STUDENT-TEACHERS' ERRORS AND THEIR MESSAGE ADJUSTMENT

Zeleke Demilew¹

ABSTRACT: This is a study carried out to investigate the classroom English of prospective graduates of Bahir Dar Teachers College. Eleven fourth year students minoring in English went out to the Tana Haik Comprehensive Secondary School in Bahir Dar for teaching practice. Seven of them were randomly taken and a thirty-minute audio recording of each of their lesson was made. This was transcribed into normal orthography and the syntactic errors were listed down. The list gave a total of 238 errors. Most of them fell into 9 classes. A few were not that easy to classify and were put under class 10. The first three of these classes were (1) verbs, (2) prepositions, and (3) articles. The employment of one message adjustment strategy - paraphrasing - was examined. Student-teachers made 83 attempts to paraphrase sentences of which 78 led to syntactic errors.

¹ Lecturer, Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Department of English Language and Literature, Addis Ababa

STUDENT-TEACHERS' ERRORS AND THEIR MESSAGE ADJUSTMENT

Zeleke Demilew¹

ABSTRACT: This is a study carried out to investigate the classroom English of prospective graduates of Bahir Dar Teachers College. Eleven fourth year students minoring in English went out to the Tana Haik Comprehensive Secondary School in Bahir Dar for teaching practice. Seven of them were randomly taken and a thirty-minute audio recording of each of their lesson was made. This was transcribed into normal orthography and the syntactic errors were listed down. The list gave a total of 238 errors. Most of them fell into 9 classes. A few were not that easy to classify and were put under class 10. The first three of these classes were (1) verbs, (2) prepositions, and (3) articles. The employment of one message adjustment strategy - paraphrasing - was examined. Student-teachers made 83 attempts to paraphrase sentences of which 78 led to syntactic errors.

> Lecturer, Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Department of English Language and Literature, Addis Ababa

1

INTRODUCTION

In the past, errors that foreign language (L_2) learners commit were attributed to interference from first language (L_1) . It was believed that errors could be predicted by carrying out a comparative study of the students' L_1 and the L_2 that he is learning (Fries, 1945; Lado, 1957). Based on this belief, different materials (Ghadessy, 1977) that were thought to minimize, if not completely eliminate, the learners' difficulties were prepared and different approaches to language teaching were introduced. However, the results of these teaching materials and of the different approaches of teaching were not as they were expected to be.

Nowadays, studies in L_2 teaching and learning have been able to identify that there are also other sources of errors. These are believed to stem from the L_2 itself. In addition researchers have begun to see the L_2 learner as having the capacity to form hypotheses about the L_2 he is learning in just the same way as the child learning his L_1 has². This is what has led to the monitoring and the systematic analysis of the errors that L_2 learners make. Such an analysis is believed to have a contribu-

² Except where the subjects of this study are concerned, any reference to the masculine gendre could be equally taken as applicable to the feminine gendre.

tion of considerable importance towards both the assessment of learning and also towards evaluating how much of what was to be taught was actually taught.

This is to say that an analysis of this nature could help educators determine (1) whether learning has taken place at all, and if it has (2) the areas that have been learnt well, and (3) the areas that have not been learnt well, and (4) the areas that have not been learnt at all.

In the light of these observations, a limited attempt was made to study the classroom English of prospective graduates of Bahir Dar Teachers College. The following are the questions that this paper will try to find answers to:

- (1) Are syntactic errors prevalent in the spoken English of prospective graduates of Bahir Dar Teachers College?
- (2) If the answer to question 1 is 'Yes', can these errors be distinctly classified?
- (3) Do these classes of error fall within the range of classes identified by previous studies (such as by Richards, 1971; Jain, 1980; Mammo Kefele, 1981, for instance)?
- (4) Can possible sources be attributed to these errors?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The difficulties that students face in the process of L_2 learning are numerous. A number of research studies have also been carried out to minimize these difficulties. Three of the areas of analysis that have so far been in use will be briefly considered.

Interference Analysis (IA) focuses on the learner's sentences in the target language which may exhibit interference from the mother tongue. IA, therefore, tends to work from the wrong sentences in L_2 back to the L_1 to identify within the L_1 the sources of the errors.

Contrastive Analysis (CA) has behavioursim as its theoretical base. The main concern of CA was the comparing and contrasting of the language systems of the L_1 and the L_2 and predicting errors. It was believed that because the learner has already made the system of his L_2 a habit, the areas where the systems of the two languages differed would be likely to cause errors. A great deal of work was done comparing and contrasting the system of English and the systems of a number of other world languages in the hope of coming up with "an inventory of areas of difficulty" (Corder, 1981:5) and "a host

of language teaching courses" (James, 1980: iii) were prepared.

The above two methods of analysis, however, ignored errors that did not systematically fit into the structure of either the L_1 or the L_2 . A third method called Error Analysis (EA) was, therefore, developed. EA, in the beginning, put its concern mainly on the analysis of the errors themselves. However, "current research tends to focus on the learner himself as generator of the grammar of his sentences in the new language" (Richards and Sampson, 1980:5). EA, "although still in its infant stages" (Klassen, 1991:10), has enabled researchers to identify the likely problem areas of the language that is being learnt and the language system learners are employing at a particular point in the course of their learning.

