

COORDINATE BILINGUALISM BETWEEN STUDENTS AND TEACHER'S UTTERANCES DURING LEARNING PROCESS IN TRILINGUAL SCHOOL: ERROR ANALYSIS

Ni Kadek Dwi Rahayu

Master of Linguistic, Udayana University, Indonesia

Corresponding author's email: rahayu.2280111018@student.unud.ac.id

Abstract

This study examined students and teacher's utterance which applied coordinate bilingualism during learning in trilingual school. From that situation, their utterances were analyzed the errors during conversation in a classroom. Moreover, the coordinate situation was also being elaborated regarding social dimensions that occurred in a classroom: social relations between participants, status relations between participants, background and formality, and language functions. The data source used were students who were from mixed marriage families that speak different languages and non-mixed marriage of one and the same language in the tenth grade at CHIS school Denpasar. This school was categorized as National Plus School which is the languages are taught is that Indonesian, English, Balinese, and Mandarin. The participatory observation, questionnaire, and in-depth interview were used to collect data. Purposive sampling method was selected in this study. The data was analyzed qualitatively and also presented informally and descriptively. The result showed that omission and mis-formation mostly appeared when the students responded the teacher's question and the teacher appeared omission and addition. Most of the students and teacher never did mis-ordering during speaking. Then, social relation more often happened than status relation during learning process.

Keywords: coordinate bilingualism; social dimension; surface strategy taxonomy

INTRODUCTION

The current linguistic situation has been a concern for various research. This situation cannot be separated from language development. The characteristic of language, including productive, dynamic, diverse, unique, and universal, supported the linguistic situation is still an urgency to explore (Chaer, 1995). The linguistic situation can be seen from the use of languages in daily life unconsciously which is demonstrated by a speaker. A speaker's language ability and cultural background is acquired from a particular place. Then, a speaker brings his own language ability and cultural background in a daily life: which raises a

language contact between them; a speaker and other speaker or as a hearer. This contact enriches the speaker's vocabularies and hearer of the language spoken by the speakers. From this phenomenon makes people change or mix the language itself. Change the language or code switching means a speaker switch the language from language A into language B, however, mix the language means a speaker still use the same language but a speaker tends to mix it with another language in a word used. For instance, a word *jujur* becomes *jujurly*.

The ability for a speaker those who can speak more than one language called bilingual. The concept of the term bilingual means those who can master two languages in which two codes can be used in the same interaction (Hamers and Blanc, 2000). Then, the name to express the ability of a bilingual is called *bilingualism*, and it also related to the psychology of a bilingual is well known as *bilinguality*. Based on Hamers and Blanc (2000), bilinguality is what makes a bilingual person accept two different language systems. In the era of revolution 4.0, no one is monolingual, many are bilingual. The cause of this phenomenon comes from social interaction between two or more people in one place. One of the places where bilingualism could be observed is school. The school is a place to study and play for many students and surely they interacted with each other. The school in the current study is trilingual school in Denpasar.

In trilingual school, they are students who are from mixed married family even non-mixed married, however most of them having and bring different culture and background surely. Then, this situation is very supporting bilingualism phenomenon. CHIS school Denpasar becomes a school that is observed in current study. CHIS School is a kind of National Plus in which the introductory language is English. Secondly, this school is located in Bali which is well known as cultural tourism besides natural tourism as well and very popular by mostly Chinese people which have the biggest population in the world beside Europe, America, Australia tourist as well. They are four languages are Indonesian, English, Balinese, and Mandarin.

There was unique phenomenon during learning process in the class in which when student A (as a stimulus) asks about school assignments as a topic of conversation using a good second language (Indonesian) as student B (as a response). However, student B (as a response) responds by using his mother tongue (English) well. It can happen the other way around. The second phenomenon, if student A (as a stimulus) uses a second language compared to his mother tongue at school, both speaking with the teacher and his friends and student B also responds with a second language that is equally good. Since the student uses language according to its function, namely at school, afterwards the third phenomenon could happen if student A (as a stimulus) during speech uses a second language when talking to student B (as a response) through a rough translation equivalent to the mother tongue unit.

