T.C.

NECMETTİN ERBAKAN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

LEXICAL AND SYNTACTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF MOTHER TONGUE INTERFERENCE ON TURKISH EFL STUDENTS' WRITTEN PRODUCTS

Samet HASIRCIOĞLU

MASTER'S THESIS

Supervisor

Asst. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Serkan ÖZTÜRK

Konya-2019

BİLİMSEL ETİK SAYFASI

Öğrencinin	Adı Soyadı	Samet HASIRCIOĞLU
	Numarası	148304031006
	Ana Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi
	Bilim Dalı	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
	Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans
	Tezin Adı	Lexical And Syntactical Analysis of the Influence of Mother Tongue Interference on Turkish EFL Students' Written Products

Bu tezin proje safhasından sonuçlanmasına kadarki bütün süreçlerde bilimsel etiğe ve akademik kurallara özenle riayet edildiğini, tez içindeki bütün bilgilerin etik davranış ve akademik kurallar çerçevesinde elde edilerek sunulduğunu, ayrıca tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanan bu çalışmada başkalarının eserlerinden yararlanılması durumunda bilimsel kurallara uygun olarak atıf yapıldığını bildiririm.

05/02/2019
Öğrencinin
Adı Soyadı İmzası
Samet HASIRCIOĞLU

T.C.
NECMETTİN ERBAKAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ KABUL FORMU

Öğrencinin	Adı Soyadı	Samet HASIRCIOĞLU
	Numarası	148304031006
	Ana Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi
	Bilim Dalı	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
	Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans
	Tez Danışmanı	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mustafa Serkan ÖZTÜRK
	Tezin Adı	Lexical And Syntactical Analysis of the Influence of Mother Tongue Interference on Turkish EFL Students' Written Products

Yukarıda adı geçen öğrenci tarafından hazırlanan "Lexical And Syntactical Analysis of the Influence of Mother Tongue Interference on Turkish EFL Students' Written Products" başlıklı bu çalışma 04/02/2019 tarihinde yapılan savunma sınavı sonucunda oybirliği ile başarılı bulunarak, jürimiz tarafından yüksek lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

	Ünvanı Adı Soyadı	İmza
Danışman	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mustafa Serkan Öztürk	
Jüri Üyesi	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Abdülhamit ÇAKIR	
Jüri Üyesi	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Fahrettin ŞANAL	

Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fak 42090 Meram Yeni Yol Meram/KONYA
Tel : 0 332 324 76 60
Faks : 0 332 324 55 10
Elektronik Ağ: https://www.konya.edu.tr/egitimbilimlerienstitusu
E- Posta: ebil@konya.edu.tr

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my supervisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Serkan ÖZTÜRK for his excellent guidance and support during this process. It has been a great opportunity to work with such a supportive advisor. I would like to thank my colleagues who helped me provide the written materials of students to discover learners' errors. I also wish to thank all of the participants, without whose cooperation I would not be able to conduct this analysis. I am grateful to my family and close friends for their continuous help and support.

Finally, my beloved wife deserves a particular note of thanks: your kind words have, as always, kept me motivated and encouraged all through this process. Your endless patience and positive thoughts have made a great contribution to this study. Also, my dear sons, who kept waiting for their father to get back home even at the weekends, deserve special thanks. Without all your support, I would not be able to conduct this research. Thank you for all the motivation and support you have provided.

Samet HASIRCIOĞLU

Öğrencinin	Adı Soyadı	Samet HASIRCIOĞLU
	Numarası	148304031006
	Ana Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi
	Bilim Dalı	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
	Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans
	Tez Danışmanı	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mustafa Serkan ÖZTÜRK
	Tezin Adı	Lexical And Syntactical Analysis of the Influence of Mother Tongue Interference on Turkish EFL Students' Written Products

ÖZET

Dillerin birçok bakımdan farklılık gösterdiği, yaşayan ve gelişen canlılar olduğu düşünülmektedir. Aynı zamanda, her dilin kendine has özelliklere sahip olduğu ve uzun süreli dil öğrenme sürecinde başka bir dille etkileşiminin İkinci Dil Edinimi alanındaki bilim insanlarının çoğuna hitap ettiği ve bu alandaki temel ilgi alanlarından biri olduğu açıktır. Dil öğreniminin devam eden bir süreç olması ve bu nedenle farklı etkenlere maruz kalması sebebiyle, dil aktarımı kavramı, çalışmaların bu kavramı aydınlatmakta tam anlamıyla başarılı olamaması bakımından hala gizemli görünmektedir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, resmi bir ortamda anadili Türkçe olan öğrencilerin yazılı İngilizce ediniminde anadil etkisinin bir sonucu olarak ortaya çıkan hataları bulmaktır. Dil aktarımının etkilediği dil alanlarını araştırma ve bu aktarımın öğretme ve öğrenme sürecindeki etkilerini tartışma amaçlanmıştır. Diğer bir amaç, hata oranları ile yabancı dil yeterlik seviyeleri arasında bir ilişki olup olmadığını bulmaktır. Araştırma sorularını cevaplamak için nitel ve nicel veri analiz yöntemleri kullanılmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, bu çalışmanın bulguları, sözlü ve söz dizimsel dil kategorileri düzeyindeki olumsuz transferin belirgin olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bunu takiben, İkinci Dil Edinimi (İDE) alanına katkıda bulunmak amacıyla daha detaylı öneriler sunulmuştur. Bu çalışmanın sınırlılıkları da dâhil edilmiştir.

T.C.
NECMETTİN ERBAKAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

Öğrencinin	Adı Soyadı	Samet HASIRCIOĞLU
	Numarası	148304031006
	Ana Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi
	Bilim Dalı	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
	Programı	Tezli Yüksek Lisans
	Tez Danışmanı	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mustafa Serkan ÖZTÜRK
	Tezin İngilizce Adı	Lexical And Syntactical Analysis of the Influence of Mother Tongue Interference on Turkish EFL Students' Written Products

SUMMARY

It is evident that languages differ in many respects, and they are regarded as living and developing things. It is also obvious that every language has unique features and its interaction with another language during the long process of language learning appeals to most of the Second Language Acquisition scholars and becomes one of the main concerns in this field. Due to the fact that language learning is an ongoing process, thereby being exposed to different kinds of factors, the concept of language transfer appears to be still mysterious in the sense that studies have failed to fully lighten the concept. The purpose of this study is to discover the errors that come out as a result of the first language influence in the written English acquisition of Turkish EFL learners in a formal setting. It is aimed to investigate the language areas influenced by the transfer and to discuss the effects of this transfer on the teaching and learning process. The other aim is to find out if there is a relationship between the error rates and L2 proficiency levels. Qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis are employed in order to answer the research questions. As a result, findings of this study have revealed that negative transfer at the level of lexical and syntactical linguistic categories is evident. It has been proved that some of the error types are in a close relationship with the proficiency levels of the students. Subsequently, more detailed suggestions have been made to contribute to the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) field. The limitations of this research have also been included.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bilimsel Etik Sayfası i
Acknowledgments iii
Özet iv
Abstract v
Abbreviations ix
List of Tables x

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1. Historical Background of Language Transfer 1
1.2. Statement of the Problem 4
1.3. Aims of the Study 7
1.4. Research Questions 9
1.5. Significance of the Study 10
1.6. Definitions 11
1.6.1. Language Transfer 11
1.6.2. Interlanguage 12
1.6.3. Error 12
1.6.4. Error Analysis 13
1.6.5. Idiosyncratic Sentences / Dialect 13

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 14
2.1. Introduction 14
2.2. Features of Sociolinguistics 14
2.3. Language Acquisition 15
2.4. Second Language Acquisition 16
2.5. Mother Tongue Interference 17
2.6. Contrastive Analysis 18
2.7. Error 19
2.8. Error Analysis 19
2.9. Error Analysis Process 20
2.9.1. Learner Language Sample Collection 20

2.9.2. Error Identification 20
2.9.3. Error Description 21
2.9.4. Error Classification 21
2.10. Sources of Errors 22
2.10.1. Language Transfer 22
2.10.1.1. Interlingual Transfer / L1 Interference 22
2.10.1.1.1. The Interlanguage Hypothesis 23
2.10.1.1.2. The Mother Tongue Effect 26
2.10.1.1.3. Fossilization 27
2.10.1.1.4. Intralingual Transfer 27
2.10.1.1.5. Overgeneralization 29
2.10.1.1.6. Communication Strategy-Based Errors 30
2.10.1.1.7. Induced Errors 30
2.10.1.1.8. Errors of Avoidance 30
2.11. Error Analysis Approaches 30
2.12. Error Analysis Studies Around the World 31
2.13. Error Analysis Studies in Turkey 33

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY 36
3.1. Introduction 36
3.2. Research Design 36
3.3. Setting and Participants 36
3.4. Data Collection Tools 37
3.5. Data Collection Procedure 38
3.6. Data Analysis 38
3.6.1. Identification of errors 40
3.6.2. Classification of errors 40
3.6.3. Calculation of errors 40
3.6.4. Tabulating the result 41

CHAPTER IV

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 42
4.1. Introduction 42
4.2. Word Choice 42
4.3. Verb Tense 45
4.4. Pluralization (Singular-Plural Noun Agreement) 48
4.5. Prepositional Interference 51
4.5.1. Preposition Addition (Adding the Wrong Preposition) 51
4.5.2. Preposition Omission 54
4.5.3. Preposition Misuse 56

CHAPTER V

5. CONCLUSION 61
5.1. Summary and Conclusion 61
5.2. Implications of the Study 68
5.3. Suggested Treatment of Written Errors 72
5.4. Limitations of the Study 72
5.5. Recommendations for Further Research 73
Bibliography 75
Appendices: 83
Samples of Students' Writings 83

Abbreviations

AL: Applied Linguistics

AWL: Academic Word List

CAH: Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

Catg.: Category

EA: Error Analysis

ELT: English Language Teaching

Freq.: Frequency

IL: Interlanguage

L1: First Language (Turkish)

L2: Second Language (English)

MTI: Mother Tongue Interference

SLA: Second Language Acquisition

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Sciences

TG: Transformational Productive Grammar

TL: Target Language

UG: Universal Grammar

List of Tables

Table 1. One-way Anova Test of Word Choice Error

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Word Choice Error

Table 3. Multiple Comparisons of Word Choice Error

Table 4. One-way Anova Test of Verb Tense Error

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Verb Tense Error

Table 6. Multiple Comparisons of Verb Tense Error

Table 7. One-way Anova Test of Pluralization Error

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Pluralization Error

Table 9. Multiple Comparisons of Pluralization Error

Table 10. One-way Anova Test of Preposition Addition Error

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics of Preposition Addition Error

Table 12. Multiple Comparisons of Preposition Addition Error

Table 13. One-way Anova Test of Preposition Omission Error

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics of Preposition Omission Error

Table 15. Multiple Comparisons of Preposition Omission Error

Table 16. One-way Anova Test of Preposition Misuse Error

Table 17. Descriptive Statistics of Preposition Misuse Error

Table 18. Multiple Comparisons of Preposition Misuse Error

CHAPTER I

1. INTRODUCTION

This section involves historical background of the research, description of the problem, aims of the research, research questions, importance of the research and operational definitions.

Learners commit errors and they do this on customary premise with specific structures. The wellsprings of L2 learners' errors might be identified with two kinds of transfers. One of them is interlingual transfer, which implies transfer from L1. Negative transfer from L1 is called L1 interference, too. The other one is intralingual transfer which implies transfer inside target language, for example, overgeneralization of syntactic standards (Brown, 1980; Richards, 1974). English language has complex structures for the greater part of the Turkish students who learn English as a second/foreign language. In this study, our aim is to recognize lexical and syntactic aspects that cause the learners to make transfer errors and to represent the connection between the quantity of errors and the proficiency levels of students.

1.1. Historical Background of Language Transfer

It is expected that language communication endeavors to happen when individuals who don't speak the same language meet up and when non-verbal communication is deficient (Odlin, 1989). By virtue of this connection, it was noticed the ancient Greek practices mirrored the principal verifications of mother tongue's impact on the target language (Jarvis and Pavlenko, 2008). Nevertheless, the illustrations are frequently constrained to unfavorable assertations related to poor people or blended utilization of Greek. This shows the transfer is seen just as a negative phenomenon.

Research regarding this matter has been started by American etymologists favoring language change in the course of last 50 years (Odlin, 1989), in spite of the fact that it has been trusted that language transfer has existed since various linguistic backgrounds have needed to cooperate with each other. It could be credited to the way that Second Language Acquisition is a subcategory of Applied Linguistics, generally

in view of behavioral approach (Mitchell and Myles, 2004: 29-33; Ellis, 2005: 359-361) and affected from these emphatically built convictions.

According to behavioral theory, old habits, which might be either aptitudes or any data, were proposed to encourage the acquisition of beforehand acquired or learned habits and to counteract them if the intended habits were alike, or they were unique (Gass and Selinker, 2001: 66-68; Mitchell and Amp; Myles, 2004: 30-33).

In consideration of the data, Lado and Weinreich are believed to play the main roles to manage language transfer. Odlin (2003), while accentuating Weinreich's work, considers it to be the principal semantic investigation on the effect of the first language. Gass and Selinker (1983) and others see Lado as the main analyst intrigued by this idea in SLA.

Weinreich (1953) specified the semantic activity including borrowing, the impact of target language on first langauge, the impact of first language on the target langauge, and demonstrated its reality in bilingualism and language contact. Then again, while Lado (1957) encouraged the possibility of comparability between the two languages, a superior instructing strategy could be given to the students when the typological remove turned out to be more troublesome and the educators knew about these challenges or similitudes (Lado, 1957: 2).

In the 1960s, after the main endeavors by Weinreich and Lado, it was discovered that the Contrast Analysis Hypothesis was acknowledged as the first language learning hypothesis (Gass and Selinker, 2001: 72-78, Mitchell and Myles, 2004: 30), - 32; Ellis, 2008: 359-361). According to Lado (1957), the hypothesis was based on the possibility that if the characteristics of first language and second language are alike, at that point the acquirement of the L2 is less demanding, and if not, it is more troublesome. Because of this idea, it is anything but difficult to see that the part of the primary language in this hypothesis is essential. Therefore, the errors of the students are ascribed to the L1 impact.

In this light of thought, CAH expects to discover the contrasts amongst L1 and L2, so unique consideration can be paid to these regions and educating is probably

going to be moved forward. Accordingly, probable errors that learners may commit could be evaded and mastering in a second language is more available (Odlin 1989; Gass and Selinker, 2001: 72-78).

CAH started to lose its power when it was discovered that the errors were not caused only by the L1 impact (Odlin, 1989; Mitchell and Myles, 2004). Observational confirmation has plainly demonstrated that behavioral theory, which is the premise of the CAH, can prompt difficulties in SLA speculations, as in language-to-language learning is never again observed as an outcome, however that there might be a few errors that cannot be clarified by cross linguistic interference. Chomsky's Universal Grammar (UG) and Transformational Productive Grammar (TG) hypotheses have rolled out radical improvements (eg, Dulay and Burt 1974, 1983, Mitchell and Myles 2004), which prompted the development of the idea of 'innate device ' 33-37; Ellis 2008: 361-363).

In spite of the fact that UG hypothesis should be accessible for the children's acquisition of mother tongue, Dulay and Burt (1974) expanded the idea and proposed that it is conceivable to assert that the acquisition of L2 is like the acquisition of L1. This UG can likewise be connected to second language acquisition. The relative investigation of the acquisition of English morphisms by Spanish and Chinese speakers defended the theory that the errors of students were like those of the mother tongue acquisition. Therefore, it is guaranteed that L2 students are frequently the consequence of the natural learning process called “developmental barriers” (Dulay and Burt, 1983: 58) and that these formative deviations are adequate to demonstrate that L1 is the principle wellspring of errors in students' errors. In addition, they trust that only a little amount of student errors can be credited to the L1 impact. (Dulay and Burt, 1983: 58). Nevertheless, this hypothesis did not keep going long on the grounds that it didn't provide adequate proof to support the theory (Odlin, 1989).

'Interlanguage' (IL) hypothesis, known as the 'learning language', was set forth by Selinker (1972), in the effort to join these two polarities (Ellis, 2008: 28). IL is thought to be a free language framework that can be affected by various components, for example, formative deviations, L1 impacts, or the way in which instruction is

given. Corder (1974) likewise gave confirmation to Selinker's hypothesis that errors may be regarded as verification of the language learning process (Selinker, 1992: 144-170).

On account of these researches, another hypothesis called 'Error Analysis' (EA) rose to analyze the advancement and processing learners' language (Gass and Selinker, 2001: 78-87, Ellis and Barkhuizen, 2005: 51-71). Thanks to the structure, a better methodical examination of students' errors was created. Provided that we think about the motivation behind this research, EA is considered to be deserving an analysis in following areas of the research.

As an outcome of the negative meanings realized by the behavioral hypothesis, the examinations identified with language transfer have been adjourned for quite a while and the advantage has been belittled (Gass and Selinker, 1983, Odlin 1989). In any case, the 1980s saw a developing disturbance in language interference. Begun with the studies by Gass and Selinker (1983) and improved by Kellerman and Smith in 1986 and by Dechert and Raupach in 1989, the research area of language transfer increased its reputation with Odlin (1989). Odlin established the framework of modern transfer researches.

In spite of the work and hypotheses that overlooked the language transfer, it was difficult to dismiss the impact of L1, despite the fact that there was no confirmation to propose that there was no language transfer in language learning.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Language transfer has long been a questionable subject of applied linguistics and SLA. Every language has its one of a kind characteristics and collaboration with another language during a long procedure of appeal to the language learning of the SLA schooling, and clearly it ends up one of the fundamental matters in this field. Because of the way that language learning is a progressing procedure, it appears that the idea of language transfer is as perplexing as in it neglects to lighten the idea of studies.

In the wake of experiencing some troubles both in Turkish and English as a teacher and a second language learner, I knew that it was imperative to investigate areas that require special consideration and give more significance to these fields in instructing and learning. In the light of this, the fundamental focal point of consideration in this study is the investigation of errors made by Turkish students in their written products in English and to comprehend what level of language transfer exists and what impacts are accessible.

Mother Tongue is the principal language in which a child characterizes the earth to move around with her. The learning of the first language happens locally and through helpful impersonation and translation. Listening and speaking skills are taught at home by parents and after that the child figures out how to read and write at school. The kid is generally presented to the first language and the odds of learning the errors are higher.

