

An Error Analysis: Orthographic Errors Produced by Australian KFL Learners

Author/Contributor:

Shin, Seong-Chul

Publication details:

Teaching Korean as a Foreign Language

v. 25-26

pp. 361-387

1598-8201 (ISSN)

Publication Date:

2001

License:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>

Link to license to see what you are allowed to do with this resource.

Downloaded from <http://hdl.handle.net/1959.4/39446> in <https://unsworks.unsw.edu.au> on 2022-06-26

An Error Analysis: Orthographic Errors Produced by Australian KFL Learners¹

Seong-Chul Shin

*Korean Studies Program, School of Languages and Linguistics,
University of New South Wales, Sydney, 2052. s.shin@unsw.edu.au*

신성철. 2001. 호주 한국어 학습자의 철자 오류 분석 연구. *외국어로서의 한국어 교육*, 25-26 권. 361-387. 본 연구는 세 가지 목적이 있는 바, 1) 영어 원어민 한국어 학습자들이 빈번하게 오류를 범하는 철자들이 어떤 것들인지를 알아보고, 2) 이들 철자오류를 형태와 빈도에 따라 분류해 보며, 3) 그런 오류들이 일어나는 원인을 잠정적이거나 밝혀보려는 것이다. 사용한 데이터는 호주의 1대학교와 2대학교에서 1999 년과 2000 년에 실시한 정규시험 (중간, 기말고사) 시험지이며, 비영어권 학생들의 것을 제외하고 영어권 학생 60 명이 작성한 130 개의 시험지를 조사하였다. Corder (1981: 38-9)에 의거, 상호보완적인 두 가지 형태의 텍스트 즉, 자유작문식 텍스트와 재구성형식 텍스트만을 선택하여 이로부터 총 949 개의 오류 철자를 추출하고 분석하였다. 분석결과, 3 개의 형태에 압도적으로 많은 오류가 집중되어 있었으며 나머지 20 여개의 오류 형태도 빈도가 적지 않음을 발견하였다. 총 40 여개의 오류형태를 그 특성에 따라 범주화시킨 결과 5 개의 유형으로 오류형태를 풀지울 수 있었다. 오류의 원인으로서는 여러 요인을 유추할 수 있었으나 그 중 두 가지 요인이 두드러졌는 바, 이는 영어와 한국어 사이의 음가나 음운형태의 차이 등으로 인한 음성학적 전이나 방해로 인한 것과, 한국어 자체에 특정 음절간의 발음이 유사하여 혼동을 일으킨 경우였다. (University of New South Wales)

1. INTRODUCTION

In the past ten years or so, Korean has been taught as part of a degree program in a number of Australian universities, and the number of students who study Korean as a foreign or second language (KFL / KSL) is relatively small but sustainable. Much time and effort has been directed to the development of curriculum and teaching materials, and students' proficiency development has been largely neglected. Presently, instructors of Korean work with limited knowledge regarding the areas of difficulty in students' acquisition of Korean and the effective strategies to rectify many of the errors that are observable in their sentence production. It is timely and necessary to examine the

¹ This is a revised version of a paper which I presented at the International Association of Korean Language Education (IAKLE) 2001 Conference held at Korea University in August 2001. I thank Dr Chung-Sok Suh, Director of the Korea-Australasia Research Centre at the University of New South Wales for the generous travel funds.

sentence production of the learners and address the key areas of difficulty in students' acquisition of Korean. There are a number of linguistic levels through which errors are assigned and examined, i.e. orthography or phonology, lexicon, morphology, syntax and discourse, and as a starting point this study focuses on orthographic or spelling errors. This report is based on the result of a pilot study, which was undertaken as part of a larger project of error analysis and pedagogical strategies. It is hoped that the result of this study can make a partial but useful contribution to the field of Korean spelling error analysis, in particular for the construction of a working hypothesis, a comprehensive error classification system and an effective pedagogical strategy.

1.1. Methods in Error Analysis

There are four major approaches which have been widely utilised for the analysis of problems that are observed in foreign or second language productions, namely, descriptive analysis, contrastive analysis (CA), error analysis (EA) and discourse / conversational analysis. Each of these four principal approaches has its own merits and limitations. In fact, they are broadly inter-related and complementary to each other. If one would like to provide a complete picture of learner language and the solution of various problematic areas, he/she will need to develop an integrated framework, encompassing the merits and advantages of all the four approaches and supplementing their weaknesses and disadvantages. This paper is certainly not intended to attempt such a work, but there is nothing to prevent the researcher doing it, thereby examining the totality of the problems associated with the learner's production. In the meantime, we will need to rely on what is currently available and what is best relevant.

