CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1   **Introduction**

2.2   **Theory on related literature**

2.3   **Conclusion**

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1   Introduction

In recent years researchers and teachers have come to figure out and understand that second language learning is a process of the creative construction of a system in which learners are consciously testing hypotheses about the target language from a number of possible sources of knowledge: knowledge of the native language, limited knowledge of the target language itself, knowledge of the communicative functions of language, knowledge about the language in general, and knowledge about life, human beings, and the universe. The learners in acting upon their environment, construct what to them is a legitimate system of language of its own right- a structured set of rules that for the time being bring some order to the linguistic chaos that confronts them.

Although large numbers of educators and linguists are currently involved in the study of second language acquisition (SLA), its research history is not very long. SLA research had its beginnings in the late 1960's when early researchers first attempted, through empirical studies, to describe the characteristics of learner language. Not satisfied with merely descriptive research, many researchers soon began attempts to explain why learners made errors, why regularities appeared in their language and why their language displayed systematic change over time. They wanted to know the mental processes that second language (L2) learners used to convert input knowledge such as the learner's employment of knowledge about her first language (L1), universal language, and general learning strategies used to acquire L2. Through such processes the learner constructs an interim language between L1 and L2.

A number of terms have been coined to describe the perspective that stresses the legitimacy of learners' second language system. The best known of these is interlanguage, a term that Selinker (1972) adapted from Weinreich's (1953) term interlingual. Interlanguage refers to the separateness of a second language learner's system, a system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and target languages which comes under error analysis.

2.2   Theory on related literature

Error analysis

The phenomenon of words and sentences red-pencilled by language teachers while evaluating students' writing are commonly known as mistakes, errors and slips. The presence of errors explains the students' inability to use appropriate grammatical structures, semantic categories and other linguistic units. The current view suggests that errors should not be looked upon as problems to be overcome, but rather as normal and inevitable strategies that language learner's use. Linguists today believe that a learner errors because he is evolving a language system, that he is always formulating and discarding hypotheses and is constantly testing his knowledge of the language against the data he encounters.

There is an Italian proverb "Sbagliando simpara" (we can learn through our errors)…making mistakes can indeed be regarded as an essential part of learning."(Norrish 1983). Brown (1987) says that language learning, like any other human learning is a process that involves the making mistakes. In order to understand the process of L2 learning, the mistakes a person made in the process of constructing a new system of

language should be analysed carefully. The error analysis can be defined as a process based on analysis of learners' errors.

The terms 'error' and 'mistakes' according to most dictionaries are synonymous, but in error analysis, it is convenient to reserve the term 'mistake' for something rather different. Corder says it will be useful to refer to errors of performance as 'mistakes' which is not significant to the language learning process, and reserve the term 'error for the systematic errors of the learner from which his knowledge of the language to date can be reconstructed.

The forerunner of Error analysis, Corder (1987) also explains the significance of learners' errors in three different ways. "The first to the teacher in that they tell him, if he undertakes a systematic analysis , how far towards the goal the learner has progressed, and consequently what remains for him to learn. Second, they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in his discovery of the language. Thirdly, and in a sense this is their most important aspect, they are indispensable to the learner himself, because we can regard the making of errors as a device the learner uses in order to learn".

Brown (1987) gives the definition of error analysis as follows: The fact that learners do make errors and these errors can be observed, analysed and classified to reveal something of the system operating within the learner led to a surge of study of learners' errors, called 'error analysis'.

There are those so-called "errors" or "mistakes" that are more correctly described as lapses. A mistake refers to a performance error, it is a failure to make use of a known

system. Everybody makes mistakes in both native and second language situations. Normally native speakers are able to recognize and correct such "lapses" or "mistakes" which are not the result of a deficiency in competence, but the result of imperfection in the process of producing speech (Brown,1987). Errors are deviances that are due to deficient competence (i-e "knowledge) of the language, which may or may not be conscious). As they are due to deficient competence they tend to be systematic and not self correctable. Whereas "mistakes" or "lapses" that are due to performance deficiencies and arise from lack of attention, slips of memory, anxiety possibly caused by pressure of time etc. They are not systematic and readily identificable and self correctable. (Corder, 1973). Learners may make mistakes in the target language, since they don't know the target language very well, they have difficulties in using it. In order to arrive at effective remedial measures the analyst must understand fully the mechanism that triggers each type of error.(Sanal 2007). The source of an error could be interlanguage or intralangauge. (Richards,1971)

