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Errors in Words & Sentence Patterns
4.0. Introductory

All native speakers of a language seem to have an intuitive idea of what is meant by the term 'word' in its general sense, whether they write the language or not. But word as a linguistic unit is more difficult to define and has been the subject of much discussion. Its notion vary from person to person and from language to language. Any grammatical unit which seems to be a word may also function as a sentence, eg. 'Black' is a word, but in an occurrence like 'What is the colour of this cloth?' the answer may be 'Black'. This occurrence is a complete sentence.

In many ways the word is a unit of langue (language as a system) and for many writing systems a written word can be defined as a sequence of letters which occurs between spaces. According to Lyons (1968 : 200) "Word is the union of a particular meaning with a particular complex of sounds capable of a particular grammatical employment". He further says that the word is the unit par excellence of traditional grammatical theory, the basis for distinction between morphology and syntax and the principal unit of lexicography. P.H. Matthews (1974 : 1-2) referring to words remarks: "Words can be used grammatically or ungrammatically in sentences; choosing the 'right word' can take agonies of time ... Learning the diverse form of words ... is the most traditional and ritualised aspect of mastering a foreign language". Smalley (quoted in Pike, 1961 : 422) says: "When
we reach the construction which has internal limitations greater than its external ones ... we call it 'syllable' or 'word'. However, the most famous definition of word which is valid for the spoken language is Bloomfield's (1933: 177-79) 'minimum free form', which means that a word is the smallest unit which can be used alone to constitute a sentence or utterance, and it must consist of at least one free morpheme. Even so there are marginal cases, eg. 'the' and 'a' in English which can hardly stand alone.

The difficulties with the definition of the word have led linguists to distinguish this concept on several levels: the phonological word is bounded by pauses, the morphemic word is defined in terms of its position in the sentence, the lexical word is a vocabulary item with a specific meaning.

In systematic grammar a word is one of five grammatical units arranged in a hierarchy of rank scale: the unit 'word' is intermediary between 'morpheme' and 'group', i.e. a word consists of one or more morphemes and a group consists of one or more words.

A proper knowledge of words only can make our utterances grammatical, appropriate and meaningful. It leads to the higher units of the phrase, the clause, the sentence and may be others still larger. Language learning, therefore, involves learning its words, learning proper uses of the words.
and learning uses of the proper words.

The syllabus of class VIII in Orissa seems to have ample provisions for teaching proper concepts of words. Each lesson in the text-book is provided with notes and explanations. There are comprehension questions for teaching vocabulary. The teacher is expected to supplement them with a large number of oral questions. The exercises also provide for the study of unfamiliar words and their uses in given contexts. It is expected, therefore, that the students have proper knowledge of the words within the syllabus.

In this section we aim at analysing the learners' errors related to content-words. Improper use of words, use of wrong words or use of unnecessary words can hamper our communication sufficiently. These three areas have been dealt with here citing typical examples from the data. Sentences like 'A demon drove out the deer', or 'the princes thrown ashes' are lacking in such communication.

The analysis reveals a good deal of errors which are due to the phonetic similarity between the words like 'flow' and 'follow' or between 'curse' and 'cross', etc. Many of the errors can be ascribed to the semantic similarity of the words, eg. 'seeing' and 'looking'; 'fall' and 'drop' etc. A third plausible source of errors seems to be the fact that a word in L₂ has more than one equivalents in L₁. There are also errors which are because of L₁ interference or which are simply distorted.
Errors related to this category are sub-categorised as follows.

1. Errors due to use of wrong words.
2. Errors due to misuse of words.
3. Errors due to unnecessary insertion of words.

4.1. Errors due to use of wrong words

Some words which are spelt wrongly because of their phonetic similarity have already been discussed in the spelling chapter. There are still more words used wrongly on the same ground. We sub-categorise the errors into phonetically similar words and semantically similar words for further precision.

