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ABSTRACT

Error Analysis in the Interlanguage of Beginning Spanish Students

by

Todd Alan Deveau

This study analyzes the errors committed in the interlanguage of beginning eighth grade Spanish students in written production. Developmental errors were extracted from examinations and categorized as errors of lexicon, morphology, syntax, or orthography. These errors were then sub-classified in an attempt to arrive at an accurate interpretation and description of the error. The final step in this error analysis consisted of explanations for the possible causes of the errors. The analysis focused on developmental errors attributed to the target language itself such as overgeneralization in addition to the use of communication strategies in production. A review of literature on error analysis and related topics precedes the research findings of this study.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Acquisition vs. Learning

Arguably the most controversial perspective regarding second language learning was introduced by the work of Stephen Krashen (1982). The "Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis" claims that there are two independent ways of acquiring languages. Krashen (1985) identifies ‘acquisition’ as a subconscious process identical in all important ways to the process children utilize in acquiring their first language, while ‘learning’ is a conscious process that results in ‘knowing about’ language (1). In his pivotal study of 1959, Robert Lado had already distinguished between these two distinct and independent ways to develop competence. He had previously stated that ‘acquisition’ was a process similar, if not identical, to the way children develop their first language, while ‘learning’ referred to conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them, and being able to talk about them (Lado 59). Brown describes ‘acquisition’ as a subconscious and intuitive process used by children to “pick up a language,” and ‘learning’ as a conscious process in which learners attend to form, figure out rules, and are generally aware of their own process (Brown 279). Krashen coined the term “monitor” for the internal editing device used in the conscious process of second language learning. His theory suggests that as
much language as possible should be `acquired,’ without monitoring, in an attempt to simulate first language acquisition. Because, according to Krashen, ‘learning’ can not become ‘acquisition,’ too much conscious attention to rules and structure forces a constant, and permanent, process of internal analysis on the learner. According to Krashen (1985), “the ‘Input Hypothesis’ claims that humans acquire language in only one way - by understanding messages, or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’ (2). Fluency results from this ‘comprehensible input’ and ‘a low affective filter,’ i.e., an attitude, motivation, and personality that allow input to become intake (Dekeyser 238). This ultimate goal of ‘intake’ refers to the input that is actually acquired by the learner. Because only a small amount of input is ever converted to intake, Krashen believes that it is essential to supply the learner with an overabundance of input.

Some criticism of the ‘Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis’ is centered on the improbability of the accurate differentiation between what is conscious and what is subconscious. The 1990 work of Richard Schmidt, an experimental psychologist, reveals that an element of ‘conscious awareness’ is necessary for long-term learning. From this point of view McLaughlin (1990) finds the premise of subconscious language acquisition highly questionable. The hypothesis suggests that the conscious and subconscious
processes involved in language learning are mutually exclusive. A number of studies by such researchers as Long, Ellis, Doughty, and Buczowska and Weist have shown the certain value of conscious rule learning in second language learning (Brown 281).

Lado had documented a study of adult EFL students in which he hypothesized that pronunciation would improve significantly more with specific teaching-learning intervention than with general acquisition experience in English classes. His conclusions were clear and his recommendations were emphatic: acquisition experience alone is less effective for the achievement of good reading pronunciation by adult EFL students than teaching-learning experience. He went on to say, “I propose that at least some of us break away from the fixation of the first language acquisition model” (Lado 66-7). Krashen’s Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis seems to contradict the studies of many linguists including Lado. Dekeyser (1990) refers to more recent positions taken by many researchers who deny the validity of the hypothesis. Several of these researchers attempt to redefine the differences between acquisition and learning. Stevick (1984) replaces these two terms with “poorly integrated” and “well-integrated” configurations in long-term memory. Tarone (1983, 1984) observes a “capability continuum” which is represented at one extreme by the learner’s
conscious intuitions about correctness, i.e., Krashen’s “learning.” But perhaps the most logical objections come from McLaughlin (1978): he replaces “conscious and unconscious” with “controlled and automatic processes.” Along with this new terminology, McLaughlin believes that learning can become acquisition, i.e., that initially controlled processes can become automatized (Dekeyser 1990). Seliger also questions Krashen’s one directional ‘input hypothesis.’ This hypothesis states that “comprehensible input is the only causative variable in second language acquisition” (Krashen 1986, 62). Seliger (1983) contends that the level of ‘output’ is also a strong indicator of the rate at which competence occurs. Those learners that sustained a high level of production (output) in the classroom and outside progressed at a faster rate than those with less interaction and self-motivation (262). This is observable in most disciplines in which it is more productive for a student actively to generate input from teachers according to the student’s own learning styles. By asking questions, forming theories, and taking risks students personalize the established curriculum in a classroom.

From second language acquisition and learning research certain conclusions seem evident. First, there are few empirical data that suggest that the differences between acquisition and learning make them completely independent of one another. Second-language acquisition, i.e., the ‘picking
up of another language.’ exists on both a conscious and subconscious level. Teaching strategies tend to lean toward either a rule-oriented approach or one in which rule-learning plays a minimal role in the classroom. The research consulted for this thesis shows that the study of the structure of the target language tends to enhance the production and comprehension of the learners. The strong objections against the terms ‘conscious’ and ‘subconscious’ cited thus far demonstrate the imprecision in Krashen’s original hypothesis. This lack of clarity identified by researchers has caused the Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis to be highly suspect. In an effort to avoid confusion, the term ‘second language learning’ (henceforth SLL) will be used to refer to a rule-based classroom setting, while ‘second language acquisition’ (SLA) will denote the absence of deductive rule presentation.

1.2 Interlanguage

Interlanguage (IL) studies have been of primary importance in second language learning for several decades. In 1963 Mel’chuk first referred to “interlingua,” which James (1994) defines as a functionally reduced dialect of the target language. The origin of research into the characteristics of the language acquired by learners beginning at the initial point of instruction has been traced to Larry Selinker (1969, 1972). “Interlanguage,” as he called it,
is "a separate linguistic system whose existence we are compelled to hypothesize, based on the observed output which results from the [target language] learner’s attempted production of a target language norm." Its identification as a “separate linguistic system” is critical in understanding its status as a language independent of L1 and L2. In the years surrounding the appearance of Selinker’s “interlanguage,” analysts such as Corder and Nemser attempted to modify the theory. Corder (1967) refers to a “transitional competence” to describe the phenomenon. The need for different terminology can be attributed to the varying philosophies of language learning held by these linguists. He admittedly borrows Chomsky’s notion of linguistic “competence” in order to preserve the idea that language learning is constantly developing, although four years later he begins using the term “transitional dialect.” (Corder 1981, 67). James (1994) confirms that SLA is describable in terms of the three systems L1, L2 and IL (180). The branch of linguistics identified by James as “Interlanguage Study” is interested in the emergence of these languages rather than in the finished product (3). He states that interlinguas are approximative systems occupying points on a continuum between L1 and L2. James borrowed the term “approximative system” from Nemser, who introduced it in 1971. However, Nemser’s terminology stresses the goal-directed orientation toward the target
language, while James’s interlingua suggests the result of the combination of languages (Corder 67).

IL has been equated with mothers using “baby talk” and “foreigner talk” used to communicate with speakers of other languages. The common thread in these modified languages is a simplification of the system. The IL is simple when compared to the L1 or L2. Corder (1975) is cautious to use the term “simplification” by insisting that “...characterising them as less complex does not entail that they have been simplified.” Simplification may better be identified as a communication strategy used within the interlanguage. By isolating the IL as a separate system researchers have been moved to analyze its potential contributions to the field of linguistics.

1.3 Contrastive Analysis

In 1945 Fries “Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis” (CAH) acknowledges a need in SLL to analyze the strong correlation between L1 and L2 structure. James (1980) provides the following definition in his book entitled *Contrastive Analysis*: “Contrastive analysis (CA) is a linguistic enterprise aimed at producing inverted (i.e. contrastive, not comparative) two-valued typologies (a CA is always concerned with a pair of languages), and founded on the assumption that languages can be compared” (3) This approach
claimed that L1 interference is the primary cause of learner error and, therefore, a look at the parallel features of the L1 and L2 would serve to establish a more beneficial foreign language syllabus through the prediction of trouble areas. Fries's CA is firmly rooted in the aspect of the behaviorist perspective in which learners are conditioned to acquire language through imitation of structures already known to them. Overcoming the differences between L1 and L2 was believed to be the most instrumental factor in SLL. The CAH denies the importance of intralingual (target language-generated) causes of error, and by extension fails to arrive at their psycholinguistic origins by overgeneralizing the use of L1 transfer. Oller and Ziahosseiny (1970) approached this theory from a more moderate perspective. They suggested that greater differences do not always result in a higher degree of learning difficulty and that intralingual factors can lead to some of the greatest learning difficulties (194). Weinreich (1953) had said years earlier that not every conjunction of favorable structural conditions results in "permanent grammatical interference" of the type one might predict (Slinker 39). The belief that CA can accurately predict error in SLL is not shared by many researchers.
1.4 Error Analysis

Error analysis (EA) is a direct descendent of the comparative analysis hypothesis. IL errors were initially evaluated using EA in order to arrive at data for the contrasting of languages. Focusing on errors soon caused many linguists to question the validity of CA, as the analysis suggested that only a portion of the problems had L1 interference at their origin. EA study has been criticized by some researchers. One shortcoming is that the process aimed at only the production element in SLL. The level of proficiency in comprehension is not a matter of concern for error analysts. The idea of a focus on error also evoked concern because of the recent trend in language teaching away from explicit grammar instruction in order to mimic L1 acquisition. The fact that EA can not assess the use of avoidance strategies used by learners is expressed by Schachter (1974) and Kleinmann (1977). Because avoidance represents a lack of production, errors of this type are difficult to observe and, therefore, difficult to analyze. A final criticism of EA was made by Gass in 1984. She believes that universals in all languages warrant in-depth study more than error analysis’s highly focused attention to the details of one specific language (Brown 207). SLL research can arrive at a better understanding of the possible existence of universals through the analysis of the learning of one language at a time. A focus on more than one
language may be necessary for language interference data, but it may confuse
the already difficult task of error classification thought to be caused by the
structure of the target language.

Errors by definition imply ignorance, deficiency, and/or accident. But
in language learning they are inevitable occurrences that are the critical
elements in defining the IL of a learner. Corder states that “for those who
attempt to describe his [the learner’s] knowledge of the language at any point
in its development, it is the ‘errors’ which provide the important evidence”
(8). The learner’s self-adjusting of an erroneous utterance to comply with
target language norms is considered normal and welcome behavior in the
acquisition process. Corder believes that for learners errors are
“indispensable” since the making of errors can be regarded as a device the
learner uses in order to learn (150). Selinker (1992) states a “modern belief
would consider errors as part of the circular progression in learning, viewing
them as a dynamic process involved in the learning process” (119). Errors
serve the essential function of acting as a resource with which the learner
explores the new language through connections, educated guessing, and
assumptions. Selinker agrees by adding the importance of errors in "self-
evaluation and, perhaps, therapy."
EA may have developed as a result of the cognitive learning theories of Chomsky as they pertain to first-language acquisition. He proposed that the "competence" of a language learner "is a set of processes possessed by the individual and developed in him as part of his maturation" (Wilkins 34). This "competence" is systematic and stable in SLL and therefore can and should be described. "Performance," on the other hand, is unstable and dependent on an abundance of affective variables such as learning environment, state of mind, personality, among others. From a Chomskian perspective these performance factors are not factors of supreme importance within first-language learning analysis. The erratic and inconsistent nature of "performance" does not allow for a methodological analysis like that possible in the study of "competence." Chomsky's competence/performance distinction has caused researchers to distinguish between mistakes and errors in their studies. Mistakes refer to faults in performance in a learner's IL, and are therefore not pertinent in an analysis. Errors, on the other hand, are representative of the learner's competence in the target language. Consequently it is the researchers responsibility to separate mistakes of performance from true errors.

EA responds to Chomsky's thoughts of language acquisition as a highly systematic progression. It validates findings in contrastive linguistic
studies and tells about the psycholinguistic processes of language learning and the strategies adopted by the learner (Corder 75). Error analysis in the IL of second language learners has produced valuable insights into such interrelated fields as applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, second language learning, and foreign language teaching. A detailed analysis of the difficulties that arise for a foreign language student may lead to a better understanding of the process of learning itself. The categorization of these errors offers the teacher and learner the potential to predict the distracting elements that may inhibit language production. Language teaching may benefit from EA by varying procedures, materials, practice time, and pace according to the data accumulated.