Human learning is fundamentally a process that involves the making of mistakes. Mistakes and errors in language learning, in this sense, is like any other human learning. Many of the mistakes are logical in the limited linguistic system within which children operate, but by carefully processing feedback from others, children slowly but surely learn to produce what is acceptable speech in their native language. Second language learning is a process that is clearly not unlike first language learning in its trial-and-error nature. Inevitably learners will make mistakes in the process of acquisition, and that process will be impeded if they do not commit errors and then benefit from various forms of feedback on those errors.

Researchers and teachers of second languages came to realize that the mistakes a person made in this process of constructing a new system of language needed to be analyzed carefully, for they possibly held in them some of the keys to the understanding of the process of second language acquisition. As Corder (1967) noted: " 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 is employing in the discovery of the language".

Error analysis in SLA was established in the 1960s by Stephen Pit Corder and colleagues (Corder, 1967). Error analysis was an alternative to contrastive analysis, an approach influenced by behaviorism through which applied linguists sought to use the formal distinctions between the learners' first and second languages to predict errors. Error analysis showed that contrastive analysis was unable to predict a great majority of errors, although its more valuable aspects have been incorporated into the study of language transfer. A key finding of error analysis has been that many learner errors are produced by learners making faulty inferences about the rules of the new language.

In order to analyze learner language in an appropriate perspective, there are different between mistakes and errors, technically. A mistake refers to a performance error that is either random guess or a "slip", in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. The hesitations, slips of tongue, random ungrammaticalities, and other lapses in native-speaker production also occur in second language speech. Mistakes, when attention is called to them, can be self corrected. Mistakes must be carefully distinguished from errors of a second language learner, idiosyncracies in the language of the learner.

Under Error analysis, the examination of errors attributable to all possible sources, not just those which result from negative transfer of the native language. Errors also arise from interlingual errors of interference from the native tongue, intralingual errors within the target language, the sociolinguistic context of communication, psycholinguistic strategies and countless affective variables.

The error analysis is concerned with the same problem as Contrastive Analysis but from an opposing point of view. In error analysis, the error has been defined as a deviation from the norm of the target language and a distinction has been made between errors and mistakes. The error is what takes place when the deviation arises as a result of lack of knowledge whereas the mistakes comes up when learners fail to perform their competence. Errors have been further divided into overt and covert (Corder,1971), errors of correctness and appropriateness, as far as identification of error is concerned, and into presystematic, systematic, and postsystematic regarding their description (Corder,1974).

As we know error analysis is a comparative process. So, in order to describe the errors, in a way, we use a special case of contrastive analysis, and we compare synonymous utterances in the learners' dialect and the target language, in other words we compare "erroneous utterance" and "reconstructed utterance". (Corder, 1973). According to Corder's model (1973) any sentence uttered by the subsequently transcribed can be analysed for idiosyncracies. A major distinction is made between "overt" and "covert" errors. (Brown ,1987) overtly erroneous utterances are completely ungrammatical at the sentence level. Covertly erroneous utterances are grammatically well-formed at the sentence level, but are not interpretable within the context.

According to Corder's model, in the case of both overt and covert errors, if we can make a plausible interpretation of the sentence, then we should make a reconstruction of the sentence in the target language and compare the reconstruction with original idiosyncratic sentence, and then describe the differences. (Brown,1987). If the learner of a foreign language makes some mistakes in the target language by the effect of his mother tongue, that is called as interlanguage errors.

In general, Second language acquisition research tackled with the error sources which might be psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, epistemic or residing in the discourse structures. Richards (1971), when trying to identify the causes of competence errors he came up with three types of errors: interference errors, which reflect the use of elements from one language to the other, intralingual errors, subdivided into errors due to overgeneralization, or to ignorance of rules restriction, which is incomplete application of the rules, or finally due to the false concept hypothesis, which demonstrate the general characteristics of rule learning and third developmental errors when the learner builds hypothesis about the target language based on limited experience.