The main concern of this paper is the learner language and more specifically an analysis of learners' orthographic errors as mentioned above. The study of errors was initiated by a desire to improve language pedagogy and as an alternative response to the weakness of contrastive analysis. Error analysis (see, for example, Corder 1967; Dulay, Burt and Krashen 1982; Sohn 1986; Taylor 1986; Lennon 1991; James 1998) essentially concerns the learner language itself and acknowledges the learner's current L2 competence as a creative and transitional system (termed as 'interlanguage', see Selinker 1972). The EA approach has an advantage in that it accommodates various range of error sources, such as L1, L2, communicative and human factors, but it also has a number of limitations. Among others, weaknesses in methodological procedures and scope are the most frequently mentioned criticism (Bell 1974; Long and Sato 1984). Corder (1967, 1981), whose work is regarded as a major contribution to the development of EA research, notes the significance of errors in three aspects: (1) they provide the teacher with a useful information about how much the learner has learnt, (2) they provide the researcher with evidence about how language is learnt, and (3) they are indispensable devices to the learner to learn the target language. For a method, Corder (1971a, 1981) and others suggest the following five steps: (1) collection of a sample, (2) identification of errors, (3) description of errors, (4) explanation of errors, and (5) evaluation of errors.

In collecting samples, natural and spontaneous ones are generally preferred, but it is not easy to obtain such samples. As an alternative, Corder (1981) suggests two kinds of elicitation: clinical and experimental. Clinical elicitation requires the learner to produce

any voluntary data orally or in writing, while experimental methods use special tools to elicit data containing specific linguistic items.

In identifying errors, Corder (1967, 1981) also makes an important point: the distinction between errors and mistakes. Errors represent a lack of knowledge and competence, while mistakes are the result of processing failures that occur while performing their competence. In this regard, errors tend to occur consistently and mistakes inconsistently. He argues that EA research should be restricted to the study of errors while eliminating mistakes from the analysis.

For the description of errors, there are a number of frameworks suggested according to the linguistic level of description and the systematicity. Some are superficial and others are more systematic. For example, Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) suggests four categories of error: (1) omissions, (2) additions, (3) misinformations, and (4) misorderings. Corder (1974) identifies three types of error: (1) presystematic errors, (2) systematic errors, and (3) postsystematic errors. Both frameworks have advantages and disadvantages. Ellis (1994) explains that the former framework may have an advantage that can give a pedagogic information (e.g. the error item and frequency), but it provides little insight into how an L2 is learnt. The latter, instead, has an advantage in that it can provide explanations for the learner's behaviour in L2 contexts by giving accounts of why and how, but it may be difficult to utilize as it requires the researcher to interview the learner.

Explanation of errors is considered to be the most important stage for EA research as it involves the processes of second language acquisition. It is concerned with the source of the error. A number of different frameworks to establish the cause of errors have been put forward. For instance, Richards (1971b) identifies three sources of errors: (1) interference errors, (2) intralingual errors, and (3) developmental errors. A more comprehensive framework, however, is found in Taylor (1986), where he broadly categorises the error source into four: (1) psycholinguistic, (2) sociolinguistic, (3) epistemic, and (4) discourse sources. Although there are a number of different ways to identify the cause for error, it is usual in error analysis to work on three principal sources of error (Richards 1971b), that is, (1) interlingual, (2) intralingual, and (3) induced errors. Interlingual and intralingual errors are often further subdivided. For example, Lott (1983) identifies three interlingual categories: (1) overextension of analogy, (2) transfer of structure, and (3) interlingual/intralingual errors. Richards (1971b) distinguishes four intralingual categories: (1) overgeneralization, (2) ignorance of rule restrictions, (3) incomplete application of rules, and (4) false concepts. Induced errors (see Stenson, 1974) account for the nature of the instruction (e.g. teaching techniques or materials) the learner has received. As this paper is concerned with the study of orthographic errors only, all these outlines on EA research may not be applicable to this present study, but it is possible to utilise the ideas as a general framework.

1.2. EA Research in Orthographic Errors

As pointed out by James et al (1993), the norms in grammar and pronunciation can vary in a foreign language situation, as long as communication is not hindered. In fact, it seems that tolerance or acceptability in learner language has been widened since the popular but misled introduction of communicative methodology where meaning and

fluency take much higher priority than form and to specify the necessity of native speaker norms in English as an international language contexts might have nurtured tolerance towards acceptable norms. Also, influential studies of learner language such as Selinker, 1972 and 1992; Tarone, 1983; Namser, 1971 where the intermediate, transitional and approximate nature of the learner language system is emphasised might have led to generous perceptions towards learners' errors in second language learning and teaching. Unfortunately but understandably, the same tolerance or acceptability does not apply to orthography. Orthography or spelling is uncompromising, and there are only two options to evaluate: correct or incorrect. No approximations are allowed in spelling. I believe this is the starting point for one who wants to venture into this field.

Despite the complex sound-symbol relationship in Korean, there are very few studies in Korean spelling error analysis, which is not surprising when considering the small amount of literature concerning language acquisition of Korean, which in turn reflects the relatively short education history of KFL/ KSL. There are numerous error analysis studies on English and other European languages, and studies of orthographic errors are also rich. After observing many of the orthographic studies, Bebout (1985: 570) evaluates the nature of the studies as falling into three main types: 'which words cause the most spelling difficulty, where errors are most likely to occur in words, or why some words or types of words yield more errors.' To ascertain the key areas of weakness in Korean orthography, the current study is focused on types of errors rather than the types of words that cause problems.

