Abstract: Analysis of student errors is a welcome element of parser-based writing aids

ERRORS MADE BY IRAQI EFL UNDEGRAGUATE STUDENTS IN USING MANDATIVE SUBJUNCTIVES

[1]Dr. Salih Mahdi Adai AlMamoory, [2]Sebe Zeid Watoot

ABSTRACT--This paper is to analyze errors made by Iraqi EFL undergraduate students in using mandative subjunctive at the University of Babylon. Identifying and analyzing errors as well as finding out their causes that are crucial in foreign language learning. This case study focuses on analyzing forty five sheets to find out solutions to improve accuracy in language competence for the learners. The results show that the learners make different types of errors and they are not qualified enough as mandative as concerned. The error analysis contributes to raising awareness about the precise use of mandative subjunctive to improve learners' language ability.

Key words--error analysis, mandative subjunctive.

I.   THE PROBLEM

The most utilize of the English show subjunctive, called the mandative or jussive subjunctive, happens in that clauses expressing a circumstance that's wanted, requested, prescribed, vital. Such a clause may be subordinate on verbs like demand, recommend, request, incline toward, and prescribe.

Languages vary differently among themselves. Learners of a foreign language make errors when they produce the target language. These errors are of different levels, levels of errors may be found at a single unit of language use. Iraqi undergraduate university learners face difficulties in using the mandative subjunctive. This study is to scrutiny what are the error types made when using English as a target language.to what extent mandative subjunctive forms in English similar/ different of those in Arabic? In what way(s) do the similarities and differences affect the speakers of the target language? What are the general inferences are derivable from the error analysis?

1.2. The Aims

The present study aims at:

1-Investigating the errors of Iraqi university learners in the mandative subjunctive.

2-Identifying the types of these errors.

3-Finding out the reasons behind making such errors.

1.3. The Hypothesis

It is hypothesized:

---

[1] *Prof.,Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, salih_mehdi71@yahoo.com*

[2] *Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, missoykon@gmail.com*

1-Iraqi undergraduate EFL learners face difficulties when using the mandative subjunctive.

2-Iraqi undergraduate EFL learners errors have different reasons such as negative transfer, overgeneralization and lack of knowledge.

1.4. Procedures and Data Collection

The study adopts the following steps:

1-Surveying the literature relates to the mandative subjunctive.

2-Analyzing the chosen data.

3-Arriving at a set of conclusions.

The data are the answers sheets of the 4th year students.

1.5 The Value

Hopefully the current study will be of some value to those who are interested in language teaching and learning as follows:

1-The study helps to interpret how learners understand and use the mandative subjunctive

2-The study discovers the practical problems behind the erroneous use of the mandative subjunctive.

1.6. The Limits

1-This study is limited to Iraqi undergraduate university EFL learners when using the mandative subjunctive.

1.7. Sample Population

Forty five Iraqi undergraduate university EFL students provide the sample population for this study. These students are intentionally tested on the use of the mandative subjunctive in the academic year 2018-2019. The choice of the fourth year students is anchored on the presumption (by the researcher) that errors committed as such level (of students study) have become fossilized.

1.8. Instruments

Each of the students is requested to answer two questions at the recognition level were question one is out of 12 items to answer with **false or true,** question two is of 12 items to be answered with multiple choice technique.

The questions number three and four are designed to investigate the production level, were question number tree consist of five items to be answered and in question four the examinees are asked to exemplify using the verbs used with that clauses to express mandative subjunctive, for more details see Appendix A.

II.   MANDATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE

2.1. The Subjunctive

The subjunctive is used to make sentences that don't describe familiar objective facts, such as wishes or theoretic suppositions. These prefer statements regarding one's state of mind, like opinion, belief, purpose, intention, or desire.

A definition of "the subjunctive" isn't actually acquired, as there has customarily been significant contradiction among grammarians about its highlights and capacities. Cannon (1959:11) defines the subjunctive: "the person who would attempt to define the subjunctive mood wholly in notional or in formal terms is on the horns of a dilemma, for the mood successfully resists definition if either of these two approaches is used to the exclusion of the other".

