

Comparative Analysis of Students' Mistakes Appearance while Working with ESP Texts

Elena Andronova¹

¹Tashkent Branch of Moscow State University named after M.V.Lomonosov, Amir Temur prospect 22, Tashkent 100060, Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10439524>

Keywords: ESP Reading, ESP Texts, Comparative Analysis, Target Language, Students' mistakes and errors.

Abstract: The article "Comparative Analysis of Students' Mistakes Appearance while Working with ESP Texts" describes the main factors of comparative issues in linguistics from the methodological point of view while teaching ESP reading. Moreover, the article shows the author's results of students' mistakes analysis provided with examples taken from ESP texts for the students of psychological faculties suggesting the ways the comparative analysis results can be helpful for further scientific research and foreign language teaching methodology as a whole.

1 INTRODUCTION

The comparative study issues of different languages system have always been of interest not only to linguists, but also to methodologists who study the problems of language intervention, revealing the connection between comparative linguistics and foreign language teaching methodology, taking into account the characteristics of the target language and the native one. Furthermore, scientists have been discussing and identifying a unified approach to comparing languages for a long time, but there is still no definite developed system of language comparison. When comparing systems of different languages, it is customary to use two approaches:

1. Level approach used to compare genetically closely related and typologically related languages, as well as to express the same level in systems of compared languages;
2. Cross-level approach is used when comparing systems of genetically distant related languages and when determining cross level synonyms within the system of each of the compared languages. In this approach, systems of genetically unrelated languages are compared, since their systems are

characterized by the absence of deep-surface identity of typological category.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The purpose of the research is to compare two languages English and Russian and find out the mistakes that students make while doing the reading tasks and to find possible solution to exclude further students' mistakes.

Despite the existence of pluralism of comparing languages methods, there is a unanimous opinion regarding the use of a "metalanguage" in linguistic typology. This term was first proposed to be used by B.A. Uspensky, who proceeds from the concept of comparison of languages or their systems. When comparing two or more languages, one of them is taken as a reference language (metalanguage), taking into account the possession of wide applicability and universality. For example, when comparing English and Russian languages, both Russian and English systems can be taken as the reference language, depending on the purpose and task of the comparison. For

example, English can be chosen as a metalanguage by comparing the categories of certainty and indefiniteness or forms of plural formation or temporary grammatical categories, since the English language system is characterized by the existence of special markers, such as definite and indefinite articles. Therefore, the problems of comparative linguistics and the phenomenon of "interference", describing the ways of comparing languages at different linguistic levels and using various comparison technologies, were studied by E.D. Polevanov, U.K. Yusupov, V.M. Bildyan, N.M. Vereshchagin, E.M. Akhunryanov, V.G. Gez, M.D. Dzhusupov, J.Kh. Buranov, I.A., Kissen M. Magometova, V.D. Arakin and others. Thus, M.D. Dzhusupov, U.K. Yusupov, Uzbekistan linguists, compared languages at different levels. T. Bushui, F. Ruzikulov considered all levels of the language (phonetic, lexical, morphological and syntactic), where a comparative analysis of the structures of the English and Russian languages is allowed. Additionally, the phenomenon of interference was considered by such scientists as W.Weinrakh, S.L. Rubinstein, I.A.Winter, E.M.Akhunzyanov, defining interference in different ways. Therefore, S. Rubinshtein described interference as a phenomenon that makes it difficult to form new skills or reduce their manifestation [4]. Furthermore, U.Weinrakh interprets interference as a deviation from the norms of linguistic structures that occurs in the process of linguistic interaction. Whereas, E.M.Akhunzyanov describes interference as "a change in the structure or elements of the structure of one language under the influence of another, and it does not matter whether it is a native or a second language, since interference can occur in both directions". I.A. Winter highlights positive and negative phenomena when using a foreign language. From the point of view of I.A. Winter, the elements of language systems influence each other, forming positive skills - transfer and negative ones – interference [7]. However, V.M.Mokienko, explaining the phenomenon of interference, says that when preparing for classes, the teacher needs to take into account the native language of students, it is necessary to eradicate interference by using positive transfer [5]. According to Bildiy V.M., a number of factors characterizing interference are determined in the scientific and methodological literature:

- a linguistic factor that determines the degree of difference between the native and studied languages;

- social factor, the scope of the language being studied;
- psycholinguistic factor that determines the type of speech activity;
- a psychological factor showing the level of language proficiency;
- a methodological factor that determines the way of language acquisition.

RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Thus, after analyzing the scientific and methodological literature, it can be inferred that the phenomenon of interference and ways to eradicate it have not been fully studied yet. Based on the obtained information about interference, we, using a comparative analysis of two genetically and typologically different languages, English and Russian, determined the nature of the mistakes made by students during tasks when reading ESP texts, which are followed by interference from the Russian language. Overall, the comparison allows "to identify those linguistic phenomena in the target language that distinguish it from the native language of students and generate typical errors" [1]. We studied the works of the above scientists and carried out a comparative analysis of Russian and English languages from the point of view of a communicative methodology for teaching reading ESP texts. This analysis helped us to identify those linguistic phenomena that distinguish the Russian and English languages we compared, despite the fact that they belong to different language families. When comparing, we considered the typological characteristics of the two languages at the phonetic, grammatical and morpho-logical levels. The metalanguage in the comparison was English, as it is students' target language. Additionally, when analyzing the literature, we also found out that when learning a foreign language, it is necessary to compare two languages using translation. Though, the communicative methodology does not imply the use of translation, but only the target language vocabulary, however we partially agree with this issue and believe that at the elementary level a teacher may use his/her native language when explaining terminology or grammatical issues. But, on the contrary, when teaching reading ESP texts, it is quite essential to develop students' reading comprehension skills without translating words and sentences. However, it is allowed to translate only key words. Although, we do not deny the fact that when learning a foreign language, one way or another, the student draws an analogy with his/her native language. Taking into account this fact, a

teacher needs to be attentive with the emerging interference and help students overcome making mistakes in a foreign language speech [6]. Thus, from teaching languages methodology point of view, linguistic comparison is essential to determine the causes of mistakes in the target language and the selection of the necessary methodology to eliminate them. Nevertheless, we note that making mistakes in both written and oral speech is a natural process of learning foreign language speech and culture, since it is not only about the assimilation of new knowledge, but also the need to decode the acquired knowledge into another language system. Furthermore, it is impossible to exclude learning without mistakes, but they can be minimized, which is the task of scientists, methodologists and teachers when searching and analyzing effective teaching methods in order not only to correct errors, but also to anticipate them and prevent their occurrence. When teaching students foreign languages, which are different in structure from their native language, methodologists resort to the help of comparative typology as an auxiliary material. The methodology requires the conclusions of comparative typology in explaining language categories. For example, explaining the grammatical category Continuous tenses, which does not exist in Russian: She is reading. – “Она читает”. What is more, analyzing students’ mistakes in terms of interference they are characterized according to the influence of students’ native language on the target language system. In the case of constant use of the native language in teaching a foreign language, students will retain errors due to the influence of their native language at all stages of learning. That is the reason why it is necessary to take into account multiple factors such as: students’ age, the ability to think critically, the students’ English level, and the typological proximity of the native and studied languages. All these factors are essential when compiling textbooks and methodological recommendations, because it is necessary to proceed from the systemic features of the native and foreign languages in order to minimize the mistakes made by students in the process of learning a foreign language. We have found out that comparison helps to identify similarities and differences in the target and native languages, and when working with ESP texts, students make mistakes, due to the fact that their native language differs in structure from the target one. Thus, the languages we compare are typologically different. Therefore, English is an analytical language (when

constructing sentences, auxiliary words are used, such as service parts of speech, auxiliary verbs, etc.), Russian is synthetic; that is, the structure of the language in the formation of sentences implies the use of inflections. When working with texts, we assessed the errors that occur when students communicate with each other or when answering questions orally on the material they read, as well as assessed the difficulties that arise during the execution of tasks on the text in English for psychologists. We analyzed the following categories of errors, such as:

-phonetic;

When students performed oral tasks on the text, we found errors in the pronunciation of words such as psychology - where students pronounce it like [psi `k ɒ l ə dʒ i] or like [psai `k ɒ l ə gi], the correct version is [sai `k ɒ l ə dʒ i]. In the first case, the reading of all letters in a given word is a direct interference of the Russian language, in which all letters in the word are read. In the second case, incorrect pronunciation indicates that there are no letter combinations in Russian that are read as one sound. The solution to this problem is to explain the reading rules to students, silent consonant “ps” -[s], and note that “ch” in this word it is pronounced as [k]. Usually, it leaves no difficulty in explaining, since in Russian there are such concepts as silent letters as well. Additionally, it is necessary to explain to students the correct pronunciation of such letter combinations as “with h”, “Sh”.

