Full Length Research Paper

The efficacy of error analysis on second language learners' written accuracy: an empirical study in the context of Arab learners of English

Dr. Anwar Mohammed Abdou Mourssi

Higher College of Technology, Muscat, P. O Box 546, P. C. 115, the Sultanate of Oman.
E-mails: anwarmohd1967@yahoo.com; anwar.mourssi@hct.edu.om; Anwar2.Abdoumourssi@live.uwe.ac.uk

Abstract

To learn English Language as a second or a foreign language, one should realize that language is not an abstract construction of the learned, or of dictionary-makers, but is something arising out of the students' work. Many people all over the world strive to learn the English language as a second language or a foreign language, because it has become one of the most famous international languages in the world. But the question is how? The author believes that to predict or to analyze the learners' errors may provide the teachers, researchers and the learners with valuable information in the areas of difficulties that learners may encounter. An empirical study was conducted on 37 Arab Learners of English (ALEs) which lasted four months. A detailed analysis was made of the errors/mistakes of the simple past tense forms in 111 written texts produced by ALEs. Written texts were collected from each subject at three stages in the experiment (after two weeks, after two months and after four months). Quantitative and qualitative analyses show the effectiveness of error analysis on second/foreign language learners' written accuracy.

Keywords: Error analysis, SLA, Interlingual mistakes, Intralingual mistakes, Metalinguistic feedback, Simple past.

INTRODUCTION

The researcher believes that we can realize the areas of grammar complexity by identifying errors, and by analyzing these errors, we might get to our aim which is improving second/foreign language learners' writing as well as speaking by analyzing their errors/mistakes. It could be considered that when we want to improve speaking while teaching writing, teacher should follow the same stages in process writing. He can ask students to think, plan, form, think aloud in pairs or in groups, reform their speaking, and then produce their speaking about the task given. When learners fail to produce target-like form of the target tense or forget about the subject in forming sentences in English, here is the role of the teacher to interact and analyze the mistakes/errors and give feedback on the production of the learners. The author thinks that the process of error analysis might determine how learners process and categorise the input data which they are exposed. The current study focuses only on written accuracy.

This paper is divided into six main sections: section one is the introduction, the literature review is presented in section two, section three describes the methods used in the current study, the analysis and the discussion are presented in section four, the conclusion is presented in section five, and finally, the references are in section six. The following section presents the literature review.

Literature Review

In this section, what is generally meant by Error Analysis is presented in 2.1, and the significance of learners' errors, the influence of L1 and other possible sources of these errors are highlighted in 2.2, then, 2.3 casts light on the process of error analysis and its impact on improving second/foreign language learners' writing as well as speaking.

The reader should be reminded that the term of metalinguistic feedback refers to both Error/contrastive analysis presented for the L2 learners after their spoken

and first written draft based on the target task provided, without providing them with the target-like form. In other word, it refers to explain the nature of the L2 learners' mistakes. Although some linguists consider Error Analysis and Contrastive Analysis are out of date, they are still current in the field of SLA (Gass and Selinker 2008).

Definition of Error Analysis

Brown (1987:17) defined error analysis as a process through which researchers observe, analyze, and classify learner errors in order to elicit some information about the system operating within the learner. Unlike the contrastive analysis hypothesis which only examines errors attributed to negative transfer from the first language, error analysis investigates all possible sources of error and thus, outperforms contrastive analysis..

Ellis et al. (2008:52) provided a detailed account of, and exemplified a model for, error analysis offered by Corder (1977). Ellis (1997:15-20) and Hubbard et al., (1996:135-141) on the other hand, gave practical advice and provide clear examples of how to identify and analyze learners' errors.

Gass and Selinker (2008) defined errors as "red flags" that provide evidence about the knowledge of second language learners. According to Richards (1974), researchers are interested in discovering errors as they are believed to contain valuable information that could be used to develop strategies towards better language acquisition techniques. In the following, the differences between errors and mistakes will be presented.

