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#### Abstract

This thesis presents an analysis of written lexicogrammatical errors, made by first-year Japanese university students studying English as their second language (L2). The perspective taken by the analysis, and the tools with which it is conducted, are those of Michael Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG).

The research is contextualised by an exploration of the history of L2 error analysis as it appears in the academic literature. Since the literature presents a somewhat confusing picture, a new framework for categorising and understanding error analyses is presented.

Sixty-six short essays, comprising 970 clauses, were collected and analysed. A total of 72 error categories were identified.

The analysis shows that many errors are actually composite in nature, deriving from two and sometimes three different 'strands of meaning', or metafunctions. The analysis also illustrates that most errors involve not merely syntagmatic departures from English grammar, but also idiosyncratic paradigmatic choices from system networks. It is therefore argued that SFG allows us to posit two interpretations of these errors. The first considers them to be incorrect realisations of meaningful choices within what is commonly called 'Standard English', or what is called in this thesis the English System Network (ESN). The second interpretation takes the concept of 'choice' as its starting point, and views errors as incorrect selections from lexicogrammatical systems. While not amounting to a theory of an emerging variety of English, this second approach allows us to model lexicogrammatical systems as they emerge from learner texts.

It is shown how these SFG-inspired perspectives can benefit language pedagogy, as they promote a greater focus on meaning than traditional, rule-based approaches. While still taking account of form, they help learners to visualise and contextualise these elements within the ESN through the use of system diagrams.
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## Glossary of acronyms used in this thesis
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| :---: | :---: |
| C\# | clause number |
| CA | contrastive analysis |
| CAH | contrastive analysis hypothesis |
| CF | corrective feedback |
| CLT | communicative language teaching |
| E\# | error number |
| EA | error analysis |
| EC | Error Category |
| ED | error description |
| EFL | English as a foreign language |
| EG | error gravity |
| ELF | English as a lingua franca |
| ELT | English language teaching |
| EP | epithet |
| ESL | English as a second language |
| ESN | English System Network |
| EA | error analysis |
| EEA | Explicit Error Analysis |
| EM | ideational-experiential metafunction |
| FD | 'My Future Dream' essay topic |
| IEA | Implicit Error Analysis |
| IL | interlanguage |
| IM | interpersonal metafunction |
| JI | 'A Job Interview' essay topic |
| JUS | Japanese university student(s) |
| L1 | first language |
| L2 | second language |
| LA | 'Last Weekend' essay topic |
| LM | ideational-logical metafunction |
| NS | native speaker |


| QEA | Quasi Error Analysis |
| :---: | :---: |
| S\# | sentence number |
| S-I | 'Self-Introduction' essay title |
| SFG | Systemic Functional Grammar |
| SFL | Systemic Functional Linguistics |
| SLA | second language acquisition |
| SR | 'My Sunday Routine' essay topic |
| TG | Transformational Grammar |
| TEA | Tacit Error Analysis |
| TFA | Transitional Form Analysis |
| TM | textual metafunction |

## Chapter 1 : Introduction

### 1.1 Introduction

This thesis presents an analysis of written lexicogrammatical errors, made by first-year Japanese university students studying English as their second language (L2). The perspective taken in the analysis, and the tools with which it is conducted, are those of Michael Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (e.g. Halliday, 1994; Halliday \& Matthiessen, 1999; Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014). The primary aim of the thesis, one which to my knowledge has never been attempted before, is to categorise and describe L2 errors in terms of Hallidayan grammatical theory. This means demonstrating that what perhaps in the past have been analysed as 'single' errors are in fact 'composite' in nature, involving the contribution of separate strands of metafunctional meaning (see section 1.3.2 below). It also means understanding errors as arising, not through the breaking of syntactic rules, but through an amalgam of (a) the incorrect realisation of appropriate meaningful choices from lexicogrammatical systems, and (b) the correct realisation of inappropriate choices from these same systems (see Chapter 5).

The error analysis presented here is oriented firmly towards practical L2 pedagogy. In this way, it differs from a perspective on error which views it as evidence of an 'interlanguage', a transitional linguistic state that is interesting for the light it sheds on learner strategies and psycholinguistic processes (see Chapter 2). It also differs from an 'emerging variety’ perspective, which tends to reject the first language (L1) as a basis of comparison, and sees many 'errors' as valid dialectical alternatives (e.g. Tan, 2005). While these views provide valuable perspectives on learner language, this thesis assumes that the aim of most students studying English in Japanese universities is to move closer to a standard native variety (see Section 1.2). The Systemic Functional Grammar interpretation
of L2 errors is thus considered to be a precursor to classroom intervention. This seems consistent with the goal of many of those who engage with Systemic Functional Grammar to "theorise language in a way that is relevant to applications in research and practice" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1999, p. ix, my emphasis).

The error analysis presented in Chapter 5 of this thesis is immediately preceded by a methodology section (Chapter 4), where the participants and method of data collection are discussed. In addition, the data analysis instrument, the 'Box Diagram', is thoroughly explained, as is the data coding system. Since much of the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 requires some degree of familiarity with Systemic Functional Grammar, Chapter 3 is devoted to this topic, which, taken together with the Methodology chapter, will provide readers new to the field with the tools to closely follow the arguments preented in the error analysis. The analysis itself is defined as an 'Explicit: Full error analysis'. This term is coined by the author as a result of an in-depth exploration of the error analysis literature, which concludes that, until now, there has been no attempt to provide a consistent and all-encompassing taxonomy in this important area of language teaching. Chapter 2 presents this literature review and the new taxonomy. In the Discussion and Conclusions section (Chapter 6) the findings of the error analysis - that the lexicogrammatical errors of English learners can be usefully analysed from a Systemic Functional Grammar perspective, and that this has important pedagogical implications - are summarised and further discussed.

In this introductory chapter, aspects of the context relevant to the analysis are described. These include the notions of 'error' and 'error analysis' (section 1.2), Systemic Functional Linguistics (section 1.3), Japan as a context for the teaching of English (section 1.4.2), and points pertaining to the teaching of grammar and writing (sections 1.4.3 and 1.4.4). The discussion then turns to an outline of the objectives of the current error analysis,
and a statement of the research questions it is designed to explore (section 1.5 and 1.6). The chapter ends with an overview of the remainder of the thesis (section 1.7).

### 1.2. Errors and error analysis

### 1.2.1 A definition of 'error'

The use of 'error' as a technical term has been problematised in various ways. One suggestion is that it is too negative or judgemental a word to associate with second language learning (e.g. Dulay \& Burt, 1974a). A more common way is to try to invalidate the use of an L1 as the basis for evaluating the L2. It is claimed that to accuse learner language of being error-filled because it deviates from an L1 is narrow-minded (e.g. Tan, 2005) or worse, a logical fallacy (Bley-Vroman, 1983). In this view, the L2 is at any one time in a state of creative transition; since it is not in its final state, and more importantly since each transitional state may be considered a language or interlanguage in its own right, it cannot meaningfully be described as containing errors.

This point relates to another method of problematising the term, which is either to use an alternative (some might say euphemistic) word, or to posit different kinds of error. An example of the former is Dulay and Burt's word 'goof' (1974a). The latter approach might describe the errors made by expert learners, like those made by a concert pianist or by an actor on stage, as 'lapses’ (e.g. Norrish, 1983) or performance 'mistakes’ (Corder, 1967), while other dichotomies include 'local / global' (Burt, 1975), and 'overt / covert' (Corder, 1971).

Yet another way to problematise 'error' is to point out that L2 production exhibits variation: the same form may be erroneous at one point, and correct at another point, even in the same sentence (Ellis, 2008). Some propose a dichotomy between an 'error', which is
a form not yet learned, and a 'mistake', which is a form learned but used inconsistently (e.g. Norrish, 1983).

However, the greater volume of academic literature, particularly that which focuses on language pedagogy rather than on language acquisition, employs the term 'error' without issue (e.g. Hanna, 1964; Hervey, 1916; Politzer \& Ramirez, 1973; ; Rebuck, 2010; Sattayatham \& Honsa, 2007). Despite the complications mentioned above, therefore, this thesis will continue to employ the terms 'error' and 'error analysis'. Having said that, it is important to clarify the meaning of 'error' as it to be understood in the pages that follow.

Lennon (1991) defined an error as

A linguistic form or combination of forms which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speaker's native speaker counterparts. (p. 182)

This thesis agrees with the thrust of Lennon's formulation, but makes two alterations. First, Lennon's definition does not acknowledge that non-native speakers may also attain mastery of the linguistic system. Therefore, the phrase 'expert speakers of English' replaces 'the speaker's native speaker counterparts'. Second, the new definition includes the particular basis of comparison that will be used in the analysis to identify an error. This concerns what is termed in this thesis the English System Network (ESN), which is explained in greater detail in Chapter 3 (section 3.5.2), but for now may be defined as the totality of systemic and structural options available to expert speakers of English, as far as these are determinable by the author, and as far as they coincide with standard varieties of English. What this means is that the nominal group in (a) below would be not be considered an error,
while the verbal group in (b) would.
(a) I'll do it Tuesday.
(b) We was brilliant out there today.

In (a), though it is not part of my own dialect, the dropping of the preposition 'on' is acceptable in standard American English; it is therefore not an error. In (b), though it is perfectly acceptable, for instance, in the English of many London natives, the use of the singular verb is not part of any standard dialect; it is therefore an error.

The justification for restricting the basis of comparison to standard varieties is that, in the author's twenty-year experience living and working in Japan, it is overwhelmingly these Englishes (and especially standard American and standard British English) which Japanese university students (a) encounter throughout their English education, (b) require for their assessment; (c) meet in tests such as TOEIC and TOEFL which play a crucial part in various educational and employment contexts in Japanese society, and (d) most frequently hear and use during 'homestays' in America, England, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It is also a reasonable assumption that, unless special circumstances adhere, language learners assume they are being taught to use a dialect of great utility; as Crystal points out, a standard English might strictly be a minority dialect, but it is also the one "most widely understood" (2003, p. 110). All this provides a pedagogical justification for using the ESN as the basis from which to determine erroneous language.

The definition of error employed in this thesis is thus:

Any linguistic form or combination of forms which does not form part of the
lexicogrammatical systems of the English System Network, and which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would not, in all likelihood, be produced by expert speakers of English.

### 1.2.2 Error analysis

### 1.2.2.1 A historical sketch

The earliest examples of error analysis (EA) represented in the literature were conducted by high school teachers, and had an explicitly pedagogic goal: as Hathaway put it, "to increase the efficiency of our teaching of [the L2]" (1929, p. 533). Though they could be finely detailed in their use of error categories and sub-categories, these early analyses amounted to little more than "information about the relative frequency of errors" (p. 512). What distinguished them, however, was their use of actual data; they were based, in other words, "on an actual scientific investigation" (p. 152).

The word 'scientific' is key here, as this was a time when linguistics was firmly establishing itself as a serious intellectual discipline. In the years immediately prior to and concurrent with the type of EA discussed above, a desire on the part of anthropologists to understand and document native cultures inspired various developments in the new science, including protocols for close, detailed linguistic comparisons of one language with another (e.g. Le Coq, 1944). Inspired by the notion from behaviourist psychology that language learning was largely a matter of stimulus-response habit formation (e.g. Upshur, 1962; Weiss, 1925), this led to the idea that L2 errors (a) should be corrected in order to avoid the formation of incorrect habits (e.g. Hendrickson, 1978), and (b) could be predicted, and thus prevented, through a contrastive analysis of the L2 and L1 (e.g. Hadlich, 1965; Pascasio, 1961; Politzer, 1958; Whitman, 1970). The implication of this 'Contrastive Analysis

Hypothesis' (Oller \& Ziahosseiny, 1970) was that errors, though indicative of poor learning, were not inevitable. Error implied failure, but the correct teaching strategies (such as drilling) could forestall them.

It will be noted that, although the previous paragraph talks about learning, the word learner does not appear. This is symbolic of the fact that L2 pedagogy, in the form of Audiolingual and Grammar Translation methodologies, was mostly teacher-centred. From the mid-1960s, however, the learner began to take centre stage, and this was accompanied by a new view of error. Essentially, the notion that first language acquisition was essentially a creative process (an idea popularised by, but not exclusive to, generative grammarians), was considered by some scholars to be a valid explanation for L 2 acquisition too (e.g. Dulay \& Burt, 1974b). This dovetailed with the concept of 'interlanguage', a term referring to transitional stages of an L2 generated by and representing learner hypotheses about the second language (e.g. Selinker \& Lamendella, 1981). Together, these ideas encouraged a more positive view of errors. Specifically, rather than being seen as indications of the failure to learn, errors were seen as the inevitable, necessary result of the engagement of language learning processes. (e.g. Guntermann, 1978).

This cognitive view of language acquisition and errors (as opposed to the behavioural view that had been dominant before Chomsky) translated into classroom methodology, somewhat paradoxically perhaps, in the form of communicative language teaching (e.g. Palmer, 1970). Bringing with it concepts such as 'negotiating the curriculum', 'student autonomy', and the teacher as 'facilitator' (e.g. Breen \& Candlin, 1980), communicative language teaching (CLT) embodied the new, tolerant view of error. With CLT, the pedagogic emphasis turned to the practice and production of language in quasi-authentic, communicative situations. As long as they did not disrupt the
communicative goal, errors could be ignored, or perhaps relegated to a final feedback session at the end of the class (e.g. Richards \& Bohlke, 2012).

CLT remains influential as an overall approach to L2 pedagogy (Richards \& Rodgers, 2001); however, the last two decades or so have seen a revival in the fortunes of 'accuracy' and, by implication, in the status of error. Concepts such as 'noticing' and 'focus of form' (e.g. Fotos, 1993) underline the growing feeling that a methodology that does not pay attention to language structure as well as communicative aspects is a flawed one. Tacit though it is, the corollary of such a view is that accurate, or error-free, structure is a worthwhile goal - as long as, of course, it does not subsume the overall objective of teaching the living language.

### 1.2.2.2 Error analysis

The historical sketch above brings out an important point. Errors have been the focus of interest in at least two distinct contexts, the theoretical, second language acquisition (SLA) context, and the practical, pedagogical context. The concept of 'error' has also been seen to have very different connotations - for instance, as something to be avoided and as something to be embraced. It makes sense, therefore, that error analysis should be a diverse undertaking; that it should have different goals and priorities depending on the orientation, theoretical or practical, say, of the research. To put it another way, there should not be a single phenomenon described as 'error analysis'; rather, this should be an umbrella term, encompassing certain well-defined branches or types of error analysis.

As Chapter 2 will demonstrate, however, this is not the case. To be more accurate, it is the case, but this has not yet been captured in the literature. We can briefly illustrate the point here. Ellis and Barkhuizen, in their survey of methods for analysing L2 data, state that "the heyday of EA was short-lived" (2005, p. 53). What Ellis and Barkhuizen are referring
to as 'EA' here is research conducted by SLA scholars who sought to explain errors by linking them with the psychological processes and strategies that were seen as a necessary part of internalising a language (e.g. Richards, 1971). As suggested earlier, this was associated with 'interlanguage' - learner language seen as a transitional system in its own right, just as a child's L1 is simultaneously transitional and systematic. For SLA scholars such as Ellis and Barkhuizen, then, 'EA' is not so much a study of errors as it is the study of transitional systems.

But such a study does not define the analysis of learner errors for most of the history of language teaching. Three examples can illustrate this.
(i) Crider (1930), interested in the psychological causes of grammar and vocabulary errors in the translation of Spanish prose into English, attributed them to the "utilisation of certain mental processes" (p. 126). Students prone to error had a poor "mind-set", betrayed "poor perceptual habits", and lacked "a high degree of memory and a capacity to maintain...attention" (p. 125). For Crider, then, errors indicated a lack of ability and intelligence - quite the reverse of seeing them as the inevitable result of creative hypothesising.
(ii) Pickett (1968) compared the use of translation and blank-filling techniques to find "the more accurate guide to linguistic ability" in the English testing of speakers of French. His analysis of randomly chosen errors led him to the belief that translation should be preferred. For Pickett, error analysis was thus a means to establishing accurate measures of linguistic ability; it was not a tool for explaining errors.
(iii) Thornbury (1997) presented several stages in a classroom dictogloss, and concluded that the "steady improvement in accuracy during each successive draft" lend support to the
notion that reconstruction activities promote learning due to their "built-in noticing potential" (pp. 332, 334). Here, the author was making use of the analysis of errors, or at least of their frequency, to support a classroom methodology that allowed some focus on grammatical form. Again, this differs considerably from an error analysis that focuses on learner strategies and psychological processes.

These three examples clearly establish that the history and objectives of the analysis of student errors go beyond the confines of a practice that had a brief 'heyday' in the early 1970 's. It is unfortunate, therefore, that the term 'Error Analysis' has become so closely associated with this latter phenomenon. It is even more unfortunate when one considers two additional points. First, even within its restricted SLA meaning, 'Error Analysis' turns out to be almost impossible to define because, to refer again to Ellis and Barkhuizen's comment, exactly what had a short-lived heyday is extremely difficult to determine. Second, the term 'Error Analysis' could hardly be less appropriate for an approach that specifically disassociates itself from the notion that learner language is 'incorrect'. As will be suggested in Chapter 2, the name 'Transitional Form Analysis' makes much more sense, and has the added advantage of leaving 'error analysis' free as an umbrella term for all analyses of L2 error.

### 1.2.2.3 Conclusion

In Chapter 2 we shall return to these points, showing with greater clarity how the literature reveals 'error analysis' to be an ill-defined concept. As mentioned above, this will be followed by the presentation of a cohesive framework for the understanding and categorisation of L2 error analysis. In turn, this will allow for the contextualisation of the EA set out in Chapter 5. In the next section of the current chapter, however, attention is
turned to the linguistic perspective from which the error analysis is conducted.

### 1.3 Systemic Functional Linguistics

### 1.3.1 Introduction

Systemic Functional Grammar, a theory of grammar, is a major component of a more general theory of language known as Systemic Functional Linguistics, both being primarily attributable to Michael Halliday. Fawcett points out that,

From some viewpoints, Systemic Functional Linguistics would not be considered one of the major theories of language of our time. If one judges the importance of a theory by the evidence of papers given at conferences...and other such events, and by its representation in the journals associated with these societies and associations, then this inference is understandable. But it is an inference that would be seriously misleading. (2000, p. xv)

Fawcett is right to imply that Systemic Functional Linguistics is a major theory of language of our time. He is, unfortunately, correct also to suggest that Systemic Functional Linguistics, compared to "the ideas of Noam Chomsky" (p. xvii), has been much less featured in the mainstream literature. This is beginning to change, however, and it is hoped that, in a small way, the research described hereafter might contribute to this ongoing process.

Because the error analysis presented through the lens of Hallidayan linguistics, it is essential to describe in some detail those aspects of Systemic Functional Grammar that directly relate to the categories and descriptions used in the analysis. This will be the focus
of Chapter 3, but first, in the following section, the most relevant aspects of Systemic Functional Linguistics in general are summarised.

### 1.3.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics

Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which took shape in the 1970s after initial work on its grammatical foundations (e.g. Halliday, 1961; Huddleston, 1965; Hudson, 1967), "seeks to develop both a theory about language as social process and an analytical methodology which permits the detailed and systematic description of language patterns" (2004, p. 21). Here, we summarise seven distinguishing features of SFL. (For a general introduction to SFL, see Eggins (2004), while for accounts of specific aspects of the theory see, e.g., Halliday \& Hasan, 1985; Halliday \& Webster, 2009; Hasan, 1996; Martin \& Rose, 2007.)

1. SFL embodies the belief that the purpose of language is communication between people. More than linguists of a structural or Chomskian persuasion, SFL linguists thus draw attention to language as being fundamentally a social phenomenon: "Language has evolved in a certain way because of its function in the social system" (Halliday, 1978, p. 37). Another way to put this is that SFL views language as (social) behaviour, as opposed to language as knowledge. This places SFL in the 'environmentalist' as opposed to the 'nativist' tradition. Halliday explains that the latter model
reflects the philosophical-logical strand in the history of thinking about language, with its sharp distinction between the ideal and the real...and its view of language as rules - essentially rules of syntax. The environmentalist represents the ethnographic tradition, which rejects the distinction of ideal and real, defines what
is grammatical as...what is acceptable, and sees language as resource...for meaning. (p. 17, emphasis in the original)
2. SFL models human language as a 'tri-stratal' semiotic system (Eggins, 2004). This distinguishes it from simpler, bi-stratal semiotic systems such as animal cries and traffic lights. In a bi-stratal system, meanings are directly realised by a form of expression, such as where the meaning 'you can't pass this point in your car now' is directly realised by a red light. Adult human language, however, being tri-stratal, has an intermediate level between meaning (semantics) and expression (physical systems such as 'sign language' and phonology). This level is the lexicogrammar; it is where meanings are realised as wordings.
3. Since language is fundamentally motivated by social concerns, the imprint of the communicative imperative can be discerned in the very structure of language. That is to say, repetition over time of the same communicative texts, such as greetings, academic essays and recipes, are accompanied by repetitions of language patterns. At the level of semantics, for example, we find repetitions of generic structure such as the 'moves' in an academic essay, and at the level of lexicogrammar we find repetitions of grammatical structure such as the use of imperative clauses in a recipe (Eggins, 2004; Rose \& Martin, 2012). These and other structures are formal patterns, to be sure, but are functionally motivated. For instance, the use of imperative clauses in procedural texts works to convey information efficiently and clearly, which is essential if the reader is to follow the path intended by the writer (Painter, 2001).
4. This dovetailing of form and function occurs because language evolves to enable
speakers to participate in fundamental communicative processes. SFL recognises three distinct timeframes in which this evolution takes place. (i) In terms of the development of a single text, "text producers" make use of resources such as cohesion to "generate meanings in real time" (Eggins, 2004, p. 51). (ii) In terms of the language development of the individual, SF linguists have studied the 'ontogenesis' of language whereby we pass from an initial protolanguage stage, through a transitional stage, and into a full language stage (Halliday, 1978; Painter, 2009). (iii) In terms of the development of language in the species, "Language evolved...in two complementary functions: construing experience, and enacting social processes" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 1999, p. xi). Halliday conjectures that "it is the demands posed by the service of [the] functions which have moulded the shape of language and fixed the course of its evolution... [T]hese functions...have...determined the way human languages have evolved" (1978, p. 22).
5. As pointed out above, SFL takes a functional view of language. It is functional "in the sense that we are interested in what language can do" (Eggins, 2004, p. 16). This, in turn, is related to what language allows people to mean. As Halliday puts it, "Language is being regarded as the encoding of a 'behaviour potential' into a 'meaning potential'; that is, as a means of expressing what the human organism 'can do', in interaction with other human organisms, by turning it into what he 'can mean'" (p.21).
6. This 'meaning potential' is organised into three distinguishable strands, or lines of meaning' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014). Halliday explains, "The semantic system of a natural language is organized into a small number of distinct components...that relate to the most general functions that language has evolved to serve" (Halliday, 1979, p. 198). SFL
refers to these components as 'metafunctions'. The metafunctions will be described in more detail in Chapter 3 as they are intrinsic to a grammatical analysis based on Systemic Functional Grammar. For now, it is sufficient to point out that each metafunction relates to an aspect of the 'situational context' (Butt et al., 2000). The 'ideational' metafunction relates to the register concept of 'field', and is concerned with the content of the world around and inside ourselves as it is expressed in a particular text; the interpersonal metafunction, related to the register concept of 'tenor', concerns the various kinds of relationship expressed by a speaker in respect of a hearer within the text; and the textual metafunction, related to the register concept of 'mode', concerns the organisation of linguistic elements and structures within the text. As Halliday and Matthiessen explain, "It is by virtue of its unique properties as a stratified semiotic system, language is able to transform experience into meaning" (1999, p. xi).
7. The description of language as meaning potential is designed to highlight the SFL notion that a text is the result of choices made by the speaker, choices which gain part of their significance from what could have been chosen, but was not. Each moment of choice can therefore be modelled as a paradigmatic system, containing an entry condition, say the interpersonal function 'polarity', and a set of alternatives, say 'positive polarity' and 'negative polarity. The various choices leading to the utterance I love ice cream, for example, have meaning in and of themselves, but also stand in meaningful contrast with choices leading to I hate ice cream, I don't love ice cream, I love chocolate ice cream, and so on.

In summary, SFL is a theory of language which prioritises a view of (spoken,
written and mmultimodal) text as, not the application of arbitrary linguistic rules, but the moment-to-moment selection of 'natural' linguistic choices (see Halliday 1994 for Halliday's conception of a 'natural' grammar). Choices in meaning arise by virtue of living within a particular "social context" (Martin \& Rose, 2007, p. 4). These choices are realisable as lexicogrammatical wordings, which in turn are realisable in physical modes of expression. All the possible choices are theoretically available to a speaker/writer; they represent a "meaning potential" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 1999, p. x), which may or may not be instantiated as spoken/written text. Over time, iterations of similar choices have resulted in certain linguistic patterns, including grammatical patterns. Thus patterns take the form of structures that are functional in nature. To the extent that spoken and written expression is the realisation of functional patterns, grammatical form may be seen as bearing the imprint of communicative history. The relationship between form and meaning, as well as that between meaning and choice, are fundamental to an understanding of SFL, and are key ingredients in this EA.

The linguistic perspective embodied by Systemic Functional Linguistics, in conjunction with the field of error analysis introduced in Section 1.2, are two major contextual strands informing this thesis. The former is examined in close detail in Chapter 2 while, as just mentioned, relevant components of Systemic Functional Grammar are discussed in Chapter 3. This chapter now turns to a third contribution: the pedagogical context.

### 1.4 The pedagogical context

### 1.4.1 Introduction

Although the methodology used in this EA can be applied to any learner text in any language teaching environment, there are aspects of the study that are specific to the pedagogical context in which it was undertaken. In the following subsections three of these are discussed: section 1.4.2 looks at the Japanese context, section 1.4.3 looks at grammar, and section 1.4.4 discusses writing.

### 1.4.2 Japan

### 1.4.2.1 Japan as an 'EFL’country

In terms of English language learning, Japan is an 'EFL' (English learned as a foreign language) country (Taguchi \& Naganuma, 2006; Yamashita \& Hirsh, 2011). The term EFL implies that, though it may be studied extensively in classrooms or privately at home, English is neither an official language nor the lingua franca in any normal, native social environment in the country of study. In contrast, where English is the recognised national language of a country, as it is for example in Australia, we can refer to non-native students of the language as 'ESL' (English learned as a second language) learners. The fact that the term 'ESL' is inadequate to cover all non-EFL situations need not concern us (but see Nayar (1997) for a detailed discussion). ESL as defined here is relevant because it is the type of learning situation encountered by Japanese university students who study abroad.

The differences between EFL and ESL are sometimes ignored, or blurred - or even both at once. An example of the latter case is Nation's book Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing (2009) where, despite the title's explicit reference to the two different English
language teaching environments, not a single mention is made of either within the text. There is a strong case to be made, however, that the distinction between EFL and ESL is a valuable one (see James (1990) for a similar sentiment). This is because foreign language environments differ from second language ones in a number of highly significant ways.

First, the distinction between EFL and ESL relates to the practical utility of the object of study and potentially, therefore, to various aspects of the instrumental motivation of the students and teachers involved. In Japan, for instance, English does not have any official capacity (Seargeant 2011) and nor, with the exception of certain international business contexts, is it studied with an expectation of being "required for any purely domestic matters" (Aspinall, 2003, p. 106). While 'motivation' is indubitably a complex phenomenon, one is surely safe in suggesting that the motivation for L2 study in EFL contexts differs substantially from that in ESL contexts, where students may have to use the target language as soon as they leave the classroom. (See Seargeant (2009, pp. 109-123) for a discussion of the particular motivations existing in Japan.)

Second, the EFL/ESL distinction relates to second language acquisition. For example, James tells us that SLA research in ESL contexts is probably not transferable to EFL:

The claim is legitimately made that much of the American second language research which is based on data from Spanish speaking immigrants or overseas students in American colleges...makes claims which are probably untrue for, and not generalisable to, foreign language teaching situations" (1990, p. 205, original emphasis).

This point is supported by researchers such as Ellis et al. (2008) who, commenting on
the literature on corrective feedback (CF), point out that "all these studies investigated CF in an ESL context. There is a clear need for further research, especially in an EFL context" (p.355). It is also relevant that, no matter what their areas of divergence, most models of SLA agree with the idea that proficiency in a second language requires a great amount of exposure (i.e., 'input') and/or practice (i.e., 'output'). Many fundamental concepts of SLA 'frequency', 'comprehensible input', 'interaction', 'automatic processing' and 'noticing', among others - relate, directly or indirectly, to these two aspects of language acquisition (for further details, see Ellis (2008)). Whereas ESL learners have the opportunity to hear and to "us[e] English on a daily basis" (Yamashita \& Jiang, 2010, p. 661), it is a distinguishing feature of EFL contexts that there is a paucity of opportunities to practise language skills outside the classroom (Patterson, 1917; Stern, 1983).

A third distinction relates to classroom procedures. Given the factors already discussed, it seems clear that English language teaching methodology will (or should) vary depending on whether the environment is EFL or ESL. This was pointed out long ago by Hornby (1946), and has been reiterated, if only by implication, ever since. For example Takada, having studied and taught in the U.S. for a number of years, found that "[b]ack in Tokyo,...teaching methods that were effective in the ESL context were not similarly effective in the EFL setting" (Oda \& Takada, 2005, p. 99). More recently, Yasuda explained that "by comparison to second language instruction contexts, foreign language contexts are unlikely to fully expose students to [phrasal] verbs. Further, learners in foreign language contexts are likely to undergo a generally slower pace of development and to achieve overall lower levels of ultimate attainment (Yasuda, 2010, p. 257). Again, Yamashita and Hirsh (2011) suggest that "the difficulty for EFL learners with a context-governed classification for count/mass nouns is that there may be limited opportunities in EFL settings for learners to encounter
different contexts of count/mass noun use in daily life", and point out that this "has important implications for future English language teaching in EFL contexts (p. 385, emphasis added).

Fourthly, the learning beliefs, strategies and experiences of the student can be significantly different according to whether they are studying in an EFL or ESL environment. An example is Loewen et al.'s (2009) finding that "ESL learners were less convinced about the need for grammar instruction and error correction and were more enthusiastic about improving communicative skills than were foreign language learners" (p.101).

There seems to be a strong case to be made, then, that the EFL/ESL distinction is of genuine significance (though see Canagarajah 2006 for an alternative view). Japan is an EFL country, and - despite occasional suggestions that English should become the official language of Japan, or that Japanese people should adopt an official 'Japanese-English' dialect (Kubota, 1998) - it is likely to remain so in the foreseeable future. Yano (2001), for example, states that English "is and will certainly stay a foreign language in that it will function only as a means of communication with non-Japanese in international settings" (p.127). Yamashita \& Jiang (2010)'s comment about the Japanese EFL participants in their study - "their exposure to English had been limited largely to language classes where they studied English as a subject" (p.654) - suggests that little has changed in the intervening decade, while Oda and Takada (2005) agree with Yano that there is no sign of the situation changing: "Despite a huge investment of resources in ELT, the evidence strongly suggests that English will remain a language used mainly for examination purposes within Japan and for interaction with foreigners outside" (p. 101).

The error analysis being described in this thesis, then, was conducted in "a typical 'English as a foreign language' country" (Yano, 2001, p. 131). But EFL environments are
far from homogenous. It is important, therefore, to explore some of the characteristics of the educational context to which specifically Japanese learners belong.

### 1.4.2.2 English in Japan: high status but low achievement

While the history of contact between Japanese people and the English language dates back at least as far as 1600 (Ike, 1995, p. 3), Harasawa informs us that Japanese people "have been learning English as a foreign language at schools and universities since the Meiji era" (1974, p. 72; note: the Meiji era was from 1868-1912). English has since then been held in generally high regard (but see Yamagami \& Tollefson (2011) for a discussion of negative attitudes towards English education held by some Japanese policy makers). This is evident in:

- the fact that some of Japan's most respected tertiary institutions, including Keio University, originated as English language schools (Harasawa, 1974);
- the fact that ELT luminaries such as Harold Palmer and A.S. Hornby were invited to live and work in Japan (Hornby, 1970; Howatt, 2004), Palmer's role being no less than "to reform English teaching in Japan" (Yamamoto, 1978, p. 153);
- the importance of English in tertiary entrance examinations. Entrance exams themselves have dominated the secondary school system since its inception in 1872 (Rohlen, 1983), and English has long been an influential presence. Forty years ago Harasawa wrote of Japanese high school students, "[S]ince most of them were seeking to enter some university, it [English] was the key to their success in later life" (1974, p. 73). Four decades later, English is still a major component of university entrance exams (Poole, 2003);
- the fact that English plays the central part in foreign language study. As Gottlieb puts it, English is "the foreign language promoted by Japan in the nation's public schools almost
- but not quite - to the exclusion of all others" (2012, p. 12). This is particularly clear in secondary schooling, where English is a compulsory subject for the full six years, three at middle school and three more at high school (Nemoto, 1999). This is often embellished by further study, after school and at weekends, at juku (cram schools) and youbiko (training schools for the university entrance exams) (Poole, 2003);
- the fact that tertiary education, too, prioritises English study - at least, over the study of other languages. Many, if not most, universities in Japan offer English courses and, where they do, first-year English study, involving several classes a week, is usually compulsory. As a result of a rapidly dwindling population, Japan has been projected to have "virtually universal tertiary education" by 2015 (Cummings, 2003, p. 37). It follows, therefore, that a high percentage of current first-year university students in Japan are at a minimum experiencing their seventh year of English study;
- the fact that English study is also popular in other forms - in the many conversation schools, in self-study packages such as those provided by the national broadcaster NHK, and in informal private lessons, typically with a native speaker;
- the importance of English tests, particularly TOEIC (see below), in corporate life. Many employees are often required, or at least pressured, to take such tests on a regular basis, even if they rarely encounter the language at work;
- the "intense fascination" English engenders quite apart from study (Seargeant, 2009, p. 3), apparent for example in the ever-growing number of loanwords (Stanlaw, 2004), and the increasing use of English in advertising (Yano, 2001). Moreover, as Kubota points out, "hastened by technological advantages in mass-communication, English has penetrated in various aspects of daily life from TV to radio, movies, and the internet" (1998, p. 297).

Despite the fact that English enjoys a high profile inside and outside the Japanese education system (Seargeant, 2009), the post-war learning of English appears not to have been a success. Learners in Japan seem to underachieve despite the emphasis on English education outlined in the previous section, and despite a series of government-led reforms designed to encourage English teaching at primary schools (Gottlieb, 2012), a more communicative methodology in secondary schools (Mantero \& Iwai, 2005), and, since 2003, greater autonomy for tertiary institutions, including the authority to design their own curricula (e.g. Kimura, 2010).

While 'underachievement' is, admittedly, a term that should be used with caution in the absence of knowledge of students' personal goals, it is a fact that Japanese takers of such global tests as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) and the Test of English for International Communication (TOEIC) perform less well than many of their East Asian counterparts (Yamagami \& Tollefson, 2011). The case of TOEIC is particularly poignant since, as already alluded to, TOEIC is considerably influential in Japanese society (in 2004 the 1423 000 Japanese test-takers comprised $41.8 \%$ of the global total (http://jalt.org/test/sai_cha.htm). In line with its influence in corporate Japan, the high status of TOEIC can be observed in both the great range of 'official' TOEIC textbooks lining the shelves of bookstores, as well as in the tendency for language schools and businesses to produce 'in-house' TOEIC teaching materials (e.g. TAC, 2014). It is further evident in the fact that many universities provide dedicated TOEIC courses; students passing these courses gain credit towards their degree even if their major is not English-related.

Yet, despite this 'TOEIC industry', in 2009 Japan ranked seventh out of nine Asian countries (taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2010/11/13/2003488424), while a 2012 survey found the mean score for Japanese test takers to be to be a barely passing 512 (out of
990) (ets.org/s/toeic/pdf/ww_data_report_unlweb.pdf). In 2010, the TOIEC Newsletter published results for 'new recruits' - that is, university graduates moving straight into full-time employment - with the preface: "In a more positive development, the average score rose by 25 points...reaching a record high of 485" (www.toeic.or.jp/library/toeic_data/toeic_en/pdf/newsletter/NewRecruits2010.pdf, my italics). Takers who score between 405-600 "can initiate and maintain predictable face-to-face conversations and satisfy limited social demands" (wie.ac.nz/toeicconversion.htm, my italics). This seems a disappointing level to have attained after up to ten years of English education.

Various reasons have been suggested for the poor performance of Japanese English learners. One is motivation. Kozaki and Ross describe "the delicate and often ephemeral nature of motivation among Japanese college students" (2011, p. 1330). We have already mentioned the challenge to motivation represented by an EFL context of learning, but various other factors are involved. For instance, Kikuchi's qualitative investigation of 47 predominantly first-year university students, identified "five demotivating factors: 1) individual teacher behaviour in the classroom; 2) the grammar-translation method used in instruction (see section 1.4.5); 3) tests and university entrance examinations; 4) memorization required for vocabulary learning and related issues; and 5) textbook/reference book-related issues" (2009, p. 467).

A second reason is said to be the generally relaxed, non-academic atmosphere of many universities. "Many students come to Japanese universities after many years of arduous studies in what has come to be known as 'Examination Hell'. Many of these students are often 'burnt-out' from studying and are looking forward to (what they believe is) their hard-earned, four-year moratorium" (Doyon, 2003, p. 4). According to Doyon, this can lead to a 'resistance' towards academic study: "What this equates to in the EFL class...is that many
students will adopt negative attitudes and hence a natural resistance towards the learning of English (not to mention their other subjects)... attribut[able] to the lack of perception of value they have towards learning in a classroom setting" (pp. 4-5).

This author's view, after a decade teaching at several non-elite universities and at least one elite university in Japan, is not so much that students resist study, but that they are not expected to study. Poole is right to say that students "are rarely pushed to excel once they have matriculated at a college or university" (2003, p. 6), but if anything he understates the case. In fact, during the first two undergraduate years, serious study is made all but impossible due to the number of classes students are required to take - usually, fourteen or more separate courses per week. Then, in third year, the infamous shushoku katsudo ('job hunting'), takes over, causing students to miss classes even in the run-up to final exams as they attend job-related seminars (including, in several universities I have personally experienced, seminars for women on how to apply make-up). In fourth year, teachers are asked by administrators to do everything possible to pass a student, even if the latter has attended few classes and submitted less work. All this is not to mention the fact that students are permitted to regularly miss classes due to 'circle' activities - the entire first month of the spring semester if you are in the yachting club at one Chiba-based university I currently work at. Such a situation, structured almost so as to obstruct the chance for academic development, can only prevail with the tacit consent of stakeholders such as politicians and corporate executives. Given such a powerful green light, it is surely no surprise that many English students fail to reach even an intermediate level at university.

Other suggestions for failing English education include:

- the idea that, despite the number of school 'years' dedicated to English study, the actual
number of contact 'hours' is insufficient (Yano, 2001);
- the theory that Japanese learners strive for an impossible native-speaker ideal; upon failing, inevitably, to meet this standard, they become inhibited from attempting to communicate (Honna, 2008);
- conflicting attitudes towards English as an object of study on the part of teachers and students (Matsuda, 2011);
- the possibility that communicative reforms, well-intentioned as they may be, may not suit the cultural sensibilities of Japanese learners and teachers (Oka, 2004);
- the idea that there may be an underlying antipathy towards becoming highly proficient at English (Rampton, 1987).

Whatever the reasons, there appears to be enough empirically supported and anecdotal evidence to support the contention that, given the public investment in English education, the years spent studying the language, and its high social status, Japanese students are not as competent in English as they perhaps ought to be.

### 1.4.2.3 English teaching in Japan

As first-year university students, the participants in the current error analysis are in at least their seventh year of English education. It is worth briefly describing the kind of English language teaching they are likely to have received.

As has been noted by a number of scholars (e.g. Amano, 2014; Christensen, 2011; Gottlieb, 2012), the Japanese education system has undergone a series of official reforms over the last three decades. These reforms have all had the express aim of promoting a communicative approach in the language classroom, and have been supported by local government initiatives, begun in 2003, to help junior and senior high school teachers learn

Communicative Language Teaching methodology (Taguchi \& Naganuma, 2006).
But government policy does not necessarily translate into classroom reality. Before the reforms, English at secondary school was usually taught through the yakudoku (literally, 'translate read') method (Hino, 1988). Like its close relative Grammar Translation, this implies an emphasis on reading, vocabulary and grammar paradigms (Hino, 1988). There is evidence that, despite the reforms, yakudoku is still the preferred methodology in Japanese secondary schools (Thompson \& Yanagita, 2015). And, with English grammar and vocabulary still the sine qua non of university Entrance exams, the fundamental basis of a form-based approach to grammar in high schools seems unlikely to change.

In contrast, universities, their hands tied neither by the bind of entrance examinations nor by a culture of rigorous academia (see the previous section), have implemented first-year and second-year English curricula with some nominal focus on 'skills' (listening, speaking, reading and writing), usually in the form of reading and writing classes, but with a strong orientation towards communication-based courses such as Oral Communication, English for Cultural Understanding, English for Current Issues, Discussion and Debate, and so on. Where native speakers are employed, these classes are likely to be conducted solely in English. However, few university Language Centres institute an 'English only' program as a matter of policy (Kanda University of international Studies, and ' $K$ ' university (Stewart \& Miyahara, 2011) are two exceptions).

What this means, then, is that the students whose work is being analysed in this thesis were probably in their first year of genuine CLT-based study. This would have followed six years of English with a nod, perhaps a substantial nod, to communication, but which was most-likely exam-oriented and methodologically conservative

### 1.4.2.4 Conclusion

In this section we have looked at Japan as a contributing context for the error analysis presented in Chapter 5. It has been suggested that, even with the caveat that Japan, being an EFL environment, provides few authentic opportunities for language use, students underachieve in their English studies. There are a variety of possible contributing factors to this, but perhaps the most relevant for young adults is an education system which emphasises cramming for exams in secondary school, and which institutionalises a non-academic approach to learning at tertiary level. Neither seems conducive to second language acquisition in any environment, let alone an "input-impoverished EFL context" like Japan (Oka, 2004, p. 4).

The Japanese EFL environment forms part of the pedagogical context in which this EA was conducted. A second contextual factor is 'grammar.'

### 1.4.3 Grammar

The error analysis in Chapter 5 is an analysis of lexicogrammar errors, which implies that lexicogrammar is a legitimate focus of study. This requires some explanation. (Note: 'Lexicogrammar' is the preferred term in Systemic Functional Grammar, used "to make explicit the fact that syntax and vocabulary are part of the same level in the code" (Halliday, 1994, p. xiv). In this thesis, unless otherwise stated, the term 'grammar' is to be understood as implying 'lexicogrammar'.)

The role of grammar in the modern history of language teaching is like that of Alec Guinness in Kind Hearts and Coronets: a shifting one. At times it has played the victim, trodden underfoot by advocates of 'natural' methods (Silberberg, 1929); at other times it has been the villain, stifling the imaginations of those forced to suffer the boredom of grammar-translation classes, or seducing with its occult glamour (Hornby, 1970). It has
played the supporting role, crucial but in the background as in the Direct Method, where grammar was taught "inductively but systematically" (Purin, 1916, p. 46). It has even played the hero, standing proud while syllabi are structured around it. As Borg and Burns (2008) put it,


#### Abstract

No area of second and foreign language learning has been the subject of as much empirical and practical interest as grammar teaching. Assumptions about grammar and its role in L2 learning often lie at the heart of different orientations to L2 pedagogy and the history of L2 teaching could arguably be described in terms of the different degrees of prominence which grammar teaching has enjoyed at different points in time. (p. 456).


To say that the place of grammar in L2 methodology is uncertain is to encapsulate a century of methodological debate in a single word.

This debate comes down to a basic dichotomy. On the one hand, when an L2 is learnt for reasons other than communication, one finds a conception of grammar that it is "the rules of morphology and syntax" (Celce-Murcia 1990, p. 135), and a methodology that focuses on the grammatical mechanics of the language. The classic example of such a bottom-up approach is schoolroom Grammar Translation, whose focus on translation exercises and vocabulary memorisation has the primary aim of helping students pass exams (as explained in the previous section, this is still a common methodology in Japanese schools). The main casualty of "the grammar method" (Patterson, 1917; Schilling et al, 1906) is 'meaning':

The content [of the texts to be translated] was unimportant: everything was done in the service of grammar, which was to train the mind. The grammatical principles were illustrated by the translation of disconnected, rather meaningless sentences, from the foreign language to the vernacular and from the vernacular to the foreign language. One part of speech after another was studied in logical sequence...It is also an unpsychological and unpedagogical method. (Silberberg, 1929, p. 383)

On the other hand, where the primary focus is on actually communicating in the L2, we often find a methodology that eschews the analytical study of grammar. In 1950 Wellek wrote, "Languages are alive, whereas grammar in itself is dry and dead" (p. 44). Since the late 1970s, English has been very much 'alive', rising to the status of a bona fide world language. The notion of learning English for genuine communicative purposes is a reality for many learners, especially with the interactive opportunities provided by the internet. And during this same period, the growth of 'communicative language teaching' methodology (see Chapter 2) has placed grammar study in an invidious position in many classrooms. Rather than have students 'struggle' with a grammatically accurate rendering of English, teachers have been urged to promote a stress-free fluency (e.g. Norrish, 1983). (It is this that perhaps underlies the notion, current since at least the very early 1990 s when I did the RSA TEFLA course at International House in London, that English instructors can be fashioned from scratch in four weeks, then sent off to 'teach' English abroad. The clear sub-text is that teaching English requires no explicit knowledge of, or training in, English grammar.)

To sum up in different terms: in the past we have tended to see the L2 from either an 'artefact' perspective or a 'specimen' perspective (the analogy comes from Halliday and

Matthiessen's discussion of 'text' (2014, p. 3)). The former perspective positions the L2 itself as the object of study, and has tended to promote mechanical grammar methodology. In contrast, a specimen perspective positions the use of the L2 as the object of study, and has tended to relegate grammar to a peripheral status.

If we look at this situation with a systemic functional approach, we see that the language use approach in fact reveals a misunderstanding of how communication works. For instance, the perfectly valid notions that language competence involves more than grammatical competence, and that fluency should be as much the goal of language learning as accuracy, neither of which entail the diminishment of the role of grammar, seem to have been misinterpreted as the idea that communication and fluency are something apart from grammar.

Halliday wrote about linguistic analysis that "there has to be a grammar at the base" (1994, p. xvi), and that it was "necessary to...insist on the importance of grammar in linguistic analysis" because
[t]he current preoccupation is with discourse analysis, or 'text' linguistics'; and it is sometimes assumed that this can be carried on without grammar - or even that it is somehow an alternative to grammar. But this is an illusion. A discourse analysis that is not based on grammar is not an analysis at all, but simply a running commentary on a text. (p. xvi)

The same may be said of language teaching, especially in the EFL context where there are no opportunities to automatise grammatical knowledge. Fortunately, there is evidence to suggest that in recent years language professionals are recognising the value of
a synthesis between the artefact and specimen positions. Two examples of this evidence are (i) publications discussing a more context-sensitive approach within communicative language teaching, and (ii) the gradual acceptance of the idea that a 'focus on (grammatical) form' is not necessarily anathema to the idea of language in use; that it may, moreover, be essential to the process of 'noticing' that seems to be a vital cognitive stage in language learning (Musgrave \& Parkinson 2014; Schmidt, 1990).

The point here is that, in both the principled use of form-focused teaching, and in the acknowledgement that methodology should be context-sensitive, we can perceive an attitude towards grammar teaching - and perhaps by extension to language teaching as a whole - that signals a willingness to abandon the 'either-or' approach of the past, and embrace a new paradigm. From this perspective, an analysis of lexicogrammar errors which prioritises both an accurate control of the systems and structures of English, and an understanding of the fact that these 'formal' properties of English are manifestations of semantic choices, and that therefore the relationship between meaning and form is a crucial one, may be seen as a sign of, and a contribution to, these encouraging times.

### 1.4.4 Writing

The errors and error categories identified in Chapter 5 come from written texts. In principle, with the exception of punctuation errors, none of these categories are writing specific. For instance, the incorrect realisation of specific deixis in 'yachting club' in I join yachting club (see Chapter 5, Error Category 2), can occur both in spoken and written language. This is as it should be; while Halliday acknowledges that there are differences between oral and written modes of language (for instance, many written registers tend to make greater use of nominalisation than does casual speech, he also points out that ultimately they both utilise the same resource, that they are "varieties of one and the same
language" (1994, p. xxiii).
On the other hand, there are certain aspects of writing that do not usually pertain to speech (excluding scripted speech of course), particularly in the classroom context. Specifically:

- writing can be drafted;
- writing can be completed over a long period of time;
- writing can be fine-tuned;
- writing is often used for assessment;
- writing can be submitted;
- writing 'remains', and is thus able to be reviewed and practised

Together, these factors contribute to the fact that a piece of writing assessment, in its submitted form, may be considered closer to a learner's understanding of English than that same students' spontaneous oral production. Rosengrant (1987) echoes this:

In a low-level speaking situation the dominant factor is no doubt the message, but in writing, even at the same low level, one tends to pay more attention to the code, that is, to the manner in which the message is conveyed...The important difference between oral and written communication leads us to believe that students are more conscious of the need for grammatical accuracy when they write than when they speak. (pp.139-140)

To sum up the point being made here, the decision to use written texts in this EA
was not based on any expectations regarding error categories. Nor was it related to any particular interest in the essay as a written genre, or in writing as a skill. Thus, while Silva and Brice (2004, p. 70) are right to point out that "it is an exciting time to be working in the area of second language writing," this is coincidental. The significance of the choice to use written assignments was the opportunity they gave participants to fully access their knowledge of English without time restraint or the pressure of producing 'online' speech. Halliday suggests that linguistics should "perhaps insist on giving priority to spoken language" because in speech "we perform without thinking" (1994, p. xxv). This makes sense for English experts, who have fully automatised "the unconscious semantic system of the English language" (p. xxv). But when it comes to English as an L2, it is precisely performance with thinking that we wish to analyse if, as is the case in this thesis, the object is to explore the clearest possible representation of learners' conception of target language systems and structures in use.

### 1.5 Objectives of this error analysis and research questions

This error analysis is not the first to focus on Japanese EFL writing; nor is it the first EA to utilise a Hallidayan perspective (see Chapter 2). The research presented in this thesis does, however, constitute the only explicit, full SFG-oriented error analysis of the written errors of Japanese university students. It has three primary objectives:

1. To attempt to locate written lexicogrammatical errors within the semiotic dimensions described by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 50)

The objective here is to propose a new way of identifying, categorising and
describing errors. Using the tools of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), L2 errors will be, as far as possible, accounted for as existing at a particular rank within a particular metafunction, and as belonging to a particular system. It is hoped that this will shed new light on errors, allowing them to be seen in many cases as composite phenomena, and in all cases as related to meaning.
2. To model errors as systemic and structural choices.

Many error analyses use traditional grammatical labels ('relative clauses', 'articles', and so on) as the basis of categorisation (e.g. Chen, 2006; Hanzeli, 1975). This reflects the fact, for these analysts, grammar is a rule-and-item-based phenomenon. Other error analyses employ categories such as 'overgeneralisation', and 'simplification', which stem from a second language acquisition (SLA) approach interested in learner strategies and processes (e.g. Richards, 1971). Although SLA analysts recognise the 'creativity' of the L2 learner (Ravem, 1968), there is still a sense that grammar is rule-bound, and that the learner's task is to hypothesise those rules (e.g. Ravem, 1974).

SFG, however, fully embraces the Saussurean insight that language is always in flux, and that its patterns at any one time are merely those that the community currently agree upon (de Saussure, 1959/2011). (Note that while SFG scholars agree that language, including grammar, changes over time (e.g. Bloor \& Bloor, 2013), as suggested in section 1.3.2 they do not agree that grammar is arbitrary.) In the words of Halliday and Matthiessen, meaning is "a joint construction, a shared resource which is the public enterprise of a collective" (1999, p. x). Given the close association between meaning and grammar, this implies that grammar, too, is "a joint construction". If so, this suggests that errors may be
thought of as (i) the selection from the jointly constructed English System Network of meanings that happen to be incorrectly realised, and/or (ii) the selection of options that are not currently part of the agreed-on lexicogrammatical framework of the ESN (though they may have been so in the past, and/or may be so in the future). For scholars who recognise emerging varieties of English (see section 1.1 above), this latter view may be seen as contributing to new meaning-form constructions; from the perspective of this thesis, however, it signals the need for classroom intervention.

To suggest to students that they are, potentially, part of a community of English users and 'constructors' is to resonate with something that is important to many Systemic Functional linguists: the idea that language knowledge is related to social and political empowerment, that linguistics is "a form of social action, a practice which...cannot be other than ideologically committed" (Martin, 2000, p. 116). In the present context, I understand this to mean that learners should be helped to make their choices more informed, and enabled to better control and access the networks available to expert speakers,

Writing about systemic theory, Halliday explained that "Whatever is chosen in one system becomes the way in to a set of choices in another, and we go on as far as we need to, or as far as we can in the time available, or as far as we know how" (1994, pp. xiv-xv, my emphasis). By modelling errors as choice, or as the realisation of choice, this error analysis acknowledges that English pedagogy should be a process of empowering the learner. If language is "a resource... a potential for understanding, representing and acting on reality" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 1999, p. 1), then, by giving learners a framework to view their grammatical choices in relation to those made by expert speakers, we are helping them to grow, better understand, and better manage that resource, to better "know how" to navigate the systems and structures of English.

## 3. To highlight the pedagogical potential of this process.

Error descriptions in this EA are therefore viewed in terms of their pedagogical potential. In other words, the research presented here is designed not only to be in accordance with the theoretical and philosophical foundations of SFG, but also to share its concern to be of practical benefit. Therefore, error categories are not only described from a fresh theoretical perspective, they are also considered from the perspective of classroom utility.

The objectives outlined above may be restated as research questions.

1. To what extent can the written lexicogrammatical errors of first-year Japanese university students be described in terms of the SFG concepts of rank, metafunction, structure and system?
2. What additional understanding of errors can be gained by viewing them from the theoretical perspectives of rank, metafunction, structure and system?
3. What pedagogical implications arise from a taking an approach to error analysis from a Systemic Functional Grammar perspective?

### 1.6 Conclusion and overview of the remainder of the thesis

This introductory chapter has defined 'error' as it is to be understood in this thesis, briefly traced the history of error analysis, introduced key features of System Functional Linguistics, and discussed relevant aspects of the situational context within which the error
analysis was undertaken.
In the next chapter, we examine the term and the concept 'error analysis' as they have been dealt with in the academic literature. We shall see that there are a number of complicating issues, including that 'error analysis' has never been clearly defined, that it lacks a typological framework, and that it is fundamentally inappropriate as a description of the study of L2 transitional forms, despite this being the concept most closely associated with the term. These issues will be addressed in detail in Chapter 2.

Chapters 3 and 4 serve preparatory functions, the former being a discussion of the most relevant concepts and categories of Systemic Functional Grammar, the latter describing the methodology used in the research. Chapter 5 then presents and discusses an analysis of the written lexicogrammatical errors of 40 Japanese university students, conducted through the lens of SFG. Finally, Chapter 6 summarises the results of the research conducted in this thesis, acknowledges its limitations, and considers the contributions it may have made to the field of second language error analysis.

## Chapter 2 : Literature Review

### 2.1 Introduction

The aim of this literature review is threefold. Ultimately, it is to show where the error analysis depicted in Chapter 5 fits in a framework within which all error analyses conducted in the field of L2 learning and acquisition can also be placed. In order to do this, however, this framework needs to be constructed and described - something that, surprisingly, has yet to be attempted in the literature on error analysis. One reason for this is that, as it turns out, the label 'error analysis' has not been applied with the greatest of care. The two initial aims of this literature review, then, are to come to an understanding of the term 'error analysis', and to establish a framework for the error analysis literature.

The chapter is divided into two main sections. In Section 2.2 the history of error analysis as it pertains to L2 learning is explored. It will be found that a distinction needs to be made between the term 'Error Analysis' (sometimes written, as here, with initial capitals) and the wider concept of 'the analysis of L2 error', referred to above and throughout this chapter as 'error analysis' (without capital letters). While the latter may encompass any exploration of learner error, the former is closely related to early work in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), helping to kick-start research into the learner's 'transitional dialect' (Corder, 1975), or 'interlanguage' (Selinker, 1972). It will be argued, however, that since the fundamental point behind the interlanguage concept was that an L2 should be viewed as a linguistic system in its own right, and since this was by definition a rejection of the traditional pedagogic notion of error as very much unsystematic, the label 'Error Analysis' seems inappropriate. It will be suggested, moreover, that as the paradoxical name for something that has never been clearly defined, 'Error Analysis' as a technical term in SLA be discontinued. This will leave 'error analysis' free to be employed as an umbrella
term for all analyses of learner error. (Until that point, single quotation marks will be used to indicate the temporary status of the SLA-specific connotation of the term).

In Section 2.3 it will be shown that the literature supports a bipartite division into 'implicit' and 'explicit' error analysis. These categories, including their various subtypes, will be explained and exemplified. The length and detail of this section is necessary because it is only once the framework has been fully established that we will be in a position to contextualise the error analysis presented in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

### 2.2 The analysis of errors in L2 scholarship

### 2.2.1 Introduction

It is a commonly-encountered view that, during a period of about ten years starting in the mid-to-late 1960s, something known as 'Error Analysis' took the place of Contrastive Analysis (or more accurately, the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis) as the preferred means of addressing learner error (e.g. Chun, 1980; Ellis, 2008; James, 1998; Richards \& Sampson, 1974Schachter \& Celce-Murcia, 1977; Spolsky, 1979). For example Ellis, in his seminal The Study of Second Language Acquisition (2008), states that "Error analysis...achieved considerable popularity in the 1970s, replacing contrastive analysis" (p. 62), while James asserts: "By the early 1970s...the [Contrastive Analysis] paradigm was generally jettisoned. The next paradigm to replace CA was...Error Analysis" (1998, pp. 4-5). It is pertinent, therefore, to begin this discussion of the analysis of errors in second language (L2) scholarship by looking at the relationship between the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis $(\mathrm{CAH})$ and learner error. Methodologies do not usually arise in a vacuum, and it will help us to more fully understand the nature of 'Error Analysis' if we have a clear conception of the context in which it arose. It will become apparent that the prevailing view is not the most
accurate assessment of what occurred.

### 2.2.2 Structuralism, audiolingualism, and the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

The CAH (Oller \& Ziahosseiny, 1970; Upshur, 1962) was closely connected to, and in some senses grew out of, the influential notions propounded by early twentieth-century behavioural psychologists that (i) children learn languages, just as they do many other things, through the development of good habits arising from extensive imitation and practice (Barrutia, 1967), and that (ii) this occurs, to a greater or lesser extent, via a process of stimulus and response (Skinner, 1957; Upshur, 1962; Weiss, 1925).

Behavioural psychology was in line with the ideas of the dominant linguistic school of the time, structuralism (Valdman, 1975). This can be inferred from the references to behaviourist notions found in the scholarly work of key structural linguists such as Bloomfield (e.g. 1926), and from their characterisation of L1 learning as a matter of acquiring the skills and good habits of the surrounding linguistic culture (Homberger, 1950).

Importantly, this 'language as habit' view was considered to be as relevant to the teaching of a second language as it was to the unconscious learning of an L1 (Corder, 1967; Fries, 1948). As early as 1917 Patterson declared,

Just as the formation of a new habit is doubly difficult when an old one must be unmade, so in teaching beginners we must guard against the formation of incorrect habits which must be unlearned. Thus, in teaching pronunciation, the safe way is never to allow the pupil to pronounce a new word until he has heard it pronounced correctly by the teacher and has practised it several times under his immediate direction. (Patterson, 1917, p. 141)

Following the success of intensive language courses for the American military during the Second World War (Ceroni, 1944; Fries, 1948; Mapes, 1943; Mastronie \& Bickley, 1959), this principle became institutionalised within the 'audiolingual' approach (Chastain \& Woerdehoff, 1968). As Kelly (1964) explained, "Under the impact of the National Defence Education Act, the audiolingual approach in general began to disseminate rapidly, and it was only natural that the particular type of materials associated with NDEA projects should have a profound effect on materials produced to satisfy the sudden demand throughout the country" (p. 432). Consisting to a great extent of oral drilling and pattern practice, audiolingualism had a twofold aim: to help students automatise the correct habits of the target language (Lado, 1948), and to teach them to avoid the "bad habits" which could "cripple [the student] for life" (Pargment, 1948, p. 497). Given this view of language learning, it is perhaps unsurprising that errors were seen as indicative of bad language habits, and therefore pernicious and to be avoided (Hendrickson, 1978).

The audiolingual approach was especially appealing to classroom teachers because it was 'scientific' (Brown, 1972). The word 'scientific' and the description of linguistics as 'a science' were often emphasized in scholarly publications. Politzer, for example, after describing Harold Sweet as "the great pioneer of scientific language teaching", went on to state that "Language Teaching should...evolve definite principles...and consolidate them in a true Science of Language Learning" (1958, p. 68). Another link with science was the development of new technologies available to teachers and students in 'language laboratories', the very name adding a scientific aura to the language lesson (Ferrell, 1956; Roertgen, 1959; Sanchez, 1950). These technologies supported classroom drills which were considered "scientific in [their] nature" (Topping, 1964). Above all, audiolingualism was given scientific credence by a method of descriptive linguistics - known most commonly as 'contrastive
analysis' (e.g. Di Pietro, 1962) - which, practised by structural linguists and available to any reader with access to the journal Language, seemed to provide language teachers with a theoretical and practical impetus for L2 syllabus development - a scientific impetus, in other words.

