasa Minangkabau: Penyelidikan atas Tatamakna dan Fungsi Komunikatifnya" (unpublished research report). Padang: Universitas Negeri Padang.

Jufrizal. 2018. 'Grammatical Meanings of Clauses with Different Word-Orders in Minangkabaunese' (a paper presented at International Seminar KIMLI-2018). Manokwari: Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia dan Universitas Papua

Jufrizal. 2019. 'Markedness in Word-order Typology of Minangkabaunese' (a paper presented at International Seminar KOLITA-17; 10-12 April, 2019). Jakarta: PKBB Unika Atma Jaya.

Jufrizal and Refnita, L. 2019. From *V-O-S* to *S-V-O* Language?: A Diachronic Study on Word-Order Typology of Minangkabaunese (a paper presented at The-7th ELITE International Conference, 7-9 September 2019. Malang: UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim.

Jufrizal and Amri Z. 2019. 'Grammatical Markedness in Minangkabaunese: The Formal and Functional Markedness Analysis' (a peper presented at International Conference on Language and Art (ICLA-8), 17 – 18 October, 2019. Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni.

Lambrecht, K. 1996. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moravcsik, E.A. 2013. *Introducing Language Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Odlin, T. (ed.). 1994. *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shibatani, M., and Bynon, T. (editor). (1999). *Approaches to Language Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shopen, T. (ed.). 2007. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I: Clause Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stern, H. H. (1994). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wei, Longxing. (2019). 'Syntactic Markedness as a Stylistic Feature in the Great Gatsby' in Studies in Linguistics and Literature. Volume 3 No 1. Scholink INC. Print ISSN 2573-6434, Online ISSN 2573-6426.

Whaley, L. J. (1997). *Introduction to Typology*. London: Sage Publication.