4.1.1. Phonetically similar words

Most of these errors like leaved ← lived, flowed ← followed, came ← can and harr ← heard etc. occurred in the dictation item. These may be teacher-induced errors, since, the faulty system of pronunciation in the schools leads to such errors. The arbitrary spelling-pronunciation system of English language itself also accounts for many errors of this type. This seems to be the plausible reason for certain errors which were met in the short textual answers. There were sentences like the following. (The underlined words are written in place of the bracketed words.)
One's a monkey lived ... (once)
Sita flowed Ram to the ... (followed)
Maricha dead. (died)
Bhasratha's pair ... (prayer)
The sage crossed the princes. (cursed) etc.

Thus the following words seem to have been
misused because of their phonetic similarity. The words
to the left and to the right of the arrow sound so similar
that the learners possibly confuse most often to use one
word for the other. This leads to 43 errors.

leaved ← lived 5
pair ← prayer 3
hart ← heard 1
sinner ← singer 1
sow ← show 4
flowed ← followed 5
followed ← flowed 8
one's ← once 1
dead ← died 1
when ← where 3
show ← saw 3
came ← can 2
cross ← curse 6

4.1.2. Semantically similar words
There are words which are similar in meaning
or at least they seem similar in meaning to the young learners
of English as $L_2$. In the use of such words the Oriya learners naturally confuse and commit errors. For example, there is only one equivalent in Oriya, i.e. 'कुळा' for English words 'beach', 'shore' and 'bank'. Oriya students write

- samudra कुळा for sea shore,
- samudra कुळा for sea beach, and
- nadi कुळा for river bank.

It is, therefore, quite plausible that Oriya students confuse the uses of 'shore', 'beach' and 'bank' and write erroneously 'sea bank', 'river beach', etc. Further, there is only one Oriya equivalent 'देखिबाः' for 'seeing' and 'looking' whereas English language differentiates between the two. Thus it leads to the possibility for Oriya students to indiscriminately use 'see' and 'look'. Our data revealed sentences like the following. (The underlined words are written in place of the bracketed words.)

The monkey fell fruits at the crocodile. (threw)
The monkey paid fruits to the crocodile. (gave)
The monkey rolled black berry of the tree. (threw)
The monkey thrown sweet fruits at him. (threw)
Maricha saw like a golden deer. (looked)
Maricha seeing a golden deer. (looked like)
They said about many things. (talked)
Sita was travelling ... (walking)
The crocodile lived in the tank. (river)
The crocodile lived on the sea bank. (river bank)
Thus the following words seem to have been misused due to their semantic similarity. The words to the left and to the right of the arrow are to some extent similar in meaning which the learners can not rightly distinguish. This leads to 49 such errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Misused Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>dropped</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rolled</td>
<td>throw</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thrown</td>
<td>threw</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seeing</td>
<td>looking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw like</td>
<td>looked like</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said</td>
<td>talked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dead</td>
<td>killed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become</td>
<td>to be</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td>gave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make</td>
<td>turned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>behind</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tank</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea bank</td>
<td>sea shore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>river beach</td>
<td>river bank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelling</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The words 'throw', 'dropped', 'fall' and 'paid' are so similar in meaning for young Oriya learners that they are likely to confuse their uses most of the time. The availability of many words in L₂ for a single word in L₁ or vice versa seems to be the reason for such errors. So
special care has to be taken in teaching such words in the class, i.e. the semantic contrast should be established clearly.

4.1.3. Words distorted

There is a class of errors found in the data which are seemingly English but completely unEnglish. These words are distorted forms or coined ones and there are 9 such errors.

- father-in-four ← fore-fathers 2
- sorrowly ← sorrowfully 3
- promised ← promised 1
- succeeded ← succaded 1
- once day ← one day 2

While 'father-in-four' may be ascribed to the students' negligence, the other errors seem to be due to the weak English spelling competence in the students. But such errors are repeated. Thus English spelling has always created problems for a learner who wants to learn English spelling.

4.1.4. Use of wrong words for no clear reason

The data also revealed some examples of substitutions of words of which no clear reason could be asserted. Words, completely opposite in meaning or far away from what the context needs are used. The students'
$L_1$ (Oriya) also does not show any degree of semantic similarity for these words. Some of such examples are as follows. (The underlined words are substituted for the bracketed words.)

