

Error Analysis of Utterance Structure

Emily L. Beltran (Ph.D)

Technological University of the Philippines- Cavite,
CQT Ave. Salawag, Dasmariñas City, Cavite 4114, Philippines
emilylbeltran@yahoo.com

**Asia Pacific Journal of
Education, Arts and Sciences**

Vol. 3 No.1, 64-74

January 2016

P-ISSN 2362-8022

E-ISSN 2362-8030

www.apjeas.apjmr.com

Date Received: December 8, 2015; Date Revised: February 1, 2016

Abstract— *The present research study examined the grammatical errors of Technology student teachers' utterance structure. This qualitative study was conducted to answer two questions: (1) what are the language backgrounds of the Technology student teachers; and (2) what are their common grammatical errors during the on-campus teaching. To address the first question, the participants were personally interviewed for their language background utilizing the developed and modified interview guide. On the other hand, to address the second question, the participants' Technology classes were observed and video recorded for transcriptions. Results demonstrate that the native language (Filipino) of the student teachers was the most commonly used. The findings also show that as regard to the grammatical errors, misinformation and omission account for most of the total errors identified, with addition and ordering of elements being less frequent among the student teachers' utterances. Further, it is also observed that technology student teachers repeatedly use the wrong forms of the words in place of the correct ones. These errors in their utterance structure are the results of the influence of their native language structures to produce a spoken discourse of the English language (L2).*

Keywords: *Error analysis, spoken discourse, technology student teachers*

INTRODUCTION

This research study describes errors on grammatical aspects of spoken English with theoretical background of error analysis. It empirically through qualitative and quantitative method finds out the errors the student teachers' utterances during their actual Observation and Participation (OP) classes.

Errors are the flawed side of speakers which are parts of conversation that deviate from some selected norms of utterances. To analyze the grammatical errors of student teachers during their actual on-

campus teaching or the Observation and Participation (OP), the typology of errors [1] was utilized. The four types of errors are omission, addition, misformation, and misordering.

Research studies cited in this present research dealt mainly on error analysis of spoken discourse particularly on its grammatical features. Ting, Mahadhir and Chang [2] for instance, examined the grammatical accuracy in spoken English in simulated oral interactions among less proficient ESL learners in a Malaysian tertiary institution. The findings show the surface structure description on misinformation and omission account for the majority of the grammatical errors among ESL learners in the tertiary institution in Malaysia.

Studying spoken discourse has been difficult to handle because the spoken data are particularly messy [3] and second language oral data are generally messier. Moreover, Abbasi and Karimian [4] investigated grammatical errors among Iranian Translation Students. Their findings illustrated that almost all of the participants had grammatical problems and most of errors were influence of the mother language.

As observed among bilingual student teachers of Technological schools, they exhibited mixed ups of their native language (L1) and second language (L2) which resulted to unstructured utterances.

With such research studies and observations in grammatical errors in spoken discourse, these would serve an educational reason by showing educators what students have learned and what they have not yet mastered in spoken discourse. Thus, the present research would as well add to literature on error analysis of student teachers' utterances.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The present study was designed to analyze the grammatical errors on the utterances of student teachers.

Specifically, the study aimed to determine the language background of the student teachers; and to determine the grammatical errors of the utterances of the student teachers in terms of Misformation, Addition, Omission and Misordering.

METHOD

The present study used a qualitative method research design. It takes a descriptive approach that uses the video recorded transcripts to describe the grammatical errors of the student teachers during on-campus teaching. The student teachers' language background was primarily established through their responses during the interview with the use of interview guide adapted from [5]. Analysis of grammatical errors for misformation, addition, omission, and misordering was made carried out.