Errors and Mistakes

Corder (1985:25) distinguished between errors of performance and errors of competence by referring to the former as *mistakes* and the latter as *errors.* Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991: 59), James (1998:78) and Ellis (2000:17) described the term 'mistake' as a random slip of a tongue and provided a criterion that might clarify the distinction between errors and mistakes. According to these authors, *a mistake* is a performance fault that the learner is able to correct when his attention is drawn to it, whereas, *an error* is believed to be not self-corrigible since a learner cannot correct it when his attention is drawn to it. Errors represent a lack of learner competence, are systematic, and might occur many times unrecognized by the learner.

The Significance of Learners' Errors

It was decided to focus on the simple past tense because errors in simple past formation seem to be commonly

found in learners' speaking and writing in the context of ALEs. Corder (1985, p. 19) was the first to draw attention to the significance of learners' errors and their systematic nature. According to him, errors must be viewed positively since they reflect the learner's systematic attempts to master the new system of the target language. They are significant for teachers, and, as they reveal how far the learner is progressing, for researchers. Further, they unmask the strategies the learner employs to discover the language and, for the learner, they represent a way to discover the nature of the target language. By committing errors the learner may be able to understand the target-like forms of the target language. Corder (1985:170) believed that errors are "an inevitable and indeed necessary part of the learning process". So what is the relationship between the learners' L1 and committing errors? In the following section, the answer is presented entitled the Influence of L1 and possible Sources of Errors.

The Influence of L1 and possible Sources of Errors

The students' errors may be seen as a result of different processes. Traditionally these processes have been considered to involve a mother tongue and a target language. Selinker (1992:37) identified five sources of errors: (1). *Language transfer*: referred to as L1 interference that means, the learner transfers the rule of his mother tongue to the target language, (2) *Overgeneralization:* referred to as developmental in L2 interference that occurs when the learner over-generalizes rules of the target language in a context where it does not fit, (3) *Strategies of second language communication*: refers to errors arising when the learner fails to make use of the target-like form of the target language rules while he tries to communicate with the native speaker, (4) *Transfer of training*: refers to errors that arise as a result of teaching situations and, (5) *Strategies of second language learning*: refers to errors that arise when the learner simplifies the target language rules to easier but non-target-like ones.

In general, the author agrees with Cook (2001:26) when he mentioned that no-one could produce a single sentence of English without having English grammar in their minds. The author's view is that the lack of a proper amount of grammar in the learners' minds might be a root cause of the mistakes and errors committed by L2 learners. Dulay and Burt (1973) claimed that only 3 per cent of learners' errors could be attributed to interference from the first language. The discussion presented in the current study, suggests that more than 7.3 per cent of errors that are committed by Arab learners of English could be attributed to interference from Arabic. The following part casts light on the error analysis process and its impact on improving second/foreign language learners' writing as well as speaking.

The Error Analysis Process and its Impact on Improving ALEs' Writing as well as Speaking

Although Ellis (1997:73) noted that error analysis did not provide a complete picture of how learners acquire an L2, as it only describes the learner's language as a collection of errors, it is my view that the predictions made by error analysis may inform practice in the classroom and provide teachers with the information they need to identify suitable strategies that learners may use to communicate or to learn the target language.

After teaching writing through stories, a detailed analysis was made of the way that students acquired a better mastery of the simple past tense. While examining the students' writing samples, plethora different types of errors were detected: local, global, interlingual, and intralingual and many others.

Certain types *of interlingual errors* which are originated in L1 and *intralingual errors* which are originated in L2 seem to be the most common ones for ALEs. However, Mourssi (2012a, 2012c) indicated that there is another type of errors which is committed by ALEs, namely, *in-between error*, which is originated in L1 and L2 as well. This may be a question of the method that teachers follow, or the learning strategies students follow while learning the target language. It might be because Arabic is classified as a pro-drop parameter language which means that learners or speakers do not use a personal pronoun in forming a complete sentence in the target language (Swain & Smith, 1987). From this point, it was decided to figure out how the process of error/contrastive analysis can help ALEs acquire the simple past as a concrete finding can be added to our knowledge.

