

## Assessing EFL Proficiency through Error Analysis among Tertiary Students in a University College in Oman

Berrington Xolani Siphosakhe Ntombela<sup>1</sup>, Reeja Riyaz<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Zululand, SOUTH AFRICA, &

<sup>2</sup> Caledonian College of Engineering, SULTANATE OF OMAN.

<sup>1</sup> [ntombelab@unizulu.ac.za](mailto:ntombelab@unizulu.ac.za), <sup>2</sup> [reeja@caledonian.edu.om](mailto:reeja@caledonian.edu.om)

### ABSTRACT

*Oman education system is unique because students have to go through a Foundation programme in preparation for tertiary education studies. This programme aims at improving students' inter alia linguistic proficiency so that they could cope with university studies. The present study reports linguistic proficiency among two groups of students who were exposed to two different Foundation programmes. These groups were given a proficiency test that measured their grammatical, vocabulary, and reading comprehension proficiencies in English language. The study adopted an error analysis approach in identifying areas where students were not proficient. That is, after the proficiency test was administered, it was analysed statistically to establish if there was any significant difference between the proficiency of two groups. The test was then subjected to error analysis to establish common areas where students had problems. The findings indicate that the group that went through the new foundation programme performed better than the other group. However, both groups had similar problems in grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension, ranging from progressive and perfect aspect, concord to word forms, collocations, and reading for specific and gist information. The study therefore recommends a support course that will help alleviate the persistent errors at post-foundation level.*

**Keywords:** Error analysis, language proficiency, foundation programme, inter language

### INTRODUCTION

English language proficiency is a requirement for all students who are pursuing studies at tertiary level in institutions where the language of teaching and learning is English. As English language continues to expand around the globe, many students find themselves pressured in situations where English language is neither a mother tongue nor spoken in the immediate community. This pressure is not only with students but institutions and teachers in particular who must use innovative approaches that would expedite the acquisition of English language. This would ensure that students who do not have sufficient exposure to the language get help.

This paper explores the students' proficiency as seen from the perspective of error analysis. That is, students were given a proficiency test\*, the results of which were analysed to identify areas where they had problems. It is important to note that these students were divided into two groups, where the first group consisted of students who had been taught through an Old Foundation Programme (OFP), and the second group through New Foundation Programme (NFP). The differences between the two programmes are discussed below. Suffice it to point out that the NFP was initiated due to the outcomes of the OFP audit, which among other

\*Available at <http://www.transparent.com/learn-english/proficiency-test.html>

points indicated that there was a need to not only revise the programme but incorporate aspects that would address study skills or soft skills.

It is fitting at this stage to situate the study in error analysis and thereafter discuss language proficiency as suggested by the results of the proficiency test.

## **ERROR ANALYSIS**

Error Analysis (EA) has been used in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research for many decades with an aim of looking for solutions that would address persistent errors committed by second language learners. On the onset it is imperative to provide a working definition of EA. Schachter (1974) differentiates between Contrastive Analysis (CA) *a priori* which is concerned with predicting errors that students are likely to make in the classroom based on the similarities and differences of the mother tongue and the target language, and CA *a posteriori* which focuses on the analysis of errors that students make when learning a second language. CA *a posteriori*, however, is regarded as a subcomponent of a much wider EA field (Schachter, *ibid*). It is clear therefore that EA focuses on errors.

Citing Corder in Ellis (1994), Nzama (2011) considers errors to be deviations made by learners resulting from not having mastered a particular linguistic element which consequently cannot be self-corrected. This definition differentiates errors from mistakes where the latter refers to inconsistent deviations resulting from language processing problems (Nzama, *ibid*). It should be mentioned that initially, errors were negatively received and had to be eradicated by all means. It was Corder (1967), however, (who is regarded as the father of EA (Nzama, *ibid*)) that began to argue the usefulness of students' errors. Among other things, Corder (*ibid*) argues that errors can be used by learners as a tool for learning; teachers can also use errors to gauge the progress of learning (Nzama, *ibid*).

