

Lexicogrammatical Features of ELF Speakers in an Asian Students Association Small Talk in Indonesia

Ernie D. A. Imperiani, Hera Amalia Mandasari
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Bandung, Indonesia
ernie_imperiani@upi.edu

Abstract—This study examines the nature of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) interaction among English users whose mother tongues are different. Specifically, this study aims to investigate the lexicogrammatical features evident in a small talk among Asian students. The data are elicited in a mixture of authentic and simulated interactions. As a stimulus for the speakers to talk, they are given topics on the Asian African Conference and its relation to their country, as well as the culture of their country. This study obtained the data by recording the conversations from ASAI (Asian Student Association in Indonesia) small talk. Using lexicogrammatical features proposed by Seidlhofer (2004) and Kirkpatrick (2008), the findings reveal that the speakers produced six lexicogrammatical features which are dropping third person present tense *-s*, confusing the relative pronouns *who* and *which*, omitting definite and indefinite articles, preposition, marking or nonmarking plural, and the use of tag questions form. Although these features are different from features in English standard forms, they are commonly used by other ELF speakers in different studies. Also, these features do not appear to cause misunderstandings in the interaction. This seems to suggest that these users are appropriating the language for their own purposes and the effectiveness of communication.

Keywords: *English as a lingua franca, lexicogrammatical features, linguistic features*

I. INTRODUCTION

English nowadays has become a globalized language that is largely used by people who do not speak English as their mother tongue (Rodliyah, Imperiani, & Amalia, 2014; Sharifian, 2009). As a globalized language, English has become the preferred option for communication among people who do not share their first language (Batziakas, 2016). Therefore, English is used as a lingua franca, known as English as a Lingua Franca (henceforth ELF). According to Jenkins (2011), ELF believes that non-native English speakers are skilled communicators. For instance, they may do code-switching or code-mixing to show solidarity and prioritize the effectiveness of communication (Batziakas, 2016; Jenkins, 2011).

Regarding ELF, one of the essential features in ELF is the communicative linguistic features. The linguistic features always differ from one study to another study. For example, the study of online discussion may focus on

linguistic features in computer-mediated communication, such as capital letters, emoticon, repetition of words (Kadir, Maros, & Hamid, 2012).

Meanwhile, Kirkpatrick (2010) states that linguistic features consist of phonological, lexis/lexicogrammar, grammatical features, pragmatic norms, and communicative strategies. These linguistic features help people to communicate effectively to identify the ability of the speakers in understanding English as a lingua franca.

Concerning lexicogrammatical features, Seidlhofer (2004); Kirkpatrick (2011); Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011) point out that several characteristics of lexicogrammatical features in ELF study, include: ‘dropping’ the third person present tense *-s*; ‘confusing’ the relative pronouns *who* and *which*; ‘omitting’ definite and indefinite articles; ‘failing’ to use correct forms in tag questions (e.g., *isn’t it?* or *no?* instead of *shouldn’t they?*); ‘inserting ‘redundant’ prepositions; ‘overusing’ certain verbs of high semantic generality, such as *do, have, make, put, take*; ‘replacing’ infinitive-constructions with *that*-clauses; ‘overdoing’ explicitness (e.g. *black color* rather than just *black*); and treating uncountable nouns as a plural. Due to the limited space of this study, the specific or detail explanation of each characteristic is not provided here, but may be seen in Seidlhofer (2004), Kirkpatrick (2011), Jenkins, Cogo, and Dewey (2011).

Studies focusing on English as lingua franca have been conducted in several ELF countries, such as China, Dane, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan. In China, for example, Ji (2016) conducted an ELF study to investigate the linguistic features in Chinese users’ communication contexts by identifying the interactions between Chinese and other Asian people by using English at live talk shows, government websites, and broadcast seminars. The results showed that lexicogrammar was the main linguistic features in the interaction and that English in Chinese conversation was not included as failed English, but preferably more like ‘errors’. Another ELF study came from Firth (1996) who used Conversation Analysis (CA) as the analysis tool. His study was to discover the accomplishment of normality on lingua franca and conversation analysis. The research examined the natural settings of management staff in communication by using English in the conversation. The

data were a recorded telephone talk between the manager and the client in Danish international trading company. The results demonstrated that the conversation was still understandable even though the conversation showed misunderstanding and abnormalities and the conversation was less of interaction or ‘internationally robust’.

