

## Fossilization: A Case Study of Three Indonesian Adults Living in English-Speaking Countries

Bernadette Santosa  
Fakultas Humaniora dan Industri Kreatif  
Universitas Kristen Maranatha  
Jl. Prof. Drg. Suria Sumantri, MPH, no. 65  
Bandung 40164, Indonesia

[bernadette.santosa@gmail.com](mailto:bernadette.santosa@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

Researches have proved that fossilization happens to every second-language learner. What varies is the degrees of fossilization and what causes it to happen. In her research, Ene (2006) mentions that advanced English language learners exhibit inconsistent use of tenses, inaccurate use of prepositions, articles, etc. This research finds similar things. Articles, tenses and prepositions are grammatical aspects which are fossilized. In addition to finding out which grammatical aspects are fossilized, this research also tries to find out factors which contribute to the participants' fossilization. Influence of their first language is one of the factors. Surprisingly however, based on the feedback from two English native speakers, there is an issue of natural use of the English language. This is surprising since the participants have been living in those English-speaking countries for more than a decade. What is more, there is one factor which leads to fossilization but is not found in the previous study nor in other research.

**KEYWORDS:** fossilization, grammar, second language acquisition

### INTRODUCTION

People learn a new language for various reasons. They can be driven by interest in the language itself or in the speaker of the target language. Some learn a new language for economic purposes; they see language as a tool to advance their careers or businesses.

Others are motivated by their fascination of the culture of the people who speak a particular language which they do not speak. Some others, unfortunately, are forced to learn a new language because of socio-political conditions which forces them to relocate to another country in which their native language is not spoken. Another

reason may be that the government enforces a certain foreign language to be included in the national curriculum so that everyone who goes to school to a certain degree learns that foreign language.

Second language acquisition studies how a person learns and acquires a language which is not his/her first language or mother tongue. There are stages in acquiring a second language, one of them is fossilization. Richards and Schmidt (2010, p. 230) define

fossilization as "a process which sometimes occurs in which incorrect linguistic features become a permanent part of the way a person speaks or writes a language. Aspects

of pronunciation, vocabulary usage, and grammar may become fixed or fossilized in second or foreign language learning.”

This paper tries to see fossilization which happens to three Indonesian adults who have been living in English-speaking countries for at least the past ten years. All of them had spent about the first twenty-five years of their lives in Indonesia, but at one point of their lives they chose or had to emigrate to another country. Two currently live in Australia, while one resides in the USA, both of which countries use English as their only language.

Not being native English speakers who started to learn English at the age of ten or even more, surely has some effects on the participants' English proficiency. According to quite a number of researches which have been done in the field of second language acquisition, it is a fact that no non-native speaker will ever get a perfect proficiency in their second language as that of its native speaker. In other words, every second language learner will experience the so-called fossilization. What remains varied is how much they fossilise, in which aspect(s) and what hinders them in acquiring native-speaker proficiency.

Departing from what has been explained above, there are two questions which this paper tries to answer. They are:

1. Which grammatical aspects are mostly fossilized?
2. How do the participants' surroundings contribute to their fossilization?

Based on the research

questions, the purpose of the research is:

1. To find out which grammatical aspects which are the focus of this research are mostly fossilized;
2. To explain how the participants' surroundings play a role in the participants' English language fossilization.

Selinker and Gass (2008) define fossilization as “to become permanently established in the interlanguage of a second language learner in a form that is deviant from the target- language norm and that continues to appear in performance regardless of further exposure to the target language.” (Gass and Selinker, 2008, p. 14)

Lee (2009) defines fossilization as the condition of there being no more room for improvement in language learning despite the inputs given, plenty of practices and learner's eagerness to improve. In other words, Lee believes that no matter how motivated a learner is, how much input s/he gets, how much practice s/he does, at some point a learner's second language proficiency will stop improving.

