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1.1 Error Analysis: A Historical Perspective

Committing errors in learning a second language is a common phenomenon. When a person learns a language other than his own, he commits a number of errors of various types. These errors can be described as irregular, erroneous and deviant speech forms. The basic reason for the production of such speech forms is that the second language differs from the learner's mother tongue or his native speech in many respects. To commit errors in learning a second language is, therefore, a natural phenomenon and one can not avoid it at the initial stages of learning a second language. The learner's errors, therefore, assume greater importance and become the focus of attention. Much efforts have been made to find out the reasons for occurrence of the errors in learning a second language. The scholars have also paid their attentions to the measures and methods of avoiding the errors in the process of learning a second language. Learner's errors can be used by teachers to gain informations about the process of language learning. These errors should not be simply used for "judgemental purposes".

Till the middle of the nineteenth century, learner's errors were not view positively. The language teachers and scholars treated them as undesirable items which must be eliminated from the learner's performance. Perhaps, for the first time French (1949:30) declared that:

Errors are accidents directly attributable to honest endeavour.
to 'get it right'.

Morgan (1956), in the late fifties realized the importance of errors and considered them to be the natural phenomenon in the second language learning process.

Brooks (1960:58) considered errors to have a relationship to learning resembling the relationship which the sin has to virtue. According to Brooks (ibid):

The principal method of avoiding errors in the language learning is to observe and practicise the right modal a sufficient number of times and that the principal way of overcoming it is to shorten the time lapse between the incorrect response and presentating once more of the correct model.

After the sixties, there was a positive wave in favour of studying the learner's errors. In Germany, the Modern Language Materials Development Service Centre prepared the teachers manual for the German Level-1. It provided the specific guidelines to treat the students errors. The manual stated that:

The student should neither be required nor permitted to discover and correct their own mistakes.

The teachers not only concentrated themselves on the correction of learner's errors but they also tried to develope comprehensive plan to correct the deviant usage of learner's performance by preparing remedial and strategic instructional materials for language learning.
They correlated the learner's errors with process of learning. As stated by George (197:189):

...at the beginning of the sixties the word error was associated with correction, at the end with learning.

Error analysis as a theory and method of language pedagogy and second language learning started with the publication of Corder's article entitled 'The Significance of Learners Errors' in 1967. Corder (1967) considers learner's errors as strategies of learning and gives reasons why the learners errors are significant to the learner, the researcher, and the teacher. According to him:

Errors are not to be regarded as sign of inhibition, but simply as evidence of his (learner's) strategies of learning. Corder (ibid).

Corder's article gave new impetus to the concept of error analysis. After Corder, Strevens (1971:10-11) was another scholar who realized the importance of error analysis:

Error analysis has suddenly found a new importance, and from being mainly a technique for short circuiting the practical difficulty of bilingual comparison it has suddenly become a vital source of information about the progress of a learner towards his eventual competence in the language, and a crucial component in our search for adequate theories of language learning and language teaching.

The teachers involved in foreign language teaching have also
regarded the significance of the learner's errors and tried to find out their remedies. Hensen and Wilkins (1974:17) suggested that:

Whenever a mistake is made the teacher should correct it at once and then repeat the correct pattern or question for the benefit of the entire class.

The scholars applied the linguistic and psychological theories to study the learner's language extensively. Linguistics helped in evolving different theories and modals for conducting error analysis of learner's performance and process of learning.

1.2 **Contrastive Analysis**

Comparison of two or more language is an old tradition in the history of linguistics. The comparative study of languages, under the heading of comparative philology, fully developed during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to find out the genetic relationship between languages and to establish their 'proto forms'.

The necessity of teaching and learning second or the foreign language emphasised a need for comparing the structure of two languages with a view to find out the differences between them which become the chief sources of error in learning a second language. Contrastive analysis, which was based on the behaviorists theory of learning in psycholinguistics and structural approach in Linguistics, came into existence with the publication of Robert Lodo's *Linguistics Across Cultures* in 1957. The proponents of CA, Fries (1945), Weinreich (1953) and Lodo (1957) were much influenced by the ideas of Fries (1945). Advocating the role of
contrastive linguistics Fries (1945:9) said:

The most effective materials are those that are based on a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner.

Several other prominent British linguists such as Henry Sweet and Harold Palmer and Danish linguist Otto Jesperson were also well aware of the pull of the mother tongue in learning a second language. Henry Sweet (1899:198) pointed out the cross association between the native and the target language:

Each idea that comes to our minds instantly suggests the native expression of it whether the words are uttered or not, and however, strongly we may stamp the foreign expressions in our memories the native one will always be strong.