As regards the former, the three most difficult aspects of the English language some of which have a universal magnitude, have been identified to be verbs, prepositions, and articles (Richards, 1945; Politzer and Ramirez, 1973; Henning, 1978).

In 1981, Mammo Kefele carried out a study of error analysis for his MA thesis. He analysed the written work of third and fourth year students (both assignment and examination) who took the course Advanced Composition II in 1979/80 at the Foreign Languages and Literature Department of the Institute

Zeleke Demilew

of Language Studies of Addis Ababa University. He found out that the errors that were detected fell "under six major categories, namely, Grammar, Style, Punctuation, Spelling, Unclassifiable Errors and Handwriting" (p.41). In the area of Grammar which accounted for "48% ... of all the errors" (P.51) he listed agreement, tenses, prepositions and particles and articles as the first four sub-categories of errors. He stated that grammar "is a major problem for the subjects" (p.51). This section of his finding is similar to the findings of the above mentioned researchers. And it is this kind of analysis which is the focus of attention of the present study.

Concerning the latter, researchers have proposed that the language system used by L_2 learners seems to be more or less the same as the system that children learning their L_1 use (Corder, 1967). In fact the proposition extends to the assertion of the presence of at least some evidence for the systematic nature of the processes or stages of L_2 learning (Nemser, 1971).

More recent research on error analysis focuses on what has been termed as 'error gravity'. Studies on error gravity attempt to find out whether or not native and non-nativespeaker teachers exhibit a difference in their perception of errors and again on whether or not a 'hierarchy' of errors could be formulated (Sheorey, 1986; McCretton and Rider,

1993). These researchers collected errors from students' written work, categorized the errors and prepared them in the form of questionnaires. It is worth noting here that the categorizations of the errors by the two researchers were fairly similar. The researchers then sought the assessment of native and non-native-speaker teachers on these errors. Sheorey found out that "roughly sixty percent of the errors belonged to four categories: tense, agreement, article and preposition" (p.307). McCretton and Rider found out seven categories of errors "most frequently made by the students" (p.179). These were "verb form, concord, prepositions, word order, negation, spelling and lexis" (Ibid).

In the degree of seriousness of errors, Sheorey found out that both the native and non-native-speaker assessors" considered tense, agreement, and question formation - all related to the verb system - to be more serious than other kinds of errors" (p.308). Just like Sheorey, McCretton and Rider provided a six-point scale (0-5) to the assessors. From a comparison of the assessments "the closest correlation in mean scores between the two groups was found for verb form errors" (p.181). Verb form errors were " considered to be the most serious errors" (<u>Ibid.</u>) by both native and non-native-speaker teachers with a nearly equivalent mean score (9:20 by the former and 9.30 by the latter). McCretton and Rider's "most significant finding is that there is a close correlation in the rank orders established

by the two groups" (<u>Ibid</u>.). The studies so far outlined were mainly based upon the written English of subjects. This study was based upon the spoken English of subjects. Despite this difference, these studies and the present study have considerable similarities in their findings.

METHOD

In the first semester of 1989/90 eleven fourth year students minoring in English went out to the Tana Haik Comprehensive Secondary School for teaching practice for three weeks. The first week was observation period. Seven of these studentteachers (all of them male) were randomly taken and they were notified that each one of them will be audio recorded on cassette once while presenting his lesson. Each one was also made aware that he will be given the chance to borrow the recording and listen to the lesson he gave. Care was taken to convince them that this will not in any way affect their grades for the course. They were also told that this was a purely voluntary undertaking and that they had no reason to be frightened of and that they had every right to say "no" if they were not willing to participate. To give room for some degree of getting used to and minimizing the effect that fear would have on the study, the recording was carried out in the last week of the practice period.

A fairly sensitive cassette-recorder with a microphone having a reasonably long cable was borrowed from the Audiovisual Centre of the college. Student-teachers were told to put the microphone in their shirt-pocket during the teaching. A thirtyminute lesson given by each of the seven student-teachers was recorded in this way. The full text of the recorded material was transcribed into normal orthography because the study was restricted to the identification and description of syntactic errors only. (Syntax is used in its broader sense here as including morphology and syntax).

The errors detected across the corpus were listed down. After having arrived at the total number of errors, the writer made an attempt to classify them. The percentage of each class of error out of the total number of errors was calculated. Attempts were also made to identify the possible causes of some of the classes of errors. Finally, some brief remarks about the message adjustment of the student-teachers were given. Here an attempt was made to describe the extent of the subjects' use of paraphrasing which is one of the message adjustment strategies.

THE ERRORS DETECTED

As was mentioned in the method part of this paper, the full text of each student-teacher's lesson was transcribed into normal orthography and the errors detected were listed down. The list gave a total of 238 syntactic errors. This number includes similar and/or identical errors made by different student-teachers and even identical errors made more than once by the same student-teacher.

During the recording, five of the seven student-teachers were dealing with passage-related work for some portion of the period. This is to say, they were either making students read a passage paragraph by paragraph, or they were reading it themselves, or they were answering comprehension questions with the students, or they were doing any combinations of these. Working on a reading passage would understandably decrease the likelihood of more syntactic errors being committed as the student-teachers were principally guided by what was presented in the textbook. It wouldn't, therefore, be unreasonable to suspect that the total number of errors would have increased if the student-teachers had been giving fullperiod lessons on their own. And yet if the 238 errors were divided by 7, it would mean that, on average, each studentteacher has committed 34 errors in 30 minutes. This obviously

means that more than one error was committed by each student-teacher every minute.

