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1. INTRODUCTION

English has undoubtedly become today’s global lingua franca. Apart from the 350-450 million of native speakers of English there are also about 800 million of people who speak it as a foreign language (James, 1998: 25). This suggests that most of the interaction in English takes place among its non-native speakers (Seidlhofer 2005).

English as a lingua franca (ELF) therefore serves as “a contact language between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom English is the chosen foreign language of communication” (Firth 1996: 240 cited in Seidlhofer 2005: 339). Other terms used for this phenomenon are ‘English as an international language’, English as a global language’ and ‘English as a world language’, but as Seidlhofer argues, the preferred term when referring to people from different mother-tongue and cultural backgrounds is ‘English as a lingua franca’ (Seidlhofer 2005: 339).

Seidlhofer (2005: 339) also claims that current English is being shaped by both its native and non-native speakers, the fact which is quite paradoxical and calls for further study of ELF. And this is exactly what led me to the idea of analysing non-native speakers’ English, i.e. English as a lingua franca.

In this thesis WE will provide a theoretical background for an analysis of ELF or ‘English as a second/foreign language’ (ESL/EFL) on the level of lexis and grammar, with attention to learners’ errors influenced by their mother tongue (MT). We will supply some of the types of errors with examples from our own collected data, demonstrating that MT transfer is a frequent, but not the only source of errors in ESL/EFL. WE will not take into account examples on the level of phonology, although We know that it is the level on which the MT transfer is most apparent.
In this chapter we will give a short overview of how the Contrastive Analysis movement was formed, discuss the related terminology and then follow the development of the Contrastive Analysis hypothesis through the three versions until it was displaced by other theories.

2.1 History

Contrastive Analysis has been the first major theory dealing with the relationship between the languages a learner acquires or masters. Linguists have always been interested in comparing and contrasting different language systems and first pioneering works appeared at the end of the nineteenth century (James 1981). The term ‘Contrastive Study’ was coined by Whorf in 1941; before that this discipline had been called ‘Comparative Linguistics’ or ‘Comparative Studies’ (Fisiak 1981).

After the Second World War the interest in teaching foreign languages increased in the USA and many linguists were concerned with pedagogically oriented contrastive studies, especially in trying to predict learning difficulties on the basis of comparing the native language with the foreign language being learnt, and also with the study of bilingualism and language contact phenomena. It was believed that pointing to the similarities of the two languages compared will make the process of foreign language learning easier for the learner. Robert Lado’s formulation of the ‘Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis’ in his Linguistics across Cultures (1957) is considered the greatest contribution in the field of contrastive studies (Fisiak 1981, James 1981 and Krzeszowski 1990).

2.2 Definitions and Terminology

Fisiak defines contrastive linguistics as “a subdiscipline 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” (Fisiak et al. 1978 cited in Fisiak 1981: 1).

As Krzeszovski explains (1990: 11), there is, unfortunately, not much consistency in the terminology related to contrastive linguistics. However, the terms ‘contrastive linguistics’ and ‘contrastive studies’ are most often used.

The term ‘contrastive linguistics’ is usually used to refer to the whole field of cross-language comparison, slightly focusing on the instances related to the theory or methodology of comparisons. Another term, ‘contrastive analysis’, can be used interchangeably with the above
mentioned terms, but linguists tend to use it to refer to the comparison proper. And finally, ‘contrastive grammar’ refers to “the product of contrastive studies, as a bilingual grammar highlighting the differences across languages” (Krzeszowski 1990: 11).

2.3 Division of Contrastive Studies

Fisiak (1981: 2-3) divides contrastive studies into theoretical and applied: “Theoretical contrastive studies give an exhaustive account of the differences and similarities between two or more languages, provide an adequate model for the comparison, and determine how and which elements are comparable …” They are language independent, which means that they do not investigate how a particular category or item present in language A is presented in language B, but “they look for the realization of an universal category X in both A and B” (Fisiak 1981: 2).

Applied contrastive studies belong to applied linguistics. Fisiak (1981: 2-3) explains that “drawing on the findings of theoretical contrastive studies they provide a framework for the comparison of languages, selecting whatever information is necessary for a specific purpose …” The main focus of applied contrastive studies is “the problem of how a universal category X, realized in language A as Y, is rendered in language B, and what may be the possible consequence on this for a field of application” (Fisiak 1981: 2-3). They are also concerned with “the identification of probable areas of difficulty in another language where, for example, a given category is not represented in the surface and interference is likely to occur” (Fisiak, 1981: 3). So they are rather interested in the surface representation of language.

Being a part of applied linguistics, applied contrastive studies depend on several other disciplines, including theoretical, descriptive and comparative linguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, didactics and psychology of learning and teaching (Krzeszowski 1990).

2.4 Formulating Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) was widely accepted in the 1950s and 1960s USA and its original purpose was purely pedagogical. The teaching method which used the CAH as its theory of learning was the audiolingual method.

Based on behaviorist and structuralist theories, the basic assumption for this hypothesis was that “the principal barrier to second language acquisition is the interference of the first language system with the second language system …” and “… that second language learning basically involved the overcoming of the differences between the two linguistic systems – the native and target languages” (Brown 1980: 148). The term ‘interference’ here refers to “any influence from the L1 which would have an effect on the acquisition of L2” (Powell, 1998: 2). we will further discuss the term ‘interference’ in chapter 3.4.
The assumptions about L1 interference were supported by the evidence from speakers’ performance in their second language. As Brown states, “it is quite common, for example, to detect certain foreign accents and to be able to infer, from the speech of the learner alone, where the learner comes from” (1980: 149).

Lado’s practical findings were based on his own experience and family background. Being an immigrant to the USA and a native speaker of Spanish, he observed what difficulties his Spanish-speaking parents had with learning English and how interference was evident in their speech.

In the preface to *Linguistics across Cultures*, Robert Lado explains:

> The plan of this book rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty in learning, and those that will not cause difficulty, by comparing systematically the language and the culture to be learned with the native language and culture of the student. (Lado 1957: vii cited in Brown 1980: 149)

Later in the same book he claims

> 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. The teacher who has made a comparison of a foreign language with the native language of the student will know better what the real learning problems are and can better provide for teaching them. (Lado 1957: 2 cited in Fisiak 1981: 4)

This formulation of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis was later called by Ronald Wardhaugh ‘the strong version’ of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Brown 1980: 157).