As already mentioned, learning a second language does not happen in a natural habitat. Subsequently, it is relatively difficult to remedy the error promptly. Insufficient presentation and absence of appropriate impersonation are different purposes behind being counterfeit. These reasons constitute real issues while associating first and second languages.

Native Language Interference refers to language users transferring data from one language to another one. Indeed, this is the change of tongue between languages. It can be fundamentally from the second to one or from the first to second. Likewise, there can be very different connections. This can happen in language learning and teaching, as well as when somebody is certainly not a native speaker of that language.

Language transfer is seen all through the procedure while applying all skills. At the point when a child takes in the native language, the perception doors are open, so he acquires it by mirroring his first language. Then again, while learning a second language, the the main language experiences having the rules that meet the scheme.

In the previous four decades, etymologists have talked about the impact of mother tongue on the target language (L2) learning technique in the Second Language

Acquisition. Even though numerous language specialists have communicated distinctive conclusions about whether there is a 'transfer', maybe the most affirmed definition has a place with Odlin. Odlin (Odlin, 1989: 27) states: that transfer is an impact occuring due to similitudes and deviations between the second language and the language which has been beforehand (maybe defectively) acquired. The learner utilizes his target language as the first language on account of contrasts between the forms of the two languages.

Krashen et al. (1982: 98) admit that the interference has a a couple of linguistic features; One is mental, the other is sociological. The mental perspective is the impact of old habits when a man learns a foreign language. Nonetheless, the socio-linguistic part of the interference is the semantic association, for example, 'linguistic borrowing' and ‘language change’ that emerge when two language communities are in contact.

First language 'interference' and 'transfer' can often be utilized correlatively and sometimes as terms that can mean diverse things. Lott (Lott, 1983: 256) portrays negative transfer as errors in student's utilization of the second language which could be backtracked to the mother tongue. Additionally, Ellis (Ellis, 1997) views 'interference' as 'transfer' and characterizes it as 'the impact that the student's L1 applies over the acquiring of an L2'.

Students shape their own impermanent standards while learning a target language (Selinker, 1971; Ellis, 1994) by utilizing their first language consciousness, however this is legitimate just when students believe that it will help them learn or when they feel themselves sufficiently qualified in the L2 to choose whether transfer is conceivable or not.

Ellis (Ellis, 1997) suggests that there is a probability of an extensive variety of errors on the target language which has diverse language forms. Consequently, it causes the first language to blend with the foreign language. Gao (Gao, 2013) conveys that a student is counseling the native language with a specific end goal to defeat the challenges facing in the target language.

Language is, especially, the human capacity to comprehend and make utilization of complex frameworks of correspondence. Individuals utilize it to express their thoughts and considerations to communicate. Man has the pleasure of being skilled with making use of data on various stages like individual, public and scholarly (Radhika and Kala, 2013). Language is developed in patterns, sounds and words by a social gathering. It is an ideal arrangement of characters.

In our day-to-day lives, language has critical significance for everybody. The inescapable necessity to convey in individuals makes it feasible for them to create language varieties. Consequently, language appears out of a convey code of association, which develops wisdom and knowledge (Radhika and Kala, 2013).

So, this research examines the impacts of mother tongue-Turkish on target language-English via investigating the errors which learners committed in their writing exam papers.

1.3. Aims of the Study

This study aims to analyze the first language affected parts of written English of Turkish-speaking students. At the end, the reflections and impacts of Turkish on the acquisition of English language are exhibited by analyzing the errors that students make while setting up an-English-written product. It is hoped to locate the linguistic dimensions in which the interference appears and to give advance clarification for this wonder. In light of the discoveries of the examination, it means to limit the negative impacts of L1 on the learning procedure and also to present instructing suggestions to add to the field of SLA.

The idea of transfer still stays disputable as researchers have not achieved an accord on characterizing the idea or its impacts on the language learning, by that means, bringing about viewpoints that should be thought about.

In this research, the accompanying definition is utilized which is characterized as the most acknowledged definition by Odlin (1989). transfer is an impact occuring due to similitudes and deviations between the second language and the language which

has been beforehand (maybe defectively) acquired. (Odlin, 1989:27). Also, every one of the conditions identified with transfer phenomenology is utilized instead of each other, paying little mind to their minor contrasts, unless otherwise stated.

With respect to the techniques embraced in transfer studies, it is realized that two fundamental methodologies have been utilized, which have not built up a typical system and constrained language transfer studies. In this regard, this research adopts the method of comparing the two linguistic forms. (Odlin, 1989).

There might be limitations that influence the recurrence of language transfer. With a specific end goal to conquer this danger, the subject of this research was chosen from around some similar age Turkish students, already educated in identical approaches and methodologies and arranged an undergraduate study. The transfer has turned out to be in any event in lexical and syntactic levels in a Turkish setting. Hence, it is expected that the outcomes acquired from the information gathered for this research will give samples of language transfer at different levels.

In second language acquisition (SLA) it is trusted that a student's mother tongue (L1) will influence his target language either positively or negatively. If the two languages are comparable, the first language will aid learning the second language positively. Notwithstanding, if they are not quite the same, the mother tongue functions adversely. As the Turkish belongs to the Altaic branch of the Ural-Altaic group and English is a West Germanic language of Indo-European group, the greater part of the students is supposed to transfer negatively because of the enormous distinction between them (Erarslan and Hol, 2015).

The concept of mother tongue interference has long been at issue in AL and SLA. It is clear that each language contains specific elements. The cooperation of one language with another over the span of long progress of language learning has consistently been a case study for SLA language specialists. Since language learning is a proceeding development, so being available to numerous kinds of determinants, the idea of 'language transfer' is still a dark concept in etymological researches (Tat, 2013).

In any case, concerning a heft of data that reviews set forth and my individual knowledge and practice in learning and teaching a foreign language demonstrate that correspondence and uniqueness between the first and second language are believed to influence the learning procedure either positively or negatively. Thus, I am, as an English language instructor, inspired by investigating the possible problems that students and instructors may face and difficulties that they encounter because of the contrasts between Turkish and English in students' written products.

This investigation plans to analyze the impacts of Turkish language as their mother tongue on students' written products of English; particularly on transfer on vocabulary, tense and preposition utilization by the students at a private university in Turkey. This investigation also aims to help second language instructors as they are the base floors of this laborious procedure. Translation and interpretation fields are likewise expected to profit from this investigation.

I hereby plan to research into this event, review the issue of Mother Tongue Interference in English word choice, use of grammar and use of prepositions and afterwards try to provide a few answers to the questions mentioned above in learning and instructing English at a private university. As a matter of fact, inquiry reviews completed at colleges and universities demonstrate that both instructors and students get puzzled with language transfer issues in the course of the procedure of English learning and instructing.

Consequently, this research will be helpful for the students and also the instructors of English on the best way to create awareness in utilizing appropriate lexical and syntactic elements in their written performances that will be free of Mother Tongue Interference.

1.4. Research Questions

In this part, the research questions and points of this investigation are given in details. As clarified previously, it is expected to discover the implications and effects of Turkish language on English as a foreign language by analyzing the written materials of Turkish EFL students. In the light of this study, it is additionally planned

to add to the SLA by drawing out some teaching implications for negligible negative L1 impacts.

So as to frame a research structure, the fundamental focal point of interest in this study will be on these inquiries below:

1. What type of interlingual errors do EFL learners make in their writings?
2. What could be the sources of errors?
3. How could these errors be classified?
4. Regarding the levels of EFL learners (Pre-intermediate, Intermediate and Upper-intermediate), how does mother tongue interference affect the use of English in terms of lexical and syntactical aspects?
5. What sort of approaches could be adopted so as to cope with the mother tongue interference?

1.5. Significance of the Study

Language interaction is supposed to happen when individuals need to convey a message and when the non-verbal collaboration isn't sufficient for this (Odlin, 1989). Along these lines, it is reported the creations made by Greeks demonstrated the primary evidence of the impact of mother tongue on the foreign language (Jarvis and Pavlenko, 2008). Still there have been, for the most part, negative examples about the utilization of Greek in an inadequate or complicated course, which shows that transfer or interference was recognized only as a negative incidence.

Language transfer is contentious, so the terms in this phenomenon need to be defined, explained to prevent vagueness. ‘Interference’, ‘cross linguistic influence’, ‘mother tongue influence’ and ‘transfer’ are regarded to have the same meanings (Tat, 2013).

Starting with one of the ancient languages put into use by Weinreich in 1953 and Lado 1957 to show L1 effect, 'interference' turns out to refuse the useful parts of the thought and just indicates the 'negative transfer' on account of its psychological association with the behaviorist hypothesis (Odlin, 2003). Subsequently, it could be

claimed that the phrase 'interference' supports the positive part of the thought since it denies the conviction that L1 and L2 may have similar aspects in common (Odlin 1989: 26).

As a Turkish native speaker and as an English instructor, I have experienced some difficulties in learning and teaching English as foreign language. I am very conscious of the reality that researching into the fields, which I, as a foreign language teacher, and my students have some difficulty in, need major consideration and paying more attention to these fields while learning and teaching is of crucial importance. Depending on this, this study will focus its attention on the examination of errors made by Turkish EFL learners in their written products to see whether mother tongue interference occurs or not; if so, what levels and sorts of indications exist.

1.6. Definitions

1.6.1. Language Transfer

The term transfer is for the most part used to allude to the impact of the current information on the acquisition of new knowledge. The idea of transfer was first examined by the contrastive experts, who were enormously influenced by behaviorist hypotheses of language learning. Later on, Ellis (1994: 341) adopted a broader strategy to transfer and expressed that 'the study of transfer involves the study of errors (negative transfer), facilitation (positive transfer), avoidance of target language forms, and their over-use'.

Language transfer (also called L1 interference, linguistic interference, and cross-linguistic influence) alludes to speakers or scholars applying information from one language to the next language. It is the transfer of etymological aspects between languages in the discourse collection of a bilingual or multilingual individual, regardless of whether from first to second, second to first or numerous other relationships. It is most usually examined with regards to English language learning and teaching, yet it can happen in any circumstance when somebody doesn't have a native level command of a language, as while converting into a second language.

1.6.2. Interlanguage

American etymologist Larry Selinker (1972) presented the expression "interlanguage" (IL) as a different linguistic framework which is plainly not the same as both the student's 'native language' (NL) and the 'target language' (TL) being studied. This framework is developed by the student while learning the TL. Hence, this framework is a deformed type of the target language containing errors caused by improper utilization of student's native language while imparting in the TL. As exposure to TL expands, TL turns out to be more successful in IL. That is, students build up a framework that is more like the TL.

Interlanguage is the term for an idiolect that has been produced by a student of a second language (or L2) who has not yet achieved proficiency. A student's interlanguage contains a few highlights of their first language (or L1) and can likewise overgeneralize some L2 writing and speaking rules. These two attributes of an interlanguage result in the framework's special semantic association.

An interlanguage is idiosyncratically based on the students' practices with the L2. It can "fossilize", or stop creating, in any of its formative stages. The interlanguage rules are asserted to be molded by a few elements, including L1-transfer, past learning methodologies, techniques of L2 acquisition, L2 communication procedures, and overgeneralization of L2 language forms.

1.6.3. Error

Gass and Selinker (2001) characterized errors as "red flags" that give confirmation of the student's knowledge of the second language. An 'error' is a deviation from accuracy or correctness. A 'mistake' is an error caused by a fault: the fault being misjudgment, carelessness, or forgetfulness. Individual language user's deviations from standard language norms in grammar, syntax, pronunciation and punctuation are sometimes referred to as errors (Brown, 1980).

1.6.4. Error Analysis

Error Analysis took its place in applied linguistics on account of work of P.S Corder in 1982 which manages student errors and interlanguage. Richards, Plott and Platt (1996:127) express that error analysis enables specialists and instructors to distinguish systems which students use in language learning, track the reason for students' errors data on basic troubles in language learning or on the best way to get ready the educating material.

1.6.5. Idiosyncratic Sentences / Dialect

Corder (1967) characterizes idiosyncratic dialect as the wrong creation in TL. Bada (1993) expressed that idiosyncratic sentences have rules that don't fit in with the standard English language rules; idiosyncratic statement created by L2 student cannot be considered as an error, rather it can be viewed as a piece of interlanguage structure of the student.

CHAPTER II

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

In this part, related works in the literature will be reviewed. This will help as bases for the entire research i.e. a few angles to be assessed here will be utilized as a part of examining our data in the following section. Owing to the fact that sociolinguistics is a broad branch of study, mother tongue interference and some other related sociolinguistic viewpoints have been chosen for the review.

2.2. Features of Sociolinguistics

Bilingualism and multilingualism are elements of sociolinguistics. As indicated by Kellerman (1995, 125-150) sociolinguistics has been characterized as the investigation of language in its social setting. The analysis of language in its social setting implies vitally the investigation of phonetic variation. Kellerman (1995, 125-150) additionally recognized two kinds of variations which are: stylistics variation and social variation.

Keshavarz (1999) recommends: The investigation of bilingualism could accordingly be said to fall inside the field of sociolinguistics in so far as the latter is a branch of knowledge which is involved with the manners by which language is utilized as a part of the public. Grosjean (2001) assessed that a large portion of the world's total populace is bilingual, and that bilingualism is available in almost each nation of the world. It is exceptionally uncommon to see a nation with only one language, even a language has assortments. McDonough (1986) advances that numerous speech communities in the world are made up of people who speak at least two communal languages.

The term bilingualism has been used to allude to such circumstances permitting that at least two languages possibly included: occasionally the term multilingualism is utilized rather as the umbrella term. From every one of the researchers that have been cited above, it is clear that bilingualism is a circumstance whereby more than a

language is available in a general public and multilingualism is referred to as a circumstance whereby more than two languages are utilized in a region.

2.3. Language Acquisition

Under ordinary conditions, any child inside the initial five years will acquire the language in his/her setting. This language is known as the mother tongue or the first language. McDonough (1986) composes that normal children in all social environments acquire, inside the space of a couple of years' familiar control of a language. Special cases are rare: kids with serious physical disability, for example, excessive mental hindrance, Down's syndrome, may not acquire a language completely; almost never a kid isn't presented to adequate discourse. McDonough (1986) additionally says that the acquirement of all languages is accepted to continue through identical formative stages. Language acquisition can likewise be the procedure by which kids figure out how to speak the language of the society they grow. McDonough (1986) has six of the phases of language acquirement which are said to have been explored to keep running over every language. These stages are:

a. Pre-language stage cooing starts at about two or three months; and babbling starts at around six months.

b. One-word stage starts at about a year or so; at about 12-18 months children create their early comprehensible phrases.

c. Two-word stage starts at about 18-20 months; at this stage, he asserts that a child has a functioning vocabulary improvement to around a few hundred.

d. Telegraphic speech starts when the child is two or three years old: “In this stage, function words and morphemes, such as preposition (in language like English) and inflectional morphemes, begin to appear.”

e. Basic mastery occurs at about four or five years.

f. Elaboration and development particularly of vocabulary, also to some degree language structure proceeds all through life.

Language acquirement proceeds through life. Age is exceptionally noteworthy in language acquirement and it has been stressed that youngsters before adolescence acquire language effortlessly compared to grown-ups. This is due to the fact that a few researchers accepted with the assistance of studies that the capacity of the mind to transfer certain data over the two sides of the hemispheres is the thing that makes conceivable the easy acquirement of language in early youth. (Kim, 2001:159-174). “There is even a critical age for acquiring sign language natively” (Kim, 2001:159-174). He also recognized a few phases in acquiring a language as McDonough (1986) did. Kim says stages like babbling stage, contact through single sign (word) and blend of two signs or words.

There are such a significant number of highlights that are associated with a child’s language. English speaking youngsters exclude function words like a, an, and the. This is called omission of articles as well. These are words that add functions rather than content to an utterance. " Even their first sentences follow a pattern". They generally comprise of a blend of a verb, noun or an adjective. Something like. "Want milk" (Kim, 2001:159-174).

In conclusion, regarding language acquisition, every language has its form and youngsters master this form during the time spent acquiring a language. No kid will take in the structure of a language that he/she doesn't have any contact with. They learn the sounds of their language and the limitations on how those sounds can consolidate. Deficiency of appropriate language acquirement in a child will cause absence of skill when the kid grows up to utilize the language in the social environment.

2.4. Second Language Acquisition

As the name proposes, second language is a language that is learnt either formally or informally after the mother tongue. Second language is called the target language as well. McDonough (1986) alludes to it as "adult language learning". He claims kids grow up speaking more than one language in numerous parts of the world. Second language acquirement study aims attention around creating information and utilization of a language by youngsters and grown-ups who definitely know at least one other language. To conclude this, Peavlenko (2009) suggests that second language

learners might be children, teenagers or grown-ups. They may have the chance to reach their target language regularly, occasionally, or rarely. They may take classes, review alone, or acquire with different levels of consciousness. A few students will end up familiar with it and will be an accurate user of the language, others will accomplish lower levels of fluency and accuracy, or maybe become proficient in just a restricted scope of circumstances.

2.5. Mother Tongue Interference

Interference is the presentation of new structures or principles in a single language under impact from another where they are already present. At the point when there is overlapping of two codes then we say interference happened (Pavlenko, 1999). Interference is probable if the languages included are connected in a few aspects. For example, if the two languages have a similar word order and if the two languages included are likewise related syntactically, interference will be likely to occur (Pavlenko, 1999).

As Grosjean (1982) states "Interference is the involuntary influence of one language on the other". Interference is not a chosen action as borrowing and code-switching might be. Grosjean (2001) additionally suggests that interference is not a component to be accentuated on the youthful bilinguals. He says this is on the grounds that they are experiencing the procedure of language acquisition different from the grown-up who have acquired his/her first language. Kellerman (1977) has claimed that interference is constantly present in bilingualism and is more apparent the closer the languages are in their phonological and morphological aspects.

Keshavarz (1999) admits that interference can be because of fragmented acquirement. Interference can happen when a bilingual begins to utilize the two languages he has acquired independently. She additionally says that interference can occur just at border of the shared languages.

In the course of the most recent thirty years, analysts have dealt with mother tongue influence and additionally on writing competence (Demirezen, 2010) in order to discover the reasons for errors, grow powerful systems and along these lines to

advance composition aptitudes. To illustrate, Haryanto (2007) supported that structural borrowing from Thai language, for example, word order, subject-verb agreement, and noun determiners showed characteristics of first language syntactic transfer. Levels of language style and Thai social learning in written discourse exhibited characteristics of first language discourse transfer.

