

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter provides theories and reviews the literature related to error analysis. Firstly, an overview of second language acquisition is provided. Secondly, error analysis and the differences between errors and mistakes are describes. To understand the errors produced by the learners, interlanguage and sources of errors are explained with their 13 subtypes. In addition, vocabulary acquisition is also given. Besides, the error correction in second language teaching and learning is discussed with its advantages and disadvantages. At the end of this chapter, studies on lexical errors are also given.

2.1 An Overview of Second Language Acquisition

Ellis (1995) sees the process of second language acquisition (SLA) as a complex one, involving many interrelated factors. It indicates the learning of an additional language after acquiring the first language. SLA is the product of many factors relating to the learner on the one hand and the learning situation on the other. It is not a uniform and predictable phenomenon. In addition, there is not only one way that learners acquire knowledge of a second language. Different learners in different situations learn a L2 in different ways. Besides, second language acquisition refers to all aspects of language that the language learners need to acquire and master. With regard to the acquisition of lexis, there have been relatively few studies in this area. The focus has been on how L2 learners acquire grammatical sub-systems.

SLA is not contrasted with foreign language acquisition. SLA is brought into use as a general term that involved both untutored (or 'naturalistic') acquisition and tutored (or 'classroom') acquisition. However, second language acquisition is sometimes contrasted with second language learning on the assumption that these are different processes. Krashen (1982: 10) proposes "the acquisition-learning distinction" hypothesis for second language acquisition. He states that "adults have two distinct and independent ways of developing competence in a second language. The first way is language acquisition, a process similar, if not identical, to the way children develop ability in their first language". It is said to be a subconscious process. Learners do not consciously know that they are acquiring language. They pick up a language in everyday interactions and are not consciously aware of the rules of grammar. According to this way of acquiring language competence, the atmosphere is usually "relaxed and natural" (Ong, 2007: 15). Learners "have a feel for correctness. Grammatical sentences sound right, or feel right, and errors feel wrong, even they do not consciously know what rules were violated" (Krashen, 1982: 10). The second way of developing competence in a second language is language learning. In this process, learners know the rules, are consciously aware of and are able to talk about them. The learning process usually takes place in the classroom in a formal situation.

2.2 Error Analysis

Error analysis (EA) is a method used in the study of errors in the 1970s, there was a need to look for sources of errors other than the mother tongue. Teachers and researchers provided evidence that "a great number of student errors cannot possibly be traced to their native language" (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982: 140). "There were many kinds of errors beside those due to interlingual interference that could neither be predicted nor explained by contrastive analysis" (Sridhar, 1980: 223).

EA is not a new approach that emerged after the failure of contrastive analysis to explain errors. It probably had a long tradition. Sridhar (1980: 221) describes traditional error analysis in the following manner: “until recently, a typical error analysis went little beyond impressionistic collections of ‘common’ errors and their taxonomic classification into categories (mistakes of agreement, omission of articles, etc)”. The particular goal of traditional error analysis was an attempt to deal with the practical needs of the classroom teacher.

EA was inspired by the generative linguistics movement of the 60s which focused on the creative aspects of language learning. The EA movement can be characterized as an attempt to account for learner errors that could not be explained or predicted by CA or the behaviorist theory. EA looks upon errors as evidence of the processes and strategies of language acquisition. It tries to account for learner performance in terms of the cognitive processes learners make use of in reorganizing the input they receive from the target language (TL). The main focus of error analysis is on the evidence that learners’ errors provide an understanding of the underlying processes of second language acquisition.

From the linguistic point of view, EA attempts to account for the developmental errors the learner makes in learning a second language. Richards (1971) acknowledges that errors such as intralingual or developmental errors occur as a result of difficulties found within the TL itself. These errors reflect the learner’s competence at a particular stage of language learning. Errors are no longer considered as undesirable forms; rather, they are seen as a necessary part of the language learning process (Ellis, 1995). In other words, errors can be considered as beneficials for the learner because he/she can use them as feedback to test his/her hypotheses about the TL.

The claim for using error analysis as the primary pedagogical tool is based on three arguments: (1) error analysis does not suffer from the inherent limitations of CA—restriction to errors caused by transfer from the mother tongue; EA brings to light many other types of errors frequently made by learners, (2) error analysis, unlike contrastive analysis, provides data on actual, attested problems, and not hypothetical problems and therefore forms a more efficient and economical basis for designing pedagogical strategies, and (3) error analysis is not confronted with the complex theoretical problems encountered by contrastive analysis (Sridhar, 1980: 223).

However, errors in EA also have some weaknesses. According to Brown (1980: 166), four weaknesses of errors are revealed: (1) too much attention to learners' errors, (2) overstressing of production data, (3) fails to account for the strategy of avoidance, and (4) keeps too closely focused on specific languages rather than viewing universal aspects of language. In the same token, Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982: 141-144) provide three different weaknesses that are different from Brown's. They propose that there are three major conceptual weaknesses that seem to have impeded the potential contributions it might have made to the EA field. They are: (1) the confusion of error description with error explanation (the process and product of error analysis), (2) the lack of precision and specificity in the definition of error categories, and (3) simplistic categorization of the causes of learners' errors. Thus, in relation to these weaknesses, the errors which a learner makes in the process of constructing a new system of language need to be analyzed carefully in order to understand the process of language acquisition.

