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ABSTRACT

A micro-analysis of the interlanguage (IL) employed by Pakistanis learning English as a second language (ESL) is performed on ten subjects' speech samples in order to gain insights into their second language acquisition. Only one aspect of ESL — collocation is studied. Collocation is idiomatic in nature and has single-lexemic function; it is assumed therefore to present some acquisitive and productive difficulties for second language learners, who would tend to fail to recognize collocations as "fixed" expressions and to view each word within them as independent and therefore replaceable. The objective of this study is to analyze the conversational collocation errors that Pakistani-Canadians make in ESL.

This study addresses the following three hypotheses:
1) that in the English speech of Pakistani subjects variation in collocation correctness will be found across discourse domains;

2) that a continuum will be found for this variation, running between _more_ Target-like collocations in the Work Talk Domain / Exposition Activity and _fewer_ Target-like collocations in the Life Story Domain / Narrative Activity;

3) that formally educated subjects will show _more_ Target-like use of collocations than informally educated subjects.

The results of this study show that there exists an IL in Pakistani-Canadians' use of the English language. The IL of Pakistani-Canadians' English seems to indicate that: 1) IL collocations are domain specific; 2) Non-target-like collocations occur most often when
referring to quantification; in T-unit initial position; and adjacent to parallel contextual and/or structural forms; and they often contain article ellipsis; 3) In addition, this study shows that formally educated subjects produce more Target-like collocations than informally educated subjects.

Furthermore, this study has generated some questions and highlighted areas that merit further research.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1: RATIONALE

Any study of errors involving a language is important for two reasons. The first reason involves the pedagogical aspect of language, that is, to discover the structures and/or concepts that are troublesome for second language learners sharing a common language background. The second reason involves the theoretical aspect of language, that is, to discover the cognitive strategies employed by second language learners in their attempts to learn and/or acquire the second or target language.

Pakistani-Canadians comprise one of the largest groups of non-native speakers of English in Canada. Among them are educators, doctors, tradesmen, accountants, businessmen and public servants working for various government agencies. They are also found in the 'blue-collar' labour force working for industrial operations such as sawmills. In addition, visiting Pakistani graduate students act as teaching assistants.
in the instruction of undergraduate courses. According to Professor Larry Selinker, some of the foreign teaching assistants are insufficiently proficient in oral English to carry out their duties adequately, and some of the Pakistanis fall in this same category and show lack of proficiency in the use of oral as well as written English. The language they use, which is a unique system of communication apart from a native language and the target language, is described by Selinker as interlanguage (IL). Selinker (1974:35) hypothesized

...the existence of a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a TL norm. This linguistic system we will call 'interlanguage' (IL).

Interlanguage is evident in a systematic pattern of language structures which has been created by the speaker. This pattern may or may not be native language or target language-like but rather specific to or created by the IL user.

Furthermore, Tarone (1982, 1984) has suggested that different linguistic environments will affect the IL of
an individual. Tarone (1982:82) suggests that interlanguage is a continuum of styles along which the learner shifts variably. She suggests that the vernacular is the most systematic form of IL.

A micro-analysis of the interlanguage(s) (IL) employed by some of these Pakistanis might provide valuable insights into their second language acquisition (SLA). However, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to undertake, study, and present all aspects of IL employed by Pakistani-Canadians.

One area worthy of analysis rests in the use of word associations, or "collocations" as they are usually termed. Collocations, due to their idiomatic nature and single-lexemic function, may present some acquisitive and productive difficulties for a SL learner, particularly if they contain cultural "markings"; i.e., elements which are features of a specific culture or are context-specific and thus utilized only for certain purposes within certain specific situations. The SL learner may fail to recognize a collocation as a "fixed" expression but
rather view each word within the chunk as independent and therefore replaceable.

Some ESL teachers may have formed very valid, though statistically unfounded, opinions about the linguistic problems unique to the language group. No language analysis research, to my knowledge, based on a controlled systematic IL analysis has been conducted on any corpus of oral production of adult Pakistani learners of English as a second language (ESL). The objective of this study is to conduct an analysis of their English language or IL for the purpose of investigating the conversational production errors that Pakistani visitors and/or Pakistani-Canadians make in learning ESL.

A research study of the use of collocations may show whether any systematic patterns in IL occur within and across domains, that is, Work Talk Domain (WTD) and Life Story Domain (LSD). WTD deals with Exposition or Description Activity and LSD deals with Narrative Activity. It is important to note that while in the present study the correct use of collocations in Narrative Activity in WTD and Exposition Activity in LSD
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in not investigated, it would be desirable to consider this in further research. This study, however, is by no means an exhaustive one but only a pilot study.

1.2: HYPOTHESES

This study attempts to examine the following three hypotheses:

1) It is hypothesized for the purpose of this study that in the use of collocations of Pakistani subjects variation will be found across discourse domains.

2) It is further hypothesized that a continuum will be found for this variation, running between more Target-like collocations in the Work Talk Domain (WTD) / Exposition Activity (Ea) and fewer Target-like collocations in the Life Story Domain (LSD) / Narrative Activity (Na)

3) In addition, it is hypothesized a formally* educated group will show more Target-like collocations and an informally* educated group
will show fewer Target-like collocations.

1.3: TERMINOLOGY

CATAPHORIC: Referring to something following.

COLLOCATION: Phrases made of words which usually occur together, such as, "for the time being", and including lexical words that are associated with certain structures, for example, "glass of".

CONTENT WORD: Conceptually-loaded lexical items: nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

ELLIPSIS: Omission of standard features.

FORMALLY EDUCATED: For the purpose of this study it means a person whose academic qualifications include at least a bachelor's degree or professional certification, such as CGA, whether obtained in Pakistan or Canada.

FORMULAIC: Non-productive or fixed expression; e.g., "pardon me".
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FUNCTION WORDS: A word whose role is primarily or wholly grammatical; e.g., prepositions, conjunctions and articles.

INFORMALLY EDUCATED: For the purpose of this study it means a person whose academic qualifications include neither a Bachelor's degree nor a professional certification.

LEXICAL SUBSTITUTION: Replacement of a content word by a synonymous but non-target like word.

REPETITION: Repeated grammatical, strategic or rhetorical structure in identical or parallel form within the transcripts.

T-UNIT: Main clause plus all embedded subordinate clauses.

TYPICALITY: Prominence of a particular feature within the transcripts (as determined by frequency of occurrences).
1.4: GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Contrastive Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>Bachelor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>Degree of freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Error Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ea (EA)</td>
<td>Exposition Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Formally Educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Informally Educated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Interlanguage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC</td>
<td>Interlanguage Collocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLB</td>
<td>Bachelor of Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>Life Story Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>Master of Applied Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Master of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Mother Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nd</td>
<td>No Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na (NA)</td>
<td>Narrative Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NL Native Language
NTL Non-Target Like
PhD Doctor of Philosophy
SL Second Language
SLA Second Language Acquisition
SLL Second Language Learning
SLT Second Language Teaching
TILS Transitional Interlanguage System
TL Target Like
U Unmarried
WTD Work Talk Domain

1.5: SYMBOLS

* This symbol following a word indicates that the word is defined in section 1.3--Terminology.

< Less than
> More than
= Equal to
"Errors" and/or "mistakes" are an inescapable part of learning anything new and in learning a second language this is not an exception. They have been the cause of much concern to teachers of ESL for a long time and the concern is as old as language teaching itself. Selinker (1984:333) claims:

...the study of grammar is 2,500 years old at least, as is the thinking and talking about language pedagogy.

The writers of ESL text books have exhibited this concern in their published materials. Research scholars have voiced their concern. A good example would be Corder's (1974) paper "The Significance of Learners' Errors". It is not a rarity to find that language teachers have always been collecting samples of errors made by SL learners in order to guide their teaching emphasis. But what is an 'error'? What is a 'mistake'? Is there a difference between the two?

Second language learners' speech and writing reflects characteristics of their language which don't
meet the TL conventions and norms -- they are abnormal, and are not present in the performance of native speakers of the target language. Corder (1974:24) [article first published in 1967] makes a distinction between 'error' and 'mistake'. 'Mistakes' are deviations due to performance such as slips of the tongue or pen, memory limitations, e.g., pronunciation, spelling, anxiety, and chance circumstances. They are typically random and are corrected by the learner when his attention is drawn to them. 'Errors', according to Corder, are systematic and consistently deviant characteristics of the learner's linguistic system at any given stage of learning. They are due to incompetency. Corder's (1974:24) argument is

...that the learner is using a definite system of language at every point in his development, although it is not...that of the second language....The learner's errors are evidence of this system and are themselves systematic.

Corder (1973:260) describes errors as

those features of the learner's utterances which differ from those of any native speaker.

Brown (1980:165) explains error as
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a noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learner.

The need to describe and discuss what constitutes 'error' with respect to the SL learner is very obvious in the literature as researchers, methodologists and SL teachers have discovered different types and causes of errors. It is not necessary to discuss types and/or causes of errors; an abridged account is provided by Hammerly (1982:173-74). For the purpose of this study, the term 'error' will refer to any systematic deviation from what native speakers of English would consider standard or non-foreign. In other words, any systematic deviant form, any erroneous expression not uttered by native speakers will be considered an error.

The next question is -- why should we study errors? We study errors for two very basic and important reasons:

1. From a theoretical point of view, to map out the cognitive strategies used in acquiring the target language (TL).

2. From a pedagogical point of view, to discover the kinds of target language structures and concepts
that cause trouble for SL learners and impede the second language acquisition (SLA) process.