Data Gathering Procedure

Data on error analysis of utterance structure of Industrial Education student teachers during on-campus teaching were gathered through the following course of actions (a) subsequent to identifying who the subjects would be, based on the English language proficiency test, the researcher personally interviewed the participants for their language profile utilizing the developed and modified interview guide [5]. The

participants of the study were also told that there would be no right or wrong responses. The language background structured interview took approximately 15 minutes to finish; (b) the researcher then observed and video recorded three classroom sessions for each student teacher in which a total of 18 classes were videotaped during the actual teaching of the participants; and (c) the researcher then transcribed the recordings into transcripts. To simplify the analysis, each utterance was given a line number in accordance to the student teachers' turns.

In the present research, the transcriptions were done by viewing and reviewing the video recorded classes of student teachers during on-campus teaching. Transcriptions were completed verbatim. The video recorded data were then transcribed manually and further validated by language experts. Thus, transcriptions were done by hand and eventually used for analysis. Words from transcripts which were highly technical, as well as the unclear names uttered, were consulted with the student teachers themselves for accuracy.

For this research, ethical considerations were closely observed hence, the identities of participants were kept confidential through the use of codenames in the analysis and reporting of data.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Language Background of Student Teachers

Items	A	B	C	D	E	F
Language first learned to speak	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog	Filipino	Filipino
Language most frequently used at home	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog	Filipino	Filipino/ Bicol
Language best understood in listening	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog/ English	Filipino/ English	English
Language spoke fluently	Filipino / English	Filipino	Tagalog	Tagalog	Filipino/ English	Filipino/ English
Language used best in writing	Filipino / English	English	Tagalog	English	Filipino	Filipino/ English
Language best understood	Filipino	English	Tagalog	Tagalog/ English	Filipino	Filipino/ English
Language usually used in thinking	Filipino / English	English	Tagalog	Tagalog/ English	English	Filipino/ English
Language most frequently used in classes	English	English	English	English	English	English
Language most frequently used outside classes	Filipino	Filipino	Tagalog	Filipino	Filipino	Filipino

Table 1 illustrates the responses of the student teachers on the questions asked during the interview. It shows that Filipino language is the prevailing verbal communication medium among the participants. Based on the data, all of the participants claimed that Filipino is the first language they learn to speak and the most frequently used by the participants in their respective homes. They declared that they spoke English frequently during class hours; however, they tended to shift to Filipino language when not in classroom or in an informal setting within the vicinity of the campus.

With the language profile of the student teachers, evidence confirms that their mother tongue seems to play a role in using the second language. Bühmann and Trudell [6] even stressed that the research evidence today clearly shows that using the learners' mother tongue is crucial to effective learning. Kroll [7] further claims that there is an underlying cognitive or academic proficiency that is common to languages and this enables transfer of literacy related skills across languages.

Table 2 presents the utterances showing the misformation errors of Student Teacher A. The errors were categorized as misformation, addition, omission, and misordering to analyze the grammatical error of student teachers' utterances.

Misformation Errors

Errors of misformation occurred when student teachers chose the wrong forms of the words in place

of the correct ones. This also includes mistakes where they supplied something although it was incorrect.

As seen in the table, misformation errors in subject-verb-agreement were commonly observed in Student Teacher A in lines 55-56 and in lines 94-95. She explicitly displayed an error when she used "*that is*" instead of "*that are*" to describe the subject of the sentence "*terms*" which is in plural form. Another mistake she exhibited is in line 74-75. Here, student teacher A exhibited ungrammaticality on numbers in which she violated the subject -verb agreement. Similarly, Student teacher A mistakenly used "doesn't" to describe the subject "those people". Student Teacher A made use of *wrong form after do* in the latter part of her utterance in lines 74-75.

Another instance is in line 371 which again SVA is violated. The verb of a sentence must agree with the subject *variety* in number. It should have been said, *there is a wide variety*.

Table 3 presents the misformation errors made by Student Teacher B. In line 645, she exhibited an error in the use of present for simple past. Here, she slipped in *tense sequence* [8]. For Dulay Burt and Krashen [1], they regard this error as the surface structure of taxonomy in *misformation* which means Student Teacher B opted to use the wrong forms in her utterance.