Another researcher who shares the same opinion that fossilization is a process in second language acquisition which no second language learner can avoid is Weijer (2014). However hard they try, whatever they do, according to Weijer, L2 learners' second language mastery will never be like that of a native speaker's. There will always be errors that a second language learner makes in his/her L2 production. It is only a matter of which aspect(s) the fossilization occurs.

In her paper about interlanguage and fossilization, Fauziati (2011, p. 27) asserts that “non-native speakers cannot attain complete TL grammar; the errors will become permanent features of their IL.” Just like Lee and Weijer, Fauziati believes that there is no such thing as successful second language learning, as there second language learners will always make errors in their L2 production, one way or another. White supports the previous researches by saying that “many fluent bilingual speakers (who acquired the L2 as an adult) show evidence of long-lasting non-native performance.” (2003, p. 129)

There are many factors which contribute to fossilization. Lee (2009, p. 152) mentions a number of factors which interact with one another and lead to fossilization. They are

“Linguistic, cognitive, psychological, or social variables ... result in different degrees of fossilization among learners whose native languages are the same causing intra-learner difference.”

Barros (2010) lists factors contributing to fossilization in a more down-to-earth and clearer way. They are:

1. Learners think that their goal in learning a language has been reached;
2. Some learners do not consider accuracy important;
3. Some learners have to learn a language although they resent the target culture;
4. Little or no corrective feedback.

Added to Barros’s list above is Lee’s (2009) insufficient written input or instruction as another factor which also contributes to fossilization.

Another important factor is

influence of learner’s first language or previous language(s) as proposed by Selinker (1972) and Han (2004) in Lee (2009). Montero, Chivas and Alvarado (2014) are of the same opinion. They assert that the influence of learners’ L1 is not to be underestimated. Learners’ first language can have positive and negative influences, depending on whether the first language bears many of little similarities with the target language.

One previous study, a doctoral dissertation written by Ene (2006) entitled *The last stages of second language acquisition: linguistic evidence from academic writing by advanced non-native English speakers* became a source of inspiration for this research.

However, as this is a dissertation, the participants, methods and scope are far more complex and elaborated than those of this research. What is more, it was a longitudinal research.

Its participants were non-native English speakers living in the USA, graduate students who were still studying and who had finished their studies of different nationalities and first languages, and their average length of stay was 9 years. They were asked to do sitting-down quizzes and take-home quizzes, and the results of the two quizzes were compared.

In her research, Ene (2006) mentioned a finding by Hinkel (1997) that non-native speakers used tenses inconsistently. In fact, oftentimes they used past tense verbs where the present tense was expected or vice versa (Ene, 2006, p. 34). She also mentioned that non-native speakers had problems with articles, prepositions, orthography, lexical choice, verb tense/agreement as well

as syntactic structure. The difference is in the frequency of the errors.

Ene’s research comes up with final stages of language acquisition being divided into four stages: the advanced stage, highly advanced stage, near-native stage and the native-like stage. It turns out that even at the near-native and native-like stages, incorrect usages still occur. So, the result of Ene’s research confirms the previous researches whose findings are similar: no second language learner will ever have second language mastery as that of a native language.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Data analysis procedure**

The participants of this study are three Indonesian adults aged between 46 and 48 years old who were born and raised in Indonesia but are now Australian and American residents and have been living there for at least 10 years at the time when

the research was carried out. They were selected because the issue of fossilization experienced by non-English native speakers living in English speaking countries appears to be very intriguing.

The three participants were given a worksheet consisting of sixteen short sentences and three short jokes in Bahasa Indonesia. The subjects were asked to rewrite the sentences and jokes in English. As none of the research subjects are Jakarta residents; in fact, none of them live in Indonesia, the worksheet was sent by email. As a consequence, despite the clear instruction that the worksheet was to be done spontaneously without thinking too much, at one sitting without consulting any sources nor asking anyone, there is no guarantee that the participants abode by it. This is the limitation of this study.

