Intralingual morphological errors in FLL: A case of creativity

Yabancı dilde o dile uygun yapılan hatalar: Bir yaratıcılık örneği

Mehmet Çelik

Hacettepe University

Abstract

This article reports on an investigation into the intralingual errors in word derivation and inflection committed in writing and speaking. The article argues that some intralingual errors can be considered "creative". One main conclusion reached is that advanced learners can attain a level of competence which would render them having certain native speaker qualities in certain domains of language, i.e. lexical competence.

Key Words: Morphological intralingual errors, error analysis, creativity, lexical competence

Öz

Bu makale, yabancı dil öğrenimi sürecinde, yazılı ve sözlü sınavlarda öğrenilen dilin kurallarından hareketle yapılan sözcük türetimi hataları üzerine bir araştırmadır. Makale bu şekilde yapılan bazı hataların "yaratıcı" olarak kabul edilmesi gerektiğini savunur. Ulaşılan önemli sonuçlardan biri, ileri düzeyde yabancı dil bilen kullanıcıların, sözcük yetisi gibi dilin belli alanlarında, anadil kullanıcılarına benzer özellikler taşıyacak düzeye gelebildikleridir..

Anahtar Sözcükler: morfolojik dil içi hatalar, hata incelemesi, yaratıcılık, sözcüksel yeti

Introduction

Given examples like Joseph Conrad, the famous writer of Polish origin who produced great works of literature in his second foreign language, English, the question has always intrigued some, including myself, of whether a person can acquire native-like competency or native linguistic skills in using his second or third language, at least in certain domains of a language. If so, should this mean that this learner is "creative" in that language in the sense that first language users are "authorized" to be creative and coin new words using existing morphological rules? With this question in mind, this article tries to explore whether second/foreign language learners may acquire the ability to be creative in word derivation and inflection.

Learners of second/foreign languages, in the process of learning, pass from one stage to the next in the proficiency levels of the language they are learning. These stages, which inevitably involve errors, are called "interlanguage" or "interim grammar." Interlanguage reveals various strategies used by learners in an effort to communicate, sometimes *transferring* from their first language and at other times *utilizing* certain rules from the learned language, target language. The former type of transfer is called "interlingual" while the latter is known as "intralingual". In this study, an intralingual error is defined as an error in the production of which knowledge of the target language plays the sole role, and the strategies and rules in the formation of words are apparent. The reason why the learner produces an intralingual error is that the learner has a concept in his/her mind to express but s/he either cannot recall a

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Çelik, Hacettepe University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language, Teaching, E-mail: mcelik@hacettepe.edu.tr

word for it at the time of production or does not possess a lexical item in his/her vocabulary.

Literature Review

Learner errors could inform the practitioners as well as the theorists of the very little known intricate learning processes. Further, errors themselves exhibit a kind of temporary system, slightly independent of both the first and the target language, and thus inform practitioners of the developmental patterns and periods of learners. No matter how far away this system may be from that of the target language, it is a system in its own right showing the developmental stages of learners. This system is not the result of chaotic processes, but is rather a product of the several rules being learned and of cognitive processing. The significance of learner errors was pointed out as early as 1967 by Pit Corder. He believed that errors produced in the process of learning a second language are not merely errors: they provide valuable information regarding the strategies learners employ to overcome a difficulty in use and expression. He stressed that, in the light of insights obtained from errors, second language instruction can be devised keeping these errors in mind. Furthermore, Corder (1971) proposed that the interlanguage a learner has can be described as an "idiosyncratic dialect".