Nevertheless, EA has not escaped criticism, chief among which is the fact that it does not explain the phenomena where students avoid using certain structures because they have not acquired them yet (Khansir, 2012). Other criticisms relate to methodological procedures in that data used in EA are collected heterogeneously, and are subjected to fuzzy categories (Dagneaux *et al*, 1998). For instance, categories like 'grammatical errors', 'lexical errors' tend to mislead because of the overlapping nature of these categories (Dagneaux *et al*, *ibid*).

Notwithstanding, the criticisms only highlight the challenges that EA must address but do not announce the annulment of EA as many linguists, particularly applied linguists, continue to use it. Suffice to note that when studying EA it is impossible to disregard CA and interlanguage (IL). We have already mentioned that Schachter (1974) regards CA *a posteriori* as a branch of a much wider EA. However, one reason that makes CA part of EA is that apart from predicting the errors that learners of a second language might commit due to differences or similarities of the two languages, it also accounts for the errors that are never made because students have avoided using the structures that would pose challenges (Schachter, *ibid*). However, CA was mostly criticized for its theory, which postulated that most errors made by second language learners are a result of mother tongue interference (Khansir, 2012). In fact, whilst on the one hand some sources of errors are said to stem from negative language transfer, which involves transfer of pronunciation, word order, grammar, semantics, writing, pragmatic, and culture; on the other hand some errors are attributed to transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and overgeneralization (Selinker, 1972). Paradoxically, Selinker (*ibid*) in Nzama (2011) defines IL as a system of temporary grammar composed of rules resulting from such cognitive processes as overgeneralization, transfer of training, language transfer, strategies of second language learning, and strategies of second language communication.

Nevertheless, IL is described by Larsen-Freeman and Long (1992) as second learners' language produced when they traverse a continuum on their way to acquiring a target language. This means IL is a language on its own, complete with rules that change as learners move towards the target language. This is one of the reasons why proponents of IL have a positive regard for errors because they are viewed as part and parcel of learning experience. Since this paper is concerned with linguistic proficiency, we shall now discuss English language proficiency.

## **ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**

It is pivotal to first present what is meant by English Language Proficiency. Cummins (1980) in Torres and Zeidler (2002) asserts that there are two levels of language proficiency: (1) the Basic Interpersonal Communicative Skills (BICS) and (2) the Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Whilst BICS refers to 'the language of natural, informal conversation; CALP is needed to read textbooks, participate in dialogue and debate and to provide written responses to tests' (Torres & Zeidler, 2002). Thus, students who have not acquired CALP are said to be 'at a disadvantage in learning science or other academic subject matter' (Torres & Zeidler, *ibid*).

Because BICS is concerned with everyday conversational skills, the proficiency tests tend to focus on Listening and Speaking. On the other hand, Writing and Reading feature prominently in CALP (Stephenson *et al*, 2004). Unlike Stephenson *et al* (2004) and Torres & Zeidler (2002), Hakuta *et al* (2000) further propose oral English proficiency and academic English proficiency as terms that have now been widely used to categorise English proficiency, needless to say that the terms are reminiscent of BICS and CALP respectively.

These levels of proficiency, however, do not answer the question of what is really meant by a 'proficient' student. Nevertheless, Hakuta *et al* (2000, p. 1) assert that students who can function in an English medium institution, taking courses that are offered in English without needing any support should be deemed proficient. Furthermore, Hakuta *et al* (*ibid*) argue that students who are fully proficient in English should be fully competitive in the academic uses of English with their age-equivalent native English-speaking peers. However, Stephenson *et al* (2004) caution that students need not be as fluent as native speakers to be regarded proficient.

Generally, there are four language skills that are regarded as determinants of English language proficiency, viz. listening, speaking, reading, and writing. These four skills are assessed in internationally recognized proficiency tests such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), and the English version of the Business Language Testing Service (BULATS) etc. As these tests measure varying levels of proficiency, where normally an institution would choose one test; what is considered as indication of proficiency would thus differ from one institution to the other. For instance, the University of Witwatersrand in South Africa requires students to be proficient in English before they are accepted, which among other criteria means a student should at least have the IELTS score of at least 7.0 (University of Witwatersrand).