Another linguist supporting the strong version of the CAH was Fries. In his opinion, “the most effective [teaching] materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with parallel description of the native language of the learner” (Fries 1945: 9 cited in Powell 1998: 1).

Although the practical process of contrasting languages is not the aim of this paper, we are going to give a brief outline of the procedure used, as Ellis (1994: 307) mentions it. The procedure involved four stages:

1. description (i.e. the two languages were formally described)
2. selection (i.e. certain items or areas were selected for comparison)
3. comparison (i.e. finding similar and different items)
4. prediction (i.e. in which areas the errors will most probably occur)
Wardhaugh believed that the strong version was “unrealistic and impracticable”, since “at the very least, this version 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” (Wardhaugh 1970: 125 cited in Brown 1980: 157).

2.5 Moderating Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

As a reaction to the criticism of the strong version of the CAH, Wardhaugh offered a ‘weak version’.

The weak version does not imply the a priori prediction of certain fine degrees of difficulty. It recognizes the significance of interference across languages, the fact that such interference does exist and can explain difficulties, but it also recognizes that linguistic difficulties can be more profitably explained a posteriori – after the fact (Brown 1980: 157).

Thus it has rather explanatory power, helping the teachers of foreign languages understand their students’ sources of errors.

In the 1970s, Oller and Ziahosseiny proposed a compromise between the two versions of the CAH and called it a ‘moderate version’. Their theory was based on their research of spelling errors in learners of English as L2 which showed that spelling errors were more common among those learners who used a Roman script in their native language (e.g. Spanish or French) than among those who used a non-Roman script (e.g. Arabic or Chinese). However, the strong version of the CAH would predict the contrary, i.e. more difficulties on the part of the learners who had to acquire a new writing system (Brown 1980).

Brown (1980: 159) concludes that interference is more likely to occur when there is similarity between the items to be learned and already known items than in the case of learning items which are entirely new to the learner. He also points to the fact that most of the errors committed by L2 learners are ‘intralingual’ errors, i.e. errors which result from L2 itself and not from L1.

Whitman and Jackson carried out a study in which predictions made in four separate contrastive analyses by different linguists were used to design a test of English grammar which was given to 2,500 Japanese learners of English as L2. After comparing the results of the test to the predictions based on the four contrastive analyses, Whitman and Jackson found out that they differed a lot. 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” (Whitman and Jackson 1972 cited in Brown 1980: 158).
Besides the problem of inappropriate predictions, Towel and Hawkins (1994: 18-19) state two other problems. One of them is that “not all areas of similarity between an L1 and an L2 lead to immediate positive transfer” (1994: 19). Towel and Hawkins support this argument by the findings of Odlin’s study in which L1 Spanish learners of L2 English omitted the copula ‘be’ at the early stages of learning regardless the fact that Spanish also has a copula verb adequate to English ‘be’ and thus the positive transfer was possible. However, it didn’t happen. The other problem, they argue, is that only a small number of errors committed by L2 learners could be unambiguously attributed to transfer from L1.

Thus, the strong version of the CAH has been proved inadequate, except for the phonological component of language, where it is quite successful in predicting the interference between the L1 and L2 in pronunciation in the early stages of L2 acquisition. Dulay, Burt and Krashen similarly conclude that “… present research results suggest that the major impact the first language has on second language acquisition may have to do with accent, not with grammar or syntax” (1982: 96).

The weak version is not satisfactory because it is only able to offer an explanation for certain errors. The only version which remains acceptable is the moderate version. However, its findings as presented by Oller and Ziahosseiny are in contradiction with Lado’s original idea.

This doesn’t mean that the idea of L1 interference was completely rejected, but the CAH is applicable in practice only as a part of Error Analysis, which will be discussed later.

Selected Papers:


2. Lewis Mukatash. Some Remarks on Arabic English Contrastive Studies
3. INTERLANGUAGE THEORY

This chapter is dedicated to Interlanguage theory or hypothesis, which arose as a reaction to the CAH. We will explain how the concept of interlanguage emerged and how it developed and was understood by different linguists. The focus will be on how a learner’s L2 system develops and how transfer and interference are related to this issue.

3.1 The Birth of Interlanguage

The CAH focused on the influence of L1 on the emerging L2 system and stressed the similarities and differences between the L1 and L2. The Interlanguage theory, which is a reaction to the CAH, basically understands second language learning as “a creative process of constructing a system in which the learner is consciously testing hypotheses about the target language from a number of possible sources of knowledge …” (Brown 1980: 162); these sources include, among other factors, both L1 and L2.

The term ‘interlanguage’ was first used by Selinker in 1969 in reference to “the interim grammars constructed by second-language learners in their way to the target language” (McLaughlin 1987: 60). However, it was Nemser who in the 1960s first mentioned ‘deviant’ learner language: “Learner speech at a given time is the patterned product of a linguistic system distinct from [NL] and [TL] and internally structured” (Nemser 1971: 116 cited in Powell 1998: 3). And, finally, it was Corder who made the whole issue important.

In McLaughlin (1987: 60) we read that the term ‘interlanguage’ can mean two things: “(1) the learner’s system at a single point in time and (2) the range of interlocking systems that characterizes the development of learners over time”. Therefore we think that one’s interlanguage is different from one’s mother tongue and target language as well. It is, as James (1998: 3) suggests, a system which holds a half-way position between knowing and not knowing the TL.

3.2 Selinker’s View of Interlanguage

In Selinker’s view, interlanguage is “a separate linguistic system resulting from learner’s attempted production of the target language norm” (McLaughlin 1987: 60-61). McLaughlin (1987: 61) also gives Selinker’s belief that interlanguage was “the product of five central cognitive processes involved in second-language learning”: (1) language transfer, i.e. transfer from the L1; (2) transfer of training, i.e. some features transferred from the training process; (3) strategies of second-language learning, i.e. an approach to the material taught; (4) strategies of second-language communication, i.e. those ways learners use to communicate with L2 speakers; and (5) overgeneralization of the target language linguistic material.
Selinker also believed that the development of interlanguage was different from the first-language development because of “the likelihood of fossilization in the second language” (McLauglin 1987: 61). Fossilization can be basically defined as the state when a learner’s interlanguage does not develop anymore, no matter how long the learner is exposed to the target language.

