AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA

Department of English Programs

A Thesis Submitted in Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL)

Syntactic Errors in Armenian Learners' Spoken Production

Thesis committee:

Irshat Madyarov, Ph.D.-Thesis Advisor Alexan Simonyan, Ph.D. Lilianna Edilian -Thesis Reader, M.A. *By:* Armine Ghazaryan

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA

We hereby approve that this thesis By Armine Ghazaryan

Syntactic Errors in Armenian Learners' Spoken Production

be accepted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the degree of M.A. in TEFL Committee of the Thesis

Irshat Madyarov, Ph.D.-Thesis Advisor

Lilianna Edilian -Thesis Reader, M.A.

Catherine Buon: Associate Dean of DEP

Yerevan, Armenia 2011

Acknowledgements

Real gratitude does not fit into words. At the same time, real gratitude needs to be expressed. I am very grateful to my Supervisor, Dr. Madyarov, for his willingness and readiness to help and guide, to answer my questions which were not always smart. I am thankful to Dr. Madyarov for his patience to listen to my data uncertainties. I am thankful for his comments and marks on my chapters which first seemed too many, but greatly helped improve my thesis.

I am Grateful to my second reader, Lilianna Edilian, for the time she devoted to me, for her suggestions, comments, patience and help.

I am grateful to Dr. Farhady, for suggesting me this topic, for motivating and challenging me to think and ask questions, for being always willing and able to answer them decisively. I am indebted to him for inspiring and making me interested at least in the theory of TEFL. I am thankful to all the personnel, my instructors and friends at AUA.

I am grateful to Dr. Simonyan, who did not know me and yet helped me.

I am grateful to Anna Ghazaryan, who did know me and yet helped me.

I am grateful to Pamela Karg for listening to my data uncertainties and marking the errors of the transcribed data.

I am thankful to Rima for readiness to help and her actual help. I am grateful to Zaruhi for helping, motivating, and tolerating me.

At last, but not least, I am grateful to my family, especially to my mother, for believing in me more than I believe in anything.

P.S. I am very, very, very grateful to myself for at last finishing up my thesis.

THANK YOU!!!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Table of Contents	4
Abstract	
Chapter One	8
Introduction	8
1.1. Background of the study	8
1.2. The objectives of the study	9
1.3. Significance of the study	9
1.4. Research Paper outline	10
Chapter Two	12
Review of the Related Literature	12
2.1. The History and Theoretical Background of CA	12
2.2. The Strong Version of CAH	
2.2.1. Models of Hierarchy of Difficulty	
2.3. Some of the Criticisms of CAH	21
2.4. The Weak Version of CAH	
2.5. The Moderate Version of CAH	
2.6. The Markedness Theory	
2.7. Error Analysis	
2.8. Procedures of Error Analysis	
2.9. Sources of Errors	

2.9.1. Interlingual Transfer	
2.9.2. Intralingual Transfer	31
2.9.2.1. Overgeneralization	
2.9.2.2. Simplification	32

2.9.3. Transfer and Generalization Combined	
2.9.4. Interlanguage Transfer	
2.9.5. Context of Learning	
2.9.6. Communication Strategies	
2.10. Categories of Errors	
2.11. Mistakes or Errors?	
2.12. Shortcomings in error analysis	
2.13. Interlanguage	
2.14. Statement of Purpose	
Chapter Three	40
Methodology	40
3.1. Research Questions	40
3.2. Participants and Data	40
3.3. Data Collection and Analysis	41
Chapter Four	
Results and Discussion	45
4.1. Research Question 1	45
4.2. Research Question 2	
4.3. Research Question 3	
4.3.1. Errors in Inversion	
4.3.1.1. Lack of inversion	92
4.3.1.2. Wrong inversion	
4.3.1.3. Overuse of Inversion	
4.3.2. Articles	
4.3.2.1. Overuse of the definite article	
4.3.2.2. Omission of the Definite Article	96
4.3.2.3. Overuse of the Indefinite Article	
4.3.2.4. Omission of the Indefinite Article	

4.3.2.5. Substitution of the Indefinite Article	
Chapter Five	
Conclusion	102
5.1. Conclusion	
5.2. Implications of the Study	
5.3. Limitations of the Study	
5.4. Suggestions for Further Research	
Bibliography	105
Appendix	

Abstract

This study aimed at investigating the syntactic errors in the spoken production of Armenian EFL learners. The syntactic errors were identified and classified in 11 relevant categories. The statistical analyses showed that the most frequent errors occur in the usage of articles and inversion in WH questions. The errors of those 2 categories were analyzed with the means of contrastive and error analyses and their possible sources were proposed. The contrastive and error analysis of the most frequent errors revealed that the sources of those errors may be the interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer and the communication and learning strategies employed by the learners. It was also observed that the source might be both the interlingual and intralingual transfer.

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Background of the study.

Who does not make errors? Only those who do not act. We all make mistakes; we make mistakes when speaking, writing and even thinking. We make more mistakes when performing those acts in another language, not in our mother tongue. Making errors in second language learning is an unavoidable process, so errors have always been an important part of second language learning and teaching. There are a number of reasons why Errors should not and can not be ignored: First, the learners might never notice and realize their errors. If the errors go unnoticed or uncorrected, it will cause error reinforcement, the learners may assume that their production is free of errors, and those errors may become fossilized. Second, errors might hold in them "some of the keys to the understanding of the process of SLA" (Brown, 2007, p. 257). As noted by Saville-Troike (2006, p. 9), "errors are windows into the language learner's mind". In his turn, Littlewood (1984, p. 24) regards errors as "the product of learning" from which "we can make inferences about the process". Still in 1981, Corder made the first argument for the significance of the learner's errors, pointing out three factors which make the errors significant: first, they give evidence to the teacher what the learners have learned and what still needs to be learned. Second, "they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is learnt or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in his discovery of the language." And third, errors are crucial to the learners themselves since the making of errors can be regarded as" a device the learner uses in order to learn. It is a way the learner has of testing his hypotheses about the nature of the language he is learning" (Corder 1981, pp. 10-11).

Thus, it is not surprising that there exists an extensive body of research on the learners' errors. The researchers have been trying to both identify and describe the learners' errors linguistically

and find the sources of those errors. This type of research became known as "Error Analysis" and disclosed several types and sources of errors.

When learning a second language, we often rely on our previous knowledge of both our mother tongue and the second language being learned. If this process of incorporating our previous knowledge to the learning process of the second language facilitates the learning, then it is called "positive L1 transfer" (in the case of the transfer of mother tongue) and "generalization" (in the case of the transfer within the second language itself). However, L1 transfer may cause errors in the second language; in this case it is called "negative transfer" or "interference". The transfer within the second language (generalization) also may cause errors; in this case it is called "overgeneralization". The other sources of errors can be the simplification, the learning strategies employed by the learners, the learning context, the previously known languages (besides the L1), etc... (for a detailed description of types and sources of errors see the following chapter of this study, as well as Keshavarz, 2008; Gas & Selinker, 2008; Brown, 2007; Travinski, 2005; Littlewood, 2004). The findings of EA have successfully been incorporated in the field of second language teaching.

1.2. The objectives of the study.

It is obvious that the understanding of the types and sources of errors may help the teacher to better treat those errors, thus facilitating the teaching process. Based on this assumption, the objectives of the study are as follows:

- 1. To identify the types of syntactic errors that newly admitted AUA students make in their spoken English
- 2. To determine the most frequently occurring errors and try to explain the possible causes of those errors.

1.3. Significance of the Study

To our knowledge, English speaking courses are not common in Armenian universities. Moreover, when learning English at schools and universities, we do not get much practice of speaking since the emphasis is mostly put on the reading and writing skills. However, speaking is one of the language skills which should be paid due attention to both by the teachers and by the learners. In fact, speaking is the actual use of the language, and being able to listen and understand, write and read does not yet mean being able to speak in that language. As stated by Littlewood (2004), "the need to speak or write makes learners pay attention to aspects of grammar which they would not need for comprehension purposes alone and thus makes them notice gaps in their knowledge." In its turn, speaking has both similarities and differences with the second type of production skills – writing; the most obvious difference is the time that can be allotted to writing and speaking. While speaking, we do not have much time to think, construct and reconstruct our sentences. Thus, naturally, even advanced learners may make more errors in their speech than in writing. That is why it is necessary to give the EFL learners an opportunity to practice speaking. For this reason, special courses of speaking could be offered to enhance the speaking skills of EFL learners, especially of those who are getting their MA degree at AUA. The results of this study could be utilized by course designers and curriculum developers in order to develop and offer speaking courses. This study will indicate the potential difficulties that learners have in speaking, which maybe later addressed during the possible speaking course. Besides, some of the errors may occur not only in the spoken, but also in the written production of the students, so the results of this study maybe compared to other similar studies, and can be also utilized in the course design of the academic writing course from which was the source of the current data collection. Hopefully, this study might be helpful both for the teachers and the learners in developing writing or speaking courses.

1.4. Research Paper Outline

The outline of the contents of the current research study is as follows:

Chapter one is the introduction of the study. It consists of the background, the objectives, the significance of the study, and the research paper outline.

Chapter two presents the theoretical background of contrastive analysis, error analysis and interlanguage. In the end of the chapter, the research questions of the current study are formulated.

Chapter three is the research methodology, which includes the description of the participants, the data and data collection, as well as the procedures of error identification.

Chapter four is devoted to the results and discussion of the study. It presents and analyzes the findings of the study, identifies, describes, categorizes and explains the syntactic errors made by Armenian EFL learners in their spoken production of English.

Chapter five covers the conclusion of the study, the implications of the findings in teaching English to the Armenian EFL learners, presents the limitations of the study and, in the end, based on the limitations of the study, suggests topics and areas of further research.

Chapter Two

Review of the Related Literature

This chapter presents the review of the relevant literature on contrastive analysis, error analysis and the notion of interlanguage. The historical perspectives, theoretical assumptions, as well as the criticism of those phenomena will be reviewed and presented. The discussion will lead to the formulation of the research questions.

2.1. The History and Theoretical Background of CA

Contrastive analysis hypothesis (CAH), as the name implies, is concerned with comparison and contrast of subsystems of one language (such as different dialects of the same language) and of the systems of two or more languages. However, there are different aims and different ways of comparing languages, and CAH has distinct features and aims and should not be confused with other types of language comparison. It is necessary to understand and differentiate between different types of language comparisons possible in order to truly understand the place and mission of CAH. The origin of comparative linguistics goes back to many centuries earlier than that of CAH, and linguists preoccupied with language comparisons pursued different goals than those of CAH.

Languages can be compared diachronically and synchronically. For example, Modern Armenian is compared to Old and Middle Armenian, in order to show the development of the language and the changes occurred in the language (diacronical comparison). Old Armenian – Grabar -, in its turn, was often compared to Old Persian and Sanskrit, in order to construct the proto Indo European Language and/or to find the place of Armenian in the family of Indo European languages. At the same time, Modern Armenian can be compared to other modern languages, with the aim of defining the typology of the language (synchronistical comparison of languages). Those comparisons show the interesting picture of the development of the language, e.g. due to

such comparisons, we find out that Old Armenian was of a different typology from the Modern Armenian. Still, there exists the third type of comparison between or among languages, namely - contrastive analysis or, as often called, contrastive linguistics or contrastive study. This third type of comparison, in some ways, is similar to typological or synchronic comparison, but the main difference lies in the aim. If typological comparison of the languages aims at categorizing languages according to their types, the aim of contrastive analysis is to determine the differences and similarities of different languages, regardless of their typology. As Fisiak (1981, p. 2) puts it: "Contrastive Linguistics may roughly be defined as a sub discipline of linguistics concerned with the comparison of two or more languages or subsystems of languages in order to determine both the differences and similarities between them." Further, Fisiak (1981, p. 3) separates two types of contrastive studies: theoretical and applied. The aim of theoretical contrastive studies, he states, is to give a complete description of differences and similarities of languages, come up with an adequate model of comparison, and determine which elements are comparable and how they are comparable, i.e. which elements are equivalent, congruent, corresponding, etc... As he explains, theoretical contrastive studies "are language independent" (p. 3): it means, theoretical studies are not interested in how a given universal of one language is represented in another one: rather, theoretical contrastive studies try to predict how a given universal can be realized in two or more languages. Contrary to that, applied contrastive studies, which are based on the findings of theoretical contrastive linguistics, aim at determining how a given universal, which has a certain representation in one language, is realized and rendered in another language. One of the objectives of such a comparison, Fisiak proceeds, can be the identification of possible difficulties, when a certain universal, having a certain representation in one language, is not represented in the surface structure of the other one. In this case, "an interference is likely to occur" (p. 4). This third type of language comparison, the contrastive analysis hypothesis (CAH) has a long and contradictory history; its origin dates back to the 1940-s, and, despite all the controversies and criticism, it's still widely used (with some modifications) in the field of TEFL-

TESL. During the World War 2, in the U.S., much attention and almost unlimited funds were devoted to the theory and practice of language teaching. The field of language teaching, among other disciplines, was and is closely connected and based on two disciplines - psychology and linguistics. The discipline of psychology tries to explain the phenomenon of learning, and the discipline of linguistics tries to explain the phenomenon of language. In the 40es, the main trend in psychology was the theory of behaviorism, which claimed that learning happens through habit formation. Thus, learning a language, according to this theory, would mean forming certain language habits. Language, in its turn, was viewed as a structure (structural linguistics). So, learning a language meant forming habits of the structure of the particular language. In view of structural linguistics, the "habits" constituting the control of one's native language are not the habits concerning separate items of the language, but the "habits concerning contrastive shapes of linguistic items, in structural patterns, functioning in a system." (Fries 1961, p. 34) the linguistic significance of any item arises only when it is contrasted with other items in the structural patterns functioning as signals in the particular language system (Fries 1961, p. 34; 1957, p. 265; 1947, p. 318). Structural linguistics attempted to find out and describe the basic contrastive features that have structural significance, i.e. signal different meanings and function as identifiers and differentiators of those meanings in all the domains of a particular language system (Fries 1961, pp. 34-35, 1957 p. 266). Structuralists assumed that in each language, there are only a limited number of patterns in which the meaning distinctions are made, perceived and responded to by contrastive features. Such features, the theory proceeds, are different for different languages, i.e. the same contrastive features which make meaning distinctions in one language, may not make such distinctions in another one. In the domain of phonetics, for example, the contrastive features of the sounds that change the meaning of the word (are structurally significant) are called phonemes. Each language has a relatively small number of structurally important physical contrasts of sounds - different phonemes, and, thus, change the linguistic meaning. On the other hand, each language may have a huge number of sounds, which

have only phonetic and not phonemic significance, i.e. the same sound sounds a little bit different in different positions in the word or by different people, but does not change the meaning of the word. According to structuralists, the sounds are not easy or difficult by themselves, in isolation; the ease or difficulty lies in the way the sounds function in the structural patterns in a particular language. (Fries 1961, p. 35; 1957, pp. 265-266; 1947, pp. 318-319; Lado 1957, p. 9; 1956, p. 26). From childhood, we form the habits of perceiving and making certain sound contrasts which have the function of distinguishing between or among the linguistic meanings in structural patterns of our native language. At the same time, we form the habit of ignoring and do not recognize the sound contrasts functioning as meaning distinguishers in another language if the same sound contrasts do not function that way in our native language: Thus, it is difficult for us not only to produce those sound contrasts, but also to hear them. The same is true also for the contrastive features functioning as meaning markers and distinguishers in all the other domains of the language system – syntax, discourse, etc... So, our deeply established native language habits and not formed L2 habits make "the learning of a second language as an adult a very different matter from the learning of the first language" (Fries 1961, p. 3; 1947, p. 319; Fries in Lado 1957, p. VIII; Lado 1956, p. 26-27). The difficulty of learning a second language lies not in the features of the second language system itself, but in the "set" of our native language habits (Fries, in Lado 1957, p. viii). Those habits are deeply seeded by the usage of the L1 in life-time period and can not be easily overcome; thus, the new habits of the L2 should be presented to the learner and the latter should establish those new habits step by step, and it takes time and effort (Lado 1956, p. 29). Thus, CA was a promising field of investigation because it seemed at the time to be based on sound foundation in the view of both linguistics and psychology. It gained popularity in the 1940s and was the leading theory for more than 20 years. CA was popular not only in the U.S., but also all over the Europe. For several years, in different countries and the major universities of the world, seminars, conferences and lectures on CA and its perspectives were held by the leading professionals of the field.