On the other hand, the institution where the research was conducted exempt students from doing a Foundation programme if they have attained an IELTS score of 5.0, which is consistent with Oman Academic Standards for General Foundation Programs' (2008) recommendation. The discussion will now turn to the Foundation programme offered in the institution where the study was conducted.

## THE FOUNDATION PROGRAMMES AT CALEDONIAN COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

We have already stated that the study was carried out among two groups of students who were exposed to two different Foundation Programmes. These programmes are the Old Foundation Programme (OFP) which was later replaced by the New Foundation Programme (NFP). As shown in Table 1 below, OFP was divided into two levels that were referred to as Stage A and Stage B, offering the same courses at different levels.

**Table 1. OFP**

<i>Stage A</i>	<i>Stage B</i>
Writing	Writing
Reading	Reading
Listening	Listening
Presentation	Presentation
Technical English	Technical English

Students were enrolled in either Stage A or B based on the placement test results. Normally, students would progress from Stage A to B, but those who performed exceptionally well in Stage A, i.e. attaining straight As in all components, were given an accelerated progression to Engineering. The syllabus, as we can see, focused on the four skills, where Speaking was covered in the Presentation component. Technical English component focused on vocabulary, especially the kind to be encountered in technical fields, and grammar presented through the four skills, which made this component an integrated one. Presentation was so named because in addition to honing oral skills, it provided presentation skills.

The NFP also had two levels as indicated in Table 2 below: NFP1 and NFP2.

**Table 2. NFP**

<i>NFP 1</i>	<i>NFP 2</i>
Project	Academic Writing
Reading	Read & Write Practical
Listening	Reading
Vocabulary	Listening
Grammar	Vocabulary
Language-in-the-Lab	Speaking & Debate
	Language-in-the-Lab

The NFP differed from the OFP in that not all courses offered in the NFP1 were offered in the NFP2 and vice versa. For example, Project was not offered in the NFP2 whilst Academic Writing, Read & Write Practical, and Speaking & Debate were only offered in the NFP2. It

should be noted that Vocabulary component is more explicit in NFP than in OFP. However, Vocabulary in both programmes covered lexical items from an engineering field. Grammar was embedded in Academic Writing in the NFP2. Moreover, even though components like Reading and Listening were offered in both OFP and NFP, the main difference was that the NFP followed a six-step method. The Six-step method brought an element of study skills, which was missing in OFP.

Similarly, a placement test was administered to check whether a student ought to be placed in NFP1 or 2. However, since the courses offered in NFP2 were regarded as more challenging than those in NFP1, it was later decided that students should all go through NFP1 before progressing to NFP2 regardless of the placement test results.

## RESEARCH

Research was conducted among 34 students: 13 OFP students and 21 NFP students. Although the sample could not be said to be representative of the population that had gone through each of the two programmes, the scores obtained by the two groups are comparable enough for us to establish the level of proficiency for each group. Data were first collected from OFP students after they had completed their Foundation programme and later from NFP students as the latter completed their Foundation programme after the first group. Collected data were in the form of Proficiency test scores. The Proficiency test administered to both groups had four parts, each testing a different element as shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Proficiency Test**

<i>Part</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Category</i>
1	1-15	Grammar (Gap Fill)
2	1-15	Grammar (Spotting Errors)
3	1-10	Vocabulary
4	1-10	Reading Comprehension

Part 1 and 2 of the test had 15 items each whilst Part 3 and 4 had 10 items each. The first two parts of the test were testing grammar whilst part 3 and 4 tested vocabulary and reading comprehension respectively. The entire test was in the form of multiple choice questions where students had to select the best option from four possible ones. Part 1 of the Grammar section required students to select the best answer that completes the given sentence; Part 2 expected students to select a word or a phrase from given options and then underlines that option in the given sentence to indicate an error.

Part 3 and 4 required students to select the best answer either to complete the given statement or to answer a question. Since the paper is concerned with students' proficiency, the test scores were analysed using error analysis in order to establish the level of proficiency deduced from the number of errors. That is, the lesser the number of errors the more proficient are the students, and vice versa. However, as Table 3 indicates, it should be mentioned that the test did not cover the Listening and the Speaking part. Thus, the proficiency that would be indicated by the test scores would only be true in as far as grammatical accuracy and reading comprehension is concerned. Table 4 below illustrates the test scores obtained by the two groups.