The remaining two of the seven student-teachers were dealing with an aspect of grammar, that is, defining and non-defining relative clauses as some of the incorrect sentences in the data reveal.

CLASSIFICATION

Most of the errors in the data fell into nine distinct classes. Six of them were related to the inappropriate application of (1) verbs, (2) prepositions, (3) articles, (4) number, i.e., singular/plural, (5) inversion, and (6) comparative and superlative forms. The seventh class was related to the improper placement of words and phrases.

A number of these classes also had sub-classes. In relation to the application of verbs, student-teachers made use of double main verb; they omitted either auxiliaries or main verbs; or they mixed up voice; they employed wrong forms of main verbs; or they mixed up tenses. (See Appendix, Class I a-d).

As regards prepositions the errors concentrated mainly on the use of particular prepositions where different ones were necessary. A number of sentences were also detected in which prepositions that ought to have been used were left out. (See Appendix, Class II a-b).

In the use of articles, their omission where they were necessary and their inclusion where they were unnecessary were found to be the two main areas of error. (See Appendix, Class III a-b).

The errors in the application of inversion centred around the employment of double inversion or the omission of inversion altogether. (See Appendix, Class VII a-b).

The eighth class involved the omission of objects and the ninth the use of double subjects. It is interesting to note, though hard to speculate the reasons behind, that the student-teachers had neither employed double objects nor had they omitted subjects.

There was also a group of errors which either did not fit in any one of the above classes, or seemed to belong to more than one class or totally defied classification. These errors were put under class ten and were identified as not-classifiable errors. (See Appendix, Class X). A similar classification has been employed by Richards (1971), Jain (1980) and Mammo Kefele (1981). It should also be noted that the results of the categorization of errors by (1) Sheorey and (2) McCretton and

Riders mentioned in the review of related literature section above and the result of this study show certain similarities.

The percentage of each class of error was then calculated out of the total number of errors. Table I below shows the frequency distribution and the percentage of each class of error from the total number of errors.

Table 1: Classification, frequency and percentage of errors

S.N	Error Class	Number of Errors	Percentage
1	Verbs	57	23.95
2	Prepositions	48	20.17
3	Articles	39	16.39
4	Number (Singular/plural)	22	9.24
5	Comparative/superlative	18	7.56
6	Words and phrases	16	6.72
7	Inversion	15	6.30
8	Omission of object	7	2.94
9	Use of Double subject	6	2.52
0	Not-classifiable	10	4.20
	Total	238	99.99

DESCRIPTION

In an effort to describe the errors and to answer the fourth research question, the first thing that was done was to try to identify errors that could be traceable to L_1 interference (interference from Amharic) - the interlingual errors. There were a couple of sentences of this sort. While attempting to paraphrase the sentence

"His knowledge of Amharic is superior to his knowledge of English," for example, a sentence which reads as

"That means he knows Amharic more than English" was produced. To mean

"The answers to these questions are at the top of the next page", the sentence

"The answers to these questions are 'on' the top of the next page" has been employed. A sentence which ought to have been uttered as

"Construct one sentence using this word" was uttered as

"Construct one sentence 'by' using this word."

That L_1 could possibly be the source of these errors could be noticed from a direct translation of the above incorrect sentences into Amharic and a comparison of the areas of deviance and the Amharic alternates. It should, therefore, be noted here that the presence of such sentences in the data probably indicates that there might still be areas of syntax in the L_2 for which student-teachers have so far been unable to overcome the interference from the L_1 .

On the whole, it may be said that the majority of the errors were caused by factors other than L_1 interference. These errors might be referred to as intralingual errors and are caused by confusion within English.

From the data it has been observed that structures with which student-teachers are familiar have been overgeneralized (Selinker, 1972) and extended to structures that are similar but not identical thus leading to the production of incorrect sentences. Student-teachers know that there are structures like:

"The meaning of this is ..." "What this means is ..." "What we mean by this is ...", and "What I mean to say is"

Zeleke Demilew

The student-teachers' overgeneralization of this knowledge led them to the production of sentences like:

"By mechanised we mean is ..." "By mechanised means is ..." and "By automation we mean is ..." (See Appendix, Class I a)

Although some of the incorrect sentences may be improved in more than one way³, it has been possible to note that the student-teachers committed them due to ignorance of rule restrictions of the L_2 as could be deduced from sentences like the following:

- (a) "Can you know my uncle who is he?"
- (b) "What made the student 'to' stop and think?"
- (c) "If there is no 'any' doubt ..."

The proposition of Richards (1971) in relation to the type of sentences mentioned above is that analogy could contribute a great deal towards their production. Hence, the form:

For example sentence 'c' could be improved as either

- i) If there is no doubt ... or
- ii) If there isn't any doubt ...

"What made the students 'to' stop and think?" might have been produced in analogy with

"What helped the students to solve ..." or the form:

"If there is no 'any' doubt ..."

in analogy with

"If there is no doubt"

or the form:

"I am talking the pronunciation of this word"

in analogy with

"I am discussing or I am explaining the pronunciation of this word" (See Appendix, Class II C).