The major goal of studying the phenomenon of errors has always remained the same, that is, an attempt to facilitate the process of SLA and second language teaching (SLT). However, in the 40's SL errors were considered something to be avoided and their eradication at any cost was the prime objective and in this sense the teacher acted as an error eradicator and therefore inadequate teaching methodology was blamed to a large extent. This school of thought, that with perfect teaching methodology errors would never be committed, is still around; and to devise a perfect teaching method that will work in every given teaching/learning situation is nothing more that an "illusion" (Ghadessy 1977). So language teachers have been using 'errors' for entirely pragmatic purposes -- to evaluate student progress and to design pedagogical materials and strategies. The student himself and influential factors) such as described by Hammerly (1982:173) were almost ignored.

Our view today, in the light of recent advances,
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has changed drastically. Today errors are looked upon with a more realistic view and approach, that is, that errors are an unavoidable and inevitable part of the process of second language learning (Corder 1975). If rules have not yet been perfectly learned or temporarily forgotten -- which is normal -- the SL learner will make errors, despite our best efforts.

Under the influence of cognitive psychology, SL errors are interpreted as manifestations of the learner's grammar and are not only useful but necessary for learning the language by means of testing hypotheses.

Richards (1974:4) summarizes Strevens' (1969) views on errors as follows:

...if a regular pattern of errors could be observed in the performance of all the learners in a situation, and if a learner were seen to progress through this pattern, his errors should be taken as evidence not of failure but of success and achievement in learning.

Strevens' views seem to provide justification that errors are quantifiable and thus can be used as one of
the measures to evaluate the learner's linguistic competence.

Just as our attitude towards the SL learner has changed, pedagogical emphasis regarding analysis of errors, techniques and theories has shifted as well. The wave of popularity that contrastive analysis (CA) once enjoyed diminished long ago. The confident pioneers of CA, Fries (1945) and Lado (1957), based their theory on the assumption of negative transfer (i.e., interference). Fries very firmly established CA as an almost integral part of foreign language teaching.

The most effective materials (for foreign language teaching) are those based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner. (Fries 1945:9)

Lado's 1957 work *Linguistics Across Cultures*, which became a classical manual for contrastive studies, supported Fries. Fries and Lado, in equating language learning with habit formation, treated error as evidence of poor teaching methods. CA was their response to error; they sought to prevent error by predicting where
it would occur through a comparison of the native language and TL systems because

Contrastive Analysis (CA) involves comparison, prediction and explanation. The structures of the language of the learner (L1) are compared with those of the language which he attempts to learn (L2). On the basis of this comparison, predictions are made of difficulties which the learner will experience in learning the L2. And by reference to this comparison, many of the errors made by the learner in speaking, writing, listening to or reading the L2 will be explained. (Hughes 1980)

CA's "strong version" (predictive or a priori) (Schachter 1974), proposes that students are prevented from learning a second language because of the interference of the mother tongue (MT) and the comparison of the TL and the mother language systems would predict those structures which would prove most difficult to learn. Based on the results of such comparisons, teaching materials could then be devised to deal with these difficult structures, thereby maximizing teaching time and minimizing the occurrence of error. CA's "weak version" (explanatory or a posteriori) utilizes the comparison of the two language systems as a
tool for explaining learner errors after they have appeared (Wardhaugh 1974). This view is supported by Duskova (1969) in his study of explanation of errors in terms of mother tongue interference, rather than as a predictor.

The close association of the strong version of CA with structural linguistics and the behaviourist view of learning gave rise to CA's weak version. CA theory enjoyed the swell of popularity for the next ten years or so. As a result it generated many contrastive materials, and many articles were published concerned with CA. However, several factors contributed to the demise of both versions. The dissolution of CA took place because of the fact that CA predicted so many possible problems that teachers were still having to select which areas to teach. Furthermore, the discovery was made that many areas which were supposed to be irksome caused no inconvenience at all while errors were occurring in areas that CA had never predicted. There was also another question of whether a predicted error actually occurred for the reason predicted, or for some other reason which was not predicted.
Many researchers questioned the validity of CA as a predictor of errors. It failed to live up to its predictive claim. Researchers, during their analysis of student errors in the light of CA, found that CA did not predict a large proportion of those errors (Hakuta et al 1977; Chau 1975). They questioned its value if it could only predict a portion of the errors actually committed by learners, after the colossal amount of work required for a complete CA of two languages.

One can attribute the lack of accurate prediction of errors to the fact that CA had undervalued the contribution of the learner, had failed to recognize fully the nature of what has to be learned (SL), and had not taken into account the way the SL is presented to the learner, i.e., method used, order of presentation, the teacher and his/her teaching style, and the amount of practice.

Whiteman and Jackson (1972) conducted controlled experiments in a school setting and Briere (1966) carried out experiments in a laboratory. The CA hypothesis tended to be falsified by the results of these studies. In addition,
Comparing two or more languages in all their aspects, the scientific approach will endeavour to find the similarities and dissimilarities between them and thus gain insight into language in general and the different forms under which this human means of communication occurs. The whole field would comprise the thousands of languages in the world, with their phonological, lexical, and grammatical systems. No single human being, or even a team of experts, could do that, and no single human brain could contain all the data. (Breitenstein 1978)

Fowler (1984:169) shares the same view:

No one has yet succeeded in describing any language with anything remotely approaching completeness.

Linguists and language teachers alike found it difficult, time-consuming and impractical to put CA techniques for language comparison into practice. And even if languages could be adequately described, there was a further problem which Rivers (1972:65) mentions:

Since the linguist's aim must be to make the description scientifically elegant rather than pedagogically applicable, the analysis will not normally be directly transferable to teaching materials and situations.
Breitenstein (1978) calls it

...a waste of time and effort to try to make a complete survey of L1 (the mother language). The qualified non-English course-writer or teacher is a sophisticated speaker of English and is competent to decide whether a sound, word, or sentence pattern of the L2 is also found in L1. What we need is a survey of L2, and of its main elements only, for that and that only is the teaching matter. If these elements correlate with those in the L1 there is no teaching or learning problem. Where there is a difference, it calls for closer study and for recommendations as to how to grade and teach the strange new elements so as to overcome the pupils' natural inclination to follow the L1 pattern.

The problem of prediction and explanation gave rise to two schools of thought -- supporters and opponents. Among supporters of CA were Rivers (1970), Ferguson (1965), DiPietro (1971), and Strevens (1965). Opponents of CA included Hamp (1968), Wolfe (1967), Gradman (1971), Ritchie (1967), and Richards (1974). But Catford (1968) suggested a more reasonable approach -- a "sophisticated error analysis", one
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...which involves both theoretically adequate linguistic categorization of errors and sophisticated statistical treatment, and could unveil the particular difficulties that are encountered by SL learners. Once these data were available, CA could be applied precisely to these areas of difficulty and could provide information on why the errors occurred. A more practical suggestion was put forward by Wilkins (1968:102).

Why do a complete predictive contrastive analysis at all if you have to verify the predictions anyway? Why not just look at errors students actually make, find the areas the error occurs in, and contrast only those areas?

Even the pioneer of CA, Lado (1957:27), himself said that certain problems could not be fully accounted for without actual observation of the speech of second language learners. Was this merely a very realistic statement or was he deliberately trying to intimate the need for error analysis? No attempt will be made here to find the answer to this question.

Under the influence of cognitive psychology, our focus has shifted from the view of the SL learner as an
error producer to that of someone capable of creative, intelligent interaction with the new language. Attitudes about the nature, status and the use of errors also shifted. The status of errors changed from the negative connotation of the Lado camp to that of positive proof of the learner's interaction with the language environment. Errors are seen as manifestations of the learner's grammar and as not only useful but necessary for learning the language by means of testing hypotheses. Those who view errors as a sign of the learner's growth in the TL came to espouse another approach to the analysis of errors. This approach became known as Error Analysis (EA) and was brought out by Corder (1974). EA is seen by some as an outgrowth of Chomsky's innateness hypothesis regarding first language acquisition by children, and it is thus extended by them to second language learning by adults.

Just as errors in first language production provide evidence for the development of that language in the child, so also should such errors in the second language production of the adult. (Robinett and Schachter 1986:145)

EA, according to Richards (1971:12), deals with the differences between the speech of second language
learners and that of adult native speakers of the language. It attempts to bring into focus what errors occur, why and how, and this knowledge is used to better understand and improve the SL acquisition process which of course involves learning and teaching processes.

Hughes (1980:1) describes EA as follows:

Error Analysis (EA) involves the identification, description, and explanation of the errors which the learner makes in the L2. It is anticipated that the study of learners' errors will lead to a better understanding of the processes by which languages are learned, and that this in turn will lead to the development of improved teaching methods, materials, syllabuses, etc. At a more mundane level, EA is seen as an activity akin to diagnostic testing, a means of ascertaining the extent of a learner's (or group of learners') control of various features of the L2.