The participants’ profiles can be seen in the following table:

Table 1: Profiles of research participants

No.	Initials	Age (Years)	Country Of Residence	Length Of Residency (Years)	Spouse
1.	DS	48	Australia	10	South Korean
2.	ES	47	USA	20	Indonesian
3.	DL	46	Australia	19	Puerto Rican

After the worksheets had been returned, they were briefly checked to make sure all questions had been answered, and then they were passed on to two raters, one Australian and one American, to get their judgement as native speakers of English. Each rater were given all three worksheets. The participants' identities were not revealed, nor were their current countries of residence. The raters were asked to focus on the participants' use of present and past tenses, articles and prepositions. However, the raters were also encouraged to give comments about any other aspects that they found interesting or even bothersome when they were giving their judgement. The reason why tenses, prepositions and articles become the focus of this research is that from more than twenty years experience of teaching English, those three aspects are the areas where mistakes are made.

Two raters of different nationalities which correspond to the participants' countries of residence were asked to evaluate the participants' work to anticipate bias in case there were differences between American and Australian English, for example in the use of prepositions. This was actually mentioned by one of the raters. Luckily, none was found, so there was no problem regarding this aspect. In fact, their evaluation results complement each other. What one rater missed were noticed by the other. But overall, their judgements are similar.

### ***Instrument***

This study uses a worksheet, a questionnaire and informal interviews as research instruments.

First, after getting the participants' consent, the worksheet was distributed. It consists of two parts. The first part is sixteen short Indonesian sentences, and the second is three short jokes in Bahasa Indonesia. The worksheet was made to elicit English sentences which were expected to contain errors in terms of grammar and to see how the raters perceive their English use. Its purpose is to answer research question 1: *Which grammatical aspects are mostly fossilized?*

On the whole, each participant only had to write about thirty sentences. The reason is that they are working people. What is more, living in western countries, they have to do the chores themselves, so they practically have little spare time. That is why the worksheet had to be made as concise as possible.

In addition to the worksheet, a questionnaire was distributed, followed up by informal interviews. The participant were asked to fill in a questionnaire in order to dig more information concerning their acquisition of the English language as a second language, including about how the people with whom they have daily interaction perceive and respond to their use of English and how they judge their own English proficiency. Informal interviews were conducted to clarify the participants' answers in the questionnaire. Hence, the questionnaire was distributed and informal interviews were carried out in order to answer research question 2: *How do the participants' surroundings contribute to their fossilization?*

The participants' perception of their English ability, the native speakers' judgement and the

feedback/responses the participants get from the people they interact with on daily basis may not match with one another, but they surely complement one another.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section will explain what has been found in the research. More importantly, it tries to answer the research questions.

### *Findings*

It can be seen in the participants' profiles presented in the previous section that all of the participants have been living in English-speaking countries for at least ten years. This shows that their exposure to the English language is basically unlimited for that period of time. Even though they may not fully use English at home, in their daily activities and interactions outside the home they must use the English language.

**Participant 1: DS.** Participant DS is male, 48 years old, and has been living in Australia for the last ten years with his wife and children. His wife is a South Korean. He speaks English with his children, colleagues and other people, but uses Chinese when speaking with his wife as Chinese is the language they have been using since they first met in China.

From the raters' evaluation on his worksheet it is found out that Participant DS made eleven mistakes in terms of the use of articles, eleven concerning tenses and two errors regarding the use of preposition. In addition, there is a comment given by the raters

concerning the participant's naturalness of Participant DS's

language use.

The mistakes Participant DS made in the use of articles are actually not related to whether to use the definite or indefinite articles as many Indonesian speakers experience, but he simply did not use articles for most of the nouns in his sentences which actually need to be preceded by either the definite or indefinite article. Some examples are \**goes to cinema (the is missing)*; \**Teacher asks her students to compose short passage (there should be A before teacher and another a before short)*; \**in taxi (the before taxi is left out)*.

The following are examples of Participant DS's errors in tenses: \**What I want to do after I grown up (the correct construction is ...after I grow up)*; using simple present tense when he should have used present perfect tense, and mixing present and past tenses when writing about events taking place at the same time.