Another occurrence is when Student Teacher B made an attempt to introduce the new subject matter in line 650. She again exhibited a shift in tense.

Table 2. Student Teacher A's Misformation Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 55-56	:Because I understand that there are terms <u>that is</u> still jargon to us. So I want us to define it first.
Lines 74-75	:These two tanks pump and both <u>has</u> uhm...water.
Lines 94-95	:Those people who <u>doesn't</u> have you may share with your group mates.
Lines 127-128	:The first two digits actually are the digits that <u>is</u> very significant in reading capacitors.
Line 177	:Has anyone, anybody in here <u>have</u> a diode?
Lines 276-277	:if there <u>is a</u> ... two terminals,
Line 371	:that there are a wide <u>variety</u>
Line 376-377	:There are lots that <u>is</u> also an avalanche diode.
Line 588	:So, imagine all <u>this</u> circuits that can contain up to a million electronic components!
Lines 597-598	Actually, these numbers and letters, <u>is</u> actually...
Line 608	Most common families you know <u>is</u> the 78 and 79 series, right?

Table 3. Student Teacher B's Misformation Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 645	: last time you <u>have</u> an activity <u>entitled</u> PCB design.
Line 650	: Ohm's law <u>was</u> actually named after a German physicist Georg
Line 692	: so this is the formulas you are going to use.
Line 725	: it seems like our marker <u>have</u> a problem
Line 751	: So transformer <u>have</u> parts,
Line 753	: the secondary winding are <u>calls</u>
Lines 766-767	: Before I <u>forgot</u> this is the schematic diagram
Line 770	: So transformer <u>have</u> types according to class
Lines 772-773	: while these two <u>is</u> according to construction
Line 801	: the definition <u>have</u> different output voltages
Lines 832-833	: Norton's Theorem is actually <u>named</u> after a scientist who <u>have</u> bell laboratories
Line 855	: that the teacher or teachers <u>is</u> telling you
Line 873	: voltage sources that <u>isreplaced</u>
Line 881	: So let us <u>said</u> that R1 is 10ohms,
Lines 931-932	: These <u>is</u> terminals A B.
Line 989	: Oh no I haven't <u>forgot</u> that.
Line 994	: <u>does</u> all of you got the correct answer?

Another subject-verb-agreement violation is demonstrated in line 692, when Student Teacher B wrongly said, this is for these are, when she meant more than one formula. In lines 725-726 as well, she illustrated a misused of have for has to noun marker in which both utterances have errors in misformation in subject-verb-agreement [1].

Table 4 illustrates the misformation errors of Student Teacher C. In line 1047 for instance, she mistakenly added the word like when she perhaps meant as. Equally, in lines 1133-1134, Student Teacher C displayed a slip in the use of present tense

for simple past, the word use for used. Another misformation error is in line 1228, when she incorrectly used the word means for meaning. In line 1331 for however, she committed error when she failed to emphasize the past participle of the verb duplicate. The incidence of misinformation errors indicates that the Student Teacher C was aware of the need to use a particular grammatical feature in certain parts of the utterances but made an incorrect choice, for example, in line 1331, she was able to give the correct form of the verb at the beginning part of the utterance but failed to do the same on the latter part.

Table 4. Student Teacher C's Misformation Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1047	: it's the same <u>like</u> our previous topic...
Lines 1133-1134	: So, I remember when we took up the digital electronics, ah, there is one experiment that we <u>use</u> the transistor
Line 1178	: it means it is <u>a</u> upgraded version
Line 1228	: so <u>means</u> it is the upgraded version
Line 1331	: the MSB is copied or <u>duplicate</u>

Table 5. Student Teacher D's Misformation Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1514-1515	: Have you noticed these inputs? A0, B0, A1 and B1, have you noticed it?
Lines 1539-1540	: that I have mentioned <u>a while ago</u>
Lines 1593-1594	: Last time you <u>act</u> like a combinational logic circuits
Line 1615	: these three resistor <u>is</u> connected
Lines 1629-1630	: we will <u>got</u> the low input from the beginning
Line 1648	: I didn't <u>prepared</u> a game

Table 5 shows the utterances of Student Teacher D for misformation errors. Lines 1514-1515 exhibited an error in pronoun antecedent, itforthem. In lines 1539-1540, the use of present perfect for simple past is observed. The use of present tense for simple past is also seen in line 1593. Student Teacher D wrongly said is for are, when she meant more than one resistor.

