TO WHAT EXTENT EFL LEARNERS HAVE MASTERED CONCORD

Amri Isyam
FBSS Universitas Negeri Padang

Abstract

Concord is one of grammatical items from which many EFL learners still commit deviations. Their deviations from this grammatical item are a reflection of their concord mastery. There are five kinds of concord. However, this article aims at describing to what extent EFL learners have mastered 3 types of concord: subject-verb, subject-complement, and subject-object. The article was based on a part of the research entitled **EFL Learners' Concord Mastery and their grammatical Deviations** *carried out by the writer two years ago. The population was 120 EFL learners consisting of three classes of the third year students of the English Department of the Faculty of Languages, Literature, and Arts of the State University of Padang, and with cluster-sampling technique one class of them was chosen as the sample comprising of 32 subjects. The data were gathered through a fifty-item test with one administration, but the sample students were required to write 4 versions of the answers. There were 2 versions of concord mastery (CM), CM1 which was based on the correct answers of version 1 and CM 2 which was based on the correct answers after the grammatical deviations were split into mistakes and errors. With the use of quantitatively descriptive method, it was found out that on the average the EFL learners' CM1 was only 64 which was categorized into satisfactory level based on 5 achievement categories proposed by UNP (2005): excellent, good, satisfactory, weak, and poor. However, CM2 on the average increased significantly to 70, and the achievement category changed into good level. The writer believes CM2 was the actual concord mastery of the EFL learners. Thus, he suggests that an EFL lecturer/ teacher not neglect concord and (s)he split grammatical deviations into mistakes and errors in order to know actual mastery of any grammatical item.*

Key words/ phrases: *EFL learners, concord, subject-verb concord, subject -complement concord, and subject-object concord*

A. INTRODUCTION

Learning English as a second or foreign language (ESL or EFL) in natural settings is about the same as learning English as the first language (EL1) in a way that the learners learn the first two skills (listening and speaking skills). Nevertheless, learning ESL or EFL in the classroom settings is very different.

In learning ESL or EFL in the classroom settings, the learners learn the language consciously. They learn the sounds (pronunciation), vocabulary, and grammar of the language consciously and relatively at the same time through the processes of teaching and learning without which they will not have the ability to acquire the language. In this case, the ESL learners seem

luckier than the EFL learners do because the former can practice speaking the language daily in the society in which they live. On the other hand, when the latter want to practice the language daily in actual communication in the society where they live, it is impossible for them to do it so. Most of the time, they practice using the language in artificial situations in the classrooms. Moreover, they learn to listen, speak, read and write in the language at relatively the same time.

For this reason, the EFL learners who are majoring in English potentially commit hundreds of thousands of language deviations from the native adults' standard in speaking or writing. One of the language components in which they often commit deviations is grammar, although they have been learning English grammatical structures for some years.

Based on the daily classroom observation about and interaction with the EFL learners like the English Department students of the Faculty of Languages, Literatures, and Arts of the State University of Padang, many of them still deviate from the native adults' standard grammar when they speak or write their own sentences in structure exercises or compositions. It is not what it is hoped. The hope is that there ought not to be a lot of students who deviate from the grammar. If there are some who commit deviations, the deviations should not be great in number. So, there is a gap between what is expected and what is observed.

Judging from what had been observed earlier, many of grammatical deviations committed by the learners in their own written sentences in grammar exercises or in their compositions dealt with concord and it seems that this concord presents a trouble spot to the learners. This can be regarded as a reflection of their levels of mastery of concord.

This article deals with a part of the research entitled *EFL Learners' Concord Mastery and Their Grammatical Deviations* which was carried out by the writer two years ago at the English Department of the Faculty of Languages, Letters, and Arts of the State University of Padang. The article is about to what extent the EFL learners have mastered concord.

Generally, concord means agreement or harmony (between persons or things) while grammatically, concord means agreement between words in number (Hornby, 1981). In fact, grammatically concord and agreement are used to mean the same thing. Grammarians like Quirk and Greenbaum (1979) prefer to use concord while others like Werner and Nelson (2002) prefer to use agreement in their books on English grammar. However, the writer will use concord and agreement interchangeably here.