The categorization and classification of learner errors in the IL could have a significant impact on SLL. In general terms, they can be attributed to one of two possible origins: those resulting from interlingual interference or intralingual errors. While the former is concerned with influence from the mother tongue, intralingual error refers to those errors generated through the structure of the target language exclusively. Richards (1974) states that "intralingual errors are those which reflect the general characteristics of rule learning, such as faulty overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules, and failure to learn conditions under which rules apply" (174). Some
linguists have chosen to identify these types of problems as ‘developmental’ errors. Still others (most notably Richards) see developmental errors as only one of many subdivisions that can be generalized as ‘intralingual’ errors.

Developmental errors in the IL are defined by Corder (1967) as those reflecting built-in stages of linguistic development. Common errors representative of the process of IL development in Spanish are the misuse of the two verbs meaning “to be,” *ser* and *estar*, and the confusion of the preterit and imperfect past tenses. Erroneous English double marking, such as ‘she didn’t went back,’ can be attributed to the developmental process. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) refer to the term ‘archiforms’ as errors which apply one form in place of several. The substitution of subject pronouns for possessive adjectives is evident in the IL of many second language learners. Similarly, Ervin-Tripp (1974) documents the application of “moi” for both “mon/ma” (my) and “moi” (me) in the IL of English-speaking students learning French (116). Váradi (1980) would classify this substitution under the canopy he calls the ‘domain of hiatus.’ He explains hiatus, or the lack of knowledge of the learner, as a result of an impoverished approximative system in which meaning can not be expressed as fluently as in a native language (Færch and Kasper 82). Although Váradi’s emphasis on learner ignorance may be plausible in his study of simplification, the focus of
EA is not on what the learner does not know, but what he can produce. Intralingual developmental errors in EA result from the body of knowledge possessed by the learner.

Overgeneralization, or the ‘regularizing of rules,’ as termed in Language Two, is usually considered the most common cause of problem in language learning. Richards (1971) identifies this phenomenon as those “errors caused by extensions of the target language rules to inappropriate contexts.” Zobl admits “it is a commonplace that learners overgeneralize,” although he does not place a high priority on the analysis of overgeneralizations (Davies, et al. 87). Examples of such false application of rules can be seen in the frequent morphological production by ESL students of ‘womans’ or ‘mans’ for the plural of ‘woman’ and ‘man,’ or ‘bringed’ in place of ‘brought.” Example in Spanish, would be the construction of “estó” or “deció” in place of the irregular forms “estuvo” and “dijo.” In an attempt to apply pluralization and past-tense marking rules in a second language, students may overgeneralize and erroneously inject exceptions into the rule system. This is also a normal occurrence in first-language acquisition as the learner tends to create a hypothesis regarding the rule system based on generalizations. These overgeneralizations are usually perceived as especially deviant and inappropriate in the target language and, therefore, are
particularly prone to immediate correction. However, these errors are valuable clues that show the learning strategies employed by the student. Overgeneralizations demonstrate a positive progression in the learner toward the target language and, therefore, should be considered welcome products in the acquisition process.

‘Induced error’ is classified by Stenson (1974) as another type of intralinguistic error. This type of error is represented by the errors derived from sequencing and presentation of target language items. Syntactic error is anticipated in language and the language learning process. Nuances of word order can vary greatly in different language systems. The “subject-verb-object” pattern in English compared to the flexible order of Spanish can create confusion in production and comprehension. A familiar problem facing native speakers of English learning Spanish is the mistaking of subject for object. In a sentence proposed by VanPatten, “Juan les da dinero a ellos,” English speakers will tend to correctly identify ‘Juan’ as the subject and ‘ellos’ as the indirect object. However, if the order were modified to, “A ellos les da dinero Juan,” the learner may misinterpret ‘ellos’ as the subject based on interference from his mother tongue. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) give examples in French German, and English of what they call ‘misordering; “Le chien a mangé les;” “Ich bin glücklich sein hier;” “He is all
the time late” (162-3). Direct translation from the mother tongue is the most common cause of such error, but this can not explain all syntactic misorderings. In the process of learning new rules of syntax, learners will test hypotheses by experimenting with different word orders. In many cases, overgeneralizations are made in the target language. Take for example the case of the positioning of objects in Spanish. Once a student has learned that objects must be attached to an affirmative imperative, such as, “Dime la verdad,” a learner may erroneously apply this rule to negative imperatives or single conjugated verbs creating, “No digasme la verdad.,” or “Yo digola.” This would be an example of the difficulty in EA resulting from the possibility of an overlap in categories (induced error and overgeneralization in this case).

A final area that fits under the canopy of intralanguage error is that of overproduction. Schachter and Rutherford (1979) isolate this group as target-language features produced correctly but used too frequently. This category is related to the appropriateness of an utterance rather than its grammaticality according to L2 rules. It is common for students learning Spanish to repeat the subject of the sentence several times while telling a story. The lack of fluency of a learner in a “pronoun-drop” language such as Spanish can frequently be recognized by the overproduction of subject pronouns that results in a simplified and sometimes “child-like” dialect. For example,
students will tend to use the subject pronoun “yo” with a first-person verb form in all situations. In Spanish a first-person verb form such as “hablo” has the same meaning as “yo hablo,” therefore native speakers and more advanced learners will frequently omit the pronoun due to its redundancy.

Corder (1981) distinguishes between overt and covert errors; those utterances that are overtly erroneous are superficially incorrect, while covertly erroneous formations appear acceptable, but are problematic in some other way, or are correct by chance (42). This distinction is important to EA in the sense that a covertly erroneous error may slip by unnoticed without a careful consideration of the context surrounding the utterance. Errors of overproduction are covert errors that tend to verify the ‘foreignness’ of a learner’s IL. The tendency for second language learners to repeat lexicon is likely the result of his impoverished IL. This factor entices the learner to be as creative as possible with a limited body of knowledge. The product of this creativity is the implementation of learner strategies.

1.5 Strategies of Communication

The use of strategies of communication by second language learners was introduced by Selinker in 1972. A certain type of error was thought to be derived from the processes undertaken by all learners in the development
of an IL. Corder (1981) states that “these errors were regarded as a by-product of the attempt of the learner to express his meaning in spontaneous speech (and writing) with an inadequate grasp of the target language system” (103). Færch and Kasper (1983) define communication strategies as “potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal” (Brown 118). These strategies differ from “learner strategies” in that communication is associated with output while learning refers to input. In a study of errors, the former is applicable on both linguistic and psycholinguistic levels. Communication strategies can be classified into one or more of three categories: avoidance, reduction or simplification, and generalization.

Avoidance behavior is among the most difficult to recognize and document. Hulstijn and Marchena (1989) clarify that avoidance strategies cannot be explained by ignorance (250). As a strategy, avoidance techniques imply that a choice is made by the learner not to use a particular element of the target language system. Laufer and Eliasson (1993) claim that “it presumes an awareness, however faint, of a given target language feature, and it always involves a quasi-intentional or intentional choice to replace the feature by something else” (36). Learners sometimes choose to use those target language structures with which they are the most comfortable, thereby
playing it safe. Hulstijn and Marchena (1989) cite three possible reasons for avoidance (250):

1. Learners may hesitate to use an L2 construction when they perceive it as markedly different from their L1 system (Kleinmann 77, 78 Schachter 74, 79).

2. Hesitation due to fear of interference error, perceiving the form as being too similar to an L1 counterpart (Kellerman 81, 77).

3. Avoidance due to an L2 form having specific (as opposed to general) semantic features.

The first two reasons suggest that interference from the mother tongue is present, while the third recognizes a comparison of forms within the target language. James (1994) refers to avoidance as “crosslinguistic influence” in terms of the description given by Kamimoto et al. (1992) and Gass (1988: 394) who see avoidance as a result of having had negative feedback in the past when L1 transfer has been attempted, but led to error (181). This influence is certainly valid but can not explain all occurrences of the avoidance strategy.

Two distinct forms of avoidance have been identified as ‘topic avoidance’ and ‘message abandonment.’ Topic avoidance can be described as the conscious decision of a learner not to communicate a certain idea based on its perceived linguistic difficulty. Message abandonment suggests that a learner attempts to communicate, but because a challenge is encountered the
learner gives up and fails to complete the message. Blum-Kulka and Levenston (1978) classify avoidance as either “apparent” or “true.” Apparent avoidance results from a lack of vocabulary, while true avoidance is that which may be used by advanced learners, teachers, and editors purposefully to reduce the content of their intended message. Avoidance and simplification have a tendency to overlap in the description of many learner errors.

Simplification is a strategy employed by language learners due to their impoverished IL. Because the approximative system of a learner is incomplete, communication is reduced to the body of knowledge possessed. While avoidance refers to the language patterns intentionally not used by the learner, simplification is concerned with the utterances that are produced but somehow reduced. Avoidance behavior and simplification occasionally go hand in hand. As a learner avoids a word or message, rather than abandon the thought, he may simplify the utterance with a related word, concept or syntactic structure. To quote Hulstijn and Marchena (1989),

> with moderate proficiency, learners feel tempted to adopt a play-it-safe strategy by using multi-purpose one-word verbs, with general meanings, rather than restricted-purpose phrasal verbs with specific, sometimes idiomatic, meanings (250).

Meisel (1977) separates simplification into two categories. “Elaborative” simplification erroneously attempts to bring the learner’s IL grammar closer
to the target norm by overgeneralizing a form to environments where it is inappropriate. An example of such behavior is the incorrect use of perceived synonyms that will be described in the next paragraph. The other, "restrictive" simplification, is a strategy utilized to get the message across by reducing the grammar so it is easier for the learner to handle (Huebner 1983, 35).

There are several ways in which a learner can maneuver his production around difficult target language structures. The most common replacement strategies are approximation, synonymity, and circumlocution or paraphrase. Approximation is the substitution of familiar vocabulary for unknown structures. Blum-Kulka and Levenston describe this phenomenon:

> using a word in the target language which does not convey the concept required in the context -a concept for which a single term may exist that is commonly used by native speakers- but which shows enough semantic elements with the derived concept to more or less convey its meaning in the given context (130).

As the name implies, synonymity is the use of certain semantic structures understood to have the same meaning as others. In the substitution of true synonyms the result is only that of repetition, which, although not native-like, is still considered appropriate. However, many pairs of synonyms share some components of meaning but differ in appropriate usage. Blum-Kulka and Levenston offer the example of "the beautiful man" as a synonymous
simplification for a learner that does not know the word ‘handsome’ (132). They go on to examine the case of a pair of words that are not true synonyms, but do share most of their semantic components. Many learners of Spanish, for example, alternate the use of “decir” and “hablar” without regard to their distinct meanings.

A simplification/avoidance strategy that is common to language learners and native speakers alike is circumlocution and paraphrase. Native speakers make use of such strategies when they find themselves unable to come up with the exact words for which they are searching. Their use by second language learners is similar, but the result will commonly be the production of an utterance with a different meaning than that which was intended. The learner may frequently have no choice but to attempt to come as close as possible to intended meaning through circumlocution. Native speakers can account for the need of these strategies as a momentary lapse or even fatigue, while for second language learners the blame falls on a deficient language system. Learners may present a semantic structure in terms of its opposite, such as “not hard” replacing the unknown word “soft.” At times intended meaning in the production of second language learners may be modified or sacrificed altogether. Meaning may be adjusted in order to bring the structure within the sphere of his linguistic capabilities. Váradi
recognizes the existence of extremes when considering the use of paraphrase and circumlocution. He states that “some learners will employ or even invent a target language form without any misgivings and others will say things not meant as long as they are said correctly” (85). The analysis of errors resulting from the conscious implementation of these strategies may help researchers gain a better understanding of the psycholinguistic processes at work in the IL.