2.3 Errors and Mistakes

In order to analyze learners' errors in a proper perspective, it is important to make a distinction between mistakes and errors. According to (Brown, 1994: 205), these two distinctions are technically very different phenomena. "A mistake refers to a performance error that is either a random guess or a slip", while an error refers to "idiosyncrasies in the interlanguage of the learner that are direct manifestation of a system within which a learner is operating at that time... Put in another way, an error is a noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learner". For example, "if a learner of English asks, "Does John can sing?" he is probably reflecting a competence level in which all verbs require a pre-posed *do auxiliary* for question formation. He has committed an error, most likely not a mistake, rather, it reveals a portion of his competence in the TL".

Corder also points out that mistakes are deviations due to performance factors such as memory limitations, spelling, pronunciation, fatigue and emotional strain. Errors, on the other hand, are systematic consistent deviances characteristic of the learner's linguistic system at a given stage of learning. 'The key point' he states, "is that the learner is using a definite system of language at every point in his development, although it is not...that of the second language...the learner's errors are evidence of this system and are themselves systematic" (Corder, 1967: 168).

Keshavarz (1993: 49) points out that errors may be seen as "rule-governed and systematic in nature and as such indicative of the learner's linguistic system at a given stage of language learning and systematic errors reveal something about the learner's underlying knowledge of the TL to date, i.e. his transitional competence". Norrish (1983: 7) says that

“errors are systematic deviation when a learner has not learned something and consistently gets it wrong, whereas mistakes are inconsistent deviations”. It means that sometimes the learner gets it right, but sometimes he or she makes a mistake and uses the wrong form. Ngara (1983: 35) looks at errors and mistakes as competence errors and performance errors. He explains that errors can be seen as “the limit of the learner’s competence in using the TL.” In contrast, mistakes are performance errors which “can be easily eliminated by emphasis on accuracy and carefulness”. This is because “the learner makes this error not because he doesn’t know the language, but because he is in a hurry, he is writing or speaking under stress, or is forgetful or simply careless”.

Dušková (1969) states that many recurrent errors of a systematic character which might be defined as errors in competence, do not reflect a real defect in knowledge, because the learners are aware of the relevant rule and are able to apply it. However, this application can not work automatically, it probably need mechanism. In addition, Lado (1957) maintains that the mistakes the learner made do not reflect the knowledge of their language. The learner could predict the knowledge of their language and what they still had to learn by studying their errors. James (1998: 83) differentiates errors and mistakes in the way that the former “cannot be self-corrected until the further relevant (to that error) input (implicit or explicit) has been provided...errors require further relevant learning to take place before they can be self-corrected”. The latter, he explains, “can only be corrected by their agent if their deviance is pointed out to him or her”.

2.4 Interlanguage

There are many similarities between the terms “idiosyncratic dialect” (Corder, 1971), “approximative system” (Nemser, 1971), and “interlanguage” (Selinker, 1969, 1972). All these terms derive from the belief that it is valuable to view the learner’s set of hypotheses about interlanguage as a language in its own right. Although this language may be limited in its size and usefulness, it is like a native language.

According to Selinker (1972), there are psychological structures latent in the brain which is activated when one attempts to learn a second language. In other words, the attempts of the learner to produce meaningful utterances in the TL has resulted the existence of a separate linguistic system which is called ‘interlanguage’. It is because the set of utterances produced by the learner will probably contain some elements of structure which parallel those of the learner’s native language and some which parallel those of the target or second language. The learner is most likely not aware of where his meaningful performance does not parallel that of the target language, though he is in the process of becoming aware of it as long as he continues to learn. According to Selinker (1972: 48), “successful second language learning, for most learners, is the reorganization of linguistic materials from an IL to identify with a particular TL”.

Selinker devises the useful term “fossilization” to refer to the process of an element of the interlanguage becoming frozen for a given learner, never to be replaced by the corresponding target language. “Fossilizable linguistic phenomena are linguistic items, rules, and subsystems which speakers of a particular NL will tend to keep in their IL relative to a particular TL, no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation and instruction he receives in the TL” (Selinker, 1972: 36).

Nemser proposes the name “approximative system” for interlanguage and defines it as “the deviant linguistic system actually employed by the learner attempting to utilize the target language” (Nemser, 1971: 55). He gives a threefold assumption that relates to the interlanguage theory: (a) learner speech at a given time is the patterned product of a linguistic system; the approximative system is distinct from both the MT and the TL, (b) approximative system at successive stages of learning form the developing stages when a learner first attempts to use the TL, and (c) in a given contact situation, the approximative system of learners at the same stage of proficiency is quite similar.

Corder (1971) uses the term “idiosyncratic dialects” for the interlanguage of the learners of a second language. He explains that “it is a dialect whose rules share characteristics of two social dialects or languages, whether these languages themselves share rules or not” (Corder, 1971: 161).