The study of ELF does not only examine the formal context, but also the data of small talk, personal, and work-related conversations (Cogo & Dewey, 2006). For instance, the study from Cogo and Dewey (2006) identified the interrelationship between Pragmatics and Lexicogrammar in the context of English as a Lingua Franca. The study took place in London, but the participants of the study were included French, German, Italian and Japanese. It was found that the study of Pragmatics and Lexicogrammar are interconnected and give impacts on each other such as the efficiency of communication, added prominence, reinforcement of proposition, increased explicitness and exploiting of redundancy.

From the three previous studies above, it can be observed that none or little attention has been given to ELF in Indonesia. Since Indonesia is considered an EFL country, it would be insightful to discover how lexicogrammar works in this context with regard to ELF. Therefore, this present study aims to fill the gap by identifying the lexicogrammatical features of English as a lingua franca and their functions in a natural setting in ASAI (*Asian Student Association in Indonesia*) club by using theory proposed by ELF scholars which are Kirkpatrick (2008), Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011), Önen (2015), and Seidlhofer (2004).

II. METHOD

A. Research Design

The present study used a descriptive qualitative method because it aimed to describe the language phenomenon in a particular context. Particularly, it described the lexicogrammatical features and interpreted their functions in small talks at ASAI club. This is as suggested by Alwasilah (2002), Atkinson, Coffey, Delamont, Lofland, and Lofland (2001) that qualitative research focuses on language phenomenon which describes the way people utter their experiences. Moreover, this presents study was held in natural settings that fulfill the criteria of qualitative research (Hancock, Ockleford, & Windridge, 2009). Therefore, a qualitative descriptive method is suitable for this study.

B. Research subject and context

The data of the study were taken from an hour small talk of ASAI members which were recorded. *ASAI (Asian Student Association in Indonesia)* is a club in the Museum of Asian African Conference. The participants of this present study come from India, Yemen, Malaysia, and Indonesia. Also, there is no range of age and gender for the participants of the conversation because the club consists of various people who come from a different range of age and gender. ASAI members were chosen as the participants considering that they are international students in Indonesia and only use English as their common language in the club.

C. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection was administered in several steps. Firstly, the researcher attempted to find a member of ASAI who agree to be respondents of the research. For research ethics, the member signed a consent form to be a participant. Secondly, as a stimulus for the speakers to talk, they are given topics on the Asian African Conference and its relation to their country, as well as the culture of their country.

After that, the conversations were transcribed. There were two tools to help transcribe the data; transcript conventions and *Inqscribe*. The transcript convention is a symbol or number to make the data easier to describe and identify.

D. Data Analysis

There were some steps in analyzing the data: identifying each utterance which shows lexicogrammatical features, classifying the lexicogrammatical features using theories from Kirkpatrick (2008) and Seidlhofer (2004), and also supported with some theories from ELF scholars such as, Jenkins, Cogo and Dewey (2011); Önen (2015), calculating the occurrence of the lexicogrammatical features, interpreting the findings, and drawing conclusions.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Lexicogrammatical features and their functions

The findings discovered the lexicogrammatical features in the small talk. The features are characterized by dropping third person present tense –s, confusing the relative pronouns who and which, omitting definite and indefinite articles, preposition, marking or non-marking plurals, the use of tag questions form, overusing verb of high semantic generality, replacing infinitive-constructions with that-clauses, and overdoing explicitness (as can be seen in Table I). These features are as proposed by ELF scholars Seidlhofer (2004) and Kirkpatrick (2008).

TABLE I. THE OCCURRENCES OF LEXICOGRAMMATICAL FEATURES

No.	Lexicogrammar Features	Number of Occurrences	Explanation
1.	Dropping third person present tense -s	3	
2.	Confusing the relative pronouns who and which	5	Who, which, and omission
3.	Omitting definite and indefinite articles	32	A, an, and the
4.	Prepositions	671	To, in, of, for, with, about, at, on, from, between and by
5.	Marking or non-marking plurals	32	Regular and irregular plural
6.	Tag question form	8	Tag question and other question forms
7.	Overusing verb of high semantic generality	0	
8.	Replacing infinitive-constructions with that-clauses	0	
9.	Overdoing explicitness	0	

Table I shows that the dominant feature that occurs in ASAI small talk is the use of the preposition. Yet, the frequent use of this feature does not affect the flow of communication and does not make any misunderstanding. On the other hand, the features of overusing verbs of high semantic generality, replacing infinitive-constructions with that-clauses, and overdoing explicitness do not occur in the small talk. Even though, these features do not occur, the ELF speakers can maintain the small talk without any misunderstanding.