According to Poutsma (1922:1), the subjunctive is a *mood*, "a form of the finite verb, or verb-group, by means of which the speaker expresses his mental attitude towards the fulfillment of the action or state expressed by the predicate". Cannon (1959:11) shows that "if the attitude is one of uncertainty, nonfulfillment, unreality, improbability, or impossibility, most grammarians would recommend the use of the subjunctive mood".

2.2. Forms of subjunctive

The subjunctive has two forms either present form or past form , which are normally the same as the indicative in the present and indicative in the past.

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 995-1002) discuss the uses of the present subjunctive in four main areas: (1) mandative clauses; (2) other types of content clause, licensed by a small number of items such as lest, if, on condition that and though; (3) exhaustive conditional clauses; (4) formulaic phrases or frames.

The most utilize of the English show subjunctive called mandative subjunctive happens in that clauses expressing a circumstance that's requested. Such a clause may be subordinate on verbs like demand, propose and request toward descriptive words like fundamental, alluring, or things like a proposal, need ;it may be a portion of the expression in arranging that, it may moreover stand freely as the subject of a clause or as a predicative expression.

As for the present subjunctive, it differs from the present indicative only in the third person singular form in which the subjunctive is written without the ending –s.

Present indicative will be like; I write, she writes, they write, we write.
Present subjunctive will be like; (that) I write, (that) she writes, (that) they write, (that) we write.

Studies as in Johansson and Norheim (1988) and Övergaard (1995), have demonstrated that present subjunctive forms are generally found in mandative clauses: content clauses which can be verbs, nouns or adjectives are semantically related to mandative items.

Leech et al. (2009) point to the rebirth of the present subjunctive in mandative clauses that had taken place first in American English, round the beginning of the twentieth century, while it reappeared in British English round the 1950s.

While in the past subjunctive, the verb be is used but in its past tense written in the 'were' form.
Past indicative will be like; I was. She was, they were, we were.

Past subjunctive will be like; (that) I were, (that) she were, (that) they were, (that) we were.

According to Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1002–4), past subjunctive appears in variation with modal preterits (including past-tense modals), in the following environments: (1) in remote conditionals, (2) in complements to wish, (3) after would rather/sooner/as soon, (4) after it BE (about/high) time.

2.3. Characteristics of Subjunctive

Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 90) discuss whether to consider subjunctive constructions finite or non-finite. The non-finite characteristics of subjunctive constructions are said to be that (1) they feature the (non-tensed) plain form; (2) they do not feature 'auxiliary do'; (3) they are usually subordinate.

Their finite characteristics are that (1) they have an obligatory subject (note that there is no mention of taking nominative pronominal subjects); (2) they commonly take the same subordinator as tensed declaratives, namely that; (3) 'except in more or less fixed expressions, the subjunctive alternates with a tensed construction'

2.3.1. That Clause Structure

According to Quirk et al. (1985:156), the most common use of the subjunctive, occurs in subordinate that-clauses when the that-clause is "introduced by an expression of demand, recommendation, proposal, resolution, intention, etc."

Hoffmann (1997: 46–60) deliberates nominal and non-finite mandative constructions as alternatives of mandative that-clauses. He comes to the conclusion that of the seven verbs of his corpus three take that-clauses only rarely (order, request, demand), two show no clear preference for finite or non-finite constructions (insist, suggest), and two do not accept non-finite constructions at all (recommend, propose).

III.   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

To analyze errors in the use of the mandative subjunctive, forty five students are examined from Iraqi undergraduate EFL students. They had learned grammar level 1, 2, 3 and Syntax. It is the most feasible way to make an analysis of errors in their use of the mandative subjunctive in English.

IV.   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Nur Baithy (2014) mentions that errors are the evidence of adjusting regulations of target language learning process and such an analysis is necessary to realize student's language competence. It is found that omissions, misformation, addition and misordering errors are committed.

The discussion below refers to 45 examples (see Appendix A) of erroneous sentences drawn from the Iraqi corpus of student mandative subjunctive.