The historic origin of EA is not very clear, at least not as clear as it is in the case of CA. It was definitely as a result of the reaction against the CA hypothesis that many theories grew, for example, the L1 learning = L2 learning hypothesis (Dulay and Burt 1974)
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and the Interlanguage hypothesis (Selinker 1974); and Frith (1975:327-32) provided a comparative account of two hypotheses. EA has a long tradition. Classroom teachers have been using it for entirely pragmatic purposes -- to evaluate student progress and to design pedagogical materials and strategies. It is fairly well established that the first approach to EA was based on the notion of interference, negative transfer theory and CA, stemming from the work of CA pioneer, Lado (1957). George (1972) claimed and supported the well-agreed upon view that interference can account for approximately only one third of the errors for adult learners. However, EA was first proposed by Corder when he published his very influential paper "The Significance of Learners' Errors" in 1967 in which he suggested a new way of looking at the errors made by SL learners. And that was the beginning of looking at errors in pedagogically insightful ways to systematically account for the occurrence of errors in either linguistic or psycholinguistic terms. He said an 'error' is seen traditionally from the teacher-centered viewpoint of the learner's performance. But if we look at it from the perspective of the language learner, there are significant similarities between the strategies employed
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by the infant learning his native language and those of
the second language learner. As Corder (1974:22) puts
it:

...some at least of the strategies adopted by the
learner of a second language are substantially the same as
those by which a first language is acquired. Such a
proposal does not imply that the course or sequence of
learning is the same in both cases.

In this view, the observed deviations are no more
'errors' than the first approximations of a child
learning his mother tongue are errors. The SL learner is
struggling and trying out successive hypotheses about
the nature of the SL just like a child struggling to
acquire his NL. Corder has set

...the stage for EA's
emergence as a valid area in
linguistic research by showing
that learner errors are worth
studying in order to gain
insight into the nature of the
second language learning
process. (Fischer 1982:117)

At this point researchers started to turn away from
CA to an examination of the actual errors that the
language learner makes. Psychologists and
psycholinguists started to turn from behavioristic
theory which says that language learning is habit formation to cognitive theory which says that language learning is the internalization of rules in a systematic order. Cognitive theory became the basis of (1) research into first language acquisition and (2) the process of EA. EA presupposes that the learner processes and stores data in an organized manner. If data are not stored properly, errors occur. These errors, then, can be taken as a sign that language learning is taking place. This is how EA evolved, absolutely different from CA. The only common thing between CA and EA is that they both compare errors.

Corder (1971a:158) says that two objects of EA are: (1) "to elucidate what and how a learner learns when he studies language" and (2) to enable "the learner to learn more efficiently by exploiting our knowledge of his dialect for pedagogical purposes".

We want to identify the differences between the two sets of rules and discover what he (the learner) has still to learn, so that we may take appropriate remedial action, and, in a more general way, identify the principal learning tasks of a given group of learners in order to incorporate this knowledge in
the designing of our syllabuses and teaching materials. (Corder 1973a:37)

From the study of a learner's errors we can infer the nature of his knowledge of a SL at any particular point in his learning career. As Valdman (1975:219) puts it,

...errors are not viewed as pathological manifestations to be eradicated, but constitute instead the most direct evidence of the learner's hypotheses and strategies.

The assumption underlying EA is that the errors discovered and described are evidence of a system which is neither the system of the NL nor of the TL, but the system of some other language. It is this 'other' language or "language learner's language" (Corder 1981:66) which EA attempts to describe. This 'other' language whether it is called Idiosyncratic dialect or transitional competence (Corder), 'interlingua' (James), Approximative system (Nemser), or Interlanguage (Selinker), is still a language -- a natural language, so that

...the language learner at all points of his learning career 'has a language', in the sense that his behavior is rule
governed and therefore, in principle, describable in linguistic terms. (Corder 1973a:36)

Corder (1971a:204-19) puts forward a method of using EA to analyse a language system that has some rules particular to SL learners by calling them 'idiosyncratic dialects' of SL learners. One wonders if the SL learner has a dialect. In my opinion the SL learner definitely has a functional language and if the learner's language is a dialect in its own right, then we are in no position to talk about errors in his functional language. However, Corder offers the following three steps:

1) RECOGNITION OF IDIOSYNCRATIC DIALECT: This step recognizes the language errors made by the SL learner and these errors fall under the broad heading of 'pedagogical' or 'linguistic' category.

2) DESCRIPTION OF IDIOSYNCRATIC DIALECT: This step is the accounting of error categorization and description of errors and falls under the heading of 'pedagogical' or 'linguistic' category, as well.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

3) PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS: This step is responsible for the explanation of the errors made by the SL learner.

Nemser's (1971:115-23) terminology is of course different from that of Corder's, but Nemser's theory, which seems very much similar to EA and 'idiosyncratic dialect', emphasizes the study of SL learners' errors as the learners' attempts to grasp the target language and move through what Nemser named 'approximative systems'. He stresses that some rules particular to individuals produce deviancy from TL norms. His claims are very similar and run parallel to the claims made by others in the fields of CA and EA that the study of these 'approximative systems' will be helpful in designing and planning ESL curriculum materials.

Just as Fries, Lado and Corder influenced the field of second language acquisition (SLA), Selinker brought a reformation in the field by unfolding his theoretically based article as well as the concept of interlanguage by publishing his very revolutionary paper "Interlanguage" in 1974. Selinker's term for what EA should study is 'interlanguage' (IL). This is a system similar to the
two previously described. Selinker (1974:35) defined IL as a "separate linguistic system" based on the output of a SL learner.

Maybe it would be more useful, in the context of the second language learner in the classroom, to speak of a series of transitional second language systems of additive and integrated rules.... (Hammerly 1982:175)

I support Hammerly's view and I am skeptical about the use of the word 'separate linguistic system'. It implies the 'completeness' of the system and therefore, presumably, that it has no deficiencies. It "is not really separate, for it comes close to matching..." but "...still short of native speaker competence" (Hammerly 1982:176). A 'complete' system should need no improvement. And if so, that is, if it is a complete system in its own right, then, we are in no position to talk about the errors in this 'separate = complete linguistic system'. But if the word 'separate' is replaced by 'successive' or 'progressive' linguistic system' or 'transitional linguistic system', it will make more sense to look for errors in a linguistic system which is continuously changing and hopefully improving and consistently developing on its way to
becoming and being recognized as a complete language system in due time. By that I mean the learner has learned the SL and acquired a complete set of rules and principles governing the TL, can communicate and sustain that conversation like a native speaker of the language, and now can claim mastery in the use of the TL. In addition, as IL is made up of elements drawn partly from the NL and partly from the TL and some from neither, the 'separate linguistic system' does not hold water since it is, in fact, a 'different' linguistic system, neither identical to the native language nor to the target language and lacks 'completeness'. This is because a given set of utterances in IL are not identical to the

...corresponding set of utterances which would have produced by a native speaker of the TL had he attempted to express the same meaning as the learner. (Selinker 1974:35)

As it is obvious that this linguistic system is constantly changing, for better or worse, over time, it would have been better to call it "TRANSITIONAL INTERLANGUAGE SYSTEM" (TILS) instead of IL.

The term 'interlanguage' is becoming established in the current literature on the subject for possibly
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the following reasons:

1) It incorporates an element of neutrality in terms of or as to the directionality of attitude as compared to the other two terms (that is, 'idiosyncratic dialect' and 'approximative systems') which imply a TL-centered perspective.

2) It takes into account the atypical rapidity with which SL learner's language changes.

3) The prefix 'inter' captures the indeterminate status of a learning system which is somewhere in between NL and TL.

4) The term 'language' implies that it is a rule-governed and adequately functional communication system.

Selinker assumes that there are 'psychological structures' latent in the brain which are activated when one attempts to learn a second language. (Richards, ed. 1974:29)

Selinker's concept of 'latent psychological structures' is not similar but close to the concept of 'latent language structures' of Lennenberg (1967) which, according to Lennenberg:

1) is already a formulated arrangement in the brain, 2) is the biological counterpart
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to universal grammar, and 3) is transformed by infants into the realized structure of a particular grammar in accordance with certain maturational stages. (Selinker 1974:33)

Any description of IL must account for the phenomenon of fossilization of errors and according to Selinker (1974:36)

Fossilizable linguistic phenomena are linguistic items, rules, and subsystems which speakers of a particular NL will tend to keep in their IL relative to a particular TL, no matter what the age of the learner or amount of explanation or instruction he receives in the TL.

There are five central processes of 'latent psychological structure' which enables an error analyst to account for recurring error patterns.

1) LANGUAGE TRANSFER: Errors resulting from NL influence.

2) TRANSFER OF TRAINING: Errors resulting from identifiable items in training procedures; such as using 'he' or 'she' without any distinction since most practice drills in books use only 'he'.
3) STRATEGIES OF SL LEARNING: Errors result from the cognitive application of inappropriate learning strategies to the materials to be learned. For example learners tend to reduce the TL to a simpler system, omitting plural markers and function words in the process.

4) STRATEGIES OF SL COMMUNICATION: Different communication approaches used by SL learners while communicating with TL speakers may also cause errors. There is a tendency to stop learning the TL once the SL learner feels he/she has attained functional competence, thus ignoring certain elements which may or may not be crucial for effective communication.

5) OVERGENERALIZATION: Fossilizable errors as a result of the overgeneralization of grammatical rules.

In addition, there are some minor processes that are involved including hypercorrection, pronunciation and holophrase learning. According to Selinker (1974:37) each process

...forces fossilizable material upon surface IL utterances, controlling to a
very large extent, the surface structures of the sentences.