Ronald Wardhaugh (1970) divided the contrastive analysis into strong version and weak version. The strong version claims that contrastive Analysis of the two languages can reliably predict difficulties and errors in learning a second language.

1.2.1 Strong Version

Following are the representative statements about the strong version of CA:

The elements that are similar to his (learner) native language will be simple to him, and those elements that are different will be difficult. (Lado, 57:2)
... the change that has to take place in the language behaviour of a foreign language student can be equated with the differences between the structure of the student's native language and culture and that of the target language and culture. The task of the linguist, the cultural anthropologist, and the sociologist is to identify these differences. The task of the writer of a foreign language teaching programme is to develop materials which will be based on the statement of these differences; the task of the foreign language teacher is to be aware of these differences and to be prepared to teach them; the task of the student is to learn them.

(Banathy, et al 1966:37)

Robert Lee (1968: 186) suggests that strong version of contrastive analysis is based on the following assumptions:

(a) The prime cause of error in foreign language learning is mother tongue interference, and the greater the differences between the two languages, the more difficulties the learners has to face. Result of a comparision between the two languages are needed to predict the difficulties that the language learner would face while learning the foreign language.

(b) What is there to teach can best be found by comparing the two languages and then substracting what is common in them so that the student has to learn equals the sum of the differences established by the contrastive analysis.

Major proponents of the strong version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, e.g., Stockwell, Bowen and Martin (1965), Politzer (1965), DiPietro (1971) supported the view that the most difficult items in target
language will be those for which no counter-parts are available in the learner's native language. The strong version of CAH faced with both theoretical and experimental criticism and it has been found that the great majority of the errors either could not be traced to sources in the learner's native language, or could adequately be explained with reference to other sources. In the words of Wardhaugh (1970:129):

The contrastive analysis hypothesis has not proved to be workable, at least not in the strong version in which it was originally expressed..... In its weak version, however, it has proved to be helpful.

1.2.2 **Weak Version**

The limitations of the strong version of CAH, which could not account for all the real problems of the second language learners, developed another "weak version" of CAH. It is believed that in the learning of a second language, the native language of the learner in fact does not interfere with learning to the extent what the proponents of the strong version of CAH presumed.

Wardhaugh (1974:183) explains weak version of CA in the following words.

In contrast to the demand made by the strong version, the weak version requires of the linguist only that he use the best linguistic knowledge available to him in order to account for observed difficulties in second language learning. It does not require what the strong version requires, the prediction of those difficulties and, conversely, of those learning points which do not create any difficulties at all. The weak version
leads to an approach which makes fewer demands of contrastive theory than does the strong version.

* The weak version uses the evidence provided by interference as its starting point and works from such evidence toward relationships between systems rather than directly between systems. Linguistic systems are important, for there is no regression to a presystemic view of language nor is the result a mere classification of errors in any way that happens to be useful. The starting point in the contrast is provided by such evidence as phonological translation, interlingual identification, perception of foreign accent, and so on, and the two systems are used only to explain the observed data of phonic interference. Consequently, there can be no unpredicted relationships and difficulties nor can there be non-occurring predicted relationships and difficulties because each statement concerning a relationship has an observed datum as its point of origin. An awareness of systems is important, however, to discourage over-analysis and to provide a basis for classifying and explaining the observed interference phenomena.

The weak version allows for very detailed contrasts based on actual interference phenomena, ranging from phonological translation at one extreme to residual foreign accent at the other. In every case a statement of contrast is anchored in evidence from sound substance, since such evidence alone necessitates that statement. Then, the particular contrast is classified into some kind of system. Since the approach
recognizes the communicative process, this further reason would tend to recommend it over the strong version.

Newmark (1966), the proponent of weak version of CAH, suggested that 'when the student does not know to say something in the target language he pads and compares it with his native language'. This happens due to not knowing something in the target language and not simply due to learner's mother tongue interference. Scholars also felt that the native language and its knowledge facilitates the learning of second language and not to inhibit it. In fact, the weak version of CAH makes no prediction as to which type of errors will be made by the learners. It takes into account the errors made by the learner in his performance of target language. The difference between the linguistic systems is made to find reasons for the errors. In this way, the weak version becomes very close to EA.

