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Abstract

Research Title: Analysis of Negative and Interrogative Formation in English Language
Case Study on the DTC Students

Student’s Name: Jamal Jafar Ahmed
Degree: MA in English Language

This research is a case study which aims at investigating negative and interrogative formation problems that face DTC students when they want to form negative and interrogative sentences. The hypothesis states that neither negative nor interrogative is part of the population’s competence. The research is built on sources which are books and references connected with the subject and they are primary and secondary sources. In methodology, the sample comprises a random sample of hundred students. The instrument for data collection is a two-part test. One part of the test is about negative formation and the other part is about interrogative formation. The data are processed by Microsoft Word 2007 and Microsoft Excel 2007. Based on the results of the test, the research came up with many results. It is found that, according to the obtained results, the hypothesis is proved to be true in that neither negative formation nor interrogative formation is part of the population competence as such. It is also found that the informants appear to be slightly better at forming negative sentences than at forming interrogative ones. Three of the findings show that the informants tend to have problems with word order, spelling, and punctuation. The study recommends, among other recommendations, more consolidation practice on the part of the students, more effective teaching on the part of teachers, and more attention on the part of materials or syllabus design.
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هدف هذا البحث لدراسة حالة صعوبات تكوين النفي والسؤال في اللغة الإنجليزية التي يواجهها طلاب كلية الدمازين التقنية عندما يحاولون نفي أو إثبات جملة باللغة الإنجليزية. تفيد الفرضية أن تكوين النفي والسؤال معاً ليس جزءاً من المقدرة اللغوية لدى الطلاب موضوع الدراسة. بنیت البحث على مصادر عبارة عن كتب ومؤلفات ذات صلة بال الموضوع وهي مصادر أولية وثانوية. في منهجية هذا البحث، تضم العينة مائة من الطلاب تم اختيارهم عشوائياً لجمع البيانات الخاصة بهذا البحث. أداة جمع البيانات هي اختبار يتكون من جزئين، جزء يختص تكوين النفي وجزء آخر يختص تكوين السؤال.

بناءً على نتائج الاختبار، Microsoft Excel 2007 و Microsoft Word 2007، خرج البحث بعدة نتائج. لقد وجد، وفقاً للنتائج المحصلة، أن الفرضية صحيحة لم يظهر تكوين النفي والسؤال كجزء من المقدرة اللغوية لدى الطلاب. كذلك وجد أن أداء الطلاب في تكوين النفي أفضل قليلاً من أداءهم في تكوين السؤال. وقد أشارت ثلاث نتائج إلى مشكلات الطلاب فيما يتعلق بترتيب الكلمات في الجملة الإنجليزية والتهجئة والترقيم. يوصي البحث، من بين عدة توصيات، بمزيد من التدريب و التمارين التي تزراعة المقدرة الطلاب في اللغة الإنجليزية، ومزيد من التدريس الفعال فيما يتعلق بالمعلمين، ومزيد من الاهتمام فيما يتعلق بالمواد وصياغة المنهج.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Background

There are many difficulties, especially in grammar, that face students while learning English. The students’ own language and English are different in several ways. Differences in sound, meaning, and structure are all to be expected. Not to equate difference with difficulty but some areas of English may seem to be problematic for some students. One can at least tell that some points of studying English, essential ones in fact, warrant some research in order to find out how learners are copying.

One of the points, in learning English, that is surely worthy of research is negatives and interrogatives formation. It is important for learners of English to be able to make statements in the positive They study English, in the negative They do not study English, and in the interrogative Do they study English?. And they should be able to do the same when an auxiliary verb is involved; for instance, He is here, He is not here and Is he here? This study amounts to be an assessment of such ability on the part of the students. For, unless the students master this ability, it is unlikely that they can make any progress in their study and use of English.

This study attempts to investigate the difficulties that face the Damazeen Technological College (henceforth DTC) students when they want to form negatives and interrogatives sentences in English.

In DTC all the students are required to undergo some general English courses which are generally referred to as university, or college, requirement.
Now, the syllabus potential of these courses is brought, by this study, into some focus. It is not that there are no syllabi in effect right now or that the available syllabi are unaware of negative and interrogative formation, the subject-matter of this research. It is just a matter of potential improvement.

1. 1 Statement of the Problem

It is realized that the formation of negatives and interrogatives in English may turn to be a problem for learners of English. This research addresses the problem that face DTC students in the formation of negatives and interrogatives.

Awareness of the existence of the problem helps us decide on either inclusion or exclusion of negative and interrogative formation in any suggested syllabus. It is inclusion if the students know about the formation. It is omission if they do not. In the case of inclusion, the study wants to find out which cases need more focus, which need less and which need none. In sum, the collective competence of the targeted students is in question here.

1. 2 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to make sure, by means of a practical study, whether negative and interrogative formation, in all its cases, is part of the students’ linguistic competence or not.

The general objective is to map out the collective competence of the targeted students.

1. 3 Significance of the Study

The significance of the study drives from the fact that it presumably provides grounds for decision-making concerning the study of negative and
interrogative formation in English. Besides, the research may help to clarify some other points that are worthy of consideration concerning the content of the syllabus to be taught.

1.4 Hypothesis of the Study

The hypothesis is two parts, one about negative formation and the other about interrogative formation.

1. The students of DTC have the problem of how to form negative sentences in English.

2. The students of DTC have the problem of how to form interrogative sentences in English.

The two parts of the hypothesis are tested or weighed against the results obtained by the test, the means of data collection, and presented in chapter four.

1.5 Limitations of the Study

Covering a group of hundred of DTC students, the study is limited in scope to the subject of negative and interrogative formation in English. In the case of negatives it is concerned with two kinds of negatives; that is, helping verb negation and full verb negation. In the case of interrogatives, it is concerned with two kinds of interrogatives; that is, helping verb interrogatives and full verb interrogatives.

This research is restricted to the one case of negation which uses the negative particle ‘not’. Other kinds of negation are beyond the scope of this work.

According to the scope, the following items are sampled out to be tested.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 progressive present</td>
<td>He is working hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 simple present of the verb ‘to be’</td>
<td>They are my friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 modal ‘will’</td>
<td>I will study history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 modal ‘can’</td>
<td>He can drive well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 modal ‘must’</td>
<td>They must stay home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 modal ‘would’</td>
<td>We would like to see you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 simple present, full verb</td>
<td>We go to school everyday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 progressive past</td>
<td>He was reading a book.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 simple past of the verb ‘to be’</td>
<td>The key was lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 simple past, full verb</td>
<td>I made a mistake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test, more of which in chapter three, contains all the tabled sample sentences above. The informants are expected to change the sample sentences first into a negative sentence and then into an interrogative one.
Chapter Two

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

This chapter tries to survey both the theoretical ideas and the literature that are relevant to this research. The idea of competence is the central framework in this research. Many references are consulted on the two areas of negation and question formation.

2.1 Word Oder in English

Grammar, in a sense, is an analysis of language. Language is analyzed in terms of sentences, and sentences are analyzed in terms of words. And the words follow some sequence or order. A definition of word order runs ‘[Word-order is] A term used in grammatical analysis to refer to the sequential arrangement of words in larger linguistic units...’ Crystal (2008:524)

Word order, then, is a matter of arrangement. That is, a matter of syntax. Words are syntactic constituents or units. Syntax is how they are combined to form bigger units or sentences. The syntactic structures of different languages maintain some kind of order and languages are prone to classification in terms of this order: ‘Some languages (e.g. English) rely on word-order as a means of expressing grammatical relationships within constructions...’ Crystal (2008:524)

In the case of English which, as Crystal says above, ‘relies on word order’, there is the phenomenon of syntactic linkage which, roughly, is a statement about the elements involved in a structure and the relations holding in between.

‘Syntactic linkage has to do with the devices (mainly morphological) by which speakers can signal which words, phrases
or clauses are linked. It is a general concept which subsumes the traditional concepts of agreement and government.’ Miller (2002:101)

Structural items at sentence level are related to one another. That is why when a subject is singular it receives a singular verb. This is a linkage of agreement and dictates what each item should look like. The following excerpt describes more what is meant by syntactic linkage in relation to English.

‘English uses word order and prepositions to signal syntactic links... in the active, declarative construction the subject and object nouns are never preceded by prepositions, the subject noun is immediately to the left of the verb (allowing for modifiers such as relative clauses) and the direct object noun is immediately to the right of the verb’ Miller (2002:107)

The sentence ‘The man who I just met bought the book’ would probably exemplify what Miller meant. The subject noun phrase ‘The man’ stands to the left of verb and the direct object noun ‘the book’ to its left while the clause ‘who I just met’ modifies the former.

Words in syntax are viewed sometimes in terms of form (e.g. noun), sometimes in terms of function (e.g. subject): ‘The form-function distinction is particularly important in the case of clause structure....’ Quirk et al (1985:49)

This study is interested in the order of subjects and verbs, the latter being in focus.