Sita **promised** Ram to kill the deer. (requested)
Bhagiratha **gave** heavenly Ganga. (prayed)
Bhagiratha prayed and **call** Ganga ... (brought)
The monkey **brought** fruits to the crocodile. (gave)
Bhagiratha prayed and **carry** Ganga ... (brought)
Bhagiratha **came** heavenly Ganga by his prayer. (brought) etc.

The analysis reveals many more words which are substituted thus. A list of such words is given below. The words to the left of the arrow are written in place of words to the right of the arrow. It is, however, to be noted that only verbs, and no other grammatical category of words have been substituted. Possibly, verbs in English pose more difficulty in spelling and use, than the other categories to the students at this level. In all, there are 38 such errors as given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Substituted Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>call</td>
<td>brought</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>came</td>
<td>brought</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carry</td>
<td>brought</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought</td>
<td>gave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caught</td>
<td>took</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put</td>
<td>took</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought</td>
<td>took</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These errors are either due to students' sluggishness in learning or carelessness in writing. However, to avoid such errors rote-learning seems to be best suited for the pupils.

4.1.5. *Phrases distorted*

Finally, there are also some errors due to distortion of phrases. 16 such errors have been detected.

- such a like ← like this 2
- such the ← in such a way 2
- for free of ← for freeing 1
- by pray of ← by praying 4
- all day ← everyday 7
Out of these, 'for free of', 'by pray of' and 'all day' may be due to \( L_1 \) interference. These are, in fact, literal translations of the Oriya equivalents. Thus wrong words have been used in many contexts rendering the scripts unreadable and affecting communication quite substantially. The students' lack of language contact outside the classroom makes the learning situation deplorable. Their learning English directly depends upon the few English classes by their English teachers and the English text-books. The teaching strategies need effective improvement to make the teaching-learning process a success.

4.2. Errors due to misuse of words

Words have been misused very frequently. In the previous chapters some of such errors have been analysed. There still remain more of them which are analysed in this subsection. 'Misuse of words' refers to the fact that the students have a knowledge about the words, but grammatically from the point of view of function or form, these are not correctly used. For example the meanings of the words 'sage' and 'heavenly' are known to them, but while using these words as adjectives these are placed after the qualifying nouns, viz. 'Ganga heavenly', 'Bhagiratha sage' etc. This leads, therefore, to sub-categorise the errors into nouns misused, verbs misused, adjectives misused etc.
4.2.1. Nouns misused

There are a few nouns like 'thief', 'advice', 'danger', 'birth' and 'seat' etc. which have been misused 21 times as follows.

Ravan is theif that Sita. ← Ravan stole Sita away. 4
Ram obeyed his advice. ← Ram obeyed her request. 3
He is very dangers. ← He is very dangerous. 5
Ganga was birth. ← Ganga was born. 4
The monkey seat the tree. ← The monkey sat on the tree. 6

In the above examples 'thief', 'birth', and 'seat' have been used as verbs; 'dangers' has been five times used as an adjective and 'advice' has been substituted for 'request'.

4.2.2. Verbs misused

In the following examples verbs, phrasal verbs or idioms have been misused leading to 19 errors.

Sagar princes were realised. ← Sagar princes were released. 4
His grand fathers made sins. ← His grand fathers commited sins. 3
Sita learnt. ← Sita heard. 4
The deer called, ah Laxman. ← The deer cried, 'Ah Laxman'. 4
Sagar's sons fired to the Sage. ← Sagar's sons abused the sage. 4
4.2.3. Phrasal verbs misused

A demon drove out the deer.  ←  A demon came out of the deer.  3
Ravan catch out Sita  ←  Ravan took away Sita.  4

4.2.4. Idioms misused

The following examples show that verbs have been wrongly used or complements wrongly formed or a slang has been used.

The princes thrown ashes.  ←  The princes were cursed to ashes.  5
He looking in a golden deer.  ←  He looked like a golden deer.  4
Cursed him to burnt down.  ←  ... cursed him to ashes.  5

4.2.5. Adjectives misused

There are 33 errors where adjectives are wrongly used as shown in the following examples.