B. Dropping third person present tense –s

The dropping third person present tense –s was evidenced in the findings. It was shown in 3 utterances. This feature was commonly shown in the ELF talk, as can be seen from Seidlhofer’s (2004) study. The example of the utterances can be seen below:

- (1) he ASK us to come
- (2) he contact
- (3) ya (.) he visit several clubs

The findings showed that all of ELF speakers produced the dropping of the third present tense –s. For example, in (1) he ASK us to come, it should be ‘asks’. The speakers of the study commonly used the first and second person in the utterances, so that the use of third person in this study was very little. However, the use of ‘dropping third person present tense –s’ means that ELF speakers showed some variations of English standard form.

The ELF speakers come from different parts of Asia and the use of third person is not common in their mother tongue. The structure of the language is also different hence the ELF speakers of the study employed non-standard form in the utterances. Despite all the errors, the speakers can still maintain the flow of the small talk.

C. Confusing the relative pronouns who and which

The findings revealed that the ELF speakers showed confusion in using the relative pronouns ‘who’ and ‘which’. The findings showed that the ELF speakers only produced five utterances in the small talk, as can be seen in below:

- (4) one of the countries who establish the organization is Indonesia <slow> (which)
- (5) one of the EARliest person (om) gave this idea (who)
- (6) those countries who involve in asian african conference (which)
- (7) and between the asian commite (om) studying in indonesia <fast>(who)
- (8) i’m just curious about (.) other people from other country that come to indonesia (who)

This excerpt did not only show utterances which used confusing relative pronouns but also show some omission of the relative pronouns. For example, in (4), (6), and (8), it showed confusing relative pronouns. As shown in the

excerpt (6), ‘those countries who involve in Asian African conference’, the word ‘who’ is best replaced by ‘which’, because the speakers tried to explain a thing. Moreover, the finding revealed that the ELF speakers also showed the omission of relative pronouns use. This proves that ELF speakers used a variation of English standard-forms in their utterances. In examples (5) and (7), the ELF speakers tend to omit the word ‘who’.

As can be seen from the findings, ELF speakers understand how to use the relative pronouns ‘who’ and ‘which’, because from the whole small talk the speakers only produce 5 utterances for overusing the relative pronouns. This finding has similarities with Seidlhofer’s (2004) findings. In her study, she found that ELF speakers tend to use a non-standard form of relative pronouns. However, the speakers can keep the conversation flow without any misunderstanding.

D. Omitting definite and indefinite articles

The study found that ELF speakers tend to omit the definite and indefinite articles. These findings revealed that all of the ELF speakers showed all types of omitting definite and indefinite articles, namely a, an, and the (as can be seen in Table II).

TABLE II. THE FREQUENCY OF OMITTING DEFINITE AND INDEFINITE ARTICLES

Definite and indefinite	Frequency	Percentage (%)
A	10	31.25%
An	6	18.75%
The	16	50%
Total	32	100%

According to Table II, ELF speakers mostly omit the indefinite ‘the’ for 50%, followed by definite ‘a’ for 31.25% and definite ‘an’ for 6%. Here is the example of the utterances:

- (9) consider as (an) important organization in Indonesia <slow>
- (10)prime minister Nehru was ONE of (the) founding father
- (11)assistant coordinator of (an) Asian student association <fast>
- (12)=ancient is like (a) THOUSands years ago
- (13)=he will take care (the) issue very well (.)
- (14) assai in (a) good hand

As can be seen from the utterances above, the speakers omit the definite and indefinite article because of the influence of their mother tongue. ELF speakers in this study come from India, Yemen, Malaysia, and Indonesia in which they are not familiar with the use of definite and indefinite articles, so that it makes the ELF speakers tend to produce an error used of definite and indefinite articles. These findings have similarities with Kachru and Nelson’s (2011) study which found that the ELF speakers in East Asian

English, especially in Korea are also failing to use the standard form of English.