2. 2. 1 Auxiliary

For the purpose of this work, ‘auxiliary’ stands for ‘helping verb’ and ‘nonauxiliary’ stands for ‘main verb’; ‘[An auxiliary is]a verb such as be, do and
have[.] used with main verbs to show tense, etc. and to form questions and negatives’ Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2010).

Auxiliaries play an essential role in the formation of negatives and interrogatives. For the purpose of this work, modals, like ‘can’, fall under the same rubric of ‘auxiliaries’. Anyway, they are more like auxiliaries when it comes to negations and questions. So much so, this citation notwithstanding: ‘The simple modals are normally characterized as a set on the basis of their distinct grammatical features in English. They are very different from main verbs.’ Yule (1998:87)

2. 2. 2 Auxiliaries versus Nonauxiliaries

Auxiliaries are not like nonauxiliaries in many respects; On the same point:

‘One important issue that comes up in the study of the English auxiliary system is that of which words function as auxiliary verbs, and how we can differentiate them. Most reliable criteria for auxiliaryhood lie in syntactic phenomena such as negation, inversion, contraction, and ellipsis (usually known as the ‘NICE’ properties) .’ Kim and Sells (2007:151)

Auxiliaries are often defined against nonauxiliaries. They are said to help the latter in some respects; ‘Auxiliary verbs are sometimes called helping verbs, because they ‘help’ the main verb in some way.’ Nelson (2001:67)

Auxiliaries make up a closed set in that they, unlike nouns for instance, are limited in number. ‘They have the semantic property of marking grammatical properties such as tense, aspect, voice or mood’ Radford (2009:5). They are often defined against nonauxiliaries which make up an open set. That is to say, their features are different from those of nonauxiliaries. Auxiliary verbs, moreover,
modify nonauxiliary verbs and reflect grammar. Nonauxiliaries impart lexical meaning:

2. 2. 3 Do-support

‘Modal verbs combine directly with not...; ordinary verbs require the support of do...’ Miller (2002:176). Because of its special status, the verb ‘do’ deserves a separate treatment; ‘English is also unusual in that if an auxiliary is not present and the sentence is negative or a question, a ‘dummy’ auxiliary do is needed.’ Gelderen (2010:105)

The abbreviations that show up in Radford’s statements here are described, courtesy of Radford 2009, in short, between square brackets made by the researcher. They are described in full in the List of Abbreviations page.

Both Gelderen, the above quote, and Radford, the following quote, used the adjective ‘dummy’ while talking about the use of the verb ‘do’ as a helping verb in the case of sentences with full verbs.

‘NEG [The head constituent of a NEGP: Negation Phrase constituent] is not an appropriate host for the affix, since it is neither overt nor verbal. The result is that the affix in T [A tense-marking constituent] remains stranded (i.e. left without a verbal host to attach to). Let us suppose that when an affix is attached to an (auxiliary or main) verb host, the resulting verb+affix substructure is spelled out as an appropriately inflected form of the relevant verb...let us further suppose that when a tense affix is stranded (i.e. unable to find a verbal host to attach to), it is spelled out as an appropriately inflected form of the dummy/expletive auxiliary do’ Radford: (2009:141)

In the sentence ‘He drives well’, the ‘s’ of ‘drive’ is a singular present tense morpheme. In the sentence ‘He does not go there everyday’, the word ‘does’ acts as a form of ‘do’ that carries or denotes the singular third person morpheme ‘s’.
Radford illustrates with examples two renditions of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person singular present tense.

‘... a third person singular present tense affix is spelled out as the contracted (affixal) form -s in sentences like (53a) below, but as the full form does in sentences like (53b) and (53c):

(53) (a) He likes pasta
(b) Does he like pasta?
(c) He doesn’t like pasta

In much the same way, the third person singular present tense form of the auxiliary have/be is sometimes spelled out as the full form has/is, and sometimes as the contracted form ’s.

What is implicitly being assumed here is that Affix Hopping and do-support are complementary PF [Phonetic Form] operations which provide two different ways of spelling out an affix.’ Radford: (2009:141)

Radford explains more.

‘We can therefore see them as two facets of an Affix Attachment operation, as in (54) below:

(54) Affix Attachment

When the PF component processes a structure whose head \(H\) contains an (undeleted) weak affix which needs a verbal host and which is not already attached to an (auxiliary or main) verb

(i) if \(H\) has a complement headed by an overt verb, the affix is lowered onto the relevant verb \([=\text{Affix Hopping}]\)

(ii) if not (i.e. if \(H\) does not have a complement headed by an overt verb and the affix is stranded), the affix is spelled out as an appropriately inflected form of Do \([=\text{Do-support}]\)’ Radford: (2009:141)
2. 3 Negation

Negation is the process of converting affirmative into negative. It is a process because it involves addition (i.e. of the negative particle ‘not’) and movements (i.e. what comes before and what comes after ‘not’).

In this research the focus is largely on simple negation using ‘not’. The use of ‘not’ is common to the two cases of negation: when there is an auxiliary and when there is a nonauxiliary. In the first case, ‘not’ is combined with the existent auxiliary. In the other case, ‘not’ combines with a form of ‘do’ compatible with main verb in terms of tense and number.

2. 4 Polarity

Talking about affirmative and negative brings about the word ‘polarity’;

‘[Polarity is] A term used by some linguists for the system of positive/negative contrastivity found in a language. The distinction between ‘positive’ and ‘negative polarity’ may be expressed syntactically (e.g. not in English), morphologically (e.g. happy v. unhappy) or lexically (e.g. high v. low).’ Crystal (2008:373)

This work confines itself to syntactic polarity only on the score of ‘not’.

2. 5 Question Formation

In what follows, the two words ‘question’ and ‘interrogative’ are employed synonymously. Questions are different from other syntactic structures in terms of many criteria. Crystal has this to say on the point:

‘[Question is] A term used in the classification of sentence functions, typically used to elicit information or a response, and defined sometimes on grammatical and sometimes on semantic or sociolinguistic grounds.’ Crystal (2008:400)
Since interrogative syntax is what is involved in this study, only syntactic terms matter; ‘We usually make questions by changing the word order: we put the auxiliary verb ... before the subject ...’ Murphy (1989:94)

This makes inversion, a matter of syntax, a defining feature for questions. That is, this change in word order is typical of questions. In contrast, in declarative sentences, it is the other way round (i.e. the subject comes first).

In transformational terms, the form 'Did the boy close the door?' may be considered as interrogative transformation (i.e. surface structure) from ‘The boy closed the door’.

2. 6 Competence and Performance

One of the seminal contributions to linguistics made by Ferdinand de Saussure is the distinction of langue, more or less the knowledge of language that is common to a community, and parole, more or less the use of language by the community. This research incorporates the competence-performance distinction, which is not completely unlike the langue-parole one.

‘...Chomsky has drawn a distinction between competence (the fluent native speaker’s tacit knowledge of his or her language) and performance (what people actually say or understand by what someone else says on a given occasion)’ Radford (2009:12)

Competence, rather than performance, is what this research is about. The focus is on the population’s competence, that is, on what the students know about negative and interrogative formation. Competence, however, even in the case of native speakers, is something unconscious, more like intuition.

‘... it’s no good asking a native speaker of English a question such as ‘How do you form negative sentences in English?’, since human beings have no conscious awareness of the processes involved in
speaking and understanding their native language. To introduce a technical term devised by Chomsky, we can say that native speakers have grammatical competence in their native language: by this, we mean that they have tacit knowledge of the grammar of their language – i.e. of how to form and interpret words, phrases and sentences in the language.’ Radford (2009:12)

Competence and performance are not that equal. In other words, they are not the same phenomenon. Given performance, it is not that easy to tell what competence looks like. Radford has this to say:

‘Very often, performance is an imperfect reflection of competence: we all make occasional slips of the tongue, or occasionally misinterpret something which someone else says to us. However, this doesn’t mean that we don’t know our native language or that we don’t have competence in it. Misproductions and misinterpretations are performance errors, attributable to a variety of performance factors like tiredness, boredom, drunkenness, drugs, external distractions, and so forth.’ Radford (2009:12)

Grammar is about competence rather than about performance. If grammar is thought to be a set of rules that describe how structures are processed, then those rules are competence, rather than performance, proper.

‘A grammar of a language tells you what you need to know in order to have native-like competence in the language (i.e. to be able to speak the language like a fluent native speaker): hence, it is clear that grammar is concerned with competence rather than performance. This is not to deny the interest of performance as a field of study, but merely to assert that performance is more properly studied within the different – though related – discipline of psycholinguistics, which studies the psychological processes underlying speech production and comprehension’ Radford (2009:12)
2. 7 Transformations

The two sentences ‘The boy did not close the door’, which is negative, and ‘Did the boy close the door?’, which is interrogative, seem to be related to the sentence ‘The boy closed the door’. The former feel more like derivations of transforms of the latter. This much is felt by native speakers.