From the phenomenon above was retrieved from Weinrich's theory about Bilingualism Types in 1953. The types are compound bilingualism, coordinate bilingualism, and sub-coordinate bilingualism. Compound bilingualism is a bilingual speaker has one concept from one set of meanings of the tow (or more) linguistic codes organized by individual, but can express themselves with the sound images (words) from both languages. After that, coordinate bilingualism means a bilingual speaker has different experiences in mastering two languages therefore, their use is rarely exchanged. The learning context is significant in determining the bilingual situation. Furthermore, sub-coordinate bilingualism is draws from

only the mother tongue units and has the sound images of the second language as rough translation quasi-equivalents of the mother tongue units. Since the current study was only focus on coordinate bilingualism, the discussion and data are just belongs to coordinate bilingualism, including social dimension that occurred during learning process.

There were four types of scale in social dimension that is 1) Social distance scale concerned with participant relationships. This scale is important in emphasizing how well we know someone is a relevant factor in the linguistic choice, 2) Status scale concerned with participant relationships This scale points to the relevance of relative status in some linguistic choices, 3) Formality scale relating to the setting or type of interaction. This scale is important in assessing the influence of the place or type of interaction on language choice, 4) This scale has synonym terms "The referential and affective function scales". The two scales are identified since language may convey objective information (referential function) and can also express how someone is feeling or subjective (affective function).

In addition, the current study also looked at the error of utterances between students and teacher during learning process in the classroom. The error analysis through utterances did not consider reflective utterances of spoken language such as "What time?" or "How to go?" as error. Based on Brown's (2003) assertion, the grammar of spoken colloquial English does not warrant using complete sentences. Thus, the data used in current study in the form of utterances during learning process which is assumed that in this context, the discussions between students and teacher are formal and surely the word choice to ask or speak something are not belong to English colloquial as example above and ignore to choose English colloquial as a data. Therefore, the finding and discussion which found is scientific and responsible.

In addition, the current study also looked at the error of utterances between students and teacher during learning process in the classroom. The error analysis through utterances did not consider reflective utterances of spoken language such as "What time?" or "How to go?" as error. Based on Brown's (2003) assertion, the grammar of spoken colloquial English does not warrant using complete sentences. Thus, the data used in current study in the form of utterances during learning process which is assumed that in this context, the discussions between students and teacher are formal and surely the word choice to ask or speak something are not belong to English colloquial as example above and ignore to choose English colloquial as a data. Therefore, the finding and discussion which found is scientific and responsible.

In analyzing the error occurred, surface strategy taxonomy used by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) in current study. This theory highlighted the four ways in which some learners modify the target form that is omission errors is characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. For instances *Mary president new company*, here some points were omitted that is *is*, *the* and preposition *of the* therefore the complete sentence is *Mary is the president of the new company*. Secondly, Addition error is the opposite of omissions. Whereas, the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance. This way consists of double markings, regularizations, and simple addition. Thirdly, mis-formation errors are defining the wrong form of the morpheme or structure. For instances *the dog eated the chicken*. The form of *eated* in the example is wrong since a past tense marker. This way has three types are regularizations, archi-forms, and

alternating forms. Fourthly, mis-ordering errors which characterized by the incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance. For examples *He is all the time late*. Actually, *all the time* is mis-ordered.

Thus, the current study has two research questions: (1) how does social dimension influence the practice of coordinate bilingualism by students and teacher during learning process? (2) What types of grammatical error from the utterances which uttered by the students and teacher based on surface strategy taxonomy?

Based on the phenomenon in the field, bilingualism's types, and surface structure taxonomy theories including social dimension during conversation between students and teacher in learning process would be discussed very clearly and complexly. Therefore, the discussions are what coordinate bilingualism is, how the mistakes produced by students and teacher during learning process in formal context especially in the classroom is, and how relationship between students and teacher during conversation that related with social dimension between them is. All of them were studied in the context of English learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study used some literature reviews to support the current study. There was study about *Penggunaan Bilingualisme pada Tuturan Siswa SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Makassar* was written by Rizal (2020) aimed to measure the number of bilingual phenomena in junior high school who were Indonesian-Bugis bilingual. This study using the theory of bilingualism classification by Weinreich was divided into Compound Bilingualism, Coordinate Bilingualism, and Sub-coordinate Bilingualism. This method used non-participatory observation and in-depth interviews. The results showed that the sub-coordinate bilingualism occupied the highest rank of 59%, 23% of the coordinate bilingualism and 18% of the compound bilingualism.