Table 1: the performance of the examinees at the recognition (Q 1+Q2) and production (Q3+Q4) levels

Question 1 Recognition Level				
Item	Number of Correct answers	Percentage	Number of Incorrect answers	Percentage
1	3	6%	42	93%
2	24	53%	21	46%
3	24	53%	21	46%
4	12	26%	33	73%
5	21	46%	24	53%
6	27	60%	18	40%

7	30	66%	15	33%
8	27	60%	18	40%
9	15	33%	30	66%
10	15	33%	30	66%
11	12	26%	33	73%
12	21	46%	24	53%
Total	231	100%	309	100%

Question 2 Recognition Level

Item	Number of Correct answers	Percentage	Number of Incorrect answers	Percentage
1	9	20%	36	80%
2	3	6%	42	93%
3	24	53%	24	53%
4	0	0%	45	100%
5	12	26%	33	73%
6	3	6%	42	93%
7	0	0%	45	100%
8	3	6%	42	93%
9	0	0%	45	100%%
10	9	20%	39	86%
11	9	20%	36	80%
12	24	53%	18	40%
Total	96	100%	447	
Total Q 1+2	327		756	

Question 3   Production Level

Item	Correct answers	Percentage	Incorrect answers	Percentage
1	3	6%	42	93%
2	0	0%	45	100%
3	3	6%	42	93%
4	3	6%	42	93%
5	0	0%	45	100%
total	9		216	

Question 4   Production Level

Item	Correct answers	Percentage	Incorrect answers	Percentage
1	0	0%	45	100%
2	0	0%	45	100%
3	0	0%	45	100%
4	0	0%	45	100%
5	0	0%	45	100%

total	0	0%	225	
Total of Q3+4	9		441	
Total of Q 1+2+3+4	336		1197	

According to Raheem (2018: 1342**)** , it is clear that foreign language skills are very crucial to communication, social interaction, language acquisition.

Cohen, Manion, Morrison and Wyse (2010:267) cited in Alkhateeb (2017:2739) show that "interaction with adults and collaboration with peers can provide opportunities for children's learning and for their cognitive development". According to Mercer and Littleton (2007) students‟ theoretical development and educational achievement is administered through classroom interaction (ibid.).

The number of the correct answers of item 1 in question 1 is underestimated. Items number 4 and 11 the number of correct answers is 12. This shows that the examinees guess wrongly depending on their intuition.

In items number 9 and 10 the number of correct answers is 15, this expresses that the examinees are not able enough to realize the correct answers because they haven't been exposed to enough knowledge concerning mandative subjunctive.

Items number 5 and 12 the total number of correct answers are 21. This indicates that part of the examinees were able to identify mandative subjunctive according to what they were exposed to.

The high number of correct answers is made for items 6,7 and 8 were the examinees may guess correctly as the number of correct answers are 27 or over or they might be qualified enough as this item as concerned.

In question two, which is designed for the recognition level, items for 7 and 9 in the examinees totally fail to make any correct answer.

In items number 2, 6 and 8 the number of correct answer is 3 which reflects that the learners themselves don't have any experiences as mandative subjunctive as regard.

In item s number 1, 5, 10, 11 the number of correct answers is nine which shows that the examinees are not exposed enough to the literature of mandative subjunctive which is well represented in their answers.

In items number 3 and 12 were the total number of the correct answer is 24, this expresses that the examinees are still lack enough exposed to manative subjunctive but what in this item looks better what have been made in other items.

Question 3 and 4 are designed for assessing the production level of the examinees. In question 3, items number 2 and 5 are totally avoided, the number of correct answers is zero. This may show that they face a hard barrier to do what they are asked for. While items number 1, 3 and 4 the number of correct answers is 3 which represent that the examinees are not qualified enough to the structure of the verbs by which mandative subjunctive is formed.

In question 4, the number of correct answers is zero, as the examinees are not native speakers nor exposed to such structures. They failed to apply the chosen structure in a short paragraph.

Consequently, the errors made may be caused by interlanguage or intralanguage interference. In addition, it is imperative the teacher ought the to be mindful of similitudes and contrasts between English and Arabic to draw

learners' considerationto interlanguage blunders, which are considered unavoidable by language specialists. At long last, educational programs and syllabus originators and dialect arrangement producers got to be mindful of this sort of errors so that fitting alterations ought to be made to encourage educating and learning.