In comparison with the number of phonetic mistakes appeared in the text, grammatical ones are made much more often, the reason for the appearance of such a number of errors is the difference in the expression of various grammatical categories in the native and target languages. For example, the most common mistake made is the use of plurality. For instance: The difference between psychologist and psychiatrist are, instead of is. This error lies in the improper notion of the subject and, accordingly, an error occurs in choosing wrong plurality of a verb form.

The next type of error is the incorrect use of the ending - s: Psychologists treat s less severe conditions; psychiatrists treat more complex mental health disorders. In this sentence, the verb is misused in the third person plural. Students transfer from the Russian language the use of the ending “-ат”: “Психологи лечат...”. This type of error manifests itself mechanically, as students translate sentences according to their native language system: -lexical;

Lexical errors in the speech of students, both when performing tasks and when reading ESP material, are formed due to a number of factors:

- a) The name and number of parts of speech in Russian and English do not match.
- b) with the coincidence of the main characteristics of the parts of speech in Russian and English, they still have some distinctive features;
- c) the grammatical characteristics of words may differ. Such as the absence of articles in Russian;
- d) the ways of word formation and the structure of words are different;
- e) the words denoting the plural do not coincide with the concepts of the plural;
- f) different ways of word formation;
- g) words with several meanings do not match each other in meaning when translated;
- h) words that have a similar pronunciation in both Russian and English, but have completely different meanings, in other words, these are "false friends" [2], [3].

- errors that occur when performing tasks when working with text.

While working with the text, performing pre - text (pre - reading), text while - reading and after text (post - reading) tasks, students have a number of errors associated with understanding what they read, as well as highlighting the main idea of the text, its subsequent orally or in writing. We would like to note that when working with ESP text, it is especially difficult to isolate the main idea from the content of what has been read, since it is necessary to understand the entire text. One of the reasons why students cannot understand the meaning of the material they read is a lack of terminology understanding and encountering unfamiliar words. While reading an unfamiliar text, students actively use the dictionary without trying to guess the meaning of the word from the context. Thus, when reading, searching for words takes a lot of time and students' attention is scattered. Moreover, the reason for making mistakes when compiling a summary of the materials lies in the fact that students just copy sentences from the text or memorize them when retelling instead of writing or telling using their own words. Therefore, the meaning of the text is either distorted or incomplete.

CONCLUSIONS

Having analyzed all types of students' mistakes while working with texts on psychology in English, we came to the conclusion that when working with texts, teachers, methodologists need to take into account the cause and frequency of

errors when choosing a foreign language teaching methodology for special purposes, so that keep them to a minimum.

Furthermore, the analysis of frequency and types of students' mistakes made when working with ESP texts in psychology will help teachers and methodologists to developing a set of lexical and grammatical exercises aimed at improving the foreign language lexical competence of students learning a language.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the higher institutions of Uzbekistan as Navoi State Pedagogical Institute, Bukhara State University, Samarkand State University, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek, and Karshi State University for providing an opportunity for us to conduct our research concerning the research aims and goals.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akhmedova L.T. (2012) Theory and practice of teaching professional Russian speech to students-philologists.: Dis dr ped .n auk . - T., , 108.
- [2] Arbekova T.I.(1990) English without errors / - M. Higher School, 220.
- [3] Philol K. Panin V.V.(2013) Persistent lexical and grammatical errors in the process of learning English and ways to correct them. Retrived from www.confcontact.com/2013_06
- [4] Rubinshtein S.L.(2015) Fundamentals of General Psychology.St. Petersburg.713.
- [5] Sternin I.A. (2006) Contrastive Linguistics. M: East-West.206.
- [6] Sternin I.A. (2015)Comparison as a linguistic methodology. Comparative studies 2015.-Voronezh: "Origins".3-11.
- [7] Winter I.A. (2008) Pedagogical psychology: Textbook for universities. Second ed., additional, corrected and revised . - M .: Universitetskaya kniga, LOGOS.384.