In this study, Rizal observed the utterances qualitatively by providing in-depth explanations of the findings listed in the research methods section, but this contrasts with the results of research which provided a percentage in it. The technique of collecting data used was not explained in detail, how the data was selected and then classified. However, there were strengths of this research, namely the observation and interview technique that had been appropriate.

Other study about *Peranan Wanita Jepang Dalam Mentransfer Bahasa kepada Anak pada Keluarga Campuran Etnik Bali – Orang Jepang di Bali* was written by Laksmi, et.al. (2003) aimed to examine the first is the strategies of parents in transferring language to their children, the second is the choice of language in KCBJ D (*Keluarga Campuran Bali-Jepang D*) and KCBJ U (*Keluarga Campuran Bali-Jepang U*), the third is the factors of strategy and language choice, and the fourth is the role of Japanese women in transferring language to their children. The theory used was language choice based on situational context factors by Fishman (1971) and Holmes (1979), the strategy of parents transferring language to their children by Romaine (1995), and several books related to the study of women. Data were collected using observation and distributed questionnaires, assisted by interview and note-taking techniques. Data were analysed using qualitative and quantitative methods, then presented in the formal and informal presentation.

The strengths of this study were the complex theories and the methods are used. The interesting part of this study was the theory of females about the roles of women in a family, especially for a Japanese woman. However, the weaknesses of this study were the term used for analysing data. There was no mention of the term of the technique of analysing data which was used, and no detailed steps explained. For the second, there was a lack of explanation regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the literature review. Laksmi, et. al mostly explained contents of the previous study only.

This research is very relevant because of the theoretical framework that is used. The theory is language choice proposed by Fishman, namely language choice based on domains. These domains are the factors of the social context situation by Holmes: social relations between participants, status relations between participants, background and formality, and language functions.

Beside of that, there was a study concern about Bilingualism Among the Adolescents in Badung Regency, Bali was written by Muliana, et.al (2015) aimed to explore the bilingualism situation and the existence of Balinese Language among adolescents. This article used two approaches: bilingualism proposed by Weinreich (1953) and language choice by Fasold (1984:180). The method and technique used was participant observation through observing the languages used among the adolescents. The results indicated that the adolescents in Badung Regency were bilinguals of Balinese and Indonesian languages. They used the Balinese language in all their communicative activities, except some females occasionally showed the Indonesian language.

The strengths of this study were the approaches such as bilingualism by Weinreich (1953) and language choice by Fasold (1984:80). Two approaches above were effective to answer the research problems; the first was the bilingualism situation, and the second was the existence of the Balinese Language. However, the weakness was the method applied. Mulia and friends adopted only one technique that was participatory observation. Since only one technique, it makes the research lack understanding. In the future, this study can broaden to find the high and low varieties using the checklist technique according to Fasold theory.

Three literatures above gave us insight about bilingualism, language choice, and social context situation. There were two studies about grammatical error in utterances, even spoken English. The study entitled Grammatical Errors in Spoken English of University Students in Oral Communication Course by Ting, Mahadhir, and Chang (2010). This study aimed at examining the grammatical errors in spoken English of university students who are less proficient in English. This study determined the types of errors and the changes in grammatical accuracy during the duration of the English for Social Purposes course focusing on oral communication. The data used was oral interaction data derived from 126 simulated interactions in role play situations produced by 42 students with lower proficiency in English, with Malaysian University English Test (MUET) in which Bands 1 to 3, enrolled in an English for Social Purposes course at a Malaysian university. The students have three role plays to be conducted and performed them at three junctures during the 14-week semester. The study used the surface structure taxonomy by Dulay, Burt and Krashen's (1982). The result also showed an increase in grammatical accuracy in the students' spoken English towards the end of the course. The strength of this study were procedures to conduct this

research and theory used. There were scientific settings for finding the data to ensure some readers that this study has not existed yet. Then, the theory about surface structure taxonomy was very complex was explained by researchers. Therefore, the theory was used also adopted in the current study, however, the current study more discusses about the intralingual and interlingual error only. Besides, there were weakness of this study; there was no specific method used and this study focused on student who are less proficient in English and did not include proficient speakers of English so that lack of empirical evidence in this study.