A severe case of misformation error is observed in lines 1629-1630, we will got the low input from the beginning. The use of verb in the simple past to attach to the auxiliary will is a misformation error. The verb got should have been said with the base form of the verb get. Another error is noticed in line 1648 when

Student Teacher D used the past participle of the verb prepare with the auxiliary verb didn't. The data indicate that Student Teacher D was uncertain with the use of the correct tense of the verb. She combined the present tense, past tense and future tense. Thus, she committed tense errors.

As observed in Table 6, Student Teacher E committed similar misformation errors repeatedly in all utterances except in lines 2004-2005, where she used the present for simple past. The habitual misformation error of Student Teacher E was in the use of will going. As a rule after certain auxiliary verb such as will, the base form of the verb shall be used.

Table 6. Student Teacher E's Misformation Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1743-1744	: you will <u>going</u> to make plate
Lines 1744-1748	: I will <u>going</u> to give you basic techniques
Line 1828	: you will <u>going</u> to shade that
Line 1936	: you will <u>going</u> to use into your pictorial...
Line 1939	: So you will <u>going</u> to apply that
Line 1980	: you will <u>going</u> to use only the smudging...
Lines 1981-1982	: you will <u>going</u> to apply shading
Line 1982	: the technique you will <u>going</u> to use is smudging
Lines 1995-1996	: you will <u>going</u> to make a pictorial drawing
Lines 2004-2005	: in way back 20 th century uhm they <u>use</u> their innovative skills
Line 2200	: but still I will <u>going</u> to give a quiz

Table 7. Student Teacher F's Misformation Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 2267	: but since he did not <u>published</u> his work
Line 2275	: Capacitors also, yes, <u>is</u> made up of uhm, an insulating device
Line 2439	: And this negative-positive-negative <u>are</u> what?
Line 2492	: Collector current <u>are</u> <u>those</u> current that flows from the collector
Lines 2511-2512	: only the connections that <u>is</u> needed

Table 7 shows the committed misformation errors of Student Teacher F. As shown in line 2267, an error in the verb is seen. The verb *published* should be in the base form because it came after the auxiliary verb *did*. On the other hand all the succeeding lines from 2275 to 2511 violate the subject verb agreement. The verbs of the sentences must agree with their subjects in number and in person.

These misformation errors make up the most of errors in the sets of the video transcripts of the student teachers were they mainly confused with the subject-verb- agreement (SVA) and tenses.

Addition Errors

Another ungrammatical element that was observed in the study was the errors of addition. Addition errors are the reverse of omission. The student teachers sometimes added items which must not appear in a well- formed utterance

As shown in Table 8, Student Teacher A added unnecessary tense markers such “-s,-es,-ies” after the verbs that follow the plural nouns. In lines 104-105 for instance, *numbers represents the value of the capacitor...*and in lines 301-302 *the anodes carries positive holes*. Both utterances violate subject-verb-agreement.

In lines 130-131, *it's a ceramic capacitors*, also violates the number agreement. A noun and the words that modify that noun must agree in number. In here,

Student Teacher A performed an addition error of the article *a*.

In lines 284-285 and line 296 however, there is an error in addition of the article “*a*”. If one is using a noun that cannot be counted or divided, such as “*repulsion*” and “*repletion*”, it is incorrect to modify that noun with “*a*,” “*each*,” “*every*,” “*either*,” or “*neither*.”

In lines 130-131, *it's a ceramic capacitors*, also violates the number agreement. A noun and the words that modify that noun must agree in number. In here, Student Teacher A performed an addition error of the article *a*.