Some errors exhibit a degree of interlanguage where learners may make intralingual errors, errors not stemming from the application of L1 rules (L1 interference or transfer). Some learners may produce forms in L2 which are not conventionally utilized by the users of the target language, though they are based on a rule in L2. What these learners are actually doing is to fill in the space that can be called "possible-but-not used." This type of effort or strategy, generally known as overgeneralization, is employed by native speakers not only in literary works but also in daily conversations (Carter and McCarthy, 2004). The fact that advanced learners and native speakers use overgeneralization and other strategies of word formation for a concept they have difficulty to express have important ramifications for matters of linguistic competence and performance. Overgeneralization may often take place when learners know one syntactic function of a word (verb, noun, etc.)

but are unable to remember other syntactic functions, and thus a need arises to come up with or coin a word.

The literature dealing with the influences of the target language in the interim grammar of the learner is extraordinarily scarce compared with that of language transfer, or interlingual errors. Acceptably enough, when second/foreign language errors have been investigated, the main concern has been to describe interlingual errors rather than intralingual ones for the obvious pedagogic purpose of improving a learner's interlanguage. For instance, Henriksen (1999) proposes a three-stage lexical development for second language learners: (1) the partial-precise knowledge dimension, (2) the dept of knowledge dimension, and (3) the receptive-productive dimension. According to this model, lexical competence forms a continuum rather than clearly identifiable stages. This model ignores a dimension in which productive lexical competence can lead to creativity where learners can create lexical forms that are "creative" in nature.

If one can ever expect to observe creative morphosyntactic efforts by L2 learners, should these learners necessarily be learning L2 in the context where it is used as a first language? Most will answer this question positively. However, it seems that learners of foreign languages are in no worse position than others. The results of two recent studies support this position: Collentine (2004) and Hu (2002). Collentine (2004) addressed the question of whether L2 (Spanish) learning "abroad" (in a formal setting in the country where it is spoken, Spain) is likely to result in a higher morphosyntactic development/intake than in a formal classroom "at home" (where it is a foreign language, the United States). The results of this study demonstrate that grammatical and lexical development in L2 learners studying "abroad" is no better than that development achieved "at home." Overall, learning context plays no significant role in the morphosyntactic abilities of L2 learners. Hu (2002) found that adult Chinese instructed learners could operationalize their metalinguistic knowledge in their performance. Thus the idea that foreign language learners cannot be creative in one or more of the language domains is not supported.

There is further support for the claim that advanced learners of foreign languages can in fact exhibit similar

strategies in using language innovatively as those by children acquiring their first languages. For instance, Jain (1974) worked in the Indian context on what he called "L1 independent errors", which he noted were caused by the following: 1) learning strategies, 2) teaching techniques, 3) folklore about the second language, 4) the age of bilingualism, i.e. the period over which the second language has been used by the speech community to which the learner belongs, and 5) the learner's sociolinguistic situation (p.190). He further noted that simplification, generalization, and over-application are some of the strategies utilized by learners to cope with the demands of the non-linguistic features of situation. As is well known, all three strategies, namely simplification, generalization, and over-application, are also utilized by first language acquirers.

Partially in contrast to the causes of intralingual errors as documented by Jain, the intralingual errors under investigation in this study appear to be related to 1) learning strategies that learners develop independently of formal teaching and 2) the lengthy period of learning (8 to 11 years). Because English has the status of a foreign language in Turkey, one cannot speak of bilingualism or a speech community that could influence learner intake. Therefore, the source of errors should be sought entirely in the generalization of rules in the input. It is argued that the type of generalization in question, in the broadest sense, is similar, perhaps identical, to the generalizations native speakers make when they struggle to name a concept that is not named, so to speak, as yet.

Purposes of the Study

The present study examines the morphological creativity in word derivation and inflection of learners in their written performances in exam papers. The purpose is threefold: (a) to investigate and describe the types of intralingual errors, (b) to explore the types of the derivational affixes and the learner strategies in coining words from stems, and (c) to explore the acceptability levels of these words by native speakers. The current study is guided by the following questions:

1. Can foreign language learners attain a level of proficiency that will enable them to coin or create words in their L2 using the derivational affixes?
2. What types of derivational affixes and coining strategies are utilized in the coining process? And what do they reveal about the choices learners make?
3. How acceptable are these coined words to the native speakers of L2?