1.2.3 Criticisms of CA

Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) has faced with theoretical, methodological and experimental criticism. Scholars like Banathy & Madarasz (1969), Duskova (1969), Butau (1970), Richards (1971), George (1972), Dulay and Burt (1972) and Whitman and Jackson (1972) have questioned CA's ability to predict the errors. Whitman & Jackson conducted four different contrastive analysis test of English and Japanese in order to predict the errors that would be made by Japanese learners of English. They compared these predictions with the errors actually made by learners in a series of test. They came to the conclusion that:

Contrastive analysis as represented by the four analysis tested in this project is inadequate theoretically and practically to
predict the interference problems of a language learner (Whitman & Jackson 1972:40).

The practical result of CA regarding the abilities to predict the errors has not been supported by the evidences. Teachers have found that error predicted by CA have often not occurred, whereas many errors would not have been predicted. According to Pit Corder (1967:162).

Teachers have not always been very impressed by this contribution from the linguist for the reason that their practical experience has already shown them where these difficulties lie and they have not felt that the contribution of the linguist has provided them with any significantly new information. They noted for example that many of the errors with which they are familiar not predicted by the linguist anyway.

James (1979 : 53-68) summed up the following nine points against contrastive analysis:

1. Interference from L1 (mother-tongue) is not the sole source of errors in L2 (target language) learning. There are other sources which CA fails to predict. Even the unsophisticated teacher who knows no Linguistics is conscious of more errors than CA can predict.
2. CA is based on, and perpetuates a naive view of language structure.
3. There are no established criteria for comparability.
4. The predictions of student errors in L2 as made by CA are not reliable.
5. CA endorses a teacher-centred rather than a learner-centred approach
to foreign language learning.

6. CA only conceives of interference in one direction, from L1 to L2.
7. We expect the strongest habit to exert most interference, so why is it that the weaker L2 habits interfere more with the L3 and L1 habits.
8. The degree of typological difference between L1 and L2 is not proportional to the interference strength.
9. Interference is an otiose idea: ignorance is the real cause of error.

Marton (1972:115) has pointed out that 'current views on pedagogical application of contrastive studies are marked by disappointment and pessimism'.

Whitman and Jackson (1972:40) have also very critical attitude toward contrastive analysis. They conclude:

Contrastive analysis is inadequate theoretically and practically to predict the interference problems of a language because interference, or native to target language transfer plays such a small role in language learning performance that no contrastive analysis, no matter how well conceived, could correlate highly with performance data, at least on the level of syntax.

1.2.4. **Validity of CA in Language Teaching and to EA**

One can not disregard the importance of CA on the basis of its criticisms. It has been a useful device in the task of language teaching, although it has some limitations. CA never claims that all errors in learning
a foreign/second language are entirely from the interference of mother tongue and it can solve all the problems of second language learning. CA gives attention only to those errors that are caused by mother-tongue interference in learning the second language (i.e., Inter-lingual error). It assumes that the key to the degree of difficulty lies in the difference between native and the target language. Since an individual tends to transfer the features of his native language to the target language, a contrastive study will be useful in identifying the similarities and differences between the languages and enables the linguist to predict the areas of difficulties for the second language learners. Contrastive analysis does not develop a new method of language teaching, but it is a form of language description across two languages which helps to the curriculum development, to the preparation and evaluation of teaching materials, to the diagnosis of learning problems and to testing.

Advocating the importance of CA, Caroll (1976 : 68) suggested some more points to be added in the CA approach. Firstly, the knowledge of unrepresented item in a learner's L1 is useful in identifying a problem area. Secondly, if certain items are attributed regularly in the target language then there is a good chance that the interference is due to the L1 and which needed more investigation. Thirdly, there are those who say that CA’S role is explanatory, predication being more efficiently left to error counts or the subjective experience of the teacher should be modified in such a way that by the time a large sample of errors has been collected, the teachers must account for as how many students have made these mistakes repeatedly and try to eliminate them as early as possible instead of presenting further teaching materials. In this way, CA is very useful tool which has the ability to predict
potential error areas and may help to explain and provide remedy for the erroroneous items which are present in learner's performance.

The criticisms of CA could not reduce the applicability of CA, as Silinker (1971) says that inspite of a serious crisis of confidence, CA is still thriving as evidenced by a number of conferences held in recent years, namely, the George Town Conference (1968), Cambridge Second International Conference (1969), and the Hawaii Pacific Conference (1971); and by the number of Ph.D. dissertations in contrastive linguistics and most interestingly by the recent growth of large scale contrastive projects in Europe. CA plays very significant role in error analysis. It traces the sources of errors and gives the causes of more than 50% of the total errors.