Another division was made by Dulay and Burt in 1974 according to which there are three types of error: the developmental ones which are based on the identity hypothesis are similar to the errors made in first language acquisition, interference errors and unique errors which cannot fall into either of the above mentioned categories. Error analysis was criticized for its weaknesses in the methodological procedures and its limited scope. It has been claimed that the error analysis has not succeeded in providing a complete view of language acquisition describing it as exclusively a collection of errors.

Schachter, Celce-Murcia (1977) criticized Error analysis on the grounds of its focusing on errors, of the fact that researchers are denied access to the whole picture and of failing to account for all the areas of the second language in which learners have difficulties. Nevertheless, despite the constructive criticism the Error analysis has been very important in the sense that it has given the error respectability and it has made obvious that the errors are a positive element in language learning.

Error analysts distinguish between errors, which are systematic, and mistakes, which are not. They often seek to develop a typology of errors. Error can be classified according to basic type: omissive, additive, substitutive or related to word order. They can be classified by how apparent they are: *overt* errors such as "I angry" are obvious even out of context, whereas *covert* errors are evident only in context. Closely related to this is the classification according to *domain*, the breadth of context which the analyst must examine, and *extent*, the breadth of the utterance which must be changed in order to fix the error. Errors may also be classified according to the level of language: phonological errors, vocabulary or lexical errors, syntactic errors, and so on. They may be assessed according to the degree to which they interfere with communication: *global* errors make an utterance difficult to understand, while *local* errors do not. In the above example, "I angry" would be a local error, since the meaning is apparent.

From the beginning, error analysis was beset with methodological problems. In particular, the above typologies are problematic: from linguistic data alone, it is often impossible to reliably determine what kind of error a learner is making. Also, error analysis can deal effectively only with learner production (speaking and writing) and not with learner reception (listening and reading). Furthermore, it cannot account for learner use of

communicative strategies such as avoidance, in which learners simply do not use a form with which they are uncomfortable. For these reasons, although error analysis is still used to investigate specific questions in SLA, the quest for an overarching theory of learner errors has largely been abandoned. In the mid-1970s, Corder and others moved on to a more wide-ranging approach to learner language, known as interlanguage.

Error analysis for L2 learner involves analysis of errors in writing, judging the accuracy or appropriateness of writing and making the necessary the changes in work. We can identify 3 level of errors in student's writing: 1) grammar (sentence level) errors, 2) paragraph level errors, and whole text level errors. The error analysis is useful and necessary as to helps the learner to make writing intelligible, ideas clear, and get higher marks as the lack of errors.

Error analysis is closely related to the study of error treatment in language teaching. Today, the study of errors is particularly relevant for focus on form teaching methodology. Based on this issue, there are various approaches to the study of errors. It can be divided into two, namely: 1) the linguistic approaches and 2) non-linguistic approaches. The linguistic approaches refer to Contrastive Analysis Approach and Error Analysis Approach, while the non- linguistic approaches refers to Sociological Approach and Psychological Approach. In this research, it will be focus more on linguistic approaches and other factors also will be determined.

Interlanguage

The term used most frequently today to describe this transitional language, *interlanguage,* was created by Selinker in (1972). Interlanguage was the first significant theory which tried to explain L2 acquisition. Interlanguage refers to the language a learner

has constructed at a specific point in time, 'an interlanguage'. It also refers to the series of languages that have been constructed over a period of time, 'interlanguage'. Ellis (1985 and 1989) proposed that interlanguage develops simultaneously in three phases: (1) innovation (the acquisition of new forms), (2) elaboration (the use of more complex language as the use of forms in different contexts is discovered), and (3) revision (the adjustments of language that are made as a result of innovation and elaboration).

Two major goals of second language acquisition (SLA) research are: to determine the second language learner's L2 grammatical knowledge (i.e., interlanguage competence); and to explain how it develops over time from an initial state to an end state, often a fossilized state. As in the case of the linguistic competence of child first language (L1) learners and adult native speakers, interlanguage competence cannot be examined directly. Instead, information about the nature of interlanguage competence can only be derived indirectly, through an examination of interlanguage performance data. Such performance data include, among others, production data (e.g.,spontaneous speech, and experimentally elicited speech data), comprehension data and grammaticality judgements. Of these various types of data, production data, particularly spontaneous speech data, have been frequently used in SLA research.