In a research Bhela (1999) resolved that while writing in the second language, students depend on their first language forms so as to create a reaction. Since the forms of first and second langauges involve contrasts, a moderately high error recurrence happening in the second language has been observed. In this manner, it demonstrates a first language interference on the second language.

Brown (1980) upheld the possibility of interference since he claimed that a significant number of challenges a target language student has with the phonology, vocabulary and grammar of L2 are because of the transfer of customs from first language. The components of first language are utilized inside setting of target language, bringing about errors in target language, as the structures of the languages, first and second languages are dissimilar.

Taking everything into account, because first language interference is not willful as different highlights of bilingualism or multilingualism seem to be, it is then not grammatical, and a deviation, not a variety of any language in which it happens. Interference is a deviation from the standards.

2.6. Contrastive Analysis

Transfer from the mother tongue was to be anticipated in circumstances of distinction between the first and the second language according to the CAH (Corder, 2000). As indicated by Corder (1983), contrastive researches are undertaken keeping in mind the end goal to find and a comprehensive contrastive investigation of the frameworks of the target language and the mother tongue of the student (Corder,1983, p.5). Corder says that because of this a stock of the fields of trouble would come. So, the student may commit extraordinary care and accentuation in his learning to the overcoming or staying away from the anticipated challenges.

2.7. Error

Corder suggests that learners commit an error when the deviation emerges because of the absence of knowledge (as cited in Ellis, 1997). That is, errors can be characterized as efficiently wrong utilization of linguistic forms or structures which are found in learner language.

2.8. Error Analysis

One method for recognizing errors in lexical, syntactic and prepositional use is EA. Above all, the word 'error' must be characterized. An error is a language occurence which is accidentally wrong and is not self-correctible by its creator (James, 1998:78). Brown considers the errors as either 'overt' or 'covert' (1994:208).

Bhela (1999) states that a comprehension of L1 linguistic form and the error types committed in target language and additionally the degree of first langauge and second langauge grammatical forms would help the instructing and learning process via providing a special educational program for every student. The educator will have the capacity to anticipate probable upcoming errors in the second language and might start to credit a reason to an error with a few degrees.

As indicated by Ellis (1997) EA was regarded as an option to CA. It is regarded as of significant worth in the classroom studies (Brown, 1994: 214). It additionally foresees the challenges of acquirement of a second language (Richards, 1974: 172). EA indicates " the significance of errors in learners' inter-language system" (Brown, 1994:204). Ellis and Richards et al claim that error analysis could be administered for academic aims (1994:51; 1993:127).

In the aspect of pragmatic classroom experience, EA will keep providing a tool through which the educator can evaluate learning and instructing and decide needs for upcoming achievement (Richards, 1974:15).

While examining errors, a precise clarification for all error types should be given that Selinker (1972) revealed as integral to second language learning: language transfer, transfer of training, techniques of second language learning, methodologies

of second language communication, and overgeneralization of TL [Target Language] linguistic material.

Error analysis enables educators to conquer the challenges students of English encounter in learning the language through making sense of the wellsprings of errors and, therefore, avoiding potential risk towards them. One might say that error analysis can be utilized to decide the student's need in learning.

2.9. Error Analysis Process

2.9.1. Learner Language Sample Collection

Researcher gathers written samples of students to obtain target data that can help in portraying learner language (Granger 1998). Through examination of original, pure information of students, scientists and educationalist can center around the language framework that students have in particular improvement process. This kind of analysis allows researchers to get informed about both the learner errors and learners' overall interlanguage (Granger 1998: p. 6).

2.9.2. Error Identification

While distinguishing errors, it is expected to make differentiation between "mistakes" and "errors". Brown (1987) asserts that errors happen not due to inadequacy in skill but rather on account of defect during the time spent creating discourse, which means mistake alludes to an inability to make utilization of known framework. Then again, errors can be considered as deviances that are because of lacking ability. It ought to be considered that students may likewise make mistakes in the utilization of language code.

Corder (1981) expressed that if there is vagueness about students' error or mistake, the most ideal approach to comprehend it by testing them with a tough assignment. If they accomplish the assignment, their inadequacy can be considered as mistakes, however in the event that they not, it can be considered as an error. In this manner, systematicity of mistakes gives analysts and educators an approach to perceive and distinguish student errors.

Corder (1981) presented the divergence between systematic and non-systematic errors. For non-systematic errors, Corder (1981) expressed that individuals make errors of some sort because of memory slips or physical state, for example, tiredness and mental conditions. These errors don't mirror an inadequacy in their own language. In the event that speaker corrects the error next time, these are called non-systematic errors, in other words, mistakes.

McDonough (1986) suggested that "systematic errors are those produced when the learner has formed some conception on the point of issue-a hypothesis which is, however, wrong in some way". These errors happen consistently and can't be rectified by the student; however, student can imply what he planned to mean.

2.9.3. Error Description

An exceptional instance of error examination is utilized as a part of request to portray the errors that student make. Synonymous expressions are compared and contrasted with students' mother tongue and the target language. That is, "wrong utterance" and "reproduced expression" are compared (Corder 1973). Brown (1980) specified about a noteworthy qualification between "overt" and "covert" errors. Overtly erroneous expressions are ungrammatical errors at the sentence level. On the other hand, grammatically well-formed but not interpretable expressions at the sentence level are called covertly erroneous.

2.9.4. Error Classification

According to the literature (Corder, 1974 Selinker, 1972) errors can be sorted grammatically, morphologically, lexically, syntactically, semantically, and organizationally. Investigation of the students' performances can exhibit an extensive variety of these kinds of errors. In grammatical category there are auxiliary verbs, tense, singular/plural nouns, possessive case, reported speech, relative clause, adjective and adverb, article, preposition, pronoun, conjunction errors. Affixation errors can be recorded under morphological classification. Errors coming about because of overgeneralization of rules, language transfer can likewise be viewed as morphological errors. Spelling errors, eggcorn (oronyms) errors, malformation errors

caused by language transfer, collocation errors caused by language transfer, overgeneralization of rules and transfer of training in lexical items can be recorded under the category of lexical errors. With regards to syntactic errors, language transfer and overgeneralization of standards are thought to be reasons for errors. Lastly, language transfer is the primary explanation behind semantic errors.

2.10. Sources of Errors

Errors show themselves in the students' written and verbal creation quickly. Various types of errors in students' generation of target language are portrayed and specified in literature (Corder 1967). In 1972, James named three wellsprings of errors: Interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and induced errors.

2.10.1. Language Transfer

2.10.1.1. Interlingual Transfer / L1 Interference

While second language creation, both langauge frameworks of L1 and L2 are initiated and looked in parallel; in this manner, if a speaker of second language plans to deliver a nominal expression in his or her second language, first language interpretation counterparts and their linguistic highlights are additionally enacted and may in this way interfere with second language production (Bordag, 2004). This interference raised the expression "interlanguage" to the literature of second or foreign language learning fields.

Selinker (1972) characterizes interlanguage as an organized semantic framework which is created by the student while learning a target language. Richards, Plott and Platt (1996) characterized "interlanguage" as a language type that has perspectives which are obtained, transferred and customized from the native language. Namely, target language students that are still learning a language deliver this type language. The interlanguage is thought to be separate semantic framework which is unique in relation to both the student's "native language" and the "target language", however connected to both by interlingual recognizable pieces of proof in the perception of the student. (Tarone, 2006)

2.10.1.1.1. The Interlanguage Hypothesis

Selinker presented the term 'interlanguage' in 1969 and expanded in 1972. Brown (2007) reveals insight into the term interlanguage by saying "just as children develop their language in gradual, systematic stages, adults, too, manifest a systematic progression of acquisition of sounds and words and structures and discourse features" (p.77). Brown (1994) proposes the interlanguage rule lets us know that second language students have a tendency to experience deliberate or semi precise formative process as they advance to full competence in the target language. Fruitful interlanguage improvement is in part an aftereffect of using input from others (p.77).

In light of his examination of learner language, Corder (1973) suggests four phases of interlanguage advancement. In the beginning stage, there are arbitrary errors which are also called presystematic errors. In this stage, student is just dubiously mindful of the way that there is some precise request to a specific class of things. This can be a phase of experimentation and speculating.

The second stage is rising stage in which students are slowly becoming more reliable in linguistic generation. Student has started to personalize certain principles however cannot correct mistakes when they are indicated or pinpointed by another person.

The third step is methodical step where student comes nearer to focus on language's linguistic framework. Student demonstrates more consistency in second language generation and can correct mistakes when she/he pinpointed out.

Last stage is stabilization phase which is also called post systematic stage. In this stage, errors diminish in number, and student becomes proficient in the structure of the second language. In particular, students have picked up the capacity to correct their mistakes individually.

As indicated by Brown (1994), second language may be overwhelmed at the initial periods of exposure by numerous negative transfers of mother tongue and

interference. Ellis (1997) supported while second language acquirement, interference happens in grammatical, lexical, and syntactic aspects.

Brown bolstered in these beginning periods, earlier arrangement of target language is well-known, the first language is the main syntactical order in past knowledge where the student could elicit (p. 213). Ellis (1997) expressed first language hinders the acquirement of a second langauge. Odlin (2002) characterized interference as the impact coming about because of likenesses and contrasts amidst the second language and the mother tongue.

Faerch and Kasper (1983) suggested that interference is a psycholinguistic procedure. In this procedure, second language students actuate their past language background in creating and utilizing their interlanguage. In spite of the fact that on a basic level transfer can happen two ways, we usually observe just one-way transference from mother tongue to the next one.

Demirezen (2010) suggested it is conceivable that the first language takes very special part in every single consequent language acquirement. Thus, negative transfer could just happen from the first language to all later learned languages, however not over those accordingly acquired ones. On the contrary, in the field, this notion is researched in four titles: negative transfer, positive transfer, avoidance, and overuse.

As indicated by Odlin (1989), interference errors may happen since student do not have the vital data in the second language or the attentional ability to enact the proper second-language routine. This kind of transfer is likewise called interference. While writing or speaking the target langauge (L2), second language students have a tendency to depend on their first language forms to create an answer. In the event that two language forms are particularly dissimilar, at that point a moderately high error recurrence could be expected to happen in second language, in this way showing a first language interference on the second language (Ellis, 1997). Lott (1983:256) characterizes transfer as native language errors.

Corder (1983) indicates that when the languages unique in structure, the danger of first language interference gets higher. Nonetheless, Faerch and Kasper (1983)

asserted individuals demonstrate more verbal transferrealted to things that are alike. So, it might pursue those languages with more similar structures (e.g. English and French) are more defenseless to shared interference than language with less similar characteristics (e.g. English and Japanese) (cited in Bhela 1999: 23).

Many scientists have conducted a great number of researches on interference in the most recent forty years. For instance, in their examination Gass and Selinker (1983) saw all target language students start with expecting that each word in the mother tongue has a solitary interpretation counterpart in the target language.

The only way a student could start conveying a message in the target language is believing the accuracy of word-for-word interpretation and contemplating in the first language (cited in Bhela 1999, p.30).

However, Demirezen (2010) proposed in his investigation that the foreign language leraners employ their mother tongue linguistic structures and the consequence of this application is the foundation of first language interference that means unavoidable interruption while learning a target language. He additionally included that an incredible part of pronunciation errors is because of inescapable native language pronunciation tendency, which show certain protection from the sounds of target language (p.73). They monitored that EFL learners experienced troubles in articulating definite sounds in English because there are no similar sounds in Turkish language. That is why, they had a tendency to articulate them in the norms of Turkish sound system.

Harayanto (2007) expressed there have been solid impacts of phonology transfer, since the sound systems of mother tongue is especially deep situated and hard to alter.

Still, L1 does not generally cause interference, at times in comparative languages it might cause positive transfer too, so it encourages learning. This is called positive transfer. As indicated by Brown (1994), "a learner for one reason or another avoids a particular sound, word, structure, or discourse category may be assumed incorrectly to have no difficulty therewith." (p.207).

In a few circumstances, when a student gains some new useful knowledge in the target language s/he may not know in which circumstance to utilize or how frequently to utilize. For example, utilizing 'thanks' time after time appears to overstate the circumstance or utilizing additional words or prepositions where superfluous, for example, 'I went to home'. In an examination on US English speakers learning Hebrew, Dulay and Burt (1983) discovered intriguing over-use impacts with expressions of excuse. In view of his research, he observed that English speaking students conveyed their immediate statements of excuse into Hebrew in a way that was fra from being native-like.

The investigation of interference relies extraordinarily on the orderly correlations of languages given by contrastive examinations (Odlin, 1989: 28). Odlin adds though numerous contrastive analyses give valuable and once in a while very discerning data about languages they study, none meets the necessities of descriptive and hypothetical sufficiency.

It is most likely that transfer forms a noteworthy issue and handicap in linguistic use among students of a target language. They can't resist allowing native language to interfere with the second language. Hence, a few errors are bearable for English speakers. Indeed, English native speakers have issues with certain structures, too.

2.10.1.1.2. The Mother Tongue Effect

As previously mentioned, interlanguage arrangement of the student depends on the information of first language and that of target language. People tend to transfer the structures and implications of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture when endeavoring to speak a second language (Çepni, 2014). This can be explained that first language impacts the learning of a second or foreign language.

The circumstance in which second language students utilize components of one language (native language) when utilizing another language (target language) is called language transfer. Behaviorist approach maintains that when students utilize the components of their native language, they apply positive or negative transfer on their

learning. For example, Lado (1964) asserts that while learning a second language a learner definitely has a broad knowledge of his first language, so this leads him to transfer from it. The transfer can turn out to be defended in light of the fact that the structure of the two languages is alike, so we get "positive transfer". On the other hand, it may proof invalid due to the fact that two languages are distinctive in form, so we get "negative transfer" – or interference.

As indicated by Selinker (1972), language transfer is one of the focal procedures which create what he calls fossilized capabilities, and which are integral to L2 learning forms. In this manner, language transfer causes the fossilization of interlanguage structures.

2.10.1.1.3. Fossilization

Selinker (1972) portrays fossilization as linguistic items, rules, and subsystems which speakers of a specific L1 tend to keep in their IL with respect to a specific TL, regardless of what the age of the student or measure of clarification and direction he gets in the TL (Selinker, 1972, p. 215). Selinker suggests that "fossilization" could be thought of confirmation for presence of interlanguage framework since learner language may differ phonologically, morphologically and syntactically from target language despite long periods of instruction and presentation of second language.

Tarone, (2006) puts forward that a focal feature for any interlanguage is its being fossilized—in other words, it stops to create eventually shy of full personality with the objective language. Hence, Bada (1993) brings up that IL is a linguistic framework which is free from the first language and the TL. Only like other languge frameworks, interlanguage is additionally an improvable linguistic structure having its own phases of development.

2.10.1.1.4. Intralingual Transfer

It is obvious that intralingual transfer is another major factor in adapting second/foreign language learning. In spite of the fact that beginning periods of language learning is described by a predominance of interference (Stenson, 1983), Brown (1980) states that students are likely to utilize more intralingual transfer when

they have started to get parts of the new framework. Richards (1974) claims that components students create reflect not the structure of the first language, but rather speculations in light of incomplete introduction to the target language (p.123). At the point when students start to learn parts of the new structure, they are prone to commit errors because of inconsistencies in the target language. These errors can be recorded under couple of classifications, for example, overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules and ignorance of rule restriction (Dictionary of Applied Linguistics, 2010). Thus, intralingual errors are made paying little respect to L1.

According to Dictionary of Applied Linguistics intralingual errors were named as overgeneralizations (errors caused by expansion of target language rules to wrong settings), simplifications (errors coming about because of students creating easier grammatical principles than the ones in the second language), developmental errors (mirroring normal phases of improvement), communication-based errors (errors coming about because of procedures of correspondence), induced errors, errors of avoidance (inability to utilize definite second language forms due to being excessively troublesome) (p.201).

Intra-lingual transfer has a significantly adverse impact on an English learner. Students of a target language in some cases make use of a few aspects of sentence structure in order to employ it on other wrong forms. Because of this, errors in the second language appear. Most of the studies that have been carried out up until now demonstrates that preposition misuse is principally induced by grammatical transfer, erroneous intake and using principles inaccurately. A few perspectives negate this platitude that prepositional errors are because of the multifaceted nature of the English language itself. Others state that the misuse or language errors can be identified with terrible instructing and resources, disregard, absence of training and inattention.

Indeed, mentalities shift extensively. The main mentality has the tendency that errors are unfortunate and, so, ought to be kept away, yet the other claims errors are unavoidable in a defective environment (Corder, 1981). In behaviorism, errors are portrayed as sins that ought to be evaded and unfortunate habits that ought not to be kept, yet in cognitivism, errors are seen as a component of the learning procedure. The

fundamental focal point of behaviorism supporters' strategies is on avoiding errors, while the focal point of the techniques for cognitivists is on scholarly investigations of the reasons for errors and methods for managing them. This justifies Faerch and Kasper's assertion (1983) that errors are peculiarities that are not proof of inconsiderateness or of unwillingness but rather of developing agonies and a longing to learn, not culpable offenses since they are mishaps (Faerch and Kasper, 1983). In reality they are a piece of the language learning process. People can't learn without making errors.

Krashen (1982) believe that the errors committed by students are the normal procedure in learning, and students will overcome this phase of interlanguage transfer and grow normally. First language transfer is one of many errors types students of target language commit. At the point when students of a target language utilize it, there are no other possibilities apart from applying to the mother tongue grammar.

2.10.1.1.5. Overgeneralization

Student expands the utilization of syntactic rule of a linguistic term beyond its acknowledged employments. This error type is discovered when the author gets familiar with a new structure in the target language, he/she at that point, accepts that the rule or structure works in any case (Gass and Selinker, 2001).

Overgeneralization may show up in various forms, for example, semantic, syntactic, morphological, or behavioral. At the point when students apply a few principles which are syntactically less complicated than target language, they have a tendency to clarify and shorten the target language. This procedure is called simplification. For example, a student may know a simple rule for structuring past tense, however s/he may not know special cases. S/he tends to create wrong structures, for example, teached, writed or comed. Errors are likewise caused by typical pattern of development. When students' linguistic ability starts to increase, these type of errors starts to vanish. That is why they are called developmental errors. (Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics" p:166).