Monographs, scholarly papers and collections of articles on the theory and practical applications and experiments on CA appeared one after another. CAH was also applied to languages other than English. However, most of the studies, made by the principles of CAH, concerned teaching English to speakers of other languages. If the European studies were more theoretical, the U.S. scholars were more concerned with the practical application – implication of CA for teaching purposes. For example, the contrast of Polish and English was the theme of different papers, published in several volumes and edited by Fisiak (for example, see Fisiak 1990; 1985; 1982; etc.).In this new approach to teaching, the emphasis was put not on "how to teach", but "what to teach" (Fries in Lado 1957, p. viii). The items of the L2 should not be taught as isolated items, rather, they should be contrasted in the structures and patterns of the L2 system (Fries 1957, p. 267) the materials to be taught should be chosen by and built on the scientific description and contrast of the L1 and L2 systems. The scientific description and contrast of two languages, according to those researchers, would discover the potential difficulties the learner would have in learning the second language.

2.2. The Strong Version of CAH

This version of CAH, which claimed to be able to a priori predict the difficulties on the bases of differences between or among languages, later, was called the strong version of CAH. One of the proponents of the strong version was Fries who claimed that "The most effective materials (of teaching) are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner." (Sighted in Lado, 1957, p. 1). This assumption is quoted by Lado – another proponent of the strong version of CAH, in his seminal work– Linguistics Across Cultures (Lado, 1957). The underlying assumption of this book, as well as of many other books and achievement tests of the time is that "in the comparison between native and foreign language lies the key to ease or difficulty in

foreign language learning" (Lado 1957, p. 1). The fundamental assumption of his book is the following quotation which is quoted by all the up-coming researchers – both the proponents and the opponents of CAH -: Lado states that "the individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture - both productively when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture, and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and the culture as practiced by natives." (p. 2). Then he assumes (the word is his) that "the student who comes in contact with a foreign language will find some features of it quite easy and others extremely difficult. Those elements that are similar to his native language will be simple for him, and those elements that are different will be difficult." (pp. 2-3). The above quoted excerpt is also quoted in all the later books and articles. However, there are other significant facts, assumptions and quotes by the early proponents of CAH, such as Lado and Fries, which are worth remembering and will be discussed along with the criticism of CA, in order to clarify the real position and actual claims of the early proponents of CAH.

Another strong claim was made by Banathy, Trager, and Waddle (1966, p. 37): they stated that the learner's language behavior should undergo a change which is equitable with "the differences between the structure of the student's native language and culture and that of the target language and culture."

2.2.1. Models of Hierarchy of Difficulty

Since the predictions made by CAH were criticized for being subjective and not meeting the "scientific description" criteria, some of the proponents of CA proposed models of defining the levels of difficulty in order to make the prediction stage of CA more formal and scientifically justified and less subjective.

Stockwell, Bowen, and Martin (1965) were a group of researchers to propose a model of hierarchy of difficulty of the expected errors of the foreign language learner: this would help the teacher or the linguist to predict the difficulty level of the relevant aspect of the L2. Although their model was devised for English and Spanish, the authors claimed that it will work for any other languages as well. The eight possible degrees of difficulty suggested for phonological contrast of two languages were based on the notions of positive, negative and zero transfer, as well as on the notions of optional and obligatory choices of certain phonemes in the two languages being compared and contrasted. By describing, analyzing and comparing the systems and properties of two or more languages and referring to the model of hierarchy of difficulty, linguists and teachers were to come up with a fairly accurate description of the phonological difficulties which the learner would face. A hierarchy of difficulty was proposed also for grammatical structures of the languages. This hierarchy included 16 levels of difficulty. In order to build a hierarchy of difficulty for grammatical structures, the dimensions of "structural correspondence" and "functional/semantic correspondence" were added to the criteria used to construct the hierarchy of phonological difficulty. Later, Clifford Prator (1967) came up with a hierarchy of difficulty for both grammatical structures and phonology of the languages being contrasted: his hierarchy was comprised of 6 categories. Prator also claimed that his hierarchy could be applied to any given languages in order to predict the potential level of difficulty that a foreign language learner would encounter.

The six categories of difficulty proposed in the hierarchy by Prator (1967) in ascending order are reworded below from Brown (2007, p251.):

Level 0 - Transfer

There is no difference, thus, no contrast between the two languages, the learner can transfer (positively) the forms of his native language to the target language. Such transfer presents no

difficulty.

Level 1 - Coalescence

For two items of the native language, the target language has only one item. In this case, the learners must overlook the distinction between the two items of the native language and get used to using one form in the target language for both the meanings of the native language.

Level 2 - Underdifferentiation

An item of the native language does not exist in the target language. Obviously, in second language production, the learner must learn to avoid those items that are present in the L1 but absent in the L2.

Level 3 - Reinterpretation

As the name implies, an item of the native language is given a new interpretation – either a new shape or distribution – in the target language.

Level 4 – Overdifferentiation

The learner is to learn an entirely new item which has little, if any, similarity to the native language item.

Level 5 - Split'

One item of the native language becomes two items in the target language. The learner must learn to understand and make this distinction which does not exist in his L1. The split is the counterpart of coalescence.

It should be mentioned that an earlier "hierarchy of difficulty" could be considered to be proposed by Lado, though he did not give any title to it, in his practical book on contrastive analysis (1957), he proposes levels of difficulty for phonology, grammatical system and the vocabulary of languages. The 0 level of difficulty of Prator's hierarchy corresponds to the same level (easy) discussed by Lado. That is, when the item is the same (or similar) in both the native and target languages, the learning of this item will present no difficulty, since the learner will positively transfer his native item to the target language (see for example, Lado 1957, p. 60). It should be highlighted that, when saying similar or the same, Lado means that items are similar in form, meaning and distribution (Lado 1957, pp. 13, 83). The level 1 of Prator's hierarchy is also discussed by Lado; he assumes that when the native language has more items than the target language, the learner will not have much difficulty:"Once the simpler system has been understood by him, he will be able to use it without much effort." (p. 44). Obviously, the Level 2 of Prator's hierarchy is thought and expected by Lado to occur in all the cases when the learner negatively transfers his native language item into the target language which does not have such an item. The level 3 (reinterpretation) of Prator's hierarchy is captured by Lado in the terms form, meaning and distribution: He states that if the item of the native language is similar to the target language item in form, but different in meaning or distribution, the learning difficulty of this item will be "more persistent" (p. 13). The phenomenon captured in level 4 of Prator's hierarchy (when the item present in the target language does not exist in the native language) is not much discussed by Lado. At first glance, this case would seam to be considered of high level of difficulty by Lado, too. However, from the discussion of cases when neither negative nor positive transfer is possible (as when learning a new writing system), and cases when negative transfer occurs (when the same symbol has different sounds) (pp. 99, 106), it is obvious that Lado assigns more difficulty to the learning a somewhat but not entirely similar item than to the entirely new one: in other words, it seams to us that more difficulty would be assigned to the level three than the level four, contrary to the assumptions and interpretations of CA's claims by Prator. Finally, it seams that the level 5 of Prator's hierarchy has the same difficulty level for Lado, too: the latter writes: "when one significant unit or element in the native language equates bilingually-with two significant units in foreign language we have maximum learning difficulty" (p. 16). However, it should be noted that although Lado describes all those cases of difficulty, he does not give certain degrees and names to levels of difficulty; he mentions, for example, that

going from one pattern to two pattern (level 5 in Prator's hierarchy) is more difficult than going from two pattern to one pattern system (level 1) (Lado 1957, pp. 62, 101, 1957, p. 14). However, he speaks in rather general terms, such as "easy", "normal" "high" for vocabulary (Lado 1957, p. 83), "more persistent", "maximum difficulty" etc. for phonology and grammar (p. 16), but sometimes some of those terms seam to be used interchangeably and not in gradual order. So, Prator's hierarchy seams to us a nice summarization and completion of Lado's well-described but not yet clearly defined types and levels of learning difficulties.

2.3. Some of the Criticisms of CAH

The CAH soon appeared to have obvious shortcomings and gained the criticism of some linguists. One of the major criticisms was caused by the fact that Empirical studies showed that not all the errors predicted with the help of CA actually occur in the actual learner performance. One of such researchers to criticize the CAH regarding the a priory predictions of the L1 interference and areas and levels of difficulty were Whitman and Jackson (1972), who, after having empirically tested the effectiveness of predictions by CAH, found no support and agreement between the early predictions made by linguists and the actual data elicited. They came to the conclusion that "contrastive analysis, as represented by the four analyses tested in this project, is inadequate, theoretically and practically, to predict the interference problems of a language learner" (p. 40). Thus it was claimed that the CAH has only theoretical background and not empirical support. However, it should be remembered that even Lado, who is considered to be one of the proponents of the strong version of CAH, always warns that the theoretical predictions made with the means of CA may not be always true and need to be also tested empirically as they may include errors: "Occasionally, however, we may encounter differences in the theoretical analysis that on further observation turn out to be of no importance" (Lado 1957, p. 17). That is why the differences found by theoretical analysis should be tested with

informants and, on the bases of the experience, be revised (1957, p. 17). Lado speaks of the "Necessity of Validating the Results of the Theoretical Comparative Analysis" (1957, p. 73). He states that the "list of hypothetical problems" should be validated by "checking it against the actual speech of students." (p. 73); or: "In the kind of comparison we are presenting here there remain problems that cannot be completely stated without actual observation of the speech of informants as they attempt to learn the foreign language. Experienced teachers who have listened to their students' pronunciation carefully may be able to decide which choice will be made when the analysis remains ambiguous." (p. 28). The same caution of validating the hypothetical assumptions is made also in his articles; for example, he writes: "I assume as a matter of course that the problems found by comparing two language systems as in the preparation of this paper may contain errors, and I assume that the data is to be tested in the speech of informants…" (Lado 1956, pp. 26-27).

The following findings also gave a reason for criticism of CAH: First, as noted in Brown (2007, p. 251): "Subtle phonetic, phonological, and grammatical distinctions were not carefully accounted for" second, a particular contrast could fit into different categories at the same time. Third, the "verifiability" of the predictions of levels of difficulty was questioned (Brown 2007, p. 252). It should be noted here that Lado also admits that a particular item in contrast can fit in different categories , in this case, (he speaks about the words), "their learning difficulty increases accordingly" (Lado 1957, p. 85).

More importantly, when examined and analyzed, many of the learners' actual errors proved not to be caused and attributable to negative transfer from the mother tongue (for example, see Wolfe, 1967; Duskova, 1967; Nemser, 1971). It should be noted, however, that not all the proponents of the CAH considered the interference of the native language to be the only and exceptional source of errors: Lado, for example, speaks about the "assumptions of importance of the native language habits in foreign language learning" (Lado 1957, p. 2); "major source of difficulty or ease in learning (transfer)" (p. 60); "primary importance (of the native language

factor)" (p. 81); "the source of the great obstacles (transferring the native habits)" (Lado 1957, p. 13); and so on, but those terms and labels do not mean that the only source of errors is the native language interference. Moreover, there are some cases when Lado speaks about intralingual transfer (as later will be called the phenomenon of transfer within the target language), namely – overgeneralization. Of course, he does not use the term intralingual, but those cases show that, even if vaguely, he is aware of such a source of error; he writes: "When both the foreign language and the native language use the same alphabet, the problem may be traceable to one of two possible causes The other possibility of spelling interference with pronunciation arises with inconsistencies in the foreign language. The symbol which in one word represents one sound turns out to represent a different sound in another word. The student mispronounces the word by assuming that the symbol represents the same sound in both cases." (1957, P. 21). In one of his articles, he talks about errors which could not be attributed to the native language transfer and writes: "it was reasonable to assume that they were in part caused by the pressure of translating" (Lado 1979, p. 568). In fact, this source of errors now would probably be attributed to psychological affects and be called by the term "anxiety". Moreover, Lado speaks even about the importance of individual differences, dialectal differences, and the learning context in the process of contrastive analysis (Lado 1957, pp. 72-73). Those examples probably support the idea that even the supporters of the strong version of contrastive analysis (at least Lado) would not be so naive to assume that the only cause of errors is the interference of the mother tongue, even if they preferred to examine and discover only the later source of errors and were primarily concerned with the contrastive analysis and its insights.

2.4. The Weak Version of CAH

The version of CAH which claimed to predict the difficulty the foreign language learners would have was called by Wardhaugh (1970, p. 123-124) "the strong version of CAH". According to

him, these predictions were unrealistic and impracticable (p. 125). The prediction in terms of levels of difficulty, according to Wardhaugh, at least "demands of linguists that they have available a set of linguistic universals formulated within a comprehensive linguistic theory which deals adequately with syntax, semantics, and phonology" (p. 125) He questions the possibility that the linguists have such a sound description of an "overall contrastive system within which they can relate the two languages in terms of mergers, splits, zeroes, over-differentiations, underdifferentiations, reinterpretations" (p. 126). Moreover, he believes that though many linguists claim to be using the strong version of CAH, in actuality they had been using the procedures of the weak version of CAH (p. 127). However, he notes that many teachers had intuitively used CA and "the best linguistic knowledge available" in order to explain and deal with the empirically observed difficulties (pp. 127-128) such an observational and a posteriori use of CA was called by him the weak version of CA (pp. 123-124) this version admits the significance of the interference of the learners' first language, but the errors are not predicted in advance; rather, the errors are explained by the teachers, with the use of their best knowledge of the learners' L1 and L2, after being committed.

This weak version of CAH today is referred to as cross-linguistic influence (Brown, 2007; Odlin, 2003; Kellerman, 1995; Kellerman & Sharwood-Smith, 1986), where the role of the L1 and L1 influence must be recognized, but where, however, there is a distinct difference between influence and prediction. In terms of prediction, the most reliable category to prove the expected errors is phonology: in other domains of the language, the predictions proved not to be always true, and the errors showed a great variety (Brown 2007, p. 253).