1.6 EA procedure

In recent decades SLL researchers have focused on EA in an attempt to explain the process and patterns of language learning. Studies have shown that intralinguistic difficulties encountered by the learner weigh heavily on the communicative competence achieved. Dulay and Burt are perhaps the strongest advocates of an intralingual attempt to categorize and explain problems common to all second language learners. From the “competence” and “performance” distinctions introduced by Chomsky to simplification and overgeneralization strategies that are employed by all learners, the importance of analysis of errors generated by the structure of the target language is immeasurable. The multiplicity of possible explanations for faults in L2 production demonstrate the difficulty encountered by researchers in applying
absolute truths to the nature of second language errors. While the value of studies in native language interference, commonly referred to as transfer, is undeniable, studies in EA are incomplete without thorough research concentrating on the definition and classification of errors resulting from within the target language itself.

According to Corder, the study of errors in the development of a foreign language provides input into the psycholinguistic process adopted by the learner. In the introduction to his frequently cited study “Error Analysis and Interlanguage” he states (Corder 1981):

Most errors were ascribed to interference and consequently a major part of applied linguistics research was devoted to comparing the mother tongue and the target language in order to predict or explain the errors made by learners of any particular language background. What was overlooked or underestimated were the errors which could not be explained in this way (1)

With the increased popularity of transfer-related theory and CA studies initiated by Lado’s highly regarded work Linguistics Across Cultures, some errors were prematurely assumed to be L1 influenced. Statistics vary greatly regarding the percentage of learner errors caused by interference compared with those attributable to the structure of the target language. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen insist that only 8-23 per cent of errors (sometimes less) of adults can be accounted for by L1 interference, while in 1979 Arabski stated that more than half the errors were caused by transfer (Kellerman 100). The most
likely cause of such statistical deviation is inconsistency in the interpretation of learner errors. In fact, one of the most frequent criticisms of EA is the lack of precise criteria for classification due to an overlapping of categories.

Advocates for the value of the study of intralingual errors are quick to admit that the most difficult step in EA is the initial interpretation of the utterance. An erroneous utterance in some cases may be interpreted as having more than one possible origin. Take for example the erroneous sentence, *He didn't know the word so he asked a dictionary.* This error may be classified as semantic in the incorrect substitution of the word “asked” for “consulted.” Or the error could lie in the omission of the preposition “for” in *He didn't know the word so he asked for a dictionary* (Corder 22). In a case such as this only the learner himself can shed light on the definitive classification of the error. In many cases the results can at best be considered inconclusive due to the inherent lack of precision in the analysis of the psychological process encountered by learners.

Many EA researchers have attempted to propose a systematic procedure that reduces the margin of error and the amount of guess work in their studies. Highly specific categorizations of errors along with their descriptions and explanations seem necessary for an effective study. In his article, “Error Analysis,” Corder (1974) proposes three independent stages
for successful EA: recognition, description, and explanation. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen stress the importance of maintaining the distinction between the process and product of EA. The process consists of the initial recognition and description of the error, while the product is the explanation of its likely causes. Too often these steps are combined, resulting in a final product that offers only a description of the error in place of an explanation of its cause.

Most linguists agree that success in EA is mostly dependent on the correct interpretation of the learner’s intentions. The reconstruction of the precise target language equivalent of the erroneous utterance is no small task. The only way definitively to determine the learner’s intention is to consult the learner. Corder has called the interpretation derived in this way ‘authoritative’ and therefore the only possible way to create an ‘authoritative reconstruction’ for comparison (127). It is, however, not common to have access to the learner’s input, leaving the analyst to devise a ‘plausible interpretation’ and reconstruction. This phase then consists of the comparison of the original utterance with the plausible reconstruction.

The description phase uses the input from the recognition of the error as its data. The first stage in describing an error should be to determine that the utterance is in fact an error of competence rather than a mere mistake of performance. According to Beason (1989), this will usually be accomplished
through establishing a pattern of systematicity for the error. If the error is not consistently produced by the learner it may be a lapse or the result of fatigue and, therefore, it would be inappropriate for the purposes of the study. Therein lies one of the most difficult responsibilities facing EA researchers due to the fact that errors frequently lack systematicity. Corder (1974) has established three distinct stages of systematicity: the presystematic stage, systematic stage, and postsystematic stage. Each stage refers to a different degree of regularity in the error production of language learners. Errors in the beginning of second language learning will usually be quite random while as a learner progresses toward fluency, systematicity will increase. In the advanced stages errors will again be produced inconsistently as they are associated normally with affective variables in the learning process, e.g., a lack of memory or attention. One goal is to identify if a learner has established a false set of rules in his IL. In the descriptive phase errors are categorized according to how they are deviant. Errors may be applied to lexicon, syntax, morphology, or orthography. Once categorized, the error is further analyzed and more specifically classified until a thorough description can be proposed. Possible error descriptions can be linguistic or psychological in origin. This description is followed by the next stage characterized by a more psycholinguistic explanation.
The explanations in EA account for the why and how of error production. Possible explanations are plentiful. Potential explanations are interference of the native language, the use of overgeneralization techniques, and teacher-induced error, i.e., error arising from the methods or materials used in teaching (Corder, 130-31). This phase of EA focuses on the process of SLL while the previous two analyze the error or product in the corpus. Recognition and description can also be associated with CA, but EA takes the next step into the psycholinguistic explanations for second language error. The following is Bartholomae’s description of the EA process from “The Study of Error”:

The basic procedure for such analyses could be outlined this way. First the reader must identify the idiosyncratic construction; he must determine what is an error...
The reader, then, must reconstruct that sentence based upon the most reasonable interpretation of the intention in the original, and this must be done before the error can be classified...according to its cause...
Error analysis, then, involves more than just making a list of errors in a student essay and looking for patterns to emerge. It begins with the double perspective of text and reconstructed text and seeks to explain the difference between the two on the basis of whatever can be inferred about the meaning of the text and the process of creating it. (265).

Bartholomae’s interpretation, although accurate in what is stated, seems to minimize the importance of the explanation phase that is so central to EA. Like Burt, Dulay and Krashen’s objection to the blurring of product and process in the analysis, Bartholomae, in his description, is mostly concerned
with the product. All three phases of EA should be given due attention for researchers to arrive at the nature of the SLL process.

The purpose of this paper is not to perpetuate the ongoing debate over the one true cause or even the major contributing factor of second language learner error. This has already been given sufficient attention by researchers. The intention of this thesis is to provide evidence and classification of errors resulting from the structure of the target language as well as those caused by the learning strategies employed by learners. As stated in 1980 by Abbott, "researchers will tend to find in their corpuses ample evidence of what they expect to find." A concentration on errors caused by communication strategies and the structure of the Spanish language in no way denies the influence of the mother tongue in the process of learning, but should be used as a supplement to previous studies in transfer. Contrastive analysis, sociolinguistic factors, and the many psycholinguistic variables together with the present analysis of intralinguistic concerns must join forces in order to arrive at a thorough account of the inhibiting factors in second language learning. In order to arrive at an understanding of the internal process employed by the learner an attempt must be made to investigate the origin of L2 errors in addition to the surface ungrammaticality of an utterance. All too
often second language research has neglected to probe deeper into mistakes in hopes of explaining the 'why' as well as the 'what' in development.
2. METHODOLOGY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESENT STUDY

This study uses EA, as previously defined, to analyze the written production of beginning Spanish as a foreign language students. The subjects were twenty-four eighth graders enrolled in first-year Spanish at River Oaks Baptist School in Houston, Texas. The course is taught over a two-year period spanning seventh and eighth grade and progresses at half the pace of a high school or college introductory course. All students in the study were "true beginners" incapable of communicating in any significant way in Spanish at the start of seventh grade. Previous exposure was limited to exploratory programs in languages, housekeepers, media, short vacations abroad, and the Spanish-speaking community. All of the students had been taught in a classroom setting with one teacher and a consistent methodology used throughout the two-year course.

The text used for the course, Dime Uno, published by D.C. Heath and Co., is a high school program that utilizes a "communicative" approach to language learning. According to the authors, "A communication-based language class provides a highly interactive, student-centered environment in which students engage regularly and frequently in paired and small-group exchanges" (T37). The grammatical sequence proposed in the text was followed with minimal deviation. A videotext program accompanying the
text was used to expose the learners to the target language in a variety of Spanish-speaking cultures and dialects. In addition to many of the exercises suggested throughout the text, supplemental activities and assignments were created by the instructor. Most of the written work assigned to the students was developed apart from the *Dime Uno* text. Examinations administered approximately every three weeks and frequent quizzes were constructed by the instructor to test the grammar and vocabulary corresponding to the text lesson. The class was taught primarily in English the first year while Spanish and English were used equally in the eighth grade. Students were highly encouraged to use the target language as much as possible throughout the course with a participation grade assessing their effort to communicate in Spanish.

The errors used in the corpus of this analysis were extracted from the examinations taken by the students in the first six months of their eighth grade year. After a deliberately slow-paced first year, the students were able to demonstrate a level of competence in Spanish that proved capable of producing the errors classified in this study. The examinations administered to the class contained sentence translations from English to Spanish, exercises including “fill-in-the-blank” and “use-this-word-in-an-appropriate-context,” in addition to written dialogues and compositions in which the linguistic
functions expected to be produced by the students were clearly detailed in the directions. Because beginning Spanish students possess a deficient amount of lexical knowledge, free compositions were not considered as part of the corpus. Errors presented in the corpus were used only if the intended meaning of the utterance could be verified without question. This study eliminates the possibility of misinterpretation of the original message intended by the student. The examinations were also designed in such a way as to prevent the mistaking of a covert error for a correct utterance. Examples of errors are included demonstrating grammatically correct statements that fail to produce the desired message. By removing the chance of misinterpretation of meaning, this study attempts to provide a reliable corpus for EA. An advantage gained by this accuracy is data that include definitive examples of simplification and avoidance that have previously represented a significant challenge in collection and interpretation for researchers. Errors were first categorized as errors of lexicon, morphology, syntax, or orthography with some occurrences of an utterance containing multiple errors of different types. Further classification of the error as developmental, overgeneralization, simplification, or avoidance followed. Next, additional more specific sub-categories were hypothesized for many errors. Due to the overlap of categories and the unlikelihood of definitive classification in all cases some
errors have been listed more than once. Every attempt was made to
determine the most likely classification of each error notwithstanding the
possibility of overlap.
3. RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1 Errors of Lexicon

A. Developmental errors

Developmental errors are natural products of the language learning process. As competency develops and IL proficiency continues to approach that of the target language, learners will inevitably encounter trouble spots in production. Inherent difficulties in Spanish will result in the creation of false hypotheses which act as hurdles for the learner to overcome. Some of these problem areas can be and have been documented as the result of first language interference. Still others may be anticipated due to the complexities and idiosyncrasies of the Spanish language itself. Spanish, for example, requires the selection of “ser” or “estar” where English uses the one verb “to be,” and “saber” or “conocer” for to “know.” The presence or absence of a required choice of lexicon in language production augments the likelihood of error. Learners lacking a certain body of linguistic and/or grammatical knowledge may also confuse parts of speech that without prior awareness may appear interchangeable, as in the substitution of “ese” for “que,” which both correspond to “that” in English. The analysis of developmental errors in lexicon may provide researchers and teachers with a clear assessment of a learner’s level of competency. Beginning-level students tend to have great
difficulty in this area, while more advanced learners normally have overcome these errors and have progressed toward developmental structures of increased complexity. A student demonstrating difficulty in the use of “ser” and “estar” would most certainly be labeled as a beginner when compared to a student struggling with the use of the imperfect subjunctive. Researchers have attempted to document the natural stages through which a learner tends to progress in order to construct language curricula that may better take into consideration a universal acquisition order. For the purposes of this paper only the errors of beginning students were taken into consideration.

The following errors represent the difficulty encountered by the students in the selection of ser or estar. At this point the learners had already received instruction on the differences between these two verbs that correspond to the English “to be.”

Yo soy entre Lizzie y Lauren.
(I am between Lizzie and Lauren./Yo estoy entre Lizzie y Lauren.)

La chica está María y el chico está Julio.
(The girl is Maria and the boy is Julio./Los chicos son María y Julio.)

Es loco.
(He is crazy./El está loco.)

Soy loco.
(I am crazy./Estoy loco.)

¿Es bien?
(Is it ok/? Está bien?)
Mi casa es lejos del parque.
(My house is far from the park./Mi casa está lejos del parque.)

¿Dónde está este chico?
(Where is this boy from/?De dónde es este chico?)