Participant DS uses the preposition *than* to be used with *prefer*, when actually the correct preposition for *prefer* is *to*. The other mistake about the use of preposition is Participant DS uses *after* instead of *when* in writing \**he'll robe a bank after he grown up* instead of *he'll rob a bank when he grows up*.

Six sentences were commented as being unnatural. One of them is *They took the bus*. as opposed to Participant DS's original sentence *They went by bus*. Grammatically speaking, the sentence made by Participant DS is accurate. In spite of this, one of the raters suggested that *took the bus* is better than *went by bus* because it is more natural.

In the questionnaire and interview Participant DS judged his

grammar as good. He is of the opinion that accurate and good grammar is quite important. When asked if anyone had ever commented on his English, he said no. When asked whether he thought his English ability needed improvement and whether he wanted to improve it, Participant DS stated his affirmation.

**Participant 2: ES.** Participant ES is female, 47 years old, and has been living in the USA for the last twenty years. She lives in Houston, Texas, with her husband and two sons. Her husband is Indonesian. In her daily communication with her family, she mixes English and Indonesian. However, at work and her other daily interactions Participant ES uses English. Even though she still has families in Indonesia, participant ES does not come to Indonesia regularly, particularly as her job requires her to travel quite a lot for quite a long period of time.

Among the three participants, Participant ES's grammar is the best. She makes only one mistake in terms of article use, only two regarding tenses and one in the use of prepositions. There being nearly no reoccurring types of mistakes indicates that her mistakes can easily be seen as coincidental.

However, curiously, in terms of naturalness, there are fourteen sentences in which the raters comment that the language is not natural, although in terms of grammar it is acceptable. Or, in one of the raters' words "Technically OK but awkward."

Some examples of her sentence of this category are *Mathilda loves to order pasta from that restaurant* which was suggested had better be *Mathilda*

*loves pasta from that restaurant* to make it sound more natural; *See, you have never seen that* to become *See!*

*You've never seen one doing that* and a suggestion to use *going home* instead of *coming home*

in *Mathilda goes to watch a movie every Friday with her two best friends, Patrick and Tina, after coming back from work.* In the examples it is seen that Participant ES's sentences are grammatically correct. Even so, for the raters they are not natural.

Participant ES believes that her English is good. She considers grammar quite important, and she admits that she often received responses about her English, especially from her children. Nonetheless, this particularly concerns her pronunciation. She said that her children often complained about her pronunciation being inaccurate. However, she claimed that other people she interacted with understood her English pretty well.

When asked to judge her grammar, Participant ES said she was satisfied with her grammar proficiency. Nonetheless, she still wants and is still trying to improve her English.

**Participant 3: DL.** Participant DL is female, 46 years old, and has been living in Australia for the last nineteen years with her husband and daughter. Her husband is a Poerto Rican. At home she uses English when talking with her husband and daughter, neither of whom speaks a word of Bahasa Indonesia, but speaks Indonesian with her aunt who lives with them. At work and outside the house, Participant DL uses English.

The result of the raters'

evaluation showed that she made nine mistakes in using articles, seven regarding tenses and three prepositions. Participant DL's mistakes about the use of articles included using *the* instead of *a* in *Every Friday after work, Mathilda goes to see the movie with her two best friends, Patrick and Tina* and missing an article when it was actually mandatory such as in *\*Teacher asked her students to write...* in which there should be *a* before *teacher*.

Regarding tenses, Participant DL appeared to confuse present and past tenses, such as in *In one night, he could finish unlimited shots of whisky* as opposed to *In one night, he can finish unlimited shots of whisky* because this was about a man's habit. Participant DL also seemed to mix up between simple present and present continuous tenses. Her sentence showed this: *They demand for shorter working hour* instead of *They are demanding shorter working hours* in writing about an instance which was happening at the moment of speaking.