Another study about Analysis of Grammatical Errors of Utterance Structure by Beltran (2014). This study aimed at examining the grammatical errors of Technology teachers' utterance structure. Observation and interview method used in this study. The typology of errors by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) were applied in this study. The four types of errors are omission, addition, mis-formation, and mis-ordering. Data source used were teacher who have Filipino as the their L1. The finding showed that mis-formation and omission were the most grammatical error by the teacher in which addition and mis-ordering being less frequent. These errors in their utterance were the results of the influence of their native language structures to produce a spoken discourse of the English language (L2). This study was relevant in the current study since theory and method used.

METHOD

Data Source

This study used utterances as a data source. They were uttered by the students and the teacher during the learning process. In detail, there were criteria of the students who were suitable to be participants in this research, they are listed as follows; 1) Students who live more than 10 years in Bali, 2) Students who have minimal one language each as the first language (L1) and the second language (L2), 3) Students who are active in the online class which answered or responded to the teacher's question, 4) Students who come from mixed marriage families even non-mixed marriage families. They are students from a Science Major class in grade 10th, male or female, consisting of 17 students. Then, the teacher was English teacher who taught the class was observed.

Then, the subjects that were observed was English. The class was conducted online, for English subject was conducted for 2 hours. The subject was recorded and observed two times.

The sampling method used in this study was Purposive Sampling (Sugiyono, 2013). This class and the major were chosen because some students came from families whose parents are of different ethnic groups and speak different languages, including Japanese-Bali, Hongkong-Bali, and Timor Leste-Chinese. Then, some of participants even Bali-Bali, Sumba-Bali, East Java-East Java, and Sulawesi-Sulawesi speak more than one language. So, the students in this major are diverse; surely, this situation brought different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Method and Technique of Collecting Data

In this study, the method of collecting data used include observation and assisted by interview. The Participatory Observation was used to carry out a direct observation of language uses. The technique of observation carried out was checklist technique (Creswell,

2014) by conducting the following steps; 1). The researcher observes the students' and teacher conversation in the Google Meet Classroom by recording, 2) The researcher transcribes the sound recordings in the form of written conversation related to the practiced of coordinate bilingualism, 3) The researcher conducts a checklist of the utterances by identifying omission, addition, mis-formation, and mis-ordering

Secondly was In-depth Interview through online by WhatsApp or Google Meet feature to support the analysis of the utterances deeply which cannot be obtained from observation (Stainback and Stainback, 1988) as follows:

1. The researcher interviewed students and teacher through WhatsApp or Google Meet features based on the data in google form.
2. The researcher note-taking the additional information beside the data from google form to support the analysis of the students' and teacher's utterances.

Method and Technique of Analyzing Data

This study used theory of bilingualism types by Weinreich (1953 in Romaine, 1995:78-79) by analyzing coordinate bilingualism practiced by the students and teacher only during learning process. Besides that, the social dimension was also analyzed regarding the situation. After that, the utterances identified the omission, addition, mis-formation, and mis-ordering error using surface strategy taxonomy by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982). The presenting data used informal method by descriptively explaining the current study's result.

FINDINGS

This study provided the findings had obtained by researcher regarding the phenomenon of coordinate bilingualism between students and teacher during learning process then it found the mistake for their utterances during learning. Based on three research questions in this study. The first finding of current study presented about the data for coordinate bilingualism practiced by students and teacher. Then, the second one was presented for the error which produced by students and teacher based on surface strategy taxonomy. Afterwards, for the third one was presented about the social dimension's interpretation, how relationship between students and teacher by looking at the diction of the utterances.

Coordinate Bilingualism practiced by Students and Teacher

In this section, the data presented below to give pictures about how coordinate bilingualism practiced by students and teacher.

Data 1

- Teacher : "What is the first text, what do you think it is about?"
Jody : "I think — is about a thief that stole the grocery to the victim for stealing the bike."
Teacher : "Okay, and then how about the picture number 2, father angry victim online con, Jody?"
Jody : "I think it is about the father angry to the victim."

Data 2

- Teacher : "and then one more maybe. Hmm Louisa?"