Chau (1975:135) regards CA as a helping device to EA. He is of the opinion that unless EA makes use of CA's insights it can not explain the inter-lingual errors.

Duskova (1969:29) suggested that:
Contrastive analysis might be profitably supplemented by the results of error-based analysis, particularly in the preparation of teaching materials.

The scholars shifted their attention from the contrastive analysis of the two languages to the process of second language learning. As Corder (1975:409) noted that:
More than there has been a gradual abondment by contrastive
analysis. Since 1968 of the stronger claims and increasingly research projects in this area have broadened their scope in two directions, firstly toward more theoretical objectives in language typology and the research for universals. Secondly toward psycholinguistic orientation concerned with the explanation of second language acquisition.

1.3 **Notion of Errors and Theories of EA**

The Contrastive Analysis, based on behaviouristic approach in nature, assumed that second language learning was a question of acquiring a set of new language habits. Therefore, most of the second language learner's errors were ascribed to interference of learner's mother tongue and consequently, a major part of second language teaching research was devoted to comparing the learner's mother tongue and the source language in order to predict and explain the errors made by the learners of particular language background. The studies under CA could not account for the real difficulties of learners. The emphasis of research shifted towards language teaching to language learning. The empirical research began in the field of second language acquisition.

The limitations of Strong Version of CAH and consequently, the emergence of weak version of CAH developed the concept of new technique of description and explanation of learner's performance in second language, which named as Error Analysis. The CAH approach was dominated by behavioristic approach, whereas, Error Analysis was inclined towards mentalistic approach of Transformation theory.
1.3.1 The View of Pit Corder

Corder (1974) views the learner's errors in a positive and optimistic manner. He has pointed out that the learner of a language progressively changes his language performance to bring it more into line with that of the native speaker. Instability in the characteristics of learner's language is thus both to be expected an desired. The learner while learning a second language constructs for himself a peculiar grammar. Whatever sentences thus learners produce may presumably be well formed in terms of his own transitional dialect. They are superficially deviant or inappropriate in terms of the target language.

Corder also distinguishes the terms like mistakes, lapses and errors. Native speakers also produce ill formed utterances. The characteristic of native speaker's errors is that when noticed by speaker or hearer they are correctable by the speaker. When a native speaker is not aware of his performance lacunas produces such errors which are mainly due to his mental strain, decision and fatigue. The lapses like the mistakes can also be recognized and corrected by the speaker. Mistakes and lapses are treated as non-systematic errors since these do not show regularity in their occurrence. From the linguistic point of view the lapses and mistakes committed by native speakers do not have a such significance. Learner's errors are systematic and consistant deviances produced due to imperfect knowledge of the target language. The learner of a second language cannot himself recognise his own errors. For such systematic errors Corder has the view that it is the transitional competence of the learner or the intermediate system constructed by the learner in the process of his second language learning which result
Corder (1971a) termed the learner's language as *idiosyncratic dialect*. To him the language of a second language learner is a peculiar dialect and, it is meaningful in the sense that it is systematic, regular consequently it is in principle describable in terms of a set of rules i.e., it has a grammar and some sub-sets of which are the sub-sets of the rules of the target social dialect. This dialect is unstable and not a language in the sense that its conventions are not shared by a social group and many of its sentences are uninterpretable by the native speakers of the target social dialect.

Corder (1974:131) also talks of the systemacity of errors. He distinguishes three 'stages' in learning as evidenced by the nature and degree of systemacity of errors committed by learners:

(a) **The presystematic stage:** The learner at his stage is unaware of the existence of a particular system or rule in the target language. His errors are quite random. He may occasionally produce a correct form. When asked to correct his own sentence, he can neither do so nor he can give any account of why he has chosen certain form.

(b) **The systematic stage:** The errors committed by the learner at this stage are regular. He has discovered and is operating some sort of wrong rules. When pointed out he himself can not correct his mistakes, but he can give some coherent account of the rule he has used in the target language performance.
The postsystematic stage: The learner at this stage produces correct forms but inconsistently. He has learned the rules of the target language but fails to apply it consistently due to the lack of attention or memory lapses. When asked about his errors he can give more or less coherent account of the rule and to some extent can also correct the ill forms he has produced.

Corder (1971) has suggested a three-steps approach to error analysis:

(a) It must be determined what the learner intended to say.
(b) The nature of at least part of the learners’s system, and how the error fits into it must be determined.
(c) The learner’s system must be discovered.

