

## Patterns of Errors in Compositions of Korean Learners of Filipino Language

RONEL O. Laranjo\* · SHIN Seong-Chul\*\*

### I. Introduction

Children learning their native language make countless errors until they master the system. The same phenomenon can be observed with adults learning a second language or foreign language. As such, errors are inevitable during the process of language acquisition and learning. Researchers assert that errors are significant in the process of second language acquisition. For instance, Corder (1981) noted that learner's errors are significant in that they provide to the researcher evidence on how language is learned or acquired and what strategies or procedures the learner is employing in the discovery of the language.

This study deals with errors produced by Korean learners of the Filipino language. The Philippines is a multi-lingual country with more than 150 languages but there is a lingua franca which is spoken by the majority of the Filipinos, the Filipino language. Filipino, also the national language, is used in schools as one of the medium of

---

\* University of the Philippines, Diliman. ronel\_laranjo@yahoo.com

\*\* University of New South Wales. s.shin@unsw.edu.au

instruction along with the English language. According to the Bureau of Immigration, in 2014 Korean students were the largest number of foreign students to apply for visa to pursue higher education in the Philippines. Most of the foreigners study in the Philippines partly because of the high proficiency of teachers in English and it being used as the medium of instruction. However, the curriculum of the schools in the Philippines includes Filipino-related subjects which all students should take. There is a minimum requirement of nine units of Filipino-taught subject in the tertiary education (the General Education Curriculum of Philippine Commission on Higher Education). Korean students are also required to get subjects taught in the Filipino language, or as a substitute, they should attend basic classes on the Filipino language. This is the main motivation of Korean students in studying the language. However, since most of them are staying in the country for a few years, they also realize the necessity of learning the Filipino language especially in communicating outside the university and in interacting with the locals.

Many researches (Mabanglo 1997; Oue 1997; Ramos & Mabanglo 2012) have been conducted on the pedagogy of the Filipino language for foreign learners but few or none of them have focused on the learner errors in the acquisition process. To address the gap, this study investigates the errors made by Korean learners studying Filipino in three different universities in the Philippines and examines some important aspects of how the Filipino language is acquired. Specifically this study poses the following three research questions to address:

1. What are the types of errors in written texts of Korean learners of Filipino across different levels (Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced)?
2. What is the proportion of intralingual errors and interlingual errors at each level?
3. What are the implications of these errors in teaching the Filipino language to Korean learners?

## II. Review of Literature

### 1. Learner Language and Error Analysis

There have been two opposing views in respect to learner errors. First is the behaviorist perspective which maintains that if the objective is to achieve the most adequate language teaching, the occurrence of learner's errors should be avoided, otherwise they would become a habit for the learner and show signs of inadequacy of teaching methods. This view is the basis of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) which claimed that the principal barrier to the second language is the interference of the first language system with the second language system (Brown 2006). The core idea of this hypothesis is that scientific structural analysis of the two languages would yield taxonomy of linguistic contrasts between them which would enable linguists and language teachers to predict the difficulties the learner would encounter in learning the language. But other researchers such as Odlin (2003) and Kellerman (1995) pointed out

that CAH does not really identify what errors occur and that it says nothing about common errors the learners make. This hypothesis also ignores the learner, the learning context and the different strategies the learner uses in language acquisition.

The other school of thought is the cognitivist (e.g. James 1998; Lightbown & Spada 1993; Selinker 1972; Corder 1971; Nemser 1971) who believes that in spite of the teacher's efforts, errors will occur, and this does not necessarily mean the learner's failure, but rather a progress in the learner who is making his own language learning system. This perspective implies that second language learning is a process of creative construction of an incomplete system in which learners are consciously testing hypothesis about the target language from a number of possible resources of knowledge (Brown, *ibid*). This learner language is called interlanguage by Selinker (1972), *approximative system* by Nemser (1971), and *idiosyncratic dialect* by Corder (1975). In this study a neutral and less-dogmatic term is preferred, thus the term 'learner language' is adopted. Learner language is what learners say or write when they are trying to communicate in a language they are learning, and by nature it is a language which is unstable and has an approximate status to the target language.

Learner language is characterized by errors which are results of the learner's conscious hypothesizing about the target language. These errors are studied in the field of Error Analysis (EA), by identifying the error items, describing the types and patterns, and explaining the cause of errors. Corder (1981: 28-47) suggests five steps in error analysis research: (1) collect a sample of learner language; (2) identify

the error (not a mistake but a systematic error); (3) describe the error (e.g. type and pattern); (4) explain the error (the cause of error), and (5) evaluate the error (e.g. acceptability and significance).

Errors can be categorized by the alteration types of surface structures. Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) suggest a *Surface Strategy Taxonomy* which highlights the ways the surface structures are altered by the language learners. They gave five types: *omission*, *addition*, *misformation*, *misordering* and *blend*. *Omission* errors are characterized by the absence of an item that must appear in a well-formed utterance. *Addition* errors are defined by the presence of an item which must not appear in a well-formed utterance. *Misformation* errors are errors with the wrong form of the morpheme or structure. The last one is *misordering* which are errors characterized by incorrect placement of a morpheme or a group of morphemes in an utterance. James (1998) suggested that the taxonomy by Dulay and et al (1982) should be renamed as *Target Modification Taxonomy* since it is based on the ways in which the learner's erroneous version is different from the presumed target version. He also suggested that *misformation* should be called *misselection* because, according to him, learner errors are not 'misformed' but 'misselected'. This study will use the term *misselection* as most of the errors are substitutions with existent words and markers. James (1998) also suggested a fifth category called *blend*, in which the learner is undecided about which features from the two language source he has 'in mind'. As a result of this, a *blend* error is produced which can also be called as cross-association, contamination or hybridization error. This study will utilize these

strategies to categorize the types of the errors made by Korean learners studying the Filipino language.