Louisa : "The first page, I think it's about a thief that stole a bike but feel sorry and so he returns it."
Teacher : "next."
Louisa : "For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed."
Teacher : "Okay, thank you Louisa."

Data 3

Teacher : "So, for the first text, I want one of you to read, mm...the first text is Wilbert."
Wilbert : "Hi, — first text Miss?"
Teacher : "Yes, first text."

Data 4

Teacher : "So, maybe one of you can share words that relate with crime or criminal, or I will choose then, Nick!"
Nick : "Online Scam Miss."
Teacher : "And then, what else?"
Nick : "Trick."
Teacher : "Good, what else?"
Nick : "Money."

Data 5

Teacher : "number six, Nick."
Nick : "Oh, okay. The shopkeeper, ew...no way. After the robbery the shopkeeper said he would think about putting cameras up in the shop."
Teacher : "yak, After the robbery the shopkeeper said he /she would think yeah, about putting cameras up in the shop."

Data 6

Teacher : "Maybe, Louisa, do you think laws are important?"
Louisa : "Yes, Miss."
Teacher : "And then, why do you think it is important?"
Louisa : "I think it is important because life will be messy without law".
Teacher : "Okay, life will be messy without law, I agree with that. Thank you" for sharing your opinion."

The datum above was categorized in coordinate bilingualism during English subject in the formal situation. Since the introductory language used in this subject was English, therefore teacher and students must use full English in the class. The datum above proved coordinate bilingualism existed in the class, since both teacher and students rarely exchange the language into their first language.

Error analysis practiced by students and teacher during learning process

The findings were between students and teacher appeared omission, addition, and mis-information error types produced. Omission occurred in teacher and students' utterances in

which there were omission towards grammatical morphemes that is *it* and *is*. Then, addition occurred since between students and teacher add an article *the* in front of person's name and plural -s in singular noun. Beside of that, mis-information error was produced since subject-verb agreement *he get scammed*.

Social dimension occurred between students and teacher during learning process

This study found that mostly social distance scale created between students and teacher's relationship. Social distance scale is emphasizing how well teacher knew the students by looking at the utterances produced. Then, it was followed by formality and functional scales during conversation between students and teacher. Every datum above would be explained in discussion section in very detail.

DISCUSSION

In this section, the findings were revealed below by giving deeper interpretation from the study result based on the research questions. The explanation for the first research question was merged into one with the third research question about coordinate bilingualism followed by social dimension between students and teacher during conversation in the classroom. Afterwards, the second research question was explained differently did not merge into one in the first and third research questions. Besides, it was given the table also to show the errors in the conversation between students and teacher using surface strategy taxonomy.

Coordinate Bilingualism and Social Dimension practiced by Students and Teacher

Data 1

- Teacher : "What is the first text, what do you think it is about?"
Jody : "I think — is about a thief that stole the grocery to the victim for stealing the bike."
Teacher : "Okay, and then how about the picture number 2, father angry victim online con, Jody?"
Jody : "I think it is about the father angry to the victim."

The first data above explained that the teacher and the students could separate their language use. Since the teacher was an English teacher which had Balinese Language as first language (L1) and English as second language (L2). In addition, Jody was a male student acquired three languages in different places and times: Indonesian, English, and Mandarin. He acquired those languages separately in which Indonesian Language acquired from birth and two languages; English and Mandarin as second language acquired from 4 years old in the school. For Indonesian Language, he uses it in his family domain and uses it to speak with his family only (L1), then, for English and Mandarin Language as second language (L2), he uses it in the school when studying English and Mandarin Subject beside to comprehend the subjects' explanation by a teacher and to communicate with other friends.

The social dimension from the utterances above was high solidarity between teacher and student which belongs to a social distance scale. The reason was Jody only answered the question from the teacher without calling the name of the teacher that is "Miss" and the teacher agree with Jody's answer even though he without calling using "Miss", it can be seen that Miss Cahya was friendly teacher, from the utterances "Okay.....". Then, the formality

scale was informal since the type of interaction occurred by looking at Jody's utterance. Afterwards, the functional scale was affective scale since Jody expressed his feeling by saying his opinion about the first and second text from the teacher **"I think is about a thief that stole the grocery to the victim for stealing the bike."** (Answer for question number one) and **"I think it is about the father angry to the victim."** (Answer for question number two).