An assumption underlying the Interlanguage Hypothesis proposed by Selinker (1972) is that interlanguage – at least partially different from the native language and the target L2 – is a linguistic system in its own right; this may be one of the few points agreed on by all SLA researchers. This suggests that in order to characterize the language learner's linguistic competence in the L2 accurately, interlanguage must be analysed in its own terms.

An interlanguage also can be define as an emerging linguistic system that has been developed by a learner of a second language who has not become fully proficient yet but is only approximating the target language: preserving some features of their first language in speaking or writing the target language and creating innovations. An interlanguage is idiosyncratically based on the learners' experiences with the L2. It can fossilize in any of its developmental stages. The learner creates an interlanguage using different learning strategies such as language transfer, overgeneralisation and simplification.

Interlanguage is based on the theory that there is a "psychological structure latent in the brain" which is activated when one attempts to learn a second language. Larry Selinker proposed the theory of interlanguage in 1972, noting that in a given situation the utterances produced by the learner are different from those native speakers would produce had they attempted to convey the same meaning. This comparison reveals a separate linguistic system. This system can be observed when studying the utterances of the learners who attempt to produce a target language norm.

To study the psychological processes involved one should compare the interlanguage of the learner with two things which are; 1) Utterances in the native language to convey the same message made by the learner and also, 2) Utterances in the target language to convey the same message made by the native speaker of that language.

An interlanguage is also a language that is used by speakers of different languages in order to be able to mutually communicate. Only two such interlanguages, Interlingua and Esperanto, have substantial speaking populations. A third interlanguage, Ido, has a smaller speaking population.

Interlanguage is the type of language produced by second- and foreign- language learners who are in the process of learning a language. In language learning, learner's errors are caused by several different processes. These include:

a. borrowing patterns from the mother tongue

b. extending patterns from the target language.

c. Expressing meanings using the words and grammar which are already known

From Richards, Jack C et al. 1992. Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics. Second Edition. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited. p.186

Interlanguage also refers to the separateness of a second language learner's system, a system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and target language Interlanguage is neither the system of the native language nor the system of the target language, but instead falls between the two; it is a system based upon the best attempt of learners to provide order and structure to the linguistic stimuli surrounding them. By a gradual process of trial and error and hypothesis testing, learners slowly and tediously succeed in establishing closer and closer approximations to the system used by native speakers of the language. Inerlingual (Weinreich:1953), Inerlanguage (Selinker:1972) Synonyms: Approximative system(Nemser:1971),Idiosyncratic dialect(Corder:1971) From Brown, Douglas B. 1994. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Third Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents. pp.203-204

Selinker(1972) coined the term 'interlanguage' to refer to the systematic knowledge of an L2 which is independent of both these learner's L1 and the target language. The term has come to be used with different but related meanings: (1) to refer to the series of interlocking systems which characterize acquisition, (2) to refer to the system that is

observed at a single stage of development ('an interlanguage'), and (3) to refer to particular L1/L2 combinations (for example, L1 French/L2 English v. L1 Japanese/L2 English). Other terms that refer to the same basic idea are 'approximative system' (Nemser 1971) and 'transitional competence'(Corder 1967) From Roderick Ellis 1994. The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford:Oxford University Press. p.710

Nemser (1971) referred to the same general phenomenon in second language learning but stressed the successive approximation to the target language in his term approximate system. While Corder (1971) used the term idiosyncratic dialect to connote the idea that the learner's language is unique to a particular individual, that the rules of the learner's language are peculiar to the language of that individual alone. Both of these share the concept that second language learners are forming their own self-contained linguistic systems. This is neither the system of the native language nor the system of the target language, but a system based upon the best attempt of learners to bring order and structure to the linguistic stimuli surrounding them. The interlanguage hypothesis led to a whole new era of second language research and teaching and presented a significant breakthrough from the shackles of the contrastive analysis hypothesis.