2.5 Sources of Errors

A number of scholars have done valuable work on the sources of errors as a basis for researchers to trace, discuss, and classify errors according to their sources. Brown (1980: 173-181) gives four types of errors with respect to their sources: (a) interlingual transfer; the transfer from the native language at the beginning stages of learning a second language, (b) intralingual transfer; the negative transfer of items or the incorrect generalization of rules within the TL, (c) context of learning; a misleading explanation from the teacher, faulty presentation of a structure or word in a textbook or a pattern that was rote memorized in a drill but not properly contextualized, and (d) communication strategies; avoidance, prefabricated patterns, cognitive and personality styles, appeal to authority and language switch. In addition, Selinker (1972: 48) distinguishes five sources of

errors: (a) language transfer, (b) transfer of training, (c) strategies of second language learning, (d) strategies of L2 communication, and (e) overgeneralization of TL linguistic material.

Dulay and Burt (1974: 115) categorize sources of errors which they prefer to call “goofs” into four types: (a) interference-like goofs (errors which reflect native language structure), (b) L1 developmental goofs (those that do not reflect native language structure), (c) ambiguous goofs (those that can be classified as either ‘interference-like goofs’ or ‘L1 developmental goofs’), and (d) unique goofs (those do not reflect L1 structure, and also not found in L1 acquisition data of the target language).

Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991: 58-59) divides errors into six types: (a) Interlanguage errors, (b) intralanguage errors, (c) overgeneralization, (d) simplification or redundancy reduction, (e) communication-based errors, and (f) induced errors. In the same token, but slightly different, James (1998: 179-189), proposes three major categories of errors: (a) interlingual errors or mother-tongue influence, (b) intralingual errors or target language causes which is further divided into two sub-categories, that is, (i) learning strategy-based errors (which occurs due to circumstances like false analogy, misanalysis, incomplete rule application, exploiting redundancy, overlooking cooccurrence restrictions, hypercorrection, and overgeneralization or system-simplification) and (ii) communication strategy-based errors (when learners apply either holistic strategies or analytic strategies), and (c) induced errors which result more from the classroom situation than from intralingual errors and interlingual errors.

Norrish (1983: 21-34) lists six sources of errors: (a) carelessness which is often closely related to 'lack of motivation', (b) first language interference, (c) translation (producing a funny phrase by translating word by word an idiomatic expression in the learner's first language), (d) overgeneralization (which covers the instance when learners conduct a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structures in the TL), (e) incomplete application of rules (the occurrence of structures when deviancy represents the development degree of rules in the TL), and (f) materials-induced errors; (i) false concept (building false concepts and faulty comprehension of distinction in the TL), and (ii) ignorance of rule restrictions (applying rules to contexts to which they do not apply).

Ngara (1983: 36-40) states that errors can possibly happen according to many sources of errors:

- (a) A source of interlingual errors or what is called approximation. Here the second language learner produces forms that are either identical to or approximations of features of his mother tongue.
- (b) Overgeneralization. This refers to the process by which the learner masters one form in the TL and then extends its application to contexts where it is inapplicable.
- (c) Incomplete learning. This refers to those errors which occur because the second language speaker has only half-learned any features of the TL and is therefore liable to produce structures or idioms that are only partially correct.
- (d) Incorrect association. These occur where the learner confuses a linguistic form in the target language with another in the same language and consequently produces a deviant form.

- (e) Pretentious verbosity. It is characterized by high sounding words and long and involved sentences.
- (f) Plain ignorance. This is a source of non-contrastive errors which occur not because the learner has half-learned a linguistic form, not because he is tempted himself in an impressive manner, but simply because he doesn't know what linguistic form to use in the particular context.

2.6 Types of Errors

Lexical errors found in the data have been classified into two general categories according to the sources of errors, that is, interlingual and intralingual errors. Interlingual errors consisted of 3 subcategories, while intralingual errors included 10 subcategories.

The researcher adopted the models related to lexical errors propounded by several linguists. Together, they form the conceptual framework which forms the basis for the researcher's data analysis. For the category of interlingual errors, the researcher adopted two of Woon's (2003), categories, namely (1) direct translation, and (2) use of native words. The last error type for this category is misordering. This type of error was taken from Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982). For the intralingual errors, three subcategories were adopted from James' (1998) classification: (1) confusion of sense relations, (2) collocational errors, and (3) distortions. James examined distortions especially at the morphological level. However, regarding the analysis of this type of error, the researcher has also included distortion errors at the morphosyntactic level. Another two error types from Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) were adopted for this categories as well: (1) omission, and (2) additions. Three more error types were taken from Woon (2003): (1) confusion of derivatives, (2) redundancy, and (3)

paraphrase. Confusibles is an error type taken from Laufer's (1992) taxonomy, while confusion of binary terms is from Zughoul's (1991). The reason that the researcher adopted types of errors from several linguists is because in the process of evaluation students' lexical errors, the researcher is able to cover all lexical errors found in the composition.