Richards (1971), extrapolating from the results of EA in various SL learning situations, shows that many of the deviant forms produced by learners can be accommodated for in terms of one or more of the processes posited by Selinker. Dickerson's (1974) study of the acquisition of selected consonant sounds of English by a group of Japanese learners demonstrates that the learners' output at any given point over time is systematic and unstable (i.e., variable). It also provides an account of the so-called 'backsliding' to IL norm noted by Selinker and many others in the performance of language learners.

CA is primarily concerned with the differences between any two languages and that aspect of the learner's performance in the SL which can be correlated with similarities in the learner's native language; IL considers NL interference as one of the explanatory tools used for language learning analysis.

Secondly, both CA and EA fail to accommodate the learner himself (as an individual) and the other contributing variables such as methodology, environment,
teaching style, teacher's personality, teacher's sex, learner's motivation and aptitude, his attitude towards the second language, the second culture and its people, and the learner's concept of school. Most important of all is the 'attitude towards the learner's performance', especially towards the 'errors'. CA merely points out the differences and predicts possible areas of difficulty; EA considers errors to be something unacceptable and seeks their eradication; but IL treats errors as evidence of learning.

From the above explanatory account of CA, EA and IL analysis it is safe to conclude that IL embraces the assumptions of CA as well as EA. CA contrasts and compares NL and TL, and EA contrasts and compares the SL learner's performance with TL speaker's performance; but IL analysis incorporates all three language analysis systems into one system, explicitly incorporating the CA of the learner's IL with NL as well as SL.
3.1: Source of Data

The IL data of this study are based on taped and transcribed interviews of ten Pakistani-Canadian subjects. These subjects were chosen by employing a statistical technique called systematic random sampling.

This technique can be used if all members in the defined population have already been placed on a list in random order. (Borg and Gall 1983:248)

For the purpose of this study, Pakistan Canada Association's directory was used to select a systematic random sample. I divided the population by the number needed for the sample, that is, $542 / 15 = 36$. Although only ten subjects were needed, fifteen were selected keeping in view the reality of attrition. Then I asked my twelve year old son, Kashif, a grade seven student, to think of or select a number smaller than 36. He gave me the numeral 30. I added 15 to this number, i.e., $30 + 15 = 45$. The forty-fifth person in the Pakistan Canada Association's directory became the first name in my sample. Then, starting with this number I selected every thirty-sixth person from the same
directory. The following numbers made up the list: 45, 81, 117, 153, 189, 225, 261, 297, 333, 369, 405, 441, 477, 513, and 549. The last number happened to be beyond the list total, but then I didn't need it anyway.

There is an exception that needs to be explained. This sample is an all male sample. I decided not to include women in this sample due to the fact that they by and large were housewives and therefore didn't share equal opportunity to interact with target speakers of the language as compared to men who, in most cases, were submerged in the target language environment for at least eight hours a day, that is, in the work environment.

If a person representing a certain number was not willing to participate in the research, the next number on the population list was automatically selected until a participant was found. However, this new participant had to be established before selecting the next number on the sample list. For example, if number 45 decided not to participate, then the new participant was found between 45 and 81.
Due to the systematic random sampling it was not possible to ensure that the sample group was homogeneous in attitude, aptitude, educational background, social, and geographical background; however, linguistically they were homogeneous -- all of them were native speakers of Urdu which is important, because, as Hammerly (1982:172) points out, studies of errors made by linguistically heterogeneous groups are worse than useless -- they are misleading.

Another common and important factor was that all the subjects migrated from the same geographical region of Pakistan, namely, Lahore. Subjects, however, didn't come from any single ESL class or walk of life. They represented different socio-economic backgrounds and all of them had varying degrees and types of exposure to the English language. And this, indeed, provided a strong point in favour of a good cross section of the Pakistani-Canadian community in Greater Vancouver. Descriptions of the subjects' work, training, and educational background are found in Appendix B.

3.2: Instrument and Procedure

A sample of the elicitation instrument is found in
Appendix A. The interviews were conducted in a conversational manner in a friendly atmosphere so as to approximate natural, relatively unmonitored and unintimidated conversation. The interviewer tried to prompt spontaneous speech without giving away any predictable pattern of what came next. Five minutes of interview with each subject in each domain were tape recorded. The written transcriptions of the taped interviews were produced for the purpose of micro-analysis. They were rechecked and only after I felt that the transcriptions I was using accurately reflected what I heard on the tape, did I go over the transcriptions and mark every collocation, disregarding false starts and slips of the tongue and, in case of self-correction, consistently counting a subject's final attempt to say the collocation correctly, even if a subject changed a correct collocation to an incorrect one. However, as Borg and Gall (1983:842) suggest, in scoring unstructured measures such as interview data, the measure should be scored independently by two or more raters. This will reduce the likelihood that the biases of a single observer will unduly influence the results, and it also permits the determination of interrater reliability.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the normal plausible interpretation make sense in the context?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;----- YES ----&gt; y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;----- NO ----&gt;</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are the grammatical rules of the target language applied correctly?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;----- YES ----&gt; y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;----- NO ----&gt;</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Ay + By = TL  
2 = Ay + Bn = NTL (Rule deficient ILC)  
3 = An + By = NTL (Context deficient ILC)  
4 = An + Bn = NTL (Rule + Context deficient ILC)

---

**ABBREVIATIONS:**
- y = Yes
- n = No
- ILC = Interlanguage Collocation
- TL = Target-like
- NTL = Non-Target-like

---

**ALGORITHM FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF TARGET and NON-TARGET-LIKE COLLOCATIONS**

FIGURE I
Therefore, two educated speakers of the target language (one English major and one Linguistics major) were employed to do the same, i.e., they independently marked each collocation using my guidelines. We then used the antecedent algorithm (independently) to select errors. Lists of errors were compared and errors where disagreement occurred were marked. We agreed upon 502/549 or 91.44% and disagreed upon 47/549 or 8.56% of errors.

Interrater reliabilities should reach at least .70, and much higher reliabilities can be obtained if training is adequate and observations are of specific behavior (Borg and Gall 1983:480) and

...70-80 percent agreement is usually considered satisfactory. (Borg and Gall 1983:479)

In this study I examined, first of all, the collocation usage which would be termed Non-Target-like where interesting features would emerge. I then examined the subjects' Target-like usage of a related form to see if any systematic discrepancies or parallels of a structural, semantic or rhetorical nature occurred between the two.

I also carried out an analysis of the frequency of
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colloctions including both raw frequencies and percentage of Target-like vs Non-Target-like usage, in order to assess typicality (Table I).
CHAPTER IV
ILC DATA ANALYSIS

4.1: RESULTS

From an initial examination of the transcripts it becomes apparent that the collocations can be categorized structurally into three general types:

1) Preposition-leading phrasal collocation; e.g., "by any means".

2) Preposition-following content word collocation which can be divided into three sub-categories:
   2a) noun + preposition (N+P) -- "state of"
   2b) verb + preposition (V+P) -- "varied in"
   2c) adjective + preposition (A+P) -- "hard to"

3) Non-prepositional collocation; e.g., "whatever the circumstance", "supposed to be".

Category 1 collocations (preposition leading phrases) occur 174 times throughout the transcripts; of these 61% (106) are TL and 39% (68) are NTL. Category 1
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colloctions are the second most used (174 occurrences) trailing behind category 2a which is used more often than any other category (i.e., 214 occurrences). Furthermore, category 1 collocations are used more often in Exposition Activity (Ea) than Narrative Activity (Na), i.e., 113 times vs. 61 times respectively. This category ranks number 4 among all the categories in terms of TL behaviour (61%).

Category 2 collocations (preposition following content word collocation) take three structural forms. The category 2a occurs most frequently among the five categories. However, it is almost at par with category 1 in terms of percentage, i.e., 62% versus 61% TL behaviour and 38% versus 39% NTL behaviour. Furthermore, category 2a collocations are more often in Ea (148 occurrences) as compared to Na (66 occurrences). Category 2b is the second least used (45 occurrences) and category 3 is the least used (21 occurrences). Collocations in category (2b) occur most often in Ea (28 times) versus Na (17 times). Category 2c shows the highest TL correlation (83%) and the lowest NTL correlation of any category (17%) (see Histogram I). Collocations in this category, like others, occur more
ILC DATA ANALYSIS

often in Ea (50 times) in comparison with Na (45 times).

Category 3 (non-prepositional) collocations comprise a multiplicity of structural forms which are linked by their absence of prepositions. Sub-categories are not established here due to the infrequency of occurrence of the category. This category represents the least number of collocations (21 occurrences) and the least TL behaviour, i.e., 52%. It seems to be the most problematic of all the collocations for the second language learner. Of the 21 collocations noted, 12 occurred in Ea and 9 occurred in Na.

In all the categories more collocations are used in Ea than in Na except one, that is, category 3. In addition, formally* educated subjects (numbers 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9) show more TL collocations (Ea=80% and Na=58.16%) than informally* educated subjects (numbers 2, 4, 5, 10) who show fewer TL collocations (Ea=57.25% and Na=57%).

Furthermore, both formally and informally educated groups show more TL collocations in Ea (that is, 80% and 57.25% respectively) versus fewer TL collocations in Na.
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(that is, 58.16% and 57% respectively). See Histogram III for individual performance. Once again, Ea is continuously showing better TL correlation than Na, i.e., 80% vs. 58.16% (formally educated subjects) and 57.25% vs. 57% (informally educated subjects). The same is true in the case of the combined average of formally educated and informally educated subjects number 1 through 10 (Table I, page 4 of 4), i.e., 66% (Ea) versus 64% (Na) TL correlation (see Histogram II under the heading 'average').

