

---

## Proficiency in Grammatical Error Identification and Competence in Syntax Transformation

**Erlinda D. Tibus**

English Faculty at SLSU-CTE  
*ertibus@gmail.com*

**Zesa S. Mino**

DepEd Teacher at Sogod National High School  
*zesa.siona@gmail.com*

**Norberto E. Milla**

Statistics Faculty at VSU-Main Campus  
*bertmilla@vsu.edu.ph*

---

### Abstract

Language is crucial in learning and in the education process. This study determined the students' proficiency in grammatical error identification and their competence in syntax transformation. The study used a descriptive-correlational design. Sixty fourth year Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) students were the respondents who had identified and transformed erroneous sentences to grammatically correct forms. The results revealed that students' level of proficiency in identifying errors is highly associated to the level of competence in transforming errors to grammatically correct sentences. Furthermore, the frequency of use of all the available learning materials at home has nothing to do with the level of proficiency in grammatical error identification and the level of competence in syntax transformation. Future researches are suggested to address the link between frequency of exposure to English language conversations, English language materials, and the role of the first language (L1) to students' proficiency in identifying grammatical errors and competence in transforming errors to their correct form.

### Keywords:

formal and functional aspects of language language, language learning, syntax

---

### Introduction

Language is one of the most influential and useful tools for human communication. Language is a method of human communication, with the use of words in a structured and conventional way (Dufour,

2017). Language is more than a communication system because it serves as a powerful identity marker which binds people together and sets them apart as a distinct social group (Consul, 2014). Moreover, it serves as an avenue for the expression of thoughts, ideas, emotions, creation of friendships, cultural

ties, economic relationships, and the determination of one's perception of reality. Without language, individuals would have difficulty in expressing their opinions to others, nor could involve themselves to activities that ordinarily exist in the society they build themselves (Di Pietro, 1994 cited in Mosh, 2014).

The role of language in every aspect of a person's life is important. However, its role is not only restricted to the transmission of messages but, to the immeasurable wisdom and knowledge of humans through education (Zedan, et al., 2013). Language plays a crucial role in learning, and if the learner is handicapped in the language of instruction, then learning may not take place at all as the teacher and the learner will not be communicating (Malekela, 2003). Language is a complex system made up of words, phrases, clauses, and discourse patterns used to conjure up images that represent the speaker's own world. It evolves over rules - grammar. Grammar is one of the most difficult aspects of a foreign language to master. It is the rules that govern how a language's sentences are formed (Thornbury, 2000).

English grammar is "a system of syntax that decides the order and patterns in which words are arranged in sentences" (Thornbury, 2000, cited in Hermanto, 2016). It is argued that mastering grammar is a complex process that requires "making a series of decisions about when and why to use one form rather than the other" (Celce-Murcia, 2002). Grammar embodies a lot of rules and one of it is the Subject and Verb Agreement (SVA). The SVA are rules to consider so that words in the sentence are grammatically correct and coherent. Effective writing depends on having solid knowledge of the syntactic aspects of the language (formal and functional) at the word, sentence, paragraph, and essay levels. It is expected that students must be proficient and competent in the syntactic structure of the language. However, even long years of exposure and learning English language in school, the grammar of the target language is just one of the things that many students do not always get right. Majority of them find it difficult to study English because of the intricacies of its grammar. Studies have reported that second language learners, teachers, and any professionals must be adept, regardless of the country or the language, on the

knowledge of the English grammar since it is the foundation for communication. It is believed that the better the grammar, the clearer the message, and the more likelihood of understanding the message's intent and meaning (Hans & Hans, 2017).

Despite the fact that English is a second language to students, teachers, and other professionals, they need to exert effort in studying the grammatical rules of the language. Knowing the grammatical rules allows speakers to produce an infinite set of sentences that can be easily understood by anyone who is proficient in the language.

Having the full grasp of the syntactic structure of English language is vital in the world today. Knowledge of the grammar of the language is one of the key factors in competitiveness and success. It is a valuable tool for learning as well as understanding a new language (Johnson, 2014). Correct grammatical construction of sentences keeps one from being misconstrued. Bradshaw (2011) said that most in-depth thinkers, regardless of their national identity, realize that correct grammar leads to the kind of power in leadership that comes from superior communication. Thus, to become a proficient and competent writer, speaker, and listener, one must be knowledgeable of the grammar of the language.