Radford has this to say on the matter;

‘In a fairly obvious sense, any native speaker of a language can be said to know the grammar of his or her native language. For example, any native speaker of English can tell you that the negative counterpart of I like syntax is I don’t like syntax, and not e.g. *I no like syntax: in other words, native speakers know how to combine words together to form expressions (e.g. negative sentences) in their language.’ Radford (2009:11)

In earlier transformational terms, roughly speaking, 'The boy did not close the door' may be considered as negative transformation (i.e. surface structure) from ‘The boy closed the door’;

‘In the early version of the Grammar, negatives are generated from an underlying affirmative through a transformation rule. That is, the negative transformation turns a positive statement into a negative one...’ Williams (2005:167)

As for questions, 'Did the boy close the door?' may be considered as interrogative transformation (i.e. surface structure) from ‘The boy closed the door’.

Below is a rough transformational workout of negative and interrogative formation. As per usual, the analysis is carried out in terms of trees. The source sentence is ‘The boy bought the book.’; ‘It is generally accepted that the DECLARATIVE ACTIVE construction ... is basic.’ Miller (2002:29)
Four things are involved above

1. tree diagram of the source sentence
2. SD

3. SC

4. tree diagram of the derived sentence

The tree diagram breaks up the source sentence hierarchically. It shows explicitly what the sentence is like in terms of units, or constituents. The units involved are S (sentence), NP (noun phrase), VP (verb phrase), N (noun), V (verb), and Det (determiner).

These units figure in the Phrase Structure Rules, associated with the source sentence, which are said to generate the source sentence: ‘The boy bought the book’. SD stands for ‘structural description’ and is the form of the sentence before any kind of change takes place. In SD representation, numbers stand for constituents.

```
The  boy        bought        the        book
SD   1          2            3          4          5
```

SC stands for ‘structural change’ and is the form of the sentence after the change. As in SD, numbers stand for constituents.

```
SC    1        did + not + buy    4           5
```

SD and SC make it is easy to tell what happens. A simple contrast between the SD and the SC in question here shows that all constituents remain the same except for ‘3’ which becomes ‘did + not + buy’. Roughly speaking, three transformations are least involved here. One for the addition of ‘auxiliary’, another for the addition of ‘past’, and yet another for the addition of the negative particle ‘not’. The second tree shows the sentence structure after the change.
Interrogative Transformation

Below is the four-stage process for the interrogative ‘Did the boy bought the book?’.

SD 1 2 3 4 5
SC Did 1 2 3 4 5
As is already made clear, this is just a rough indication of what is involved in the transformational rendition of negative and interrogative. Otherwise, much more is involved.

2. 8 Second Language versus Foreign Language

As this research is concerned with English language, it is to the point to see whether the status of English in the country is that of a second language or a foreign language.

‘A distinction is sometimes made between learning in a “foreign language” setting (learning a language that is not generally spoken in the surrounding community) and a “second language” setting (learning a language that is spoken in the surrounding community). That is, Japanese students in an English class in Japan are learning English as a foreign language (EFL) and, if those same students were in an English class in the USA, they would be learning English as a second language (ESL). In either case, they are simply trying to learn another language, so the expression second language learning is used more generally to describe both situations’ Yule (2010:187)

The following table states what looks like differences between second language and foreign language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L₂vsFL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L₂</td>
<td>FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a language other than L₁</td>
<td>a language other than L₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a major role</td>
<td>no major role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official status</td>
<td>no official status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary for success</td>
<td>not necessary for success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judging from the table, it seems that local status of English is that of a second language.

In the table above, two terms are introduced: \( L_1 \) which stands for first language, and \( L_2 \) which stands for a language other than, or acquired after, \( L_1 \). As is seen later in this chapter, the two terms are transcribed a little differently as \( L1 \) and \( L2 \).

2. 9 Contrastive Analaysis, Interlanguage and Error Analysis

Language learning can be measured by frequent analysis of the learners’ progress, that is, what and how they are doing at particular stages. This kind of analysis tells about their learning problems, what they find easy or difficult to learn, whether they need more attention, more teaching or more practice.

This research is about the population’s current status of learning. Hence this word about contrastive analysis, interlanguage and Error Analysis. These three are relevant to the subjects because they are more or less concerned with measuring learners’ progress. They are presented here, courtesy of Spillner (1991), in no great detail.

All of the three seems to be connected in some way.

‘During the past twenty years, error analysis has occupied a central position in applied linguistics and in foreign language teaching. Its theoretical concepts and the empirical research have been in close relation with the contrastive hypothesis on one hand, and with the interlanguage hypothesis on the other hand.’ Spillner (1991: ix)

Contrastive Analysis has much to say on the influence of mother tongue. It seems to claim that the earlier linguistic system (i.e. the first language acquired) has more or less some impact on any later acquired systems.
‘In contrastive linguistics, errors produced in the process of foreign language acquisition are thought to be caused by more or less unconscious transfer (in the mind of the learner) of mother tongue structures to the system of the target language. Insofar as there are considerable contrasts between the two language systems, there is, according to this hypothesis, a high probability of negative transfer, resulting in errors within target language performance.’ Spillner (1991: ix)

Contrastive Analysis suggests that difficulties are met where the two language (i.e. mother tongue and target language) are different. The supposition here is presumably that there is some ease of learning where the two languages are similar, and some difficulty in learning where they differ.

‘Errors in the second language are, on one side, evidence for existing language contrasts and hence for learning difficulties. On the other side, when undertaking error analysis, they may be regarded as caused by structural learning contrasts. This type of error is meant to be possibly avoided by a systematic contrastive analysis and preventive didactic strategies and by teaching material deduced from the results of contrastive analysis.’ Spillner (1991: ix)

Interlanguage is a statement about learner’s language or the stages involved in learning a language. It has to do with what goes on learners’ mind while processing, and proceeding along, a new linguistic system.

‘The interlanguage hypothesis of second language acquisition is based on the assumption that the transition from zero knowledge to a native speaker or near-native speaker competence does not proceed abruptly but in typical steps, which are, to a certain degree, predictable.’ Spillner (1991: ix)

Errors made by learners more or less reflect their stage of learning. For it is by virtue of errors that their progress in learning can be indentified and discussed.

‘In this view, errors are indicative of the different intermediate learning levels. Didactic measures, like correcting
and preventing errors, have their reason in facilitating the learner's transition from one learning level to another.’ Spillner (1991: ix)

The following excerpt shows what Contrastive Analysis and Interlanguage hypothesis have in common.

‘These competing theories of foreign language learning have in common that they take into account the predictability of deviant language performance during the process of acquisition; for both, empirical error analysis is an essential methodical instrument; in both cases, errors are relevant likewise for diagnosis and evaluation of the process of language acquisition as for the development of therapeutic or corrective language teaching strategies.’ Spillner (1991:ix)

2. 10 Mistakes versus Errors

The two words ‘mistake’ and ‘error’ seem to be synonymous, but when it comes to evaluating learners’ progress, it is helpful to make a distinction between the two.

‘In order to analyze learner language in an inappropriate perspective, it is crucial to make a distinction between mistakes and errors, technically two very different phenomena’ Brown (2000:217)

Mistakes are performance-related. They are more like slips of the tongue. They are made by learners as well as by native speakers. They can often be corrected on the spot.

‘A mistake refers to a performance error that is either a random guess or a “slip,” in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. All people make mistakes, in both native and second language situations. Native speakers are normally capable of recognizing and correcting such “lapses” or mistakes, which are not the result of a deficiency in competence but the result of some sort of temporary breakdown or imperfection in the process of producing speech. These hesitations, slips of the tongue, random ungrammaticalities, and other performance
Errors are competence-related. They reflect learners’ current stages of understanding the target language system. This makes errors a good starting point to go about analyzing learners’ progress.