Bebout, who tested two groups of subjects learning English as a first and as a second language by using eight error categories, reports that there were significant differences between the subject groups in three categories (involving one consonant and two vowel symbols), but there was no significant difference between the groups on the other vowel and consonant categories. This result indicates that there are areas of more difficulty in spelling for second language learners and that there are areas of intrinsic orthographic difficulty, regardless of the learner groups. The fact that there are comparative and intrinsic areas of difficulty signifies that there are different causes of errors according to the group, thus requiring different spelling strategies to rectify the problems. The study by James et al (1993), where spellings produced by bilingual subjects were investigated, categorizes the types of errors into three, namely, L1 interference, non-interference and dual (or multiple) origin. The three types of errors are further sub-categorized into such types as mispronunciations, phoneme-to-grapheme, lexical cognate, overgeneralizations, homophone confusion and letter naming. James et al found that there is a strong L1 influence on L2 production (i.e. spelling errors) and that it is possible to avoid or reduce the orthographic errors by identifying the potential problematic areas through contrastive analysis. Similar findings and claims can be seen in Sohn (1986) where composition errors produced by American university students learning Korean were examined. Sohn finds four types of orthographic errors in his study, and these are graphic mismatch, phonemic transcription, wrong pronunciation and wrong graphic association of sound features. Sohn claims that much of the error types are attributable to three types of confusion concerning the allophonic Korean consonants, nasals and laterals, and some vowel sounds. As he observed, phonological interference from L1 (English) was the strongest factor of these confusions.

The aim of this study is threefold: 1) to identify the orthographic features that present particular difficulties to English native speakers learning Korean as a foreign language at two Australian universities; 2) to classify those orthographic errors in terms of their type and frequency; and 3) to provide possible explanation for the cause of those problematic orthographic features. Although it falls outside the primary aim of this study, a brief discussion is offered for pedagogic strategies to be used in the second language learners' spelling.

2. METHOD

2.1. Subjects

The subjects selected in this study are 60 2nd and 3rd Year students from Griffith University and the University of New South Wales. As this study was intended to focus on English native speaker learners of Korean (ENSLK), there was a casual subject selection process. Out of 94 students in total, 34 students who were not or were considered to be not native speakers of English are not included for the purpose of this study. These students have learned Korean as a foreign language for about two to three years, and they were native speakers of English or were deemed to have English as their first language. Among the 60 students in this study, there are 26 3rd Year students and 34 2nd Year students. By institution, 18 3rd Yr and 23 2nd Yr students come from Griffith, and 8 3rd Yr and 11 2nd Yr students come from UNSW.

2.2. Data²

The data used in this study comes from written examination papers administered during the 1st and 2nd semesters in 1999 and 2000 at the two universities. Out of 182 papers in total, 130 papers were selected for analysis, and the other papers were excluded due to the above-mentioned reasons. The type of examinations that the current study is concerned with is short written, mid-semester and end-of-semester examinations. The main reason for the decision not to include homework types of data (e.g. worksheets, essays) is that most of them do not represent the true nature of the students' proficiency (orthographic knowledge in this case) in Korean since they are often corrected by native speakers of Korean. The study uses two classes of composition data: a free composition type of data and a reformulation type of data (Corder 1981:38-9). Accordingly, the textual data selected for this study consists of short answer questions, translation tests and free/ essay composition tests. In this way, it is hoped that the constraints of textual data will be complemented, thereby increasing the validity of the findings.

2.3. Procedure

Identifying orthographic errors requires a decision-making process which distinguishes between orthographic and other levels of errors, i.e. lexical, morphological and syntactic. In this study, the focus will be on phonology and graphology-related errors (i.e. errors relating to phonemes and graphemes): phonemic errors (i.e. those relating to

² Data were collected from five Australian universities. In the present paper only Griffith and UNSW data are analysed. The other data will also be analysed as part of a larger project.

sounds) and graphemic errors (i.e. those relating to written symbols), although in physical representation they exist as one unit (e.g. *bin* for *pin* in English; *dal* for *tal* or *ttal* ‘moon’ / ‘mask’ / ‘daughter’ in Korean)³. This way, orthographic errors are distinguished from morphology-related errors which are related to word forms (e.g. *chin.gu.kwa* for *chin.gu.wa* ‘with a friend’), lexical errors related to ‘meanings’ (e.g. *jag.a.seo* for *jeog.eo.seo* ‘small in size’ / ‘small in number’) and syntactic errors related to the functions of grammatical items (e.g. *hwa.leul.naess.eun.de.do* for *hwa.leul.nass.neun.de.do* / ‘even if (I) got angry’). Therefore, this study does not include misspellings related to lexical, morphological and syntactic errors.

After identifying orthographic errors, legible misspelled words were selected and listed in Korean along with correct spellings, then transliterated in Roman letters. Each misspelling was classified according to the phonemic/graphemic features and coded by error type (e.g. *ae* for *e*). If one word contains more than one type of error (e.g. *sam.po* for *san.bo* / ‘taking a walk’), the errors were classified into two or more types (i.e. *m* for *n* and *p* for *b*). Numbers of each error type were computed and calculations were made of the distribution and relative frequencies of the error types. Finally, attempts were made to categorize the pattern of error types according to their nature and frequency.