2.5. The Moderate Version of CAH

Oller and Ziahosseiny (1970) were among those who criticized both the strong and the weak versions of CAH. Based on their research and empirical data, they proposed a new version of

CAH, which they called the moderate version. They claimed that their proposed version had more explanatory power because it draws on the nature of human learning. They empirically tested and concluded that those who used non-Roman script (Arabic, Japanese) had less spelling difficulties when learning English, than those who's native language used Roman script (Spanish, French). They assumed that the strong form of CAH would have predicted that the learning of an entirely new writing system (Level 4 in the hierarchy of difficulty) would be more difficult than reinterpreting (Level 3) spelling rules. Oller and Ziahosseiny found the opposite to occur, concluding that "wherever patterns are minimally distinct in form or meaning in one or more systems, confusion may result" (Oller & Ziahosseiny 1970, p. 186). Oller and Ziahosseiny's study supported the conclusion that subtle distinctions either between the L1 and L2 or within the L2 itself will cause greater difficulties, and this finding, according to them, contradicts the CAH predictions. Brown agrees with this point citing different researchers whose studies also seem to contradict the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. When bringing different examples of subtle differences at lexical level, he mentions the false cognates, such as the Spanish word "embarazar" and the English word ""embarrassment" (Brown, 2007, p. 254). Brown (p. 254) sums up the discussion by the following statement: "the forms within one language are often perceived to be minimally distinct in comparison to the vast differences between the native and target language, yet those intralingual factors can lead to some of the greatest difficulties". So those researchers conclude that great difference does not necessarily mean great difficulty, and, contrary to that, subtle and minute differences will cause more difficulty. It is necessary to remember, however, that by the word "similar", the contrastivists meant the similarity of form, meaning and distribution. Contrastivists realize that if the item of the native language is similar to that of the target language in form, but different in meaning and distribution, the learner will have high level of difficulty. With regards to Oller and Ziahosseiny's research and findings which seem to contradict the CAH, the following clarification made by Lado much earlier than both Oller and Ziahosseiny's research and Prator's

hierarchy of difficulty were conducted should be sighted: when talking about learning a writing system which is similar to the previously known system, he writes that "the problems of learning to write and to identify the symbols is automatically eliminated. The only remaining problems will be those of associating familiar symbols to strange sounds. Such is the case of English 'and Spanish, for example." (Lado 1957, p. 99). "The same symbol might represent two different sounds in the two languages. In such a case the student tends to transfer the native language symbolization to the foreign language" (Lado 1957, p. 21); "he (the learner) will have difficulty both in reading and in writing the foreign language whenever a symbol the same as one in his own language represents a different sound in the foreign language." (p. 101). Those symbols "constitute a learning burden" (p. 105). Interestingly, he brings different examples (from the same Spanish and English) of such a negative transfer which is caused by similar forms and different meanings and distributions. On the contrary, when talking about learning a language which uses a previously unknown (entirely different)writing system, he notes that "in the case of Chinese and alphabetic languages, the differences are so fundamental that hardly any transfer at all may be expected to occur." (p. 99). Further, he explains that "Between English and Korean there will be no major negative transfer such as would result if some symbols were similar but represented different sounds. And there will be no positive transfer as when similar symbols represent similar sounds." (P. 106). Thus, Oller and Ziahosseiny's study seems to be contradicting Prator's hierarchy of difficulty, but not Lado's assumptions. Regarding Brown's example of false cognates, again Lado should be remembered and referenced in order to show that at least some of the contrastivists also recognized that "subtle and minute difference will cause more difficulty" (Brown, sighted above). Lado writes: "These words that are similar in form but different in meaning - deceptive cognates as we have called them - constitute a special group very high on a scale of difficulty. We will label them difficult."

(pp. 84-85). Lado was not the only proponent of CAH who recognized that partial differences and subtle distinctions may cause greater troubles: Fries, in his turn, writes: "If two sounds are

distinctive points on the pattern in my language, i.e., are used to distinguish meanings, then it is easy for me to hear somewhat similar differences in another language and to make them systematically. If, however, the two sounds in my language are never used to distinguish meanings-- are simply positional variants of one distinctive sound (have only subtle distinctions) -then they are very difficult for me even to hear in learning another language where they are distinctive." (Fries, 1947, p. 319).

Brown, admitting and recognizing the disadvantages and limitations of CAH, agrees with those researchers who recognize that the role of CLI (Cross Linguistic Influence) is significant, though not the only factor, in the process of second language acquisition (Brown, 2007;Odlin, 2003; Jaszczolt, 1995). The notion of cross-linguistic influence implies not only the impact of the L1 on L2, but also the affect of L2 on L1, as well as all any subsequent languages the learner masters (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Brown, 2007). Research on CLI continues to provide important information which helps to better understand and explain some processes involved in second language acquisition. In favor of CAH, Brown discusses the findings by Sheen (1996), which showed that in ESL classes for Arabic students, the overt and explicit attention to the given syntactic contrasts between the two languages helped to decrease the error rates (see Brown 2007, p. 255). He concludes that "the strong form of the CAH was too strong, but the weak form was also perhaps too weak. CLI research offers a cautious middle ground." (p. 255). The interference of mother tongue proved to be one of the most important sources of errors, and contrastive analysis offers a way of finding out (no matter a priori or a posteriori) and dealing with such errors. That is why research on CA continues to be carried out up to day and now includes theoretical and practical books and articles on contrastive rhetoric, contrastive pragmatics, contrastive discourse, contrastive genre analysis, contrastive semantics, contrastive functional analysis, as well as contrastive analysis of cultures.

2.6. The Markedness Theory

Fred Eckman (2004, 1981, 1977) offered a method of predicting and deciding directionality of difficulty. This method, called Markedness Differential Hypothesis or known as markedness theory, determines the relative degrees of difficulty based on the principles of Universal Grammar.

Celce-Murcia and Hawkins (1985, p. 66) summarize markedness theory with the following description:

"It distinguishes members of a pair of related forms or structures by assuming that the marked member of a pair contains at least one more feature than the unmarked one. In addition, the unmarked (or neutral) member of the pair is the one with a wider range of distribution than the marked one. For example, in the case of the English indefinite articles (a and an), an is the more complex or marked form (it has an additional sound) and a is the unmarked form with the wider distribution."

Eckman (1981) suggested that those items which are marked i.e. have an additional feature, will be more difficult to acquire than those items which are unmarked and have a wider distribution. The markedness theory also assumes that degrees of difficulty depend on and correspond to the degrees of markedness. The findings of many other researchers support the assumptions of markedness theory which also explains why there is a natural order in first language acquisition (see Major and Faudree, 1996; Rutherford, 1982 among others).

2.7. Error Analysis

As described above, when tested empirically, the CAH appeared to have different shortcomings and limitations which gave rise to harsh criticism. First, not all the errors predicted by CA actually happened to occur in learners' production (Larsen-Freeman 1994, p. 55). Second, not all the errors could be attributed to the native language interference; many errors could not be

explained by CA, and third, second language learners who had different native languages often tended to make the same errors when learning the same L2 (Brown, 2007). These considerations led the researchers to look for, investigate and analyze other sources of errors. This research gained the name "error analysis" and uncovered interesting facts about and new types and sources of errors made by L2 learners. If CAH claimed to predict the errors "a priori", the mission of error analysis was to identify, explain and classify the errors "a postiori" (Brown, 2007, p. 256), after they are made. While the role of L1 is recognized and identified in error analysis, the latter does not make predictions based on the differences between the two languages, rather, in error analysis, the cases of L1 interference are identified and analyzed on actual – already occurred errors, and not on predicted ones. So, L1 interference is one of the sources of errors, but there are many other different sources as well which are discussed and explained in the research of error analysis. Error analysis discovered different possible sources of errors – native language interference (as suggested by CAH), intralingual errors within the target language itself, the context of learning, the context of production, psychological or cognitive strategies and many other variables. The CAH was criticized not only on practical ground, but also because of its underlying psychological foundation. As discussed above, the psychological grounding of CAH was the theory of behaviorism. Soon this theory of learning gained a harsh criticism by the cognitive theory of learning. In behaviorism, second language acquisition was viewed as a process of overcoming those native language habits which cause negative transfer and reinforcing and transferring those native language habits which result in positive transfer. Language errors were considered by behaviorists to be the main danger in the process of the L2 learning as they could lead to the development of bad language habits. Thus, the mission of Contrastive Analysis was to contrast the languages to find the potential sources of errors and help the teachers prevent their learners from making those errors.

Behavioral approach was strongly criticized since "it did not take into account certain properties of language, especially language creativity" (Trawinski 2005, p. 8). The tendency of error

avoidance and refusal at any cost started to be considered a wrong approach since "empirical evidence did not prove the detrimental influence of error on language acquisition" (Trawinski 2005, p. 9). Cognitive psychology viewed the process of learning (including language learning) as a mental process where, through experiencing and constructing personal meaning from that experience, new information is added to the old information, thus building the learner's language system (Trawinski 2005, p. 13). As described in (Trawinski 2005, p. 15), "coming across a new language form, we tend to assimilate it, to understand as much as possible on the basis of our internalized linguistic knowledge, later, when we have understood the message and start analyzing and experimenting with the newly observed language rule, we modify our previous linguistic repertoire so as to incorporate the new language principle." This approach to language learning led to a new view on errors made during the learning process. Errors became to be viewed as a necessary component of the learning process. When confronting a new unit of a language, the learner makes hypotheses about it, experiments with it and tests his hypotheses. Naturally, this results in making errors but "does not lead to the internalization of incorrect language system" (Trawinski 2005, p. 15). Moreover, errors started to be viewed not as defects which must be prevented at any cost, but rather as indicators of the learners' knowledge of the L2 (Gass & Selinker, 2001; Richards, 1984; Dulay & Burt, 1974). Consequently, error analysis became one of the methods of investigating the processes involved in second language acquisition (Brown, 2007; Saville-Troike, 2006; Littlewood, 1984). CA started to be viewed as a branch of EA that "can only account for the errors that are due to the interference" (Farhady & Delshad, 2006, p. 55). So, CA was supplemented with EA, the combination of which opened a new insight to the learner's language system and SLA processes.

2.8. Procedures of Error Analysis

Obviously, the first step in error analysis should be the identification and description of errors.

Corder (1971) suggested a model of identifying and describing learners' errors. First of all, he made a clear distinction between covert and overt errors: Overt errors are those which are, without any doubt, ungrammatical at the sentence level. Covert errors, contrary to overt ones, seem and are grammatically correct at the sentence level, but when considered in a broader context, are not interpretable. For this distinction made by Corder, Brown (2007, p. 261) suggests the terms "sentence level" and "discourse level". The model proposes the following steps: transcribing the utterance; identifying both the overt and covert erroneous usages; if a plausible interpretation is possible, reconstructing the correct sentence; comparing the erroneous and correct sentences; describing the differences; if the native language is known, translating the sentence to verify whether the interference of L1 could be the source of error.

However, not always a plausible interpretation of the erroneous utterance is possible; in such cases," the researcher is left without any analysis of the error" (Brown 2007, p. 263).

2.9. Sources of Errors

After identification and description of errors, it is necessary to find and explain the different sources of the occurred errors. Some of those sources are:

2.9.1. Interlingual Transfer

Though interlingual transfer, called also negative transfer or interference, appeared to be not the only source of errors, it is still recognized and considered to be one of the most important sources of errors. Interlingual Transfer occurs especially in the first stages of learning a second language, when the learner does not yet have sufficient knowledge of the L2 and, when having difficulties to find the adequate form and feeling a lack of knowledge of the L2, relies on his native language and transfers the forms of his L1 into the L2.

2.9.2. Intralingual Transfer

The research on learner language and error analysis extended the understanding of sources of errors from only interlingual transfer to include many other causes and sources of errors. One of the most significant contributions of EA is the discovery and investigation of intralingual errors. Those errors are caused by the language being learned, independent of the learners' L1. Thus, learners of different language backgrounds may and do make the same errors which are caused by the L2 itself and their limited exposure to the L2. Intralingual errors are also called developmental since they indicate the developmental level of the learner's language system. Some of those developmental errors are made also by the native speaker children. Researchers (Odlin, 2003; Jaszczolt, 1995; Taylor, 1975) found that intralingual transfer occurs in more advanced stages of L2 learning when the learner has already mastered enough of the language and starts making generalizations.

Intralingual errors usually include overgeneralization and simplification induced errors.

2.9.2.1. Overgeneralization

When confronting with a new, unknown and difficult form, the learner often relies on his previous knowledge of the L2 and transfers his previous (old) knowledge to the new situation. This phenomenon is called overgeneralization. For example, if the learner needs to use a new verb in the past tense and he does not know that it is an irregular verb, he will tend to use it as a regular verb and will add "ed" in the end, using his previous knowledge and overgeneralizing the rule which requires adding the ending "ed" in order to construct the past form of the verb.

2.9.2.2. Simplification

In the process of simplification, the learner omits some elements, producing a speech which is similar to "telegraphic speech" which also takes place in early L1 acquisition. This process occurs more in the early stages of language learning. This process may cause errors, but, at the same time, it helps the learner communicate in the L2 with minimum L2 knowledge and linguistic competence. However, as noted by Littlewood (2004, p. 510) it is debatable whether

such simplified utterances "are best seen as products of the speaker's developing linguistic system or simply as one-off strategies designed to solve an immediate communication problem."

2.9.3. Transfer and Generalization Combined

Obviously, in many instances, the learner may rely on his previous knowledge of both his L1 and L2; in this case, those two potential sources may occur together and reinforce each other.

2.9.4. Interlanguage Transfer

Research on EA has shown that one of the sources of errors may be the interlanguage transfer – the influence of one L2 (in the broad sense of the term) over another. For Example, an Armenian native speaker may make errors in English which are caused by his other L2 – Russian or any other language.

2.9.5. Context of Learning

Under the term "context of learning", are understood both the formal (classroom) and informal (outside the classroom) learning. The context of learning proves to be the next major cause of errors. For example, a teacher or the learning materials may give a faulty explanations or false information which the student will use later. For example, until recently, we have been using the phrase "to keep a wish" since our teacher taught us that phrase. At the same time, the learner may use an erroneous form and, if not corrected by the teacher, he will think that that form is right and will continue using it without even knowing he is making an error. When learning the language in informal context, the learner may hear incorrect forms which he may assume to be correct and later use in his speech as well.

2.9.6. Communication Strategies

When trying to convey his message, the learner may use different communication strategies which may be a source of errors. For example, the learner may knowingly and deliberately use a direct translation of his L1 form into his L2, or use wrong or simplified forms, even if he knows that those are not correct forms in the L2. However, he may hope thus to convey the meaning,

paying the cost of the error. Word coinage, circumlocution, false cognates (Tarone, 1981), and prefabricated patterns (Brown, 2007) may also be sources of errors.

2.10. Categories of Errors

In research on error analysis, different categories for descriptions of errors have been proposed, one of which identifies errors of addition, omission, substitution, and ordering (see Brown 2007, p. 263). It is obvious that these categories are general. The errors can be categorized according to the domains of the language they occur in – phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, etc... However, as noted by Brown (p. 264), the error of one level can cause an error also in another level; for example, a phonological error may cause an error in syntax as well.