E. Preposition

The findings showed a variation use of prepositions. It includes all the eleven types of prepositions proposed by Carter et al. (2000, as cited in Önen, 2015) namely *to, in, of, for, about, from, with, between, at, on* and *by*. Table III below shows the overall occurrence of prepositions in the small talk.

TABLE III. THE DISTRIBUTION OF PREPOSITIONS

No.	Preposition	Ranking	Frequency	Percentage
1.	To	1	212	31.59%
2.	In	3	126	18.77%
3.	Of	2	134	19.97%
4.	For	4	53	7.89%
5.	With	7	20	2.98%
6.	About	6	36	5.36%
7.	At	10	7	1.04%
8.	On	8	17	2.53%
9.	From	5	50	7.45%
10.	Between	9	9	1.34%
11.	By	10	7	1.04%
Total			671	100%

According to Table III, the use of the preposition ‘to’ is the most frequent prepositions used by the speaker for 31.59%, followed by of, for, from, about, with, on, between, at and by. ELF speakers mostly used the preposition ‘to’ in their utterances. The speakers mostly repeat the preposition ‘to’ in the conversation, for example, “she is very hospitable **to** us and **to** us community all the time” or “museum giving me a platform for me **to to to** volunteering”. ‘To’ occurred as the most used preposition which is also shown in Önen’s (2015) research. The results of her finding found that ELF speakers tend to use the preposition ‘to’ in their utterances to complete their sentence. Meanwhile in Kirkpatrick’s (2010) study, preposition ‘about’ is the most frequent preposition.

This present study shows some variations of the preposition, such as the exaggeration use of prepositions, omission of prepositions and other (as can be seen in Table IV).

TABLE IV. THE DISTRIBUTION OF EXAGGERATION, OMISSION AND OTHER PREPOSITIONS

Preposition	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Exaggeration use of prepositions	42	72.4%
Omission of prepositions	9	15.5%
Other use of prepositions	7	12.0%
Total	58	100%

As can be seen from Table IV, ELF speaker tends to exaggerate their prepositions in their conversation for 72.4%. The extra use of prepositions means the speaker utters more than one preposition in a sentence by using a non-standard form of English. The use of extra prepositions and repetition include as the type of exaggeration use of prepositions (see examples (15) and (16) below). Then, the omission of prepositions occurred for 15.5%, meanwhile 12.0% the speakers used incorrect prepositions. The speaker rarely omits the preposition and rarely used incorrect preposition in their utterances.

F. Exaggeration use of prepositions

The findings showed some exaggeration prepositions for 72.4%. ELF speakers of the small talk use extra prepositions in their utterances. Here are some utterances which indicate the exaggeration use of prepositions:

- (15) if beginner who doesn’t know anything **about** he can go to the museum <fast>
- (16) Asia start **from** (.) **from** far Middle East (.) until <slow> Far East
- (17) so **in** FIVE students from different part of asias <slow>
- (18) **In** (2) **in** India they have collaboration <fast>
- (19) Ramayana come **to** he:re
- (20) em museum is not about (3) a learning **about** history <slow>
- (21) We always give <fast> the presentation **of about** our countries

The example above shows that there are some differences in the way exaggeration preposition are produced in the small talk. There are repetition and redundant preposition. In examples (16) and (18), they showed repetition preposition. For example, (16) Asia start **from** (.) **from** far Middle East (.) until <slow> Far East, the speaker utter preposition ‘from’ twice. This repetition preposition was spontaneously produced by ELF speakers. Besides repetition, the other type of exaggeration is redundant prepositions. This type showed some prepositions that are used in non-standard form and can be deleted. This type of redundant preposition can be seen in examples (15), (17), (19), (20) and (21). For example, (17) so **in** FIVE students from different part of Asia’s <slow>, the preposition ‘in’ can be deleted from the utterance. If preposition ‘in’ is deleted from the utterance it would not change the meaning that the speaker tried to deliver. The exaggeration use of the preposition was not making the conversation obstructed. All of the speakers keep the flow of the conversation without noticing the extra use of the prepositions.