Based on the analysis of children’s speech, Selinker found a “definite systematicity in the interlanguage”, which was evidenced by certain cognitive strategies: language transfer, overgeneralization of target language rules and simplification. So his view of interlanguage is “an interim grammar that is a single system composed of rules that have been developed via different cognitive strategies … and the interlanguage grammar is some combination of these types of rules” (McLaughlin 1987: 62-63).

3.3 Other Views of Interlanguage and its Properties

Adjemian stressed the dynamic character of interlanguage systems. In his opinion, interlanguage systems were “by their nature incomplete and in the state of flux”. He saw the individual’s L1 system as relatively stable, but not the interlanguage. In this way, “the structures of the interlanguage may be ‘invaded’ by the first language” (McLaughlin, 1987: 63). So Adjemian shares Selinker’s opinion about the influence of the first language on the developing interlanguage.

Tarone’s view differed from those of Selinker and Adjemian because she thought that interlanguage was “not a single system, but a set of styles that can be used in different social contexts” (McLaughlin 1987: 64). So she stresses the social factor involved in the use of interlanguage.

Nemser argued that interlanguage was an autonomous system and supported his argument by the evidence that there are “elements which do not have their origin in either [i.e. neither L1 nor L2] phonemic system” (Nemser 1971: 134 cited in Powell 1998: 3). He used the term ‘approximative system’, as he thought that a learner of a L2 undergoes a process of approximation of the emerging system to the target language (Brown 1980: 163).

Corder defines interlanguage as “a system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and target language”. In his opinion, every L2 learner creates an interlanguage which is unique to this individual and he called this phenomenon ‘idiosyncratic dialect’ (Brown 1980: 163). He stressed the importance of errors as a source of information and argued that “the appearance of error in a learner’s production was evidence that the learner was organizing the knowledge available to them at a particular point in time” (Powell, 1998: 4).

All these interpretations stress different aspects of interlanguage. However, all of them share the basic idea that interlanguage is an independent language system lying somewhere
between MT and TL. As James put it, it occupies a “halfway position … between knowing and not knowing the TL (1998: 3).

3.4 Transfer, Interference and Cross-linguistic Influence

I have already mentioned the terms ‘transfer’ and ‘interference’ in chapter 2.4 since they have their roots in the behaviourist theories of L2 learning and are closely related to CAH. Now we know that behaviourism does not give a satisfactory explanation of the learner’s native language influence and that, actually, any of the previously acquired languages can cause interference. Therefore Sharwood Smith and Kellerman came up with the term ‘cross-linguistic influence’ which is theory-neutral and can be used as a superordinate term for the phenomena of ‘transfer’, ‘interference’, ‘avoidance’, ‘borrowing’ etc.

The terms ‘transfer’ and ‘interference’ are not synonymous: Transfer usually refers to the influence of L1 on L2 in both positive and negative way, whereas interference is usually used in negative sense, so it corresponds to negative transfer. Weinrich’s definition of interference (1953: 1 cited in Dulay et al. 1982: 99) supports this idea: Interference are “those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of languages in contact”. However, we must note that there is often inconsistency in usage of these terms by various linguists. Therefore we will use ‘transfer’ as a neutral term including both positive and negative transfer, and ‘interference’ as a synonym of negative transfer.

Kellerman defined transfer as “those processes that lead to incorporation of elements from one language into another” (Kellerman 1987 in Ellis 1994: 301). Odlin offers a ‘working definition’ of transfer: “Transfer is the influence resulting from the similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired” (Odlin 1989: 27 in Ellis 1994: 301).

According to Dulay, Burt and Krashen interference can be understood from two different perspectives. From the psychological or behaviourist perspective it is the influence from old habits on the newly learned ones. From the sociolinguistic point of view they see transfer as “the language interactions … that occur when two language communities are in contact” (Dulay et al. 1982: 98-99). In this point of view we are talking about the issues of borrowing, code switching and fossilisation.

3.5 Positive and Negative Transfer

When talking about language transfer in the behaviourist interpretation of the term, we usually differentiate between two types of transfer: ‘positive transfer’ and ‘negative transfer’.
Positive transfer occurs where a language item in L1 is also present in L2, so acquisition of this item makes little or no difficulty for the learner. An example could be the use of plural markers ‘-s’ and ‘-es’ in English and Spanish. A L1 Spanish learner of L2 English should use the English plurals correctly if the positive transfer is operating.

Negative transfer comes when there is no concordance between L1 and L2 and thus, acquisition of the new L2 structure would be more difficult and errors reflecting the L1 structure would be produced (Powell 1998: 2 and Dulay et al. 1982: 97). In our own research we have found that L1 Spanish learners of L2 English tend to use the English long-adjective superlatives incorrectly. For example, they say the more beautiful girl instead of the most beautiful girl. The reason is probably a negative transfer, since in Spanish both comparative and superlative uses the same word más, just the superlative uses it together with a definite article: ‘el/la más + adjective’.

3.6 Borrowing

Linguistic borrowing is a sociolinguistic phenomenon and a form of language interference which appears among bilingual speakers. It is very common in multilingual societies all over the world (Dulay et al. 1982: 113). Powell defines borrowing as “the incorporation of linguistic material from one language into another” (1998: 8).

Most commonly borrowed items are, Dulay et al. (1982: 113) explain, “lexical items that express either cultural concepts that are new to the borrowing group, or notions that are particularly important in a given contact situation”. For example, after discovering the American continent, English and other old European languages borrowed words from the native American languages, such as maize, tomato, igloo, etc.

Words that are borrowed into a language usually preserve their general sound pattern, but they also modify it according to the phonetic and phonological system of the borrowing language. After that, the words are incorporated into the grammar of the borrowing language, i.e. they are given articles, inflections, etc (Dulay et al. 1982: 114).

‘Integrated borrowing’ refers to a word which was borrowed into a language and speakers of that language learn this word from each other without understanding its original meaning in the language of origin. On the other hand, ‘creative borrowing’ is characterized by speakers using a word from another language to express a concept closely related to the culture of that language (Dulay et al. 1982: 114).