The CAH (or 'applied' contrastive analysis (Pollock, 1978)) hypothesized that the most difficult linguistic problems faced by the language learner (and therefore the errors to which s/he would most likely be prone) could be both predicted and explained by a description - to be "applied to all the features of the sound system and structural arrangement" (Fries, 1948, p. 15) - and subsequent comparison, of the student's native language and the particular target language s/he was attempting to learn (Hadlich, 1965; Pascasio, 1961; Politzer, 1958; Whitman, 1970). In Moulton's words,

The investigator analyses the phonological structures of the two languages, notes the points of agreement and disagreement between them, and then, on the basis of the observed disagreements, tries both to predict the errors which a learner will make and to explain why he will make them. (Moulton, 1962, p. 101)
(Note that Moulton's specification of 'phonological' structures is indicative of the fact that, as Twaddell pointed out in 1960, "The domain of language habits which linguistic research has most thoroughly investigated is that of pronunciation" (1960, p. 581).)

Since the fundamental source of L2 errors was considered to be negative transfer the disruptive effect the L1 had on the learner's ability to learn L2 habits, as opposed to the 'facilitation' effect of positive transfer (Jakobovits, 1969; Upshur, 1962) - the hope, which amounted to certainty in the minds of scholars such as Barrutia, provided by the Contrastive

Analysis Hypothesis was that this 'interference' could be foreshadowed and dealt with:


#### Abstract

The relatively new methods of contrastive analysis have now shown us what was always logically surmised by good language teachers but never scientifically proven as it is today...These contrastive studies have proven beyond a shadow of doubt that the interferences from the native language on the target language are discoverable and, hence, predictable. (Barrutia, 1967, p. 24)


The pedagogical fruit of a detailed contrastive analysis would be 'scientifically' derived information, for example in the form of a "hierarchy of difficulties" (Briere, 1966), which, via academic journals or language textbooks, would inform the teacher as to which items required treatment in the classroom, and in which order they should be so treated (Green, 1963; Hammerly, 1973; Moulton, 1962). (Note that contrastive analysis (CA) was a set of analytical tools; it provided the basis for the CAH , but was not equivalent to it. Note too that this distinction is not observed by many scholars, as can be seen by the Ellis and James quotes in 2.2.1.)

Scholars working with the CAH saw themselves as having two main tasks. The first was to identify and describe the different categories of error to which learners were prone (for example, see Moulton (1962), Topping (1964) and Kandiah (1965) for three different classifications of pronunciation error). The second was to be of practical use in the classroom. This could take the form of illustrative examples of classroom techniques (e.g. Moulton, 1962), explicit interference prediction (e.g. Muller \& Muller, 1968) and/or a focus on the grading of difficulties, for example where Green (1963) arranges his list of "problems of phonic interference" in "a scale of difficulty, first, for paradigmatic cases of interference,
secondly, for syntagmatic instances" (p. 88).

### 2.2.3 Problems with the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

Towards the end of the 1960s we can observe opposing views of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. For some, it was the mainstay of classroom methodology, providing a practical guide to syllabus preparation:

Today, contrastive analysis is a widely accepted technique among second language teachers and is commonly used to guide classroom and laboratory activities in terms of the type of materials to be introduced at specific times and the nature of the practice exercises to which the learner is to be exposed. (Jakobovits, 1969, p. 56)

For others, however, the CAH was problematic. Some said that contrastive analyses were too narrow in their scope and should broaden their focus (Briere, 1966; Topping, 1964) For others such as Kandiah (1965), the fault lay in the typical order followed by the CAH (contrastive analysis $\rightarrow$ error prediction). Kandiah argued that an analysis that used learner errors as its basis would result in a more effective 'error analysis $\rightarrow$ CAH' procedure, leading in turn to more efficient course development (1965, p. 159). Nemser agreed:

Contrastive analysis specialists..., often primarily concerned with techniques for establishing inter-systemic correspondences, have been content for the most part to derive empirical support for their formulations from impressionistic observation and intuition. Investigation of [L2] data would, therefore, yield as its first result new concrete information on learner behaviour of high utility to the classroom teacher to the planning of pedagogic strategy. (1971/1974, p. 60)

In addition, there were accusations that the CAH was inappropriate when applied to particular aspects of L2 pedagogy. For Hadlich (1965) the CAH, though acceptable as a learning tool for pronunciation and syntax, was harmful with regard to the learning of vocabulary. And Upshur (1962) felt that there was a "logical inconsistency" in the CAH that made it inappropriate as a theory of language testing: "It is an impractical method for determining test content when students from many language backgrounds are to be tested, and it is a theoretically invalid method for determining test content when students of a single native language background are to be tested" (p.127).

Other criticisms had a broader target. One such issue concerned what for many was the CAH's greatest strength: its capacity to predict errors. Wardhaugh, for example, called it a 'pseudo-procedure', pointing out that the 'strong' version of CA - "the idea that it is possible to contrast the system of [two languages] in order to predict those difficulties which a speaker of the second language will have in learning the first language and to construct teaching materials to help him learn that language" (1970, p. 124) - not only allowed one to make the requisite linguistic comparison without any reference to actually occurring data, but also claimed to be based on detailed linguistic and contrastive theories that did not in fact exist (p. 125, and see Scott \& Tucker, 1974). Dulay and Burt (1974c) went further, concluding that not only did transfer theories lack predictive power, they were also useless for the understanding of language acquisition: "If the principles of habit formation do not predict the difficulties [encountered by children learning English] can it explain how they do acquire language structure? There seems to be little reason to assume so" (p. 135).

### 2.2.4 A new conception of error

These attacks on the CAH as the basis for language pedagogy came hand in hand with three related developments in linguistics and language teaching, developments which contributed to learner error being newly conceived as a natural and necessary (Guntermann, 1978) part of the language learning process. The relationship between these developments and this new conception of error is summarised below.
(i) The rise of Chomskian views of language learning and the decline of behaviourism. By the late 1960s, Chomsky had successfully debunked the psychological underpinnings of behaviourism (e.g. Chomsky, 1957), and had established Transformational Grammar (TG) as the new linguistic paradigm (notwithstanding contemporary work of equal brilliance by Michael Halliday within a different paradigm (see Chapter 4)). Many scholars interested in second language learning were influenced by Chomsky's ideas. This influence was made explicit by some, such as Ravem (1968, 1974), whose research was motivated in part by the hope of finding "a psychological reality in transformational rules" (1974, p. 154). It was also an implicit presence in the work of scholars who made reference to Chomskian terms such as 'deep’ structure (e.g. Hanzeli, 1975; Jakobovits, 1968), to general tenets of Chomsky's linguistic theory such as the idea that language learning was essentially a creative act (Schachter \& Celce-Murcia, 1977), to error description based on 'surface structure taxonomies' (Ellis \& Barkhuizen, 2005), and so on.

Despite his dismantling of behaviourism, some scholars did attempt to marry Chomsky's grammatical revolution with the CAH (e.g. Wyatt, 1966), and even with the prevailing audiolingual methodology. Dingwall (1964), for example, wrote approvingly of the idea that "the 'ideal basis' for the preparation of a set of second language teaching materials would be complete T-grammars of each language involved" (p. 147), and accordingly set
forth a set of assumptions and directives he thought would "produce an ordered output which should constitute a fully adequate and sound basis for the preparation of instructional materials" based on drilling and pattern practice (p. 151). (However, complicated instructions and explanations such as

After the application of all appropriate obligatory TRs, pair the strings of terminal symbols generated by the UTRs of the FL where possible with strings of the NL. Structural divergence may be manifested not only in the derived strings but also in structurally divergent Structural Descriptions as well as Structural Changes (p. 157).
might explain why neither Transformational Grammar nor a TG-based Contrastive Analysis approach, have flourished in the FL classroom.)

The dominant view, however, was that if Chomsky's ideas were applicable to L2 acquisition, the prevailing methodology and its associated philosophies would have to change. In particular, learner errors could no longer be viewed as the avoidable, unwanted consequence of L1 transfer, but had to be seen as the inevitable, natural result of 'creative construction', analogous to the transitional forms produced by children learning their mother tongues (Dulay \& Burt, 1974c). Accordingly, the early SLA literature downplayed the role of mother tongue interference, stressing instead the importance of errors which "cannot be accounted for by contrastive analysis" (Richards, 1971, p. 214). Richards and others coined new labels for such errors, and for their putative causes. For instance, Richards (pp. 206-213) described four categories of 'intralingual' and 'developmental' error: 'over-generalisation', 'ignorance of rule restrictions' and 'incomplete application of rules', and 'false concepts hypothesised'.

Especially significant, and clearly inspired by Chomskian notions of universal grammar and innate grammatical knowledge, was the concept of a 'built-in syllabus' residing within the L2 learner (e.g. Corder, 1967). SLA scholars, "noting similarities to errors produced by children who are acquiring the target language as their mother tongue" (Schachter \& Celce-Murcia, 1977, p. 443), posited a similar role for L2 errors. It is here that we see the close connection between an interest in learner error and the birth of the field of Second Language Acquisition. Thus Corder, whose 1967 publication "The significance of learners' errors" is considered by some to be the founding document of SLA, wrote that

The problem is to determine whether there exists such a built-in syllabus and to describe it. It is in such an investigation that the study of learners' errors would assume the role it already plays in the study of child language acquisition...the learner's errors are evidence of this system and are themselves systematic. (1967, p. 24)
(ii) The greater respect paid to the learner and learner data. A corollary of the notion of a built-in syllabus was the prioritising of the learner's role in his or her own language development at the expense of the teacher and curriculum. As Corder put it,

The simple fact of presenting a certain linguistic form to a learner in the classroom does not necessarily qualify it for the status of input, for the reason that input is 'what goes in' not what is available for going in, and we may reasonably suppose that it is the learner who controls this input, or more properly his intake. This may well be determined by the characteristics of his language acquisition mechanism and
not by those of the syllabus. (1967, p. 165)

An essential part of this shift was the rigorous attention paid to "highly valued" (Valdman, 1975, p. 423) language data produced by learners. As Khalil wrote, "One of the main arguments in favor of error analysis in general has been that, unlike contrastive analysis, error analysis deals with the actual errors that are made by the language learner. Thus, error analysis is based on empirical data and permits a realistic, as opposed to probabilistic, analysis of errors" (1985, p. 337).
(iii) The concept of interlanguage. The third development that coincided with dissatisfaction with the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis was the concept of 'interlanguage'. In its application to L2 acquisition the word 'interlanguage' (IL), first coined by Selinker in 1969 (Selinker, 1969), indicates (i) that learner language is considered, in the words of Huebner (1983), "a linguistic system in its own right" (p.33), and (ii) that between the L1 and the L2 we can identify "a series of interlanguages", analogous to the "biologically based series of developmental stages" undergone by L1 children (Selinker \& Lamendella, 1981, p. 202; Hanzeli, 1975). Together, these points lead to the conclusion that "semi-sentences" (Jakobovits, 1968: 108) are inevitable and necessary stages in an internal restructuring process, just as they are for children acquiring their mother tongue (Ellis, 2008). Corder put the case clearly:

We interpret [the child's] 'incorrect' utterances as being evidence that he is in the process of acquiring language and indeed, for those who attempt to describe his knowledge of the language at any point in its development, it is the 'errors' which
provide the important evidence...The best evidence that a child possesses construction rules is the occurrence of systematic errors...It is by reducing the language to a simpler system than it is that the child reveals his tendency to induce rules...A learner's errors...provide evidence of the system of the language that he is using (i.e. has learned) at a particular point in the course (and it must be repeated that he is using some system, although it is not yet the right system). (1967, pp. 23, 25)

Though Corder makes free use of the term 'error' in the passage just quoted, Ellis (2008) correctly draws attention to the idea that an interlanguage view of L2 acquisition "casts doubt on the use of the term error itself" (p. 409). We shall return to this point below.

To summarise, the three developments discussed above facilitated a paradigm shift in the mainstream view of learner error. With the collaboration of a fourth factor Communicative Language Teaching, an approach which encouraged a learner-centred pedagogy where teachers were 'facilitators', 'guides' and 'co-participants' and where the choices and directions within curricula were ideally the result of 'negotiation' between learner and teacher (Breen \& Candlin, 1980; Richards \& Rodgers, 2001) - errors were now conceived of as positive signs that learners were hypothesising about the target language and employing essential language learning strategies. The close association of all these factors is highlighted in a comment such as "Errors...may provide insights into the innate processes of language acquisition and the strategies devised by learners to communicate intended messages" (Valdman, 1975, p. 423).

### 2.2.5 'Error Analysis': problems with the term and the concept

By the early 1970's, studies which took this new conception of error as their
starting point had been given a name: 'Error Analysis' (e.g. Hanzeli, 1975; Jain, 1974). This would seem to be final support for the idea, mentioned in Section 2.2.1, that 'Error Analysis' superseded the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. A closer analysis of the literature, however, reveals muddy waters.

One point to mention is that, strongly criticised as it was, the CAH was not universally dismissed. Despite Schachter and Celce-Murcia's assertion that "proponents of the CA hypothesis are dwindling rapidly and that the theory behind it has lost its prestige and popularity" (1977, p. 442), some scholars believed in its continued relevance. Kellerman (1979, p. 55), for example, wrote of an approach giving "new life to CA's aspirations" (p. 55), while Zobl (1982) referred to a "refinement of the contrastive analysis hypothesis" such that if "the role of prior L1 knowledge [is] conceptualized as a variable which may introduce variation into a developmental sequence, [CA can] provide a theoretical perspective for second language acquisition study" (p. 169). Even studies such as Dulay and Burt's were forced to acknowledge the fact that 'interference' played at least some part in error production (Dulay \& Burt, 1974c).

James (1990) confirms the notion that the CAH did not disappear with the emergence of 'EA', speaking of "a modest but significant revival of confidence in CA in the early 1980s" (James, 1990, p. 205). This revival was camouflaged somewhat by the use of new terminology. Thus Kellerman (1995) pointed to the rehabilitation in the SLA literature of "the role of crosslinguistic influences" (p. 125), and James' notion of 'transfer analysis' was a self-confessed "relabeling" of the CAH (1998, p. 5).

Another example of the resurgence of the CAH , at least in its 'weak', diagnostic form whereby errors are merely explainable (not necessarily predictable) through reference to mother tongue interference (Wardhaugh 1970), is research into contrastive rhetoric,
defined by Connor (2002) as "the insight that, to the degree that language and writing are cultural phenomena, different cultures have different rhetorical tendencies. Furthermore, the linguistic patterns and rhetorical conventions of the L1 often transfer to writing in ESL and thus cause interference" (p. 494). Additional examples in the literature include Kang (1992)'s discussion of cultural interference; Chan (2004), which provides evidence, based on "a contrastive analysis of...five syntactic structures" that in the English of Hong Kong ESL students, L1 interference plays a major role (p. 58); Jung (2004), which found evidence to support the claim "that learners transfer their L1 features in L2 learning and that with growing L2 proficiency, learners gradually become sensitive to the characteristics of the target language, approximating its norms" (p. 734); Ohata (2004), an unapologetic contrastive analysis of the sound systems of Japanese and English aimed at elucidating "pronunciation difficulties for Japanese ESL/EFL learners" (p. 17); Laufer and Girsai (2008), who "investigated whether incorporating contrastive analysis and translation activities into a text-based communicative lesson would make a significant difference in acquiring new vocabulary" (p. 709), finding support for this position; and Collins (2007) who writes: "When teaching homogeneous classes of Japanese EFL learners, I had the impression that these errors were less frequent. This was not surprising, given the absence of a compound past form in Japanese that might compete for simple past in English" (pp. 295-6).

As these examples from the literature clearly illustrate, the notion of L1 interference as a means of error explanation was not usurped by 'EA'. We can go further, however, and question the assumption that 'Error Analysis' is unambiguously distinguishable from the CAH. Interestingly, some descriptions of 'EA' sound remarkably similar to the motivations of its supposedly discredited predecessor. Dagut \& Laufer (1985)
write that "a prime constructive purpose of error analysis is (or should be) to identify the sources of a learner's difficulties, as a necessary preliminary to helping him or her overcome them" (p. 73). This exactly describes the goals of the CAH, which sought to 'identify the sources of a learner's difficulties' (via the comparison of the L1 and L2) as a 'preliminary' (via careful prediction) to 'helping him or her overcome them'. And Valdman informs us that "the observation and the analysis of learner errors are essential steps in the selection and ordering of grammatical features" (1975, p. 423, my italics), which is an excellent paraphrase of the CAH goal of developing hierarchies of difficulty for pedagogical purposes (Briere, 1966; Moulton, 1962).

On a similar note, it will be recalled that one advantage claimed of 'Error Analysis' over the CAH was its dedication to empirical data. Apart from the fact that, as we have already seen, CAH scholars themselves soon recognised the value of a data-driven approach (e.g. Kandiah, 1965), it can also be observed that some 'Error Analysts' failed to live up to these self-imposed standards. For instance, Hanzeli (1975) writes that
...first year students often produce ungrammatical sentences like 'Il le veut chercher'. It is likely that they had been exposed previously to a large number of sentences without modals and concluded (perhaps they had even been told) that the normal position of the object pronoun is 'before the verb'...In the next learning stage, the error resulting from this wrong hypothesis will be of the type ' $J$ 'entends le chanter', patterned on 'Je pense le voir'... (p.428)

Words such as 'often', 'like', 'likely', and 'perhaps', the use of predictive 'will', and the lack of any reference to, or provision of, actually-occurring data, all point to an 'Error

Analysis' (Hanzeli uses the term, complete with capitals, on p. 426) that is no more empirically sound than the mocked contributions of CAH advocates.

Indeed, 'EA' advocates occasionally seemed to apply double standards. In an article entitled 'Error Analysis and grading in the preparation of teaching materials', Valdman refers to "the obsessive concern with error avoidance that has characterised audio-lingual oriented language instruction generally" (1975, p. 423). In the next two paragraphs, however, he rejects the notion that a less strict attitude to the treatment of errors be tolerated in modern language classrooms because "there is evidence...that native speakers expect a high level of correctness on the part of learners who have acquired the L2 by formal training" (p. 424). It is unclear why aiming for a high level of correctness is only 'obsessive' if it occurs in the audiolingual classroom.

The CAH then, particularly in its weak form continues to influence scholars to this day. Moreover, some of its concerns are hard to distinguish from those of scholars invoking 'EA'. These points cast doubt on the accepted narrative that 'EA' arrived as a new paradigm (e.g. James, 1998).

The problem with the term 'Error Analysis' goes deeper than this. A more serious concern is that it is defined in vague, multiple and often contradictory ways, to the extent that one begins to question the very existence of a phenomenon describable as 'Error Analysis'.

Khalil (1985), for instance, refers to "conventional error analysis" as an "approach to errors that focuses on the expression of meaning" (p. 336). That he is speaking of an SLA view of 'Error Analysis' is beyond doubt since, as well as quoting from Corder (1967), he writes that errors "provide valuable feedback to both teachers and learners regarding learner strategies and progress. They also provide researchers with insights into the nature of the language acquisition process itself" (p. 335). But an approach to errors that focuses on
strategies and processes does not necessarily entail a focus on the expression of meaning. For instance, not one of the collection of eleven papers edited by Jack Richards under the title Error Analysis (1974) centres on semantic factors, while James' 304-page Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis (1998) contains three pages on lexical errors and no other reference to semantics. Therefore, when Khalil writes that "studies focusing on the expression of meaning have typically analyzed errors in terms of their frequency, type, and source" (1985, p. 335), describing these studies as 'conventional error analysis', it is difficult to know what he means. If anything within 'EA' may be described as conventional, it is surely a concern with the psycholinguistic processes involved in language acquisition. While these may be affected by the learner's desire to convey and understand meaning, this does not make meaning per se the research focus.

Accordingly, Spolsky (1979) makes no mention of meaning, describing "those working in error analysis" as "students of psycholinguistics whose studies might lead to some understanding of the nature of second language acquisition and not necessarily to some immediate way to improve second language teaching" (p. 254). But Spolsky adds a new twist to our understanding of 'EA'; he separates it not only from language teaching (as we have just seen), but also from the concept of interlanguage (IL). He writes,

Three of the buzz words that have been liberally sprinkled throughout writing on the theory of second language pedagogy over the past three decades are 'contrastive analysis'..., 'error analysis', which has fought for equal or higher billing since 1965, and 'interlanguage', which has been in vogue for the last five years or so. (p. 251)

Note that Spolsky is not suggesting that these are competing terms for a single phenomenon;
on the contrary, he proceeds to describe the three 'buzz words' in turn, underlining their differences.

It should be said that Spolsky is not alone. James (1990) echoes, and even expands on, the notion that 'EA' and IL studies are quite distinct: "There is a constant tension between the descriptive and long-term explanatory priorities of those engaged in IL studies and contrastive analysis research on the one hand and the shorter-term pedagogic priorities of EA on the other" (p. 207). However, James' distinction is due to the equating of 'error analysis' with 'pedagogic priorities' - in common with a general confusion regarding the true referent of the term (see further below) but in direct contradiction to Spolsky's view. What marks out Spolsky's idea as unusual is that he sees 'EA' as "most concerned...with language acquisition and learning (psycholinguistics), and interlanguage with communicative competence (sociolinguistics)" (p. 252). This would seem to contradict the whole basis of interlanguage; for example Selinker, who coined the term, discusses it in a paper "concerned with the linguistic aspects of the psychology of second language learning" (1972, p. 173).

In separating 'EA' and interlanguage (IL), Spolsky and James fly in the face of many scholars who see the terms as having much closer ties. Chan (2010) asserts that "Because errors are indicative of a learner's interlanguage...there is a need to investigate the [learner's] written output" (p. 296), and describes the comparison of "learners' interlanguage strings with their mother tongues" as "a sub-procedure in the diagnostic phase of EA" (p. 297). For Scott and Tucker (1974), 'EA' and 'IL' appear to be almost synonymous: "the research to date suggests that second-language learners do form rules which they test and revise through successive stages. Thus, error analysts speak of the development of...an 'interlanguage' to describe the evolving system of the student as he progresses from zero competence to native speaker competence in the target language" (p. 70). And Kellerman (1979) clearly identifies
early "interlanguage research" with 'Error Analysis': "the main emphasis in interlanguage research has shifted from a rather static error oriented view of language learning to a dynamic view of learners' language as a constantly evolving system" (Kellerman, 1979, p. 37). It is worth noting that Kellerman here exemplifies a related confusion, this time with the concept 'interlanguage'. It is exactly a "dynamic view of learners' language" that defined interlanguage research from the beginning (e.g. Corder, 1967); in other words, there was no previous IL stage from which to "shift". What we are probably encountering here is the tendency on the part of some writers to use 'interlanguage' synonymously - and anachronistically - with 'L2 output'.

Perhaps it is only to be expected that different authors, expressing their views at different times and from the perspective of different linguistic philosophies and cultures, should espouse contrasting definitions of 'EA'. What is less predictable, however, is that single authors betray tentative or even contradictory conceptions of 'EA' within the space of a single publication. One is surprised, for example, to find Spolsky (1979) describing it as both a "fad" (p. 252) and a "field" (p. 254), and employing both a valedictory tone ("The field of error analysis provided a very useful bridge to studies of first language acquisition" (p. 253, my emphasis)) and phraseology that suggests 'EA' is very much of the present ("In recent years, there has appeared a large number of papers that deal with differences or similarities in the order of second language learners' acquisition of specific features "(p. 253, my emphasis)).

More seriously, this trend is strikingly apparent in publications that are considered to be major contributions to the field, including books on, and book-length collections of papers dedicated to, 'Error Analysis'. The next few pages explore the notion of 'Error Analysis' as revealed in some of these publications.
H.V. George opens his discussion of 'A survey of error analysis' (Part 1 of his 1972 book, Common Errors in Language Learning: Insights from English), described a quarter of a century later by Carl James as "still the best ever published on EA" (1998, p. 13), with the point that "many books have been written on English language teaching, few pages on learners' errors" (p. 1). To rectify this situation, George produced a far-sighted and enlightening discussion of some of the psychological and cognitive factors that lead learners to produce 'unwanted forms'.

However, several criticisms may be levelled at Common Errors. For example, George focuses exclusively on the 'explanation' of errors. This goes against the general view that an error analysis should include error 'identification' and 'description' stages (e.g. Corder, 1972; Ellis, 2008). Related to this is the point that George's work does not appear to data-driven. As we have seen, it was the fact that the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis made non-empirical claims that laid it particularly vulnerable to criticism. However, in Common Errors there are few if any examples of actually-occurring errors; or at least, George's discussions are anecdotal, with no evidence that the errors upon which they are based were clinically or experimentally collected (Ellis \& Barkhuizen, 2005).

Third, and most important, George contends that there are two explanations for learner error: the 'rejection of redundancy', and 'interference'. The author reinforces the idea that these are two separate explanations by incorporating the distinction in the structure of his book: errors caused by redundancy are discussed in Part 2, while Part 3 is devoted to interference errors. However, a careful reading of George's redundancy theory reveals many of the Part 2 errors to be related to L1 interference. This passage, concerning redundancy in the grammar of English comparatives, is representative of many:

The learner's mother tongue may simply state the designatum being compared, and the given designatum with which the comparison is made, then restate the first designatum and the term and outcome of the comparison: Ahmed Ali, Ahmed tall is equivalent to Ahmed is taller than Ali...To a learner with a mother tongue like this, the redundancy of English comparative forms is most apparent; and the English forms are accordingly difficult to establish. (p.120)

Given that George sets up his two category system so emphatically, it is a disadvantage that many of the errors in one category appear to be equally amenable to selection for the second.

In summary, though considered by at least one expert in the field to be the finest work on 'EA' ever published (James, 1998), George's analysis appears to involve no empirical data, can be accused of lacking several requisite stages, and contains categories that are clearly distinguished in name, but not in practice.

The second example is a collection of papers edited by Jack Richards (1974), which bears the seemingly unambiguous title Error Analysis. Revealingly, however, the phrase 'error analysis' is absent not only from the titles of all but one paper, but also from the body of many of the articles. Thus Selinker (Chapter 3) refers to learner utterances that differ from the target language as "English interlanguage", Nemser (Chapter 4) writes, not of errors, but of "the speech behaviour" of L2 learners, and not of 'Error Analysis' but of the "investigation of...learner systems" (p. 63), Ravem (Chapters 7 and 8) writes of "captur[ing] the syntactic regularities of my informant's speech" (p. 125), while Dulay and Burt (Chapter 6 ), having "spent many hours" looking for an alternative to 'error', come up with the term 'goof' (p. 106).

What we have, then, is a collection of papers united under the title Error Analysis, which to a great extent avoids or rejects the term. This paradox is encapsulated in the first chapter, 'The study of learner English’ (Richards \& Sampson, 1974) which, despite serving as an introductory chapter, does not explicitly define the term that serves as their title. In fact, the suspicion arises that the authors are uncertain about what 'Error Analysis' means. They write, for example, that
...current research...is reflected in a growing terminology for a field of research which deals with the learner's attempts to internalize the grammar of the language he is learning. This terminology includes 'error analysis', 'idiosyncratic dialects', 'interlanguage', 'approximative systems', 'transitional competence', 'l'état de dialecte'. (p. 5)

Since five of the six phrases introduced here are synonyms - indeed, they were already coalescing into the umbrella term 'interlanguage' - the implication is that 'error analysis' is considered by the authors to be equally synonymous. Assuming the passage to be the result of deliberate cohesive choices, the authors are thereby confusing the process of analysis with the phenomenon analysed. Richards and Sampson surely did not intend this; however, since they have so tentatively introduced the tern 'EA', it remains a possible reading of the text.

Norrish (1983) presents a similar paradox. In a book described as "an excellent account of EA for teachers" (James, 1998, p. 18), Norrish's main aim, despite his title, is to assert that errors cannot and should not be dealt with in the classroom. This emerges in a number of ways, such as the decision to head the very first subsection 'Errors as failure' ( p .

1, my emphasis), to begin the section 'Uses of error analysis' with the non-sequitur 'Dangers' (p. 88, my emphasis), to conclude the same section with the words "what an error analysis can never do is..." (p. 91, my emphasis), and to end the book with von Humboldt's quote about language being unteachable (p. 121). Norrish also asserts that, because language is a system of systems, dealing with an error successfully will not help a student's "capacity to use the language for communicative purposes" (p. 88, my italics).

Again, then, we have a major work on learner error which, contrary to what the unsuspecting reader might expect, seems reluctant to embrace both the terminology and the concepts involved.

Although this is emphatically not the case with Carl James (1998), several major issues with James' book make Ellis' assertion that it is "a powerful defence of EA" (2008, p. 45) a difficult one to agree with. These issues have nothing to do with James's odd take on linguistic history ("Language change used to be thought of as a dull philological field of study, involving the parroting of sound changes and vowel shifts" (p. 57)), his lack of awareness of the work of functional grammarians ("It would be convenient to be able to make general and valid statements about how a unified system called lexico-grammar operates in language, but no such accounts are yet available" (p. 142)) or his tendency towards opaque assertions ("Knowing how learners avoid certain likely errors is the first step to discovering how to help the same learners avoid the errors they fail successfully to avoid" (p. 18)), and self-contradiction ("When it comes to raw intuitions, all errors 'feel' the same, though some might feel more serious than others" (p. 97)). The real problems with Errors concern the definition of key concepts and James's examples of error analysis in action.

To give just one example of the first issue, James defines error analysis in the
following ways:

- "Error Analysis is the process of determining the incidence, nature, causes and consequences of unsuccessful language" (p.1).
- Error analysis is "comparing one's interlanguage with [the target language], and noticing the discrepancies between the two" (p. 8).
- "EA [is] the study of linguistic ignorance, the investigation of what people do not know and how they attempt to cope with their ignorance" (p. 62).
- "But learners usually prefer to try to express themselves in the TL by alternative means...The study of this substitutive language (called IL) is EA" (p. 63).
- An Error Analysis is error correction where "we do more than say that it is wrong. We also indicate in what ways, describing the nature of the wrongness" (pp. 237-8).
- "Let us be clear about what 'explanation' means here. What it does not mean is diagnosis: it is not a question of making clear to the learners why they have produced a wrong form, but in what way their IL version is different (or deviant) from the target form. Explanation is, in effect, comparative description: quite simply EA" (p. 263).

These fluctuating definitions of 'error analysis' raise the question as to which Ellis was referring to when he described Errors as "a powerful defence of EA." For it is clear that James is struggling to distinguish between two competing perspectives of 'error analysis' the SLA notion that 'EA' is the study of interlanguage, and therefore of a system in its own right, and the pedagogic notion that 'EA' is the analysis of the differences between the target language and the erroneous forms produced by a student.

Defining 'Error Analysis' is also an issue in Ellis \& Barkhuizen (2005). The
authors begin by distancing it from the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (p. 52). Yet their description of the latter, that it "provided an explanation for why learners make errors, and...served as a source of information for identifying which structural areas of the target language teachers needed to teach" is more or less a paraphrase of their description of 'Error Analysis': a "set of procedures for identifying, describing and explaining learner errors" (p. 51).

A second issue surrounds Ellis and Barkhuizen's conception of when 'Error Analysis' developed. They assert that researchers looking for an alternative to the CAH "turned to EA" (p. 52). This wording indicates that 'Error Analysis' existed prior to "the late 1960s and early 1970s [when] Corder spelt out the theoretical rationale and empirical procedures for carrying out an EA" (p. 52). And indeed the authors confirm this impression:

EA has, perhaps, the longest history of all the methods for analysing learner language to be considered in this book. The study of 'bad language' in the context of native speaker usage can be traced back to the prescriptive grammarians of the $18^{\text {th }}$ century, and is reflected in such well-known publications as Fowler's The King's English (1906). (p. 52)

It seems odd to hedge with the word 'perhaps'. There can be no doubting that 'EA' has "the longest history" of any method discussed in the book; after all, none of the others (obligatory occasion analysis, frequency analysis and metaphor analysis to name three) are sourced before 1970 , let alone prior to 1800 . The answer can only be that the authors have in mind a different conception of 'EA'. And they do:

As a research tool for investigating how learners acquire an L2, EA has a much shorter history, dating from the 1960s...[It was] closely associated with nativist views of language learning and the emergence of interlanguage theory (pp. 52, 54).

Now, this notion of 'EA' fits much better with the idea of it being a "method" with "a set of procedures" (p. 1). But 'EA' cannot have a long history, and include prescriptive dictionaries and books on common errors (p.52) and at the same time have a short history and be associated with SLA research. Yet it is this paradoxical position Ellis and Barkhuizen appear to hold.

These brief summaries of some of the major contributions to the field have revealed a great terminological confusion. However, we can begin to resolve the issue by simply identifying two opposing referents for the label 'error analysis'. The first, the one we have been referring to as 'Error Analysis', is restricted to research within SLA. It is thus inextricably linked to IL and the study of the learner's "provisional grammar" (Hanzeli, 1975). The second, a homonym but otherwise unrelated, usually refers to pedagogically motivated analyses of learner error. Thus for Valdman (1975, p. 423), "the observation and the analysis of learner errors are essential steps in the selection and ordering of grammatical features" in a syllabus, while Dagut and Laufer (1985), as we noted above, declared the "prime constructive purpose" of error analysis to be the identification of "sources of learner's difficulties, as a necessary preliminary to helping him or her overcome them" (p. 73, my emphasis).

In fact, 'remedial' error analysis, in its position as "the grandfather of our rather young science" (Corder, 1975, p. 409), long predated the interlanguage era. As Schachter and Celce-Murcia put it, "Trained and sophisticated language teachers have undoubtedly applied

EA to one degree or another for decades" (1977, p. 442). For example, it is interesting to compare the following passage, published more than eighty years ago, with the Valdman and Dagut \& Laufer quotations above:


#### Abstract

The present work was undertaken...in order to provide material for a study of the frequency of errors occurring in the written work of German students in secondary schools and colleges...[I]t is...published in the hope that it may serve possible pedagogic and other uses along similar lines. A few such uses may be indicated briefly. Information about the relative frequency of errors in German composition, based on an actual scientific investigation, is particularly useful for preparing new grammars, for drill purposes, and for serving as an objective basis for classroom procedure, by indicating those topics of formal grammar which need most emphasis and intensive study. (Hathaway, 1929: 512)


Similarly, Crider wrote in 1930 that, "Teachers of modern languages are interested in knowing what errors are made when a student translates a foreign language into the vernacular. Psychologists are interested primarily in knowing why the students make these errors. This article gives the report of a study made to answer experimentally the queries of both the teacher and the psychologist" (1930, p. 123). And, as a third example, Milligan \& Bottke (1943) had these goals:

From the accumulation of several years' testing this study has taken a sampling in order to determine, principally, the major errors that are made by American students. It was incidentally interesting to ascertain if, as thought, girls made fewer errors than
boys, if there was real progress from the first to the third semesters, whether students with high marks in other phases of the work were equally better in pronunciation, the common minor errors, and what common English speech habits carried over into French (Milligan \& Bottke, 1943: 55).

Spillner points out that the CA/EA debate of the 1970s and 1980s "largely neglected...the analysis of errors within the mother tongue...[that] were published in the psychological and psycholinguistic literature at the beginning of the $20^{\text {th }}$ century" (1991, p. xiii). He might have added that, if scholars as influential as Burt could write "In recent years the acceptance of [the notion that "familiarity with the types of errors students actually make" is important] has led to a great deal of empirical research on adult foreign language errors" (1975, p. 54, my emphasis), the debate also largely neglected the contributions of the early L2 literature.

Not only did pedagogically oriented analyses of L2 error pre-date 'Error Analysis', they have also long outlasted it. This is evident, for example, when Ferris (1999) writes "I recently completed a detailed error analysis of first week diagnostic essays written by my 21 university ESL students" (p. 6), or when Chen (2006) states that "the procedure of the error analysis...is in accordance with the following four steps: 1. Data collection, 2. Identification of errors, 3.Classification of errors into error types, 4. A statement of error frequency" (p. 85).

The view that 'EA' refers to a theory-based, psycholinguistic-oriented procedure, separate from pedagogic goals certainly solves some difficulties. For instance, we saw earlier that there are widely differing assumptions concerning the constituent parts of an 'error analysis'. For many scholars, the explanation of errors is the crucial stage (e.g. Ellis, 2008). In this view, the procedures leading up to error explanation are just that: preliminary steps. Here,
we can identify 'Error Analysis' as the referent. For other researchers, however, the analysis of learner error need not concern itself with explanation at all; it is in fact the earlier stages the collection, identification and categorisation of errors - that constitute the analysis; they are in no sense 'preliminary'. Thus in Feng, Ogata \& Yano (2010), the authors present their 'Writing Error Analysis Model' (WEAM), a CALL component designed "for instructing composition of writing in Japanese as a foreign language" (p. 79). The model facilitates such things as the collecting of a corpus of compositions, the creating of a "relative mapping profile of morphological errors [which] can be sent back to the learner as feedback information" (p. 86). It is the identification and categorisation of morphological errors which counts as error analysis (and gives the WEAM its name), there is no interest in examining the source of error. Here, then, we can identify a different referent: let us refer to it for now as error analysis.

But there is one problem that the identification of multiple referents does not solve: the fact that the SLA concept of 'Error Analysis' is inherently paradoxical. This was touched on earlier when discussing Richards (1974): the relative scarcity of the phrase 'error analysis' in that collection was pointed out, as was, in contrast, the many references to 'interlanguage'. Ellis (2008, p. 42) explains that "interlanguage theory credited learners with playing an active role in constructing [mental] grammars. It treated their behaviour, including their errors, as rule-governed." By definition, however, as well as by philosophical and psychological principle, such a mental grammar does not contain 'errors'. Corder stated that

Language learning is a creative activity - it is a process of discovering some sort of regularity in the language data presented to the learner. The learner creates a language system for himself and what he has created, or what he is continually
creating, is, both formally speaking, in terms of its structural properties, and functionally speaking, in terms of what it can be used for, a language. (1975, p. 410)

There is no sense here that learner language contains 'errors', and indeed Corder himself suggests that there is "a problem of whether 'error analysis' is a suitable name for what we are doing" (p. 409). This is later echoed by Lapkin, who wrote that "errors [which] may...be considered as developmental,...should perhaps be designated by a label other than 'error'" (1980, p. 66). The point is reinforced by those who take the position that, if learner language is to be respected in this way, it makes no sense to evaluate it with respect to a native-speaker model (e.g. Bley-Vromen, 1983). This is because "learners' utterances are only erroneous with reference to target-like norms, not to the norms of their own grammars" (Ellis, 2008, p. 409).

It is therefore misleading and, as we have seen, a source of considerable confusion to refer to any study of IL as error analysis.

### 2.2.6 Conclusion

It seems fair to suggest that the problems with defining 'error analysis' reflect, if not a slight hubris on the part of some scholars in the 1970s, then at least the perhaps unfortunate decision to describe what were in effect SLA-oriented interlanguage studies as 'Error Analysis', thereby (i) establishing a term that could hardly have been less appropriate given the mainstream SLA view of learner language, and (ii) obscuring other applications of the study of L2 error.

For these reasons, and for the purposes of the subsequent discussion, this study rejects the notion of a "field of EA" (Schachter \& Celce-Murcia, 1977, p. 450). It rejects not only the notion that 'EA' in some way superseded the CAH, but also the validity of the
label itself. Instead, we shall refer to this SLA-oriented field as 'transitional form analysis'. This allows us to set up error analysis (EA) as a cover term for all scholarly explorations of learner error, including those with an exclusively pedagogical objective.

It also allows us to establish a firm framework for the categorisation of error analyses, in turn providing a context for the specific EA presented in Chapter 5. This framework is the subject of the next section.

### 2.3 Categories of error analysis

### 2.3.1 Introduction

In section 2.2 we examined the term 'error analysis' as it has been used in the second language (L2) literature. It was established that, 'Error Analysis', often written with initial capital letters (e.g. Hanzeli, 1975), and which I have consistently enclosed in quotation marks, refers primarily to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) studies of learner interlanguage, particularly in the two decades from about 1965-1985. It was suggested that to refer to this SLA-oriented discipline as 'Error Analysis' is misleading, partly because the notion of interlanguage is by definition antithetical to the concept of error, and partly because, both before and after the heyday of these studies, the investigation of L2 errors was and has been a staple of the pedagogic enterprise, and not limited to SLA research.

It was also demonstrated that major accounts of the analysis of L2 error are afflicted by inconsistencies concerning such fundamental aspects as the definition of 'error' and EA, the procedure an EA should follow, and just what the word 'analysis' might signify. It was proposed, therefore, that error analysis (without capitals and quotation marks) serve as an umbrella term for all research relating to L2 errors.

We are now in a position to look at the error analysis literature more analytically,
and establish an EA typology. This will permit the error analysis conducted in Chapter 5 to be seen in its proper context in terms of the academic EA literature as a whole. Since this is important to achieve, it has been necessary to examine the EA literature in great detail, and as a result the remainder of section 2.3 is perhaps surprisingly long.

### 2.3.2 Two categories of error analysis

The previous discussion has clearly shown that there are different kinds of error analyses. One obvious division that has emerged is one identified by Corder (1975), who distinguished between 'remedial' error analysis, which had explicitly pedagogical objectives, and what I have termed Transitional Form Analysis, which was focussed on interlanguage systems. As we have seen, however, this categorisation has not helped to reduce the confusion surrounding the term 'error analysis'.

The following account also recognises two types of error analysis (EA), but from a different perspective. As we have seen, Transitional Form Analysis was often undertaken with a philosophical approach that denied the very concept of error. This raises an interesting question: to what extent does the EA literature actually analyse, primarily and explicitly, L2 errors? By establishing categories 'explicit error analysis', and 'implicit error analysis' we are not only able to answer this interesting and important question, we also find that EAs can be clearly sorted: while an EA might be both pedagogical and theoretical in orientation, it cannot be both explicit and implicit in design.

In the next two sections each of these EA types will be discussed and illustrated with examples from the academic literature.

### 2.3.3 Type 1: Implicit error analysis

Implicit error analyses involve studies where the research includes an EA that
remains unacknowledged. This may be because (i) the researcher does not view L2 forms as erroneous, or because (ii) the identification of L2 error is tangential to the researcher's focus; necessary though it may have been, the analysis stage is not reported. In the first case we have 'Tacit' error analysis, and in the second case we have 'Quasi' error analysis'.

### 2.3.3.1 Tacit error analysis

'Tacit error analysis' (TEA) refers to studies whose authors do not refer to their work as error analysis because either (a) they do not acknowledge that learner language is erroneous, or (b) their focus is on correct forms. Unsurprisingly, therefore, TEA studies rarely if ever contain lists of errors or error categories. Different categories of TEA can be distinguished according to particular research agenda. These divisions are described below.

### 2.3.3.1.1 Errors in English as a lingua franca

Tacit error analysis sometimes occurs where the research agenda is to promote English as a lingua franca (ELF). From an ELF perspective, to describe L2 data as erroneous is to unjustifiably judge it against a native speaker standard variety of English. Thus for Tan (2005), "The impression given from learner corpora research is that learner language is flawed because it contains usages which are considered unnatural and inauthentic when compared to native language usage" (p. 128). This, she continues, is indicative of "imperialistic assumptions about the ownership of English, rather than [of] the present role of English as a lingua franca" (p. 128).

The thrust of the ELF argument is that what from an 'imperialistic' viewpoint might appear to be a deviant form may actually reflect the valid cultural and linguistic identity of the speaker. For instance, many of the Thai EFL students in Tan's study wrote 'teacher' without an article, as in this example: After that, teacher ran after and asked him
to give a reason (Tan, 2005, p. 133). This, according to the author, is not an error because in Thailand "a respect for roles, and one's position in the family and society, are taught very early in life, and remain deeply ingrained throughout a Thai person's life. Hence, titles of respect are obligatory" (ibid). In other words, the students are using 'teacher' as a title (somewhat akin to 'Professor X' in Professor X ran after him). Since this is an 'authentic' act of Thai English, "purists among us" (p. 134) should accept is as such.

The point to be observed here is that, despite her well-argued position, Tan must have conducted an error analysis on her data. First of all, the very act of selection implies an awareness of, and more importantly an implicit acknowledgement of, some 'standard' variety of English from which her data deviates. Whatever these deviations are termed, whether 'errors' or 'Thai English', they must still have involved principles of description in the sense referred to by Ellis: "The description of learner errors involves a comparison of the learner's idiosyncratic utterances with a reconstruction of those utterances in the target language or, more recently, with a baseline corpus of native-speaker language" (2008, p. 51).

It should also be pointed out that there are troubling aspects of Tan's presentation and interpretation of her data. First of all, it leaps out at once that, if we exclude the particular noun phrases with 'teacher' Tan holds up for discussion, there are no article errors in any of the sample texts. This, of course, serves to strengthen Tan's argument: if students have fine control of the article system, then the absence of an article before 'teacher' is more likely to be a deliberate, ELF manipulation of the grammar. Yet, in a study of the English L2 written errors of 237 Thai medical school students, Sattayatham and Honsa (2007) found that articles were the second most frequent error type in both sentence level translation (out of 48 error types) and opinion paragraph activities (out of 28 error
types) (pp. 184-5). In addition, the writing of the authors themselves illustrates article usage that some native English speakers might find unusual: "Other prominent errors are 'the articles' and 'the question tag'. We do not have articles and question tag in Thai system, so the students tend to omit them or use them wrongly" (p. 184). These factors indicate that, perhaps, Tan's examples are not representative of Thai English. If this should in fact be the case, we are unable to fairly judge the extent to which the omission of an article before 'teacher' might possibly reflect a more general lack of control of the Determiner system.

Secondly, of the four examples Tan provides of the use of 'teacher + zero article', one is particularly problematic : "for him because he was teacher in a public university" (p. 184). Unless the university is unimaginably tiny, it seems unequivocal that the student is referring to 'teacher' as a job name here, and not to the culturally loaded 'title'. If so, this example surely displays an erroneous use of the Determination system, even in Thai English. But the significant point is not that the analysis is questionable but that, again, Tan has conducted an analysis, one that involves applying criteria of grammatical right and wrong an error analysis, in fact.

### 2.3.3.1.2 Developmental stages/sequences in the L2

When Tacit Error Analysis occurs in the ELF literature it is part of a general political approach. L2 Englishes (Singaporean English, Pakistani English, and so on) should be seen as valid target varieties in their own right; therefore, grammatical patterns in those varieties should not be compared to a native speaker norm and should not be considered to contain errors purely on the basis of that comparison.

A second major category of TEA occurs with certain examples within the field of Transitional Form Analysis where the focus is on identifying stages and sequences of grammatical development. Here, the stand is not so much political as logical. If learner
language necessarily passes through stages of development, if each stage is viewed as systematic in its own right, and/or if learner language is seen as hypothesis testing leading to a restructuring of a particular stage/system, then it is as meaningless to refer to L2 'errors' as it is to refer to the trial and error displayed by child L1 learners as error-filled. From this perspective, L2 data does not contain errors, it merely displays differences from "adult language" (Ravem, 1968). Nevertheless, one can usually identify a point in the methodology of this research that is difficult to describe other than as error analysis.

An example occurs in Hakansson \& Nettelbladt (1993). Interested in comparing developmental sequences of Swedish word order between, on the one hand, L1 (normal) and L2 learners, and on the other hand, L1 learners with 'specific language impairment' (that is, learners "characterised by a late onset of speech and a slow rate of language development" (p. 132)) and L2 learners, the authors found that, although L1 (normal) and L2 sequences were different, the word order development of L2 learners and impaired L1 learners was similar. Hakansson and Nettelbladt describe participants as having "problems with word order" (p. 134) or producing "forms which are not used in the target language" (p. 137), but never as making 'errors'. However, the investigation of L2 developmental sequences involves observing the learner's transition from knowledge of only his or her own L1 lexicogrammatical system towards a new system. It is the gap between these systems that, by definition, enables investigators to study 'development'. Therefore, even though they never put it in these terms, Hakansson \& Nettelbladt must have closely studied how learner language deviated from L1 Swedish. Such deviations are exactly what are denoted by the term 'error' in explicit EAs (see below), and thus the authors' research can be said to have involved error analysis.

The perspective that lies behind developmental stage/sequence TEA is generally a
theoretical one, where teaching is kept out of the picture, and where L2 learning is cast as 'acquisition' based on the interaction of cognitive strategies and a language learning faculty. Zobl (1982) exemplifies this perspective. For example, although in Section 2.1 we saw that the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is usually related to classroom goals, Zobl expresses no interest in pedagogy and comes from a clear SLA perspective: "...if the contrastive analysis hypothesis is to provide a theoretical perspective for second language acquisition study, it is paramount that the role of prior L1 knowledge be conceptualized as a variable which may introduce variation into a developmental sequence" (p. 169). Moreover, Zobl refers to the SLA theory of developmental sequences as an established fact: "Structures of the L2, however, are acquired by progressing through a sequence of developmental stages" (p. 169), and evokes Chomskyan linguistic theory: "both adults and children approach the task of second language acquisition by reactivating their faculty for language acquisition" (p. 171). And although containing numerous examples of learner language, Zobl's article completely avoids the word 'error'. Instead, he speaks of a "delay in achieving targetlike control" (p. 172) of "variability" in copular use (p. 173, of "verb-final order [preceding] the verb-internal order" (p. 174), and so on.

### 2.3.3.1.3 Scoring an instrument designed to test L2 performance

Another environment conducive to TEA is where an L2 measure of some kind is designed, implemented and then scored. Here, the reason for downplaying errors is neither political nor logical; rather, it is a matter of emphasis. That is to say, although students' performance on a particular test will inevitably contain errors, the researchers' focus, both in the design of the instrument and in the discussion of the ensuing data, is centred on 'correct' results. For instance, in order to explore VanPatten and Cadierno's conclusions regarding input and output practice, DeKeyser and Sokalski (1996) tested two linguistic
structures: direct object clitics and the conditional. Commenting on the scoring of the former, they write, "All production task items on the direct object clitic tests received 1 point for correct choice of direct object clitic. Some items also required the participants to place the direct object clitic properly in the sentence; we awarded a second point for doing this correctly" (p. 629). Other examples that fit in this category include Ellis (2008b) and Zhu (2008).

To summarise, a research focus on correct results is an implicit acknowledgement that the data contains errors. Moreover, the identification of those results necessitates at least the identification of erroneous text. The fact that a tossed coin may land on heads should not hide the fact that part of the very meaning of this result is dependent on that of the other side, tails. Similarly, the decision of researchers such as Zhu (2008) to focus on correct responses is appropriate to their concerns; those responses, however, gain part of their significance from not being errors.

Tacit Error Analysis, then, is a subcategory of Implicit Error Analysis. Analyses may be assigned to this category when the recognition of errors in a corpus of L2 data is important to a piece of research, but where this is not acknowledged by the author. Such errors may be given another name ('non-targetlike forms'), or they may be completely hidden from view (for instance when the research focus is on 'correct' forms). There is of course no negative implication here; researchers have their own agenda, and there is no obligation on them to refer explicitly to L2 'errors'. This should not, however, obscure the point that the lexicogrammatical errors of L2 learners contribute to a substantial amount of research that appears to tacitly avoid, or even reject this truth.

### 2.3.3.2 Quasi Error Analysis

In contrast to the situation with Tacit Error Analysis, scholars engaged in Quasi

Error Analysis (QEA) do make clear mention of 'error'. However, while an analysis of L2 errors is part of the research methodology, and while a breakdown of errors and error categories, as well as examples from the data, are often provided by the researcher, the errors themselves are not the primary focus. For this reason, these studies are still categorised as 'implicit'. The most important subcategories of QEA are discussed below.

### 2.3.3.2.1 Error gravity

Studies of 'error gravity' (also referred to as 'error tolerance' (e.g. Piazza, 1980), 'seriousness of error' (e.g. Birdsong \& Kassen, 1988), 'error evaluation' (Ellis \& Barkhuizen, 2005), even 'interlanguage attitude' (Gynan, 1984)) blossomed in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a consequence of a newly-established learning goal that stressed successful communication ahead of grammatical accuracy, and the growing belief that aspects of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972) were important to measure. Rather than spend classroom time on correcting what were felt to be irrelevant grammatical minutiae, teachers were encouraged to focus on issues which hindered 'real' communication (Dulay \& Burt, 1974c). As Chastain wrote, "If the goal of communicative competence is chosen [by the language teacher], the important consideration is not whether the learner's utterance is linguistically correct but whether or not it is comprehensible to a native speaker" (1981, p. 288).

Error gravity (EG) studies investigate the response of one group of participants to the errors of another, usually with a view to establishing "a hierarchy of error gravity" (Chastain, 1981, p. 288) for classroom use. The usual variables focussed on in these studies are mode of error (whether the errors were spoken or written) and/or the status of the participants involved (whether, for example, the evaluator is a native speaker (NS) or a non-native speaker (NNS). Three of these patterns are expanded on below.

L2 writing errors $\rightarrow$ L1 native speakers: In these studies, native speakers are asked to indicate the relative seriousness of L2 written errors. For example, Chastain (1981) examined native speaker reactions to contextualised 'word' and 'form' errors in noun and verb phrases written by American second-year university students studying Spanish. 59 native Spanish speakers were asked to underline any errors they found, and to indicate whether they were 'comprehensible and acceptable', 'comprehensible but unacceptable', or 'non comprehensible' (p. 289). While Chastain found that "most of what [the] students wrote...was understood, if not always favourably received by some native speakers" (p. 293), he also discovered that "form errors were more comprehensible in noun phrases than word errors", whereas "form errors were slightly less comprehensible and acceptable in verb phrases than word errors" (pp. 291, 292). He concludes that the data "support the hypothesis that some errors are more serious than others from a communicative point of view", and that therefore these errors "should receive primary attention from second language teachers and learners" (pp. 293-4).

While most researchers use authentic data, some have employed invented examples. Tomiyana (1980), for instance, gave two passages in English, each of which had been "mutilated in six different ways" (i.e., were deliberately altered to include six different error types), to 120 postgraduate American university students who were asked to correct the errors and then to "rate the likely academic achievement of the person who wrote the passage" (p. 73). It was found that "unnecessarily inserted articles or connectors" did not seriously affect communication, and that of the two it was better for teachers to focus attention on connector errors than article errors (p. 78).

While participants are usually provided with contextualised errors to judge, this is
not always the case. Janopoulos (1992) justified his decision to use decontextualised errors on several counts, one of these being that "the possibility that subjects in this study could identify the samples as being NNS in origin was minimized" (p. 112). This was important because Janopoulos' methodology involved deceiving half the participants (members of five different university departments) into thinking the written errors were made by English native-speaking undergraduates, while the other half were correctly informed of the errors' L2 provenance. While Janopoulos found no significant difference in overall ratings, there were "indications that the faculty polled in this study seemed to be more tolerant of certain error types committed by NNS student writers than they were when rating the same errors they believed were committed by NS students" (p. 116). Janopoulos made the interesting point that, if further research confirmed these indications, such leniency may actually put NNS at a disadvantage when taking exams that were "normed to NS standards" (p. 118).

Comparing the responses of different groups of NS to L2 written errors, as Janopoulos did, is a theme with variations in EG studies. One such variation can be found in Song and Caruso (1996) who introduced two variables: ESL faculty versus English faculty, and holistic versus analytic rating. Although they found no significant differences with respect to analytic rating, the authors found that "raters with more years of experience in teaching and holistic evaluation tended to be more lenient in their holistic evaluation" while, also in holistic rating, "English faculty seemed to give greater weight to the overall content and quality of the rhetorical features in the writing samples than they did to language use" (p. 163).
$L 2$ writing errors $\rightarrow$ L1 versus L2 native speakers: In these studies, researchers are interested in how native speakers and non-native speakers differ in their responses to L2
written errors. Salem (2007), using as data the EFL written errors of native Hebrew-speaking university students, compared the responses of two groups of native-speaking teachers (one group living locally in Israel, the other abroad), with a group of native Israeli teachers. Dividing the errors into three types ('lexical', 'word-dependent' and 'pure-grammar') she found that "the pure-grammar errors were judged more severely by the local teachers than by the overseas assessors; and the lexical errors were scored higher by the local NS teachers than by their [native Hebrew-speaking] colleagues and the overseas teachers" (p. 197). Salem further suggests that the 'word-sensitivity' of an item "the generalisability extent of a rule which has been infringed" (p. 217) - is a hidden factor in error evaluations. She found that there was a general trend to rate as less severe highly word-sensitive errors such as collocations and deviant patterns such as 'enjoy to +V '. Errors relating to general grammar rules, such as mistakes in the formation of the passive voice and relative clauses, were judged more harshly (p. 216).
$L 2$ speaking errors $\rightarrow$ L1 native speakers: Here, the researcher exposes L2 speaking errors, usually captured on tape recordings, to native speakers who are then asked to respond. Thus Ensz (1982), wanting to "determine which category of errors typically made by French-speaking Americans, errors in pronunciation, vocabulary or grammar, is the most objectionable to the French ear" (p. 133), played tape recordings to "French people with whom American speakers of French are most likely to interact" (p. 135). She found that the native speakers were less tolerant of grammatical errors than they were of pronunciation and lexical errors. (See also Guntermann, 1978; Politzer, 1978).

It will have been observed that a common factor in all EG studies is a focus on error. However, what should also be apparent is that this is a secondary focus. It is
secondary in two senses. First, the researcher must have engaged in at least a basic error analysis in order to collect the initial data. This procedure, however, is rarely described as it never the study's first priority. The focus on error is also secondary in the sense that the data collected during the EA stage is not the data put up for analysis and discussion. The latter, of course, consists of participant responses to the EA data. Thus, although EG studies refer explicitly to error, and may provide explicit lists of categorised errors, since this is not the primary research focus error gravity studies remain firmly in the Implicit Error Analysis category.

### 2.3.3.2.2 Error Correction

This is also true of a second major type of QEA, 'error correction'. Like error gravity studies, the error correction literature also arose in the mid-1970s, again as a response to the movement away from an Audiolingual methodology, with its low-tolerance attitude to error, to a communicative approach, which as we have seen problemetised the whole notion of how to deal with errors. Error correction studies can take several forms, but only two are discussed in detail here.

Some scholars write generally about error correction, informing readers of the pros and cons of different types of error treatment. These are particularly prevalent in the early years, when it was felt teachers needed to be instructed how to correct errors. Hendrickson's advice to focus on "errors that seriously impair communication" and to make use of "peer correction or self-correction with teacher guidance" (1978, p. 396) was typical of the new communicative, student-centred approach to error (see also Cohen, 1975; Fanselow, 1977). However, similar work continues to be published today. Lee (2004), for example, surveyed several hundred university and secondary school teachers and students in Hong Kong on various aspects of error correction. Lee found several problems, including (i) correction
tended to be overly comprehensive, (ii) error codes were not necessarily understood by students, and (iii) "only slightly over half of the teachers' error feedback was accurate", suggesting the need for better teacher training (p. 402).

As we would expect with Implicit Error Analysis, error in these studies are identified but rarely attended to closely. Thus Fanselow (1977), discussing how errors were determined for the purposes of exploring their in-class treatment, writes: "When a teacher treated part of a response as incorrect, the treated part was labelled incorrect...Some teachers asked students to change full forms to contractions in one part of the lesson and accepted full forms in another part of the lesson. Since full forms were considered errors at one point, they were labelled as errors whenever they occurred" (p. 584). Whether or not a full form can fairly be described as an 'error' at all is not the point; the analysis is not of errors, it is of the treatment of errors.

Another category of error correction studies empirically investigates which type of error correction is most efficacious in a particular language learning context (e.g. Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992). While such studies take the view that error correction is beneficial for students (and it should be noted that a constant theme of the EC literature is that students want their work to be corrected (e.g. Chandler, 2003; Ferris \& Roberts, 2001), a third group of EC studies problemetises this assumption. The key series of texts here is the argument between Truscott (e.g. Truscott, 1996; Truscott, 2004; Truscott, 2007) and Ferris (e.g. Ferris, 1999; Ferris, 2004).

Truscott's position is that grammar correction is ineffective, potentially harmful, and "has no place in writing courses and should be abandoned" (1996, p. 328). As well as outlining some practical problems associated with the correction of grammar errors, Truscott claims theoretical support from research showing "that much of L2 grammatical
learning follows natural orders, and that problems can arise when instructional sequences are inconsistent with those orders" (p. 344). Apart from noting with interest the connection between such a viewpoint and the tendency on the part of some SLA scholars to downplay 'error', one detects a degree of bias in Truscott's argument. For instance, he asserts that "the acquisition of lexical and morphological knowledge involves subtle learning processes. To be effective, correction must address these processes, not just pass information from teacher to learner" (p. 343). But this (i) conveniently fails to define 'effective', thereby sweeping aside potential benefits of correcting student work (see below), (ii) adds interpersonal attitudinal elements to his prose ('must', 'just') that give an unwarranted sense of authority to what is only an opinion, and (iii) advances a condition upon error correction - that it address subtle learning processes - that would render any teaching strategy ineffective.