Faced with the problem of using a certain language component, be it a morpho-syntactic structure or a lexical item, learners basically have two main strategies to adopt: avoid it altogether, or attempt to use it. In cases where learners are proficient, or self-confident, in working out the meanings and syntactic functions of words by the help of the derivational affixes attached, it follows that they have at their disposal a grounding knowledge of derivational processes. Therefore, a learner who opts for the "attempt" strategy can thus employ this knowledge of his/hers to coin a word for a concept (syntactic function such as noun, verb, etc.) they have in their minds, for which they do not have the exact lexical item in their vocabulary. (One can never know whether the concept is conceptualized in L1 or L2. This should not be a problem at all for a study of this kind since the learner is trying to utilize L2 resources). As such it can even be argued that the inability to know or even remember the exact (established) word constitutes a lexical gap for them.

The second question addresses the listing and the nature of the affixes used for the lexical gaps in the interlanguage. A consideration of the most frequently used affixes will reveal the prototypical forms for those categories such as negation, noun, verb, and so on. Strategies such as overgeneralization and ignorance of rule restrictions are common in nonnative performances as well as in native speakers. In such strategies, even a process called simplification may be at work. For instance, the negative derivational prefix un- can be applied disregarding the initial consonantal features of the stems they are attached to.

The third research question tries to obtain linguistic legitimacy by means of a "grammaticality judgment" task, which elicits native speaker views/intuition on the "Englishness" of the coined words. This is particularly

important in that mere description and favorable justification of the coined words may ignore the socio-psychological aspect of the language phenomenon.

This article argues that several strategies such as overgeneralizations, hypercorrection and backformation at fairly advanced levels of foreign language learning can be regarded as "innovative" and "creative" on the part of the learner and that such performances should not be classified alongside other types of errors since they exhibit a native-like linguistic capacity. Therefore, this article examines the "creativity" nature, in the broadest sense, of some intralingual errors in the sense of the word Noam Chomsky used in his model of transformational-generative linguistics. Following a brief survey of error analysis in more recent history, the article details the procedures of collecting, identifying and classifying the intralingual errors committed by learners. Acceptability judgments of native speakers with a background in EFL/ESL are examined on the novel usages of intralingual errors. After a statistical analysis of native speaker intuitions on the subject, the consequences of accepting such errors as creative attempts by learners are discussed.

Method and Analysis

This section consists of several subsections. Namely, collection of errors, identification and analysis of errors, classification of error types, frequency of errors, and finally the section that reports the acceptability judgments of 8 native speakers regarding the errors under investigation.

Collection of Errors

The learners whose errors are investigated are all enrolled in a teacher training course at Hacettepe University. Throughout the learning process, students not only improve their general English skills but also get taught vocational subjects. The examples forming the basis of this study were taken from essay type exams as well as oral exams in three courses: Introduction to Linguistics, Speaking Skills, and Teaching Methodology. The author kept a logbook over a period of two years for such errors. In the logbook, not only the errors themselves but also the sentences they were used in were noted carefully.

Identification and Analysis of Errors

The level of creativity effort used by learners can also be understood by the fact that only five of the words can be found in the dictionary (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 2001): functional, transitional, completeness, explosive, and necessaries. (Yet, these words are not used in their correct senses.) Below, morphological errors are identified and analyzed with respect to their classifications (see also Table 1).

Table 1.
Classification of Errors

Overgeneralization	Hypercorrection	Innovative	Metonymy	Backformation
Undivisible	Bounded	Necessaries	Completeness	pronunciate
Untransitive	Spoked	Pluralize	Explosive	
Unmeaningful	Syntactical			
Processive	Functional			
Communicational				
Transitional				
Audial				
Audio-linguistic				
Unstressful				
Objectiveness				

Backformation

There is only one word in this class: *pronunciate*. It appears that it is produced from *pronunciation* through a relatively common process called 'backformation'. That is, given that *pronunciation* is a noun like *creation*, which can yield the verb form *create*, *pronunciate* is derived through analogy. Obvious enough, it is based on the rule that nouns that end in *–ion* suffix can be made verbs by removing that suffix. Examples of genuine backformation are abundant: *edit* from *editor*, *televise* from *television*, *donate* from *donation*, and so on. A typical usage is: "Some words are *pronunciated* in different ways."