2.6.1 Interlingual Errors

Interlingual Errors are "errors caused by the interference or negative transfer of the learner's mother tongue" (Richard, 1971: 173). Errors occur when the automatic transfer of L1 structures to L2 performance is negative transfer and when the L1 and L2 structures are different. Interlingual transfer or interference from the native language significantly occurs at the beginning stages of learning the L2. "Before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only linguistic system in previous experience upon which the learners can draw... These errors are attributable to negative interlingual transfer" (Brown, 1994: 213-124). There are two subcategories of interlingual errors: (1) direct translations, and (2) use of native words.

2.6.1.1 Direct Translations

This type of errors occurs when the learners translate directly words from the L1 to the L2, but does not convey the meaning intended in the target language. Sentences produced with this kind of error sound odd and funny to proficient speakers of English or native speakers, but they are understood among the Thais even though they are not acceptable.

The following sentences are examples of direct translation:

- *Though, it's just his dream but I known which make him happy.
(I know he's happy)
- *Infinally, our trip's last day is coming. (Finally, the last day of our trip was drawing near.)
- *I saw many people had happy and enjoyment with their family.
(I saw many people were happy and enjoyable with their family.)

2.6.1.2 Misordering

Misordering errors occur as a result of the “incorrect placement of a morpheme or group of morphemes in an utterance” (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982: 162). They observe that misordering frequently occur when the learners produce written or spoken utterances in the TL using “word-for-word translation of native language surface structures” (Dulay, Burt and Krashen 1982: 163).

The following are examples of misordering:

- *I think everything in the world also is difficult. (is also)
- *This is because it uses many program software of three-D animation such as.... (software program)
- *We all had an impressible lunch in a luxury restaurant where is food very tasty. (food is)

2.6.1.3 Use of Native Words

This type of error can be grouped into two categories: (i) the use of L2 loan words in the L1 and (ii) the use of L2 words. In his analysis of lexical errors made

by Polish learners of English, Arabski (1979; cited in Zughoul, 1991: 56) uses the term “lexical shift” which is the use of words or lexical items of the L1 in the L2. Arabski further states that the most obvious influence of the L1 is seen in the use of L1 lexical items.

However, this kind of error found in one interlanguage may not be as serious in another due to the differences in the lexicon. They are attributed to “perceived language distance” (Kellerman, 1977 & Ringbom, 1982, cited in Zughoul, 1991: 56). For instance, Malay is perceived as “closer” to English compared to Thai where the use of technical vocabulary is concerned. Certain lexical items in Malay are loan words from English and they look and sound similar, for examples, *teknologi*, *operasi*, *klinik*, etc. These words in Thai are absolutely different. There is a great distance between the MT (Thai) and the TL (English).

2.6.2 Intralingual Errors

Intralingual errors within the target language itself are another major category of error found in second language learning. Intralingual errors occur because of the difficulty of the TL or due to partial exposure to the TL. According to Richards (1971: 174-178), intralingual errors produced by the learners involve four systematic sources of errors: (1) overgeneralization (when the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of other structures in the TL), (2) ignorance of rules restrictions (the application of rules to contexts where they do not apply), (3) incomplete application of rules (a failure to fully develop a structure), and (4) false concepts hypothesized (a failure to comprehend fully a distinction in the TL). Many researchers, especially, Taylor (1975, cited in Brown, 1994: 214) have found that after the learners have familiarized with the system of the second language, “more and more intralingual” errors occur. At this stage, “negative intralingual

transfer or overgeneralization” takes place. The researcher has identified eleven subcategories in the analysis of errors found in the study. There are: confusion of sense relations, collocational errors, distortions, omissions, additions, misordering, confusion of derivatives, redundancy, paraphrasing, confusibles, and confusion of binary terms.

2.6.2.1 Confusion of Sense Relations

This kind of error is one of the semantic errors found in the use of L2 vocabulary. In this category, errors occur when the learners select inappropriate words to convey the intended meaning in the TL. The learners have not understood the different meanings of an English word and its usage in different contexts. Students need to learn that in English, there are word sets such as synonyms, superonyms, hyponyms, and so on. The semantic field theory claims that “the vocabulary of language is structured, just as the grammar and phonology of a language are structured – the words of a language can be classified into sets which are related to conceptual fields” (Lehrer, 1974: 15) Thus, the learners cannot generalize these word sets by assuming that they can be used interchangeably. The problem of this kind of error can be seen clearly, especially among foreign language learners who are encouraged to learn synonyms and rely heavily on monolingual or bilingual dictionaries. They tend to assume that synonyms of a word have the same meaning and can be used in all contexts. As stated by Zughoul (1991: 47-48) that English is “very rich in synonyms because of the French, Latin, and Greek influences on the language and because of the vast number of borrowings from different languages”. However, it has been generally argued in the semantic field theory that “there are no real synonyms in language and that no two words or two sentences have exactly the same meaning”. Palmer (1976, cited in Zughoul, 1991: 48) argues that “it seems unlikely that two words with exactly the same meaning would both survive in a language. Words that are

considered synonyms, especially those “exploited” in dictionaries are in fact different in meaning in some respect”. With regard to this, James (1998: 151) provides four major types of errors:

- (i) Using a more general term where a more specific one is needed
- (ii) Using too specific a term
- (iii) Using the less apt of two co-hyponyms
- (iv) Using the wrong one from a set of near-synonyms

The following are examples of errors of confusion of sense relations:

- *On the beach which full of the white beach as far as the eyes can see
I feel fresh and cheerful. (sand)
- *It is easier to think you understand when you just have surface
knowledge. (superficial)
- *It (work) is not all of life, so let’s give yourself time. (ourselves)

2.6.2.2 Collocational Errors

Another common lexical error is in the use of collocations. Collocations are “the other words any particular word normally keeps company with” (James, 1998: 152). Cowie (1992, cited in Yang & Xu, 2001: 54) defines collocations as “a composite unit that permits the substitutability of items for at least one of its constituents.” As Firt aptly puts it, “You shall know a word by the company it keeps” (cited in Zughoul, 1991: 51). Thus, collocations rely heavily on word-association knowledge. The wrong choice of collocation produced by the learners can be considered as “unEnglish”, which is “directly related to transfer from the native language”. Semantically, however, it is

understood by the native speakers of English because it makes sense, but is not normally used in that way (Zugoul, 1991: 51).

James (1998: 152) gives three degrees of collocation:

- (i) Semantically determined word selection. He gives the example:
“It is right to say *crooked stick* but not *crooked year* because in the world as we know it years cannot literally ‘be’ crooked.”
- (ii) Combinations with statistically weighted preferences. He gives the example of the word ‘*army*’ with the collocations ‘*big losses*’ and ‘*heavy losses*’. However, the latter phrase is preferred as in the sentence “an army has suffered heavy losses”.
- (iii) Arbitrary combinations. At this degree of collocation, James illustrates this with the following examples: We “*make an attempt*” and “*have a try*” but we cannot “*make a try*” and “*have an attempt*”, despite the synonymy of “*attempt*” and “*try*”.

The following are examples of collocational errors:

- *She rushed to the beach for touching the fresh air. (to breathe in the fresh air)
- *They are fighting again and again to go to the aim. (achieve their aim)
- *This sweeping beach offers fine-grained white sand and crystalline waters. (crystal-clear water)

2.6.2.3 Distortions

James (1998: 150) explains that distortions as “the intralingual errors of form created without recourse to L1 resources”. The outcomes are forms non-existent in the TL. They are the result of the misapplication of one or more of the following processes:

- (i) omission e.g. **intresting* (interesting)
- (ii) overinclusion e.g. **freshermen* (freshmen), **dinning room* (dining room)
- (iii) misselection e.g. **delitouse* (delicious)
- (iv) misordering e.g. **littel* (little), **ferporate* (perforate)
- (v) blending e.g. **the depths of the ocean* (depth + deeps)

The following are examples of distortions from the data except blending which has no record:

(i) omission

- **Another occupation in which we have to use English is an ambassdor. (ambassador)*

(ii) overinclusion

- **My favorite passtime is play internet. (pastime)*

(iii) misselection

- **Of cause, some people were friendly. (of course)*

(iv) misordering

- **We even saw a theif who was very clever. (thief)*

2.6.2.4 Omissions

Omissions are erroneous sentences characterized by “the absence of an item that must appear in a *well-formed utterance*” (Dulay, Burt and Krashen, 1982: 154). The cause of this error is probably difficulties in finding the correct word to convey the intended meaning. When the learners face such a problem, they tend to leave a blank because they do not know the correct word to use. Zahira (2003: 95) argued that “when the learners have limited vocabulary, they prefer to leave out the lexical item because they cannot find suitable lexical items for their sentences”. As a result, the sentences make very little or no sense at all. This state of ignorance is a sign of incompetence and the learners are not yet able to make corrections themselves. On the other hand, if the cause of the omissions is due to errors of slips of the tongue or lapses, the learners would be able to correct themselves if they were given the opportunity. Slips of the tongue can be considered as “incidental, nonsystematic and superficial disturbances in verbal executions” (James, 1998: 87).

The following are examples of omissions:

- *Although, the day began with dreadful _____ but it was happy ending. (experience)
- *We parked our car at the parking_____ of Samila beach. (lot)
- *I _____ very relaxed when I stayed at the beach. (was)

2.6.2.5 Additions

Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982: 156) define addition errors as “the opposite of omissions. They are characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in the well-formed utterance”. Addition errors result from the all-too-faithful use of certain rules. They suggest three subtypes of addition errors:

- (i) double marking e.g. **I didn't went; *He doesn't knows my name.*
- (ii) regularization e.g. **sheeps, *eated*
- (iii) simple addition (neither a double marking nor a regularization)

The following are examples of additions:

(i) *double marking*

- **We went to visited my friend's house.*

(ii) *regularization*

- **I can relax by play games and musics.*

(iii) *simple addition*

- **Samila beach is very beautiful. The sky at here is so clear.*

2.6.2.6 Confusion of Derivatives

The different forms of word classes: nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs in the TL itself are complex and interrelated. When learners produce written or spoken utterances, they are confused by these different forms of the TL. This is due to the difficulties in the TL. A rule that exists in the L2 is not found in the L1. Thus, such errors occur when the learners fail to identify the correct word class, for example the learner uses

adjectives where nouns are required. Woon (2003: 65) divides confusion of derivatives into 4 groups:

- (i) confusion between nouns and verbs
- (ii) confusion between nouns and adjectives
- (iii) confusion between verbs and adjective
- (iv) confusion between adjectives and adverbs

Ong (2007: 28) categorizes confusion of derivatives into 3 groups with subcategories:

- (i) errors related to nouns
 - nouns used as verbs
 - nouns used as adjectives
 - nouns used as gerund
- (ii) errors related to verbs
 - verbs used as nouns
 - verbs used as adjectives
- (iii) errors related to adjectives
 - adjectives used as nouns
 - adjectives used as adverbs

The following are examples of confusion of derivatives:

- *When I was on the beach I feel freedom, happy and relax. (free, relaxed)

- *Everybody couldn't deny that English has no important to them.
(importance)
- *It (Swimming) is very challenge for me. (challenging)

2.6.2.7 Redundancy

Redundancy is the needless use of different words or phrases to repeat the meanings of other words or phrases in the same sentence. "The needless repetition of such words or phrases could be considered as redundant and therefore erroneous" (Woon, 2003: 74).

The followings are examples of redundancy:

- *The resort is full of comfortable accommodations, shops, and entertaining places at here.
- *Secondly, for getting sun bed some people they are really crazy about tan skin.
- *It is depend on each individual person how to manage with that thing.

2.6.2.8 Paraphrasing

Another difficulty due to the TL is the errors resulting from paraphrasing. When the learners have learned an idea in the L1 but do not know or recall the appropriate word to express such an idea in the L2, they may use more words or phrases than necessary to convey their intended meaning. Woon (2003: 81) describes paraphrase as

a state of “simplification strategy which the learners employ to replace lexical item that they don’t know”.

The following are examples of paraphrasing:

- *Sunday morning, my uncles, my ants, my cousins, my sisters, my brother, my parents and I started our trip from Pattani at my uncle's house. (my family members)
- *Last year I used to have an experience accident. (I had an accident)
- *Everyday, after I finish the study in the 19 building, I have to inside in the JFK library for reading the newspaper. (I go to)

2.6.2.9 Confusibles

Confusibles are errors that Laufer (1992) calls ‘synforms’. Room (1979) refers to them as ‘confusibles’; and Phythian (1989) uses the term ‘confusables’ (cited in James, 1998: 145). They are pairs of words that look and sound similar: *parricide/patricide, accessory/accessary*. Laufer (1992; cited in James, 1998: 145) identifies six ways in which pairs of synforms can be similar:

- (i) have the same number of syllables
- (ii) have the same stress pattern
- (iii) be of the same word class
- (iv) have the same initial part
- (v) have some phonemes in common
- (vi) have phonemes with shared features

Laufer groups confusibles into four main types:

- (i) the suffix type e.g. *consider<able> / consider<ate>*
- (ii) the prefixing type e.g. *<com>press / <sup>press*
- (iii) the vowel-based type e.g. *seat/set, manual/menial*
- (iv) the consonant-based type e.g. *prize/price, ledge/pledge*

The following are examples of confusibles:

- *I work up early in the morning. (woke)
- *At lunch time, I walk through a canteen of university in order to have a lunch together. (to)
- *How is lucky for anybody who leave near wonderful place like the sea. (live)

2.6.2.10 Confusion of Binary Terms

Palmer (1976 cited in Zughoul, 1991: 55) defines binary terms as “relational opposites” of lexical items. In other words, binary terms refers to two lexical items that are rationally opposite to each other such as *come-go, here-there, give-take*, etc.,. These words generally exhibit the relationship between items rather than “oppositeness in meaning”. Erdmenger (1985, cited in Zughoul, 1991: 55) also includes antonymy relations as in *thick-thin*, complementary relations as in *female-male*, converse relations as in *doctor-patient* and directional relations as in *come-go*. The confusion of binary terms occurs when the learners are confused by the “rational opposites” and use inappropriate terms.

The following are examples of confusion of binary terms:

- *People all around the world go to take diving courses here. (come)
- *It was very fantastic for us and very excited because we never came there before. (went)

2.7 Vocabulary Acquisition

Learning a second language entails learning numerous aspects of that language, one of them is vocabulary. Even though traditionally vocabulary has given less attention in second language pedagogy than any other aspects, particularly grammar, vocabulary is the most important component in L2 ability. Wilkins (1972: 111) states the importance of vocabulary that “while without grammar very little can be conveyed, without vocabulary *nothing* can be conveyed”. Thus, for the second language learners they need vocabulary knowledge to function well in that language. Allen (1983) observes the relevance of vocabulary in communication. He holds the view that vocabulary problems frequently interfere with communication. When people do not use the right words, they fail to communicate..

The quality of vocabulary use in the compositions and the lexical errors which appear in the written work, to some extent, are fundamentally a result of vocabulary acquisition. The learning of vocabulary is much more than knowing ‘a list of words’, There are in fact many different kinds of vocabulary items or “words” for second language learners to acquire. Besides a set of single words, they also need to know “set phrases, variable phrases, phrasal verbs and idioms” (Folse, 2004: 2). In addition, in order to learn a new word, learners need to “find out what it means and consider how to use it in sentences before incorporating it into their natural vocabulary” (Hilton and Hyder, 2003: 10).