Exaggeration use of preposition was also shown in Seidlhofer (2004), Cogo and Dewey (2012), Önen (2015) and Ji (2016). The similarity between this study and other previous studies is the ELF speaker used redundant prepositions in their utterances. As discussed by Önen (2015) ELF speakers tend to extend the pattern of English standard form. For example, “it’s good to: it’s sympathy to ask **to** the person who walks in the”, the speaker adds a preposition ‘to’ and leave the standard form of English.

Meanwhile, in Cogo and Dewey’s (2012) study, it was shown that the redundant use of preposition is an extension of the English standard form. Therefore, the functions of this extra use of prepositions were showing the characteristic of the ELF speaker who tends to extend the use of the preposition. Moreover, Önen (2015) and Ji (2016) state that semantic study also influences the extra use of prepositions.

G. Omission of prepositions

The findings showed some omission prepositions for 15.5%. ELF speakers of the study rarely omit the preposition that they used. Here are the utterances that ELF speakers produce in the small talk.

- (22) beside that he is helping the major all the time <slow> (.) (om) receiving the delegates (for)
- (23) But INDONESIA has to manage the relationship both (om) the country (of)
- (24) the legacy (om) Asian African conference (of)
- (25) I’m belong (om) ASIAN country (to)
- (26) but as (om) my opinion <fast> (in)
- (27) I (.) myself not agree (om) this idea <slow> (with)
- (28) on Saturday we go (om) museum (to)

In examples, (23) and (24), ELF speakers tend to omit preposition ‘of’, meanwhile (25) and (28) they tend to omit preposition ‘to’. For example, (27) I (.) myself not agree (om) this idea <slow> (with), the sentence is not complete and should be inserted the suitable preposition. The suitable preposition for this utterance is ‘with’. Even though ELF speakers omit preposition in their utterances, communication between each speaker is still flowing without any obstructed. This study also discussed by Ji (2016) who stated that the preposition omission can be influenced by the mother tongue of the ELF speaker. In the study, Ji discussed how ELF Chinese speakers who influence by the use of their mother tongue in omitting the prepositions. In addition, it is shown how common ELF speaker’s utterances influence by their mother tongue.

H. Other use of prepositions

The findings showed other use of prepositions for 12.0%. ELF speakers showed some errors while using some prepositions, such as misunderstood the use of ‘on’ and ‘in’. The results of the ELF speaker’s utterances are provided below.

- (29) I have some, emotional attachment <fast> **from** this conference (with)
- (30) For example (.) you can tell as **for** my understanding, Indonesia (in)
- (31) is a peaceful co-existence (.) and the idea **of** NOT interfering each other (for)
- (32) the influence of Indian culture **on** Indonesian (in)
- (33) the friendship **of** Nehru and Sukarno <slow> (between)
- (34) if you need any assistant **in** publishing <slow> outside Indonesia (for)
- (35) So it is one of the MOST CONSERVATIVE country **of** the world (in)

The utterances showed that the speaker mostly misunderstood to use the preposition ‘in’. In examples, (30), (32) and (35), prepositions ‘for’, ‘on’ and ‘of’ can be replaced by ‘in’. The speakers tend to use the preposition ‘of’ to complete their utterances. However, even though the speakers produce error prepositions, they can follow the topic of the small talk.

This error was also discussed by Cogo and Dewey (2012) and Ji (2016). Their study explained that this error is called as a variation. Ji (2016) suggests that variations appear because of the influence of the speaker’s mother tongue. Ji also concluded that this variation is shown because of the speaker’s confusion between transitive and non-transitive verbs. On the other hand, Cogo and Dewey (2012) stated that this variation is shown as innovative prepositions used by the speakers. It means that ELF speaker tends to use variations of prepositions based on their mother tongue.

I. Marking or non-marking plurals

The use of regular or irregular plural is important to give exact information to other people. It shows the exact quantity of something. The speakers of the small talk spontaneously show some errors or the use of non-standard form in their utterances. The data shows some errors in using the regular plural and other errors, as can be seen in Table V.

TABLE V. ERROR USE OF REGULAR AND IRREGULAR PLURAL

Plural types	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Regular plural	30	93,75%
Irregular plural	0	0%
Others	2	6,25%
Total	32	100%

Table V provides information on plural implementation in a non-standard or incorrect form, as can be seen from the table, the speaker of the small talk often produce error implementation in regular plural for 93.75%. In contrast, 0% represents the use of a non-standard form of irregular plural which is not shown in the utterances. Moreover, the “others” type providing the use of plural which is not include as regular and irregular plural.