Another thing to note here is that from preliminary observations, many ‘errors’ were noticed in transliterations of foreign loan words into Han-geul. Although these might not be properly considered as spelling errors, there are nonetheless orthodox orthographic forms for loan words, and an increasing number of dictionaries list them for reference and instructors of KFL will correct the ill-formed transliterations. Considering this reality, a decision was made to include unorthodox transliterations in the selection, but to categorize them separately.

3. RESULTS⁴

In all, 949 misspelled items were selected and analysed. In terms of frequency, there were three most frequent error types where one type of error occurs more than 60 times: 1) *ae* for *e* or *e* for *ae* (86 times); 2) *eo* for *o* or *o* for *eo* (83 times); 3) *j* for *ch* or *ch* for *j* (65 times). Secondly, there were 19 other active error types occurring 10 to 30 times each, and these are: 4) *s* for *ss* or *ss* for *s*; 5) *d* for *t*; 6) *eu* for *u* or *u* for *eu*; 7) *g* for *kk* or *kk* for *g*; 8) *d* for *t* or *t* for *d*; 9) *ng* for *n* or *n* for *ng*; 10) *o* for *u* or *u* for *o*; 11) *wae* for *oe* or *oe* for *wae*; 12) *b* for *p* or *p* for *b*; 13) ϕ for *h* or *h* for ϕ ; 14) $\phi.l$ for *l*. ϕ or *l*. ϕ for $\phi.l$; 15) *l.l* for $\phi.l$ for $\phi.l$ for *l.l*; 16) *n* for *nh* or *nh* for *n*; 17) *a* for *wa* or *wa* for *a*; 18) *a* for *eo* or *eo* for *a*; 19) *eo* for *yeo* or *yeo* for *eo*; 20) *e* for *ye* or *ye* for *e*; 21) *eu* for *o* or *o* for *eu*; and 22) *m* for *n* or *n* for *m*. Thirdly, less active error types which occur less than 10 but more than 5 times include: 23) *ui* for *oe* or *oe* for *ui*; 24) *n.n* for $\phi.n$; 25) *eo* for *eu* or *eu* for *eo*; 26) *j* for *g* or *g* for *j*; 27) *j* for *jj* or *jj* for *j*; 28) *ae* for *a* or *a* for *ae*; 29) *i* for *ui* or *ui*

³ The Revised Romanization system prepared and authorized by the Korean Government is used to transcribe Korean forms. To avoid confusion, each Han-geul letter is romanized according to Han-geul spelling instead of pronunciation, as stated under the title 3. Special Provisions for Romanization (8) in the booklet *The Revised Romanization of Korean*. Dots are used to indicate the boundaries between syllabic blocks.

⁴ I would like to thank Dr Duk-Soo Park at the University of Sydney for his valuable comments and advice on data analysis and interpretation of the results, although any shortcomings are mine.

for *i*; and 30) *l.l* for *l*. ϕ or *l*. ϕ for *l.l*. Other miscellaneous types of errors occurring less than five times are not listed here.

Among the active 40 error types, there were 18 vowel misspellings (35.6%), and 22 consonant misspellings (35.2%), which is quite balanced. This balance is compared with the results found in English data (Bebout, 1985: 584 and James et al, 1993: 290) where vowel spellings were considerably higher than consonant misspellings. If we look at the most active 22 error types in the current study, however, there is an indication of a similar trend that vowel misspellings (30.2%) more intensively occurred than consonant misspellings (28.5%) in Korean as well.

3.1 below lists the frequency of 40 types of errors and some examples. Misspellings are indicated with * and correct spellings in the brackets. To save space, only 2 - 4 examples for each type are given. The symbol ϕ means missing letters (spellings).

3.1. Error Types

1) *ae* for *e* or *e* for *ae*: 86 (9.1%)

- *ga.gae (ga.ge) 'shop'
- *eo.jae (eo.je) 'yesterday'
- *je.mi (jae.mi) 'interesting'
- *de.hag.gyo (dae.hag.gyo) 'university'

2) *eo* for *o* or *o* for *eo*: 83 (8.7%)

- *eo.neul (o.neul) 'today'
- *meog.yo.il (mog.yo.il) 'Thursday'
- *bon.ho (beon.ho) 'number'
- *bol.go (beol.go) 'to earn (money)'

3) *j* for *ch* or *ch* for *j*: 65 (6.8%)

- *jeg (chaeg) 'book'
- *a.jim (a.chim) 'morning'
- *chae.beol (jae.beol) 'conglomerate'
- *cha.dong.ja (ja.dong.cha) 'passenger car'

4) *s* for *ss* or *ss* for *s*: 30 (3.2%)

- *seub.ni.da (sseub.ni.da) 'to spend'
- *seo.ya (sseo.ya) 'to write'
- *5 ssi (5 si) '5 o'clock'
- *ssi.jag.hab.ni.da (si.jag.hab.ni.da) 'to begin'

5) *d* for *tt*: 27 (2.9%)

- *da.la.ga.yo (tta.la.ga.yo) 'to follow'
- *dae (ttae) 'occasion'

6) *eu* for *u* or *u* for *eu*: 28 (3.0%)

- *jeob.seu (jeob.su) 'receipt'
- *ssa.eum (ssa.um) 'fight'
- *jung.ga (jeung.ga) 'increase'
- *su.mul.sal (seu.mu.sal) 'twenty years old'