Another cause of error is believed to be the incomplete application of the rules of the L_2 which in most of the cases assumes the form of simplification. This kind of measure may have been adapted with the intention of giving precedence to communicating ideas over achieving correct syntatic formations. Sentences of the following sort seem to confirm this:



- (a) "Why the student decided to make a great effort?"
- (b) "What part of speech it is?"
- (c) "Your act shouldn't be like a fool."

Because L_2 learners hypothesize false concepts about the L_2 , deviant sentences will be produced. For instance, students learn that a future action can be expressed using any one of the three tenses the present simple, the future simple, and the continuous present. However, which particular tense properly applies to which particular future context remains obscure most probably due to students' exposure to inefficient method of teaching. Therefore, student-teachers produced sentences of the following type:

- (a) "Before I am going to start the passage"
- (b) "Before I am going to read it ..." (See Appendix, Class Ic).

In some cases, the errors that were committed for one or the other of the above reasons have also gone to the extent of impeding communication. A few of these instances are indicated hereunder.

- (a) "Every country strongly will to develop its industry."
- (b) "I told you do your sentence is that constructed by using the word 'at'."

- (c) "It is paper-like material used to tie a finished goods."
- (d) "Somebody may ask you whether you use the language that you taught in class outside of the class." (See Appendix, Class I and X).

It is to be noted that syntactic errors (such as slips of the tongue) can be committed and are committed even by native speakers. Nonetheless, one question needs to be asked before concluding this section of the paper. That is "Can the number of errors manifested by this study be tolerated?" The writer thinks that they cannot. After all, as has been mentioned above, each student-teacher has, on average, committed 34 errors in 30 minutes. And this is not an easy matter noting the fact that the errors studied were only grammatical ones. Moreover these students are fourth year students minoring in English and so we would expect them to have performed better than was exhibited in this study. Most likely also, they would be assigned to teach English in the senior grades of secondary schools (grades 11 and 12) after they graduate, i.e., after a semester. Under these circumstances it wouldn't be difficult to imagine to what kind of teaching their future students will be exposed. Furthermore, after having listened to the recordings, the student-teachers showed no awareness of the errors they committed. Surprisingly what the writer noticed in his subsequent discussion with them was a feeling of satisfaction.

But where does the problem lie? The areas of syntax around which most of the errors were committed (60.51%) of the

Zeleke Demilew

errors were in verbs, prepositions and articles) are incorporated in the service and skill courses that the college offers at the level of first year and above. It should be pointed out here "that degree of mastery of the semantic subtleties around the proper use of prepositions may be among the most sensitive indicators of degree of acquisition of English as a second language" (Henning, 1978:396). The problem is, therefore, most likely to have emanated from the method of teaching employed while these courses are being offered. This is a possible area of investigation for further studies.

The student-teachers' background, the qualification and experience of their teachers in the schools (elementary, junior, senior), etc. could have bearings on their present knowledge of the language. The objectives of the two freshman English courses are believed to be rectifying the weaknesses (errors) of previous learning and improving the level of general proficiency of students and helping them better cope with their academic endeavours. Considered from this angle, one point is clear, though. That is, strict adherence to the patterns of presentation of materials as in the two freshman courses 101A and 101B does not contribute towards developing the communication abilities of students to the extent desired.

MESSAGE ADJUSTMENT

The main point of teaching is the effective transmission of message from teacher to student. This is best achieved by

employing different strategies. A comprehensive discussion of these strategies will not only go beyond the scope of this paper but will also be rather speculative as "little work has... been published on the topic" (Corder, 1981:103). Hence, it is only a few of the observations made that are touched upon below.

Researchers in applied linguistics have come up with the concept of communicative strategies. When people use a language to convey their message, they employ different strategies. But these strategies are more easily perceivable in non-native speakers. According to Corder, communicative strategies are "a systematic technique employed by a speaker to express his meaning when faced with some difficulty" (<u>Ibid</u>.); this is to say when the speaker's resources of the language are inadequate.

It is assumed that the non-native speaker does not always have the linguistic means to express the messages he likes to pass over to his listeners. So he employs certain strategies of communication of which message adjustment is the major one. These strategies assume varied forms and involve the speaker in risk-avoiding or in risk-running. The risk avoidance strategies are expressed in the form of topic avoidance, message abandonment, semantic avoidance, or message reduction.

Topic avoidance is " a refusal to enter into or continue a discourse within some field or topic because of a feeling of total linguistic inadequacy" (Ibid., p.105). Message abandon-

Zeleke Demilew

ment is "trying but giving up" (<u>Ibid.</u>). Semantic avoidance is "saying something slightly different from what you intended but still broadly relevant to the topic of discourse" (<u>Ibid.</u>). Message reduction is "to say less or less precisely what you intended to say" (<u>Ibid.</u>).

The risk-running strategies are expressed in the form of borrowing, that is, taking items from out of the target language; or even switching, that is, altogether leaping onto another language. The less risk-taking strategy is paraphrasing, that is, trying to get round one's problem with the resources at one's disposal (<u>Ibid</u>.).

Understandably, the use of paraphrasing is one means of message simplification which helps teachers to get their meanings across to their students by applying the resources at their disposal. Two questions were thus raised:

- (1) Have the student-teachers employed this strategy? and
- (2) To what extent have they succeeded in the effective employment of the strategy?

Table 2 below shows (1) the number of sentences each studentteacher uttered more than once, and the total number of times that these were repeated; and (2) the number of attempts that student-teachers made to paraphrase sentences and the number of times that these attempts led to syntactic errors.