Ferris acknowledges that Truscott raises an important issue, but counters his position with the point that, until research has conclusively shown error correction to be ineffective, there are good reasons to continue the practice. These reasons include the importance of helping students become "more self-sufficient in editing their own writing", and the fact that "surveys of student opinion about teacher feedback have consistently affirmed the importance that L 2 students place on receiving grammar correction from their teachers" (1999, p. 8). It is revealing that, just as Truscott's SLA-based, learner-oriented position is anti-error correction, so Ferris' pedagogy-based, student-oriented approach seeks to promote it. This reinforces and supports the distinction we have made between the restrictive 'Error Analysis', a misnomer and renamed 'Transitional Form Analysis', and the inclusive 'error analysis' to which error correction belongs.

To sum up, error correction studies, like their error gravity counterparts, engage in an error analysis that plays only a secondary role in the research. Again as with EG, lists of
errors and categories may be explicitly provided, but the aim of the error correction study is to explore how errors are treated, not to shed light on the errors themselves.

Quasi Error Analysis, then, is regarded here as 'implicit' because, although it unambiguously presents L2 errors as errors, and makes no effort to disguise an error analysis stage, it relegates this stage to a secondary position - so secondary, at times, that it is left out of account altogether.

### 2.3.4 Type 2: Explicit Error Analysis

As we have seen, Implicit Error Analysis (IEA) implies that a researcher attends to learner error but (a) either does not refer to this part of the research process, or refers to it in terms that to some degree disguises the notion of error, or (b) places his/her primary focus on a related issue, such as the effect of error feedback.

While IEA covers many of the error analyses in the literature, there is a second category, 'Explicit Error Analysis' (EEA), in which errors are unambiguously front and centre. Even within EEA, however, we can discern a continuum of explicitness according to variables such as the extent and scope of the analysis, and the attention paid to error categorisation. Three general divisions of EEA may be distinguished. In Basic Error Analysis, the analysis does not extend beyond error identification, unless it is with the provision of basic frequency analysis; in particular, there is no attempt to explain errors, and error categories are minimally discussed, if at all. In Middle Error Analysis, the researcher goes beyond the identification of errors and a discussion of error frequency, but still employs categories that are not justified or problemetised. Finally, in Full Error Analysis, the analysis both extends beyond error identification and frequency information and provides a full discussion of error categories.

These three types are expanded upon and exemplified below.

### 2.3.4.1 Basic Error Analysis

In contrast to any subcategory of Implicit Error Analysis, Basic EA places the analysis of learner error at the heart of its methodology. However, unlike Middle and Full EA (see below), studies in this group are restricted both in the scope of analysis and in the discussion of error categories. In terms of the former, the scope of the analysis is restricted to basic frequency information; any discussion of the data is fundamentally tied to error frequency. In regards to the latter, error categories are not subjected to any kind of explanation or discussion.

One of the earliest Basic EAs was published by Hathaway in 1929. The author was aware she was stepping into new territory:

The present work was undertaken...in order to provide material for a study of the frequency of errors occurring in the written work of German students in [American] secondary schools and colleges. A distinct example of pioneering, it is now published in the hope that it may serve possible pedagogic and other uses along similar lines. (p. 512)

30 high school teachers returned to the author a check-list of pre-determined (i.e., not data-driven) lexicogrammatical errors made in written compositions by learners of German (see pp. 513-516). It had been stressed to the informants, who recorded the errors from spring 1926 to June 1927, that "every error should be recorded and tabulated somewhere, somehow", and that "the tallies for each error should be entered in Arabic numbers on the set of final sheets" (p. 518). Hathaway presents her data in a series of 20 tables where errors
are "arranged in order of descending frequency" (pp. 520-531). For instance, Table 8, "Errors in Use of German Passive", shows that the most frequent error, at 188 instances, was the "use of auxiliary sein for werden" (p. 523).

Hathaway's work is archetypal Basic EA. First of all, it is clearly explicit in its analysis of error. Second, the analysis does not venture beyond these frequency lists. Naturally, this does not imply that the author's ultimate objective is to report on error frequency. As Hathaway explains, she hopes the information will be put to good use:

Information about the relative frequency of errors in German composition, based on an actual scientific investigation, is particularly useful for preparing new grammars, for drill purposes, and for serving as an objective basis for classroom procedure, by indicating those topics of formal grammar which need most emphasis and intensive study. (p. 512).

Thirdly, while there is some discussion of individual errors within the chosen categories, the categories themselves are simply 'given'; they are traditional grammar categories - the subjunctive (Table 7), nouns (Table 13), and so on - and they are assumed to be adequate for purpose.

A more recent example of Basic EA is Sattayatham \& Honsa (2007), in which the researchers calculate error frequency rates for Thai EFL learners at four medical schools. Having worked out the top 10 errors for three types of writing - sentence and paragraph translation, and opinion paragraph composition - they use chi-square tests to show
a dependency between sentence level translation and paragraph level translation at
0.05 level of significance. This means that if the students can translate from Thai into English very well at sentence level, they can also translate into English very well at paragraph level. (p. 186)

A similar dependency was found to adhere between paragraph level translation and opinion paragraph composition (187). The authors therefore suggest that greater attention should be placed on translation in both Thai medical school classrooms, and more generally (p.189). As with Hathaway, error categories are traditional and unanalysed, no discussion of the source of errors is entered into, and the authors' recommendations are based directly on their frequency results.
(Other examples of Basic EA include Crider, 1930; Feng, Ogata \& Yano, 2010; Guntermann, 1978; Milligan \& Bottke, 1943.)

### 2.3.4.2 Middle Error Analysis

As with Basic EA, Middle Error Analysis studies have L2 error as their explicit and primary research focus, though they do not consider error categories worthy of scrutiny. Unlike Basic EA, however, these studies go beyond the mere identification and statements of error frequency. We can identify certain favoured research topics within Middle EA.

### 2.3.4.2.1 Using the results of an EA to consider the source of L2 errors

Many researchers are interested in why learners make errors. They generally take one of two views: that most errors can be explained by L1 interference, or that errors are primarily the result of interlanguage processes.

The former view can be found in Chen's study of Taiwanese low-level EFL university students (2006), which begins by using the calculation of error frequency to
discover whether "there is a significant difference in written error rates between those...who receive [supplemental] Computer Assisted Instruction...and those who receive traditional instruction alone" (p. 81). The author reports no significant differences between the two types of instruction (p. 92).

At this point, Chen moves beyond Basic EA by addressing the question of "how and why the errors are formed" (p. 95). Her explanation is that they occur due to L1 interference; indeed, she considers no other possibility:

The researcher identified eight error categories where the greatest number [of errors] occurred: (1) verbs, (2) punctuation, (3) lexicon, (4) syntax, (5) capitalization, (6) subject omission, (7) prepositions, and (8) articles. Language transfer problems in terms of these errors may benefit EFL educators' grammar instruction especially when comparing the two languages. The very different grammatical structures between Mandarin and English make it more difficult for beginning EFL students to learn English, yet such distinct differences could also make it easier for educators to compare the two languages when instructing English grammar. (p. 101).

Chen's analysis is problematic, however, because her research design is not intended to address the cause of her students' errors. For example, it neither allows for the possibility of alternative causes, nor attempts to produce serious support for the L1 interference theory. Instead, Chen makes assumptions such as the following: "Some errors in tenses and subject-verb agreement were found because the students forgot to conjugate verbs...[for example:] She say... This finding [supports the] assertion that most Taiwanese EFL students have difficulties in the use of English verbs due to the absence of verb conjugation in

Mandarin" (p. 96). Here, both the assumption that students "forgot" to conjugate verbs, and the claim that this is because there is no verb conjugation in Mandarin, appear not as products of Chen's research design but as speculations. Therefore, while the EA is Middle, it is not particularly insightful.

The interlanguage perspective on why learners commit errors produces studies we have termed Transitional Form Analysis (TFA), and which other scholars term 'Error Analysis'. In the current framework, TFA research is but one subtype of error analysis. It is, in fact, the explicit counterpart to the Tacit EAs found in 'Developmental stages/sequences in the L2' above. The difference is that, while studies in the latter category avoid speaking of 'error', examples in Middle EA have no such qualm.

An example is Hanzeli (1975), who explains that the learner hypotheses evident in a learner's "provisional grammar" (p. 426) can be traced by an exploration of errors. He gives the following illustration:
...to give a syntactic example, first year students often produce ungrammatical sentences like *Il le veut chercher...Once the student is corrected to Il veut le chercher, he is likely to...arrive at the following superficial observation: place the pronoun object before the conjugated verb in the complex verb phrase...In the next learning stage the error resulting from this wrong hypothesis will be of the type *J'entends le chanter... (p. 428).

Noor (1993) was interested in the acquisition of English temporal conjunctions by Saudi Arabian EFL university students. He gave a cloze test to (a) intermediate students, (b) advanced students, and (c) a control group of native speakers. Participants were given 76
items each involving a two-clause sentence, such as Once everything was finished, Ibrahim appeared, and were then asked to decide whether the main clause event happened first, second, or at the same time as the subordinate clause event (pp. 108-9). As well as using frequency counts to demonstrate, for example, that the intermediate group found both 'first' and 'second' temporal conjunctions (TCs) problematic, but less so than 'same time' TCs, Noor speculated on the sources of these errors. While finding "somewhat weak evidence of transfer" (p. 122), he attributed error primarily to processing strategies. For example,

The present study showed that our EFL learners...may concentrate[e] more on preposed TCs than on those in the embedded position, which may lead them to commit fewer errors on preposed TCs. That is to say, most of the errors committed on the embedded variable may be due mainly to such a strategy. (p.122)

With reference to our EA framework, the important thing to note here is that Noor is not employing error categories. 'Embedded' and 'Preposed' TCs are linguistic categories, while 'first' and 'second' are semantic categories; neither can double as error categories since no participant actually produced a word of English. Thus, although Noor can demonstrate which types of TC were difficult for learners to process semantically, and can even develop useful hierarchies of difficulty within each type (pp. 112-3), he does not identify different kinds of TC error and more importantly cannot be certain that the learners would demonstrate the same error tendencies in production.

We saw that Hanzeli (above) viewed L2 error as the result of internal processes, but did not place the errors in explicit categories. Powell (1975), in contrast, identified three sources for the oral errors of 223 American high school learners of French. As well as
intralingual and interlingual (i.e. L1 interference) errors, she found 'reduction' errors to play a crucial role in L2 speech. These occur where, for example, "the verb was...deleted...in sentences containing stative verbs" (p. 40). Noting that these errors do not affect an interlocutor's capacity to understand the message, Powell speculated that the speaker's communicative priority is the explanation for many reduction errors: "If students were asked for their priorities in foreign language learning, it is doubtful that many would choose grammatical accuracy over communicational accuracy...Several of the reductions that occurred in the language of the subjects in the present study seem to reflect this bias" (p. 40). Note that Powell's error categories are not justified or discussed beyond their initial definition. That is, in common with scholars such as Hathaway who employ the categories of traditional grammar, Powell assumes her categories to be valid. This is not meant as a pejorative comment; just as there is no sense in which Complex EA is 'better' than Middle (or Basic) EA, so there is nothing inadequate about a study that does not hold its categories to account. The point is a descriptive one, allowing us to categorise EAs such as Powell's as Middle Error Analysis. What it also suggests, interestingly, is that the researcher (often unconsciously) takes a linguistic position that is as 'given' as his/her categories of error. Just as Hathaway's error categories indicate an implicit assumption of the validity of traditional grammar, so it seems unlikely that Hanzeli and Powell, say, would question the idea that "the second language learner...adopts successive interim grammars, which are defined by his errors" (Powell, 1975, p. 38). Certainly, such a cognitive perspective is assumed in their work. As we shall see, however, one of the features of Full EA is that a close attention paid to error categories reflects a parallel desire on the part of the researcher to highlight a particular linguistic perspective.

### 2.3.4.2.2 Measuring linguistic accuracy

Another focus we find within Middle EA is the attempt to measure linguistic accuracy. Rosengrant (1987), for example, compared the spoken and written performance of 7 English-speaking university students learning Russian, in order to investigate whether "writing ability could be predicted on the basis of oral proficiency" (p. 138). While her finding that "the lower a student's oral proficiency rating the greater the average number of written mistakes and vice versa" (p. 144) is less than startling, Rosengrant also noticed a more interesting pattern:

Evaluation of the student compositions clearly showed that the students who had originally received the highest oral proficiency ratings...also tended to make more mistakes in spelling and case usage and fewer mistakes in their choice of words. In other words, they made more mistakes of a mechanical nature and had less difficulty expressing their meaning than did their less proficient counterparts. (p. 145)

Rosengrant then uses this frequency data to suggest a link between the successful written performance of a given function, and written work that is "limited to mechanical errors" (p. 145). In taking this step, the analysis moves into the 'middle' category.

### 2.3.4.2.3 Guiding language teaching

A third type of Middle EA occurs when the results of a study are used to help lay the groundwork for an L2 syllabus, or to guide the preparation of teaching materials - but where, again, error categories are left unanalysed.

Musgrave and Parkinson (2014) were interested in the use of modified noun
phrases in L2 academic writing, and analysed a corpora of student essays written by 21 advanced international ESL learners studying at Victoria University of Wellington. In comparison to 'expert' writers, the ESL learners were found to use fewer noun-noun structures and post-modifying relative clauses and prepositional phrases, while showing a "striking...reliance on attributive adjectives" (p. 147). Focussing on noun modifiers, the authors illustrate some of the "many examples of incorrect forms" (p. 147):

For example, in the noun group, 'the optimum way of energy generator', the learner has chosen the incorrect form of the second noun, choosing 'generator' rather than 'generation'. Errors are also found in sequences such as 'Fears were raised of radiations leaks' and 'nuclear power plants technology'. (p. 148)

These errors in production, as well the problems students appear to have with comprehending noun-noun structures, inspired the authors to design a pedagogic task "to increase learners' understanding of the various meaning relations expressed by noun-noun phrases and also to increase their ability to move backwards and forwards between clausal and nominal constructions when expressing these meanings" (p. 154).

Middle EA, then, is categorised as 'Explicit' because it embodies a clear focus on learner error, and it provides an analysis that goes beyond the presentation of frequency statistics. Nevertheless, because it does not subject error categories themselves to analysis, it is considered a separate category from 'Full' error analysis.

### 2.3.4.3 Full Error Analysis

As mentioned above, Full EA not only undertakes analysis beyond the
identification of errors and beyond a discussion of error frequency, but also accounts for, explains and/or justifies error categories. As also suggested, this tends to involve the highlighting of a particular perspective on language learning. These perspectives provide a convenient way to identify subtypes of Full EA.

### 2.3.4.3.1 Highlighting a cognitive process/strategy perspective

Some Full EAs reveal a clear process/strategy perspective on language learning. Typically, these see learner language as creative and systemic, and are therefore related to some of the interlanguage-oriented Basic and Middle EAs discussed earlier. The difference is that, in Full EA, the perspective is highlighted through an explicit discussion of error categories.

Richards, in his 1971 article 'A non-contrastive approach to error analysis' (1971) focuses on "several types of errors, observed in the acquisition of English as a second language, which do not derive from transfers from another language" (p. 205). These errors "reflect the learner's competence at a particular stage, and illustrate some of the general characteristics of language acquisition" (p.205).

Richards identifies two general causes of error: 'intralingual' errors "have to do with faulty rule learning at various levels" (p. 206), while 'developmental' errors "illustrate the learner attempting to build up hypotheses about the English language from his limited experience of it in the classroom or textbook" (p. 206). According to Richards, the first cause leads to three subtypes of error, while a fourth error-type is developmental in origin. These are illustrated in Table 2.1:

Table 2.1: Subtypes of error identified by Richards, 1971.

| Error Type (intralingual) | Gloss | Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Over-generalisation | the learner creates a deviant structure on the basis of his experience of other structures in the target language | We are hope |
| 2. Ignorance of rule restrictions | the failure to observe the restrictions of existing structures | The man who I saw him |
| 3. Incomplete application of rules | structures whose deviancy represents the degree of development of the rules required to produce acceptable utterances | systematic difficulty in the use of questions can be observed |
| Error Type (developmental) | Gloss | Example |
| 4. False concepts hypothesised | faulty comprehension of distinctions in the target language | One day it was happened |

Richards, then, focuses explicitly on error categories. Indeed, his examples of L2 error serve to illustrate the categories more than as phenomena to be analysed. This focus on categorisation stems directly from Richards' wish to highlight non-contrastive errors; to highlight, that is, a strategy approach to language learning.

There are, however, several problematic aspects to with Richards' formulation. First, some error types are described inconsistently, as when the author paraphrases (2) as the "failure to observe rule restrictions" (p. 208). Assuming that he is still talking about "systematic errors...[that] cannot be described...as occasional lapses in performance" (p. 205), one wonders how a learner can be (a) accused of 'failing to observe' something s/he
has yet to acquire, and (b) both 'ignorant' of a rule restriction and knowledgeable enough to fail to apply it. Second, some of Richards' descriptions are too general to be useful. For instance, his definition of (3) as "a structure whose deviancy represents the degree of development of [a rule]" would seem to be applicable to all grammatical errors. And third, although Richards rests his definition of developmental errors on their being attributable to failures of pedagogy, he gives examples of teacher/textbook-induced errors for all three intralingual types too (e.g. "Certain types of teaching techniques increase the frequency of over-generalised structures. Many pattern drills and transform exercises are made up of utterances that can interfere with each other to produce a hybrid structure" (p. 207)).

These issues do not undermine the status of Richards' work as Full EA. In common with other SLA analysts, Richards sees L2 errors as resulting from internal cognitive processing. Since his aim is to actively promote this view, "exclud[ing] from discussion" L1 interference (p. 173), he is careful to explain, and justify through exemplification, his error categories.

A second example is Dulay and Burt's (1974c) study, which considered data from studies of Norwegian and Spanish child learners of English. Their interlanguage perspective is clearly stated: "We hypothesise that the child's organisation of L2 does not include transfer from (either positive or negative) or comparison with his native language, but relies on his dealing with L2 syntax as a system" (p. 115). In fact, it is a stated aim of the research to categorise errors "within this framework of process" (p .115, emphasis in the original). Dulay and Burt's explicit highlighting of a 'process' view of L2 acquisition is accompanied by a similarly explicit presentation of their error categories. They state that their account "requires that the goofs be accurately categorisable" (p. 115), and accordingly they not only list a set of categories, but define them. (Note: Dulay and Burt use 'goof' as a synonym for
'error', albeit one that in their minds has a less pejorative connotation (see Dulay \& Burt, 1974a)). The avoidance of the word 'error', therefore, is not a reason to categorise the study as Tacit Error Analysis.)

- Interference-like errors "reflect native language structure, and are not found in L1 acquisition data of the target language" (p.115).
- L1 developmental errors "reflect native language structure, but are found in L1 acquisition data of the target language" (p. 115).
- Ambiguous goofs are those that can be placed in either of the first two categories
- Unique goofs "do not reflect L1 structure, and are also not found in L1 acquisition data of the target language" (p. 115).

These explanations are brief, to be sure, but the points to note are, first, that the categories are not taken for granted, and second, that the explanations are motivated by a wish to explain and support a linguistic standpoint. This becomes clearer when we realise that the authors' initial listing of four categories is a red herring. Having presented us with and exemplified the categories, Dulay \& Burt dispense with three of them immediately, leaving only interference errors available for discussion (p. 118). The reason for this is the authors' desire to explain the errors "which appear to confirm the transfer process posited by the CA hypothesis" (p. 118) in terms of non-transfer processes, that is, as 'Developmental' errors. For instance, the sentence *She's putting hers pyjamas on appears to "reflect modifier-noun number agreement, obligatory in Spanish but not existent in English" (p. 118), and therefore be an 'Interference-like' error. Dulay and Burt beg to differ. Such errors "are instances of overgeneralising the possessive $-s$ from NP's which are nouns,
e.g. Tim 's, Mary's' (p. 118), and therefore have nothing to do with the L1.

Thus the real goal of Dulay and Burt's analysis is to persuade the reader that all child L2 errors can be interpreted as 'Developmental'. This allows them to speculate on the "formulation of hypotheses about children's production strategies in L2 acquisition" (p. 119). These production strategies are formulated as 'rules' hypothesised by the learner - for example, learners are thought to employ "a rule using a minimal number of cues to signal the speaker's semantic intention" (p. 120), leading to situations where, say, "aux-subject inversion, which is in fact redundant" is omitted in wh- questions (p. 120).

Dulay and Burt's conception of L2 data, then, is that its errors demonstrate creativity and systematicity, and must therefore be the result of "active mental organisation" (p. 96). This suggests a Chomskian view of language, and this is confirmed by mentions of "base" and "transformed" structures, "syntactic rules", "innate" mental processes, and the formulation of their goal as "that of searching for the rules of mental organisation that limit the class if possible hypotheses a child uses when learning a language" (p. 110). Such a view is typical of SLA-oriented interlanguage studies of the time.

Thus we have identified two main types of EA, Implicit and Explicit, and recognised several sub-types. This is summarised as Table 2.2:

Table 2.2: Taxonomy of categories of error analysis

| Type of Error Analysis | Sub-type | Examples |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Implicit Error Analysis (IEA): An EA was conducted, but not acknowledged | Tacit Error Analysis: (i) L2 language not considered 'erroneous', or (ii) the focus is on correct forms | Studies in developmental sequences; research in English as a Lingua Franca |
|  | Quasi Error Analysis: error are not the primary focus | Research on error gravity and error correction |
| Explicit Error Analysis (EEA): Error are explicitly analysed and discussed | Basic Error Analysis: restricted to identification of errors and basic frequency information | Hathaway (1925) |
|  | Middle Error Analysis: goes beyond identification and frequency, but error categories not analysed | Noor (19993) |
|  | Full Error Analysis: goes beyond identification and frequency and categories analysed | Richards (1971) |

### 2.3.5 EAs conducted within Japanese EFL and Systemic Functional Grammar contexts

The Error Analysis presented in Chapter 5 of this thesis was conducted from the functional perspective of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) and within the Japanese EFL milieu (see Chapter 1). This chapter concludes by looking specifically at examples of EAs produced within these contexts, and placing them within the framework developed in sections 2.4.3 and 2.4.4. After that, the significance of the EA in Chapter 5 should be more clearly discernible. It will be noted that, due to the relative lack of published material in the

SFG and Japanese EFL error analysis literature, this section of the literature review is relatively brief. This is an additional rationale for the Explicit Error Analysis presented in Chapter 5.

### 2.3.5.1 EAs conducted within the Japanese EFL context

### 2.3.5.1.1 Implicit Error Analysis: Tacit Error Analysis

Sasaki (1990) is a clear example of Tacit Error Analysis conducted from a 'developmental stages/sequences’ perspective. The fact that, first, Japanese and English are at opposite ends of the Topic-prominent/Subject-prominent continuum, and that, second, 'existential there' structures are absent in the former but present in the latter, motivates Sasaki to investigate the acquisition of existential there by Japanese EFL high school graduates. Sasaki's work illustrates the features we would expect of TEA. For example,

- The nine categories she presents are not 'error categories'. Rather, they are the ungrammatical and grammatical "sentence [types] produced by the students" (p. 350).
- Though she uses the phrase "ungrammatical in English" (e.g. p. 351), Sasaki never uses 'error', 'mistake', 'deviant form' and so on. Thus, although her study focuses on forms that are not those of the L1, and therefore constitutes an error analysis, this aspect of the research remains tacit.
- The modifier in English serves to emphasise Sasaki's position that learner language is a system in its own right. For instance, she suggests that low-level Japanese students may avoid native-like existential there structures "so as to follow their own interlanguage rules of topic-continuity" (p.363), while she finds evidence of "a general change from the use of topic-prominent to subject-prominent structures as their proficiency level
increases" (p. 363).

A different type of TEA occurring within the Japanese EFL context is Sasaki (2011). The author states that she is interested in "the long-term effects of varying lengths of overseas experiences on the L2 writing ability and motivation of 37 Japanese university students" (p. 101). However, although she had "two EFL writing specialists" (p. 88) rate compositions over a period of four years, and although their rating involved scores according to categories such as "vocabulary", "language use" and "mechanics" (p. 88), we are provided with no further details of the scoring procedure, and with no examples of student writing. Instead, very general comments are made, such as "...the three Study Abroad groups' fourth-year composition scores were all higher than those of their first-year compositions, but the SA-8-11 group was the only one that continually improved until the fourth year" (p. 91). Thus, although we assume that at least a Basic EA must have been part of the methodology, this remains unacknowledged.

Further examples of TEA in the Japanese EFL context include the following:

- Gilmore (2011): The author includes, among other instruments, a grammar test designed to measure the grammatical improvement of two groups of Japanese university students, one having been taught a textbook-based course of study, the other having been exposed to numerous examples of authentic materials such as TV shows and newspaper articles. Gilmore informs the reader that "the mean scores...increased only slightly for both...groups" (p. 803), but provides no details or discussion of any errors made.
- Yasuda (2010): Yasuda uses scores on a phrasal verb test given to two groups - a 'traditionally' taught control group, and an experimental group taught 'cognitive semantically' - to explore whether first-year JUS improve their understanding of the meaning of phrasal verbs if exposed to a cognitive methodology. The test scores are "determined by the number of correct answers" (p.259), and thus no effort is made to present an analysis of student errors.
- Yamashita (2007): The TOEIC test reading section is used by the researcher to test the reading proficiency of 291 Japanese university students as part of a study of the relationship between L 1 and L 2 reading attitudes. The results of the test allow the author to establish three proficiency levels (Advanced, Middle and Lower), but no data is provided regarding actual errors.
- Ishikawa (1995): Here, the author sets out to (a) compare the effect of two different writing task types on the proficiency of Japanese EFL writers (across 25 objective measures), and (b) assess which of the 25 measures is the most reliable for analysing changes in very-low level EFL writing proficiency. While Ishikawa focuses closely on grammatical 'correctness' (see pp. 57-59), there is no discussion of errors. Rather, there is a scoring system whereby writers receive 2 points for perfection, 1 point for "each understandable correct answer" and 0 points for "an incorrect, incomprehensible or no answer" (p.55), and a series of tables showing statistical analyses of error-free T-units and clauses (e.g. p. 60).


### 2.3.5.1.2 Implicit Error Analysis: Quasi Error Analysis

An Error Analysis categorisable as Quasi Error Analysis is Sakai's (2011) study of
the effectiveness of error feedback in the form of recasts. As is typical of this kind of EA, the identification of errors plays the important role of providing initial data, but is not the Sakai's primary research focus. That the latter is not the errors, but the effect of recasts on the noticing of errors, is clear from the study's conclusions:

- "recasts do facilitate L2 learners' noticing of errors even when they did not notice their linguistic problems or errors at the moment of production" (pp. 377-8);
- "recasts are effective in drawing L2 learners' attention to otherwise non-salient forms and in informing L2 learners that over-generalized forms such as shaked and fighted are ungrammatical in the target language" (p.376);
- "both the recast and the no-feedback groups noticed their linguistic problems or errors through the activity of production ( $7.9 \%$ for the recast group; $10.4 \%$ for the no-feedback group)" (p. 376).


### 2.3.5.1.3 Explicit Error Analysis: Basic EA

An example of Explicit Error Analysis of the Basic type occurs in Harder (1981). The author uses error frequency statistics to support his thesis that, in a writing course, "teaching the essential discourse techniques...without much emphasis on sentence errors" is effective in reducing grammar mistakes in an expository essay (p. 28). Harder gives an indication of the grammar categories and error analysis involved:

A comparison of the first and last essay of one typical student demonstrates a significant change in the frequency and types of errors. The first essay had 8 out of 18 incorrect sentences that included 17 errors, while the last essay had only 6 out
of 23 incorrect sentences and only 8 errors. Essay one had 4 kinds of minor errors: faulty articles, faulty diction, incorrect singular and plural forms, incorrectly chosen prepositions or other structure words. Three other kinds of errors interfered with clarity: ambiguity in word order, lack of parallelism and incorrect negation. (p. 35)

It can be seen that Harder not only refers explicitly to errors, but has organised them into grammatical types (article errors, preposition errors, and so on), and, further, into more encompassing categories ('minor' errors, and errors that 'interfere with clarity'). However, it is equally apparent that his analysis is based entirely on error frequency. This is underlined by Harder's statement that "the main question of the experiment was whether the sentence structures would become more correct even if the focus was on the discourse structure of the total essay", and the finding that "The considerable reduction in grammatical errors demonstrates that it is sufficient to identify such errors for the students and allow them to make corrections independently..." (p. 37, my emphasis). Thus, while this EA is explicit, it does not qualify for Middle or Full categorisation.

### 2.3.5.1.4 Explicit Error Analysis: Full EA

One study that does qualify as Full EA is Nakamori (2002): With three colleagues, Nakamori taught relative clauses to junior and senior high school students in both the traditional 'linear' method which despite being "common practice" in officially approved ministry textbooks (p. 30) has not worked well, and in the 'hierarchical' method, which the author claims is more psychologically sound than either the linear method or methods based on transformational theories. The hierarchical method first introduces an activating context
(for example, the need to verbally indicate one dog from a picture of three), and then shows how the relative clause is used to 'restrict' the meaning of a particular head noun (e.g. the dog which is running over there). Next, the relative clause is "inserted into a matrix clause in a subject or object position" (p. 31), giving a sentence such as The dog which is running over there is called Spot. In this way, a noun phrase with a relative clause can be generated "without moving or transforming anything" (p.32).

As required in a Full EA, Nakamori does not take his "error typology" (pp.34-5) for granted, but explains each category. 'MD', for example, occurs when "students transferred the rightward modification directions of Japanese" (p. 35), while 'ND' indicates "no deletion of the relativised noun" (p.36). Moreover, these categories are not only data-driven, but arise organically from the author's description of his 'hierarchical' method. We may thus observe a feature of Full EAs that was illustrated earlier, but with a different emphasis. It was pointed out that Full EAs tended to accompany the highlighting of some linguistic stance. This is also true here, but it is the highlighting of an applied linguistic stance - that is, the advocacy of a particular teaching methodology - rather than that of a theoretical linguistic view of language or language acquisition.

### 2.3.5.2 EAs conducted from a Systemic Functional Grammar perspective

The grammatical perspective taken by all the research we have encountered so far is that of a formalist position, either a traditional one (e.g. Hathaway, 1929, Nakamori, 2002) or a generative/cognitive one (e.g. Ravem, 1968). A functional perspective is rarer (though see Ellis \& Barkhuizen (2005) for examples of 'functional analysis' studies), and this is certainly true of EAs coming from a specifically Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) standpoint.

SF grammarians view text as the physical realisation of (a) lexicogrammatical choices of wording, which realise (b) higher (more abstract) semantic choices (see Chapter 4). Given this focus on choice, and given the unstated but intrinsic commitment to respecting the speaker/writer's choices, it is not surprising to find that SFG-oriented error analyses tend to be of the Tacit kind. Rather than label learner language as erroneous, researchers tend to draw attention to the unwanted consequences of certain grammatical and cohesive choices. Naturally, since errors are not their explicit focus, these EAs do not contain error categories.

Macken-Horarik (2006), for example, employs an SFG perspective (in conjunction with Bernstein's code theory) to analyse the 'examination English' of six Australian Year 10 students who, as part of the 'School Certificate' examination, were required to read a short story and respond to an 'open question' about it. The author endeavours "to analyze the distinctive fashions of meaning in tactical, mimetic and symbolic readings using SFL" (p. 27); that is, her purpose is to use the tools of SFL to uncover what kinds of text readings produce low, mid-range and high ratings from examiners.

Macken-Horarik's work is Tacit Error Analysis because the author's purpose is not to highlight errors per se, but to show where and how the choices made by some students do not "mesh with those valorized (implicitly or explicitly) by examiners" (p. 27). Similarly, her solution is not couched in terms of, say, a need for students to study harder, but is aimed at society itself, and the need for a more "visible pedagogy" that would allow all students to "develop highly valued orientations to meaning in English" (p. 127).

But tacit though it may be, Macken-Horarik's discussion does involve EA. For instance, in her exploration of the language of 'tactical' writers (that is, students in the D and E range), she considers their use of Thematic development:

Textually, tactical readers demonstrate a local engagement with the text - keying on one or more aspects, without relating these to its global pattern of meanings. [This] results in a fitful movement in clausal starting points from student self, to the author and to the enigmas of the story...In fact, an unstable angle on the interpretive task is a key feature of the rhetoric of the tactical reading and produces an impression of a local and atomistic orientation to text structure. Students appear unsure about the grounds of a legitimate reading and this is reflected in an unstable method of development in the response text. (p. 15)

Words and phrases such as a fitful movement, unstable, [an] atomistic reading, unsure clearly indicate the key ingredient for an EA: the comparison between a flawed text and some 'unflawed' reference point. This combination of a critical reading with a lack of explicit reference to error is characteristic of Implicit, Tacit EA.

Coffin (2003) demonstrates the tendency of SFG-oriented EAs to remain Implicit even more clearly. In her discussion of two letters of complaint, one successful and one not, she begins:

Syntactically, Text A is riddled with errors such as a lack of person-verb agreement, inaccurate use of prepositions, and inaccurate punctuation and spelling. Text B , in contrast, makes very few errors of this type. Assessing such errors is, of course, an important part of diagnosing students' language competence...However, additional functional, rather than structural, dimensions of language use also need to be taken into account... (p. 11)

Coffin then analysis the letters according to these function dimensions. For instance, concerning interpersonal modality, she writes, "In Text B, the writer is unequivocal in terms of information and opinions expressed...Text A writer, however, introduces an intermediate modal meaning concerning obligation. This contributes to the overall lack of authority and assertiveness of the Text A writer" (p. 16).

There are two points to make here. First, whereas Coffin was happy to refer explicitly to syntactic errors, she avoids this word when discussing functional issues. Thus the writer of Text A has not made 'wrong' choices, but choices that lead to an inappropriate "lack of authority and assertiveness". As we have seen, this is symptomatic of TEA.

Second, if inaccurate prepositions, lack of person-verb agreement and so on are errors, but the failure to use functional resources appropriately is not an error, then Coffin appears to imply that functional issues are not amenable to explicit error analysis. The error analysis in Chapter 5 illustrates that this implication does not hold true.

As noted at the beginning of this section, there is a relative lack of published error analyses conducted (a) from an SFG perspective, and (b) with a Japanese EFL context as its target. It is hoped that the study reported in Chapter 5 of this thesis serves to rectify this situation to a small extent.

### 2.4 Conclusion

Chapter Two has surveyed the literature on error analysis throughout the last century of academic research in the field, and has shown that the term 'error analysis' has, somewhat surprisingly, never been clearly defined. Therefore, in order to be able to contextualise the current error analysis the chapter has also undertaken that task and set up a
taxonomy of cateogories of error analyses. As it was important to provide sufficient justification for the categories sert up in the taxonomy, Section 2.3 was particularly lengthy and detailed.

Before moving on the error analysis itself, and a description of its methodology, we turn first to a more detailed discussion of Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar, and of how it is utilised in therror analysis presented in Chapter 5.

## Chapter 3 : Systemic Functional Grammar

### 3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter we saw that 'error analysis' was a complex term, and could be separated into several subtypes. It was suggested that examples of Explicit $\rightarrow$ Full error analyses' were quite rare in the literature, in particular those conducted from the perspective of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). It was also suggested, in the concluding section, that such an analysis of student errors might be beneficial in the context of English language teaching (ELT) in Japan.

Chapter 5 presents and discusses a detailed analysis of the written lexicogrammatical errors in a corpus of short essays written by Japanese university students. The methodology used in the analysis is presented in Chapter 4. However, because of the importance of Hallidayan theory and description to both the argument set out hitherto, and the error analysis to come, we precede these chapters with an outline of the key features of SFG itself. In order to maintain the focus on errors, each 'key feature' is discussed in relation to and with examples from the data.

### 3.2 Systemic Functional Grammar

Systemic Functional Grammar is a description and explanation of the grammar of a particular language. There are, of course, other grammatical descriptions. Some of these, such as Transformational Grammar and Minimalist Grammar, are formal. Others, such as Functional Grammar and Role and Reference Grammar, are rather more concerned with meaning. It is to this latter group that SFG belongs (Butler, 2005).

SFG is largely attributable to M.A.K. Halliday, though he himself acknowledges several sources and influences. For instance, "when asked to compare his own approach with those of other linguists who helped shape...his own thinking...Halliday notes Firth's interest in varieties of a language, Hjelmslev's focus on language as a whole and Jakobson's search for
universals across all languages" (Webster, 2009, p. 3). Although the great majority of publications have focussed on English, Halliday and Matthiessen suggest that "the theoretical concepts [involved in SFG] are general to all languages" (1999: xi). Indeed, many other languages have been the subject of SFG analysis. Halliday himself began by applying his theories to Chinese (Halliday, 1957/ 2002), while other languages analysed include French, German, Tagalog and Japanese (Caffarel, Martin \& Matthiessen, 2004),

Systemic Functional Grammar gets its name from the fact that it is a theory of grammar that is both systemic and functional. It is systemic because SFG prioritises "the paradigmatic ordering in language" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, p. 22). Rather than look only at how certain grammatical elements combine with others, a systemic approach highlights "what could go instead of what" (p. 22). In other words, it views language in terms of the options that are available to speakers of a language at any given moment. These options are modelled as system networks (see Section 3.5).

SFG is functional partly because, as Halliday puts it, "it is designed to account for how the language is used. Every text...unfolds in some context of use; furthermore, it is the uses of language that, over tens of thousands of generations, have shaped the system" (Halliday, 1994, p. xiii). SFG identifies three highly general uses of language, called metafunctions (see Section 3.7). It is functional, too, in the sense that a grammatical category in SFG tends to be, not the name of a grammatical class such as 'preposition', but a description of the functional role it plays in a particular meaning-structure, such as 'Process' or 'Mood' (see sections 3.6-3.8).

Finally, SFG is a theory of grammar because its focus is on the middle level of three language strata, the lexicogrammar (see Chapter 1, section 1.3). The lexicogrammar is abstract; the words we speak, hear, write, read or sign are physical manifestations, at the expression level, of abstract 'wordings' (Halliday, 1994, p. xvii). SFG models these abstract
wordings as a combination of system - "networks of interlocking options" - and structure "how the options are realised" (pp. xiv-xv).

Having explained Systemic Functional Grammar in general terms, the discussion now moves on to more specific aspects of the theory.

### 3.3 Rank

The lexicogrammar embodies a type of organisation known in SFG as the rank scale. The rank scale, which is organised as a constituent hierarchy, can be illustrated as follows:

## (a) The beautiful cat leapt onto my shoulder

Clause: The beautiful cat leapt onto my shoulder.
Group: The beautiful cat
Word: The
Word: beautiful
Word: cat
Morpheme: beauty-
Morpheme: -ful

In addition to existing simultaneously at different strata (the semantic, lexicogrammar and expression strata), the sentence above is simultaneously composed of units of different types. Specifically, the beautiful cat leapt onto my shoulder is a clause, the beautiful cat is a group, beautiful is a word, and -ful is a morpheme. It will be observed that the morpheme -ful is a constituent of the word beautiful, which is a constituent of the group the beautiful cat, which is a constituent of the entire clause. This hierarchy of 'units' forms the rank scale.

There are two points to note about the lexicogrammar rank scale. First, as will be further explained below, units can form unit complexes. This, however, does not entail a change of rank. In other words, a clause complex is considered to be at the same rank as a clause (Halliday \& Matthiessen, p. 437). Second, although there are justifications for considering prepositional phrases (e.g. onto my shoulder) to operate at the same rank as groups (e.g. both groups and phrases realise functions in the clause, prepositional phrase functions are often identical to those of adverbial groups and furthermore, and so on), there is also justification for positing a separate rank - or at least a special status - for preposition phrases (e.g., Halliday states that the latter is in some ways "more clause-like rather than group-like" (1994, p. 213). This will be discussed further during the discussion of 'phrase rank' errors in Chapter 5 (section 5.5), where it is suggested that it may make pedagogical sense to alert students to this clause-like feature of the prepositional phrase. (Note: in this thesis, 'preposition phrase' is preferred to 'prepositional phrase' to maintain an internal consistency such that the '-al' suffix is associated with groups, thus: 'nominal group', 'verbal group', 'adverbial group', 'prepositional group'.)

Ex 1 provides examples from the data (Appendix A) of errors located at (i) clause rank (ii), group rank, and (iii) word rank. (Note that for convenience, authentic examples from the data are identified as 'Ex 1', 'Ex 2', etc, while invented illustrations are tagged '(a)', '(b)' etc.)

## Ex 1

(i) I love ? so much. (EC22b)
(ii) ? Test was very hard. (EC2c)
(iii) My tall is 150 cm . (EC1a)
(* 'EC' refers to the Error Category in which the error is categorised in Chapter 5)

Ex 1(i) is a clause rank error because the item that is missing is a Participant in the clausal structure Particpant (I) + Process (love) + Participant (?) + Circumstance (so much). Ex 1 (ii) is an error at group rank because the missing item missing is a Deictic in the nominal group structure Deictic (?) + Thing (Test). Finally, Ex 1 (iii) is a word rank error because tall is an incorrect choice at the lexical end of the lexicogrammar continuum. (Note: 'Process', 'Deictic' and other terms will be explained below.)

### 3.4 Rankshift

One of the key concepts in Hallidayan SFG is 'rankshift'. This refers to the use of a particular grammatical unit to "function in the structure of a unit of its own rank or of a rank below" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 9-10). The invented clauses (b) and (c) illustrate.
(b) Put it on the table [[I bought yesterday]]
(c) Put it on the table [in the corner]

In (b), the clause I bought yesterday has been down-ranked to function as Qualifier in the structure of the rank below, the underlined nominal group. In (c), the preposition phrase in the corner performs the same role, though this time the phrase and the group within which it functions can be said to be at the same - or similar - rank. (Note that, by convention, rankshifted clauses are shown within double square brackets, and rankshifted groups/phrases are contained within single square brackets.)

In SFG, the term 'rankshift' is used interchangeably with the more familiar term 'embedding' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, p. 382). This means, first, that SFG does not
employ the latter term for subordinate clauses. In SFG these are described as 'hypotactic' clauses (see below). It also means, however, that an opportunity is missed to label two different types of rankshift. Consider (1) below:
(d) [[Taking regular exercise]] is an excellent idea.

Here, the non-finite clause taking regular exercise is performing a function, Subject, that is prototypically realised by a nominal group (compare That's an excellent idea). In other words, a clause has been 'downgraded' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, p. 9) to the rank of group, and we have rankshift. Unlike (b) and (c), however, the rankshifted unit does not occur 'inside' a host unit. Whereas the clause I bought yesterday exists inside the nominal group the table I bought yesterday in (b), in (d) taking regular exercise forms the complete nominal(ised) group itself. This sense of being 'inside', or contained 'within' something is evoked well by the word 'embedded'. It is therefore proposed that the specific term 'embedded rankshift' be used for elements taking on the Qualifier/Postmodifier function (as in b. and c.), while the more inclusive label 'rankshift' be used for cases such as (d). Since the two types of rankshift are so structurally different, it is suggested that this distinction will also be a useful classroom aid.

While in the EA there are no error categories specifically related to rankshift or embedded rankshift, it will become clear that, along with taxis (see below), such 'complex structures' are the locus for most errors in the written work of Japanese university students.

### 3.5 System

### 3.5.1 The notion of system

A system is an abstract representation of the set of alternatives faced by a language user at a particular moment in a communicative event. There are very many systems in language, some small and simple like the DEIXIS system shown in Fig 3.1, some large and complex like TRANSITIVITY (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). (Note that it is conventional to write system names in capitals.)

Fig 3.1: DEIXIS system (adapted from Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p.366)

DEIXIS $\rightarrow\left[_{\text {non-specific }}^{\text {specific }}\right.$

It is the organisation of meanings into systems of choices that makes Hallidayan functional grammar 'Systemic':

A text is the product of ongoing selection in a very large network of systems...Systemic theory gets its name from the fact that the grammar of a language is represented in the form of system networks, not as an inventory of structures. Of course, structure is an essential part of the description; but it is interpreted as the outward form taken by systemic choices, not as the defining characteristic of language. A language is a resource for making meaning, and meaning resides in systemic patterns of choice. (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 23)

Since it is the notion of system that best encapsulates the SFG model of language as choice, an effort has been made in the error analysis to account for every error
systemically. With very few exceptions, this has been successful (see Chapter 5). An example is provided in Ex 2, where has is accounted for as an incorrect selection from the ideational $\rightarrow$ experiential clause-rank system PROCESS TYPE. The writer has selected the relational-possessive Process has rather than the existential Process is (see 'Error Category 7' in Chapter 5 for a full description and a visual representation of the PROCESS TYPE system).

## Ex 2

There has rice field surrounded my house (EC23)

### 3.5.2 Delicacy

It has been pointed out several times that, from an SFG perspective, lexicogrammatical wordings are realisations of choices from systems within the semantic stratum. Before describing some of the key systems within the English System Network relevant to the current error analysis (EA), it is important to illustrate how these choices are modelled. Consider the MOOD system shown in Fig 3.2:

Fig 3.2: MOOD system (adapted from Bloor and Bloor, 2013, p. 50)


As can be clearly seen, the choice between interrogative and declarative is made only after 'indicative' has been selected from MOOD. In other words, if a writer were to select 'imperative' from this system, INDICATIVE TYPE would not become accessible. Thus
we cannot have a clause that is at once imperative and interrogative, but we can have one that is simultaneously indicative and interrogative. Systems that can be modelled as a 'chronological' sequence in this way are said to be related by delicacy (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 23). Thus, with reference to the system network MOOD, the choice 'interrogative' occurs through (i) the selection of 'indicative' from the system MOOD operating at the first stage of delicacy, and then (ii) the selection of 'interrogative' from the system INDICATIVE TYPE operating at the second stage of delicacy.

### 3.5.3 Instantiation

It is important to recognise that a lexicogrammatical system operates at an abstract level, and represents "the potential that lies behind" actual instances of language use (Matthiessen, Teruya \& Lam, 2010, p. 121). SFG in fact posits a 'cline of instantiation', from language potential at one end, via recognisable text types and registers in the middle, to actual instances of language in use at the other end. The error analysis in Chapter 5 takes as its data specific texts, and attempts to relate them to the systemic potential inherent in the English System Network.

### 3.6 Structure and realisation

As we saw in Chapter 2, most EAs have focussed, tacitly in many cases, on language as a rule-based rather than a meaning-based system. One problem with this is that it can result in the functional roles of grammatical elements being sidelined; an error might be described in terms of breaking a rule (for an example, a verb might be described as failing to 'agree' with its subject) or in terms of psychological processing (as a case of 'overgeneralisation', perhaps), but not in terms of the meanings a writer is conveying. This maintains the idea in students' minds that learning grammar is equivalent to learning grammatical rules instead of ways of meaning.

A second, related problem is that the term 'structure' becomes little more than a synonym for 'rule'. One need merely apply the rules of English grammar to get well-formed, well-structured English sentences. This association of structure and rule suggests, wrongly according to a functional approach, that grammar as it were 'starts' with structure, that understanding the syntagmatic ordering of elements is enough to understand the way grammar 'works'.

In SFG, 'structure' does not have this connotation. Rather, structures show a "functional organisation" that is the result of realising semantic meanings organised as 'systems' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 24). For instance, a structure showing ideational-experiential meaning is Actor + material Process + Goal, while one showing textual meaning is Given + New. From this point of view, structure in SFG is still important, still "an essential part of the description" (p. 23), but it is not primary. Structure "is interpreted as the outward form taken by systemic choices, not as the defining characteristic of language" (p. 23).

This relationship between system and structure, is that of intra-stratal realisation. That is to say, within the single stratum of lexicogrammar, systemic meanings (such as 'Interrogative') are realised as syntagmatic structures (such as 'Finite ${ }^{\wedge}$ Subject). SFG also identifies inter-stratal realisation, whereby the wordings sorted out in the lexicogrammar are realiations of more abstract meanings in the semantic stratum, and wich are themselves made concrete in the expression stratum.

The error analysis in Chapter 5 attempts to see errors in terms of system (see the next section), and so very few error categories are described as 'structural'. Only in cases where no clear function or system can be identified is this term used. An example from the data is given in Ex 3, where the omitted possession marker is considered a structural mistake.

Ex 3
I'm interested in other country culture. (EC7)

### 3.7 Metafunction

It was pointed out above that the lexicogrammar realises semantic meanings as wordings. One of the key concepts of SFG is that the totality of these meanings can be organised into just three types, called metafunctions. They are "the modes of meaning that are present in every use of language... A text is a product of all three; it is a polyphonic composition in which different semantic melodies are interwoven, to be realised as integrated lexicogrammatical structures" (Halliday, 1975, p. 183).

The three metafunctions are the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual. The ideational metafunction is usually split into two, the experiential and the logical. This has resulted in some inconsistency in the SFG literature as to whether there should be identified three or four metafunctions. This thesis takes the view that there are three, and that 'ideational $\rightarrow$ experiential' and 'ideational $\rightarrow$ logical' are two subtypes of ideational metafunction, thereby "bringing together the logical and the experiential under a single heading" (Halliday, 2003, p. 18).

The metafunctions and their contributions are summarised in the following subsections.

### 3.7.1 The ideational-experiential metafunction

The ideational-experiential metafunction (hereafter 'EM') serves to realise into wordings our representations of the 'goings-on' in the world. It does so primarily through the system of TRANSITIVTY (see section 3.8.4), whereby all happenings and events are construed as one of six clause types, exemplified in the following invented examples:
(e) material clause: I have climbed Mt Fuji.
(f) mental clause: I like Mt Fuji.
(g) relational clause: Mt Fuji is the largest mountain in Japan.
(h) behavioural clause: Sometimes I stare at Mt Fuji.
(i) verbal clause: "I like Mt Fuji", he said.
(j) existential clause: There's only one Mt Fuji.

One of the key features of the EM is the fact that its meanings are organised as configurations of structures based on a segmental 'structural mode' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 451). For example, in both (e) and (f) there are three 'segments' in the clause, organised as the figure Participant + Process + Participant. 'Process' and 'Participant' are generic functions; when we use specific role-names, we get (e): Actor: $I+$ material Process: have climbed + Range: Mt Fuji, and (f): Senser: I + mental Process: like + Phenomenon: Mt Fuji.

While the EM, like all metafunctions, is most clearly delineated at clause level, clauses are not the only grammatical units that have experiential meanings and structure (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). For instance, the nominal group the largest mountain in Japan is composed of the experiential structure Deictic: The + Epithet: largest + Thing: mountain + Qualifier: in Japan.

One important thing to recognise about experiential structures, whether of the clause or another rank, is that each function within the structure contributes a unique meaning to the whole. Halliday describes such structures as 'multivariate' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). The significance of multivariate experiential structures is that they always embody two layers of meaning. One layer is the meaning of the structure as a whole;
the other layer is the individual meanings provided by participant functions. For instance, in He's been to the moon, the role of the Deictic (the) in 'the moon' is both partial, as it does not comprise the entire group on its own, and yet crucial, as it contributes the meaning 'recoverability from context' that is intrinsic to the communicative value of the utterance.

In the error analysis in Chapter 5, then, an error will be assigned to the EM if it affects the experiential meaning/structure of a grammatical unit. For example, in Ex 4, the preposition phrase in two hours fails to realise the intended Circumstance meaning 'Duration':

Ex 4
I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours. (EC1a)

Since the preposition 'in' does not correctly realise the Circumstantial function Duration, the writer of Ex 2 is considered to have made an error located within the experiential metafunction.

### 3.7.2 The ideational-logical metafunction

Whereas the ideational-experiential metafunction is characterised by Halliday as consisting of multivariate structures, the ideational-logical metafunction (LM) is comprised of univariate structures (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). In practice, this means that the LM is realised as unit complexes consisting of "the same functional relationship" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 451). Just as with multivariate structures, these can occur at all ranks. Below are examples of (k) a clause complex and (l) a group complex.
(k) The picnic was cancelled because the weather was terrible.
(1) The picnic and the cricket were both called off.

In ( k ), two clauses - the picnic was cancelled, because the weather was terrible - are joined together, forming a 'complex' of clauses. In this particular example, the join is effected by means of the binding conjunction 'because', resulting in a 'hypotactic' clause complex. In (1), two nominal groups - the picnic, and the cricket - are joined together through the linking conjunction 'and', resulting in a paratactic group complex. (Note: 'hypotactic' and 'paratactic' are explained in section 3.8.4.)

As well as structural relationships, the LM embodies logico-semantic relations (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014) such as 'cause', 'temporality' and 'purpose'. For example in ( $k$ ), the Binder because realises the relation 'reason' between the two clauses, while in (l) the Linker and realises the relation 'addition' between the two groups.

In Chapter 5, an error will be located within the LM if it adversely affects the logico-semantic interpretation of a unit. An example is shown in Ex 5, where the reader is unsure as to whether the intended relation is 'addition' (and) or 'alternation' (or).

## Ex 5

(...) foreign language, culture, music, ? food. (EC39)

### 3.7.3 The interpersonal metafunction

The interpersonal metafunction (IM) is concerned with personal relationships and other aspects of communicative 'exchange' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). As with the ideational metafunction, we find these aspects most clearly at clause rank, but also at other ranks. This can be illustrated with the following example:
(m) I was a useless cook.

In (m) interpersonal elements at clause rank include the pronoun $I$, which establishes 'first-person speech role', and the Finite was, which realises both primary tense 'past', and positive polarity. (It should be noted here that, in Chapter 5, it will be suggested that 'past' is not only interpersonal in nature, but also has an experiential aspect.) At group rank, there is an interpersonal contribution in the form of the interpersonal Epithet useless.

In the error analysis in Chapter 5, an error will be located in the interpersonal metafunction if it compromises the status of a unit as a communicative exchange. For example, in Ex 6 the writer has selected primary tense from the MOOD DEIXIS system (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 162). However, this indicates that the event actually occurred (in speaker-past time), whereas in fact the writer is referring to a hypothetical event that cannot be fixed temporally.

## Ex 6

If I had a free time I watched a movie on my TV. (S-I10.C19-20)

### 3.7.4 The textual metafunction

The textual metafunction (TM) concerns the way a writer positions elements of a text in order to (i) add to its cohesiveness, and (ii) highlight certain types of meaningful structure. For instance, in She usually drinks coffee in Starbucks, the word she at once (i) acts cohesively by signalling reference to a previously mentioned girl or woman, and (ii) is Theme in the thematic structure and Given in the information structure. (Thematic and information structure are explained in greater detail in section 3.8.1.4 below).

The writer, it will be observed, did not have to convey the message this way. He could have written, for example, Usually, she drinks coffee in Starbucks (the underlining indicating intonational emphasis). In this case, the routine aspect of the event - usually has assumed some of the burden of Theme. Regarding information structure, while in

Starbucks occurs at the end of the message and thus has the status of New in the original example (see Martin (1992) on the concept of 'minimal New'), the marked stress on coffee overrides this and indicates that this time it is the type of drink that is New.

Again, the TM is not only operative at clause level. As Halliday and Matthiessen point out (2014, p. 382), textual considerations are partly behind differences in meaning between examples such as ( n ) and (o):
(n) a well-developed plan
(o) a plan that's well developed

Assuming neutral intonation, in (n) the status of New is carried by the word plan. In (o), however, plan comes across much more as Given information; rather, it is the fact that the plan is well developed that is New.

In Chapter 5, an error is located within the TM if it adversely affects the thematic flow of a text, and/or betrays unnaturally marked information structure.

### 3.8 Functions

Traditional approaches to grammar tend to emphasise word classes such as 'noun' and 'verb'. SFG also makes use of these 'primary' word classes (Matthiessen, Teruya \& Lam 2010; Bloor \& Bloor 1995), though with some differences. For example, Halliday groups nouns, pronouns, numerals, determiners and adjectives together as kinds of nominal (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 379).

However, an SFG approach to grammar highlights the fact that class labels tell us very little about how to use a word, or what it does. For example, when we say that, in a given nominal group, word X is a common noun, a word class approach predicts that it will be able to fill the slot Give me a/some $\qquad$ , that it will be countable or uncountable, and so
on. If, on the other hand, we say that in a given nominal group word X is an adjective, a word class approach predicts that it will accept the comparative form, that it will probably fill the slot She was very $\qquad$ , and so on. But none of these predictions hold for the word 'car' in He's a car salesman.

The solution in SFG is to place the greater burden on function labels. These provide much clearer information. For example, when we say that, in a given nominal group, word X is a Classifier, this predicts (i) the position in the group where car will be found (i.e., immediately before the Thing), and (ii) that X is being used to identify a 'kind' or 'category' of something. Both of these predictions are borne out by He's a car salesman. This focus on function makes SFG far more informative about practical language use than other grammars. (See also Bloor \& Bloor, 1995: 25.)

### 3.8.1 Clause-level functions

In this section we shall briefly gloss the clause functions that will be found to be problematic for Japanese university students. The section will be organised according to metafunction (see 3.3 above).

### 3.8.1.1 Ideational-experiential clause-level functions

At clause level, the three major ideational-experiential functions are Process, Participant and Circumstance. Of these, Process is most 'central' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 221). As Thompson (2004, p. 87) puts it, "Processes are the core of the clause from the experiential perspective: the clause is primarily 'about' the event or state that the participants are involved in." Indeed, so 'core' is the Process that the six sub-types of Process bear the same names as the six clause types we saw earlier (section 3.5.1). For instance in (e) (reproduced below), have climbed is a material Process:

## (e) I have climbed Mt. Fuji

Participants are directly involved, grammatically speaking at least, in the activity described by the Process. Since Participant functions vary according to clause type, and since many clauses involve more than one Participant function, they greatly outnumber Process functions. In (e), since $I$ and $M t$. Fuji are involved in the climbing, they are Participants. In a material clause, these Participant functions are labelled Actor and Scope respectively.

Together, Process and Participant(s) make up the "experiential centre" of the clause" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 221). They are obligatory, for example, in any declarative and interrogative clause. More peripheral are Circumstances. In (m), yesterday is a Circumstance of Time. It will be observed that the grammatical integrity of the clause would be unaffected by the omission of yesterday. To this extent, Circumstances, unlike Participants, are "not directly involved in the process' ( $\mathrm{p}, 221$ ); they have an augmenting role, and are often grammatically optional.

In the EA, errors directly related to ideational-experiential clause functions will be glossed as 'Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational (experiential). This is illustrated in Ex 7, where the Process appears to have been omitted (Chapter 5 will suggest an alternative interpretation of what are usually termed 'omitted' elements):

## Ex 7

(...) but I ? hard on writing test. (EC22a)

### 3.8.1.2 Ideational-logical clause-level functions

There are only two ideational-logical clause functions. Linkers and Binders are conjunctions that serve to connect independent and dependent clauses respectively (the SFG
terms 'paratactic' and 'hypotactic' clauses are introduced below). An example of a Linker is but in (p); an example of a Binder is while in (q).
(p) I wanted to go but I couldn't.
(q) I wanted to go while I was still young enough.

It should be noted that, in describing Linkers and Binders as functions rather than, or in addition to, word classes I am departing from Halliday and Matthisessen (2014). However, consider Matthiessen, Teruya and Lam's explanation of 'function': "In the syntagmatic organisation of a unit, each element of structure serves one or more structural functions...The structural function of an element represents its contribution in the organic whole of the unit it is part of; it is the role that this element serves" (2010, p. 102). It seems reasonable to suggest that, in the syntagmatic sequences represented by (p) and (q), but and while are, first, elements within those structures, and, second, that the roles they serve their functions - are best described as linking and binding ones. Importantly, the ability to identify Linker and Binder as functions is likely to help learners come to a clearer understanding of the role and importance of different types of conjunction, and of tactic relations (see below).

### 3.8.1.3 Interpersonal clause-level functions

Within the interpersonal metafunction there are two sets of functions. One division is between Mood and Residue. The Mood, itself composed of two functions, Subject and Finite, "is the element that realises the selection of mood in the clause" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 142). It therefore performs a function that can be distinguished from those of Subject and Finite (see below). This contrasts with 'Residue', which is really just a 'container' name for that part of the clause which is not the Mood.
(r) Are you going to the park?

In (r), Are you comprises the Mood element, which here realises interrogative (as opposed to declarative and imperative) mood, and going to the park is the Residue.

The second division consists of Subject, Finite, Predicate, Complement and Adjunct. These functions will now be briefly discussed in turn.

## Subject

The Subject's primary role is to show "the entity that the speaker wants to make responsible for the validity of the proposition being advanced in the clause" (Thompson, 2004, p. 53). It also plays a structural role within the Mood, in that the order in which it appears with respect to the Finite determines whether a clause is declarative or interrogative. While Subjects can be ellipsed in clause complexes, the formal English written register does not allow Subject ellipsis in a major clause simplex.

In Chapter 5, a Subject error will be described as 'Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal'. For instance, in Ex 8 the learner appears to have omitted the Subject' (see Chapter 5, EC10).

## Ex 8

But ? enjoyed!! (EC27)

## Finite

In addition to working with the Subject to help determine the mood of a clause, the Finite also (i) carries the polarity of the clause (is/isn't teaching), (ii) situates the clause in time by expressing 'primary tense' (was/is/will (be) teaching), and (iii) attaches modal values to a
proposition (can/might teach) (Thompson, 2004, pp. 50, 53).
In the EA, a Finite-related error will be described as 'Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal'. Such an error is illustrated in Ex 9, where 'primary tense' in the second clause should have been past.