In lines 284-285 and line 296 however, there is an error in addition of the article “*a*”. If one is using a noun that cannot be counted or divided, such as “*repulsion*” and “*repletion*”, it is incorrect to modify that noun with “*a*,” “*each*,” “*every*,” “*either*,” or “*neither*.”

Table 9 presents the addition errors committed by Student Teacher B. As observed in lines 672-673 *voltage is equals to current*, the utterance exhibits an error when an *is* added to the word *equal*, which is used as an adjective to modify the noun *voltage*. Similar errors were observed in lines 675, 890, and 891 when the utterances used the word *equal* as verb instead of adjective. In line 692 however, addition error occurred when *s* is added to the predicate nominative *formula* in which its subject (*this*) and verb (*is*) are both singular.

Table 8. Student Teacher A's Addition Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 104-105	: <i>Actually those numbers... numbers <u>represents</u> the value of the capacitor that you are holding right now.</i>
Lines 130-131	: <i>it's a ceramic <u>capacitors</u>...</i>
Lines 284-285	: <i>This means that there will be <u>a</u> repletion. There will be <u>a</u> repletion of the direction.</i>
Line 296	: <i>if there is <u>a</u> repulsion?</i>
Lines 301-302	: <i>We understand the anodes <u>carries</u> positive holes right?</i>

Table 9. Student Teacher B's Addition Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 672-673	: <i>So the first one is voltage is <u>equals</u> to current times the resistance</i>
Line 675	: <i>the next one is current is <u>equals</u> to voltage over resistance</i>
Line 692	: <i>this is the <u>formulas</u> you are going to use.</i>
Line 890	: <i>V over R and I_B which is <u>equals</u> to V over R</i>
Line 891	: <i>V is <u>equals</u> to 10 ohms</i>

Table 10. Student Teacher C's Addition Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1150-1151	: what does the symbol or number in the transistor or semiconductor code <u>stands</u> for?
Lines 1164-1165	: the first letter is always letter S in <u>a</u> Japanese

Table 11. Student Teacher D's Addition Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1584	: chains of light that <u>walks</u>

Table 12. Student Teacher E's Addition Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1855-1856	: what is the difference of <u>the</u> picture A from picture B. Anyone?
Line 1949	: So <u>this what</u> shading is about

TABLE 13

Student Teacher F's Addition Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 2242-2243	: capacitors are devices that <u>stores</u> an electrical charge
Line 2457	: wherein positive and negative charges <u>flows</u>
Lines 2533-2534	: photos <u>means</u> light

Table 10 shows the utterances of Student Teacher C that exhibit addition errors. As seen in lines 1150-1151 for instance, the utterance has auxiliary verb does and the main verb stands. This utterance violates the rule after auxiliary verb does in which it requires the base form of the verb stand.

Another addition error is observed in lines 1164-1165 when Student Teacher C added the article a before the noun Japanese. It goes against the number agreement. If one is using a proper noun such as "Japanese," it is incorrect to modify that noun with "a".

As shown in Table 11, there is a distinctive occurrence of addition error committed by Student Teacher D. The utterance in line 1584 chains of light that walks violates the SVA. Student Teacher D committed an error of addition when she added s as singular inflection of the verb walk.

Table 12 shows the utterances with errors of addition carried out by Student Teacher E. As seen in line 1949 So this what shading is about, Student Teacher E displayed an error on extra word. Only one

of the marked words is necessary to signal that a noun follows. Instead of So this what shading is about, consider So this shading is about.

Table 13 presents the addition errors of Student Teacher F. As shown, he violated the subject-verb-agreement in all his utterances in the table. In line 2457 for instance, the subject charges is in plural form that requires a plural verb. The verb flows therefore should be said as flow instead of flows. As similar error is noted in lines 2533-2534 photos means light. The verb mean agree with its subject photos.