Laufer (1997: 141) points out several strategies on how to learn a new word. They are: (a) knowing the form of the words including knowing how the word is pronounced and spelt, (b) knowing the word structure and its root that go with it, affixes, and inflection such as plural forms, (c) knowing the syntactic pattern of the word such as knowledge of the part of speech, (d) knowing the meaning of the word, e.g. the referential, metaphorical, and affective and pragmatic meanings, (e) knowing the lexical relation of the word e.g. synonyms and antonyms, and (f) knowing common collocations and the rules on how the word can be used together. Oxford and Scarcella (1994: 231-233) asserts that “knowing a word involves not only an ability to recognize it when it is heard or seen, but also the ability to match it with native language translation”.

Gu (2003, cited in Ong, 2007: 34) indicates three important stages to learn a new word: (a) identifying and handling a new word, (b) committing a word to memory, and (c) attempting to use the learned word. In the same way, Nation (1999, cited in Ong, 2007: 34) points out three important methods and routes for SLA students to learn vocabulary. They are: (a) noticing, (b) retrieval, and (c) creative use.

Theoretically, Schmitt (2000: 116) provides two approaches to vocabulary acquisition. He claims that second language learners acquire vocabulary through the same processes that children go through when learning their native language: “*explicit learning* through the focused study of words and *incidental learning* through exposure when the learner focuses on the use of language”, but their learning context is usually different. When learners acquire vocabulary through explicit learning, their attention will directly focus on the information to be learned, which gives the greatest chance for its acquisition.

However, the process of this type of acquisition is time-consuming and it is difficult to learn an adequately sized vocabulary. Incidental learning, on the other hand, can occur when the learners use the language for communicative purposes. In this process, the students will get a double benefit for time expended but it is slower and more gradual.

Schmitt (2000: 117) describes the characteristics of vocabulary acquisition. He points out that “vocabulary acquisition is incremental in nature”. The component types of word knowledge cannot be completely learned simultaneously. For example, the learners cannot have full collocational competence before they know the basic meaning of a word. In the same token, Henricksen (1999, cited in Schmitt, 2000: 118) gives a description of the various aspects of incremental development of vocabulary knowledge. She provides three dimensions of knowledge which can be acquired to various degrees. They are: (a) learners can have knowledge ranging from zero to partial to precise; all word knowledge ranges on a continuum, rather than being known and unknown, (b) the depth of knowledge requires mastery of a number of lexical aspects, and (c) receptive and productive mastery; words are first learned receptively, and then developed to become known productively.

2.8 Error Correction

Error correction is an important stage in second language teaching and learning. It is advantageous for both teachers and learners. Teachers are able to know what the students have learned, and what they have failed to learn. For the students, error correction is beneficial to them because they are able to recognize their own weaknesses in language use. Eskey (1983, cited in Ferris, 2002: 4) states that “the ability to correct errors is crucial in many settings and that students’ accuracy will not magically improve all by itself”. Moreover, because L2 students are in the process of acquiring the L2 lexicon and the

morphological and syntactic system, they need distinct involvement from the teacher to help them develop strategies for finding, correcting, and avoiding errors (Ferris, 2002).

However, error correction has disadvantages as well. If teachers pay too much attention to the errors and correct every error, the students may lose confidence in their language use and try to avoid committing errors. According to the results of avoidance, teachers cannot know the true ability of the learners' language competence. Holley and King (1971, cited in Hendrickson, 1982: 115) state that "teachers need to be aware of how they correct student errors and to avoid using correction strategies that might embarrass or frustrate students".

A number of researchers have given suggestions on error correction. Norrish (1983: 71-75) gives three approaches in correcting written errors. (1) Checking work in group or pairs. This approach saves the teacher's time and encourages communication among the students. It has even more advantages if the correction work is conducted in English. Besides, a group of four is convenient and allows a large number of communication possibilities. (2) Integrated skills activities. This is a practical approach which can help students learn a second language effectively. When the teacher feels that corrective work is necessary, the treatment will be much more successful if the written exercise involves the learner in activities that use all the language skills. (3) Using a correcting code. By using this approach, the teacher writes a code of indication in margins or over the error. It will lead the learners, if they are given adequate time, to work out for themselves what is wrong, and try to correct it. It is more profitable if the teacher concentrates only on errors which are in the areas the class has been working on.

Byrne (1991: 124-126) provides four approaches to error correction: (1) Correct all the mistakes. This is the traditional approach to the correction of written work which is time-consuming and can be discouraging to the students if they get their work back covered with red ink. He suggests that it is better if the teacher can correct the students' errors in the class while they are still engaged in writing and everything is still fresh in their mind. (2) Correct mistakes selectively. This approach is more positive than total correction. The teacher attempts to correct only the mistakes in certain areas. (3) Indicate mistakes so that the students can correct them. Normally, it is done by underlining the mistakes and using some kind of symbol to focus the attention of the students on the kind of mistake they have made. The teachers can get the students, individually, in pairs, or in small groups, to identify most of the mistakes for themselves. In addition, this approach makes the students more aware of the kind of mistakes and is likely to result in something being learned. (4) Let the students identify and correct their own mistakes. This approach is not a procedure that the teachers are likely to be able to follow all the time. However, the teachers should occasionally be prepared to hand over the whole business of correction to the students.

