EFL LEARNERS' GRAMMATICAL DEVIATIONS FROM CONCORD:
What degree did they become mistakes and errors?

Amri Isyam
Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris
FBSS Universitas Negeri Padang

Abstract

This article, based on the other part of the research entitled EFL Learners' Concord Mastery and their grammatical Deviations carried out by the writer, aims at describing to what degree EFL learners have committed grammatical deviations from 3 types of concord: subject-verb concord (SVC), subject-complement concord (SCC), and subject-object concord (SOC) and to what extent those deviations became mistakes and errors. With the population of 120 EFL learners 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 one class of them chosen as the sample comprising of 32 subjects by cluster-sampling technique, the data were gathered through a fifty-item test with one administration but with 4 versions of the answers. Thus, with 4 versions of grammatical deviations (GD): GD of version 1 (GD1), GD2, GD3, and GD4 taken from the answers of the test of version 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively, and the overall grammatical deviations (OGD) as the accumulation of the 4 versions of GD, and by using quantitatively descriptive method, it was found out that on the average the EFL learners' GD1 was more than one-third of the total test items (TTI), and that of the OGD was nearly a half of TTI. Besides, after the split of OGD into mistakes and errors it was known the ratio between the two kinds of GD was about 2:5, or in every 7 GD there were 2 mistakes and 5 errors on the average. Furthermore, there were 3 types of grammatical errors (GE) found for each kind of concord: omission, addition, and misformation. Misformation had the greatest percentages of GE for SVC and SOC. Most of the GE of this type dealt with the use of plural verbs for singular ones, that of possessive adjective (their) for reflexive genitive (their own), that of reciprocal pronoun referring to 2 peeople (each other) for reciprocal pronoun referring to 3 people or more (one another) and that of object pronoun (them) for reciprocal pronoun referring to 3 people or more (one another). For SCC the omission type of the GE had the greatest, and most of them were absence of plural indicators –s/-es.

Key words/phrases: *grammatical deviations, mistakes, errors, omission, addition, and misformation.*

A. INTRODUCTION

In the learning processes, the EFL learners, who are majoring in the language, potentially commit hundreds of thousands of language deviations from the native adults' standard in speaking or writing, but these deviations gradually decrease and their speaking and writing abilities gradually increase through exercises, training and practicing in a set of courses or lecture subjects, including direct or indirect correction by their peers and lecturers when they commit them. It is hoped the higher year they are in the more the deviations will decrease and the more their speaking and writing abilities will increase. If they still make deviations in oral communication, either in pronunciation or grammar, it would not matter much as long as what they

communicate can be understood by the people whom they speak to. These people would not remember the deviations because they might not pay much attention to them. Nevertheless, the deviations in grammar in written communication or written production, as in compositions (working) papers, research reports, theses, etc.), are considered embarrassing because it could give an undesirable impression, for they can be detected easily and might matter to the readers who consider the writers rather weak in grammar and vocabulary. In fact, it will be more embarrassing if the grammatical deviations are still relatively great in number, and they are committed by the EFL learners who are majoring in English, like the English Department students of the Faculty of Languages, Letters, and Arts of State University of Padang, although they have been learning English grammatical structures for more than two years.

In fact, there are always deviations committed either by English native speakers or ESL/EFL learners in using the language in oral or written communication. However, the native speakers' deviations, most of which are in oral form, are not many, and they usually occur owing to physical conditions such as fatigue and illness or owing to inattention, not owing to lack of competence.

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 that was why the writer carried out a research two and a half years ago. The research was entitled *EFL Learners' Concord Mastery and Their Grammatical Deviations* carried out at the English Department of the Faculty of Languages, Letters, and Arts of the State University of Padang.

This article deals with the second part of the research. It discusses about grammatical deviations from concord between subject-verb, subject-complement, and subject-object especially when the

object was a reflexive or reciprocal pronoun and to what degree the EFL learners have committed grammatical deviations from it.

In fact, there are always deviations committed either by English native speakers or ESL/EFL learners in using the language in oral or written communication. However, the native speakers' deviations, most of which are in oral form, are not many, and they usually occur owing to physical conditions such as fatigue and illness or owing to inattention, not owing to lack of competence. The learners' deviations, which are probably still relatively great in number, are possibly only mistakes, or maybe they are really errors. To know whether the deviations are only mistakes or really errors, Ellis (2003:17) says that we need to distinguish them.