In this study, proficiency is focused on the ability to use the formal aspect of the language while competence is referred to as the psychological capacity in using the functional aspect of the language. Students need to be proficient in identifying grammatical errors and be competent enough in transforming these grammatical errors into their correct forms to avoid speech errors. Moreover, their knowledge and understanding of the grammar of the English language is the key to all their successful business and academic communications.

Likewise, researchers believed that variables such as availability of learning materials at home, frequency of use of these available materials, students' response to exposure to grammar lessons have direct association to the linguistic proficiency and competence level of students. However, with the limited literature to support this belief, this study was crafted.

## Framework of the Study

This study is anchored on two syntactic theories - the formal theory of Ferdinand de Saussure (1916) and the functional theory of Simon Dik (1970). Both theories are primarily concerned with linguistic form, e.g. how a word is pronounced, what it means, or where it occurs in the sentence. Saussure described formal approach to language as the internal structures of language, which is primarily interested in the linguistic form itself; while functional linguistics, is focused on the functions language serves and the ways that syntax is organized to serve these functions. Dik (1970) described functional linguistics as an instrument of social interaction among human beings, used with the intention of establishing communicative relationships.

In an educational context, one is expected to be an adept both in formal and functional aspects of the grammar of the language because good grammar is the essence of effective communication. Nevertheless, advancing language growth are associated with early home and preschool experiences, such as the availability of reading materials at home; humble act of reading various books with diverse subjects to a young child; etc. Dickinson, et al. (2012) strongly claimed that reading books persistently to a child at an early stage is an effective technique of nurturing language acquisition as well as improving children's early reading success. Thus, earlier constant exposure to reading materials is one of the significant variables, besides availability of learning materials at home and exposure to grammar lessons, which boosts later language learning.

Consequently, both proficiency and competence towards the use of the language are believed to have been affected by the prevalent use of reading materials at home.

## Purpose of the Research

Victoria (2012) stressed the need to consider the variety of factors in communication of which the underlying competence of the participants in speech interaction is a fundamental ingredient in effective

transmission of message. The prime purpose of this research endeavour is to assess the proficiency (the speaker-hearer's mastery of the linguistic form of his language) in identifying grammatical errors and competence (the ability to understand the meaning of language in concrete situations) to change the syntactic errors into its grammatical form.

Specifically, this sought to (1) identify available learning materials at home and the frequency of use of these learning materials; (2) identify students' response to exposure to grammar lessons; (3) evaluate the proficiency level in identifying grammatical errors and their competence in transforming grammatical errors to its correct form; and (4) determine the association between student's demographic profile, frequency of use of learning materials, proficiency in grammatical error analysis, and competence in syntax transformation.

## Methodology

### Methods and Design

The study used the descriptive-correlational design. The study collected information on the availability of learning materials at their respective homes and the frequency of use of these materials. Participants' frequency of exposure to grammar lessons and their attitude towards grammar were also obtained. In addition, the level of proficiency of students in identifying grammatical errors and their level of competence in changing these grammatical errors into its correct form were also evaluated. Furthermore, association between students' demographic profile, frequency of use of learning materials, proficiency level in grammatical error analysis, and competence level in syntax transformation were established.

### Research Respondents and Locale of the Study

The study involved sixty Grade 10 students who belonged to the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) program at a national high school in Southern Leyte, Philippines. This institution is the largest national secondary school in the whole Division of Southern Leyte, with a population of 2,877 students, 77 teachers, and 21 school staff. The

school offers five (5) special programs namely; (1) Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), (2) Model Class program (MC), (3) Special Program of the Arts (SPA), (4) Special Program for Sports (SPS) and the Regular program.

Of the sixty students, 40 (66.7%) are 15 years old and the rest are 16 or 17 years old. Also, 38 of the 60 students are females.

### Research Instrument

In gathering the required data, a researcher-made questionnaire was used. The first part of the questionnaire is about the demographic profile of the respondents. The second part consisted of four tables with questions about the availability of learning materials at home, frequency of use of these materials, response of students towards grammar and the frequency of their exposure towards grammar lessons. The third part contained the worksheet of 30 sentences. These sentences were evaluated by the participants whether or not these sentences have errors. If errors are found, students have to change the errors into its correct form.