According to Cook (2001:19), one of the most important aspects in the grammar of many languages is the order of words (syntax). Another aspect in grammar consists of changes in the forms of words which are more important for some languages than with others (inflection of morphology). Mourssi (2012b, 2012d) concluded that teaching English as a foreign language in the context of ALEs, it could be said that grammar is easier to study in L2 learning than with other aspects of the language because it is highly systematic and its effects are usually fairly obvious in their speech. However, the question here is which type of grammar is being taught. My view is that in the Middle-East (Arab World), we are teaching traditional grammar. Cook (2001:22) mentions that even main course books often rely on students knowing the terms of traditional grammar. The author thinks that there are some reasons behind teaching traditional grammar in the Arab world. One of these reasons might be the similarity between the methods of teaching grammar in Arabic, (Mourssi, 2013).

It is known that most Arab learners when learning Standard Arabic at school do so by learning the grammar following a traditional way of teaching. Teachers and learners agree that this is the best method of learning a language. Students learn the parts of speech, analyzing sentences which mean labelling the parts with their names and giving rules that explain in words how they may be combined.

The author believes that the students' knowledge of traditional grammar categories can be drawn upon in picture-story writing. Using pictures might motivate learners to produce the language without being shy or fearful of committing mistakes because they expect that the teacher will explain the mistakes and analyze them on the board. This in turn, improves their internalized grammatical system. In the following section, methods used in the current study will be presented.

METHODS

This section discusses the subjects of the study, the research question and the methods used in the analysis of the written texts.

The subjects of the study

Based on the results of a placement test, one class was selected from a total of 12 enrolled in grade 12. The target location was in one of the Omani government secondary schools (High School). The group consisted of 37 Arab Learners of English (ALEs), with ages ranging between 16 and 18, pre-intermediate to intermediate level in English. The subjects were all Arabic speakers and had been learning English as a foreign language for eight years attending four to five sessions per week on average.

The research question

The current study seeks to answer the following question: What is the impact of error analysis on second/foreign language learners' written accuracy? This is to provide empirical evidence in relation to the acquisition of the Second language structures to test hypotheses emerging from SLA and thus contribute to the advancement of theory on Second Language Acquisition.

Methods assigned to the research question

For the research question presented above, qualitative and quantitative analyses were followed for all the simple past tense forms produced by the samples in 111 written texts which had been collected chronologically. The author thinks in order to explore the efficacy of error analysis on the acquiring L2 grammar, three writing texts were collected from each sample in the group, the first

writing text (B) was collected after the first two weeks; the second writing (M) after the first two months while the third writing (F) was collected at the end of the experiment. The author thinks that writing is one way to get evidence of the state of a student's internalized grammar system and to measure the improvement occurs from a certain interlanguage stage to another.

In the following section the three variables which pose problems for ALEs will be discussed. These variables could be classified as: an *intralingual error* which is originated in L2; an *interlingual error* which is originated to L1 and *in-between* error which is originated in L1 and L2 as well.

DISCUSSION

As a starting point in discussing the variables have been indicated, there are two important questions: the first is how L2 learners learn the second language, and the second question is in what sequence they learn L2. I think to answer these two questions. The author mentions the findings of Cook (2001:30) who suggested six stages. They are as follows: the first stage is that firstly their grammar is just words; the second uses words in an SVO order; the third uses word order with some elements moved to the beginning or end; the fourth stage is the use of simplified S-procedures; the fifth uses the "S-procedure; and the last stage is acquiring the order of subordinate clauses. Here, the researcher would like to comment on that saying that most Arab Learners of English might not follow the same sequence in L2 learning, (Mourssi, 2012a, 2012c). On the other hand Dulay and Burt (1973) claimed that L2 learners have a common order of difficulty for grammatical morphemes. The sequence of Dulay and Burt (1973) comes as follow: plural "S"; progressive "ing"; copula "be"; auxiliary "be"; articles; irregular past tense; third person "S"; and finally possessive "S". The author believes that we cannot generalize this sequence for Arab learners of English. In the following, the first variable classified as an interlingual error (pro-drop parameter) will be discussed.