Errors can also be categorized according to their significance in the processes of conveying and comprehending the meaning of the production. If the error does not hinder the comprehension, it is referred as a local error, if the meaning is distorted and can not be comprehended, then the error is called global (Burt & Kiparsky, 1972).

Another categorization of errors was proposed by Lennon (1991) which includes two categories. The first category is the domain, and the second is the extent of the error. As summarized in Brown (p. 264) "Domain is the rank of linguistic unit (from phoneme to discourse) that must be taken as context in order for the error to become apparent, and extent is the rank of linguistic unit that would have to be deleted, replaced, supplied, or reordered in order to repair the sentence."

2.11. Mistakes or Errors?

In order to better understand the learner's language system and different processes involved in it, a distinction should be made between two notions – errors and mistakes. As well summed up in Brown (2007, p. 258): "A mistake refers to a performance error that is either a random guess or a "slip:' in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly." As is clear from the definition, the making of a mistake does not mean that the learner is not aware of the rule; moreover, he can himself notice his own mistake and correct himself when his mistake is pointed out to him. Such mistakes may be caused by different factors, such as "tongue-twisters", but not by the deficiency in competence or lack of knowledge. Such types of mistakes – hesitations, random ungrammatical forms, slips of the tongue – occur in native speakers' production as well. Contrary to that, errors made by a second language learner are noticeable deviations from the grammatical rules of the target language; an adult native speaker supposedly will not produce such deviations. As Brown (2007, p. 259) explains: errors are "idiosyncrasies in the language of the learner that are direct manifestations of a system within which a learner is operating at the time." Brown proceeds (p. 259) that errors reflect the competence of the learner; they reveal the stage of the learner's language system and competence level in the target language. However, sometimes it is hard, if not impossible, to clearly distinguish and make a distinction between an error and a mistake; we agree with Brown who states that such a distinction sometimes bears subjectivity (p. 259). This difficulty is caused by the fact that, in order to decide whether the learner made a mistake or an error, we need the learners to self-correct themselves. However, such a self-correction may not occur (p. 259); the learners may prefer to continue not selfcorrecting themselves, even if they notice their own mistake and are able to correct it. Though the criterion of frequency may be helpful, sometimes it may not be a safe means for distinguishing errors from mistakes; in such cases, further examination and rich data of learner's production is needed in order to make more or less true and safe assumptions (see Brown 2007, p. 259).

2.12. Shortcomings in error analysis

The first and obvious shortcoming of error analysis is the tendency of over-emphasis on errors; Brown (2007, p. 260) warns against paying too much and sometimes unnecessary attention to the errors and forgetting about the correct utterances of the learner. The second disadvantage of error analysis, according to Brown, is its emphasis on production data and inability to account for comprehension errors. However, it is worth noting that for this case, there are special tasks to elicit data on comprehension. The third shortcoming of error analysis is its inability to account for the avoidance strategy, when the learners deliberately avoid using the forms and constructions they are not sure of (Gass & Selinker, 2008; Ellis, 2000; James, 1998; Tarone, 1981; Kleinmann, 1977; Schachter, 1974). The absence of error does not necessarily mean that the learner does not have any difficulty in that area, contrary to that, avoidance may indicate difficulties. However, it should again be noted that, in case of necessity, special tasks may be conducted to elicit those constructions and items being avoided; this is true especially in contrastive analysis. This is one of the areas where contrastive and error analyses supplement each other, providing more sufficient data on learners' language.

2.13. Interlanguage

Trying to extent their knowledge of the EFL learners' language system, teachers and linguists came to recognize and try to discover the other issues, difficulties and processes involved in SLA. Amongst those aspects are the intralingual and strategic effects, as well as the context of learning, the learners' limited knowledge of the L2, the communication functions of the language, the language in general, the learners' overall knowledge, experience and the ways of exploration of life and the world surrounding them, including the usage of the L2. All those factors form the learners' language system which is unique to each learner and is in a state of constant and continuous change. The learner's language became not to be viewed as a system full of errors, but as a constantly changing and improving language system which continually
tends to approximate the target language system. Since the 1960-s, this language system, the learners' L2, became a promising field of investigation. The learners' L2 system has received different names: interlanguage (Selinker, 1972); approximative system (Nemser, 1971); idiosyncratic dialect (Corder 1971). These designations have both similarities and differences; they both share the belief that the learner's language is a legitimate and self-structured system which is neither the L1, nor the L2 system. However, each of the above-mentioned terms were coined by different scholars in order to emphasize different aspects and characteristics of the learner's language system: Selinker (1972) used the term "interlanguage." With this term, Selinker implies that the learner's language is a structurally separate system and has an intermediate position between the learner's L1 and L2. By using the term "approximative language system", Nemser put the emphasis on the notion that the learner's language is changing and tending to successively approximate the target language system. In his turn, Corder used the term idiosyncratic dialect in order to point out that each language learner has his/her unique and particular language system.

The task of analyzing the learner' language is a tough one because of the instability and variation of the learner's system (see Brown 2007, p. 261). The system constantly accepts new information which either is added to the old information or substitutes it; this system can include even contrary forms (Brown 2007, p. 261). In the first stages of language learning, the correct forms coexist with the incorrect ones, then, with successful learning, the incorrect forms gradually vanish being replaced only with the correct forms (p. 269). In order to define the different stages of learner's language development, Brown borrowed (the word is his) some notions from Corder (see Brown 2007, p. 266-267) and came up with four stages of learner's language development in regard to the learner's errors. The first stage proposed by Brown corresponds to Corder's "presystamatic stage", in which the errors are random and the learner is vaguely aware that there is a systematic structure in the L2 and makes rather wild guesses of how

37

to perform. In this stage, the errors are random and inconsistent, since the learner experiments with different options. Brown calls the second stage "emergent", in this stage the learners' production is more consistent, and the learner starts discerning a system and using certain rules in his production. Though these rules may not be correct in the target language, they are legitimate in the learner's internal language system. In this stage, the learner may already be familiar with and use the correct rule and form in some cases, and the incorrect rule and form in other cases. This phenomena of backsliding (moving from the correct to incorrect and then back again to the correct form) is referred to as v-shaped learning (Gass & Selinker, 2001). In this stage, the learner is usually still incapable of self-correction if his errors are pointed out to him. The phenomenon of avoidance is typical for this stage.

In the third stage, the rules are not well-formed in the learners' language system and though vshaped learning processes may still occur, the learner's production is more consistent and approximates the target language standards. This stage is truly systematic. The most significant difference between the second and third stages is the fact that in the third stage, the learner is capable of self-correction if his errors are pointed out to him. The final stage is called "stabilization" by some researchers "(for example, Long, 2003) or "postsystematic stage" (Corder, 1973). In this stage, the learner makes relatively fewer errors and can himself notice and correct his errors. However, in this stage, miner errors may go unnoticed and become fossilized (Han & Selinker, 2005) or stabilized (Long, 2003).

Brown cautions that those four stages are not the same for the entire language system of the learner. The latter may be in the first stage regarding one form or aspect of the language, and in the second stage regarding another aspect and so on. Brown also warns that these stages do not adequately account for sociolinguistic, functional, pragmatic or nonverbal strategies all of which are important aspects of learner's competence (Brown 2007, p. 269).

38

2.14. Statement of Purpose

This study tries to identify, grammatically categorize, and explain the syntactic errors occurred in the speech of Armenian EFL learners. For the identification and linguistic categorization of the errors, the above-discussed procedures of EA will be used in this study. After the identification of the number and the nature of the errors, we will refer to the means of CA a postiori and EA with the aim to discover and analyze the sources of the most frequently occurring errors. In light of the above-mentioned factors and based on the research purpose, the research questions to be addressed are the following:

- 1. What are the types of syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?
- 2. What are the most frequently occurring syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?
- 3. What are the major sources of the most frequently occurring syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?

Chapter Three

Methodology

In this study, the techniques of error analysis were employed in order to identify, grammatically categorize, and explain the occurrence of syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners. In this chapter, first the research questions will be posed, then the description of the data and participants will be provided, and then the techniques of data collection and data analysis will be presented. In the end, the statistical techniques performed to answer the proposed research questions will be described.

3.1. Research Questions

- 4. What are the types of syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?
- 5. What are the most frequently occurring syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?
- 6. What are the major sources of the most frequently occurring syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?

3.2. Participants and Data

The participants of this study are 21 students newly admitted to AUA in the summer of 2010. The native language of the participants is Armenian, and their second language is Russian. The age, gender, as well as any other foreign languages (besides English) of the participants was not considered in this study. Their proficiency level of English might be considered high intermediate or advanced, as they all have scored 550 or more on TOEFL. The participants were not selected randomly; they were all students admitted to different departments of AUA. The data consists of their speech recorded at their Academic Writing courses at AUA in the summer of 2010. Their speech can be considered semi prepared as they were making presentations on their papers written earlier. The recorded and analyzed data for this study consists of 180-minute speech of 21 students. The length of the speeches ranges from 5 to 12 minutes.

3.3. Data Collection and Analysis

As mentioned above, the data were recorded at the Academic Writing courses held at AUA in 2010. All the 21 participants gave an agreement to be recorded for a research purpose. The recordings were transcribed and the written data were compared to the recordings several times in order to avoid any mismatches and errors. There were 193 cases of uncertainties, when we were not sure of a pronounced word or phrase. The length of each of those cases was 5-10 seconds. Those cases were displayed for a linguist (a professor teaching at the TEFL department at AUA) and a native speaker (teaching English at a university). The correlation between the two raters' interpretations was 79.24 percent; there were 42 cases of different interpretations. Those cases were filled in the data, considering the context and the content of the speech. Some items that were not audible by the two raters were not included in the data. The length of those items not included in the transcribed data does not exceed 3 minutes. The transcribed data consists of 21074 words.

The next step in this study was the identification of syntactic errors. First of all, it should be noted that this study does not make a distinction between errors and mistakes (for a detailed overview on this distinction see Brown 2007, p. 258). Though some of the deviant forms were self-corrected by the learners, those cases were few, and, even if self-corrected by the learners, such cases were counted as errors, as they at least show that the learners had not mastered the correct forms completely. However, the corrected forms of the errors were also counted as correct occurrences. The identification of the syntactic errors was based on the grammatical acceptability of the forms on the sentence level. If the sentence and all the syntactic items were

41

grammatically acceptable on the sentence level, but erroneous on the discourse level, they were not counted as errors, as this study is concerned only with syntactic errors. After identification, the errors were grouped in the relevant grammatical categories in which they occurred. It should be mentioned that, besides those 11 categories, there were some more types of syntactic errors which were not analyzed and explained in this study because of the complexity of error identification and the difficulty of reconstruction of the erroneous sentences. In many cases, such erroneous sentences were not possible to reconstruct in order to find the type of error. This study is not considering the errors in word order, infinitive of purpose, errors in using a wrong part of speech as well as some other errors the nature of which, as mentioned, was not clear. Thus, this study is concerned only with those syntactic errors, which could be clearly and systematically identified and categorized. The categories of errors were not based on any pre-determined taxonomy; rather, the categories became clear after the nature of the errors was determined. After the identification and categorization of the errors, the data were also read and checked by a second reader (a native speaker teaching English at a university) in order to have reliability of error identification.

After the errors were categorized in their relevant categories, the number of errors in each category was counted. Then, the number of occurrences of the forms in each of the category (including both the errors and non-errors) was also counted. Such an approach gave an opportunity to account also for the avoidance strategy (Schachter, 1974). It should be noted that one sentence might include different types of errors which were counted in their relevant categories. At the same time, one sentence was counted in different categories as occurrences of the relevant forms. For example, in one sentence, there are occurrences of modal, negation, tense, etc... Those occurrences were counted in their relevant categories. If one sentence included several finite verbs, all of them were counted in the tense category as occurrences, and, if one of the verbs was not correctly formed or was used in a wrong tense, that verb was also counted in the tense category of errors. At the same time, if one sentence included an error of both negation

42

and subject-verb agreement, those errors were counted in their relevant categories. It should be also mentioned that the category of wrong pronouns includes only those errors which were not counted as errors in the categories of disagreement in the noun phrase or subject-verb disagreement. Besides, when counting the overall occurrences of subject-verb agreement, only those cases were counted in which the learners had to use one of several forms, for example, when they had to choose between the linking words am, is and are. Obviously, those occurrences when the learners didn't need to make any distinction between the linking word or the verb were not counted as occurrences of subject-verb agreement. I.e. the occurrences of the subject with the copula will or with the verb in past simple – entered – were not counted in the category of subject-verb agreement occurrences. The following sentences will clarify the procedures of error and occurrence counting:

1. Advertising must promote the sale of a commodity or service, to advance an idea or to bring some changes in taste and fashion.

Errors in modals: 2

Occurrences of modals: 3

This sentence has also occurrences of articles, noun agreement, tense, etc. which are also counted in the relevant categories.

2. The article not have been Completed...

Errors: negation and subject-verb agreement.

Occurrences: 1: negation; 2: sv agreement; 3: article; 4: tense; 5: passive.

3. Cyberspace has revolutionized (the needed) World economy and has revitalized and make (tense) our life interesting.

Errors: 1: article; 2: tense.

Occurrences: 1: article; 2: tense; 3: tense; 4: tense.

In order to analyze the data quantitatively, the Friedman and Wilcoxon tests were conducted. The Friedman test was used as a non-parametric alternative to repeated measures of ANOVA in order to identify differences in occurred errors across all the categories, and the Wilcoxon test was used as a post-hoc test in order to identify where those differences lie.

After the identification of the most frequently occurring errors, those errors were described in terms of grammar and their possible sources were determined with the help of contrastive and error analysis.

All those steps were undertaken to answer the research questions posed in the beginning of this chapter.

Chapter Four

Results and Discussion

In this chapter, one by one, each research question will be posed, the relevant findings, tables and tests will be provided, and the answer to the research question will be presented.

4.1. Research Question 1 What are the types of syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL

learners?

In the current data, in total 994 errors and 11528 Occurrences (including both the errors and non-

errors) were identified and grouped into 11 categories. The categories, numbers of errors,

occurrences and percentages of errors within each category are displayed in the following table:

Table 1: Categories, Numbers of Errors,	Occurrences and Percentages of	Errors within E	ach
Category:			

		PREPOSITIONS	PREPOSITIONS	PRONOLINS	PRONOLINS	MODELS	MODALS
DACCIVE		I KEI OSITIONS	I KEI OSITIONS	IRONOUNS	IRONOUND	MODELS	MODALS
PASSIVE	DACCINE						
	PASSIVE						
ERRORS	OCCUR.	ERRORS	OCCUR.	ERRORS	OCCUR.	ERRORS	OCCUR.
25	224	107	1070	26	2005	10	210
25	234	127	18/8	36	2085	19	319
10 (00)		6.7(0)		1 720/		5.0(0)	
10.68%		6.76%		1.73%		5.96%	

ARTICLES	ARTICLES	INVERSION	INVERSION	SV DISAGREEMENT	SV DISAGREEMENT	NOUN AGREEMENT	NOUN AGREEM
ERRORS	OCCUR.	ERRORS	OCCUR.	ERRORS	OCCUR.	ERRORS	OCCUR.
507	1697	41	127	79	1673	62	814
29.88%		32.28%		4.72%		7.62%	

The following table displays the raw percentages of errors of each category in the total number of errors of all the categories.