At least there are five kinds of concord in the English language: 1) the concord or agreement between a (sentence) subject and its verb (subject-verb concord), 2) the concord between a subject and its verb complement (subject-complement concord) especially when the complement is a noun or noun phrase, 3) the agreement between the subject and its verb object (subject-object concord) particularly when the object is a reflexive pronoun, 4) the agreement between a noun/pronoun and its possessive adjective (noun/pronoun-possessive adjective concord), and 5) the concord between a noun/pronoun and possessive pronoun (noun/pronoun possessive pronoun concord). Nevertheless, not all of them will be discussed here. The discussion is limited to only the first three types because the research dealt with those three types.

Subject-verb concord is the agreement between a subject and its verb. Quirk and Greenbaum (1979), Allen (1995), Kirn and Jack (2002),

Fuchs and Bonner (2002), and Werner et al. (2002) say that this kind of concord exists in seven out of twelve tenses covering **1a:** *the Simple Present Tense with be,* **1b:** *the Simple Present Tense with other verbs,* **2:** *the Simple Past Tense with be,* **3:** *the Present Continuous Tense,* **4:** *the Simple Future with be going to,* **5:** *the Past Continuous Tense,* **6:** *the Present Perfect Tense,* and **7:** *the Present Perfect Continuous Tense.*

The subject-verb concord or agreement in those tenses depends on the subjects of the sentences which possibly consist of personal pronouns or nouns/ noun phrases. Quirk and Greenbaum (1979:180) name the concord between the personal pronoun subjects and their verbs as concord of persons and these grammarians (1979:176) call the concord of noun subjects and their verbs as the concord of number. He claims that this concord of number is the most important type of concord. In addition, the verbs are possibly lexical verbs (LVs) or auxiliary verbs (AVs).

The personal pronoun subjects are grouped into singular pronouns and plural pronouns. The singular pronouns are classified into the first singular pronoun (SP1): *I*, the second singular pronoun (SP2): *you*, and the third singular pronouns (SPs3): *he/she/it* while the plural pronouns are classified into the first plural pronoun (PP1): *we*, the second plural pronoun (PP2): *you*, and the third plural pronoun (PP3): *they*. Besides, nouns are grouped into count nouns (CNs) and non-count nouns (NCNs). CNs are classified into singular nouns (SNs) and plural nouns (PNs). Furthermore, the subject of a sentence is not only a personal pronoun or noun, but it might also consist of a singular/plural demonstrative pronoun (SDP/PDP): *this/ that/ these/ those,* an indefinite singular pronoun (ISP): *somebody/ something/ everybody/ nothing, etc., an* indefinite plural pronoun (IPP): *all, some, many,*

several, a few, etc., a gerund/ an infinitive, or a noun clause (NCl).

When the subject is SP1: *I* or SP2: *you* for tenses 1a, 2 or 1b, the concord is a lexical verb (LV): *am/are, was/ were,* or *a verb stem/ verb 1* respectively. The concord for the same subjects (*I* or *you*) with tenses 3 and 4; or 5; is the same as that in tenses 1a and 2, but it functions as an auxiliary verb (AV) while for tenses 6 and 7 the concord is an auxiliary verb (AV): *have*

If the subject is an SP3: *he/she/it,* an SDP: *this/that*, an SN, an NCN (which is considered the same as an SN) or an ISP: *somebody/ anyone/ nobody/* etc), the concord is a singular lexical/ auxiliary verb (SLV/SAV). It means that in tenses 1a, 2, and 1b, the concord: *is, was,* or *a verb stem/verb 1* plus *-s/-es* (except for *have*, it changes to *has*) as an SLV is used respectively, while in tenses 3 and 4; or 5; the concord is the same as tenses 1a or 2, but its function is an SAV. However, the subject of a sentence with tenses 6 or 7 has the concord: *has* functioning as an SAV.

For PP1: *we*, PP2: *you*, PP3: *they,* PDP: *these/those*, a PN, or an IPP: *all/some/many/several/a few* with tenses 1a, 2, or 1b, the agreement is a plural lexical verb (PLV): *are, were*, or *a verb stem/verb 1* respectively, and for the same subject with tenses 3 and 4; 5; or 6 and 7, its concord is a plural auxiliary verb (PAV): *are, were,* or *have* respectively. Furthermore, for tense 1b in a negative sentence/question, its concord is the SAV/PAV: *does* or *do* when the subject is an SP3/an SDP/an SN, or an SP1/an SP2/a PP1/a PP2/a PP3/a PDP/a PN.