In the worksheet, Participant DL used a preposition when it was actually not necessary, for example *\*They demand for shorter working hour* in which *for* is unnecessary since *demand* does not require a preposition. In addition, she used *than* instead of *to* for the verb *prefer*.

There were eight comments regarding her unnatural use of language one of them concerns her diction in the sentence *you need to pay more attention to Gareng...* The rater commented that *need to* was too strong, and therefore suggested to use *should* instead.

Another one is *See, you never seen it before* which was suggested to be *See, you have never seen such*

*a thing before* to make it sound more natural.

Different from the other two participants, Participant DL regards her English as sufficient (below good). She is of the opinion that accurate grammar is of high importance. The feedback/response people usually give her in terms of her English is correction, but she did not specify what kind of correction nor in which aspect.

Even though she regards her English proficiency merely sufficient, she believes her grammar is good. Participant DL also stated that she still wants to improve her English.

### **Discussion**

As suspected and then confirmed by the two pilot studies done before the actual worksheet were distributed, tenses, articles and prepositions were the most problematic for the participants.

When asked about their erroneous use of articles, Participants DS and DL responded that they were not aware of that. There is some sort of inconsistency which is found here. On the one hand, both participants believe that good grammar is important for communication. On the other, they overlooked the importance of articles in their sentences. And they made quite many mistakes in this area.

It is a fact that inappropriate use of articles in most cases hardly cause problems, let alone communication breakdowns. Perhaps this is why they do not consider articles too important, and consequently do not pay much attention to whether they should be used or which articles to use. This matches the second fossilization



factor which Barros (2010) listed. It is that when communication purposes are fulfilled, second language learners may feel there is no need to improve anymore.

There seem to be other factors which contribute to the participants' fossilization in terms of article use. Even though both participants have been Australian residents for at least a decade, it cannot be denied that being brought up in Indonesia and speaking Bahasa Indonesia for the first thirty years of their lives affect their second language acquisition greatly. It is a fact that Participant DS does not use Bahasa Indonesia at all in his daily interactions, while Participant DL still uses Bahasa Indonesia when talking with her aunt, who lives with her and her family. It is also a fact that Participant DS's length of residency in Australia is only about half the time of Participant DL's length of residency. Despite all that, it is apparent that the influence of Bahasa Indonesia in Participant DS's English still gives big contribution to Participant DS's fossilization.

In addition to this, Participant DS's appears to have less opportunity to use English compared to the other two participants since he speaks Mandarin with his wife, with whom he must interact the most. Obviously, this also contributes to his fossilization. What is more, never getting feedbacks from his interlocutors as he admitted in the questionnaire may give him the thought that although his English is not flawless, people with whom he interacts every day have no problems in understanding him. Therefore, although he says he still wants to improve his English, he has no reason to. This is in line with two of

Barros's (2010) four factors which cause fossilization. They are no or little corective feedback, and because L2 learners have achieved their goal in learning the L2, which is communication.

Similar to Ene's (2006) findings, all three participants encountered a problem regarding preposition. Interestingly, in addition to other prepositions, all of them made a mistake regarding one particular preposition. It is the wrong preposition for *prefer*; instead of using the preposition *to*, they use *than* or *rather than*. This is interesting as it appears to show the influence of the participants' first language, Bahasa Indonesia. In Bahasa Indonesia we say *lebih suka A daripada B*. Therefore, they use *than* and *rather than* which are rough translations of *daripada*. What is intriguing is that although they been speaking English for more than ten years almost every minute of it, their first language still strongly influences their English.

The possible reasons for the participants' wrong use of preposition explained above confirm what Han (2000), Kellerman (1989), Selinker and Lakshmanan (1992), in Lee (2009) agree upon, that fossilization also happens because of internal factors such as L1 interference. In fact, Selinker (1972) and Han (2004) in Lee (2017) avow that L1 interference is one of the main reasons for fossilization.