It is true indeed that an error is different from a mistake. Scovel (2001:48) states that as early as 1967, S.Pitt Corder made the useful observation that it was important to distinguish between mistakes and errors. Scovel further says that up to that time the two terms had been used interchangeably as synonyms, as they were usually used in everyday speech, but Corder was wise enough to see that SLA (second language acquisition) research was better served if the words were defined to describe two different types of linguistic misbehavior.

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. Earlier than Ellis, Scovel (2001:48) 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.

Much earlier than that, a mistake whose other name according to Corder in Dulay (1982:139) is a performance error may also occur due to forgetting the rule of the language or a slip of the tongue, and then Chomsky in Scovel (2001:49) claims that a mistake reveals nothing about the underlying competence a language user has about language structure.

On the other hand, an error occurs because an EFL learner is lacking in knowledge of the rule of the language, and it is called a competence error by Chomsky in Dulay (1982:139). In relation to this, Corder in Dulay (1982:139) adds that an error is a systematic deviation due to the learner's still developing the knowledge of the L2 rule system.

As an example, Scovel (2001:49) says that the 'original sentence' below contains a common error made by beginning ESL (and EFL) students.

Original sentence : * My friend is chemistry teacher.
(a) Target Sentence : My Friend is *a* chemistry teacher.
(b) ESL/EFL correction : * My friend is *the* chemistry teacher.

He says that native speakers of English rarely make a mistake like this. He adds that when they do, they rapidly repair their miscue by providing the correct version (a) because they have the competence to understand, at least tacitly, that English grammar requires the indefinite article *a* in this context. Scovel further says that learners of English, on the other hand, especially beginners who are still struggling to understand the complex way in which English marks noun phrases with articles, will frequently 'correct' their original error, when pointed to them, with yet another error, by using *the* (b), demonstrating that they are lacking in linguistic competence in this new grammatical system.

In fact, Dulay et al. (1982:138) say that language teaching experts, teachers, and even mothers have realized that committing errors is an inevitable part of learning, and

people are not able to learn a language without first systematically making errors. This idea is supported by Hendrickson (1987), Richard-Amato (1988), Brown (1994a), Stevick (1996), Scovel (2001), and Thombury (2001).

Furthermore, Dulay et al. state that the majority of the grammatical errors an EFL learner makes do not reflect his mother tongue, but they are very much like those young children make as they learn their first language. Researchers have found that like EL1 learner's errors, most of the errors an EFL learner makes indicate he is gradually building an EFL rule system.

So, the point is that when the ESL/EFL learners make deviations because of lack of performance, the deviations are called mistakes. The mistakes occur because they do not perform as they know. They know some particular rules of the language, but they do not apply them when they speak or write. This means that they know what mistakes they have made when they realize them or other people remind them of them, and they know how to correct them. On the other hand, if they commit deviations owing to lack of competence, the deviations are named errors. The errors take place since they do not know some particular rules to apply as they perform the language. Thus, they do not know how to correct the errors though they are reminded of them or given the chances to correct them.

However, GD which are committed by the EFL learners and heard in their oral communication or found in their written sentences, assignments, compositions, papers, etc., cannot be said as errors before it is not certain that they are really errors because not all GD are errors. Some of them are possibly mistakes and some others are probably errors (Brown, 1994a).

Now, how should GD be split into errors and mistakes or how should errors be distinguished from mistakes? To do it, Ellis (2003:17) suggests two ways. One way is to check the consistency of the learner's performance. If he consistently substitutes the verb *contain* for *contained* (in the Simple Past Tense) for example, this would

indicate a lack of knowledge and it means he commits an error. However, he continues, if the learner sometimes says *contain* and sometimes *contained,* this would suggest that he possesses knowledge of the correct form and it means he commits a mistake. The second way, Ellis says, is to ask the learner to try to correct his own GD. If they are able to correct the GD, the deviations are mistakes. If they are unsuccessful, they are errors.