Metonymy

Metonymy can be roughly described as the act of referring to an object or concept by an expression which bears a part-whole relationship to that object or referent. The first case is *completeness*. It is used instead of *completion*. Both are nouns for the verb *complete* but they have different meanings. *Completeness* is the opposite of *incomplete*, meaning finished or final product whereas *completion* refers to the act or process of finishing something.

Explosive is used to refer to a phonological feature of consonants in place of *plosive*. *Plosive* sounds are made by stopping of the flow of air coming out of the mouth and then suddenly releasing it. It appears that learners who are acquainted with the 'sudden release' character associated it with a kind of explosion. The word *explosion* involves meaning elements such as 'sudden', 'loud', and 'release'. Incidentally, of course, *plosive* is part of the word *explosive* and that is perhaps how they were initially arranged phonologically (key word learning), and/or in part-whole relationship, that is, *metonymy*.

Innovative Usages

Two words exist in this class. *Pluralize* seems to be conceptualized as a verb and used as such, being coined from the adjective *plural*. The strategy used is to add the suffix *–ize* to the adjective, as is the case in *conceptual-conceptualize*.

Necessaries is a word that the author, like many of his colleagues, thought would not be in the dictionary. However, it was recorded as an old fashioned usage, with the meaning 'the things that you need, especially in order to live' (Oxford Learner's Dictionary). Given that this word was never taught to our students, what might have happened is that the learner could not recall the word *necessity* but instead used a more frequent word *necessary*, and finally made it plural: *necessaries* through regular plural formation. Interestingly, the trait that enabled the learner to conceptualize and finally use it was previously used by native speakers.

Hypercorrection

It seems that a process known as 'hypecorrection' is in operation here: an effort to correct a supposedly incorrect form. This class is illustrated by four examples. The word *bounded* is used to signify the past participle form of the verb *bind*, when it was in fact *bound* itself is that form. What seems to have happened is that learner took *bound* as the first form and applied the regular verb inflection for the past participle, producing *bounded*.

The form *spoked* is another example of this class: it is intended for the past participle form of *speak*, which is *spoken*. Here it can be assumed that the learner is more familiar, which is in fact more frequent, with the form *spoke* than *spoken*, and thus the erroneous past participle form *spoked* is produced by adding the regular suffix *–ed*.

Syntactical is used instead of *syntactic*, which is the adjective form of *syntax*. Interestingly, *syntactical* does in fact exist in the on-line dictionary 'Free Dictionary', with the meaning "of or relating to the rules of syntax." The same dictionary records the form *syntactic* for the same meaning. The learner strategy may be based on the existence forms like *cleric-clerical*, which have the same ending.

The last example in this class is *functional*. It is used in place of *function* in the context "Functional words are prepositions, articles, conjunctions, etc." The strategy of the learner, it seems, lies in his/her knowledge that adjectives can and do precede nouns. The reason why this use is labeled hypercorrection is that though the word *function* is sufficient to bring about the intended

meaning, learners may feel that for *function* to qualify for a term it needs to be a complex lexical item.

Overgeneralization

The process of overgeneralizing has been extensively used to classify intralingual as well as interlingual errors. Intralingual errors have at times been referred to as errors made by means of the overgeneralization strategy of learners, which is also apparent in first language acquisition. According to Richards (1971), intralingual errors "…reflect the general characteristics of rule learning such as faulty generalization, incomplete application of rules and failure to learn conditions under which rules apply." The remaining 10 words appear to be in this class.