The main idea to analyzing interlanguage is to study the speech and writing of learners or known as learner language (Lightbrown & Spada 1993; C.James 1990). Production data is publicly observable and is presumably reflective of a learner's underlying competence- production competence. It also follows that the study of the speech and writing of learner (main focus in this research is in writing) is largely the study of the errors of learners. "correct" production yields little information about the

actual linguistic system of learners, only information about the target language system that learners have already acquired.

Teachers can give appropriate feedback after checking out learner's interlanguage. Learners need not worry so much about making mistakes. They can assume that making mistakes is a procedure of development from mother tongue to Second Language.

The variable shape of interlanguage

The concept of interlanguage has had a major impact on the field of second language acquisition. Studies on interlanguage focus on the linguistic and psychological aspects of second language acquisition research. Before the 1960's language was not considered to be a mental phenomenon. Like other forms of human behavior language is learnt by processes of habit formation. A child learns his mother tongue by imitating the sounds and patterns he hears around him. By approval or disapproval, adults reinforce the child's attempts and lead the efforts to the correct forms. Under the influence of cognitive linguists this explanation of first language acquisition was criticized. Language cannot be verbal behavior only, since children are able to produce an infinite number of utterances that have never heard before. This creativity is only possible because a child develops a system of rules. A large number of studies has shown that children actually do construct their own rule system, which develops gradually until it corresponds to the system of the adults. There is also evidence that they pass through similar stages acquiring grammatical rules. Through the influence of cognitive linguists and first language acquisition research the notion developed that second language learners, too, could be viewed as actively

constructing rules from the data they encounter and that they gradually adapt these rules in the direction of the target language.

However wrong and inappropriate learners' sentences may be in regard to the target language system, they are grammatical in their own terms, since they are a product of the learner's own language system. This system gradually develops towards the rule-system of the target language.

The various shapes of the learner's language competence are called interlanguage. The term draws attention to the fact that the learners' language system is neither that of his mother tongue nor that of the second language, but contains elements of both. Therefore, errors need not be seen as signs of failure only, but as evidence of the learner's developing system.

While the behaviorist approach led to teaching methods which use drills and consider errors as signs of failure, the concept of interlanguage liberated language teaching and paved the way for communicative teaching methods. Since errors are considered a reflection of the students' temporary language system and therefore a natural part of the learning process, teachers could now use teaching activities which did not call for constant supervision of the student's language. Group work and pair work became suitable means for language learning.

Spelling errors

Spelling is the writing of a word or words with the necessary letters and diacritics present in an accepted standard order. It is one of the elements of orthography and a prescriptive element of alphabetic languages. Most spellings attempt to approximate a transcribing of the sounds of the language into alphabetic letters; however, completely phonetic spellings are often the exception, due to drifts in pronunciations over time and irregular spellings adopted through common usage.

Spelling is a highly complex task that is gradually mastered over a period of time as an individual becomes acquainted with the properties and purposes of written language. Spelling involves the use of strategies, which may vary according to the words being attempted and the knowledge that the writer has acquired through experiences with words. (Faye Bolton & Diane Snowball)

Richard Gentry (1982) described the developmental stages learners go through in learning to spell as:

1. **Prephonemic Spelling**.
   Children scribble, form letters, and string letters together but with no awareness that letters represent phonemes or speech sounds. Children can, however, create meaningful messages through their exploration. Prephonemic spelling is typical of preschoolers and beginning kindergartners.

2. **Early Phonemic Spelling**.
   There is a limited attempt to represent phonemes with letters (i.e., using one or two letters for a word—"m" for "my" or "nt" for "night"). This stage is typical of many kindergartners and beginning first-grade children.

3. **Phonetic Spelling**.
   The child uses letters for phonemes (i.e., "lik" for "like" or "brthr" for "brother"). The child represents most phonemes, understands the concept of a word, but may not quite be reading fluently yet. Many ending kindergartners and beginning first-graders are at this stage.

4. **<u>Transitional spelling</u>**.

        In this stage, children are internalizing information about spelling patterns. The words they write look like English words. For example, the child may write "skool" for "school" and "happe" for "happy." Rules are not always employed correctly. With continued reading and writing practice, children integrate more spelling rules and patterns. This stage usually includes first through third-grade children.

5. **<u>Standard spelling</u>**.