Mi estudiantes están mucho tonto
(My students are very silly/Mis estudiantes son muy tontos)

Mi estudiantes están mucho inteligente.
(My students are very intelligent/Mis estudiantes son muy inteligentes.)

Vosotras fuisteis cansada.
(Y’all were tired/Vosotras estabais cansadas.)

El parque es en la esquina.
(The park is on the corner/El parque está en la esquina.)

El libro es entre la cilla.
(The book is on the chair/El libro está en la silla.)

¿De donde está esto chico?
(Where is this boy from/?De dónde es este chico?)

Lisa oyó Raúl fue enfermo.
(Lisa heard that Raúl was sick/Lisa oyó que Raúl estaba enfermo.)

Ellos nombres están Jorge y Lupe.
(Their names are Jorge and Lupe/Sus nombres son Jorge y Lupe.)

Vosotros fuisteis cansado.
(Y’all were tired/Estabais cansados.)

Ellos están hermanos.
(They are siblings/Ellos son hermanos.)

La mesa está dura.
(The table is hard/La mesa es dura.)
Mi casa es muy lejos.
(My house is very far./Mi casa está muy lejos.)

La tienda es en la tercera planta.
(The store is on the third floor./La tienda está en la tercera planta.)

¿Dónde fuiste anoche?
(Where were y’all last night? ¿Dónde estabais anoche?)

¿Es Katalina allí?
(Is Katalina there?/¿Está Katalina allí?)

Yo fui enferma, pero ahora yo estoy bien.
(I was sick, but now I’m well./Yo estaba enferma, pero ahora estoy bien.)

Overproduction of the verb “ser” is common in learning Spanish. In this first example the learner is applying the previously learned rule that “ser” must be used when telling time. The learner has failed to take into consideration the difference between telling time and projecting time, and, therefore has overgeneralized the use of “ser.”

Ellos salen son las tres.
(They leave at three./Ellos salen a las tres.)

The following error is also quite common at the beginning levels of Spanish learning. Due to the fact that English uses “to be” in weather expressions,
students are frequently tempted to use "ser" or "est"ar when the use of "hacer" is usually required. As in the case of distinguishing between "ser" and "est"ar," this is also considered an error that marks the learner as a beginner.

Va a ser mucho viento.
(It's going to be very windy./Va a hacer mucho viento.)

English speakers without adequate grammatical knowledge also tend to substitute the verbs "ser" and "est"ar" for "hay." The English similarity between "they are" and "there are" also begs interference from the first language.

Son muchos colores en su falda.
(There are many colors in her skirt./Hay muchos colores en su falda.)

Idiomatic expressions tend to be trouble areas for non-native speakers. The following idioms that require the use of "tener" qualify as exceptions to the rules already assimilated into the IL system of the use of "est"ar" for temporary characteristics. Therefore the persistent misuse of "est"ar" can be
classified as an overgeneralization in development, while interference of
English adds to the difficulty of a correct lexical choice.

Los hombres están muchas hambres.
(The men are very hungry./Los hombres tienen mucha hambre.)

Mrs. Craft está no prisa.
(Mrs. Craft is not in a hurry./La señora Craft no tiene prisa.)

Estoy sueño.
(I’m sleepy./Tengo sueño.)

Jennifer está vergüenza.
(Jennifer is ashamed./Jennifer tiene vergüenza.)

Because the two verbs “saber” and “conocer” correspond to “to
know,” their production lends itself to error in the same way as “ser” and
“estar.” While “saber” is used for the knowledge of information, “conocer”
is needed when referring to familiarity with people and places.

Yo no conozco.
(I don’t know./Yo no sé.)

Conozco Madrid es la capital de España.
Yo conozco Madrid es el capitol de España.
(I know that Madrid is the capital of Spain./Sé que Madrid es la capital
de España.)

Error in preposition usage has also been classified under the canopy
of developmental error. The many nuances of prepositional phrases
especially when coupled with the individual rules associated with “por” and “para” in Spanish, allow for the likelihood of incorrect usage. Such error can be seen in all levels of linguistic competency. Beginners will tend to use the two interchangeably demonstrating a lack of familiarity with the rule system.

Voy al almacén a comprar un regalo por mi madre.
(I’m going to the department store to buy a gift for my mother./Voy al almacén para comprar un regalo para mi madre.)

Yo tengo que compra un regalo por mi mama.
(I have to buy a gift for my mom./Tengo que comprar un regalo para mi mamá.)

Estudia por el examen mañana.
(Study for the test tomorrow./Estudia para el examen mañana.)

Prepara la tarea por martes.
(Prepare the homework for Tuesday./Prepara la tarea para el martes.)

Ella hizo una comida por yo.
(She made a meal for me./Ella me preparó una comida.)

Yo traigo un regalo por tú.
(I brought you a present./Te traje un regalo.)

In addition to the erroneous selection of “por” and “para,” students also demonstrated the substitution of some prepositions in situations that are seemingly unrelated to their native language system. In these examples errors can be observed in the production of “durante,” “de,” “a,” and “el” due to incomplete development in the IL of the learner.
Duermo muy bien por la noche y por la clase de inglés. (I sleep very well at night and during English class./Duermo muy bien por la noche y durante la clase de inglés.)

Quieren tener un festivo por viernes. (They want to have a party on Friday./Quieren tener una fiesta el viernes.)

¿Qué es el numero de teléfono por Margarita? (What is Margarita’s telephone number?/¿Cuál es el número de teléfono de Margarita?)

La numero de teléfono por Margarita es... (Margarita’s telephone number is.../El número de teléfono de Margarita es...)

Yo quiero llegar en la mañana de sábado. (I want to arrive on Saturday morning./Quiero llegar el sábado por la mañana.)

Yo tengo que doy un regalo para mi primo. (I have to give my cousin a present./Tengo que darle un regalo a mi primo.)

The subjects also made many errors of inappropriate direct translation, or calques, from English as well as incorrect lexical choices representative of their continued development as seen in these examples.

¿Oyó ese Julio hizo un A en inglés? (Did you hear that Julio got an A in English?/¿Oyó que Julio sacó una A en la clase de inglés?)

El regresó uno regalo a la tienda. (He returned a gift to the store./El devolvió un regalo a la tienda.)
Yo fui **comprando**.
(I went shopping./Fui de compras.)

¿**Adónde es** este chica de?
(Where is this boy from?/¿De dónde es este chico?)

El es **vendo** pedir de un hamburguesa.
(He is going to ask for a hamburger./El va a pedir una hamburguesa.)

Yo compraste somos zapatos...y somos chocolates.
(I bought some shoes...and some chocolates./Compré unos zapatos...y unos chocolates.)

**Ello estoy vendo desear**
(He is going to ask for/El va a pedir)

**nada mas**
(nothing much/nada de nuevo)

**Que es ridiculoso.**
(How rediculous./Qué ridículo.)

B. Archiforms

Archiforms were recognized by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) as further examples of developmental errors of lexicon. The deficient approximative systems of language learners lead to the substitution of familiar lexicon for that which is unknown or that presents a challenge to the student. The category of overgeneralization goes hand in hand with these substitutions. The use of possessive adjectives in Spanish is particularly
challenging for beginning learners. Once a student is taught possessive adjective usage, he is presented with the need for clarification that corresponds to the use of “su.” Because the possessive adjective “su” is vague and may correspond to the English your (singular), your (plural), his, her, its, and their, the preposition “de” must accompany it when clarification is needed. In the first example below the student may know that “sus casas” is vague. In order to clarify meaning the student has substituted “ellas” incorrectly rather than the acceptable form “las casas de ellas.”

Tú sabes dónde están ellas casas?
(Do you know where their houses are?/¿Sabes donde están sus casas? or ¿Sabes donde están las casas de ellas?)

Yo quiero saber ellos números de teléfono.
(I want to know their phone numbers./Quiero saber sus números de teléfono. or ...los números de teléfono de ellos)

Das mi ellas número teléfono.
(Give me their phone number./Dame su número de teléfono. or ...el número de teléfono de ellos)

Ellos nombres están Jorge y Lupe.
(Their names are Jorge and Lupe./Sus nombres son Jorge y Lupe.)

Yo soy lejos de tú.
(I am far away from you./Yo estoy lejos de ti)
Possessive adjectives were also substituted for subject pronouns. It is possible that once instructed that possessive adjectives correspond to each subject pronoun the student subconsciously replaced one for the other.

Vuestros ayudasteis anoche.
(Y’all helped last night./Vosotros ayudasteis anoche.)

¿Su sabe los nombres del estudiantes?
(Do you know the names of the students/?Sabe usted los nombres de los estudiantes?)

The next several errors show the replacement of subject pronouns for the lexical components they represent. The students were taught that “they” can correspond to “ellos” or “ellas” depending on whether a male was part of the group. The erroneous substitution of “los ellos” for “the boys” or “the men” may be the result of the referent of “ellos” (two or more males) being mistaken for the words “boys” and “men.” The replacement of pronouns for nouns demonstrates the psychological process of the students making and testing hypotheses in the target language.

Los ellos criticaron el periódico.
(The boys criticized the newspaper./Los chicos criticaron el periódico.)

Aquella ella leyó un libro.
(That girl read a novel./Aquella chica leyó una novela.)

¿Sabes donde los ellos vivieron?
(Do you know where the boys live/?Sabes dónde viven los chicos?)
las ellas
(the girls/las chicas)

los ellos
(the men/los hombres)

"Bien" and "bueno" correspond to "well" and "good" in English. Some students demonstrated the substitution of one for the other in Spanish seemingly without regard for context or meaning. It is interesting to note that the same use of archiforms is common in the use of "good" as an adverb in place of "well" by native speakers of English.

Yo fui un chico muy bien.
(I was a good boy./Yo era chico bueno.)

Yo hice bueno.
(I did well./Me fue bien.)

Estas películas fueron muy bien.
(These films were very good./Estas películas eran muy buenas.)

es muy bien
(it’s very good/es muy bueno)

No puedo nadar muy bien.
(I can’t swim very well./No puedo nadar muy bien.)

Estas películas fueron muy bien.
(These films were very good./Estas películas eran muy buenas.)

Yo fui un chico muy bien.
(I was a good boy./Yo era chico bueno.)
C. Overgeneralizations

Lexical overgeneralizations demonstrate that a learner has developed a system from which he makes his decisions in the target language. Once a rule is learned a student will tend to apply it to as many situations as possible in order to increase the potential communication to which he has access. In doing so he will inevitably apply the rule to a situation in which it is inappropriate. In lexicon, many overgeneralizations are made based on the learner's association of a word to a particular function, such as time, without taking into consideration the presence of a different linguistic structure. The first example below shows that the student may be applying his knowledge that Spanish uses “por” when referring to morning, afternoon or night. What he has not taken into consideration is the presence of a specific time which will require the use of the preposition “de.”

a las ocho por la mañana
(at eight in the morning/a las ocho de la mañana)

The next errors were committed by students who appear to have used the present tense orthography of the verb “ir” in their construction of its past tense forms. The fact that the words do exist in Spanish as the past tense of the verb “ver” probably reinforced their usage.

Yo no vi a la escuela.
(I didn’t go to the school./No fui a la escuela.)

El vió a el parque ayer.
(He went to the park yesterday./El fue al parque ayer.)

Ellos vieron al casa a miercoles pasado.
(They went to the house last Wednesday./Ellos fueron a la casa el miércoles pasado.)

The confusion of “muy” and “mucho” in Spanish may be the result of an overgeneralization of the use of “mucho” in weather to denote “very.”

Hace mucho buen tiempo hoy.
(It is very good weather today./Hace muy buen tiempo hoy.)

Hace muy frío hoy.
(It is very cold today./Hace mucho frío hoy.)

Mi estudiantes están mucho tonto
(My students are very silly/Mis estudiantes son muy tontos)

Mi estudiantes están mucho inteligente.
(My students are very intelligent/Mis estudiantes son muy inteligentes.)

Yo descanso muy en el verano.
(I rest a lot in the summer./Descanso mucho en el verano.)

Tú debes estudiar muy.
(You should study more./Debes estudiar más.)

Yo recibo muy regalos para mi feliz cumpleaños.
(I receive many presents on my birthday./Recibo muchos regalos para mi cumpleaños.)
The following errors probably resulted from the misconception that if “ella” denotes “she,” and “ellos” and “ellas” represent “they” then “ello” must be “he.” This type of overgeneralization also provides a good look into the learner’s IL as the learner has taken a temporary step backward in competence through the testing of his hypothesis.