For reliability, the researcher-made questionnaire was pilot-tested to other fourth year students who were not under the STEM program while content validity was done with the collaboration of language experts. After thorough evaluation of the content validity and reliability of the original instrument based on the responses from the pilot test, certain items in the first and second part of the instruments were reworded or rephrased to clarify the information being solicited. Meanwhile, for the third part, which contains the worksheet, only 30 sentences were retained from the original 100 sentences. Using Cronbach alpha, the reliability coefficient of the remaining 30 items is 0.87.

### Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and measures of central tendency (mean, median and mode) were used to summarize and characterize the demographic profile of the students, the availability of learning materials and the frequency of use of these materials, the level of proficiency of students in identifying grammatical

errors, and their level of competence in transforming errors into correct form. In addition, the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to establish the association between frequency of use of available materials and students' level of proficiency in identifying grammatical errors and their level of competence in transforming errors into correct form.

To determine the level of proficiency (*Beginning, Developing, Approaching Proficiency, Proficient, and Advanced*) of students based on their scores, the Guidelines on the Assessment and Rating of Learning Outcomes under the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum, DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012 was adopted. The same descriptors were applied to determine the level of competence.

## Results and Discussion

### Availability and Frequency of Use of Learning Materials

*Table 1. Availability of Learning Materials*

Learning Materials	No. of Students	%
Books	60	100.00
Journals	47	78.33
TV	55	91.67
PC	40	66.67

Table 1 shows the available reading materials in the respective homes of the respondents. All the sixty respondents have books at home and about nine in every ten respondents indicated that they have television sets at home. In addition, about 7 or 8 in every ten reported that they have personal computers (PC) and/or journals at home.

The availability of these learning materials at home is influential on the acquisition of the grammatical aspects of the language. Students who have any learning materials in the home positively contribute to increase the level of competence and proficiency of the use of language. This is congruent to the report of NAEP (1998) that students with higher reading performance were more likely to report four types of reading materials in their homes -

*Table 2. Frequency of Use of Learning Materials in the Respective Homes*

Learning Materials	Never		Sometimes		Always		Median	Description
	No. of students	%	No. of students	%	No. of students	%		
Books	0	0.00	22	36.67	38	63.33	2	Always
Journals	13	21.67	25	41.67	22	36.67	1	Sometimes
TV	5	8.33	6	10	49	81.67	2	Always
PC	20	33.33	18	30	22	36.67	1	Sometimes

encyclopedias, magazines, newspapers, and at least 25 books, (as cited in Raising Readers, 1999). Thus, it is essential for all the homes to have variety of reading materials because these facilitate in the learning of the grammar of the language.

However, Needleman et al., (1991) stressed that the biggest obstacle to literacy is the scarcity of books and appropriate reading materials. A Research Foundation reported that in the Philippines, for example, public elementary and secondary schools lack 95 million books in 2011. Also, in many homes, there simply are not any books, magazines, or newspapers appropriate for children.

Table 2 presents the frequency of use of the learning materials available in the homes of the respondents. Students are always using books and televisions while available journals and computers are only used sometimes. The data suggest that students who frequently use learning materials are more likely to acquire the grammar of the language. Consistent use of these learning materials also offers children the opportunity to encounter new vocabulary items embedded in varied grammatical sentences. According to Dickinson, et al., (2011), the power to create interactional contexts that nourish language development is greatly dependent to book reading. Books which are well-written for children use well-formed and relatively short sentences that are rich in varied vocabulary. Furthermore, books often use the same words in diverse grammatical constructions, offering implicit lessons in how words are used. In contrast to spoken discourses, books have pinned the importance of vocabulary expansion by varying word choices (Dickinson & Tabors, 2001).

Moreover, there is a great evidence that attention and comprehension, receptive vocabulary, some expressive language, letter-sound knowledge, and knowledge of narrative and storytelling all benefit from high-quality and age-appropriate educational programming. However, literature has not established whether children develop grammar, phonological awareness, and knowledge of literacy from viewing such programming (Close, 2004).

#### **Students' Response to Exposure to Grammar Lessons**

Table 3 presents the responses of the students to grammar. Elicitation of their authentic perception with regard to their interest to the exposure to grammar lesson is shown here. Based on the result, everybody has a positive response with interest with regard to exposure to the grammar of the English language. This response shows their willingness to learn the intricacies of the language. According to Bloom (2000), language learning occurs best when the subject matter are of immediate interest to children. Thus, through exposure to the grammar of the language, children would find it easier to regulate their own thoughts, feelings, and actions or abilities that are essential to social development and school success (Blair, 2002).