Student Teacher	No. of Sentences Repeated	No.of Times Sentences were repeated	Attempts to Paraphrase	No. of Times Attempts led to Error
1	15	54	7	6
2	10	25	12	12
3	21	64	11	11
4	23	64	10	8
5	13	59	18	18
6	32	107	15	14
7	18	66	10	9
Total	132	439	83	78

Table 2: Sentence Repeats and Attempts at Paraphrasing.

In the whole corpus of the recorded material, 132 sentences were found to have been repeatedly uttered by the studentteachers for a total of 439 times with little or no change in the form of the construction of the sentences. As can be observed from Table III below, the times of repeat ranged from a minimum of two to a maximum of sixteen.

On the other side of the scale, the subjects of this study made a total of eighty-three attempts to paraphrase sentences out of which 78 led to syntactic errors. This means that in nearly 94% of the cases their attempts at paraphrasing sentences were not a success. Let us, at this point, cite some examples of these attempts. A few of these were mentioned in the discussion part above. A sentence which read as:

"Lencho's knowledge of Amharic is superior to his knowledge of English." was paraphrased as

"That means he knows Amharic more than English" and this was further paraphrased as

"His knowledge of Amharic is higher than his knowledge of English."

The sentence

"When I saw Tigist she was absorbed in the book she was reading." was paraphrased as

"All her attention was focusing in the reading the book."

Again the sentence

"Every country is anxious to develop its industry."4

This is a sentence that appears in a passage in the Grade 10 Textbook.

Was paraphrased as

"Every country strongly will to develop its industry." (See Note 7 under Appendix).

The attempt to paraphrase the sentence

"Cellophane is a material used to wrap finished products". resulted in

"It is material used to wrap or tie 'a' finished goods."

A further attempt to paraphrase the sentence

"Construct a sentence using 'at'." led to the production of

"I told you do your sentence is that constructed by using the word at."

The indication here is that the variety of sentences employed by the student-teachers was fairly limited. Whether or not the considerably large number of repeats were intentionally made for fear of committing errors cannot be answered for certain.

tences			
Times of Repeat (a)	Number of Sentences (b)	Times of Repeat by Num- ber of Sentences (a) (b)	
2	59	118	
3	45	135	
4	5	20	
5	7	35	
6	4	24	
7	5	35	
8	3	24	
10	2	20	
12	1	12	
16	1	16	
Total	132	439	

Table 3: Number of Times of Repeat by Number of Sentences

An examination of the figures in Table II and III raises one striking question. If the general picture of the situation looked like this with respect to fourth year students minoring in

English, what would it look like with respect to the trainees of the other departments of the college? From the point of view of the comparatively better exposure that English minors would be expected to have, this question is worth investigating.

CONCLUSION

This study has brought to light:

- (1) The total number of errors detected was fairly high;
- (2) It was possible to classify most of the errors, and the classes fell within the range of classes identified by previous studies such as by Richards, 1971; Jain, 1980; Mammo Kefele, 1981;
- (3) The sources of the errors were both interlingual and intralingual;
- (4) A considerable number of sentences were repeatedly uttered with little or no change in their structure; and
- (5) Most attempts by the student-teachers to paraphrase sentences were not successful.

Hence within the bounds of this study, the following could be concluded.

- The level of general English proficiency of the studentteachers, as reflected by their classroom language, is rather low;
- (2) Their skill of message adjustment as revealed by their skill of paraphrasing is poor; and
- (3) They have little knowledge of classroom language ⁵.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To help solve the problems identified by this study, the recommendations below have been forwarded.

Any given instance of language is inextricably bound up with its context of situation. The classroom is a particular context of situation. And, therefore, classroom language is a particular kind of language taking place in the classroom and probably nowhere else. It is one kind of register on its own.

- (1) In order to improve the level of general English proficiency of the students, effective methods of teaching the different language skills, that is the service and the skill courses, should be employed.
- (2) Ways and means of acquainting and equipping students of the college with the knowledge of classroom language must be found and implemented.
- (3) In order to have a fair idea of the extent to which the findings of this study apply to the trainees of the other departments of the college (if at all they do) further studies to investigate their classroom English should be carried out.

REFERENCES

Corder, S.P.(1967). "The significance of Learners' Errors", IRAL, V, 4: 161-169.

(1981). <u>Error Analysis and Interlanguage</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fries, C.C. (1945). <u>Teaching and Learning English as a</u> Foreign Language. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Zeleke Demilew

- Ghadessy, M. (1977). "Error Analysis: A Criterion for the Development of Materials in Foreign Language Education." <u>ELT Journal</u>. XXXI, 3:244-248.
- Henning, G.H. (1978). "A Developmental Analysis of Errors of Adult Iranian Students of English as a Foreign Language." <u>Language Learning</u>, XXVIII, 2: 393-399.
- Jain, M.P. (1969). "Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance." In: J.C. Richards (ed.), <u>Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition</u>, pp. 189-215, London: Longman, 1980.

James, C. (1980). Contrastive Analysis. London: Longman.