The forms *undivisible* and *untransitive* take the *in-* negation prefix rather than the *un-*. Incidentally though, the prefix *un-* appears to cater for the needs for those adjectives that are not conventionally used with an established negation prefix such as *undamaged*, *untrained*, *unmanned*, and so on, which also have /d/ and /t/ sounds at the initial position. The form *unmeaningful* is very much like the ones above. For the intended meaning, there is already a word *meaningless*. Thus instead of replacing the suffix *–ful* with *-less* to negate the meaning, learners obviously preferred to overgeneralize the use of *un-* prefix to adjectives.

The words *unstressful* and *stressful* are used to designate the phonological terms *unstressed* and *stressed*. A stressed syllable is one that is pronounced with stress while an unstressed one is not. The meaning *with* expressed in the derivational suffix *–ed* does also exist in the suffix *–ful*. Therefore, through analogy *–ed* is replaced by *-ful*. *Communicational* is intended for *communicative*, a term for a specific teaching method in language teaching. Because *communication* is a far more frequent term in the courses, when learners failed to recall the adjective form of it, they produced *communicational*, taking *communication* as the base form.

Objectiveness was used to signify the word *objectivity*. *Objective* occurs more frequently than *objectivity* in readings, so learners added the noun-making suffix *–ness* to produce *objectiveness*. Further,

audial is used in an effort to come up with the adjective form of it, *auditory*. The *–al* adjective-making suffix is added to the noun form *audio*. Another example is *processive*. It was instead of *process* for the expression *process writing*. Learner knowledge indicates that nouns can be preceded by adjectives. In this instance, learners may have thought that the adjective form may be more appropriate, and thus produced *processive*, coupled with the need to make it sound a complex term.

Audio-linguistic was intended for *audio-lingual*. Inable to recall the established form *audio-lingual*, the learner came up with *audio-linguistic*, the latter part of which is one of the most frequently occurring expressions in the readings. Finally the last example of this strategy is *transitional*. It is used instead of *transitive*, a term in grammar to refer to the ability of a verb to take object(s). Vaguely recalling that the term in question has the part *transit* in it, learners may try to derive an adjective form. Given the noun form *transition* is quite frequent, one strategy would be to obtain the adjective form through the suffix *–al*, and thus *transitional*.

Frequency of errors

Needless to say, not all errors occur equally frequently. The following table illustrates the number of learners and the frequency of errors, along with the intralingual errors and the actual words/terms learners intended to produce.

In order to find out how native speakers of English with an ELT background would react to the intralingual errors under investigation, a questionnaire was designed using the Likert-type scale (see the Appendix). The scale ranged from 1 to 5, indicating the range of acceptability of the words in question *in the context* they occurred. The context is very important here since, taken out of context, some words can easily be discarded as mis-formed, or even words that already exist in the lexicon but for a different meaning or sense.

The questionnaire was administered to 8 native speakers, 4 females and 4 males, at a location of their choice. All of the participants were teachers of English working in Turkey, with an experience range of 3 to 20. Though there was a section explaining the purpose and scope of the survey, a verbal orientation was also supplied.

Table 2.

Frequency of Errors for Intralingual Errors Judgment of Acceptability

No	Errors	Intended meaning	No of learners	No of instances
1	pronunciate	pronunciation	3	4
2	syntactical	syntactic	3	3
3	bounded	bound	6	8
4	communicational	communicative	4	6
5	undivisible	indivisible	5	6
6	objectiveness	objectivity	7	9
7	untransitive	intransitive	4	4
8	functional	function	2	2
9	audial	auditory	2	3
10	unmeaningful	meaningless	5	6
11	transitional	transitive	3	3
12	processive	process	1	2
13	audio-linguistic	audio-lingual	2	3
14	necessaries	necessities	2	2
15	completeness	completion	3	3
16	spoked	spoke	1	1
17	explosive	plosive	3	4
18	unstressful	unstressed	3	3
19	stressful	stressed	3	3
20	pluralizes with	is made plural with	1	2

Results and Discussion

The primary concern in the acceptability levels in Table 3 is the results given in the column Mean. Participants were to chose a figure between 5 and 1. The higher the total Mean, the higher the level of acceptability and understandability of the word/term under investigation. An overall look reveals that none of the items is in the range of Totally Unacceptable. Further, only one item is close to Unacceptable, which is *spoked*. 4 items, that is *audial, undivisible, explosive, unstressful*, stand in the range between Unacceptable and Undecided.