For expletive there, the verb depends on the noun that follows it. When the noun is singular or non-count noun, the concord is an SLV or SAV. If the noun is plural, the concord is a PLV/PAV.

Furthermore, the subjects may be compound or coordinated with coordinating conjunctions *and*, like *Tom and I*, a *pen and a ruler, coffee and tea*, *Bill and Helen*, etc. The subjects of these kinds are also plural; thus, the concord between these subjects and their verbs is a PLV or PAV (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1979; Isyam et al., 1994; Fuchs, 2000; and Kirn and Jack 2002).

However, if the subject is a PN as a name, title, or quotation, or a plural noun that refers to sum of money, a period of time, or a distance, or when a compound or coordinated subject is used as a name or title, the LV or AV is singular (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1979; Murphy, 1993; Herwings, 2002; Werner and Spaventa, 2002; Werner and Nelson, 20002). The examples are as in:

1. *Caravans is* one of the best novels written by James A. Michener.
2. *One million rupiahs is* going to be given for our mosque.
3. *Romeo and Juliet has* had a great effect on youth.

In addition, for common collective nouns such as *government, team, staff*, etc, or noun phrases with quantifiers like *none, each + SN*, or *each of, none of + PP or the/these + PN*, the subject-verb concord is an SLV or SAV. The same thing is true for quantifiers such as *some/much/a little/most/all + NCN* or *some of/ a lot of/most of/all of + the/this + NCN*, fractions such as *one fourth of, a half of + the/that +NCN*, percentages like *ten percent of/thirty percent of + the +NCN*, the indefinite article a/an with *an SN*, or *the number of + a PN*. In contrast, when each of the quantifiers (except *much* is replaced with *many)*, fractions, or percentages is followed by a PN, the concord is a PLV or PAV. It is also applicable for *a number of*, which is always followed by a plural noun, and for two part subject: *both ... and ...* (Syarif & Zainil, 1995;

Maurer, 2000; Werner & Nelson, 2002). The examples are as the following:

4. *AC Milan was* playing against Manchester United at this time last night.
5. *A half of the food is* spoiled.
6. *Ten percent of the students* often *come* late.
7. *None* of the lecturers *is* lecturing right now.
8. *Each* of the rooms in the house *has* its own bathroom.
9. *All* of these girls *have* been working more attentively and patiently.
10. *A lot of students are* careless.
11. *A lot of homework* needs a lot of time.
12. *An unforgettable experience remains* in everybody's mind forever.
13. *A number of* students *seem* tired now.
14. *The number of* students of this university *increases* every year.
15. *Both the students and the lecturer were* in the classroom at that moment.

Nevertheless, the concord for two-part subjects such as *either ... or ..., neither ... nor ...,* or *not only ...but also ...* depends on whether the closest part is an SN or a PN. In addition, the agreement for two part subjects like: *..., together with ... ; ..., along with ...; ..., as well as ...;* or *..., in addition to ...* is dependent on whether the first part is an SN or a PN. Furthermore, in an adjective clause in which the subject has been replaced, the verb form depends on whether the noun it modifies is an SN or a PL. For *the only one of ...* + an adjective clause, even though it is followed by plural nouns, the verb remains an SLV or an SAV. In contrast, *one of the + plural noun* with an adjective clause goes with a PLV or a PAV because the adjective clause modifies the noun in the prepositional

phrase (Maurer, 2000; Werner and Spaventa, 2002; Werner and Nelson, 2002), as in:

16. Neither the students *nor the lecturer speaks* when the athan is heard.
17. *The students*, along with the lecturer, were silent because of the athan.
18. The *boy* who *is* standing outside is my son's friend.
19. The *books* which *are* lying on the floor belong to Mary.
20. Tom is the only *one* of the students who *has* practiced speaking a lot.
21. Tim is one of the *students* who *have* known the answer to the puzzle.

Can gerunds and infinitives be as the subjects of sentences? A gerund is *a verb* (base form/verb stem/verb 1) + *-ing* that functions as a noun. An infinitive is *to + base form/verb stem/verb 1*. Both a gerund and an infinitive can be as the subjects of sentences, and they always have SLV or SAV except two coordinated gerunds or infinitives are used (Quirk, 1979; Werner et al., 2002; and Werner and Nelson, 2002) as in:

22. *Doing* assignments *needs* concentration.
23. *Doing* assignments and *writing* papers *need* concentration.
24. *To be* honest *is* the best policy.
25. *To keep* promises *is* one thing that a Moslem must do.
26. *To be* honest and *to keep* promises *are* two things a Moslem must do.