3.7 Code Switching

The term ‘code-switching’ refers to “an active, creative process of incorporating material from
both of a bilingual’s languages into communicative acts” (Dulay et al. 1982: 115). Rapid switches from one language into the other are very characteristic for code-switching.

There is a widespread opinion that code-switching is an evidence of a lack of proficiency, fluency or control over the language systems on the part of the speaker. However, this is not true. On the contrary, code-switching is most frequent among the most proficient bilinguals and is governed by strict structural and grammatical rules of both the languages involved. It has a strong sociolinguistic function: most importantly, it works as an ethnic marker (Dulay et al., 1982: 115).

Code-switching can take form of (a) inserting words or short phrases from one language into single sentences in another language or (b) altering the languages in terms of entire phrases or clauses. The following examples have been taken from a study of adults' speech in Spanish-English bilingual community by Aurelio Espinosa (in Dulay et al. 1982: 115):

(a)  *Vamos a ir al football game y después ...*

    *We’re going to go to the football game, and then ...*

    *Comieron turkey pa’ Christmas?*

    *Did you eat turkey for Christmas?*

(b)  *He is doing the best he can pa’ no quedarse atrás, pero lo van a fregar.*

    *He is doing the best he can in order not to be kept back, but they’re going to mess him up.*

### 3.8 Fossilization

Fossilization is defined in Brown (1980: 181) as “relatively permanent incorporation of incorrect linguistic forms into a person's second language competence”. That means that the L2 learner continues committing certain errors, no matter how much input he or she receives, and his or her interlanguage doesn’t develop anymore - it has fossilized.

Selinker in his paper titled ‘Interlanguage’ (published in Richards 1974: 36) argues that fossilization is a rather a psychological phenomenon since

many of these [fossilized] phenomena reappear in IL performance when the learner's attention is focused upon new and difficult intellectual subject matter or when he is in a state of anxiety or other excitement, and strangely enough, sometimes when he is in a state of extreme relaxation (Selinker publ. in Richards 1974: 36).
The main property which makes the Interlanguage theory different from the CA and also Error Analysis is that it is wholly descriptive and avoids comparison (James 1998: 6). This fact caused a revolution in L2 research and teaching because it was for the first time when a learner’s imperfect L2 system was understood as an autonomous system.
4. ERROR ANALYSIS

Error Analysis (EA), third of the major theories dealing with errors in L2 acquisition, will be the focus of this chapter. First we will define Error Analysis, summarize its goals and compare it to the CAH and Interlanguage theory. This will be followed by its brief history and discussion on the importance of learners’ errors and concepts of ignorance and deviance. The main focus will be on various linguists’ interpretations of the error-mistake difference, procedures of the EA itself and finally, the possible sources of errors.

4.1 Definitions and Goals

Error Analysis is a theory replacing the Contrastive Analysis, which was abandoned by linguists and teachers due to its ineffectiveness and unreliability. EA also belongs to applied linguistics but it has no interest in explaining the process of L2 acquisition. It is rather “a methodology for dealing with data” “(Cook 1993: 2 cited in James 1998: 7).

At the very beginning of his *Errors in Language Learning and Use*, Carl James defines Error Analysis as “the process of determining the incidence, nature, causes and consequences of unsuccessful language” (James 1998: 1). Later he goes on explaining that EA “involves first independently or ‘objectively’ describing the learners’ IL ... and the TL itself, followed by a comparison of the two, so as to locate mismatches” (1998: 5).

There is one difference which distinguishes EA from the CA and this is the importance of the mother tongue: when doing EA the mother tongue does not enter the picture at all and therefore has no importance. In the CA, as we have explained earlier, the mother tongue is of vital importance. However, this does not mean that EA is not comparative. It is, because it describes errors on the basis of comparing of the learners’ interlanguage with the target language. It actually builds on the Interalanguage theory, but the distinction between them is that the IL theory remains wholly descriptive and avoids comparison (James 1998: 6). At the same time EA acknowledges L1 transfer as one of the sources of errors, which makes it related to the CAH.

James (1998: 62-63) also refers to Error Analysis as the study of linguistic ignorance which investigates “what people do not know and how they attempt to cope with their ignorance”. The fact that learners find ways how to cope with their ignorance makes a connection between EA and learner strategies, which we divide into learning strategies and communication strategies.

Corder suggests that Error Analysis can be distinguished from ‘performance analysis’ in that sense that “performance analysis is the study of the whole performance data from individual learners, whereas the term EA is reserved for the study of erroneous utterances produced by groups of learners” (Corder 1975: 207 cited in James 1998: 3).
4.2 Development of Error Analysis

Early works in EA dealing with L2 data were taxonomic, i.e. they focused on collecting and classifying errors. On the other hand, early analyses dealing with native speakers’ data were mainly interested in searching for the causes of errors (James 1998). In the 1960s EA was acknowledged as an alternative to the behaviourist CA and in the 1970s it became so popular that Schachter and Celce-Murcia could call it “the darling of the 70s” (Schachter and Celce-Murcia 1977: 442 cited in James, 1998: 11). EA and CA were competing to establish supremacy of one over the other.

H. V. George (1972) and M. Burt and C. Kiparsky (1972) published two of the most significant taxonomic works. George concludes that the main causes of L2 learners’ errors are (a) redundancy of the code, (b) unsuitable presentation in class, and (c) several sorts of interference. In The Gooficon by Burt and Kiparsky the authors argue that the learners’ MT has no effect on the errors they make in the L2. They categorized errors into six groups: (a) clausal, (b) auxiliary, (c) passive, (d) temporal conjunctions, (e) sentential complements and (f) psychological predicates (James 1998).

In 1987 J. B. Heaton and N. D. Turton published Longman Dictionary of Common Errors which lists alphabetically the 1,700 most common errors in English made by foreign learners. They collected the data from Cambridge First Certificate in English answer papers (James 1998).

4.3 The Importance of Learners’ Errors

The most important and innovatory feature of EA is that it is quite error-friendly, meaning that errors are not seen as something negative or pathological anymore, but as Corder claims, “a learner’s errors … are significant in [that] they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in the discovery of the language” (Corder 1967: 167 cited in Brown 1980: 164).