Data 2

- Teacher : "and then one more maybe. Hmm Louisa?"
Louisa : "The first page, I think it's about a thief that stole a bike but feel sorry and so he returns it."
Teacher : "next."
Louisa : "For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed."
Teacher : "Okay, thank you Louisa."

The situation above showed that the teacher was an English teacher which had Balinese Language as first language (L1) and English as second language (L2). Louisa organised the language separately. Louisa got three languages separately; Indonesian, Mandarin, and English. She has been acquiring Indonesian languages since she was 2,5 years old at home (L1) meanwhile Mandarin Language as second language (L2) and English Language as third language (L3), she acquired since she was 3,5 years old simultaneously. Because she acquired languages as a second and as a third language, her English Language had a little bit of an error in the structure of the language which got influenced by her second language (Mandarin Language) because her father was from Hongkong that did not speak English.

The utterances above pointed high solidarity between teacher and student which belongs to a social distance scale. The reason was Louisa answered the question without being followed by greeting word that is "Miss" at the end of her utterances. Beside the teacher also supported build an intimate relation with the student to make the situation in the online class were happy and lively. It can be seen from the spirit of the teacher when teaching the students during learning. Then, the formality scale was informal since Louisa's types of interaction build intimate relationships between teacher. Afterwards, for the function scale was affective scale since Louisa expressed her opinion regarding both texts.

Data 3

- Teacher : "So, for the first text, I want one of you to read, mm...the first text is Wilbert."
Wilbert : "Hi, — first text Miss?"
Teacher : "Yes, first text."

Wilbert practised Coordinate Bilingualism since he uses languages separately because he had Indonesian as first language (L1) acquired when he was 1 years old naturally from both of his parents and used it when speaking with parents or other families and acquired a second language (L2) those are English and Mandarin when he was 4 years old formally in the school in which used it when speaking with the teacher and other friends only. Besides that, he had studied in International School previously therefore, he got exposure from his experience to fluent use of English at school.

The social dimension above was high status between teacher and student which belongs to a status distance scale. Wilbert used the term “Miss” to represent the greeting when answering the teacher’s question “Hi, first text Miss?”. The formality scale was formal since Wilbert used a language in an appropriate place during learning process of English Subject. Afterwards, the function scale was affective scale because of Wilbert re-asking to the teacher to make confirmation regarding the order by the teacher therefore, here Wilbert expressed his feeling to ensure based on what he heard earlier by re-asking.

Data 4

- Teacher : “So, maybe one of you can share words that relate with crime or criminal, or I will choose then, Nick!”
- Nick : “Online Scam Miss.”
- Teacher : “And then, what else?”
- Nick : “Trick.”
- Teacher : “Good, what else?”
- Nick : “Money.”

The utterances above represented that Nick was a bilingual student who practised coordinate bilingualism's type. He used language well, since used it separately. Based on the interview result, he has Indonesian Language acquired when he was 1,5 years old naturally (L1) through his parents and has two languages as second language (L2); English and Mandarin acquired when he was 6 years old formally at school. However, the exposure of the English Language is more in advance than in Mandarin. Nick uses English Language in the class to translate the meaning of sentences into Indonesian Language therefore, he comprehended the explanation from the teacher and it was valid for Mandarin Language as well.

The social dimension above was high solidarity between teacher and student which belongs to a social distance scale. The reason was that Nick mostly uttered the word without greeting “Miss” in his utterances. When the teacher asked him in the second times, he directly answered it and the teacher responded cheerfully and built the class circumstances impassionate, it is seen from when observing the class, therefore this situation influenced Nick to answer the question cheerfully also. The formality scale was informal since Nick and Teacher were like peer relationships. Afterwards, the function scale was affective since Nick expressed his feeling based on his opinion regarding words relating to criminals.

Data 5

- Teacher : “number six, Nick.”
- Nick : “Oh, okay. the shopkeeper, ew...no way. After the robbery the shopkeeper said he would think about putting cameras up in the shop.”
- Teacher : “*yak*, After the robbery the shopkeeper said he /she would think yeah, about putting cameras up in the shop.”