Bhagiratha sage  ←  Sage Bhagiratha  4
Ganga heavenly  ←  heavenly Ganga  8
fruits sweet  ←  sweet fruits  6
Sita beautiful  ←  beautiful Sita  4
heart sweet  ←  sweet heart  6
deer golden  ←  golden deer  5

Thus the students are familiar with the words and their meanings, but use them erroneously.
One reason for such misuse of nouns, verbs, phrasal verbs and idioms seems to be the students' lack of vocabulary. But this may also be due to the fact that they fail in distinguishing verbs from nouns and forming verbs from nouns. Secondly, the influence of \( L_1 \) seems to be generating such errors. This influence is two-fold: Pattern-based and Concept-based. Often verbs in \( L_2 \) have been formed in a pattern similar to \( L_1 \). Verbs in Oriya like 'Janma hela', and 'pāpa kalā' are formed by adding nouns with verbs, eg. 'janmā' (N) + 'hela' (V) where the English equivalent is birth (N) + was (V) and so 'was birth', and 'pāpa' (N) + 'kalā' (V) where the English equivalent is sin (N) + made (V) and so 'made sins'.

The conceptual transfer of \( L_1 \) is seen in expressions like 'Catch out Sita' where the Oriya equivalent is 'Sitānku dhari neigala' and 'gave up fruits' where the Oriya equivalent is 'phala deiddalā'.

So far as the wrong use of nouns as adjectives is concerned, the students might be lacking in the skill of forming adjectives from nouns by adding suffixes to these. The wrong uses of idioms seems to be due to the random idiomatic use of English verbs in combination with prepositions which becomes a hard nut for the pupils to crack, and the teaching in this case also, has not helped them to overcome these difficulties. The wrong placing of adjectives after nouns attests to the fact that even teaching in \( L_1 \) is not
properly carried out. Because there is no substantial
difference in such areas of $L_1$ and $L_2$, a proper knowledge
of $L_1$ grammar should have sufficed for students to use
adjectives correctly in $L_2$ also. Thus the inherent difficulty
in $L_2$ system, influence of $L_1$ and bad teaching-learning system
may be held responsible for such errors.

4.3. Errors due to unnecessary insertion of words

There are 79 errors where unnecessary words
have been inserted. These are either nouns, verbs, quantifiers,
adverbs or conjunctions. Further, the insertions are either
one word insertion or more than one word insertions. Some
errors of this type have been discussed in the section 'Word-
order'. In the following examples the bracketed words are
inserted.

4.3.1. Verbs inserted

From it (carry) Sita believed. ← From it Sita
believed. 2
sita (gave) requested Ram. ← Sita requested
Ram. 3
The crocodile (dropped) ate fruits. ← The crocodi
ate fruits. 2
Bhagiratha prayed (bring) Ganga. ← Bhagiratha
prayed Ganga. 3
Ganga came (jumped) from heaven. ← Ganga came from
heaven. 4
4.3.2. **Nouns inserted**

Ram killed (arrow) the deer. ← Ram killed the deer.  
One (day) morning ... ← One morning ...  
In the (tree) jungle ... ← In the jungle ...  
The monkey said (words) ... ← The monkey said ...  
Sagar sons were cursed (fire). ← Sagar sons were cursed.  
The crocodile (tree) ate fruits. ← The crocodile ate fruits.

4.3.3. **Quantifiers inserted**

(all) once ← once  
(some) every day ← everyday  
(each) many fruits ← many fruits

4.3.4. **Adverbs inserted**

Near a sea (there) a monkey lived in a tree.  
Many years ago (then) Ganga came...  
The crocodile was (here) under the tree.  
Ganga came (there) to the earth.

4.3.5. **Conjunctions inserted**

When Sita became sad (so) he followed.  
He was eating (as well as) fruits.  
Maricha cheated Sita (because) in a disguise.  
The deer ran (and) into the forest.
4.3.6. *More than one word inserted*

The heavenly (is to the) Ganga came. 3

Maricha (are into the ) cheated Sita. 3

The heavenly Ganga (on to the because) came. 4

Ganga was flowing (the) sage cursed by earth). 2

The demon Maricha cheated Sita ( his a cheat). 2

In the fine morning (in the Sita)... 2

In the above examples it is evident that the insertions are not systematic. A full clause is often meaninglessly inserted. The students do not seem to have acquired the basic word order of the language. However, the influence of L₁ is very often visible in these cases. 'One day morning', 'The monkey said words', and 'Near a sea there' seem to be literal translations of Oriya 'dine sakāle', 'mānkalā ṭathā kahilā', and 'seṭhāre samudra pākhare'. Though redundancy of adverbs is not permissible in Oriya, often in spoken English and quite often in the classroom, such sentences are spoken and students seem to have picked up from such environments errors like 'Near a sea there', 'Many years ago then', 'here under the tree' and 'there to the earth' etc.