Ex 9
I did part-time job Saturday every day, so I study little at night. (EC26)

## Predicator

The Predicator is "realised by a verbal group minus the temporal or modal operator" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 151), the latter being the Finite element discussed above. It is involved in four functions. In the words of Halliday and Matthiessen, it "specifies...'secondary' tense: past, present or future relative to the primary tense. (ii) It specifies...aspects and phases like seeming, trying, hoping...(iii) It specifies the voice: active or passive...(iv) It specifies the process...that is predicated of the Subject" (pp. 151-2).

There are two additional points to note concerning the Predicator. First, it is often 'fused' with the Finite. This is illustrated below, where primary tense (past) and the material process 'go' are realised as a single word.
(s) We went home.

Second, and in a sense at the other extreme, the Predicator can exist in clauses where there is no Finite at all. (t) exemplifies this situation, where [[to win]], being non-finite, is Predicator-only.
(t) To win the World Cup is every footballer's dream.

In the EA, a Predicator error will be described as 'Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal', and will include examples such as Ex 10 where the Predicator appears to be missing.

Ex 10
My future dream is ? Wedding Planner. (EC28)

### 3.8.1.4 Textual clause-level functions

There are two related but distinct organisational structures in the textual line of meaning: Thematic structure, made up of Theme and Rheme, and Information structure, consisting of Given and New.

## Thematic structure

The Theme functions to "serve as the point of departure of the message; it is that which locates and orients the clause within its context" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 89). SFG identifies three types of theme corresponding to the three metafunctions (Thompson, 2004, pp. 158-160). These are illustrated in the invented example (u) below:
(u) Surely, therefore, it was the wrong decision.

In (u), therefore is a textual Theme, playing a cohesive role in terms of what has gone before; surely is an interpersonal, or 'modal' Theme, conveying the writer's own attitude towards the proposition; it is the ideational, or 'experiential' or 'topical', Theme. This is the only obligatory Theme element (compare It was the wrong decision, which has lost its textual and interpersonal Themes). As Halliday and Matthiessen put it, "the Theme of a
clause ends with the first constituent that is either participant, circumstance or process" (2014, p. 105).

Like the Residue (see 3.6.2.3 above), the Rheme is a 'containing' function rather than one that can actually be said to perform a role. It is that part of the clause that is not selected as Theme. Therefore, in the EA, the only error in thematic structure concerns the Theme. A thematic error will be described as Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual, and is illustrated in Ex 11 below, where the writer appears to have omitted the ideational Theme.

## Ex 11

For example, ? enjoy dancing, skateboarding, watching movie and trip to other country. (EC33)

## Information structure

In addition to thematic structure, a clause in its guise as a message contains units of information. The relevant functions are Given and New, since "information, in this technical grammatical sense, is the tension between what is already known or predictable" (i.e. Given) "and what is new or unpredictable" (i.e. New) (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 116). The Given element is in fact optional because (i) sometimes an entire message will contain new information, or (ii) the surrounding context may render the explicit uttering of shared information unnecessary, as in imperative clauses (Bloor \& Bloor, 1995, p. 69). Nevertheless, particularly in writing where authors must create their own context, many messages do contain a Given. (An interesting example of an author playing with information structure is the common narrative technique of using the definite article, sometimes in the very first sentence of a story, when readers can have as yet no shared knowledge. The result is to pull the reader into the story by making us feel that there must
be shared knowledge, and forcing us to work hard to access it.) An example of a New-only message is an existential clause such as There was a big storm last night.

English particularly uses the resources of intonation to realise the information unit; as a consequence, it can be difficult to accurately determine information structure in writing. Nevertheless, the EA in Chapter 5 identifies certain errors where the decision to use marked information structure is identified as contributing to the problem (see EC30). An example is provided in Ex 12 where, because 'music' is introduced in the first clause, it should be in unmarked Given position in the following nominal group, giving (the) music I usually listen (to) is...

## Ex 12

I like listening to music._ usually listen music is 60's ~ 70's music.

### 3.8.2 Functions at group and phrase rank

Halliday and Matthiessen write that "The three functional components of meaning, ideational, interpersonal and textual, are realised throughout the grammar of a language" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 361). We can thus expect to find functions from within all three lines of meaning at group and phrase ranks. However, they also explain that "whereas in the grammar of the clause each component contributes a more or less complete structure, so that a clause is made up of three distinct structures combined into one..., when we look below the clause, and consider the grammar of the group, the pattern is somewhat different. Although we can still recognise the same three components, they are not represented in the form of separate whole structures, but rather as partial contributions to a single structural line" (p. 361)

These contributions are not equal, however, as in practice, SFG represents groups and phrases primarily as having ideational structures, both experiential and logical.

Interpersonal and textual contributions are far less detailed; for example, in Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) the ideational structure of nominal groups takes up thirty pages, whereas the other metafunctions receive little more than a paragraph each. Most of the functions defined below, then, are ideational ones. As in the previous section, we shall briefly describe those group and phrase functions that are involved in the error categories identified in Chapter 5.

### 3.8.2.1 Nominal group ideational $\rightarrow$ experiential functions

There are seven functional parts of the nominal group described in Halliday and Matthiessen, 201 (pp. 364-396). Of these, Deictic, Numerator and Thing feature in the EA.

## Deictic

Deictics show "whether or not a specific subset of the Thing is intended; and if so, which" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 365; for 'Thing', see below). Specific Deictics include this, my and the; non-specific Deictics include $a$, some and each. (See pp. 365-374.) An example of a Deictic error from the EA is provided in Ex 13, where the writer has seemingly omitted a specific Deictic.

Ex 13
After, I went to watch a movie with my mother....After I watched ? movie, (...) (EC2c)

## Numerative

"The Numerative element indicates some numerical feature of the particular subset of the Thing, either quantity or order, either exact or inexact" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 374). Quantitative Numeratives include one, a couple of and few; ordinative Numeratives include first, next and subsequent (pp. 374-5). The only Numerative error in the EA is
shown in Ex 14, where the writer incorrectly selected 'quantitative' from the system NUMERATION.

## Ex 14

I'm 4 year student.

Thing
The Thing is "the semantic core of the nominal group. It may be realized by a common noun, proper noun or (personal) pronoun" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 383). Common nouns include book, water and felines, and are involved in grammatical categories such as countability and animacy (p. 385). Proper nouns include Beethoven and Tokyo, while pronouns include $I$ and we. Of these, only common nouns prove problematic in the data. An illustrative example is given in Ex 15, where the writer incorrectly selected 'non-singular' from the NUMBER system.

## Ex 15

I also like trip! (EC3)

### 3.8.2.2 Nominal group ideational $\rightarrow$ logical functions

As well as forming a potentially seven-part multivariate structure (i.e., Deictic + post-Deictic + Numerative + Epithet + Classifier + Thing + Qualifier), the nominal group also embodies the iterative 'is a subset of' structure, located within the ideational $\rightarrow$ logical metafunction (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 389). (Note: 'multivariate' and 'univariate' configurations were introduced in sections 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 above). Here, the functions are three: obligatory Head, with optional pre- and post-Modifiers. For instance, in (v), a, lovely and red are pre-Modifiers, one is Head, and with white stripes is the post-Modifier.
(v) She chose a lovely red one with white stripes

Since nominal groups are obliged to contain a Head, but are not required to contain a Thing (p. 390), we identify an error such as Ex 16 as containing a 'null Head', and therefore being located within the ideational-logical metafunction:

Ex 16
My part-time? is at restaurant which is beef tongue. (EC8)

### 3.8.2.3 Phrase rank functions

In SFG, preposition phrases are regarded as 'minor clauses' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 425), and this is reflected in the functional names attributed to them. Consider (w) below:
(w) It's under the table.

Here, the prepositional group under is both Minor Process, from an ideational-experiential perspective, and Minor Predicator from an interpersonal perspective. Similarly, the nominal group the table functions as experiential Minor Participant and interpersonal Minor Complement. (Interestingly, although the Participant is specified as Minor Range (p. 425), the Process is not identified by Halliday and Matthiessen as 'material'.)

An example of an error involving a phrase rank function is provided in Ex 17, where the writer has appeared to omit a required 'null Minor Process/Predicator'.

Ex 17
[...] So, university is really far ? me. (EC18)

### 3.9 System and metafunction

As discussed earlier in this Chapter, SFG identifies several strands of meaning, called metafunctions. Metafunction and system have a special connection in SFG. It was Halliday's observation that certain systems appear to cluster around certain very general semantic areas, like moons around a planet, that led to his insight that language consisted of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings (Halliday, 2003). Thus, just as functions are the province of particular metafunctions (for instance Theme and Rheme occur within the textual metafunction), so too are systems and system networks.

Since entire system networks are vast and complex, there has been no attempt to reproduce them in this thesis (the reader is directed to Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), Martin (1992) and Matthiessen (1995) for thorough systemic representations). In the error analysis in Chapter 5, however, examples of modified and simplified system network diagrams are a feature of what are termed there 'instantial' and 'system' interpretations of learner error.

### 3.10 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a brief overview of Systemic Functional Grammar, with a focus on those aspects that will resonate in the description and analysis of errors in Chapter 5.

To summarise, SFG views language as meaningful, communicative behaviour. It consists of three strata, one of which, the lexicogrammar, is structured as a hierarchy of ranks: clause, phrase and group, word and morpheme. All texts, including those in the data (see Appendix 1), are realisations, at the expression level, of wordings in the lexicogrammar,
which in turn are realisations of meanings in the semantics.
These meanings are of three kinds, called metafunctions. The ideational metafunction is concerned with what is being communicated; with events in the world - the events themselves (ideational $\rightarrow$ experiential) and the relationships between them (ideational $\rightarrow$ logical). The interpersonal metafunction deals with who is communicating; with the interactants in an exchange and their attitudes towards it. And the textual metafunction is concerned with how a message is communicated; with its organisation as a cohesive text.

Within the lexicogrammar, clustering at each of the metafunctions, are systems of meaningful options and associated structural configurations. These are then realised as the syntagms of written text. Although structures (such as Actor + Process + Goal) are essential to an understanding of Hallidayan grammar, it is the systems from which they are selected that epitomise the SFG conception of language as choice. It is therefore within the system network that we shall endeavour, in the first instance, to locate errors made by Japanese university students. That is to say, the error analysis in Chapter 5 will (i) view the participants' texts, including erroneous grammatical units, as the realisation of meaningful choices, and attempt to reveal the particular systemic choices which have contributed to those errors.

Before this, however, it is necessary to examine the methodology used in this SFG-based error analysis. This is the task of Chapter 4.

## Chapter 4 : Methodology

### 4.1 Introduction

This study uses a Systemic Functional Grammar framework to locate and analyse grammatical errors in the writing of first-year Japanese university students in order to (i) explore the incorrect grammatical choices made by Japanese university students, (ii) determine the locations of these errors within the English system network, and (iii) improve our understanding of how SFG might be used in the classroom to facilitate correct grammatical choices.

The current chapter describes the participants and the data, notes the ethics approval gained for the project, and presents and discusses the methods of data collection, categorisation, coding and description.

### 4.2 Participants

The participants in this research project were 40 Japanese first-year students enrolled in three ' B '-level (high-beginner/low-intermediate) second-semester writing classes at a well-known university in central Tokyo (hereafter referred to as 'the university') (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Number of participants in the project

| Class | Registered | Registered (Japanese) | Participated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 20 | 18 | 15 |
| 2 | 21 | 19 | 13 |
| 3 | 19 | 16 | 12 |
| Total | 60 | 53 | 40 |

As can be seen in the table, a total of 60 students were originally enrolled in these classes. This included seven students from South Korea and China. The final number of participants was the result of two factors. First, I chose to exclude students who had not been educated in Japanese secondary schools. This was because I was specifically researching the writing of Japanese students, or rather, the writing of students who were products of English education in Japan. I was able to determine that all the non-Japanese students in my classes had been educated - and indeed in most cases had already graduated from university - in their home countries. Secondly, of the remaining 53 Japanese-educated students, 13 chose not to participate (see further section 4.3 below).

At the university, English classes are compulsory in the first year, but also available (mainly in the form of content-based courses designed by the teacher) for students in later years. Since this suggests that participants from all four years were potentially available, my decision to focus only on the work of first-year students, rather than aiming for a greater spread of data, needs to be discussed.

The decision was made for three reasons. First, it seemed most desirable (and ethical) to disrupt the students' regular workload as little as possible - not at all, ideally. The simplest way to do this was to use as data the written homework activities students submitted as part of their regular assessment schedule. This would negate the need for any special data-gathering activities that would have been necessary in a Seminar class. While it would also restrict opportunities to control for grammatical structures (with the exception noted below), the lack of interference in students' busy schedules (as was pointed out in Chapter 1, first-year students take around 15 classes per semester) was an additional consideration. So too was the fact that I was teaching three first-year writing classes at the time and was therefore in a position to collect data myself, without bothering other teachers. Additionally, this method of data collection meant that the data collected was 'authentic'
work required of these students in the normal course of their education.
The second reason to focus on first-year students was that I wanted to gather data that, though coming from one specific social group, might, through further research, prove to be indicative of the English of the 'typical' Japanese university student (JUS). Since Japanese students undergo six or more years of compulsory English education before university, it is safe to assert that all first-year university English students are in at least their seventh year of continuous study. However, though as Ikegashira et al. point out, "most universities make English compulsory for [university] freshmen" (2009: 18), after the first year (or second year in some universities), English study becomes optional, and there can be sharp falls in (i) the numbers of students studying English, and (ii) the number of contact hours even for those who do continue their studies. With all this in mind, I felt that at the university it would be the work of first-year students that would best typify the written English of their counterparts across the country. That the data would also give a clear idea of which grammatical errors were persisting beyond secondary school despite so many consecutive years of study, and would therefore suggest lexicogrammatical areas upon which high school curricula might focus attention, was a bonus.

The third reason I concentrated on first-year students was to avoid a skewed sample within the institution. Since English is an elective subject from second-year onwards at the university, it seemed possible that students enrolled in these classes might be more intrinsically motivated to study English than those who declined to take them. It was also possible that the typical student in an elective class would be more competent, or at least 'in form', to use a sporting analogy, than second, third, or fourth-year students who had not taken English classes since first year. (It should be noted, however, that although the students were all from ' B ' level classes - and thus 'average' in another sense, too - the range of ability was extremely wide, as can be seen from the texts in Appendix 1.)

To sum up, in order to best explore the lexicogrammatical errors made in written work by Japanese university students, I decided to collect data from first-year students, as it would likely most closely represent the English of the average student.

### 4.3 Data and data collection

The data used for the project were short essays, of on average $70-130$ words, written by first-year students during the second semester of a compulsory writing course at the university. As explained above, these essays were written and submitted as part of the usual assessment requirements of the course. Copies of the students' work were made, and the originals marked and returned to students.

The essay topics, in order of submission, were: Self-Introduction (S-I), My Sunday Routine (SR), Last Weekend (LW), My Future Dream (FD), and A Job Interview (JI). With one exception, these same topics had been part of the set syllabus for B-level classes since prior to my arrival in 2006. The only concession I made to the project related to the JI topic. This was supposed to be a short narrative entitled 'My First Job Interview'. For the 2010 syllabus, I asked students to remember or imagine their first job interview, and write it in dialogue form. I did this in order to generate some interrogative clauses in the data.

In line with ethical requirements (see further below) students were given consent forms, written in both English and Japanese, and were asked to sign and return the forms in a drop box outside my office if they were happy for me to use their work in my research. This, combined with the fact that, as the semester progressed, some students dropped out of the course and therefore did not submit all the assigned tasks, meant that I was unable to collect a text for every participant for every topic. As can be seen in Table 4.2, 75 of the submitted texts were usable, giving a total of nearly 1000 analysable finite, non-finite and rankshifted/embedded clauses.

The essays were collected between September and December, 2010. At various
points in the semester, students submitted their short, handwritten texts for feedback, grading and assessment. The only variance from my usual practice here was my request for handwritten work. Since the focus of the project was the lexicogrammatical choices made by a particular social group, first year JUS, and since those choices were meant to reflect their actual grammatical knowledge, I did not want spellcheckers, automated grammar correctors and so on to influence the participants' decision making.

As there were five essay topics, there were five essay-collection days. On each of these days, I would collect the essays at the beginning of the class, make copies, and then return the copied versions towards the end of the lesson. This was to give all students five minutes to make any corrections should they desire to do so, the intention being to improve the probability that any remaining errors reflected a student's current grammatical knowledge-base, and were not the result of tiredness, sloppiness or some other random variable. I restricted the time to five minutes because I have observed a tendency for some students, given too much reflection time, to 'hyper-correct' - to alter something that was mistake-free, but that ends up containing an error.

Finally, I had the students swap papers with a partner, and underline any word they could not read. Upon receiving their papers back, students erased any underlined word (Japanese students do not stop using pencils after primary school) and rewrote it as clearly as possible. This was to lessen the chance of mistakes in transcriptions of the essays.

During the semester, I kept the work of students from my three different classes in separate files. However, after finishing grading in January 2011, I checked the consent forms, and then arranged the texts of all participating students according to theme rather than class.

### 4.4 Ethics

Ethical approval for this study was sought from the Ethics Committee of

Macquarie University. In addition, information and consent forms were prepared in both English and Japanese and given to the students at the beginning of class. The forms are attached to this thesis as Appendix 7D.

### 4.5 Error analysis

### 4.5.1 Error analysis - Introduction

Having gained ethics approval and collected the data, the error analysis itself involved the following steps:

1: $\quad$ Definition of 'error' (see Chapter 1, Section 1.2)
2: Preparation of the data for analysis (Section 4.5.2)
3: Identification and description of errors (4.5.3)
4: Analysis and discussion (Chapter 5)

This section outlines steps 2 and 3 (the definition of error was discussed in Chapter 1, while the analysis and discussion of errors can be found in Chapters 5 and 6).

### 4.5.2 Preparation of the data for analysis

Preparing the data for the analysis involved three stages (i) data transcription, (ii) the organisation of texts into lists of sentences and clauses, and (iii) the metafunctional and structural analysis of every clause.

### 4.5.3.1 Transcription of the data

The texts were transcribed by the researcher into MS Word from the students' handwritten submissions. Each transcription was reviewed and checked several times. In addition, texts were coded according to topic, and given a number based on the (random)
order I transcribed them; thus 'Text FD1', for example, points to the first transcribed 'My Future Dream' text (Appendix 1).

### 4.5.3.2 Organising the data: Sentence List and Clause List

In order to prepare the transcribed texts for analysis, they needed to be organised as lists of sentences and clauses. Accordingly, immediately below the transcribed text, there appears a 'Sentence List', with each sentence coded according to topic, text number and sentence number (Fig 4.2). Thus, in Fig 4.1, 'FD1.S3' refers to the third sentence in the first 'My Future Dream' text: I want to do happy life.

## Fig 4.1: Example Sentence List

## Sentence list

1. FD1.S1(i-ii): I want to become ground staff. Because I use English in my job.
2. FD1.S2: Therefore I need to study English very hard.
3. FD1.S3: I want to do happy life.

A 'sentence' was defined according to written convention, i.e. as the text occurring between a capital letter and the next full stop. The only difficulty arose with certain punctuation errors - and indeed, this brings up the reason for including a sentence list at all. Consider Sentence 1 in Fig 4.1. According to the definition, Because I use English in my job is a sentence. However, according to the register of formal writing, it lacks a main clause, and is therefore incomplete. In such cases, I coded the 'sentences' as (i) and (ii). This coding indicates that there are two sentences as far as the writer is concerned, but that they ought to have been combined into one. What this means for the EA is that the full stop after ground staff is a punctuation error; it is the sentence list that most clearly reveals such errors.

Below the Sentence List is the list of clauses. Each clause has been coded according
to topic, text number and clause number. Thus 'FD1.C3' (Fig 4.2) refers to the third clause in the first 'My Future Dream’ text: Because I use English in my job.

## Fig 4.2: Example Clause List

Clause list

1. FD1.C1: I want
2. FD1.C2: to become ground staff.
3. FD1.C3: Because I use English in my job.
4. FD1.C4(i): [[Working hard]] makes me happy.
5. FD1.C4(ii): [ Working hard]]
6. FD1.C5: I think
7. FD1.C6: I'll have a happy life.

A 'clause' was defined according to the conventions established in the SFG literature (e.g. Butt et al., 2000). Points to note include:

- Non-finite clauses, such as to become ground staff (FD1.C2) are listed and counted separately (Fig 4.3).
- Secondary clauses in mental and verbal projection are counted and listed separately (see Chapter 3 for an explanation of projection). An example in Fig 4.2 above is I'll have a happy life (FD1.C6), which is projected by I think (FD1.C5).
- Cases such as I want to become ground staff (FD1.C1-2) are analysed as two clauses in a relationship of (mental) projection, and not as a single clause with a hypotactic verbal
group complex. The reason for this was discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3.7.2.2.
- Rankshifted and embedded clauses are also counted separately. However, since they occur within another clause, the 'host' clause's number is retained. This is illustrated in Fig 4.3., where the host clause My hobby is playing volleyball is given the code C6(i), while the embedded clause [[playing volleyball]] receives the code C6(ii).

Fig 4.3: Coding embedded and rankshifted clauses

1. S-I12.C6(i): My hobby is [[playing volleyball]].
2. S-I12.C6(ii): [[playing volleyball]]
3. S-I12.C7(i): I like the volleyball player [[wearing a white headband]].
4. S-I12.C7(ii): [[wearing a white headband]].

### 4.5.3.3 Metafunctional and structural analysis: the box diagram

After the clause list was completed, each clause was subjected to a grammatical analysis using the 'box diagram' method developed by Halliday. The box diagram is not a fixed design; Halliday and others in the field often employ modifications to the model (e.g. Fawcett, 2000). What all box diagrams have in common, however, is the ability to show in a literal sense the metafunctional lines of meaning that occur simultaneously in any clause.

Fig 4.4 on the following page presents a sample box diagram. The sentence analysed is S-I19.S11: I think I'm dull person.

Sentence S-I9.S11: I think I'm dull person.
Clause S-I9.C14( $\alpha$ ): I think
Clause S-I9.C14(' $\beta$ ): I'm dull person.

Analysis of clause S-I9.C14( $\alpha$ )- ‘ $\beta$ )
Analysis of clause S-19.C14( $\beta$ )

|  | I | think |  | I | 'm | $\Theta$ dull person. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Complement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{ng}: \quad$ sing $+\mathrm{Ep}+$ Thing |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Mood |  | Residue |
| textunmarked $\rightarrow$ | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  |  | full sto |

Error list
E93: S-I9.C14(' $\beta$ ): EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

The following is a list of the most relevant features of the box diagram (BD):

- The analysed clause is identified in italics above the BD.
- The clause itself appears in the top row of the BD. The missing element is indicated by ' $\theta$ '. (Note that errors other than 'missing element' will be underlined to aid the reader).
- Indications of rank appear (i) in the title of the BD (in italics). This will always indicate clause rank (except where rankshift is involved) because the BD is an analysis of the entire clause, and is not restricted to the rank of the erroneous unit; (ii) in the structural row of the BD. In the example, ' ng ' and ' vg ' indicate nominal and verbal groups.
- Functions, and the metafunctions within which they operate, appear from the second row downwards, in the order ideational-experiential functions, ideational-logical functions, interpersonal functions, textual metafunctions.
- Reading from left to right, the functions form metafunction-specific structures. For example, in the ( $\alpha$ ) clause, we see an ideational-experiential structure formed by the functions Senser + Mental Process, and two interpersonal structures: Mood + Residue, and Subject + Finite + Predicator
- Functions are also specified where they occur in an erroneous unit smaller than a clause. In Fig 4.4, the error occurs in the nominal group dull person. Accordingly, a separate nominal group analysis, showing the functions Epithet (Ep) and Thing, appears in the structural line. Note that the missing singular Decitic is indicated by a crossed out
'sing'.
- In the ( $\alpha$ ) clause, the single word 'think' corresponds to two interpersonal functions. This is because Finite-past and Predicator are 'fused'. If the clause had been, say, I'm thinking... , then the analysis would have been ' $m$ ': Finite' and 'thinking': Predicator'.
- The Finite has the superscript ${ }^{\text {'+' }}$ indicating positive polarity, while 'present' refers to Primary Tense.
- Taxis and logico-semantic relations are indicated in the ideational-logical row. In this example, the letter ' $\alpha$ ' refers to the primary clause in a clause complex of projection (or hypotactic expansion). " $\beta$ ' indicates the secondary, projected clause (in hypotactic expansion, the secondary clause is indicated by ' $x$ ', ' + ' or ' $=$ ' before $\beta$. Parataxis is indicated by numbers ( 1,2 , etc)
- In a clause complex the primary clause can be considered thematic. This means there can be two or three 'levels' of Theme. Thus, in Fig 4.4, clause ' $\alpha$ ' (I think) is labelled 'Theme ${ }^{1}$, while the clause-internal Theme ' $r$ ' is ' $\mathrm{Theme}^{2}$ '.
- As it is part of the meaning of a clause as an exchange, the relevant speech function ('declarative', 'interrogative' or 'imperative) is indicated after 'Mood' in the interpersonal line.
- Two features of Fig 4.4 are included for purposes of illustration only: (i) the punctuation row, and (ii) the indication of thematic marking. In the box diagrams in

Appendices 1-5, a punctuation line is included only when there is a punctuation error, and only marked Themes are explicitly indicated.

- Though not shown in Fig 4.4, an additional ideational-logical row is employed for group complexes.
- Sometimes, as here, two clauses are included in a single box diagram. This usually happens in cases of mental projection, where the projecting clause (e.g. I want, I think) is short enough to allow sufficient room for the secondary clause.
- Note that there is no indication of 'system' in the box diagram. This is indicative of the point made in Chapter 3, that the BD is essentially a structural model. SFG models systems as 'system networks'. Examples of these will be given, where appropriate, in Chapter 5.

Below the box diagram is either an 'error list' or an indication that there are 'no errors'. As can be seen in Fig 4.4, the error list contains the error or errors identified in the BD. Each error is numbered, coded and described according to rank, metafunction, system where appropriate, and error category (see 4.5.6, 4.5.7 below). Note that in many cases, as here, there are two interpretations of the same error. This will be fully explained in Chapter 5.

### 4.5.4 Identification and description of errors

### 4.5.4.1 Identification of errors

According to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) the procedure for identifying errors should take the following steps:

1. Prepare a reconstruction of the sample as this would have been produced by the learner's native speaker counterpart.
2. Assume that every utterance/sentence produced by the learner is erroneous and systematically eliminate those that an initial comparison with the native speaker sample shows to be well-formed. Those utterances/sentences remaining contain errors.
3. Identify which part(s) of each learner utterance/sentence differs from the reconstructed version.

With the caveat that, for reasons discussed earlier, the "learner's native speaker counterpart" is assumed to have knowledge of several standard dialects, this three stage protocol is suitable for the current EA. The procedure can be illustrated using a short text from the 'My Sunday Routine' group (Ex 4.1):

Ex 4.1
(1) I usually work on Sundays. (2) I go to work place by car. (3) I work at Disney store. (4) I usually play tennis. (5) I play tennis with my friends...
(1): eliminated. Note that if the student had written I usually work Sundays, the sentence would still have been eliminated as the omission of 'on' is an acceptable form in some standard varieties of English.
(2): retained, as no reconstruction in Step 1 produces the clause 'I go to work place by car' i.e., with null Deictic in the prepositional phrase Circumstance.
(3): retained, as, similarly, no reconstruction in Step 1 produces the clause 'I work at Disney store ${ }^{\prime}$.
(4): eliminated.
(5): eliminated.

On the face of it, this portion of Text SR2 seems clear-cut, with little or no contention about either the eliminated sentences, or the errors in (2) and (3). Yet even here there are issues that need to be dealt with. There is, for example, a reading of (3) that is error-free. If the writer works in a shop actually called 'Disney store' then the choice of null Deictic in the prepositional phrase at _ Disney store is appropriate. (While the small 's' in 'store' works against this reading, it is not conclusive, as (a) it might be a 'lapse' not an error (see Chapter 1) and (b) the creative use of capitalisation in the consumer industry has become commonplace (e.g. iPod)).) To deal with such cases, the following procedure was used:
(a) Search the surrounding text - the co-text - for evidence that allows us to eliminate or retain the clause.
(b) Where the co-text fails to supply the answer, as in this case, access features of the real-world situational context that I am, or can become, familiar with.

Here, for example, it is an easy matter to check the Internet for a shop named, in English or Japanese, '(The) Disney Store'. If I find one, the student can be given the benefit of the doubt; if not, one is justified in identifying an error.

Something similar occurs in S-I1.C10: And I couldn't come (to) this class for four weeks. Here, in my capacity as teacher, my knowledge of the situational context allows me to identify the error as being located in the Finite. Specifically, I know that the month-long absence being described refers to the duration of a yachting camp, and that this camp
occurred after the text was written. Since 'couldn't' contains 'Finite: past', we may locate the error in the Finite.

A second issue, in a sense the direct opposite of the 'Disney store' case, is raised by (4). This time there is no grammatical mistake (as explained in Chapter 1, 'error' and 'mistake' are used interchangeably in this EA), and the sentence has therefore been eliminated. But in fact, the word 'usually' works in a different way to most adverbs of frequency - a point rarely, if ever, noted in textbooks. Whereas utterances such as I often go to McDonald's, or Sometimes I Skype with my friend are 'internally' cohesive (that is, the hearer has no need of contextual support of any kind to understand the speaker's meaning), the substitution of 'usually' produces non-cohesive text. To understand, say, I usually go to McDonald's, we require some co-textual landmark against which to measure 'usually'. This could be through marked intonation (I usually go to McDonald's (though you go to Burger King), or through circumstantial support, for example as an answer to the question "What do you do on Friday afternoons?" $\rightarrow$ "I usually go to McDonald's".

Unlike the previous issue, we have no resource to real-world context here; the meaning must be searched for entirely within the co-text. Interestingly, in this particular case there are no co-textual clues in the body of the text. However, we can locate a cohesive link in the title, 'My Sunday Routine'.

### 4.5.4.2 Description of errors

## Coding

It is not necessary to memorise the coding described below to follow the argumentation or error analysis in this thesis. However, the detailed coding system is used so that all errors listed throughout can be readily identified and located in the appendices.

Once a lexicogrammatical error has been identified, it needs to be described. There
are three aspects involved in an error description (ED): coding, locating the error within the overall system network, and providing a gloss.

Important features of the coding can be illustrated with reference to the following example:

## Ex 4.2

E284: SR2.C2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC SPECIFICITY $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection of a non-specific determiner as Deictic
(i) The description begins with the error number (e.g. E284). The errors in the data are numbered consecutively, E1 being the first error in the first analysed text from the first piece of coursework, 'Self-Introduction', E738 being the last error in the final analysed text from the final piece of coursework. 'My first job interview'.
(ii) The error number is followed by the error code (e.g. SR2.C2), which consists of, first, a two-letter symbol (e.g. $S R$ ) representing the particular essay topic, as shown in the 'Topic' column of Table 4.2 above; second, the 'text number' (e.g. SR2), identifying the particular text being analysed within a given topic; and third, the 'clause number' (e.g. C2), indicating the particular clause in which the error is found. 'SR2.C2' therefore refers to the second clause of the second My Sunday Routine text.
(iii) The error code has two variants. First, when a clause has more than one error, an additional number at the end of the code is used to differentiate between them. For example, if there happened to be two errors in clause SR2.C2, they would be coded SR2.C2.1 and SR2.C2.2. Second, when the error is one of punctuation, the code refers
to a particular sentence rather than a particular clause. This is to accommodate cases such as that shown in Ex 4.3 below, where the learner has chosen to create two sentences according to the punctuation, but only a single clause complex according to lexicogrammatical choices:

## Ex 4.3

My part-time job is Starbucks. The Starbucks nearby Tokyo Dome.
E112: S-I11.S4(i-ii): Punctuation $\rightarrow$ sub-sentence rank $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection of a full stop instead of a comma or dash

Note that in cases such as this, where a full stop incorrectly divides a single sentence into two, the 'primary' sentence number is maintained across both parts, and each is given a 'secondary' sentence number (e.g. S-I4(i) and S-I4(ii)).

## Location

Errors are located according to (i) rank, (ii) metafunction, and (iii) system.
(i) The error is first located on the rank scale. This usually involves a consideration of the grammatical element itself, and also the function realised by the unit in which in which the element occurs. In Ex 4.2, the error involves a determiner, which functions as Deictic in a nominal group. Therefore, the error is located at group rank. As can be seen, the unit is written in bold, while the type of unit is specified in brackets: thus, Group rank (nominal). The function (Deictic) and element (determiner) appear in the error gloss.
(ii) The error is next located within one of the metafunctions. In the example, because Deictics are part of the experiential structure of the nominal group (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014), the error is located within the ideational metafunction. Again, this is written in bold, with sub-types indicated following a hyphen: for example,

## ideational-experiential.

(iii) Finally, the error is located within the system network. In the example, the error involves the choice between a specific and a non-specific Deictic. These are the two options available in the system DEICTIC SPECIFICITY (or, rather, these options form the system). The system is written in bold capitals.

## Error gloss

The final part of the error description is the error gloss. The essential point to note about this gloss is that it attempts to incorporate, in its phrasing, the SFG notion that language acts are achieved through successive systemic choices (Thompson, 2004, p. 35). The principle that language is a matter of choice was referred to in the description of 'system' in Chapter 3, where it was explained that systems are modelled as sets of paradigmatic options. Somewhat paradoxically, these options are both limited and infinite. They are limited in the sense that, in most cases, context restricts the number of communicatively viable alternatives (Thompson, 2004: 9). On the other hand, as Chomsky has famously emphasised (e.g. Chomsky, 1965), we are able to create entirely new texts - and indeed, we do so every single day. The available choices are extensive enough to allow us to express all the texts that have gone before, and all that are yet to come, to communicate all that is real, and all that is hypothetical - all, in fact, that is or ever will be conceivable.

From this point of view, one of the most striking differences between the English
system network (ESN) as it is employed by native speakers, and the ESN as it is employed by learners, is the greater degree of choice afforded to the native speaker. This is perhaps most evident as we approach lexis, where a limited access to lexical options manifests itself as an over reliance on certain grammatical elements. By way of illustration, the data collected for the current thesis contains numerous examples of and, but, and so used as sentence-beginning Conjunctive Adjuncts, but very few elements such as in addition, however and therefore.

The difference is not only a matter of the quantity of options, but of their quality, too. Thus, with reference to a given lexicogrammatical system, a native speaker is likely to select an appropriate option more or less every time, whereas a learner may well choose incorrectly. For example, the DEICTIC SPECIFICTY system involves assigning specific (e.g. this, the) and non-specific (e.g. a, some) Deictics in nominal groups. Any random native speaker text (perhaps excepting those of young children) will show the correct distribution of these Deictics, whereas a text composed by a JUS, particularly a low-level one, will in all likelihood contain errors in the system. This is one reason we can identify (j) below, as a learner-generated text:
(j) Yamagata is very beautiful place. \{ \} Air is clear, people is very kind, and \{ \} food is delicious. (From Text S-I18)

A native writer would recognise that, because air and food are being brought into the discussion as properties of Yamagata, a specific Deictic such as 'the' is required in the positions marked '\{ \}'. The actual learner-writer, however, has selected the 'null' Deictic which, as Halliday and Matthiessen point out, has the meaning 'non-specific' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014).

To sum up the point being made here, if 'correct' language is conceived as the English System Network (ESN), and if it can be modelled as appropriate selections from lexicogrammatical systems within the ESN, then errors can be modelled as incorrect realisations from these same systems. To this end, the error descriptions incorporate this crucial SFG concept into their phraseology. Here, repeated for convenience, is E284, this time preceded by its accompanying clause:
(k) Clause SR2.C2: I go to work place by car.

E284: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational (experiential) $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC SPECIFICITY $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection of a non-specific determiner as Deictic

This section has discussed three stages in the error analysis procedure employed by the researcher in this thesis. First the term 'error' was defined. Then the steps taken to prepare the data for analysis were presented and illustrated. Finally, aspects involving the identification and description of errors were discussed. The remaining steps in the procedure, the analysis and discussion of identified errors and error categories, are the focus of Chapter 5.

### 4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has presented and exemplified the methodology of the research presented in this thesis. The participants were described, as were the procedure via which they voluntarily submitted the short essays serving as data (see Appendix 1), and the process of gaining ethics approval for the project. In addition, the chapter explained the principles of data coding, error identification and categorisation, and error description.

In describing these methodological aspects, Chapter 4 has completed the preliminary stage of the thesis. Chapter 1 introduced the research, outlining aspects of the
situational context in which it was conducted, introducing concepts such as error analysis and Systemic Functional Linguistics, explaining why it was felt that a Hallidayan approach to the written errors of Japanese university students might be pedagogically important, and presenting the research questions the thesis is designed to answer. In Chapter 2, it was demonstrated that the term 'error analysis' (EA) was ill-defined in the literature, and that a framework for the categorisation of EAs was required. Having proposed one idea for such a framework, it became possible to contextualise and describe the current research as an example of Explicit: Full EA. It was also suggested that this would be the first Explicit $\rightarrow$ Full EA to be conducted from a Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) perspective. Chapter 3 focussed on SFG, explaining those aspects of the theory that were relevant to the approach taken here, introducing important SFG concepts such as metafunction, function and system, and giving examples from the data of errors associated with each of these concepts.

The thesis now moves on to detail the error analysis itself.

## Chapter 5 : The Error Analysis

### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an error analysis of lexicogrammatical errors made by Japanese first-year university students studying English. The analysis is a Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) one in the sense that the errors are categorised and described according to the model of grammar developed by Michael Halliday and bearing that name (see Chapter 3). What this means is student texts are analysed not according to the grammatical rules they may have broken, but rather to the extent that they have successfully or unsuccessfully realised meanings, insofar as those meanings are realised in the wordings chosen.

The error analysis is contained in the following section (section 5.2) which, after a short introduction, presents the error categories in ascending order according to the lexicogrammar rank scale. Thus, section 5.2.2 looks at word rank errors, 5.2.3 discusses errors at group rank ('nominal group' errors are the subject of section 5.2.3.2.1, 'verbal group' categories of section 5.2.3.2.2), and so on through to clause rank (section 5.2.6). Errors 'around the clause' are examined in section 5.2.7, and the analysis concludes with a look at punctuation categories (section 5.2.8). The findings of the error analysis are summarised in the final section (5.3), where readers interested in a preview of the 71 error categories and sub-categories can find them listed in Table 5.69 (pp. 296-298).

### 5.2 An error analysis of the lexicogrammatical errors of first-year

 Japanese university students
### 5.2.1 Introduction

The following pages present an 'Explicit: Full' error analysis (EA) of some 73
error categories (see Chapter 2 for an explanation of 'Explicit: Full'). The analyses vary in length; some amount to little more than a brief comment, others involve several pages of discussion. Generally speaking, the categories nearer the beginning of the EA are covered more extensively. This is because many key points of the analysis recur multiple times, and repeating these each time they arise would serve little purpose. However, every category includes at a minimum (i) an indication of the category number and name, (ii) the number of errors within the category, (iii) the 'error description(s)', and a table or tables of examples ('instances').

The appendices will prove useful support for the reader, as they contain (i) in Appendices 1-5, the complete set of texts, with each text broken down into sentence lists, clause lists, and box diagram analyses of every erroneous clause; and (ii) in Appendix 6, tables with complete lists of errors for every error category. For the convenience of the reader, the Appendices, which run to several hundred pages, are presented in two separate volumes.

Before embarking on the EA, it may be worthwhile to reiterate several important aspects of the analysis. First, as indicated by the label 'Explicit: Full', this EA not only identifies and categorises errors, but also holds the error categories themselves to account. Second, as this is an SFG-based analysis, the learners' texts are considered to be the result of acts of meaningful choice (as explained in Chapter 1, this was one of the reasons for selecting the written mode, as it offered learners the opportunity to redraft their work). This principle is enshrined in the error descriptions, many of which contain the words 'choice' and 'select'. It also allows for the occasional use of the term 'intended meaning', which is not to be understood as an attempt to read the student's mind, but as a reminder that the structures being analysed were the realisation of abstract systemic choices.

An additional repercussion of viewing text as choice is that, in cases where an
element required by the English System Network is absent from the text, as in It Pro really fun (E40), the error can be seen in a unique way: as the writer's realisation of that element. See EC14, EC18 and EC22a

Another point to make is that, since the focus here is on meaning, the word 'grammatical' is used specifically to indicate the successful amalgam of formal accuracy and co-textual consistency. This is significant because it allows the analyst to go beyond the clause when this is required for an assessment of 'intended meaning' (see above). In turn, this helps to avoid the absurdity of describing the clause I listen to music (E483) as 'grammatical' when it occurs in an essay entitled 'Last Weekend', and as part of the following sequence:

I went to mall with my mother. I bought bag and shoes. I studied English. I listen to music. (Text LW 12)

A final, crucial point concerns the composite nature of errors. In the error analysis, we will observe on numerous occasions that an error can be seen as two or sometimes three errors when viewed from the standpoint of different metafunctions. However, in this thesis the fact that a similar phenomenon can be observed when viewed not across metafunctions but across ranks is not focussed on to any great extent.it will also be apparent that the identification of composite errors has not extended to rank. This is merely because of space; this thesis would need to be twice this length to engage in a full discussion of all composite errors, and so it was decided to sacrifice the description of errors in single structures at more than one rank. To give an example, the interpersonal system Primary Tense governs the choice of past, present or furture at clause rank (see EC26 below). However, since this is realised by the Finite, and since the Finite is part of the verbal group, there is also a system
of Tense at group rank. In other words, the selection of tense affects group and clause simultaneously. However, in this error analysis only the clausal system is taken into account. Thus, although we identify errors by their rank, we do not involve rank in the consideration of composite errors. To repeat, this is a matter of realising that we have to draw the line somewhere, and not because errors reverberating across different ranks is less significant than the reverberation across metafunctions.

With these points in mind, we turn now to the error analysis itself. This begins with the lowest rank on the lexicogrammar scale, word rank, and then continues with group and then clause rank errors. After that errors 'around the clause' and, finally, punctuation errors are discussed. Within each rank, error categories are organised by metafunction. Ideational categories come first, then interpersonal error categories, and finally categories of the textual metafunction. This does not mean that all ranks will include categories within all metafunctions, only that where they do occur, they will be presented in that order.

Having discussed some important points regarding the error analysis, we now turn to the analysis itself, beginning with word rank categories.

### 5.2.2 Word rank errors

### 5.2.2.1 Introduction

There is only one primary error category at word rank (EC1), but it can be separated into two sub-categories. The first, EC1a, concerns incorrect choices from lexical systems. The second, EC1b, contains errors in the realisation of word class.

### 5.2.2.2 Word rank error categories

## ECla (40 errors)

ED: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $X \rightarrow$ incorrect choice from a lexical system network

Errors in this category are traditionally referred to as 'vocabulary errors', or 'wrong word', and often labelled as such in teacher-to-student error feedback (e.g. Lee, 2004). From the perspective of the Japanese EFL student, there is not much guidance in this approach, with the implication being that there is little she can do to develop her understanding of English vocabulary beyond the traditional method of studying lists of mostly disconnected words (this is a common sight in cafes, trains and so on in Japan), doing extensive reading, and so on. A Systemic-Functional approach, it is hoped, might encourage learners to view lexis not so much as individual items on a page or list, but in a fresh light, as intrinsic parts of lexical systems.

Viewed from this perspective, the error category description for EC1a is as follows:

Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $X \rightarrow$ incorrect choice from a lexical system network

This error description begins by identifying EC1a as ideational. It is not inevitable that lexical mistakes occur within this metafunction, but it so happens that in the current corpus there are no interpersonally-based errors. The general term 'ideational' is employed because the category includes both ideational-experiential errors such as E180: My tall is 150 cm , and ideational-logical mistakes such as E275: I have had seven cats when I was a child.

Another point to note about the description is that the term 'LEXICAL SYSTEM $X$ ' uses capital letters to indicate that the errors do originate from choices within systems (see Chapter 3), but uses the letter ' $X$ ' to signal that these systems will differ for every instance in the category. We shall return to this point in a moment.

Although lexical errors - like any other error - can affect the reader's understanding of the whole clause (and even beyond), they occur in the first place as constituents of groups. Therefore, in the tables below, the data have been separated according to the class of group immediately at risk. For example, 'are' in E66: By the way, are you like sneakers?, occurs in a verbal group, and so can be found in Table 5.1. (Each table provides a representative set of examples. For the full list of EC1a errors, see Appendix 6, Table EC1a.)

Table 5.6: Ten instances of EC1a: 5 in nominal and 5 in verbal groups

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E189: S-I16.C3 | My tall is 150cm. |
| E206: S-I16.C10(‘ $\beta$ ).2 | (I want) to go to abroad concert someday! |
| E611: FD6.C10 | I have an another dream. |
| E675: JI1.C13 | Do you have a passion about job? |
| E724: JI9.C8( $\alpha$ ) | Where team do you want (to join)? |
| E66: S-I7.C12 | By the way, are you like sneakers? |
| E427: LW7.C16 | I studied my homework. |
| E494: LW15.C13.4 | (It was hot day), so I put off jacket. |
| E543: LW17.C2.4 | I hoped for grandmother in the hospital. |
| E648: FD9.C10(‘ $\beta$ ).2 | I didn't know what Australian spoke to me. |

Table 5.7: Eight instances of EC1a: 2 in conjunction, 1 in an adverbial and 5 in prepositional groups

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E99: S-I10.C7 | (I live there) when I was born. |
| E284: S-I21.C12 | (I have had seven cats) when I was a child. |
| E220: S-I17.C7.2 | She play piano well more [than me]. |
| E226: S-I17.C12.4 | I had go Okinawa at March. |
| E228: S-I17.C14 | Because my university is very far [to home]. (So I don't have time I can't work.) |
| E313: SR3.C10.2 | I usually study English at short time. |
| E597: FD4.C5 | They looked beautiful and cool for me. |
| E607: FD5.C5.2 | I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years. |

Strictly speaking, EC1a contains lexicogrammatical errors, rather than merely 'lexical' ones. In Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), the term 'lexicogrammar' indicates that lexis is considered to be grammar taken to its most delicate stage (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). As this implies, SFG models lexical choices as occurring 'after' more grammatical ones (though this does not imply an actual chronological sequence). Thus we move through a process of selecting options from very general lexicogrammatical systems, such as the choice between 'specific' and 'non-specific' in the nominal group's DEIXIS system (see EC2c), to lexicogrammatical systems. Unlike grammatical systems, the latter reach a point
where the options in the system are identical with, or very close to, the wordings that realise them.

We can illustrate this by considering E675 below:

## E675: ‘Do you have a passion about job?

Here, the context of a first ever job interview (see Chapter 4 for an outline of the five essay topics) makes this realisation of the interviewer's intended meaning problematic, partly because it suggests, wrongly, that the student is already employed (as in "Are you passionate about your job?"), and partly because, since the topic under discussion does not concern a current salaried position, 'passion' in the context of a job interview collocates more naturally with 'work' (as in "Do you have a passion for (hard) work?").

The differences in meaning between 'job' and 'work' are not easy for learners to grasp. While traditional strategies for learning vocabulary (dictionary definitions, corpus collocations, vocabulary cards, and so on) can certainly help, SFG offers an additional tool that not only allows learners to literally 'see' the distinction, or rather that there is a distinction, but also emphasises its semantic province. This tool is the system network, which models the semantic features that are either selected or not selected on route to a particular wording (see Chapter 3).

As Halliday and Matthiessen explain, describing "lexical items in terms of systems of features...is helpful because it shows how, when you choose a word, you are selecting among sets of contrasting features" (2014, p. 64). To give a very simple example of what this means, we could suggest that one difference between 'job' and 'work' involves, among an interplay of other aspects, the feature 'outside authority'. According to this invented example, 'a job' would indicate that you answer to a boss, while work is neutral with
respect to this feature. We can even show this in a simple diagram, as follows:

Fig 5.1: ‘Job' and 'work' differing with respect to the feature 'outside authority'
$\rightarrow$ outside authority $\rightarrow\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { present (job, position, etc) } \\ \text { neutral (work, task, etc) }\end{array}\right.$

A diagram such as this can help remind students that words differ in non-arbitrary ways. They are part of a system, and can be understood not just in terms of their dictionary definitions, but in terms of the paradigmatic relationships they enter into with other words in the system. This is important because, without such a meaning-based perspective, the temptation is to explain an error such as E675 in terms of countability. Surely, however, a grammatical feature that applies to hundreds of thousands of nouns is not the only, or even best way to approach a lexical issue that pertains to two specific words. SFG highlights the lexical end of the lexicogrammatical continuum, and thereby promotes an interpretation of lexical error that is meaning-based, systemic and oriented towards lexical features. (Note: The sketch above is designed only to suggest the pedagogical potential of introducing students to lexical systems. For a classic, groundbreaking discussion of lexical systems, see Hasan 1996.)

The problem for this thesis is that a full account of the errors in EC1a would require the construction of separate lexical system networks for each different instance. This is not true of grammatical systems. To illustrate using examples from the data, the grammatical systems involved in, say, I received, I hoped and I studied share certain characteristics. For example, all three select 'declarative' from the MOOD system, and 'past' from the system PRIMARY TENSE. The fact that there are grammatical systems which pertain to many, or even to all errors within a category, means, for example, that the $40+$ cases of PRIMARY TENSE error can be represented in a single SND (see EC26). At the 'lexical end',
however, the systems containing the items received, hoped and studied are less obviously related, if at all. For example, studied might belong to a paradigm containing options such as 'reviewed', 'researched' and ''went over', the alternatives to hoped might include 'prayed', and 'wished (that)', while received might enter into a system with 'got', 'underwent' and 'took'. Furthermore, note that in the corpus of essays being used here the system containing the options 'hoped/prayed/wished (that)' is found only in Clause 2 of Text LW17. None of the remaining clauses have cause to utilise the system. This contrasts with PRIMARY TENSE, a system found in $100 \%$ of the finite clauses (other than those which erroneously fail to realise tense).

Thus, although analysing errors systemically has great potential in the classroom, perhaps especially for easily confusable items such as put off-take off (E494), and speak-say (E648), the conclusions to be drawn are text-specific, and cannot be widened to cover the data as a whole. The further analysis of errors via lexical systems, then, is left for future research. Before moving on to EC1b, however, there is an important point to be made concerning lexical errors in preposition and conjunction groups.

The meanings realised by these groups are related, respectively, to the experiential clause system of CIRCUMSTANTIATION and the logical clause complex system of LOGICO-SEMANTIC RELATION (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 443, 673). These systems concern meanings, such as Location $\rightarrow$ Time, that are realised by particular prepositions (e.g. 'in', 'at') or conjunctions (e.g. 'when', 'before'). This explains why prepositions and conjunctions, and also some other word classes such as determiners, are often considered 'grammar words' as opposed to 'content' words. In fact they are both, and what this means is that, unlike nominal and verbal lexical errors, preposition and conjunction errors are amenable to an analysis that employs general grammatical systems.

Such an analysis can help alert teachers and students to some significant trends,
such as the difficulty Japanese students have with systemic options within the semantic field of 'time'. The inability to correctly realise temporal meanings is a glaring feature of preposition group errors, nearly half of which relate to Location $\rightarrow$ Time or Extent $\rightarrow$ Duration, while two of the three conjunction group errors involve the confusion between 'since' and 'when' (see Table 5.2 above). We can illustrate a systemic approach to preposition group errors with the following examples:

E226: I had go Okinawa at March.
E313: I usually study English at short time.

At first glance these errors look identical: in both cases the writers have incorrectly selected 'at'. However, by looking at them systemically, we can see that they differ in an interesting way. In E226 the writer should have used 'in'. However, both 'in' and 'at' are common realisations of Location $\rightarrow$ Time in the English System Network, as exemplified by the pair 'at night' and 'in the evening'.

This suggests that the difference between the two prepositions can be traced to an advanced state of delicacy within the subsystem Location $\rightarrow$ Time. We might posit, for instance, a delicate systemic choice between 'whole time-event' and 'within a time-period' such that 'at' evokes a whole time-event, giving 'at night', 'at New Year', 'at dawn' and so on, while 'in' implies 'a time period', giving 'in the middle of the night', 'in the new year', 'in the morning'. Moreover, as Location $\rightarrow$ Time was in fact the intended Circumstance Type, the writer can be said to have successfully negotiated his way to this delicate area of the network, only to falter as the options became increasingly delicate. However, this is not the case with E313 where the writer has attempted to realise the meaning 'Extent $\rightarrow$ Duration', but has used a preposition that is not available in this part of the
network. In other words, this error originated at an earlier stage of delicacy than E226, where the choice was not between two items within the same delicate subsystem, but between the macro options 'Extent' and 'Location' All this is shown in diagram form in Fig 5.2 below, where blue highlighting signals the correct path chosen by the author of E226, and red highlighting indicates the choice the learner should have made in E313, but did not.

Fig 5.2: Simplified CIRCUMSTANCE TYPE system network

(Note: Unless otherwise indicated, the system diagrams in this chapter, including their entry conditions and features, are modified versions of those in Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014)

One implication of the above systemic functional analysis is that errors such as E313 may be identified as more grammatical than lexical. Rather than a description involving lexical systems, a more appropriate description might be:

Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process,
or even,

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ CIRCUMSTANCE TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Circumstance type.
(Note: for a discussion of the terms 'phrase rank' and 'Minor Process' see section 5.5 below.)

However, staying with the lexical interpretation for now, in respect to classroom pedagogy, the important point is not the distinction between 'grammatical' and 'lexical' preposition errors, but the idea that EC1a errors are an amalgam of both. This points to a methodology by which students could be taught prepositions in association with the CIRCUMSTANTIATION meanings to which they most commonly relate, and also encouraged to locate them in the system network, so that what can seem a somewhat arbitrary and impenetrable area of English lexicogrammar becomes something associated always with meaning, and therefore as 'understandable' and accessible. At the same time, the difficulty students have with sorting out, say, Location $\rightarrow$ Time prepositions such as 'in', 'at' and 'on', can be seen in its proper context - as something perfectly reasonable, given the fact that mastering them involves understanding very delicate distinctions in meaning. These and other classroom possibilities occur as the result of employing an SFG approach to error, and in particular to exposing students to the utility of system diagrams. Further discussion of these factors will be postponed, however, until the first genuinely grammatical category, EC2.

To sum up, then, EC1a contains errors where an incorrect choice has been made from lexical systems. Being at the most delicate end of the lexicogrammatical continuum, we are unable to make general comments about most of these errors; the analysis would require the construction of unique systems for each instance. However, in the case of conjunction and especially preposition group errors, we have noted that many relate to general LOGICO-SEMANTIC and CIRCUMSTANTIAL fields of meaning such as Time. Concentrating on prepositional phrases, it has been demonstrated that the systems involved
are in some cases more grammatical than lexical, and it has been suggested that this might have practical classroom implications.

## EC $1 b$ (10 errors)

ED: $\quad$ Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

The second word-rank category is EC1b. Here, errors arise because, although the writer has managed to select the correct item from a lexical system, he has failed to realise the appropriate word class.

An example from this category is the following:

E275: So Tokyo is useful and convenience city.

Here, the student was able to navigate to the correct option in the network. That is to say, from a set of options including perhaps words such as 'modern' and 'handy', he chose one that appears to realise his semantic 'intention' (see section 5.2 for a discussion of this term). However, in the process of realising the wording 'convenient' as text, he did so as 'convenience' instead of 'convenient', which is not acceptable within the current conventions of the English System Network.

EC1b is one of very few error categories in this analysis to be regarded as fundamentally rule-based, and not amenable to the meaning-oriented aims of an SFG approach. (This does not imply that differences in word class are semantically irrelevant. It means, rather, that it would be difficult to explain the semantic difference between, say, 'enjoy’ and 'enjoyable’ (E474) without recourse to form-based factors. Further research, however, might suggest word class functions that can be modelled systemically.)

Four instances of EC1b are provided in Table 5.8 below, but no further analysis is considered necessary. (See Appendix 6, Table EC1b, for the full list of errors in this category.)

Table 5.8: Four instances of EC1b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E275: S-I20.C5.2 | So Tokyo is useful and convenience city. |
| E474: LW13.C9 | It was really enjoy. |
| E673: JI1.C8 | 'I'm interesting in this company.' |
| E691: J13.C7.3 | 'Why do you choice our company?' |

### 5.2.3 Group rank errors

### 5.2.3.1 Introduction

There are 16 primary error categories at group rank (EC2-EC17). Of these, 9 are located within the nominal group and 6 within the verbal group; a single adverbial group category completes the list. The analysis of errors at group rank begins with the nominal group.

### 5.2.3.2 Group rank error categories

### 5.2.3.2.1 Nominal group error categories

As mentioned above, there are 9 primary error categories of the nominal group. Several of these, however, contain sub-categories, as we shall see. The analysis of nominal group errors begins with the ideational-experiential metafunction.

EC $2 a$ ( 86 errors)
ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect
realisation of singular deixis
ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise non-singular deixis

The sub-categories of EC2 all involve the nominal group system DETERMINATION. EC2a, which with 86 tokens is the largest in the entire error analysis, contains nominal groups which ought to include the non-singular determiner ' $a$ ', but do not. This can be seen in the 10 examples listed in Table 5.9 (the complete list of EC2a errors can be found in Appendix 6, Table EC2a). Note that the nominal groups within which the errors occur are enclosed in curly brackets. When these occur within preposition phrases (e.g. E153), or within a nominal group complex (e.g. E23), the larger units are enclosed in an additional set of curly brackets.)

Table 5.9: 10 instances of EC2a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E23: S-I2.C7(‘ $\beta$ ).3 | (I want) to get \{over 500 [of TOEIC score], all credit and \{sing driver's licence\}\}. |
| E37: S-I4.C13.2 | My part-time job is \{pg \{sing supermarket\}\}. |
| E46: S-I5.C13 | I'm working \{at \{sing hotel and fitness club\}\}. |
| E92: S-I9.C14(‘ $\beta$ ) | (I think) I'm \{sing dull person\}. |
| E93: S-I10.C4.1 | There is \{sing very beautiful city\}. |
| E103: S-I10.C12 | (I learn to dance) when I was \{sing high school student\}. |
| E104: S-I10.C13 | I went \{to \{sing dance studio\}\} twice [a week]. |
| E133: S-I12.C4 | I'm \{sing only child, \} (so I want to get brothers or sisters!) |
| E138: S-I12.C8 | (I began play ...) when I was \{sing junior high school student\} (and I continue it). |
| E161: S-I13.C8 | I work \{in \{sing pub\}\}. |

This error-type is traditionally referred to as the 'omission' of the indefinite article (e.g. Scott \& Tucker, 1974). This defines the grammatical class of the absent element, and
says something about the surface structure of the nominal groups involved (Ellis, 2008). What it does not do, and to be fair does not aim to do, is draw attention to the grammatical function of the absent element.

It should be clearly stated that there is no criticism intended here. Information about class and syntactic structure has been an important contribution to our understanding of foreign language mistakes since at least the 1930s (see Chapter 2). However, an SFG approach, with its focus on text as meaning, can illuminate the errors in category EC2a in certain significant ways.

The following example may be taken as representative (note that the brackets indicate co-text that is not part of the 'host' clause, while 'sing' refers to the missing singular Deictic):

E92: (I think) I'm sing dull person.

The first point to note is that, in this projected relational clause (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014), the writer is attributing to herself the quality of 'dullness'. Since this is an act of classification rather than definition - the meaning is 'I'm a member of the class of dull people', not 'I'm this/that particular dull person' - the nominal group must first select 'non-specific' from the DEIXIS system. As indicated in blue in Fig 5.3, the writer has done this successfully. (Note: the items in parentheses indicate examples of available English System Network (ESN) realisations.)

Fig 5.3: Nominal group DEIXIS and DEICTIC NUMBER systems


But as this system network diagram (SND) also indicates, the selection of 'non-specific' leads to a second obligatory choice, that between 'singular' and non-singular'. Each choice leads via lexical systems at later stages of delicacy to particular realisations; the choice of 'singular', for instance, might lead eventually to the selection of 'a', or perhaps 'one'. This is the path taken by expert writers. In E93, it is the path the writer should have taken, but did not.

This brings us to a stage that will recur in many of the error categories that follow. Having identified the source of the error (in terms of the SND), the systemic-minded analyst is presented with two ways to interpret the writer's actual selection. These interpretations are discussed below.

## 1: The 'instantial' interpretation

According to this interpretation, writers are assumed to have made the correct selection from a system, but to have realised it incorrectly. (See Chapter 3 for an explanation of the technical term 'realised'.) The term 'instantial' is used for two reasons. First, other possible labels such as 'realisation', 'textual', and 'structural' are already used as technical terms in this error analysis, and are therefore unavailable. Second, the 'cline of instantiation' is a term Halliday coined to describe the process by which linguistic potential in the system becomes linguistic reality in a text. It therefore seems appropriate to use 'instantial' to label an interpretation whereby the correct selection from a system had the potential to be realised correctly in the process of instantiating it as text, but was not.