*Table 3. Students' Response to Exposure to Grammar Lessons*

Response to Grammar	No. of students	Percent
Negative with interest	1	1.67
Positive with interest	59	98.33

In addition, it is revealed that 59 out of 60 students are positively interested to be exposed to grammar lessons in their language classes. This means that their consistent exposure to grammar lessons would have a positive effect on their proficiency in identifying grammatical errors in sentences and their competence in transforming grammatical errors to its correct form. Students' exposure to the grammar of the language through language-based interaction and classroom instruction would help them acquire mastery of the intricacies of the language grammatical structure. Moreover, they will learn to use the language socially in appropriate ways. Dickinson et al., (2011) stressed that children must abundantly hear much language from professionals and other individuals who use the language, regardless of the context, in order to be immersed to broad range of vocabulary and sentence structures. Through this immersion, both their overall levels of proficiency and specific aspects of their second language competence, such as grammatical development will be developed (Genesee, 2007).

### Proficiency in Identifying Grammatical Errors and Competence in Transforming Errors into Its Correct Form

Table 4 shows the cross tabulation of students' proficiency in identifying the grammatical errors and their competence of transforming errors into the grammatical form of the utterances.

The result shows that 32 (53.3%) of the 60 students have advanced level of proficiency in

identifying grammatical errors and of them 31 (96.9) have advanced level of competence in transforming errors to its grammatical form. Meanwhile, six (10%) of the 60 students are proficient in identifying errors and all of them are competent in correcting these grammatical errors into their correct form. In addition, 20 (33.3%) of the 60 students are approaching proficiency in identifying grammatical errors and all of them are approaching competence in transforming these errors to its correct form. Less than 3% of the students have beginning or developing proficiency in identifying grammatical errors. This finding suggests that higher level of proficiency in identifying errors is significantly associated with higher level of competence. In fact, calculating the correlation between level of proficiency and level of competence results to Spearman rho value of 0.9880 with p-value<0.01. In other words, proficiency in identifying grammatical errors is strongly associated with the competence in transforming errors into grammatically correct sentences.

Though the data revealed that majority of the students have at least approaching proficient and competent levels, the data also suggest that there is still a need to come up with some interventions to ensure that all learners will achieve the advanced proficiency and competence levels.

English teachers must consistently give learners sufficient classroom opportunities on the explanation of the grammar of the language and the meaningful application of these rules in various social contexts. They should teach grammar using deductive

**Table 4. Proficiency in Identifying Grammatical Errors and Competence in Transforming Errors into Its Correct Form Cross Tabulation**

Proficiency Level	Competence Level										Total
	Beginning		Developing		Approaching Competent		Competent		Advanced		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
<b>Beginning</b>	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (1.7%)
<b>Developing</b>	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 (1.7%)
<b>Approaching Proficient</b>	0	0	0	0	20	100	0	0	0	0	20 (33.3%)
<b>Proficient</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	100	0	0	6 (10.0%)
<b>Advanced</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1	31	96.9	32 (53.3%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	1	1.67	1	1.67	20	33.33	7	11.67	31	51.67	60

reasoning or inductive reasoning (Thornbury, 2000). Then, some communicative based tasks might be used to practice the rules (Andrews, 2007). In order to help benefit the most from grammar classes, learners must understand the rules and be able to apply them properly and appropriately.

**Association Between Frequency of Use of Learning Materials, Proficiency in Grammatical Error Analysis and Competence in Syntax Transformation**

*Table 5. Association between Frequency of Use of Learning Materials, Proficiency in Grammatical Error Analysis, and Competence in Syntax Transformation*

<b>Learning Materials</b>	<b>Proficiency in Grammatical Error Analysis</b>	<b>Competence in Syntax Transformation</b>
<b>Books</b>	0.1653 (0.2070)	0.1471 (0.2621)
<b>Journals</b>	0.1798 (0.2265)	0.1617 (0.2775)
<b>TV</b>	0.1138 (0.4081)	0.1216 (0.3766)
<b>PC</b>	0.0955 (0.5576)	0.0955 (0.5576)

Note: Figures in the table are Spearman rho coefficients and values inside the parentheses are the p-values.