Furthermore, there are several names of errors as the experts call them. Corder in Brown (1994a:167) differentiates errors into overt and covert ones, while Burt and Kiparsky in Hendrickson (1987) distinguishes them as global and local errors. Corder says that overt errors are utterances that unquestionably ungrammatical and covert errors are utterances which are grammatically well formed but not interpretable within the normal context of communication. Burt and Kiparsky describe local errors as those errors that do not significantly hinder communication of a sentence's message and global errors as those errors that cause a listener or reader to misunderstand a message or to consider a sentence incomprehensible.

Hendrickson (1987) modifies Burt and Kiparsky's local and global errors. He defines a local error as a linguistic error that makes a form or structure in a sentence appear awkward but it causes a proficient speaker of a foreign language little or no difficulty in understanding the intended meaning of a sentence, given its contextual framework. On the other hand, a global error is a communicative error which causes a proficient speaker of a foreign language either to misinterpret an oral or written message or to consider the message incomprehensible with the textual content of the error.

The example for a covert/global/-communicative error is 'Your time has come' which was spoken by a Japanese hotel employee to his guest in Tokyo, and his intended meaning was 'it's time to wake up', but such a sentence is usually uttered by native speakers only to mean that 'it's time for someone to die'. For a(n) overt/local/linguistic error, the example can be seen on page 5 above.

In addition, (overt) errors can be classified into several types, but different language teaching experts or educators might use different or the same terms in classifying them. Dulay et al. (1982:154-162) categorizes them as errors of *omission, addition, misformation,* and *misordering*. Brown (1994a: 169) classifies them as errors of *addition, omission, substitution,* and *ordering* whereas Ellis (2003:18) names them as errors of *omission, misinformation, misordering,* and *over generalization*.

Next, Dulay et al. claim that *omission* is characterized by *the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance* like 'I went to movie', or 'He teach English', while *addition* is the opposite of *omission. Addition* is characterized by *the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance*, and it usually occurs in the later stages of L2/FL acquisition, when the learner has already acquired some target language rules. In fact, it results from the all-too-faithful use of a certain rule.

This type of errors is subdivided by Dulay et al. into three: *double marking, regularization,* and *simple addition. Double marking* occurs because *two items rather than one are marked for the same feature of a tense*; for example, an EFL learner might say 'He do*es*n't know*s* my name', or 'We *did*n't *went* there'. *Regularization* or *overgeneralization* as named by Ellis happens when *there are both regular and irregular forms*, and the learner applies the rules for the regular forms to the irregular ones as in 'We saw a lot of sheep*s*', or 'John go*ed* to Bukittinggi yesterday'. *Simple addition* occurs *if the learner uses an item that is necessary not to appear in a well formed structure* as in 'Fishes do*es*n't live on land'.

In addition, Dulay et al. explains that *misformation* is the most common type of errors committed by L2/FL learners, and its characteristic is *the use of the wrong form*

of a morpheme or structure. While in the *omission* type the item is not supplied at all, in this *misformation* (or *misinformation* as called by Ellis, 2003:18) type a learner supplies something although it is incorrect. The example is as in 'The boy *do*n't often watch TV', or 'They *was* playing football'. For the last type, *misordering*, Dulay and his co-authors (1982:161) assert that its characteristic is *the incorrect placement of a morpheme or a group of morphemes in an utterance*, for example: 'Yesterday went the farmers to their rice fields.'

Thus, overt errors as named by Corder, local errors as called by Burt and Kiparsky, and linguistic errors as modified/defined by Hendrickson mean the same thing, and so do covert errors, global errors, or communicative errors. Overt/local/-linguistic errors are ungrammatical utterances or sentences, but they do not hinder or break off communication as seen in the example on page 5, while covert/global/communicative errors are grammatical utterances, but they hinder or break off communication as in the example on page 7 above. According to the writer a lot of errors in speaking and writing are linguistic errors because many student errors in speech and writing performances are grammatical.

The linguistics errors can be classified into four types: *omission, addition, misformation/misinformation, and misordering.* Besides, the type of addition can also be subdivided into three sub-types: *double marking, regularization/over generalization,* and *simple addition.*

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This research was a quantitatively 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. Gay (1987: 110) says that cluster sampling is sampling in which groups, not individuals, are randomly selected, and all the members of selected groups have similar characteristics. The researcher drew lots from the three classes of regular students by writing each class's name on a piece of paper, rolling the pieces, putting them in a box, and drawing one. So, the drawing was done once, and all of the members of the selected class consisting more or less forty students were involved as the sample of the research. By doing so, the sample would represent the population

much more than enough. Minimal sample for descriptive research is 10% (Gay, 1987).