The next step is to attempt to explain the source of errors. Explanation for the cause of errors is considered to be the most important stage for EA research (Ellis 1994: 57) as it involves the process of second language acquisition. Brown (2007) identified four sources of errors: interlingual transfer; intralingual transfer; pedagogical context; and communication strategies. The first source is the interlingual transfer, which comes from the native language of the learner. This happens because the native language is the only linguistic system upon which the learner can draw from before getting familiar with the system of the second language. The negative transfer from the learner's first language may result from a number of interferences, such as grammatical, prepositional, and lexical interference. Intralingual transfer, which is the generalization within the target language, is the second source of errors. According to studies (Odin 2003; Jaszczolt 1995), the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interference but once learners have begun to acquire parts of the new system of the target language, more and more intralingual transfer is manifested. The context of learning is the third source of errors. Language learners can make errors because of a misleading explanation from the teacher or a wrong presentation of a structure or word in the course books, and other factors from the learning environment. The sociolinguistic context of natural, untutored language acquisition can give rise to certain dialect acquisition that may itself be a source of error (Brown 2007). The last source of errors is the communication strategies used

by the learners. Communication strategies are “potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal” (Faerch and Kasper 1983: 36). These communication strategies help the learner to enhance getting their message across but sometimes these can become a source of error.

In SLA research little attention has been given to EA studies in Filipino<sup>1)</sup>, let alone in errors produced by Korean learners of Filipino. Studies in this area on Filipino as their second or foreign language are briefly reviewed. An error analysis was used by Mayos (1988) in her study analyzing the written texts of Filipino students from Benguet whose native language is Ilocano and studying Filipino in school as a second language. The researcher enumerated and quantified the common errors of the students in orthography, nominals (nouns and pronouns), verb aspects (perfective, imperfective, contemplative), modifiers (adjectives and adverbs), connectors and markers. This research identified the errors using the prescriptive grammar in school and the frequency of errors was counted. The study also investigated the background of the teachers who handled the Filipino classes if they were qualified to teach or not. The study concluded that the main problem of the students in studying Filipino is the lack of resource materials such as textbooks that adequately address and present the Filipino grammar. However,

---

1) There are a significant number of EA studies dealing with errors produced by learners of other Asian languages. For instance, for studies of errors produced by English-L1 or Chinese-L1 learners of Korean as a foreign, second or heritage language, please see, for example, Shin S-C (2002, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2010 and 2016), Shin S-C and Joo, A (2015), and Shin S-C and Kang (2015).

the researcher did not discuss much on the linguistic factors that may have caused the errors. In her research, Catabui (1969) described the errors in oral and written texts of students whose first language is Ibanag, a language spoken in the northern part of the Philippines. In oral Filipino, the students interchangeably pronounced the sounds /i/ and /e/, and /o/ and /u/ and had some difficulties in pronouncing the stress. In written language, the students committed errors in spelling the diphthongs, capitalization, hyphenation, and i/e and o/u interchange which are not present in Ibanag language. At grammar level, the students committed errors in verb formation, possessive pronoun and particle. The errors were attributed to the interference of Ibanag language features. Oue (1997), a native Japanese teacher of Filipino language in Japan, identified the problems of Japanese learners studying Filipino. Oue identified the difficulties of Japanese students in learning Filipino pronunciations of /u/, /r/, /l/, /ʔ/, /h/, /si/, /tu/, /yi/ and consonant clusters. In grammar, Japanese students had difficulty in acquiring the complex Filipino verb formation and focus. These difficulties are traceable both in Japanese language and the complex structure of Filipino language, especially in the verbs.

## 2. The Filipino Language: A Brief Overview

The Philippines is home of more than 150 languages. There are eight major languages including Tagalog, and for unification purposes and easy communication, Pilipino, a language based on the Tagalog language, was proclaimed as the national language in 1959. Then the name was changed in 1987 to Filipino, a language based on the



Philippine languages and other languages spoken in the country such as Spanish and English. Since the Philippines was a former colony of Spain, many Spanish words were included in the Philippine languages. Due to the American colonial rule and its strong institutional influence, English became an official language of the Philippines along with Filipino. As a result of Japanese invasion and its occupational rule during the Pacific War, there are also some Japanese words that were included in the Philippine languages. There are also some elements of influence from Arabic and Chinese languages that were exchanged as languages of trade partners of the Filipinos even before the pre-colonial time. Since Philippine languages belong to the same Austronesian language family, however, they have common language elements called the universal nucleus (Paz 1995), which are the common features of languages in the Philippines. Philippine languages have common language features in phonology, morphology and syntax which make a lingua franca possible and is called Filipino. Filipino is used in schools along with English language as medium of instruction.

There are 28 letters in the Filipino language: Aa, Bb, Cc, Dd, Ee, Ff, Gg, Hh, Ii, Jj, Kk, Ll, Mm, Nn, Ññ, Ng ng, Oo, Pp, Qq, Rr, Ss, Tt, Uu, Vv, Ww, Xx, Yy, Zz. The Filipino language is consistent in reflecting pronunciation in orthography, which means that words are spelled as they are pronounced. Filipino and Korean languages have similarities in terms of orthography as Hangeul is also almost consistent in representing the pronunciation of words. Filipino is an agglutinative language and one of the key features of its grammar is the complexity of the verbs. Aspect in the Filipino verb system

may be defined as the characterization of an event as completed, not completed if not completed, and as begun or not begun (Schachter and Otnes 1972; Malicsi 2013). Verbs in Filipino are inflectable for three aspects: perfective, imperfective and contemplative. Perfective aspect characterizes an event as completed. Imperfective aspect characterizes an event as begun but not completed. Contemplative aspect pertains to action that has not begun. There is also another aspect that occurs in some verbs: the recent perfective aspect, which is an action that is recently completed. Filipino as an agglutinative language has many affixes; there are two major productive affix groups, which are agent focus: *-um-* and *mag-*. Korean language is also agglutinative with its rich inventory of affixes. The basic sentence structure of Filipino language is Predicate/Verb + Subject + Object. This structure is different to the Subject + Object + Verb/Predicate of the Korean language.