2.10.1.1.6. Communication Strategy-Based Errors

Yang (2010) claims that errors involve holistic and analytic strategies. Students expect that if you can state X in the L2, at that point you should have the capacity to state Y. This can be found in various structures, for example, utilizing close equivalent words. The other alternative is to utilize an antonym or inverse, and fourth choice is to coin a word.

Explanatory techniques are utilized to express ideas in an indirect way. This is accomplished by evasion which utilizes implication rather than straightforward reference. The students distinguish at least one criteria properties of the referent and say these trying to allude to the thing being referred to.

2.10.1.1.7. Induced Errors

Stenson (1983) first utilized “induced errors” term to allude to student errors that come about more from the classroom circumstance than from either the learners' inadequate skill in English sentence structure or first language interference. James (1998) characterized this type of error as "material-induced errors, teacher-talk induced errors, and exercise based induced errors which are considered classroom-based error".

2.10.1.1.8. Errors of Avoidance

Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (2002) characterizes this technique as abstaining from utilizing a challenging word or structure when speaking or writing in a second/foreign language. Rather than utilizing challenging words, student utilizes more straightforward words. For instance, a learner who isn't sure of the utilization of the relative clause in English may abstain from utilizing it and utilize two more straightforward sentences: "This is my friend. His father is a doctor." instead of "This is my friend whose father is a doctor".

2.11. Error Analysis Approaches

Keshavarz (1999) expressed that there have been two fundamental ways to deal with the investigation of students' errors which are Contrastive Analysis and Error

Analysis. (p. 11). As indicated by Keshavarz, "Error Analysis" rose because of deficiencies of Contrastive Analysis. In contrastive analysis, created from behaviorist hypothesis, students' native language and target language are compared, that is; formal differences between first language and target language are investigated to anticipate errors. Corder (1983) calls attention to that identifying the distinctions would prompt a superior comprehension of the potential issues that a student of the specific L2 would confront. Nevertheless, Kim (2001) notices that Contrastive Analysis lost its capacity because of the fact that it prompts erroneous or uninformative anticipations of student errors, as errors did not happen where anticipated, but rather errors showed up where CA had not anticipated.

Worried about the unwavering quality of the CA study, analysts respected Error Analysis in 1970. Brown (1980) points out that the way in which students commit errors and these errors could be traced, investigated and categorized to uncover something of the framework working inside the student prompted a flood of investigation of students' errors, called 'error analysis'.

Error Analysis, characterized by Corder (1967), is a technique utilized by both analysts and educators which includes gathering samples of learner language, distinguishing the errors in the sample, portraying these errors, arranging them as indicated by their tendency and causes, and assessing their reality.

Studies handling with semantic errors are uncommon in writing. Al-Shormani and Yehia Ahmed Al-Sohbani (2012) issued an article called "Semantic Errors Committed by Yemeni University Learners: Classifications and Sources". They grouped semantic errors into many classifications and subcategories. They labelled 1388 semantic errors. They have discovered that "Omission of Letters Category" scores the most elevated number of errors while "Misselection of a Prefix Classification" is the least one.

2.12. Error Analysis Studies Around the World

Around the world, there have been numerous researches carried out on error analysis. Chamimah (2007) carried out a research on lexical errors of students of The

State Islamic University of Malang at Al-Hikmah Al-Fathimiyyah. She discovered 234 errors. The most noticeable error from the data was "distortion classification" with 136 errors, 72 errors in "formal miss election", and 26 errors in "miss formation".

Duskova (1969) studied lexical errors and discovered four sorts when she examined the compositions of 50 Czech postgraduate students: disorientation of words with formal comparability, close meaning, and misuse of words caused by one or a few counterparts amongst Czech and English, and distortions among lexical errors. She inferred that beginners had a tendency to make frame-based relations, while further developed students had a tendency to make meaning based relations.

Roos (1990) studied university students' syntactic errors in their compositions. She closed her investigation prescribing the utilization of remedial feedback which ought to be in the form of critical thinking exercises.

Kusumawati (2008) examined morphological errors in the compositions of the fifth semester students of English Letters and Language Department of UIN Malang. The consequence of this examination demonstrates that there are a lot of morphological errors in English students' written works. The scientist discovered a wide range of morphological errors in students' works, which are "Omission, addition, malformation and disordering". Based on the discoveries, she found that the most prevailing sort of morphological error is omission with 25 times utilization.

In his examination on morphological errors that students confer in their written works, Riantini (2011) expects to depict the kinds of morphological errors made by the students of SMPN 1 Kalibaru in the 2010/2011 academic year and the frequency of each sort of morphological errors. The outcomes demonstrate that there are four sorts of morphological errors in the compositions. The errors include plural inflection errors as many as 66 (56.41%), the third person singular verb inflection errors up to 26 (22.22 %), possessive inflection errors upwards of 7 (5.98 %), and present participle inflection errors as many as 18 (15.38). Furthermore, the most morphological error in compositions made by the students was the plural inflection errors as many as 56.41 % of entire errors.

Al-Shormani and Al-Sohbani (2012) carried out a research on semantic errors commited by second/foreign language students. They arranged semantic errors recognized in their research into three general classes: lexical, collocation and lexicogrammatical. Every one of these classifications is ordered into further classifications and subcategories relying upon the errors found. They labelled 1388 semantic errors and discovered that omission of letters classification scores the most noteworthy number of errors with a percentage of 18.08% while misselection of a prefix class is the most minimal with a percentage of 0.68%. It has likewise been discovered that L1 sources incorporate interpreting ideas, words and expressions literally from L1 into L2 and applying L1 structures to L2. In any case, L2 sources incorporate having false ideas about L2, inadequate learning of L2 semantic framework and perplexity about L2 vocabulary.

Haryanto (2007) studied syntactic errors on writings created by the twelfth-year students. He arranged the syntactic errors into seven categories. There were errors in creating verb group, errors in subject-verb agreement, errors in the utilization of articles, errors in the utilization of prepositions, errors in pluralization, errors in the utilization of pronouns, and errors in the utilization of conjunctions. He figured out that the learners made 235 syntactic errors which were characterized in 153 errors creating verbal groups, 3 errors in subject-verb agreement, 10 errors in the utilization of article, 30 errors in the utilization of preposition, 12 errors in noun pluralization, 23 errors in the utilization of pronoun, 4 errors in the utilization of conjunction.

2.13. Error Analysis Studies in Turkey

Saltık (1997) carried out a research to investigate and quickly clarify the primary linguistic issues of students of English experience in their written products. To understand this point, he dissected example articles of various first students at the Middle East Technical University.

The errors of the students were dissected by the recurrence they happened, to check whether they demonstrated certain attributes uncovering the idea of English proficiency they had. He discovered that the most dangerous zones are in the three fundamental areas of linguistics, orthography, lexico-semantics, and syntactico-

morphology. The errors in the initial two areas were generally made by physical science students while those in syntactico-morphology were regularly made by sociology students. The judgment come out of the research of error analysis can suggest a few proposals to the teaching of these points.

Gürsel (1998) dissected student errors to examine and arrange the works of students in Department of Foreign Languages. He discovered that the most challenging area for Turkish students of English is morphology. Syntax was observed to be the second most troublesome field. The third tough area was prepositions. The research also centered around wellsprings of errors and uncovered that the intralingual errors were more than interlingual errors.

Yılmaz (2004) conducted a research to attract consideration regarding the errors that happen in the utilization of collocations and idioms in sentence translation from Turkish into English with an exceptional accentuation on Error Analysis. In view of the information, she found that most errors were intralingual. A large portion of the errors were because of overgeneralization and false concepts. Just a little measure of errors were interlanguage errors which are caused by first language interferenece. It is clear that language students have issues of lexical connections, collocations, limitations, information on colloquial expressions, which means, sense relations and word choice.

In his study called Error-Analysis Based Second Language Teaching Strategies, Şanal (2008) asserts that correcting the students' errors is of crucial importance to let them acquire the correct forms of the target language swiftly. He also suggests the instructors should be attentive to the fact that all language practice must be devoted to the spots of language use that pose serious learning problems. According to Şanal, instructors will highly benefit from conducting errors analysis studies in the classroom. He concluded that "errors are no longer seen as "unwanted forms", instead errors can be accepted as an indication of some kind of learning activity taking place in the learner."

Sığınç (2008) examined errors in compositions of elementary school students to portray kinds and wellsprings of errors in language learning and teaching process in a foreign language setting and to display the formative procedure of language students' advance through their written performances. Based on the information gathered, she labelled thirteen diverse error categories. These include article, missing copula, wrong word choice, overgeneralization, spelling, wrong pronoun, missing subject, wrong word order, subject-verb agreement, rule-restriction, missing preposition, missing verb, and L1 transfer errors. Her investigation showed that the vast majority of the learners' errors rise up when they are in the 7th grade and diminishing in 8th grade. The outcomes likewise demonstrate that linguistic reasons for errors depend on two classifications: interlingual and intralingual.

Kırkgöz (2009) examined the kinds of composed errors in a corpus of 120 papers submitted by 86 Turkish students who were starters in English. She discovered that there was a transcendence of interlingual errors.

In her investigation, Erkaya (2012) considered errors in a corpus of 17 English papers composed by 17 Turkish learners. The researceher distinguished the errors in vocabulary, sentence structure and grammar. She sorted errors as gloabl and local and found that word choice errors comprised a large portion of the global errors which hindered comprehension.

Atmaca (2016) researched the sorts and recurrence of students' composed errors in their final examination. She contemplated the errors of the students in their end of the year test and found that students submitted errors in regard prepositions, verbs, articles, sentence structure, punctuation, gerunds, pluralism, possessives, tense structure, and word choice.

CHAPTER III

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This section includes the research design, portrayal of the partcipants, instrumentation, data collection method, and data analysis. This research intends to explore source and kind of potential learner errors in their written products.

3.2. Research Design

In respect to Jarvis (2000) and Odlin (2003) present research employs the comparative approach to compare and contrast the linguistic forms of learner's first language, second language and interlanguage (IL). After analyzing learner's IL structures according to the comparison made between Turkish and English, examples of mother tongue interference at lexical and syntactical degrees will be labelled and identified.

This research is planned as descriptive study, which intends to discover errors in EFL learners' written materials in a formal educational setting. As Best and Kahn (2006, p.113) state descriptive research attempts to discover answers to question by investigating occasions and conditions that happened earlier and the researcher just chooses important factors for an analysis. As the definition suggests, descriptive research configuration best fits for this research.

3.3. Setting and Participants

This study was carried out among English Preparatory Students at a private university in Central Anatolia in Turkey in order to find out the extent to which mother tongue interference is certain at lexical and syntactical levels in English.

In this study, the level of mother tongue interference at lexical and syntactical degrees is analyzed independently based on the learners' level of English. In this research, twelve different classes at a private university, consisting of approximately twenty students in each, at different levels of English, took part to prove how mother tongue interference is evident in English. All the English Preparatory classes in 2016-

2017 Academic Year were included in the study according to the target language levels which are Elementary, Pre-intermediate and Intermediate.

There were 252 participants after eliminating non-native Turkish speakers out of 268. The students took this education under a program run by English Preparatory School at a private university in Central Anatolia in Turkey. In this program, students get an education of at least 4 quarters and each quarter comprises of 8 weeks. Each week students get 27 hours of English in four skills. The same coursebook is used by all the students in the program. Therefore, the risk of mother tongue interference owing to material use is removed.

3.4. Data Collection Tools

During the academic year, the students learn how to write a paragraph and types of it and then comes writing short essay and essay types.

Students' written performances both as a paragraph and an essay were examined to find out errors related to language transfer. When analyzed, their errors were categorized in lexical and syntactical degrees; word choice, verb tense, pluralization, preposition addition, preposition omission, preposition misuse. Hence, for the vocabulary and grammar parts, items were selected from the students' written performances. The selection was done according to 'The General Service List (GSL)' (West, 1953), which includes the most widely useful 2,000 word families in English. West (1953) used a range of criteria, which are frequency, ease of learning, coverage of useful concepts, and stylistic level, to choose these words. Moreover, as the vocabulary criteria, Academic Word List (AWL), which includes 570 headwords emerging with high frequency in academic textbooks across a range of disciplines, was used.

3.5. Data Collection Procedure

The data have been provided from English Preparatory School students' Third Quarter Final Writing Exam. The program is run by English Preparatory School at a private university in Central Anatolia. Until the right time to get the data, students were instructed for at least 8 weeks in order to write an accurate paragraph. For the higher levels, the students were taught how to write an essay in different types for at least 8 weeks to create comprehensible, high quality short essays. All of these were a part of necessary procedure that needs to be followed in accordance with the curriculum. Therefore, students were not instructed to create any data solely for the research. As usual, they took their regular quarterly final writing exam.

Each pre-intermediate student was supposed to write a paragraph made up of 110-120 words regarding the instructions and topics given in their exam paper. However, each intermediate student was supposed to write a short essay consisting of four paragraphs and 250-270 words according to the instructions and topics given in their exam paper. Necessary permission and approval were taken from the University Research Ethics Committee in order to get a copy of 268 English Preparatory Class students' final writing papers.

3.6. Data Analysis

Qualitative data were examined through content analysis. Numbers were given to every participant and also letter "A" was ascribed to paragraphs while letter "B" is credited to essays. Every content was dissected word by word and sentence by sentence to spot idiosyncratic statements. Subsequent to recognizing the utterances, they were investigated again to distinguish and code the sorts of errors. Corder's algorithm was utilized here to recognize errors.

The researcher analyzed and coded the data twice at different times in order to make sure of the intra-rater reliability. After a while, another coder, who had at least ten years experience in teaching and classroom management experience, evaluated the data using the same codes to ensure inter-rater reliability.

As the accompanying advance of the investigation, error types were sorted, and their frequencies were inscribed. Relying on the literature (Corder, 1974; Selinker, 1972) errors could be classified grammatically, morphologically, lexically, syntactically, and semantically. Evaluations of the students' written performances can show an extensive variety of these sorts of errors. Grammatical classification includes errors in auxiliary verbs, tense, pluralization, possessive case, reported speech, relative clause, adjective and adverb, article, preposition, pronoun, conjunction etc.

Affixation errors can be recorded under morphological class. Errors coming about because of overgeneralization of standards, language transfer can likewise be viewed as morphological errors. One can record spelling errors, eggcorn (oronyms) errors, malformation errors induced by language transfer, collocation errors induced by language transfer and overgeneralization of standards under lexical errors category.

With regards to syntactic errors, language transfer and overgeneralization of principles are thought to be reasons for errors. Eventually, language transfer is the fundamental cause of semantic errors. Moreover, in 1972, James distinguished three wellsprings of errors: Interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and induced errors.

There were a few stages in applying the error analysis to evaluate the data gathered. The accompanying steps depended on the system expressed by Corder as cited by Ellis (1994: 48). The phases are introduced below:

1. Sample Collection:
   Choosing what tests of language student to utilize for the investigation and how to gather them together
2. Error Identification:
   Distinguishing the errors by examining the errors the student committed thoroughly
3. Error Classification:
   Gathering the errors inspected and expressing the groups of the errors

4. Explanation of errors:
   Clarifying the errors by building up the wellspring of the errors and ascertaining how frequently the mistakes show up

Concerning the phases of error analysis concept above, the data were analyzed as follows:

3.6.1. Identification of errors

In this progression, the researcher examined the gathered data and endeavored to discover the lexical and syntactical errors. He attempted to investigate the information as objective as he could.

3.6.2. Classification of errors

When the researcher identified the errors, he classified them in the following categories:

a. word choice errors

b. verb tense errors

c. pluralization errors

d. preposition addition errors

e. preposition omission errors

f. preposition misuse errors

3.6.3. Calculation of errors

In this step, the researcher calculated the errors to know how frequent the Turkish EFL learners committed those errors.

3.6.4. Tabulating the result

When the researcher figured out and organized the errors, he showed the results on a table. This table was intended to simplify the description of the percentage of each error. In this way, the consequence of the investigation of the syntactical and lexical errors in paragraphs and essays written by Turkish EFL learners were displayed as a table.

3.6.5. Drawing a conclusion

In the last phase, the researcher would make an inference in view of the research. In this progression, he needed to make a legitimate conclusion as a concise error analysis.

CHAPTER IV

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

Section four presents the results and discoveries of the research that have been acquired through error analysis of Turkish EFL learners' written products. This part portrays the detailed examination of structures that are observed to be transfer influenced. Results are arranged to be presented one by one with all the statistical findings.

There were six classifications that rose up out of the data gathered. The L1 induced errors included tenses; preposition addition, preposition omission, preposition misuse; pluralism and word choice. At that point, the findings will be interpreted and exemplified for comprehensive discussion.

4.2. Word Choice

This sort of interference is seen when a language particle in the learner's first language interferes with a particle in the second language. Lexical interference of the mother tongue can turn out to be clearer when the learner translates idioms, proverbs and phrasal verbs word by word as in the accompanying examples:

I loved my *episode* at university. (*department*)

I sat *per computer*. (*in front of a computer*)

The nurse *fainted* me. (*anesthetized*)

After day, we went to a café. (*The next*)

We *rode* a car. (*drive*)

I was *turning* from my school. (*return*)

My friends *made a birthday*. (*had a birthday party*)

Table 1. One-way Anova Test of Word Choice Errors
Word Choice

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	89,02	5	17,80	3,82	,002
Within Groups	1143,94	246	4,65		
Total	1232,96	251			

The statistical analysis determined by one-way Anova revealed that there was a highly significant difference between groups (F (5,246) = 3.82, p= .002<.05) in terms of the dependent variable of Word Choice.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Word Choice Error
Word Choice

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
upperb1	29	3,34	3,41	,63	2,05	4,64	0	13
midb1	46	2,02	2,63	,38	1,24	2,80	0	10
lowerb1	48	1,85	2,42	,35	1,15	2,56	0	10
uppera2	43	1,58	1,59	,24	1,09	2,07	0	7
mida2	44	1,41	1,08	,16	1,08	1,74	0	5
lowera2	42	1,33	1,31	,20	,92	1,74	0	5
Total	252	1,85	2,21	,14	1,57	2,12	0	13

According to the data gathered, it is seen that Word Choice error was committed by each group as shown in the Table 2 above. The Word Choice error was most frequently committed by Class Upper B1 with a mean of 3,34 while the one committing the fewest Word Choice errors was the Class Lower A2. A notable result Table 2 demonstrates is that the highest level of B1 classes had the highest mean, and the lowest level of A2 classes had the lowest mean of this type of error, which revealed that the quantity of means increased with the advancing proficiency levels.