To return to EC2a, the instantial interpretation says that the writer, faced with the semantic choice between 'singular' and 'non-singular', actually made the correct choice, 'singular', but made an error in realising the choice as lexicogrammatical wording - an error that became visible, and categorisable, when instantiated as text. Since the system involved is the DEICTIC NUMBER system, we arrive at the following error description:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of singular deixis

Now, although this description does not interpret the error as an incorrect systemic choice, and therefore does not include within it a reference to DEICTIC NUMBER, the explanation of the error benefits greatly from a systemic analysis. For instance, as mentioned earlier, in all 85 cases of EC2a the error is to realise 'singular' with no Deictic. What this means is that the writers have all made two correct selections from the system network, 'non-specific' and then 'singular' (see Fig 5.4):

Fig 5.4: EC2a: 'instantial' interpretation


Fig 5.4 shows that, though she correctly selected 'singular', the writer's actual realisation lies outside the options available to expert writers (as indicated in red).

The system diagram is valuable because it serves as a visual illustration of both why the writer's realisation is erroneous - the null Deictic is not one of the options available
for realising singular deixis - and what she did wrong: she chose a structure that does not realise the meaning she intended. But Fig 5.4 does more than this.

It emphasises, for example, that the indefinite article and other Deictics have essential, meaningful functions. It specifies these functions, too. For instance, it specifies that the function of ' $a$ ' is to realise the meaning 'singular' in non-specific nominal groups, and that 'null' is a realisation of non-singular, also in non-specific nominal groups. The network diagram also clearly demonstrates that access to Deictics such as 'a', 'some', and ' $\Theta$ ' is dependent on the earlier choice of 'non-specific'. This further layer of meaning, whereby the indefinite article actually means 'singular and non-specific', can be traced as a movement from least to greatest delicacy as we move from left to right. Note too that the DEIXIS and DEICTIC NUMBER systems, the choices that accompany them, and the wordings that realise them, are all modelled as required components of nominal group deixis. In other words, if a learner wishes to realise a singular (and non-specific) nominal group, she must select a singular Deictic such as ' $a$ '; equally, if she wishes to realise a wording with the element ' $a$ ' (she may do, if she is interested in experimenting with grammar), the writer must ensure that the nominal group as a whole is singular and non-specific.

Another important aspect of the diagram is that it shows clearly not merely what the learner did wrong, but also what she did right. And in fact, as we can see in Fig 5.4, the blue sections outnumber the red. Although the student made a mistake, she also made successful choices, correctly selecting 'non-specific' and 'singular' (though see Interpretation 2, below). If teachers make use of system networks as a feedback tool, even low level students may be persuaded that their linguistic output reveals achievement and success, not only failure. This may be a valuable motivational catalyst. (This is speculation, but suggests an area of future research.)

Finally, Fig 5.4 reminds us that the meaning 'singular' resides partly in its
paradigmatic opposition to 'non-singular' (and vice versa). This Saussurean insight (e.g. Chomsky, 1965) is a key aspect of SFG: "[W]hen we analyse a text, we show the functional organisation of a structure; and we show what meaningful choices have been made, each one seen in the context of what might have been meant but was not" (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, p. 24). This point brings us to the second interpretation of E92.

## 1: The 'system'interpretation

The instantial interpretation says, in effect, that the writer meant 'singular', but failed to realise this in accordance with the conventions of the English System Network. Though the tools used to describe and analyse 'instantial errors' are very much SFG-based, the interpretation does have in common with other approaches a syntagmatic orientation. Attention is focussed on the realisation of systemic options rather than on the options themselves. There is, however, an alternative way of reading EC2a errors, one that takes SFG principles even further.

Consider this example:

E94: There is ? very beautiful city.

The key to the second interpretation is to recall that the system network specifies the meaning of the null Deictic ' $\Theta$ ', used in nominal groups such as very beautiful city in E94, to be 'non-singular'. Since ' $\theta$ ' does have this value in the DEICTIC NUMBER system, analysts have the option to interpret these nominal groups as the result of 'deliberate' acts of meaningful choice. This is in line with the philosophy behind Systemic Functional Linguistics, which takes texts as they are, and interprets the meanings contained therein as authorial choices (Thompson, 2004). In other words, authors are assumed to be able to
control systemic choices. With regards to E94, this 'system' interpretation says that the learner knew the 'non-singular' value of ' $\Theta$ ', and selected it on that basis.

This casts the absence of the indefinite article in a new light. Instead of appearing as the incorrect realisation of the correct choice 'singular', it becomes the correct realisation of the incorrect choice 'non-singular'. From this latter point of view, the error description is reworded as follows:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise non-singular deixis

The revised system diagram is shown in Fig 5.5:

Fig 5.5: EC2a: ‘system’ interpretation


The diagram shows that the initial choice of 'non-specific' was correct, but that the error occurred at the next stage of delicacy with the choice of 'non-singular'. All the advantages of a system diagram discussed above pertain here, including the point that the student's successful employment of the system can be highlighted in addition to the failures. Here, for instance, the null Deictic is shown in blue because it is a correct selection given the choice of non-singular, even if that choice is itself an error.

To clarify: in There is beautiful city there is an error. However, from the system perspective the error is not the choice of ' $\theta$ '; on the contrary, the null Deictic is a valid way
to express 'non-singular'. The error according to the system interpretation is the selection of 'non-singular' from the DEICTIC NUMBER system. This contrasts with the instantial interpretation, where the choice of ' $\Theta$ ' was an error.

Both interpretations of EC2a are valid. Perhaps the major difference is the effect the choice of interpretation has on classroom explanations. With the first interpretation, the focus will be on helping students match systemic choices with their correct realisations. This is similar to traditional error feedback (see Chapter 2) except that in this case the SFG perspective (i) prioritises the functional association between choice and realisation between 'singular' / 'no-singular' and ' $a$ ' / ' $\Theta$ ' - and (ii) offers a visual map of the choices involved in the journey from meaning to wording.

With the second interpretation, the focus will be on emphasising to students the notion that, in the English System Network, the absence of a Deictic in a text is not an omission, but a selection - the selection of ' $\theta$ '. This takes us back to the point brought up earlier, that systemic choices are paradigmatic; the meaning of the selected option is tied inextricably to the meanings of the elements that are in the same system, but were not chosen. The nuance can be hard to explain, but we might say that, in this case, ' $\Theta$ ' not only means 'non-singular' in the passive sense, but also signifies a defiant 'not singular' in more vigorous sense. If learners can be taught to view systemic meanings in this way, they can be encouraged to analyse their choices thus: "I have no Deictic here. This has a meaning in the system. It means 'non-singular', and it means that in There is beautiful city I do not consider 'city' to be singular. Is this the meaning I intend?" In other words, by viewing EC2a errors in this way, we can encourage students to view every moment of writing as the expression of a meaningful choice.

It may be argued that the system interpretation is counter-intuitive, and that one shouldn't confuse the selection of the null Deictic with the omission of the indefinite article.

There are two counters to this argument. First, we do not know what was going through the writers' minds when they wrote their essays; all we have is the evidence of the texts themselves, and this lends support to both interpretations. Second, the argument is actually irrelevant. The purpose of the system interpretation is not to suggest it is the right one, or better than any other; the purpose is to provide a model for analysts - the most important group of whom are the learners themselves - to view texts as the result of meaningful choices. What the second interpretation says is that, in 85 cases, learners chose to realise a non-specific singular nominal group with the null Deictic. This 'choice' is in fact a legitimate one in non-specific, non-singular nominal groups, such as 'cats' in I love cats. The fact that it is the wrong choice in There is beautiful city does not make it any less of a choice, and nor does it change the systemic value of the null Deictic.

To sum up, EC2a errors invite two interpretations. The first analyses an error as incorrectly realising ESN systemic options. This says in effect that the writer made the correct choice, but realised it erroneously. Thus the realisation is key. The second, system interpretation analyses an error as signifying a systemic option available in the ESN, but not in this particular context. In effect, this says that writer made the incorrect choice, though its realisation may well have been correct. Here, the systemic choice is key. Both interpretations arise as the result of an SFG approach to error: both describe the error in terms of function, meaning, and communicative import.

## $\underline{E C 2 b}$ (4 errors)

ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of non-singular deixis

ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise singular deixis

There are only 4 instances of EC2b in the data (see Table 5.10). Like its companion category, these errors are at (nominal) group rank and involve the ideational-experiential system DEICTIC NUMBER.

Table 5.10: Four instances of EC2b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E109: S-I10.C18[i].1 | I like [[watch $\underline{a}$ movie]]. |
| E112: S-I10.C19 | If I had $\underline{a}$ free time I watched a movie on my TV. |
| E283: S-I20.C17 | If you have $\underline{a}$ time, please come to my shop! |
| E328: SR6.C7.2 | I listening $\underline{a}$ music. |

It will be observed that errors E112, E283 and E328 involve the mass nouns 'music' and 'time'. A singular Deictic with a mass noun is ungrammatical in the ESN: "[W]ith non-specific Deictics, the system is 'singular/non-singular'; mass nouns are grouped together with plural, in a category of 'non-singular'" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014: 369, my emphasis). Because of this, the assignment of these errors to EC 2 b is unproblematic.

E109, however, involves the countable noun 'movie', and this leads to a potential difficulty.

E109: I like [[watch a movie]].

By definition, countable nouns may be singular; indeed, in category EC2a we saw 85 instances of countable noun where learners should have used a singular Deictic, but did not. For this reason the clause above, taken out of context, does not appear to contain an error. To assign E109 to EC2b, therefore, requires justification.

To provide this justification, we first note that the topic in Text S-I10 is 'Self-Introduction', and that in her short essay the writer introduces a number of things about herself:

My name is X. I live in Ibaraki... My hobby is dance!...I enjoy dance in this school. I belong to dance circle, 'Rabbit'. ... I like watch a movie. ... My favourite foreign drama is Glee. (See Text S-I10 in Appendix 1)

Given this co-text, we can be sure that 'movie' is 'non-specific'. As we recall from the previous error category, the writer's selection of ' $a$ ' is in line with this meaning and cannot yet be labelled erroneous.

However, we now need to take into account the fact that, in the self-introduction text-type, the use of ' $a$ ' is actually the marked option; the unmarked option is to use the null Deictic with plural forms, giving clauses such as 'I like watching movies', 'I enjoy sleeping in on Sunday mornings', and so on. The use of ' $a$ ' in clauses such as 'I like watching a movie every now and then", and "I enjoy sleeping in on a Sunday morning", while available in the ESN, is unexpected. (The concept of marked and unmarked structures, while by no means unique to SFG, is a key ingredient of a Hallidayan approach to lexicogrammar (e.g. Halliday, 1967). Therefore, it is in line with an SFG-based analysis of error to bring in the concept when appropriate.)

The next step is to note that the marked option in these clauses gives them a certain nuance, one rather hard to describe, but certainly one that implies advanced control of the system, since from an SFG point of view, 'advanced control' includes functional awareness, or the ability to manipulate the interplay between form and meaning. In other words, if the author of "I enjoy sleeping in on a Sunday morning" is aware of the nuanced meaning ' $a$ '
contributes to the nominal group, we would be entitled to expect him to show a reasonable level of control of the DEICTIC NUMBER system throughout his text.

This is not the case with Text S-I10, however. Leaving aside other error-types, such as the verbal group mistakes in I like watch a movie, we find Deictic errors in several clauses, including There is very beautiful city ...I learn to dance when I was high school student. I went to dance studio twice a week. There is thus no evidence to support the contention that the marked use of ' $a$ ' in E109 is intentional; on the contrary, the evidence points clearly in the opposite direction. We may therefore safely describe I like watch a movie as containing an error in the nominal group a movie, and may further assign the error to EC2b. Again, however, there are two ways to view E109 and the other three examples of EC2b.

## Instantial interpretation

Whereas EC2a/1 errors occurred as a consequence of the incorrect realisation of singular deixis, here it is the realisation of non-singular that is erroneous. This leads to the error description,

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of non-singular deixis

This is illustrated in Fig 5.6 where, as before, blue and red type indicate correct and incorrect systemic choices. (The reader is referred to the previous error category for a discussion of the advantages and pedagogical potential of system diagrams. These will not be repeated each time.)

Fig 5.6: EC2b: 'instantial' interpretation


As the diagram illustrates, the learners have negotiated the system network successfully, but have realised 'non-singular' with an option that lies outside the English System Network.

## System interpretation

Turning to the second perspective, EC2b errors may be analysed as involving the incorrect choice of 'singular' rather than as the incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' deixis. This suggests the following error description and system network diagram:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise singular deixis

## Fig 5.7: EC2b: ‘system’ interpretation



Here we see that the choice of ' $a$ ' is correct insofar as it realises 'singular', but that the latter is the incorrect systemic choice to have made. As with EC2a/2, this suggests that some students may benefit from a methodology that emphasises the functional import of Deictic selections - both the selection actually made, and the selection(s) that could have been
made, but were not.
This concludes the discussion of Error Categories 2a and 2b, which contain 89 instances of either (i) incorrect realisations of the options 'singular' and 'non-singular' or (ii) incorrect systemic choices, from the system DEICTIC NUMBER. It does not conclude the involvement of the DEIXIS system network, however, which is also the locus of the next three primary error categories, ECs2c-e.

## EC 2c (47 errors)

ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of specific deixis

ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

EC2c is the second-largest ideational-experiential nominal group category, containing 47 instances. The Table above provides 10 representative examples (the complete list can be found in Appendix 6, Table EC2c).

Table 5.11: Ten instances of EC2c

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E2: S-I1.C6.2 | Kumamon is \{sp favourite character\}. |
| E12: S-I1.C9.3 | I join \{sp yachting club\}. |
| E108: S-I10.C17.2 | I practise hard \{for \{sp next event\}\}. |
| E196: S-I16.C6.2 | (I member of dance club.) [sp Dance club's] name is Rabbit. |
| E214: S-I16.C15.2 | I like \{sp weather [in Australia] \}. |
| E242: S-I18.C17.2 | \{sp Air\} is clear, (people is very kind, and food is delicious.) |
| E278: S-I20.C7.2 | I use \{\{sp Sobu Line\}, Keisei Line and Musashino Line \}. |
| E301: SR3.C3.4 | I usually go to shopping \{at \{sp afternoon\}\}. |
| E496: LW15.C14.2 | (Sunday is TOEIC test day.) ... \{Before \{sp test\}\}, I listening to music. |
| E655: FD10.C9.2 | I'm interested in id sightseeing business. |

The issue here involves the same system network as EC2 errors, but at an earlier stage of delicacy. As can be seen in Fig 5.8 below, the error relates to the DEIXIS system. As before, there are two interpretations of the errors, and thus two error descriptions and two system diagrams. The instantial description and system diagram are:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of specific deixis

Fig 5.8: EC2c: 'instantial' interpretation

DEIXIS $\rightarrow\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { specific (the, this, etc) } \theta \\ \text { non-specific }(\theta, a, \text { etc })\end{array}\right.$

And the system interpretation and diagram are:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

Fig 5.9: EC2c: 'instantial' interpretation


What both interpretations have in common is the fact that, whereas in EC2 the
writers navigated this system without issue, here DEIXIS has proved problematic. The following example illustrates this:

E200: [sp Dance club's] name is Rabbit.

This is a relational identifying clause, where the Token, 'Rabbit' and the Value, 'dance club's name', are in a relationship such that 'Rabbit' identifies, or represents, the name of the club (see Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 279-284 for a discussion of the terms 'Token' and 'Value'). In a sense, the groups on either side of the Process are being set up as equivalent and, just as $2+4=6$ can be expressed as $6=2+4$, so the clause above could be written as Rabbit is [the] dance club's name with little change in experiential meaning (p. 265).

In such structures, if there is a Deictic element in the relevant nominal groups it tends to be a specific one. The reason for this becomes clear if we consider this invented example:

## A dance club's name is Rabbit.

This is no longer an identifying clause; the sense of specificity has been lost, and one possible interpretation of the clause is 'Any member of the class of dance clubs carries the name Rabbit'. This is not the meaning intended by the writer, however, who wishes to refer to a specific club. This demonstrates, therefore, that one of the functions of an identifying clause is to specify. Accordingly, the ESN requires a writer to select 'specific' from the DEXIS system. The instantial diagram above suggests that 'specific' was indeed selected, but was then incorrectly realised with the null Deictic. On the other hand, the system
interpretation says that the writer actually chose 'non-specific'. The realisation ' $\theta$ ' was correct; the choice from the system was erroneous.

In the discussion thus far, it is interesting to observe that we have not had cause to mention the 'correct' reconstruction of E196, namely The/That/This dance club's name is Rabbit. The significance of this is twofold. First, it shows that an SFG approach to error can raise learners' awareness of systemic options independently of requiring them to learn particular wordings. This has a number of possible pedagogical benefits. To mention just one, it can provide teachers with greater options when providing error feedback (EF). Traditionally form-focused, EF tends to concentrate on realisations in the expression stratum. For instance, in the case of missing articles, a teacher might insert an arrow with a question mark, or write 'missing word' in the margin. An SFG-based approach to feedback can open up more abstract linguistic strata. For instance, given

Last weekend is TOEIC test...Before ? test I listening to music
a teacher could ask, "Is 'test' meant to be specific or non-specific?", or "What meaning does the null Deictic usually realise?" In comparison with a form-oriented comment such as "There's a missing word here", these appeals to the DEIXIS system can remind learners that text choices are based on more fundamental selections. It helps, too, that these choices are more accessible than their textual realisations; for instance, it may be easier to learn the two option system 'specific' / 'non-specific' than it is to learn the set of determiners than realise these choices.

Thus the fact that the DEIXIS system can be studied independently of its realisations has potential resonance for classroom methodology. But there is a second significance, one related to the metafunctional location of EC2c. Consider the following examples:

## E2: Kumamon is sp favourite character.

E655: I'm interested in sp sightseeing business.

Like E196, the underlined nominal groups are specific, and therefore require a specific Deictic. But whereas the choice was to some extent open in E196 ('this' and 'that' cannot be ruled out), this is not true of E2, which requires 'my', nor of E655, which requires 'the'. Why should this be? The answer to this question brings up one of the fundamental benefits of an SFG approach to learner error.

What is going on here is that, in all the nominal groups that contain ideational-experiential DEXIS errors, one, and sometimes two, additional systems are at work. Furthermore, these systems are located within different metafunctions. With reference to the examples above, E2 exemplifies an error in the interpersonal system of PERSON, while E655 demonstrates a problem controlling the textual REFERENCE system. Since the three systems involved - DEIXIS, PERSON and REFERENCE - are connected in this way, it makes sense to deal with error categories that are related (even though they implicate different metafunctions) as they arise, rather than presenting them 'metafunction by metafunction' as a purely theoretical organisation of the discussion would suggest. We shall begin with the interpersonal category EC9.

## EC9 (7 errors)

ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ${ }^{\prime}+$ interactant'
ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select ${ }^{\prime}$ interactant'

Table 5.12: Seven instances of EC9

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E3: S-I1.C6.3 | Kumamon is \{int favourite character\}. |
| E6: S-I1.C7.3 | \{ _int Favourite foods\} is Karashirenkon, and Basashi. |
| E157: SI13.C3.3 | I live in Ichikawa City \{with \{int twin sister\}\}. |
| E325: SR6.C3.3 | I visit \{ [a grandmother's] house\}. |
| E337: SR7.C3.3 | I visit \{ [int grandmother's] house\} with my mother. |
| E493: LW15.C13.3 | (It was hot day,) so I put off \{int jacket\}. |
| E542: LW17.C2.3 | I hoped \{for \{int grandmother\}\} in the hospital. |

Table 5.12 above lists all the instances of EC9 error in the corpus. They have in common the fact that in each case the specific Deictic involved is the possessive first-person pronoun 'my'. In six cases this Deictic is absent, while in E325 the non-specific Deictic 'a' makes an inappropriate appearance.

These seven examples emerge due to the fact that there are two main types of Deictic specification: 'proximity' and 'possession' (see Fig. 5.10).

Fig 5.10: Two types of deictic specificity


Proximity is realised by demonstrative determiners such as this and that. Possession, which is the pointing out of actual and metaphorical ownership, is realised, via the system of PERSON, in the form of possessive determiners such as $m y$ and your. As its name suggests, the PERSON system enables a writer to make choices involving interactants (my, your) and non-interactants (his, its) in the text. Unlike experiential meanings, these are not offered as
objective qualities of the Thing; they add, rather, a layer of subjective significance. Thus, assuming a focus on the nominal rather than the verbal group, I found this necklace comes across as objective and non-controversial ('That's not a necklace' is a somewhat unlikely response), whereas in I found my necklace the nub of the argument concerns possession, and is more 'at risk' (That's not yours' does not seem an unusual response).

What is being described here as 'subjective', and 'at risk' is the province of the interpersonal metafunction. Therefore, an error involving the PERSON system can be located interpersonally, giving us an error category in addition to the one that deals with determiners in their experiential, specifying role. And this is the justification for recognising EC9, which contains instances where a writer has either failed to realise 'first-person interactant' correctly (instantial interpretation) or has incorrectly chosen to select 'non-interactant' (system interpretation). The two error descriptions are:

1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ' + interactant'

2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select ${ }^{\text {' }}$ interactant'

Two points regarding Table 5.7 above require some discussion. First, as mentioned earlier, E325 is different from the remaining six instances in substituting the non-specific Deictic ' $a$ ' for the specific possessive Deictic 'my':

E325: I visit [a grandmother's] house.

Some will object that 'a grandmother's house' is well-formed and, moreover, realises a
plausible meaning. This is true but, as explained earlier in this chapter, the focus of the current EA is the grammatically probable, based on meaning, rather than the grammatically possible, based on form. In the example, the writer is clearly intending to specify the house she visited. Since many houses are owned by 'a' grandmother, the non-specific Deictic is extremely unlikely to be correct. Now, if this argument is accepted, there appears to be a choice between assigning the error to EC2c (the incorrect realisation of 'specific') or to EC9 (the incorrect realisation of 'interactant'). But as has been shown, this is not a choice at all, because both errors are present in the clause, one in the experiential metafunction, the other in the interpersonal.

So far, then, an SFG approach has helped us discern two errors in seven of the 46 instances listed in Table 5.8. But this is not the end of the matter. Consider E655, repeated below for convenience, and its reconstruction immediately following:

## E655: I'm interested in ? sightseeing business.

Reconstruction: I'm interested in the sightseeing business.

In the reconstruction, the definite article does not have an interpersonal resonance, and yet experiential specificity is still not the only meaning involved. This is because 'the' plays a dual role in the ESN: in addition to specificity, it indicates 'recoverability' from the co-text or wider situational or cultural context. In the reconstructed example, 'the' not only signals that a particular "business" known to writer and reader is the object of discussion (i.e., specificity), but also that there is only one 'sightseeing business' that the writer could be referring to, and the referent is therefore recoverable, or identifiable.

This is a textual strategy, part of the system of cohesive strategies constructed by the writer to orient readers as they navigate the text. The particular strategy involved here is
homophoric reference. As with 'sun' in 'Don't look at the sun' and 'Prime Minister' in 'The Prime Minister resigned', sightseeing business is presented as if there were only one such business, even though this is not strictly true. Here, 'the' indicates shared knowledge (between writer and reader) of the world beyond the text itself; the referents of 'sun', 'Prime Minister' and 'sightseeing business' are identifiable because in each case common sense points to only one plausible interpretation.

To reiterate, a reference item such as 'the' (and others such as 'this', and 'she') indicate to the reader that a referent is recoverable, or identifiable. This is in fact one of two options in the REFERENCE system (Fig 5.11).

Fig 5.11: Simple textual REFERENCE system


As reference is a textual strategy, distinct from either the experiential and interpersonal meanings, a third error category is required to complete our analysis of this nominal group. This is labelled EC36a, and has the following pair of descriptions:

EC $36 a$ (47 errors)
ED1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
ED2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Reference $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'

It will be noted that the category is described as occurring 'around' the clause. This
is to acknowledge the fact that reference "evolved specifically as a resource for making it possible to transcend the boundaries of the clause" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, p. 603), and is not confined to units within the lexicogrammar rank scale (clause $\rightarrow$ group $\rightarrow$ word $\rightarrow$ morpheme).

In summary, an SFG approach to the data has shown that what might appear to be a single mistake, such as the omission of a determiner, is in many cases a composite affair, consisting of two, or even three separate errors. This is because text itself is composite, consisting of layers of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings (see Chapter 3). Moreover, although this is not the focus of the error analysis (as mentioned in the Introduction to Chapter 5), it will be observed that the errors occur at different areas of the rank scale. While EC2c and EC9 are both errors of the nominal group, EC36a affects matters beyond the strict grammatical boundaries of the clause, and thus resonates beyond the lexicogrammatical scale, and into discourse.

As a final illustration, we may look again at clause S-I1.C6:

## Kumamon is ? favourite character.

From an experiential perspective, what is missing here is a signal of specificity. 'Kumamon' should be presented, not as a non-specific member of a general class of characters, but as having specific qualities that are germane to its representation. The writer has failed to realise this meaning. From an interpersonal perspective, what is missing is a signal of possession. 'Kumamon' has significance as being the favourite character of an interactant in the exchange between writer and reader. This meaning has not been realised either. And from a textual perspective, the text has been so constructed that the reader can identify the
referent of this interactant without its having to be named or introduced. However, the writer has left this cohesive signal unrealised.

So in a single nominal group, in the absence of the single word 'my', the writer has made three errors. Moreover, each of these errors can be modelled with reference to systemic choices. There are two aspects to this. First, the choices required by the particular context - 'specific deixis', 'speaker-interactant', and 'recoverable' - have not been realised. But second, the systems themselves represent required choices in the realisation of the writer's intended meanings. In other words, it is not merely that the writer should have chosen, say, a specific Deictic rather than a non-specific one, but that the choice itself is required, and may not be abrogated. This, it is argued, has pedagogic potential. If students are taught the structure of nominal groups from a meaning-based, systemic perspective, they may gain a greater appreciation of why certain Deictics are required in certain contexts; they may learn to match intended meaning with required systems and their systemic options. This, in turn, may lead to a greater understanding of, and perhaps eventually for a more instinctive feel for, which particular Deictics realise these contextual meanings.

## EC $2 d$ (4 errors)

ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-specific'

ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'specific'

Like its companion category EC2c, this category involves the first stage of delicacy in the DETERMINATION system network - namely, the choice between 'specific' and 'non-specific' in the system of DEXIS (see Fig 5.8 above). In comparison with EC2c,
however, there are few instances in the data. The error occurred only 4 times, and 2 of those occurred in the same nominal group complex (see Table 5.13 below).

Table 5.13 Four instances of EC2d

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E145: S-I12.C14[i].2 | (I like) [[ watch \{the movie\} ]], too. |
| E287: SR1.C4.2 | I usually buy the clothes. |
| E701: JI4.C8[ii].4 | ('My hobby are) \{\{ [[read the book]] \}, [[play...]], and [[listen to music]] \}.' |
| E703: JI4.C8[iii].4 | ('My hobby are) \{[[read the book]], \{ [[play the game]] \}, and [[listen ...]] \}.' |

Once again, we can interpret the category in two ways. According to the instantial interpretation, the learners opted for 'non-specific' in the system, but incorrectly realised this meaning with the definite article. The error description and system diagram are thus:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-specific'

Fig 5.12: EC2d: ‘instantial' interpretation

DEIXIS $\rightarrow\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { specific }\{\text { the, this, etc }\} \\ \text { non-specific }\{a, \theta, \text { some, etc }\} \text { the }\end{array}\right.$

The system interpretation, on the other hand, views the source of the error as the incorrect selection of 'specific'. The realisation 'the' is therefore correct, but the ESN does not recognise this Deictic as realising unmarked non-specific meanings. (It should be noted that in a clause such as 'The Japanese elephant is rarely spotted', the nominal group Subject is 'non-specific', but this is a marked use of 'the', and not the one intended by these
writers.) The error description and system diagram are:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'specific'

Fig 5.13: Nominal group DEIXIS system

DEIXIS $\rightarrow\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { specific }\{\text { the, this, etc }\} \\ \text { non-specific }\{a, \theta, \text { some, etc }\}\end{array}\right.$

The following example illustrates the benefit of an SFG approach to this error:

E287: I usually buy the clothes.

If the student's problem is one of realisation, it follows that she is aware, perhaps unconsciously, of the distinction between 'specific' and 'non-specific'. The first diagram above (Fig 5.12) confirms this by highlighting her correct choice in blue, but also shows that her attempt to realise the meaning lies outside the English System Network. Moreover, the diagram encourages her to try out the sentence using options within the network - within the curly brackets. She may also observe that 'the' occurs within its own set of curly brackets, alongside the selection of 'specific'.

If, on the other hand, the writer's problem is systemic, the second diagram alerts the learner to the fact that there is a meaning-based issue here. According to this interpretation, the choice of 'specific' was a conscious choice. It implies, "I have successfully communicated the fact that I believe 'clothes' to be specific ones. I am intending to write about specific clothes, not clothes in general'. The system diagram says, "I was wrong to communicate this." In other words, the system diagram encourages the
learner to match her intended meaning with the meaning she ought to have intended.
The crucial point, of course, is that the writer did not intend to mean 'specific'. In fact, the likelihood is that she was not aware of the DEIXIS system, its implications, and its realisations, at all. But an SFG approach brings meaning to the attention of the learner. An SFG approach says "I write, therefore I mean". And the role of the system diagram is to indicate these meanings, how they relate to the forms which realise them, and where the writer succeeded and failed within the terms of the English System Network.

In the discussion of EC2c, it was demonstrated that the missing Deictic in a nominal group such as 'work place' in I go to ? work place by car (E293), is not a single mistake but a composite one. The same phenomenon occurs with EC2d errors, since 'the' implies not only experiential specificity but also textual identifiability. We may therefore identify the following error category and descriptions:

EC 36b (4 errors)
ED1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-identifiable'

ED2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ reference $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'identifiable ${ }^{\prime}$
(Note: see Table 5.8 above for the list of EC36b errors)
To take the instantial interpretation as our example, the system diagram below (Fig 5.14) shows that in cases such as E291 (I usually buy the clothes) the reference error is to realise 'non-identifiable' with an element, 'the', that in the ESN indicates the exact opposite.

Fig 5.14: Textual REFERENCE system


Thus the nominal groups in Table 5.8 each contain two errors, one ideational-experiential, and one textual. While there are only 4 instances of each of these two categories, they combine with the related categories discussed earlier to total more than 100 cases where learners have shown a lack of control of the DEIXIS, REFRERENCE and PERSON systems.

## EC $2 e$ ( 14 errors)

ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ unrecoverable realisation of deixis

The final sub-category of deixis errors has 15 instances. A representative sample of 5 is shown in Table 5.14 (see Appendix 6, Table EC2e) for the complete list):

Table 5.14: Five instances of EC2e

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E389: LW3.C11 | I did $\{$ ? TOEIC test $\}$. |
| E459: LW12.C1 | I went $\{$ to $\{$ ? mall \} with my mother. |
| E480: LW15.C1.2 | Last weekend is $\{$ ? TOEIC test $\}$. |
| E500: LW16.C3 | I used $\{$ ? Train $\}$. |
| E560: LW16.C23.1 | (I walked my house) used $\{$ ? umbrella $\}$. |

This category is significant because it represents the first time we have been unable to posit a system interpretation for an error at group rank. The reason for this will be explained
below.
First, however, from an instantial perspective, the category involves nominal groups where it is not possible to confidently reconstruct the deixis error. The examples range from instances where the choices of 'specific' and 'non-specific' are equally likely (e.g. E560: 'using an / my umbrella'), to instances where one option seems indicated, but not enough to warrant assigning the error to a different category (e.g. E480: 'Last weekend is the / (a?) TOEIC test'; E459: 'I went to a / (the?) shopping mall with my mother'). Since the first interpretation focuses on realisation, this uncertainty may be taken to indicate a similar uncertainty on the part of the learners regarding the systemic options 'specific' and 'non-specific'. In other words, this is the first grammar category we have encountered where we cannot determine which choice the writer made. For this reason, the error description and system diagram (where brown highlighting signifies uncertain selections) are as follows:

## Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ unrecoverable realisation

 of deixisFig 5.15: Nominal group DEIXIS system


The fact that in these 15 instances the choice between 'specific' and 'non-specific' is unrecoverable justifies their inclusion in category EC2e.

When we attempt a system interpretation, however, something interesting occurs. The system view insists that we take the text as it is. In all 15 instances what is in the text is the null Deictic and, as we have pointed out in earlier discussions, this indicates the
meaning 'non-specific'. As already pointed out, 'non-specific' is a viable, if not always preferred, option in every case. Therefore, from a systemic perspective, there are no errors in DEIXIS.

It might be argued that clauses such as I used train (E500) do contain a systemic error, since the selection of ' $\theta$ ' also means 'non-singular', and all the nominal groups in Table 5.10 are singular. This is true, and presents something of a paradox. If we accept the system view, and interpret the nominal groups as selecting 'non-singular', then the 15 errors can be re-categorised as EC1a. However, as pointed out in the earlier discussion, we cannot do this because EC1a errors involve cases where the only choice was non-specific deixis (e.g. E51: Chiba is ? good place for live). Systemically speaking, this places the 15 instances of EC2e in limbo. The best solution is probably to add them to EC1a, but with the caveat that they depend on a possible interpretation of Deictic specificity, not a definite one.

The most interesting thing about the above discussion is that it all stems from what appears to be a very simple error: the absence of a Deictic. An SFG approach shows that there are in fact layers of meaning involved in the selection of any Deictic, and this opens up the exciting possibility of exposing students to the relevant system networks, of persuading them that when they write a word as 'simple' as $a$ they are making meanings, that even the null Deictic is a selection full of meaningful potential, and that familiarity with systemic choices and their realisations is the key to gaining control of their English.

## EC $3 a$ (54 errors)

ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of plural Thing

ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise singular Thing

This error, which is often referred to in traditional Explicit EAs as 'number', is the second-most frequent error in the data.

The Table below lists 10 instances of EC3a (the full list of can be found in Appendix 6, Table 3a).

Table 5.15: Ten instances of EC3a

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E24: S-I2.C9 | I like \{ movie\}. |
| E132: S-I11.C11 | But I have \{[a lot of] class\}. |
| E253: S-I18.C21 | I hate \{frog\}. |
| E470: LW13.C5 | But, I have to get \{500 point \} |
| E560: FD2.C7.2 | For example, $\{\{$ many $\underline{C D}\}$, movie and music\}. |
| E596: FD4.C4.2 | (...) I was attracted \{ \{cabin attendant\} [in $N$ airport] \}. (They looked beautiful....) |
| E598: FD4.C6 | And I like \{airport\} very much. |
| E602: FD5.C1(bii). 1 | (I want to become supervisor) [[who make \{TV program\} ]]. |
| E696: JI4.C8 | \{'My hobby\} are [[read the book]], [[play the game]], [[and listen ...music]].' |
| E708: JI5.C7(b). 3 | (I want) to help \{for \{weak human\}\}.' |

An SFG-oriented analysis also uses the term 'number', but here it refers to the name of an ideational-experiential system attached, as it were, to the "semantic core of the nominal group", the Thing (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014: 383). In their introduction to SFG, the authors describe three 'vectors' along which "words capable of functioning as Thing are ordered in terms of the grammar" (p. 385). It is the first of these vectors, the experiential distinction between 'count' noun and 'mass' noun, which involves the NUMBER system, and which is the source of EC3a errors.

An illustrative example of the error is E470:

E470: But, I have to get \{500 point \}.

As expected, where an error involves choices from a lexicogrammatical system, there are two interpretations of the error.

According to the instantial view, EC3a results from learners correctly selecting 'plural' from the NUMBER system, but realising it incorrectly, for example, in E476, as 'point'. This provides the following error description:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of plural Thing
and can be modelled as Fig 5.16:

Fig 5.16: EC3a, 'instantial' interpretation


The system interpretation sees the problem as stemming from a more abstract level. Here, the realisation 'point' is actually seen as a successful one, given the choice 'plural'. The error is the systemic choice itself, which ought to have been 'singular'. This view gives us a new error description and system diagram (Fig 5.17):


#### Abstract

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise singular Thing


Fig 5.17: EC3a 'system' interpretation


It is worth reiterating the point that, although only the second interpretation bears the name 'system' and includes the system name (in this case, NUMBER) in its error description, both interpretations utilise the systemic foundation of a 'Systemic' Functional Grammar approach to language. Thus, even when the error is considered one of realisation, it is the realisation, not of a grammar rule, but of a meaningful selection from a system. The student is encouraged to view the ' $s$ ' in 'points' as embodying the function 'plural'. The challenge is not so much to 'add an 's', but to complete the 'meaning' with its associated wording. We are not 'adding' something to 'point', we are 'completing' its meaning.

Furthermore, and again to reiterate an earlier point, we can see that the instantial system diagram contextualises the student's actual realisation in an exciting way. That is, the realisation that takes the form 'point' is not merely incorrect; it is in its own right a meaningful wording, in as much as it realises the meaning 'singular'. This way of presenting the error has great potential for Japanese students, whose language does not grammaticalise NUMBER within the Thing. The system diagram clearly illustrates the fact that, unlike in Japanese, the English System Network permits no escape: the failure to realise 'plural' (with countable nouns) results in the meaning 'singular'.

## EC $3 b$ (3 errors)

ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'

ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-singular'/ 'plural'

There are only 3 instances of EC3b, which results from the inappropriate addition of 's' to a common noun. They are listed below in Table 5.11:

Table 5.16: Three instances of EC3b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E43: S-I5.C9.2 | \{My families\} are 6 people. |
| E82: S-I9.C3 | (I'm 18 years old) and I'm \{in \{1't grades $\}$ \}. |
| E131: S-I11.C10 | \{\{1 years\} ago\}\} I went to Disneyland three times [a week]. |

As before, we can establish two error descriptions, the first interpreting the error as an incorrect realisation of 'singular', the second as the incorrect system choice 'non-singular' (E43) or 'plural' (E82 and E131). The descriptions, with their accompanying system diagrams, are thus:

## Instantial

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular ${ }^{\prime}$

Fig 5.18: Nominal group NUMBER system ('instantial' interpretation)


System

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-singular'/ 'plural'

Fig 5.19: Nominal group NUMBER system ('system' interpretation)


Beyond the points made in previous error category discussions, however, there seems little to add. This is because a close look at the 3 instances of EC3b suggest that the problem is not associated with the NUMBER system per se, but with other factors. In the case of E43, for example, the student is dealing with a Thing, 'family' that has a dual status; in certain contexts it is discrete, and therefore countable (Three families got together at the $B B Q$ ), and in others it is collective, and therefore only 'singular'. The student is likely to have read or heard both 'family' and 'families', and be understandably confused; the error may therefore also be amenable to a psycholinguistic approach. In the case of E82 and E131, it is notable that the former occurs in the secondary clause of a paratactic expansion, while the latter occurs within a marked Theme. It is a trend with many of the errors in this analysis that they occur within 'complex' structures, raising the possibility that there is some connection between written errors and complexity of unit structure. We shall return to this point briefly at the end of the chapter.

EC 4 (4 errors)
ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

This error category contains the only examples in the data of nominal groups where the locus of an error is not possible to determine. The error description, and the four instances, are as follows:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

As there are only a few cases, we can look at briefly at each.
(i) E20: I work at Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant.

This nominal group is different from the others in that it is 'well-formed'. However, two points count against accepting its SF grammaticality (that is, the successful conjunction of grammar and 'intended' meaning). First, the situational context tells us that there is more than one restaurant at Tokyo Disneyland, and so at the very least Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant contains a reference error (see EC36). Second, and more importantly, teachers familiar with Japanese, and with the English of Japanese students, knows that the syntagm 'one of X ' is often problematic for Japanese learners of English, and that this is related to grammatical features of Japanese such as the lack of any requirement to modify nouns with Deictics. In other words, an expert speaker, in the same context, would almost certainly have realised the meaning as 'one of Tokyo Disneyland's restaurants', 'a restaurant at Tokyo Disneyland', or 'one of the restaurants at Tokyo Disneyland'. What appears to have happened in E20 is that the student has resorted to the strategy of direct translation, since in
the Japanese "Tokyo Disneyland の restaurant", the の ('no') is a possession marker.
Though it can be useful to be aware of the L1, it is the aim of the current error analysis to focus exclusively on the meanings that exist in the submitted texts. In this case, as pointed out above, there are several alternative meanings, and therefore we cannot pinpoint a specific error. What we can say, however, is that the writer generally lacks control of the SPECIFICITY and NUMBER systems: in fact, he fails to make a correct choice throughout Text S-I2, other than in cases where the Thing is a proper noun such as 'Chiba' and 'Disney' (see Appendix 1A, Text S-I2). This suggests that the student would benefit from an SFG approach to understanding the experiential systems involved in Thing modification, and in particular from an exposure to system diagrams such as those discussed in early error categories.

## (ii) E21: (I want) to get over 500 [of TOEIC score], ...

Here, though as with E20 we know what the writer 'wants to say', we cannot determine whether the best reconstruction is 'over 500 on the TOEIC' (Numerator as Head), 'over 500 points on the TOEIC', (Thing as Head) with 'TOEIC' in the post-Modifier, or 'a TOEIC score of over 500', (Thing as Head, with TOEIC as pre-Modifier).

An SFG approach to the error might turn to the textual notion of Information structure for an initial solution. This will be discussed more fully below, but for now we can point out that, if the student is encouraged to consider where she wishes to place the Information focus, she can then place it in the post-Head Qualifier as 'New'. If the focus is on the test, we get over 500 score on (the) TOEIC, and if it is on the result we get (a) TOEIC score of over 500. In E21, the structure is confused; if we can help the learner sort that problem out, the experiential concerns can be approached in ways addressed in
previous categories.
(iii) E84: ... I have no output [[that skill or translate Japanese to English]].

This is the only example in the entire corpus which I have found impossible to even begin to reconstruct (though there are 2 instances of unrecoverable clauses at EC24). One possibility is that 'or' is a red herring, and that output is an instance of 'incorrect lexical realisation' (EC1a), giving something like "don't have the skill to translate Japanese to English". But this is a guess, and no specific error can be determined with confidence.
(iv) E432: My part-time is at restaurant [/which is beef tonguel].

The simplest solution here is to suggest an 'incorrect Process Type' error (EC23), and reconstruct the nominal group as (a) restaurant [[which serves beef tongue]]. Another plausible idea would be to invoke Information structure, as with E21 above, and rework the example as (a) beef tongue restaurant. And a final, less satisfactory solution, but one that keeps the writer's syntagm almost intact, is (a) restaurant which is a beef tongue restaurant. As we cannot determine which of these was the author's intended meaning, no further experiential analysis can occur.

Though we have been unable to assign the 4 instances of EC4 to more specific categories, one significant aspect of these nominal groups stands out. In every case, the groups themselves, and/or the reconstructions they suggest, involve the SFG concept of 'rankshift' (Chapter 3). The following possible reconstructions illustrate the point:
(i) I work at a restaurant [at Tokyo Disneyland].
(ii) I want to get over 500 [on the TOEIC test].
(iii) I don't have the skill [[to translate Japanese to English]].
(iv) My part time job is at a restaurant [[which serves beef tongue]]

When there is no rankshift, the elements of a structure at a particular rank come from the rank below. For instance, in the group-rank structure Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant, the elements of the Classifier and Thing are respectively a word complex and a word, both belonging to the rank of word. However, in (i) above, at Tokyo Disneyland is a prepositional phrase, not a word. In other words, despite functioning as Qualifier within a nominal group, it is actually a structure at the same rank. This occurs again in (ii), while in (iii) and (iv) the rankshift is even more striking because the nominal group Qualifiers consist of full clauses.

There is a pedagogical implication here, because attention to rankshifting, and the vital role it plays in the formation of nominal groups in English, would clearly benefit Japanese EFL students. To take one example, Classifiers and Qualifiers both occur before the Head in Japanese, and this accounts in part for errors such as E20 above. If students are taught (a) to recognise the difference, in both Japanese and English, between these two functions, (b) to observe that in English the latter is always post-Head, and (c) that Classifiers are words, while Qualifiers are groups/phrases and clauses, this SFG understanding of English nominal group structure would be a valuable supplement to their existing knowledge.

Earlier, in the discussion of E21 and E432, the textual system of INFORMATION was alluded to. There is in fact a separate error category which concerns this system; despite the fact that this the category is located within the textual metafunction, it seems appropriate to discuss it now.

## EC 10 (4 errors)

ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Information structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Given $\rightarrow$ New structure

As just explained this error category contains errors related to the textual system INFORMATION. There are 4 clear instances of EC10, and these are listed in Table 5.17 below. In addition, E21 and E412 from the discussion may be kept in mind (they are not included in the Table because, as we have seen, a clear reconstruction was impossible to determine).

Table 5.17: Four instances of EC10

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E87: S-I9.C9.3 | \{ [[I usually listen [] music\} is 60 's ~70's music. |
| E537: LW16.C24(i).4 | \{ [[I eat]] dinner\} is instant food. |
| E604: FD5.C2(b) | (I want) to make \{[about [all over the world]] TV\}. |
| E618: FD7.C1(bi).2 | (I will want) to do \{ [need English]l job\}. |

The key to EC10 is Halliday and Matthiessen's insight into the textual significance of Classifier and Qualifier positions. They write,

Textual meaning is embodied throughout the entire structure [of the nominal group], since it determines the order in which the elements are arranged, as well as patterns of information structure just as in the clause (note, for example, that the unmarked focus of information in a nominal group is on the word that comes last, not the word that functions as Thing...). This means that there is a certain potential for assigning experientially similar meanings different textual statuses within the structure of the nominal group. In particular, they may be presented wither as Classifier or as Qualifier...with the Qualifier having the greater potential as news.
(2014, pp. 387-8)

When we consider the four clauses in Table 5.14 in this light, we can see that, from a textual perspective, what the students have done is select the wrong element as the focus of information. This becomes clearer if we look at the following reconstructions that correct the errors in information focus:
(a) The music I usually listen to is 60's-70's music.
(b) The dinner I ate is instant food.
(c) I want to make TV about places all over the world
(d) I will want do a job that needs English

In each case, the focus of information, the part of the nominal group that has the greater potential as 'news' is now in its more natural, unmarked position in the Qualifier. In each erroneous nominal group, the learner placed these parts in Classifier position. This put the information focus on the Thing (music, dinner, TV, job), a marked choice with no justification. The error description suggested by this analysis is therefore as follows:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Information structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Given $\rightarrow$ New structure

EC 5 (1 error)
ED1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'ordinative'

ED2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMERATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect
choice to realise 'ordinative' as 'quantitative'

There is only one example in the data of an error in the system of NUMERATION (shown in Table 5.18).

Table 5.18: One instance of EC5

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E48: S-I6.C3.2 | I'm [4 year] student. |

Let us briefly discuss the error with reference to the two systemic functional perspectives introduced in this chapter.

According to the instantial interpretation, learners correctly chose 'ordinative' from the system, but realised it incorrectly, as shown in the error description and in Fig 5.19:

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMERATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'ordinative'

Fig 5.20: EC5: 'instantial' interpretation


This interpretation seems plausible when we consider, first, that the syntagm ' $4^{\text {th }}$-year' is embedded, and therefore quite difficult to master in itself, and second that the
qualitative variation＇4－year＇is appropriate in very similar lexical contexts（e．g．I＇m doing a ［4－year］course）．（A third point－that such similar structures are easily confused when，as in Japan，there is little chance for learners to automatise the difference－is also worth considering as a contributing factor）．In such situations，a system network diagram helps students to visualise，and thereby potentially reinforce，the points that（i）ordinative and qualitative realisations distinguish different meanings－which is why they appear as different options in the system，and（ii）mixing these realisations，as in＇4 year student＇，may render the intended meaning unclear．

The system interpretation says that the error lies in the student＇s choice of ＇quantitative＇from the system，and not from the realisation＇four＇．The resulting error description and system diagram are shown below：

Group rank（nominal）$\rightarrow$ ideational－experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER NUMERATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise＇ordinative＇as＇quantitative＇

Fig 5．21：Nominal group NUMERATION system（＇instantial＇interpretation）


The possibility that＇quantitative＇was a deliberate choice is suggested by the Japanese translation of the nominal group：四年生 $\rightarrow$ yon－nen－sei $\rightarrow 4$ year student．Since Japanese does distinguish between quantitative and ordinative numeration in some contexts －e．g．，＂This is my $4^{\text {th }}$ year＂：四年目です $\rightarrow$ yon－nen－me desu－（This is my） $4^{\text {th }}$ year－this
suggests that the problem is specific to the compound noun structure Classifier (Numerator + Thing), whereby English continues to distinguish between quantitative and ordinative functions, but Japanese does not.

An SFG approach to this problem points to the use of agnate structures, a technique used to illustrate a great number of points in Halliday \& Matthiessen (2014). (This is not to suggest that the concept of agnate structures is unique to Hallidayan grammar, but rather that the principal is fundamental to the way SFG is presented, and that therefore 'an SFG approach to error' will include agnate structures as an analytic tool where appropriate.)

In reference to the current example, we can help learners understand the difference between, say, 'I'm a $4^{\text {th }}$ year student' and 'This is a 4 -year course' by asking them to consider the following agnate clauses:
(i) I'm in my $4^{\text {th }}$ year
(ii) This course goes for 4 years

As can now be clearly seen, the two Classifiers, which appeared almost identical, have translated into quite difference functions. Thus, in (i) the underlined prepositional phrase realises a circumstantial Atribute of metaphorical Location $\rightarrow$ Place (or perhaps Location $\rightarrow$ Time) beginning with 'in', whereas in (ii) it realises a Circumstance of Extent $\rightarrow$ Duration beginning with 'for'. This points to the system network we encountered in EC1a, reproduced below:

Fig 5.22: Simplified CIRCUMSTANCE TYPE system network


Looked at in this way, the student has taken the path indicated in red in Fig 5.22. Whereas the intended meaning was '4th year is the year I am currently (located) in', the meaning he actually produced was ' 4 years is the duration of my student status'.

Using the NUMERATION and CIRCUMSTANCE TYPE systems together in this way not only helps to reinforce the difference between qualitative and ordinative realisations, but has the additional advantage of making the language less of a mystery, and more of an integrated whole. One aspect of language rarely explored in EFL classrooms is the relationship between alternative ways of expressing similar meanings. Learning to manipulate agnate structures is one way to do this, and an important tool of an SFG approach.

EC 6 (4 errors)
ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of experiential structure

This category contains errors that are more usefully seen as a structural, syntagmatic problem than as involving the 'paradigmatic axis' (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). There are four instances of EC6; they are listed in Table 5.19, and this is followed by the error description:

Table 5.19: Four instances of EC6

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E285: S-I21.C14 | I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks. |
| E681: JI2.C9.2 | 'What do you like baseball team?' |
| E683: JI2.C11.2 | 'Who do you like baseball player?'' |
| E693: JI4.C5.2 | 'What do you like sport?'' |

Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of experiential structure

An initial point to observe here is that three of the instances of this category occur in 'Job Interview' texts, which is the only topic that encouraged students to attempt interrogative mood. Therefore, and notwithstanding the fact that E681 and E683 come from the same text, it would be a mistake to dismiss EC6 as containing a small number of tokens. On the contrary, the error exemplified in the interrogative clauses is frequently to be heard in the Japanese EFL classroom.

The category itself contains nominal groups whose 'experiential structure' has been disrupted. This 'experiential structure' is insightfully identified by Halliday and Matthiessen as "the experiential patterning that is embodied in nominal group structure", the "progression... from the kind of element that has the greatest specifying potential to that which has the least" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 380, 381). For instance, in 'What baseball team', the Deictic 'what' concerns "the immediate context, the identification of the item in terms of the here-\&-now" (compare 'my baseball team', 'this baseball team') (p. 380). ('About three' plays a similar role in E285, although "quantitative features" are "less naturally definitive" than Deictics (p.380)). Classifiers have the least "identifying potential" (p. 381), and so 'baseball' occurs immediately before the Thing itself. (Qualitative attributes have more potential to specify, so an Epithet such as 'hopeless' would have come before the

Classifier (though after any Deictics and Numerators)).
However, the issue here is not the order of elements within the nominal group, but the fact that its dedicated structure has been interrupted. The writers have actually maintained the correct order, but in E285 the prepositional group 'for' has come between the Numerator 'three' and its sub-modifier 'about', while in the other three instances both the verbal group 'do...like' and an additional nominal group 'you' have inserted themselves between Deictic and Classifier / Thing. (An interesting point to note is that, if we take an SFG position regarding prepositions and see them as Minor Processes, then in all four cases the nominal group is interrupted by a Process element.) Except under exceptional circumstances, the ESN does not permit the experiential structure of the nominal group to be interrupted. An SFG approach to error can thus highlight not only where such an interruption has occurred, its location in purely syntagmatic terms, and also in terms of the pattern of experiential specificity, but also the fundamental point that there is an experiential structure to be interrupted. For students who have an EC6 issue, this may be an important step towards resolving it.

This ability of SFG to simultaneously raise awareness of structure and function, of the existence of a structure and its semantic role, mirrors what we found earlier regarding system network diagrams, and appears to be an beneficial consequence of applying Hallidayan theory to grammatical errors.

We have seen, then, that nominal groups embody an experiential structure, and that this has been disrupted in the four instances of EC6. It may have been noticed, however, that whereas E285 is contained within the bounds of a preposition phrase Circumstance, E681, E683 and E693 resonate across the entire clause. In so doing, they have disrupted the basic clause structure Theme ${ }^{\wedge}$ Rheme, which belongs to the textual metafunction. This means that we are able to identify a new error category, EC34, which despite being a clause
rank category should be brought in to the discussion here. The error description and Table of instances are as follows:

EC 34 (3 errors)
ED: $\quad$ Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Theme $\wedge$ Rheme structure

Table 5.20: List of EC34 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E680: JI2.C9.1 | 'What do you like baseball team?' |
| E682: JI2.C11.1 | 'Who do you like baseball player?' |
| E692: J14.C5.1 | 'What do you like sport?' |

Here, students have chosen, wrongly, to dissect the Theme, and place one part in the Rheme. This error is understandable because the WH- element often acts alone as interpersonal/experiential Theme, for example in 'What is your name?'. Indeed, in the three instances of EC34, the learners have shown a partial understanding of the basic thematic principle that "one particular element comes first", that element being the one expressing "the missing piece of information" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 101). It is only a partial understanding, however, because the writers have failed to grasp that, in cases such as these, the full compass of that 'particular element' goes beyond the WH-item itself. This is due to another thematic principle, that the Theme extends up to and including the first ideational-experiential element of the clause (Halliday \& Matthiessen, Chapter 3). In JI2.C4, for example, the textual and experiential structure of the agnate declarative mood clause would have been:

Theme [Senser ( $I$ ] + Rheme [Mental Process (like) + Phenomenon (X baseball team)],
where the experiential Theme is Senser (I), and the rest of the clause is Rheme. In the interrogative mood, the structure should become:

Theme [Phenomenon (What baseball team)] + Rheme [Mental Pro... (do) + Senser (you) + ...cess (like)],
where the experiential Theme is Phenomenon (Which team), with the remainder as Rheme. (Note: some SFG analysts would not include 'do' in the experiential analysis, considering it as embodying only an interpersonal function)

It can now be seen that what the writer has done is to place part of the experiential Theme in the Rheme, thus:

Th... [Phenom... (What) + Rheme [Mental Pro... (do) + Senser (you) + ...cess (like)] + ...eme [...enon (baseball team)]

Therefore, although the interpersonal Theme is intact in the question word 'What', the experiential Theme has been partly displaced. Since an element cannot be both Theme and Rheme at the same time, and since more importantly the experiential Theme is incomplete, we have the textual errors categorised as EC34.

In summary, the four nominal groups in Table 5.19 above show a disrupted experiential structure we categorise as EC6. In addition, three of these point to a clause rank textual error, whereby part of the Theme has been placed in the Rheme. These 3 errors
occur within a separate category, EC34. An SFG approach has therefore shed light on these errors by (i) establishing that there are two discontinuous structures involved, one at group rank and one at clause rank, (ii) describing the nature of the patterns that have been disrupted, and (iii) revealing that there are two lines of meaning involved, an experiential one and a cohesive textual one. It should also be noted that, while both errors are located at group rank, EC34 clearly resonates throughout the clause since it is a disruption of the clausal Theme ${ }^{\wedge}$ Rheme structure. We could therefore posit an additional error category to capture this fact, but as already stated the EA in this thesis is restricting composite analyses to those affecting metafunction.

## EC 7 (4 errors)

ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of grammatical relationships within a nominal group

Although this error concerns the incorrect realisation of lexicogrammatical wordings, and is therefore similar in kind to the 'instantial' interpretations of previous categories, the term 'structural' is preferred here (see the Error Description (ED above) because, just as with EC10 discussed above, there is no competing system interpretation here. Unlike EC10, however, which involved the textual Information structure', the errors in this category are not linked to a particular metafunctional structure, such as Mood structure or Transitivity structure. Therefore, the description employs the term 'structural' to distinguish errors of this type from 'instantial' and 'structure' errors.

Though the 4 errors share the fact that they fail to correctly realise grammatical relationships, each error manifests a different variation on the theme. From that perspective, there are four sub-categories of EC7; these shall be briefly discussed in turn.

## EC 7 a (1 error)

ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural relationship between Head and Thing

The single error in this category, and its error description, can be seen in the ED above and the table below:

Table 5.21: One instance of EC7a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E139: S-I12.C10 | I like \{various kinds [str book] \}. |

Here, the relationship between Head (kinds) and Thing (book), which is categorised by Halliday and Matthiessen as 'type-collective' ('type' as opposed to 'measure', and 'collective' indicating that that Head is larger than the Thing (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 394-395)), should be marked by 'of', the "generalised marker of a structural relationship between nominals" (p. 394). The learner has not realised 'of', however, and this constitutes the error. (Note that, since the structure concerned involves both experiential and logical elements, the error is located generally in the ideational metafunction.)

EC 7b (1 error)
ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural relationship between possessive Deictic and Thing

The Table below, shows the only example of EC7b:

Table 5.22: One instance of EC7b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E186: S-I15.C13 | I'm interested in [other country poss] culture. |

Here, there is a relationship of metaphorical possession between 'other country' and 'culture'. This should be marked with apostrophe + ' $s$ ', but has not been. Functionally, the effect of the missing apostrophe is to change 'other country' from Deictic to Classifier. This structural-functional interplay is something that a traditional approach would be unlikely to pick up, but which an SFG perspective is able to highlight.

## EC 7c (1 error)

ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural relationship between Modifier and Head

The single error in this category is shown in Table 5.23:

Table 5.23: One instance of EC7c

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E76: S-I8.C6 | This year \{my karate $\underline{\text { ' }}$ dream\} is [[I win the All Japan championship]] |

Here, the learner has inserted an explicit structural marker between the second Modifier ('karate') and the Head ('dream'), where this is not required by the ESN. As
discussed earlier, the relationship between Modifier and Head is the logical one of sub-categorisation; this relationship is inherent in the order of the elements themselves, and there is no extra marking required, or indeed available. In the example, the learner has successfully established the interpersonal marker of possession ('my'), but has then chosen, inappropriately, to mark the Modifier-Head relationship as well. The reader will observe that functionally, this is the reverse of EC7b: 'karate' has become Deictic instead of Classifier.

EC 7d (1 error)
ED: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect metafunctional realisation of structural relationship

The single error in this category, and its error description, are as follows:

Table 5.24: One instance of EC7d

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E430: LW8.C1.3 | I had test /of driving] on last weekend. |

This fourth variation of EC7 has occurred because the learner has mistaken the logical relationship of Modifier-Head sub-categorisation for the experiential relationship of thing-Qualifier post-Modification. To clarify, 'driving' is actually a sub-category of 'test', providing the probable expert reconstruction,

I had a driving test (on) last weekend.

The learner's text is reminiscent of cases such as 'a test of skill'. But the latter does not
require the reconstruction＇a skill test＇，because the function of＇skill＇is not primarily a logical one，serving to sub－categorise，but an experiential one，serving to specify．The distinction is a subtle one，but the failure to realise it leads to the error．

There are two important observations to make regarding the four errors gathered together as EC7．First，it is helpful to note that，in Japanese，the structural marker＇$の$＇ （written＇no＇in roman letters）can be used in all four instances（‘の＇＝structural marker）：
（i）いろんな本の種類（literally：various book／s＋の＋kind／s）
（ii）ほかの国の文化（literally：other＋の＋country＇s／－ies（country＋の）＋culture
（iii）私の空手の夢（literally：my（I＋の）＋karate＋の＋dream）
（iv）免許の試験（literally：license＋の＋test）

This suggests that learners may benefit from some dissection of the structural functions＇of＇， ＇＇s＇and Modifier－Head sub－categorisation，and how they compare with Japanese realisations，where＇の’ takes on all three functions．

Second，and in keeping with points made earlier in this error analysis，it is significant that the errors occur across different metafunctions．Apart from the fact that such access to the layering of meaning is a particular advantage of taking an SFG approach to error，it also suggests classroom feedback possibilities．For instance，learners can be encouraged to associate possessive Deictics with interpersonal meanings，and thus see them as functioning to encode writer－reader relationships．Then，in E77，the words＇my＇and ＇karate＇s＇can be compared on this basis．The student should see that＇my＇tells the reader ＇whose＇dream is being evoked，but that the＇＇s＇in＇karate＇s＇plays no interpersonal role at all．Ideally，the student may wonder about the の in the Japanese translation，and this could
lead to a useful discussion about the contribution of the logical metafunction.
To sum up, EC7 errors occur only once per sub-category, but together they show how an SFG perspective can locate important commonalities, and at the same time expose revealing differences.