7) *g* for *kk* or *kk* for *g*: 24 (2.5%)

- *ga.geum (ga.kkeum) 'sometimes'
- *gam.ppag (kkam.ppag) 'completely'

- *ga.kke (ga.ge) ‘shop’
- *kkae.gos.ha.ge (kkae.kkeus.ha.ge) ‘cleanly’

8) d for t or t for d: 22 (2.3%)

- *bo.dong (bo.tong) ‘usually’
- *dab.ni.da (tab.ni.da) ‘to ride’
- *tong.geu.la.mi (dong.geu.la.mi) ‘circle’
- *tae.hag.gyo (dae.hag.gyo) ‘university’

9) ng for n or n for ng: 22 (2.3%)

- *jeong.gong (jeon.gong) ‘major study’
- *hwang.gyeong (hwan.gyeong) ‘environment’
- *jeon.chaeg (jeong.chaeg) ‘policy’
- *jun.gug.mal (jung.gug.mal) ‘Chinese language’

10) o for u or u for o: 18 (1.9%)

- *na.jong.e (na.jung.e) ‘later’
- *sog.je (sug.je) ‘homework’
- *gwa.mug (gwa.mog) ‘subject’
- *sun.nim (son.nim) ‘guest’

11) wae for oe or oe for wae: 17 (1.8%)

- *dwaeb.ni.da (doeb.ni.da) ‘to be all right’/‘to become’
- *oe.nya.ha.myeon (wae.nya.ha.myeon) ‘because’

12) b for p or p for b: 16 (1.7%)

- *bi.lo (pi.lo) ‘fatigue’
- *bi.u.myeon (pi.u.myeon) ‘to smoke’
- *toe.pi (toe.bi) ‘compost’
- *bog.jap.hae.seo (bog.jab.hae.seo) ‘complex’

13) ϕ for h or h for ϕ : 14 (1.5%)

- *beon.eo (beon.ho) ‘number’
- *il.eul.ab.ni.da (il.eul.hab.ni.da) ‘to work’
- *ma.heum (ma.eum) ‘mind/heart’
- *pyeon.han.ha.ge (pyeon.an.ha.ge) ‘comfortably’

14) ϕl for l. ϕ or l. ϕ for ϕl : 14 (1.5%)

- *deu.leo.ga.go (deul.eo.ga.go) ‘to go in’
- *do.la.wass.eo.yo (dol.a.wass.eo.yo) ‘came back’
- *dal.eun (da.leun) ‘different’

15) ll for ϕl or ϕl for ll: 13 (1.4%)

- *il.leum (i.leum) ‘name’
- *eol.lyeob.da (eo.lyeob.da) ‘difficult’
- *o.la.ga.go (ol.la.ga.go) ‘to climb’
- *ppa.li (ppal.li) ‘quickly’

16) n for nh or nh for n: 12 (1.3%)

- *man.a.yo (manh.a.yo) ‘many’
- *gwae.chan.a.yo? (gwaen.chanh.a.yo?) ‘is it OK?’
- *anh.bad.a.yo (an.bad.a.yo) ‘don’t receive’
- *anh.geu.leoh.da (an.geu.leoh.da) ‘not the case’

17) a for wa or wa for a: 12 (1.3%)

- *ba.yo (bwa.yo) ‘to see’

- *ga.mog (gwa.mog) ‘subject’
 *byeon.hwa (byeon.ha) ‘to change’
 *joh.wa.hae.yo? (joh.a.hae.yo?) ‘do (you) like...?’
- 18) a for eo or eo for a: 10 (1.1%)**
 *a.meo.ni (eo.mo.ni) ‘mother’
 *a.leum.deo.un (a.leum.da.un) ‘beautiful’
 *dol.eo.ga (dol.a.ga) ‘to return’
 *deo.eum.ju (da.eum.ju) ‘next week’
- 19) eo for yeo or yeo for eo: 10 (1.1%)**
 *pi.meon (pi.myeon) ‘to smoke’
 *i.leog.seo (i.lyeog.seo) ‘curriculum vitae’
 *bu.lyeo.yo (bul.eo.yo) ‘to blow’
 *jyeol.yag (jeol.yag) ‘frugality’
- 20) e for ye or ye for e: 10 (1.1%)**
 *e.bae (ye.bae) ‘worship’
 *ge.hag (gye.hoeg) ‘plan’
 *ga.gye (ga.ge) ‘shop’
 *ga.ya.gyess (ga.ya.gess) ‘have to go’
- 21) eu for o or o for eu: 10 (1.1%)**
 *o.leun.jjeug (o.leun.jjog) ‘right’
 *go.dong.hag.gyo (go.deung.hag.gyo) ‘high school’
- 22) m for n or n for m: 10 (1.1%)**
 *sim.bal (sin.bal) ‘shoes’
 *dan.bae (dam.bae) ‘cigarette’
- 23) ui for oe or oe for ui: 9 (1.0%)**
 *hui.sa (hoe.sa) ‘business company’
 *ui.gug (oe.gug) ‘foreign country’
- 24) n.n for ϕ n: 9 (1.0%)**
 *hal.meon.ni (hal.meo.ni) ‘grandmother’
 *dan.ni.myeon.seo (da.ni.myeon.seo) ‘to attend /go’
- 25) eo for eu or eu for eo: 8 (0.8%)**
 *seob.ni.da (sseub.ni.da) ‘to spend’
 *neu.mu (neo.mu) ‘too (much)’
- 26) j for g or g for j: 8 (0.8%)**
 *si.jan (si.gan) ‘period of time’
 *gae.hwal.yong (jae.hwal.yong) ‘for recycling’
- 27) j for jj or jj for j: 8 (0.8%)**
 *il.jig (il.jjig) ‘early’
 *yu.jjeum.e (yo.jeum.e) ‘these days’
- 28) ae for a or a for ae: 7 (0.7%)**
 *dae.haeg.gyo (dae.hag.kyo) ‘university’
 *na.lae (na.la) ‘nation’
- 29) i for ui or ui for i: 7 (0.7%)**
 *geo.i (geo.ui) ‘almost’
 *sa.ui (sa.i) ‘interval/between’
- 30) ll for l. ϕ or l. ϕ for ll: 7 (0.7%)**