Evidently, such a large number of faulty sentences denote the poor state of English teaching situation in Orissa. It is really very strange to find such sentences written by class VIII students even after five years of their English learning.
4.4. Loan words from $L_1$

Before we discuss $L_1$ interference, we need to mention two peculiarities that our data revealed. In one case the student has written part of his answers in Oriya. Possibly, he could not follow the direction given at the top of the question. In the other case, and there are two such instances, the answers of the students are not at all textual and contain purely self-inventory materials. These are not related to our analysis and we need not do in detail about them.

Coming to $L_1$ interference, here also our data revealed two peculiarities. In the first case the $L_1$ words are fully substituted for $L_2$ words and transliterated into English, which we call 'loan words from $L_1$'. In the second case, new words are built which partly resemble $L_1$ and partly $L_2$. This we call 'hybrid'.

The possible explanation for 'loan words from $L_1$' seems to be that the students cannot readily find the appropriate English equivalent words and therefore, transliterate the mother-tongue words into English. There are four such examples repeated 14 times in the data. The less number of errors relating to loan words from $L_1$ may be due to the fact that students at class VIII level do not have that much of intelligence and innovativeness to select and use such words. The examples are given below.

banabas ← living in the forest 2
jamukoli ← black berry 3
The examples are Oriya words and the students have used them in their raw forms except for the English appearance. Two of these words 'banabas' and 'ashram' may be grouped under Indian English and are therefore comprehensible to Indians. But the other two, i.e. 'jamukoli' and 'koli' are typically Oriya lexical words for 'black berry' and are not comprehensible to one who is not conversant in Oriya.

Use of such words seems to be quite natural in $L_2$ learning situation. But, in the interest of learning English the use of such words should be discouraged, for, English is learnt for broader perspectives and broader communication.

4.5. Hybridization

Kachru (1969 : 651) notes that hybridization is an interesting feature of South Asian English and can provide materials for sociolinguistic studies in the area related to it. Burrow (N.D. : 374) also remarks that the tendency to substitute new words has been permanently active in Indo-Aryan languages. It is mainly in the vocabulary that detailed confirmation of such influence must be sought.
A hybrid (or mixed form) is described as one which comprises two or more elements and in which at least one element is from \( L_1 \) and one from English, e.g. 'kumkum mark' where 'kumkum' is an inland word and 'mark' is an English word. It is possible to make a further distinction between (a) open set hybrid items like 'lathi-charge', and (b) closed system hybrid like 'police-wala'.

Our data yielded a category of errors where students have created words partly English and partly Oriya. This again seems to be due to the need of motivation for communication, or probably, the students do not readily find the English equivalent. The occurrences of these errors are quite rare, because creation of hybrids also needs a bit of knowledge and intelligence which students at this level seem to lack. We have only 7 examples repeated 13 times. These are either verbs, nouns, adjectives or phrases. The hybrids are listed below after the example.