Allwright (1990) argued that learning materials should teach students to learn. They should be resource books for ideas and activities for instruction or learning and that they should give teachers rationales for what they do. Moreover, language learning materials are viewed to have underlying instructional philosophies, approaches, methods, linguistic, and cultural content. These resulted to a hidden curriculum which covers the teacher-student attitude towards the material in terms of its content, its role in the teaching-learning relationship, and its values concerning gender and society. Language learning materials, therefore, are considered as an important factor which influence whatever transpire inside the classroom (Littlejohn and Windeatt, 1989, cited in Kitao & Kitao, 1995).

Data in Table 5 reveals the correlation between the frequency of use of learning materials available at

home, students' proficiency in identifying grammatical errors and their competence in transforming grammatical errors to its correct form. Evidently, there is no significant association between the frequency of use of learning materials and students' proficiency to identify grammatical errors. Similarly, there is no significant association between frequency of use of learning materials and students' level of competence in changing grammatical errors into its correct form. This means to say that the frequency of use of these learning materials at home are not determinants of students' proficiency and competence to identify and correct grammatical errors.

These results imply that frequency of use of these learning materials are not indicators for students' proficiency and competence in identifying and correcting grammatical errors. There might be underlying factors that have facilitated the students' proficiency in identifying grammatical errors and their competence in transforming grammatical errors to its correct form other than frequency of use of learning materials.

**Conclusion**

This study looked into the students' frequency of use of learning materials available at their respective homes, their proficiency in grammatical error identification, their competence in syntax transformation, and the interrelationships among these variables. In the Philippines, only few studies explored on students' level of proficiency in identifying grammatical errors and students' level of competence in transforming these errors into the correct form, as well as looking into the effect of the frequency of use of all the available learning materials at home to the levels of both skills.

The results of the study revealed that students are less frequently using learning materials at home and more than half of them have advanced level of proficiency in identifying grammatical error. Likewise, more than half of the student-respondents have advanced level of competence in transforming grammatical errors into their correct form. The findings of the study further revealed that students' proficiency in grammatical error identification is

strongly associated with their competence in syntax transformation. However, the frequency of use of all the available learning materials at home has nothing to do with the level of proficiency in grammatical error identification and the level of competence in syntax transformation.

This study provides an evidence that both formal and functional aspects of the language are essential in the context of good communication. Likewise, the understanding of the grammar of the language facilitates clear and effective communication.

Thus, it is a challenge for every teacher to continually improve the classroom language instruction and the quality of language learning of students through students' engagement to various pedagogical activities and exposure to English language learning materials.

• • •

## References

- Allen, E., & Valette, R. (1997). *Classroom techniques: Foreign languages and English as a second language*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Allwright, R. L. (1990). What do we want teaching materials for? In Rossner, R. and Bolitho, R. (Eds.), *Currents in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Andrews, K. L. Z. (2007). The effects of implicit and explicit instruction on simple and complex grammatical structures for adult English language learners, *TESL-EJ*, 11(2). Retrieved March 3, 2012, from <http://tesl-ej.org/ej42/a5.html>.
- Blair, C. (2002). School readiness: Integrating cognition and emotion in a neurobiological conceptualization of children's functioning at school entry. *American Psychologist*, 57(2), pp. 111–127.
- Bloom, P. (2000). *How children learn the meanings of words*. MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass, USA.
- Bradshaw, W. (2011). *The big ten of grammar: identifying and fixing the ten most frequent grammatical errors*. Canada: Vine Publication.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2002). Why it makes sense to teach grammar in context and through discourse. In Hinkel, E. and Fotos, S. (Eds.). *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 119–134). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Close, R. A. (1982). *English as a foreign language*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Close, R. A. (2004). *Television and language development in the early years: A review of the literature*. National Literacy Trust. Retrieved from [http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/assets/0000/0429/TV\\_early\\_years\\_2004.pdf](http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/assets/0000/0429/TV_early_years_2004.pdf).
- Consul, S. M. (2014). The morphological system of Iniskaya. *Journal of Educational and Human Resource Development* 2014, pp. 48-69.
- DepEd Order No. 73, s. 2012. *Guidelines on the assessment and rating of learning outcomes under the K to 12 basic education curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-73-s-2012>.
- DepEd Order No. 16, s. 2015. *Addendum to DepEd order no. 1, s. 2015 (Declaring January 24, 2015 as commencement of early registration for SY 2015-2016)*. Retrieved from <http://www.deped.gov.ph/orders/do-16-s-2015>.
- Di Pietro, R. (1994). Helping people do things with English. In Mosha, M. A. (2014). Factors affecting students' performance in English language in Zanzibar rural and urban secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 35, 2014.