As the table indicates, the words *pluralize, functional, communicational, audio-linguistic* received very favorable acceptance levels. The results are very encouraging in view of the scores obtained from the native speakers. Further encouragement was supplied when the author elicited verbal feedback from the participants after they responded to the questionnaire. They explained that they could perfectly understand the meaning of the 'created" words/terms in the context they were used in. This explanation, one would expect, should result in higher levels of acceptance than they actually reported. One plausible justification of their recorded judgments could be that they were apprehensive that their acceptance would mean legitimizing the morphological formations.

What account can be offered to the creative morphological errors under investigation in terms of learning process? One line of reasoning is that these learners have been taught hundreds of L2 rules throughout their education. It is possible to see some reflection of this thinking in the literature on second

Table 3.
Descriptive Statistics for Linguistic Acceptability

Words	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Dev.
pluralize	8	1,00	4,00	5,00	4,62	,51
functional	8	1,00	4,00	5,00	4,37	,51
communicational	8	3,00	2,00	5,00	4,00	1,30
audio-linguistic	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,87	1,55
syntactical	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,87	1,55
completeness	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,75	1,58
necessaries	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,50	1,69
unmeaningful	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,50	1,41
objectiveness	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,37	1,59
pronunciate	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,25	1,66
processive	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,12	1,80
transitional	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,00	1,41
untransitive	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,00	1,69
bounded	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	3,00	1,41
audial	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,75	1,58
undivisible	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,75	1,58
explosive	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,62	1,59
unstressful	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,50	1,85
spoked	8	4,00	1,00	5,00	2,37	1,68

language acquisition research. In the last decades, some studies (Bialystok, 1982; Birdsong, 1989 among others) have argued that different types of metalinguistic knowledge (i.e., overt and verbalizable knowledge about L2) can help L2 learners perform in different domains to differing extents. Though the present study is not an empirical one, we are not in a position to speculate on the relationship between metacognitive knowledge and performance. Rather, given the type of foreign language teaching in Turkey at almost all levels of instruction (primary, secondary, and tertiary, we are justified in stating that learners who committed the intralingual errors in their essay type written exams have been trained largely through metacognitive strategies.

The type of intralingual errors that have been discussed in this article are similar to those discussed by Jain (1974), who worked on data obtained in India. For instance, if learners apply regular plural rule formation to words like *data, criteria,* and *scissor* to produce *datas, criterias,* and *scissors* respectively, Jain calls this process "creative mood." Native speakers too can overgeneralize as in *people-peoples, money-monies,* and so on. As a matter of fact, in native speaker speech, a process called 'simplification' is utilized for words like *a pair of pants-pants.*

Conclusion

This study examined the morphological and morpho-syntactic errors committed in English by native speakers of Turkish. Alongside with syntax, morphology is an area where learners of foreign languages continuously develop in the form of modifying and developing their lexicon. Just like native speakers of a language, especially children acquiring their first languages, advanced learners of a foreign language may actually feel confident enough to come up with morphological formations they think is right for a concept they have in their minds.