Table 2: The Percentages of Errors of Each Category in the Total Number of Errors in All the Categories:

PASSIVE	PREPOSITIONS	PRONOUNS	MODALS	VERB	+	TENSE	ARTICLES	IN
				INFINITIVE	OR			
				GERUND				

2.52%	12.78%	3.62%	1.91%	1.01%	8.05%	51.01%	4.

4.2. Research Question 2

What are the most frequently occurring syntactic errors in the English spoken production

of Armenian EFL learners?

The numbers and percentages displayed in the above illustrated tables, yield information only about the selected sample of 21 AUA students and could not be generalized to the whole population of AUA students. In order to be able to make such generalizations and answer the second research question, some other statistical analyses were done. First, a Friedman test was conducted in order to find out whether there is a significant difference among the average percentages of errors in 11 categories or not (for the whole population). As stated by Pallant (2007), the Friedman Test is the non-parametric alternative to the one-way repeated measures analysis of variance. It is used when the same sample of subjects or cases is taken and measured three or more points in time, or under three different conditions. Our null-hypothesis was that there is no significant difference among the 11 categories. If the null-hypothesis was confirmed, it might mean that the students would have the same difficulty in all the categories is more difficult than the others for the students. However, the test rejected our null hypothesis, showing that there is a significant difference between the average percentages of errors in at least two categories. The following table displays the results of the Friedman Test:

Ranks					
	Mean Rank				
ID	8,48				
ARTICLES	11,10				
INVERSION	8,33				
SV DISAGREEMENT	6,17				
NOUN DISAGREEMENT	6,43				
TENSE	5,26				
PASSIVE	6,52				
PREPOSITIONS	7,19				
PRONOUNS	4,29				
MODALS	4,83				
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND	4,83				
NEGATION	4,57				

Table 3 – Friedman Test

Test Statistics ^a					
N	21				
Chi-Square	75,598				
Df	11				
Asymp. Sig.	,000,				

a. Friedman Test

As table 3 demonstrates, Chi-Square value for Friedman test is 75,598, P is 0,000 which is less than selected significant level of 0,05. That is, the null hypothesis about no significant difference among the percentages of 11 error categories is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference between the average percentages of errors in at least two categories, i.e. at least in one category, errors occur more frequently than in others. As this test does not show particularly which categories are significantly different - which categories are more difficult than the others, another test, the Wilcoxon Test, was carried out in order to clarify where exactly the differences lie. The Wilcoxon test is designed for use with repeated measures, that is, when the subjects are measured on two occasions, or under two different conditions. This test is a non-parametric alternative to the repeated measures t-test, but instead of comparing the means, it converts scores to ranks and compares these ranks (Pallant, 2007). In this research study, this test is used as a post-hoc test to identify where exactly the differences lie between the categories. With the help of this test, the average percentage of errors in each category was compared to the average percentages of errors in each category was compared to the average percentages of errors in each category was compared to the average percentages of errors of all the other categories. The test results are demonstrated in the following tables:

Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test

For this test, 0.05 was chosen as the significance level. Since this project is concerned with error frequencies and not course treatment, this significance level seems satisfactory.

Table 4 - Comparison of percentages of errors in articles and inversion

		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
INVERSION	- Negative Ranks	11 ^a	13,55	149,00
ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	10 ^b	8,20	82,00
	Ties	0^{c}		
	Total	21		

Ranks

a. INVERSION < ARTICLES

b. INVERSION > ARTICLES

c. INVERSION = ARTICLES

Test Statistics^b

-			INVERSION - ARTICLES
Z			-1,164 ^a
Asymp. tailed)	Sig.	(2-	,244

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 4 reveals the results of comparison of percentages of errors in articles and inversions. As it can be seen from the table, Z-tests statistics is -1,164, P is 0,244, thus showing no significant difference between two types of errors. That is, the null hypothesis about no significant difference between the two projects is not rejected.

Table 5 - the comparison of percentages of errors of Subject Verb disagreement and articles

Ranks

	-	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
SV DISAGREEMENT	Negative Ranks	21 ^a	11,00	231,00
- ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	0^{b}	,00,	,00,
	Ties	$0^{\rm c}$		
	Total	21		

a. SV DISAGREEMENT < ARTICLES

b. SV DISAGREEMENT > ARTICLES

```
c. SV DISAGREEMENT = ARTICLES
```

Test Statistics^b

			SV DISAGREE MENT -
			ARTICLES
Ζ			-4,015 ^a
Asymp. tailed)	Sig.	(2-	,000

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 5 presents the results of comparison of articles and SV disagreement. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -4,015, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two

types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of SV disagreement errors.

Table 6 –comparison of percentages of errors of noun disagreement and articles

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NOUN	Negative Ranks	21 ^a	11,00	231,00
DISAGREEMENT -	Positive Ranks	0 ^b	,00	,00
ARTICLES	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		
a. NOUN DISAGREE ARTICLES b. NOUN DISAGREE	MENT < MENT >			
ARTICLES c. NOUN DISAGREE ARTICLES	MENT =			
Test Statistic	cs ^b			

	NOUN DISAGREE MENT - ARTICLES
Z	-4,015 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 6 presents the results of comparison of articles and noun disagreement. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -4,015, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of Noun disagreement errors.

Ranks				
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
TENSE - ARTICLES	Negative Ranks Positive Ranks Ties Total	21 ^a 0 ^b 0 ^c 21	11,00 ,00	,00

 Table 7- Comparison of percentages of errors of articles and tense

a. TENSE < ARTICLES

b. TENSE > ARTICLES

c. TENSE = ARTICLES

Test Statistics ^b			
TENSE - ARTICLES			
Z	-4,015 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 7 presents the results of comparison of articles and tense. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -4,015, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of tense errors.

 Table 8 -comparison of percentages of errors of articles and passive

Ranks	
-------	--

		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PASSIVE -	Negative Ranks	16 ^a	12,12	194,00
ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	5 ^b	7,40	37,00
	Ties	0^{c}		
	Total	21		

a. PASSIVE < ARTICLES

b. PASSIVE > ARTICLES

c. PASSIVE = ARTICLES

Test	Statistics ^b
1 551	Statistics

	PASSIVE - ARTICLES
Z	-2,728 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,006

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 8 presents the results of comparison of articles and passive. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -2, 728, P is 0,006 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in passive.

 Table 9 - comparison of percentages of errors of articles and prepositions

Ranks				
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PREPOSITIONS -	Negative Ranks	21 ^a	11,00	231,00
ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	0^{b}	,00	,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PREPOSITIONS < ARTICLES

b. PREPOSITIONS > ARTICLES

c. PREPOSITIONS = ARTICLES

Test Statistics ^b			
	PREPOSITIO NS - ARTICLES		
Z	-4,015 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 9 presents the results of comparison of articles and prepositions. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -4,015, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of

0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in preposition.

Ranks				
		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS -	Negative Ranks	21 ^a	11,00	231,00
ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	0^{b}	,00	,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

 Table 10 – comparison of percentages of errors of articles and pronouns

a. PRONOUNS < ARTICLES

b. PRONOUNS > ARTICLES

c. PRONOUNS = ARTICLES

Test Statistics ⁶		
	PRONOUNS	
	- ARTICLES	

Z		-4,015
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 10 presents the results of comparison of articles and pronouns. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -4,015, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors.

	Rank	S		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS -	Negative Ranks	20 ^a	11,45	229,00
ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	1 ^b	2,00	2,00
	Ties	0^{c}		
	Total	21		

 Table 11 –comparison of percentages of errors of articles and modals.

a. MODALS < ARTICLES

b. MODALS > ARTICLES

c. MODALS = ARTICLES

Test Statistics ^b				
	MODALS - ARTICLES			
Ζ	-3,945 ^a			
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000			

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 11 presents the results of comparison of articles and modals. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -3,945, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in modals.

 Table 12-comparison of percentages of errors in articles and verb + infinitive or gerund

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE	Negative Ranks	19 ^a	11,32	215,00
OR GERUND - ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	2 ^b	8,00	16,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND <
ARTICLES
b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND >
ARTICLES
c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERND =

ARTICLES

Test Statis	stics ^b
	VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - ARTICLES
Z	-3,458 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,001

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 12 presents the results of comparison of articles and modals and verb + infinitive or gerund. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -3,945, P is 0,01 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of verb + infinitive or gerund.

 Table 13 comparison of percentages of errors in articles and negations

	Ran	ks		
		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION -	Negative Ranks	21 ^a	11,00	231,00
ARTICLES	Positive Ranks	0^{b}	,00	,00
	Ties	0^{c}		
	Total	21		

a. NEGATION < ARTICLES

b. NEGATION > ARTICLES

c. NEGATION = ARTICLES

Test Statistics	Test
-----------------	------

	NEGATION - ARTICLES
Ζ	$-4,015^{a}$
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 13 presents the results of comparison of articles and negations. As it can be seen from the table, Z-test statistics is -4,015, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. Thus, null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of errors was rejected. The results showed a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of article errors is significantly larger than the percentage of negation errors.

Table 1	14 –com	parison	of perce	entages	of errors	in	inversions	and SV	Disagreement
		p	or p • • • •		01 0 11010				21000100100110

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
SV DISAGREEMENT	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	13,92	181,00
- INVERSION	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	4,14	29,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. SV DISAGREEMENT <
INVERSION
b. SV DISAGREEMENT >
INVERSION
c. SV DISAGREEMENT =
INVERSION

Test Statistics^b

	SV
	DISAGREE
	MENT -
	INVERSION
Z	-2,837 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,005

- a. Based on positive ranks.
- b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 14 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and SV Disagreement. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,837, P is 0, 005 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of SV disagreement errors.

Table 15 - comparison of inversions and Noun disagreement

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NOUN	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	10,46	136,00
DISAGREEMENT - INVERSION	Positive Ranks	4 ^b	4,25	17,00
	Ties	4 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. NOUN DISAGREEMENT < INVERSION

b. NOUN DISAGREEMENT > INVERSION

c. NOUN DISAGREEMENT = INVERSION

Test Statistics ^b				
	NOUN DISAGREE MENT - INVERSION			
Z Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	-2,817 ^a ,005			

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 15 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and noun disagreement. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,817, P is 0, 005 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of noun disagreement errors.

Ranks					
		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	
TENSE –	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	13,92	181,00	
INVERSION	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	4,14	29,00	
	Ties	1 ^c			
	Total	21			

Table 16 – comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and tense

a. TENSE < INVERSION

b. TENSE > INVERSION

c. TENSE = INVERSION

	TENSE - INVERSION
Z	-2,837 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,005

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 16 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and tense. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,837, P is 0, 005 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of tense errors.

 Table 17 – comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and passive

	Ran	ıks		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PASSIVE -	Negative Ranks	11 ^a	7,64	84,00
INVERSION	Positive Ranks	3 ^b	7,00	21,00
	Ties	$7^{\rm c}$		
	Total	21		

a. PASSIVE < INVERSION

b. PASSIVE > INVERSION

c. PASSIVE = INVERSION

Test Statistics ^b				
	PASSIVE - INVERSION			
Z	-1,977 ^a			
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,048			

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 17 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and passive. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,977, P is 0, 048 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in passive.

 Table 18 - comparison of percentages of inversions and prepositions

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PREPOSITIONS -	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	14,54	189,00
INVERSION	Positive Ranks	8 ^b	5,25	42,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PREPOSITIONS < INVERSION

b. PREPOSITIONS > INVERSION

c. PREPOSITIONS = INVERSION

Test Statistics ^b			
			_

	PREPOSITIO
	NS -
	INVERSION
Ζ	-2,555 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,011

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 18 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and prepositions. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,555 P is 0, 011 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of preposition errors.

Table 19 - comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and pronouns

	Ranks	S		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS -	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	12,00	156,00
INVERSION	Positive Ranks	5 ^b	3,00	15,00
	Ties	3 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PRONOUNS < INVERSION

b. PRONOUNS > INVERSION

c. PRONOUNS = INVERSION

Test Statistics^b

	PRONOUNS
	-
	INVERSION
Z	-3,071 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,002

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 19 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and pronouns. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -3,071 P is 0, 002 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors.

	Rank	ζS.		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS -	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	8,85	115,00
INVERSION	Positive Ranks	2 ^b	2,50	5,00
	Ties	6 ^c		
	Total	21		

 Table 20 – comparison of percentages of errors in inversions and modals

a. MODALS < INVERSION

b. MODALS > INVERSION

c. MODALS = INVERSION

	MODALS - INVERSION
Z	-3,125 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,002

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 20 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -3,125 P is 0, 002 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in modals.

 Table 21 - comparison of inversions and verb + Infinitive or gerund

Ranks				
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - INVERSION	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	7,31	95,00
	Positive Ranks	1 ^b	10,00	10,00
	Ties	7 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < INVERSION

b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > INVERSION

c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = INVERSION

Test Statistics ^b			
	VERB + INFINITIVE		
OR			
	GERUND -		
	INVERSION		
Ζ	-2,669 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,008		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 21 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and verb + gerund or infinitive. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,669 P is 0, 008 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in the usage of verb + infinitive or gerund.

Table 22 – comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and negation

	_	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION -	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	9,88	128,50
INVERSION	Positive Ranks	3 ^b	2,50	7,50
	Ties	5 [°]		
	Total	21		

a. NEGATION < INVERSION

b. NEGATION > INVERSION

c. NEGATION = INVERSION

Test	Statistics ^b
------	-------------------------

	NEGATION - INVERSION
Z	-3,129 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,002

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 22 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in inversion and negation. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -3,129 P is 0, 002 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of inversion errors is significantly larger than the percentage of negation errors.