- *jul.lib.ni.da (jul.ib.ni.da) ‘to reduce’ *gol.eo.yo (geol.lyeo.yo) ‘it takes (time).’
- 31) n. ϕ for ϕn or ϕn for n. ϕ : 7 (0.7%)**
 *dan.i.go (da.ni.go) ‘to go / attend’
 *a.ne (an.e) ‘inside’
- 32) wi or oe or oe for wi: 7 (0.7%)**
 *chwi.geun (choe.geun) ‘recently’
 *choe.jig (chwi.jig) ‘getting a job’
- 33) ϕg for g. ϕ or g. ϕ for ϕg : 7 (0.7%)**
 *ji.geob (jig.eob) ‘job’
 *sa.hoeg.hag (sa.hoe.hag) ‘sociology’
- 34) i for eu: 5 (0.5%)**
 *i.lim (i.leum) ‘name’
 *jil.gib.ni.da (jeul.gib.ni.da) ‘to enjoy’
- 35) i for wi or wi for i: 5 (0.5%)**
 *sib.ge (swib.ge) ‘easily’
 *chwi.lyo (chi.lyo) ‘treatment’
- 36) j for s or s for j: 5 (0.5%)**
 *ye.jang (ye.sang) ‘anticipation’
 *mas.neun (maj.neun) ‘right /correct’
- 37) m for b: 5 (0.5%)**
 *sim.nyeon (sib.nyeon) ‘10 years’
 *sseum.ni.da (sseub.ni.da) ‘to write’
- 38) yeo for ye or ye for yeo: 5 (0.5%)**
 *yeo.jang (ye.jeong) ‘schedule’
 *ma.sye.yo (ma.syeo.yo) ‘to drink’
- 39) ϕ for ng or ng for ϕ : 5 (0.5%)**
 *yeo.hwa (yeong.hwa) ‘movie’
 *yo.don (yong.don) ‘pocket money’
- 40) ϕs for ss. ϕ or ss. ϕ for ϕs : 5 (0.5%)**
 *wa.seo.yo (wass.eo.yo) ‘came.’
 *man.na.seu.myeon (man.nass.eu.myeon) ‘to meet’

There were more than 50 ill-formed transliterations of loan words. Some of the examples are listed below without attempting to classify them, as it is not so important at a linguistic level.

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| *ba.bae.gyu (ba.be.kyu) ‘barbecue’ | *bi.da (pi.teo) ‘Peter’ (x5) |
| *bi.jja (pi.ja) ‘pizza’ (x6) | *chi.gin (chi.kin) ‘chicken’ |
| *deo.la (dal.leo) ‘dollar’ | *ba.seu (beo.seu) ‘bus’ |
| *gae.im (ge.im) ‘game’ | *gol.geol (kol.geol) ‘call girl’ |
| *ko.o.pi (keo.pi) ‘coffee’ | *lae.jeo (le.jeo) ‘leisure’ (x2) |
| *li.beo.teu (li.po.teo) ‘reporter’ | *na.eu.teu. (na.i.teu) ‘night’ |
| *o.jeon (o.jon) ‘ozone’ | *teg.si (taeg.si) ‘taxi’ |
| *a.lu.ba.i.teu (a.leu.ba.i.teu) ‘arbeit’ | |
| *ta.len.teu (tael.laen.teu) ‘talent / TV stars’ | |

3. 2. Patterns of Error Type

The error types presented in 3.1 above can be categorised into five patterns.

1) Pattern 1: Mismatch in vowel sounds

‘Similar’ vowel or semi-vowel sounds are mismatched, particularly between (a) *ae* and *e*; (b) *eo* and *o*; (c) *eu* and *u*; (d) *o* and *u*; (e) *wae* and *oe*; (f) *a* and *wa*; (g) *a* and *eo*; (h) *eo* and *yeo*; (i) *e* and *ye*; and (j) *eu* and *o*, as shown in (1), (2), (6), (10), (11), (17), (18), (19), (20) and (21), respectively.

2) Pattern 2: Mismatch in allophonic consonant sounds

Pairs of allophonic consonant sounds are mismatched, particularly between (a) *j* and *ch*; (b) *s* and *ss*; (c) *d* and *tt*; (d) *g* and *kk*; (e) *d* and *t*; (f) *b* and *p*; (g) *j* and *jj*, as shown in (3), (4), (5), (7), (8), (12) and (27), respectively.