Table 3. Multiple Comparisons of Word Choice Error
Dependent Variable: Word choice
Gabriel

(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
upperb1	midb1	1,32	,51	,13	-,18	2,82
	lowerb1	1,49*	,50	,04	,00	2,98
	uppera2	1,76*	,51	,01	,24	3,29
	mida2	1,93*	,51	,00	,42	3,45
	lowera2	2,01*	,52	,00	,48	3,54
midb1	upperb1	-1,32	,51	,13	-2,82	,18
	lowerb1	,16	,44	1,00	-1,15	1,48
	uppera2	,44	,45	,99	-,91	1,79
	mida2	,61	,45	,94	-,73	1,96
	lowera2	,68	,46	,88	-,67	2,05
lowerb1	upperb1	-1,49*	,50	,04	-2,98	,00
	midb1	-,16	,44	1,00	-1,48	1,15
	uppera2	,27	,45	1,00	-1,06	1,61
	mida2	,44	,45	,99	-,88	1,77
	lowera2	,52	,45	,98	-,82	1,87
uppera2	upperb1	-1,76*	,51	,01	-3,29	-,24
	midb1	-,44	,45	,99	-1,79	,91
	lowerb1	-,27	,45	1,00	-1,61	1,06
	mida2	,17	,46	1,00	-1,19	1,54
	lowera2	,24	,46	1,00	-1,13	1,63
mida2	upperb1	-1,93*	,51	,00	-3,45	-,42
	midb1	-,61	,45	,94	-1,96	,73
	lowerb1	-,44	,45	,99	-1,77	,88
	uppera2	-,17	,46	1,00	-1,54	1,19
	lowera2	,07	,46	1,00	-1,30	1,45
lowera2	upperb1	-2,01*	,52	,00	-3,54	-,48
	midb1	-,68	,46	,88	-2,05	,67
	lowerb1	-,52	,45	,98	-1,87	,82
	uppera2	-,24	,46	1,00	-1,63	1,13
	mida2	-,07	,46	1,00	-1,45	1,30

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

A Gabriel Post Hoc Test revealed that there was a significant difference between Upper B1 and Lower B1(p=0.04) regarding the dependent variable of word choice errors. In addition, the comparison of the Upper B1 and Upper A2 turned out to be significant (p=.01<0.05). In the comparison of Upper B1, Mid A2 and Lower A2, it is seen that they had a high significance of difference (p=.00). Mid B1 was compared to the remaining groups revealing no statistically significant difference.

For the participants it was word choice errrors that led to biggest problems such as misunderstanding and incomprehensibility. A couple of times the researcher couldn't make sense of what the student endeavored to state but not constantly as he was a native speaker of Turkish. The outcomes of the present research bolster those of Darus and Subramaniam's (2009) which affirmed learners' absence of appropriate words.

The same was valid for some of Kırkgöz' (2009) illustrations taken from students' written materials. The students translated the words from Turkish into English, yet they didn't avert understanding as Kırkgöz was a native speaker of Turkish. If she had not been a native speaker of Turkish, the selection of words may have brought about misconception. In addition, the present research underpins Rabab'ah's (2005) study. In the light of his experience in teaching English majors, Rabab'ah expressed that Jordanian learners "lack[ed] the necessary vocabulary they need[ed] to get their meaning across" (p. 183).

4.3. Verb Tense

Another type of error that is observed in the students' essays is verb tense error. They, for the most part, neglected to pick the right time expression to characterize the activity and they utilized irregular verbs inaccurately. In this part learners, most of the time, utilize a wrong tense which caused a lack of success in passing on a message. The following examples illustrates this type of error. The real wellspring of errors in the accompanying examples is that in English, present simple tense is utilized to express these circumstances, while in Turkish present continuous tense is utilized.

I *am living* in Konya for 12 years. (*live*)

How *are* you *feeling*? (to ask for opinion) (*do you feel*)

They *are loving* their children. (*love*)

He *is wanting* to pass university exam. (*wants*)

I'*m coming* early in the mornings. (repeated action) (*come*)

Table 4. One-way Anova Test
Verb Tense

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	18,25	5	3,65	4,26	,001
Within Groups	210,42	246	,85		
Total	228,67	251			

An analysis of variance (Anova) yielded significant variation between groups (F (5,246) = 4,26, p= .001<.05) regarding the dependent variable of Verb Tense.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Verb Tense Error
Verb Tense

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
upperb1	29	,79	1,89	,35	,07	1,51	0	7
midb1	46	,09	,41	,06	-,04	,21	0	2
lowerb1	48	,58	1,16	,16	,25	,92	0	6
uppera2	43	,05	,21	,03	-,02	,11	0	1
mida2	44	,07	,25	,03	-,01	,15	0	1
lowera2	42	,36	,90	,14	,07	,64	0	5
Total	252	,30	,95	,06	,18	,42	0	7

As Table 5 revealed, Verb Tense error occurred in each group. It is shown in the table that Verb Tense error appeared in Class Upper B1 with the highest mean (,79); the second highest mean belonged to Class Lower B1 (,58). On the other hand, Class Upper A2 had the lowest mean of this kind of error (,05). Finally, it is also shown in the table that B1 classes committed a lot more errors than A2 classes in total (B1: 2,27; A2: 0,48).

Table 6. Multiple Comparisons of Verb Tense Errors
Dependent Variable: Verb Tense
Gabriel

(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
upperb1	midb1	,70*	,21	,02	,06	1,35
	lowerb1	,21	,21	,99	-,43	,85
	uppera2	,74*	,22	,01	,09	1,40
	mida2	,72*	,22	,01	,07	1,38
	lowera2	,43	,22	,53	-,22	1,09
midb1	upperb1	-,70*	,21	,02	-1,35	-,06
	lowerb1	-,49	,19	,13	-1,06	,07
	uppera2	,04	,19	1,00	-,54	,62
	mida2	,01	,19	1,00	-,56	,60
	lowera2	-,27	,19	,93	-,85	,31
lowerb1	upperb1	-,21	,21	,99	-,85	,43
	midb1	,49	,19	,13	-,07	1,06
	uppera2	,53	,19	,08	-,04	1,11
	mida2	,51	,19	,11	-,06	1,09
	lowera2	,22	,19	,98	-,35	,80
uppera2	upperb1	-,74*	,22	,01	-1,40	-,09
	midb1	-,04	,19	1,00	-,62	,54
	lowerb1	-,53	,19	,08	-1,11	,04
	mida2	-,02	,19	1,00	-,61	,56
	lowera2	-,31	,20	,85	-,90	,28
mida2	upperb1	-,72*	,22	,01	-1,38	-,07
	midb1	-,01	,19	1,00	-,60	,56
	lowerb1	-,51	,19	,11	-1,09	,06
	uppera2	,02	,19	1,00	-,56	,61
	lowera2	-,28	,20	,90	-,88	,30
lowera2	upperb1	-,43	,22	,53	-1,09	,22
	midb1	,27	,19	,93	-,31	,85
	lowerb1	-,22	,19	,98	-,80	,35
	uppera2	,31	,20	,85	-,28	,90
	mida2	,28	,20	,90	-,30	,88

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Multiple comparisons test of Verb Tense error supported that there was a significant difference between Upper B1 and Mid B1 classes (p=.02). The table demonstrates that high differences were between Upper B1, Upper A2 and Mid A2 classes (p=.01<.05). It is also seen that Upper B1 and Lower B1 had a similarity

(p=.99). The second notable high resemblance was between Mid B1, Upper A2 and Mid A2 (p=1.00>.05). Moreover, another considerable similarity was between classes Lower B1 and Lower A2 (p=.98).

Verb tense was not an exceptionally repeated error in students' papers. In Turkish and in English, the tenses are some way or another comparable. Some of the time, however, they are not utilized similarly in the two languages, and that might be the reason why problems happen. The following are the verb tenses in Turkish language: present, present progressive, future, definite past, indefinite past, necessity, subjunctive, conditional, and imperative.

The present perfect tense in English language is the only tense that Turkish language does not reserve. The illustration shown above might be an issue of perplexity of tenses or because Turkish does not involve the aforementioned tense. Because of this difference an English native speaker utters, "I have lived in Konya for 12 years," a Turkish native speaker utters, "I am living in Konya for 12 years."

Nevertheless, the students from Thailand in Bennui's (2008) study claimed that in Thai, there was no time and tense connection, which means time indicates what the speaker intend to say. The verb form kept as before regardless of the time- - present, past, future, and so forth. One of Haryanto's (2007) students expressed: "First, it **makes** me love (to) read when I **was young until future** I read books." Bennui (2008) clarified that the learner utilized the present simple tense in a sentence that was in the past. The student likewise utilized the future word "to express a future in the past" (p. 85).

4.4. Pluralization (Singular-Plural Noun Agreement)

In student essays these pluralization errors have been observed. In the cases below, it is clear that learners are employing a grammatical structure which exists in mother tongue to the second language. Regarding "four days" or "two hours", pluralization is not applied on the nouns according to Turkish grammar rules. This rule of Turkish language contradicts the one in English language.

We stayed *four day. (four days)*

The concert lasted about *two hour*. *(two hours)*

That days were so great. *(Those days)*

I am young *people. (I am a young person.)*

Table 7. One-way Anova Test
Pluralization

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27,06	5	5,41	8,02	,00
Within Groups	165,92	246	,67		
Total	192,98	251			

According to the Table 7, there is a highly significant difference between groups (F (5,246) =8,02, p=.00<.05) considering the Pluralization Errors.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Pluralization Error
Pluralization

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
upperb1	29	1,24	1,48	,27	,68	1,80	0	6
midb1	46	,76	,92	,13	,49	1,04	0	5
lowerb1	48	,40	,79	,11	,17	,63	0	4
uppera2	43	,33	,60	,09	,14	,51	0	2
mida2	44	,25	,53	,08	,09	,41	0	2
lowera2	42	,21	,47	,07	,07	,36	0	2
Total	252	,49	,87	,05	,38	,60	0	6

As shown in the table above, each group had pluralization errors. However, the highest mean was in the Class Upper B1 (1.24). It is seen that the means of Mid A2 and Lower A2 are really close to each other (.25;.21). Despite the similarity between these two components, the upgoing number of means shows that learners committed more pluralization errors as their proficiency level got higher (Lower A2: ,21< Upper B1: 1,24).

Table 9. Multiple Comparisons of Pluralization Errors
Dependent Variable: Pluralization
Gabriel

(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
upperb1	midb1	,48	,19	,20	-,10	1,06
	lowerb1	,84*	,19	,00	,27	1,42
	uppera2	,91*	,20	,00	,33	1,50
	mida2	,99*	,19	,00	,41	1,58
	lowera2	,97*	,20	,00	,39	1,57
midb1	upperb1	-,48	,19	,20	-1,06	,10
	lowerb1	,36	,17	,40	-,14	,87
	uppera2	,43	,17	,19	-,09	,96
	mida2	,51	,17	,05	-,01	1,03
	lowera2	,49	,17	,07	-,03	1,02
lowerb1	upperb1	-,84*	,19	,00	-1,42	-,27
	midb1	-,36	,17	,40	-,87	,14
	uppera2	,07	,17	1,00	-,45	,59
	mida2	,14	,17	,99	-,37	,66
	lowera2	,13	,17	1,00	-,39	,65
uppera2	upperb1	-,91*	,20	,00	-1,50	-,33
	midb1	-,43	,17	,19	-,96	,09
	lowerb1	-,07	,17	1,00	-,59	,45
	mida2	,07	,17	1,00	-,45	,60
	lowera2	,06	,18	1,00	-,47	,60
mida2	upperb1	-,99*	,19	,00	-1,58	-,41
	midb1	-,51	,17	,05	-1,03	,01
	lowerb1	-,14	,17	,99	-,66	,37
	uppera2	-,07	,17	1,00	-,60	,45
	lowera2	-,01	,18	1,00	-,54	,52
lowera2	upperb1	-,97*	,20	,00	-1,57	-,39
	midb1	-,49	,17	,07	-1,02	,03
	lowerb1	-,13	,17	1,00	-,65	,39
	uppera2	-,06	,18	1,00	-,60	,47
	mida2	,01	,180	1,00	-,52	,54

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

A Gabriel Multiple Comparisons Test of Pluralization error showed that there was a noteworthy difference between Upper B1 Class and the rest of the groups (p=.00<.05) except for the Mid B1 (p=.20). In addition, Mid B1 and Mid A2 had a significant difference (p=.05). It should also be noted down that there was a considerable resemblance between Lower B1 and all the A2 classes.

It is obvious that singular/plural noun agreement errors in students' essays were induced by mother tongue interference. In the Turkish language, a noun that comes

after expressions/words, for example, a lot of, various, many, and any number more than one, does not need the plural marker. That is why learners had numerous errors in pluralization when they utilized the expressions/words above, as appeared in the illustrations.

The present examination bolsters Kırkgöz' (2009) discoveries. As a native speaker of Turkish, she demonstrates some cases of the Turkish rule and students' errors: "He is drinking three cup of coffee. We have a big garden and three dog. There is two telephone on the table. There is a few apple in the basket".

4.5. Prepositional Interference

In this research, participants committed prepositional errors under three categories: addition of wrong preposition, omission of the preposition, misuse of the preposition.

4.5.1. Preposition Addition (Adding the Wrong Preposition)

The participants committed following samples of preposition addition errors:

He promised *to* me.

I went *to* home.

We went to *in* hospital.

It's impossible *for* to forget it.

I went *to* near my house.

Table 10. One-way Anova Test
Preposition Addition

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4,998	5	1,00	,95	,44
Within Groups	256,891	246	1,04		
Total	261,889	251			

According to the One-way Anova test results, there were no statistically differences between any of the groups in terms of the dependent variable of Preposition Addition (Adding the Wrong Preposition) Errors (F (5,246) =. 95, p=.44>.05).

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics of Preposition Addition Errors

Preposition Addition

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
upperb1	29	,59	,73	,13	,31	,86	0	2
midb1	46	,43	,83	,12	,19	,68	0	4
lowerb1	48	,63	1,29	,18	,25	1,00	0	7
uppera2	43	,58	,82	,12	,33	,83	0	3
mida2	44	,89	1,26	,19	,50	1,27	0	5
lowera2	42	,55	,91	,14	,26	,83	0	3
Total	252	,61	1,02	,06	,48	,74	0	7

The output of Descriptive Statistics puts forward that Preposition Addition Error was committed by each group in the study. This type of error was most frequently committed by Class Mid A2 (.89); least frequently by Mid B1(.43).

Table 12. Multiple Comparisons Preposition Addition
Dependent Variable: Preposition Addition
Gabriel

(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
upperb1	midb1	,15	,24	1,00	-,56	,86
	lowerb1	-,03	,24	1,00	-,74	,67
	uppera2	,00	,24	1,00	-,72	,73
	mida2	-,30	,24	,97	-1,02	,42
	lowera2	,03	,24	1,00	-,69	,76
midb1	upperb1	-,15	,24	1,00	-,86	,56
	lowerb1	-,19	,21	,99	-,81	,43
	uppera2	-,14	,21	1,00	-,79	,49
	mida2	-,45	,21	,42	-1,09	,19
	lowera2	-,11	,21	1,00	-,76	,53
lowerb1	upperb1	,03	,24	1,00	-,67	,74
	midb1	,19	,21	,99	-,43	,81
	uppera2	,04	,21	1,00	-,59	,68
	mida2	-,26	,21	,97	-,89	,37
	lowera2	,07	,21	1,00	-,56	,72
uppera2	upperb1	-,00	,24	1,00	-,73	,72
	midb1	,14	,21	1,00	-,49	,79
	lowerb1	-,04	,21	1,00	-,68	,59
	mida2	-,30	,21	,93	-,95	,34
	lowera2	,03	,22	1,00	-,62	,69
mida2	upperb1	,30	,24	,97	-,42	1,02
	midb1	,45	,21	,42	-,19	1,09
	lowerb1	,26	,21	,97	-,37	,89
	uppera2	,30	,21	,93	-,34	,95
	lowera2	,33	,22	,86	-,31	,99
lowera2	upperb1	-,03	,24	1,00	-,76	,69
	midb1	,11	,21	1,00	-,53	,76
	lowerb1	-,07	,21	1,00	-,72	,56
	uppera2	-,03	,22	1,00	-,69	,62
	mida2	-,33	,22	,86	-,99	,31

A Gabriel Post Hoc Test revealed a similarity between individual groups of different classes having different proficiency levels. The table above shows that all the groups had this type of error, but there was not a considerable difference in the number of means to reveal the source group leading the variation.

4.5.2. Preposition Omission

The students made the following samples of preposition omission errors:

He smiled me. (smiled *at* me)

I looked the results. (looked *at* the results)

Some people waited the concert. (waited *for* the concert)

I listened Metallica song. (listen *to* Metallica song)

He shared it the social media. (shared *on* the social media)

Table 13. One-way Anova Test

Preposition Omission

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2,93	5	,58	,33	,88
Within Groups	425,96	246	1,73		
Total	428,90	251			

The statistical analysis determined by One-way Anova brought out that there was no significant difference between groups (F (5,246) =.33, p=.88>.05) concerning Preposition Omission Errors.

Table 14. Descriptive Statistics of Preposition Omission Errors

Preposition Omission

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
upperb1	29	1,10	1,93	,35	,37	1,84	0	10
midb1	46	,98	1,35	,20	,58	1,38	0	5
lowerb1	48	,92	1,44	,20	,50	1,34	0	8
uppera2	43	,91	,99	,15	,60	1,21	0	5
mida2	44	,89	1,08	,16	,56	1,22	0	3
lowera2	42	,71	1,08	,16	,38	1,05	0	4
Total	252	,91	1,30	,08	,75	1,07	0	10

It is shown by descriptive statistics that each group in the study had Preposition Omission Errors. Mean differences were distributed according to the proficiency levels. To illustrate, the highest mean belonged to the Class Upper B1 (1,10) whereas this type of error was least frequently committed by Lower A2 (.71). So, it is seen that mean differences go up with the growing proficiency levels showing higher levels committed more errors.