- Klassen, J.(1991). "Using Student Errors for Teaching." In: English Teaching Forum, XIX, 1: 10-16.
- Lado, R. (1957). <u>Linguistics Across Cultures</u>. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Mammo Kefele (1981). "Classification and Explanatory Analysis of Student Errors in Advanced English Composition II, 1979/80." Master's Thesis. Addis Ababa University.
- McCretton, E. and Nigel, R. (1993). "Error Gravity and Error Hierarchies." IRAL XXXI, 3: 177-188.
- Nemser, W. (1971). "Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners." IRAL IX, 2: 115-123.
- Politzer, R.L. and Arnulfo, G. R. (1973). "An Error Analysis of the Spoken English of Mexican American Pupils in a Bilingual School and a Monolingual School." <u>Language</u> <u>Learning</u>, XXIII, 1: 39-61.
- Richards, I.A. (1945). <u>Basic English and Its Uses</u>. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Richards, J.C. (1971) "A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis." <u>ELT Journal</u>, XXV, 3: 204-219.

Richards, J.C. and Gloria, P. S. (1980). "The Study of Learner English." In J.C. Richards ed., <u>Error Analysis:</u> <u>Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition</u>. London: Longman.

Selinker, L. (1972). "Interlanguage." IRAL, X, 3: 219-231.

Sheorey, R. (1986) "Error Perceptions of Native-speaking and Non-native-speaking Teachers of ESL." <u>ELT Journal</u>, XL, 4: 306-312.

Zeleke Demilew

Appendix I

Representative Errors

Class I Errors in the Appropriate Use of Verbs

- a. Use of Double Main Verb.
 - 1. Is the direction is not clear to you?
 - 2. By mechanised we mean is ...
 - 3. By mechanised means is ...
 - 4. By efficiency means is ...
- b. Omission of Auxiliary or Main Verb (Voice mixed up)
 - 1. What kind of idea, what kind of person, the thing what we are talking about.
 - 2. The two activities in which Ato Tilahun engaged is teaching and research.
 - 3. Somebody may ask you whether you use the language that you taught in class outside of the class.¹
 - 4. The students surprised being asked to help Ato Tilahun.²
 - 5. They wrap before they become to be products.³
- c. Wrong Tense/Wrong Verb Form
 - 1. Ato Tesfaye who has came by bus is teaching us English.
 - 2. May be he have got also a cape.⁴
 - 3. I hope we have seen yesterday ...⁵

- 4. You will found it there.
- 5. The students didn't thought how many times they imitated the sounds of their parents.
- 6. Before I am going to start the passage ...⁶
- 7. The teacher has gave them.
- 8. Every country strongly will to develop its industry.⁷
- d. Mixing Tenses (Present and Past)
 - 1. I was in the library when the director gets in.
 - 2. I hope you will complete it in a good manner because we have seen the passage exhaustively yesterday.⁸
 - 3. I came and say I have a brother.

Appendix II

Class II Errors in the Use of Prepositions

- a. 'For' instead of 'to'
 - 1. Is the direction not clear 'for' you?
 - 2. Why are cement and steel industries important 'for' Ethiopia?
 - 3 I think these words are not new 'for' you.
 - 4. Is there any word which is not clear 'for' you?

b. 'By'/'on' instead of 'in'

1. You are doing the exercise 'on' your textbooks.

Zeleke Demilew

- 2. 'By' this way do the exercise
- 3. We should try to identify 'by' another way.
- c. Necessary Prepositions Omitted
 - 1. She departed her son in tears.
 - 2. You the middle try.
 - 3. I am talking the pronunciation of this word.
 - 4. It refers direction in this case.
 - 5. The students surprised being asked to help ... 9
- d. 'On' instead of 'to'
 - 1. It became clear after we added 'on' the first sentence.¹⁰
 - 2. Please turn 'on' 'again' your reading passage.11
 - 3. Turn your text 'on' page 67.
- e. Unnecessary Prepositions Used
 - 1. I can also discuss 'in' it 'by' now.¹²
 - 2. If we drop 'out' this modifier, we cannot identify the teacher."
 - 3. I'll not allow you to enter 'to' my class.
 - 4. Why 'for'?
 - 5. Construct one sentence 'by' using this word.
- f. 'In,' 'on' instead of 'with', 'at', 'to'
 - 1. All her attention was focusing 'in' 'the' reading the book.¹⁴
 - 2. The answers to these questions are 'on' the top of the next page.

- 3. We will end up 'on' this.
- 4. Do you agree 'on' his answer.

Appendix III

Class III Article Error

- a. Unnecessary Articles Used
 - 1. We employ 'a' sophisticated machines.
 - 2. In 'a' mechanised industries...
 - 3. We put 'a' cotton into one machine.
 - 4. It is material used to wrap or tie 'a' finished goods.
 - 5. All her attention was focusing in 'the' reading the book.¹⁵

b. Necessary Articles Omitted

- 1. It hasn't noun phrase.
- 2. It is cleaning instrument.
- 3. We learn in this class English language.
- 4. It is instrument used for cleaning.
- 5. It is activity which is done by applying one's hand.

Class IV. Errors in the Use of Number

a. Singular instead of Plural

- 1. This is one of the 'advantage' of automation.
- 2. The boy who has 'eye glass' is my brother.
Zeleke Demilew

- 3. In the town you find different 'kind' of jewellery houses.
- 4. There are different 'kind' of machines.
- b. Plural instead of singular.
 - 1. Have you done your 'homeworks'?
 - 2. It shows the 'relations' to the place.
 - 3. What are the 'importances' of practical knowledge?
 - 4. This question was one of the 'questionnaires'.16
 - 5. Is the general 'ideas' of the passage clear to you?