3) Pattern 3: Misrepresentation in nasal and lateral sounds

A nasal or lateral sound moves (or ‘assimilates’) to another similar sound or influences adjacent segments, thus the nasal or lateral sound is switched, or doubly spelled. This pattern occurs particularly between (a) *ng* and *n*; (b) *m* and *n*; and (c) *l* between vowels, and (d) *n* between vowels, as shown in (9), (14), (15), (22), (24), (30) and (31).

4) Pattern 4: Omission and addition of ‘weak’ sounds

The grapheme or symbol of a ‘weak’ sound is omitted or added. Particularly, this is the case in ‘*h*’ when it comes after, before or between nasals and laterals, as shown in (13) and (16).

5) Pattern 5: Miscellaneous errors

Errors in this category are difficult to characterise as they are small in number and sporadic, and do not fit into any of the patterns in this study. For example, a wrong graphic association error as shown in (26); a phoneme-to-grapheme misrepresentation error as shown in (33), and the *b*-to-*m* sound change error as shown in (37).

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Error identification, analysis and categorisation will always involve a certain degree of inaccuracy. Nevertheless, this study was able to identify, if tentatively, key areas of difficulty in Korean orthography and to establish a certain picture of error patterns.

First, a very high frequency of errors was observed in two pairs of vowel sounds: *ae* and *e* (Type1), and *eo* and *o* (Type 2). Type 1 and Type 2 involve a mismatch in sound features of vowels. It seems very probable that this high frequency mismatch was due to the perceived similarity between the pairs of vowels and the differences in sound quality between the Korean and English equivalents. Because of this intra-lingual similarity and inter-lingual difference, it was quite possible that students were confused with

differentiating these sounds. The confusion in the use of /ae/ and /e/ is experienced not just by KFL learners but also by native speakers. The care-free—or casual—pronunciation of /e/ for /ae/ is often found in native speakers' speech, as in *mwo.he.yo?* instead of *mwo.hae.yo?* ('What are you doing?') and *eo.tteoh.ge.ji.ne.yo?* instead of *eo.tteoh.ge.ji.nae.yo?* ('How are you doing?'). Although this type of inaccuracy is not often found in native speakers' compositions, its frequent verbal use might have led to the foreign learners' eventual confusion in their written (and spoken) production. For the discrepancy in sound quality, Sohn (1986: 497-8) explains, as the cause of confusions, the difficulty of pinpointing the English equivalent of Korean /ae/ and the mismatch between Korean /o/ and English /o/. For this reason, English native speaker learners of Korean (ENSLK) seem to perceive Korean /ae/ as *e* or vice versa, and Korean /o/ as *eo* or *u*, or vice versa, as seen in the examples in 3.1. It seems that confusion in other pairs of vowels such as *eu* and *u* in Type 6, *wae* and *oe* in Type 11 is also due to both the perceived similarity and the mismatch between Korean and English in their sound qualities. However, this does not seem to be the case in less active errors such as *a* and *wa* in Type 17, *a* and *eo* in Type 18, *eo* and *yeo* in Type 19, and *e* and *ye* in Type 20. It seems probable that the errors in these types were simply caused by mispronunciation of the words or wrong graphic association of the phonemes.

Not surprisingly, there was a high frequency of errors in Korean allophonic consonants, particularly in such pairs as *j* and *ch* (Type 3); *s* and *ss* (Type 4); *d* and *t* or *tt* (Types 5 and 8); *g* and *kk* (Type 7); and *b* and *p* (Type 12). These types involve differentiating the sound qualities of [lax], [aspirate] and [tense], and the failure to do so is largely attributable to the confusion of their sound features, as Sohn (1986:497) has pointed out. It is interesting to observe that there was a much higher rate of confusion between *j* and *ch* than other pairs and another allophonic pair in this series *j* and *jj* (Type 27). It is not clear whether this higher rate of difficulty was caused by a higher rate of words containing this pair or a higher perception of difficulty with differentiating the [lax] and [aspirate]. By observation, however, there were more words containing *j* than *jj* in the data, and probably this was the factor that produced a higher rate of errors. This was also the case in *g* and *kk* and in *b* and *p* where words containing [aspirate] or [tense] had a lower rate of appearance. Sohn (1986: 497) explains that the problems in these allophonic series of consonants are due to the mismatch in sound patterns between Korean and English. In Korean, there is a clear distinction in sound quality between *b*-, *d*-, *g*-, *j*- and *s*-series: (*b*, *p*, *pp*); (*d*, *t*, *tt*); (*g*, *k*, *kk*); (*j*, *ch*, *jj*) and (*s*, *ss*). In English, however, these distinctions by [aspirate] and [tense] are not clear, which seems to cause confusion for English native speaker learners of Korean.