How about an NCl in the subject position? When an NCl is the subject, the subject-verb concord or agreement is an SLV/SAV except when a coordinated subject which has two noun clauses is used, the concord is a PLV/PAV (Quirk, 1979; Werner and Spaventa, 2002; Werner and Nelson, 2002), as in:

27. *That the prices of primary needs have increased is* obvious.
28. *What I know is* different from what you know.
29. *Where Bill went and what time he came back are* not important.

The subject-complement concord must exist between the subject (S) and the complement (C) when the complement is a noun or noun phrase in a sentence whose pattern is Subject-Verb Complement or SVC. When the subject is singular, the complement is singular, and when the subject is plural, the complement is plural or compound/ coordinated (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1979; Murphy 1993; Kirn and Jack, 2002; Werner et al., 2002; Werner and Nelson, 2002). However, Werner and Nelson claim that there is an exception if the SVC pattern is in the adjective clause with *the only one of* …where the complement is singular, or in the adjective clause with *one of ...* where the complement is plural. In addition, Quirk and Greenbaum (1979) mention that there is an exception of a noun clause as a subject for its complement may be plural/compound or an exception of a plural noun/pronoun as a subject for its complement may be singular. Look at the examples below:

30. *Lita* is *a mid wife.*
31. *Dino and Dini* want to become *doctors.*
32. *Romeo and Juliet* is *a good romance movie.*
33. *One* of the EFL learners here is *a public servant*.
34. *Some* of them are private *employees.*
35. *All* of the lecturers of that medical faculty are *doctors.*
36. *A half* of those girls are *nursing students*.
37. *Ninety percent of* the police are *policemen.*
38. *The man and the woman* are *husband and wife*.

39. *More than one student* is *an employee*.
40. *More than three students* are *employees*.
41. *A number of course participants* are *pediatricians*.
42. Either the instructor or the course *participants* are *lecturers*.
43. The course *participants*, as well as the instructor, are *lecturers*.
44. The *doctor* who is standing among the nurses is *an internist*.
45. The *doctors* who are talking to the nurses are *professors*.
46. Alice is the *only one* of the nurses who is *a vegetarian*.
47. Alice is one of the *people* who are *vegetarians*.

Furthermore, Quirk and Greenbaum (1979) mention that there is an exception of a noun clause, or a plural noun as a subject for its complement is plural/compound or singular respectively as in:

48. *What they need most* is *scientific books*.
49. What that *person* needs is *food and money*.
50. *Good manners* are *a rarity* nowadays.

Subject-object concord is as necessary as subject - complement concord when the object is a reflexive or reciprocal pronoun and its related structure for the subject and the object refer to the same person or thing (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1979; Murphy, 1993; Fuchs, 1995; and Kirn and Jack, 2002) as in:

51. The old *lady* sat in the corner talking to *herself*.
52. If *you* want some more to eat, help *yourselves*.
53. *Tom* and *Ann* are standing in front of the mirror and looking at *themselves*.

54. *Tom* and *Sara* are talking to *each other*.
55. *Bill, Tim*, and *Diana* are talking to *one another*.

When a reflexive pronoun is used in an imperative sentence, yourself and yourselves are used for the singular and plural subject respectively because in the imperative sentence the subject is understood to be *you* (Fuchs, 1995) as in:

56. Don't be so hard on *yourself*, John. You are too impatient.
57. "Don't push *yourselves* so hard," Bill told his employees in his office.

Besides, Murphy (1993) and Fuchs (1995) assert that a reflexive pronoun is also used to emphasize a noun or pronoun and the position of the reflexive pronoun is after the noun, or with pronoun it is at the end of the sentence as well. The examples are as in:

58. *I* always do my assignments *myself*.
59. The *job itself* is not important to him.
60. The computer *operators themselves* have problems with the instructions.

Also, Murphy and Fuchs add that a reflexive pronoun can follow the preposition: *by*, and it means alone or without any help as in:

61. *Susan* lives *by herself*, but she has a lot of friends nearby.
62. The *children* painted their house *by themselves*.