At the very beginning of Errors in Language Learning and Use James stresses the uniqueness of human errors: “Error is likewise unique to humans, who are not only sapiens and loquens, but also homo errans” (1998: 1). He supports the idea of the importance of learners' errors by claiming that “the learners’ errors are a register of their current perspective on the TL” (1998: 7).

James (1998: 12) gives Corder's five crucial points, originally published in Corder’s seminar paper titled ‘The significance of learners’ errors’:

1. L1 acquisition and L2 learning are parallel processes, they are ruled by the same mechanisms, procedures and strategies. Learning a L2 is probably facilitated by the knowledge of the L1.
2. Errors reflect the learners’ inbuilt syllabus or what they have taken in, but not what the teachers have put into them. So there is a difference between ‘input’ and ‘intake’.

3. Errors show that both learners of L1 and L2 develop an independent language system - a ‘transitional competence’.

4. The terms ‘error’ and ‘mistake’ shouldn't be used interchangeably.

5. Errors are important because they (a) tell the teacher what he or she should teach, (b) are a source of information for the researcher about how the learning proceeds, and (c) allow the learners to test their L2 hypotheses.

4.4 The Criticism of Error Analysis

James paraphrases Corder's argument that “it is not deemed legitimate ... to compare the child’s or the FL learner's ID [idiosyncratic dialect] to the dialect of adults or of native speakers respectively” (James, 1998: 16). The reason is that “the child or the FL learner are neither deliberately nor pathologically deviant in their language, so it would be wrong to refer to their repertoires as erroneous” James (1998: 16).

Bell also criticizes EA by calling it “a recent pseudoprocedure in applied linguistics” (Bell 1974: 35 cited in James 1998: 17). In his opinion, the EA data are of only poor statistical inference, errors are usually interpreted subjectively and it lacks predicative power (James 1998: 17).

Schachter criticizes that EA does not take into consideration the strategy of avoidance, i.e. that learners tend to avoid certain language items which they are not sure about, and so they don’t make errors in the areas where they would be expected to make them (James 1998: 18).

More criticism comes from Dulay et al. (1982: 141-143) who point to the fact that EA confuses explanatory and descriptive aspects, in other words the process and the product; and also that error categories lack precision and specificity.

However, despite all the criticism EA remains the most wide-spread practice, because it has proven to be the most effective approach to L2 learners’ errors.

4.5 Linguistic Ignorance and Deviance

I have already introduced James’s view of EA as a study of linguistic ignorance. In his opinion, there are two ways in which the ignorance is usually manifested: silence and substitutive language. Silence means that the learner makes no response and we can distinguish between
cultural silence, referring to the fact that some cultures are from the nature more silent than others, and silence as a consequence of ignorance which is labeled ‘avoidance’. However, the focus of EA is the other category - substitutive language, which is, in fact, a learner’s interlanguage (James 1998: 62-63).

Another issue related to EA is Incompleteness which James defines as the “failure to attain full NS-like knowledge of the TL” or, similarly “an overall insufficiency (compared with NS competence) across all areas of the TL” (1998: 63). It is different from ignorance in that sense that a learner can be ignorant of a particular structure, irrespective of his or her proficiency in the TL.

There are four categories of learners' ignorance of TL: (1) grammaticality, (2) acceptability, (3) correctness and (4) strangeness and infelicity (James 1998: 64-65).

(1) When an utterance is grammatical it means that it is well-formed in terms of a particular grammar. So a piece of language is ungrammatical if there are no circumstances under which it could be used in this way. We judge grammaticality of a sentence out of context and regardless of it.

(2) According to Lyons (1968: 137 cited in James 1998: 67) “an acceptable utterance is one that has been, or might be, produced by a native speaker in some appropriate context and is, or would be, accepted by other native speakers as belonging to the same language in question”. The word ‘context’ is the key word in this definition, since we have to contextualize the utterance so that we could judge its acceptability.

On the basis of grammaticality and acceptability, Corder (1973: 272 cited in James 1998: 68) divided errors into covert and overt errors. A covertly erroneous utterance is superficially well-formed and can be revealed only when referring to the context. This utterance is grammatical, but unacceptable. On the other hand, an overtly erroneous utterance is ungrammatical, so it cannot be used in any context. EA is principally concerned with utterances which are both ungrammatical and unacceptable (James 1998: 68-69).

(3) An utterance is correct when it is in concordance with prescriptive normative standards of the language in question. Utterances that are acceptable but incorrect at the same time are common (James 1998: 74).

(4) Allerton (1990 cited in James 1998: 75) introduced four categories of “linguistically strange word combinations”: (a) inherently strange combinations, (b) semantically disharmonious combination, (c) combinations that are simply ungrammatical and (d) instances of locutional deviance which are common in foreigners’ English since they result from violating cooccurrence restrictions of English (James 1998: 75).

Infelicities refer to errors on pragmatic level (Austin 1962 in James 1998: 76). Austin differentiates between four kinds of infelicity: (a) a gap appears if the L2 speaker lacks “the
linguistic means for performing the desired speech act” (James 1998: 76); (b) we have a misapplication when a speech act is performed correctly but the speaker, the addressee or the circumstances are inappropriate for this speech act; (c) a flaw appears when the linguistic execution of the speech act is imperfect; and (d) a hitch means that “the execution of the speech act is cut short” (James 1998: 76).

4.6 Defining Mistake and Error

Brown (1980: 165) insists that “it is crucial to make a distinction between mistakes and errors” because they are “technically two very different phenomena”.

The concept of intentionality plays an essential role when defining an error since “an error arises only when there was no intention to commit one” (James, 1998: 77). So an erroneous utterance is that which was made unintentionally, whereas when there is an intention to produce a deviant utterance, we simply call it deviance. A good example of a language deviance is an advertising jingle (James 1998: 77).

The basic distinction between a mistake and an error is also based on the concept of corrigibility. If the learner is able to self-correct after using an incorrect expression or utterance, we are talking about a mistake. On the other hand, when the learner produces an unintentionally deviant utterance and is not able to self-correct, he or she committed an error (James 1998: 78).

Corder (1967 1971 in James, 1998: 78) associates the error vs. mistake distinction to the issue of competence vs. performance. In this way, errors are seen as failures of competence and mistakes as failures of performance. Corder argues that „mistakes are of no significance to the process of language learning since they do not reflect a defect in our knowledge” and “they can occur in L1 as well as L2” (Corder 1967: 166-167 cited in James 1998: 78-79). On the other hand, errors “are of significance; they do reflect knowledge; they are not self-correctable; and only learners of an L2 make them” (James 1998: 79).