 Table 23 – comparison of percentages of noun disagreement and subject verb disagreement

ixaiik5				
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NOUN	Negative Ranks	8 ^a	8,19	65,50
DISAGREEMENT -	Positive Ranks	13 ^b	12,73	165,50
SV DISAGREEMENT	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		
 a. NOUN DISAGREEN DISAGREEMENT b. NOUN DISAGREEN DISAGREEMENT c. NOUN DISAGREEN DISAGREEMENT 	AENT < SV AENT > SV AENT = SV			
Test Statistics	Sb			
D	NOUN ISAGREE			

Ranks

	NOUN
	DISAGREE
	MENT - SV
	DISAGREE
	MENT
Z	-1,738ª
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,082

- a. Based on negative ranks.
- b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 23 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in noun disagreement and SV disagreement. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1, 1738P is 0, 082 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

 Table 24 –comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and tense

Ranks				
N Mean Rank Sum of Ran				
TENSE - SV	Negative Ranks	12 ^a	10,75	129,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	8 ^b	10,12	81,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. TENSE < SV DISAGREEMENT

b. TENSE > SV DISAGREEMENT

c. TENSE = SV DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b			
	TENSE - SV DISAGREE MENT		
Z	-,896 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,370		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 24 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in tense and SV disagreement. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,896 P is 0,370 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PASSIVE - SV	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	7,22	65,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	11 ^b	13,18	145,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

 Table 25 - comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and passive

 Ranks

a. PASSIVE < SV DISAGREEMENT

b. PASSIVE > SV DISAGREEMENT

c. PASSIVE = SV DISAGREEMENT

Test	Statistics	b

	PASSIVE - SV DISAGREE MENT
Z Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	-1,493ª ,135

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 25 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and passive. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,493 P is 0,135 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 26 - comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and prepositions

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PREPOSITIONS - SV	Negative Ranks	7 ^a	8,86	62,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	14 ^b	12,07	169,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PREPOSITIONS < SV DISAGREEMENT

b. PREPOSITIONS > SV DISAGREEMENT

c. PREPOSITIONS = SV DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b		
	PREPOSITIO NS - SV DISAGREE MENT	
Z	-1,860 ^a	
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,063	

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 26 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and prepositions. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,860 P is 0,063 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 27 - comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and pronouns

	Ran	ks		
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS - SV	Negative Ranks	17 ^a	11,18	190,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	3 ^b	6,67	20,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		
a. PRONOUNS < SV	/			
DISAGREEMENT				
b. PRONOUNS > SV				
DISAGREEMENT				
c. PRONOUNS = SV	/			
DISAGREEMENT				
Test Statis	tics ^b			
	PRONOUNS			
	SV			

	PRONOUNS - SV
	DISAGREE MENT
Z	-3,173 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,002

- a. Based on positive ranks.
- b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 27 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and pronouns. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -3,173 P is 0,002 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of errors in SV disagreement is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors.

Table 28 –comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and modals

	Rank	KS		
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS - SV	Negative Ranks	14 ^a	8,07	113,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	16,17	97,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. MODALS < SV DISAGREEMENT

b. MODALS > SV DISAGREEMENT

c. MODALS = SV DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b		
	MODALS - SV DISAGREE MENT	
Z	-,299 ^a	
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,765	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 28 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,299 P is 0,765 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Ranks				
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - SV DISAGREEMENT	Negative Ranks Positive Ranks Ties	13 ^a 7 ^b 1 ^c	8,46 14,29	110,00 100,00
	Total	21		

Table 29 -comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and verb + infinitive or gerund

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < SV DISAGREEMENT b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > SV DISAGREEMENT c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = SV

DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b		
	VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - SV DISAGREE MENT	
Z Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	-,187 ^a ,852	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 29 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and verb + gerund or infinitive. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,187 P is 0,852 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION - SV	Negative Ranks	13 ^a	10,00	130,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	11,43	80,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

 Table 30 – comparison of percentages of errors in SV Disagreement and Negation

a. NEGATION < SV DISAGREEMENT b. NEGATION > SV DISAGREEMENT c. NEGATION = SV DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics^b

	NEGATION - SV DISAGREE MENT
Ζ	-,933 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,351

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 30 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in SV disagreement and pronouns. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,933 P is 0,351 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

 Table 31 –comparison of Noun Disagreement and Tense

_	Rank	KS		
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
TENSE - NOUN	Negative Ranks	14 ^a	12,64	177,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	7,71	54,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. TENSE < NOUN DISAGREEMENTb. TENSE > NOUN DISAGREEMENTc. TENSE = NOUN DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b			
	TENSE - NOUN DISAGREE MENT		
Z	-2,138 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,033		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 31 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and tense. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,138 P is 0,33 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of errors in noun disagreement is significantly larger than the percentage of tense errors.

Table 32 - comparison of percentages of errors of Noun disagreement and passive

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PASSIVE - NOUN	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	6,89	62,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	9 ^b	12,11	109,00
	Ties	3 ^c		t
	Total	21		
a. PASSIVE < NOUN DISAGREEMENT				
b. PASSIVE > NOUN DISAGREEMENT				
c. PASSIVE = NOUN DISAGREEMENT				

Test Statistics ^b			
	PASSIVE - NOUN DISAGREE MENT		
Z	-1,024 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,306		

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 32 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and passive. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,024 P is 0,306 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 33 – comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and Prepositions

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PREPOSITIONS - NOUN DISAGREEMENT	Negative Ranks	11 ^a	10,82	119,00
	Positive Ranks	10 ^b	11,20	112,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PREPOSITIONS < NOUN DISAGREEMENT

b. PREPOSITIONS > NOUN DISAGREEMENT

c. PREPOSITIONS = NOUN DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics^b

	PREPOSITIO NS - NOUN DISAGREE MENT
Z Asymp. Sig. (2-	-,122 ^a
tailed)	,903

- a. Based on positive ranks.
- b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 33 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and prepositions. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,122 P is 0,906 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 34 – Comparison o	f percentages of	f errors in Noun I	Disagreement and	d Pronouns
-------------------------	------------------	--------------------	------------------	------------

Ranks

		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS - NOUN	Negative Ranks	15 ^a	11,87	178,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	5 ^b	6,40	32,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PRONOUNS < NOUN DISAGREEMENT

b. PRONOUNS > NOUN DISAGREEMENT

c. PRONOUNS = NOUN DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b			
	PRONOUNS - NOUN DISAGREE MENT		
Z	-2,725 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,006		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 34 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and pronouns. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,725 P is 0,006 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of errors in noun disagreement is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS - NOUN	Negative Ranks	11 ^a	9,45	104,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	9,57	67,00
	Ties	3 ^c		
	Total	21		

Table 35- comparison of percentages of errors in Noun Disagreement and Modals

a. MODALS < NOUN DISAGREEMENT

b. MODALS > NOUN DISAGREEMENT

c. MODALS = NOUN DISAGREEMENT

Test Statistics ^b			
	MODALS - NOUN DISAGREE MENT		
Z	-,806 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,420		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 35 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,806 P is 0,420 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 36 - comparison of Noun Disagreement and Verb + Infinitive or Gerund

_	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	8,33	75,00
OR GERUND - NOUN DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	7,50	45,00
	Ties	6 ^c		t
	Total	21		
a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < NOUN DISAGREEMENT b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > NOUN DISAGREEMENT c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = NOUN

DISAGREEMENT

Test Statis	stics ^b
	VERB +
	INFINITIVE
	OR
	GERUND -
	NOUN
	DISAGREE
	MENT
Z	-,852 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,394

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 36 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and verb + infinitive or gerund. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,852 P is 0,394 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 37 - comparison of percentages of errors in Noun Disagreement and Negations

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION - NOUN	Negative Ranks	12 ^a	9,92	119,00
DISAGREEMENT	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	8,67	52,00
	Ties	3°		
	Total	21		

a. NEGATION < NOUN DISAGREEMENT

b. NEGATION > NOUN DISAGREEMENT

c. NEGATION = NOUN DISAGREEMENT

Test Stati	stics ^b
	NEGATION - NOUN DISAGREE MENT
Z	-1,459 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,145

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 37 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in Noun disagreement and negation. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,459 P is 0,145 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

 Table 38 - comparison of percentages of errors in Tense and Passive

	R	anks		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PASSIVE -	Negative Ranks	8 ^a	5,75	46,00
TENSE	Positive Ranks	11 ^b	13,09	144,00
	Ties	2 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PASSIVE < TENSE

b. PASSIVE > TENSE

c. PASSIVE = TENSE

Test Statistics ^b		
	PASSIVE - TENSE	
Z Asymp Sig (2-	-1,972 ^a	
tailed)	,049	

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 38 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in passive and tense. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,972 P is 0,049 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of errors in passive is significantly larger than the percentage of tense errors.

 Table 39 - Comparison of percentages of errors in Tense and prepositions

	Rank	KS		
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PREPOSITIONS -	Negative Ranks	4 ^a	11,00	44,00
TENSE	Positive Ranks	17 ^b	11,00	187,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PREPOSITIONS < TENSE

b. PREPOSITIONS > TENSE

c. PREPOSITIONS = TENSE

	PREPOSITIO NS - TENSE
Z	-2,485 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,013

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 39 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in tense and prepositions. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,485 P is 0,013 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of preposition is significantly larger than the percentage of tense errors.

 Table 40 - comparison of percentage of tense and pronouns

	Ka	liks		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS -	Negative Ranks	14 ^a	11,79	165,00
TENSE	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	7,50	45,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

Ranks

a. PRONOUNS < TENSE

b. PRONOUNS > TENSE

c. PRONOUNS = TENSE

Test Statistics ^b		
	PRONOUNS - TENSE	
Z	-2,240 ^a	
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,025	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 40 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in tense and pronouns. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,240 P is 0,025 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of tense errors is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors.

 Table 41 –comparison of percentages of errors in tense and modals

_	Rank	KS		
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS - TENSE	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	8,56	77,00
	Positive Ranks	9 ^b	10,44	94,00
	Ties	3 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. MODALS < TENSEb. MODALS > TENSEc. MODALS = TENSE

Test	Statistics ^b
------	-------------------------

	MODALS – TENSE
Z	-,370 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,711

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 41 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in tense and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,370, P is 0,711 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 42 -comparison of percentages of errors in tense and verb + Infinitive or gerund

Rank	KS		
	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE Negative Ranks	12 ^a	7,50	90,00
OR GERUND - TENSE Positive Ranks	7 ^b	14,29	100,00
Ties	2 ^c		
Total	21		

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < TENSE

b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > TENSE

c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = TENSE

Test Statistics ^b		
	VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - TENSE	
Z Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	-,201 ^a ,841	

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 42 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in tense and verbs + infinitive or gerund As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,201 P is 0,841 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

 Table 43 – comparison of percentages of errors in tense and Negation

Raiks				
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION -	Negative Ranks	11 ^a	8,82	97,00
TENSE	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	10,57	74,00
	Ties	3 ^c		
	Total	21		

Ranks

a. NEGATION < TENSE

b. NEGATION > TENSE

c. NEGATION = TENSE

Test Statistics^b

	NEGATION - TENSE
Z	-,501 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,616

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 43 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in tense and negation. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,501 P is 0,616 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 44 -comparison of percentages of errors of passive and prepositions

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PREPOSITIONS -	Negative Ranks	10 ^a	14,40	144,00
PASSIVE	Positive Ranks	11 ^b	7,91	87,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. PREPOSITIONS < PASSIVE

b. PREPOSITIONS > PASSIVE

c. PREPOSITIONS = PASSIVE

Test Statistics^b

	PREPOSITIO
	NS -
	PASSIVE
Z	-,991 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,322

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 44 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in passive and prepositions. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,991 P is 0,322 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

	Ran	ks		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS -	Negative Ranks	11 ^a	14,00	154,00
PASSIVE	Positive Ranks	8^{b}	4,50	36,00
	Ties	2 ^c		
	Total	21		

Table 45 -comparison of percentages of errors in passive and pronouns

a. PRONOUNS < PASSIVE

b. PRONOUNS > PASSIVE

c. PRONOUNS = PASSIVE

Test Statistics ^b		
	PRONOUNS - PASSIVE	
Z	-2,374 ^a	
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,018	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 45 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in pronouns and passive. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,374 P is 0,018 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of noun errors in passive is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors.

Table 46 - comparison of percentages of errors in passive and Modals

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS - PASSIVE	Negative Ranks	10 ^a	8,60	86,00
	Positive Ranks	4 ^b	4,75	19,00
	Ties	7 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. MODALS < PASSIVEb. MODALS > PASSIVEc. MODALS = PASSIVE

Test Sta	atistics ^b
----------	-----------------------

	MODALS - PASSIVE
Z	-2,103 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,035

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 46 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in passive and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -2,103 P is 0,035 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of errors in passive is significantly larger than the percentage of errors in modals.

Table 47 – comparison of percentages of errors in passive and verbs + infinitives or gerunds

	Rank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - PASSIVE	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	7,33	66,00
	Positive Ranks	4 ^b	6,25	25,00
	Ties	8 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND <PASSIVEb. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND >

PASSIVE

c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = PASSIVE

Test Statistics ^b			
	VERB +		
	INFINITIVE		
	OR		
	GERUND -		
	PASSIVE		
Z	-1,433 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,152		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 47 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in passive and verb + infinitive or gerund. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,433 P is 0,152 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 48 –comparison between percentages of errors in passive and negations

Kaliks					
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	
NEGATION -	Negative Ranks	10 ^a	7,25	72,50	
PASSIVE	Positive Ranks	3 ^b	6,17	18,50	
	Ties	8 ^c		t	
	Total	21			

Ranks

a. NEGATION < PASSIVE

b. NEGATION > PASSIVE

c. NEGATION = PASSIVE

Test S	Statistics ^b
--------	-------------------------

	NEGATION - PASSIVE
Z	-1,887 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,059

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 48 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in passive and verb, infinitive or gerund. As the table pictures, Z -test statistics is -1,887 P is 0,059 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 49 – comparison between percentages of errors in prepositions and pronouns

	Rank	S		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRONOUNS -	Negative Ranks	19 ^a	10,74	204,00
PREPOSITIONS	Positive Ranks	1 ^b	6,00	6,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

D 1

a. PRONOUNS < PREPOSITIONS

b. PRONOUNS > PREPOSITIONS

c. PRONOUNS = PREPOSITIONS

Test Statistics ^b				
	PRONOUNS			
	-			
	PREPOSITIO			
	NS			
Z	-3,696 ^a			
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,000			

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 49 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in prepositions and pronouns. As the table pictures, Z -test statistics is -3, 696, P is 0,000 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of prepositions is significantly larger than the percentage of pronoun errors.

Table 50 –compari	son of percentag	ges of preposition	ns and modals
-------------------	------------------	--------------------	---------------

	Kank	KS		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS -	Negative Ranks	15 ^a	11,00	165,00
PREPOSITIONS	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	11,00	66,00
	Ties	0 ^c		
	Total	21		

Ranks

a. MODALS < PREPOSITIONS

b. MODALS > PREPOSITIONS

c. MODALS = PREPOSITIONS

Test Statistics ^b				
	MODALS - PREPOSITIO NS			
Z	-1,721 ^a			
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,085			

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 50 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in prepositions and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,721, P is 0,085 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 51	-comparison of	percentages of	f errors in	prepositions a	nd Verb	+ infinitive or	gerund
I able 51	comparison or	percentages o		prepositions u			Soruna

Ranks						
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - PREPOSITIONS	Negative Ranks	15 ^a	10,47	157,00		
	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	12,33	74,00		
	Ties	0 ^c				
	Total	21				

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < PREPOSITIONSb. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > PREPOSITIONSc. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = PREPOSITIONS

Test Statistics ^b			
	VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - PREPOSITIO NS		
Z Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	-1,442 ^a ,149		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 51 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in prepositions and verb + infinitive or gerund. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,442, P is 0,149 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 52 –comparison of percentages of errors in prepositions and negations

		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION -	Negative Ranks	15 ^a	10,53	158,00
PREPOSITIONS	Positive Ranks	5 ^b	10,40	52,00
	Ties	1 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. NEGATION < PREPOSITIONS

b. NEGATION > PREPOSITIONS

c. NEGATION = PREPOSITIONS

Test Statistics ^b			
	NEGATION - PREPOSITIO NS		
Z	-1,979 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,048		

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 52 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in prepositions and negations. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,979, P is 0,048 which is less than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors, and the table of ranks shows that the percentage of prepositions is significantly larger than the percentage of negation errors.