4.2: DISCUSSION

CATEGORY 1:

The prepositional phrases within this category (such as, "in order to") are often acting as discourse-connectives. As such, they are largely "frozen" (i.e. not prone to morphological change like, for example, phrasal verbs). Does the infrequency of this form suggest an inability to connect discourse, a lack of knowledge of discourse-connecting structures, or are these structures rarely used by native speakers also? The "frozen-ness" or formulaic nature of these
collocations, one might speculate, should make them easier for the L2 learner to decipher than other collocations since their function and form is fixed. However, significantly their TL frequency of usage by percentage is much better in Ea, i.e., 64% in Ea vs. 56% in Na. Of course, these changes may be a reflection of varying lengths of transcripts per activity and time depending on the words spoken per minute, i.e., some subjects spoke at a faster rate than others.

The fact that 35% (61/174) of category 1 collocations occurred in Na and 65% (113/174) occurred in Ea leads one to think that these collocations are somewhat domain-specific and activity type-specific. It is a fact that in this case 30% more collocations are used in Ea. It is also in Ea that more TL usage of collocations (64% vs. 56%) and TL language has occurred. Is there some inherent feature within this activity type which is affecting L2 behaviour?

An examination of specific NTL collocations in category 1 reveals a number of significant features. Often (perhaps due to their discourse connecting function) the NTL category 1 collocations appear in
T-unit initial position: e.g., "in usual case", "in the reverse case". What is of interest here is that their syntactic similarity is supported by a lexical similarity, that is, the use of "in....case". In both situations the collocations are embedded in explanations, though their rhetorical functions are different. "In usual case" appears to express the sense of frequency or normality. "In the reverse case" is a contrastive device to clarify an explanation. Nonetheless, the structural similarity between these two NTL collocations may indicate an IL pattern. Both these collocations would be interpreted as mixed collocations: "in usual case" may be a confusion of "in the usual situation" and "in most cases"; "in the reverse case" might be a combination of "in the opposite case" and "in the reverse situation". A third NTL collocation, although not a mixed collocation, also relates to the pattern of the two previous examples: "in case of" employs the key collocation of "in" and "case" and is also found in T-unit-initial position. However, in this example, the collocation has a "cataphoric" function; it identifies the topic of the explanation following. The different function might explain why the NTL behaviour is not, as in the earlier examples, an
occurrence of lexical substitution, but rather of article ellipsis. As will be seen later, article ellipsis (particularly the indefinite article) is a regular feature within NTL collocations.

Another category 1 error, "in excess to" parallels the P+N+P form of "in case of" as well as the TL collocation "in order to". Is "in" a source of collocative difficulty or is an IL phenomenon at play? Interestingly, "in order to" appears with the structure "convert....to the right in order to" which parallels "in excess to .... convert to the left side". While "in order to" may have a different semantic function than "in excess to" (purpose vs. quantity), the subject may equate form to context. That is, both structures appear in explanations of specific locations. In addition, they both appear following a copula of the verb "to be". The syntactic, contextual and semantic parallels seem more than coincidences; some IL phenomenon, such as overgeneralization, seems to be functioning.

One aspect of the category 1 NTL collocations which holds promise is the link to the concept of quantity. Aside from "in excess to" and "in usual case"
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(which in a sense is a quantitative unit), the two other NTL collocations "twice as much as many as" and "for long time" refer to quantitative information. SL research has shown for some time that expressions of quantity hold some difficulty for SL learners; this data appears to provide additional support.

"For long time", aside from its quantification of time, shows the article ellipsis feature previously discussed. Furthermore, its occurrence, like the other NTL prepositional phrases in this category, is within the context of an explanation.

CATEGORY 2a (N+P):

This category ranks the highest in number of occurrences (214). However, TL and NTL use of collocations in Na as well as in Ea follows category 1 very closely: 66/214 or 31% occurred in the Na and 148/214 or 69% occurred in the Ea -- 38% more collocations used in Ea. Once again more TL use of collocations occurred in Ea, i.e., 64% (Ea) vs. 58% (Na). This rate of high similarity between Ea and Na in both categories, 1 and 2a collocations, leads to an interesting speculation -- that the IL of subjects in
this study is very systematic. Will this trend extend into other categories? And if so, why? Is it possible that the phenomenon of fossilization has taken place?

Let's look at the use of collocation 'say about' and 'talk about'. Is there a possibility that 'say about' is equated to 'talk about'? Is this a lexical substitution or is overgeneralization at work? Another question arises; is 'say about' a feature of universal core IL, and is lexical substitution within a collocation a common IL feature? Additional data, involving subjects from different parts of the world, will and can help answer these questions, a task which is beyond the scope of this study. However, in the case of these subjects it certainly seems true. This study's investigation of the use of the v+p type of collocation suggests how difficult it must be to achieve TL use. Subjects of this study, however, seem to show that they have overcome this difficulty by developing a logical system of their own which is being modified as the need arises over time. Further data would no doubt help consolidate the findings.
CATEGORY 2b (V+P):

These collocations have the second most infrequent occurrences -- only 45. Just as before, better TL usage of collocations continues to occur in Ea. In this category the trend continues: 17/45 or 38% collocations occurred in Na and 28/45 or 62% collocations occurred in Ea -- 24% more collocations are used in Ea. In this category, unlike the ones before, not more but equal TL use of collocations have occurred in Ea and Na, i.e., 71% in both. A striking difference that appears here is that repetition* in this category is much higher than in any other category. Upon close examination it is discovered that some collocations are overgeneralized. For example, the use of 'relation to' extends the semantic range of the concept to encompass both 'relationship' and 'relation'. The same is true in case of 'change of', where the one collocation covers two contexts -- 'change of' and 'change in'.

CATEGORY 2c (A+P):

This category ranks third in terms of total collocations used, i.e., 95 in total. However, it followed the same trend as category 1 and category 2a,
that is, (1) more collocations are used in Ea (50/95 or 53%) and in Na (45/95 or 47%); and (2) more TL use of collocations in Ea than Na (84% vs. 82%) has occurred.

The interesting point to note is that NTL collocations are mostly used in 'explaining' the same concept, the same context, and the same rhetorical function. Perhaps the use of these collocations is more over-valued than it should be and therefore, its use is overgeneralized. This is the category in which more than any other category the TL use of collocations has occurred and the subjects have achieved the highest TL correlation. i.e., 83% (79/95) -- Table III.

The subjects have used A+P collocations relatively correctly, such as, 'dependent on', 'depend on', 'that of', 'lower than', 'amount of', 'higher than'. However, there exists an exception sometimes: some subjects substitute one preposition for another. Do they think 'on' and 'at' are interchangeable? At least they have used them so. We must not overlook the possible confusion due to certain similarities between NL and TL.

In most cases subjects seem to be fairly conscious
Regarding their use of the language and they are monitoring their speech. This claim is supported by the fact that most subjects have immediately applied self-correction mechanisms.

On the other hand, based on correct usage of A+P collocations (83%), it can be attributed to a simple slip of the tongue.

Although it seems obvious that Pakistani-Canadians' use of collocations is domain specific, more data involving subjects of different origins and native languages, is required to generalize any final conclusion and to know whether IL is affected.

Category 3:

It is interesting to note that the least TL language occurs within the least used category. In this case only 21 collocations are used: 12/21 (57%) in Ea and 9/21 (43%) in Na. Here TL usage is at its lowest point, i.e., 52%. This is one category in which higher TL use of collocations occurs in Na (67%) instead of Ea (42%). It does not follow the same trend as has been the case with all other categories.
NTL collocations can be divided into two types structurally:

1) Noun Phrases
   "quarter of", "two and a half".

2) Verb + Object
   "to have a trip", "got such a disease",
   "have a way for".

What immediately strikes one at first glance is that the indefinite article ellipsis characterizing the NTL noun phrase collocation is not a feature of the verb + object NTL collocations. Is this representative of a systematic relationship involving the presence or absence of a collocated verb? A second observation about the noun phrases above is that they both are specifically quantitative. NTL collocations, as in category 1, appear in expressions of quantity. Is the ellipsis here, then, a feature of quantification rather than structure?

The verb + object NTL collocation lacks the obvious similarity of the noun phrases. "To have a trip" may represent another lexical substitution, where a native
speaker would say "to take a trip" or "to go on a trip". "Got such a disease" may simply represent a tense error, or it may indicate a homophonic transfer from "caught such a disease". "Have a way for" is used where a native speaker might say "have any way to achieve". Although it is unclear from these collocations if any theoretical system links them, two structural features are shared: their transitive construction and their expression of action. Of course "got such a disease" is not really an action, but perhaps the internalization of the verb "get", as action (from other contexts), has taken place.

Of equal interest here is the relative infrequency of collocations of this type in the transcripts. One would expect intuitively more frequent appearances of idiomatic expressions, such as, "rough and tough" and "bury the hatchet". In this data, however, the only expression of this type which occurs is the use of "way of life". It seems probable that such idioms are simply not acquired by these subjects and therefore don't appear in their IL -- no such expression is recorded. Perhaps such idioms are culturally bound and therefore less susceptible to acquisition than other lexemes. What is also significant here is that the only strong idiom
utilized -- "way of life" is completely TL. Perhaps TL usage occurs when the idiom assumes extreme lexical marking -- that is, when the literal meaning is so clearly impossible that the L2 learner can recognize the chunk must be an idiom. Therefore the learner will be more likely to learn it as a chunk or collocation.