Edge (1989 in James 1998: 80-81) uses the term mistake as a cover term for all the wrong instances which foreign language learners produce and he divides mistakes into three categories:

- **Slips** occur, according to Edge, as a consequence of processing problems or carelessness. The learner is usually able to self-correct if he or she has a chance to do so.

- **Errors** refer, in Edge's opinion, to “wrong forms that the pupil could not correct even if their wrongness were to be pointed out” but it is still evident what the learner wanted to say (James 1998: 80).

- **Attempts**, Edge’s last category, are “almost incomprehensible, and the learner obviously has no idea how to use the right form” (James 1998: 81). In this situation learners usually
employ their compensatory communication strategies.

The next classification we would like to discuss is that of Hammerly (1991 in James 1998). For him, “the status of learner deviance must be determined in terms of the classroom” (James 1998: 81). Hammerly divides deviances which learners make in the classroom context into **distortions** and **faults**.

Distortions are, in his opinion, “unavoidable and necessary, occur even with known TL forms, and should be ignored by the teacher” (James 1998: 81). He further distinguishes between learner distortions and mismanagement distortions and this distinction is based on the fact whether or not the item has been taught in the class. Learner distortions appear when the item has been “adequately taught ... clearly understood and sufficiently practiced” (Hammerly 1991: 85 cited in James 1998: 81), whereas mismanagement distortions are consequences of inadequate teaching and practice of the item in question.

Hammerly’s second category, faults, appear when the learners “attempt to express freely ideas that require the use of structures they haven’t yet learnt” (Hammerly 1991: 72 cited in James 1998: 82). He again distinguishes between learner faults and mismanagement faults, the former being consequences of learners’ overextension without being encouraged by the teacher, and the latter appear when the teacher connives with the students’ overextension.

As we can see, Hammerly’s view is quite extreme and he has been criticized for his constant search for someone to blame, either the learners or the teacher. On the other hand, Edge’s ideology is completely different because he “applauds learners who ... keep trying and taking risk rather than playing safe or avoiding error” (James 1998: 82).

The most recent classification of deviances is that of James (1998: 83-84):

- **Slips** refer to lapses of the tongue or pen and the author is able to spot and correct them. The discipline which is engaged in studying them is called lapsology.

- **Mistakes** can be corrected by their author only “if their deviance is pointed out to him or her” (James 1998: 83). James further divides them into first-order mistakes, when simple indication of the deviance is enough to enable self-correction, and second-order mistakes, when more information about the nature of the deviance is needed to enable self-correction.

- **Errors** occur when the learner is unable to self-correct until further relevant input is provided, i.e. some more learning has to take place.

- **Solecisms** are defined by James as “breaches of the rules of correctness as laid down by purists and usually taught in schools” (1998: 83). A good example is split infinitives.
4.7 Procedures of Error Analysis

Error analysis involves four stages (James 1998):

The first stage is when errors are identified or detected and therefore James (1998: 91) terms it error detection. It is, actually, spotting of the error itself. First we collect a set of utterances produced by a L2 learner. A sentence is usually taken as a basic unit of analysis and than the informant, a native speaker or the analyst himself, points out the suspicious or potentially erroneous utterances and decide if the utterance in question is really erroneous or not. However, this may not be so easy since there are many factors involved. It is easier, for instance, to spot someone else's error than one's own, or to find the error in written language than in spoken (James 1998: 91-100).

The following stage is called error location and it is when the informant locates the error. James argues that some errors are difficult to locate because they can be diffused throughout the sentence or the whole text and appear only after the whole text is carefully examined (1998: 92-93). Burt and Kiparsky call such deviances global errors (opposite to local errors): “the sentence does not simply contain an error: it is erroneous or flawed as a sentence” (James 1998: 93).

The third stage is error description. It is obvious that a learner’s language has to be described in terms of some language system. The Interlanguage hypothesis would suggest that the “learner language is a language in its own right and should therefore be described sui generis rather then in terms of the target” (James 1998: 94). If we take Corder’s idea of idiosyncratic dialect, which is the learner's version of the target language, we can compare it to the native speaker's code since both the codes are considered dialects of the same language and therefore “should be describable in terms of the same grammar” (James 1998: 94). Another reason why a learner's language should be described in terms of the TL is because EA is, by its nature, TL-oriented (James 1998: 95).

James (1998: 95-96) also argues that the grammar used for the description must be comprehensive, simple, self-explanatory, easily learnable and user-friendly. For these reasons, he rejects scientific and pedagogic grammars and recommends descriptive grammars, particularly Crystal's (1982) Grammar Assessment Remediation and Sampling Procedure (also known as GRARSP). There are, in James’s opinion three main purposes of the description stage: (1) to make the errors explicit, (2) it is indispensable for counting errors, and (3) it is a basis for creating categories since it reveals which errors are different or the same (James 1998: 96-97).

And finally, the last step in EA is error classification or categorization (James 1998: 97). We can categorize errors into dictionaries or taxonomies. Since the whole chapter 5 will deal with various error taxonomies, in this section we will concentrate on dictionaries only. Dictionaries of errors are organized alphabetically and contain both lexical and grammatical information.
A good example of up-to-date dictionaries of errors is Turton’s (1995) *ABC of Common Grammatical Errors*, which includes not only grammatical errors, but lexical as well. Another one is that of Alexander (1994), based on his own database of over 5,000 items collected during his ELT career. Interestingly, one of the categories in Alexander's dictionary is that of errors caused by L1 interference with L2 English (James 1998: 97-101).

Dictionaries of ‘false friends’ represent another kind of dictionaries. They are, according to James (1998: 101), “relevant to learners of a specific L2 who speak a particular mother tongue”. For Czech learners of L2 English there is Sparling’s *English or Czenglish* (1991) which contains the most common false friends and other items that usually cause troubles for L1 Czech learners.

### 4.8 Sources of Error

Identifying sources of errors can be, in fact, considered a part of error classification. Error Analysis is innovatory in respect to the CAH in the sense that it examines errors attributable to all possible sources, not just negative L1 transfer (Brown, 1980: 166).