Interlingual Errors

According to Corder (1971), interlingual errors or transfer errors are those attributed to the native language (NL) but are common errors that L2 learners commit due to L1 interference/s. Interlingual errors happen when the learner's L1 habits (patterns, systems or rules) interfere or prevent the learner from acquiring the patterns and rules of the second language. Richards (1974:173) on the other hand presented two types of errors: interlingual errors, which are caused by the interference of the learner's mother tongue, and intralingual errors, which result from faulty or partial learning of the target language. The source of errors is often ambiguous and forms ambiguous errors that could be classified equally either as developmental or interlingual, for these errors reflect the learner's native language structure while at the same time possess qualities often found in the speech of children during their first language acquisition (Dulay et al, 1982:172).An example of an interlingual error exhibited by Arabic students in general and the subjects of the current study in particular concerns the pro-drop parameter. In what follows the discussion is about pro-drop parameter which represents a type of interlingual errors.

Pro-Drop Parameter

Pro-drop was chosen because it is very typical of Arabic speakers and seems to be a common error for most of the subjects of the research. James (1998:182) described parameter as a notion in Universal Grammar theory which views the L1 acquisition as a process involving children who are on the lookout for clues, as this forms part of the nature of the language being used in their native environments. The Arabic language is considered as a pro-drop language, while English is not.

According to Chomsky (1988:64), the pro-drop parameter *also so called "the null subject parameter"* determines whether the subject of a clause can be suppressed. The following examples are taken from the samples' first written text (writing B):

* reached the hospital. * put him in the jail. * because went to the super market. *sold our old car and bought new car. * ran away from the police. * hit the supermarket. * used the first aid box* give her medicine

In the following, the second variable classified as an intralingual error (forming simple past tense) will be discussed.

Intralingual Errors

According to Richards et al. (1993:187), intra-lingual errors are frequent, regardless of learner's language background. These errors reflect the learner's competence at a particular stage and elucidate some of the general characteristics of the language having acquired. They may also be influenced or caused by the strategies used by the learner or the way the language was taught. In the following is the discussion of forming the simple past which represents a type of intralingual errors committed by ALEs in the current study.

The Errors of Forming Simple Past

Cristall (2008:479) defined "tense" as an adjective category used in the grammatical description of verbs

(along with aspect and mood), and it is used to refer primarily to the way grammar marks the time when action took place and as denoted by the verb. Traditionally, there is a distinction between past, present and future tenses, and often presented with further divisions (perfect, pluperfect, etc.). In linguistics, the relationship between tense and time has been the subject of further studies, while it can be gleaned that a relationship between the two has not yet been empirically established. Tense forms (i.e. variations in the morphological form of the verb) can be used to signal meanings other than temporal ones. In English for example, the past-tense form (e.g. I knew) may signal a tentative meaning and not necessarily an elapsed as in some contexts (e.g. the author wishes he knew – that is, 'know now'). Thus, there is neither a simple one-to-one relationship between tense forms and time.

The present tense in English may help to refer to future or past time, depending on its context, for example:
I'm going home tomorrow.
Last week I'm walking down this street.

These two sentences cannot be accepted grammatically in Arabic Language. Both of them are considered expressing the present continuous. On the other hand, using *last week* in the second sentence does not match with the Arabic structure at all. From this point, it is noticed that there are many differences between the structure of the English sentence and the Arabic one.

It is worth mentioning that in Arabic, a word can already represent a complete sentence, which cannot be acceptable in English, since this word contains a subject S, a verb V, and an object O. For example:

(dharabtahoo) means (I hit him). When we analyze the sentence in Arabic, we can see that (dharab) is the verb which equal hit, (t) is the subject of the sentence which equal (I), and (hoo) is the object of the sentence which equal (him). To explain more clearly, see the following description:
* dharab   t   ahoo
* hit   I   him.