One would expect to have more NTL collocations in a more formal activity such as Ea since the subjects would probably be paying more attention to the contents they are trying to express in words than to the language or the words themselves. In addition, one might also expect more NTL collocations in this activity (Ea) due to the fact that questions are not anticipated and therefore verbal responses are not rehearsed. However, if these hypotheses were correct, one would expect a high proportion of TL collocations in Na. This, however, by and large, is not the case. In fact, more TL collocations occur in Ea and more NTL collocations occur in Na. Both, language and contents, are controlled by the speakers in both activities (Ea and Na). One might speculate that the speaker may not have had the opportunity to narrate his life story to other people very often. On the other hand, however, the speaker may
have well rehearsed the contents and the language concerning Ea through studying, listening to lectures, and discussing the contents with colleagues in his field.

This study shows that more collocations, in general, are used in Ea. Equal TL usage of collocations have occurred in category 2b; and higher TL usage of collocations and TL language have occurred in category 1, 2a and 2c. The only exception is category 3 where higher TL usage of collocations has occurred in Na.

4.3: RESULTS VS. INITIAL HYPOTHESES

Results very strongly support and validate my initial hypotheses:

1) **variation** across discourse domains is present;
2) **more** target-like collocations are found in the Work Talk Domain (i.e., Ea) and **fewer** target-like collocations are found in Life Story Domain (i.e., Na) (see Histogram II); and the null hypothesis that there is no statistical difference is rejected (see section
4.4: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The chi-square (X) test statistic can be used to determine whether the observed proportions differ significantly from a priori or theoretically expected proportions (Glass and Hopkins 1984:282);

and this is usually termed the "X goodness-of-fit test". There are different versions of the same formula; however, I have used the following one for the calculations:

\[ \chi^2 = \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \]
The critical values of chi-square, using Table D (Glass and Hopkins 1984:531), are:

- at $a = .05$ and $df = 1$, i.e., $\chi^2_{df=1} = 3.84$;
- at $a = .01$ and $df = 1$, i.e., $\chi^2_{df=1} = 6.64$;
- at $a = .001$ and $df = 1$, i.e., $\chi^2_{df=1} = 10.83$.

The null hypothesis is rejected in 8 out of 18 cases (i.e., 44.44%) of TL and NTL proportions in Na and Ea. For more detail see Table I (page 4 of 4).

**HYPOTHESIS # 1**

The hypothesis that there is variation in collocation correctness across discourse domains is confirmed by the differences found in the correctness of the subjects in the two discourse domains under study. Although the ranges (39% - 100% in Ea and 44% - 100% in Na) are similar, the distribution of the scores is
different, as can be seen in Histogram VI and as confirmed statistically in the discussion of hypothesis number 2.

HYPOTHESIS # 2

The following data are taken from Table I (page 4 of 4) bottom row titled 'ST/ACT' in the column titled 'AVERAGE'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Ea</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL Collocations</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>31.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL Collocations</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three chi-square values are significant at $a = .001$ and df = 1; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.

HYPOTHESIS # 3

The following data are the sum of collocation frequencies (subjects 1 - 10) taken from Table I bottom row titled 'ST/ACT'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TL Collocations</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>72.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL Collocations</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>39.25</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chi-square value is significant in case of TL
collocations at $a = .001$ ($a = .05$ when averages were used to calculate the chi-square) and $df = 1$; thus, the null hypothesis is rejected.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

The results of this study of Pakistani-Canadians' IL seem to illustrate that IL collocations tend to be:

1) Domain/Activity specific;
2) NTL collocations occur most often when:
   a) referring to quantification
   b) in T-unit initial position
   c) adjacent to parallel contextual and/or structural forms;
3) NTL collocations often contain:
   a) article ellipsis.

In addition, we can make a number of conjectures about IL collocations. It would seem that a wider semantic range for collocations, as compared to native speakers' usage, is a feature of Pakistani-Canadians' interlanguage. One might expect this, of course, since it is likely that a SL learner would have gained access to only a few contexts and domains.

Secondly, it is likely that collocation in IL is
more limited than in the TL: the learner may not view relationships as word associations, and hence substitute lexical items according to the context. These two points are linked in the sense that IL is a form of simple language. The use of wide semantic ranges for each lexeme and infrequent word associations are by their very nature elements of simple languages. It seems important to study other data sources to test the generalizability of these hypotheses. Furthermore, this suggests the need to carry out a taxonomic analysis of the ranges for the collocations.

The NTL usage within the subjects' IL does not affect comprehension for the native speaker. Possibly this is a function of the frequent repetition of various collocations. One might ask if these repetitions are due to the nature of the speech act, the jargon of the domain, the result of a limited vocabulary, or whether some other force is at work. Just because comprehension is not affected and communication is not hampered (whether or not fossilization has taken place), it should be realized that these tendencies mark speakers as non-natives, pronunciation notwithstanding.
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The data from this study suggests that collocations are domain specific, that is, Work Talk Domain or Exposition Activity in the sense that they are used more frequently, i.e., 351/549 or 64% in Ea and 198/549 or 36% in Na (see Histogram IV). In addition, higher TL collocation usage is present in Ea, i.e., 233/351 or 66% versus 127/198 or 64% in Na. Furthermore, this initial analysis indicates that NTL collocations do not occur randomly. They may be present as a result of the discourse function of their context (as in quantification examples), the effects of language transfer, or their own inherent structural properties.

Finally, the analysis of this data seems to support the notion of a core IL. What this core IL actually is remains for future research to determine. One would need to study a more extensive data base before making any generalizations about core IL features.

As far as article ellipses are concerned, this study has shown that articles in conjunction with collocations are used in a TL manner more often in the Work Talk Domain or Exposition Activity than in the Life Story Domain or Narrative Activity. Also another
CONCLUSION

interesting phenomenon that has been noted is that frequency of the use of articles across Narrative and Exposition activities or Life Story and Work Talk Domains changes fairly dramatically. Article ellipses have been noted in Na more often.

This study has taken a short step into the world of adult Pakistani-Canadians' English as a second language. It has presented the evidence that there exists an IL in adult Pakistani-Canadians' English language. Furthermore, it has highlighted areas that merit further research and study. For example, an investigation of psycholinguistic reasons behind TL and NTL use of collocations in a longitudinal study might provide an evidence of fossilization. Any of these undertakings would be a challenge and of course Pakistani-Canadians' IL is waiting for further research and exploration.

QUESTIONS/IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. What are the psycholinguistic reasons behind higher TL usage in Ea?

2. Why is there a greater occurrence of article ellipsis in Na?

3. What are the ranges of collocations in terms of
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Taxonomic analysis?

A possibility remains open that IL is specific to domain/activity and it may not be transferable -- thus leaving opportunity for much further research in this area. In addition, it would be desirable to consider and study Exposition Activity in Life Story Domain and Narrative Activity in Work Talk Domain. Furthermore, the prospect for a longitudinal study to provide evidence of fossilization is there.
APPENDIX A
ELICITATION INSTRUMENT

LIFE STORY DOMAIN / NARRATIVE ACTIVITY (Na):

1. Tell me about your family.
2. What kind of work are your brothers and sisters doing?
3. Tell me a real story of your life -- something that has happened to you, a surprising, horrifying or shocking event. It may be an incident that is funny or scary, or simply an interesting event that you would like to share with me.

WORK TALK DOMAIN / EXPOSITION ACTIVITY (Ea):

1. Did you go to school in the old country?
2. What did you study there?
3. What did you do to earn a living in Pakistan? What was your trade or profession?
4. Were you required to upgrade your previous studies, your trade or professional skills in order to secure employment here in Canada?
5. Tell me, what do you do now?
What exactly is involved in your line of work?
What are the demands of your trade or profession?
Describe your job.
APPENDIX B

DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECTS

THE FOLLOWING APPLIES TO ALL TEN SUBJECTS WHO ARE DESCRIBED IN THE FOLLOWING PAGES.

1) To protect the identities of the subjects, names and some other information have been changed.

2) F = Formally educated

3) I = Informally educated

4) M = Married

5) U = Unmarried

6) N/A = Not Applicable

7) All subjects were born in Pakistan. They are now naturalized Canadian citizens. All of them, however, have dual citizenship.

8) Their English language proficiency can be subdivided into the following three categories:

A) LEVEL 1: Either no English or a word here and there, subjects understand little or no English at all.
B) LEVEL 2: Subjects at this level are able to understand and produce some common conversational English words and phrases but they are unable to use English as a significant conversational tool. They are at the receptive level.

C) LEVEL 3: Subjects are at the survival level. They can make themselves understood using a combination of words and gestures. They often tend to change language code -- occasionally replacing English words with words from their native language. They can communicate ideas, however, but with difficulty.

D) LEVEL 4: Subjects have little difficulty communicating their ideas in English, they use considerably fewer gestures and words from their native language. Errors are made with more complex forms and structures.

E) LEVEL 5: Subjects have a fairly high
SUBJECTS

degree of proficiency in English and approach native like proficiency in the case of some subjects. Use of idioms and metaphors is somewhat difficult for this group. Pronunciation is definitely not native-like.