Le traigo la carta a **ello**.
(I sent him a letter./Le mandé una carta a él.)

**Ello** hizo su tarea ayer.
(He did his homework yesterday./El hizo su tarea ayer.)

**Ello** regresó al parque.
(He returned to the park./El regresó al parque.)

The next several errors also represent overgeneralizations of lexicon.

¿**Tesor** compras regalos a todos tus parientes?
(Do you buy presents for all of your relatives/?Les compras regalos para todos tus parientes?)

La tienda es en la **tercer** planta.
(The store is on the third floor./La tienda está en la tercera planta.)

**Ellos** estudiaron a **mañana**.
(They studied this morning./Ellos estudiaron esta mañana.)

**el noche pasado**
(last night/anoche)

**Me gusta** Robert.
(I like Robert./Quiero a Robert.)
3.2 Errors resulting from Communicative Strategies

Simplification is a communicative strategy common to all learners. In the construction of meaning in a second language there is a deficient pool of vocabulary from which the learner has to choose. In order for him to communicate he must attempt to come as close as possible to his intended meaning. A learner that does not know a word may employ simplification rather than abandon the message entirely. Approximation, synonymity, cirumlocution and paraphrase are common means in the reduction process. Students seem to make their best guess as to an acceptable way to produce a message by referring to their knowledge of the target language before they look to their native language for answers. Through this strategy, learners will frequently convey their meaning although it will be in some way erroneous. Communicative strategies are quite difficult to analyze since it is not always possible to identify correctly the intended meaning. In addition, many covert errors will slip by unnoticed because they are superficially correct. "¿Dónde están estos chicos?" does not appear to be an error until the intended meaning of "Where are these boys from?" is considered. The difficulty in arriving at the definitive intended meaning of an utterance in the absence of the subject himself is one of the strongest criticisms of error analysis. In the following data the subjects were asked to produce specific utterances through
translations, fill-in-the-blanks, and highly specific written dialogues that assure that the intended meaning is known. This section presents simplification techniques separated into the specific strategies that were employed. The possibility of an overlap in strategies within simplification and even in distinguishing between simplification and avoidance is likely in many cases. The author has attempted to arrive at the best possible classification of these errors recognizing the likelihood of this overlap.

A. Circumlocution/Paraphrase

Learners will attempt to convey desired meaning in a variety of ways rather than admit defeat. When a student does not know a specific lexical item he may replace it with known words that come close to the intended meaning. They may approach an unfamiliar word by saying “what it is not” or “what it is like” without having to state that which is unknown. As stated previously, this strategy is not unique to second language learners, as it is frequently employed in first language usage.

¿Qué hace tiempo la estación?
(What is the weather in the winter/?Qué tiempo hace en el invierno?)

Me encanta jugar sportos cuando llover.
(I love to play sports when it rains./Me encanta jugar a deportes cuando llueve.)

Yo tomo fotografías cuando hace viento un poco más.
(I take pictures when it is not very windy./Saco fotos cuando no hace mucho viento.)

¿Tú fuiste el noche pasado?
(Did you go out last night/?¿Saliste anoche?)

¿Fuisteis la fiesta no con mi?
(Did y’all go to the party without me/?¿Fuisteis a la fiesta sin yo?)

la día pasado
la día pasada
(yesterday/ayer)

el noche pasado
(last night/anoche)

a la noche
(tonight/esta noche)

en el noche
(tonight/esta noche)

Fue al parque pasado.
(He went to the park yesterday./Fue al parque ayer.)

La cuestan es pequeño.
(It doesn’t cost a lot./Cuesta poco. or No cuesta mucho.)

exámines de fin
(final exams/exámenes finales)

no bien
(bad/mal)

El officina de postales es en esquina.
(The post office is on the corner./El correos está en la esquina.)

Yo les di el trabajo casa el semana pasada.
(I gave them the homework last week./Les di la tarea la semana pasada.)
Preferimos ir a la tienda de zapatos.
(We prefer to go to the shoe store./la zapatería)

Ellos nos sirven manzanas.
Nos sirve manzana a nosotros.
Ellos nos sirven naranjos.
Ellos nos sirven naranjas, manzanas, y melón.
(They serve us fruit./Ellos nos sirven fruta.)

B. Synonymity

As the name implies, synonymity is the substitution of a perceived synonym for another word. Due to the deficient vocabulary of a beginner, perceived synonyms are frequently only similar conceptually. The data also show a number of occasions on which the students chose antonyms to replace the desired word based solely on their lexical similarity. Many of the examples below classified under this category may also be considered errors of approximation.

Ellos no van al centro comercial nada.
(They never go to the mall./Ellos no van al centro comercial nunca.)

No tenemos historia también.
(We don’t have history either./No tenemos la clase de historia tampoco.)

Nadie estudió para que examen.
(No one studied for that test./Nadie estudió para ese examen.)

La clase de ciencias es dura.
(The science class is hard./La clase de ciencias es difícil.)
El regresó uno regalo a la tienda.
(He returned a gift to the store./El devolvió un regalo a la tienda.)

¿Vosotros hablasteis la verdad anoche?
(Did y’all tell the truth last night?/¿Dijisteis la verdad anoche?)

Los correos está en el rincón.
(The post office is on the corner./El correos está en la esquina.)

Madre y yo decidimos descansar.
Mamá y yo decidimos dormir.
(Mom and I decided to rest./Mamá y yo decidimos descansar.)

Yo no busco la joyería.
(I can’t find the jewelry store./No encuentro la joyería.)

Mi madre habló
(My mother said/Mi madre dijo)

Le di una carta a ella.
(I sent her a letter./Le mandé una carta a ella.)

Tú tienes que las películas.
Tú tienes ir el video.
(You have to go to the movies./Tienes que ir al cine.)

Pablo tiene temo.
(Pablo is scared./Pablo tiene miedo.)

Yo sirví el desayuno a ellos.
(I served them the meal./Les servi una comida.)

Las chicas quieren decirle el razón.
(The girls want to tell him the truth./Las chicas quieren decirle la verdad.)

Ellos les gusta tener una fiesta.
(They want to have a party./Ellos quieren tener una fiesta.)

Yo pago un regalo para mi mamá.
(I bought a present for my mom./Compré un regalo para mi mamá.)

La guesta es bueno.
(The price is good./El precio es bueno.)

Nosotros no miramos una película.
(We didn’t see the movie./No vimos la película.)

C. Approximation

The insertion of familiar vocabulary for unknown is a common reduction technique. Meaning will occasionally be sacrificed as long as the utterance is complete. If, for example, a time marker such as “tonight” is unknown, a learner might substitute another time marker of different meaning in its place. This is the case in the first two examples below.

¿Quieres estudiar conmigo anoche?
(Do you want to study with me tonight?/Quieres estudiar conmigo esta noche?)

Le di tarea a ellos ayer.
(I gave them the homework last week./Les di la tarea la semana pasada.)

Le traigo la carta a ello.
(I sent him a letter./Le mandé una carta a él.)

Tuvimos divertirse jugando en la playa.
(We had a good time playing at the beach./Nos divertíamos jugando en la playa.)

Yo salgo Madrid es la capital de España.
(I know that Madrid is the capital of Spain./Yo sé que Madrid es la capital de España.)
Yo traigo hambre.
(I am hungry./Tengo hambre.)

Nosotros desearmos, “Hola, cómo estás?”
(We said, “Hi, how are you?/Dijimos, “Hola, ¿cómo estás?”)

Yo corro dura mi práctica de baloncesto.
(I run during my basketball practice./Corro durante la práctica de baloncesto.)

Dura el examen yo recordé algo.
(During the test I remembered something./Durante el examen recordé algo.)

Las chicas quieren desearte...
(The girls want to tell her.../Las chicas quieren decirle...)

saca el autobús
(take the bus/toma el autobús)

Tuví un fin de semana muy bueno.
(I had a very good weekend./Pasé un fin de semana muy bueno.)

Yo tomo fotografías
(I take pictures/Saco fotos)

El va a preguntar una hamburguesa.
(He is going to ask for a hamburger./El va a pedir una hamburguesa.)

¿Viste alguien, pero no compró?
(Did you see something that you didn’t buy/?¿Viste algo que no compraste?)

Hubo tres dulces, pero ahora hay nunca.
(There were three candies, but now there are none./Había tres dulces, pero ahora no hay ningún.)

Yo voy a darle más cosas.
(I am going to give them many things./Voy a darles muchas cosas.)

¿Es la verdad?
¿Serioso?
(Seriously?/De verás or ¿En serio?)

Vas en el autobús.
(Take the bus./Toma el atobús. or Coge el autobús.)

El juego y yo practicamos esta mañana.
The team and I practiced this morning./El equipo y yo practicamos esta mañana.)

El está va a decir para...
Ello ir a preguntar para...
(He is going to ask for.../El va a pedir...)

A Pablo le gustan comprar las calcetines elegantes.
A Pablo le gusta gastar calcetines caro.
A Pablo le gustan buscar calcetines costan.
A Pablo le encanta comprar calcetines de mucho dolares.
A Pablo le gusta gastar calcentines expienado.
(Pablo likes to buy expensive socks./A Pablo le gusta comprar calcetines caros.)

Compró diez dólares.
(It cost ten dollars./Costó diez dólares.)

Yo todos haciendo mi tarea.
(I always do my homework./Siempre hago mi tarea.)

A mis padres les gusta mirar ropa.
A mis padres les gusta mirar por ropa.
A mis padres les gusta mirar para ropas.
(My parents like to look for clothes./A mis padres les gusta buscar ropa.)

¿Qué grado hiciste?
(What grade did you get/?¿Qué nota sacaste?)

Yo tomo photographias cuando hace viento un poco mas.
(I take pictures when it is not very windy./Saco fotos cuando no hace mucho viento.)
Pablo escribió el novel.
Pablo escribió la novela.
Pablo escribió la hada.
Pablo escribió el libro.
Pablo escribió la ________.
(Pablo wrote the story./Pablo escribió el cuento.)

El hombre fue un aficionado de correte.
(The engineer was a track fan./El ingeniero era aficionado al atletismo.)

Nadaste es difícil y interesante.
(Swimming is hard and interesting./La natación es difícil e interesante.)

Nosotros no natación porque hace frío.
(We don’t swim when it is cold./No nadamos cuando hace frío.)

Empezamos a limpiar la casa, pero no finamos.
(We started to clean the house, but we didn’t finish./ Empezamos a limpiar la casa, pero no terminamos.)

Nosotros recibimos sellos de España.
(We received letters from Spain./Recibimos cartas de España.)

No pude buscar el bote.
No pude buscar la bota.
No puedo ver la lancha.
(I couldn’t find the boat./No podía encontrar el barco.)

un vestido amarillo
(a yellow skirt/una falda amarilla)

la vestir
(the clothes/la ropa)

¿Deciés el correcto anoche?
(Did y’all tell the truth last night/?Dijisteis la verdad anoche?)

A ellos les gusta encontrar para ropa morada.
(They like to look for purple clothes./A ellos les gusta buscar ropa morada.)
ver por
ver para
(to look for/buscar)

D. Errors of Avoidance

In cases where a learner can not arrive at an acceptable simplification he may avoid the problem area all together. He may simply leave the word(s)
out or revert to borrowing the English equivalent. In some cases, a student
may invent a word by making an English word comply with Spanish
orthography. Lexical avoidance is usually the result of the learner’s lack of
knowledge or the perceived difficulty of an utterance. The following cases of
the avoidance of “ser” and “estar” may be due to the learner’s lack of
confidence regarding their correct usage.

Yo * jugador tenis.
(I am a tennis player./Soy jugador de tenis.)

La oficina * entre la parque y gimnasio.
(The office is between the park and the gym./La oficina está entre el
parque y el gimnasio.)

¿Qué * sus teléfonos números?
(son/números de teléfonos)

¿Quiénes * las nuevos estudiantes?
(son)

Yo no * lejos de la casa.
(estoy)
Tú * comprándome un perro.
(are/estás)

Yo le sentí una carta a ella.
(I sent her a letter./Le mandé una carta a ella.)

Yo sentéle una carta.
(I sent him a letter./Yo le mandé una carta.)