We have discussed 6 'primary' error categories concerning the experiential line of meaning within nominal groups. The next category, EC8, occurs within the logical metafunction.

EC 8 (2 errors)
ED: $\quad$ Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of nominal group Head

There are only 2 instances of EC8, perhaps indicating that the issue is not a serious one for Japanese students (see Table 5.25).

Table 5.25: Two instances of EC8

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E417: LW7.C6(i).3 | \{My part-time Head\} is at restaurant [[which is beef tongue]]. |
| E467: LW13.C2 | Because I had \{a TOEIC Head $\}.$ |

While not all nominal groups contain the experiential function Thing (for instance, 'sad' in 'He's sad' is Epithet, not Thing), the logical function Head is a requirement in every nominal group. In the following examples, the Head is underlined:

He's sad (Epithet as Head)
Are you going to eat all three? (Numerator as Head)

Are you going to eat all three apples? (Thing as Head)

As Halliday and Matthiessen explain, when applied to the nominal group the particular logical structure involved is the relationship of sub-categorisation, whereby, in effect, each element in the structure is considered to be a sub-category of the elements to the right (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 388-389). For instance, consider the likely reconstruction of E417:

My part-time job is at restaurant which is beef tongue.

Here, 'part-time' is a sub-category of job, in paradigmatic relation with other sub-types of job such as 'full time' and 'temporary', and 'my' is a sub-category of 'part-time job', in paradigmatic relation with other sub-types such as 'your' and 'Tuesday night's'. From this perspective, then, the error in E417 and E467 is that the writers have included the modifying elements - the sub-categories - but have failed to include the Head - the 'host' category, as it were.

An SFG analysis can thus help to show students who are prone to this error the functional 'point' of elements in the logical structure. The idea that sub-categories build towards a category that is not 'sub', is a simple one, a logical one in fact. It also makes sense that if the 'host' is unrealised, then the sub-categories remain in limbo, their functional role unfulfilled. This means that even very low level learners can engage with the nominal group's logical structure, even while the experiential structure, with its complex system networks, remains problematic.
(Note: Readers might wish to point out with regard to E467 that expert speakers often use test names as Head, as in I've got TOEIC next week or I think the TOEFL is the
hardest test. However, this seems to be related to the notion of specificity/recoverability. In the first example, 'TOEIC' may be interpreted as a proper name, while in the second case 'test' is ellipsed and the Deictic 'the' signifies homophoric reference (see EC36). Expert speakers tend not to use this logical structure with non-specific singular reference: I'm doing an IELTS tomorrow is unusual. We may therefore interpret E467 as having an unrealised Head.)

With EC8, the 7 ideational nominal group rank categories are complete. We may now turn to verbal groups, since the only interpersonal and textual nominal group categories have already been discussed (see EC2c and EC2d above).

### 5.2.3.2.2 Verbal group error categories

There are 6 primary error categories identified within the class of verbal group, though again, several of these are divided into sub-categories. The analysis begins with ideational-experiential categories of error. (Note that the analysis begins with EC12, as EC 11 is postponed until a later point.)

## EC $12 a$ ( 10 errors)

ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'

ED2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'.

There are 10 instances of EC12a, in which the system EVENT NUMBER proved problematic to learners. These are listed in Table 5.26:

Table 5.26: Ten instances of EC12a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E218: S-I17.C6 | She study piano. |
| E219: S-I17.C7.1 | She play piano well more than me. |
| E222: S-I17.C9 | She teach piano at my house. |
| E505: LW16.C5.5 | (...) but test begin at 13:00. |
| E589: FD3.C3(bii) | (But I want) to work [Ithat use English]]. Such as CA, h.w. and announcer. |
| E603: FD5.C1(bii).2 | (I want) to become supervisor[[who make TV program]]. |
| E619: FD7.C1(bii) | (I will want to do) [[need English]] ( job). |
| E638: FD9.C2(bii).7 | (I would like to become) someone [[make happy]]. |
| E652: FD10.C6 | But there are only English always, (...) |
| E723: J19.C4.2 | 'Because your company have good future.' |

EC12a may be a controversial category, partly because it is more often conceived as subject-verb 'agreement' or 'concord' (e.g. Lee, 2004) and analysed as an entirely form-based phenomenon, and partly because there is no EVENT NUMBER system in the verbal group networks provided in works such as Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) or Matthiessen (1995). However, at least two factors point towards the idea that the verbal group contains such a system.

First, as Halliday constantly points out, grammatical features do not arise in a vacuum, but evolve along with the communicative needs of a community (Halliday, 1978). The fact, therefore, that in some languages the distinction between singular and plural is grammaticalised in the verb must have meaning. The argument that in many languages (e.g. Japanese) such a distinction is not present in the verb and therefore the phenomenon must be purely syntagmatic is unconvincing. Japanese does not display a Number distinction in nouns, either, and nobody would argue that there was no systemic meaning there.

Secondly, given the isolated clauses
(a) Some was eaten, and

## (b) Some were eaten,

the only form difference is in the verb. Yet this is enough to tell us significant features of the thing eaten - so in (a), we know that something considered to be a 'mass substance', such as cake or roast chicken, was consumed, while in (b) something considered isolatable, such as pieces of cake or chicken wings, was eaten. To claim that this difference is deducible from the form, and has nothing to do with meaning, is like saying that the difference between 'is' and 'was' in He is sleeping and he was sleeping is entirely form-based, and unconnected to the interpersonal function embodied in the Finite.

For these reasons, it seems justifiable to posit an EVENT NUMBER system, perhaps situated after the network choices '(i) verbal group $\rightarrow$ (ii) FINITENESS: finite $\rightarrow$ (iii) DEITICITY: temporal $\rightarrow$ (iv) TENSE: present' (see Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014, p. 410). If this is accepted, the usual two interpretations for system-based errors are indicated.

Starting with the instantial interpretation, and using E226 as illustration, a basic system diagram of the error

E226: She study piano
looks like this,

Fig 5.23: 'Instantial' interpretation of EC12a

and the error description is,

Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'.

This SFG-oriented analysis of the error can make a contribution in the classroom the nature of which may be starting to become clear. With this first interpretation it is to say to the learner, "OK, you made an error in your wording, but you understand the concept of the 'singular' / 'non-singular' choice at issue. That's positive. Unfortunately, your choice of realisation actually has a different meaning in the system, not the one you are intending. Remember, it is not enough to make a meaningful selection; that selection must then reappear in the wording you choose, and then in the expression."

The second, system interpretation, is even more meaning-focussed. The diagram and error description are:

Fig 5.24: ‘System’ interpretation of EC12a


Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'.

Here, we are saying to the learner, "Yes, your realisation of 'non-singular' perfectly matched the meaning you chose; that's a positive. Unfortunately, in this clause the verbal group should contain a 'singular' meaning, shouldn't it? Let's think about why you chose 'non-singular'.

It is not so much that an SFG approach to error places the burden of choice on the writer; it is a much more positive, empowering responsibility that we are encouraging learners to embrace. That is, the learner is being exposed to the truth that (a) she is in control of her choices, and that (b) those choices are the same ones available to expert writers. The only difference between a text containing EC12a errors, and one with no such error, is that the author of the latter made the correct selection from the very accessible system EVENT NUMBER. In this way, SFG has the potential to make language learning much less of a mystery.

## EC 12b (4 errors)

ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'

ED2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular

This category contains the 4 instances shown in Table 5.27:

Table 5.27: Four instances of EC12b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E7: S-I1.C7.4 | Favourite foods $\underline{\text { is }}$ Karashirenkon, and Basashi. |
| E78: S-I8.C9.2 | My favourite sports $\underline{\text { is }}$ badminton, tennis, soccer. |
| E243: S-I18.C18 | (Air is clear,) people $\underline{\text { is }}$ very kind, (and food is delicious.) |
| E268: S-I19.C14 | Why does university students have to find a job ...? |

The analysis of this category does not raise any significant factors beyond those covered in EC12a. Therefore, no further discussion is deemed necessary.

## Error Category 13 (1 error)

ED: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ anomalous

Little needs to be said about this error, as there is no evidence in the data, nor in my general experience, to suggest that this is anything other than an anomalous error. It is worth pointing out, however, that it occurs within an embedded clause functioning as Act (Halliday \& Matthiessen, p. 251), and that this gels with previous observations regarding complex structures. As mentioned earlier, this point will be discussed briefly later in the chapter. The single instance is shown below.

Table 5.28: One instance of EC13

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E716: J12.C8[i] | (I like) [la watching baseball.' ']] |

## EC14a (6 errors)

ED: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

Turning now to the logical metafunction, EC14a contains 6 instances where the selection 'Present' from the SECONDARY TENSE system has caused the learners problems. Several examples are shown in Table 5.29.

Table 5.29: Six instances of EC14a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E30: S-I4.C3.2 | I'm live in Saitama. |
| E49: S-I6.C4.2 | I'm_live in Chiba. |
| E106: S-I10.C16 | We are practise our dance every Monday and Thursday. |
| E520: LW16.C17 | I was look forward to this movie. |
| E563: FD2.C5(b) | (I think) my English skill is improve. |
| E670: FD11.C9 | I'm go, (and I make friends.) |

Here, it is not important whether or not the selection of a particular tense was the best alternative (E30 and E49 are dubious, for example, with the present tense strongly indicated). What matters is that the learners did choose to employ a Secondary Tense, but realised it incorrectly. There is no 'system' interpretation here, only a structural one (the term 'instantial is reserved for incorrect realisations from systems). That is to say, the error is in line with traditional approaches, and considered a formal mistake.

However, note that the error description still centres on meaning in an SFG approach:

## Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

Whereas a traditional analysis would merely bring the omission of '-ing' to a learner's attention, an SFG perspective highlights the point that these verbal groups contain two present tenses. The first, Primary Tense present, is interpersonal and indicates the 'now' (or 'then' in E520) of the speech event. However, the second, Secondary Tense present, narrows
the focus to indicate: 'as for now (then), I am (was) actually engaged in a particular activity' (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014). It is this 'ongoing', or 'incomplete', sense that is the contribution of the logical metafunction, and realised by '-ing'.

In short, even errors of form are revealed by an SFG approach to be meaning-related.

EC $14 b$ ( 2 errors)
ED: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'past'

Table 5.30 shows the only 2 instances of EC14b:

Table 5.30: 2 EC14b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E216: S-I17.C3.2 | I had play piano at junior high school. |
| E225: S-I17.C12.3 | I had go Okinawa at March. |

In substance, the error analysis is identical to EC14a except that the Secondary Tense involved is 'past' in these examples. Once again it is irrelevant that in neither instance is the past-in-past (past perfect) tense appropriate. The errors are assigned to the category because 'Secondary Tense $\rightarrow$ past' has been incorrectly realised.

EC $14 c$ (4 errors)
ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection of ${ }^{\prime}$ Secondary Tense,

EC14c is different from the previous sub-categories of EC14 because here the
learner has encountered a systemic choice. Specifically, these errors occur where only a Primary Tense has been selected, but where the most likely English System Network reconstruction also utilises a Secondary Tense. Some examples are provided in Table 5.31:

Table 5.31: One instance of EC14c

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E661: FD11.C5 | It $\underline{\text { iq }}$ my future dream (since I'm a child.) |

To take E661 as illustration, the learner selected Primary Tense: 'present', but no Secondary Tense:

E661: It is my future dream (since I'm a child.)

However, an expert writer knows that to codify the important element of past time into the first clause requires the selection of Secondary Tense: 'past', giving:

It has been my future dream (since I'm a child.)

Once again, we can see that an SFG approach can help learners understand their errors in a uniquely meaning-oriented way. Rather than alerting them to a 'wrong tense', the analysis provided above can highlight the true meaning of the 'serial' English tense system (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014). The student seems to know that there is an element of 'present' in the meaning - hence her use of 'is'. And she appears also aware of a past element - in 'since I'm a child'. But an SFG approach can teach students how to put these elements into a single verb form, though a combination of Priary and Secondary tense choices.

EC 14d (4 errors)
ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection of ${ }^{\prime}+$ Secondary Tense,

As can be seen from the example in Table 5.32, this is the opposite of EC14c. Here, there was no need for the learner to select Secondary Tense, since Primary Tense itself would have been the appropriate realisation of the 'intended' meanings. That she did select Secondary Tense thus constitutes an error.

Table 5.32: One instance of EC14d

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E215: S-I7.C3.1 | I had play piano at junior high school. |

The next few error categories deal with the interpersonal metafunction.

## EC $15 a$ (17 errors)

ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite'

ED2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

EC15 errors involve the interpersonal system FINITENESS (see below). The larger group is EC15a which contains 17 instances. 10 of these are listed in Table 5.33:

Table 5.33: Ten instances of EC15a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E19: S-I2.C3[ii].2 | My hobby is [[watching baseball]] and [[\{listen\} to music]]. |
| E26: S-I3.C8[i].2 | I like [[ \{go\} to karaoke]]. |
| E72: S-I7.C16(‘ $\beta$ ).3 | (I want) \{keep\} collect. |
| E73: S-I7.C16(‘ $\beta$ ).4 | \{I want\} keep \{collect . |
| E92: S-I9.C12[i].2 | (I hate) [[sing]] (because I can't do well.) |
| E113: S-I10.C18[i].3 | I like [ [watch a movie]] |
| E118: S-I10.C21(‘ $\beta$ ).2 | (I want) go to Tsutaya after school. |
| E140: S-I12.C7.2 | I \{began play\} volleyball (when I was jr high school student and I continue it.) |
| E178: S-I14.C14[i].2 | (My hobby is) [[listen to music]] |
| E315: SR3.C9.3 | (I usually study English) use textbook. |

The Table shows that this error occurs in a variety of grammatical contexts: in embedded clauses following an emotive Mental Process (e.g. E26), in desiderative Mental Process projections (e.g. E118), in non-finite hypotactic expansions (e.g. E315) and in nominalisations functioning as Complement (E178).

As usual, since FINITENESS is a system, there are two possible interpretations of the error.

## Interpretation 1

In the instantial interpretation of EC15a, writers made the appropriate choice to access the FINITENESS system, and also correctly opted for 'non-finite', but failed to realise the correct wording. This is illustrated in Fig 5.25.

## Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite'

Fig 5.25: Verbal group FINITENESS system ('instantial' interpretation)


Interpretation 1 says that the learners' problem lies not in identifying when to choose non-finite verbal groups, but in mastering their form. Other than to refer the reader to previous discussions of the utility of network diagrams, then, there seems little to add except to note in passing that the structures involved (embedded clauses, mental projections, nominalisations and hypotactic expansions) have in common an advanced degree of syntactic complexity. This might partly explain why, even after one or more redrafts, and even though they have selected the correct option, writers appear to be missing the fact that they have realised certain non-finite verbal groups as finite. We shall return to this point later.

## Interpretation 2

From this perspective, EC15a involves the incorrect systemic choice of 'finite'. The error description and system diagram are shown below:

Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Fig 5.26: Verbal group FINITENESS system ('system' interpretation)


In contrast to the first interpretation, this analysis of EC15a errors implies that some learners have difficulty in conceptualising when to employ non-finite verbal groups. One possible way to approach this problem is to show students that the Finite element in a verbal group indicates that a particular clause is given temporal (or modal) identity; this identity is not required, or not appropriate, in non-finite clauses. For instance, in E111, (I want) go to

Tsutaya after school, the temporal identity is 'present', as indicated by the Primary Tense selection in the projecting clause $I$ want. This can be confirmed by imagining a second 'speaker', who in disagreeing with the first says "No you don't." This means, 'No, you don't want, now, to go to Tsutaya.' While the verbal group in the projected clause go to Tsutaya, contains crucial experiential information in the form of the Material Process ' go ', temporally speaking, it is irrelevant. The argument is not about 'going', it is about 'wanting'. Therefore, the second verb does not need to show temporality, and indeed, according to the conventions of the ESN, must not. Note that this 'explanation' is not pretending to be theoretically sophisticated. However, it uses the SFG emphasis on the functional meaning of elements to help learners understand their errors.

In this interpretation of EC15a, then, learners have incorrectly realised the correct selection of 'non-finite'. Before turning to EC15b, however, the question of form in non-finite verbal groups opens the door to a new lexicogrammatical system, that of ASPECT. Earlier, we deferred the analysis of Aspect errors. Now is the appropriate time to take up that discussion.

## EC 11 a (5 errors)

Having chosen 'non-finite' from the system, writers are faced with choosing the appropriate 'Aspect' of the verb. The choice, initially at least, is between imperfective (I like playing tennis) and perfective (I like to play tennis). This is illustrated in Figure 5.27:

Fig 5.27: Verbal group FINITENESS and ASPECT systems


Some verbs require a choice of one Aspect or the other. The errors categorised as 11a are cases where the appropriate choice was 'imperfective', but learners failed to realise it (see Table 5.24).

Table 5.24: Three instances of EC11a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E560: LW16.C23.2 | (I walked my house, ) used umbrella |
| E655: FD7.C3.2 | From become a university student |
| E149: S-I12.C14[i].3 | (I like) [[watch the movie]], too. ECIIb |

As can be seen, the actual realisations (used, become, etc) show a formal issue, in that leaerners have failed to supply the imperfective ending '-ing'. Therefore, the error is described as structural:

ED: Group rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfect'Aspect

## EC11b (5 errors)

This category is essentially the same as the previous one, except that the verbs involved require the selection of 'perfective' Aspect, and learners have made structural
errors in their realisations (Table 5.25).

Table 5.25: Five instances of EC11b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E69: S-I7.C16[‘ $\beta$ ].1 | (I want) keep collect. |
| E115: S-I10.C21[‘ $\beta$ ].1 | (I want) go to Tsutaya after school. |
| E690:FD11.C1\|(‘ $\beta$ ).1 | (I want) be a groundstaff |
| E559: FD2.C2(' $\beta$ ) | (I want) to diving in Oafa Island and I want to feel nature. |
| E752: J16.C6 | ('I want) to recording.' |

## EC 11c (10 errors)

Other verbs, however, allow writers a choice of Aspect. The examples in Table 5.26 show three of these verbs (play, watch, listen):

Table 5.26: Three instances of EC11c

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E136: S-I12.C7.1 | I (began play] v/ball (when I was jnr high school student and I continue it.) |
| E146: S-I12.C14[i].3 | (I like) [[watch the movie]], too. |
| E174: S-I14.C14[i].2 | My hobby is listen to music |

This time, the verbs as realised lie in a kind of limbo state between perfective and imperfective. We can analyse this as learners failing to take advantage of the opportunity to select for Aspect, giving us the following instantial interpretation:

ED: Group rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to select from the ASPECT system.

In EFL textbooks in Japan, what we are calling 'Aspect' here is usually referred to
as the formal choice between 'ing-verbs' and 'to-verbs'. These appear in arbitrary lists, and rarely if ever is an attempt to associate the selection of one or the other with a motivation based on meaning. A Hallidayan perspective, however, is different, and has encouraging pedagogical implications. Specifically, Halliday and Matthiessen suggest that "the imperfective represents the real, or actual, mode of non-finiteness ('realis'), while the perfective represents the potential or virtual ('irrealis')" (2014: 490). While by no means implying that this is a foolproof guide, it does appear to explain a great number of problematic instances.

To take an example from each category, in

E560: I walked my house, used umbrella,
we can suggest to students that this is realis: the narrator did walk to his house, and therefore '-ing' is indicated. In

E690: I want be a groundstaff,
'wanting' implies that this is irrealis: the learner is not 'a groundstaff' yet, and so 'to' is indicated. Finally, the tendency within the ESN to use imperfective Aspect in examples such as

E174: My hobby is listen to music,
can be explained by the fact that, if it is a hobby, then this is more realis than irrealis: the writer does listen to music, and often, so '-ing' is indicated.

## EC $15 b$ ( 10 errors)

ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'

ED2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-finite'

To return now to EC15, EC15b is the opposite of its companion; learners have selected 'non-finite' rather than 'finite'. Table 5.37 lists the 10 examples:

Table 5.37: Ten instances of EC15b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E82: S-I8.C16 | (I usually listen to music) or sleeping in my free time. |
| E329: SR6.C7.4 | I listening a music. |
| E330: SR6.C10.2 | I cooking dinner for my family. |
| E332: SR6.C16.3 | I swimming in pool. |
| E339: SR7.C5.3 | I watching movie. |
| E344: SR7.C9.2 | I reading a book. |
| E345: SR7.C10 | I cooking breakfast. |
| E497: LW15.C14.4 | Before test, I listening to music. |
| E550: LW17.C7.2 | After I watching TV I slept to 2am. |
| E565: FD2.C6.2 | I listening Eng an hour every day now. For example, many CD, movie and music. |

An interesting point that emerges from the Table is that six of the examples come from just two texts, SR6 and SR7. The implication, that EC15b does not represent as serious a problem as it might at first seem from the relatively large number of instances, is supported by a second factor. It is notable that, in every case, the erroneous groups in SR6-7 occur in simple Subject + (Finite)/Predicator structures (I cooking, I swimming, etc). This contrasts with the remaining three tokens, which are contained within clause complexes (e.g. (1): (...) or I sleeping...) and/or are part of or follow a marked Theme (e.g. (8): Before test, I
listening...). This raises the possibility that the authors of SR6-7 are particularly low-level learners, and that the FINITENESS system is perhaps not a major issue for slightly higher-level writers unless the structure is surrounded by complicating factors such as clause complexing. A closer look at the two texts supports this argument, since both SR6 and SR7 contain the tell-tale use of short, single clause sentences, which nevertheless betray insecure grammar: I visit a grandmother's house...I listening a music...I swimming in pool (SR6), I go to shopping...I watching movie...Because I love musical (SR7).

The point being made here is that, of the two interpretations shown above in the error descriptions, these errors are best analysed as instantial - as the incorrect realisation of 'finite.'

## ECs 16a, 16 (3 errors)

Table 5.38 shows the three errors in EC16

TABLE 5.38: One instance of EC16a and 2 instances of EC16b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E15: S-I1.C10.2 | I \{couldn't come\} this class for four weeks. |
| E528: LW16.C21 | I can't cycling. |
| E508: LW16.C10.2 | I can't hear listening [TEST].. |

In the verbal group system network presented by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, p. 410) the sub-system Deiticity involves a choice regarding the Finite such that it is either temporal or modal. The former leads to the system of TENSE (covered in this error analysis by the clausal PRIMARY TENSE system; see EC26), but the latter has no further stages of delicacy. While on most occasions, at least in the English System Network as it is now, the modal element carries no sense of temporality (as, for instance, in the invented example He
must have played yesterday) this is not always the case.
For instance, compare the following examples:
(a) I can't come to this class for four weeks
(b) I couldn't come to this class for four weeks

In these invented examples, the two underlined structures differ only in the modal verbs 'can't' and 'couldn't'. Moreover, there is no other signal in the clause of temporality (other than Duration in 'for four weeks'). And yet we know that (a) is referring to the future, and (b) to the past. The temporal feature can only be in the modal verb itself, and therefore it seems justified to posit a MODAL TENSE system situated after DEITICITY.

If this is accepted, the following descriptions and system diagrams result for EC16a:

ED1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

ED2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ MODAL TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'past'

Fig 5.28: EC16: 'instantial' interpretation
$\rightarrow$ DEITICITY $\rightarrow \begin{aligned} & \text { temporal } \rightarrow \text { TENSE } \\ & \text { modal } \rightarrow \text { MODAL TENSE } \rightarrow\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { Modal Tense } \rightarrow\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { present (can't come, etc) } \\ \text { couldn't come }\end{array}\right. \\ \text {-Modal Tense }\end{array} \text { (couldn't come, etc) }\right.\end{aligned}$

Fig 5.29: EC16: ‘instantial' interpretation


The two errors contained in EC16b would have the same analysis (merely replacing 'past' for present), so it is not repeated here.

This concludes the analysis of group-rank errors and error categories. There is one category, however, that is indeterminable between group and phrase rank, and errors in this category are discussed next. (Note: the term 'phrase rank' is discussed in section 5.2.5)

### 5.2.4 Group/phrase rank error categories

### 5.2.4.1 Introduction

There is only one error category where the rank of the item concerned is unable to be determined.

### 5.2.4.2 Group/phrase rank category

## EC 17 ( 10 errors)

ED: Phrase / Group rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

This category is one of several where the error description carries the phrase 'intended realisation unrecoverable'. EC17 is unique in that, although in most cases the 252
writers' overall meaning is clear, there are elements of two different groups/phrases in the realisations, and an expert writer could use either one of them. Five instances of the category are shown in Table 5.39.

Table 5.39: Five instances of EC17

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E229: S-I17.C18 | (I like travel) but I can't travel much time. |
| E305: SR3.C4.3 | I usually go to shopping on alone. |
| E481: LW15.C3 | I got up at early. |
| E544: LW17.C3 | After I came back to home at 12:00pm |
| E724: JI2.C14(b).2 | I want to work this company for childhood |

To illustrate the point, E305 could be reconstructed as either I usually go shopping alone (adverbial group), or as I usually go shopping on my own (preposition phrase). Similarly, E544 could be read as After I came back home at 12:00pm (adverbial group), and equally as After I came back to my house at 12:00pm (preposition phrase).

Because the reconstruction is unclear, the error description is:

## Phrase / Group rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

The reader may protest that there is a simpler solution, namely to view the error as the spurious insertion of a preposition at the beginning of an adverbial group, giving us alone, last weekend, there, early, home and abroad. However, since each erroneous unit begins with the preposition, and since, as already demonstrated, there is a perfectly acceptable agnate preposition phrase for each adverbial group, we cannot completely dismiss valid expressions such as on my own, to (the place), at dawn, and in another country.

An SFG approach supports this view because, as has been pointed out several times already, SFG interprets lexicogrammatical wordings as realisations of semantic meanings. We are able, therefore, to transcend a view of EC17 as simply containing ill-formed adverbial groups. For example, the difference in meaning between 'last weekend, and 'on the weekend' might be small, but it exists nevertheless (the former contains an ordinative Numerator, for instance, while the latter contains homophoric reference). For this reason, we are able to describe the structures in EC 17 as being semantically unclear.

Finally, it should be noted that among this group E229 is anomalous in that the alternative reconstructions realise meanings that are more diverse than the remaining members of the category. Possible reconstructions of much time include
(i) I can't travel much (or many times a year) = Quantity
(ii) I can't travel often (or frequently) = Frequency
(iii) I can't travel for long periods of time $=$ Duration

As we can see, these interpretations involve three different Circumstances (Quantity, Frequency and Duration), each contributing to a different overall meaning. The form-function relationship in this category is thus more than indeterminate, it is indeterminable. That is to say, in the examples discussed earlier we could not decide between the group or phrase because both were present. Here, however, meaning (iii) Duration - requires a non-existent preposition phrase. This difference in degree perhaps justifies a separate category for E229; however, since it is a matter of degree, the decision has been made to group them together.

### 5.2.5 Phrase rank errors

### 5.2.5.1 Introduction

We have already seen that prepositions are a problematic area of English grammar for Japanese learners. In the discussion of EC1a, the 45 examples of incorrect preposition were discussed as lexical errors occurring at word rank (within the prepositional group). There is another possibility, however, and that is to view preposition errors as occurring at a higher rank.

We can, for example, consider them clause rank errors. This means concentrating their role in helping to realise the clausal function Circumstance. Although Processes and Participants are described as "the experiential centre of the clause", and Circumstances as "optional augmentations" (Halliday \& Matthiessen, p. 221), this somewhat disguises the fact that these 'augmentations' are extremely common, and vital components of many clauses. In other words, though structurally optional, meanings such as Extent, Location and Accompaniment are often crucial to the overall meaning of a clause. Now, as Halliday \& Matthiessen demonstrate, with the exception of Manner, which tends to be realised by adverbial groups, Circumstantial meanings are usually realised by prepositional phrases (pp. 310-332). Therefore, we can analyse an incorrect preposition as leading to an incorrect Circumstance Type from the clause-based system of that name. Thus:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ CIRCUMSTANCE TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Circumstance type.

However, let us consider for a moment the nature of the preposition's role in Circumstances realised by preposition phrase. It was pointed out in Chapter 3 that Halliday
has stated that the preposition phrase is in some ways more like a clause than a group. For one thing, the phrase is larger than a group, consisting in fact of two different classes of group, a prepositional group and a nominal group. If it consisted of two units of the same class of group, this would merely be a group complex. However, a preposition phrase, just like all non-imperative major clauses, has as its constituents more than one class of group. Halliday is clear to stress this point: "But note that preposition phrases are phrases, not groups; they have no logical structure as Head and Modifier, and cannot be reduced to a single element. In this respect, they are clause-like rather than group-like" (1994, p. 425).

The 'clause-like' nature of the preposition phrase leads Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) to analyse it as, ideationally, 'Minor Process + Minor Range', and interpersonally, as 'Minor Predicator + Minor Complement' (p. 424). The similarity of these structures to certain clause structures is no coincidence: "When we interpret the preposition as 'minor Predicator' and 'minor Process' we are interpreting the preposition phrase as a kind of 'minor clause' - which is what it is" (p. 125).

The description of the phrase as a 'minor clause', and Halliday's decided emphasis that the preposition phrases "are...not groups", suggests that these structures lie somewhere between clause and group rank. For this reason, the three error categories below are identified as being at 'phrase rank', with this term intended to be understood as 'a status that is not clause rank, but arguably not group rank either'. More importantly, they are so identified because there appear to be pedagogical advantages in doing so. However, it is also fully acknowledged that SFG has not at this point recognised a separate 'phrase rank'.

There are 3 error categories in this section; we begin with EC18.

### 5.2.5.2 Phrase rank error categories

There are three error categories at phrase rank. Two of these are ideational-experiential, the other is interpersonal. We begin with the ideational categories..

## $\underline{\text { EC18 (51 errors) }}$

ED1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of the Minor Process

ED2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

The table below provides a sample of 10 instances (Appendix 6, Table EC18, contains all 45 errors). (Note: curly brackets enclose the relevant preposition phrases; Min Pro indicates the missing prepositional group.)

Table 5.39: Ten instances of EC18

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E14: S-I1.C10.1 | I couldn't come \{Min Pro this class\} for four weeks. |
| E27: S-I3.C11 | My part time job is \{Min Pre an apparel clerk\}. |
| E31: S-I4.C4 | So university is really far \{Min Pro me\}. |
| E36: S-I4.C13.1 | My part-time job is \{Min Pro supermarket\}. |
| E38: S-I5.C5('ß) | (It takes about 2 hours from here, so I want) to live \{Min Pro myself\}. |
| E79: S-I8.C11.1 | My part-time job is \{Min Pre flower shop [in Daiei] \}. |
| E88: S-I9.C9[i] | \{ [[I usually listen Ain Pre ]] music\} (is 60's ~ 70's music). |
| E118: S-I11.C4.2 | My part-time job is \{Min Pre S/bucks. The S/bucks [nearby T Dome]\} . |
| E143: S-I12.C13 | (I often go book shop... and I buy or rent it), so I read a book \{Min Pre two weeks\}. |
| E168: S-I14.C8[i] | (.And, I like) [[watching soccer \{Min Pre TV\} ]]. |

The following discussion uses E31as illustration:

E31: So university is really far \{Min Pre me\}

## Structure interpretation 1

A structure perspective leads to the following error description:

Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of the Minor Process

This description is derived from the conception of preposition phrase as 'minor clause' discussed above. The relevant point here is the fact that 'Minor Process ${ }^{\wedge}$ Minor Range' identifies an ideational-experiential syntagmatic structure. Since the Minor Process 'for' has not been realised, E31 is categorised as per the error description. Viewed as a structure, we can represent the error thus: $\Theta+$ Minor Range .

## Structure interpretation 2

As was argued in relation to EC14, the absence of an element may in some cases be interpreted as the selection of 'null' from a system. Of course, a structure is not a system, but if students are taught to become conversant with system diagrams, it is possible to present the issue in a way that is visually familiar (see, for example, Matthiessen 1995). In this case, Phrase transitivity (a term coined here by analogy with 'Transitivity' at clause rank) which has the structure Minor Process ${ }^{\wedge}$ Minor Range, may be represented thus:

Fig 5.32a: Phrase Transitivity structure represented as if it were a system
preposition phrase $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Minor Process } \\ \text { Minor Range }\end{array}\right.$

The learner's error may be described in the following terms:

Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process',
so that the diagram becomes:

Fig 5.32b: EC18 represented as if it were a system
preposition phrase $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { Minor-Process } \rightarrow \square_{\square}+\text { Minor Process }(\text { for, in, etc }) \\ \text { Minor Range }\end{array}\right.$

It should be emphasised again that the figure is not representing a system. The Minor Process is a structural function, which is why its 'options', +/- Minor Process have initial capitals. However, what is being suggested here is that this representation gives the teacher a potentially valuable aid when discussing with students their grammatical choices in terms of meaning. Thus we can say to the writer of E31, "OK, so you chose the meaning 'no Minor Process' here. That's your choice, fine. But could you explain to me exactly what
that meaning is? And I'm wondering why you preferred that choice to the alternative option to include the Minor Process."

Thus an SFG approach is able to view what appears to be the simple 'omission of the preposition' in a fresh light. It can be seen as the incorrect realisation of a Minor Clause, thus emphasising the crucial, clause-like function of the prepositional group, or it can be seen as a meaningful selection, but one that is not interpretable within the English System Network.

EC19 (1 error)
ED1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of the Minor Range

ED2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Range'

There is only one error in EC19 (see Table 5.40 below), and on this occasion this is likely to indicate a 'random', text-specific error, rather than an endemic issue. Nevertheless, we can interpret the error in the same terms as EC18 above, and the reader is referred to that discussion, and to EC23 below. (The difference here is that in EC19 it is the Minor Range that is unrealised rather than the Minor Process, and therefore the meaning-based pedagogical implications will refer to the kind of information contained in the nominal group rather than the preposition group.)

Table 5.40: One instance of EC19

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E317: SR5.C1 | I went \{to Min Retrge\} with my sister. |

## EC20 (1 error)

Apart from the fact that here the metafunction is interpersonal, and the function concerned is the Minor Complement, the analysis is again very similar to that of EC23. The main pedagogical point is that a failure to realise the Minor Complement removes from the clause a potential Subject (see Halliday \& Matthiesen, 2014, p. 424). The error descriptions and table are shown below:

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Complement ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Complement'

Table 5.41: One instance of EC20

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E318: SR5.C2 | I went \{to Alin Comp \} with my sister. |

This concludes the discussion of phrase rank errors. The EA turns now to clause rank.

### 5.2.6 Clause rank errors

### 5.2.6.1 Introduction

The next group of errors covers problems that involve clausal structures and systems.

Usually the analysis begins with the ideational metafunction. However, on this occasion we first look at a category where the metafunction cannot be determined, and indeed can be said to therefore involve two different metafunctions.

### 5.2.6.2 Clause rank error categories

## EC $21 a$ (3 errors)

ED: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log and interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of past time

Table 5.42 shows the three errors in this category:

Table 5.42: Three instances of EC21a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E57:S-I6.C9 | If you never watch those movies, please watch! |
| E73:S-I8.C3 | so I choose this class. |
| E84:S-I9.C7 [ia] | [[why I decide to choose this class]] |

In each case, the writer has realised past time with the present tense. Now, there is a category (EC26a) which contains instances where the option 'present' from the system of PRIMARY TENSE has been wrongly selected. Here, however, the selection of 'present' cannot definitely be sourced as the error because there are two equally valid reconstructions, one of which does make that choice. Taking E57 as an example, both the following are acceptable:
(i) If you have never watched those movies, please watch! (Primary Tense: present, Secondary Tense: past)
(ii) If you never watched those movies, please watch! (Primary Tense: past)

Since (i) above employs the logical system SECONDARY TENSE, while (ii) employs

PRIMARY TENSE, we locate these errors within both the ideational and interpersonal metafunctions. The argument here is that each potential tense would have brought a different meaning to the text, and therefore the non-selection of each is an error that reverberates despite its lack of realisation.

## EC 21b (4 errors)

ED: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

EC21a's companion category has 4 instances (Table 5.43):

Table 5.43: Three instances of EC21b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E381: LW2.C8 | So I practise more. |
| E383: LW2.C10 | Because I graduate from university.. |
| E552: FD1.C2.1 | (I want to become ground staff.) Because of I use English in my job. |
| E582: FD2.C15(' $\beta$ | (I think) I don't marry |

The analysis here is essentially the same, except that it is future time that is at issue.

Taking as an example E381, the two reconstructions below are equally valid:
(i) So I'll practise more (Primary Tense: future)
(ii) So I'm going to practise more (Primary Tense: present; Secondary Tense: future)

Again, we cannot decide between the two realisations, one where future time occurs as a Primary Tense selection, the other where it occurs as an option from Secondary Tense.

Therefore, the error is described as being within both ideational-logical and interpersonal metafunctions.

In EC21, then, we have a category that contains a composite error where at first only one is apparaent.

EC $22 a$ (26 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of the

## Process

ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process',

Errors in this and the next two categories are gathered under EC22 because they all involve Transitivity structures. In EC21a, learners have failed to include the Process in a clause. Table 5.44 presents a representative sample of these errors:

Table 5.44: Eight instances of EC22a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E40: S-I5.C8.1 | It Pro really fun. |
| E191: S-I16.C5.1 | I Prө member [of dance club]. |
| E247: S-I18.C20.2 | But Prө rather cold place. |
| E349: LW1.C2.2 | Then Prө very hot. |
| E353: LW1.C4.1 | Because I Pre very very tired. |
| E356: LW1.C5b.2 | (I thought) Pro dead. |
| E365: LW1.C7(ii).2 | (My purpose is) [[Pro No.1 badminton player [in Japan] J]. |
| E572: FD2.C9(b).1 | (I want) to Pro many festival every year. |

With rare exceptions, the English System Network does not allow for the omission of the Process in the type of written essay exemplified in the current data. (This is not the case in spoken genres, where ellipsis and the use of clauses without a Mood structure are
common.) And yet the data, which of course consists of written English clauses, contains 25 instances of major clauses without a Process. As the table illustrates (the complete list of errors can be seen in Appendix 6, Table EC22a), these errors occur in various contexts clauses with or without a Subject, in finite and non-finite clauses, in embedded clauses, in clause simplexes and clause complexes, and so on.

The relative frequency of the error is mirrored by that of the non-realisation of the Minor Process (EC18), and surely this is no coincidence, since, as the function names imply, the Process and Minor Process play analogous roles in their structures. Indeed, this category essentially employs the same two interpretations as EC18. To summarise the earlier analysis, the first interpretation was a structure-based one, leading in the case of EC22a to the following error description:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of the Process

The structure in question can vary slightly, but it may be described in general terms as Participant + Process (+ Participant/Circumstance). The erroroneous realisation of the structure may be written as: Particpant $+\Theta$ ( + Particpant/Circumstance).

For example, in

E353: Because I Pro very very tired,
the experiential structure is Carrier $(I)+\Theta+$ Attribute (very very tired), with 'Carrier' and 'Attribute' the names of two relational clause Participants.

The second interpretation carries the error description,

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process',
and leads to the proposed diagram shown below, where it is suggested that 'null Process' was a selection, representing some Japanese students' idiosyncratic conception of the options available in English grammar.

Fig 5.32: EC22a represented as if Transitivity were a system


Two points need to be reiterated here. First, Fig 5.32 is not representing a system. It is illustrating a way to present a structure to students that may be helpful, and indeed familiar to them if an SFG approach is a regular feature of classroom teaching. Secondly, posing a null option is not an attempt to genuinely 'explain' the error; there is no suggestion that learners actually consider 'null Process' a viable selection (though they may, and that is something we can investigate as future research). The point is fourfold: (i) as well as systems, functional structures too are flexible, and allow a degree of choice on the part of the writer; (ii) the absence of an element is as much a selection as the presence of that element; (iii) analysing the text as the outcome of meaningful choices therefore allows us to
ascribe 'motivation' to both absent and present elements; and (iv) adult EFL students can be taught this - we can present the idea that all texts reveal positive and negative choices, and that these affect the moment to moment flow of meaning. As stressed throughout the analysis, making learners aware that every grammatical choice carries a meaning is something rarely emphasised in most classroom approaches. An SFG perspective thus offers a fresh and invigorating tool for teachers and students to discuss their errors.

It is important to observe that the errors in EC22a are once again examples of composite errors. This is because the element functioning as Process in the experiential structure has an equally important role within the interpersonal metafunction. In fact, it serves a dual role, functioning as Finite and Predicator (see Chapter 3). Therefore, just as we saw earlier with the interplay between specific Deictic (experiential metafunction), interactant (interpersonal) and 'recoverable the' (textual), here we have a second and third error resonating together with EC22a (though in this case both are interpersonal). These categories are EC27b (missing Finite) and EC28 (missing Predicator). This is a point that would not be picked up by a traditional analysis, and yet each absence in the composite structure has significant repercussions, as we shall see.

Finally, the double structure analysis of EC22a (and indeed EC18) is germane to several of the remaining error categories, specifically:
ideational-experiential metafunction: EC22b
interpersonal metafunction: EC27a, EC27b, EC28, EC30
textual metafunction: EC33a, EC33b

Rather than repeat each time the 'system diagrams' and associated discussion, when these
error categories occur the reader will be referred back to EC22a. However, certain aspects specific to the individual categories will be discussed where appropriate.

## EC $22 b$ ( 15 errors)

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of $a$ Participant

ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ TRANSITIVITY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'

Table 5.45 presents a representative sample of EC22b, in which a Participant is missing from the Transitivity structure. The table indicates that a variety of Participant roles are involved::

Table 5.45: Four instances of EC22b

| Error code | Clause | Unrealised Participant |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| E348: LW1.C2.1 | Then Part very hot. | Carrier |
| E360: LW1.C6.1 | But Part enjoyed! | Senser |
| E361: LW1.C6.2 | But enjoyed Part!! | Phenomenon |
| E455: LW11.C5.1 | Part Went to café. | Acrtor |

In terms of the SFG-based analysis of the errors, there is little to add to EC22a, and the reader is referred to that discussion. We note, however, that here again we have, not 'an' error, but a complex of errors. To take one example, the absence of the experiential participant role Carrier in E374 (see below) is one of three errors.

[^0]The first question mark (in red) indicates the position of an element - in expert hands probably the pronoun 'it' - that acts as the interpersonal function Subject, and also as the textual function Idetaional Theme. These functions will be discussed when the EA reaches EC27a and EC33a.

## ECs 22c/1, 22c/2 (15 errors)

ED: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process

There are 15 examples of EC22c in the data. They come in two variations, identified as EC22c/1 and EC22c/2. Four of each type are listed in Table 5.46:

Table 5.46: Four instances of EC22c/1 and 4 instances of EC22c/2

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E169: S-I14.C10.1 | I go to snowboarding every winter. |
| E171: S-I14.C11.1 | Of course I went to snowboarding this winter. |
| E292: SR2.C9.1 | I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother. |
| E294: SR3.C1.1 | I usually go to shopping on Sunday. |
| E8: S-I1.C8(' $\beta$ ).1 | (I think) you should visit in Kumamoto. |
| E237: S-I18.C11.2 | (When I was high school student,) I joined to track and field club. |
| E398: LW5.C3.1 | I meet to my boyfriend. |
| E401: LW5.C7.1 | I gave for him photo book. |

It is immediately apparent that the first 4 instances are variations on a very specific theme: the insertion of the preposition 'to' into an idiomatic verb form consisting of the Material Process 'go' and the '-ing' form of an activity such as shop or ski. This suggests
that the relatively large number of tokens is more a reflection of the utility of the expression rather than of a pervasive grammatical issue - an interpretation supported by the fact that there are actually only two verbs involved in the data: eight instances of go to shopping, and two of go to snowboarding (see Appndix 6, Tables EC22c/1 and EC22c/2).

That students experience difficulty with the structure is unsurprising given that it really is an anomalous form. It is perhaps closest to the Process + Scope structure seen in examples such as have a bath and do your homework (see Halliday \& Matthiessen, pp. 240-241), but the '-ing' form does not suggest the treatment of, say, 'snowboarding', as a Participant, as easily as Scopes with mass and count nouns such as 'homework' and 'a bath'. Another possibility is that snowboarding and so on are gerunds. However, given that this term is usually used to refer to the nominal nuance, as it were, of examples such as I like snowboarding, (compare I like it), 'gerund' seems unsatisfying here.

The solution employed here is to highlight the Transitivity structure involved, and see the error in those terms. This gives the following error description:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process

To take E169 as an example, an expert writer would produce,

I go snowboarding every winter

Here, 'snowboarding can be interpreted as part of the Process, with 'go snowboarding' being an anomalous type of phrasal verb perhaps, or it can be analysed as Range, and so as a Particpant. Either way, what it is not is a Circumstance of Location, which is what the
learner turned it into with the preposition 'to'.
An SFG perspective in the classroom could emphasise the function of Location Circumstances with 'to', and invite students to explain where 'snowboarding' and 'shopping' are, perhaps by pointing them out on a map drawn on the board. By focussing on Circumstantial meaning in this way, the point that these structures are not Circumstances might impress itself on the learners.

As far as category EC22c/2 is concerned, these are different variations on the same theme. In these cases a preposition has been inserted into a nominal group, which would realise a Particpant function in the hands of expert writers, but has here become 'reduced' to Circumstance status. The error description is thus:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant

This is more problematic to approach from a meaning-based perspective, but it is noteworthy that Processes such as 'join' have an element of movement within their own lexical meaning, and thus a preposition such as 'to', which also has this element, is superfluous. However, it is possible that this is an error that needs to be approached from a more syntagmatic point of view.

Before continuing with the next ideational error category, we note that the the two categories just discussed are mirrored by two interpersonal categories, EC29/1 and EC29/2. The analysis is very similar, except that instead of the experiential functions Particpant and Circumstance, we have the interpersonal functions Complement and Adjunct. The errors are exactly the same as in the previous category, and the specific error desscriptions are:

ECs 29/1, EC29/2 (15 errors)
ED: $\quad$ Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as Predicator/Complement

EC $23 a$ ( 2 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'possessive'
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ PROCESS TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'intensive'

## EC $23 b$ ( 1 error)

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'Existential'

ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PROCESS TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'Relational'

These categories are discussed together because they both involve the selection of incorrect Processes. The errors are shown in the two tables below:

Table 5.47: Two instances of EC23a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E42: S-I5.C9.1 | My families are 6 people. |
| E161: S-I13.C4 | My family ig five people (and I have three dogs.) |

Table 5.48: One instance of EC23b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E96: S-I10.C5.1 | There has rice field surrounded my house. |

Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of these error categories is how few instances
they contain. This suggests that even at a relatively low level of writing ability, students show good control of one of the most important experiential systems, PROCESS TYPE.

In EC23a, the two learners correctly chose 'Relational Process' from the PROCESS TYPE system, but, subsequently, incorrectly selected a verb from the Intensive sub-category. In both examples, the correct choice would have been 'Relational $\rightarrow$ Possessive'.

However, considering the point from a textual metafunction perspective, it is possible that what is occurring here is a topic-comment realisation (as is normal in Japanese) rather than a Theme-Rheme one. Experts in the English System Network would most likely say "There are 6 people in my family", or "I have 4 brothers and sisters", thereby putting the (underlined) Subject and Theme together as is the unmarked tendency in English (Halliday, 1994). It appears that these learners may have put the topic 'family' first, and then struggled to find a continuation appropriate within the ESN.

EC23b shows an interesting variation, with the learner successfully selecting the appropriate Subject 'there' as Theme, but then selecting a Relational continuation instead of the correct Existential one.

By bringing to the classroom activities that practise Thematic - and Information structure, an SFG interpretation of error can help students understand that issues such as the selection of Process Type are not merely centred in the verb, but resonate across the clause and indeed across metafunctions.

## Error Category 24 (3 errors)

ED: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended meanings unrecoverable

These three clauses are the only ones in the data which cannot be categorised except as 'unrecoverable' (though we have seen that some group rank structures are unrecoverable,
too). Therefore, no further analysis is attempted.

Table 5.49: Three instances of EC24

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E64: S-I7.C8 | I want to go to New York once again this year, because I'm really favourite there. |
| E651: FD10.C5 | I often watch TV and Twitter about world news. |
| E727: J19.C10(b) | "Because I want to distribute" |

## EC 25 (1 error)

ED1: Clause rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'middle'

ED2: Clause rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ AGENCY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'effective'

Though there is only a single instance of EC25, this is without doubt attributable to the methodology of the research and not to a factor such as the 'simplicity' of the structure involved. On the contrary, examples like that shown in Table 5.50 abound in the English of Japanese learners.

Table 5.50: One instance of EC25

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E517: LWI6.C12.4 | Test was finished 15:00. |

The traditional analysis of this error would probably focus on the verbal group, and
describe the error as the incorrect use of the passive voice. As has consistently been emphasised, such form-oriented approaches have an important contribution to make, and are not being rejected here. However, a Hallidayan perspective on this example raises interesting points not available to traditional analyses.

Instead of the verbal group, if we focus on the clause as a whole we can interpret the clause from an ergative perspective (see Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 332-355). Rather than viewing the writer's challenge as the choice between transitive and intransitive structures, an ergative interpretation brings in the concept of Agency. Now, the choice is between deciding whether a Process was brought about by an outside agent (effective) or not (middle).

From a purely transitive perspective, and given '(the) test' as Theme, the writer has accurately conveyed the fact that, even if there was a Particpant responsible for the Process, s/he is not important to the meaning. Therefore, the writer understandably chose 'passive': "test was finished at 15:00 (by whom or what is not important)". It is interesting to note, in passing, that since the alternative situation is theoretically accurate - the test was presumably 'finished' by someone, in the sense that an authority figure must have announced 'stop work' or something similar - this explains why there is no out-of-context grammatical error in E517.

However, taking an ergative perspective, and given '(the) test' as Theme, there is no outside Agency, so we realise the meaning as simply "test was finished at 15:00". This interpretation leads to the two error descriptions below:

Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'middle’

Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ AGENCY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select

## 'effective’

Here, then, an SFG perspective has allowed us to shed fresh light on the use of 'be + -en' in problematic structures such as E517. The error can be sourced to a lack of understanding of the semantic function Agency, and of how English realises concepts that relate more to ergativity than to transitivity, despite the fact that it is the latter which dominates grammar pedagogy.

EC 26a (32 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'past'
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'present'

The table below shows a representative sample of EC26a errors.

Table 5.51: Eight instances of EC26a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E102: S-I10.C11.2 | I learn to dance (when I was high school student) |
| E258: S-I19.C2.2 | I've taken Justin's class last year. |
| E368: LW1.C10.2 | (TOEIC was very difficult.) I do my best. |
| E391: LW4.C6.2 | (I met my mother....) We talk about my father. |
| E392: LW4.C7.2 | My father recently falls to ladder (...) |
| E414: LW7.C5.2 | ( I did part-time job Saturday...,) so I study little at night. |
| E440: LW9.C4.2 | After we finish shopping, ((we went to Karaoke).) |
| E450: LW10.C15.2 | (After I bought things I went to eat pizza.) I eat vegetable pizza. |

Within the interpersonal line of meaning, the function that has associated with it the greatest number of errors in the data is the Finite which, together with the Subject,
comprises the core system within the clause as exchange: MOOD.
The particular interpersonal role of the Finite that is relevant here is its realisation, via the system PRIMARY TENSE, of one aspect of what Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) term 'interpersonal deixis'. As they put it, "primary tense construes time interpersonally, as defined by what is 'present' to you and me at the time of saying" (p. 144). In writing, of course, 'present' time is usually disassociated between the two parties in the exchange writer and reader - and this places a greater reliance on an author to control interpersonal deixis accurately and effectively.

To illustrate with E450, the implication of 'eat' is that the proposition is valid for the 'now' of the writer-reader exchange. EC26a reveals that, on 34 occasions, learners misconstrued this semiotic space. Instead of locating the event firmly in the author's (and by default, the reader's) past, they have indicated some kind of 'present' significance. As we see from the surrounding co- text, however, the learner should have selected 'past', since clearly she is writing about an event that has already taken place:

## Excerpt from text LW10:

I bought new bag, $T$-shirt, and some books. New bag is very cute. T-shirt is very cool. After I bought things, I went to eat pizza. I eat vegetable pizza. It taste good.
(It is interesting to note that, from the perspective of the ESN, 'eat' in the present tense indicates a 'habitual occurrence', and 'habitual' is no more related to 'present' than it is to 'past' and 'future'. This raises the possibility that there is more to tense than is contained within interpersonal, and logical, meanings. However, the question of what might be termed 'experiential tense' eneters the realm of speculation rather than theory, and therefore cannot be taken up here.)

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'past'

The three clauses shown in Table 5.52 below show that in EC26b learners have incorrectly realised (instantial interpretation) or selected (system interpretation) 'past' from the PRIMARY TENSE system:

Table 5.52: Three instances of EC26b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E120: S-I11.C6(‘ $\beta[i]) .2$ | (I feel especially) Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert (is very <br> interesting. Because so many people come into the $S / b u c k s)$. |
| E187: S-I15.C14.2 | I had learned calligraphy. |
| E418: LW7.C7.2 | It tasted good. |

EC $27 a$ (13 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Subject
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null
Subject'

EC $27 b$ ( 18 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite

These categories were considered above, in the discussion of EC22 errors. The reader is referred to that discussion, but for convenience a list of examples is provided here.

Table 5.53: Six instances of EC27a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E210: S-I16.C13.3 | Sub So excited!!!! |
| E248: S-I18.C20.3 | But Sutb rather cold place. |
| E357: LW1.C5b.3 | (I thought) Sut dead. |
| E456: LW11.C5.2 | (After we play tennis) Sub went to cafe. |
| E525: LW16.C19.3 | (After I watched movie,) Sut back to my home. |
| E667: FD11.C8.3 | (I want to go Miami.) Because, Sub the most beautiful city. |

Table 5.54: Six instances of EC27b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E254: S-I18.C22.1 | So, please Fin not show frog to me. |
| E351: LW1.C2.4 | Then Fin very hot. |
| E354: LW1.C4.2 | Because I Fin very very tired. |
| E358: LW1.C5b.4 | (I thought) Fin dead. |
| E377: LW2.C5.4 | (By tennis, I lost many times) but Fin very fun. |
| E486: LW15.C8.3 | (I went to X University) where TOEIC place Fin. |

As was pointed out earlier, these errors are the interpersonal contributions to what are composite phenomena. In the case of EC27a, from an interpersonal perspective the significance of a missing Subject is twofold. First, it means we are unable to say for certain who or what is being predicated of the Process. E456 illustrates the point:

E456: (After we play tennis,) ? went to cafe

Here, the intended Subject (from an instantial persepective) could be 'we', but it doesn't have to be. It could be 'the others', 'Dave', 'I', or, in fact, just about anything. This can be demonstrated by imagining an internal tag question 'said' by the interested reader. What would this tag question be? 'Oh, did he? you? she? they?'

The second problem with a missing Subject is that there can be no selection of mood, since in non-imperative clauses this is composed of Subject + Finite (in that order for declarative mood, and in reverse order for interrogative mood). For instance, in (I thought) ? dead (E358), it is probable that the writer was intending declarative mood (I thought I was dead), but an interrogative solution is conceivable (I thought was I dead?).

The point is that these interpersonal meanings are highly unlikely to be picked up by a response to error that picks out 'missing words', or perhaps alerts the student that he as 'forgotten the Subject', but leaves this as a formal issue, and not a 'truely' grammatical one (that is, one that highlights the meanings inherent in grammatical forms).

The issue in EC27b, where learners have not realised the Finite, is not substantially different from matters discussed in EC26 - since it is the Finite that realises Primary Tense - and just above in EC27a - since the Finite is also part of the Mood structure. Therefore, no further discussion is required.

EC 28 (9 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Predicator
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null
Predicator'

A list of all nine instances in this category is shown in Table 5.55:

Table 5.55: Nine instances of EC28

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E366: LW1.C7(ii).3 | (My purpose is) [[Pred No.1 badminton player [in Japan] ]] |
| E573: FD2.C9(b).2 | (I want) to Pred many festival every year. |
| E579: FD2.C11(ii).2 | (My future dream is) [[Pred Wedding Planner]]. |
| E584: FD3.C3(bii).2 | (But I want) to Pred work [[that use English]]. Such as CA, h.w and announcer. |
| E609: FD6.C2.2 | To Pred my dream real, (...) |
| E630: FD9.C1(ii).2 | (My future dream is) [[Pred cabin attendant or hotelman]]. |
| E660: FD11.C3(b).2 | (I want) to Pred abroad (to study English) |
| E684: J12.C13(b).2 | (Why do you want) to Pred our company?' ' |
| E711: JI6.C5(b).2 | (What work do you want) to Pred with some musicians?' ' |

The predicator lies within the Residue in the Mood $\wedge$ Residue interpersonal structure. The Residue, similar perhaps to the textual function 'Rheme', is unusual in that it has a role that is usually defined in negative terms; i.e., it tends to be discussed in terms of its not being the Mood (see EC27). But the Predicator is not insignificant; it is an intrinsic element in another interpersonal structure, that of Subject + Finite + Predicator (+ Complement) (+ Adjunct). In this structure it has four distinct functions (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014, pp. 151-2):
(i) It specifies secondary tense, as in He was sleeping;
(ii) In verbal group complexes it specifies "other aspects and phases like seeming" (p. 151), as in They seem to like me;
(iii) It carries a marker of passive voice, as in She was beaten in the final, while it does the same for active voice by default: She beat him in the final;
(iv) It "specifies the process...that is predicated of the Subject" (p. 152).

These functions indicate that an SFG approach in the classroom could be beneficial. For instance, given E512,
(...) but I ? hard on writing test,
it could be pointed out to the student that the options available to the reader here include 'was trying', 'have tried' and 'am going to try', which select for Secondary Tense 'present, 'past' and 'future' respectively. The student could be asked which of these (if any) the null Predicator is meant to indicate and, more importantly, how the reader is supposed to know. Such an appeal to meaning might help alert the learner to the importance of realising the Predicator.

## EC 30 (2 errors)

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Complement
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Complement'

This category is another that does not need to be discussed any further. The errors contained in it were among those discussed as part of EC22.

## EC 31 (2 errors)

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'declarative'
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ IndICATIVE TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'interrogative'

This category is a case where the small number of instances - just two errors, made by the same author in the same clause complex - belies the difficulty for students of the issue involved. The errors occur in what are traditionally known as 'indirect questions'; the
two instances are shown in Table 5.56:

Table 5.56

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E264: S-I19.C12[' $\beta$ a].1 | I don't know [ [ what does he want to dol] (and...) |
| E266: S-I19.C13['ßa].1 | (...and [I DON'T KNOW]) [[what should he dol]. |

The reason there are only two examples of the error is almost certainly because these are the only attempts at indirect questions in the corpus. (It is interesting to note, in passing, that Text S-I19 reveals a combination of features (relative length, at 33 clauses, an injection of personal emotion, as in I really don't understand it!!, interest in the world, in How about other country?, and grammatical ability, as in friends [[who speak English]]) that is also unique in this data set. This is significant since it supports the idea that the errors here (see also EC35 below) are not idiosyncratic and author-specific, but likely to be affect many learners who attempt the structure.

From a purely systemic point of view, the error is a simple one. The MOOD system offers a choice between indicative and imperative moods, and if indicative, a subsequent choice between declarative and interrogative. The error is either the incorrect realisation of 'declarative', or the incorrect choice of interrogative from the system INDICATIVE TYPE, depending on whether we take the instantial or system perspective. The two error descriptions, and the system SND are as follows:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'declarative'

Fig 5.33: EC31: ‘instantial’ interpretation


## Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ IndICATIVE TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select

 'interrogative'Fig 5.34: EC31: 'system' interpretation


From an SFG perspective, perhaps the reason the structure is problematic for learners is not the INDICATIVE TYPE system itself, but (i) recognising that there are two appearances of the system in the 'host clause', and (ii) understanding the relationship between these two appearances.

## EC 32 (1 error)

ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'modal'
ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ modal DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'temporal'

There is only one error in this category, and it is shown in Table 5.57

Table 5.57: 1 instance of EC32

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E114: S-I10.C20.2 | (If I had a free time) I watched a movie on my TV. |

In earlier discussions concerning the interpersonal metafunction it was pointed out that, within the MOOD system network, the choice of 'Finite' leads to a new sub-system whereby writers select either 'temporal' or 'modal'. In the error above, we know that the learner is writing about a hypothetical situation. Hypothetical situations are displaced in time. Unlike 'habituality' (EC27a), which implies 'all' times, and therefore is licensed to select 'temporal', hypotheticality implies 'no' time. Therefore, as expert users of the English System Network, we select 'modal' from the mODAL DEIXIS system. Clearly, since the writer of E114 selected realised or selected 'temporal', this constitutes an error.

The analysis above is one centred on meaning and function. The Finite functions to realise temporality and modality. The latter are meanings. Past time, for example, is a meaning, and so is 'hyptheticality'. Something cannot both be situated in actual past time, and at the same time hypothetical, so we have a conflict of meanings. The point is not that traditional approaches, which might point to an incorrect form of the 'second conditional', cannot, or do not, appeal to meaning. The point is that an SFG approach cannot but appeal to meaning, partly because it sees almost every grammatical choice as meaningful, and partly because it emphasises that a text does in fact reflect these choices.