Table 15. Multiple Comparisons Of Preposition Omission Errors
Dependent Variable: Preposition Omission
Gabriel

(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
upperb1	midb1	,12	,31	1,00	-,79	1,04
	lowerb1	,18	,30	1,00	-,72	1,09
	uppera2	,19	,31	1,00	-,73	1,13
	mida2	,21	,31	1,00	-,71	1,14
	lowera2	,38	,31	,97	-,55	1,32
midb1	upperb1	-,12	,31	1,00	-1,04	,79
	lowerb1	,06	,27	1,00	-,74	,86
	uppera2	,07	,27	1,00	-,75	,90
	mida2	,09	,27	1,00	-,73	,91
	lowera2	,26	,28	,99	-,57	1,09
lowerb1	upperb1	-,18	,30	1,00	-1,09	,72
	midb1	-,06	,27	1,00	-,86	,74
	uppera2	,01	,27	1,00	-,81	,83
	mida2	,03	,27	1,00	-,78	,84
	lowera2	,20	,27	1,00	-,62	1,02
uppera2	upperb1	-,19	,31	1,00	-1,13	,73
	midb1	-,07	,27	1,00	-,90	,75
	lowerb1	-,01	,27	1,00	-,83	,81
	mida2	,02	,28	1,00	-,81	,85
	lowera2	,19	,28	1,00	-,65	1,04
mida2	upperb1	-,21	,31	1,00	-1,14	,71
	midb1	-,09	,27	1,00	-,91	,73
	lowerb1	-,03	,27	1,00	-,84	,78
	uppera2	-,02	,28	1,00	-,85	,81
	lowera2	,17	,28	1,00	-,67	1,01
lowera2	upperb1	-,38	,31	,97	-1,32	,55
	midb1	-,26	,28	,99	-1,09	,57
	lowerb1	-,20	,27	1,00	-1,02	,62
	uppera2	-,19	,28	1,00	-1,04	,65
	mida2	-,17	,28	1,00	-1,01	,67

Multiple comparisons test of Preposition Omission put forward that groups do not differ significantly. According to the table, this error type was committed by all the groups, but none of them stepped forward to create a significant difference within the participant components.

4.5.3. Preposition Misuse

The prepositional misuse samples comprise of the precedents below.

I started university *at* Ankara. (*in*)

I fell in love *to* her. (*with*)

She was dead *in* 8th April. (*on*)

Table 16. One-way Anova Test
Preposition Misuse

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	16,63	5	3,32	2,43	,03
Within Groups	336,63	246	1,36		
Total	353,27	251			

One-way Anova Test claimed that there is a remarkable difference between groups (F (5,246) = 2,43, p=.03<.05) regarding the dependent variable of Preposition Misuse Errors.

Table 17. Descriptive Statistics of Preposition Misuse Errors
Preposition Misuse

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
upperb1	29	1,10	1,291	,240	,61	1,59	0	4
midb1	46	,78	1,073	,158	,46	1,10	0	3
lowerb1	48	,75	1,896	,274	,20	1,30	0	11
uppera2	43	,70	,860	,131	,43	,96	0	3
mida2	44	,48	,792	,119	,24	,72	0	3
lowera2	42	,21	,520	,080	,05	,38	0	2
Total	252	,65	1,186	,075	,50	,80	0	11

As shown in the table above, preposition misuse error occurred in each group. It is seen that Preposition Misuse Errors' mean differences were distributed rationally according to the proficiency levels. This type of error was most frequently committed by Upper B1 (1,10) and the mean difference decreased gradually down to Lower A2 (.21). It is once more seen that the quantity of means increases with the advancing proficiency levels.

Table 18. Multiple Comparisons of Preposition Misuse Errors
Dependent Variable: Preposition Misuse
Gabriel

(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
upperb1	midb1	,32	,27	,98	-,49	1,14
	lowerb1	,33	,27	,96	-,45	1,16
	uppera2	,40	,28	,90	-,42	1,23
	mida2	,62	,28	,31	-,20	1,45
	lowera2	,88*	,28	,02	,06	1,72
midb1	upperb1	-,32	,27	,98	-1,14	,49
	lowerb1	,03	,24	1,00	-,68	,75
	uppera2	,08	,24	1,00	-,65	,82
	mida2	,30	,24	,97	-,42	1,03
	lowera2	,56	,25	,29	-,17	1,31
lowerb1	upperb1	-,35	,27	,96	-1,16	,45
	midb1	-,03	,24	1,00	-,75	,68
	uppera2	,05	,24	1,00	-,67	,78
	mida2	,27	,24	,98	-,45	,99
	lowera2	,53	,24	,37	-,19	1,27
uppera2	upperb1	-,40	,28	,90	-1,23	,42
	midb1	-,08	,24	1,00	-,82	,65
	lowerb1	-,05	,24	1,00	-,78	,67
	mida2	,22	,25	,99	-,52	,96
	lowera2	,48	,25	,58	-,27	1,23
mida2	upperb1	-,62	,28	,31	-1,45	,20
	midb1	-,30	,24	,97	-1,03	,42
	lowerb1	-,27	,24	,98	-,99	,45
	uppera2	-,22	,25	,99	-,96	,52
	lowera2	,26	,25	,99	-,48	1,01
lowera2	upperb1	-,88*	,28	,02	-1,72	-,06
	midb1	-,56	,25	,29	-1,31	,17
	lowerb1	-,53	,24	,37	-1,27	,19
	uppera2	-,48	,25	,58	-1,23	,27
	mida2	-,26	,25	,99	-1,01	,48

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Multiple comparisons test revealed that only Upper B1 and Lower A2 classes had a statistically significant difference (p=.02<.05) in aspect of Preposition Misuse

Error. The rest of the classes had similar means. However, a high similarity appeared in the comparison of Mid B1, Lower B1 and Upper A2 (1.00). In fact, these results above showed a rational distribution between groups, so the highest proficiency level was different from the least proficient one.

For most L2 students, prepositions might be hard to learn, as well. In Turkish, there is one suffix which is comparable to the preposition at, in, and on in English. The particular preposition is spelled diversely in different circumstances to blend with the sound that precedes the addition, for instance, ev (house/home) and evde (in the house or at home); araba (car) and arabada (in the car); mutfak (kitchen) and mutfakta (in the kitchen); tuvalet (bathroom) and tuvalette (in the bathroom) (Erkaya, 2012).

Subsequently, when Turkish speakers learn English prepositions, for example, at, in, and on, they end up confounded and don't know when to utilize them. In the present examination, members either excluded prepositions entirely or included wrong ones.

The present research affirms what was found in Darus and Subramaniam's (2009) study. Kırkgöz' (2009) likewise discovered errors in the utilization of prepositions in students' expositions and the mistakes were a similar kind that the analyst of the present paper discovered: addition of a preposition, omission of a preposition and misuse of a preposition.

The sample that Kırkgöz (2009) gave was the accompanying: "Suzanne is <u>on</u> downstairs". Since in Turkish a suffix is added to the word *downstairs* which progresses toward becoming aşağıda (da is the suffix comparable to at, in, and on), the students may have thought in L1 and translated into L2, and the outcome was the preposition omission.

Masangya and Lozada's (2009) results are additionally bolstered by the present research. The analysts affirmed how troublesome it was for students to learn L2 prepositions. They found that the most noteworthy number of errors submitted by their members was in the utilization of relational words which represented a noteworthy percentage of the whole study.In this manner, Masangya and Lozada (2009) faulted students' perplexity for the quantity of prepositions in English.

The consequences of the research are in parallel with those of Alhaysony (2012) about article errors where mistakes happened because of L1 impedance (interlingual) and L2 highlights (intralingual) and exclusion mistakes shaped an essential piece of the error information. In like manner, in this investigation there were 44 (16.29%) article errors and 25 of them were omisson mistakes.

Furthermore, this examination discoveries are in parallel with those of Rocha Erkaya (2012) in that word choice was by a long shot the most widely recognized and genuine error and that brought about continuous misconception. She made reference to local and global errors with their impact on the stream of correspondence in addition to L1 interference as a result of cross-semantic contrasts.

The aftereffects of the examination are in parallel with those of Alhaysony (2012) about prepositional errors where errors happened because of L1 impedance (interlingual) and L2 highlights (intralingual) and omission errors shaped an essential piece of the error input. In any case, as the members are low level language students, they tend to transfer language standards of their first language so interlingual errors mean the vast majority of the errors already found by Alhaysony (2012) and Brown (1980).

Nonetheless, the investigation discoveries additionally demonstrate contrasts with some past examinations like Mahmoodzadeh (2012) in which the subjects under investigation committed errors identified with misusing and redundancy of prepositions more as often as possible than the errors identified with the oversight of prepositions while making an interpretation from Persian into English in light of the fact that in this examination relational word errors were continuous sort of errors.

This research discoveries additionally diverge from those of Mungungu (2010) where spelling and tense errors are the most widely recognized errors for the three languages investigated. Notwithstanding, in this examination, Verb Tense was found to have low recurrence and rate.

It is clear that elemantary level students' errors in Turkish EFL setting could result from both interlingual and intralingual factors, that is, they may transfer certain guidelines and structures from their local language into the target langauge or they may overgeneralize target language rules while making up sentences. Subsequent to taking in a specific L2 structure, students may create the right structure; however

sooner or later with the coming new data about various language structures, the student may deliver the inaccurate frame by making overgeneralizations yet then s/he utilizes the right structure once more.

Learners can lessen the wrong structures with the assistance of criticism of the educator and U-shaped learning happens in such manner. In addition, when students endeavor to utilize an etymological structure, they might have dificulties in light of the fact that there are numerous signs and choices to browse and a competition among the signals begins for the student as proposed in Competition Model.

Since every language has its particular guidelines and structures, distinctive linguistic structures are required in various languages, which could be clarified by typological universals looking for likenesses and differences among the global languages.

We should remember that there are numerous variables influencing language acquisiton procedure like age, mindset, inspiration, inclination, uneasiness and learning methods. Just on the off chance that we consider all these variables, we would be able to get the comprehensive view. Hence, we can allude to second language interfence which is an expansive term comprising of tarnsfer, avoidance, language loss and rate of learning (Kellerman and Smith, 1986) while managing L2 students' errors.

CHAPTER V

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary and Conclusion

This research expected to discover basic errors that learners commit in their written materials. Learner passages and essays were assembled and examined with an error code list that was accumulated from various articles. Every error was coded, and every particular learner mistake is recorded by this error code.

As an answer to the question "What type of interlingual errors do EFL students make in their writings?", it can be said that students commit word choice, verb tense, pluralization, preposition addition, preposition omission and preposition misuse errors.

Word choice errors have the highest frequency among other error types followed by preposition omission, preposition addition, preposition misuse, pluralization and verb tense. In the paragraphs and essays of the 252 students, there are 531 word choice errors. The number of Preposition Omission errors is 241. 154 errors counted as preposition addition. Preposition misuse errors are recorded to be 152. So, prepositional errors are 547 in total. There are 126 pluralization and 75 verb tense errors, which means grammatical errors are 201 in total.

In the light of these numbers given above word choice error constitutes % 41,51 of all the errors committed, which is a really high frequency and, thus, main focus of the study. Preposition omission makes up 18,84 % of all. 12,08 % is the frequency of preposition addition. Preposition misuse comprise 11,88 % of the total error number. Pluralizataion forms 9,85 % of all. Verb tense error presents only 5,86 % of the total number of errors.

As for the second question, 'What could be the sources of errors?' it can be expressed that the main source of errors observed in the writings of students is interlingul errors. There are some intralingual errors too, but our main focus is on the interlingual transfer effects in students' written products since the overwhelming majority of their errors are interlingual, that is, committed as aresult of mother tongue

interference. All of the 1279 errors of different types were of interlingual transfer, which shows that exposure to the second language with the help of knowledgeable instructors must go on to reduce this number

Concerning the third question 'How could these errors be classified?' an arrangement procedure was planned according to the requirements of study. An Error Code List was obtained from these studies and then each of 252 paper analyzed line by line marked by a predetermined colour code. As a consequence of this long, exhausting preparation period, errors were grouped under three main titles as grammatical, lexical, prepositional errors. Grammatical errors include pluralization and verb tense subdivisons. Prepositional errors comprise of preposition addition, preposition omission and preposition misuse.

As to the question, 'Regarding the levels of EFL learners (Pre-intermediate, Intermediate and Upper-intermediate), how does mother tongue interference affect the use of English in terms of lexical and syntactical aspects?' according to some popular belief it is said that being exposed to second language decreases the frequency of interlingual transfer errors and increases the frequency of intralingual errors. However, in this study this is not the case for some of the error types and proficiency levels:

According to the data gathered, it is clear that Word Choice error was committed by each group. The Word Choice error was most frequently committed by Class Upper B1 with a number of 97 errors which constitutes 18,26 % of all word choice errors. On the other hand, the one committing the fewest Word Choice errors was the Class Lower A2 with a number of 69 that forms the 12,99 % of all. A notable result demonstrated is that the highest level of B1 classes had the highest frequency, and the lowest level of A2 classes had the lowest frequency of this type of error, which revealed that the the number of word choice errors increased with the advancing proficiency levels, that is, the number of word choice errors and the proficiency level were inversely proportional.

The most possible reason for this unexpected result may be the task of writing between 250-270 words in their essays. Words 10 % below the target vocabulary range

meant -25 % of their total point for each class. Thus, it is quite likely that students tried to meet the word range necessity, but did not care about their errors, accuracy, structural perfection and also correct word choice. It can be clearly seen that they just tried to produce sentences, use words as many as possible, but not accurate ones. On the other hand, A2 students had to write between 110-120 words, which limits the numbers of the sentences to be written and decreases the possibility of making more errors.

Moreover, the exam duration was around 75 minutes for B1 classes, so another possibility would be that they did not have enough time to check for the mistakes or to think of the accurate English counterparts of the words or the structures that they had in their minds for a four-paragraph essay. The topics were carefully chosen, and students had four options to choose from. They had lots of things to write in their minds, but they were not exposed to the language enough to commit to paper without committing any errors.

They might have thought of the Turkish word in their minds but were not good at finding the correct equivalent in English in such a limited time period. This may have led them to perform negative transfer of the Turkish words, and to commit word choice error. For instance, one of the students had "bölüm" in his mind. He tried to say, "I love my *department* at university.", but instead he said, "I love my *episode* at university." because he was exposed to this word in the drama series he watched online. There are two options here: The student was not aware of the negative transfer he performed and just used it, or he was aware that it was not the accurate word choice, but he did not have enough time to think of the correct one.

On the contrary, A2 students had 60 minutes to write just one paragragh with at least 100 words. It means it is a good time to check for the accuracy, coherence, cohesion and word choice. They had enough time to decide on the correct English counterperts of the words in their minds. All in all, these factors might have been effective in the low frequency of this type of error in A2 exam papers.

As it was revealed, Verb Tense error appeared in each group, too. It is shown that Verb Tense error occured in Class Upper B1 with the highest mean (,79) with a number of 23, which makes up % 30,66 of this type of error in total. On the other hand, Class Upper A2 had the lowest mean of this kind of error (,05) just with a number of 2. Consequently, it is clearly seen in the study that B1 classes committed a lot more errors (55 errors) than A2 classes (20 errors) in total.

The reason for this may be that A2 students were responsible for limited verb tense forms for the exam while B1 students had a wide range of forms to utilize. In paragraphs, A2 students were expected to write between 110-120 words, which add up to around 11-12 sentences, and this meant using a few verb tense patterns was enough to complete a successful paragraph. However, in B1 classes students had to deal with 250-270 words, which add up to approximately 25-27 sentences, and this meant there were lots of verb tense forms to make use of, which made it much more challenging for the B1 students.

Furthermore, their minds might have been puzzled which verb forms to use in a specific situation. For example, one of the students had "Üniversite sınavını kazanmak istiyor." in his mind, but he said, "He is wanting to pass university exam." instead of saying "…wants to pass…" as in Turkish the verb "istemek" is mostly used in present continuous verb tense form to refer to general facts. Thus, for the student it is quite normal to use the verb "want" in present continuous verb tense form in English, too.

As seen in the previous chapter, each group had pluralization errors. However, the highest mean was in the Class Upper B1 (1.24). It is seen that the means of Mid A2 and Lower A2 are really close to each other (.25;.21). In spite of the similarity between these two classes, the increasing number of means demonstrates that learners made more pluralization errors as their English proficiency level went up (Lower A2: ,21< Upper B1: 1,24).

There may not be a definite reason or explanation for this result, but it may be because the students try to convey the meaning being unaware of the negative transfer they perform. One of the students had "Konser iki saat sürdü." in his mind, but he said,

"The concert lasted about two hour." instead of saying "…two hours." as in Turkish a noun does not have plural suffix if it has a number just before it.

The study reveals that, there was no statistical difference between any of the groups in terms of Adding the Wrong Preposition Errors. Also, findings suggest that Preposition Addition Error was committed by each group in the study. This kind of error was most frequently committed by Class Mid A2 (.89); least frequently by Mid B1(.43). Statistical tests revealed a similarity between individual groups of different classes having different proficiency levels. It is shown that all the groups had this type of error, but there was not a considerable difference in the number of means to define the source group leading the variation.

154 Adding Wrong Preposition errors were committed in total, but proficiency levels were not effective in this type of error. Both A2 and B1 students used their mother tongue knowledge to add the wrong preposition. For instance, one of the students had "Eve gittim." in his mind and said, "I went *to* home." instead of saying "I went home." because of the fact that in Turkish "-e" is used to describe a direction. So, the student made use of his own mother tongue to describe the direction and added "to" preposition wrongly committing another interlingual transfer.

The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between groups ($F (5,246) =.33$, $p=.88>.05$) concerning Preposition Omission Errors. It is demonstrated that each group in the study had Preposition Omission Errors. Mean differences were distributed according to the proficiency levels. To illustrate, the highest mean belonged to the Class Upper B1 (1,10) whereas this type of error was least frequently committed by Lower A2 (.71).

It is seen that mean differences go up with the increasing proficiency levels showing higher levels committed more errors. A Gabriel Post Hoc Test revealed a similarity between individual groups of different classes having different proficiency levels. It is clearly seen that all the groups had this type of error, but there was not a considerable difference in the number of means to point out the source group leading the difference. Since the learners are not instructed explicitly, the prepositions may keep being an interlingual interference factor in the higher levels, too. For instance,

one of the students had "Bana gülümsedi." in his mind and wrote "He smiled me." instead of saying "He smiled at me." because in Turkish "me" means "beni/bana", so there is no need to add a preposition. Here again the student's mother tongue interfered with the target language and he committed an error of preposition omission.

In the present study it is claimed that there is a signficant difference between classes (F (5,246) = 2,43, p=.03<.05) considering the dependent variable of Preposition Misuse Errors. As clearly shown, preposition misuse error appeared in each group. It is seen that Preposition Misuse Errors' mean differences were distributed rationally according to the proficiency levels.