2.9 Studies of Lexical Errors

Research in EA have focused mainly on two components of interlanguage, that is, syntax and phonology to the neglect of the lexicon as evidenced by many researchers such as Ramsey (1981); Zoghoul (1991); and Dušková, (1969). Ramsey (1981, cited in Zughoul, 1991: 45) claims that “teachers and syllabus designers have been under the influence of the tenets of audiolingualism where lexis is relegated to a secondary status in comparison to phonology and syntax”. In addition, the complexity inherent in the area of lexis does not lend itself as easily as phonology and syntax to quantification and scientific analysis

(Zughoul, 1991). Dušková (1969) has acknowledged that certain lexical errors are difficult to differentiate and they are less homogeneous as compared to errors in grammar.

Ong's (2007) study of lexical errors in the English written work of pre-university science students reveals that the main lexical errors found in the study were intralingual errors (75.77%), caused by the complexity and difficulty in the learners' TL. The error type "confusion of sense relations" represented the highest frequency of occurrence (10.6%), while lapses had the least frequency of occurrence (1.5%) among the lexical errors identified. In most studies conducted on lexical errors, for examples, Woon (2003), Zahira (2003), and Tan (1994), the percentage of intralingual errors is greater than that of interlingual errors.

According to Woon (2003), the lexical errors in the written work of form four Chinese educated ESL students of SMK Taman Connaught, Kuala Lumpur were examined. Out of the total number of lexical errors, 84.2% were accounted for intralingual errors whilst only 15.8% were accounted for interlingual errors. She concluded in her study that MT interference was not the main factor of lexical errors made by Chinese ESL students. Similar to Zahira (2003) and Tan (1994), their study revealed that Malay students generally committed intralingual errors than interlingual errors. Zahira (2003) conducted the study of lexical errors of upper secondary Malay learners of English. It is revealed that 66.13% were accounted for intralingual errors while 33.87% were accounted for interlingual errors. In Tan's (1994) study, the result revealed that intralingual errors constituted 88% of the total number of errors and interlingual errors constituted only 11%. It is implied that in the ESL setting, difficulty of the TL language is the main cause of errors.

On the other hand, the research conducted with the EFL students gave the different result. Cha (1996) who conducted a study on the lexical errors of Korean EFL students found that interlingual errors are the main source of errors committed by Korean EFL students. The highest lexical errors found in her study were the “literal translations” error type (32.2%). This study shows that the MT interference has a great influence on the performance of EFL students.

In many studies on Thai EFL learners, lexical errors were considered to be a secondary factor after grammar. Khaourai (2002) conducted a study on errors in the English compositions of English major students at Rajabhat Institute, Nakhon Pathom. In her analysis, she grouped errors into three categories: grammatical errors, syntactic errors, and lexical errors. The results revealed that grammatical errors occurred most frequently (69.65%), while lexical errors came in third place (10.31%). Kemthong (1981) conducted research on the errors of students at Ramkhamhaeng University. The results showed that the most frequent error that committed was in the use of punctuation (59.93%) and in second place came the use of lexical items and expression (54.73%).

Kertpol (1983) analyzed errors in the compositions written by secondary students. He found that the main cause of errors was incomplete application of rules, followed by errors due to translation from Thai into English. Lexical errors both in meaning and function were also found. Lukanavanich (1988) carried out an analysis of the written errors of first-year English students at Bangkok University. The results showed that the errors were mainly grammatical or structural errors. Lexical errors and stylistic errors were also found.

Cheojarnchin (1990) conducted an error analysis of the written errors of Mattayom Suksa 4 students at Udonpittayanukul School. The results revealed that the errors found in the written work of the students were structural errors, lexical errors, spelling errors, and punctuation errors, respectively. The most frequent errors were structural errors. Srinon (1999) studied an error analysis of the free compositions written by the first-year students at Mahamakut Buddhist University, Ayutthaya Province. The results showed that a total of 47 types of errors in the sample which could be ordered into top ten frequencies from the most to the least: (1) errors in the use of tenses, (2) errors in the use of determiners, (3) errors in the use of prepositions, (4) errors in the use of verb forms, (5) punctuation errors, (6) literal translation from L1 (Thai) to L2 (English), (7) errors in the use of adverbs, (8) wrong choice of words, (9) errors in the use of nouns, and (10) errors in the use of adverbs. Regarding the sources of errors analyzed, 32.10% resulted from the mother tongue interference, 17.70% from carelessness, 15.63% from overgeneralization, 14.40% from ignorance of rule restrictions, 10.29% from false concept hypothesized, and 9.88% from incomplete application of rules. The most important finding of this study is that most of the students in the sample group used first language structures to write the English compositions, which was the main cause of the written errors.

2.10 Summary

The literature related to error analysis provided in this chapter is the conceptual framework that the researcher uses to analyze and explain the errors of this study. They are the framework of analyzing used for all the discussions and explanations of the causes of errors.