EC $33 a$ (11 errors)
ED1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ideational Theme

ED2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null ideational Theme,

This category was discussed earlier, as part of the composite error also including missing Subject and Missing Participant. The reader is therefore referred to EC22a. A table of examples and the error descriptions are provided here for convenience:

Table 5.58: Four instances of EC33a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E60: S-I7.C5.3 | For example, ideational Theme enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] <br> and trip [to other country]. <br> E202: S-I16.C8.5 Example, ideational Theme Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |
| E212: S-I16.C13.5 | ideational Theme So excited!!! |
| E250: S-I18.C20.5 | But ideational Theme rather cold place. |

From one point of view, the absence of the ideational Theme does not lead to any additional interpretative problems for the reader (beyond, that is, those resulting from the absence of Subject and 'first' Participant). However, an SFG perspective allows us to introduce the concept of a 'starting point' of a message, and showing that this is as important to an instance of text as contributions from the ideational and interpersonal strands of meaning. As there are no specific examples here, we shall not pursue the topic; however, interested readers are referred to SFL work on the role of marked Theme in recipes and other text-types.

## EC 33b (2 errors)

ED: $\quad$ Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of textual Theme

In EC33b it is not the ideational Theme that is missing, but the textual Theme (Table 5.59):

Table 5.59: One instance of EC33b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E121: | (I feel especially) [textual Theme TD held b/ball match, concert]] (is very interesting. |
| S-I11.C6( $\beta[\mathrm{B}[\mathrm{i}] .3$ | Because so many people come into the S/bucks. |

Since here the textual Theme functions as a formal link between clauses with minimal meaningful significance, no further analysis is provided.

## EC 34 (3 errors)

ED: $\quad$ Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place the ideational Theme in the Rheme

This category has been covered, and the reader is directed to EC6. A table of examples and the error descriptions are provided here for convenience:

Table 5.60: Three instances of EC34

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E680: JI2.C9.1 | 'What do you like baseball team?'' |
| E682: J12.C11.1 | 'Who do you like baseball player?' |
| E692: JI4.C5.1 | 'What do you like sport?'' |

This concludes the analysis of errors at clause rank. The next area is beyond the lexicogrammatical rank scale, termed 'around the clause' by Halliday (e.g. Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014).

### 5.2.7 Errors around the clause

### 5.2.7.1 Introduction

There are three primary categories located 'around' the clause. The first of these is EC36a.

### 5.2.7.2 Around the clause error categories

EC 36a (39 errors)
ED1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable' ED2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Reference $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'

This category was discussed as part of the analysis of EC2c, where it was demonstrated that there is a textual element to nominal groups inappropriately lacking specific determiners. The reader is therefore referred to that discussion, and to Appendix 6, Table EC36a, for a full list of errors.

In Table 5.61 below, the opportunity is taken to exemplify the three different kinds of reference that occur in the data.

Table 5.61: Six instances of EC36a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E434: LW8.C10.1 | (I ate Chinese restaurant...near the station...) ...we went to id Chinese restaurant. |
| E446: LW10.C10.1 | (I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books.) id New bag is very cute. |
| E298: SR3.C3.1 | I usually go shopping at id afternoon. |
| E306: SR3.C7.1: | I usually study English at id morning. |
| E100: S-I10.C8.1 | My grandmother is id most kind person [in my family]. |
| E213: S-I16.C15.1 | I like id weather [in Australia]. |

The first two errors in the Table, E434 and E446, are examples of endophoric (i.e. within-text) anaphora (i.e., pointing back). This is the type of reference which students are familiar with from school, when they are taught to "introduce something for the first time with ' $a$ ', and from then on with 'the'". For instance, in

E446: (I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books.) id New bag is very cute.
the writer's error is not to indicate that the 'new bag' is identifiable, since it was introduced in the previous clause.

E298 and E306 exemplify perhaps the most conceptually difficult type of reference, homophoric reference, which is the idea that something is identifiable because it exists, uniquely, "out there", or is the only possible referent in the context, and so on. Thus, in

E298: I usually go shopping at afternoon,
expert writers use 'the' because days have only one afternoon.
Finally, E100 and E213 illustrate students' attempt to produce structural cataphora, where 'the' functions to point forwards to elements in the same group that serve an
identifying role. For example, in

E213: I like id weather [in Australia],
the Qualifier 'in Australia' allows the reader to identify the particular weather concerned, and therefore expert writers would employ the Deictic 'the' at the start of the nominal group. By its very nature, this type of reference often occurs in what we have been referring to as a complex structure, specifically in nominal groups with rankshifted prepositional phrase or clause Qualifiers, such as in relative clauses. It is therefore not surprising that there are no successful examples of structural cataphora in the data.

An SFG approach to reference issues may have great potential. This is not to imply that 'reference' itself is the province of Functional Grammar (though see Halliday and Hasan (1976), for a full and enduringly insightful functional account of reference and other cohesive devices), but because an 'SFG approach' means helping learners access the systemic meanings inherent in the system.

To give a brief example, we can ask learners to compare the following:
(i) I met a teacher who taught you last year
(ii) I met (some) teachers who taught you last year
(iii) I met the teacher who taught you last year
(iv) I met the teachers who taught you last year
and ask, "In which example(s) do $I$ think you can write down, exactly, the name(s) of the teacher(s) I met, and what is the reason for your answer?". This meaning-based approach helps learners realise, among other things, that (a) reference tells us about the writer's
assumptions about the reader's contextual knowledge, though it tells us nothing about his/her actual knowledge, and (b) the absence of a referring element means 'non-identifiable', a point that we have established in earlier error category discussions.

ECs 37a, 37b, 37c (3 errors)

The three categories grouped together as EC37 have in common the fact that they all involve the system of reference, and they all contain just a single instance. Table 5.62 displays the error categorised as EC37a.

Table 5.62: One instance of EC37a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E67: S-I7.C13 | (By the way, are you like sneakers?) $\quad$ I love it. |

The issue here concerns the choice between 'plural' and 'singular' reference. Since 'sneakers' is plural, the referring element also needs to be plural. The fact that is not leads to the identification of EC37 and the following instantial (1) and system (2) error descriptions:

ED1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of plural reference

ED2: $\quad$ Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select singular reference

These descriptions stress yet again how an SFG perspective can show what appears to be a matter of formal agreement (plural $\rightarrow$ plural) as in fact being fundamentally meaning-based. This is nicely illustrated by E67 because the clause in isolation is, in a strictly formal sense, grammatically correct. However, it is not 'meaningfully' correct
because in the ESN the wording 'it' plays the dual role we have encountered so often in this error analysis: it is at once the particular realisation of a meaningful choice, and at the same time a meaningful choice realised as wording. In expert hands, we know that 'it' in 'I love it' is successful on both counts. However, in the learner's hands 'it' is syntagmatically inaccurate as the realisation of the meaning 'plural', and at the same time paradigmatically inaccurate in the meaningful choice the wording reflects.

Crucially, all this is independent of the actual referent. It is all contained within the wording 'it' and the systemic choice it 'means'. This is very different from describing the error as a problem with agreement.

## EC $37 b$ (1 error)

EC37b also contains one error (Table 5.63).

Table 5.63: One instance of EC37b

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E263: S-I19.C9 | (I think speaking skill is the most important for) me but writing skill is also the same. |

Here the issue is related to REFERENCE but is not the result of a systemic choice; therefore, the description identifies E267 as 'structural':

ED: $\quad$ Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ reference item has unclear frame of reference

As Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), put it, a comparative reference item has "a frame of reference - something by reference to which what I am now talking about is the same or different..." (p. 632). In the case of E263, the reference item 'same' has no such frame of
reference, or at least, not one that can be readily discerned. (An alternative to this interpretation would be to categorise 'the same' as EC1a, 'incorrect lexical choice', and suggest the alternative word 'similar(ly important)'.)

## EC 37c (1 error)

This category is similar to EC37a, except that the incorrect choice involved two categories of Cohesion rather than two categories of Reference. Otherwise, the essentials of the analysis are similar, and little comment is required beyond the presentation of the single instance and the error descriptions.

Table 5.64: The single instance of EC37c

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E142: S-I12.C12 | (I like various kinds book. I often go b/shop or library) and I buy or rent $\underline{i t}$, ... |

ED1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of substitution ED2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ COHESION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'reference'

This concludes the error categories identified 'around' the clause. The final, brief section concerns punctuation errors.

### 5.2.8 Punctuation Error Categories

### 5.2.8.1 Introduction

The four categories identified below are the only ones that can be described as writing specific. In this sense they are anomalous categories as it was not the aim of the analysis to focus on writing, merely to use the written mode to ensure learners had an
opportunity, were it wanted, to redraft their grammar. Nevertheless, since punctuation serves to alert the reader to a writer's own choices regarding intonation, clause boundaries, and so on, it does not seem irrelevant to the discussion to include these categories.

### 5.2.8.2 Punctuation error categories

EC 39a (28 errors)
ED: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus

EC 39b (10 errors)
ED: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

Error Category 39c (1 error)
ED: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to use a comma instead of a full stop or semi-colon

## EC 39d (10 errors)

ED: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to use a comma instead of a paratactic Linker

The tables below show instances of EC39a, EC39b, EC39c and 39d. With regards to the first, E28 and E176 are examples where the learner has inserted a full stop before the secondary clause of a paratactic expansion, while the next two errors exemplify situations where a full stop has interrupted a hypotactic expansion. The second table (Table 5.66) illustrates cases where the writers have incorrectly inserted a full stop within a clause. Table 5.68 shows the single instance of a learner choosing a comma instead of a full stop or
semi-colon. Finally, Table 5.69 shows two instances where, rather than use the paratactic Linker 'and', the writer has opted to supply a comma.

Table 5.66: Four instances of EC39a

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E28: S-I4.S3(i-ii) | I'm live in Saitama. So university is really far me. |
| E179: S-I15.S3(i-ii) | I was born Niigata prefecture. But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993. |
| E402: LW6.S2(i-ii) | After, I went to X University. Because I had a TOEIC test. |
| E673: FD11.S5(i-ii) | I want to go Miami. Because, the most beautiful city. |

Table 5.67: Four instances of EC39b

| E201: S-I16.C7 | I love dance and music. Especially rock music! |
| :--- | :--- |
| E295: SR2.C9 | I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother. |
| E323: SR5.C5 | I usually study English. At home. |
| E575: FD2.C6 | I listening English an hour every day now. For example, many CD, movie and music. |

Table 5.68: One instance of EC39c

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E417: LW7.S5 | Sunday, I received TOEIC, after that I met my friend and friend's family. |

Table 5.69: Two instances of EC39d

| E78: S-I8.C9.1 | My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, Link soccer. |
| :--- | :--- |
| E679: FD9.C8(i) | There, I enjoyed [[shopping]],Link [[sightseeing.]]. |

As mentioned in the Introduction, punctuation errors are specific to writing; this is because they relate more to rhetorical conventions than systemic choices of meaning generalisable to the English System Network as a whole. Because this thesis is not investigating the conventions of writing per se, no instantial or system analysis is attempted here. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that an SFG approach to punctuation has pedagogical implications. Three examples may be briefly mentioned.

First, the fact that punctuation is the way a writer conveys certain textual and interpersonal meanings through, for example, intonation, pauses and so on, can be demonstrated through examples and practice. Second, the fact that this process is a matter of choosing the effects and meanings she wishes to convey is very much a Systemic Functional tenet, and can help give learners a greater sense of control over their writing. And finally, different ways of representing similar meanings through punctuation could be of great interest and value to the learner. For instance, using the following example:

I want to go Miami. Because, the most beautiful city. (E663)
the following variations could be discussed in terms of the differences in meaning they produce, or in terms of the differences between the expert writers' versions and the learner's, or in terms of the reasons an author might wish to use the different alternatives, and so on:

I want to go Miami because (it is) the most beautiful city.
I want to go Miami; (it's) the most beautiful city.
I want to go Miami, the most beautiful city (in the world).
(It's) the most beautiful city in the world so I want to go.

With this brief look at punctuation errors, the error analysis is complete.

### 5.3 Summary and conclusion

In this section, a summary of the some of the main points to emerge from the error analysis is presented. But first, the next three pages present, in tabular form, all the error descriptions that have been identified according to rank and metafunction (Table 5.69).

Table 5.69 : Summary of Error Analysis, Categories

| Summary of Error-Analysis/-Categoriesa |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | Ideational (experiential unless stated): incorrect...o | Interpersonal:-incorrect...0 | Textual: incorrect...○ |
| Around $\cdot$ the Clauseo | a | $\rightarrow$ realisation of non-finite vg\\| <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select-finite vg\\| <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of finite vg <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select $n o n-$ finite $v g \\|$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of present-Modal-Tense $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice-to-select-past-Modal-Tense\\| <br> $\rightarrow$ a | ```\(\rightarrow\) realisation of identifiable-reference \(\boldsymbol{\\|}\) \(\rightarrow\) choice-to-select-non-identifiable- reference \({ }^{\|}\) \(\rightarrow\) realisation of non-identifiable- reference\| \(\rightarrow\) choice-to-select-identifiable-reference \(\uparrow\) \(\rightarrow\) realisation of plural-reference \(\boldsymbol{\|}\) \(\rightarrow\) choice to select singular-reference \(\uparrow\) \(\rightarrow\) realisation of frame of reference \(\boldsymbol{\|}\) \(\rightarrow\) realisation of substitution \(\boldsymbol{\top}\) \(\rightarrow\) choice to select - REFERENCE``` |
| Clause ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\rightarrow$ realisation of past-time-(also-interpersonal) $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of future time-(also-int.) $\mid$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of Process $\boldsymbol{T}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select' 'null'Process $\boldsymbol{T}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of a-Participant\| <br> $\rightarrow$ choice-to select 'null'Participant\| <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to realise Circumstance instead of Process/Participant <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of Process-Typeף <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of clause (unrecoverable) $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of middle Agency $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select effective Agencyo | $\rightarrow$ realisation-of past-time-(also-logical) $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of future time-(also-log.) <br> $\rightarrow$ choice-to-realise:Adjunct as-Predicator $/$. Complement <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of past-Primary-Tense $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select present-Primary-Tense\\| <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of present-Primary-Tense\\| <br> $\rightarrow$ choice-to select past-Primary-Tense $\uparrow$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of Subject $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select 'null'Subject\| <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of Finite $\boldsymbol{\square}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice-to select' 'null'Finite $\boldsymbol{T}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of Predicator $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select 'null'Predicator $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of Complement $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select 'null' Complement $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of declarative mood $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice-to-select interrogative mood $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of modal-Deixisil <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select-temporal-Deixis-a | $\rightarrow$ realisation of ideational-Theme $\boldsymbol{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select 'null'ideational' Theme ${ }^{\\|}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ realisation of textual-Theme $\boldsymbol{T}$ <br> $\rightarrow$ choice to select 'null'textual-Themed |

Table 5.69: Summary of Error Analysis, Categories - continued

| Summary of Error Analysis/ Categories |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ideational (experiential unless stated): incorrect.... | Interpersonal: incorrect... | Textual: incorrect... |
| Phrase | - realisation of Minor Process <br> - choice to select 'null' Minor Process <br> - realisation of Minor Range <br> - choice to select 'null' Minor Range | - realisation of Minor Complement <br> - choice to select 'null' Minor Complement |  |
| Group | - realisation of singular dexixis choice to realise non-singular deixis. realisation of non-singular deixis. choice to realise singular deixis. realisation of specific dexix. choice to select non-specific deixis. realisation of deixis (unrecoverable) realisation of plural Thing choice to realise singular Thing realisation of singular Thing choice to select non-singular Thing realisation of nominal group (unrecoverable) realisation of ordinative, numeration choice to select quantitative numeration realisation of experiential structure realisation of grammatical relations hips within a nominal group (exp. and logical) realisation of Head (logical) realisation of singular Event choice to select non-singular Event realisation of non-singular Event choice to select non-singular Event realisation of present Secondary Tense (log) realisation of past Secondary Tense (log) choice to select ' - Secondary Tense' (log) choice to select ' + Secondary Tense' (log) realisation of imperfect Aspect choice not to select from ASPECT realisation of phrase / group (unrecoverable) | - realisation of '+ interactant' <br> - choice to select ' - interactant' | - realisation of Given $\wedge^{\wedge}$ New structure <br> - realisation of Theme ${ }^{\wedge}$ Rheme structure |

Table 5.69: Summary of Error Analysis, Categories - continued

Chapter 5: The Error Analysis

| Summary of Error Analysis/Categories |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ideational (experiential unless stated): incorrect.. | Interpersonal: incorrect... | Textual: incorrect... |
| Word | - realisation from a lexical system <br> - realisation of word class | - |  |
| Punctuation | - choice to select full stop at a clause nexus <br> - choice to select full stop within a clause <br> - choice to select a comma instead of a full stop or semi-colon <br> - choice to use a comma instead of a paratactic Linker | - |  |

As stated in the introduction to Chapter 1, the primary aim of this thesis is to conduct a Systemic Functional Grammar analysis of the lexicogrammatical errors in the written work of Japanese university students. As Chapter 2 pointed out, if successful this would produce the first 'Explicit: Full' error analysis to make use of the tools of Hallidayan linguistics.

The error analysis conducted over the previous 140 or so pages has demonstrated, first of all, that it is possible to analyse grammar errors from an SFG perspective. In other words, a grammar error - a missing definite article, for example, or perhaps the incorrect choice of Primary Tense - does not have to be viewed one-dimensionally, as the misuse of a formal rule. An SFG approach to error means that learner mistakes can be considered through the lens of meaning.

In practice this means recognising:
(i) that the elements of grammar (determiners, prepositions, and so on) are wordings that realise systemic meanings. This is as true for correct language as it is for erroneous uses of the English System Network. For instance, that missing definite article referred to above usually functions, in the texts of expert writers, to realise the experiential meaning 'specificity'. More than that, it's absence - the choice of an alternative Deictic - usually signals 'non-specific' as a contributing meaning (assuming we are not talking about nominal groups with proper nouns as Thing such as Tokyo). So the student who chooses to leave out 'the', when it is required by the meaning-based, jointly-constructed ESN, is not failing to reproduce a grammar rule, but failing to control a grammar meaning. The first is a trivial matter, and was recognised as such by scholars such as Burt (1975), who found that article errors
were 'local' and therefore "need not be controlled by the learner to communicate successfully" (p. 58). The second is fundamental, but is rarely highlighted in the literature. It means recognising, for example, that the student who chooses not to realise the first element of a specific nominal group is not merely omitting a determiner; she is omitting a Deictic, a key orienting element in the experiential structure of the group.
(ii) that 'an' error is in rarely a singularity. Language is a multi-layered system; almost every time we write (or speak) we are communicating along three strands of meaning simultaneously, as well as across ranks (though the latter was not a focus of the error analysis, as explained in section 5.1.1). This is true for both the syntagmatic and the paratagmatic axes. Regarding the first, it applies to metafunction-specific structures. For instance, the student who chooses not to realise the Subject of a clause is making an interpersonal structure error; he is omitting (a) the person (or thing) being held accountable in a communicative exchange in the structure Subject + Finite + Predicator (+ optional Complement and Adjunct), and (b) part of the Mood structure, Subject + Finite) which tells us what kind of exchange is at issue ("Sorry, are you telling me that or asking?"). But he is also making an ideational-experiential structure error, because the Actor, the instigator of some action ("Sorry, who scored the goal?") and operating in a structure such as Actor + Material Process + Goal) is missing too. And there are textual structure errors: (a) the learner has failed to realise the Theme, that cohesive element that carries the burden of helping the reader follow the argument as it unfolds ("Sorry, I'm getting lost here - who are we talking about now?"), and which operates in the structure Theme + Rheme; (b) there is a possibility that an important part of information structure, Given + New, has not been realised, too.

We have seen, too, that the composite nature of errors also applies to metafunction-specific systems. For example, when a learner fails to realise the Process, she is electing not to make a choice from the ideational-experiential system PROCESS TYPE (and from its various sub-systems, of course); this means that the reader may be unable to determine what particular event is being written about. But she is simultaneously making an error affecting the interpersonal system PRIMARY TENSE, meaning that the reader may be unsure whether past, present or future time is being referred to. The ideational-logical metafunction system SECONDARY TENSE might also be at risk, for instance if the 'intended' verbal group was something like 'had gone', or 'is going to go'.
(iii) that errors can be visualised, not just talked about. That is, we can use system network diagrams to show learners what their texts means to an expert reader. More interestingly, we can ask students to show us (or other students) the path they thought they were taking, and the path they actually took. The first would be a visual illustration of 'intended meaning'; the latter an illustration of actual meaning - or, more likely, non-ESN meaning.

One point that should be mentioned is the observation, raised several times during the analysis, that many errors occur in 'complex' structures - rankshifted clauses, embedded structures, complexes, expansions and projections (compare e.g. Yasuda (2010), Nakamori (2001)). Since these structures are important carriers of various kinds of meaning and nuance, this strongly suggests that language classes should pay attention to helping learners use them. And if this is done with an SFG orientation, it will focus on the utility of these structures in everyday communication. This will make them interesting and motivating to learn, rather than something to approach with timidity.

### 5.3.3 Conclusion

In summary, then, Chapter 5 has shown that an SFG analysis of error, in keeping with the fundamental tenets of Systemic Functional Linguistics as a whole, leads to the identification of categories and descriptions that are meaning-based. In turn, the analysis has demonstrated that such meaning-based descriptions open up approaches to classroom methodology that appear to have great potential.

## Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions

## Chapter 6 : Discussion and Conclusions

### 6.1 Introduction

This thesis has presented an error analysis (EA) of the written lexicogrammatical errors of a group of Japanese first-year students studying at a respected university in Tokyo. The model of grammar used, and the general approach to language taken in the analysis was that of Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG).

The error analysis can be categorised as an Explicit: Full analysis of learner errors - that is, one where both (i) L2 errors are identified, categorised and discussed, and (ii) the error categories themselves are also thoroughly discussed and justified. It was found that Explicit: Full analyses are relatively uncommon. Certainly, there appear no such explorations of the written errors of Japanese learners conducted from an SFG perspective. The analysis presented in Chapter 5, therefore, is the first of its kind. (For Explicit: Full EAs conducted from without an SFG perspective, see e.g. Nakamori (2002), Richards (1971).)

The thesis identified several factors acting to contextualise the error analysis, either in its general situational context, or with regards to the particular research project. These were introduced in Chapter 1, while some were also discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. They included the fact that (a), it was conducted in Japan, an EFL country with a generally disappointing record of English achievement given the many years of EFL education in that country (see also Kazuki \& Ross (2011); Poole (2003)); that (b), the participants were first-year students at a Japanese university, and therefore part of an education system that, again generally speaking, sometimes values activities, such as participation in sports clubs, at least as highly as an academic approach to tertiary study (Doyon, 2003); that (c), it focussed on writing, and in particular on short written essays, meaning that the participants had time to redraft their work; that (d), with the exception of reference and some punctuation errors, it concentrated on lexicogrammatical mistakes within the sentence; and that (e), it employed a Hallidayan approach, in that it viewed the texts as communicative
events, and therefore every word as encompassing choice and the intent to 'mean' (Halliday \& Matthissen, 1999).

### 6.2 Limitations of the research and future research

There are several limitations of this research. Most obviously, the data comes from a small number of students. A larger number of participants would have shown more clearly whether or not some of the smaller error categories were indicative of a widespread phenomenon.

Other limitations pertain to some of the factors mentioned in the previous section. First, the participants are very particular: all from the same university, all in their first-year, and all Japanese. It will be important in future research to find out whether the error patterns discovered in the current corpus extend to high school students, for example, or to learners at other universities, to EFL students in other countries, or to non-Japanese students studying in Japan. Having said that, since English is such an important part of Japanese education, the fact that this study concentrates on errors made by Japanese students, all of whom were in at a minimum in their seventh year of English study, can be considered an advantage, too. In contributing to an understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the English of Japanese university students, this study - or at least future research based on this or similar studies - might be able to feed back into the secondary school syllabus and provide valuable and authentic guidance.

Also, the focus on written, lexicogrammatical errors is a limitation. We need to know whether the same error categories are found in Japanese learners' spoken English, too. Furthermore, broadening future studies to include discourse errors may also produce valuable insights. This is particularly true considering the fact that Systemic Functional Linguistics is well-suited to a discourse approach (e.g. Martin \& Rose, 2007). On the other hand, since grammar errors are such a staple of the error analysis literature (see Chapter 2),
bringing the tools and philosophy of SFG to an existing understanding of grammar errors is an important contribution in its own right. Discourse by its very nature is oriented to meaning. Grammar is too but, although we have seen a trend in recent years to acknowledge this (for instance, in the literature on 'focus on form' - e.g. Fotos \& Nassaji, 2013), when applied to errors the communicative, functional role of grammar is something that still needs championing. Thus, while the limitations of an exclusive focus on lexicogrammar must be acknowledged, it may also play a part in raising the profile of grammar as meaning.

Another possible limitation of the study is that it does what was criticised by many in the 1970s: it focuses on erroneous structures to the exclusion of units that contain no errors (see Ellis, 2008). It is certainly true that much could be gained by a Systemic Functional analysis of grammatically correct groups and clauses, and it is therefore a limitation of this study that it does not attempt this. However, it is also true that the aim of this thesis was to attempt an SFG description of errors. SFG descriptions of correct language abound, and in that sense to focus also on accurate structures would have contributed nothing new to the literature.

The final limitation to be mentioned here is that, though I make numerous suggestions as to how an SFG-oriented methodology might be directed at helping learners understand, and perhaps overcome, their errors, there is as yet no empirical research evidence to support these ideas. On the other hand, there does exist a large body of research, conducted in both EFL and ESL contexts, that focuses on Systemic Functional approaches to language pedagogy (e.g. Butt et al., 2000; Jones \& Lock, 2011). The work done in this thesis can perhaps act as a bridge between such publications and pedagogical contexts where grammatical errors are given a greater focus by teachers and institutions.

### 6.3 Summary of Findings

In this thesis, 980 clauses from 66 student texts were analysed using the
box-diagram method developed by Halliday and employed by many SFG analysts (see Chapter 4). As a result of this analysis, 70 error categories were identified. These were described and discussed in Chapter 5.

A very important finding was that many errors are not the single entities they are usually described as, but are in fact composite phenomena. This, as far as I can determine, is a new discovery in the field of error analysis. That the effect of grammatical errors can reverberate elsewhere, for example at discourse level, is well-known. However, the fact that an error, such as the missing 'we' in E458: After we play tennis, $\theta$ went to cafe, can be interpreted as three distinct mistakes has never been discussed in the literature before, at least not in the context of an analysis of L2 errors. Note that these are not 'alternatives': we are not talking about three ways of looking at the same error. Through an SFG perspective, the analysis was able to distinct three distinct errors in examples such as E458: (i) missing Actor, missing Subject, and missing ideational Theme. These are distinct errors because they occur in different types of meaning (hence the significance of locating errors within their corresponding metafunction).

Furthermore, it was found that many errors are an amalgam of two different interpretations. They embody, first, an 'instantial' element. That is, they can be seen as the incorrect realisation of correct systemic choices. Second, they embody a 'system' element. In other words, they can be viewed as resulting from the incorrect selection from a system. In both cases systemic choice is paramount, and in both cases system network diagrams were able to demonstrate not only where learners had erred in their navigation of the systems, and in their particular realisations of selections from the systems, but also of where, in terms of the English System Network employed by expert writers, they had succeeded.

This latter point relates to another finding of the research: that an SFG perspective on error points to exciting pedagogical possibilities (see also Macken-Horarik (2006), Coffin (2003)). At a general level, an SFG approach makes it possible to relate almost every
grammatical error to a meaning-based source, not (only) a rule-based one. This is not necessarily a better way for all learners to consider grammatical issues, but it can certainly act as a valuable additional pedagogic tool. It is also possible, via the system network diagram, to show learners where their error lies, to what extent they have successfully navigated the system prior to making the error, why it is erroneous, and so on.

Finally, it was found that some errors did not immediately favour a system interpretation. In particular, structural errors (as opposed to the errors of structure mentioned above), such as the failure to include a marker of possession appear to be sufficiently categorised as instantial. On the other hand, certain errors that appear to be only realisation mistakes (such as the missing Actor /Subject /ideational Theme referred to earlier), were found to be usefully considered as a kind of 'Japanese English System Network feature'. In this way, we were able to suggest that one interpretation of the many errors of 'omission' in the data is that Japanese university students might be attaching a null option to various structures, turning them into systems of choice rather than fixed syntagms. For example, the transitivity structure Particpant + Process can be seen instead as two systems: PARTICIPANT, with the choices $+/$ - Particpant, and PROCESS, with the choices +/- Process. The point of this interpretation is not to suggest that it is indicative of an emerging variety of English, or that students are perhaps directly translating elliptical structures from Japanese (though both are possibilities). The point is a pedagogical one. Rather than say to a student, "You need a subject here", we can show her the system diagram, and say, "This (e.g -Particpant) is the choice you have made. Compared to this choice (i.e. +Particpant), what does it mean?" This focus on meaning may have benefits in the classroom - though this is something for future research.

In summary, the findings of this thesis are that, first, student errors can be described from the perspective of Systemic Functional Grammar; that second, this results in an analysis that allows even erroneous language to be interpreted as resulting from systemic
choices; and that third, such an analysis points to various important pedagogical implications.

### 6.4 Research Questions

1. To what extent can the written lexicogrammatical errors of first-year Japanese university students be described in terms of the SFG concepts of rank, metafunction, structure and system?

Perhaps the most pertinent finding was that almost without exception the categories of error identified were found to be amenable to a Systemic Functional description. The only categories that were not so described were those which appeared to be entirely form-based, in the sense that the choices made by the learners in the expression stratum had no analogue as meaning. An example of an error of this type was I can't cycling (E??). This is not to suggest that an SFG approach cannot also embrace errors of this kind, merely that in this thesis no attempt was made to do so.

Regarding the nature of the SF description, it was found that most errors were able to be located in terms of rank, metafunction system, and/or structure (see Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014). The only exception was EC??, where the exact rank was indeterminable. Occasionally, a structure-based description was preferred over a system-based one (for instance, E??, I meet to my boyfriend, was described in terms of transitivity structure as the incorrect realisation of a Participant as a Circumstance). However, in the majority of cases a particular system was identified.
2. What additional understanding of errors can be gained by viewing them from the theoretical perspectives of rank, metafunction, structure and system?

The greatest contribution to our understanding of errors lies in the interplay of structure and system. Traditional EAs (e.g. Hathaway, 1925) have tended to favour formal descriptions of error, an approach which, consciously or unconsciously, promotes a rule-based view of grammar and that does not give similar attention to grammatical meaning. As this thesis has shown, however, an SFG-based description does two things. First, it promotes a functional, meaning-based understanding of error. Second, it reminds us that there is syntagmatic and a paradigmatic component to any instance of text (Halliday \& Matthiessen, 2014), including text which does not conform to the conventions of the English System Network or of any variety of English that is expected and/or dominant in a particular social setting.

## 3. What pedagogical implications arise from a taking an approach to error analysis from a Systemic Functional Grammar perspective.

The first and most important pedagogical implication arising from this error analysis is that a clear demonstration has been provided of how lexicogrammatical errors can be approached from as meaning-based, functional perspective. It is important to note the word 'demonstration'. The point is not merely that grammar errors can be viewed as meaning-based, though an SFG approach certainly emphasises that this is an achievable target. The key aspect is that, through the use of system network diagrams (SNDs), teachers and students are provided with a tool that enables learners to also visualise the 'meaningful contexts' that surround a particular error.

We have seen that the SNDs show error in two different lights. First, they highlight the appropriate choices learners have made within systems, and reveal an error to be the incorrect realisation of one particular selection. Moreover, as is the case for example with
errors in deixis (EC2), the incorrect realisation is sometimes shown to match the correct realisation of a quite different meaning. Together, these points serve two functions: on one hand they promote the fact that learners have achieved some significant success despite the error, and on the other they remind the learner that a particular realisation isn't an arbitrary veneer, but a conduit of meaning. For instance, the choice to realise the meaning 'singular' in I went to party ( E ??) as ' $\Theta$ ' instead of ' $a$ ' is not without consequence, because as the system shows, the null Deictic has an important role in the system: it functions to mean 'non-singular'.

The second perspective on errors provided by the SND is to suggest they are correct realisations of the learner's meaning, but that the selection of this meaning was itself erroneous. Again, this serves to show, on one hand, that the learner succeeded in certain aspects despite the error, and on the other that it is meaning that holds the key to grammaticality.

To reiterate, then, a fundamental pedagogical implication of the research is the fact that grammar pedagogy, whether it be in the form of the presentation of grammatical structures, or of the provision of error feedback, or any other grammar-based activity, is amenable to a meaning-based approach.

There are also possible motivational implications. As suggested out above, the SNDs provide a visual record of students' successes, in addition to their failures. The instantial SND says to the student, "You made the right choice here, you found the right meaning. OK, you used the wrong structure to show that meaning to the reader, and the structure you used actually has a different meaning in the system. But that's good to know, too." The other interpretation says, "You used the right words here to convey your meaning. That's great!. OK, the meaning you chose was the wrong one according to the system, but that's something you can learn." Both perspectives provide solace to the struggling language learner; both, by relating the successes and failures of the text to a
visible system of limited choices, may make learning appear more achievable.
A final point to make is that the implications discussed above relate to the general point that grammar is not the severe, rule-laden, opaque master it can sometimes appear. But this is not the impression given by so many approaches to grammar in the classroom. To give just one example, the ubiquitous, impersonal abbreviations used in many forms of error correction ('ww' (wrong word), 's/v' (subject-verb agreement), 'wf' (word form), 'act/pass" (active / passive), 'A' (article use) are some examples provided in Corpuz (2011)) may help the learner pay attention to formal infelicities, but do nothing to help her capture the function of these grammatical items. However, an SFG approach, while never suggesting that formal considerations are unimportant, puts them in their rightful place: as the handmaidens of meaning.

### 6.5 Implications

The implications of this thesis can be considered with regards, to three groups of people: students, teachers and teacher educators.

As far as the students are concerned, various specific implications were brought up throughout Chapter 5, and there is no need to repeat them here. But speaking more broadly, an SFG approach (i) allows errors to be seen as related to meaning rather than rules, (ii) emphasises to learners not so much what errors they made, but why they made them; and (iii) helps students view language as a network of options. These options are shared by all users of the English System Network, experts and novices alike, which can give students a sense of belonging to a group even in the new language.

For teachers, again the implications have been suggested in some detail earlier in this thesis. Perhaps the most important general point to make is that an SFG approach to error allows teachers to stay faithful to the communicative orientation that is in vogue in modern language teaching, but also permits a firmly theoretical foundation for those who
appreciate a more formally rigorous approach. That SFG permits this flexibility is due to its founding tenet that the forms of language have evolved for the sake of human communication.

Finally, as far as teacher educators are concerned, the implication is clear: if, as a professional body, we agree that exposing students to the benefits of a Systemic Functional, meaning-based approach to learning language, including the understanding of language errors, is a positive step, then teachers too must be introduced to SFG in a more rigorous and systematic way. Even more than is already the case, teacher education courses, whether at degree level or Masters level, courses around the world should include courses on Hallidayan linguistic thought, and encourage the use of SFG principles in teacher training activities, assignment writing, and so on. Moreover, teacher educators should join the call for more SFG-based textbooks.

### 6.6 Conclusion

Trying to learn English as a foreign language, particularly in a context like Japan where there are so few opportunities to practise, is a hugely daunting task. In particular, grammar must seem to many learners forbidding and inhospitable, its rules and patterns and structures blocking the path to progress, like jagged rocks in a dark cave. How ironic, then, that in that darkness it is grammar itself that holds the torch. Taught wisely, it illuminates those same structures and rules, recasting them as navigators on the pathway between meaning and communication.

This thesis has shone the torch of Systemic Functional Grammar on a surprising target: lexicogrammatical error. In so doing, it has shown errors in their true light, not as the breaking of arbitraty rules, not yet as trivia to be ignored, but as witnesses of those areas within the English System Network where learners lack control of meanings. SFG helps to identify and describe the systems and structures at risk in the English of Japanese learners;

## Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusions

moreover, is suggests ways of dealing with these issues in the classroom. In other words, an SFG approach enables the analysis of grammatical errors to contribute to the fundamental goal of foreign language study: to learn how to mean.
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## Appendix 1: Self-Introduction Texts

## Text S-I1

My name is X. I'm 19 years old. I live in Tokyo, but my hometown is Kumamoto in Kyushu. There are many delicious foods, good water and nature. Kumamon is favourite character. Favourite foods is Karashirenkon and Basashi. I think you should visit in Kumamoto. I join yachting club. And I couldn't come this class for two weeks. Because I have to go very important tournament. I want to speak English. Therefore, I will study English very hard.

## Sentence list

1. S-I1.S1: My name is X.
2. S-I1.S2: I'm 19 years old.
3. S-II.S3: I live in Tokyo, but my hometown is Kumamoto in Kyushu.
4. S-I1.S4: There are many delicious foods, good water and nature.
5. S-I1.S5: Kumamon is favourite character.
6. S-I1.S6: Favourite foods is Karashirenkon and Basashi.
7. S-I1.S7: I think you should visit in Kumamoto.
8. S-I1.S8: I join yachting club.
9. S-I1.S9(i-ii): And I couldn't come this class for two weeks. Because I have to go very important tournament.
10. S-I1.S10: I want to speak English.
11. S-I1.S11: Therefore, I will study English very hard.

Clause list

1. S-I1.C1: My name is X.
2. S-II.C2: I'm 19 years old.
3. S-I1.C3: I live in Tokyo,
4. S-I1.C4: but my hometown is Kumamoto in Kyushu.
5. S-I1.C5: There are many delicious foods, good water and nature.
6. S-I1.C6: Kumamon is favourite character.
7. S-I1.C7: Favourite foods is Karashirenkon and Basashi.
8. S-I1.C8( $\alpha$ ): I think
9. S-I1.C8(' $\beta$ ): you should visit in Kumamoto.
10. S-II.C9: I join yachting club.
11. S-I1.C10: And I couldn't come this class for two weeks.
12. S-II.C11: Because I have to go very important tournament.
13. S-I1.C12( $\alpha$ ): I want
14. S-I1.C12(' $\beta$ ): to speak English.
15. S-I1.C13: Therefore, I will study English very hard.

Sentence S-I1.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I1.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II.C1


No errors

Sentence S-I1.S2: I'm 19 years old.
Clause S-I1.C2: I'm [19 years] old.

Analysis of clause S-II.C2

|  | I | 'm |  | [19 years] old. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I1.S3: I live in Tokyo, but my hometown is Kumamoto in Kyushu. Clause S-I1.C3: I live in Tokyo,

Analysis of clause S-II.C3

|  | I | live |  | in Tokyo, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicate | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: del |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I1.C4: but my hometown is Kumamoto in Kyushu.

Analysis of clause S-II.C4


## No errors

Sentence S-I1.S4: There are many delicious foods, good water and nature.
Clause S-I1.C5: There are many delicious foods, good water and nature.

|  | There | are |  | many delicious foods, good water and nature. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | - | Pro: Existential |  | Part: Existent |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 | +3 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | Theme | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I1.S5: Kumamon is favourite character.
Clause S-I1.C6: Kumamon is favourite character.

Analysis of clause S-II.C6

|  | Kumamon | is |  | $\theta$ | favou | chara |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identifier/Token | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identified/Value |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sp | + Epithe | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : int |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  | id |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E1: S-I1.C6.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E2: S-I1.C6.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'
E3: S-I1.C6.3: EC9/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘+ interactant' EC9/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select '- interactant'

Sentence S-I1.S6: Favourite foods is Karashirenkon and Basashi.
Clause S-I1.C7: Favourite foods is Karashirenkon and Basashi.

Analysis of clause S-II.C7


## Error list

E4: S-I1.C7.1: $\quad$ EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E5: S-I1.C7.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'
E6: S-I1.C7.3: EC9/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ' + interactant' EC9/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select '- interactant'

E7: S-I1.C7.4: EC12b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC12b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'

Sentence S-I1.S7: I think you should visit in Kumamoto.
Clause S-I1.C8( $\alpha$ ): I think
Clause S-I1.C8(‘ $\beta$ ): you should visit in Kumamoto.


## Error list

E8: S-I1.C8(' $\beta$ ).1: EC22c/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Circumstance instead of a Goal E9: S-I1.C8(' $\beta$ ).2: EC29/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise an Adjunct instead of a Complement

Sentence S-I1.S8: Ijoin yachting club.
Clause S-I1.C9: I join yachting club.

|  | I | join |  | $\Theta$ | yachting club. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sp | + Classifier + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  | id |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E10: S-I1.C9.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E11: S-I1.C9.2: EC21a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of past time
E12: S-I1.C9.3: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

Sentence S-I1.S9(i-ii): I couldn't come this class for two weeks. Because I have to go very important tournament. Clause S-I1.C10: I couldn't come this class for four weeks.

Analysis of clause S-II.C10


Error list
E13: S-I1.S9(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus
E14: S-I1.C10.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E15: S-I1.C10.2: EC16/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'modal present'
EC16/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ MODAL TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'modal past'

Sentence S-I1.S9(ii): Because I have to go very important tournament.
Clause S-I1.C11: Because I have to go very important tournament.

|  | Because | I | have to go |  |  | very important | tournament. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circumstance: Place |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | pp: Minor Pro | + Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | $\beta$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: mod/pres | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E16: S-I1.C11.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18 /2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E17: S-I1.C11.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I1.S10: I want to speak English.
Clause S-I1.C12( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I1.C12(' $\beta$ ): to speak English.

|  | I | want |  | to speak | English. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental: Desiderative |  | projected Metaphenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Behavioural | Part: Range |
| id: $\log$ | Projection: ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  |  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I1.S11: Therefore, I will study English very hard.
Clause S-I1.C13: Therefore, I will study English very hard.

|  | Therefore, | I | will | study | English | very hard. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Degree |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: modal | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | - | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Text S-I2

I'm X. I live in Chiba. My hobby is watching baseball and listen to music. My favourite song is One Direction's "What makes you beautiful". I work at Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant. I like Disney. I want to get over 500 of TOEIC score, all credit and driver's licence. So, I'll study hard. I like movie. Especially I like MIB and High School Musical.

Sentence list

1. S-I2.S1: I'm X.
2. S-I2.S2: I live in Chiba.
3. S-I2.S3: My hobby is watching baseball and listen to music.
4. S-I2.S4: My favourite song is One Direction's "What makes you beautiful".
5. S-I2.S5: I work at Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant.
6. S-I2.S6: I like Disney.
7. S-I2.S7: I want to get over 500 of TOEIC score, all credit and driver's licence.
8. S-I2.S8: So, I'll study hard.
9. S-I2.S9: I like movie.
10. S-I2.S10: Especially I like MIB and High School Musical.

Clause list

1. S-I2.C1: I'm X.
2. S-I2.C2: I live in Chiba.
3. S-I2.C3: My hobby is [[watching baseball $]$ ] and [[listen to music $]]$.
4. S-I2.C3[i]: [[watching baseball]]
5. S-I2.C3[ii]: [ [listen to music]]
6. S-I2.C4: My favourite song is One Direction's "What makes you beautiful".
7. S-I2.C5: I work at Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant.
8. S-I2.C6: I like Disney.
9. S-I2.C7( $\alpha$ ): I want
10. S-I2.C7(' $\beta$ ): to get over 500 of TOEIC score, all credit and driver's licence.
11. S-I2.C8: So, I'll study hard.
12. S-I2.C9: I like movie.
13. S-I2.C10: Especially I like MIB and High School Musical.

## Sentence S-I2.S1: I'm $X$.

## Clause S-I2.C1: I'm $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I2.CI

|  | I | 'm |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/ Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I2.S2: I live in Chiba.
Clause S-I2.C2: I live in Chiba.

Analysis of clause S-I2.C2

|  | I | live |  | in Chiba. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I2.S3: My hobby is watching baseball and listen to music.
Clause S-I2.C3, C3[i], C3[ii]: My hobby is [[watching baseball]] and [[listen to music]].


Error list
E18: S-I2.C3[ii].1: EC11a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ id-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfective' EC11a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ i id-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective'
E19: S-I2.C3[ii].2: EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Sentence S-I2.S4: My favourite song is One Direction's "What makes you beautiful". Clause: S-I2.C4: My favourite song is One Direction's "What makes you beautiful".

Analysis of clause S-I2.C4


## No errors

Sentence S-I2.S5: I work at Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant. Clause S-I2.C5: I work at [Tokyo Disneyland's] restaurant.


Error list
E20: S-I2.C5: EC4: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence S-I2.S6: I like Disney.
Clause S-I2.C6: I like Disney.

|  | I | like |  | Disney. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I2.S7: I want to get over 500 of TOEIC score, all credit and driver's licence.
Clause S-I2.C7( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I2.C7(‘ $\beta$ ): to get over 500 [of TOEIC score], all credit and driver's licence.

Analysis of clauses S-I2.C7a-b

|  | I | want |  | to get | over 500 [of TOEIC score], all credit |  |  | d $\Theta$ | driver's | licence. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Part: Goal |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{ng}: \mathrm{D}+\mathrm{Th}$ : singular | ng : $\operatorname{sing}$ | $+\mathrm{Cl}$ | + Th |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ngc : | 1 | +2 |  |  | 3 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E21: S-I2.C7( ${ }^{( } \beta$ ).1: EC4: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable
E22: S-I2.C7( ${ }^{\beta}$ ).2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E23: S-I2.C7(' $\beta$ ).3: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I2.S8: So, I'll study hard.
Clause S-I2.C8: So, I'll study hard.

Analysis of clause S-I2.C8

|  | So, | I | 'll study |  | hard. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Manner |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite: future | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I2.S9: I like movie.
Clause S-I2.C9: I like movie.

|  | I | like |  | movie. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
|  |  |  |  | ng: Thing: singular |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E24: S-I2.C9: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I2.S10: Especially I like MIB and High School Musical.
Clause S-I2.C10: Especially I like MIB and High School Musical.

Analysis of clauses S-I2.C10


## No errors

## Text S-I3

My name is X. I'm 19 years old. I was born in Tokyo but I live in Kashiwa in Chiba Prefecture. I was a baseball player for nine years but now I belong to a dance club at X University. I'm dancing Sunday and Monday. I like go to karaoke. It is very fun. Sometimes I go to Karaoke alone. My part time job is an apparel clerk. I work five days a week.

## Sentence list

1. S-I3.S1: My name is $X$.
2. S-I3.S2: I'm 19 years old.
3. S-I3.S3: I was born in Tokyo but I live in Kashiwa in Chiba Prefecture.
4. S-I3.S4: I was a baseball player for nine years but now I belong to a dance club at X University.
5. S-I3.S5: I'm dancing Sunday and Monday.
6. S-I3.S6: I like go to karaoke.
7. S-I3.S7: It is very fun.
8. S-I3.S8: Sometimes I go to Karaoke alone.
9. S-I3.S9: My part time job is an apparel clerk.
10. S-I3.S10: I work five days a week.

Clause list

1. S-I3.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I3.C2: I'm 19 years old.
3. S-I3.C3: I was born in Tokyo
4. S-I3.C4: but I live in Kashiwa in Chiba Prefecture.
5. S-I3.C5: I was a baseball player for nine years
6. S-I3.C6: but now I belong to a dance club at $X$ University.
7. S-I3.C7: I'm dancing Sunday and Monday.
8. S-I3.C8: I like [[go to karaoke]]
9. S-I3.C8[i]: [[go to karaoke]].
10. S-I3.C9: It is very fun.
11. S-I3.C10: Sometimes I go to Karaoke alone.
12. S-I3.C11: My part time job is an apparel clerk.
13. S-I3.C12: I work five days a week.

Sentence S-I3.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I3.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I3.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite $^{+}:$present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |
|  | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S2: I'm 19 years old.
Clause S-I3.C2: I'm [19 years] old.

|  | I | 'm |  | [19 years] old. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood; decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S3: I was born in Tokyo but I live in Kashiwa in Chiba prefecture.
Clause S-I3.C3: I was born in Tokyo

|  | I | was | born | in Tokyo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Goal | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  |  | decl |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I3.C4: but I live in Kashiwa in Chiba Prefecture.

Analysis of clause S-I3.C4

|  | but | I | live |  |  | shiwa | in Chiba Prefecture. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
| id:log | x2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ppc: | 1 | $=2$ |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S4: I was a baseball player for nine years but now I belong to a dance club at X University. Clause S-I3.C5: I was a baseball player for nine years

Analysis of clause S-I3.C5

|  | I | was |  | a baseball player | for nine years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute | Circ: Duration |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I3.C6: but now I belong to a dance club at X University.

Analysis of clause S-I3.C6

|  | but | now | I | belong |  | to a dance club | at X University. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Circ: Time | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | +2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Circ Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  |  | Re... | Mood: decl |  | ...sidue |  |  |
| text marked $\rightarrow$ | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S5: I'm dancing Sunday and Monday.
Clause S-I3.C7: I'm dancing Sunday and Monday.


## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S6: I like go to Karaoke.
Clause S-I3.C8: I like [[go to Karaoke]]
Clause S-I3.C8[i]: [[go to Karaoke]]

Analysis of clauses S-I3.C8-C8[i]


Error list
E25: S-I3.C8[i].1: EC11a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect
EC11a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ i ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E26: S-I3.C8[i].2: EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite'
EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Sentence S-I3.S7: It is very fun.
Clause S-I3.C9: It is very fun.

Analysis of clause S-I3.C9

|  | It | is |  | very fun. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S8: Sometimes I go to Karaoke alone.
Clause S-I3.C10: Sometimes I go to Karaoke alone.

Analysis of clause S-I3.C10

|  | Sometimes | I | go |  | to Karaoke | alone. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: <br> Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Manner |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Mood Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I3.S9: My part time job is an apparel clerk.
Clause S-I3.C11: My part time job is an apparel clerk.

Analysis of clause S-I3.C11

|  | My part time job | is |  | $\ominus$ | an apparel cla |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Circumstance: Role |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: Minor Pro | + Minor Range |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E27: S-I3.C11: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Role Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I3.S10: I work five days a week.
Clause S-I3.C12: I work five days [a week].

|  | I | work |  | five days [a week]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Frequency |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Text S-I4

My name is X. I'm 19 years old. I'm live in Saitama. So university is really far me. It takes about 1 hour. And, my hobby is listening to music. Especially, I like rock music. For example, B'z and Bon Jovi. When I take a train or take a walk, I necessary to bring my iPod. Then, my favourite food is yakiniku and curry. But I hate to eat vegetables. My part-time job is supermarket.

## Sentence list

1. S-I4.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I4.S2: I'm 19 years old.
3. S-I4.S3(i): I'm live in Saitama.
4. S-I4.S3(ii): So university is really far me.
5. S-I4.S4: It takes about 1 hour.
6. S-I4.S5: And, my hobby is listening to music.
7. S-I4.S6(i): Especially, I like rock music.
8. S-I4.S6(ii): For example, B'z and Bon Jovi.
9. S-I4.S7: When I take a train or take a walk, I necessary to bring my iPod.
10. S-I4.S8: Then, my favourite food is yakiniku and curry.
11. S-I4.S9: But I hate to eat vegetables.
12. S-I4.S10: My part-time job is supermarket.

Clause list

1. S-I4.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I4.C2: I'm 19 years old.
3. S-I4.C3: I'm live in Saitama.
4. S-I4.C4: So university is really far me.
5. S-I4.C5: It takes about 1 hour.
6. S-I4.C6: And, my hobby is [[listening to music]].
7. S-I4.C6[i]: [[listening to music]]
8. S-I4.C7: Especially, I like rock music.
9. S-I4.C8: When I take a train
10. S-I4.C9: or take a walk,
11. S-I4.C10: I necessary to bring my iPod.
12. S-I4.C11: Then, my favourite food is yakiniku and curry.
13. S-I4.C12: But I hate [[to eat vegetables]]
14. S-I4.C12[i]: [[to eat vegetables]].
15. S-I4.C13: My part-time job is supermarket.

Sentence S-I4.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I4.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |
|  | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I4.S2: I'm 19 years old.
Clause S-I4.C2: I'm [19 years] old.
Analysis of clause S-I4.C2

|  | I | 'm |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}:$present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |
|  | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I4.S3(i-ii): I'm live in Saitama. So university is really far me.
Clause S-I4.C3: I'm live in Saitama.

|  | I | 'm | live | in Saitama. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
|  | , | vg: $\alpha \Theta$ | $\beta \theta$ 每 |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E28: S-I4.S3: EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus
E30: S-I4.C3.2: EC14a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

Sentence S-I4.S3(ii): So university is really far me.
Clause S-I4.C4: So university is really far me.


## Error list

E31: S-I4.C4: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Angle Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

## Sentence S-I4.S4: It takes about 1 hour.

Clause S-I4.C5: It takes [about 1] hour.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C5

|  | It | takes |  | [about 1] | hour. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I4.S5: And, my hobby is listening to music.
Clause S-I4.C6: And, my hobby is [[listening to music]]
Clause S-I4.C6[i]: [[listening to music]]

Analysis of clauses S-I4.C6-C6[i]

|  | And, | my hobby | is |  | [[listening to music $]$ ]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | $2$ | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I4.S6(i-ii): Especially, I like rock music. For example, B'z and Bon Jovi.
Clause S-I4.C7: Especially, I like rock music. For example, B'z and Bon Jovi.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C7


Error list
E32: S-I4.C7: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

Sentence S-I4.S7: When I take a train or take a walk, I necessary to bring my iPod. Clause S-I4.C8: When I take a train

Analysis of clause S-I4.C8

|  | When | I | take |  | a train |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material: |  | Part: Scope |
| id: $\log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ (Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Clause S-I4.C9: or WHEN I take a walk,

Analysis of clause S-I4.C9


No errors

Clause S-I4.C10: I necessary to bring my iPod.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C10


Error list
E33: S-I4.C10: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I4.S8: Then, my favourite food is yakiniku and curry.
Clause S-I4.C11: Then, my favourite food is yakiniku and curry.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C11

|  | Then, | my favourite food | is |  | yakiniku and curry. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{ng}:$ Deictic $+\mathrm{Ep} \quad+\mathrm{Th}$ : singular |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | enh | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E34: S-I4.C11.1: EC38/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'extending'
EC38/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ CONJUNCTION TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select extending 'enhancing'
E35: S-I4.C11.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I4.S9: But I hate to eat vegetables.
Clause S-I4.C12: But I hate [[to eat vegetables]]
Clause S-I4.C12[i]: [[to eat vegetables]].

Analysis of clauses S-I4.C12-C12[i]

|  | But | I | hate |  | [ [to eat | vegetables]]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Macro-Phenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | [[Material | Goal]] |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | [[Predicator | Complement]] |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I4.S10: My part-time job is supermarket.
Clause S-I4.C13: My part-time job is supermarket.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C13


Error list
E36: S-I4.C13.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Location Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E37: S-I4.C13.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘singular
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text S-I5

My name is X. I'm from Chiba Prefecture. I live in Sanmu-city in Chiba. It takes about 2 hours from here, so I want to live myself. I like music and dance. I'm belonging to X's dance club. It really fun. My families are 6 people. I'm youngest. And I have a cat. He is so cute. I'm working at hotel and fitness club. I want to do more kinds of job, so I'll try many things this year.

## Sentence list

1. S-I5.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I5.S2: I'm from Chiba Prefecture.
3. S-I5.S3: I live in Sanmu-city in Chiba.
4. S-I5.S4: It takes about 2 hours from here, so I want to live myself.
5. S-I5.S5: I like music and dance.
6. S-I5.S6: I'm belonging to X's dance club.
7. S-I5.S7: It really fun
8. S-I5.S8: My families are 6 people.
9. S-I5.S9: I'm youngest.
10. S-I5.S10: And I have a cat.
11. S-I5.S11: He is so cute.
12. S-I5.S12: I'm working at hotel and fitness club.
13. S-I5.S13: I want to do more kinds of job, so I'll try many things this year.

## Clause list

1. S-15.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I5.C2: I'm from Chiba Prefecture.
3. S-I5.C3: I live in Sanmu-city in Chiba.
4. S-I5.C4: It takes about 2 hours from here,
5. S-I5.C5( $\alpha$ ): so I want
6. S-I5.C5(‘ $\beta$ ): to live myself.
7. S-I5.C6: I like music and dance.
8. S-I5.C7: I'm belonging to X's dance club.
9. S-I5.C8: It really fun.
10. S-I5.C9: My families are 6 people.
11. S-I5.C10: I'm youngest.
12. S-I5.C11: And I have a cat.
13. S-I5.C12: He is so cute.
14. S-I5.C13: I'm working at hotel and fitness club.
15. S-I5.C14( $\alpha$ ): I want
16. S-I5.C14(‘ $\beta$ ): to do [more kinds of] job,
17. S-I5.C15: so I'll try many things this year.

## Sentence S-I5.S1: My name is $X$.

Clause S-I5.C1: My name is $X$.


## No errors

## Sentence S-I5.S2: I'm from Chiba Prefecture.

Clause S-I5.C2: I'm from Chiba Prefecture.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C2

|  | I | 'm |  | from Chiba Prefecture. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Circumstantial Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | (Predicator) | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I5.S3: I live in Sanmu-city in Chiba.

Clause S-I5.C3: I live in Sanmu-city in Chiba.

|  | I | live |  | in Sanmu-city in Chiba. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  | ppc: | 1 | $=2$ |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I5.S4: It takes about 2 hours from here, so I want to live myself.
Clause S-I5.C4: It takes about 2 hours from here,

Analysis of clause S-I5.C4

|  | It | takes |  | about 2 hours | from here, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Circumstantial Attribute | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Clause S-I5.C5( $\alpha$ ): so I want

Clause S-I5.C5(‘ $\beta$ ): to live myself.

Analysis of clauses S-I5.C5a-b


Error list
E38: S-I5.C5(' $\beta$ ): EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Manner Circumstance EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

## Sentence S-I5.S5: I like music and dance.

Clause S-I5.C6: I like music and dance.

|  | I | like |  | music |  | and | dance. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: | ng |  | + ng |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence: S-I5.S6: I'm belonging to X's dance club.
Clause: S-I5.C7: I'm belonging to X's dance club.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C7

|  | I | 'm | nging | to X 's dance club. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Rel: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  | vg: $\quad \alpha \Theta$ | $\underline{\beta}$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E39: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system

Sentence: S-I5.S7: It really fun.
Clause: S-I5.C8: It really fun.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C8

|  | It | $\Theta$ |  |  | really fun. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pre |  |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Fin |  | (Predicator) | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E40: S-15.C8.1: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E41: S-I5.C8.2: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'

Sentence S-I5.S8: My families are 6 people.
Clause S-I5.C9: My families are 6 people.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C9

|  | My families | are |  | 6 people. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational $\rightarrow$ intensive |  | Part: Attribute |
|  | ng: D + Th: plural |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | (Predicator) | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E42: S-I5.C9.1: EC23a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'possessive'
EC23a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PROCESS TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'intensive'
E43: S-I5.C9.2: EC3b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC3b/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'plural'

Sentence: S-I5.S9: I'm youngest.
Clause S-I5.C10: I'm youngest.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C10


Error list
E44: S-I5.C10.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E45: S-I5.C10.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

Sentence: S-I5.S10: And I have a cat.
Clause S-I5.C11: And I have a cat.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C11

|  | And | I | have |  | a cat. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational | ive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I5.S11: He is so cute.

Clause S-I5.C12: He is so cute.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C12

|  | He | is |  | so cute. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |  |
| id:log | (Predicator) |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I5.S12: I'm working at hotel and fitness club.
Clause S-I5.C13: I'm working at hotel and fitness club.

|  | I | 'm working |  | at | $\Theta$ | hotel and fitness club. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Pro | Minor Range |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: pg | + ng: sing | + | Classifier | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  | wc: 1 | +2 |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E46: S-15.C13: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence: S-I5.S13: I want to do more kinds of job, so I'll try many things this year.
Clause: S-I5.C14( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause: S-I5.C14(' $\beta$ ): to do [more kinds of] job,

Analysis of clauses S-I5.C14 $(\alpha-\beta)$

|  | I | want |  | to do | [more kinds of] job, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |
|  |  | - |  | Pro: Material | Part: Scope |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I5.C15: so I'll try many things this year.

Analysis of clause S-I5.C15

|  | SO | I | 'll try |  | many things | this year. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Time |
| id: $\log$ | x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$f future | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Text S-I6

I'm XY. Call me X. I'm 4 year student. I'm live in Chiba. Chiba is good place for live. My hobby is playing basketball, skateboarding, reading book, listening music and watching movie. My favourite movie are "Snatch", "Butterfly Effect" and "Joe Black". They are very very interesting!! If you never watch those movies, please watch!

## Sentence list

1. S-I6.S1: I'm XY.
2. S-I6.S2: Call me X.
3. S-I6.S3: I'm 4 year student.
4. S-I6.S4: I'm live in Chiba.
5. S-I6.S5: Chiba is good place for live.
6. S-I6.S6: My hobby is playing basketball, skateboarding, reading book, listening music and watching movie.
7. S-I6.S7: My favourite movie are "Snatch", "Butterfly Effect" and "Joe Black".
8. S-I6.S8: They are very very interesting!!
9. S-I6.S9: If you never watch those movies, please watch!