In addition, a reflexive pronoun can also follow *be*, and it means act in a typical way (Murphy, 1993 and Fuchs, 1995) as in:

63. Relax and *be yourself* on your interview.
64. *Ronald* hasn't *been himself* since he lost his job.

Furthermore, besides reflexive pronouns and reciprocal pronouns (each other/one another), reflexive genitive such as *my own + noun* can be used as an object, and the speaker or the writer must pay attention to the concord or agreement between the subject and the reflexive genetive (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1979; Murphy, 1993; Fuchs and, Bonner, 1995; and Maurer, 2000) as in the following examples:

65. *I* will use *my own* car to drive you to the Town Hall.
66. The *two* public s*ervants* are ruining *their own* careers.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was a quantitative-ly descriptive research. Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 116) say that both qualitative and descriptive research are concerned with providing descriptions of phenomena that occur naturally without the intervention of an experiment or an artificially contrived treatment. In addition, Gay (1987: 189) says that descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. Besides, it deals with describing and interpreting events, conditions, or situations at present.

Seliger and Shohamy further state that a descriptive study might describe an aspect of second/foreign language acquisition from a more synthetic perspective or might focus on the description of a specific constituent of the process, such as on the acquisition of a particular language structure or on one language learning behavior to the exclusion of others. They add that in a descriptive study the researchers begin with general questions in mind about the phenomenon they are studying or with more specific questions and with a specific focus. Because the questions are decided in advance, the research only focuses on certain aspects of the possible data available in the language learning context being described.

The population of the research was 120 third year students, especially the regular ones, of the English Department of the State University of Padang in the academic year of 2006 -2007 belonging to Education and non-Education Programs. It comprised of two classes (3A and 3B) of Education Program and one class of non-Education Program having about 40 members each. He took them as the population because they had learned the three types of the concord (subject-verb concord, subject-complement concord, subject-pronoun concord) he researched on. To get the sample of the research, the researcher applied cluster sampling technique.

The test items were constructed in such a way in paragraphs that the sentences in which the items were available were interrelated and meaning-fully contextual. Seliger and Shohamy suggest (1989) that the test items not be in isolated sentences but in a meaningful context with other sentences. The allocated time for doing the test was 100 minutes.

The evidence on content validity needs to be accumulated in order to find out if the test is a good representation of the content which needs to be measured (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989). To obtain evidence of content validity, the test was judged by a very senior Language Testing lecturer of the English Depart-ment who compared the test content with the content of the material decided to be measured before the test was adminis-tered. After she had done it, she believed and stated that the test was valid.

The sample students were required to answer the test in four versions in one administration because the test did not only aim at finding concord mastery but also at finding how often grammatical deviations occurred

for according to Ellis (2003) if a deviation sometimes occurs and sometimes disappears it is a mistake, or if it occurs more often it is an error. The allocated time to do the test was 100 minutes. The test was administered to them soon after the result of the try out had been known, and the revision had been done to it. There were 32 students of the selected sample who came for the test. So, the actual sample consisted of only 32 students, not 40.

From the test result, the researcher got each sample student's correct answers of version 1 (CA1) taken from the first version of the answers of the test and his/her correct answers of version 2 (CA2) resulting from the split of grammatical deviations into mistakes and errors. To what extend all the sample students of the research had mastered the concord was reflected in their CA1 and CA. Each test item weighed 2 points and the number of the test items was 50; thus, the ideal score was 100 (50 times 2). The score ranging from 81 to 100 (81-100) was: excellent, 66-80: good, 56-65: satisfactory, 41-55: weak, and 0-40: poor. It meant that the subjects whose scores fell into each category were considered respectively to have mastered the concord excellently, well, satisfactorily, weakly, and poorly. This was based on what UNP (2005) claims on the evaluation of the students' learning achievement. Then, the researcher found out the number and percentage of the subjects for each category.

C. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

As seen in Table 1 below, it was found that the EFL learners' CM1 (concord mastery of version 1) was only 64% of the concord tested on the average based on CA1 (correct answers of version 1), and such mastery belonged only to satisfactory category based on the evaluation system which is proposed by UNP (2005) categorizing its students learning achievement into five levels: (1) excellent (81-100), (2) good (66-80), (3) satisfactory (56-65), (4) weak (41-55), and (5) poor (0-40). It means that on the average the EFL learners' concord mastery of version 1 was not as good as it had been expected.