Another example, (qatalnahoom) which means (We fought them). This also cannot be accepted in English. When we analyze the sentence in Arabic and English, we can see that, (qatal) equal (fought), and (na) equal (we), and (hoom) equal (them). To explain more, see the following description:
* qatal   na   hoom
*fought   we   them

According to Cristall (2008:479) the term "aspect" refers primarily to the way the grammar marks the duration or type of temporal activity denoted by the verb. In addition, there are studies related to aspectual contrasts such as between perfective and imperfective, where a perfective would refer often to the completion of an action, while imperfective is the expressive duration without specifying completion. For example:
* darasto   droosy   ams.

* studied   lessons my   yesterday
I studied my lessons yesterday.
Yesterday I studied my lessons.
* fi al sabeaa ams konto adros droosy
*konto adros droosy ams fi al sabeaa.
Yesterday at seven I was studying my lessons.
I was studying my lessons yesterday at seven.

From these points, we can notice how difficult it is for Arab Learners of English (ALEs) to learn English Language as a foreign language without knowing and understanding the differences between English and Arabic language. So one theory for SLA might not be enough and also one teaching method or approach might not be enough to acquire L2 linguistic items also. From the analyses of the ALEs' errors and mistakes, and evaluating their improvement, Innovated Writing Process IWP was suggested to be followed in teaching writing aiming at improving their speaking as well as writing, (Mourssi, 2012d).

Due to intralingual errors, the author believes that this type of errors may be found of several types. Related to the samples of the current study, there are many patterns of intralingual errors students usually commit. Some of these errors are: lexical mis-selection, verb mis-selection, tenses' errors, preposition, articles and negation. While analysing students' errors, he found a plethora of errors in the fields of forming "simple past tense". Here are some examples taken from the samples' first written text (writing B):
* Boy halp a man / the boy tak nabr the car.
* After he shock the old man and Ahmed.
* Ahmed was walked on main street.
* Abdullah catched his hand.
* They were come back from school.
* the policeman writed eroprt.
* She was studied alone.
* the man crash the car.
* The ambulance was come fast.
*it raining a lot.
* They coming quickly.

In the following, the author will discuss the third variable which could be classified as in-between error (an error which is originated in L1 and L2 as well).

In-between Errors

Mourssi, (2012a, 2012c) indicated that in addition to interlingual errors which are originated in L1 and intralingual errors which are originated in L2, there is another type of errors namely *in- between error*, which is originated in L1 and L2 as well. In the current study, the subjects used two types of in-between errors which are: first, using verb *to be* + the simple past tense forms or agent or the past participle forms or the gerund, and second, using *to* + the simple past tense forms or the past participle forms.

Table 1. Using verb *to be* + the simple past/past participle or gerund

Stage	Non-target-like forms
B	23 (88.46 %)
M	2 (7.69%)
F	1 (3.84 %)
Total	26

Table 2. Using *to* + the simple past tense forms or the past participle forms

Stage	The Experimental Group
B	3 (60%)
M	1 (20%)
F	1 (20%)
Total	5

Using verb to be + the simple past/past participle or gerund

In the current study 26 non-target-like forms, representing the total number of the non-target-like forms produced by the subjects in the three chronological written texts. Table 1 above shows the proportion of the non-target-like forms.

The analysis of the non-target-like simple past forms produced by the samples of the current study indicated that second language learners used the auxiliary verb *to be* in conjunction with the simple past tense form and sometimes with the past participle or the gerund form, even though they have not studied the simple past passive or progressive yet. In my opinion this happens due to transfer from the subjects' L1, the equivalent of which is كان *kana.* This verb form is used to describe and narrate events which have happened in the past. This might be considered to constitute a case of negative transfer.