Table 53-comparison of percentages of pronouns and modals

_	Rank	S		
	_	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
MODALS -	Negative Ranks	10 ^a	6,00	60,00
PRONOUNS	Positive Ranks	9 ^b	14,44	130,00
	Ties	2 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. MODALS < PRONOUNS

b. MODALS > PRONOUNS

c. MODALS = PRONOUNS

Test Statistics ^b			
	MODALS - PRONOUNS		
Z	-1,408 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,159		

- a. Based on negative ranks.
- b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 53 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in pronouns and modals. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,408, P is 0,159 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 54 –comparison of percentages of errors in pronouns and verb + infinitive or gerund

Kanks				
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - PRONOUNS	Negative Ranks	9 ^a	5,00	45,00
	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	13,00	91,00
	Ties	5 [°]		
	Total	21		

D 1

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < PRONOUNS

b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > PRONOUNS

c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = PRONOUNS

Test Statistics ^b			
	VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - PRONOUNS		
Z	-1,189 ^a		
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,234		

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 54 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in pronouns and verb + infinitive or gerund. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -1,189 P is 0,234 which is more

than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

 Table 55 – Comparison of percentages of errors in pronouns and Negations

	Rank	S		
	-	Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION -	Negative Ranks	10 ^a	5,80	58,00
PRONOUNS	Positive Ranks	7 ^b	13,57	95,00
	Ties	4 ^c		
	Total	21		

a. NEGATION < PRONOUNS

b. NEGATION > PRONOUNS

c. NEGATION = PRONOUNS

Test S	Statistics ^b
--------	-------------------------

	NEGATION - PRONOUNS
Z	-,876 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,381

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 55 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in pronouns and negations. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,876 P is 0,381 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is supported. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 56- comparison of percentages of errors in modals and verb + infinitive or gerund

Ranks				
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND - MODALS	Negative Ranks	7 ^a	6,57	46,00
	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	7,50	45,00
	Ties	8°		ı.
	Total	21		

a. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND < MODALS

b. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND > MODALS

c. VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND = MODALS

Test Statistics ^b		
	VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND – MODALS	
Z Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	-,035 ^a ,972	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 56 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in modals and verb + infinitive or gerund. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0,035P is 0,972 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

 Table 57- comparison of percentages of errors in modals and Negations

Ranks					
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	
NEGATION –	Negative Ranks	6 ^a	7,58	45,50	
MODALS	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	5,42	32,50	
	Ties	9 ^c			
	Total	21			

a. NEGATION < MODALSb. NEGATION > MODALSc. NEGATION = MODALS

Test Statistics^b

	NEGATION – MODALS
Z	-,510 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,610

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 57 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in modals and negations. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0, 510, P is 0,610 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

Table 58 - comparison of percentages of errors in verb + infinitive or gerund and negations

	Kallf	13		
		Ν	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
NEGATION - VERB +	Negative Ranks	7 ^a	7,71	54,00
INFINITIVE OR GERUND	Positive Ranks	6 ^b	6,17	37,00
	Ties	8 ^c		
	Total	21		

Dople

a. NEGATION < VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND b. NEGATION > VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND c. NEGATION = VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND

Test Statistics ^b		
	NEGATION - VERB + INFINITIVE OR GERUND	
Ζ	-,594 ^a	
Asymp. Sig. (2- tailed)	,552	

a. Based on positive ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 58 presents the results of comparison of percentages of errors in verb + infinitive or gerund and negations. As the table pictures, Z –test statistics is -0, 594, P is 0,552 which is more than the selected significance level of 0,05. That is null hypothesis about no significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors is rejected. There was a significant difference between the percentages of two types of errors.

The above illustrated tables show that there is no significant difference between the average percentages of errors in the categories of Articles and Inversion. On the other hand, the test shows that there is a significant difference between the average percentages of errors of those two categories (articles and inversion) and the remaining 9 categories. The test also shows that there are some differences among some of the remaining categories, but most of them are not significantly different from each other. It means that the average percentages of errors occurring in these categories are not significantly different – the difficulty level of such categories is not significantly different. As already mentioned, there is a significant difference among the categories of articles and inversion and the remaining 9 categories. With 95 percent confidence interval, these results suggest that the population of AUA students makes significantly more errors in the article and inversion usages than in any other category. Thus, the most frequently occurring errors are made in the articles and inversions. In the light of this finding, the remainder of this chapter is devoted to the explanation of the sources of those two – most frequently occurring error types.

4.3. Research Question 3

What are the major sources of the most frequently occurring syntactic errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners?

4.3.1. Errors in Inversion

As discussed above, the findings suggest that the population of AUA students has more difficulties and makes more errors in inversion, than in any other category, with the exception of articles. In the current data, three types of errors of inversion occurred.

4.3.1.1. Lack of inversion

In this type of errors, there was a lack of inversion in WH questions:

Example

"What mobile operators you know currently operating in Armenia?"

In order to find out the source of such an error, a contrastive analysis of Armenian and English needs to be undertaken. In Armenian, any type of questions can be made from the positive statement with the help of special intonation and stress. So, Armenian does not require inversion in order to change a statement into a question (see Papoyan & Badikyan 2003, pp. 69-71). Contrary to that, the grammar system of the English language requires inversion in questions, including WH questions (for a detailed explanation of WH questions, see Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman 1999, pp.259-271). Thus, the Armenian learner of English needs to learn and remember to use that rule which does not exist in his L1. However, in spoken production, when the learner does not have much time to construct his sentences, even if he knows the English rule, he may not be able to apply that rule and may transfer his L1 construction of changing a statement into a question. Not surprisingly, the participants of this study instead of using inversion in their WH questions used the same stress and intonation that they would use in Armenian. Thus, the source of this error – lack of inversion in WH questions – may be the L1

negative transfer from Armenian into English. However, it should be noted that this study is concerned with spoken data, and, in spoken language, the native speakers of English also often do not use inversion in questions and WH questions. So, this type of deviation from the English grammatical rule may be caused also by the nature of spoken production.

4.3.1.2. Wrong inversion

In this case, the students use inversion in WH questions but not completely correctly.

Example:

How did it originated?

These cases show that the students are aware of the rule of inversion in wh questions but have not internalize the rule completely and do not know or do not remember that bear infinitive needs to be used in these questions. They make use of the auxiliary did and put the verb in past simple. Thus, this might be considered an error caused by the complex rules of the second language itself. The rule of using the verb in past simple is overgeneralized and used in cases when there is a restriction to that rule. The source of this type of error may be considered the intralingual transfer.

4.3.1.3. Overuse of Inversion

In this type of errors, the participants used inversion when not needed, i.e. in WH imbedded questions.

Example:

First of all, let me > let us understand what is flag desecration amendment...

This type of errors is probably not caused by L1 negative transfer because, as mentioned above, Armenian does not use inversion as a means of changing a statement into a question. Thus, the source of error lies in the English itself. This is an error of intralingual transfer – transfer within the L2 itself. In this case, the participants overgeneralize the rule that requires inversion in WH questions. They have learned this rule but do not know or forget that the rule of inversion has restrictions and does not apply to imbedded WH questions. Thus, they apply their previous knowledge of English and make an error of overgeneralization.

4.3.2. Articles

The quantitative analyses suggest that the most frequent errors occur in the category of articles, with the exception of inversion. It should be noted that other studies also have shown that articles are the most difficult area for the Armenian EFL learners (Aleksanyan, 2010; Celce-Murcia, 2006).

In the current data, 507 article errors were made, 194 of which were the errors in using the indefinite article a/n, and the remaining 313 errors were made in the usage of the definite article the. The participants made errors of omission, overuse and substitution of the definite and indefinite articles.

4.3.2.1. Overuse of the definite article

In these data, there were 58 cases of errors in overuse of the definite article /the/.

Through the examination of the errors and the English and Armenian language rules, different sources of those errors may be suggested (for an overview of the Armenian article system, see Sargsyan, 2004, pp. 24-25; Asatryan, 2002). One of the sources is possibly the negative transfer of participants' L1. In some cases, the participants used the definite article /the/b before the proper nouns, violating the rule of the English language which does not permit such a usage (for an overview of the English article system, see Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman 1999, pp. 271-297):

Example:

The slogan of the (the not needed) BMV

It would be impossible to imagine that the (the not needed) Barak Obama, for all his eloquence...

The Armenian language, however, does require a definite article before the proper nouns if the latter are used in certain cases, including the nominative case. In the second example illustrated above, the Proper noun "Barak Obama" is used in the nominative case. Possibly, the participants, not knowing the rule of English, transfer their L1 rule to English. However, in the first example demonstrated above, the proper noun "BMV" is used in the possessive-genitive Case. In this case, the Armenian language also does not allow the use of the definite article with proper nouns used in the possessive-genitive Case. At the same time, it should be noted that the Armenian language does not permit the use of the definite article with common nouns used in the possessive case. Thus, the source of this error may lie not in the Armenian language, but in the participants' interlanguage. The English article system proves to be one of the most problematic areas for EFL learners of different L1 backgrounds (see Bataineh, 2002; Wong & Quek, 2007; among others). Such cases probably show the gab in the participants' knowledge of the article system of English. For example, the following examples may suggest that the participants are not aware of the rule of English which does not permit a definite article before generic nouns.

Example:

The (the not needed) many studies have shown that...

It will not change the (the not needed) people's fixed views and disreputable behavior... Others argue that the (the not needed) Western society is becoming...

For the first two examples, the Armenian language also does not permit a definite article with generic nouns. In those cases, the source of error probably lies in the complexity of the article system of English and the participants' interlanguage. As English most of the time requires either a definite or an indefinite article, the participants may suppose that in these cases an article is also needed and, not knowing the restriction to the rule of definite article usage, make

overgeneralizations and use the article when not needed. The source of error in overuse of the definite article in the third example, however, possibly lies also in the L1 transfer. In the third example, the Armenian language requires to use a definite article with "Western society" which would not be used in Armenian as a generic noun.

4.3.2.2. Omission of the Definite Article

In the current data, there were 240 cases of omission of the definite article /the/. One of the sources of this type of error may be the intralingual transfer, namely – overgeneralization. The following examples illustrate some of the cases when the participants omitted the definite article before proper nouns:

Example:

.. The president of (the needed) United States of America.

(The needed) Czech Republic

(The needed) Republic of Armenia

Possibly, the participants are aware of the English language rule which does not permit the usage of a definite article with proper nouns. However, they may not be aware or in uncontrolled and quick speech forget about the restriction to that rule which requires using a definite article with some proper nouns, such as "the United States of America", "the Republic of Armenia" etc.. As already mentioned, the Armenian language requires a definite article with proper nouns in nominative and some other cases. So, the source of this type of error cannot be the L1 transfer. Rather, the source of this kind of errors is the intralingual transfer.

However, there are many cases of omission of the definite article the causes of which is difficult to detect. In the following examples, both the Armenian and the English language require a definite article which was omitted in the participants' speech.

Example:

(The needed) First problem...

As I research Also (the needed) situation in Russia...

In this step we see some factors like (the needed) cost of (the needed) product, (the needed) characteristic of the advertisement of (the needed) product, packaging...

The Armenian language does not permit the use of a definite article with a noun used in a possessive case. So, the errors in cases when the noun is used in the possessive case (of product) may be caused by L1 transfer. However, in the other cases, the noun is used in nominative case and again the definite article is omitted. These cases cannot be caused by L1 transfer as the Armenian language would require a definite article. At the same time, in the third example, one of the nouns in the possessive case is used with an article, the second noun, again in the possessive case, is used without an article. There were many such examples of inconsistency in the article usage in the current data. These examples show that the participants' interlanguage is not completely formed and they are not sure of the rules and do not master the complex English article system. At the same time, those examples may suggest that the participants know the rules but not always manage to use the rules in their speech because of the time constraints, and, probably, because of the lack of practice of speaking.

4.3.2.3. Overuse of the Indefinite Article

From 194 errors in the use of the indefinite article a/n, 41 are cases of overuse. One of the causes of such an error may lie in the nature of spoken production. Very often the participants use the sound /a/ in their speech. This gives them time to think and construct their sentences. Of course, such cases cannot be considered as errors. However, our personal experience shows that Armenian EFL learners make use of this sound in cases when they are not sure whether an indefinite article is needed or not. Unfortunately, we also often used this technique of using a sound like the indefinite article /a/ in cases when we were not sure. That sound can be interpreted by the listener both as a redundancy and as an article. Thus, those cases could not be ignored and put aside by us. For that reason, we asked a linguist and a native speaker to listen to those cases

and give their interpretation. Most of the interpretations of the two raters correlated. We counted as errors only those cases for which both the raters were certain of the intention of using an article. This type of errors is probably caused by the learners' communicative strategies which may both help and cause erroneous structures, as in the current case.

Example:

Free speech is only a (a not needed) symbolic conduct and...

It is possible to expect that the participants might not be sure whether an indefinite article is needed or not. So, they decide to use a sound which can be counted as both an article and a redundancy. However, there were many cases in which it was certainly clear that the participants surely intended to use an indefinite article. Many of those cases were also erroneous. The source of the errors in the following examples lies probably in the English language: Examples:

The existence of legal frameworks for business and for a (a not needed) professional experience. This topic gave a (a not needed) rise to various interpretations...

In the Armenian language, the notion of indefinite article is connoted either by the indefinite pronoun /MI/ (one) originated from the numeral 1, or by 0 article. In the examples illustrated above and in many other cases in the data, the Armenian language does not permit the usage of the Armenian indefinite pronoun /MI/. So this error cannot be caused by the L1 transfer. The source of this type of errors might be in the English article system. The usages of the indefinite article demonstrated above are erroneous because, according to the rules of English, no indefinite article is used before non-count nouns. However, the participants say "a money" etc... Probably they have learned that the English language requires an indefinite article before nouns which are not used as definite nouns. However, they might not be aware of the restriction to that rule which

does not permit the usage of indefinite articles with non-count nouns. Thus, this type of erroneous usages may be caused by intralingual transfer – overgeneralization.

4.3.2.4. Omission of the Indefinite Article

In the data analyzed, there were 138 cases of omission of the indefinite article a/n. most of these errors may be caused by L1 transfer. As already mentioned, the Armenian language has two options of connoting indefiniteness: in the first case, the indefiniteness is connoted by no use of any article – 0 article is used. In the second case, the notion of indefiniteness may be conveyed with the usage of the indefinite pronoun /MI/ (1). However, the use of the indefinite pronoun is not obligatory; it is used not to show, but to emphasize the indefiniteness. Contrary to that, in the English language, the use of indefinite article is obligatory in the appropriate context and its omission is considered an error. So, many errors of this type, as demonstrated in the following examples, may be caused by L1 transfer.

Examples:

When you come to (a needed) shop ...

As a son for (a needed) white woman and a black man,....