        At this stage, children spell most words correctly. This stage usually occurs by the middle to the end of third grade or in fourth grade. Children are ready to learn to spell homonyms, contractions, and irregular spellings and to internalize the rules that govern spelling.

While some words admit multiple spellings, some spellings are not considered standard, and thus labeled as misspellings. A misspelled word can be a series of letters that represents no correctly spelled word of the same language at all (such as "liek" for "like") or a correct spelling of another word (such as writing "hear" when one means "here," or "no" when one means "know"). Misspellings of the latter type can easily make their way into printed material because they are not caught by simple computerised spell checkers.

One of the most massive studies of spelling errors ever is by Cramer and Cipielewski (1995). They analyzed what they decided were 55 types of spelling errors in 18,599 unedited children's compositions written on topics of the children's choice. These children were enrolled in grades 1 thru 8, in 256 classrooms in all 50 states of the USA. A total of 1,584,758 written words were examined.

These investigators contend that "the English language is not the chaotic beast of mythology it is often made out to be. On the contrary, it is systematic and reasonably predictable" in the conventional way it is spelt (p15). However, in a doubtless unintended acknowledgement of the guiding principle of simplified spelling, the authors agree that

conventional "spelling knowledge has been shown to be much more than the ability to match letter to sound".

The authors present four "features" in conventional English spelling that they feel make it "reasonably predictable" (p16). These are:

1. the predictable way affixes are spelt;

2. the fact that two words related in meaning may have similar spellings although they are pronounced differently, eg, *signal/sign*;

3. regular consonant letter-sound matches;

4. spelling patterns within words.

While not so stated in their report, feature number 4 presumably refers to the fact that there also are some "regular" vowel letter-speech sound matches in English spelling. The simplified spelling movement has made a strong case that too many spellings of words are not controlled by these four influences. Hence its insistence of the need for a highly systematic procedure for spelling all speech sounds.

The Cramer and Cipielewski (C&C) study does reiterate key information on which spelling reform is based. Thus they found there were over three times as many categories of misspellings of vowel sounds as of consonant sounds. Misspellings of vowel sounds also constituted 38% of the total spelling errors in the study. For consonant sounds the figure was 17%. The 10.5% of spelling errors the study found appearing exclusively in affixes and inflections also involved vowel sounds. Therefore probably close to half the misspellings involved defective transcription of vowel sounds.

This finding supports the heavy concentration by advocates of simplified spelling on reformation of vowel spellings. With reform in this area of spelling, a large percent of present spelling errors would decline, consistent with Cramer and Cipielewski (C&C) data. Similarly, Treiman (1993) found that 22% of first-grade children's misspellings of vowel sounds in words were "legal substitution errors". That is, these spelling mistakes were not correct for the particular word, but were possible conventional spellings of the vowel sound. There are 22 different possible spellings of the vowel /i/ (Groff & Seymour, 1987). Reducing the number of legal substitutions undoubtedly would facilitate children's learning to spell /i/ and other vowel sounds.

The C&C study calculated high coefficients of correlation (r's) between words children misspell from grade to grade. (An r of +1.00 indicates a perfect positive relationship between two variables.) For example, the r found between grades 3 and 5 was .85; between grades 4 and 7 was .83; between 6 and 8 was .91; and between 5 and 8 was .83. As the study correctly noted, "the words primary grade children misspell are, in many instances, the words intermediate and junior high school children continue to misspell" (p28). The investigators then inadvertently repeat the simplified spelling solution to this problem: "Clearly if one could reduce the errors children make on a relatively small subset of troublesome words, substantial progress in spelling proficiency would be made" (p28).

Simplified spelling is the most rational way to cope with this subset of "troublesome" words, its promoters maintain. Acceptance of this relatively small gain in the direction of simplified spelling also would indicate that advocates of spelling reform are willing to heed the advice that the future of reformed spelling depends on avoiding "the

radical and wide-sweeping proposals that have doomed previous simplification movements" (Venezky, 1983, p26).

Taking this limited step toward simplification of the spelling of vowels therefore might do better to overcome the natural conservative attitude of the populace toward change in any forms of the language, including its spelling. The probability of popular acceptance of regularization of vowel spellings would likely increase if the proposed changes did not eliminate the morpheme identity of words, i.e. did not obscure their shared semantic bases (eg, the spellings *signal/sign* would be retained).