The instrument which was used to gather the data needed for this research was an achievement test. Bailey (1998), and Genesee and Upshur (2002) say that an achievement test is a test which measures or assesses how much the students have achieved or mastered certain course contents or a defined domain of language.

That was why the special test for this research was constructed by the researcher himself, and it certainly covered what it intended to measure, namely the three types of concord as it had been mentioned previously. Seliger and Shohamy (1989) indirectly say that a researcher may construct a test as an instrument for his research. The test was a completion or gap filling type test comprising of 50 items: 25 items about subject-verb concord, 15 about subject-complement concord, and 10 about subject-pronoun concord.

The test items were constructed in such a way in paragraphs that the sentences in which the items were available were interrelated and meaningfully 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.

After being constructed, the test was tried out to a class that was not selected as a sample because to Seliger and Shohamy (1989) it is important to examine the quality of the procedure before the instrument (test) is administered to insert changes and revisions. Due to the test instruction and some test items, the instrument was revised.

Furthermore, Seliger and Shohamy (1989) say that reliability and validity are two criteria that are the most important to assure the quality of the data gathering instrument procedures. In this case, the researcher needed test-retest reliability and content validity. Gay (1987) and Seliger and Shohamy (1989) state that test-retest reliability is used when the researcher needs to examine whether the test results in stable data from one administration to another

while content validity is the degree to which a test measures an intended content area.

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 Department who compared the test content with the content of the material decided to be measured before the test was administered. After she had done it, she believed and stated that the test was valid.

Despite the fact that Gay (1987) states that a valid test is always reliable, the researcher felt that it was necessary for him to find test-retest reliability. To obtain it, the same test was given twice to a class of regular students selected as a sample class within one week interval. After the researcher had computed the raw scores of the test-retest by using the Pearson *r* formula (Coefficient of Correlation) to know reliability coefficient, he found that the coefficient was 0.87. Downie and Heath (1970) say that if an *r* or a coefficient is 0.80 or above, it is considered high. In addition, if the coefficient is high, the test has good test-retest reliability Gay (1987). So, what Gay (1987) states about this earlier was proven.

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 grammatical

deviations of version 1 (GD1) and overall grammatical deviations (OGD) as the accumulation of grammatical deviations of version 1, 2, 3 and 4 (GD1, 2, 3, and 4), the total of GD1 and that of the OGDs, and then the OGDs were split into mistakes and errors in order to find out to what degree all the sample students of the research have committed mistakes and errors.

Table 1: The Subjects' GD1 and Percentage; GD 2, 3, and 4; OGD and the percentage.

SBJ	GD1	%	GD2	GD3	GD4	0GD	%
1	32	64	3	0	0	35	70
2	19	38	2	2	0	23	46
3	13	26	0	0	0	13	26
4	30	60	3	2	1	36	72
5	16	32	2	0	2	20	40
6	20	40	3	3	1	27	54
7	13	26	3	0	1	17	34
8	20	40	2	0	0	22	44
9	21	42	0	1	2	24	48
10	14	28	6	1	1	22	44
11	23	46	1	0	0	24	48
12	24	48	2	1	0	27	54
13	8	16	1	1	1	11	22
14	9	18	0	1	0	10	20
15	19	38	2	1	0	22	44
16	21	42	2	0	0	23	46
17	14	28	3	0	0	17	34
18	10	20	0	1	0	11	22
19	13	26	0	1	0	14	28
20	15	30	6	1	0	22	44
21	9	19	1	2	0	12	24
22	10	20	1	0	0	11	22
23	25	50	2	0	0	27	54
24	10	20	0	0	1	11	22
25	28	56	6	2	0	36	72
26	17	34	2	0	0	19	38
27	26	52	6	2	2	36	72
28	5	10	2	1	0	8	16
29	3	6	0	0	0	3	6
30	24	48	3	1	0	28	56
31	33	66	0	1	0	34	68
32	26	52	0	0	4	30	60
N 32	∑ 569 M 18	M 36				∑ 675 M 21	M 42

C. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Grammatical Deviations

To what extent the subjects committed grammatical deviations (GD) is shown in

Table 1 above. As seen there were 5 classifications of GD: GD1, 2, 3, 4, and OGD. The table shows to what extent each subject made overall grammatical deviations (OGD). As the accumulation of grammatical deviations of version 1(GD1), GD2, GD3 and GD4, it is seen in the table that the OGD were very different from GD1 for each sample subject and the total number of GD1 was 569 with the average: 18 or 36 % and the total number of the OGD was 675 with the average: 21 or 42 % of the total TI (50 test items). If each was compared with the highest and the lowest GD1 (33 and 3) or OGD (36 and 3), it was considered moderate. If it was compared with the total TI, it was considered quite high.

It is also seen in the table above that the highest OGDs were 36 or 72% of the test items (TI), and they were made by 3 subjects, subjects 4 (GD1: 30 + GD2: 3 + GD3: 2 + GD4 :1), 25 (28 + 6 + 2 +0), and 27 (26 + 6 + 2 + 2). The lowest were 3 or 6%, and it was committed by sample subject number 29. Besides, this sample subject did not have any GDs of versions 2, 3, and 4.

Then, the researcher grouped the OGDs into very high, high, moderate, low, very low categories. The were 3 other subjects whose OGD were considered very high, namely subjects 1 , 31 and 32: 35 (32 + 3 + 0 + 0) OGD or 70%, 34 (33 + 0 + 1 + 0) or 68% and 30 (26 + 0 + 0 + 4) or 60%. So, there were 5 subjects whose OGD belonged to very high category.

Furthermore, there were 8 sample subjects whose OGD belonged to high category, namely subjects 2, 6, 9, 11, 12, 16, 23, and 30 with 23 (19 + 2 + 2 + 0), 27 (20 + 3 + 3 +1), 24 (21 + 0 + 1 + 2), 24 (23 + 1 + 0 + 0), 27 (24 + 2 + 1 + 0), 23 (21 + 2 + 0 + 0), 27 (25 + 2 + 0 + 0), and 28 (24 + 3 + 1 + 0) OGD or 46 ,54 ,48 , 48, 54, 46, 54 and, 56% of the TI respectively.

Besides, the same number of subjects as high category committed OGD which were categorized into moderate OGD. The 8 subjects were subjects 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 17, 20 and 26 whose OGD were 20 (16 + 2 + 2 + 0), 17 (13 + 3 + 0 + 1), 22 (20 + 2 + 0 + 0), 22 (14 + 6 + 1 + 1), 22 (19 + 2 + 1 +0), 17 (14 + 3 + 0 + 0), 22 (15 + 6 + 1 + 0) and 19 (17 + 2+ 0 + 0) or 40, 34, 44, 44, 44, 34, 44, and 38 % of the TI.

On the contrary, there were 8 other sample subjects that committed OGD belonging to low category. These 8 subjects were subjects 3, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24 who made 13 (13 + 0 + 0), 11 (8 + 1 + 1 + 1), 10 (9 + 0 + 1 + 0), 11 (10 + 0 + 1 + 0), 14 (13 + 0 + 1 + 0), 12 (9 + 1 + 2 + 0), 11 (10 + 1 + 0 + 0) , and 11 (10 + 0 + 0 + 1) OGD or the same as 26, 22, 20, 22, 28, 24, 22, and 22% of the TI. In addition, the OGD of 2 other subjects, namely number 28 and 29 with 8 (5 + 2 + 1 + 0) and 3 (3 +

0 + 0 + 0) OGD, were classified into very low category.

So, 6 subjects' (19%) OGD were considered as the OGD with very high category; 8 (25%), 8 (25%), 8 (25%), and 2 (6%) other subjects' as those with high, moderate, low, and very low categories (as shown by Table 2).

Table 2: OGD Categories and Number of Subjects (NOS) for Each Category.

Range of OGD	Category	Nos	%
30 - 36	Very high	6	19
23 - 29	High	8	25
16 - 22	Moderate	8	25
9 - 15	Low	8	25
2 - 8	Very low	2	6
		N 32	100

2. Mistakes and Errors

Now let us see to what degree the GD (OGD in this case) became mistakes and to what degree they became errors in Table 3. After the OGD were separated into mistakes and errors, it was found out that the percentage of mistakes and errors of each sample subject. For subject 1, 14% (5 out of 35) of the OGD committed became mistakes, and 86% (30 others) became errors. For the rest of the subjects, the percentages of their mistakes and errors can be seen in the table.