J. Regular plural

The regular plurals have many types according to the last alphabet of the word. There are seven types of regular plural, likewise Vowel (+ -s), Consonant (+ -s), ss, sh, ch, x (+ -es), Vowel + y (+ -s), Consonant + y (+ -ies), Vowel + o (+ -s), and Consonant + o (+ -es). It showed only two types of regular plural, namely Consonant (+ -s) and Consonant + y (+ies). The sample of the utterances are displayed below:

- (36) those **country** follow

- (37) Asian African conference ONE of the **BIGGEST organization** in the world
- (38) some of the Arabian **country** <slow>
- (39) if you have very big business <fast> in some **company** in some **country** <fast>
- (40) so:me of Yaman **student** come to Indonesia
- (41) But your respond toward this two **CLUB**

As can be seen from the utterances above, the speaker misspelled with the use of regular plural. In examples (37), (40), and (41) it showed the non-standard form of a consonant (+ -s). For example (37) Asian African conference ONE of the **BIGGEST organization** in the world, this utterance explains that the word 'organization' did not follow the correct form. The word 'organization' must follow the standard form of regular plural which is consonant followed by -s 'organizations'.

Moreover, in examples (36), (38), and (39) it showed the non-standard used of consonant + y (+ -ies) form. As an illustration, in (38) some of the Arabian **country** <slow>, this utterance showed that the word 'some' itself explains that the country is more than one. Then, the speaker also removes the standard form of consonant + y (+ -ies), so 'country' can be replaced by 'countries'. However, the use of non-standard form in this utterances were not obstructing the flow of the conversation. There was not any misunderstanding during the conversation.

The use of regular or irregular nouns is also discussed in Kachru and Nelson (2011). They discovered that there is no big gap between the uses of regular or irregular nouns. The ELF speakers of Southeast Asian Englishes are showed some common use of 'redundant partitives nouns' and 'agreement in number with the head nouns', it becomes the characteristic of the ELF speaker in those countries.

K. Other plural

As it has been explained, there are two types of plural, namely regular and irregular plural. However, some speakers incorrectly used both types.

- (42) so in FIVE students from different part of **Asias** <slow>
- (43) to make this two **offices** closer **hh**

As we can see from the utterances above, some speakers use a non-standard form of plural. In example (42) and (43) the word Asia and office did not have any plural form. Therefore, the speaker misunderstood with the standard form of regular and irregular plural. However, all of the speakers were not disturbed by this and keep the flow of the conversations.

L. Tag question form

The use of tag questions is commonly used in a conversation among ELF speakers, but the use of tag questions in the study of ELF has some variations. Seidlhofer (2004) states in her work that an ELF speaker is 'failing' to use correct forms in tag questions, for example, the standard form is 'shouldn't they?' but ELF speakers use 'isn't it?' or 'no?'. The findings showed that the speakers

actively ask questions to each other during the talk but there are only two questions that can be categorized as tag questions.

- (44) What's your opinion <slow> about Asian African conference that held in Indonesia back then because as far as I know your country Yemen <slow> (.) also contribute in Asian African conference, **right?**
- (45) I also contact HE, **right?**

The findings show that the speaker rarely uses tag questions when they communicate with other people. The speakers of this study rather use a question form, such as 'When you say ANCIENT, what do you mean ancient?' and 'OK, so I will start talking about my field of study? <slow>'.

Overall, the flow of the conversation was not obstructed because the speaker rarely uses the tag question form. The result of this present study is also different from the research done by Ji (2016). Ji's study showed that the speakers often used tag question, namely 'right?' because of the habit and culture of the speaker. However, the similarity of the present study and other previous studies is that the conversation flows naturally without any misunderstanding.

M. Other question form

The findings of the data showed some characteristics of the ELF speakers in producing the questions. The characteristics showed in the findings were 'repetition question' and the speakers answer the question by themselves.

- (46) Why you have this topic as your research? **Why you pick this topic as research?** <fast>
- (47) Maybe for the last question, can you give me some information about the POPULAR culture in your country? **Maybe what culture very popular in your country?** <fast>
- (48) **OK**, how many of them? **How many of?**

As can be seen above, in examples (46), (47), and (48), the speakers tend to repeat their question to make sure that it is delivered clearly to other speakers.