Corder (1971: 107-8) promotes that error analysis should include *overt* and *covert* errors. Covert errors are formally suitable but do not carry the meaning intended by the learner.

Corder (1974) pinpoints three stages of involved in error analysis and they are logically dependent upon each other. These are:

(a) Recognition , (as mandative subjunctive as concerned) Iraqi are not aware enough of using mandative subjunctive properly.

(b) Description, the chosen data include different types of errors.

(c) Explanation , the errors made could be iterlinguistic or intralinguistic ones.

The process of recognizing and identifying errors is one of comparing original utterances with their plausible reconstruction and authoritative reconstruction (that is an interpretation/ reconstruction of the utterance derived from the learner himself) and identifying the difference. Recognition of errors is thus crucially dependent upon correct interpretation of the learner's intention.

Selinker (1972:209-241) finds five central processes underlying language learner language which differentiate it from the means in which first language acquisition proceeds:
a-language transfer b- transfer of training c-strategies of L2 learning
   d- strategies of L2 communication e- overgeneralisation of L2 rules
He uses the term "language transfer" rather than "interference" to stress the vigorous role of the learner.

He also emphasizes that it is not easy to differentiate L2 learning strategies from L2 communication strategies on the basis of production data alone. The distinction is a psycholinguistic one. When communicating, the speaker concentrates on getting his meaning across and permits inaccuracies in form to be produced to accomplish this end.

According to Tarone (1988:29), the learner's internalised language is best read by obtaining production in the "vernacular style.

Spillner (1991:ix) positions that errors are data in contrastive phonetics; they are thought to be caused by oblivious exchange of mother tongue structures to the framework of the target dialect and deliver data around both frameworks.

V.   CONCLUSION

The study has arrived at:

1-Iraqi EFL university learners make different types of errors in mandative subjunctive.

2-The errors made by the examinee are either because lack of exposure, lack of knowledge and over generalization.

3-English as a foreign language differs in this area from the examinees native language which causes negative transfer that yields bad performance.

REFERENCES

1. Alkhateeb, M. (2017) Investigating EFL Classroom Interaction Process in Iraqi Intermediate Schools. University of Babylon Magazine,25:6.

2. Azar B.S. (2009). Understanding and Using English Grammar. 3th edition. Dong Nai Publishing House, p.225.

3. Cannon, C.D. (1959). A Survey of the Subjunctive Mood in English. American Speech, 34(1), 11-19.

4. Cohen, Manion, Morrison and Wyse. (2010). A Guide to Teaching Practice. London: Routledge.

5. Corder, S. (1981). Error Analysis and Inter Language. Oxford; Oxford University press.

6. Ellis R., and Barkhuizen G.(2005). Analysing Learner Language. Oxford University Press.

7. Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey Pullum.(2002). The Cambridge grammar of the English language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8. Hoffmann, Sebastian. (1997). Mandative Sentences. A study of variation on the basis of the British National Corpus. Unpublished Lizentiats-Arbeit. Universität Zürich.

9. Hundt, Marianne. (2009). Colonial lag, colonial innovation or simply language change? In Günter Rohdenburg and Julia Schlüter (eds.), One language, two grammars? Differences between British and American English, 13–37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10. Johansson, Stig and Else Norheim.(1988). The subjunctive in British and American English. ICAME Journal 12. 27–36.

11. Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair and Nicholas Smith. (2009). Change in contemporary English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

12. Övergaard, Gerd. (1995). The mandative subjunctive in American and British English in the 20th century. Uppsala: Uppsala University.

13. Poutsma, H. (1922). Mood and tense of the English verb. Groningen: Noordhoff.

14. Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

15. Raheem, M.D.(2018). The Impact of Reciprocal Listening Activities on Fifth Preparatory Students'Listening. Comprehension.College of Basic Education , April 38,1342.

16. Selinker (1982). Style in Language. Cambridge; M.I.T press

17. Spillner (1999). Error Analysis. (http//:www.google.com)