As seen, the highest percentage of the mistakes (6 out of 8 OGD) was 75, and it belonged to subject 28. In contrast, the lowest percentage of errors (2 out of 8 OGD) was 25 and it belonged to the same subject. However, this subject did not commit the most mistakes. In fact, (s)he committed the fewest errors. Subject 29 who committed as few errors as subject 28, but the former did not have as low percentage of errors as the latter. The most mistakes, 18 out 36 OGD, were made by subject 25, and the percentage was 50%.

On the other hand, the most grammatical errors were 32 out of 36 OGD, committed by subject 4. The percentage was 89, and this was not the highest one. The highest was 91, and it belonged to

subject 18 who committed 10 errors out of 11 OGD. Besides, the fewest mistakes (1) and the lowest percentage of mistakes (9%) were also gained by the same subject. However, subject 29 who made as few mistakes as subject 18 did not have the same percentage as this subject.

Table 3: Mistakes and Errors after They Were Split from OGD.

SBJ	OGD	Mistakes	%	Errors	%
1	35	5	14	30	86
2	23	6	26	17	74
3	13	3	23	10	77
4	36	4	11	32	89
5	20	7	35	13	65
6	27	8	30	19	70
7	17	5	29	12	71
8	22	4	18	18	82
9	24	7	29	17	71
10	22	9	41	13	59
11	24	6	25	18	75
12	27	9	33	18	67
13	11	4	36	7	64
14	10	2	20	8	80
15	22	3	14	19	86
16	23	6	26	17	74
17	17	6	35	11	65
18	11	1	9	10	91
19	14	6	43	8	57
20	22	12	55	10	45
21	12	7	58	5	42
22	11	2	18	9	82
23	27	7	26	20	74
24	11	4	36	7	64
25	36	18	50	18	50
26	19	4	21	15	79
27	36	10	28	26	72
28	8	6	75	2	25
29	3	1	33	2	67
30	28	7	25	21	75
31	34	7	21	27	79
32	30	6	20	24	80
N 32	M 21	∑ 192 M 6	29	∑ 483 M 15	M 71

At last, after the total (grammatical) mistakes (192) and errors (483) had been known, it was found that the average of each was 6 and 15 or 29% and 71% of the average of OGD as shown by Table 4.

So, subject 25 committed the most mistakes. On the other hand, subjects 16 and 29 made the fewest. In addition, subject 28 and 18 got the highest and the lowest percentages of mistakes. The total mistakes

were 192 and the average was 6 or 29%. For errors, subject 4 committed the most while subject 28 and 29 made the fewest. For the percentage of errors, subject 18 got the highest while subject 28 had the lowest. The total errors were 483, and the average was 15 or 71% of the average of OGD.

As Table 1 on page 14 shows, the 32 sample subjects committed 675 OGD totally in the answers of 50 test items. Out of these OGD, 483 were found out as grammatical errors (GE) as they can be seen in Table 3 on page 17. Then, they were grouped according to each type of concord: S-VC (subject-verb concord), S-CC (subject-complement concord), and S-OC (subject-object concord, especially about reflexive and reciprocal pronoun objects and the related structures) that he researched on. Then, the researcher classified the errors of each type of concord, calculated the number and the percentage of errors of each error type. The types of errors of each type of concord were as described in the following points:

1. Subject-Verb Concord (S-VC)

Out of 25 test items about S-VC tested, 23 items had the answers which were regarded as GE (grammatical errors), and after the calculation was made it was found that there were 213 GE. Compared with the GE of the other types of concord, the GE of this type were the most, and the percentage was the highest, namely 44%.

Then, the 213 GE were classified based on the types of errors, and the classification resulted in 3 types of GE. They were *omission* (which is characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed/grammatical utterance or sentence), *addition* as the opposite of omission (which is characterized by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed/grammatical utterance or sentence), and *misformation* (its characteristic is the use of the wrong form of a morpheme or structure).