**Table 4. Proficiency Test Scores for OFP versus NFP**

Score in %	OFP: n=13	NFP: n=21
60-64	0	6
55-59	1	2
50-54	0	4
45-49	0	5
40-44	1	0
35-39	3	3
30-34	3	0
25-29	2	1
20-24	2	0
15-19	1	0

As Table 4 illustrates, the highest percentage score obtained by NFP students was between 60 and 64 whilst the highest one among OFP students was between 55 and 59, which suggests an average attainment for both groups as there were no scores above 64%. Most students in OFP, i.e. 12 out of 13 scored below 50%, whilst in NFP 12 out of 21 scored 50% and above. Thus, among other things, when considering the Mean, SD and T-value of the two groups, the null hypothesis stating that the difference between the two groups is insignificant is rejected as shown in Table 5 below.

**Table 5. Analysis of Proficiency Test Results**

	Number	Mean	SD	High Score	Low Score	T-value
OFP	13	32.3	10.67	58	18	P=1.330
NFP	21	50.7	9.86	64	28	p≤.05

In brief, Table 5 indicates that although we have observed average attainment for both groups, NFP students' proficiency would be considered higher than OFP ones. However, in order to get a better picture on how these groups performed in each of the four test parts, it is essential to compare the analysis of errors for these groups. Table 6 below shows the number of errors that most students committed in each part. In that respect, a token was assigned to represent the item that most students got wrong. For example, out of 15 items in Part 1 for OFP, most students got 4 incorrectly, which means they got 11 items correctly.

**Table 6. OFP Analysis of Errors**

Group	Test Part	Category	Tokens	Percentage
OFP	1	Grammar	4	26.6
	2	Grammar	8	53.3
	3	Vocabulary	5	50
	4	Reading Comprehension	9	90
NFP	1	Grammar	6	40
	2	Grammar	2	13.3
	3	Vocabulary	4	40
	4	Reading Comprehension	3	30

Table 6 indicates that Part 4 at 90% was the least obtained by OFP students although Part 2 and 3 were also not as good at 53.3 and 50% respectively. This further indicates that on the whole, OFP students were less proficient. On the other hand, it shows a better performance by NFP students where Part 1 and 3 at 40% each were the least obtained followed by Part 4 at 30%. In other words, OFP students had most problems with Part 4 whilst Part 1 and 3 were the most problematic for NFP students. We shall now look into each part of the test, analysing types of errors committed before categorizing them. Table 7 therefore presents the analysis of Part 1, showing common errors made by students in both OFP and NFP groups.

**Table 7. Part 1 Common Errors**

<i>Group</i>	<i>Error</i>
OFP & NFP	1. Juan <u>studying</u> in the library this morning.
NFP	3. The movie was <u>good as</u> the book.
OFP & NFP	5. Mr. Hawkins requests that someone <u>send/sent</u> the data by fax immediately.
NFP	6. Who is <u>the tallest</u> , Maria or Sachiko?
OFP & NFP	11. The company will upgrade <u>there/their/it's</u> computer information systems next month.

Table 7 shows common errors committed by either one or both groups. These errors were in Part 1 of the Proficiency test where each number represents the question; for instance, in Question 1 of Part 1, both groups chose *studying* as the correct answer when completing the sentence “Juan \_\_\_\_\_ in the library this morning.” This means most students thought the sentence “Juan studying in the library this morning\*” is the correct one. The other questions that were mostly wrong as shown in Table 8 were 3, 5, 6, and 11. Table 8 further shows that all common errors in Part 1 were committed by NFP students with the exception of Question 1, 5, and 11. Table 9 below shows common errors from Part 2 of the test.

**Table 8. Part 2 Common Errors**

<i>Group</i>	<i>Error</i>
OFP	2. Takeshi swam one <u>hundred</u> laps in the pool yesterday.
OFP	4. Mr. Feinauer <u>does</u> not take critical of his work very well.
OFP& NFP	5. Yvette and Rinaldo <u>send</u> e-mail messages to other <u>often</u> .
OFP& NFP	10. <u>Each</u> day <u>after</u> school, Jerome run five miles.
OFP	11. He goes never to the company <u>softball</u> games.
OFP	12. Do you <u>know</u> the student who books were stolen?
OFP	14. I told the salesman that I was not interesting in <u>buying</u> the latest model.
OFP	15. Frederick used work for a <u>multinational</u> corporation when he lived in Malaysia.