Preposition Misuse Error was most frequently made by Upper B1 (1,10) and the mean difference diminished gradually down to Lower A2 (.21). It is once more seen that the quantity of means goes up with the increasing English proficiency levelsof the students. Multiple comparisons test revealed that only Upper B1 and Lower A2 classes had a statistically significant difference (p=.02<.05) in aspect of Preposition Misuse Error. The rest of the classes had similar means. In fact, these results above showed a rational distribution between groups, so the highest proficiency level was different from the least proficient one. The most probable expalanation for this outcome may be that the students of highest proficiency had an attempt to write colorful essays trying to convey each message they had in their minds.

Being B1 level students may have given them the courage to decorate their writings with a wide range of sentence patterns. However, this led them to commit more preposition misuse errors than A2 students. To illustrate, one of the students had the message of "Ona aşık oldum." to convey in his story and he wrote "I fell in love *to* her" instead of writing "I fell in love *with* her." since he knows that preposition of "to" means "-e/-a" in Turkish. That is why first language interfered with the target language in this case.

Odlin (1989) suggests that the significance of getting formal guidance can not be disparaged. Because it is thought to diminish the transfer recurrence as students are accepted to be progressively mindful of the language, for example, language structure, linguistic structure, etc, and to have the capacity to obtain the aptitude of self redress

and checking. Examining the interlingual transfer (Ellis, 1997) of the subjects seems to help this case. Hence, it appears to be essential to incorporate explicit teaching so as to change over transferable forms into nontransferable forms.

Clinical elicitation strategy (Corder, 1973) uncovered that grammatical interference will in general be more predominant and powerful than lexical interference in acquiring of English amidst Turkish members. Despite the fact that there is no sufficient proof to guarantee that Turkish students will transfer grammatical highlights of the Turkish language inevitably, it very well could be thought that members have furnished us with more proof for the linguistic interference particularly in preposition, verb tenses and pluralization levels.

Past researches on the negative transfer have demonstrated that grammatical interfernce has been found to happen as often as possible in English writings of Turkish students. In this aspect, the discoveries of this examination give off an impression of being in accordance with the past investigations. The distinction between the syntactic forms of the two languages clearly prompted the troubles clarified above. In this respect, the response to the main research question has just been given as the hints of interference have been detected at grammatical dimension just as at lexical dimension.

In this study, the sorts of written errors committed by Turkish students who have different levels of English competence has been researched. Discoveries demonstrate that the beginning periods of language learning are portrayed by a transcendence of interlingual errors. It is proposed that student errors ought not to be viewed as a disappointment, but rather as a genuine advancement the student is making in obtaining the information of the target language, specifically, as errors give to the researcher the proof of how language learning or acquisition takes place, what techniques the student is utilizing in the revelation of the language.

As Corder (1967) uttered “a learner's errors… are significant in (that) they provide to the researcher evidence of how language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in the discovery of the language” (pp. 167). Errors demonstrate the instructor what parts of language input have been

comprehended, learned or befuddled. Additionally, by having the capacity to foresee errors to a specific degree, educators can be very much prepared to enable learners to limit or deal with their learning issues. Errors are vital to the student since they may, in return, advantage from different types of input on them.

5.2. Implications of the Study

This section tries to answer the fifth research question of "What sort of approaches could be adopted so as to cope with the mother tongue interference?

Since learners experience issues in many parts of sentence structure, this calls for a re-assessment of the manners in which language is educated and the teacher's accentuation to raise students' mindfulness for delivering adequate bits of writing as far as exactness and clear correspondence. It is widely accepted by the educators that inspiration is an incredible asset regardless of whether the best materials and writings are given; a learner will adapt just in the event that the individual is encouraged enough to do so.

This can come true by structuring intriguing and engaging exercises to welcome and draw on the students' inborn inspiration. A requirements investigation is constantly fundamental along the teaching procedure for the determination of proper remediation just as the suitable strategies and approaches to be utilized.

This expects educators to bring some systematicity into error methodology. Knowing about students' regular troubles is not enough, they had better assess these challenges with the end goal of giving them suitable accentuation in their corrective instructing, or else the issue will continue, and learners will be unequipped for creating a piece of writing without various syntactic errors.

On that account, we should attach enough importance to error correction and the learners should be given enough feedback. Thus, students' attention must be drawn on the distinction among Turkish and English. They additionally should be presented more to the challenges which might be experienced in the target language; namely, they require more routine exercises with regards to the important structures so as to

get acquainted with them and afterward to have the capacity to utilize them suitably in their compositions.

Known as a standout amongst the most persuasive specialists contemplating the error investigation with respect to the phenomenon of mother tongue interference, Corder (1982:1) clarifies that there have dependably been two legitimizations proposed for the investigation of students' errors: the educational legitimization, specifically that a decent comprehension of the idea of error is important before an orderly method for annihilating the errors could be discovered, and hypothetical legitimization, asserting that an investigation of students' errors is a piece of methodical investigation of students' language that is important for comprehension of the procedure of target language acquiring. We necessitate such information on the off chance that we are to make any well-established recommendations for the advancement and enhancement of the materials and methods of language teaching.

It is featured by Odlin (1989:177) that recognizing the comparative and diverse sections of the second and first language both in structure related and message related regions while framing a second language sentence is of vital significance regarding the track of the learning and acquiring procedure of a second language.

In view of above explanations, it is now recognized that discoveries of this research may helpful with the educating and learning procedure. Consequently, present area expects to give some helpful advice dependent on the aftereffects of the example information with the motivation behind adding to the target language acquisition procedure.

Corder (1982:8) suggests that it is practically outlandish not to accomplish the total acquiring of a target language if students get the inspiration. With this regard, members are accepted to have the essential inspiration as they are required to achieve a specific level of language competence so as to proceed with their instruction. In this way, these interfence errors could be thought to symbolize a characteristic advancement of language acquiring that could be customized and moved forward. With this regard, it is obviously simple to guarantee that instructing the language

explicitly assumes a pivotal job as far as expanding the consciousness of students on the explicit regions dependent on the aftereffects of interference researches. Nevertheless, the ongoing pattern in foreign language education is the methodology called Communicative Language Teaching known as CLT which for the most part underscores the significance of interaction. That is, meaning is viewed as the fundamental objective of learning a foreign language. In this manner, it is conceivable to run across structure related errors that outcome from L1 impact as students center around passing on the message.

Corder (1982: 99) points out that a student when needed to interact will have plan of action to whatever etymological information he has which will improve the probability of effective correspondence. In the event that he does not have the imperative knowledge of L2 to accomplish fruitful correspondence, he will have plan of action to the L1, or a different language knowledge he has to compensate this insufficiency, borrow or steal.

It may end up with not focusing on the linguistic and syntactic highlights of a second language. As the consequences of present examination traits, the noteworthy measure of interference errors to the grammatical impact of Turkish language, it is fundamental to enhance the familiarity with students in the arrangement of second language forms. Notwithstanding the explicit instructing, expanding the 'meta phonetic mindfulness' which can be distinguished as the cognizant consciousness of the L2 structures ought to be pointed, too (Tat, 2013).

As Jarvis (2009) proposes, meta semantic mindfulness empowers students to perceive ‘cross linguistic’ contrasts as in students can recognize the highlights of a L2 from the structures of a L1 and furthermore to pick up the capacity to figure the implications of obscure words, in this manner improving their language capacities, and diminishing the dimension of conceivable transfer related errors.

Besides its viability regarding grammar and syntax, explicit education is likewise accepted to be helpful for vocabulary instructing. As Stenson (1983) puts forward, if students are acquainted with the distinctions and likenesses two languages

share in phonology, cognates, false friends, etc, their mindfulness can be expanded. Hence, the probability of the event of negative transfer can be kept at a lower level.

Additionally, it is likewise essential to give students authentic materials as in they will be presented to the genuine language with the goal that implicit acquisition of L2 vocabulary and different structures is bound to be attainable. It is additionally observed to be fundamental to recognize students with a few systems that they can depend on, for example, thinking in the target language instead of endeavoring to convert into the target language (Brown, 1994:27). For example, with the utilization of this technique, it is expected to dispense with tarnsfer affected errors.

Bhela (1999:29) asserts that a customized learning program for every individual is proposed to be valuable in encouraging the learning and showing process by making the chance to focus on explicit regions and to suit teaching systems and materials for students' needs. As Odlin (1989:162) proposes, target group arranged course books ought to be structured so as to have the capacity to incorporate contrastive clarification of the two languages.

Nonetheless, it may be hard to set up these sorts of books if the classes comprise of students with various L1 foundations. For this situation, what is recommended by Odlin (1989) is the utilization of bilingual word references alongside the help of the educator who is required to know about the cross semantic mindfulness and the issues raised because of this impact.

To sum up, it is verifiably evident that if educators have an awareness of the interference and how to manage this, it is a lot less demanding to anticipate negative transfer. As a consequence, the preparation of instructors on this issue ought to be of help with the acquiring of the target language with the assistance of proposals clarified previously.

5.3. Suggested Treatment of Written Errors

Zamel (1985) proposes that recognizing big and minor errors might be a decent guide in picking what to address. In this way the educator ought to organize which errors to address in students' works. Error correction may appear as an instructor remedy, peer rectification, and self-correction. On account of instructor amendment, the educator can utilize institutionalized techniques to show to their students the sort and place of errors. Arrangements of images are frequently valuable if the instructor first trains her students on their importance and what is demanded from the learners when a specific image is utilized. A noteworthy advantage of peer correction is that by rectifying the mistakes of their schoolmates, learners can turn out to be more critical learners of the langauge. Self-revision is likewise helpful for a student in that through adjusting his/her mistake the learner can end up mindful of his/her error and can discover that specific language item better.

5.4. Limitations of the Study

Having referenced the likelihood of negative transfer at lexical and linguistic dimensions, it appears to be vital to think about the restrictions of this examination. Without doubt each examination has brought a few limitations as Tarone (2006) set forth that beyond a shadow of a doubt, each examination has confinements, and each elicitation strategy utilized in the investigations has its partisans and its faultfinders.

In view of this announcement, it is fitting to take a gander at the limitations as far as the unwavering quality of the recognizable proof of results, and the adequacy of the examination.

Beginning with the primary worry, as referenced in the former sections present examination receives the model that takes into consideration the near investigation of first and second language highlights with the students' IL portrayed by Ellis. In connection to this, the greatest restriction may be regarded as the absence of another mother tongue group that may have empowered to look into two groups that share diverse L1s. In any case, this may be perceived as the beyond the scope of this examination as it doesn't attempt to give a general picture of every single Turkish

learners of English. However, the discoveries of the examination give off an impression of being in accordance with the past investigations directed on language transfer. This may be of help to expand the trustworthiness of the findings.

As of now referenced over, these worries don't establish enough proof to nullify the effectiveness of this investigation. The strategy utilized for this examination is additionally a standout amongst the most usually favored strategies in the investigations of language transfer. Embracing the comparative model that is portrayed above and the utilization of 'elicitation strategy' for the information gathering instrument seem, by all accounts, to be sufficiently productive to empower to direct the study by giving the vital outcomes.

In conclusion, with regards to the order of the data discoveries, results are separated into two principle classes; lexical and syntactical. Two distinctive grouping structures are utilized so as to make the idea clearer for the lexical transfer while the syntactical transfer is clarified by means of regions that the information discoveries outline.

The principle worry in this angle may be identified with the characterization itself. As Jarvis (2009) features, the issue of characterization in language transfer studies seems, by all accounts, to be frail as there is no definite system created. Remembering this reality, it is unjustifiable to scrutinize the viability of the classification of the discoveries.

5.5. Recommendations for Further Research

Pointing out the point of this investigation, the examples of mother tongue interference assuming an imperative job in the acquiring of written English products of Turkish native speakers have been discovered and inspected all through this paper. It has just been recognized that positive transfer is beyond the scope of this research.

In this way, the negative impact of English language has been focused on. In any case, as various investigations have uncovered, transfer assumes a powerful job in the acquiring of an L2 positively, too. However, the absence of researches on this part

demonstrates a major disparity in the investigations of language transfer. It appears to be crucial to comprehend the facilitative job that the idea of transfer has so as to empower to enhance the nature of the teaching and learning process.

Odlin (1989:155) illustrates the areas that language transfer studies should focus on as follows; 'social context', 'subsystem effects', 'longitudinal comparisons', 'subsystem interactions', 'bidirectionality', 'borrowing and substratum transfer', 'acquisition of non-European languages', 'comprehension and production', and 'child bilingualism'. Of all, 'bidirectionality' which could be depicted with a case of contrasting Turkish EFL learners and English native speakers learning Turkish is by all accounts a critical territory as more speculations are probably going to be made dependent on this sort of similar investigations which may bring about being progressively mindful of the structures and highlights of two languages. Acquisition and negative transfer obviously have all the earmarks of being a need in the language transfer contemplates. Examining both the impact of mother tongue on the target language, and second language on the first language would empower to unfurl some strange zones and add to the showing learning procedure.

It is likewise worth referencing the necessity of building up a structure for the investigations of negative transfer alongside the necessity of concentrating on unfurled transferrable etymological frameworks. This may prompt increasingly solid and productive investigations to be directed later on.

This investigation featured the error types and wellsprings of Turkish speaking students' compositions in English with a predetermined number of members and in a constrained area. Besides, this investigation can be recreated in a long-drawn out time period and with a higher number of members. Moreover, a more intricate research should be possible to reveal insight into specific sorts.

Bibliography

Alhaysony, M. (2012). An analysis of article errors among Saudi Female EFL students: A case study. Asian Social Science, 8(12), 55-66.

Al-Shormani, M. Q & Al-Sohbani Y. A (2012) Semantic Errors Committed by Yemeni University Learners: Classifications and Sources, *International Journal of English Linguistics; Vol. 2, No. 6*; 2012

Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Error Analysis of Turkish EFL Learners: A Case Study. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *232*, 234-241. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.007

Bada, E. (1993). Phonemic identifications in English: A case of interlingual transfer by adult speakers of Turkish, Japanese, and Arabic. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Exeter*, Exeter.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education*. (10 ed., p. 113). Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Bhela, B., (1999). Native language interference in learning a second language: Exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage. '*International Education Journal*', 1(1).

Bordag, D (2004) Interlingual and Intralingual Interference during Gender Production in *Czech and German, Cahiers linguistiques d'Ottawa, Vol. 32*: 1-23 ISSN 0315-3167., Department of Linguistics, University of Ottawa

Brown, H.D. (1980). *Principles of Learning and Teaching English.* New Jersey Prentice- Hall Inc.

Brown, H., D (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Candling, R.B. (2001). *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. New York: Longman Inc.

Chamimah, Nur (2007), Lexical Errors of English Writing Written by the Students of The State Islamic University of Malang at Al-Hikmah Al-Fathimiyyah, *Thesis, Degree of Master of Arts.*

Corder, S. P. (1967). *The significance of learners' errors. IRAL, 5,* 161-170

Corder, S.P. (1971). Idiosyncratic Errors and Error Analysis reprinted in Richards 1974.

Corder, S.P., (1973). The elicitation of interlanguage. In: Svartik, J., (ed.) Errata: Papers in Error Analysis. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup.

Corder, S.P. (1974). Error Analysis in J.P.B. Allen and S.P Corder ed, *Techniques in Applied Linguistics. The Edinburgh course in applied linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S.P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S.P., (1983). A role for the mother tongue. In: S. Gass, S., and Selinker, L., (eds.) *Language transfer in language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Corder, S.P. (2000). *Error Analysis*: London, Longman Publisher.

Çepni, G. (2014). *Error Analysis in Writings of English Language Teaching Prep Students: A Study On Bilinguals Of Kurdish And Turkish Majoring In English* (Graduate). Çağ University.

Darus, S., & Subramaniam, K. (2009). Error Analysis of the Written English Essays of Secondary School Students in Malaysia: A Case Study. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *Volume 8* (Number 3).

Demirezen, M., (2010). The causes of the schwa phoneme as a fossilized pronunciation problem for Turks. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol:2, pp.1567–1571.*

Dulay, H. & Burt, M., (1974). 'Natural Sequences in Child Second Language Acquisition' in *Language Learning 24: 1,* pp. 37-53.

Dulay, H., Burt, M. & Krashen, S. (1982) Language Two. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1983) ,*Goofing: An Indicator of Children's Second Language*

Duskova, L. (1969). On sources of errors in foreign language learning. *International Review of Applied linguistics, 7,* 11–36.

Elkilic, G., & Han, T. & Aydın, S., (2009). Punctuation and Capitalisation Errors Of Turkish Efl Students In Composition Classes: An Evidence Of L1 Interference. *International Symposium on Sustainable Development.* Sarajevo, Bosnia & Herzegovina. pp.279-284.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G., (2005). *Analysing Learner Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Erkaya, O.R., (2012). Vocabulary and L1 Interference – Error Analysis of Turkish Students. *Mextesol Journal*. 36(2).

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1983). Plans and strategies in foreign language communication. In Claus Færch & Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), Strategies in Gass, S. and Selinker, L.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (eds.), (1983). Language Transfer in Language Learning: *Series on Issues in Second Language Research.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Gass, S. & Selinker, L., (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An Introductory Course.*

Gass, S., and Selinker, L., (2008). *Second language acquisition: an introductory course.* 3rd ed. New York: Routledge. 64

Granger, S (ed). 1998. *Learner English on Computer*. London: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Grosjean, F. (2001). Individual bilingualism. In: Mesthirie, R., (ed.) *Concise encyclopaedia of sociolinguistic.* Oxford: Pergamon, pp.10-15.

Gürsel, E. (1998) Error analysis of the English writings of the students from the department of foreign language at the University of Gaziantep. *Thesis for Master of Arts.* Retrieved from Higher Education of Turkey Thesis Database

Haryanto, T (2007) Grammatical Error Analysis in Students' Recount Texts. The Case of the Twelfth Year Students of SMA N 1 Slawi in the Academic Year of 2006/2007. *Thesis for degree of Master of Arts*

Hol, D., & Erarslan, A. (2015). Moving Beyond Language: Awareness Of Efl Learners In Target Language Culture. *Cbu International Conference Proceedings*, *3*, 331. doi: 10.12955/cbup.v3.620

James, C., (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: exploring error analysis.* London: Longman.

Jarvis, S., (2000). Methodological rigour in the study of transfer: indentifying L1 influence in the interlanguage lexicon. *Language Learning* Vol. 50, pp. 245-309.