Other research studies which have looked at negative transfer confirm the influence of L1 in the acquisition of past morphology. In a classroom setting study, Housen (1995) observed over a three-year period six learners of L2 English whose native language was French and Dutch. Housen's results were mixed: the French learners were overall less proficient than the Dutch learners and never reached the stage where they could use past morphology productively. Transfer factors were involved specifically in the case of the past/non-past distinction, where Dutch is closer to English.

In addition, Anderson (2008:20) explained why the progressive form was used as a substitution of the simple past in the Swedish context. She explained that the students do not master how or when to use the progressive form and that they use the progressive form whenever they want. It is also worth mentioning that the same phenomenon was found in Kohlmyr's study (2003: 279-280) of Swedish 16-year-old learners of English. This can be evidence of the similarities between Arab learners of English and European learners of English. It is noticed that ALEs use the progressive forms as a substitution for the simple past tense forms.

Using to + the simple past tense forms or the past participle forms

The analysis of the non-target-like simple past forms produced by the samples of the current study indicated that second language learners used the infinitive + the simple past tense forms or the past participle forms: 22 non-target-like forms, representing 2.2% of the total number of the non-target-like forms. Lightbown and Spada (2006:79) mentioned that a number of studies show that many errors can be explained better in terms of learners' developing knowledge of the structure of the target language rather than in terms of an attempt to transfer patterns of their first language. Table 2 above shows the proportion of the forms representing using *to* + the simple past tense forms or the past participle forms

Table 2 above shows using *to* + the simple past tense forms or the past participle forms. The learners used *to* + the simple past tense or the past participle, e.g. *to visited, to came, to ran,* and *to called.* It is likely that this is again transfer from Arabic, where the equivalent of *to* أن "*ann*", is commonly used in narrating stories. This is again an instance of negative transfer and, though these forms were infrequent, their existence undermines a strong form of the argument presented by (Lightbown and Spada, 2006).

Table 3. The whole statistics of the three stages related to the whole samples in the group.

Stage	Simple past forms produced in the experiment	
	Target-like forms	Non-target-like forms
B	296 (25.36%)	229 (46.26%)
M	342 (29.30%)	223 (45.05%)
F	529 (45.32%)	43 (8.68%)

Tracing the target-like and non-target-like simple past forms in the three written texts

To measure the development of the internalized grammatical system due to implementing the process of error/contrastive analysis, the author traced the target-like and non-target-like simple past forms in the three chronological written texts, namely, writing B, writing M, and writing F. Table 3 shows the calculations of tracing the target-like and non-target-like simple past forms related to three written texts for the whole samples in the group.

Table 3 represents the target-like and non-target-like forms produced by the whole subjects in the three chronological stages in the experiment. It shows that the participants used a number of 296 (25.36%) target-like simple past forms in the first writing text. And the number of the target-like simple past forms increased in the second writing text. They used a number of 342 (29.30%) target-like simple past forms while the number increased to 529 (45.32%) target-like simple past forms. The participants committed a number of 229 (46.26%)) non-target-like simple past forms in the first writing text and the number reduced to a number of 223 (45.05%) non-target-like simple past forms, while the number sharply reduced to 43 (8.68%) non-target-like simple past forms.

The results provided above indicated the efficacy of error/contrastive analyses on second/foreign language learners' written accuracy.

In general, the comparison between verbs used in text one with verbs used in text two, it can be noticed that a progress occurred when there was a reduction in the amount of non-target-like forms and an increase in the amount of target-like forms. This can provide a supporting imposition over the impact of error/contrastive analysis in the form of feedback given by the teacher which is based on negotiation and interaction on improving second/foreign language learners' written accuracy.

CONCLUSION

The data collected as part of this study appear to indicate that it is helpful to analyze interlanguage through the prism of both the L1 and the L2. That reflects and supports the researcher's hypothesis (or intuition) that

most Arab learners of English think in Arabic first, before performing the task in English. It might be the case that this happens with most of the Arab learners of English up to higher levels, e.g. ESP courses, but certainly at intermediate and pre-intermediate levels.