Cramer and Cipielewski unfortunately offer some controversial opinions as to why children make spelling mistakes, and especially the same ones year after year. These researchers make the dubious assumption that one can look at a child's misspelling of a word and tell whether it was caused (a) "by misunderstanding how to spell words correctly", or (b) by "inattention" on the speller's part (p30). The fact that misspellings of certain homophones persist as the most common misspellings made by children, grades 1 thru 8, is presented as "proof" of this "inattention" to the spelling task.

The homophone *too* was found to be the most frequently misspelled word across eight grade levels. The fact that their was found to be the fifth most frequently misspelled word, *there* the sixth, and *they're* the 15th, are viewed as signs of "carelessness or indifference by children as they spell homophones." The omission of a letter in a word also is seen as a prime example of "inattention".

"Omitted letters proved to be the single greatest cause of spelling errors" across all grade levels, the study deduced (emphasis added) (p30). Children in the study misspelled the word *because* in 175 unique ways, most of which involved the omitting of a letter (Marine, 1995). Since such omitted letters "are due to inattention to the spelling task", the study rationalized, this psychological factor has overwhelming influence on the incidence of spelling errors.

However, the claim that inattention is a major *cause* of spelling errors is a hypothesis open to question. The authors of the study in effect admit so when they properly note that "most people value the ability to spell correctly very highly" (p36), and therefore do not take learning to spell lightly. A person's "educational qualifications and even intelligence" may be assumed from observations of his or her spelling performance, the study's investigators concede (p36). This judgment evidently acts as a stimulus for students to be attentive when spelling words. Thus only 1.5% (!) of the words handwritten by accomplished students (applicants to Cambridge University, the United Kingdom) were misspelled (Wing & Baddeley, 1980).

Children's thoughts are ahead of their hand and finger movements during handwritten spelling. Thus, spelling errors are produced that their writers later are able to correct, provided they were pointed out to them. However, there was no indication from the C&C study that the children were examined on their ability to subsequently correct the misspellings they made. Therefore citing children's purported apathy toward correct spelling as a principal cause of their misspellings appears much like blaming a victim for the offense committed against him or her.

This "offense", spelling reformers maintain, is the unpredictability of conventional spelling. This handicap to spelling utility cannot be remedied satisfactorily by trying to make conventional spelling tasks easier for children to master. Spelling reformers would consider, as largely a diversion from the essential issue, C&C's advice (p38) that words given to children to learn to spell be based on factors such as the frequency of their appearance in oral language and in school subjects, the frequency with which certain words are misspelled (the prime contribution of their study), the four "features" that govern conventional spelling (noted above), and information on "developmental spelling stages". Spelling reformers contend that if words were spelled predictably these considerations would become minor.

The "developmental spelling stages" that children are said to pass through are of much current interest to educators. These are supposedly important for teachers to consult when deciding what words children are given to learn to spell, and how instruction for them is to be provided. When a child is encouraged to "invent" the spellings of words (instead of writing them according to direct and systematic instruction), over time this pupil will spell a word differently, depending on the particular "natural" stage of spelling development in which he or she happens to be. That a peculiar form of invented spelling is used is held to be proof that a student is at a certain one of these various stages.

This information is considered useful to teachers who stress the use of invented spellings by their pupils. It "helps those teachers make sense of misspellings", Beers (1995, p54) contends. This teacher "is likely to feel less overwhelmed by the number of invented spellings if the misspellings can be systematically identified and organized for instruction" (p54). Treiman (1993), among others, agrees.

An immediate flaw in such advice (Groff, 1986) is that these teachers appear to be given an unmanageable task. They have the overwhelming job of (a) identifying accurately which of their students is at each of the various developmental stages, and then (b) devising uniquely different instruction for each developmental stage. The developmental spelling experts (e.g. Beers, 1995) so far have failed to provide a practical plan (the valid and reliable criteria to be fulfilled) for the successful completion of this first task.