Omission Errors

Errors of omission, on the other hand, consist of the omission of necessary elements in tense or number markers, for instance, the omission of the grammatical morphemes. These include the omission of "-s/-es/-ies" for the verbs after the third person singular in the simple present tense. Thus, the omission errors appear when the student teachers omit some the elements from their utterances.

Table 14. Student Teacher A's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 486-487	: <i>So have any idea what we'll have this morning?</i>
Lines 559-560	: <i>So at that time <u>it very</u> crucial</i>
Line 591	: <i>Lots of circuit <u>into</u> that small point of a pen</i>

Table 15. Student Teacher B's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 682-683	: <i>So it actually <u>come</u> from the ohm's law triangle</i>
Line 723	: <i>Is there anyone who <u>get</u> the answer for number one?</i>
Line 829	: <i>You're dismiss <u>__</u>.</i>
Line 842	: <i>voltage can be represent <u>__</u> with current source</i>
Lines 957-958	: <i>Norton's equivalent circuit which is surely <u>look</u> like this.</i>
Line 971	: <i>so you can be prepare <u>_</u></i>
Line 991	: <i>so class <u>please quiet</u>.</i>

As shown in Table 14, Student Teacher A performed few omission errors in her utterances. In lines 486-487 for example, she missed her subject and auxiliary verb for her yes/no question. In lines 559-560 on the other hand, she committed the error of omission when she overlooked the verb after the subject *it*. The omission was mainly related to the use of the copula *be*. Similarly, in line 591, the verb was also omitted. The omission of the copula *is*, which functions as the main verb in affirmative statements, makes the utterance ungrammatical in English.

Table 15 presents Student Teacher's B errors of omission in her utterances. Noticeably, the singular inflection of verbs in lines 682-683, line 723, and lines 957-958 were missed. Subject- Verb -Agreement was violated in the identified utterances. In line 829, line 842 and line 971 however, there was a loss of past participle inflection of verbs. This type of error may

be a case of "past tense and present tense being not morphologically marked" [9]. In line 991 however, the omission was mainly related to the use of the copula *be*, which functions as the main verb in the utterance, making it ungrammatical in English.

As shown in Table 16, Student Teacher C committed the omission errors when she missed the past participle inflection of verbs *measure*, *master*, *pass*, *specify*, *describe*, *range* and *ask*. She also unsuccessfully produced the singular inflection of verbs *act* in line 1128 and *shift* in line 1330. In lines 1049-1050 however, Student Teacher C missed out a certain *verb* after the infinitive *to* and overlooked a certain *conjunction* before the verb *happen*. The plural inflection of the noun *person* in lines 1395-1396 was also neglected.

Table 16. Student Teacher C's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1042-1043	: <i>its output is <u>measure</u></i>
Lines 1049-1050	: <i>So, the first thing we have <u>to</u> is</i>
Lines 1058-1059	: <i>there will be no such thing or <u>bad things happen</u></i>
Lines 1065-1066	: <i>its output is <u>measure</u></i>
Lines 1085-1086	: <i>because I know you <u>master</u> the way or measuring ahh</i>
Line 1109	: <i>it would be <u>pass</u> tomorrow.</i>
Line 1128	: <i>It <u>act</u> as a switch and as an amplifier.</i>
Line 1154	: <i>a unique code so that they can be <u>specify</u></i>
Lines 1154-1155	: <i>or <u>describe</u> from the other types</i>
Lines 1175-1176	: <i>it <u>range</u> from 100-9999</i>
Line 1270	: <i>then you <u>ask</u>, they <u>ask</u> them</i>
Line 1330	: <i>it <u>shift</u> into the right direction</i>
Lines 1395-1396	: <i>you can have three <u>person</u> in a group</i>

Table 17. Student Teacher D's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 1450-1451	: <i>Ok somebody tell me what ah activity we have done...?</i>
Line 1615	: <i>these three <u>resistor</u> is connected</i>
Line 1669	: <i>Ma'am Mae Ann___ given you an assignment.</i>
Line 1689	: <i>it <u>like</u> waiting someone in the tricycle terminal</i>

As observed in Table 17, omission errors were made by Student Teacher D. In line 1450-1451 for instance, she failed to produce the auxiliary verb **will** to her interrogative utterance. The plural inflection of the noun **resistor** in line 1615 was ignored. In line 1669 however, the helping verb **has** was omitted. Student Teacher D also failed to produce the singular inflection of verbs **like** in line 1689.