¿Tú quieres estudiarme anoche?
(Do you want to study with me tonight/?Quieres estudiar conmigo esta noche?)

¿Te gustaría * al cine conmigo?
(ir)

A nosotros nos gustan * suéteres en el invierno.
(llevar)

Tú tienes que * al cine.
(ir)

Yo siempre * mi tarea.
(hago)

Estoy cansada y * sueño.
(tengo)

A Pablo le encantan comprar calcetines *.
(Pablo loves to buy expensive socks./caros)

¿* él estudió?
(When did he study/?Cuándo)

El comenzó estudiar Saturday.
(el sábado)

Estudió todo el día Saturday y Sunday.
(sábado/domingo)

Mañana tú tienes que * un permeable.
(to wear/llevar)

Yo siempre * mi tarea.
(do/hago)

Yo dormí para un tiempo grande.
(for a long time/mucho tiempo)

Yo * llevo una falda azul.
(I want to wear/quiero llevar)

¿Qué tiempo los estudiantes salen escuela?
(A qué hora)

El correos es en la intersection.
(corn/er/esquina)

3.3 Errors of Morphology

A. Plural and gender marking

Plural and gender marking in Spanish is a new concept for English speakers. Its absence in English, except with regard to demonstrative adjectives, denies a means of linguistic comparison for students. Consequently, the number of developmental errors in this category is quite large.

1. Developmental

unos películas
(unas)

Las clases fueron buenos y muy interesante
(buenas/interesantes)
la semana pasado
(pasada)

los corbatos bonitas
(las/corbatas)

las calcetines negros
(los/negros)

¿Sabes el nobres del estudiantes?
(los/de/los)

el números
(los)

zapatos viejas
(viejos)

los chicas
(las)

el televisión
(la)

la fin de semana pasada
(el/pasado)

vosotras hicisteis sus tarea
(su)

el pupitre es dura
(duro)

la miércoles pasada
(el/pasado)

la viernes pasada
(el)

mi parientes
(mis)

la departemente
(el departamento)

a la ocho
(las)

los par de zapatos
(el)

el capitol
(la capital)

las discos
(los)

esta chico
(este)

este mañana
(esta)

esas calcetines
(esos)

las nuevos estudiantes
(los)

la numero de telefone
(el)

la examen
(el)

la semana pasado
(pasada)

al casa
(la)
la piso
(el)

el libros
(los)

la museo el domingo
(el/los domingos)

mi estudiantes es muy bueno
(mis estudiantes son muy buenos)

el sábados
(los)

mi estudiantes tonto y estúpido
(mis/tontos/estúpidos)

los cines
(el cine)

camareros amable
(amables)

vosotras - cansada
(cansadas)

el composision
(la)

una par de zapatos
(un)

uno regalo
(un)

su abuelos
(sus)

un hamurguesa
(una)
mi zapatos
(mis)

muchas colores
(muchos)

la par de zapatos
(el)

buen comida
(buena)

esto chico
(este)

mi calcetines
(mis)

eso libro
(ese)

el estrello
(la estrella)

este chica
(chico)

eso libro
(ese)

mucho regalos
(muchos)

un muy buena película
(una)

la parque
(el)

Cuál es el números
(Cuáles son los)

uno sombrero
(un)

cienta y una pesetas
(ciento una)

calcetines caro
(caros)

un carta
(una)

compré muchos
(mucho)

la correos
(el)

mi padres
(mis)

la fin de semana pasada
(el/pasado)

mi colores favoritas
(mis/favoritos)

del estudiantes
(de los)

al tienda
(a la)

uno momento
(un)

los profesoras
(las)
el exámenes
(los)

una cuenta
(un cuento)

ropa moradas
(morada)

el officina
(la)

nuestro examines
(nuestros)

nuestro tarea
(nuestra)

fueron muy dificil
(dificiles)

uno animal
(un)

al escuela
(a la)

2. Overgeneralization

The rules far outnumber the exceptions in the case of plural marking and gender in Spanish. For a beginner, it is usually safe to assume, for example, that a noun that ends in "-a" is feminine while those that end in "-o" are masculine. This rule, however, is not without exception, thereby causing consistently predictable error in gender agreement. Because it is not present
in English, learners will make false hypotheses in number and gender agreement. Overgeneralizations are a commonplace in this area of morphology.

Los hombres están muchas hambres.
(mucha/hambre)

un foto
(una)

Cuántos cuestan
(Cuánto)

estudiamos muchos
(mucho)

toda la día
(todo el día)

el radio
(la)

doscientos escuelas
(doscientas)

a las uno
(la una)

tienen mucho hambres
(mucha hambre)

camisetas marronas
(marrones)

la día
(el)

¿Cuántos cuestan?
(Cuánto)
tienen sueños
(sueño)
una programa
(un)
el clase
(la)
conmiga
(conmigo)
dos miles
(mil)
una mapa
(un)
todos clases
(todas)
cientos dos
(ciento)

The next two errors probably resulted from the overgeneralization of the rule requiring the omission of the final “o” in “tercero” before a masculine singular noun. The students erroneously omitted the “a” applying the rule to feminine nouns.

la tercer planta
(tercera)
el tercer casa
(la tercera)
The following error may have been caused by the overgeneralization of the learner's knowledge that "zapato" is masculine.

el zapatería
(la)

B. Subject/verb agreement

Spanish verb inflection presents difficulty for many learners. The varied forms of a verb conjugation dependent on the subject, tense, and mood in Spanish are a significant hurdle to overcome in the development of competence. The somewhat lengthy list that follows shows the problems encountered in subject-verb concordance for a beginner.

1. Developmental

Juan y Paco vimos
(vieron)

los zapatos cuestas
(cuestan)

me gustó los museos
(gustaron)

me encanta mercados
(encantan)

nosotros no vieron
(vimos)
el libro cuestan
(cuesta)

le encantan comprar
(encanta)

le gustaron ver los videos
(gustó)

vosotros hiciste
(hicisteis)

mi famalia y yo fueron
(fuimos)

te llamas estudiantes
(se llaman)

los números está
(están/son)

las chicas quieres
(quieren)

los zapatos fue
(fueron)

mi hermano metí
(metió)

las discos fue
(fueron)

sombreros es
(son)

el equipo y yo practicaron
(practicamos)

yo siempre hacer
(hago)

nosotros reciben
(recibimos)

le gustaron ver
(gustó)

te encantan comprar
(encanta)

ellos criticaros
(criticaron)

cuando llover
(llueve)

mi mamá escribir
(escribe)

un par de zapatos cuestan
(cuesta)

ellos sirvenos
(nos sirven)

la camarera sirvesles
(les sirve)

Roberto viste
(vio)

yo fue
(fui)

tu fui
(fuiste)

nosotros ayudasteis
(ayudamos)
las camisetas viene
(vienen)

A Lamar lleváis
(Lamar lleva)

estos no es
(son)

yo no es
(soy)

yo vamos
(voy)

Eso vamos
(va)

usted metí
(metió)

el director dije
(dijo)

ellos sirvis
(sirven)

ellos sirve
(sirven)

le gustan buscar
(gusta)

tú sabe
(sabes)

los chicos vive
(viven)

les di mis padres
(me dieron)
2. Overgeneralization

The difference in construction between the English “to like” and the corresponding Spanish form “gustar” creates a challenge for learners. This is
most certainly caused by first-language interference, but may be considered overgeneralization of target-language morphology as well.

nos gustamos libros
(gustan)

les gustan la película
(gusta)

tú gustaste las faldas
(te gustaron)

It is likely that in the following seven errors the learners overgeneralized the "-o" ending representative of the first person singular in the present tense by ending the first person singular past tense forms similarly.

yo oyó
(oí)

yo vió
(ví)

yo entró
(entré)

yo compró
(compré)

yo comió
(comí)

yo practicó
(practiqué)
yo estudió
(estudió)

el director dije
(dijo)

Mi amiga sabes
(sabe)

la policía vinieron
(vino)

¿Qué ocurrieron hoy?
(ocurrió)

C. Pronoun/possessive adjective error

1. Developmental

A large number of errors of pronoun and possessive adjective usage was encountered in the corpus. All of the students exhibited significant difficulty in concordance and in confusion of pronouns and possessive adjectives. In the early stages of language learning the quantity of input is so very high that students appear to categorize grammatical features according to their function. In the case of the following errors it appears that subject and object pronouns and possessive adjectives may have been lumped into a category of linguistic components that represents “people” in general. Subject pronouns, indirect and direct objects, and possessive adjectives share the common characteristic of the identification of people in an utterance,
possibly resulting in their confusion and misrepresentation. The sheer number of choices at a learner’s disposal in the development of competency creates a significant amount of error in the usage of these linguistic elements.

Das mi sus números de teléfono.
(Dame)

¡Escribe una carta a su tía!
(tu)

Le di tarea a ellos.
(les)

Les dan muchos regalos a ti.
(Te)

Vosotras hicisteis tu tarea.
(vuestra)

A Pablo te encantan
(le)

Les traigo almuerzo a vosotros.
(os)

¡Prepara su tarea!
(tu)

Gloria le dio un regalo a mi.
(me)

Te compras regalos a todos tus parientes.
(les)

Vimos un muy buena película con sus amigos.
(nuestros)

Das mi ellas números de teléfono.
(Dame sus)

¡Estudia para su examen!
(tu)

a vosotros les gusta
(os)

Las camareras les sirven la comida a Uds.
(ellos)

A mis padres, yo voy a darle mas cosas.
(darles)

Yo voy a dar un regalo muy grande.
(darles [a mis padres])

Le di un regalo a ti.
(Te)

2. Overgeneralization

yo gustó nadar
(me gustó)

yo encanta jugar
(me)

yo gustó comprar
(me)

yo gustaría
(me)

3. Induced error

These two morphological errors demonstrate the mistaking of the subject for the object in the sentence. They have been classified as induced
errors because they result from confusion in the sequencing and presentation of the language.

Les di un perro a mis padres.  
(Me dieron un perro a mi.)

Les di mis padres un disco compacto.  
(Me dieron)

4. Simplification

This substitution of subject pronoun for direct object is certainly a case of direct translation in terms of syntax, while morphologically it may represent synonymity in that the pronoun was perceived as an alternative for the object.

yo no ver tú  
(no te vi)

Mi amigas visitaron yo  
(me visitaron)

D. Errors of infinitive usage

The majority of the following errors reveal the student’s tendency to conjugate all verbs in a sentence. Developmentally, the student has not yet mastered the proper use of the infinitive even though it may be perceived as “easier” morphologically to conjugate only one verb. Most of the structures
listed below were taught individually as those requiring infinitive usage prior
to instruction regarding the present tense verb forms. After learning the forms
of verbs the students appear to have overgeneralized the need to conjugate all
verbs even in these inappropriate situations.

Debes **comes** más.
(comer)

Yo tengo que **doy**
(dar)

Tengo que **corre**
(correr)

Vosotros ayudasteis la mujer **cruza** la calle.
(cruzar)

tengo que **compra**
(comprar)

deb**o estudia** mucho
(estudiar)

me encanta jugo
(jugar)

tengo que **vas**
(ir)

voy a **corro**
(correr)

voy a **dormo**
(dormir)

Hace va a hace muy viento.
(Va a hacer mucho viento.)

voy a leo libros
(leer)

va hace frío
(va a hacer frío)

Estoy pienso hacer voy al cine.
(pienso ir)

ellos deben van
(ir)

prefiero a llevo
(llevar)

Tú debes estudias más.
(estudiar)

no puedo encuentro
(encontrar)

Debes das un regalo
(dar)

Yo pienso hago nada.
(No pienso hacer nada.)

ellos quieren tengo
(tener)

puedes me das
(darme)

puedo voy
(ir)

Johnny no puede vine
(venir)
The following errors show both direct translation from English and a misunderstanding of the English past tense marking "did" in a negative construction for the action verb "to do." While the students' testing of this hypothesis suggests developmental error in the negative, the appearance of this same construction in the affirmative is an overgeneralization applied within the target language. The students seem to have transferred their incorrect usage of the verb "hacer" as a past marker intralingually to form the affirmative past tense in Spanish.

no hizo ir
(no fue)

hizo ver
(vio)

hizo comprar
(compró)

no hicieron ir
(no fueron)

Roberto hizo practicar
(practicó)

Uds. hicieron limpiar
(limiaron)

no hicimos ver
(no vimos)
E. Other morphological errors

1. Developmental

El está va a decir para
(He is going to ask for/El va a pedir)

Comemos Taco Bell.
(We ate Taco Bell./Comimos Taco Bell.)