Table 1: CM and its Category before and after the Separation of Total Grammatical Deviations into Mistakes and Errors.

SBJ	CA1	CM1	CATEGORY	CA2	CM2	CATEGORY
1	18	36	Poor	20	40	Poor
2	31	62	Satisfactory	33	66	Good
3	37	74	Good	40	80	Good
4	20	40	Poor	18	36	Poor
5	34	68	Good	37	74	Good
6	30	60	Satisfactory	31	62	Satisfactory
7	37	74	Good	38	76	Good
8	30	60	Satisfactory	32	64	Satisfactory
9	29	58	Satisfactory	33	66	Good
10	36	72	Good	37	74	Good
11	27	54	Weak	32	64	Satisfactory
12	26	52	Weak	32	64	Satisfactory
13	42	84	Excellent	43	86	Excellent
14	41	82	Excellent	42	84	Excellent

15	31	62	Satisfactory	31	62	Satisfactory
16	29	58	Satisfactory	33	66	Good
17	36	72	Good	39	78	Good
18	40	80	Good	40	80	Good
19	37	74	Good	42	84	Excellent
20	34	68	Good	40	80	Good
21	41	82	Excellent	45	90	Excellent
22	40	80	Good	41	82	Excellent
23	25	50	Weak	30	60	Satisfactory
24	40	80	Good	43	86	Excellent
25	22	44	Weak	32	64	Satisfactory
26	33	66	Good	35	70	Good
27	24	48	Weak	24	48	Weak
28	45	90	Excellent	48	96	Excellent
29	47	94	Excellent	48	96	Excellent
30	26	52	Weak	29	58	Satisfactory
31	17	34	Poor	23	46	Weak
32	24	48	Weak	26	52	Weak
N	M	M		M	M	
32	32	64	Satisfactory	35	70	Good

However, as seen in the comparison between CM1 and CM2 which was based on the subtraction of errors from the total test items (TI) whose result was named CA2, it was found that CM2 increased by 2 to 20 as CA2 increased by 1 to 10 except for subject 15, 18, and 31. Their CM2 remained the same as CM1, while for subject 4 his/her CM2 decreased by 2.

Therefore, many of their CM categories changed from poor to weak, weak to satisfactory, satisfactory to good, or from good to excellent category as it was experienced respectively by subjects number 31; 11, 12, 23, 25, and 30; 2, 9, and 16; 19, 22, and 24. CM2 category of the other subjects (number 1 and 4/poor; 27 and 32/weak; 6, 8, and 15/satisfactory; 3, 5, 7, 10, 17, 18, 20 and 26/good; 13, 14, 21, 28, and 29/excellent) remained the same as CM1.

So, Table 1 on the previous page shows that there were 12 subjects whose CM2 increased to higher category because their CA2 increased. For 19 other subjects, in spite of their CM2 increase, their category remained the same as CM1. Unfortunately, for the other subject, namely subject number 4, his/her CM2 decreased by 4 (from 40 to 36) as his/her CA2 decreased by 2 (from 20 to 18). However, his/her CM2 category was the same as CM1. Besides, the average of CM2 was 70. It means the average increase of CM2 was 6 (from 64 to 70) as the average increase of CA2 was 3. Thus, the average increase of CM2 was so significant that the concord mastery category changed from satisfactory to good.

The writer believes that CM2 was the actual concord mastery of the EFL learners because as mentioned above it was derived from the subtraction of the errors from TI after the split of the overall grammatical deviations into mistakes and errors. Ellis (2003:139 & 141) defines a mistake as a deviation in usage that reflects the learner's inability to use what he actually knows of the target language, and an error as a deviation in usage which results from a gap in a learner's knowledge of the target language. In fact, he says that mistakes reflect occasional lapses in performance and

they occur because the learner is unable to perform what he actually knows while errors reflect gaps in the learner's knowledge and they occur because the learner does not know what the correct ones are. This idea of Ellis's is strengthened by Scovel (2001:48) who views mistakes as any inaccuracies in linguistic production in either L1 or L2 that are caused by fatigue, inattention, etc., and that are immediately correctable by the speaker or writer, and errors as goofs which appear because of the learner's lack of competence.