Among the most frequent sources of errors Brown counts (1) interlingual transfer, (2) intralingual transfer, (3) context of learning, and (4) various communication strategies the learners use. James (1998: 178-179) similarly classifies errors according to their source into four diagnosis-based categories with the difference that he terms category (3) induced errors.

1. **Interlingual transfer**, i.e. mother-tongue influence, causes interlingual errors. They are very frequent at the initial stages of L2 learning since the L1 is the only language system the learner knows and can draw on and therefore negative transfer takes place (Brown 1980: 173). Brown also argues that when one is learning L3, L4 etc., transfer takes place from all the previously learnt languages but the degree of transfer is variable (1980: 173).

2. **Intralingual negative transfer** or interference is the source of intralingual errors (Brown 1980: 173-174). Brown gives only overgeneralization as a representation of negative interlingual transfer, but James (1980: 185-187) goes into more details. He refers to intralingual errors as learning-strategy based errors and lists 7 types of them:

   1. **False analogy** arises when the learner incorrectly thinks that a new item behaves like another item already known to him or her. For example the learner already knows that *dogs* is plural from *dog*, so he or she thinks that *sheeps* is plural from *sheep*.

   2. **Misanalysis** means that the learner has formed an unfounded hypothesis in the L2 and is putting it in practice. James (1980: 185) gives as an example the situation when the learner assumes that *its* can be used as a
pluralized form of *it*.

3. **Incomplete rule application** happens when the learner doesn't apply all the rules necessary to apply in a particular situation. In fact, it is the converse of overgeneralization.

4. **Exploiting redundancy** appears because there is a lot of redundancy in every language, e.g. unnecessary morphology, and intelligent learners try to avoid those items which they find redundant to make their learning and communication easier. The opposite of exploiting redundancy is overlaboration which is usually observable in more advanced learners.

5. **Overlooking coocurrence restrictions** means that the learner doesn't know that certain words go together with certain complements, prepositions etc. An example given by James (1998: 186) is when the learner ignores that the verb *to enjoy* is followed by gerund and not bare infinitive.


7. **Overgeneralization** means that the learner uses one member of a set of forms also in situations when the other members must be used. This usually leads to overuse of one form and underuse of the others. Well known candidates for overgeneralization are pairs as other/another, much/many, some/any etc. (James 1998: 187) - the learner uses one of them instead of distinguishing between them and using each in the appropriate situation. Overgeneralization of language rules is also common, e.g. *Does she can dance?* reflects that the learner overgeneralizes the use of auxiliary verbs in questions.

(3) **Context of learning** refers to the setting where a language is learnt, e.g. a classroom or a social situation, and also to the teacher and materials used in the lessons. All these factors can cause induced errors (Brown 1980: 174). As Brown explains, “students often make errors because a misleading explanation from the teacher, faulty presentation of a structure or word in a textbook, or even because of a patent that was rotely memorized in a drill but not properly contextualized”. James (1998: 191-200) divides induced errors into the following subcategories:

- materials-induced errors
- teacher-talk induced errors
- exercise-based induced errors
- errors induced by pedagogical priorities
- look-up errors

---
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I don’t think it is necessary to discuss them further because the nature of these errors is evident from their names. However, we will supply an example Last time when I *have been there ... (SK speaker) in which the incorrect application of present perfect probably reflects deficient explanation of the use of present perfect on the part of the teacher.

(4) **Communication strategies** are consciously used by the learners to get a message across to the hearer. They can involve both verbal and non-verbal communication mechanisms (Brown 1980: 178). We distinguish among the following communication strategies:

- **Avoidance arises** when a learner consciously avoids certain language item because he feels uncertain about it and prefers avoiding to committing and error. There are several kinds of avoidance, e.g. syntactic, lexical, phonological or topic avoidance (Brown 1980: 178-179).

- **Prefabricated patterns** are memorized phrases or sentences, as in ‘tourist survival’ language or a pocket bilingual phrasebook, and the learner who memorized them usually doesn't understand the components of the phrase (Brown 1980: 180). However, their advantage is, as Hakuta (1976: 333 cited in Brown 1980: 179) notes, that they “enable learners to express functions which they are yet unable to construct from their linguistic system, simply storing them in a sense like large lexical items”.

- **Cognitive and personality styles** can also cause errors. For instance, Brown (1980: 180) suggests that “a person with high self-esteem may be willing to risk more errors, in the interest of communication, since he does not feel as threatened by committing errors as a person with low self-esteem”.

- **Appeal to authority** is a strategy when the learner, because of his uncertainty about some structure, directly asks a native speaker, a teacher or looks up the structure in a bilingual dictionary (Brown 1980: 180).

- **Language switch** is applied by the learner when all the other strategies have failed to help him or her. So the learner uses his or her native language to get the message across, regardless of the fact that the hearer may not know the native language (Brown 1980: 181)
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5. ERROR TAXONOMIES

Although error taxonomies are part of the EA, we decided to dedicate a whole chapter to them, since they are a huge topic. According to Dulay et al.(1982), the most commonly used taxonomies are based on (1) linguistic category, (2) surface strategy, (3) comparative analysis, and (4) communicative effect.

James (1998: 102) drew on the *New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (1993), which defines ‘taxonomy’ as “the branch of science which deals with classification”. James (1998: 102-103) also argues that “a taxonomy must be organized according to certain constitutive criteria. These criteria should as far as possible reflect observable objective facts about the entities to be classified”. However, he notes, the criteria are not mutually exclusive: we classify errors simultaneously according to more criteria at the same time.

Dulay et al. (1982: 145) in their discussion about taxonomies “focused on error taxonomies that classify errors according to some observable surface feature of the error itself, without reference to its underlying cause or source” and they call these ‘descriptive taxonomies’.

We have supplied the most common categories of errors with examples from our own data collection. This is the case, above all, in the Comparative taxonomy, since this taxonomy best accounts for the issue of mother-tongue transfer. The data was collected mainly among exchange students at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece, and among our own students in private language schools in the Czech Republic. our subjects’ level of English was from pre-intermediate to upper-intermediate, none of them was a native speaker of English. The mother tongue background of our subjects was Czech/Slovak (CZ/SK), Spanish (ES) or Greek (Gr).