‘Mistakes must be carefully distinguished from errors of a second language learner, idiosyncrasies in the language of the learner that are direct manifestations of a system within which the learner is operating at the time. An error, an noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflects the competence of the learner. Learners of English who ask, “Does John cansing?” are in all likelihood reflecting a competence level in which all verbs require a preposed do (Brown’s italics) auxiliary for question formation. Such, it is an error, most likely not a mistake, and an error that reveals a portion of the learner’s competence in the target language’ Brown (2000:217)

2.11 Analyzing Errors

As an example of learners’ errors being analyzed, Brown provides Barry Taylor’s table, given underneath, and says:

‘The analysis of intralingual errors in a corpus of production data can become quite complex. For example, in Barry Taylor's (1975:95) analysis of English sentences produced by ESL learners, just the class of errors in producing the main verb following a modal yielded the following nine different types of error:

1. Past-tense form of verb following a modal
2. Present-tense form of verb following a modal
3. -ing form of verb following a modal
4. are (for be) following will
5. Past-tense form of verb following do
6. **Present-tense-son a verb following do**

7. **-ing on a verb following do**

8. **Past-tense form of a verb following be** (inserted to replace a modal or do)

9. **Present-tense-son a verb following be** (inserted to replace a modal or do)' Brown (2000:225-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8.1. Typical English intralingual errors in the use of articles (from Richards 1971: 187)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Omission of THE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) before unique nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) before nouns of nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) before nouns made particular in context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) before a noun modified by a participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) before superlatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) before a noun modified by an <em>of</em>-phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) before a noun modified by an <em>of</em>-phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) before superlatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(k) before unique nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. THE Used Instead of Ø</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) before proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) before abstract nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) before nouns behaving like abstract nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) before plural nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) before some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. A Used Instead of THE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) before superlatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) before unique nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. A Instead of Ø</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) before a plural noun qualified by an adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) before uncountables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) before an adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Omission of A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before class nouns defined by adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before adjectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 12 Describing Errors

As errors proved to be of significance in studying learning progress, they came to be described in many ways. ‘A number of different categories for description of errors have been identified in research on learner language’ Brown (2000:222)

In dealing with errors, the first thing to be done is to identify them. Identification of errors gives labels to tell them apart. The following is a summarized taxonomy of errors based on Brown (2000):

1. An error can be identified as one of addition, omission, substitution, or ordering.

2. An error can be said to occur on one of the levels: phonology, orthography, lexicon, grammar, or discourse.

3. An error can be identified as or global, in which case the message is hard to understand, or local, in which case the message is understandable.

4. Errors can also be identified in terms of domain and extent, both of which invoke the notion of linguistic rank.

5. An error can be said to be covert or overt (This distinction was mentioned or cited by Brown while discussing the matter of error identification).

2. 13 Identifying the Sources of Errors

According to Brown (2000), there are four sources of error:

1. Interlingual Transfer (i.e. L1 interference)
2. Intralingual Transfer (i.e. generalizations within target language (henceforth TL))

3. Context of Learning (i.e. blamable materials and/or teaching)

4. Communication Strategies (i.e. techniques employed by learners)

2. 14 Teaching Grammar

It is also important to discuss the techniques used to teach these forms of sentences and their different elements; ‘The real question is not why we teach grammar, but how.’ Williams (2005:41)

In this respect, drill and exercise is the most common;

‘The most common approach to teaching grammar is drill and exercise. Students drill on grammar terminology—noun, verb, preposition, and so on—and then complete exercises in which they are required to identify the various parts of individual sentences. Given enough encouragement and practice, students can become very good at these activities.’ Williams (2005:20)

But against activities based on drill and exercise, he goes to say: ‘But it should be obvious that there is no match between such activities and speaking and that the fundamental requirement of learning outcomes is not met.’ Williams (2005:20)

Teaching negative and interrogative formation waits on the consideration above.

Below are four approaches for teaching grammar.

1. Present, Practice, Produce

Three things are involved here.

1. Understanding a grammatical point
2. Doing drills and written exercises on the point

3. Using the point communicatively

Larsen-Freeman says:

‘Across the various languages and subsystems of grammar, perhaps the most widely practiced traditional approach to grammatical instruction has been portrayed as the three Ps – present, practice, produce.

In the first stage, an understanding of the grammar point is provided; sometimes by pointing out the differences between the L1 and L2. In the second stage, students practice the grammar structure using oral drills and written exercises.

In the third stage, students are given “frequent opportunities for communicative use of the grammar to promote automatic and accurate use” (Sheen, 2003, p. 226), cited in Long and Doughty (2009:523)

2. Input-processing

This is about paying attention to a problematic feature.

Larsen-Freeman says:

‘VanPatten (1990) argued that the problem is that L2 learners have difficulty attending simultaneously to meaning and form. To remedy this problem, VanPatten (2004) has proposed “input processing,” whereby learners are guided to pay attention to a feature in the target language input that is likely to cause a problem’, cited in Long and Doughty (2009:524)

3. Focus on the Form

On this approach Larsen-Freeman says:

‘Noting that some aspects of an L2 require awareness and/or attention to language form, and further, that implicit learning is not
sufficient for SLA mastery, Long (1991) calls for a focus on form within a communicative or meaning-based approach to language teaching, such as task-based (e.g., R. Ellis, 2003; Pica, Kang, &Sauro, 2006) or content-based language teaching’, cited in Long and Doughty (2009:525)

4. Grammaring

This is about an accurate, effective use of grammar. Larsen-Freeman says:

‘Larsen-Freeman (2001, 2003) offers “grammaring” – the ability to use grammar structures accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately as the proper goal of grammar instruction. The addition of “-ing” to grammar is meant to suggest a dynamic process of grammar using’, cited in Long and Doughty (2009:526)

2. 15 Getting Grammar

The word ‘getting’ above may stand for either ‘acquiring’ or ‘learning’.

Acquisition of grammar takes time and involves stages;

‘It might take several months, or even years, to master all the uses of a particular type of grammatical construction. For example, the apparently simple process of 'asking questions' in English breaks down into three major stages:

• The earliest stage makes use of intonation ... e.g. Daddy there?, spoken with a high rising tone, in effect asks 'Is Daddy there?'

• During the second year, children start to use question words. What and where are usually the first to be acquired, with why, how, and who coming later. These questions become more complex as the third year approaches, e.g. Where Katie going?, What you doing in there?

• A major advance comes with the learning of the verb to be, and such auxiliary verbs as have and do.’ Crystal (2007:257-8)


2. 16 Previous Local Studies

It is worth noting, in conclusion, that HajirAbdelqadirAbdelmohsin Osman’s work, an unpublished PhD thesis and is cited here twice, is an example of a local study conducted on same subject-matter (i.e. negatives and interrogatives).

The work treats of problems facing Sudanese students studying negatives and interrogatives. The students that compose the population of the study are the students who study English at the department of English, faculty of Education, University of Gadarif. The findings include that:

‘Sudanese learners of English find difficulties in dealing with negation and interrogation…Specific and concrete examples of these difficulties are:

Using the wrong auxiliary in question formation.

Auxiliary omission.

Lack of inversion’ Osman (2011: 244)

As for existing English Language syllabuses, the study indicates that 50% of teachers sampled by means of a questionnaire recommends ‘a separate course’ (Osman 2011: 245) for the subject of negation and interrogation.

As for material, Osman says that it ‘should be as eclectic and comprehensible as possible’ Osman (2011: 246)

As for teaching methodology, Osman’s study recommends: ‘Training the students in asking question in real life communication opportunities’ Osman (2011: 246)

Another example of a local study, actually an MA study, is DuriaSalih Mahmoud Salih’s which aims at Sudanese secondary school students and their
problems with some aspects of English language. The work looks for ways to solve the problems.

Some of the points highlighted by the findings of Salih’s study are motivation, strategies comprehension, and interference of L₁.
Chapter Three

Methodology

3.0 Introduction

By its very nature, this work is all data-dependant. The data are collected, by means of a test, analyzed, and made presentable in terms of tables and figures using Microsoft Word 2007 together with Microsoft Excel 2007.

3.1 Population and Sample

The population of the study is the group of DTC students. The random sample comprises a hundred students. Differences between students of any type whatsoever are bypassed. That is, at this stage the work targets the DTC students in general. Further research may consider these differences but this one does not.

3.2 Instrument

As a means of data collection, this study employs a test of two parts. One part is for testing out formation of negative sentences and the other is for testing formation of interrogative sentences.

3.3 The Test

The test comprises ten statements. The students are asked to give the negative and interrogative equivalents in writing.

3.4 Procedure

The testing took place for the most part during lectures. The papers were delivered and collected on the spot by the researcher with extensive help from DTC lecturers. No problems were encountered in the process.
3.5 Method of Data Analysis

Results of the test were counted out in terms of correct and incorrect answers. All results are displayed, using Microsoft Word 2007 and Microsoft Excel 2007, in terms of tables and figures as shown in the following chapter.
Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Discussion

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents results of the test and presents discussions based on these results. In order to make the discussion more to the point, every piece of result is tabulated and each table is accompanied by an illustrative figure.

They are four types or results here: the general result which spans the whole test; the result of the negative part of the test; the result of the interrogative part of the test; and the result for each sentence of either test in isolation.

The first three types of result: the general result, the negative test result, and the interrogative test result, are presented one after another in that order. The discussion in the three cases is rather general. The results are weighed against the research hypothesis and the discussion proceeds in search of some generalizations.

Discussion then applies to the last type of result: results of the sentences considered in isolation. Each result is weighed against the research hypothesis and sources of error are sought for in the process.