Table 18. Student Teacher E's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 1740	: <i>perhaps it also <u>make</u> the object beautiful</i>
Lines 1773-1774	: <i>It is coming from different <u>direction</u></i>
Lines 1780-1781	: <i>it <u>follow</u> the shape of the object.</i>
Lines 1789-1790	: <i>It also <u>make</u> the object you know</i>
Lines 1808-1809	: <i>and let's <u>assume</u> that it is 45 degrees</i>
Line 1809	: <i>and the light rays <u>reach</u> the object</i>
Lines 1814-1815	: <i>and you <u>notice</u> that there's someone...</i>
Line 1821	: <i><u>Base</u> on our discussion</i>
Lines 1900-1901	: <i>have different <u>direction</u> over-lapping each other</i>
Lines 1910-1911	: <i>it contours or <u>follow</u> the shape of the object</i>
Line 1914	: <i>it <u>seem</u> so easy to identify</i>
Line 1973	: <i><u>Base</u> on our discussion</i>
Lines 2022-2023	: <i>there are different <u>result</u></i>
Lines 2092-2093	: <i>So as you have <u>notice</u> in the sketch</i>
Line 2097	: <i>as you have <u>notice</u> that in the lower part</i>
Line 2102	: <i>ahh will be <u>increase</u></i>

Table 18 shows the error of omissions committed by Student Teacher E. Most of the errors were in the past participle inflection of verbs. She unsuccessfully produced these all, perhaps because of her unawareness of the inflected morpheme "ed". Other omission errors were on the loss of the singular inflection of verbs in line 1740, lines 1789-1790, lines 1910-1911 and 1914 respectively. The use of the base form of the verb for singular subjects (e.g. it follow the shape of the object) is a subject-verb- agreement

error on the basis of the surface structure. However, in most of the utterances of Student Teacher E, the type of error may be another case of past tense and past participle being not morphologically marked.

Similarly, the plural inflection of the nouns in lines 1773-1774, lines 1900-1901 and lines 2022-2023 were all missed out by Student Teacher E. These errors in using the correct plural form of nouns were found to some extent in the spoken discourse of Student Teacher E in which the "s" marking for plurality is left out. The difficulty with plural form may be due to L1 influence [10].

Table 19. Student Teacher F's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Lines 2259-2260	: <i>is an insulating device which <u>prevent</u> those plates</i>
Line 2536	: <i>this thing <u>resist</u> light</i>

As shown in Table 19, Student Teacher F produced the error of omission in his utterances. In lines 2259-2260, he exhibited the loss of the singular inflection of verb **prevent**. In the same way, in line 2536 the singular inflection of verb **resist** was also omitted. In these utterances, the final "s" is omitted from the verb in the third person singular in the present tense.

To sum up, student teachers evidently missed out certain verbs in their utterances. Also, in the succeeding utterances of student teachers, the final "s" was omitted from their verbs in the third person singular in the present tense. With the omission of (-s), such as, "Since (in English) all grammatical persons take the same zero verbal ending except the third person singular in the present tense... omissions of the (-s) may be accounted for by the heavy pressure of all other endingless form." [8]

Misordering Errors

Errors of ordering are made when the correct elements are wrongly sequenced. These happen when student teachers put incorrect position of a morpheme or a group of morpheme.