As it can be seen on the next page, it was found out that there were 48 errors of omission type, 27 of addition type, and 138

of misformation type, and their percentages were 22, 13, and 65. Besides, it can be clarified here that most of the errors of omission type were the absence of *–s/-es* as the indicator of the third singular person subject. In contrast, most of those of addition type were the presence of the third singular person indicator for plural subject. For misformation type, most of the errors were the use of plural verbs for singular verbs.

So, on S-VC, the most errors (138 out of 213 or 65%) were categorized into misformation, and the fewest (27 or 13%) were categorized into addition. In addition, most of the errors of each type were the absence of *-s/-es* ending for singular subject, the presence of *-s/-es* ending for plural subjects/verbs, and the use of plural verbs for singular verbs or subjects.

2. Subject-Complement Concord (S-CC)

For S-CC, there were 15 test items, and in the answers of these 15 test items it was found out that there were 154 GE (32% of the total GE) consisting of 3 kinds of errors, which were the same as those that were found in S-VC.

So, on S-VC, the most errors (138 out of 213 or 65%) were categorized into misformation, and the fewest (27 or 13%) were categorized into addition. In addition, most of the errors of each type were the absence of *-s/-es* ending for singular subject, the presence of *-s/-es* ending for plural subjects/verbs, and the use of plural verbs for singular verbs or subjects.

3. Subject-Complement Concord (S-CC)

For S-CC, there were 15 test items, and in the answers of these 15 test items it was found out that there were 154 GE (32% of the total GE) consisting of 3 kinds of errors, which were the same as those that were found in S-VC.

As shown by Table 9 above, among those GE, 126 (the most errors) or 82% were the errors of omission type, not misformation type as found in S-VC. 79 or 63% out of the errors of this type dealt with the absence of plural indicator: -s/-es,

and the rest (47 or 37%) dealt with the absence of indefinite article *a*.

Besides, 27 errors (18%) belonged to misformation type. The other one belonged to addition type. The errors of misformation type comprised of 20 cases (74%), which dealt with the wrong use of indefinite article *a* or *an* for plural nouns as complements, and 7 others (26%) that were about the wrong use of *–s/-es* as plural indicator for singular nouns.

As a conclusion, 154 GE (32% of the total GE) occurred in S-CC, and the error types that were found were the same as in S-VC. 126 (82%) out of these 154 GE belonged to omission type errors, and 79 or 63% of the errors of this type dealt with the absence of *-s/-es* as plural indicator.

4. Subject-Object Concord (S-OC)

The last type of grammatical concord that was researched on was S-OC, and 10 out of 50 test items on concord were about S-OC. In the answers of the 10 items, 116 GE were found out.

After the 116 GE were classified, the 3 types of errors found in S-VC were also found in S-C. However, the most errors: 101 (87%) dealt with misformation, not omission type. 11 (10%), and 4 (3%) dealt with addition types of errors respectively. They can be seen in the table on the next page.

The 101 errors of misformation type consisted of the wrong use of possessive adjectives for reflexive genitive, that of reciprocal pronoun referring to 2 people for reciprocal pronoun referring to 3 people or more, and that of plural pronoun object for reciprocal pronoun referring to 3 people or more (see the table below). In fact, there were 18, 12, and 8 errors for each (see TI 10 and 40 in the table). 38 other errors of the same type dealt with the wrong use of reflexive, object, and reflexive genitive pronouns for reciprocal one referring to 2 people, and the wrong use of reflexive and object pronouns for reciprocal pronoun that refers to 3 people or more. The number of the errors for each wrong use that had been described or mentioned varied from 1

to 3. In addition, there were 25 errors (with asterisks) that were grouped into misformation type, but they could not be said as the use of the wrong form of morphemes or structures because there are not any morphemes or structures like these in English (See TI 34, 39, 40, 41, 43 and 49 in the table above).

The rest of the errors were classified as omission and addition types, and each of which dealt with the absence of -*es* plural indicator for plural reflexive pronoun and the presence of -*es* ending as the same indicator for singular reflexive pronoun. There were 11 (10%) and 4 (3%) errors of omission and addition types respectively (See TI 49 and 42 in the table above). In addition, the learners committed 569 GD1 (grammar deviations based on the answers of version 1) with the average: 18 GD1 or 36%, and 675 OGD (overall grammatical deviations based on the accumulation of GD1, 2, 3, and 4) with the average: 21 OGD or 42% of the total TI (50 test items). If each was compared with the highest and the lowest GD1 (33 and 3) or OGD (36 and 3), it was considered moderate. If it was compared with the total TI, it was considered quite high.