Although not as trivial as the use of articles, wrong use of preposition does not result in communication problems that much either, unless it concerns locations or positions such as *on*, *in* or *under*. If an English native speaker hears a non-native speaker say *to prefer*

*something \*(rather) than something else*, the native speaker will still understand what the non-native speaker means. Again, because of this, unless it is in an English language classroom setting, most probably this kind of error will not get any response from any English native speakers. This is what Barros (2010) means by fossilization can also happen when there is no or little corrective feedback.

The findings show that the participants have problems in using tense. This is in line with what Ene (2006) finds. In her dissertation, she found out that non-native English speakers actually use tenses inconsistently.

Of all the three participants, Participant DS can be said to be the most careless in terms of his grammar. Relating this with his profile, which reveals that he uses two different languages in his daily interactions, which are English and Mandarin, this seems to be quite a big contributor to his language performance.

Even though Participant DS uses Mandarin only when talking to his wife but with the other people he uses English, the interaction he has most often should be with his wife.

Therefore, not only does he not get as much exposure to the English language compared to Participants ES and DL, but he also have less opportunity to use the English language. This looks like a significant factor. Unfortunately, no researchers seems to have addressed this. It is not about exposure, which is more of the passive/receptive activity; this is more about the opportunity to use the target language, which is something active.

From the questionnaire it is

revealed that two participants regard their English proficiency as good and one sufficient. The two participants who claim that their English is good still believe they need to improve, but only one of them, Participant ES, stated that learning a language is a life-time process. The other one, Participant DL, however, who says that her English is sufficient, still wants to improve but does not seem to do anything to make it happen. It looks like Participant ES the strongest motivation to keep improving her English.

This appears to be the reason why Participant ES's grammar is the best among the three. In other words, Participant ES's grammatical acquisition is the most successful among three.

A possible reason why in terms of naturalness she is at the bottom is that probably because unconsciously sees herself as a life-time learner, and therefore tends to be very careful. This results in her grammar being accurate but regarding the naturalness, her sentences are perceived as awkward. I would say that in terms of grammar, participant EL has acquired the English grammar. Nonetheless, she has not acquired its naturalness. In other words, it has fossilized. The result of this research is in line with Weijer (2014) and Fauziati (2011). Both Weijer and Fauziati believe that no non-native speakers will be able to have perfect mastery of their second language since errors will always occur. Furthermore, Fauziati (2011) also states that grammatical accuracy is not correlated with how natural one's L2 use is. One may have good grammatical accuracy but when it comes to naturalness, it is perceived

as awkward by native speakers of the L2. This is clearly seen in Participant ES. Her grammatical accuracy is quite high; she only made one mistake in terms of article use, only two regarding tenses and one in the use of prepositions. However, in terms of natural use of language, she scored the worst of three.

This research also confirms Lee's (2009) finding that fossilization is caused by a

number of factors which interact with one another. "Linguistic, cognitive, psychological, or social variables ... result in different degrees of fossilization among learners whose native languages are the same causing intra-learner difference." The three participants' second language acquisition clearly reveals this. They are roughly of the same age, all of them were born and brought up in Indonesia, they have the same mother tongue, and for the past decade or more they have been residing in English-speaking countries. Hence, they share similar profiles. However, the degrees of fossilization are different.

Another thing that this research confirms is Lee's (2009) finding that there are different degrees of fossilization among learners whose native languages are the same. Being roughly of the same age, born and brought up in the same country, having the same mother tongue, and for the past decade or more they have been residing in English-speaking countries does not result in the same degree of fossilization.

In the questionnaire all participants express longing to improve their English, which is a very positive thing. Unfortunately,

their busy lives seem to prevent them from taking courses or spend some time to do activities which can help them improve their English ability. From this it can be seen that interest and willingness alone is not enough to prevent fossilization. There must be something else which play(s) a significant role. Realising it or not, the fact that they hardly have any communication problems as a result of their English proficiency in a way demotivates them to become more proficient English users.