5.1 Errors Based on Linguistic Category

These taxonomies classify errors according to the language component or linguistic constituent (or both of them) which is affected by the error. Among language components we count phonology, syntax and morphology, semantics and lexicon, and discourse (Dulay et al. 1982: 146). Researchers use the linguistic category taxonomy as either the only one or combined with some other taxonomy. This taxonomy is also useful for organizing the collected data.

Dulay et al. (1982: 147-154) give as examples two error analyses that used this taxonomies for primary classification of the collected data. The first one was carried out by Burt and Kiparsky (1972) and the other by Politzer and Ramirez (1973). Both of them classified errors made by students of English as L2, just the background of the analyses was different. The former contains the following main categories:

A. The skeleton of English clauses, containing missing parts and misordered parts
B. The auxiliary system
C. Passive sentences  
D. Temporal conjunctions  
E. Sentential complements  
F. Psychological predicates  

5.2 Surface Strategy Taxonomy

This taxonomy concentrates on the ways in which surface structures are altered. Using this taxonomy, Dulay et al. (1982: 150) divide errors into the following categories: (1) omission, (2) additions, (3) misformation, and (4) misordering. Omission is typical for the early stages of L2 acquisition, whereas in the intermediate stages misformation, misordering, or overuse are much more common (Dulay et al. 1982: 155).

(1) **Omission** means that an item which must be present in a well-formed utterance is absent. There is evidence that grammatical morphemes (e.g. noun and verb inflections, articles, prepositions) are omitted more often than content morphemes which carry the meaning (Dulay et al. 1982: 154-155). For instance, in the sentence *My father plumber* the grammatical morphemes *is* and *a* are omitted.

(2) **Additions** are the second category of Surface strategy taxonomy and also the opposite of omission. The presence of an extra item which mustn't be present in a well-formed utterance is characteristic for additions (Dulay et al. 1982: 156). Dulay et al. divide them into three categories: (a) double markings, as in *Did you went there?,* (b) regularization, e.g. *sheeps,* *cutted,* and (c) simple addition, which contains the rest of additions (1982: 156-158).

(3) **Misformation** refers to “the use of the wrong form of the morpheme or structure” (Dulay et al. 1982: 158). There are three types as well: (a) In regularizations an irregular marker is replaced by a regular one, as in *sheeps* for sheep. (b) Archi-forms refer to the use of one member of a class of forms instead of using all the members, e.g. using *this* in the situations when either *this* or *these* should be used. (c) Alternating forms are represented by “free alternation of various members of a class with each other”, as in *those dog* and *this cat* used by the same learner (Dulay et al. 1982: 157).

The following examples of misformation are taken from our own data collection:

*Do all the *childs go through all the stages?* (GR) regularization  
*I have *take one packet of *tissue. (FR) archi-form and omission*

(4) We talk about **misordering** when we come across an utterance where a morpheme or a group of them is incorrectly placed, as in *I get up at 6 o'clock always,* where *always* is misordered (Dulay et al. 1982: 162).
5.3 Comparative Taxonomy

The Comparative taxonomy classifies errors on the basis of comparing the structure of L2 errors to other types of constructions, most commonly to errors made by children during their L1 acquisition of the language in question. In this taxonomy, we work with two main error categories: (1) developmental errors, and (2) interlingual errors, and, of course, (3) ambiguous errors, and (4) the ‘grab bag category’ of other errors (Dulay et al. 1982: 163-164).

(1) **Developmental errors** refer to errors which are similar to those made by children who are acquiring the target language in question as their mother tongue. They are the opposite of interlingual errors, i.e. those caused by L1 interference. The research has shown that most of the errors committed by L2 learners are developmental. They are called developmental because they are characteristic for both L1 and L2 development (Dulay et al. 1982: 164-165).

The following are our examples of developmental errors:

- *I have *take one packet of *tissue. (FR)
- *Let’s *close the light. (GR)
- *On the *opposite we have several studies ... (ES)
- ... *on the centre of the page ... (GR)

(2) **Interlingual errors** are, as Dulay et al. (1982: 171) argue, “similar in structure to a semantically equivalent phrase or sentence in the learner’s native language”, e.g. *the man skinny said by a Spanish speaker of English reflects the word order of the Spanish equivalent phrase el hombre flaco.

In our own research we have come across these deviant sentences containing interlingual errors:

- *Ambulance is the place where you go when you are sick. (CZ) false friends with ambulance
- *I must *tell him for that. (CZ) reflects říci o něco, intended ask for
- *I *have birthday. (CZ) instead of It is my birthday, reflects mám narozeniny
- *Yesterday we discussed *about these things. (Lucka, CZ) reflects diskutovat o
- *You should buy a ticket because they *control them very often. (CZ) false friends with kontrolovat
- *I *gave this exam last year. (GR) wrong collocation, reflects δείνω εξετάση = to *give an exam
- *I haven't *given the exam yet. (GR) wrong collocation, reflects δείνω εξετάση = to give an exam

(3) **Ambiguous errors** could be classified as both developmental and interlingual errors. Such erroneous utterances usually reflect the learner’s L1 and, at the same time, are similar to errors produced by children during their L1 acquisition (Dulay et al. 1982: 172). E.g. *I don't have *nothing (SK), as well as *They are speaking *before toilet doors (CZ) could be considered both
interlingual and developmental error.

(4) Other errors are those which simply do not fit in any of the above mentioned categories of this taxonomy (Dulay et al. 1982: 172).

5.4 Communicative Effect Taxonomy

This taxonomy focuses on the effect the errors have on the listener or reader. Dulay et al. (1982: 189) argue that “errors that affect the overall organization of the sentence hinder successful communication, while errors that affect a single element of the sentence usually do not hinder communication”. They call the former (1) global errors and the latter (2) local errors.

(1) Among global errors they include:
- wrong order of major constituents
- missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors
- missing cues to signal obligatory exceptions to pervasive syntactic rules
- regularization of pervasive syntactic rules to exceptions
- wrong psychological predicate constructions (i.e. predicates describing how a person feels)
- improper selection of complement types (i.e. subordinate clauses)

(2) Local errors include, according to Dulay et al. (1982: 191-192), errors in noun and verb inflections, articles, auxiliaries, formation of quantifiers, etc.
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