Table 20. Student Teacher F's Omission Errors

Line No.	Utterances
Line 2264	: <i>A capacitor before looks like this...</i>
Lines 2647-2648	: <i>you have to tell your classmates how <u>are you going</u> to do that.</i>

Table 20 presents the ordering error of Student Teacher F. In lines 2647-2648 for example, in the use of phrasal verbs, "you have to tell your classmates how are you going to do that". It should be noted that if an utterance includes a statement about a question rather than a direct question, the subject should come before the verb. So, it should have been said as "You have to tell your classmates how you are going to do that". Though there were few cases identified, it doesn't necessarily mean that the other student teachers have mastered the rule of ordering in verb forms but it may only show that they are by some means grammatically competent in terms of avoiding errors of ordering.

The participants committed ungrammatical utterance structure, which supports the claim of [4] that most of errors of non- native speakers of English were of interlingual, indicating the influence of the mother language. The slips were categorized as errors of misformation, omission, addition, and ordering.

CONCLUSION

Misformation errors make up the most of errors in the sets of video transcripts in which they were mainly confused with the Subject- Verb- Agreement (SVA) and tenses. There were also errors of omission on "-s/-es/-ies" for verbs after the third person singular in the simple present tense. Another ungrammatical element that was observed in the study was on addition, in which unnecessary tense markers were used. Errors of ordering were also produced when correct elements were wrongly sequenced. An examination of the types of errors based on surface structure descriptions [1] shows that the most frequent error is misinformation, followed by omission, then addition errors, and then the misordering. It can be noted then that grammatical errors on spoken discourse are different from written discourse as what [11] states that the spontaneous speech contains several errors and utterances are usually brief

Thus, data of the present study reveal that there was an interference of Filipino language (L1) in structures of the utterance of English language (L2). Data further present a variety of Philippine English based on the utterances of student teachers which are patterned on the Philippine language structures.

RECOMMENDATION

There is an evidence of a need to disseminate the results of the study to other student teachers who are teaching content subjects using English as a medium of instruction for them to be aware of their own levels of spoken discourse performance.

Also, there is a need for English teachers who handle student teachers to make their students develop effective spoken discourse performance in terms of phonology, morphology, and syntax because these are what the latter's important tools in communication when they will be in the field of actual professional teaching.

Likewise, in order to generalize the results to other populations, it is necessary to have geographically diverse samples that would include student teachers across disciplines from different colleges and universities.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dulay, H. Burt, M., & Krashen, S. Language two. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- [2] Ting, S., Mahadhir, M., & Chang, S. Grammatical errors in spoken English of university students in oral communication course. GEMA Online™ Journal of Language Studies Malaysia Sarawak. 10 (1), 53-70, 1970
- [3] Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. Measuring spoken language: a unit for all reasons. Applied Linguistics, 21(3), 354-375, 2000.
- [4] Abbasi, M., & Karimnia, A. An analysis of grammatical errors among Iranian translation students: Insights from interlanguage theory. European Journal of Social Sciences, 25(4), 525-536.,2011.
- [5] Pareja, T. (2003). Selected Students' Oral Proficiency in Storytelling. Sinag. 2(2).
- [6] Bühmann, D., & Trudell B. Mother tongue matters: Local language as a key to effective learning. UNESCO. Place de Fontenoy, Paris, France. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001611/161121e.Pdf>, 2008.
- [7] Kroll, B. Second language writing research. Insights for the classroom. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [8] Richards, J. A non- contrastive approach to error analysis. London: Longman Limited, 1970.
- [9] Bautista, M., & Gonzales, A. Southeast Asian Englishes. In B. B Kachru, Y. Kachru & C. L. Nelson (Eds.), The Handbook of World Englishes (pp. 130-144). Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006
- [10] Maros, M., Hua, T., & Salehuddin, K. Interference in learning English: Grammatical errors in English

essay writing among rural Malay secondary school students in Malaysia. Jurnal e-Bangi, 2(2). Retrieved from <http://eprints.ukm.my/114/1/Marlyna.pdf>, 2007.

- [11] Beattie, G. Talk: An analysis of speech and non-verbal behaviour in conversation. Open University Press: Milton Keynes, 1983.