### III. Research Methodology

#### 1. Data and Subjects

The data for this study are 35 written compositions collected from three private universities in the Philippines which conduct Filipino classes for speakers of languages other than Filipino in the span of two semesters in 2013-2014. The students were of different levels: Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced. The Beginner level students received at least 30 hours of class instruction, Intermediate level

students had 60 hours of class hours while Advanced level students attended at least 90 hours of classes in their respective universities. Korean learners' primary language is Korean and they are also learning English as a second language. The instructional language in the Filipino class was mixed of English and Filipino language: at the Beginner level, the dominant medium of instruction was English while at the Intermediate to Advanced levels, Filipino was more utilized in the classroom. The instructors for the courses were native Filipino whose English was also at native or near-native level. The Korean learners were composed of 15 respondents for the Beginner level, 15 respondents for the Intermediate level and only 5 respondents for the Advanced level<sup>2)</sup>. Their ages range from 16 to 18 years old.

## 2. Data Collection Procedure and Analysis

To collect data samples of the learner language of Filipino, questionnaires were distributed to the students in the middle of the semester. Filipino classes in each of the source universities were usually composed of 10-15 students per class at different levels. The questionnaire elicited students' nationality, gender, age, language proficiency in Filipino in terms of speaking and writing skills, as well as other languages that they speak or have studied which can

---

2) The enrolments in the Advanced course were much lower than those in Beginners and Intermediate courses, and thus the number of respondents was only five. For this reason, this paper intends not to compare the groups, and the presentations of analysis and discussion will be more focused on the results from Beginner and Intermediate learners.

influence their production of the Filipino language. For the proficiency level, students were asked to self-assess themselves and the student's self-assessment was counter-checked by their respective teachers. The students were then asked to write an essay with at least 10 sentences introducing themselves in Filipino for 15 to 20 minutes. To maintain the integrity of the data, the students were not allowed to look at their notes or books or to communicate to their classmates or teacher while writing the essay.

The process of identifying errors was conducted by one of the researchers who is a native speaker of Filipino and an expert in the language with several years of teaching experience in the education system. To minimize the subjectivity on the judgement of error and mistake, the researchers decided to consider an element as an error if it was made by at least two learners rather than trying to make the distinction between them. In the process of classification and categorization of errors, the established taxonomy proposed by Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) and James (1998) widely used in error analysis research was utilized. The errors were also classified according to different linguistics levels: orthographic, morphological and syntactical (Corder 1981). Then attempts have been made to identify the sources of errors to explain the errors. Among the four sources of errors identified by Brown (2007: 263-266), only the first two (interlingual and intralingual transfers) were considered because the researchers were not able to observe the learners inside the classroom and the teachers' pedagogical methods. Aside from the qualitative method described above, the errors were also quantified and presented as percentage.

#### IV. Analysis and Results

A total of 213 errors were identified for analysis from 349 sentences produced by the three different groups, and they consist of 108 errors from 151 sentences produced by the Beginner group; 94 errors from 152 sentences produced by the Intermediate group; and 11 errors from 46 sentences produced by the Advanced group.<sup>3)</sup> Most of the errors (80.8%) were morphological errors.

Across all levels, the highest proportion of errors was found in *misselection* at the morphological level (59.3% to 77.8%), as shown in Table 1 below. Under omission errors, the learners from Beginner committed most errors at the morphological level (14.8%), followed by Intermediate level students (10.6%). Orthographic *misselection* errors were also notably produced at the Beginner (7.4%) and Intermediate (5.3%) levels. Errors at all other types and levels were minimal.

<Table 1> Percentage of Errors Per Type and Linguistic Level

Linguistic Levels	Morphological N (%)	Orthographic N (%)	Syntactic N (%)	Total
Types				
Misselection				
Beginner	64 (59.3)	8 (7.4)	3 (2.8)	75 (69.4)
Intermediate	69 (73.4)	5 (5.3)	0	74
Advanced	7 (77.8)	0	0	7

3) Since the number of errors produced by the Advanced group was only 11, this paper does not intend to focus on the statistical comparison or importance. Instead much of the presentations and discussion is focused on errors produced by the Beginner and Intermediate groups.

Omission				
Beginner	16 (14.8)	2 (1.9)	4 (3.7)	22 (20.4)
Intermediate	10 (10.6)	2 (2.1)	2 (2.1)	14 (14.9)
Advanced	0	2 (18.2)	0	2
Blend				
Beginner	2 (1.9)	3 (2.8)	0	5 (4.6)
Intermediate	0	2 (2.1)	0	2
Advanced	0	0	0	0
Addition				
Beginner	2 (1.9)	2 (1.9)	0	4 (3.7)
Intermediate	0	2 (2.1)	0	2 (2.1)
Advanced	2 (18.2)	0	0	2
Misorder				
Beginner	0	0	2 (1.9)	2 (1.9)
Intermediate	0	0	2 (2.1)	2
Advanced	0	0	0	
Total	172 (80.8)	28 (13.1)	13 (6.1)	213

The subsections below present and describe some examples of errors produced by the three groups of students under the following error taxonomies and categories: (1) morphological misselection; (2) morphological omission; (3) orthographic omission; (4) orthographic misselection; (5) orthographic blend; (6) syntactic omission; (7) syntactic misorder; and (8) miscellaneous types. Note: The asterisk (\*) is used to indicate an incorrect grammatical feature and the arrow symbol (>) indicates the intended correct orthography with bold. The intended meaning is given with the single quotation mark (‘ ’). In the presentation of examples, the individual lexical and grammatical items corresponding to each of the Filipino lexical and grammatical items are not given. Instead the primary meaning of an intended

sentence or clause is given only in the form of translation because of three reasons: first because the focus is not on the analysis of linguistic structures but on the identification and analysis of a particular erroneous item; second because it is assumed that many readers of this article would be Filipino speakers; and third because the space for a journal article is limited.

### 1. Morphological Misselection

(a) Misselection of particles: There were three types of misselection of particles, and the first type was misselection of linkers, as shown in (1) and (2). In Filipino, a linker (-ng/na/-g) is necessary between an adjective and a noun and a noun; a noun and an adjective, and between nouns. When the adjective ends with a vowel, the linker -ng is attached to the adjective; when the adjective ends with a consonant (except the nasal -n), the linker -na is used; but when it ends with a consonant *n*, the linker -g is attached. From this and other similar samples, it appears that the learners know the rule but have not mastered them yet.

(1) \**Ang maliit na kapatid ko na lalaki ay estudyante.* > *Ang nakababatang kapatid kong lalaki ay estudyante.* ‘My younger brother is a student.’