To meet the second task, Beers (1995) simply advises dividing up the customary sequence of direct and systematic teaching of spelling skills into successive parts, and then implementing these separate parts at each of the developmental stages. As it turns out, there appears to be little essential change in content and sequence of instruction given in invented spelling/developmental spelling classrooms from that provided in classrooms that base spelling instruction purely on how predictably words are spelt.

Another area of research on children's spelling of which orthographic reformers should be aware is the extent to which students' phonological awareness affects their acquisition of spelling skills. Unfortunately, "there has been little research on the relation between [children's] phonemic [phonological] awareness and spelling" (Treiman, 1993, p32). Much more study has been conducted on the effects of children's phonological awareness on their development of reading than of spelling proficiency.

Thus "it is now well-established that there is a strong connection between children's ability to detect and manipulate the sounds making up spoken words, and their reading development" (Goswami, 1994, p.32). Likewise, "phonological sensitivity, coupled with letter knowledge, is sufficient for comprehending the alphabetic principle" (i.e., understanding that written language is a graphic representation of its oral version) (Bowey, 1995, p67).

This sensitivity to speech sounds is critical for children's learning to decode words. Thus "phonological processing skills should be considered to be important human abilities in their own right, similar to the intellectual abilities assessed on measures of general intelligence" (Torgeson, Wagner, & Rashotte, 1994, p282). It is predicted confidently that a "7-minute phonological awareness test will predict ease of initial reading acquisition [by children] better than a 2-hour intelligence test!" (Stanovich, 1994, p284). Thus phonological awareness appears to have a crucial influence on children's spelling development, more than for their reading acquisition, since to spell a word correctly the child must be more aware of its speech sounds than to read the word (Tangel & Blachman, 1955).

Phonological awareness by children refers to their ability to answer successfully questions such as these about spoken monosyllabic words:

(1) Do *run* and *sun* rhyme? Say a word that rhymes with *cat*.

(2) How many sounds are there in *at*? In *cat*?

(3) Do *run* and *sun* begin the same?

(4) Does *run* begin with an /f/?

(5) Does *sun* end with an N?

(6) What is the first sound in *big*? The last sound? The second sound?

(7) What word does /r/-/a/-/n/ say?

(8) Do *sit* and *meat* have the same middle sound?(9) Say *meat* without the /m/ sound. Say *meat* without the /t/ sound.

(10) Say *os* with the first sound last. Say *os* with the last sound first.

(11) Change the middle sound of *beat* to /a/.

This sequence of phonological tests is said to represent the approximate order of difficulty of the items for young children. But there is only limited evidence as to the precise degree that improving students' phonological awareness affects their ability to spell conventionally. This data will likely be forthcoming, due to the current high interest among educators in the subject.

Interpretations of recent research on children's spelling also would put heavy new burdens on teachers. These interpretations indicate that teachers not only should be expected to notice carefully whether children misspell words. Teachers must also master, and recall when needed, all of the intricate and expansive interpretations from research as to why young children misspell words as they do. Thus, no longer may a *bona fide* teacher simply instruct children to substitute, omit, add, or rearrange letters in words they misspell. Teachers now also must be prepared to reveal to individual young children the unconscious thoughts they exercised when they misspelled a word. It is highly doubtful, however, whether these all-encompassing new demands on already over-burdened teachers are either practical or expedient.

2.3   Conclusion

In order to solve the spelling problem faced by the students' in English writing, other than listing theories involve in this research, the errors are systematically analyzed to find out the causes of the errors. The material used in the technique is a specific set of words, sentences, name of a game, etc. Perhaps a method which is a set or collection of techniques, perhaps arranged systematically, like the Direct Method or the Grammar-Translation Method. A methodology or approach is a theoretical or philosophical explanation of learning. Different approaches may share the same techniques and even the same methods. Different methods may also share the same techniques. Some techniques derive from particular methodologies; others have arisen independently.

The teacher can select from a wide variety of techniques for developing skills in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and of course create original ones. These techniques are generally quite standardized. The teacher also might choose techniques from among established teaching methodologies that focus to greater or lesser degrees on grammar study, repetition drills, or practice of conversation patterns for daily use; all intending to stimulate learning, but perhaps suitable for different learning needs and goals especially in Second Language learning. Therefore, the language learner can learn and improve their Second language writing.