4.1 The General Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Test sentence</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>He is working hard</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>They are my friends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>I will study history</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>He can drive well</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>They must stay home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>We would like to see you</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a</td>
<td>We go to school everyday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a</td>
<td>He was reading a book</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 The General Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Test Sentence</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>He is working hard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>They are my friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.b</td>
<td>I will study history</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b</td>
<td>He can drive well</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b</td>
<td>They must stay home</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.b</td>
<td>We would like to see you</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.b</td>
<td>We go school everyday</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.b</td>
<td>He was reading a book</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.b</td>
<td>The key was lost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.b</td>
<td>I made a mistake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 The General Result

Table 1 and Figure 1 above show the result of the whole test. This result shows that in all cases the number of the correct answers exceeds the number of the wrong answers. This means that in all the 20 cases, the research hypothesis (i.e. that the informants do not know how handle matters of both negative formation and interrogative formation) is proved to be true over and over again.
4. 2 The Negative Formation Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>test sentence</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a</td>
<td>He is working hard</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.a</td>
<td>They are my friends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.a</td>
<td>I will study history</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a</td>
<td>He can drive well</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a</td>
<td>They must stay home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.a</td>
<td>We would like to see you</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.a</td>
<td>We go to school everyday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.a</td>
<td>He was reading a book</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.a</td>
<td>The key was lost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.a</td>
<td>I made a mistake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Negative Formation Test Result

![Figure 2 Negative Formation Test Result](image)

Table 2 and Figure 2 show the result for the negative formation test. This result shows that in all the ten cases of negations the correct answers outnumber the incorrect ones. This means that the research hypothesis is verified by the majority.

4. 3 The Interrogative Formation Test Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>test sentence</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.b</td>
<td>He is working hard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.b</td>
<td>They are my friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.b I will study history 3 97 100
4.b He can drive well 9 91 100
5.b They must stay home 3 97 100
6.b We would like to see you 3 97 100
7.b We go to school everyday 5 95 100
8.b He was reading a book 3 97 100
9.b The key was lost 1 99 100
10.b I made a mistake 1 99 100

Table 3 Interrogative Formation Test Result

Table 3 and Figure 3 show the result for the interrogative formation test. This result, just like the one before, shows preponderance on behalf of incorrect answers, which in turn pleads the case of the research hypothesis.

4. 4 The Result by Sentences

1.a He is working hard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.a He is working hard</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Result of 1.a
This sentence ‘He is working hard’ is the first one, of the negation test, to be negated. The negation, for the most part, involves adding the negative particle ‘not’ at the right place. But matters of word order must also be attended to.

As is clear from the associated table and figure, the result shows that 22 of the informants gave correct answers while 78 gave incorrect ones. The proportion 22:78 supports the research hypothesis regarding negation, that the population does not know how to form negation in English. This is true at least of the majority.

Correct answers, however, are open for some discussion. For instance, the answer ‘He is not workin hard’ missed the right spelling. But this is disregarded as the word ‘working’ is already given. The answer ‘he is not working hard’ missed capitalization. This is also disregarded as the focus here is more on the negation structure. One answer is considered correct though not complete: ‘he is noT working’ (where ‘hard’ is left out). The ‘t’ of ‘not’ seems like an upper case in the original answer.

A discussion of incorrect answers is no less worthy of attention as it may lead to insights into how matters of negation. That is to say, incorrect answers may
reflect the way negation is processed or dealt with. They may also act as indications of trends or directions in negation.

First of all, there seems to be a problem with word order. The answer ‘Hard He is working’ is an example. Another example is the answer ‘He hard is working’. Aside from word order, both of the two answers lack the negative particle ‘not’.

Even when the ‘not’ is provided, it tends to show up in different positions and many formats. The following answers exemplify this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no is work hard</th>
<th>He is not work hard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He is no working hard</td>
<td>He is working not hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No He is working hard</td>
<td>No not working hard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some answers display uses of ‘do’: ‘He desn’t working hard’, ‘He des not working hard’, and ‘I do nt working hard’. This answer displays a use of ‘are’: ‘are not working hard’.

The sources of error for this mismanagement of progressive tense negation are likely to range from interlingual transfer or L₁ interference: ‘No He is working hard’; to intralingual transfer or generalizations within TL: ‘He desn’t working hard’; to context of learning or faulty materials or teaching shortcomings: ‘are not working hard’: and to communication strategies or learning techniques followed by learners: ‘No He is working hard’.

2.a They are my friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.a They are my friends</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Result of 2.a
The sample sentence to be negated here is in the simple present tense. In order to negate it, all that is required is putting ‘not’ immediately after the verb ‘are’. The result, as is shown by table 5 and figure 5, is 16 of correct answers and 84 of incorrect ones. This result, just like the one before, lends much support to the research hypothesis respecting negation: that the population does not know how to go about negation in English. The present result shows the hypothesis to be true at least of the majority.

Discussion of correct answers may prove profitable. Some informants write out sentences regardless of punctuation details: ‘they are not my friends’. In the answer ‘They are Not my friends’, the ‘n’ of ‘not’ is capitalized. As long as the right structure of negation is provided, the sentence is considered as correct.

Discussion of incorrect answers may prove no less profitable. First of all, two answers were not made complete and that is why they are not counted among the correct answers. The two sentences are written out without the possessive adjective ‘my’, i.e. They are not friends.

Some answers show the use of verb ‘do’, which is actually used in negation and interrogation but not in the present context. Examples are: ‘Do not they are
“friends” and ‘They are did n’t my friends’. On the other side, both answers succeeded in including the negative particle ‘not’.

‘He is’ is used instead of ‘They are’ in the answer: ‘He is not my friend’. This means that, as far the negation of third person singular is concerned, the answer is correct. But that is not the case here and the sentence is not counted among the correct ones. In the following two examples, ‘he’ and ‘they’ are used together in the first, and ‘is’ and ‘are’ are used together in the second:

he not they are my friends
he is not are friends

In the following examples, the negative particle ‘not’ appear in different places:

are not my friends (here the subject is omitted in the original)
they are my friends not
they Not are my friends

No they are not frends

The source for these mishandlings of the negative particle is presumably the communication strategies on the part of the learners.

3.a I will study history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Result of 3.a
The third sentence to be negated exemplifies the modal ‘will’. As is the case with all modals, what is required here is the addition of ‘not’ immediately after ‘will’. The related table and figure show the result to consist of 15 correct answers and 85 of incorrect answers. This outcome goes straight to further support the research hypothetical claim that negation is not part of the population competence as such.

Correct answers are worthy of some discussion. One of the answers here showcases contraction: ‘I will n’t study history’. Even though this contraction is not right, the answer is considered correct because ‘n’t’ is inserted in the right place. The other 14 showed knowledge in handling negation. Thus, though this number of correct answers is not sufficient to reject the hypothesis, it could be said that the hypothesis is weakened by 15%.

Incorrect answers may reflect some trends in forming negation amongst the population. for instance, the verb ‘do’ appear in different forms and different places in what follows:

- donot study history
- done will study history
- did,t study history
- Do not will study history
I will do not study history

These informants know that a form of ‘do’ is required to form negatives in English. What seems to have happened is that they sort of generalized the rule for ‘do’ insertion. ‘do’ is only possible when the sentence contains a full or main verb which is not proceeded by any modal or any helping verb.

Some insertions of the verb ‘be’ also occurred:

I m not will study history               he is not study history

I m I will study history

In the above answers, the informants seem to misapply the rule for the use of ‘be’ which is not needed here because of the presence of the modal ‘will’ and the absence of any form of ‘be’.

One of the answers showcases the insertion of ‘shall’: ‘I shall not study history’, which makes the negation right but not in accordance with the requirement of the test.

Another case for comment is the answer ‘I will not studes history’ which inflects, though not rightly, the main verb which is out of the question here because of the presence and the precedence of ‘will’.

There are also insertions of the negative particle ‘not’:

I not will study history               no I will study history
not is study history                   No study history I will
ne not I will study history

The informants who provided the above answers know that negation in English involves the insertion of ‘not’. But the insertion of ‘not’ also involves knowing where to insert it when there is a modal.
The source for error of not knowing the proper place for ‘not’ within negative structures is arguably due to insufficient practice, assuming that the learners’ have had enough teaching on the matter together with dedicated materials. Anyway, lack of exposure to negation to structures is likely to result in such errors.

4.a He can drive well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Result of 4.a

This is the fourth sentence to be negated in which the modal in focus is ‘can’. It is the same kind of negation treatment as that of ‘will’. The result, as shown by table 7 and figure 7, yields the proportion 21:79; that is, 21 of correct answers and 79 of incorrect ones. One again, the hypothetical claim of the research receives a good deal of support. This is the fourth piece of support that the research hypothesis receives in a row.