Third, the confusion in nasal and lateral sounds seemed to be caused by a combination of assimilation, wrong pronunciation and phoneme-to-grapheme transcription. It is probably due to the fact that the nasal *n* tends to assimilate to *ng* when it comes immediately before a syllable beginning with *g* or when it is followed by a syllable ending in *ng*. The opposite is also the case where *ng* is vulnerable to change to *n* when it comes immediately before a syllable beginning with *g*, as seen in *jun.gug.mal* for *jung.gug.mal* in Type 9. A similar trend can be seen in *m* and *n* pairs where *m* is replaced by *n* or vice versa. Lateral *l* was often the subject of phoneme-to-grapheme transcription in the in-between vowels, which is largely due to assimilation. In other cases, *l* and *n*

were doubly spelled between vowels, and the cause of this phenomenon is also attributable either to assimilation or mispronunciation.

Fourth, the omission or addition of the 'weak' sound *h* was probably caused by the 'weak' nature of the sound (i.e. pronunciation) and the learners' lack of understanding about the grammatical usage of *an* and *anh* for 'negation'. This occurred particularly before, after and between laterals or nasals, but it is not clear whether the nasal or lateral sounds have a linguistic effect on the omission or addition of *h*, or whether it reflects the usual practice of speakers (i.e. learners) to economise the effort involved in articulation or to facilitate ease of articulation.

Finally, among a number of miscellaneous and sporadic error types, there were some types with potential significance such as the examples in Types 26 and 36, where the cause of confusion has little to do with the sound value but instead with the wrong graphic association of the sound. This is due to the similar shapes of competing spellings in Korean. There are other sporadic errors for which we need more examples to justify forming a discrete category. As for the transliteration of loan words, it seems that although the number does not carry any significant linguistic meaning, constant production of unorthodox forms signifies that transliteration cannot be simply ignored and that some more positive measures should be taken at least at the pedagogical level. It is illogical to pay little attention to diagnosis and prevention of ill-formed transliterations that are produced by learners while at the same time continuing to correct these exact same problems again and again.

As a whole, this study supports the findings in Sohn (1986) where phonological interference from English was strong and where the cause of key errors was drawn from the differences in sound quality and sound patterns between Korean and English. This study, however, also recognises the importance of the students' lack of knowledge and training, and deficiencies in the broad range of input, but these are difficult to define. In other words, it is not easy to determine what errors are due to simple mistakes and which are due to systematic errors. This study is left with such questions as why some of the commonly predicted errors did not much occur and how effectively the areas of weakness can be improved. One possible explanation is that the subjects do have a problem with the high frequency error types, but that drawing data from examination papers possibly limited the range of words which can contain potential error types. A future study might improve on this weakness by using a systematically prepared vocabulary list whose distribution of potential difficulty is evenly constructed.

The findings of this study reinforce the necessity of input and training based on contrastive analysis as well as error analysis regarding the key areas that gave problems. Both teachers and students need to pay more attention to problem areas for prevention and remedial purposes. To have a better understanding of students' acquisitional development of orthography and other levels of language description, there is a need for further study in students' proficiency development in Korean, comparing other learner groups from other institutions and other language backgrounds. Also, we must devise pedagogically effective learning and teaching strategies which can give practical and educational solutions.

References

- Bebout, L. 1985. "An Error Analysis of Misspellings Made by Learners of English as a First and as a Second Language", *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, Vol. 14, No 6. pp 569-593.
- Bell, R. 1974. 'Error analysis: a recent pseudoprocedure in applied linguistics'. *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics* 25-6: 35-9.
- Corder, S.P. 1967. 'The significance of learners' errors'. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5: 161-9
- Corder, S.P. 1971a. 'Idiosyncractic dialects and error analysis'. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 9: 149-59.
- Corder, S. P. 1974. The Significance of Learners' Errors, in: Richards, J. C. (ed.), *Error Analysis. Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Singapore: Longman.
- Corder, S.P. 1981. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H. and M. Burt, and S. Krashen. 1982. *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jain, M. P. 1974. Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance, in: Richards, J. C. (ed.), 1974.
- James, C. 1998. *Errors in Language Learning and Use - Exploring Error Analysis*. London/New York: Longman.
- James, C., Scholfield, P., Garrett, P., and Griffiths, Y. 1993. "Welsh Bilinguals' English Spelling: An Error Analysis", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 14, No. 4. pp 287 – 306.
- Lennon, P. 1991. 'Error: Some problems of definition, identification and distinction'. *Applied Linguistics* 12: 180-95.
- Long, M and C. Sato. 1984. 'Methodological issues in interlanguage studies: An interactionist perspective' in Davies et al (eds.). 1984. *Interlanguage*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lott, D. 1983. 'Analysing and counteracting interference errors'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 37: 256-61.
- Nemser, W. 1974. Approximate Systems of Foreign Language Learners, in: Richards, J. C. (ed.), 1974.
- Richards, J. C. 1971b. 'A non-contrastive approach to error analysis'. *English Language Teaching Journal* 25: 204-19.
- Richards, J.C. (ed.). 1974. *Error Analysis. Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Singapore: Longman.
- Sohn, H. M. 1986. Patterns of American Students' Composition Errors in Korean, in: *Linguistic Expeditions*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co. pp 487-528.
- Stenson, B. 1974. 'Induced errors' in Schumann and Stenson (eds.) 1974. *New Frontiers in Second Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Taylor, G. 1986. 'Errors and Explanations' *Applied Linguistics* 7: 144-66