NOTE: All subjects in this study are at level 4 and 5 (five subjects at level 4 and five subjects at level 5).
SUBJECT NUMBER........... 1 (F)
NAME...................... Ahmad Ali
AGE...................... 38
YEARS IN CANADA........... 10
MARITAL STATUS........... M
CHILDREN............... 2
   MALE...... 1 (9 yrs.)
   FEMALE... 1 (4 yrs.)
EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. BA
   CANADA... Lumber Grading Certificate
JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Lumber Grader
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 4
COMMENTS: Ahmad was an insurance salesman in Pakistan. His only contact with the target language group is in his place of employment where he works as a lumber grader. He would prefer a 'white-collar job' but under the circumstances accepted a 'blue-collar job' because of the language barrier at the time. He is now quite content, but not very happy. His children speak English at home although he is trying hard to motivate them and create an interest for them to learn Urdu. He has no other relatives in Canada.
SUBJECT NUMBER........ 2 (I)
NAME.................... Yousaf Kamran
AGE...................... 47
YEARS IN CANADA....... 18
MARITAL STATUS........ M
CHILDREN................. 2
    MALE..... 1 (18 yrs.)
    FEMALE... 1 (12 yrs.)
EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. Marine Engineer Diploma
CANADA... N/A
JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Marine Engineer II
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 5
COMMENTS: He was a marine engineer in Karachi, Pakistan. He now works for B.C. Ferries as 2nd. Engineer, very happy and satisfied. His son is studying to be a criminologist. His wife has a part time job in a food processing plant. They want their children to learn Urdu as an additional language and have succeeded to some extent. They also feel very strongly about the religious education of all Pakistani-Canadian children. Both Urdu and English are used at home. He has one sister living in Canada.
SUBJECT NUMBER........... 3 (F)

NAME...................... Mohammad Usman

AGE....................... 43

YEARS IN CANADA......... 4

MARITAL STATUS.......... M

CHILDREN............... 3

MALE....... 2 (6 and 3 yrs.)

FEMALE... 1 (2 yrs.)

EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. MAS

CANADA... Ph.D. (Pending)

JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Student

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 4

COMMENTS: He is a Ph.D. (Economics) student. He has taught graduate students and supervised research projects. He has been in Canada for 4 yrs. and still hasn't overcome cultural shock. He finds social adjustment very difficult because his social and religious values are often in conflict with Canadian cultural values. However, these difficulties provide ample motivation for him to complete his studies at an accelerated rate so he can return to Pakistan as soon as possible. His wife is here but his children are in Pakistan.
SUBJECT NUMBER........ 4 (I)

NAME................. Zameer Sheikh

AGE.................... 43

YEARS IN CANADA....... 11

MARITAL STATUS........ M

CHILDREN.............. 0

   MALE..... 0

   FEMALE... 0

EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. Grade 12

   CANADA... N/A

JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Bookkeeper

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 4

COMMENTS: He was a bank manager in Pakistan. He
told me he had little formal training, if any, in the field of accounting. After working as
security guard and airline ticket sales clerk, he has settled for a bookkeeper's position with
an accounting firm. He is not very satisfied but has accommodated himself to reality. His
two brothers-in-law are living in Canada.
SUBJECT NUMBER ........... 5 (I)
NAME ..................... Akbar Akhtar Shah
AGE ...................... 32
YEARS IN CANADA ........... 14
MARITAL STATUS .......... U
CHILDREN ................. 0
   MALE ...... 0
   FEMALE ... 0
EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. FA (Grade 12)
   CANADA... N/A
JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Architectural Technician
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 4
COMMENTS: He had earned his grade 12 certificate in Pakistan before he came to Canada. He enrolled in the Architectural Drafting program but for undisclosed reasons couldn't complete the program. He worked at various kinds of jobs. He now, however, works for a health care agency looking after elderly citizens. He intends to stay in Canada. Two brothers and two sisters live in Vancouver.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>6 (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>Rashid Bhatti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEARS IN CANADA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>PAKISTAN. BSc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STATUS IN CANADA</td>
<td>Correctional Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMENTS</td>
<td>He earned a degree in science from Panjab University. He lived in different countries in the Far East. He moved to Canada approximately 14 years ago. His daughter is attending university and wants to become a doctor; his son is in high school and intends to follow in his sister's footsteps. He has two sisters in Toronto. Urdu is the dominant language at home. Both children are 100% proficient (all four basic skills) in Urdu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT NUMBER............ 7 (F)

NAME....................... Majid Waseem

AGE......................... 44

YEARS IN CANADA............ 21

MARITAL STATUS............. M

CHILDREN..................... 5

MALE..... 2 (20, 5 yrs.)

FEMALE... 3 (17, 14, 11 yrs.)

EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. BA, LLB.

CANADA... Dip. Admn.

JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Industrial Relations Counsellor

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 5

COMMENTS: He practised as a lawyer in Pakistan. In Canada he is active in municipal level elections; however, he has never held any position. He has been in Canada for 21 years. His son is in his fourth year of a Business Administration program. His daughter is determined to become a doctor. His social contact with native speakers of the TL is more than that of any other subject. English and Urdu are both practised at home.
SUBJECT NUMBER........ 8 (F)

NAME...................... Anwar Choudhry

AGE...................... 45

YEARS IN CANADA......... 22

MARITAL STATUS......... M

CHILDREN............... 1

   MALE.... 1 (26 yrs.)

   FEMALE... 0

EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. BSc, BEd.

   CANADA... N/A

JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Import/Export Co.

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 5

COMMENTS: He is a businessman. A few years back he had a radio show to meet the needs of the East Indian community. He owns and runs a laundry store. He is not very active now due to his ailing health. He has an adopted son (his wife's nephew) and three grandchildren. He has two other relatives in Vancouver. He was happy to be part of this research.
SUBJECT NUMBER......... 9 (F)
NAME..................... Nawaz Din
AGE...................... 34
YEARS IN CANADA........ 2
MARITAL STATUS........... U
CHILDREN.................. 0
                       MALE...... 0
                       FEMALE... 0
EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. MSc
               CANADA... Ph.D. (Pending)
JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Student
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 4
COMMENTS: A graduate student of Chemistry. He
definitely plans to return to Pakistan. He has
great difficulty adjusting himself to the
Canadian culture. Lack of social life and his
native food is a problem for him. Cultural
differences make him homesick and is in a
constant state of nostalgia. He has no
relatives in Canada. He is not married. He had
received some informal training and practice in
spoken English before he came to Canada.
SUBJECT NUMBER .......... 10 (I)
NAME .................... Mohammad Latif
AGE ..................... 38
YEARS IN CANADA ......... 15
MARITAL STATUS .......... M
CHILDREN ................. 3
    MALE ..... 0
    FEMALE ... 3 (19, 18, 15 yrs.)
EDUCATION --- PAKISTAN. FA (Grade 12)
    CANADA... N/A
JOB STATUS IN CANADA... Accounting and Insurance Agency
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY... Level 5
COMMENTS: He was an elementary school teacher in Pakistan. He served in the armed forces as an officer. He came to Canada 15 yrs. ago and worked as a life insurance salesman. He now, however, manages his own insurance agency; in addition, he works as a bookkeeper and income tax consultant. One daughter is studying medicine and another one is in business administration school. His wife works in a supervisory capacity in a garment manufacturing company. Urdu and English are both practised at home although English is the dominant language.
### TABLES

**COLLOCATION FREQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>ACT.</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Ea</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Ea</th>
<th>Na</th>
<th>Ea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub. 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>60% (3)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>40% (4)</td>
<td>43% (3)</td>
<td>39% (7)</td>
<td>59% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>40% (2)</td>
<td>70% (5)</td>
<td>57% (3)</td>
<td>59% (11)</td>
<td>41% (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>50% (3)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>87% (7)</td>
<td>100% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>50% (3)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>87% (7)</td>
<td>100% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td>67% (4)</td>
<td>100% (9)</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>33% (2)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>87% (7)</td>
<td>100% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>100% (2)</td>
<td>71% (12)</td>
<td>100% (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>29% (5)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>87% (7)</td>
<td>100% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ST/ACT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TL</th>
<th>HTL</th>
<th>TOTAL ACT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69% (11)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% (10)</td>
<td>69% (36)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% (16)</td>
<td>70% (16)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% (5)</td>
<td>31% (5)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47% (9)</td>
<td>47% (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABBREVIATIONS:**

TL = target like  
HTL = non-target like  
Na = narrative activity  
ACT = activity  
Ea = exposition activity  
SUB = subject  
ST = sub-total  
CAT = category  
P = formally educated  
I = informally educated

**TABLE I**

(Page 1 of 4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>ACT.</th>
<th>SUB.</th>
<th>4 (I)</th>
<th>5 (I)</th>
<th>6 (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>42% (5)</td>
<td>40% (2)</td>
<td>44% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>Ra</td>
<td>58% (7)</td>
<td>60% (3)</td>
<td>56% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a
| TL   | 31% (5) | 38% (3) | 45% (10) | 64% (9) | 70% (28) |
| NTL  | 100% (1)| 69% (11)| 62% (5)  | 55% (12)| 36% (5)  | 30% (12)|
| ST   | 1       | 16      | 8       | 22      | 14       | 40      |

2b
| TL   | 100% (1)| 50% (2) | 33% (1) | 71% (5) | 50% (1) |
| NTL  | 50% (2) | 67% (2) | 29% (2) |         | 50% (1) |
| ST   | 1       | 4       | 3       | 7       | 2       |