The analysis of the errors has shown that they errors are not accidental nor can they be regarded as trivial. On the contrary, they are all based on word derivation rules as well as on other cognitive processes that they are already very familiar with. These are overgeneralization, hypercorrection, innovative usage, metonymy, and backformation. Secondarily, however, given the acceptability judgments of native speakers, the learner attempts observed in intralingual errors can and should be considered as a step to having native intuition and application in the morphology of English. Thus, just like

what is observed in the developmental stages of acquiring, the attempts can be categorized as "creative" in the same sense. It is only then, perhaps, that we can identify the rightful place of famous writers in English, or other languages, as a second/third language like Joseph Conrad: one can become a native-user of a foreign language, at least in limited domains.

References

Bialystok, E. (1982). On the relationship between knowing and using linguistic forms. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 181-206.

Birdsong, D. (1989). *Metalinguistic performance and interlinguistic competence*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (2004). Talking, creating: interactional language, creativity and context. *Applied Linguistics*, 25/1: 62-88.

Collentine, J. (2004). The effects of learning contexts on morphosyntactic and lexical development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 227-248.

Corder, P. (1967). The significance of errors. In J.C. Richards (ed.) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. (pp. 19-30) London: Longman.

Corder, P. (1971). Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. In J.C. Richards (ed.) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. (pp. 158-171) London: Longman.

Henriksen, B. (1999) Three dimensions of vocabulary development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 303-317.

Hu, G. (2002). Psychological constraints on the utility of metalinguistic knowledge in second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 347-386.

Jain, M.P. (1974). Error analysis: source, cause and significance. In J.C. Richards (ed) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. (pp.189-215) London: Longman.

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, (2001). Hornby, A.S. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J.C. (1974). (ed.) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman.

Richards, J.C. (1971). A non-contrastive approach to error analysis. In J.C. Richards (ed) *Error analysis: perspectives on second language acquisition*. (pp.172-188) London: Longman.

Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE

The Scale: Number-Meaning Equation

1	2	3	4	5
Totally Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Undecided	Acceptable Enough	Fully Acceptable

1. Some words are <u>pronunciated</u> (pronounced) in different ways.
    1   2   3   4   5

2. Affixes produce <u>syntactical</u> (syntactic) changes in words.
    1   2   3   4   5

3. An affix is a <u>bounded</u> (bound) morpheme.
    1   2   3   4   5

4. <u>Communicational</u> (communicative) competence is a type of competence in which learners' actual communication skills are emphasized.
    1   2   3   4   5

5. Suprasegmental phonology deals with <u>undivisible</u> (indivisible) parts of language.
    1   2   3   4   5

6. There is no <u>objectiveness</u> (objectivity) in this view.
    1   2   3   4   5

7. Some verbs are transitive and others are <u>untransitive</u> (intransitive).
    1   2   3   4   5

8. <u>Functional</u> (function) words are prepositions, articles, conjunctions, etc.
    1   2   3   4   5

9. Audio-lingual approach is a method in which <u>audial</u> (auditory) materials are used.
    1   2   3   4   5

10. Some words aren't used because they are <u>unmeaningful</u> (not meaningful).
    1   2   3   4   5

11. <u>Transitional</u> (transitive) verbs can take -able suffix.
    1   2   3   4   5

12. One of them is <u>processive</u> (process) writing, which is structural and based on sequences.
    1   2   3   4   5

13. In audio-<u>linguistic</u> (-lingual) method, oral repetition of structures are very important.
    1   2   3   4   5

14. <u>Necessaries</u> (necessities) for a spoken product are: lexis, grammar, and connected speech.
    1   2   3   4   5

15. Fall tone indicates <u>completeness</u> (completion) of the utterance.
    1   2   3   4   5

16. Some words are <u>spoked</u> (spoken) stressed.
    1   2   3   4   5

17. /p/ and /b/ sounds are both bilabial and <u>explosive</u> (plosive).
    1   2   3   4   5

18. In English, function words are <u>unstressful</u> (unstressed) while content words are <u>stressful</u> (stressed).
    1   2   3   4   5

19. If a word ends in a voiceless, it <u>pluralizes</u> with /s/ (it is made plural with /s/)
    1   2   3   4   5