There are little differences among the set of correct answers. The differences are shown between the brackets:
Incorrect answers show some sort of variety in the use of ‘not’:

- He can Not driving well
- Do not He can drive well
- Not can drive well
- have not drive well
- He can drive Not well
- what can drive well
- I dont drive well

This variety of errors is likely to suggest a variety of sources. Intralingual transfer, however, seems to be the one involved here.

5.a They must stay home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Result of 5.a

Testing out the use of ‘must’ in negation, this is the fifth sentence of the negation part of the test. When it comes to negation, ‘must’ is no different from
other modals in annexing immediately to the modal. Both table 8 and figure 8 above point out the result to consist of 8 correct answers and 92 incorrect ones. In other words, the majority of the students have problems forming negatives in English, which means that the research hypothesis is further strengthened.

Some remarks may be extracted from the 92% data of incorrect answers. First, some answers did provide the negative particle ‘not’ but missed the right place for it:

- They not must stay home  
  must not stay home
- they must stay home not

Some answers provide ‘no’ for ‘not’:

- no They must S Tay home  
  No they must home stay

Some answers showcase uses of verb ‘be’:

- They is Not must stay home  
  They are not must stay home
- They isn’t must stay home

One of the answers opted for a use of ‘do’:

- They did n’t must stay home.

One answer seems to display word order problem:

- must stay they home.

The source of using ‘must’ incorrectly in negation structures appears to originate partly in interlingual transfer and partly in intralingual transfer.
6.a We would like to see you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.a We would like to see you</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Result of 6.a

The modal would appear in this sentence which is the sixth to be negated. 4 correct answers and 96 incorrect ones make up the result which is displayed by the related table and figure. According to this result, all the population but four have some problems or another when it comes to negation with ‘would’. This result, then, follows the same line of support for the hypothesis so far made by the previous results.

The following are some of the incorrect answers with remarks where possible.

*we would like to not see you*          no we would like to see you

*we not would like to see you*

Of the three above answers, the first two missed the right position for ‘not’. The third one used ‘no’ only which is not enough to negate the sample sentence.

*we des not would like to see you*          *dont would like to see you*
we would Do not like to see you  

we did n’ t would like to see you (the comma of ‘n’t’ looks like it is over the ‘n’)

The five sentences above used, in different ways, a form of ‘do’ together with the modal ‘would’.

we kan not would like to see you  

we is Not would like to see you

we shall noT like to see you  

he is we would like to see you

The four answers above used ‘can’, ‘shall’, and ‘is’ which are not required in this context. The last one left out the negative particle ‘not’.

Causes for these patterns are traceable in part to the lack of knowledge of the rules for negation. Another suggestible source is communications strategies employed by the learners.

7.a We go to school everyday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.a We go to school everyday</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Result of 7.a

![Figure 10 Result of 7.a](image)
The seventh sentence to be negated showcases a main verb in the present tense. This is where a form of verb ‘do’ is brought about and linked to the negative particle ‘not’: We do not go to school everyday. As is clear from the associated table and figure, the result is made up of one correct answer and 99 incorrect ones. This is again a big support for the research hypothesis which proves 99% true in this case.

Though the correct answer is written somewhat like this: ‘we do not’ (the ‘is over the ‘t’) go to school everyday’, the punctuation matters are disregarded as the components of negation (i.e. do+not+go) are provided.

Some incorrect answers are worthy of some attention and, where possible, some remarks.

\[ I don't go to school \quad do not go to school everyday \]

The two answers above both used the right form of ‘do’, but the first changed the subject of the sentence from ‘we’ to ‘I’ and the second left the subject out altogether. The first sentence also left out the adverb ‘everyday’. Except for these shortcomings, the two sentences could be said to have partly done well in forming negation. The shortcomings could be attributed to not yet mastering the rules of negation in such a case.

\[ we did not go to school everyday \quad dient go to school \]

\[ we didn't go to school everyday \]

Of the above three answers, the first two could be said to be correct if the main verb of the sample sentence is in the past and if matters of punctuation are disregarded. The third one suffers from omission of the subject and from lack of punctuation too.
we not go to school everyday  
No we go to school everyday

we go Not to school everyday

we go to not school everyday

The five answers above used ‘not’ (the first three) and ‘no’ (the last two) for negation, but they do not provide the right form of ‘do’ necessary for negation in such a case.

we can not go to school everyday  
we will not go to school everyday

we are not going to school

we hav not go to school everyday

The four answers above inserted ‘can’, ‘are’, ‘will’, and ‘hav’ instead of the right form of ‘do’. On the other hand, they all provided the negative particle ‘not’ in the right place.

he is go to school everyday

What is noticeable about the above answer, apart from the absence of any negation, is the insertion of ‘he is’ in the initial position.

In sum, all the above attempts at negation seem to be attributable to lack of knowledge of the rules involved in negation. They are also referable to lack of sufficient exposure to negations structures of this kind.

8.a He was reading a book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.a He was reading a book</th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 Result of 8.a
This is the eighth sample sentence to be negated. The kind of negation to be sorted out here is that which involves the past progressive tense. The table and figure given here present a result of 13 correct answers and 87 incorrect ones. This result, like all the other results so far, strengthens the research hypothesis by 87% majority.

As far as correct answers are concerned, some are considered correct regardless of punctuation (e.g. ‘he was not reading a book), and regardless of an addition like ‘no’ (e.g. No He was not reading a book).

Consideration of incorrect answers leads to many observations and remarks.

He is not reading a book

He Do not was reading a book

he isn’t was reading a book
do not reading a book

he is was reading a book

He don’t reading a book

He was no r\ Reading a book

i don’t can was reading a book

H not was reading a book

He desn’t was reading a book

He Not reading a book

did’t reading a book
he can not reading a book

All the errors that are involved here seem to relate to the fact that the grammar of progressive tense negation is not yet well mastered, a fact, if verified, suggests context of learning (i.e. insufficient teaching and questionable materials) as a likely source.

9.a The key was lost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.a The key was lost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 Result of 9.a

Figure 12 Result of 9.a

The ninth sentence in the negation test, which showcases simple past tense, received a result, as shown by the attached table and figure, of 4 correct answers and 96 incorrect ones. According to this result, the 96% majority have problems forming negative sentences. This majority further supports the research hypothesis.

As for the sum of correct answers, slight deviations from punctuation are disregarded. An example is the answer ‘the key was not lost’ in which the negation is carried out correctly and is not affected by the lack of capitalization.
In order to find out whether there are any trends in dealing with negation among the informants, some of the incorrect answers are provided here.

*The key is not lost*  
*the not key was lost*

*The key not was lost*  
*The key not was lost*

*No the are key was lost*  

The key it n’ot was lost (the ‘ is over the ‘n’ in the original)

*no the was key lost*  
*not they key was lost*

*No The key was lost*  
*They key are not lost*

*The des n’t key was lost* (the ‘ is between ‘n’ and ‘t’ in the original)

*I can not key was lost* (This sentence is found in the gap for the interrogative)

The sources suggestible for such errors as the above ones seem to include interlingual transfer or L1 interference on the hand and intralingual transfer or TL generalizations on the other.

10.a I made a mistake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.a I made a mistake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 Result of 10.a
The result for the last sentence to be negated, which presents a sentence in the simple past tense, consists of incorrect answers only, which strongly supports the research hypothesis.

The source of this erroneous handling of the syntax of simple past tense negation is presumably traceable in intralingual transfer or generalizations made the learners as they are getting more and more knowledge in TL.

1.b He is working hard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.b He is working hard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Result of 1.b

Figure 13 Result of 10.a

Figure 14 Result of 1.b
The first sample sentence to be made a question comes in the progressive present tense. The easiest way is to change it into a Yes/No question by means of subject-verb inversion.

As is made clear by the associated table and figure, the result consists of 7 of incorrect answers and 93 of incorrect ones. This means it is somewhat hard for the majority to make the sample sentence a sentence. But it also means that the interrogative part of the research hypothesis (i.e. that the population do not know how to form questions) is largely true.

A look at the sum of correct answers may not seem to be out of place here.

\[
\begin{align*}
is & \text{ He working hard?} & is & \text{ he working hard?} \\
is & \text{ He working hard} & who & \text{ is working hard}
\end{align*}
\]

All the above answers are considered correct, despite the lack of punctuation, because they abided by the interrogative syntax for Yes/No type and for wh-word type (when wh-word acts as the subject).

It is profitable to have a look at some of the incorrect answers as observations here may lead to some insights.

do you working hard

This looks like an error of substitution: ‘do you’ seems to be substituted for ‘Is he’. It could also be considered an intralingual error [SOURCE], where the rule for using ‘do’ might be generalized. On another aspect, it is an overt error: the grammar is not right.

\[
\begin{align*}
wat & \text{ the working hard} & wat & \text{ is working hard}
\end{align*}
\]
How is working hard?  How working hard?

why is working hard?  who is work?