Appendix IV

Class V Errors in Comparative and Superlative

- 1. That means he knows Amharic more than English
- 2. His knowledge of Amharic is higher than his knowledge of English.
- 3. Addis Ababa is the big city of the country.
- 4. Less workers are needed to operate it.
- 5. They are produced within lesser amount of time.

Class VI Errors in the Proper Placement of Words or Word Groups

- 1. Is not it?
- 2. Is it clear now how to do it?

- 3. What we take care of only is about Gojjam where it is situated.
- 4. Please a little speak loudly.
- 5. So we can omit even who has done it.
- 6. You can understand from the example its meaning.

Class VII Errors in the Application of Inversion

- a. Double Inversion
 - 1. Can you tell me who is he?
 - 2. Can you know my uncle who is he?
 - 3. Does it mean that do you know all the words?
- b. Omission of Inversion
 - 1. As what part of speech it is used in this sentence?
 - 2. Why the student decided to make a great effort?
 - 3. What part of speech it is?
 - 4. In what situation we are now?

Class VIII Omission of Object

- 1. Can you understand without the modifier?
- 2. I'll check whether you have done or not.
- 3. Who can make short?
- 4. Who can choose the correct word and insert in the blank?

Class IX Use of Double Subject

- 1. Is it clear now how to do it.
- 2. Is he absent number 7?
- 3. The first one is industry which is mechanised one.

Class X Not-classifiable Errors

- 1. A technologist is a person who has got skill in how and the way things proceed in industry.¹⁷
- 2. ... the noun that what we are talking about ... 18
- 3. It is not our matter.¹⁹
- 4. I told you do your sentence is that constructed by using the word at.²⁰
- 5. They need force which needs movement of the body action.²¹
- 6. Your act shouldn't be like a fool.²²
- 7. Here productions are produced.²³
- Increment of industries implies decrement of unemployed people.²⁴

Appendix V

Notes on Appendix

¹This is an example of a sentence that hinders communication. ²It also has an error in preposition.

³Verb form is wrong. The active is used instead of the passive.

⁴May be considered as an error of subject/verb agreement.

⁵What is to be said of the future is said of the past.

⁶The present simple is more appropriate.

⁷ Anxious' is taken to mean 'will'. Also see footnote on page 13.

⁸The sentence was uttered in reference to already done homework.

⁹See note 3.

¹⁰It should have read as 'It became clear after we-added a defining relative clause to the first sentence.'

¹¹Also 'again' is misplaced.

¹²Two unnecessary prepositions are used. It should have read as 'I can also discuss it now.'

¹³The sentence was uttered while trying to explain a sentence with a defining relative clause. It is the relative clause that is referred to as 'modifier'.

¹⁴This should have read as '... on reading the book' or better still '... on the book she was reading.'

¹⁵See note 14.

¹⁶Also has an error of omission. Should have read as '... one of the items in the questionnaire.'

¹⁷This is a kind of working definition. It could possibly be improved as '... who is skilled in industrial operations'.

¹⁸It should have read as '... the noun about which we are talking...'

¹⁹What was intended seems to be 'It does not concern us'.

²⁰Should have read as 'I told you to construct a sentence using the word at..'

²¹This is an attempt to describe how crafts are powered.

²²The verbal form should have been used instead of the nominal. It should have read as 'You shouldn't act like a fool'.

²³What was intended seems to be 'Here materials are produced.'

²⁴A possible improvement could be 'An increase in the number of industries brings about a decrease in the number of unemployed people.'

THE ETHIOPIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES TO CONTRIBUTORS

1. GENERAL

- 1.1 The Ethiopian Journal of Education publishes scholarly articles based on work in education and related areas.
- 1.2 Besides original research papers, EJE publishes book reviews, dissertation abstracts, short communications and comments on articles published in EJE.

2. STYLE AND FORMAT

Before submitting the manuscripts for publication in EJE, authors should ensure that the following requirements are complied with:

2.1 Title Page

- 2.1.1 The following shall appear on the Title Page:
 - a. the full title of the article;
 - b. the name(s) of the author(s);
 - c. the title(s), academic position(s) and affiliation(s) of the author(s) referred to at the bottom of the page

with the use of an asterisk if it is a single author or numerical subscripts against each name.

- 2.1.2 It is the responsibility of the authors to declare the degree of contribution made by each of them to the preparation of the study. But normally, the following rule shall apply;
 - a. <u>equal</u> contribution is presumed when the names are written in alphabetical order; or
 - b. the degree of contribution shall be determined by the order in which the names appear, unless indications are given by the authors to the contrary.
- 2.13 All correspondences will be made with the author whose name appears first (unless indicated otherwise).
- 2.2 Length of an Article
 - 2.2.1 Manuscripts should not exceed 30 pages, including an abstract in about 100 words which should be provided on a separate page.
 - 2.2.2 The manuscripts should be typed double spaced on one side of A4 type white paper. A space of one inch should be left on the left and right margins as well as at the top and bottom of each page.