(2) \**Mayroon po ako maraming kaibigan na mabait.* > *Mayroon po akong maraming kaibigang mabait.* ‘I have many good friends.’

The second type of misselection of particles was observed in the object marker *ng* as shown in (3) and (4). *Ng* is used as an object marker while *sa* is a directional complement marker or locative marker, e.g. *Nag-aaral ako sa Ateneo* (I study in Ateneo).

(3) \**Nag-aaral ako sa Business Management.* > *Nag-aaral ako ng Business Management.* ‘I am taking up Business Management.’

(4) \**Gusto ko ng Pilipinas dahil sa mga tao.* > *Gusto ko sa Pilipinas dahil sa mga tao.* ‘I like Philippines because of the people.’

The third type is the misselection of topic marker as in (5).

(5) \**Negosyante siya at yung kompany niya ay nandito sa Philippines.* > *Negosyante siya at ang kompanya niya ay nandito sa Pilipinas.* ‘He is a businessman and his company is here in the Philippines.’

*Ang* (the) is used interchangeably with *yung* (that/the) in informal or daily speeches but in written form, *ang* is preferred and used more frequently.

(b) Misselection of pronouns and lexical items: The study has identified two types of *misselection* regarding pronoun and lexical items. The first one comes from the first person singular pronoun (*ako* vs *ko*) as in (6). *Ako* and *ko* are first personal pronouns. *Ako* is used as the nominative subject which usually comes with an intransitive verb while *ko* is used after a transitive verb.



- (6) \**Estudyante ko sa De La Salle University.* > *Estudyante ako sa De La Salle University.* ‘I am a student in De La Salle University.’

The second type can be further divided into misselection of nouns (7) and (8), adjectives (9), verbs (10) and usage of English terms (11), (12) and (13).

- (7) \**Ako ay labing pintong taong gulang.* > *Ako ay labing pitong taong gulang.* ‘I am seventeen years old.’

- (8) \**Nagaaral ako ng architecture sa UST ngayon at maganda ang buhay ko dito.* > *Nag-aaral ako ng arkitektura sa UST ngayon at maganda ang buhay ko dito.* ‘I am currently studying architecture in UST and I am having a good life here.’

- (9) \**Ang maliit na kapatid ko na lalaki ay estudyante.* > *Ang nakababatang kapatid kong lalaki ay estudyante.* ‘My younger brother is a student.’

- (10) \**Nakakita ako sa Makati.* > *Nakatira ako sa Makati.* ‘I live in Makati.’

- (11) \**Ang nickname ko ay Chang.* > *Ang palayaw ko ay Chang.* ‘My nickname is Chang.’

- (12) \**Ang mga Pilipino ay masasaya pero ayaw ko ng mga tao sa labas ng school dahil sa mga ginagawa nila sa mga foreigners.*

> Ang mga Pilipino ay masasaya pero ayaw ko ng mga tao sa labas ng paaralan dahil sa mga ginagawa nila sa mga banyaga.  
 ‘The Filipinos are happy but I don’t want the people outside the school because of what they are doing to the foreigners.’

- (13) \*Gusto kong pumunta sa Korea pero may klase ako so hindi kaya. > Gusto kong pumunta sa Korea pero may klase ako kaya hindi kaya. ‘I want to go to Korea but I have a class so I cannot go there.’

In (7) *pinto* means ‘door’ while *pito* means ‘seven’. The words have almost the same morphological structure or spelling which may have caused confusion to the learners. In (8) the English word *architecture* was used instead of Filipino *arkitektura*. It was probably because of a simple confusion due to the formal and phonological similarity or because of the contextual preference of the Filipino society where academic disciplines are often referred in English. In (9) *maliit* means ‘small’ while *nakababata* means ‘younger’. In the sentence above, the second word is more appropriate than the first one. In (10) *nakakita* means ‘to see something’ while *nakatira* means ‘to live’. The words have almost the same morphological structure, which may have caused confusion to the learner. And (11), (12) and (13) are generally acceptable in spoken discourse, however, in written form, Filipino equivalent words or borrowed words respelled in Filipino orthography are more accepted. These errors can be attributed to learners’ lack of vocabulary or the learner’s casual code-switching that are often practiced or preferred in the English-speaking Filipino

society.

(c) Misselection of verbal aspect and gerund: The study has identified three types of misselection of verbs. The first one is the misselection of imperfective verbs as in (14) and (15), the second is misselection of mag-, and ma- verbs as in (16), and there is also misselection of gerunds as in (17), (18), (19) and (20).

(14) \*Gusto kong pupunta sa iba't ibang bansa. > Gusto kong pumupunta sa iba't ibang bansa. 'I like traveling to different countries.'

(15) \*Pupunta ako sa Korea tuwing summer. > Pumupunta ako sa Korea tuwing tag-init. 'I go to Korea every summer.'

(16) \*Ngunit, minsan gusto ko magbalik sa Korea dahil gusto kong magkita ang mga pamilya ko at mga kaibigan ko. > Ngunit, minsan gusto kong magbalik sa Korea dahil gusto kong makita ang mga pamilya ko at mga kaibigan ko. 'However, sometimes I want to go back to Korea because I want to see my family and friends.'

(17) \*Mahilig akong bumabasa ng aklat at gamitin ng internet. > Mahilig akong bumasa ng aklat at gumamit ng internet. 'I like reading books and surfing the internet.'

(18) \*Ang dahilan ng pumupunta sa Pilipinas ay para nag-aaral ng Ingles at Filipino. > Ang dahilan ng pagpunta ko sa Pilipinas ay

*para **mag-aral** ng Ingles at Filipino.* ‘My reason of coming to the Philippines is to study English and Filipino language.

(19) \**Sa siyam na taong **pagtitira** ko rito sa Pilipinas, marunong na akong magsalita ng Ingles at Filipino.* > *Sa siyam na taong **pagtira** ko rito sa Pilipinas, marunong na akong magsalita ng Ingles at Filipino.* ‘In my nine years of living here in the Philippines, I can speak English and Filipino.