Example 1: The monkey \textit{flete} fruits at the crocodile. ←–

The monkey threw fruits at the crocodile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Oriya</th>
<th>Oriya + English</th>
<th>Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbs: fling</td>
<td>phingibā</td>
<td>fling + -ed</td>
<td>flete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pray</td>
<td>dhyān</td>
<td>dhyān + -ed</td>
<td>dhyaned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kill</td>
<td>maribā</td>
<td>maribā + -ed</td>
<td>marroed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns: black berry</td>
<td>jāmu</td>
<td>jāmu + fruit</td>
<td>Jamufruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deer</td>
<td>mruga</td>
<td>mruga + 's</td>
<td>murgart's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. : big</td>
<td>bada</td>
<td>bada + all</td>
<td>All bado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase: Victory to Mother Ganga</td>
<td>Gangāmā</td>
<td>Ganga ki jay + mother</td>
<td>Mother Ganga ki jay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
2
3
2
1
1
2
In the above examples the words 'dhyaned', 'jamu fruit', and 'all bado' have Oriya roots and English suffixes. In 'flete' and 'murgart' the words are partially English and partially Oriya. The phrase 'Ganga mother ki jay' also is a combination of words — some English, some Hindi and some Oriya. Hybridization is a natural phenomenon in the process of L₂ learning. Languages are flexible and hybridization is a process whereby new items are added to it. But until the hybrids have got social recognition, it is harmful to bring them into refined writing. However, at class VIII level hybridization should be discouraged. Otherwise it may so happen that the students will begin to overgeneralise the process of hybridization, whereby L₂ learning will be greatly affected. They will look for more of such words in Oriya, which will lighten their linguistic burden because of the inherent simplicity in learning such words rather than learning the English words.

Number of errors related to words is shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the errors</th>
<th>Frequency of errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of wrong words: a. phonetically similar</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. semantically similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. distorted words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. distorted phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. for other reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Misuse of words:
- a. nouns misused: 21
- b. verbs misused: 19
- c. phrasal verbs misused: 7
- d. idioms misused: 18
- e. adjectives misused: 33

---

### Unnecessary insertion of words:
- a. verbs inserted: 14
- b. nouns inserted: 18
- c. quantifiers inserted: 7
- d. adverbs inserted: 11
- e. conjunctions inserted: 13
- f. more than one word inserted: 16

---

### Loan words from $L_1$
- 14

### Hybridization
- 13

---

### Grand total
- 359

The table indicates that wrongly used words amount to maximum errors, i.e. 155 and errors due to loan words from $L_1$ and hybridization amount to 14 and 13 respectively. Misuse of words accounts for 98 errors while unnecessary insertion of words has 79 errors.

The following table shows the total number of errors analysed in this study.
Table - 29
Total number of errors analysed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of errors</th>
<th>Frequency of errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Errors due to spelling etc.</td>
<td>4394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical errors</td>
<td>3985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errors related to words and sentences</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reveals that 8738 errors have been analysed in this study, out of which 4394 errors relate to spelling etc., 3985 errors relate to grammar and 359 errors relate to words and sentences.

4.6. Errors relating to Sentence-Patterns

A.S. Hornby (1976: 5) notes: "... the learner is — or should be — more concerned with sentence-building. For this he needs to become acquainted with the patterns of English sentences". Every language has its own sentence patterns and the intended message, for proper communication, must be patterned accordingly. The sentence patterns in English and Oriya differ widely. So that Oriya students, who have been accustomed to the patterns of Oriya language from their childhood, are found quite often to organise the message in a pattern parallel to their mother-
tongue. Thus the mother-tongue, Oriya, considerably affects the English sentence patterns of Oriya learners of English as \( L_2 \). This section is concerned with certain erroneous sentence patterns which have been detected in the study related to simple, complex and compound sentences.

4.6.1. Simple sentence-patterns

The errors in simple sentences are both at the noun phrase level and the verb phrase level. On the noun phrase level the errors are due to omission, insertion or substitution and on the verb phrase level the errors are due to omission, insertion and substitution. The errors have been diagramatically represented. The dotted branch line in each case indicates the point of error. The diagram to the right hand side gives the correct pattern of the erroneous sentence.

As the study reveals, the errors are more at the verb phrase level than at the noun phrase level. The reason is due to the influence of Oriya language. In Oriya, the tendency is always to place the adverbs and the objects with the verb phrase. Thus with its normal SOV sentence pattern and its further tendency to focus on verb phrases, Oriya language influence accounts for most of the erroneous English sentence patterns.
(a) Errors at the noun phrase level

1. Omission of noun phrase

The patterns of sentences have been affected due to omission of noun phrases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incorrect pattern</th>
<th>Correct pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-a</td>
<td>1-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Diagram 1-a]</td>
<td>![Diagram 1-b]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - ) Came into the forest.</td>
<td>Maricha came into the forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( - ) Gave fruits to the crocodile.</td>
<td>The monkey gave fruits to the crocodile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-a                2-b
| ![Diagram 2-a]    | ![Diagram 2-b]  |
| Sita saw ( - ).   | Sita saw the deer. |
| Bhagirath brought(-)... | Bhagirath brought Ganga... |

ii. Insertion of the noun phrase

Noun phrases have been unnecessarily inserted into the sentences leading to erroneous structures.
Another example in this pattern is

Ram killed the animal deer. ← Ram killed the deer.