How do you working hard?

All the seven answers above opted for using a wh-word, including ‘how’, to make the sample sentence a question. The source behind the first, i.e. ‘wat the working hard’, is probably inerlingual transfer as L₁ seems to be at work here. But another probable source is intralingual transfer as this seems a case of ‘what’ overgeneralization.

The three answers ‘wat is working hard’, ‘how is working hard?’, and ‘why is working hard?’ look more like covert errors because, regardless of punctuation and spelling matters, they are grammatical as they stand, but once looked at from the perspective of what the context demands, they tend to be out of place here. The suggestible source for their occurrence seems to be communication strategies or techniques of processing language structures used by the learners in the course of acquiring TL.

2.b They are my friends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.b They are my friends</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 Result of 2.b
Featuring a verb in the simple present tense, this is the second sample sentence in the interrogative part of the test. The easiest way to make it a question is inverting ‘They’ and ‘are’, leaving the rest of the sentence intact.

The result, as illustrated by the given table and figure, consists of 5 correct answers and 95 of incorrect ones. As such, this result goes a long way (95%) to prove that the research hypothesis about question formation (i.e. the population do not know how to form questions) is right.

The following three sentences are considered correct regardless of matters of punctuation because the question structure is given:

\[ \text{are They my friends?} \quad \text{are they my friends?} \]

\[ \text{are they my friends} \]

In case they may reveal any insights about question formation process, some incorrect answers are highlighted here and, if possible commented on.

\[ \text{are you friends} \quad \text{my are They friends?} \]

\[ \text{is they friends} \quad \text{They are friends my?} \]
They are my friends? Friends They are my

The first two of the six answers above are errors of omission considering what is left out. The remaining four could be considered errors of substitution.

can this your friends? wat is my friends

can not are my friends How are my friends

do you are my friends if they my friends?

what my friends

The errors involved in the seven answers above could have an intralingual common source, i.e. generalizing the use of ‘can’, ‘do’, ‘what’, ‘how’, and ‘if’.

3.b I will study history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.b I will study history</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Result of 3.b

The third sample sentence to be made interrogative contains the modal ‘will’. Inversion of ‘I’ and ‘will’ - keeping the rest intact and adding a question mark at the end in the case of writing - is the easiest way to make a question here.
As depicted by the given table and figure, the correct answers resulting from the test here are 3 and the incorrect ones are 97. Obviously enough, this result gives a great deal of support to the research hypothesis respecting interrogative formation.

As far as correct answers are concerned, the two ones below are passed as correct because inversion takes place anyway:

\[
\text{will I study history} \quad \text{will I study history?}
\]

Rather than an analytical account, the following is a brief selective look at some incorrect answers; it is a sort of looking into some details in order to be able to get to some insights on how interrogative formation is processed or handled by the informants concerned.

\[
\text{would I study history?} \quad \text{I will study history?}
\]

The above two are right in respects. First, as they stand, they are questions. The first one is clearly a question. The second can also be considered a question in terms of intonation.

\[
\text{will study I history}
\]

In the above answer the modal ‘will’ appears initially which is correct, but then, instead of being followed by the subject, it is followed by the main verb. This kind of error is likely to stem from insufficient practice on inversion.

\[
\text{Can you study history?}
\]

The above answer is grammatical as it stands but it is considered incorrect because it lacks context.

\[
\text{I will wat study history} \quad \text{wat study will history}
\]
what will study history  Is I will study history

do you know This history  are you stady history

I do you study history  wy I will study history

One probable source for the errors made in the above answers is probably lack of exposure to interrogative structures. Another suggestible source is intralingual Transfer.

4.b He can drive well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.a He can drive well</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 Result of 4.b

![Figure 17 Result of 4.b](image)

The fourth sentence of the interrogative part of the test is the where the modal ‘can’ figures. As is the case with all sentences containing a modal, one the easiest way to form a question, of the Yes/No type, is by simply inverting the subject and the verb. The verb inverted is either an auxiliary verb or a modal.

The resulting correct answers, as displayed by the associated table and figure, are 9 in number while the incorrect ones are 91. Just like all the other
results so far obtained, this one imparts more force on the interrogative part of the research hypothesis.

A quick look at some of the correct answers may be appropriate here.

*Can he drive well*  
*Can He drive well*

*can He drive well?*  
*who can drive well*

Incorrect answers are not less important than correct answers as far as search for insights on interrogative formation is concerned. Some of the incorrect answers are here provided for observation sake with some related remarks on their possible sources.

*can you drive well*  
*is he drive well*

*can drive He well*  
*wy He can drive well*

*He can well drive*  
*Can you drive well?*

*He well can drive?*  
*do you know drive*

*Where he can drive well*  
*If He can driver well?*

*Wat can drive well*  
*how can drive well?*

The sources from which such errors as the above ones originate are likely to be communication strategies and context of learning.

5.b They must stay home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 Result of 5.b
Three of correct answers and ninety seven of incorrect ones make up the result of the fifth sentence to be made a question. The focus of the sentence is on the modal ‘must’ which can be inverted with the subject ‘They’ to make a question of the Yes/No type.

Speaking of the result in terms of the research hypothesis, the proportion 3:97 clearly tells that the informants, at least in their majority, are not completely aware of the way questions are made in English.

Two of the correct answers are written like this: ‘must they stay home?’ which misses the right punctuation. Another correct answer is ‘who must stay home’ (N.B. The second letter of ‘must’ is not clearly written in the original) where, aside from incorrect punctuation, ‘who’ initiates the question correctly.

Trends in question formation might be traceable in the set of incorrect answers below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wHo they must stay home} & \quad \text{They must stay home?} \\
\text{IF must stay home?} & \quad \text{wy They are must stay home} \\
\text{Can you stay in home?} & \quad \text{are they must stay at home}
\end{align*}
\]
They home must stay
Can they must stay home?

have they sTay home (The ‘t’ looks like a capital ‘T’ in the original)

are they must stay home

Such trends in handling interrogative formation are accountable for probably in terms of lack of knowledge of the rules involved in such structures and lack of enough exposure to the language in general.

6.b We would like to see you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.b We would like to see you</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 Result of 6.b

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Figure 19 Result of 6.b

This is the sixth sample sentence to be made a question. Inverting ‘would’ with the subject ‘We’ would result in a question of the Yes/No type. The result obtained, as shown by the given table and figure, consists of 3 correct answers and 97 incorrect ones. This means that once more the research hypothesis regarding interrogative formation is true by 97%.
Lack of proper punctuation is again noticeable in two of the correct answers: ‘would we like to see you’ and ‘would we like to see you?’. Both, however, managed to give the right interrogative structure.

Going over some of the incorrect answers may shed some light on the way interrogative structures are processed on the part of some of the informants.

- *are we would like to see me*  
- *Are we would like to see you*  
- *You we would like to see?*  
- *dont not would like to see you*  
- *we would like to see you?*  
- *are they would like to see you*  
- *do you like To see him* (The ‘t’ looks like upper case in the original)  
- *If we like you?*

The source for the occurrences of errors such as the ones above is likely to the communication strategies adopted by the informants.

7.b We go to school everyday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.b We go to school everyday</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 Result of 7.b
The seventh sample sentence in the interrogative part of the test comes with the main verb in the simple present tense. This is where do-support comes into action. Inversion takes place after the appropriate form of ‘do’ is provided. If a wh-word is chosen for a subject, then inversion is not required.

Speaking of the result, as shown by the related table and figure, only five answers are found to be correct. The rest deals a big support to the research hypothesis which claims that question formation is not part of the population competence as such.

Not all of the correct answers provided are of the Yes/No question type. In fact, regardless of punctuation, three of five correct answers used ‘who’ as a subject, i.e. Who go to school everyday?. The other two, again regardless of punctuation, are of the Yes/No type. Both, however, did not observe full capitalization: ‘do we go to school everyday?’

A slight scanning of incorrect answers may help discover some directions in forming questions.

*do you go to school everyday* (change of subject)
we are not go to school everyday (the first word looks like ‘we’ in the original)

we go to school everyday?

wy we go to school everyday

can is go to school everyday

I go to school everyday?

These directions in dealing with interrogative structures may stem from context of learning. The informants might not have been given enough instruction on how to handle interrogative structures. Lack of well designed materials might be another source here.

8.b He was reading a book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.b He was reading a book</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 Result of 8.b

The eighth sample sentence of the interrogative part of the test uses the progressive past tense, an interrogative Yes/No version of which is easily
obtainable by inversion. As is clear from the table and figure here, the result displays 3 answers as correct and 97 ones as incorrect. Once more the research hypothesis on forming questions receives a great deal of support.

Some remarks are due to the three correct answers which are given below.

was He reading a book? was He reading

was H reading a book?