- 2.3 Citation of Notes and References
 - 2.3.1 All materials, refereed to or quoted must be acknowledged. Plagiarism is illegal and unethical.
 - 2.3.2 Direct quotations should be as short as possible and should be reproduced exactly in all details (spelling, punctuation and paragraphing).
 - a. short quotations of less than four lines are run into the text and enclosed in quotation marks.
 - b. long quotations (i.e. more than five lines) should be set off from the text in a separate paragraph, indented (four spaces) and single spaced. Quotation marks are omitted.
 - 2.3.3 References in the text should read as follows:
 - Smith (1992:42) has suggested that ... or
 - One educator (Flanders, 1970:16) has argued that...
 - Use "*et al*". when citing a work by more than three authors.

Example: Interaction analysis (Flanders et al., 1970) suggests...

The letters a, b, c and so on should be used to distinguish citations of different works by the same author in the same year.

Example: Daniel (1985a, 1985c) recommended that...

2.3.4 Essential notes should be indicated by consecutive subscript numbers in the text and collected on a separate page at the end of the text, titled '<u>Notes</u>'. Such numbered notes should be kept to a minimum.

Numbered notes should be used to make clarifications about the references used, to include points left out in the text, or to add some items readers may want to know.

2.3.5 All references cited in the text and other supporting materials should be listed alphabetically by author in a section titled <u>References</u> or <u>Bibliography</u> and appearing after <u>Notes</u>. Ethiopian Authors should be listed in the alphabetical order of first name. Daniel Taddesse, for example, should be listed under D and not under T. Write Ethiopian names in full in the Bibliography (i.e. first and second names) as they are given in the publication you are citing. Avoid using honorific titles such as Ato, Dejach, Dr, Wzro, etc. in citation or references.

A. Published Articles

The following are examples of different entries in <u>References</u> or <u>Bibliographies</u>.

- i) Kremmer, L. (1978). "Teacher's Attitude Towards Educational Goals as Reflected in Classroom Behaviour", <u>Journal of Educational Psychology</u>, 70,6: 993-997.
- ii) Ayalew Shibeshi (1989). "Some Trends in Regional Disparities in Primary School Participation in Ethiopia", <u>The Ethiopian</u> <u>Journal of Education</u>, X,1: 25-51.
- Note: The volume and issue numbers should be entered exactly as they are given in the journals cited (i.e. in Roman or Arabic numerals).
- **B.** Books
 - i) Perrott, E. (1982). <u>Effective Teaching: A Practical</u> <u>Guide to Improve Your Teaching</u>. New York: Longman Inc.

Listing of several works by the same author should be in the chronological order of the year of publication. Here is an example:

Guidelines to Contributors

- ii) Ryans, D.G. (1989). <u>Characteristics of Teachers</u>. New Delhi: Starling Publishers(p) Ltd.
- iii) _____ (1972). <u>Analysing Teaching</u>. New York: Macmillan Co. Ltd.
- C. Contributions in Books
 - Philip, W.J. (1986). "Life in Classrooms" in Norris G. Haring, <u>Analysis and Modification of</u> <u>Classroom Behaviour</u>, pp. 13-17. New Jersey: Parentice-Hall, Inc. 1972.

D. Contributions in Proceedings

- Marew Zewdie and Fanta Suppa, Attitudes of Teachers Towards the ESLCE. In Proceedings of the Workshop on Major Issues Related to the ESLCE and Possible Solutions, Nazareth 25-27 April 1991, pp. 235-257, Addis Ababa, Institute of Educational Research.
- E. Conference/Seminar Papers
 - Amare Asgedom (1990). Communication Theories and Instructional Practice: A Limited Effect Perspective; Paper presented at the First

Annual Seminar of the Faculty of Education, 17-20 May, 1990. Nazareth, Ethiopia.

F. Unpublished Works

Tirussew Teferra (1989). The Psychology and Educational Problems of Handicapped Students in Addis Ababa University, A Research Report, Institute of Educational Research, Addis Ababa University.

3. OTHER IMPORTANT RULES TO CONSIDER

3.1 Tables and diagrams:

Tables and diagrams should be properly labelled and carefully drawn. They should have short titles. All footnotes to tables and all sources should be placed under the table.

3.2 Section Headings:

Major section headings must be centered on the page. Sub-headings must be aligned with the left margin.

3.3 Language:

English and Amharic are the Languages of publication. Al authors must avoid sexist and racist language.

3.4 Responsibility for Views

Any statements in an article accepted for publication remain the sole responsibility of the author and should in no way be construed as reflecting the opinions of the Editors or the Publisher.

3.5 Copyright

Authors submitting manuscripts do so on the understanding that if they are accepted for publication, copyright to the articles, including the right to reproduce in all forms and media, shall be assigned exclusively to the publisher.

3.6 Originality of the Paper

EJE publishes only original investigations. Authors are not allowed to submit the same manuscript for concurrent consideration by another journal. Already published manuscript should not also be submitted to EJE for publication.

Note of Thanks

The Editorial Board of the Ethiopian Journal of Education appreciates the professional support rendered by the following reviewers of the articles published in this issue.

- 1. Dr. Marew Zewdie Addis Ababa College of commerce
- 2. Dr. Dejenie Leta Institute of Language Studies, AAU
- Dr. Abdurahman M. Korram Kotebe College of Teachers Education
- 4. Dr. Goertler W. Curriculum & Instruction, AAU
- Dr. Ayele Meshesha Department of Educational Psychology, AAU
- Dr. Joachim G. Wagner Institute of Curriculum Development and Research, AAU