The analysis of the samples' errors indicated that there are three types of errors committed by ALEs in forming the simple past tense in English which are: interlingual, intralingual and in-between errors. Finally, the decrease of the non-target-like forms occurred gradually from writing B, to writing M. Then, finally to writing F, besides the increase of the target-like forms occurred sharply from writing B, to writing M, and finally to writing F, indicate the efficacy of error analysis on improving second/foreign language learners' written accuracy.

REFERENCES

Andersson L (2008). Error made in time and tense: An investigation of errors made in time and tense in composition writing by 9th grade learners of English in Sweden: Gotebrag University, Department of English, and Linguistic C-essay. Interdisciplinary paper.

Brown HD (1987). Principles of language learning and teaching (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs. N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Chomsky N (1988). Language and Problems of Knowledge: The Managua Lectures. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data.

Cook VJ (2001). Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corder SP (1977). 'Simple codes' and the source of the second language learner's initial heuristic hypothesis. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 1/1:1-10.

Corder SP (1985). Error Analysis and Interlanguage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, 5th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Dulay H, Burt M (1973). Should we teach children syntax? Language Learning 23:245–58.

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

Ellis R (1997). Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis R (2000). Learning a Second Language through Interaction. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ellis R, Loewen S, Elder S, Erlam S, J Philip, Reinders H (2008). Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching, Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data.

Gass M, Selinker L (2008). Second language Acquisition. An Introductory Course. Third edition. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Housen A (1995). It's about time. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vrije Universiteit, Brussels, Belgium.

Hubbard P, Jones H, Thornton B, Wheeler B (1996). A Training Course for TEFL. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

in: De Bot, K., D. Coste, R. Ginsberg and C. Kramsch, (eds.). Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural Perspectives. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 39-52.

James C (1998). Errors in language learning and use. Exploring Error Analysis. Harlow: Longman Limited.

Kohlmyr P (2003). To Err Is Human….: An investigation of grammatical errors in Swedish 16-year-old learners' written production in English. Goteborg Universitet, Goteborg.

Larsen-Freeman D, Long HM (1991). An Introduction to Second Language acquisition Research. Harlow: Longman.

Lightbown P, Spada H (2006). How Languages are Learned. Second edition Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long M (1991). Focus on Form: A design feature in language teaching methodology,

Mourssi A (2012a). Analyzing Interlanguage Stages ALEs Pass Through in the Acquisition of the Simple Past Tense, English Language Teaching; Volume. 5 (1):148-163.

Mourssi A (2012b). The impact of Reflection and Metalinguistic Feedback in SLA: A Qualitative Research in the Context of Post Graduates. The Int. J. Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 1(1):122-139.

Mourssi A (2012c). The Acquisition of the Simple Past Tense in the Context of Arab Learners of English, Arab World Engl. J.; 3(3):204-222

Mourssi A (2012d). The Innovated Writing Process (IWP) Approach: a Practical Bridge between Recent SLA and Applied Linguistics Theories, Engl. Linguist. Res.;1(2), 102-118.

Mourssi A (2013). The Efficacy of Ex-implicit in between Implicit and Explicit Grammar Teaching Approach on Second/Foreign Language Learners' Writing. The Int. J. Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World, 2 (2):43-53.

Richard-Amato P (2003). Making it happen: from interactive to participatory language teaching. Theory and Practice. White Plains. NY. Longman.

Richards J (ed.) (1974). Error Analysis: Perspectives on Language Acquisition. London: Longman.

Richards J, Platt J, Weber H (1999). Longman Dictionary of Language and Applied Linguistics (18th ed.). Harlow: Longman Group UK.

Sakel J, Everett D (2012). Linguistic Fieldwork. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selinker L (1992). Rediscovering Interlanguage. London: Longman.

Swain M, Smith B (1987). Learner English. A teachers' guide to interference and other problems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.