Table 8 presents common errors committed by both groups. In this part, students were presented with sentences where they were expected to underline the error. In question 2 for

example, most students underlined *hundred* as an error in the sentence “Takeshi swam one hundred laps in the pool yesterday” instead of *swam*. Unlike Part 1 where all common errors were committed by OFP students, in Part 2 all common errors were committed by NFP students except for question 5 and 10 which were shared with OFP students. These errors were in Question 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15. Table 9 below shows common errors that were committed by both groups in Part 3 of the test.

**Table 9. Part 3 Common Errors**

<i>Group</i>	<i>Error</i>
OFP& NFP	1. The rate of <u>money/bills</u> has been fluctuating wildly this week.
OFP& NFP	2. The bus every <u>week/late</u> arrives late during bad weather.
OFP& NFP	4. Jerry Seinfeld, the popular American comedian, has his audiences <u>keeping their noses out of someone’s business</u> .
NFP	6. The critics had to admit that the ballet <u>pathology</u> was superb.
OFP	8. We were <u>upon</u> friends in that strange but magical country.
OFP	9. The hurricane caused <u>extended</u> damage to the city.
NFP	10. Many cultures have special ceremonies to celebrate a person’s <u>right</u> of passage.

Table 9 shows that both groups had the same number of errors either from the same question or a different one. For example, both groups committed errors in question 1, 2, and 4, but NFP students had other errors in question 6 and 10 whilst OFP students had other errors in question 8 and 9. In Part 3 students were supposed to choose the correct word or phrase that best completes the statement. The common errors that were committed in Part 4 of the test, which was a reading comprehension, are shown in Table 10 below.

**Table 10. Part 4 Common Errors**

<i>Group</i>	<i>Error</i>
OFP & NFP	1. What is Erik’s address? <u>Interstate 25/13 Erika Street</u>
OFP	2. Which is the closest to Erik’s house? <u>The shopping centre.</u>
OFP	3. The main focus of the presentation will be <u>monthly salary figures</u> .
OFP	4. Who will give the presentation? <u>Steven Roberts.</u>
OFP	5. Which of the following countries is not included in the tour? <u>Devon</u>
OFP	6. How many people can go on this tour? <u>An unlimited number.</u>
OFP & NFP	7. What can we infer about this area of Southern England? <u>The coast often has harsh weather/the land is flat.</u>
OFP & NFP	8. What is the purpose of this announcement? <u>To encourage college graduates to study broadcasting.</u>
OFP	9. The expression “to become synonymous with” mean <u>to be the same as/to be the opposite of.</u>

Questions in Table 10 were based on the Reading Comprehension extracts (see Appendix 1). Table 10 shows that OFP students committed most common errors in Part 4. NFP and OFP students had errors in question 1, 7 and 8, whilst only OFP students committed errors in question 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9. These errors are a result of students' lack of reading comprehension skills as the answers depended on how well they had understood the passage. We can therefore assert that OFP students are less proficient in the reading comprehension skill compared to NFP students.

The common errors presented in the tables above were further categorized into different aspects as demonstrated in the following tables. Table 11 and 12 respectively present categories of common errors for Part 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 of the test.

**Table 11. Part 1 & 2 Category of Errors**

<i>Part 1</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Part 2</i>	<i>Category</i>
1	Progressive aspect	2	Past tense form – irregular verb
3	Comparative	4	Word form – adjective vs. noun
5	Concord	5	Determiner – use of ‘each’
6	Comparative	10	Concord
11	Concord	11	Word order – negation
14	Perfective aspect	12	WH form
		14	Verb form (participle)
		15	To-infinitive

Since Part 1 & 2 was testing the grammatical part; Table 11 shows areas of these parts where students struggled. For instance, the errors show that students had a problem with the English tense system, concord, English verb forms to mention a few.