(20) \**Sa siyam na taong **pagtitira** ko rito sa Pilipinas, marunong na akong magsalita ng Ingles at Filipino.* > *Sa siyam na taong **pagtira** ko rito sa Pilipinas, marunong na akong magsalita ng Ingles at Filipino.* ‘In my nine years of living here in the Philippines, I can speak English and Filipino.’

As stated above, Filipino verbs can be classified into four major aspects: perfective, imperfective, contemplative and recent perfective, and the affixes to be inflected depends on these aspects and the focus of the verb. In (14) and (15) the contemplative aspect was used instead of imperfective. In sentence (16), agent focus affix *mag-* was used instead of *ma-*. *Mag-* is one of the most productive affixes in Filipino while there are fewer verbs where *ma-* can be inflected. It could be observed that learners also use *mag-* often than other affixes. In sentences (17), (18), (19) and (20), it could be observed that the learners use the imperfective verbal aspect in place of gerunds, which is similar to the gerund feature of the English language. The gerund in Filipino has the same form as the imperative form.

Still other types include the combination of a Filipino affix and an English noun to a verb as in (21).

- (21) \*Masaya ang buhay ko rito sa Pilipinas at gusto kong mag graduate dito. > Masaya ang buhay ko rito sa Pilipinas at gusto kong magtapos dito. 'I am happy with my life here in the Philippines and I want to graduate here.'

As stated above, code-switching is a common practice in the Philippines, (21) is considered an error in the written because it has an equivalent in Filipino lexicon.

## 2. Morphological Omission

The study has identified five types of omission of function words. The first one was the omission of a linker between an adjective and a noun.

- (22) \*Ako ay **labing walo taong** gulang. > Ako ay \***labing walong taong** gulang. 'I am 18 years old.'

In Filipino, a linker is necessary between an adjective and a noun. When the adjective ends with a vowel, the linker *-ng* is attached to the adjective as in the example above *labingwalong taon* (eighteen + *-ng* + year); when the adjective ends with a consonant (except the nasal *n*), the linker *-na* is used as *labing-anim na taon*; but when it ends with a consonant *n*, the linker *-g* is attached as in *masunurin*

+ *g bata* = *masunuring bata* (obedient child).

The second type was omission of topic markers *ang* and *si*. Observe (23) and (24) below. *Ang* is a subject marker which is followed by a common noun while *si* is also a subject marker which is followed by a proper noun and the marker is obligatory.

(23) \*Pangalan ko ay Eutteum Chae. > Ang pangalan ko ay Eutteum Chae. ‘My name is Eutteum Chae.’

(24) \*Ako ay Song.> Ako ay si Song. ‘I am Song’

The third type was the omission of object particle *ng* as seen in (25).

(25) \*Gusto ko bumabasa mga libro. > Gusto ko ang pagbabasang mga libro. ‘I like reading books.’

The fourth type was the omission of a linker between the subject and predicate as observed in (26) and the omission of linker between a noun and an adjective as in (27).

(26) \*Mahilig ako mag-computer at marunong din ako mag-violin.  
> Mahilig akong magkompyuter at marunong din akong magbiyulin. ‘My hobby is playing in the computer and I also know how to play violin.’

(27) \*Siya ay 15 taon gulang. > Siya ay 15 taong gulang.

‘He/She is fifteen years old.’

The fifth type of omission is observed in topic marker as in (28).

- (28) \**Masarap talaga pagkain dito.* > *Masarap talaga ang pagkain dito.*  
‘The food here is really delicious.’

### 3. Orthographic Omission

The analysis has found *omission of hyphen* between the affix ending in a consonant and the root beginning in a vowel. Observe (29) and (30) below.

- (29) \**nagaaral* > *nag-aaral* ‘study (imperfective)’

- (30) \**magaaral* > *mag-aaral* ‘study (contemplative)’

The basic pattern of syllable in Filipino is Consonant Vowel (CV), therefore, if a word begins with a vowel there is a glottal stop /ʔ/ in front of it. In the case of *aral* ‘study’, the phonemic representation is /ʔa.ral/ which becomes /nagʔaʔaral/ when inflected with *nag-*. Glottal stop is represented by a hyphen in Filipino orthography.

### 4. Orthographic Misselection

Two types of *misselection* were identified, and the first type was observed in usage of l instead of r as in (31) below.

(31) \**pabolito* > *paborito* ‘favorite’

In Korean, since [r] and [l] are allophones depending on the location where it is pronounced, they are represented orthographically by a single character ‘ㄹ’. However, in Filipino, /r/ and /l/ are two phonemic sounds and represented by two different letters. As Koreans find it very hard to pronounce [r] correctly in English and thus tend to pronounce it as [l], the student might have spelled the Filipino word as they tend to pronounce [r] as [l].

The second and third types of misselection were the misspellings of noun as observed in (32) and (33), and the non-capitalization of proper noun (34).

(32) \**estudyente* > *estudyante* ‘student’

(33) \**hay-iskul* > *hayskul* ‘high school’

(34) \**filipino* > *Filipino* ‘Filipino’

In (32), the misspelled ‘e’ might have been influenced by the English spelling ‘e’ in ‘student’, and in (33) the learner might have been influenced by the idea of splitting the words ‘high’ and ‘school’ in English. In (34) the non-capital of the initial letter could have been influenced by the Korean practice where the Korean alphabet Hangeul is spelled without distinction between upper and lower cases.

## 5. Orthographic Blend

The study has identified a blend in spelling blend as in (35) and (36).



(35) \*Philipinas > Pilipinas (Filipino)/ Philippines (English)

(36) \*Cristiano > Kristiyano (Filipino)/ Christian (English)

The equivalent word in the target language (Filipino) and source language (English) are almost structurally the same resulting to blending in the learner language. In (35) and (36), the errors were caused by mixing spellings from English and Filipino.

## 6. Syntactic Omission

The analysis has identified two types of omissions: omission of *ay* and omission of topic, as shown in (37) and (38) below.

(37) \*Ang nanay ko si Si Jeung Mi. > Ang nanay ko ay si Si Jeung Mi. 'My mother is Si Jeung Mi.'

(38) \*Nakatira sa Manila. >Nakatira ako sa Manila.