What is unexpected, however, is that after the participants' work had been rated, an issue of unnatural use of the language came up. Considering that in total there are 29 instances in which the participants' use of English are awkward or weird compared to the other three grammatical items, it seems that the participants' unnatural use of their second language is very obvious.

It is interesting that both raters perceive Participants DS, ES and DL's English as still being unnatural even though all of them have been living in English-speaking countries for at least a decade, and consequently have been exposed to and using the language for so long.

This shows that second language acquisition may not be measured by what can be assessed such as mere grammatical accuracy, but it also has to include natural use of the second language. In fact, I believe this is where the real fossilization happens. At least from the result of this research it is revealed that it is impossible for a non-native speaker to use his/her second language in a natural way.

What is also apparent in the research result is that grammatical accuracy is not correlated with how

natural one's L2 use is. One may have good grammatical accuracy but when it comes to naturalness, it is perceived as awkward by native speakers of the L2.

One thing that this research finds which seemingly has not been addressed by previous researches is the fact that not only being exposed to the target language is important for learners' success in second language acquisition, but how much they practice or use it actively is also of high significance. One of the participants does not seem to get as much opportunity to practice English as the other two which appears to be the reason for his highest degree of fossilization.

This kind of research had actually better be done when there is minimum time constraints. The reason is that the subject is people, and as a consequence, its success is mostly dependent on them. By giving their consent to become participants, they are asked to devote quite a lot of their valuable spare time to do some grammar exercises, fill in a

questionnaire, and even give an interview. With them living in different countries than the researcher, this was quite a problem, mainly because of the time difference between Indonesia and Australia, especially with the USA. As an effect, more time was needed to collect the necessary data and additional but important information.

Phonological fossilization is actually the type of fossilization which most certainly occurs. This is another interesting, not to mention

challenging, area to be conduct a research on. In addition, still related to phonology, fossilization in terms of intonation is also interesting to be studied.

## CONCLUSION

From the findings and discussion section above it can be said that the result of this research is in line with the findings of some previous studies which is no non-native speakers will be able to have perfect mastery of their second language since errors will always occur. The findings also shows that grammatical accuracy is not correlated with how natural one's L2 use is. One may have good grammatical accuracy but when it comes to naturalness, it is perceived as awkward by native speakers of the L2.

The fact that the raters made no comments let alone complained about different uses of expressions such as *goes to the movies*, which is typical American English, and *goes to the cinema*, which is more widely used by the Brits and Australians, shows that both raters acknowledge both varieties and do not insist on the one which people of their own countries mostly use. This may also be the reason why in their daily interactions with native English speakers the participants have got nearly zero criticisms or negative responses about their English. If this is the case, then this proves that the world Englishes have actually been accepted by quite a big number of English native speakers. The question is: will this lead to early fossilization? Only time will tell.

## REFERENCES

- Barros, L. O. (2010, August), *Fossilization in language learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.luizotaviobarros.com/2010/08/fossilization-language-learning.html>
- Ene, S. E. (2006). *The last stages of second language acquisition: linguistic evidence from academic writing by advanced non-native English speakers*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona. Retrieved from <https://arizona.openrepository.com/handle/10150/195720>
- Fauziati, E. (2011). Interlanguage and error fossilization: A study of Indonesian students learning English a foreign language. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 25-40.
- Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Montero, R. L. , Chaves, M. J. Q & Alvarado, J. S. (2014). Social factors involved in second language learning: A case study from the Pacific Campus, Universidad de Costa Rica. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas*, 20, 435-451.
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. (Fourth edition). London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Weijer, J. (2014). The role of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition. In Sloos, M. & Weijer, J. (Eds). *Chinese Accents and Accented Chinese: Proceedings of the 1st CAAC Workshop* (pp. 3-15). Shanghai: Fudan University.
- White, L. (2003). Fossilization in steady state L2 grammars: Persistent problems with inflectional morphology. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 6(2), 129-141. DOI: 10.1017/S1366728903001081