Besides, out of those 675 OGD, 192 or 28% became mistakes, and 483 others or 72 % became errors. On the average, each learner committed 6 mistakes and 15 errors more or less. So, the ratio between mistakes and errors was 2:5 more or less. This ratio was considered big because in every 7 grammatical deviations, there were 2 mistakes and 5 errors on the average. It means the ratio between how much the learners were confused about and how much they did not know concord was 2:5.

Types of errors for each type of concord were the same, namely omission, addition, and misformation. For the subject-verb concord (S-VC), the greatest errors were misformation type. For the subject-complement concord (S-CC), the greatest ones were omission type, and for the subject-object concord (S-OC), they were misformation type. So, for all types of concord that were researched on, misformation type errors were the greatest. This was in accordance with what Dulay et al. (1982) claim that misformation is the most common type of errors that EFL learners commit.

D. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The average of the grammatical deviations found in their first answers was more than one-third of the total test items (50 items), and that of the overall deviations found in the first, second, third and fourth versions of the answers was quite high or great. If it was compared with the total test items, it was nearly a half of them.

The ratio between the mistakes (what they are confused with on concord) and the errors (what they did not know on concord) they committed was great. It was 2:5 more or less, or in every 7 grammatical deviations there were 2 mistakes and 5 errors on the average.

There were 3 types of grammatical errors for each kind of concord that was researched on. The first type was *omission*. *Ommission* as Dulay et al (1982) mention the absence of an item that had to appear in a well-formed/grammatical utterance or sentence. The second was *addition*. It is ,as Dulay et al further state, the presence of an item which is necessary not to appear in a well-formed/grammatical utterance or sentence, while the third: *misformation,* as these experts say, is the use of the wrong form of a morpheme or structure.

The last type had the greatest percentages of grammatical errors for subject-verb, and subject-object concord. Most of the errors of this mis formation type dealt with the use *plural verbs* for *singular ones* and the use of possessive adjectives *(their)* for reflexive genitive *(their own)*, reciprocal pronoun referring to 2 people *(each other)* for reciprocal pronoun referring to 3 people or more *(one another)* and object pronoun *(them)* for reciprocal pronoun referring to 3 people or more *(one another)*. In addition, for subject-complement concord the omission

type had the greatest, and most of the errors of this type were the absence of plural indicators –s/-es.

Therefore, he suggests that an EFL lecturer/teacher not neglect concord, especially the three types of it. It is best that (s)he pay more serious attention to the three grammatical items dealing with the problems found.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

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

Brown, H. Douglas. 2003. *Language Assessments: Principles and Classroom Practice*. San Francisco: Longman Group Ltd.

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

Collerson, John. 1995. *English Grammar: A Functional Approach*. Newtown, NSW: Primary English Teaching Association.

Cook, Stanley J. and Richard W. Suter. 1980. *The Scope of Grammar: A Study of Modern English*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath. 1970. *Basic Statistical Methods*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

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

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

Genesee, F., and J. A. Upshur. 2002. *Classroom-Based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. New York: CUP.

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

Hedge, Tricia. 2000. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Hongkong: OUP.

Hendrickson, James M. 1987. "Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice". In Long, M. H., and J. C. Richards (eds.) *Merthodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Herndon, Jeanne H. 1976. *A Survey of Modern Grammars*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kaikkonen, and J. Lehtovaara. 2001. *Experiential Learning in Foreign Language Education*. London: Longman.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 2003. *Teaching Language: From Grammar to Grammaring*. Toronto: Newbury House.

Long, Michael H., and J. C. Richards (eds.). 1987. *Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

McNamara, Tim. 1996. *Measuring Second Language Performance*. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Nunan, David. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. London: Prentice Hall International Ltd.

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

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

Stenson, Nancy. 1974. "Induced Errors". In John Schumann and Nancy Stenson (editors), *New Frontiers of Second*

Language Learning. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Thornbury, Scott. 2001. *How to Teach Grammar.* Harlow: Longman Group Ltd.