Corre a la tienda rápido.
(Run to the store quickly./Corre a la tienda rápidamente.)

Me encanta jugo deportes cuando llueviendo.
(I love to play sports when it rains./Me encanta jugar deportes cuando llueve.)

Está nevando en el invierano.
(It snows in the winter./Nieva en el invierno.)

Comprándome un suéter en la tienda.
(He is buying me a sweater in the store./Está comprándome un suéter en la tienda.)

Yo querí ayudar, pero no puedo.
(I wanted to help, but I couldn’t./Yo quería ayudar, pero no podía.)

yo fuí comprando
(I went shopping/fui de compras)

Ello estoy yendo desear una hamburguesa.
El es yendo pedir de un hamburguesa.
El yendo pedirle una hamburguesa.
(He is going to ask you for a hamburger./El va a pedirle...)

Después esquila yo dando Emily un regalo.
(After school I’m going to give Emily a present./Después de clases, voy a darle a Emily un regalo.)

Tú comprándome un perro.
(You are buying me a dog./Estás comprándome un perro.)

Nosotros comprándome muchos regalos anoche.
(We were buying many presents for me last night./Estábamos comprándome muchos regalos anoche.)

¿Dónde están viven?
(Where do they live/?¿Dónde viven?)

Ellos quieren tengo una fiesta al la viernes.
(They want to have a party on Friday./Quieren tener una fiesta el viernes.)

Yo fuí a mi casa y duermo.
(I went home and slept./Fui a casa y dormí.)

¿Viste alguien pero no compró?
(Did you see something that you didn’t buy/?¿Viste algo que no compraste?)

Yo todos haciendo mi tarea.
(I always do my homework./Siempre hago mi tarea.)

Ustedes está enfrente de la clase.
(You are in front of the class./Usted está enfrente de la clase.)

En la clase de inglés hicimos nada hoy porque la profesora no está allí.
(We didn’t do anything in English class today because the teacher wasn’t there./En la clase de inglés no hicimos nada hoy porque la profesora no estaba.)

Estoy veniendo en avion.
(I’m coming by plane./Vengo en avión.)

Yo estoy llevando una camisa.
(I’m wearing a shirt./Llevo una camisa.)
2. Overgeneralization

él gustó/nosotros gustamos/Uds. gustaron/gustaste/gustó

Yo querí ayudar, pero no puedo.
(I wanted to help, but I couldn’t./Yo quería ayudar, pero no podía.)

Ellos quieren tener una fiesta a la viernes.
Ellos quieren tengo una fiesta al la viernes.
(They want to have a party on Friday./Quieren tener una fiesta el viernes.)

Son las 661-7179.
([The phone number] is .../Es el ...)

3. Simplification

Las discos de músicas en la televisión fue criticaron.
(The records on TV were criticized./Los discos en la televisión fueron criticados.)

¿Viste alguien pero no compró?
(Did you see something that you didn’t buy?/¿Viste algo que no compraste?)

Yo todos haciendo mi tarea.
(I always do my homework./Siempre hago mi tarea.)

3.4 Errors of syntax

A. Omission

La última película * vi fue Bean.
(que)
Yo di * mis padres unos películas.
(a)

* Ella * encantó dar fiestas.
(A/le)

Yo vi una vestida, pero no * compré.
(lo)

Vi una chequeta blanca, pero no * compré.
(la)

Vi unos otros zapatos, pero no * compré.
(los)

Yo estoy listo * ir al cine.
(para)

Yo sé * Madrid es la capital de Spain.
(que)

Ellos deben ir * el correos.
(a)

Estudia para * examen mañana.
(el)

A ustedes * gusta la camisa blanca.
(les)

A mis padres * gusta buscar ropa.
(les)

Preferimos ir * el zapatería.
(a)

Estoy listo * pedir.
(para)

Fui al mercado * comprar flan.
(para)

Yo fui * ver fútbol americano.
(para)

Voy * hacer mi tarea el jueves.
(a)

Quiero ayudar * todos los niños en el mundo.
(a)

A ella * gusto dar fiestas.
(le)

* ella encantó dar fiestas.
(A)

¿*Dónde fuiste?
(Adónde)

¿Cómo te llamas * estudiantes nuevos?
(los)

¿Cuándo salen * escuela?
(de)

¿* qué planta es el departamento de hogar?
(En)

Ellos visitaron * sus abuelos.
(a)

ayudasteis * la mujer
(a)

* su hermano le gustó
(a)

Comenzamos * limpiar la clase.
(a)
El perdió * ella.
(a)

Ellos criticaron * el árbitro ayer.
(a)

El comenzó * estudiar Saturday.
(a)

¿* qué hora salen?
(A)

Visitaron * mi abuela.
(a)

Tú tienes * ir.
(que)

Tienes * ir al cine.
(que)

Va * hace frío.
(a)

Yo leo * libro cuando hace fresco.
(un)

Me gustan los sándwiches * jamón y queso.
(de)

Yo dé * mis padres una camiseta.
(a)

después * escuela
(de)

Lisa oyó * Raúl fue enfermo.
(que)

La oficina entre la parque y * gimnasio.
(el)
número * teléfono
(de)

Comienzo la escuela a * ocho.
(las)

Yo * di * ella una carta.
(le/a)

* Señora Craft tiene una prisa.
(La)

Yo * servi la comida.
(les)

Tú * viste yo en el cine.
(me)

Yo * vi tú en el clase.
(te)

después * la examen
(de)

un millón * hamburguesas
(de)

tuvimos * escribir
(que)

clase * ciencias
(de)

es en * esquina
(la)

* Sr. Deveau está enfrente * la clase ahora.
(El/de)

Yo sé * voy a estar enfermo.
(que)

a * siete y cuarto
(las)

B. Addition

Te deseamos ir a la casa a ti.

vi unos otros zapatos

Yo prefiero a nadar.

Camina una media cuadra.

Ellos deben que ir.

un mil dólares

en el sábado pasado

decidimos a descansar

está entre de mamá y papá

prefiero a nadar

a ella regresó

a ella hizo

soy una aficionada

vi a una película

en la semana pasado

prefiero a llevo (llevar)
soy un aficionado

a ella oyó

hay los parques de bonitos

¿Dónde están viven?

¡Vamos a!

pienso a dormir

pedir de

síge para una cuadra

adónde los chicos viven

tiene una prisa

hago mi la tarea

fui al Colorado

viste a la película

¿Cuánto cuestan por los camisas?

estoy entre de

ciento y dos

viajé a la Europa

ropa de morado

está en el enfrente de
C. Word order

Yo di les
(Les di)

Yo sentéle una carta.
(le mandé)

Yo servéle la comida.
(le servi)

Yo servíles la comida.
(les servi)

Das mi sus números de teléfono.
(Dame)

teléfonos números
(números de teléfono)

yo no ver tú
(no te vi)

¿Dónde es este chico de?
¿Dónde es el chico de?
¿Dónde es de ese chico?
¿Esta chico es de dónde?
(De dónde es este chico?)

¿Qué hace tiempo?
(¿Qué tiempo hace?)

sirvenos
(nos sirve)

María traes
(les trae)

quieren decir la verdad a le
(quieren decirle la verdad)
tú das papas fritas a me
(me das papas fritas)

ayudasteis me
(me ayudasteis)

dieron mi un regalo
(me dieron)

¿Cuánto es un par de zapatos blancos cuestan?
¿Cuánto cuesta la par de zapatos blancos cuestan?
(¿Cuánto cuesta el par de zapatos blancos?)

hizo muy buen comida
(hizo una comida muy buena)

yo deles la tarea
(les di la tarea)

yo y mis amigas jugamos
(mis amigas y yo jugamos)

un camarero sirvome
(me sirvió)

¿Fue escribiendo la carta a el presidente de Mexico facil?
(Era fácil escribir la carta al presidente de México?)

The following several errors show the overgeneralization of Spanish syntax rules acquired by the students. The placement of the adjective after the noun as well as the two cases in which the object is placed after the verb demonstrate a regularization of rules applied to inappropriate situations.

camina una cuadra media
(camina media cuadra)
fui a la iglesia de mi
(mi iglesia)

la planta tercera
(la tercera planta)

el piso séptimo
la piso séptimo
(el séptimo piso)

la planta séptima
(la séptima planta)

quiero los colores todos
(quiero todos los colores)

puedes me das
(puedes darme)

quiero lo ayudar
(quiero ayudarlo)

D. Errors of negative construction

The creation of negative constructions in Spanish is particularly problematic in the development of beginning students. Specifically, the use of a double negative construction is resisted by many learners. Direct translation from English is observable in the errors containing post-verbal placement of the negation rather than the correct pre-verbal positioning.

Mrs. Craft está no prisa.
(La señora Craft no tiene prisa.)
Yo tengo no clases el sábados.
(No tengo clases los sábados.)

Nosotros deseamos comer nada.
(No queremos comer nada.)

Yo pienso hacer nada esta semana.
Yo pienso hago nada esta semana.
(No pienso hacer nada esta semana.)

Hubo tres dulces, pero ahora hay nunca.
(no hay ningún)

hicimos nada hoy
(no hicimos nada hoy)

Compré nada.
(No compré nada.)

Voy a hacer nada.
(No voy a hacer nada.)

E. Other Syntax errors

These first two examples may have resulted from the overgeneralization of structures relating to time. In projecting when something will occur, Spanish uses "a la" and "a las" in the presence of a specific time. Its overgeneralization to the days of the week is quite likely.

¿Qué hicieron a las sábado pasado?
(el)

Ellos quieren tengo una fiesta al la viernes.
Quieren tener una fiesta a la viernes.
(el)

Also related to time is the overgeneralization of the use of "por."

Time requires the use of "por" in situations that do not include a specific time. Otherwise, "de" is used.

a * ocho por la mañana
(las/de)

a * siete y cuarto por la mañana
(las/de)

Yo quiero llegar en la mañana de sábado.
(por/el)

Yo tengo a cambiar.
(que)

Compré un regalo de mi madre.
(para)

Tengo que doy un regalo para mi madre.
(a)

Yo sé de Madrid es la capital.
(que)

hizo una comida por yo
(para mi)

Yo fui a avion.
(en)

No regreso para escuela.
(a)
3.5 Orthographical errors

Orthographical errors were abundant in the corpus. To avoid repetition errors in orthography were only included once, even in the case of multiple occurrences. There are many possible causes for the errors listed below. Incomplete knowledge of Spanish accentuation rules as well as the lack of a written accent in English resulted in the misplacement and overproduction of accents. Accentuation errors can be classified as either developmental or overgeneralization depending on the particular case.

preferímos (preferimos)
mama (mamá)
papa (papá)
donde (dónde)
esta (está)
composision (composición)
dondé (dónde)
semana (semana)
tú (tu)
tu (tú)
exámen (examen)
está (esta)
el (el)
el (él)
esquiña (esquina)
examines (exámenes)
zapátos (zapatos)

The following errors appear to have been caused by the incorrect categorization of verbs as “-ar,” “-er,” or “-ir” verbs. The students were
instructed that verb conjugations vary depending on their initial categorization according to their endings.

yo miré (miré)
decidimos (decidimos)
escribe (escribe)
desea (deseas)
desea (desea)
preferimos (preferimos)
salimos (salimos)
preferimos (preferimos)
preferís (preferís)
preferís (preferís)
preferen (prefieren)

The two contractions in Spanish, “al” and “del” were also overproduced or avoided in several cases. The orthography rule requiring the changing of “y” to “e” before “I” and “hi” also proved difficult for the students in the data.

de el (del)
al casa (a la)
a el (al)
y interesante (e interesante)

Overgeneralizations listed below were also quite commonplace. The failure to capitalize the proper noun “España,” which occurred several times in the corpus, may have been an overgeneralization of the fact that the adjective “español” is not capitalized in Spanish.
ciento (cien)
primero libro (primer)
tercero libro (tercer)
aminales interesantes (interesantes)
cincocientos (quinientos)
nuevecientos (novecientos)
sietecientos (setecientos)
españa (España)

The remainder of the orthography errors included in this section that were discovered in the corpus show signs of interference from English, the combining of similar words in the target language, and possible performance mistakes.

televíción (televisión)
el cajo (la caja)
nueves (nuevos)
capitol (capital)
teléfono (teléfono)
questan (cuestan)
questa (cuesta)
inverano (invierno)
vierno (verano)
esquela (escuela)
la cilla (silla)
a hora (ahora)
uno sombrero (un)
examine (examen)
bibliotecca (biblioteca)
biliotecha (biblioteca)
priefero (prefiero)
trecer (tercer)
noventientos (novecientos)
cientos y dos (ciento dos)
ciento dos (ciento dos)
setentacientos (setecientos)
seisacientos (seiscientos)
infranca (enfranca)
claue (clase)
denada (de nada)
cien dos (ciento dos)
ciento y dos (ciento dos)
quatro cientos (cuatrocientos)
oye (hoy)
officina (oficina)
dose (doce)
roho (rojo)
hugamos (jugamos)
veniendo (viniendo)
barko (barco)
tuven (tuvieron)

The following orthographical errors in the production of verb forms all demonstrate the overgeneralization of a variety of previously learned rules. The first several examples show the misclassification of “stem-changing” verbs as regular verbs and vice-versa or the failure to change the stem in cases where it is required.

encontran (encuentran)
costan (cuestan)
vene (viene)
tenen (tienen)
jugan (juegan)
empizo (empiezo)
empizas (empiezas)
empiza (empieza)
empizan (empiezan)
yo pino (yo pongo)
These errors show overgeneralization in which the students have erroneously followed the stem-changing pattern in the first-person plural and informal second-person plural. These forms all conserve the infinitive stem.