**Table 12. Part 3 & 4 Category of Errors**

<i>Part 3</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Part 4</i>	<i>Category</i>
1	Collocation	1	Specific Details
2	Routine	2	Specific Details
4	Idiomatic Expression	3	Specific Details
6	Wrong word/meaning of ‘ballet’?	4	Inference
8	Preposition	5	Specific Details
9	Wrong word form	6	Specific Details
10	Wrong Word/Collocation	7	Inference
		8	Reading For Gist
		9	Inference

Part 3 & 4 of the test was concerned with vocabulary and reading comprehension. Errors in these parts show that students lacked proficiency in understanding vocabulary and in reading skills. For example they used wrong words and had difficulties with collocation.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

The paper set out to investigate students' proficiency in English by way of comparing test scores of two groups that underwent different Foundation programmes at Caledonian College

of Engineering in the Sultanate of Oman. The attained scores indicate that students who were exposed to the New Foundation Programme were more proficient in grammatical accuracy and reading comprehension than those who went through the Old Foundation Programme. Although it is not apparent in the study why NFP students proved more proficient than OFP ones, it was indicated that NFP had an element of study skills, which was missing in the OFP. In a different study conducted in the same institution, Sivaraman *et al* (2012) report that students who had gone through the Old Foundation Programme did not perform satisfactorily in the module that developed soft skills at Engineering level compared to those who had not gone through Foundation programme but had a direct entry into engineering due to the highest marks obtained in the placement test. Therefore, it can be deduced that the study skills embedded in the NFP may have contributed to the improved students' proficiency.

Even though NFP students are said to be more proficient than OFP ones, their level of proficiency is average, i.e. the highest score was only 64% compared to 58% obtained by OFP, which is a difference of 6% - even the mean is only 50.7. This indicates that there is still a great need to improve the proficiency of NFP students. This is further evidenced by the fact that NFP students committed grammatical errors in every question in Part 1 of the test as shown in Table 8. This should not be too surprising as Ntombela (2011) in a study conducted in the same institution reports that students who had gone through NFP performed poorly in the writing section, with grammatical inaccuracies persisting among other errors.

In addition to grammatical inaccuracy, NFP students performed just as poor as OFP students in the vocabulary section. The vocabulary section sought to establish students' competency in collocation and idiomatic expressions in a given context. For example, both NFP and OFP students did not know that the 'rate of' does not collocate with 'money' or 'bills' but with 'exchange'. This may have been caused by lack of exposure to the vocabulary used in the financial sector especially because, as an engineering institution, emphasis is on the engineering vocabulary. Similarly, they probably did not understand that the expression 'keeping their noses out of someone's business is not consistent with what a comedian does to the audience. Therefore, vocabulary incompetence could result from the fact that even though vocabulary features in both OFP and NFP, it is of a technical nature and may not improve general usage as expected in the proficiency test.