- (49) So it's a when you have to submit for skripsi (.) is skripsi or paper? = <fast> = Oh paper <fast>
- (50) Yazen ya: (L1)? (.) I met Yazen few weeks ago I think in the museum <slow>
- (51) He ride BICYCLE? = that's very nice

The other characteristics that can be seen from the data are 'answering their own question'. In examples (49), (50), and (51) the speakers ask the questions because they are recalling the topic of the conversation or recalling their memory. The characteristics of how ELF speakers ask a question are also shown in a study performed by Kachru and Nelson (2011). The ELF speakers in Southeast Asian tend to reverse the subject and verb of embedded questions and lack of inversion.

IV. CONCLUSION

From the findings, it was revealed that the ELF speakers' utterances show six lexicogrammatical features as proposed by ELF scholars; namely, dropping third person present tense –s, confusing the relative pronouns who and which, omitting definite and indefinite articles preposition, marking or non-marking plural and use of tag questions form.

Also, ELF speakers demonstrated some errors in producing regular plural for 30 times, but in the irregular plural, they did not show any error. It means that the speakers have already acknowledged the use of irregular plural. Then, the ELF speakers showed some errors in the use of third person present tense, definite and indefinite articles, and relative pronouns of 'who' and 'which'. These three features are not common for the ELF speakers to use because their 'mother tongue' language does not use any of these features.

From the findings, it can be concluded that the errors or non-standard forms that were produced by the ELF speakers did not affect the flow of the small talk and did not create any miscommunication. Those errors, in fact, are not considered as a failure but it shows that ELF speakers produce a kind of variation of English standard form in their utterances. In addition, there are some features that are influenced by the ELF speakers' mother tongue language. The ELF speakers also show some correct standard form of English in the area of prepositions, marking or non-marking plural, and use of tag question, overusing verb, infinitive constructions, and explicitness.

REFERENCES

- Alwasilah, A. C. (2002). *Pokoknya kualitatif: Dasar-dasar merancang dan melakukan penelitian kualitatif*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. (2001). *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.
- Batziakas, B. (2016). Making specific meaning through flexible language use in ELF conversations. *Intercultural Communication. New Perspectives from ELF*.
- Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2006). Efficiency in ELF communication: From pragmatic motives to lexico-grammatical innovation. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 5(2), 59-93.
- Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2012). *Analysing English as a lingua franca: A corpus-driven investigation*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On 'lingua franca' English and conversation analysis. *Journal of pragmatics*, 26(2), 237-259.
- Hancock, B., Ockleford, E., Windridge, K. (2009). *An introduction to qualitative research. The NIHR RDS for the East Midlands/Yorkshire and the Humber*.
- Jenkins, J., Cogo, A., & Dewey, M. (2011). Reviews of developments in research into English as a lingua franca. *Lang. Teach.*, 44(3), 281-315. doi: 10.1017/S0261444811000115
- Jenkins, J. (2011). Accommodating (to) ELF in the international university. *Journal of Pragmatics*. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.011
- Ji, K. (2016). The linguistic features of ELF by Chinese users in China-ASEAN communication contexts. *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 5(2), 273-290. doi: 10.1515/jelf-2016-0020
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2011). *World Englishes in Asian context*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kadir, Z. A., Maros, M., & Hamid, B. A. (2012). Linguistic features in the online discussion forums. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(3), 276-281.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2008). English as the official working language of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN): Features and strategies. *English Today*, 24(2), 27-34.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as a Lingua Franca in ASEAN: A Multilingual Model*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2011). English as an asian lingua franca and the multilingual model of ELT. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 1-13. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444810000145>
- Önen, S. (2015). The use of prepositions in English as lingua franca interactions: corpus IST-erasmus. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(5), 160-172.
- Rodliyah, R. S., Imperiani, E. D. A., & Amalia, L. L. (2014). Indonesian tertiary students' attitudes towards the use of local culture vs target culture reading materials in English reading class. *Bahasa & Sastra*, 14(1), 109-120.
- Shariffan, F. (2009). *English as an International Language: Perspective and Pedagogical Issues*. MPG Books Ltd.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-23