2c
| TL   | 100% (2)| 100% (2)| 57% (4) | 100% (5)| 86% (12)|
| NTL  | 100% (1)|         | 43% (3) |         | 14% (2) |
| ST   | 2       | 1       | 2       | 7       | 5       | 14     |

3
| TL   | 60% (3) | 50% (1) |         | 33% (1) |
| NTL  | 40% (2) | 50% (1) | 100% (1)| 67% (2) |
| ST   | 5       | 2       | 1       | 3       |

ST/ACT
| TL   | 75% (3)| 39% (15)| 44% (8) | 50% (25)| 79% (22)| 74% (65)|
| NTL  | 25% (1)| 61% (23)| 56% (10)| 50% (28)| 21% (6) | 26% (23)|
| TOTAL ACT. | 4 | 38 | 18 | 56 | 28 | 88 |

**ABBREVIATIONS:**

TL = target like  
NTL = non-target like  
Na = narrative activity  
ACT = activity  
Ra = exposition activity  
SUB = subject  
St = sub-total  
CAT = category  
P = formally educated  
I = informally educated

**TABLE I**

(Page 2 of 4)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>ACT.</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Ra</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Ra</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Ra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
<td>(P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>50%(3)</td>
<td>67%(10)</td>
<td>100%(2)</td>
<td>75%(6)</td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>50%(3)</td>
<td>33%(5)</td>
<td>100%(2)</td>
<td>25%(2)</td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>67%(6)</td>
<td>84%(16)</td>
<td>100%(3)</td>
<td>58%(7)</td>
<td>40%(2)</td>
<td>68%(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>33%(3)</td>
<td>16%(3)</td>
<td>42%(5)</td>
<td>60%(3)</td>
<td>32%(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>80%(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>67%(4)</td>
<td>89%(8)</td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td>100%(5)</td>
<td>100%(2)</td>
<td>100%(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>33%(2)</td>
<td>11%(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>80%(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>20%(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ST/ACT

| TL   | 67%(18) | 80%(35) | 100%(6) | 73%(19) | 50%(4) | 72%(26) |
| NTL  | 33%(9)  | 20%(9)  | 27%(7)  | 50%(4)  | 28%(10) |      |
| TOTAL ACT. | 27 | 44 | 6 | 26 | 8 | 36 |

ABBREVIATIONS:

TL = target like
N TL = non-target like
Ha = narrative activity
ACT = activity
Ra = exposition activity
SUB = subject
ST = sub-total
CAT = category
F = formally educated
I = informally educated
### TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT.</th>
<th>ACT.</th>
<th>SUB. 1-10</th>
<th>ST/CAT. X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ha + Ha)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE I

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>83% (5)</td>
<td>100% (3)</td>
<td>56% (34)</td>
<td>64% (72)</td>
<td>61% (106)</td>
<td>13.62 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>17% (1)</td>
<td>4% (27)</td>
<td>36% (41)</td>
<td>39% (68)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.54 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35% (61)</td>
<td>65% (113)</td>
<td>32% (174)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2a

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>38% (5)</td>
<td>67% (4)</td>
<td>58% (38)</td>
<td>64% (94)</td>
<td>62% (132)</td>
<td>23.75 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>62% (8)</td>
<td>33% (2)</td>
<td>42% (26)</td>
<td>36% (54)</td>
<td>38% (82)</td>
<td>8.24 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31% (66)</td>
<td>65% (146)</td>
<td>39% (214)</td>
<td>31.42 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2b

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>71% (12)</td>
<td>71% (20)</td>
<td>71% (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>100% (1)</td>
<td>100% (2)</td>
<td>29% (5)</td>
<td>29% (8)</td>
<td>29% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38% (17)</td>
<td>62% (28)</td>
<td>8% (45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 2c

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>80% (4)</td>
<td>80% (4)</td>
<td>82% (37)</td>
<td>84% (42)</td>
<td>83% (79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>20% (1)</td>
<td>20% (1)</td>
<td>18% (8)</td>
<td>18% (8)</td>
<td>17% (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47% (45)</td>
<td>53% (50)</td>
<td>17% (95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TABLE 3

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>67% (6)</td>
<td>42% (5)</td>
<td>52% (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>33% (3)</td>
<td>5% (7)</td>
<td>40% (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43% (9)</td>
<td>57% (12)</td>
<td>4% (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ST/ACT

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>56% (14)</td>
<td>65% (11)</td>
<td>64% (127)</td>
<td>66% (233)</td>
<td>66% (360)</td>
<td>31.21 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>44% (11)</td>
<td>35% (6)</td>
<td>36% (71)</td>
<td>34% (118)</td>
<td>34% (189)</td>
<td>11.68 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACT.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36% (198)</td>
<td>64% (351)</td>
<td>GT (549)</td>
<td>42.63 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ABBREVIATIONS:

- TL = target like
- NTL = non-target like
- Na = narrative activity
- ACT = activity
- Ea = exposition activity
- SUB = subject
- ST = sub-total
- CAT = category
- GT = grand total
- I = informally educated

* = p < .05 ; ** = p < .01 ; *** = p < .001

**TABLE I**

(Page 4 of 4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank No.</th>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Number of Collocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2a (V + P)</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (Prep. lead.)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2c (A + P)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2b (N + P)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (Non - Prep.)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 549

**TABLE II**
TABLE III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>NTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2c (A + P)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2b (N + P)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2a (V + P)</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (Prep. lead.)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (Non - Prep.)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV

**NARRATIVE ACTIVITY vs. EXPOSITION ACTIVITY**

and

**FORMALLY EDUCATED vs. INFORMALLY EDUCATED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Na vs. Ea</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>F vs. I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 TL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>&gt;106&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&gt;68&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a TL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>&gt;132&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>&gt;82&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b TL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&gt;32&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&gt;13&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c TL</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>&gt;79&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>&gt;16&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 TL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt;11&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>&gt;10&lt;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This graph represents Table I (p. 4 of 4) 2nd. last column titled "average".
HISTOGRAM III
TL COLLOCATIONS BY SUBJECT AND/OR DOMAIN

THIS GRAPH REPRESENTS TABLE I BOTTOM ROW TITLED 'ST/ACT'.
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TOTAL 549

NTL 199 34.42%

TL 360 65.58%
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FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

1. The following information is obtained from Statistics Canada, Vancouver, B.C. Canada, For reference information see 'Statistics Canada' in bibliography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>PSO*</th>
<th>PMO**</th>
<th>TPC***</th>
<th>PSO %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro. Vancouver</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,380,729</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>2,883,367</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>24,880</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>25,309,331</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pakistanis of Single Origin
** Pakistanis of Multiple Origin
*** Total Population of Canada

2. Professor Larry Selinker (The University of Michigan) referred to it when he was teaching a graduate course -- ENED 543 / RESEARCH IN ESL --
FOOTNOTES

during the summer session 1986 at the University of British Columbia, British Columbia, Canada.

3. Notions of such a linguistic system have been developed independently by Jakobovits (1969) and Nemser (1971).

4. The notion 'interlanguage' is introduced in Selinker (1969).

5. A) 'Acquisition' and 'learning' are used interchangeably in this thesis. For further details see Krashen (1981).

   B) "The usefulness of the distinction between acquisition and learning has been emphasised by Lambert (1966) and the possibility that the latter may benefit from a study of the former has been suggested by Carroll (1966)." (Corder 1974:20)

CHAPTER II

1. George Whitworth, Indian English: an examination of
the idiom made by Indians in writing English (n.d.). Also F.Q. French (1964), Common Errors in English, London.


3. Teaching method and style; teacher's personality and sex; student's motivation and aptitude; their attitude towards TL, people and culture. What I would like to point out is that Asian immigrants may prefer an authoritative teaching style instead of a North American democratic teaching style; or students coming from a male dominated society may prefer a male teacher; and in some cultures and customs school is seen as a place in which to be 'taught' and not necessarily one in which to 'learn'.

4. Hughes' footnote explains: "I shall make the simplified assumption that the learner knows only one language and is learning only one language."
5. Two broad categories of errors: linguistic and psycholinguistic. Linguistic is also known as pedagogical because of its relevance to the design of curriculum and teaching materials and/or aids for regular or remedial SL courses and because it provides feedback about the efficacy of pedagogical practice. The psycholinguistic category looks at different ways (how and why) languages are learned, and at the relationship between native language acquisition and foreign language learning. Svartvik (1973) named it 'performance analysis'.

6. See footnote number 5.

7. Selinker introduced the term in 1969.

8. See footnote number 3.

9. See footnote number 3.

10. See footnote number 3.
FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER III


2. All subjects share geographical background, i.e., they are all from Greater Vancouver (in Canada) and from Lahore (in Pakistan).


4. See Terminology for definition -- section 1.3.

5. See Ch. I for definition of "error".


CHAPTER IV

1. A) Consult Table I (4 pages) for all numerical data. B) In most cases decimal numbers and percentages have been rounded off to the nearest tenth.
2. It is the average of the 'ST/ACT' (Sub-total/Activity) of the subjects number 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Consult TL collocations in Ea and Na -- bottom row of Table I.

3. It is the average of the 'ST/ACT' (Sub-total/Activity) of the subjects number 2, 4, 5, and 10. Refer to TL collocations in Ea and Na -- bottom row of Table I.
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