- tienenos (tenemos)
- puedís (podéis)
- dicimos (decimos)
- dicís (decís)
- recordamos (recordamos)
- recordáis (recordáis)
- empiezamos (empezamos)
- empiezáis (empezáis)

The spelling changes required in Spanish orthography of certain verbs in order to conserve pronunciation are commonly not observed or overgeneralized by beginners. Numerous examples follow that reveal an incomplete comprehension of such rules while providing insight into the thought processes motivating early language production.

- leyí (leí)
- leyíste (leíste)
- leyimos (leímos)
- leyístis (leísteis)
- cruzó (cruzó)
- dijo (dijo)
- él conozce (conoce)
- yo practiqué (practicó)
- iendo (yendo)
yo jugé (jugué)
yo criticé (critiqué)
empecamos (empezamos)
yo practicé (practiqué)
yo pagé (pagué)
leyemos (leemos)

The use of written accents in verb orthography is also overgeneralized. In the first series of errors below students rely on their knowledge of the existence of an accent in the informal second person plural in the present tense to make the same assumption for the past tense.

despertastéis (despertasteis)
leistéis (leísteis)
decidistéis (decidisteis)
resolvístéis (resolvisteis)
aparcastéis (aparcasteis)
hicistéis (hicisteis)

fuí (fui)
dáis (dais)
hizó (hizo)
leyo (leyó)
hicé (hice)

In the case of many verbs Spanish uses a new stem in the construction of the preterit tense. In these examples students attempting to produce this verb tense demonstrate a variety of problems associated with overgeneralization. Neither the pattern of verb endings nor the use of the preterit stem has been mastered for these highly irregular verbs.
tuvi (tuve)
venió (vino)
deció (dijo)
hació (hizo)
hacisteis (hicisteis)
hacieron (hicieron)
yo hicí (hice)
decieron (dijeron)
tú hices (hiciste)
yo hací (hice)
tú haciste (hiciste)
el hazó (hizo)
yo querí (quise)
deció (dijo)
dijió (dijo)
yo pudí (pude)
yo tení (tuve)
yo de (di)
yo dice (dije)
diciste (dijiste)
dico (dijo)
dicimos (dijimos)
dicisteis (dijisteis)
dé (di)
daron (dieron)
yo tuvo (tuve)
yo dijo (dije)
yo hizo (hice)
el tuve (tuvo)
el dije (dijo)
el hice (hizo)
vini (vine)
dicieron (dijeron)
Spanish verbs that have a stem-change in the present tense do not necessarily exhibit these qualities in the preterit. These errors generalize this characteristic of the present tense to the simple past.

- él jugó (jugó)
- comienzó (comenzó)
- sirvi (serví)
- cuestó (costó)
- cuestaron (costaron)

Even in the present, stem changes provide a challenge for students. In the first example the decision of which “e” to change to “ie” resulted in the changing of both.

- prefiero (prefiero)

The “i” present in the irregular first person singular form of “traer” has remained in this next example.

- ellos traen (traen)

Knowing the conjugation of the verb “decir” this student has recreated the infinitive to resemble its forms.

- dicir (decir)

The irregular first person singular forms of the following verbs have also been generalized in place of their unique forms.
haco (hago)
dico (digo)
yo sabo (sé)

The three attempts below at the same verb form suggest the difficulty learners have in Spanish orthography as it applies to verb forms.

segue (sigue)
segui (sigue)
sige (sigue)
4. CONCLUSIONS

The following tables represent the frequency of production of each type of error found in the data. All percentages were rounded to the nearest whole number. Table 1 represents the total number of errors within each linguistic group analyzed in this study.

Table 1
Total Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of Errors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthography</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>806</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All subjects, without exception, committed errors in each of the four categories. As beginning language students each possesses a different IL tailored especially for him. The significant number of errors in each linguistic category identifies the subjects’ level of competence as beginners. Spanish morphology represented the majority of errors (33%) with lexicon contributing 27% of all errors found. 22% of the errors were attributed to orthography. The fewest errors were found in the area of syntax. It should be mentioned that many errors were committed several times by different students, but repetitions of the same error were only included once in the study. This aspect
of the study lowered totals for all areas but most significantly in orthography and morphology.

Table 2 depicts the errors of lexicon found in the data. Two tables have been provided in order to separate developmental errors from those resulting from the use of communicative strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th># of errors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archiforms</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralizations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12% of all errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Strategies within Lexicon</th>
<th># of errors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximation</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for all errors</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total for Lexicon</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>27% of all errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students involved in the study committed many different types of lexical errors. The use of archiforms and overgeneralizations can both be considered examples of developmental errors, but in this study they were extracted to create distinct classifications. Those errors designated solely as
developmental are examples of cases in which the learner exhibited difficulty in lexical choice due to the complexities of the Spanish language. The decision whether to use “ser” or “estar,” “por” or “para,” and “saber” or “conocer” present significant challenges for the learner. Evidence of this can be seen in that 43% of all lexical errors in the data have been attributed to the developmental process (including archiforms and overgeneralizations) in language learning. The division of developmental errors into categories may help researchers arrive at a more specific understanding of the techniques employed by learners.

Communicative strategies are best considered from a lexical perspective. Due to the inability to produce certain lexical items, the students applied replacement techniques that they were already using when communicating in their first language. While first-language simplification and avoidance strategies tend to lead to more fluid speech void of lengthy hesitation, their use in a second language frequently results in error. Simplification without error requires the knowledge of true synonyms and a vocabulary sufficient enough to produce the intended meaning via circumlocution or approximation. For a beginning Spanish student the IL is not close enough to the target language for errorless simplification to occur with any regularity. The use of communication strategies accounted for 57%
of lexical errors. Of the total of 121 errors the majority were found to be examples of simplification strategies such as circumlocution, synonymity, and approximation. The fact that the three types of simplification tend to overlap made it quite difficult in this study to classify errors definitively within simplification. Students had a tendency to attempt to produce some form of simplification before giving in to avoidance. Only 19% of the errors representing the use of communicative strategies were classified as avoidance.

Morphological errors were the most numerous of the four categories of errors found in the data representing 33% of the total errors. Table 3 shows the frequency of each error in morphology.

**Table 3**

**Morphology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th># of Errors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Plural Agreement</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overgeneralization</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/Verb Agreement</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overgeneralization</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns/Poss.</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>Overgeneralization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Induced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simplification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive Usage</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overgeneralization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simplification</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>33% of all errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high occurrence of error in morphology may be the result of the complexities inherent in the Spanish language with regard to concordance. Plural and gender marking posed the most difficulty for the subjects. Of the total of 266 morphological errors, 103 fall within this category. The lack of concordance in gender and number in English is the most probable cause of the students' difficulty. The high frequency of situations in which it is necessary for a learner to demonstrate production of gender and number agreement also increases the likelihood of error. The majority of errors could be classified as developmental while only 23% were caused by overgeneralizations. It is quite likely that in many cases the developmental errors may have been more performance-related than demonstrations of a lack of competence.

Subject/verb agreement also proved problematic for the students. The verb system in Spanish must be memorized by a learner and recalled according to the subject of an attempted utterance. The many possible choices at a learner's disposal in determining verb form increase the risk of error. The majority of the 14 errors found to be overgeneralizations show the erroneous testing of hypotheses in the comparison of different verb tenses. Subject/verb agreement accounted for 27% of the morphological errors.
The remaining 35% of the errors associated with morphology were divided into several categories. Pronoun usage along with possessive adjectives contributed 10% of the morphological errors. These were classified mostly as developmental errors except in unique cases of overgeneralization as in the production of "gustar" with indirect object pronouns. Incorrect use of an infinitive or its absence represented 12% of the errors. An additional 13% were a collection of errors revealing developmental errors, overgeneralizations, and simplifications that did not apply to the previous categories.

Errors of syntax were found to be the least common in the data. Only 18% of the total errors could be categorized as syntactic errors. Table 4 breaks down their appearance in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of Errors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omission</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18% of all errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Omission, addition, and word order account for the overwhelming majority of errors of syntax. The content words are the most important words for the communication of meaning in all languages. The omission of seemingly less-important words is common in language development due to a lower sense of urgency for their correct production. Addition errors, however, take on a more significant role in the assessment of the competence level of a learner. As learners take chances and create hypotheses, they will include additions demonstrating their particular level of fluency. Many of the omissions and additions included in the data may be the result of transfer from English in the form of calques. Errors in word order also have this same tendency to result from direct translations while overgeneralizations were also observed in the corpus. The positioning of negations in Spanish provided approximately 6% of the syntax data mostly in the omission of negation in an utterance requiring a double negative. The final 13 errors of syntax reveal overgeneralizations associated with preposition choice. Prepositions were frequently chosen based on connections formed by the students with English. This tendency may be the result of the learners’s interpretation of prepositions as less important to meaning than content words.

Errors in orthography have been separated into two categories - spelling and overgeneralizations. The errors designated as spelling errors have
not been further classified due to the inability to arrive at their definitive origins. The possibility is great that they may be errors of performance caused by carelessness, fatigue, or some other variable not indicative of competence. However, errors labeled overgeneralizations in this category were chosen based on the likelihood that the words were misspelled as a result of the erroneous application of a previously learned orthographical rule. Table 5 depicts the results of the classification of errors of orthography.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># of Errors</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgeneralization</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>22% of all errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students showed a strong tendency to apply rules inappropriately in orthography. Overgeneralizations in this area far outnumber those found in lexicon, morphology, and syntax. Orthography and morphology are more heavily dependent on rule memorization and application than the other two categories. In learning verb forms students memorize patterns that they may apply to as many verbs as possible. In the implementation of this strategy the learners committed many errors, but the number of correct orthographical constructions created using this technique is
far greater than the errors highlighted here. Overgeneralizations of this type are stepping-stones in competence resulting from the application of rules that provide students with the tools necessary for production. Developmental errors of this type are resolved in later stages of linguistic maturation as class lessons begin to shed light on exceptions in the Spanish system of orthography and morphology. By starting with the most general rules and working up to the highly specific exceptions, students are equipped with a multi-level interwoven system that must be consciously tapped until fluency is reached.

This study may provide data for the construction of language syllabi that take into consideration the likely occurrence of certain developmental errors. Errors are produced based on complexities within the target language, the use of communicative strategies, and from first language transfer. The first two have been analyzed in this thesis in an attempt to provide data to accompany that which already exists in the field of first language interference. The data also suggest possible psychological patterns at work in the production of Spanish in the IL of beginning learners in their tendency to overgeneralize, as seen throughout the corpus. Researchers and teachers may benefit from a better understanding of the possible explanations as to why there are observable regularities in the errors produced by second language learners.
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