1.3.2 Selinker's Interlanguage

Selinker has pointed out the interlanguage phenomena in the performance of second language learners. He uses the terms fossilization to refer to a mechanism which, as he assumes, exists in the latent psychological structure. Selinker (1972 : 215) states that:

Fossilizable linguistic phenomena are Linguistic items, rules and subsystems which speakers of a particular NL will tend to keep in their IL relative to a particular TL, no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation and instruction he receives in the TL.

The latent psychological structure according to selinker consists
of five central processes. These five central processes are:

1. If the fossilizable items, rules, and subsystems which occur in IL performance are a result of the NL, then we are dealing with the process of *language transfer*;

2. If these fossilizable items, rules, and subsystems are a result of identifiable items in training procedures, then we are dealing with the process of *transfer of training*:

3. If they are result of an identifiable approach by the learner to the material to be learned, then we are dealing with *strategies of second language learning*:

4. If they are a result of an identifiable approach by the learner to communicate with native speakers of the TL, then we are dealing with *strategies of second language communication*, and finally;

5. If they are a result of a clear overgeneralization of TL rules and semantic features, then we are dealing with the *overgeneralization of TL linguistic material*.

Selinker hypothesizes that these five processes are central to second language learning, and that each process forces fossilizable material upon surface IL utterances. He further states that combinations of these processes would produce fossilized IL competence. Besides these processes, Selinker
further adds few more processes such as; spelling pronunciation, cognate pronunciation, holophrase learning and hypercorrection. These are reflected in the IL performance of the second language learners. Selinker finds five categories of influences which may lead to errors. Errors might be due to:

1) Negative transfer from the native language,

2) The influences of the teaching procedures,

3) The learner’s own strategies of acquisition,

4) The learner’s necessity to communicate in the second language to a degree exceeding his competence, or

5) Overgeneralization.

1.3.3. Nemser’s Approximative System

Nemser (1971:116) describes the L2 learners data as Approximative System. He defines the approximative system as:

The deviant Linguistics system actually employed by the learner attempting to utilize the target language. Such approximative systems vary in character in accordance with proficiency level; variation is also introduced by learning experience (including exposure of target language script system), communication function, personal learning characteristics, etc.

Nemser treats approximative system as learner pidgin, because L2 learners usually incorporate elements of grammar from their mother tongue.
and lexical elements from the target language. Nemser observes that the speech of a learner is structurally organised, manifesting the order and cohesiveness of a system, although one frequently changing with a typical rapidity and subject to radical reorganisation through the massive intrusion of new elements as learning proceeds. Nemser stresses that such learner speech should be studied not only by reference to approximative system and target language but in its own terms as well. Nemser observes the structural independence and unstable nature of LA. LA have frequent and systematic occurrence of element which can neither be attributable to the LS nor to the LT and the fluctuation in learning are a process of change in normal language system which exhibit true internal coherence. The amount and type of deviation in successive stages of learning varies systemically. Nemser divides them into two major stages; earlier stages are characterized by syncretism or under-differentiation of target language which influence the phonological, grammatical and lexical categories of the target language. The later stages are marked by the addition, interference types of reinterpretation, hyper-correction and analogy.

Nemser (1971:117) Justifies the study of the approximative system of the learner with the help of following reasons:

1. The systematic examination of learner speech has largely been neglected. The language teachers have rarely attempted comprehensive studies of these irregularities of the learners within a linguistic frame work.

2. Such investigation is also a pre-requisite for the validation of both the
3. The direct examination of LS is required as well by the suppositions of the contrastive approach itself. This approach is based on a general view of learning, i.e., prior learning effects the subsequent learning. Since the language structure are not comparable in their entireties and the learner's exposure to LT is gradual, the contrastive analysis faces a problem which can be resolved by reference of La. As said by Upshur (1962:123-27) the precepts of contrastive analysis itself force the inclusion of reference to La data in the prediction and elucidation of his subsequent learning behaviour.

Nemser approximative system conveys that the study of the learner's target language system is necessary to find out:

1) Interference errors and
2) Developmental errors.

1.3.4 View of George

George (1972:2-9) views the learner's errors with reference to the second language teaching programme. He states that:

An error is an unwanted form which a particular course designer or a teacher of second language does not want. These forms do occur and are expected to occur because of the fact that the learner puts the other language items in his own way.