However, there might be another source of this type of errors. For example, the errors in the following examples may be caused both by L1 and intralingual transfer:

Examples:

Universities had failed to take seriously their responsibility to instill (a needed) sense of ethics...

... Uncertainties of (an needed) accounting education...

An EFL learner, who has learned that no indefinite article is used before non-count nouns, may not be sure whether the words "sense", "education" etc. are count or non-count nouns. For example, the word "education" is a non-count noun in Armenian so the omission of the indefinite article may be caused by L1 transfer. At the same time, that same word is an abstract noun in English, and, according to the English language rules, no indefinite article is used with abstract nouns, i.e. light. Thus, the participants may know the rule and not the restriction of the rule; they may not know that with this particular abstract noun – education - an indefinite article is needed.

4.3.2.5. Substitution of the Indefinite Article

There were some cases when the indefinite article an was substituted with the indefinite article a. it is a developmental error that is common to EFL learners of different L1 backgrounds. Many studies have shown that the marked items are more difficult to learn (or probably to use) than the unmarked ones (for detailed explanation see Gas & Selinker, 2008, p. 145; Eckman, 1981). When the learner acquires the unmarked form /a/, he may use it also instead of the marked form /an/. The following is an example of such an error:

Example:

Views vary whether flag-burning is a (should be an) expression of free speech...

Surprisingly, there were two cases of the opposite phenomenon – when the indefinite article /a/ was substituted with the indefinite article /an/:

Examples:

The first is setting an (should be a) fixed point as a target...

The next is setting an (should be a) corridor,...

Both these errors are made by the same participant. However uncommon, some studies have shown that sometimes such cases may occur as well (discussed in Gas & Selinker 2008, p. 145-146).

In the current data, there were also cases of substitution of the indefinite article with the definite article and vice versa. It was not possible to systematically analyze those cases and suggest

possible sources of such errors as there were only a few of them which did not yield enough information to make any judgments.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

This chapter provides the summery of the research findings, discusses the pedagogical implications and applications of the findings, and the theoretical conclusions drawn from the study. The chapter also presents the limitations of the study and offers suggestions and areas for further research.

5.1. Conclusion

This study aimed to identify, categorize and describe the errors in the English spoken production of Armenian EFL learners. The study also attempted to identify and explain the sources of the most frequently occurring errors. 11 categories of errors were identified, and the sources of two of them were proposed and explained. The quantitative analyses suggested that the most frequent errors occur in article and inversion usage. The participants made errors of overuse, omission, and substitution of the definite and indefinite articles. In WH questions, three types of errors occurred – wrong inversion, omission of inversion, and overuse of inversion in WH imbedded questions. The contrastive and error analysis revealed that the sources of errors in these categories may be the interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, as well as the communication and learning strategies employed by the learners. The findings reveal that an error may be caused by two factors simultaneously; for example, an overuse of the indefinite article may be caused both by the L1 negative transfer and intralingual transfer, namely – overgeneralization.

5.2. Implications of the Study

Teachers need to be aware of the types and sources of errors in their students' speech. Unfortunately, the English speaking courses are not common in Armenian EFL settings. The Armenian EFL learners do not have many opportunities to practice speaking in English, and, even if they are aware of the rule, they may make errors because of the lack of practice of speaking. If the teachers know the potential difficulties and errors of their students and the probable sources of those errors, they can better provide for learning and focus on the areas where attention is needed. The understanding of causes of errors may help the teachers better explain the rules of the L2 and the differences of the L1 and L2 to their students. This may help the teachers explain to their students not only where the error occurs, but also why it occurs. In this case, the students will also be aware of both their errors and the causes of those errors. This might help the students to diminish their errors consciously, i.e. they will be aware of their errors caused by interlingual and intralingual transfer. They will also recognize that some of their learning strategies cause errors and develop new strategies. Finally, the findings of this study could be utilized by curriculum developers and could be used in effective teaching materials. This study may also suggest insights into some of the processes of SLA. For example, in the current data, many participants made errors and than self-corrected themselves. This confirms the claims that both the correct and incorrect forms may coexist together, and, the same learner may be in one developmental stage with regards to one area, and in another stage with regards to another area of the language (Brown, 2007).

5.3. Limitations of the Study

The results of this study should be taken with caution in light of the following factors: 1. The participants of this study were not selected randomly; all the participants were newly admitted to AUA and had a 550 or higher score on TOEFL. This means that the results of the study can be generalized only to the population of AUA students with high intermediate or advance proficiency level in English. Armenian EFL learners with other proficiency levels in English might have made more or other types of errors.

103

2. Some types of syntactic errors were not investigated because of the complexity of error identification and the impossibility of reconstructing the correct sentences. For example, errors in word order, using a wrong part of speech, and adverbial of purpose were not considered.

3. This study was concerned with the frequencies of errors and not the error gravity or seriousness of each type of errors.

4. In error explanation, the most recognizable sources were suggested; however, there may be other sources of errors which might not be counted for and discovered in this study because of the difficulty to include all the variables.

5.4. Suggestions for Further Research

This study was concerned only with syntactic errors. It would be helpful and interesting to do an error and contrastive analyses of errors in lexical, semantic and discourse levels of the language. The aim of this study was the explanation of possible sources of the most frequently occurring errors. However, it would be helpful to diagnose and investigate the sources of the other types of errors, e.g. errors in noun agreement, etc... Finally, this study analyzed the semi-prepared speech of the participants. Another study could be carried out to investigate the errors in unprepared spoken production. Such studies might reveal helpful information on errors, their sources, and the complex phenomenon of interlanguage; this information may be helpful in the teaching process both for the teachers and the learners.

104

Bibliography

Aleksanyan, R. (2010). Analysis of the Errors in Armenian Speakers' English Writings: The Role of the Negative L1 Transfer. Unpublished MA Thesis, Yerevan, American University of Armenia.

Asatryan, M. (2002).

[Modern Armenian language].

Yerevan: Yerevan State University Press.

Banathy,B.,Trager,E.,&Waddle,C. (1966). *The use of contrastive data in foreign language coarse development*. In A. Valdman (Ed.), *Trends in Language Teaching* (pp. 35-56). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bataineh, R.F. (2002). A case study of the impact of the native language of an adult Arab learner of English in an English-speaking environment. Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics 28(1): 5-26.

Burt, M. & Kiparsky, C. (1972). *The gooficon: A repair manual for English*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House. In Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching (5th edition)*. NY: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching (5th edition)*. NY: Pearson Education.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2006). An error analysis of the IEP placement and exit essays of low proficiency English learners at AUA. Unpublished manuscript, American University of Armenia.
Celce-Murcia, M. & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). The grammar book. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Celce-Murcia M. & Hawkins B. (1985). Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and interlanguage analysis. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), Beyond basics: Issues an research in TESOL (pp. 64-66).
Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Corder, P. (1981). Error analysis and interlanguage. Oxford: OUP.

Corder, S. (1973). Introducing applied linguistics. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguine Books.

Corder, S. (1971). *Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis*. International Review of Applied Linguistics 9: 147-159.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1974). *A new perspective on the creative construction processes in child second language acquisition*. Language Learning 24.

Duskova, L. (1969). *On sources of errors in foreign language learning*. International Review of Applied Linguistics 7: 11-36.

Eckman, F. (2004). *From phonetic differences to constraint rankings*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 26: 513-430.

Eckman, F. (1981). *On the naturalness of interlanguage phonological rules*. Language Learning 31: 195-216.

Eckman, F. (1977). *Markedness and the contrastive analysis hypothesis*. Language Learning 27: 315-330.

Ellis, R. (Ed.). (2000). *Learning a second language through interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Farhady, H. & Delshad, S. (2006). *An Introduction to Methodology for TEFL/TESL*. Tehran: Rahnama Publication.

Fisiak, J. (1990). *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics* 26. Poznan: Adam Mickewicz University.

Fisiak, J. (1985). *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics* 20. Poznan: Adam Mickewicz University.

Fisiak, J. (1982). *Papers and studies in contrastive linguistics* 14. Poznan: Adam Mickewicz University.

Fisiak, J. (1981). *Contrastive linguistics and the language teacher*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.Fries, C. C. (1961). *Advances in linguistics*. College English 23: 30-37.

Fries, C. C. (1957). Structural linguistics and language teaching. The Classical Journal 52: 265-

268.

Fries, C. C. (1947). *Implications of modern linguistic science*. College English 8: 314-320.
Fries, C. C. (1945) *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*, Ann Arbor:
University of Michigan Press, In Lado, R. (1957) *Linguistics across cultures. Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Michigan: Ann Arbor.

Gass, S. Selinker, L. (2008). Second language acquisition: An introductory course (3rd ed.). NY: Routledge.

Gass, S. Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course (2nd ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Han, Z.-H., & Selinker, L. (2005). *Fossizilatio in L2 learners*. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 455-470). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: exploring error analysis*. London: Longman.

Jaszczolt, K. (1995). *Typology of contrastive studies: Specialization, progress, and applications*. Language Teaching 28: 1-15.

Kellerman, E. (1995). Cross-linguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere? Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 15, 125-150.

Kellerman, E. & Sharwood-Smith, (1986). *Cross-linguistic Influence in second language acquisition*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Keshavarz, H. (2008). Contrastive analysis and error analysis. Tehran: Rahnama Press.

Kleinmann, H. (1977). *Avoidance behavior in adult second language acquisition*. Language Learning 27: 93-107.

Lado, R. (1979). *Language and thought: Effect of translation vs interpretation*. TESOL Quarterly 13: 565-571.

Lado, R. (1957) *Linguistics across cultures. Applied linguistics for language teachers*, Michigan: Ann Arbor.

Lado, R. (1957). Sentence structure. College Composition and Communication 8: 12-16.

Lado, R. (1956). A comparison of the sound systems of English and Spanish. Hispania 39: 26-29.

Lennon, P. (1991). Error: some problems of definition, identification, and distinction. Applied

Linguistics 12: 180-196.

Littlewood, W. (2004). *Second Language Learning*. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Littlewood, W. (1984). Foreign and second language learning. Cambridge: CUP.

Long, M. (2003). Stabilization and fossilization in interlanguage development. In C. Doughty &

M. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 487-535). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Major, R. & Faudree, M. (1996). *Markedness universals and acquisition of voicing contrasts by Korean speakers of English*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18: 69-90.

Nemser, W. (1971). *Approximative systems of foreign language learners*. International Review of Applied Linguistics 9: 115-123.

Odlin, T. (2003). *Cross-linguistic influence*. In Doughty, C. & Long, M.(ed.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Malden: Blackwell publishing.

Oller, J. & Ziahosseiny S. (1970). *The contrastive analysis hypothesis and spelling errors*. Language Learning 20: 183-189.

Pallant, J. (2007). SPSS. Survival manual. Sydney: Ligare Book Printer.

Papoyan, A. & Badikyan, Kh. (2003). *[The syntax of modern Armenian]*. Yerevan: Yerevan State University Press.

Prator, C. (1967). *Hierarchy of difficulty*. Unpublished classroom lectures, University of California, Los Angeles. In Brown, H. D. (2007), *Principles of language learning and teaching (5th edition)*. NY: Pearson Education.
Rutherford, W. (1982). *Markedness in second language acquisition*. Language Learning 32: 85-108.

Sargsyan, A. (2004). *A Short Guide to Modern Armenian Language*. Yerevan: Yerevan State University Press.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). Introducing second language acquisition. Cambridge: CUP.

Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. Language Learning 24: 205-214.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics 10: 209-231.

Sheen, R. (1996). *The advantage of exploiting contrastive analysis in teaching and learning a foreign language*. International Review of Applied Linguistics 34: 183-197.

Stockwell, R., Bowen, J., & Martin, J.(1965). *The grammatical structures of English and Spanish*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tarone, E. (1981). *Some thoughts on the notion of "communication strategy"*. TESOL Quarterly 15: 285-295.

Taylor, B. (1975). *The use of overgeneralization and transfer learning strategies by elementary and intermediate students in ESL*. Language Learning 25: 73-107.

Trawinski, M. (2005). *An Outline of Second Language Acquisition Theories*. Krakow: Wydawnictwo Naukowe AP.

Wardhaugh, B. (1970). The contrastive analysis hypothesis. TESOL Quarterly 4: 123-130.

Whitman, R. & Jackson, K. (1972). *The unpredictability of contrastive analysis*. Language Learning 22: 29-41.

Wolfe, D. L. (1967). "Some Theoretical Aspects of Language Learning and Language Teaching". Language Learning 17(4): 173 -188.

Wong, B. & Quek, S. (2007). *Acquisition of the English definite article by Chinese and Malay ESL learners*. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 4(2): 210–234.

Appendix *Examples of Errors*

Articles

Definite articles *Overuse* the (the not needed) many studies have shown that .. So for a politician it is a not very long period of the (the not needed) time.

Omission (the needed) First problem in this step we see some factors like (the needed) cost of (the needed) product, (the needed) characteristic of the advertisement of (the needed) product, packaging, .. An amendment to (the needed) constitution means ..

Substitution The instead of a let's imagine the (should be a) situation: we have a very nice shop ...

Indefinite article *Omission* when you come to (a needed?) shop uncertainties of (an needed) accounting education .. if not (a needed) professional looks at this table, ..

Overuse

and this is important not only for people just like a (a not needed) consumers, The existence of legal frameworks for business and for a (a not needed) professional experience, ...

Substitution:

An instead of a The first is setting an (should be a) fixed point as a target, .. the next is setting an (should be a) corridor, ..

a instead of an

views varry whether flag-burning is a (should be an) expression of free speech ...

Inversion

Overuse first of all, let me > let us understand what is flag desecration amendment .. Do you know what is amendment, sorry?

Omission "What mobile operators you know currently operating in Armenia?"

Wrong Inversion

How did it originated?

Modals

Wrong formation

advertising must promote the sale of a commodity or service, to advance an idea or to bring some changes in taste and fashion.

Wrong usage

Concerning his political career, I should confess that he started it not very long ago.

Tense

Wrong usage

At that period of time, there was a sense that America was not ready to accept a black politician and it would be a hard time for black politicians to win the votes of the white population, well, because of the racial resentments and because of the sense among whites that black politicians will (wrong tense use , should be would,) not share their values and Interest.

Wrong formation so this (is needed) all which I can say for you,

Passive

This survey carried out (should be was carried out) .. his son also (is needed) considered to be a Muslim.

Prepositions

Overuse ... his public perception changes at (at not needed) every moment.

Substitution and on some of them we'll Speak (should be about).

Omission First, I would like to tell (about needed) the types of setting inflation target ...

Sv agreement

This (s and copula agreement) Are .. this is (should be these are, sv and subject compliment agreement) may be two problems...

everyone who want (sv agreement)

Negation

the article not have been Completed, .. but for countries like Armenia, Azerbajdzhan, that have not good financianal > developed financianal institutions, ..

Agreement in the Noun Phrase

This Arguments this Questions some types of question Armenian consumers have may be the two big problem. That goals

Pronouns

if every employee cares about its own little aim...

Verb + Infinitive or Gerund

And Hunanyan offered the journalists (to needed, infinitive)leave the building, (to needed, infinitive) leave the hall and carry out the woonded deputies.