In these examples the direct object 'food' and another direct object 'animal' have been repeated. Two objects can not occur grammatically without a conjunction.

iii. Substitution of noun phrase

4-a. 4-b.

Sita told her husband to take it for her.

Sita told her husband to take it for her.
In this sentence pattern noun phrases 'for her' and 'it' have been substituted. In such cases the direct object, ('it' in this case) should come first followed by the indirect object.

5-a.

```
S
 NP VP
   NP VP NP
      Site the cheated. demon
```

5-b.

```
S
 NP VP
   VP NP
      cheated Sita.
```

6-a.

```
S
 NP VP
   VP NP
      was
         NP (NP)Adv. the river beside.
```

6-b.

```
S
 NP VP
   VP NP
      was
         (NP)Adv. beside the river.
```

The other examples in this pattern are:
This tree was river beside. ← This tree was beside the river.
The monkey was the tree under. ← The monkey was under the tree.

In 5-a. above two NPs. and in 6-a. the adverb and the VP have been mutually substituted.
(b) **Errors at the verb phrase level**

1. **Omission of VP**

   Omission of VP accounts for one erroneous pattern. Below, the diagrams and the examples show the omissions of the verb phrases.

   7-a. 
   
   \[ \begin{array}{c}
   S \\
   \downarrow NP \\
   \quad \downarrow VP \\
   \quad \quad \downarrow NP \\
   \quad \quad \quad \text{Maricha} \\
   \quad \quad \quad \downarrow VP \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow NP \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{(-)} \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{as a deer.}
   \end{array} \]

   7-b. 
   
   \[ \begin{array}{c}
   S \\
   \downarrow NP \\
   \quad \downarrow VP \\
   \quad \quad \downarrow NP \\
   \quad \quad \quad \text{Maricha} \\
   \quad \quad \quad \downarrow VP \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \downarrow NP \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{VP} \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{came} \\
   \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{as a deer.}
   \end{array} \]

   The other examples in this pattern are as follows.

   The bracketed VPs are always missing.

   The monkey (gave) the crocodile to eat.
   The crocodile and the monkey (became) friends.
   Bhagiratha (brought) heavenly Ganga to the earth.
   He (said) O' my friend...
   She (said) Laxman, you go.
   The king of Lanka (sent) to the demon.
   The animals (wanted) to go.

11. **Insertion of VP**

   There are three erroneous sentence patterns due to the insertion of VPs.
Two other examples are:

He **became** cursed Sagar sons.  
They **became** **were** friends.

In the above diagrams and the examples 'appeared', 'became' and 'were' have been unnecessarily inserted. In 9-a. below 'come' has been inserted.

iii. **Substitution of VP**

Substitution of VP accounts for the maximum erroneous sentence patterns. As shown in the following diagrams the VP has been always replaced by an NP.
10-a. Sita requested Ram to catch the deer.

10-b. Sita requested Ram to catch the deer.

11-a. The monkey and the crocodile became nice friends.

11-b. The monkey and the crocodile became nice friends.

12-a. They became friends.

12-b. They became friends.
Other examples are: The monkey river water drinks.

He black berry ate.

Demon Maricha Sita deceived.

Pattern 13-a. is normal to Oriya language. So for Oriya learners of English as L2 quite often this pattern becomes a trouble spot in English. 14-a. below is a further example of this pattern.
The above analysis and diagrams show that there are as many as 14 different kinds of erroneous simple sentence-patterns occurring in the data. Patterns in the verb phrases are relatively more. To remedy the errors related to sentence-patterns the basic SVO pattern of English needs be stressed. It may be shown in a comparative way with the basic SOV pattern of Oriya language. The patterns could be drilled through substitution-tables and other exercises like dictation, translation and controlled composition could be undertaken.