George (et. al) regards language learners as an efficiency-seeking
organism, who selects, organises, and stores input related to the second language according to its own procedures. The teacher/course designer supplies input and feedback to the second language learner. The learner’s errors are the principal means by which the teacher determines the nature of the feedback and future input which will be most profitable to the learner. George divides errors into two large categories: 1) those due to the perception of redundancy and 2) those due to interferences. The perception of redundancy includes principally errors characterized by omissions, failure to make obligatory distinctions, and certain types of analogizing. George's use of interference covers both native language influences and influences from previously learned elements of the second language.

1.3.5 View of Jain

Jain (1974) presents a detailed analysis of errors in the Indian context. He examines errors of Indian students learning English in their own right. Jain pointed out that the learner internalise some rules of the language and they miss sub-rules. Jain’s study relates learner’s errors to learning strategies, teaching techniques, folklore about second language and learner's socio-linguistic situation in a precise manner. Jain (1974:28) also observes the learner's tendency in socio-linguistic situation. He states about the tendency of the learner in the following words:

In the case of the second language learner, the tendency to reduce the target language to a simpler system is exemplified at all levels of syntax. Allied to this, tendency of reduction is the second language learner's typical situation in which he learns the second language in his speech community. The learner has very little opportunity to expand the second
language system that he has been reducing to cope with once class room instruction is over, nor he has much motivation because he can get by with his reduced system of the second language, it is functional or operational for him in his situation.

1.4 **Summary and Conclusion**

In the present chapter we have discussed the emergence of Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis. The attitudional shift of teacher/researcher/course designers towards learner’s error have also been discussed.

Initially the approach to errors analysis was waved by the principles of contrastive analysis. The proponent of contrastive analysis Fries (1954), Lado (1957), Weinreich (1954), Politzer (1965) and DiPietro (1971) tried to find an explanation of errors made by a second language learner by referring to the difference between the source language and the target language. They thought that the most effective language teaching materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the target language to be learned, carefully, compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner. CAH developed into strong version and the weak version.

The strong version claimed that the structural difference in learner's mother tongue and target language creates difficulties in learning. The learner transfers the elements of the mother tongue in learning the target language.

The weak version advocates that ignorance is the real cause of errors. The weak version states that when the student does not know to say something
in target language, he may use other strategies to communicate in the second
language. In this way, the weak version becomes very close to error analysis
which describes and classifies learner's errors without any preconceived
notions.

CA influenced pedagogical research for more than a decade but it
faced with many criticisms. The scholar realised it as a teacher-centred
approach which accounts for the hypothetical errors due to interference of
the learner's mother tongue. It ignores other factors which results in various
types of systematic errors.

The EA emerged in a new climate which was very much influenced
by the Chomskian approach in the field of linguistics. EA gathers real and
attested errors of learners from their performance data. According to Corder
The learners while learning a second language overgeneralise the patterns of
target language. They also mix up the rules of their native language and the
target language which results in various types of systematic errors.

A number of terms have been devised to describe the errors of
second language learner's performance. There is commonness between
and Selinker's (1969, 1972) *interlanguage* (IL). All three of them view
learner's set of hypotheses about the target language in its own right. These
terms refer to the same phenomenon, but emphasise different aspect.
'Transitional competence' describes the system of rules that a learner has
developed at a particular stage and emphasises its temporary or transitional nature as the learner progresses. Idiosyncratic dialect emphasises that at any given time, the learner operates a self-contained dialect, the dialect which have uniqueness in comparison to target language. 'Approximative system' views the structural aspects of the learner's language which 'approximates' more or less closely to the target language system. The term 'interlanguage' draws attention to the fact that the learner's language system in neither that of the mother nor that of the second language, but contains elements from both.
ERROR ANALYSIS : NATURE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY
2.1 **Pedagogical Significance of Learner's Error**

The study of learner's errors is very significant from the pedagogical point of view. It gives a guideline to the teacher/syllabus designer for designing a remedial course of the target language. They may evaluate the effectiveness of the teaching materials and the teaching methods/techniques they use. Learner's errors pin point their difficulties which give insight to the teacher in solving the learners problems. Error Analysis also reflects the process of second language learning. As Corder (1981:6-7) says that:

> The differences in first and second languages those proposed by contrastive linguistics do not say anything about the process that takes place in learning the first and second language. The new hypothesis, i.e., the study of errors confirms verification or rejection of new hypothesis with regard to child language acquisition and its implication to the learning of the second language.

According to Corder (1981:10-11), the learner's errors are significant in the following different ways:

1. To the researcher they provide evidence of the system of the language the learner is using at a particular point or in other words we may say as he acquires or learns a second language and while learning it what sort