How many subjects were for each category of CM1 and CM2 can be seen in Table 2 below. As the table shows, the number of subjects of excellent, satisfactory, weak, and poor categories of CM2 was not the same as that of CM1. The number of subjects for excellent category increased by 3 (9%) from 5 (16%) to 8 (25%), and for satisfactory category by 2 (6%) from 6 (19%) to 8 (25); on the contrary, the number

Table 2: The Number of Subjects of CM1 and CM2 According to Each Category of CM.

CATEGORY	NOSCM1	%	NOSCM2	%
Excellent	5	16	8	25
Good	11	34	11	34
Satisfactory	6	19	8	25
Weak	7	22	3	9
Poor	3	9	2	6
	N 32	100	N 32	100

of subjects for weak category decreased by 4 (13%) from 7 (22%) to 3 (9%), and for poor category by 1 (3%) from 3 (9%) to 2 (6%). Although for good category the number of subjects of CM1 and 2 remained the same, some of the subjects or the persons were different.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

On the average the EFL learners' concord mastery was categorized into satisfactory level based on 5 achievement categories: excellent, good, satisfactory, weak, and poor. However, after the split of the grammatical deviations into mistakes and errors it increased on the average so significantly that the achievement category changed into good level. The writer believes the concord mastery after the split was the actual concord mastery of the EFL learners. Thus, he suggests that 1) an EFL lecturer/teacher not neglect concord as a grammatical item to be mastered better by EFL learners, and 2) s(he) split any grammatical deviations into mistakes and errors in order to know the EFL learners' actual mastery of (a) grammatical item(s) tested before assigning marks by asking them to answer a grammar test at least in four versions for certain items of the test whose answers they might get confused with.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, W. Stannard. 1995. *Living English Structure.* London: Longman Group Ltd.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1994a. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1994b. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, J. Dean. 1991. *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Dulay, H., M. Burt, and S. Krashen. 1982. *Language Two.* New York: OUP.,

Ellis, Rod. 2003. *Second Language Acquisition*. New York: OUP.

Fuchs, Marjorie, and Margaret Bonner. 2002. *Grammar Express: For Self Study and Classroom Use.* New York: Longman Group Ltd.

Fuchs, M., M. Westheimer, and M. Bonner. 1994. *Focus on Grammar: An Intermediate Course for Reference and Practice.* New York: Longman Group Ltd.

Fuchs, Marjorie, and Margaret Bonner. 1995. *Focus on Grammar: A High Intermediate Caurse for Reference and Practice*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.

Gay, L. R. 1987. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application.* Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.

Herwings, Martin. 2002. *Advanced Grammar in Use.* Cambridge: CUP.

Hornby, A. S. 1981. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English.* Oxford, London: OUP

Isyam, A., Zulnasri, and Jufrizal. 1994. *English Structure and Excersices: Book II.* Padang: Jurusan Bahasa Inggris FPBS-IKIP Padang.

Kirn, E., and D. Jack. 2002. *Interactions I: A Communicative Grammar.* New York: Random House Inc.

Maurer, Jay. 2000. *Focus on Grammar: An Advanced Course for Reference and Practice.* New York: Longman Group Ltd.

Murphy, Raymond. 1993. *English Grammar in Use: A Self-Study Reference and Practice Book for Intermediate Students.* Cambridge: CUP.

Quirk, Randolph, and Siddney Greenbaum. 1979. *A University Grammar of English.* London: Longman Group Ltd.

Scovel, Tom. 2001. *Learning New Languages: A Guide to Second Language Acquisition.* Scarborough, Ontario: Newbury House.

Seliger, H. W., and E. Shohamy. 1989. *Second Language Research Method* Oxford: OUP.

Syarif, Hermawati, and Yetty Zaini!. 1995. *English Structure and Exercises: Book III*. Padang: Jurusan Bahasa Inggris FPBS-IKIP Padang

UNP. 2005. *Buku Pedoman Akademik Universitas Negeri Padang*

2005/2006: Fakultas Bahasa, Sastra dan Seni. Padang: UNP.

Werner, P. K., J. P. Nelson, K. Hyzer, and M. M. Church. 2002. *Interactions 2: Grammar.* New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Werner, P. K., and Lou Spaventa. 2002. *Mosaic 1: Grammar.* New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Werner, P. K., and J. P. Nelson. 2002. *Mosaic 2: Grammar*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.