- Dickinson, D. et al., (2011). How reading books fosters language development around the world. *Child Development Research*, 2012. Retrieved from <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/cdr/2012/602807/>.
- Dickinson, D. K. & Tabors, P. O. (Eds.). (2001). Beginning literacy with language: Young children learning at home and school. In Dickinson, D. et al., (2011). How reading books fosters language development around the world. *Child Development Research, Volume (2012)*. Retrieved from <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/cdr/2012/602807/>.
- Dik, S. C. (August, 2017). *Functional discourse grammar*. Retrieved from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Functional\\_discourse\\_grammar](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Functional_discourse_grammar).
- Dufour, F. (November 9, 2017). *Exploring the possibilities for the emergence of a single and global native language*. Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3068406>.
- Genesee, F. (2007). Top ten most consistent findings from research on foreign language immersion. *The ACIE Newsletter, May 2007, 10(3)*. Retrieved from [http://carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol10/may2007\\_researchfindings.html](http://carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol10/may2007_researchfindings.html).
- Hans, A. and Hans, E. (2017). Role of grammar in communication – writing skills. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities*, 5(1), January 2017.
- Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching*. Malaysia: Longman.
- Johnson, J. (2014). *Ask daily grammar: Why is grammar important?* Retrieved from <http://ask.dailygrammar.com/Why-is-grammar-important.html>.
- Kitao, K., and Kitao, S. K. (September 16, 1982). College reading textbooks do not meet needs. *The Daily Yomiuri*, p. 7.
- Kitao, K., Kitao, S. K., Yoshida, S., Yoshida, H., Kawamura, K., and Kurata, M. (1995). A study of trends of college English reading textbooks in Japan: An analysis of college English reading textbooks for 1985. In Kitao, K. and Kitao, S. K. *English teaching: Theory, Research and practice* (pp. 205-216). Tokyo: Eichosha.
- Littlejohn, A., & Windeatt, S. (1989). Beyond language learning: Perspective on materials design. In Kitao, K., Kitao, S. K., Yoshida, S., Yoshida, H., Kawamura, K., and Kurata, M. (1995). *A study of trends of college English reading textbooks in Japan: An analysis of college English reading textbooks for 1985*.
- Mackay, W. A. (2011). *Grammar: Sets of rules*. Retrieved July 1, 2014 from <http://your.usc.edu.au/wacana/2/grammar.sla.html>.
- Malekela, G. (2003). English as a medium of instruction in post-primary education in Tanzania: Is it a fair policy to the learners? In: Brock-Utne, B., Desai, Z., & Qorro, M. (eds.). *Language of instruction in Tanzania and South Africa*. (LOITASA). Dar es Salaam: E&D Limited. Retrieved from <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/viewFile/17455/17714>.
- Mosha, H. (2014). New directions in teacher education for quality improvement in Africa. *Papers in Education and Development*, 24, pp. 23-28.
- Needleman, N. et al., (1991). *Raising readers. The tremendous potential of families*. Retrieved from [https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/startearly/ch\\_1.html](https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/startearly/ch_1.html).
- O'Neill, R. (1990). Why use textbooks? In Rossner, R. and Bolitho, R. (Eds.). *Currents in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Quist, D. (2000). *Primary teaching methods*. London: Macmillan.
- Raising readers (*July 1999*). *Start early, finish strong: How to help every child become a reader*.

Retrieved from [https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/startearly/ch\\_1.html](https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/startearly/ch_1.html).

Roy-Campbell, Z. and Qorro, M. (1997). *Language crisis in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.

Saussure, F. (November 2017). *Structuralism*. Retrieved from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Structuralism>.

Philips, J. W. (n.d.). *Structuralism and semiotics*. Retrieved from <https://courses.nus.edu.sg/course/elljwp/structuralism.htm>.

Thornbury, S. (2000). *How to teach grammar*. London: Pearson ESL.

Thornbury, S. (2000). How to teach grammar. In Hermanto, O. (2016). Analysis of second grade students writing competence, errors, and problems in accounting department of SMK PGRI PALU. *Jurnal Bahasantodea*, 4(1), January 2016.

Victoria, C. (2012). *English as a universal language*. Cambridge, UK: Robinson College.

Zedan, A. M., et al., (2013). The role of language in education: Arabic as case study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier, 70, pages 1002-1008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.151>.