4.6.2. Complex sentence-patterns

The structures of complex sentences also have not been properly maintained by the learners under this analysis. The subordinating conjunctions have either been omitted, eg. (a) below, or both the subordinating and coordinating conjunctions have been used, eg. (b-1) below. Further, the relative pronoun has been used along with the personal pronoun, eg. (b-ii) below.

(a) Omission of subordinating conjunction

(i) It is the demon Maricha cheat Sita.←

It was the demon Maricha who cheated Sita.

(ii) The crocodile came to the tree the monkey lived.←

The crocodile came to the tree where the monkey lived

(iii) Maricha came to Panchabati Sita lived.←

Maricha came to Panchabati where Sita lived.
In the above sentences 'who' and 'where' have been omitted whereby the structures of the complex sentences are damaged. The structure should have been complex sentence = Main Clause + Subordinating Conj. + Subordinating Clause.

(b) **Insertion of conjunctions**

There are sentences like the following.

(i) When Sita became sad so he followed the deer.
(ii) Bhagiratha who was the grand son of Sagar he took Ganga from heaven to the earth.

In case of the sentence (i) above co-ordinating conjunction 'so' and the subordinating conjunction 'when' have been used simultaneously. In sentence (ii), after writing 'Bhagiratha who was the grand son of Sagar' the pronoun 'he' becomes redundant. In both of these sentences, the complex sentence structure of English is affected.

4.6.3. **Compound sentence pattern**

In compound sentences the particular kind of error that has been found is the omission of the co-ordinating conjunction. Without using comma, full-stop or co-ordinating conjunctions, main clauses have been grouped together. Often more than two main clauses are found to have been put together. Some examples of such errors are given below.
(a) **Omission of one conjunction**

Sita said ( - ) Ram killed the deer.
Bhagiratha prayed ( - ) Ganga came to the earth.
He came near the tree ( - ) the fruit of black berry ate.
Ram saw the deer ( - ) an arrow in Maricha.
Bhagiratha prayed ( - ) the heavenly Ganga came to the earth.

In the above sentences the dash '(-)' indicates that the subordinating conjunction 'and' and 'so' have been omitted. The normal structure of a compound sentence is:

```
Compound Sentence = Main Clause + Subordinating Conjunction + Main Clause.
```

(b) **Omission of more than one conjunction**

In the data there are also sentences of the following type where more than one conjunction has been omitted.

Ram followed the deer ( - ) shot an arrow ( - ) killed it.
The crocodile came there ( - ) asked for fruit ( - ) ate.
Bhagiratha prayed Ganga ( - ) Ganga came ( - ) saved sagar son

In all the above three sentences, conjunctions in the ( - ) places have not been written. Thus in simple sentences numerous erroneous patterns have been found while in complex sentence two erroneous patterns and in compound sentence only one erroneous pattern has been detected.
Simple sentence is the basic pattern from which one moves to the higher units of complex and compound sentences. So, if simple sentence pattern is properly stressed and the students are sufficiently trained, it would consequently lead to their language efficiency in complex and compound sentence-formation.

In Orissa structural method has already been introduced since 1957 and elementary structures, prepared by the NCERT, have already been divided, distributed over years and introduced into the school-syllabuses from class IV. According to the Board's view : in class VIII, students learn the last 21 English structures, i.e. at the end of class VIII a student is expected to be perfect in elementary English structures. Under such circumstances it is really surprising and heartening to note that they fall into erroneous sentence patterns many a time. If five years' of English teaching has not helped the students, possibly, nothing else can.

Sebeok (1974 : 222) states : "A child will retain grammar even when repeating utter nonsense, whereas a chimpanzee apparently will exclude grammar even when conveying perfect meaning". In view of this statement and in view of the numerous erroneous sentence patterns, revealed in our study, one may rightly suppose that inspite of all things said and done, the structural method of teaching English is not strictly and properly followed in these schools and the structures are not adequately drilled in the class. The teaching seems to have been based on the old Grammar-Translation method.