In Filipino, the basic sentence pattern is Predicate (Verb/ Adjective/Nominal) + Subject (Noun) and there is a derived construction called *Ay Inversion* (Schacter and Otones 1972) which has such pattern as Subject + *ay* + Predicate, where *ay* is obligatory. The error in (38) might have been caused by the learners' first language. In Filipino, a subject is obligatory in a sentence, while in Korean, the subject is often deleted, especially in spoken discourse.

## 7. Syntactical Misorder

The analysis has observed three types of misorder at the syntactical level. The first type is the misplacement of subject (possessive pronoun) as in (39).

- (39) \*Ang paboritong Pilipinong pagkain ko ay pansit kasi walang ganoon sa Korea. > Ang paborito kong Pilipinong pagkain ay pansit kasi walang ganoon sa Korea. ‘My favorite Filipino food is pancit (noodles) because there is no such kind in Korea.’

The subject in Filipino is usually placed in the initial slot of the sentence or close to it. Though the learner’s structure is acceptable in spoken discourse, the second form is preferred in written form.

The second type is misplacement of particle as in (40).

- (40) \*Hindi ako pa marunong magtagalog noon. > Hindi pa ako marunong mag-Tagalog noon. ‘I do not know how to speak Tagalog then.’

Particles like *pa* also occupies a certain slot inside the sentence which can be before or after the subject. If there is a negation, *pa* comes after it before the subject. The negation pattern is discussed below.

The third type is the misorder in negation as observed in (41).

- (41) \*Hindi gusto ko ipis at langaw. > Hindi ko gusto ang ipis at

langaw. 'I do not like cockroach and fly.'

*Hindi* is used to negate a sentence in Filipino and placed before the predicate and no movement is triggered, e.g. *Umalis ang bata* ('The kid left') → *Hindi umalis ang bata*. ('The kid did not leave'). However, if the subject has no marker or is a pronoun, the negator precedes the subject, e.g. *Magaling siya*. ('He/She is good') → *Hindi siya magaling*. ('He/She is not good').

#### 8. Miscellaneous types

There were a number of other miscellaneous types that were sporadic across the error categories and types. They include morphological blend as in (42), morphological addition as in (43) and (44), syntactic misselection as in (45) and (46), and orthographic addition as in (47) and (48).

- (42) \**Estudyante ako sa Pamantasan ng Ateneo de Manila University*. > *Pamantasan ng Ateneo de Manila* (Filipino)/ *Ateneo de Manila University* (English)
- (43) \**Ang* *estudyante ako sa Ateneo*. > *Estudyante ako sa Ateneo*  
'I am a student in Ateneo.'
- (44) \**Dalawang taon na akong sa Pilipinas*. > *Dalawang taon na ako sa Pilipinas*. 'I have been in the Philippines for two years.'
- (45) \**Aking nanay si Kim Suk Hee*. > *Ang aking nanay ay si Kim Suk Hee*.  
'My mother is Kim Suk Hee.'
- (46) \**Ako ay 181cm taas*. > *Ako ay may taas na 181 sentimetro*.

‘My height is 181 centimeters.’

(47) \**hanap-buhay* > *hanapbuhay* ‘job/work’

(48) \**mag-bakasyon* > *magbakasyon* ‘to take a vacation (imperative)’

In (42) the learner was not able to delete the English word (‘university’) resulting to blending of Filipino and English terms. In (43) the marker *ang* was incorrectly added, while in (44) the linker was added. These could be an overgeneralization of the rules about markers and linkers. In (45) and (46) the learners’ sentences follow the pattern of English sentence or a one to one translation which makes it ungrammatical in Filipino. In (47) a hyphen was added in a compound noun and in (48) between the affix and the root.

## V. Discussion

The above presentation of results can be summarized as follows: This study was not intended to compare the error types by proficiency levels and it was impossible to do that because of the very small number of subjects at Advanced level and the very small number of errors produced by them. Nevertheless, it was possible to look at some general error patterns mainly based on errors from Beginners and Intermediate groups. The highest percentage of errors across the student proficiency levels was found in the morphological misselection at all linguistic levels, while other types of errors were produced with varying degrees of much smaller percentages. Second, Korean learners of Filipino from Beginner to Advanced level have

orthographic difficulty in using hyphen as they tend to either remove or overuse it as observed in the examples of omission of hyphen in (29) and (30) and addition of hyphen in (47) and (48). Hyphen is the orthographical representation of voiceless glottal stop /ʔ/ in Filipino. The teacher may not have taught this usage to the students or probably not much emphasis was given. Third, Korean learners at all levels, especially at Beginner and Intermediate levels, also have morphological difficulty in using the linkers *-ng*, *-g*, and *-na* which are called as nasal linker by Gonzales (1971: 144) where he describes it necessary to maintain the structural unity of the phrase (the verb phrase with its complements, the noun phrase with its structure of modification including the equivalent of relativization in English). This feature of Filipino language seems difficult to acquire for Korean learners because of its complicated rules. Fourth, another type of recurring errors from Beginner to Advanced level Korean learners is on the formation of verbs as observed in (14) to (20). The agglutinative nature of verb system is regarded as the most difficult feature of the Filipino grammar. However, it is observed that errors produced by Korean learners are similar to those of developmental errors committed by Filipino children featured in Gonzales (1971) which shows the acquisition process of the Filipino language by children. Gonzales (1971: 96-97) observed that children use 'wrong' combinations of infixation in verbs which include *mag-*, and *ma-* verbs which is also evident in Korean learners.

In terms of the broad source of errors, it appears that there are more intralingual errors than interlingual errors across all levels. Intralingual errors come from the learner's generalization of what they

have learned within the target language (i.e. Filipino), whereas interlingual errors are attributable to the negative transfer or interference from the learner's native language and other known language (i.e. Korean and English). At the Beginner level, the intralingual errors are mainly found in omission and addition of hyphen; omission, addition and misselection of function words (linker, topic markers, object markers, locative markers); misspelling of nouns; misselection of pronoun and lexical items (nouns, adjectives and verbs); misselection of verbs (imperfective verbs, mag- verbs, gerunds); disorder of words; and disorder in negation. The errors that could be attributed to the interlingual transfer errors are manifested in the omission of subject and usage of /l/ instead of /r/. There were also errors that resulted from the interference of English language, including spelling, word blends and misselection at syntactical level. At the Intermediate level, the errors that could be attributed to the English intralingual transfer are the usage of English terms, combination of Filipino affix + English noun and spelling blending. The intralingual errors in the Filipino language are omission and addition of hyphen; omission and misselection of function words (linker, topic markers, object markers, locative markers); misspelling of nouns; non-capitalization of nouns; misselection of verbs (imperfective verbs, mag- verbs, gerunds); and misplacement of subject and particle. The proportion of error sources by each learner level is shown in Table 2 below.