Nick used English separately only in the class when joining English Subject. He never mixed his utterance when responding or answering questions from the teacher. When he failed to answer the question, he used an English diction to say that he had a fault saying something, the phrase was “**no way**”. Therefore, he organised the language well and did not

get influence from his first language even other second language (L2) i.e., Mandarin. It showed that he was coordinate bilingual.

The social dimension from the utterances above was high solidarity between teacher and student which belongs to a social distance scale. The reason was Nick answered the question directly without being followed by a greeting word “Miss” in his opening words “Oh, okey....”. Then, the teacher responded him by using informal Indonesian’s “yak”. The formality scale was informal indeed since his intimate relationship to the teacher. Afterwards, for the functional scale was affective scale since Nick expressed his feeling based on his knowledge and comprehension regarding question for number six.

Data 6

Teacher : “Maybe, Louisa, do you think laws are important?”
 Louisa : “Yes, Miss.”
 Teacher : “And then, why do you think it is important?”
 Louisa : “I think it is important because life will be messy without law”.
 Teacher : “Okay, life will be messy without law, I agree with that. Thank you” for sharing your opinion.”

Louisa; she organised English Language to use in the class to communicate with teachers rather than the other languages that she had. She had two languages in which got in simultaneously, but both of the languages did not as a second language, however every single language was a second and a third language. Since her father was from Hongkong and did not speak English at all, her English Language error occurred again. The error was the English's diction that was unsuitable for her utterance.

The social dimension that could be seen from the utterances above was high solidarity between teacher and student which belongs to a social distance scale. The reason was that Louisa did not initially greet the teacher and the teacher responded by using slang in English, “Okay...” It can be seen that they did the same action during a class conversation. Then, for the functional scale was the referential scale since the teacher wanted to share the student's opinion about the importance of law by asking the student (Louisa) until she got new information from her continuously. It was the same as the teacher giving new information regarding the importance of law from the student (give objective information)

Error analysis practiced by students and teacher during learning process

This section explained the types of error that practiced by students and teacher during conversation in the classroom based on surface strategy taxonomy. The explanation displayed in a very detail by using table what types of error produced are and the example of the error from the utterances between them.

No	Utterances	Error Types based on surface strategy taxonomy
Data 1	Teacher : “What is the first text, what do you think it is about?” Jody : “I think — is about a thief that	Omission

Data 1	Teacher	stole the grocery to the victim for stealing the bike.” : “Okay, and then how about the picture number 2, father — angry victim online con, Jody?”	
Data 2	Jody	: “I think it is about the father — angry to the victim.”	
Data 3	Teacher Louisa	: “next.” : “For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed.”	
Data 4	Teacher Wilbert Teacher	: “So, for the first text, I want one of you to read, mm...the first text is Wilbert.” : “Hi, — first text Miss?” : “Yes, — first text.”	
	Teacher Nick	: “So, maybe one of you can share words that relate - with crime or criminal, or I will choose then, Nick!” : “Online Scam Miss.”	
Data 2 Data 6	Teacher Louisa Teacher Louisa	: “next.” : “For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed.” : “Maybe, Louisa, do you think laws are important?” : “Yes, Miss.”	Addition
Data 2	Teacher Louisa	: “next.” : “For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed.”	Mis-information

Omission

Students and teacher produced seven errors during conversation in the classroom. The data came from the first until the fourth data.

(1) *"I think — is about a thief that stole the grocery to the victim for stealing the bike."*

(2) *"I think it is about the father — angry to the victim."*

(3) *"For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed."*

(4) *"Hi, — first text Miss?"*

The utterances above were produced by students to the teacher. They are Jody and Wilbert. The first utterance was an error since the student did not say grammatical morpheme as a subject pronoun of the word 'text', a question from the teacher. Then, the second utterance occurred the error since omission a copula *is* after the subject *father*. It could be *"I think it is about the father — angry to the victim."* Afterwards, the third and fourth utterances were same. The error was only the grammatical morpheme after the verb 'see' as an object pronoun from the object of 'bicycle' that was stolen by the victim. Then, for number four, the student could say *"Hi, the first text Miss?"* since the student confirmed the teacher's instruction.