The better attainment of NFP students over OFP ones could be a result of the improved curriculum. Notwithstanding, there is still much room for improvement as the level of competence for NFP students indicates averageness. Improvement can be made by incorporating elements of general English usage which would help increase students' general communicative competence and grammatical accuracy. Most importantly, students would need more linguistic support at post-foundation level. The NFP, however robust, may not be sufficient in maintaining and improving proficiency at post-foundation level. Since the courses and level of education at post-foundation level is higher, continued support should be provided in order to address pertinent linguistic errors that could not be sufficiently addressed by the Foundation programme.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-170.
- [2] Cummins, J. (1980). Teaching English through content-area activities. In P. Rigg & V. Allen (Eds.), *When they don't speak English* (pp. 139-151). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- [3] Dagneaux, E.; Denness, S. & Granger, S. (1998). Computer-aided error analysis. *System* 26 1998), 163-174.
- [4] Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: OUP.
- [5] Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute Policy Report 2000-1.
- [6] Khansir, A. A. (2012). Error Analysis and Second Language Acquisition. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(5), 1027-1032. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.5.1027-1032.
- [7] Larsen-Freeman, & Long, M. H. (1992). *An introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Longman.
- [8] Ntombela, B. X. S. (2011). The viability of six-step method in teaching academic writing in EFL context. *Paper presented at International Conference on English Language Teaching (ICELT2011), DamaiLaut, Parak, Malaysia, 18-20 September, 2011.*
- [9] Nzama, M. V. (2011). *Error Analysis: A study of errors committed by IsiZulu speaking learners of English in selected schools*. Unpublished MA dissertation: University of Zululand.
- [10] Oman Academic Standards for General Foundation Programmes. (2008). Retrieved August 28, 2009, from [http://www.oac.gov.om/files/assurance/draft\\_standards/gfp\\_standards\\_v4.pdf](http://www.oac.gov.om/files/assurance/draft_standards/gfp_standards_v4.pdf)
- [11] Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. *Language Learning*, 24(2).
- [12] Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL*, 10(3), 209-223.
- [13] Sivaraman, I., Al Bulushi, A. H. M., Rao, D. H., & Rizwan, S. M. (2012). Entry into engineering programs – performance comparison of foundation students with direct entry students. *Paper presented at Oman Quality Network for Higher Education Regional Conference, Muscat, Sultanate of Oman, 20-21 February, 2012.*
- [14] Stephenson, A., Johnson, D.F., Jorgensen, M. A., & Young, M. J. (2004). Assessing English language proficiency: Using valid results to optimize instruction. *Paper presented at the 81<sup>st</sup> annual meeting of the California Educational Research Association (CERA), November 14, 2003.*
- [15] Torres, H. N., & Zeidler, D. L. (2002). The effects of English language proficiency and scientific reasoning skills on the acquisition of science content knowledge by Hispanic English language learners and native English language speaking students. *Electronic Journal of Science Education*, 6(3).
- [16] University of Witwatersrand. Retrieved March 7, 2013, from [http://www.wits.ac.za/files/9ch5s\\_436677001398407197.pdf](http://www.wits.ac.za/files/9ch5s_436677001398407197.pdf)

Reading Comprehension Extracts

Q. 1 – 2	<p>Directions to Erik's house</p> <p>Leave Interstate 25 at exit 7S. Follow that road (Elm Street) for two miles. After one mile, you will pass a small shopping center on your left. At the next set of traffic lights, turn right onto Maple Drive. Erik's house is the third house on your left. It's number 33, and it's white with green trim.</p>
Q. 3 – 4	<p><i>Date: May 16, 1998</i>  <i>To: Megan Fallerman</i>  <i>From: Steven Roberts</i>  <i>Subject: Staff Meeting</i></p> <p><i>Please be prepared to give your presentation on the monthly sales figures at our upcoming staff meeting. In addition to the accurate accounting of expenditures for the monthly sales, be ready to discuss possible reasons for fluctuations as well as possible trends in future customer spending. Thank you.</i></p>
Q. 5 – 7	<p><i>The B&amp;B Tour</i></p> <p><i>Spend ten romantic days enjoying the lush countryside of southern England. The counties of Devon, Dorset, Hampshire, and Essex invite you to enjoy their castles and coastline, their charming bed and breakfast inns, their museums and their cathedrals. Spend lazy days watching the clouds drift by or spend active days hiking the glorious hills. These fields were home to Thomas Hardy, and the ports launched ships that shaped world history. Bed and breakfasts abound, ranging from quiet farmhouses to lofty castles. Our tour begins August 15. Call or fax us today for more information 1-800-222-XXXX. Enrollment is limited, so please call soon.</i></p>
Q. 8 – 9	<p><i>Anna Szewczyk, perhaps the most popular broadcaster in the news media today, won the 1998 Broadcasting Award. She got her start in journalism as an editor at the Hollsville County Times in Missouri. When the newspaper went out of business, a colleague persuaded her to enter the field of broadcasting. She moved to Oregon to begin a master's degree in broadcast journalism at Atlas University. Following graduation, she was able to begin her career as a local newscaster with WPSU-TV in Seattle, Washington, and rapidly advanced to national television. Noted for her quick wit and trenchant commentary, her name has since become synonymous with Good Day, America! Accepting the award at the National Convention of Broadcast Journalism held in Chicago, Ms. Szewczyk remarked, "I am so honored by this award that I'm at a total loss for words!" Who would ever have believed it?</i></p>