&lt;Table 2&gt; Percentage of Intralingual and Interlingual Errors

Sources of Errors	Beginner (%)	Intermediate (%)	Advanced (%)
Interlingual	40.2%	47.7%	31.6%
Intralingual	59.8%	52.3%	68.4%

The number of interlingual error increased from the Beginner to Intermediate level before it was decreased at the Advanced level, and there was a significant difference between the percentages in interlingual and intralingual errors at the Advanced level, where the intralingual errors were two times higher than the interlingual errors but the statistical validity for the Advanced level is doubtful and is susceptible to distort the general trends shown in the Beginners and Intermediate groups because of the very small number of subjects and error data.

Researchers (e.g. Brown 2007) of English as second language have found that the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interlingual transfer errors but once learners have begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more intralingual transfer errors are manifested. However, the results of this study does not support such findings as shown in the table above and present a different case because the proportion of intralingual errors were considerably higher than that of interlingual errors even at the Beginners level. This indicates that the findings of this study support the previous claims that many of the errors might be related to the complexity of the Filipino language (Ramos & Mabanglo 2012; Oue 1997; Mayos 1988; Catabui 1969). The complexity refers to language specific features of the Filipino language such as verbal system, relativization (use of linker), and syntax structure.

In addition to the two broad sources of errors, there could be some induced errors that might have been caused by the context of learning. For example, explanations of a particular learning item in learning materials or in the classroom or both were misleading or insufficient or the presentation of a learning item was not clear or well-sequenced so bringing confusion to the learners or the learning environment was unfavorable or inappropriate for learners. Though it is not intended to examine this aspect in this paper so it is impossible to present practical evidence to support the third source, it is possible to assume such induced factors in any foreign or second language classroom, and the context of learning in this study will be no exception.

## VI. Conclusion

As a preliminary investigation, this study has limitations, which mainly come from the lack of control of variables (e.g. relatively small number of subjects, unfocused subjects and the imbalanced number of participants) in the data collection process and some ad hoc error categorizations. Nevertheless, it was able to observe the general trends of error production by Korean learners of Filipino. It is tentatively concluded that there are specific types of errors that are made by the Korean learners and some indicate areas that will present particular difficulties to the Korean learners of Filipino. This information has implications in teaching and in designing curriculum for Korean learners. By knowing the types and sources of errors, the teacher can formulate ways on how to teach those problematic items



more effectively, which could help the students to prevent from committing the same errors. The teachers could also explicitly point out the students' errors, especially the interlingual errors, and explain the correct usage during the class so that the students themselves can be aware of their own errors and prevent fossilization. As for intralingual errors, a curriculum focusing on the usage of hyphen and linkers, as well as the verb formation of the Filipino language should be given more attention and, where possible, highlighted. For the Beginner level learners, it should be emphasized to the students that in Filipino sentences, the topic is obligatory especially in written form. Further research needs to be undertaken in this area of Filipino as a foreign, second or heritage language based on a particular level of learners with more control of subjects and refined error categorizations.

### ⟨References⟩

- Almario, Virgilio (ed.). 2014. *Ortograpiyang Pambansa* (2014 edition). Manila: Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. *KWF Manwal sa Masinop na Pagsulat*. Manila: Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- Brown. H. Douglas. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th edition). London: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Carlos, Victoria P. 2008. *I'd Like to Speak Filipino 2* (Revised edition). Manila: Ample Printing Press.
- Catabui, Sacrificia. 1969. "Problems in Learning Pilipino among the

- First Year High School Students of the Cagayan Valley Institute of Technology.” MA Thesis. Philippines: University of the Philippines-Diliman.
- Corder Stephen. 1975. “Error Analysis, Interlanguage and Second Language Acquisition.” *Language Teaching* 8(4): 201-218.
- Corder, Stephen. 1981. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- De Leon, Myra P. 2013. *Modyul sa Special Filipino 1*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Publishing House.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., Krashen, S. 1982. *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. 1983. *Strategies in Interlanguage Communication*. London: Longman.
- Gonzalez, Andrew. 1984. *Acquiring Pilipino as a First Language: Two Case Studies*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Gonzales-Garcia, Lydia. 1999. *Makabagong Gramar ng Filipino*. (Revised edition). Manila: Rex Bookstore.
- James, Carl. 1998. *Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. New York: Longman.
- Jaszczolt, K. 1995. “Typology of Contrastive Studies: Specialization, Progress and Applications.” *Language Teaching* 28: 1-25.
- Kagan, Olga. 2012. “Intercultural Competence of Heritage Language Learners: Motivation, Identity, Language Attitudes, and the Curriculum.” *Proceedings of Intercultural Competence*

- Conference 2*: 72-84. [http://cercll.arizona.edu/\\_media/development/conferences/2012\\_icc/kagan\\_ic\\_heritage\\_ic\\_2012.pdf](http://cercll.arizona.edu/_media/development/conferences/2012_icc/kagan_ic_heritage_ic_2012.pdf)
- Kellerman S. 1995. "Cross-Linguistic Influence: Transfer to Nowhere?" *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 15: 125-150.
- Laranjo, Ronel O. 2015. "An Error Analysis of Interlanguage of Heritage Learners and Korean Learners of Filipino Language." MA Thesis. Korea: Korea University.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. 1993. *How Languages Are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mabanglo, Ruth Elynia S. 1997. "Pagpapahusay ng Filipino sa mga Filipino/ Di-Filipino sa Labas ng Filipinas." *Daluyan: Journal ng SWF sa Talakayang Pangwika* 8(1-2): 35-48.
- Macarian, Evelun. 2014. "Koreans Top Foreign Students in PH Universities." *Inquirer.net*  
<http://globalnation.inquirer.net/105358/koreans-top-foreign-students-in-ph-universities>
- Malicsi, Jonathan C. 2013. *Grammar ng Filipino*. Quezon City: Sentro ng Wikang Filipino.
- Mayos, Norma. 1988. "Difficulties in Filipino Grammar of Fourth Year High School Students from State University of Benguet (School year 1988-1989)." MA Thesis, University of the Philippines-Diliman.
- Odlin, T. 2003. "Cross-Linguistic Influence." C. Doughty & M. Long (eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing. 436-386.