(6) *"Okay, and then how about the picture number 2, father — angry victim online con, Jody?"*

(7) *"Yes, — first text."*

(8) *"So, maybe one of you can share words that relate - with crime or criminal, or I will choose then, Nick!"*

The utterances above were produced by teacher to the students when she gave instruction during learning process. The sixth utterance was an error since the teacher did not say completely for the sentence in English as an auxiliary verb to connect the subject with its verb/adjective. So that after the word 'father' should be added copula *is* to connect the adjective of 'angry'. But then, it was a different error in the seventh utterance which omitted grammatical morpheme that is *the* so that the utterance should be "yes, the first text". The situation was when the teacher answered the student named Wilbert's confirmation towards the teacher's instruction to him. And seen that Wilbert's confirmation was also error to the teacher, so the teacher got influence from the student's mistake. For the eighth utterance above, there was omission again from the teacher in one word that is *relate-*. The collocation *relate- with* normally should be *related with* in which the teacher should not omit the letter '-d'.

Addition

(1) *"For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed."*

(2) *"Maybe, Louisa, do you think laws are important?"*

The first utterance above was produced by student named Louisa. She added an article *the* in front of person name *Ferry*. She said *I think Ferry is angry to.....* without the article. Then, for the second utterance was produced by teacher. In this case, the teacher made a mistake towards utterance to the student. Since, she asked the student about law, which was supposed to be a singular form, not a plural noun. So that, the teacher did an error by adding

plural -s and copula *are* in her question. The meaning of the utterance also influenced the student's answer.

Mis-information

(1) *"For the second page, I think the Ferry is angry to see — he get scammed."*

The utterance above was produced by student in which the error was in the utterance "..... *he get scammed.*" The student made error towards the subject and verb agreement. This phenomenon is characterized by using the wrong form based on the structure. Even though the message had been delivered to the teacher, the structure of utterance was still error. It should be ".....*he gets scammed*".

CONCLUSION

From the phenomenon in Trilingual school during learning process especially in English subject, both students and teacher had practiced coordinate bilingualism when doing conversation. From seventeen students in science major, only four students responded the teacher's questions or instructions and they practiced coordinate bilingualism very well. In addition, students and teachers showed more social distance scale than status distance scale. Besides that, both students and teacher showed formality dimension during conversation. Then, only one referential scale occurred during conversation between them. Since the teacher wanted to share the student's opinion about the importance of law by asking the student (Louisa) until she got new information from her continuously. This term meant that language may convey objective information. The errors of omission and mis-formation mostly appeared when the students responded the teacher's question and the teacher appeared omission and addition. Most of the students and teacher never did mis-ordering during speaking.

REFERENCES

- Brown, J. D. (2003). Promoting fluency in EFL classrooms. *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual JATL Pan-SIG Conference, Kyoto, Japan* (pp. 1-12). Kyoto: Kyoto Institute of Technology. <http://jalt.org/pansig/2003/HTML/Brown.htm>
- Beltran, E.L. (2014). Analysis of Grammatical Errors of Utterance Structure. *International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies*, 9(3), 1303-1312. ISSN: 2028-9324.
- Chaer, A. dan Leonie, A. 1995. *Linguistik Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Creswell, J. W. 2014. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Fourth Edition. California: SAGE Publications.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., and Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamers, J.F. and Blanc, M. (2000). *Bilinguality and Bilingualism*. Second Edition. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Laksmi, et.al. (2003). *Peranan Wanita Jepang dalam Mentransfer Bahasa kepada Anak pada Keluarga Campuran Etnik Bali – Orang Jepang di Bali* (thesis). Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.

- Muliana, et.al. (2015). Bilingualism Among the Adolescents in Badung Regency, Bali. *e-Journal of Linguistics*, 9(1), 1-10. ISSN 2442-7586.
- Romaine, S. (1995). *Bilingualism*. Second Edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Rizal, M. (2020). *Penggunaan Bilingualisme pada Tuturan Siswa SMP Muhammadiyah Makassar* (undergraduate thesis). Makassar: Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Ting, S. H., Mahadhir, M., and Chang, S.L. (2010). Grammatical Errors in Spoken English of University. *GEMA: Online Journal of Language Studies*, 10 (1). 53-70. ISSN: 1675-8021.