Jarvis, S., and Pavlenko, A., (2008). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Oxon: Routledge.

Jarvis, S., (2009). Lexical transfer. In: Pavlenko, A., (ed.) *The bilingual mental lexicon. Interdisciplinary Approaches.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 99-124.

Kellerman, E., (1977). Towards characterisation of the strategies of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, Vol: 2,* pp. 58-145.

Kellerman, E., (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In: Gass, S., and Selinker, L., (eds.) *Language transfer in language learning.* Rowley, MA: Newbury, 122-134.

Kellerman, E., (1995). Cross-linguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere. *Annual review of applied linguistics,* Vol:15, pp.125-150. 65

Kellerman, E., and Sharwood Smith, M.S., (1986). *Cross-linguistic influence in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Keshavarz, M, D. (1999). *Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis (6thed.).* Tehran: Rahnama Press

Kim, S. (2001). An Error Analysis of college students' writing: Is that really Konglish? *Studies in Modern Grammar, 25,* 159-174.

Kırkgöz, Y., (2009). An analysis of written errors of Turkish adult learners of English. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, Vol:2, pp. 4352-4358.

Kusumawati, R (2008) Morphological Error Found in the English Essays of the Fifth Semester Students of English Letters and Language Department of UIN Malang. *Published Thesis, Degree of Master of Arts of UIN Malang*

Krashen, S., (1982). *Principles and practice in Second language Acquisition.* Pergamon Press, pp. 9-45.

Lado, R., (1957). Excerpts from '*Linguistics Across Cultures*" in Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (eds.), (1983), pp.21-31. *Learning Strategies' in Gass, S. & Selinker, L. (eds),* pp.54-68. Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lado, R. (1964). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach.* Mc Graw-Hill.

Lott, D. (1983). Analysing and counteracting interference errors. *ELT Journal*, *37*(3), 256-261. doi: 10.1093/elt/37.3.256

Mahmoodzadeh, M. (2012). A Cross-linguistic Study of Prepositions in Persian and English: The Effect of Transfer. *Theory and Practice In Language Studies*, *2*(4). doi: 10.4304/tpls.2.4.734-740

Masangya, E., & Lozada, L. (2009). An Investigation on the Relationship between the Language Exposures and Errors in English Essays of High School Students. *Philippine ESL Journal*, *Vol. 2*(February 2009).

McDonough, S, H. (1986) *Psychology in foreign language teaching, 2nd edition* Allen & Unwin (London and Boston) publishing

Mitchell, R., and Myles, F., (2004). *Second language learning theories*. 2nd ed. London: Arnold.

Mungungu, S. S. (2010). *Error analysis: Investigating the writing of ESL Namibian learners*.

Odlin, T., (1989). *Language transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Odlin, T., (2002). Language transfer and cross-linguistic studies: Relativism, universalism, and the native language. In: Kaplan, R.B., (ed.) *The Oxford handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.253-261.

Odlin, T., (2003). Cross-linguistic influence. In: Doughty, C., and Long, M., (eds.) *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 436-486.

Odlin, T., (2005). Crosslinguistic Influence and Conceptual Transfer: What are the Concepts? In *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol:25, pp.3-25.

Odlin, T., (2006). Could a contrastive analysis ever be complete? In: Arabski, J., (ed.) *Cross-linguistic influences in the second language lexicon*. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 22-35. 66

Pavlenko, A. (1999). New Approaches to Concepts in Bilingual Memory' in Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 2 (3), pp.209-230.

Pavlenko, A. (ed) (2009). The Bilingual Mental Lexicon. Interdisciplinary Approaches. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Radhika, V., & Kala, M. (2013). Interference of Mother Tongue in Learning a ForeignTongue. *ELT Voices – India, Volume 3 Issue 2 | April 2013*(ISSN 2230-9136 ELT Research Paper 7).

Riantini, H. (2011). An Analysis of The Seventh Year Students' Morphological Errors In Descriptive Paragraph Writing At Smpn 1 Kalibaru In The 2010/2011 Academic Year. Retrieved from http://repository.unej.ac.id/handle/123456789/4164

Richards, J.C., (1974). *Error analysis. Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition.*London: Longman Group Ltd.

Richards. J.C. Plott, J. and Platt H. 1996. *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* London: Longman.

Richards, J.C., and Renandya, W.A. (2002), *Methodology in language teaching. An anthology of current practice*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roos, J.H. 1990. Syntactic error analysis of written work of Students at Vista University. *Unpublished (M.A. dissertation) Rand Afrikaans University*

Saltık, S (1997) A Study of error analysis in the essays of freshman students at the Middle East Technical University. *Thesis for Master of Arts in Education* Retrieved from Higher Education of Turkey Thesis Database

Selinker, L. (1969). Language transfer. General Linguistics, Vol: 9, pp. 67-92.

Selinker, L., (1972). Interlanguage in *International Review of Applied Linguistics (IRAL) 10, Vol.2*, pp.209-231.

Sığınç, A (2008) Error Analysis in Writing Skill: A case study of Private Pamukkale Eğitim Vakfı Primary School Students. *Master of Arts Thesis in Education*. Pamukkale University Institute of Social Sciences Retrieved from Higher Education of Turkey Thesis Database

Stenson, N. (1983). Induced errors, in "*A Tentative Analysis of Errors in Language*"

Şanal, F. (2008). Error-Analysis Based Second Language Teaching Strategies. Retrieved from http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/view/389

Tarone, E Interlanguage. (2006) In Keith Brown (Editor in Chief), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2nd Ed., Vol. 5.* (pp. 747-752). Oxford: Elsevier University Press.

Tat, G. (2013). *Language Transfer in the Written English of Turkish Speaking Learners of English* (Postgraduate). University of Westminster, London.

Weinreich, U., (1953). Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. The Hague: Mouton.

West, M. (1953). *New General Service List.* Retrieved from http://www.newgeneralservicelist.org/

Yang Wenfen (2010) *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 1, No. 3*, pp. 266-268, May 2010

Yang, W. (2010) A Tentative Analysis of Errors in Language Learning and Use, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 1, No. 3,* pp. 266-268, May 2010

Yılmaz, F (2004) A Study on Error Anaysis in the Use of Collocations and Idiomatic Expressions in Sentence Translation from Turkish to English. *Master Thesis. Selçuk University* Retrieved from Higher Education of Turkey Thesis Database

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to Student Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(1), 79. doi: 10.2307/3586773

Appendices:

Samples of Students' Writings

For Live

Who wants to bring person which don't have life? In today's world, most of people grow up with video games. So, they can't learn how to live. This video games have a lot of negative effects. Two of the most common effects are psycial effects and psy-logical effects.

First and main negative effect of video games is psycial effects. First of all, when people get much time with video games it can be result with eye illnesses. So, they can't see very well. Moreover, when they are playing video games they don't matter how to sit. Also, it's gonna be big problem for their psycial types. Their shoulders can be disorder.

Second negative effect of video games is psycial effects. For one thing, this games feels like you have to play every time. So, it's mean this people who plays this games is don't sleep very well. It's a good way for much stress. In addition, video games causes being a person which don't have a social life. This people can't learn how to communicate with other people. They don't talk too much with their family and they don't have a real friends.

Given all this, there are two significant negative effects of video games are psycial effects and psy-logical effects. Video games have negative effects on people's eyes and psycial types. Because of people getting too much time with video games. Also, this games means to have no social life. So, they can't get friends easily because they can't know anything about communicate. They don't talk with their family. I think all people who live in this world have to see this negative effects.

275

(Pink) 6 (Pluralization)

(Yellow) 5 (Word Choice)

(Blue) 1 (Misuse of the Preposition)

Scanned by CamScanner

Overweight

Can you imagine a life without move? In this time, most people don't move in day and this situation cause of obesity and other overweight ills. There are many cause of overweight two of them; don't move and bad feed

First and the most important cause of overweight is don't move. First of all, most people are not exercising and they sitting in day. For example, my friend Ahmet don't exercise and he play video games, watch TV always so this situation cause of take weight for him. Secondly, some people who have overweight are driving cars and they don't walking always. For instance, according the seseerch 40 percent of American people are driving cars for their every work so this cause of they being overweight

Another and more less important cause of overweight is bad feed. To begin with, Most of English people eating a lot of junk food and they become overweight. Because, junk foods including a lot of trans oil so they cause of badly growing up for people. Also, A lot of eating cause of being overweight. Because, a lot of and irregular eating effect person's body badly so they can be overweight person

In conclusion, There are two main cause of being overweight; don't move and bad feed don't move one of them with don's exercise and driving cars always. Besides that, bad feed another of them with junk food and eating a lot of. If you don't want to be overweight person eat regularly and healty.

250

(Blue) 2 (Misuse of the Preposition)

(Purple) 3 (Verb Tense)

(Pink) 2 (Pluralization)

(Yellow) 6 (Word Choice)

Scanned by CamScanner

Causes Of Cancer

Can you imagine being cancer of any part of your life? Most of people in the world especially works in danger jobs being cancer many different reasons Two of the most common reasons for causes of cancer are chemicals and harmful foods.

The first and immediate reason for being a cancer is chemcals Nowadays there are too many factories work without chemicals. for example some of factories have labs. The people who work in that labs, breathe chemical gas and they being cancer, or that factories or labs give up their harmful rubbish to lakes, water sources so we could being cancer to. Secondly hospitals could be causes of cancer. Some parts of hospital has harmful for human health. Radiation cause of cancer, If we don't take a caution for radiation being a cancer us.

Another reasons cause of cancer are harmful foods. Firstly everyday we eat harmful foods. That harmfull foods are harmful for our body. Especially eat crops with GDO is not good for us. We have to escape from this. It's better to eat seasonal crops. Secondly fast foods is not better than homemades. Fast food is one of the causes of cancer and most of the people prefer fast food. We prefer homemade foods and eat healthy foods for don't be a cancer.

Two of the most common reasons for causes of cancer are chemicals and harmful foods. The causes are work in danger jobs, radiation in the hospitals, crops with GDO and unhealthy fast foods. So we are in danger all of reasons. And we have to protect ourselves. from causes of cancer.

(Yellow) 9 (Word Choice)
(Blue) 1 (Misuse of the Preposition)
(Orange) 1 (Preposition Omission)
(Green) 1 (Preposition Addition)
(Pink) 1 (Pluralization)

Scanned by CamScanner

SNOW AND SUN

Everyone has a favorite season and everyone feels relax themself in their favorite season. there are many something good in every season. But one of most be loved season is winter and other is summer. But there are two differences between summer to winter weather and working.

First winter is quite different from summer regarding weather and working. In summer, weather is soo hot and most people hate from soo hot. In summer people usually stay at home or stay cold places because of hot and also hot is very danperous for our health. However In summer most people don't work and go holiday. Is there anyone who doesn't like holiday? Everyone likes to go holiday. Also In summer they don't have to work.

Second summer is quite different from winter regarding weather and working. In winter weather is not hot so we can go hotter places if we get cold. In winter people can go out wherever they want. However in winter people have to go to work everyday. It's so hard, they are tired but it's nessesary for them.

To sum up, there are two differences between summer to winter but as you know every seasons have something good. I'm a winter boy so I think winter is better than summer. So what do you think about that?

(Yellow) 6 (Word Choice)
(Green) 1 (Preposition Addition)
(Orange) 4 (Preposition Omission)
(Pink) 1 (Pluralization)
(Blue) 2 (Misuse of the Preposition)

Scanned by CamScanner

choice your life

Can you imagine people how play videogames? The most people play video games. In this days every children play video games A lot of game company give free game. Children every day go to net and play online game. Video game company very big work hall and these company earn a lot of money. There are two significant negative effect heal and time missing.

The first negative effect is heal. Many people every day play games. Firstly some people not every day play games. Every minutes play games. These people don't see clear. In USA and china 0/0 50 people use glases. and these 0/0 35 people play games. Next so many people care about body. A few people says how thinner than how weight. But these people play video games. They sit the chair, eat junk food and play games. For example in Germany fat people 0/0 30 play game.

The second negative effect is time missing is the most important thing in this world. To begin with work people don't care about work just play my games. Most player don't earn money. In addition children every day play video games and don't care about study. Every day go to net. For example in Turkey students escape the school and go to net and play video games.

In conclusion there are many negative effects of video games. People everyday play video games and care about anythink. Besides that these world not funny or helpful. Heal and time missing important think with human life. We also must play but shoubn't everyday play videogames.

(Pink) 5 (Pluralization)
(Orange) 3 (Preposition Omission)
(Yellow) 4 (Word Choice)

Scanned by CamScanner

Cinema and Home

Have you ever moved home or cinema? According to research, %50 people movieing home or cinema So people perfer movieing home or cinema. There are two main differences between home or cinema in terms of price and quality.

Firstly, movieing home is quite different movieing cinema in terms of price and quality. To begin with, it is very cheap movieing in home. Because if you movieing film in home you don't pay price. For example, if you want to movie film in home you open computer and you movie film in home. You don't pay price. However, it isn't really quality. movieing film in home. If you movieing film in home you don't enjoy because home don't have voice quality and big screen. You are boring. For example, home don't have film areas Because of you are boring.

Secondly, movieing cinema is quite different movieing home in terms of price and quality To start with, it is expensive movieing in cinema. Because cinema have special areas for film. For example, if you want to movieing film in cinema you pay between 25- 30 TL price. However, it is really quality movieing film in cinema. Because cinema have film areas. For example, cinema have voice quality and big screen. You aren't boring.

To sum up. there are two main differences between home or cinema in terms of price and quality. A lot of people prefer movie in home and movie in cinema. I think you should movie in cinema. Because it is really quality and cinema have big screen and voice quality. It is up to you.

(Orange) 8 (Preposition Omission)

(Blue) 11 (Misuse of the Preposition)

(Yellow) 4 (Word Choice)

Scanned by CamScanner

SUMMER LIFE OR WINTER LIFE

Do you prefer summer and winter? According to the research %60 people prefer summer. The rest of them prefer winter. Because, 10.000 people plan for summer while 6.000 people plan for winter. There are two main differences between: work and holiday.

Firstly, summer different from winter in terms of work and holiday. To begin with, summer doesn't work. Because, much work places are holiday and there aren't working. For example, school, MEB and a few goverment work places. Also, summer has got a lot holiday. For example, Hotels are opening on summer.

Secondly, winter different from summer in terms of work and holiday. To begin with, people are very working at winter. Because, people are working for summer. For example, people are cooking food for summer, and people are eaching money for summer. Also, people aren't holiday at winter. Because, everybody work at winter.

To sum up, there are two main differences between work and holiday. Opinions change from person to another. In my opinion, people should prefer summer. Because, summer has got good holiday. Also people don't work at summer. so people are very comfortable at summer. Which would you prefer? Summer or winter?

(Orange) 2 (Prep Omission) WORDS:200

(Purple) 6 (Verb Tense)

(Pink) 1 (Pluralization)

(Blue) 6 (Misuse of the Preposition)

Scanned by CamScanner

- GOOD PERSON -

Have you ever seen alone person? Nowadays, most people have brother / sister with rising population in the world. There are two significant positive effects of having a brother / sister ; heals the life and to be helpful.

The first positive effect of having a brother/ sister is heals the life. To begin with, when you have brother / sister , this give energy to you. Because, he /she is be your near if you feel tired. For example, the boy work hard for his exam and he feel tired , his brother is felt energic with his words or his behaviours in this time./Also, people feel happy because of their brother /sister. For example, when the little girl lost her toy, her sister tries to laugh her little sister.

The second positive effect of having a brother /sister is to be helpful in every situation. First of all, you don't think clothes problem when you have a brother or sister. for example; the young girl want to wear good dress for party, she can take it from her sister. In addition, if you have a brother /sister, they are always your near to help your problem. This problem can be money or your unhappy./for example; I need to help for my problem so I go to my sister to help me in this time.

In conclusion, there are many positive effects of having a sister / brother ; heals the life and to be helpful. If you have a sister / brother, you are always feel energic and happy. Besides that, they share of their clothes and help your problem. If you have a brother/ sister, life is being more beautiful.

(Yellow) 2 (Word Choice)

(Orange) 1 (Preposition Omission)

(Blue) 1 (Misuse of the Preposition)

(Green) 1 (Preposition Addition)

Scanned by CamScanner

SUMMER AND WINTER

Which one do you like the weather? Many people think that summer is better. Weather of the our country is different. Most of appear summer and winter. There are two main differences between summer and winter in terms of holiday and transportion.

Firstly, summer different from winter in terms of travel and transport. To begin with, people want holiday so they wait that coming summer. Because people go to beach. They want to swim and be relax. In addition, transportation is very easy in summer. Because everybody goes the holiday. So roads are free and some people prefer to walk.

Contrary to summer, winter has different issues in terms of holiday and transportation. To start with, winter is good idea for winter sports. For example, if you want to ski you have to wait winter. Skiing is very exciting. However, transportation is very difficult in winter. Because ice blocked the road and people can't go everywhere. This situation is a bit annoying.

In brief, there are differences in holiday and transportation between summer and winter. You do which on is very exciting for you. If you like exciting you can prefer winter. It is up to you.

(purple) 1 (Verb Tense)
(orange) 2 (Preposition Omission)
(yellow) 1 (Word Choice)
(green) 1 (Preposition Addition)

Scanned by CamScanner

Do you prefer watching movies at home or watching movies at the cinema? According the research %60 people prefer watching movies at the cinema. There are two main differences between watching movies at home and watching movies at the cinema: crowded and high quality.

First all all watching movies at home different from watching movies at the cinema in terms of: crowded and high quality. To begin with, If you watch movies at home, maybe you can be alone it's not crowded. This situation not enjoyable. Because not crowded. Also, you don't have high quality at home. For example, If you watching movies at home, you watch small TV and maybe, this situation not interesting.

Secondly, watching movies at the cinema different from watching movies at home in terms of: crowded and high quality. To start with, watching movies at the cinema is very enjoyable. Because, cinema saloon is very crowded. For example most important films come to cinema, everybody come to cinema for watching films. On the other hand cinema saloons have high quality. For example high quality volume and big wall and this situation is interesting.

To sum up, there are 2 main differences between watching movies at home and watching movies at the cinema crowded and high quality. I think, you should prefer watching movies at the cinema because all it's very enjoyable but important idea it's your idea.

(Orange) 2 (Preposition Omission)
(Purple) 1 (Verb Tense)
(Yellow) 3 (Word Choice)

Scanned by CamScanner