All the of three are not punctuated rightly. The second left out the ‘e’ of ‘He’ and the third left out the phrase ‘a book’.

Investigating some of the incorrect answers may tell something about the way interrogative formation is dealt with by the informants concerned.

What was reading a book? (It is not clear whether the initial ‘w’ is upper or lower case in the original)

wat He was reading a book

The above two answers show two uses of ‘what’. In the first sentence it suggests an inanimate subject. In the second, it appears where ‘what’ may appear in ‘wh-word’ question, when ‘what’ is the subject. The existence of ‘He’, however, makes ‘wat’ redundant.

is he reading a book are you reading a book

are you reading This book He reading was a book?

The above four answers display different uses of verb ‘be’. The first, regardless of punctuation, is correct as it but it is considered incorrect with respect to test sentence tense context. The second is also true as it stands but it is
considered as incorrect but the subject ‘you’ is not the subject of the test sentence. The same thing applies to third sentence: the subject is ‘you’ not ‘he’. The fourth looks like an error of ordering.

*How was reading a book?*  
*He was reading a book?*

*wat are reading a book*  
*Can he reading a book?*

The sources for the errors occurring in the above four answers are presumably relatable to intralingual transfer and communication strategies.

9.b The key was lost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.b The key was lost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 Result of 9.b

This is the ninth sample sentence to be made interrogative. It showcases the simple past tense. The result shows the number of correct answers as 1 and that of incorrect answers as 99. This high percentage of incorrect answers lends much support to the interrogative part of the research hypothesis.
The correct answer ‘was the key lost’ is not punctuated rightly but the interrogative structure is maintained. Some of the incorrect answers are given below. Looking at them may suggest their possible sources.

*what key was lost*  
*who the key was lost*

*wat the key was lost*  
*why the key was lost?*

*wat is key was lost*

*where is key …* (There is a mark written at the end of this sentence in the original. The mark looks like something between a question mark and an exclamation mark)

*I can not key was lost*  
*The key was lost?*

*do the key was lost?*  
*is it the The key was lost*

Possible sources that account for the errors above are probably interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and context of learning.

10.b I made a mistake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>correct</th>
<th>incorrect</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 Result of 10.b

---

Figure 23 Result of 10.b
This is the last sample sentence to be negated, the main verb of which is in the simple past tense. The simple Yes/No interrogative version would involve inverting ‘I’ and ‘did’, while a wh-word interrogative versions, with ‘who’, would involve just inserting ‘who’ in place of ‘I’.

According to the given table and figure, the result gives one answer as correct and 99 as incorrect. This is a further big support to the interrogative part of the hypothesis.

The correct answer is ‘who, made a mistake’. It is considered as correct despite the punctuation matters. Incorrect answers came in variety. Only four are chosen for comment on their possible sources.

*I wat made a mistake* \hspace{1cm} *did I made a mistake?*

*do you made a mistake?* \hspace{1cm} *made I amistak*

The possible sources for the occurrence of such errors are intralingual transfer, context of learning and communication strategies.
Chapter Five

Conclusions, Findings, and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

This research tries to figure out what the learning situation looks like concerning negative and interrogative structures. Sampling out a random group of DTC students, the research sets out with a two-part hypothesis about the formation of both negative and interrogative structures. The hypothesis states that the population does not know how to process out negative as well as interrogative constructions.

In order to test the hypothesis, a test, as a data collection means, was carried out. The sample is made up of a hundred students chosen randomly. The data are sorted out in terms of correct and incorrect answers. The results are made displayable using Microsoft Word 2007 and Microsoft Excel 2007.

As far as the result as a whole is concerned, it can be said that the majority of the targeted students do not know how to form negatives and interrogatives in English.

As for the result of negative formation test alone, the answers which are incorrect are greater in number than the answers which are correct. This means that, as far as the negative formation is concerned, the majority of the students do not know how to form negative sentences in English.

The same statement above applies in the case of interrogative formation. That is to say, the majority of the students do not know how to handle interrogative structures.
In summary, the whole trend of the results is that the majority of the students do not know how to form negative and interrogative sentences.

5. 2 Findings

Based on the result of the test, the research came to these findings.

1. The hypotheses state that the informants do not know how to form negatives and interrogatives. Now, it is clear from the results obtained that this is the case.

2. The students are better at forming negative sentences than at forming interrogative ones.

3. It is found that the students tend to have problems working out word order in English.

4. Most of the answers tend to suffer from spelling matters.

5. Most of the answers are not punctuated correctly.

6. Proposed sources for errors recurrent in the answers are communication strategies, context of learning, and intralingual transfer.

7. Many students used the negative particle ‘not’ or some version of it. This use of ‘not’, whether correctly or incorrectly, denotes that these students partly know what negation involves.

8. The difference between modals and/or auxiliaries on the one hand and full or main verbs on the other is sometimes overlooked.
5. 3 Recommendations

1. On the part of the students, more consolidation practice and assignments should be given on negative and interrogative formation.

2. On the part of teachers, teaching of negative and interrogative formation should be as effective as possible.

3. On the part of teaching materials or syllabus design, more attention should be given to negative and interrogative structures. The point of more practice is stressed by the kind of practice given in the appendix.

4. More attention should be given to matters of word order, spelling, and punctuation.

5. Learners should be made aware of the difference in form of grammar of the modals and/or the auxiliaries on one hand and the full or main verbs on the other.

6. Further research, with better techniques, should be conducted in order to better evaluate learners’ progress.

7. This research is based on a written data which reveals matters like word order, spelling, and punctuation. But of course it does not tell anything about speech matters like pronunciation and intonation. Perhaps further research would take care of that.

5. 4 Suggestions for Further Studies

This research covers the formation of negatives and interrogatives in English. It is restricted to the one case of negation which uses the negative particle ‘not’. Other kinds of negation are not covered and are open to more
research. The same applies to interrogative formation where interrogatives with Wh-words, for instance, are not covered here and are open to more studies.
Appendices

1. The Test

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
تكوين النفي والسؤال في اللغة الإنجليزية

حول الجمل الآتية إلى صيغة النفي [a] و صيغة السؤال [b]

Make the following statements [a] negative and [b] interrogative

1. He is working hard

[a]..........................................................................................

[b]..........................................................................................

2. They are my friends

[a]..........................................................................................

[b]..........................................................................................

3. I will study history

[a]..........................................................................................

[b]..........................................................................................

4. He can drive well

[a]..........................................................................................

[b]..........................................................................................

5. They must stay home

[a]..........................................................................................

[b]..........................................................................................
6. We would like to see you

7. We go to school everyday

8. He was reading a book

9. The key was lost

10. I made a mistake
2. Practice Example 1

The below practice is an example of materials on negatives and interrogatives.

‘PRACTICE 16-SELFSTUDY Present verbs: questions and short answers.

Directions: Complete the questions with DO, DOES, IS, or ARE. Then complete both the affirmative and negative short answers. [1 and 2 are done]

1. A: ----Are---- you leaving now?
   B: Yes, ----I am----. OR: No, ---- I'm not-----.

2. A: ----Do---your neighbors know that you are a police officer?
   B : Yes ----they do----. OR: No, ----they don’t ----.

3. A: -----------you follow the same routine every morning?
   B: Yes-----------. OR: No------------.

4. A: -----------Dr. Jarvis know the name of her new assistant yet?
   B: Yes, -----------. OR: No-----------.

5. A-----------Paul and Beth studying the problem?
   B: Yes, -----------. OR: No-----------.

6. A: -----------they understand the problem?
   B: Yes-----------. OR: No-----------.
7. A: ------------Mike reading the paper and watching television at the same time?

B: Yes------------. OR: No, ------------.

8. A ------------you listening to me?

B: Yes,------------. OR: No, ------------.

9. A: -------------that building safe?

B: Yes,------------. OR: No, -------------.

10. A: ------------the weather affect* your mode?

B: Yes,------------. OR: No, -------------.

*The word affect is a verb: The weather affects my mood.’ Azar and Azar (1999)
3. Practical Example 2

This is a sample of an assignment on negatives and interrogatives. The aim is to make the students familiar with the structure of affirmative sentences, negative sentences, and interrogative sentences.

1. I should go now.
   I should not go now.
   Should I go now?

2. This is my duty.
   This is not my duty.
   Is this my duty?

3. This is what I mean.
   This is not what I mean.
   Is this what I mean?

4. We are working hard enough.
   We are not working hard enough.
   Are we working hard enough?

5. This is what the words mean.
   This is not what the words mean.
   Is this what the words mean?

6. They speak English.
   They do not speak English.
   Do they speak English?
7. We write well.
We do not write well.
Do we write well?

8. The evidence supports the claim.
The evidence does not support the claim.
Does the evidence support the claim?

Work does not reduce stress.
Does work reduce stress?

10. That is what family does for family.
That is not what family does for family.
Is that what family does for family?
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