- Oue, Masanao. 1997. "Ang Pagpapahusay sa Pagtuturo ng Filipino sa mga Estudyanteng Hapones: Mga Suliranin at Solusyon." *Daluyan: Journal ng SWF sa Talakayang Pangwika* 8(1-2): 21-34.
- Paz, Consuelo et. al. 2003. *Ang Pag-aaral ng Wika*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Quetua, Fe Laura et.al. Miclat, Mario and Baquiran, Romulo Jr. (eds.). 1999. *Sangguniang Gramatika ng Wikang Filipino*. Quezon City: Sentro ng Wikang Filipino.
- Ramos, Teresita and Mabanglo, Ruth. 2012. *Southeast Asian Language Teaching: The Language Learning Framework for Teachers of Filipino*. Special Issue. [http://cotseal.net/cotseal/pages/documents/Journal\\_of\\_SEA\\_Filipino\\_2012.pdf](http://cotseal.net/cotseal/pages/documents/Journal_of_SEA_Filipino_2012.pdf)
- Richards, Jack C. (ed.). 1974. *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman.
- Selinker, Larry. 1992. *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. London: Longman.
- Shin, Seong-Chul. 2002. "Australian Students' Lexical Errors in Korean: Type, Frequency and Cause." *Journal of Korean Language Education* 13(1): 307-338.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Substitution Errors by English L1-KFL Learners: Nominative by Accusative." *International Review of Korean Studies* 3(1): 59-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Lexical Errors Caused by Semantic Similarity in Korean." *Teaching Korean as a Foreign Language* 32: 141-170.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Types and Patterns of English L1 Students'

- Misspellings in Korean.” *Journal of Korean Language Education* 18(3): 99-122.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. “Locative Substitution Errors by English L1-KFL Learners.” *The Language and Culture* 4(1): 23-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. “Grammatical Errors in Chinese KFL Learners' Compositions and Teaching Implications.” *Teaching Korean as a Foreign Language* 35: 75-100.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016. “English L1-Korean L2 Learners' Cognitive Knowledge and Difficulty of Grammatical Error Items.” *Language Facts and Perspectives* 37: 173-201.
- Shin, Seong-Chul and Joo, Alice. 2015. “Lexical Errors in Korean-Australian Learners' Compositions.” *Journal of Korean Language Education* 26(Special Edition): 129-162.
- Shin, Seong-Chul and Kang, Seung Hae. 2015. “English L1-Korean L2 Learners' Grammatical Knowledge on High Frequency Grammatical Error Items.” *Journal of Korean Language Education* 26(4): 59-99.
- Sohn, Ho-Min. 1999. *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yap, Fe Aldave. 2010. “Global Filipino in Multilingual Education.” *Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference Filipino as a Global Language*. <http://larc.sdsu.edu/images/larc/Yap-GLOBAL-FILIPINO-IN-MULTILINGUAL-EDUCATION.pdf>
- Zafra, Galileo et.al. 2005. *Gabay sa Editing sa Wikang Filipino (tuon sa pagbabaybay)*. Quezon City: Sentro ng Wikang Filipino.

(2016.10.24. 투고, 2016.11.13. 심사, 2016.11.17. 게재확정)

<Abstract>

## Patterns of Errors in Compositions of Korean Learners of Filipino Language

**RONEL O. Laranjo**

(University of the Philippines, Diliman)

**SHIN Seong-Chul**

(University of New South Wales)

The study analyzes errors produced by Korean learners of the Filipino language in their written compositions, presents types and categories of the errors and provides some possible explanations for the cause of errors. The study has conducted a survey and collected 35 written compositions from three different groups (Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced) learning Filipino at three universities in Manila. A total of 213 errors from 349 sentences were analyzed. Errors were classified at three linguistic levels (orthographic, morphological and syntactic) and categorized into five types such as omission, addition, misselection, disorder and blend. It has been revealed that the largest proportion of errors was from morphological misselection at all proficiency levels: Beginner (59.3%), Intermediate (73.4%) and Advanced (77.8%), followed by morphological omission. Types of errors are presented along with examples and possible

sources of errors are explained. It has turned out that there were more intralingual errors interlingual than errors at all levels and implications of these errors in teaching are discussed.

**Key Words:** Error Analysis, Filipino, Korean Learner, Error Type, Error Pattern, Composition, Second Language

<국문초록>

## 한국계 필리핀어 학습자의 작문 오류 유형 연구

로널 라란호 · 신 성 철

본 연구는 한국계 필리핀어 학습자의 작문에 나타난 오류를 분석하여 이들 오류의 유형과 항목을 제시하고 오류의 추정 원인을 제시한다. 이를 위해 마닐라 시내 3개 대학에서 필리핀어를 학습하는 초급, 중급 및 고급 학생들을 대상으로 작문 과제를 완성하는 설문 조사를 실시하여 35개의 작문을 수집하였다. 총 349개 문장에서 추출된 213개의 유효 오류를 분석하여 철자, 형태 및 통사 오류로 분류하고 누락, 첨가, 오선(misselection), 오순 (misorder) 및 혼합 등 다섯 유형으로 항목화하였다. 가장 많은 비율의 오류는 모든 등급 (초급 59.3%; 중급 73.4%; 고급 77.8%)에서 형태적 오선 오류였으며 형태적 누락 오류가 뒤를 이었다. 실례와 함께 오류 유형을 제시하고 오류의 추정 원인을 설명한다. 모든 등급에서 언어내 오류가 언어간 오류보다 많음을 보여주었고 이에 대한 교육적 시사점을 논의한다.

주제어: 오류 분석, 필리핀어, 한국계 학습자, 오류 유형, 오류 형태, 작문, 제2언어