Clause list

1. S-I6.C1: I'm XY
2. S-I6.C2: Call me X.
3. S-I6.C3: I'm 4 year student.
4. S-I6.C4: I'm live in Chiba.
5. S-I6.C5: Chiba is good place [for live].
6. S-I6.C6: My hobby is [[playing basketbal1]], [[skateboarding]], [[reading book]], [[listening music]] and [[watching movie]]
7. S-I6.C6[i]: [[playing basketball]]
8. S-I6.C6[ii]: [[skateboarding]]
9. S-I6.C6[iii]: [[reading book]]
10. S-I6.C6[iv]: [[listening music]]
11. S-I6.C6[v]: [[watching movie]]
12. S-I6.C7: My favourite movie are "Snatch", "Butterfly Effect" and "Joe Black".
13. S-I6.C8: They are very very interesting!!
14. S-I6.C9: If you never watch those movies,
15. S-I6.C10: please watch!

## Sentence S-I6.S1: I'm $X Y$.

## Clause S-I6.C1: I'm $X Y$.



## No errors

Sentence S-I6.S2: Call me X.
Clause S-I6.C2: Call me $X$.

Analysis of clause S-16.C2

|  | Call | me | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identified | Part: Identifier |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator | Complement | Complement |
|  | (mood: imp) Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I6.S3: I'm 4 year student.
Clause S-I6.C3: I'm 4 year student.

|  | I | 'm |  | $\Theta$ | 4 year | student. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | $+\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{ng}(\mathrm{N} \rightarrow$ quant $)+\mathrm{Th})$ ) | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E47: S-I6.C3.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular
E48: S-I6.C3.2: EC5/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'ordinative'
EC5/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMERATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'quantitative'

## Sentence S-I6.S4: I'm live in Chiba.

Clause S-I6.C4: I'm live in Chiba.

|  | I | 'm | live | in Chiba. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  | vg: $\alpha \Theta$ | $\beta \Theta$ ing |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E49: S-I6.C4.2: EC14a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

Sentence S-I6.S5: Chiba is good place for live.
Clause S-I6.C5: Chiba is good place [for live].

Analysis of clauses S-I6.C5(i-ii)

|  | Chiba | is |  |  | good | place | [for live]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Epithet | + Thing | + Qualifier |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: del |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E50: S-I6.C5.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E51: S-I6.C5.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ Lexical System $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I6.S6: My hobby is playing basketball, skateboarding, reading book, listening music and watching movie.
Clause S-I6.C6: My hobby is [[playing basketball]], [[skateboarding]], [[reading book]], [[listening music]] and [[watching movie]].
Clauses S-I6.C6[i-v]: [[playing basketball]], [[skateboarding]], [[reading book]], [[listening music]], [[watching movie]]

Analysis of clauses S-[6.C6-C6[v]


Error list
E52: S-I6.C6[iv]: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Location Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E53: S-I6.C6: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E54: S-I6.C6[iii]:EC3a/1: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E55: S-I6.C6[v]: EC3a/1: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I6.S7: My favourite movie are "Snatch", "Butterfly Effect" and "Joe Black".
Clause S-I6.C7: My favourite movie are "Snatch", "Butterfly Effect" and "Joe Black".

|  | Му | favourite | movie | are |  | "Snatch", "Butterfly Effect" and 'Joe Black". |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Identified/Value |  |  | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Id |  | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |  |
|  | ng : Deictic + | Epithet | + Thing $\rightarrow$ singular |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 | +3 |
| int |  | Subject |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  | Compl |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E56: S-I6.C7: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise ‘singular'

Sentence S-I6.S8: They are very very interesting!!
Clause S-I6.C8: They are very very interesting!!

Analysis of clauses S-I6.C8

|  | They | are |  | very very interesting!! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id : $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Thing |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I6.S9: If you never watch those movies, please watch!
Clause S-I6.C9: If you never watch those movies,

Analysis of clauses S-I6.C9

|  | If | you | never |  |  | those movies, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Behaver | Pro: Behavioural |  |  | Part: Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | K | Subject | Modal Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood (negative polarity) |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E57: S-I6.C9: EC21a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of past time

Clause S-I6.C10: please watch!

Analysis of clauses S-I6.C10

|  | please | watch! |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  |  |  |
| id:log | $\alpha$ |  |  |
| int | Modal Adjunct | Pro: Behavioural |  |
|  | (imperative mood) | Redicator |  |
| text | interpersonal | ideational |  |
|  | Theme $^{3}$ |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme $^{1}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

No errors

## Text S-I7

My name is X. I live in Saitama. Usually, I take 1 hour to university. I have many hobbies. For example, enjoy dancing, skateboarding, watching movie and trip to other country. I went to New York and Cairns last year. I want to go to New York once again this year, because I'm really favourite there. But, I'm job hunting now. So I'm busy and can't accumulate the money. By the way, are you like sneakers? I love it. I'm collected Air Jordans, Puma, Adidas and Pro-Keds. I have many sneakers. I want keep collect.

## Sentence list

1. S-I7.S1: My name is X.
2. S-I7.S2: I live in Saitama.
3. S-I7.S3: Usually, I take 1 hour to university.
4. S-I7.S4: I have many hobbies.
5. S-I7.S5: For example, enjoy dancing, skateboarding, watching movie and trip to other country.
6. S-I7.S6: I went to New York and Cairns last year.
7. S-I7.S7: I want to go to New York once again this year, because I'm really favourite there.
8. S-I7.S8(i): But, I'm job hunting now.
9. S-I7.S8(ii): So I'm busy and can't accumulate the money.
10. S-I7.S9: By the way, are you like sneakers?
11. S-I7.S10: I love it.
12. S-I7.S11: I'm collected Air Jordans, Puma, Adidas and Pro-Keds.
13. S-I7.S12: I have many sneakers.
14. S-I7.S13: I want keep collect.

Clause list

1. S-I7.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I7.C2: I live in Saitama.
3. S-I7.C3: Usually, I take 1 hour to university.
4. S-I7.C4: I have many hobbies.
5. S-I7.C5: For example, enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country].
6. S-I7.C5[i]: [[dancing]]
7. S-I7.C5[ii]: [[skateboarding]]
8. S-I7.C5[iii]: [[watching movie]]
9. S-I7.C6: I went to New York and Cairns last year.
10. S-I7.C7( $\alpha$ ): I want
11. S-I7.C7(' $\beta$ ): to go to New York once again this year,
12. S-I7.C8: because I'm really favourite there.
13. S-I7.C9: But, I'm job hunting now.
14. S-I7.C10: So I'm busy
15. S-I7.C11: and can't accumulate the money.
16. S-I7.C12: By the way, are you like sneakers?
17. S-I7.C13: I love it.
18. S-I7.C14: I'm collected Air Jordans, Puma, Adidas and Pro-Keds.
19. S-I7.C15: I have many sneakers.
20. S-I7.C16( $\alpha$ ): I want
21. S-I7.C16(' $\beta$ ): keep collect.

Sentence S-I7.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I7.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-17.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I7.S2: I live in Saitama.

Clause S-I7.C2: I live in Saitama.

Analysis of clause S-I7.C2

|  | I | live |  | in Saitama. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I7.S3: Usually, I take 1 hour to university.

Clause S-I7.C3: Usually, I take 1 hour to university.

Analysis of clause S-I7.C3

|  | Usually, | I | take |  | 1 hour | to university. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | , | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Modal Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I7.S4: I have many hobbies.

Clause S-I7.C4: I have many hobbies.

Analysis of clause S-I7.C4

|  | I | have |  | many hobbies. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | 'Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I7.S5: For example, enjoy dancing, skateboarding, watching movie and trip to other country.
Clause S-I7.C5: For example, enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country].
Clauses S-I7.C5 [i-iii]: [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]]

Analysis of clauses S-I7.C5(i-iv))

|  | For example, | $\Theta$ | enjoy |  | [[...]] |  | [ [watc | ng movie]] | d trip | [to other | countr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Macro-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  | nom: vg | $+\mathrm{ng}(\mathrm{Th} \rightarrow \underline{\text { sing }}$ ) | $\mathrm{ng}: \mathrm{Th} \rightarrow \operatorname{sing}^{\text {sin }}$ | + Qu: pp (pg + ng (D | Th $\underline{\text { sing }}$ ) |
| id:log |  |  |  |  | ngc: 1 | +2 |  | +3 |  |  | +4 |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Sub | $\mathrm{F}^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (decl) |  | [Mo]od |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | id Th | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Th[eme] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E58: S-I7.C5.1: EC22b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Participant
EC22b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'
E59: S-I7.C5.2: EC27a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Subject
EC27a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Subject'
E60: S-I7.C5.3: EC33a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ideational Theme
EC33a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null ideational Theme'

E61: S-I7.C5[iii]: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E62: S-17.C5.4: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E63: S-I7.C5.5: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I7.S6: I went to New York and Cairns last year.
Clause S-I7.C6: I went to New York and Cairns last year.

|  | I | went |  | to | New York and Cairns |  | last year. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  | Circ: Time |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  | ngc: 1 | +2 |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Adju |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I7.S7: I want to go to New York once again this year, because I'm really favourite there.
Clause S-I7.C7( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I7.C7(‘ $\beta$ ): to go to New York once again this year,

Analysis of clauses S-I7.C7a-b

|  | I | want |  | to go | to New York | once again | this year, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Place | Circ: Time | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I7.C8: because I'm really favourite there.

Analysis of clause S-I7.C8

|  | because | I | 'm | really favourite | there. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | , | Part: Participant | Pro: Relational $\rightarrow$ attributive | Part: Attribute | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Fin ${ }^{+}$: pres | Complement | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E64: S-I7.C8: EC24: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence S-I7.S8(i-ii): But, I'm job hunting now. So I'm busy and can't accumulate the money.
Clause S-I7.C9: But, I'm job hunting now.

Analysis of clauses S-I7.C9

|  | But, | I | 'm | job hunting | now. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Time |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | , | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap comma |  |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E65: S-I7.S8(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus

Sentence S-I7.S8(ii): So I'm busy and can't accumulate the money.
Clause S-I7.C10: So I'm busy


No errors

Clause S-I7.C11: and can't accumulate the money.

|  | and | [I] | can't | accumulate | the money. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | [ACTOR] | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| id: $\log$ | +2) |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | [SUBJECT] | Finite ${ }^{\text {neg }}$ : modal | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | [IDEATIONAL] | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | ...Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I7.S9: By the way, are you like sneakers?
Clause S-I7.C12: By the way, are you like sneakers?


Error list
E66: S-I7.C12: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I7.S10: I love it.
Clause S-I7.C13: I love it.

|  | I | love |  | it. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  | ref-singular |

Error list
E67: S-I7.C13: EC37a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of plural reference
EC37a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select singular reference

Sentence S-I7.S11: I'm collected Air Jordans, Puma, Adidas and Pro-Keds.
Clause S-I7.C14: I'm collected Air Jordans, Puma, Adidas and Pro-Keds.

Analysis of clause S-I7.C14


Error list
E68: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I7.S12: I have many sneakers.
Clause S-I7.C15: I have many sneakers.

Analysis of clause S-I7.C15

|  | I | have |  | many sneakers. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I7.S13: I want keep collect.
Clause S-I7.C16( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I7.C16(' $\beta$ ): keep collect.

Analysis of clauses S-I7.C16(a-b)

|  | I | want |  | keep collect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material |
|  |  |  |  | vg : perf $\rightarrow$ zero $\quad \mathrm{vg}$ : perf |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |
|  |  |  |  | vgc: $(\alpha \quad=\beta)$ |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator |
|  |  |  |  | vg : fin $\quad \mathrm{vg}$ : fin |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |

Error list
E69: S-I7.C16(' $\beta$ ).1: EC11c/1: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'perfective' EC11c/2: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective-zero'
E70: S-I7.C16(' $\beta$ ).2: EC11a/1: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfective' EC11a/2: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective'

E71: S-17.C16( $\beta$ ).3: EC15a/1: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'
E72: S-17.C16( $\beta$ ).4: EC15a/1: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

## Text S-I8

My name is X. I want to get more English skills, so I choose this class. This year is very important for me. I have job hunting and final karate club competition. This year my karate's dream is I win the All Japan championship. I practise every day and more strongly. I like sports, walking and sleeping. My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, soccer. I work part-time five times a week. My part-time job is flower shop in Daiei. It's very difficult but it's interesting. My character is very lazy. I usually listen to music or sleeping in my free time.

## Sentence list

1. S-I8.S1: My name is X.
2. S-I8.S2: I want to get more English skills, so I choose this class.
3. S-I8.S3: This year is very important for me.
4. S-I8.S4: I have job hunting and final karate club competition.
5. S-I8.S5: This year my karate's dream is I win the All Japan championship.
6. S-I8.S6: I practise every day and more strongly.
7. S-I8.S7: I like sports, walking and sleeping.
8. S-I8.S8: My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, soccer.
9. S-I8.S9: I work part-time five times a week.
10. S-I8.S10: My part-time job is flower shop in Daiei.
11. S-I8.S11: It's very difficult but it's interesting.
12. S-I8.S12: My character is very lazy.
13. S-I8.S13: I usually listen to music or sleeping in my free time.

Clause list

1. S-I8.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I8.C2( $\alpha$ ): I want
3. S-I8.C2( ${ }^{\prime} \beta$ ): to get more English skills,
4. S-I8.C3: so I choose this class.
5. S-I8.C4: This year is very important for me.
6. S-I8.C5: I have [[job hunting]] and final karate club competition.
7. S-I8.C5[i]: [[job hunting]]
8. S-I8.C6: This year my karate's dream is [[I win the All Japan championship]].
9. S-I8.C6[i]: [[I win the All Japan championship]]
10. S-I8.C7: I practise every day and more strongly.
11. S-I8.C8: I like sports, [[walking]] and [[sleeping]].
12. S-I8.C8[i]: [[walking]]
13. S-I8.C8[ii]: [[sleeping]]
14. S-I8.C9: My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, soccer.
15. S-I8.C10: I work part-time five times a week.
16. S-I8.C11: My part-time job is flower shop in Daiei.
17. S-I8.C12: It's very difficult
18. S-I8.C13: but it's interesting.
19. S-I8.C14: My character is very lazy.
20. S-I8.C15: I usually listen to music
21. S-I8.C16: or sleeping in my free time.

## Sentence S-I8.S1: My name is $X$.

Clause S-I8.C1: My name is $X$.

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I8.S2: I want to get more English skills, so I choose this class.
Clause S-I8.C2( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I8.C2(' $\beta$ ): to get more English skills,

Analysis of clause S-I8.C2 ( $\alpha-$ - $\beta$ )

|  | I | want |  | to get | more English skills, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Part: Goal |
| id: $\log$ | Hypotactic expansion: 1 (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Clause S-I8.C3: so I choose this class.

Analysis of clause S-I8.C3

|  | so | I | choose |  | this class. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| id: $\log$ | $\times 2$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E73: S-I8.C3: EC21a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of past time

Sentence S-I8.S3: This year is very important for me.
Clause S-I8.C4: This year is very important for me.

Analysis of clause S-I8.C4

|  | This year | is |  | very important | for me. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute | Circ: Angle |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I8.S4: I have job hunting and final karate club competition.
Clause S-I8.C5, C5[i]: I have [[job hunting]] and final karate club competition.


Error list
E74: S-I8.C5.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E75: S-I8.C5.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

Sentence S-I8.S5: This year my karate's dream is I win the All Japan championship.
Clause S-I8.C6: This year my karate's dream is [[I win the All Japan championship]].
Clause S-I8.C6[i]: [[I win the All Japan championship]]

Analysis of clauses S-I8.C6(i-ii)


Error list
E76: S-I8.C6: EC7c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of relationship between Modifier and Head

Sentence S-I8.S6: I practise every day and more strongly.
Clause S-I8.C7: I practise every day and more strongly.


## No errors

Sentence S-I8.S7: I like sports, walking and sleeping.
Clause S-I8.C8: I like sports, [[walking]] and [[sleeping]].
Clauses S-I8.C8[i-ii]: [[walking]], [[sleeping]]

Analysis of clause S-I8.C8(i)

|  | I | like |  | sports, [[walking]] and [[sleeping]]. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon/Macro-Phenomenon |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 | +3 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  | Comp |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I8.S8: My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, soccer.
Clause S-I8.C9: My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, soccer.

|  | My favourite sports | is |  | badminton, tennis, soccer. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |  |
|  |  | vg: Event-singular |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc: |  | +2 | +3 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| convention $\rightarrow$ |  |  |  | Link |  |  |  |

Error list
E77: S-I8.C9.1: EC39d: Convention $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise paratactic linker
E78: S-I8.C9.2: EC12b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC12b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select ‘singular’

Sentence S-I8.S9: I work part-time five times a week.
Clause S-I8.C10: I work part-time five times [a week].

Analysis of clause S-I8.C10

|  | I | work |  | part-time | five times [a week]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Attribute | Circ: Interval |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I8.S10: My part-time job is flower shop in Daiei.
Clause S-I8.C11: My part-time job is flower shop [in Daiei].

|  | My part-time job | is |  | $\Theta$ | $\Theta$ flower shop [in Daiei]. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Circumstantial Attribute: Place |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: Minor Pro | + Minor Range |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: [pg] | $+\mathrm{ng}($ sing | + Class | + Th | + Qual) |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  | junct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E79: S-I8.C11.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E80: S-I8.C11.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Sentence S-I8.S11: It's very difficult but it's interesting.

Clause S-I8.C12: It's very difficult

Analysis of clause S-I8.C12


## No errors

## Clause S-I8.C13: but it's interesting.

Analysis of clause S-I8.C13

|  | but | it | 's |  | interesting. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Att |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x 2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | extual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | heme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I8.S12: My character is very lazy.
Clause S-I8.C14: My character is very lazy.

Analysis of clause S-I8.C14

|  | My character |  | is | very lazy. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I8.S13: I usually listen to music or sleeping in my free time.
Clause S-I8.C15: I usually listen to music or sleeping in my free time.

Analysis of clause S-I8.C15

|  | I | usually | listen |  | to music |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Behaver |  | Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Range |
| id: $\log$ | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I8.C16: or sleeping in my free time.

Analysis of clause S-I8.C16


Error list
E81: S-I8.C16: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'
EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

## Text S-I9

My name is X. I'm 18 years old and I'm in $1^{\text {st }}$ grades. I can't speak English too much because I have no output that skill or translate Japanese to English. I want to build skill and also vocabulary. That's why I decide to choose this class. I like listening to music. I usually listen music is 60 's $\sim 70$ 's music. I love British music more than American music. But, I like listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German. I hate sing because I can't do well. I think I'm dull person.

## Sentence list

1. S-I9.S1: My name is X.
2. S-I9.S2: I'm 18 years old and I'm in $1^{\text {st }}$ grades.
3. S-I9.S3: I can't speak English too much because I have no output that skill or translate Japanese to English.
4. S-I9.S4: I want to build skill and also vocabulary.
5. S-I9.S5: That's why I decide to choose this class.
6. S-I9.S6: I like listening to music.
7. S-I9.S7: I usually listen music is 60 ' $\sim 70$ 's music.
8. S-I9.S8: I love British music more than American music.
9. S-I9.S9(i): But, I like listening to world music.
10. S-I9.S9(ii): For example Italian, Israel and German.
11. S-I9.S10: I hate sing because I can't do well.
12. S-I9.S11: I think I'm dull person.

Clause list

1. S-I9.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I9.C2: I'm 18 years old
3. S-I9.C3: and I'm in $1^{\text {st }}$ grades.
4. S-I9.C4: I can't speak English too much
5. S-I9.C5: because I have no output [[that skill or translate Japanese to English]].
6. S-I9.C5[i]: [[that skill or translate Japanese to English]]
7. S-I9.C6( $\alpha$ ): I want
8. S-I9.C6(' $\beta$ ): to build skill and also vocabulary.
9. S-I9.C7: That's [[why I decide to choose this class]].
10. S-I9.C7[ia]: [[why I decide
11. S-I9.C7[i’ $\beta$ ]: to choose this class]]
12. S-I9.C8: I like [[listening to music]].
13. S-I9.C8[i]: [[listening to music]]
14. S-I9.C9: [[I usually listen]] music is 60 's $\sim 70$ 's music.
15. S-I9.C9[i]: [[I usually listen]]
16. S-I9.C10: I love British music more [than American music].
17. S-I9.C11: But, I like [[listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German]].
18. S-I9.C11[i]: [[listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German]]
19. S-I9.C12: I hate [[sing]]
20. S-I9.C12[i]: [[sing]]
21. S-I9.C13: because I can't do well
22. S-I9.C14( $\alpha$ ): I think
23. S-I9.C14(' $\beta$ ): I'm dull person.

Sentence S-I9.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I9.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-19.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite $^{+}:$present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  | Residue |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I9.S2: I'm 18 years old and I'm in $1^{\text {st }}$ grades.
Clause S-I9.C2: I'm [18 years] old

Analysis of clause S-I9.C2

|  | I | 'm |  | [18 years] old |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Moo | : decl | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I9.C3: and I'm in $1^{s t}$ grades.

|  | and | I | 'm |  | in | $1^{\text {st }}$ grades. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Attribute |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{ng}:$ Num + Thing $\rightarrow$ plural |
| id:log | +2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E82: S-I9.C3: EC3b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC3b/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'plural'

Sentence S-I9.S3: I can't speak English too much because I have no output that skill or translate Japanese to English.
Clause S-I9.C4: I can't speak English too much

Analysis of clause S-19.C4

|  | I | can't speak |  | English | too much |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Behaver | Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Range | Circ: Degree |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {neg }}$ : modal | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Clause S-I9.C5: because I have no output [[that skill or translate Japanese to English]].
Clause S-I9.C5[i]: [[that skill or translate Japanese to English]]


Error list
E83: S-I9.C5: EC4: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

## Sentence S-I9.S4: I want to build skill and also vocabulary.

Clause S-I9.C6( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I9.C6(' $\beta$ ): to build skill and also vocabulary.

Analysis of clauses S-I9.C6( $\alpha$ - $\beta$ )


[^1]Sentence S-I9.S5: That's why I decide to choose this class.
Clause S-I9.C7, C7[i]: That's [[why I decide to choose this class]].

Analysis of clause S-19.C7

|  | That |  | 'S | [[why I decide to choose this class $]]^{*}$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Token | Pro: Relational: Circ $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Value |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## Error list

*See below

Clause S-I9.C7[i- $\alpha]$ : [ $[$ why I decide
Clause S-I9.C7[i-‘ $\beta$ ]: to choose this class]]

Analysis of clauses S-I9.C7[() $\alpha-\beta]$


Error list
E84: S-I9.C7[i- $\alpha$ : EC21a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of past time

## Sentence S-I9.S6: I like listening to music.

Clause S-I9.C8: I like [[listening to music]].
Clause S-I9.C8[i]: [[listening to music]]

Analysis of clauses S-I9.C8-C8[i]


## No errors

Sentence S-I9.S7: [[I usually listen]] music is 60 's $\sim 70$ 's music.
Clause S-I9.C9-C9[i]: [[I usually listen]] music is 60 's $\sim 70$ 's music.

Analysis of clause S-I9.C9


Error list
E85: S-I9.C9.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E86: S-I9.C9.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'
E87: S-I9.C9.3: EC10: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Information structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Given as New
*See below

Clause S-I9.C9[i]: [[I usually listen]]

|  | [[I | usually | listen |  | $\theta$ ]] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | [ $\mathrm{Part:}$ Behaver | $\square$ | Pro: Behavioural |  | Min Pre |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | [[Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | [Minor Predicator] ]] |
|  | [[Mood |  |  | Resi[due] ]] |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E88: S-I9.C9[i]: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I9.S8: I love British music more than American music.
Clause S-I9.C10: I love British music more [than American music].

|  | I | love |  | British music | more [than American music]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon | Circ: Degree |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I9.S9(i-ii): But, I like listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German.
Clause S-I9.C11: But, I like [[listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German]]. Clause S-19.C11[i]: [[listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German]].

Analysis of clause S-I9.C11(i-ii)

|  | But, | I | like |  | [[listening | to world music. For example Italian... and German]]. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Macro-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\square$ |  |  | [[Pro: Behavioural | Part: Range]] |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  | [[ | ngc: | 1 | $=2$ (ngc: | $1+2$ | +3) ]] |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | [[Predicator | Comp |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | [[ Residue]] |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop |  |  |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E89: S-I9.C11: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

Sentence S-I9.S10: I hate sing because I can't do well.
Clause S-I9.C12: I hate [[sing]]
Clause S-I9.C12[i]: [[sing]]

|  | I | hate |  | [[sing] $]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Macro-Phenomenon |
|  |  |  |  | [[Pro: Behavioural]] vg: perf |
| id: $\log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | [[Predicator]] |
|  |  |  |  | vg: fin |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | [[Residue]] |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E90: S-I9.C12[i].1: EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect EC11b/2:Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E91: S-I9.C12[i].2: EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Clause S-I9.C13: because I can't do well.

Analysis of clause S-I9.C13

|  | because | I | can't do |  | well. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Degree |
| id: $\log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {nes }}$ : modal | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I9.S11: I think I'm dull person.
Clause S-I9.C14( $\alpha$ ): I think
Clause S-I9.C14(‘ $\beta$ ): I'm dull person.

Analysis of clause S-I9.C14(a-b)

|  | I | think |  | I | 'm | $\Theta$ dull person. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\quad \alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Complement |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ng: $\quad$ sing + Ep + Thing |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Mood |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E92: S-I9.C14(' $\beta$ ): EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text S-I10

My name is X. I live in Ibaraki. My hometown is Tsukubamirai City. There is very beautiful city. There has rice field surrounded my house. I live there when I was born. My grandmother is most kind person in my family. I respect her! My hobby is dance! I learn to dance when I was high school student. I went to dance studio twice a week. I enjoy dance in this school. I belong to dance circle, 'Rabbit'. We are practise our dance every Monday and Thursday. I practise hard for next event. I like watch a movie. If I had a free time I watched a movie on my TV. I want go to Tsutaya after school. My favourite foreign drama is Glee.

## Sentence list

1. S-I10.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I10.S2: I live in Tokyo.
3. S-I10.S3: My hometown is Z.
4. S-I10.S4: There is very beautiful city.
5. S-I10.S5: There has rice field surrounded my house.
6. S-I10.S6: I live there when I was born.
7. S-I10.S7: My grandmother is most kind person in my family.
8. S-I10.S8: I respect her!
9. S-I10.S9: My hobby is dance!
10. S-I10.S10: I learn to dance when I was high school student.
11. S-I10.S11: I went to dance studio twice a week.
12. S-I10.S12: I enjoy dance in this school.
13. S-I10.S13: I belong to dance circle, 'Rabbit'.
14. S-I10.S14: We are practise our dance every Monday and Thursday.
15. S-I10.S15: I practise hard for next event.
16. S-I10.S16: I like watch a movie.
17. S-I10.S17: If I had a free time I watched a movie on my TV.
18. S-I10.S18: I want go to Tsutaya after school.
19. S-I10.S19: My favourite foreign drama is Glee.

Clause list

1. S-I10.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I10.C2: I live in Tokyo.
3. S-I10. C3: My hometown is Z .
4. S-I10.C4: There is very beautiful city
5. S-I10.C5: There has rice field surrounded my house.
6. S-I10.C6: I live there
7. S-I10.C7: when I was born.
8. S-I10.C8: My grandmother is most kind person [in my family].
9. S-I10.C9: I respect her!
10. S-I10.C10: My hobby is dance!
11. S-I10.C11: I learn to dance
12. S-I10.C12: when I was high school student.
13. S-I10.C13: I went to dance studio twice a week.
14. S-I10.C14: I enjoy dance in this school.
15. S-I10.C15: I belong to dance circle, 'Rabbit'.
16. S-I10.C16: We are practice our dance every Monday and Thursday.
17. S-I10. C17: I practice hard for next event.
18. S-I10.C18: I like [[watch a movie]].
19. S-I10.C18[i]: [[watch a movie]]
20. S-I10.C19: If I had a free time
21. S-I10.C20: I watched a movie on my TV.
22. S-I10.C21( $\alpha$ ): I want
23. S-I10.C21(' $\beta$ ): go to Tsutaya after school.
24. S-I10.C22: My favourite foreign drama is Glee.

Sentence S-I10.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I10.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational | - $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id : $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I10.S2: I live in Ibaraki.

## Clause S-I10.C2: I live in Ibaraki.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C2

|  | I | live |  | in Ibaraki. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I10.S3: My hometown is Tsukubamirai City.
Clause S-I10.C3: My hometown is Tsukubamirai City.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C3

|  | My hometown | is |  | Tsukubamirai City. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite $:$ present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  |  |  |
| text | Residue |  |  |  |  |
|  | ideational |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I10.S4: There is very beautiful city.
Clause S-I10.C4: There is very beautiful city.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C4

|  | There | is |  | $\Theta \quad$ very beautiful city. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Epithet | + Thing) |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |
| class $\rightarrow$ | adverb |  | verb | adverb adjective noun |  |  |

Error list
E93: S-I10.C4.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E94: S-I10.C4.2: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence S-I10.S5: There has rice field surrounded my house.
Clause S-I10.C5: There has rice field surrounded my house.

|  | There | has |  | rice field | surrounded my house. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Pro: Relational |  | Part: (Existent) | Circ: Place |
|  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{ng}:$ Class + Thing $\rightarrow \underline{\text { singular }}$ |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E95: S-I10.C5.1: EC23b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'Existential'
EC23b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PROCESS TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'Relational'
E96: S-I10.C5.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'* EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E97: S-I10.C5.3: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

[^2]Sentence S-I10.S6: I live there when I was born.
Clause S-I10.C6: I live there

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C6

|  | I | live |  | there |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E98: EC14c: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to select from the system

Clause S-I10.C7: when I was born.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C7

|  | when | I | was | born. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Goal | Pro: Material |  |
| id:log | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E99: S-I10.C7: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I10.S7: My grandmother is most kind person in my family.
Clause S-I10.C8: My grandmother is most kind person [in my family].

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C8

|  | My grandmother | is |  | $\theta$ | most kind person [in my family]. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Token | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Value |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: (sp | + Epithet | + Thing | + Qualifier) |
| id : $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  | id |  |  |  |

Error list
E100: S-I10.C8.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ reference $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E101: S-I10.C8.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific' EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

## Sentence S-I10.S8: I respect her!

Clause S-I10.C9: I respect her!


## No errors

Sentence S-I10.S9: My hobby is dance!
Clause S-I10.C10: My hobby is dance!

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C10

|  | My hobby |  |  | dance! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive: Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I10.S10: I learn to dance when I was high school student.
Clause S-I10.C11: I learn to dance

Analysis of clauses S-II0.C11

|  | I | learn | to dance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |
| id:log | , | vgc: $\quad \alpha$ | + $\beta$ |
|  | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E102: S-I10.C11.2: EC26a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'past'
EC26a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'present'

Clause S-I10.C12: when I was high school student.

Analysis of clause S-II0.C12

|  | when | I | was |  | $\theta$ | igh schoo | student. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : $\operatorname{sing}$ | + Classifier | + Thing) |
| id: $\log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Resi... | Mood |  |  | ...due |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E103: S-I10.C12: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I10.S11: I went to dance studio twice a week.
Clause S-I10.C13: I went to dance studio twice [a week].

Analysis of clause S-I10.C13


Error list
E104: S-I10.C13: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I10.S12: I enjoy dance in this school.
Clause S-I10.C14: I enjoy dance in this school.

Analysis of clause S-I10.C14


## No errors

Sentence S-I10.S13: I belong to dance circle, 'Rabbit'.
Clause S-I10.C15: I belong to dance circle, 'Rabbit'.

Analysis of clause S-I10.C15

|  | I | belong to |  | $\theta$ | dance circle, | Rabbit' |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : ? | + Class + Thing | Qualifier? | Thing? |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite*: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E105: S-I10.C15: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

Sentence S-I10.S14: We are practise our dance every Monday and Thursday. Clause S-I10.C16: We are practise our dance every Monday and Thursday.

Analysis of clause S-I10.C16

|  | We | are practise |  | our dance | every |  | Th |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Time |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  | vg: $\alpha \Theta$ | $\theta$ ing |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E106: S-I10.C16: EC14a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

Sentence S-I10.S15: I practise hard for next event.
Clause S-I10.C17: I practise hard for next event.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.CI7

|  | I | practise |  | hard | for | $\theta$ | next | event. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Manner | Circ: Purpose |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: pg | + ng ( sp | + Num | + Thing) |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E107: S-I10.C17.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E108: S-I10.C17.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific' EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

Sentence S-I10.S16: I like watch a movie.
Clause S-I10.C18: I like [[watch a movie]].
Clause S-I10.C18[i]: [[watch a movie]]

Analysis of clauses S-I10.C18(i-ii)


Error list
E109S-I10.C18[i].1: EC2b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular'
EC2b/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'
E110: S-I10.C18[i].2: EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect
EC11b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E111: S-I10.C18[i].3:EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Sentence S-I10.S17: If I had a free time I watched a movie on my TV.
Clause S-I10.C19: If I had a free time

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C19


Error list
E112: S-I10.C19: EC2b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC2b/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular

Clause S-I10.C20: I watched a movie on my TV.

Analysis of clause S-IIO.C20


Error list
E113: S-I10.C20.1: EC14c: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to select from the system
E114: S-I10.C20.2: EC32/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'modal'
EC32/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ MOOD deIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'temporal'

Sentence S-I10.S18: I want go to Tsutaya after school.
Clause S-I10.C21( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I10.C21(‘ $\beta$ ): go to Tsutaya after school.

Analysis of clauses S-I10.C21a-b

|  | I | want |  | go | to Tsutaya | after school. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | [[Pro: Material vg: perf $\rightarrow$ zero | Circ: Place | Circ: Time]] |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | [ Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct]] |
|  |  |  |  | vg: fin |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | [R]esidue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | [R]heme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E115: S-I10.C21 (' $\beta$ ).1: EC11c/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'perfective' EC11c/1:Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E116: S-I10.C21 (' $\beta$ ).2: EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Sentence S-I10.S19: My favourite foreign drama is Glee.
Clause S-I10.C22: My favourite foreign drama is Glee.

Analysis of clause S-I10.C23

|  | My favourite foreign drama | is |  | Glee. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | Ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Text S-I11

My name is X. I'm nineteen. I live in Tokyo. My part-time job is Starbucks. The Starbucks nearby Tokyo Dome. Working at Starbucks is very interesting. I feel especially Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert is very interesting. Because so many people come into the Starbucks. I like all of Disney very much. For example Disney's movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character. I especially like Donald Duck in Disney character. 1 years ago, I went to Disneyland three times a week. But I have a lot of class.

## Sentence list

1. S-I11.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I11.S2: I'm nineteen.
3. S-I11.S3: I live in Tokyo.
4. S-I11.S4(i): My part-time job is Starbucks.
5. S-I11.S4(ii): The Starbucks nearby Tokyo Dome.
6. S-I11.S5: Working at Starbucks is very interesting.
7. S-I11.S6(i): I feel especially Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert is very interesting.
8. S-I11.S6(ii): Because so many people come into the Starbucks.
9. S-I11.S7(i): I like all of Disney very much.
10. S-I11.S7(ii): For example Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character.
11. S-I11.S8: I especially like Donald Duck in Disney character.
12. S-I11.S9: 1 years ago, I went to Disneyland three times a week.
13. S-I11.S10: But I have a lot of class.

## Clause list

1. S-I11.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I11.C2: I'm nineteen.
3. S-I11.C3: I live in Tokyo.
4. S-I11.C4: My part-time job is Starbucks. The Starbucks [nearby Tokyo Dome].
5. S-I11.C5: [[Working at Starbucks]] is very interesting.
6. S-I11.C5[i]: [[Working at Starbucks]]
7. S-I11.C6( $\alpha$ ): I feel especially
8. S-I11.C6(' $\beta$ ): [[Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert $]]$ is very interesting.
9. S-I11.C6( $\left.{ }^{-} \beta[\mathrm{i}]\right)$ : [[Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert]]
10. S-I11.C7: Because so many people come into the Starbucks.
11. S-I11.C8: I like all of Disney very much. For example Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character.
12. S-I11.C9: I especially like Donald Duck in Disney character.
13. S-I11.C10: 1 years ago, I went to Disneyland three times a week.
14. S-I11.C11: But I have a lot of class.

Sentence S-I11.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I11.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II 1.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I1 1.S2: I'm nineteen.

## Clause S-I1 1.C2: I'm nineteen.



## No errors

## Sentence S-I11.S3: I live in Tokyo.

Clause S-I11.C3: I live in Tokyo.

|  | I | live |  | in Tokyo. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicate | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I11.S4(i-ii): My part-time job is Starbucks. The Starbucks nearby Tokyo Dome.
Clause S-I1 1.C4: My part-time job is Starbucks. The Starbucks [nearby Tokyo Dome].

|  | My part-time job | is |  | $\Theta$ | Starbucks. | The Starbucks [nearby Tokyo Dome]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Circumstantial Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro |  | Minor Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ngc: 1 | $=2$ |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap full stop $\quad$ full stop |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E117: S-I11.C4.1: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause
E118: S-I11.C4.2: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I11.S5: Working at Starbucks is very interesting.
Clause S-I11.C5: [/Working at Starbucks]] is very interesting.
Clause S-I11.C5[i]: [/Working at Starbucks]]

Analysis of clauses S-I11.C5(i-ii)

|  | [[Working at Starbucks]] | is |  | very interesting. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I11.S6(i-ii): I feel especially Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert is very interesting. Because so many people come into the Starbucks. Clause S-I11.C6( $\alpha$ ): I feel especially
Clause S-I11.C6(‘ $\beta$ ): Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert is very interesting.
Clause S-I11.C6(‘ $\beta[\mathrm{i}])$ : [[Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert]] *

Analysis of clause S-I11.C6( $\alpha$ )-C6( $\beta[i])$


Error list
E119: S-111.S6(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus
*See below

Clause S-I11.C6(‘$\beta[\mathrm{i}]):$ [[Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert]]


Error list
E120: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]) .2$ : EC26b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present' EC26b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'past'
E121: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]) .3:$ EC33b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of textual Theme EC33b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null textual Theme'
E122: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]$ ).4: EC39d: Convention $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise paratactic linker

E123: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]$ ).5: $\quad \mathrm{EC} 3 \mathrm{a} / 1$ : Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E124: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]$ ).6: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I11.S6(ii): Because so many people come into the Starbucks.
Clause S-I11.C7: Because so many people come into the Starbucks.

Analysis of clause S-II 1.C7

|  | Because | so many people | come |  | into | the |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | , | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ: Place |  |
| id:log | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | $1$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I11.S7(i-ii): I like all of Disney. For example Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character. Clause S-I11.C8: I like [all of] Disney. For example Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character.


Error list
E125: S-I11.C8.1: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause
E126: S-I11.C8.2: EC39c: Convention $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise paratactic linker
E127: S-I11.C8.3: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational- $\exp \rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E128: S-I11.C8.4: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I11.S8: I especially like Donald Duck in Disney character.
Clause S-I1 1.C9: I especially like Donald Duck in Disney character.

|  | I | especially | like |  | Donald Duck | in | character. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser |  | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon | Circ: Place |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ng: Thing $\rightarrow$ singular |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E129: S-I11.C9.1: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E130: S-I11.C9.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SySTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I11.S9: 1 years ago, I went to Disneyland three times a week.
Clause S-I11.C10: 1 years ago I went to Disneyland three times [a week].

Analysis of clause S-I1 1.C10

|  | 1 | years | ago | I | went |  | to Disneyland | three times [a week]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Circ: Time |  |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Interval |
|  | Minor Range |  | Minor Process |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ng: Num | + Thing $\rightarrow$ plural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct |  |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Re... |  |  | Mood: decl |  | ...sidue |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { text } \\ \text { marked } \rightarrow \end{gathered}$ | ideational |  |  | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E131: S-I11.C10: EC3b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC3b/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'plural'

Sentence S-I11.S10: But I have a lot of class.
Clause S-I11.C11: But I have [a lot of] class.

|  | But | I | have |  | [a lot of] | class. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Possessed |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: Extended Num | $\rightarrow$ singular |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E132: S-I11.C11:
EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

## Text S-I12

My name is X. I live in Togane City in Chiba prefecture. There are 4 people in my family. I'm only child, so I want to get brothers or sisters! My hobby is playing volleyball and reading book. I began play volleyball when I was junior high school student and I continue it. I like various kinds book. I often go bookshop or library and I buy or rent it, so I read a book two weeks. I like watch the movie, too. I prefer foreign movie to Japanese movie because I think foreign movie is more excite than Japanese movie and foreign movie have big scene and wonderful action.

## Sentence list

1. S-I12.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I12.S2: I live in Togane City in Chiba prefecture.
3. S-I12.S3: There are 4 people in my family.
4. S-I12.S4: I'm only child, so I want to get brothers or sisters!
5. S-I12.S5: My hobby is playing volleyball and reading book.
6. S-I12.S6: I began play volleyball when I was junior high school student and I continue it.
7. S-I12.S7: I like various kinds book.
8. S-I12.S8: I often go bookshop or library and I buy or rent it, so I read a book two weeks.
9. S-I12.S9: I like watch the movie, too.
10. S-I12.S10: I prefer foreign movie to Japanese movie because I think foreign movie is more excite than Japanese movie and foreign movie have big scene and wonderful action.

## Clause list

1. S-I12.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I12.C2: I live in Togane City in Chiba prefecture.
3. S-I12: C3: There are 4 people in my family.
4. S-I12.C4: I'm only child,
5. S-I12.C5( $\alpha$ ): so I want
6. S-I12.C5(' $\beta$ ): to get brothers or sisters!
7. S-I12.C6: My hobby is [[playing volleyball]] and [[reading book]].
8. S-I12.C6[i]: [[playing volleyball]]
9. S-I12.C6[ii]: [[reading book]]
10. S-I12.C7: I began play volleyball
11. S-I12.C8: when I was junior high school student
12. S-I12.C9: and I continue it.
13. S-I12.C10: I like various kinds book.
14. S-I12.C11: I often go bookshop or library
15. S-I12.C12: and I buy or rent it,
16. S-I12.C13: so I read a book two weeks.
17. S-I12.C14: I like [[watch the movie]], too.
18. S-I12.C14[i]: [[watch the movie]]
19. S-I12.C15: I prefer foreign movie to Japanese movie
20. S-I12.C16( $\alpha$ ): because I think
21. S-I12.C16( $\beta$ ) : foreign movie is more excite [than Japanese movie].
22. S-I12.C17: and foreign movie have big scene and wonderful action.

Sentence S-I12.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I12.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II2.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I12.S2: I live in Togane City in Chiba prefecture.
Clause S-I12.C2: I live in Togane City in Chiba prefecture.

Analysis of clause S-I12.C2

|  | I | live |  | in Togane City |  | in Chiba prefecture. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ppc: | 1 | $=2$ |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I12.S3: There are 4 people in my family.
Clause S-I12.C3: There are 4 people in my family.

|  | There | are |  | 4 people | in my family. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | - | Pro: Existential |  | Part: Existent | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | Rheme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I12.S4: I'm only child, so I want to get brothers or sisters!
Clause S-I12.C4: I'm only child,

Analysis of clause S-II2.C4

|  | I |  | 'm | $\Theta$ | only | child, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Classifier | + Thing) |
| id: $\log$ | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E133: S-I12.C4: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Clause S-I12.C5( $\alpha$ ): so I want

Clause S-I12.C5(' $\beta$ ): to get brothers or sisters!

Analysis of clause S-II2.C5( $\alpha-\beta$ - $)$


## No errors

Sentence S-I12.S5: My hobby is playing volleyball and reading book.
Clause S-I12.C6-C6[ii]: My hobby is [[playing volleyball]] and [[reading book]].

Analysis of clause S-II2.C6


Error list
E134: S-I12.C6: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E135: S-I12.C6[ii]: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational- $\exp \rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I12.S6: I began play volleyball when I was junior high school student and I continue it.
Clause S-I12.C7: I began play volleyball

|  | I | began | play | volleyball |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
|  |  | vg: perf $\rightarrow$ zero |  |  |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 (Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
|  | , | vgc: $\quad \alpha$ | x $\beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
|  |  |  | vg: fin |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E136: S-I12.C7.1: EC11b/1: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect
EC11b/2: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E137: S-I12.C7.2: EC15a/1: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite'
EC15a/2: Group rank (vgc) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Clause S-I12.C8: when I was junior high school student

|  | when | I | was |  | $\theta$ | or high s | student |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : $\sin$ g | + Classifier | + Thing) |
| id:log | x $\beta$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Complem |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\text { ...Theme }{ }^{1} . .$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E138: S-I12.C8: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Clause S-I12.C9: and I continue it.

|  | and | I | continue |  | it. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| id: $\log$ | +2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I12.S7: I like various kinds book.
Clause S-I12.C10: I like [various kinds] book.

|  | I | like |  | [various kinds ] |  | $\theta$ | book. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  | Pre Mod + Head | + str marker | + Thing |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Comp | nent |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E139: S-I12.C10: EC7a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural relationship between Head and Thing

Sentence S-I12.S8: I often go bookshop or library and I buy or rent it, so I read a book two weeks.
Clause S-I12.C11: I often go bookshop or library

|  | I | often | go |  | $\theta$ | $\theta$ | bookshop | or | library |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor |  | Pro: Material |  | Circumstance: Place |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ng : $\operatorname{sing}$ | + Thing |  | + ng |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 (Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  | djunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E140: S-I12.C11.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E141: S-I12.C11.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Clause S-I12.C12: and I buy or rent it,

Analysis of clause S-II2.C12

|  | and | I | buy | or rent | it, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Part: Goal |
| id:log | +2) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | vgc: $1 \quad+2$ |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | ...Theme ${ }^{1}$... |  |  |  | reference |

Error list
E142: S-I12.C12: EC37c/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of substitution
EC37c/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ COHESION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'reference'

Clause S-I12.C13: so I read a book two weeks.

Analysis of clause S-II2.C13


Error list
E143: S-I12.C13: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Interval Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I12.S9: I like watch the movie, too.
Clause S-I12.C14: I like [[watch the movie]], too.
Clause S-I12.C14[i]: [[watch the movie]]

Analysis of clause S-II2.C14(i)


Error list
E144: S-I12.C14[i].1: EC36b/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-identifiable'
EC36b/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'identifiable'
E145: S-I12.C14[i].2: EC2d/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-specific'
EC2d/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'specific'
E146: S-I12.C14[i].3: EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect
EC11b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'

## E147: S-I12.C14[i].4: <br> EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' <br> EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Sentence S-I12.S10: I prefer foreign movie to Japanese movie because I think foreign movie is more excite than Japanese movie and foreign movie have big scene and wonderful action.
Clause S-I12.C15: I prefer foreign movie [to Japanese movie]

Analysis of clause S-I12.C15


Error list
E148: S-I12.C15.1: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E149: S-I12.C15.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

## Clause S-I12.C16( $\alpha$ ): because I think

Clause S-12.C16(' $\beta$ ): foreign movie is more excite [than Japanese movie]

Analysis of clauses S-II2.C16( $\alpha-‘ \beta)$

|  | because | I | think |  | foreign movie | is | more ex | [than | Japanese | movie] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | Part: Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Rel: Int $\rightarrow$ Att | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{ng}(\mathrm{Cl}+\mathrm{Th} \rightarrow \underline{\text { sing }})$ |  | ng: Ep-as-H | + Qual (pp: pg | $+\mathrm{ng}(\mathrm{Cl}$ | $+\mathrm{Th} \rightarrow$ sing)) |
| id:log | $\mathrm{x} \beta \quad$ (Expansion: 1 | (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: pres | Predicator | Subject | Fin ${ }^{+}$: present | Complement |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  | Theme ${ }^{6}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E150: S-I12.C16(' $\beta$ ).1: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

E151: S-I12.C16(‘ $\beta$ ).2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E152: S-I12.C16(‘ $\beta$ ).3: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Clause S-I12.C17: and foreign movie have big scene and wonderful action.


## Error list

E153: S-I12.C17.1: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E154: S-I12.C17.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

## Text S-I13

My name is X. My blood type is O. I live in Ichikawa City with twin sister. My family is five people and I have three dogs. They are very cute. I love so much. I work in pub. I enjoy working there. I like shopping with my friends. In my free time, sleeping, talking someone by cell phone and walking. My hobby is listening music.

## Sentence list

1. S-I13.S1: My name is X.
2. S-I13.S2: My blood type is O.
3. S-I13.S3: I live in Ichikawa City with twin sister.
4. S-I13.S4: My family is five people and I have three dogs.
5. S-I13.S5: They are very cute.
6. S-I13.S6: I love so much.
7. S-I13.S7: I work in pub.
8. S-I13.S8: I enjoy working there.
9. S-I13.S9: I like shopping with my friends.
10. S-I13.S10: In my free time, sleeping, talking someone by cell phone and walking.
11. S-I13.S11: My hobby is listening music.

## Clause list

1. S-I13.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I13.C2: My blood type is O.
3. S-I13.C3: I live in Ichikawa City with twin sister.
4. S-I13.C4: My family is five people
5. S-I13.C5: and I have three dogs.
6. S-I13.C6: They are very cute.
7. S-I13.C7: I love so much.
8. S-I13.C8: I work in pub.
9. S-I13.C9: I enjoy [[working there]].
10. S-I13.C9[i]: [[working there]]
11. S-I13.C10: I like [[shopping with my friends]]
12. S-I13.C10[i]: [[shopping with my friends]]
13. S-I13.C11: In my free time, [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]] and [[walking]].
14. S-I13.C11[i]: [[sleeping]]
15. S-I13.C11[ii]: [[talking someone by cell phone]]
16. S-I13.C11[iii]: [[walking]]
17. S-I13.C12: My hobby is [[listening music $]]$.
18. S-I13.C12[i]: [[listening music]]

Sentence S-I13.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I13.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II3.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational | ive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id : $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I13.S2: My blood type is $O$.
Clause S-I13.C2: My blood type is $O$.

Analysis of clause S-I13.C2

|  | My blood type | is |  | O. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I13.S3: I live in Ichikawa City with twin sister.
Clause S-I13.C3: I live in Ichikawa City with twin sister.

Analysis of clause S-II3.C3

|  | I | live |  | in Ichikawa City | with $\quad \Theta$ |  | twin | sister. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Accompaniment |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process |  | Minor Ra |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: pg | +ng (sp | $+\mathrm{Cl}$ | + Thing) |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ng (int |  | ) |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E155: S-I13.C3.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E156: S-I13.C3.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E157: S-I13.C3.2: EC9/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of '+ interactant' EC9/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select '- interactant'

Sentence S-I13.S4: My family is five people and I have three dogs.
Clause S-I13.C4: My family is five people

Analysis of clause S-I13.C4

|  | My family | is |  | five people |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational $\rightarrow$ Intensive |  | Part: Possessed |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E158: S-I13.C4: EC23a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'possessive'
EC23a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PROCESS TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'intensive'

Clause S-I13.C5: and I have three dogs.

Analysis of clause S-I13.C5

|  | and | I | have |  | three dogs. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: P | sive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Possessed |
| id:log | +2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I13.S5: They are very cute.
Clause S-I13.C6: They are very cute.

|  | They |  | are | very cute. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relationa: | ensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I13.S6: I love so much.
Clause S-I13.C7: I love so much.

Analysis of clause S-I13.C7

|  | I | love |  | $\Theta$ | so much. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part | Circ: Degree |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Comp | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E159: S-I13.C7.1: EC22b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Participant
EC22b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'
E160: S-I13.C7.2: EC30/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Complement
EC30/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Complement'

Sentence S-I13.S7: I work in pub.
Clause S-I13.C8: I work in pub.

|  | I | work |  | in | $\theta$ | pub. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng::sing | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E161: S-I13.C8: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular’
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Sentence S-I13.S8: I enjoy working there.

Clause S-I13.C9: I enjoy [[working there]].
Clause S-I13.C9[i]: [[working there]]

|  | I | enjoy |  | [[working | there]]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Micro-Phenomenon |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | cl Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | cl Theme |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I13.S9: I like shopping with my friends.
Clause S-I13.C10: I like [[shopping with my friends]].
Clause S-I13.C10[i]: [[shopping with my friends]]

Analysis of clauses S-I13.C10(a-b)

|  | I | like |  | [[shopping with my friends]]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Micro-Phenomenon |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I13.S10: In my free time, sleeping, talking someone by cell phone and walking.
Clause S-I13.C11-C11[iii]: In my free time, [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]]* and [[walking]].

Analysis of clause S-I13.C11

|  | In my free time | $\theta$ | $\theta$ |  | [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]]* and [[walking]]. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Time | Part | Pro |  | Phenomenon |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 | +3 |
| int | Adjunct | Sub | Fin | [Predicator] |  |  |  |  |
|  | Re... | [Mood] |  | ...sidue |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { text } \\ \text { marked } \rightarrow \end{gathered}$ | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E162: S-I13.C11.1: EC22b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Participant
EC22b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'
E163: S-I13.C11.2: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E164: S-I13.C11.3: EC27a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Subject
EC27a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Subject'
E165: S-I13.C11.4: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite EC27b/2:Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'
*see below

Clause S-I13.C11[ii]: [[talking someone by cell phone]]

|  | [ [talking | $\Theta$ | someone | by cell phone]] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Pro: Behavioural | Part: Range |  | Circ: Means |
|  |  | A Min Pro | Minor Range |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | Rheme |  |  |  |

Error list
E166: S-I13.C11[ii]: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Location Circumstance EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I13.S11: My hobby is listening music.
Clause S-I13.C12: My hobby is [[listening music]].

Analysis of clause S-I13.C12(i)


## Error list

*see below

Clause S-I13.C12[i]: [[listening music]]

Analysis of clause S-I13.C11(ii)

|  | [[listening | $\Theta$ | music $]]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Pro: Behavioural | Range |  |
|  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |
| id:log |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Residue |  |  |
| text | Rheme |  |  |

Error list
E167: S-I13.C12[i]: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Location Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

## Text S-I14

My name is X. I'm from Tochigi. Tochigi is very far from Y University. I take three hours. So, I'm tired every day. I like soccer and snowboarding. I play soccer once a week in Tochigi. And, I like watching soccer TV. My favourite team is Barcelona. I go to snowboarding every winter. Of course I went to snowboarding this winter. My favourite snowboard player is Shawn White. I think he is the best player all over the world. My hobby is listen to music. I often listen to J-pop. My favourite musician is Mr Children. I want to work at an airport in the future. So, I study hard.

## Sentence list

1. S-I14.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I14.S2: I'm from Tochigi.
3. S-I14.S3: Tochigi is very far from Y University.
4. S-I14.S4: I take three hours.
5. S-I14.S5: So, I'm tired every day.
6. S-I14.S6: I like soccer and snowboarding.
7. S-I14.S7: I play soccer once a week in Tochigi.
8. S-I14.S8: And, I like watching soccer TV.
9. S-I14.S9: My favourite team is Barcelona.
10. S-I14.S10: I go to snowboarding every winter.
11. S-I14.S11: Of course I went to snowboarding this winter.
12. S-I14.S12: My favourite snowboard player is Shawn White.
13. S-I14.S13: I think he is the best player all over the world.
14. S-I14.S14: My hobby is listen to music.
15. S-I14.S15: I often listen to J-pop.
16. S-I14.S16: My favourite musician is Mr Children.
17. S-I14.S17: I want to work at an airport in the future.
18. S-I14.S18: So, I study hard.

Clause list

1. S-I14.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I14.C2: I'm from Tochigi.
3. S-I14.C3: Tochigi is very far from Y University.
4. S-I14.C4: I take three hours.
5. S-I14.C5: So, I'm tired every day.
6. S-I14.C6: I like soccer and snowboarding.
7. S-I14.C7: I play soccer once a week in Tochigi.
8. S-I14.C8: And, I like [[watching soccer TV]].
9. S-I14.C8[i]: [[watching soccer TV]]
10. S-I14.C9: My favourite team is Barcelona.
11. S-I14.C10: I go to snowboarding every winter.
12. S-I14.C11: Of course I went to snowboarding this winter
13. S-I14.C12: My favourite snowboard player is Shawn White.
14. S-I14.C13( $\alpha$ ): I think
15. S-I14.C13( $\beta \beta$ ): he is the best player all over the world.
16. S-I14.C14: My hobby is [[listen to music]].
17. S-I14.C14[i]: [[listen to music]]
18. S-I14.C15: I often listen to J-pop.
19. S-I14.C16: My favourite musician is Mr Children.
20. S-I14.C17: I want [[to work at an airport in the future]].
21. S-I14.C17[(i): [[to work at an airport in the future]]
22. S-I14.C18: So, I study hard.

Sentence S-I14.S1: My name is X.
Clause S-I14.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II4.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational | $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id : $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I14.S2: I'm from Tochigi.

Clause S-I14.C2: I'm from Tochigi.

Analysis of clause S-I4.C2

|  | I | 'm |  | from Tochigi. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Circumstantial Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S3: Tochigi is very far from Y University.
Clause S-I14.C3: Tochigi is very far [from Y University].

Analysis of clause S-II4.C3

|  | Tochigi |  | is | very far [from X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I14.S4: I take three hours.

## Clause S-I14.C4: I take three hours.

|  | I | take |  | three hours. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I14.S5: So, I'm tired every day.

Clause S-I14.C5: So, I'm tired every day.

Analysis of clause S-I14.C5


## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S6: I like soccer and snowboarding.
Clause S-I14.C6: I like soccer and snowboarding.

Analysis of clause S-II4.C6

|  | I | like |  | soccer and snowboarding. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S7: I play soccer once a week in Tochigi.
Clause S-I14.C7: I play soccer once [a week] in Tochigi.

Analysis of clause S-I14.C7

|  | I | play |  | soccer | once [a week] | in Tochigi. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Interval | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S8: And, I like watching soccer TV.
Clause S-I14.C8: And, I like [[watching soccer TV]].
Clause S-I14.C8[i]: [[watching soccer TV]]

Analysis of clause S-I14.C8(i)

|  | And, | I | like |  | [[watching | soccer | $\theta$ | TV]]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Senser |  |  | Part: Macro-Phenomenon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | [ Pro : Behavioural | Part: Range | Circ: Place]] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Min Range |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | $1$ | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E168: S-I14.C8[i]: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Location Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

## Sentence S-I14.S9: My favourite team is Barcelona.

Clause S-I14.C9: My favourite team is Barcelona.

Analysis of clause S-II4.C9

|  | My favourite team | is |  | Barcelona. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S10: I go to snowboarding every winter.
Clause S-I14.C10: I go to snowboarding every winter.

Analysis of clause S-I14.C10

|  | I | go |  | to snowboarding | every winter. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ | Circ: Interval |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E169: S-I14.C10.1: EC22c/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
E170: S-I14.C10.2: EC29/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as Predicator/Complement

Sentence S-I14.S11: Of course I went to snowboarding this winter.
Clause S-I14.C11: Of course I went to snowboarding this winter.

Analysis of clause S-I14.C11

|  | Of course | I | went |  | to snowboarding | this winter. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | - | Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ completed |  | Circ | Time |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Comment Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | , | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E171: S-I14.C11.1: EC22c/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
E172: S-I14.C11.2: EC29/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as Predicator/Complement

Sentence S-I14.S12: My favourite snowboard player is Shawn White.
Clause S-I14.C12: My favourite snowboard player is Shawn White.

Analysis of clause S-I14.C12

|  | My favourite snowboard player | is |  | Shawn White. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S13: I think he is the best player all over the world.
Clause S-I14.C13( $\alpha$ ): I think
Clause S-I14.C13( ${ }^{\prime} \beta$ ): he is the best player [all over the world].

|  | I | think |  | he |  | is | the best player [all over the world]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part: Id/Token | Pro: | Int $\rightarrow$ Id | Part: Identifier/Value |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Subject | Fin ${ }^{+}$: pres | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E173: S-I22.C13(' $\beta$ ): EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LexiCAL SySTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I14.S14: My hobby is listen to music.
Clause S-I14.C14: My hobby is [[listen to music]].
Clause S-I14.C14[i]: [[listen to music]]

Analysis of clauses S-I14.C14(i-ii)


Error list
E174: S-I14.C14[i].1: EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfective'
EC11b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective'
E175: S-I14.C14[i].2: EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite'
EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

## Sentence S-I14.S15: I often listen to J-pop.

Clause S-I14.C15: I often listen to J-pop.


## No errors

## Sentence S-I14.S16: My favourite musician is Mr Children.

Clause S-I14.C16: My favourite musician is Mr Children.

Analysis of clause S-I14.C16

|  | My favourite musician | is |  | Mr Children. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I14.S17: I want to work at an airport in the future.

Clause S-I14.C17( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I14.C17(' $\beta$ ): to work at an airport in the future

Analysis of clauses S-I14.C17(i-ii)

|  | I | want |  | to work | at an airport | in the future. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Part: Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  | - | - |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Place | Circ: Time]] |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Fin ${ }^{+}$: pres | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I14.S18: So, I study hard.
Clause S-I14.C18: So, I study hard.

Analysis of clause S-II4.C18

|  | So, | I | study |  | hard. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Manner |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | Ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Text S-I15

I'm X. My birthday is December $4^{\text {th }}$. I was born Niigata prefecture. But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993. I like sports. Especially baseball and soccer. I have played baseball for 6 years. My favourite singer is Michael Jackson. My part-time job is working bar at baseball stadium and cleaning for airline. I hate cats because I have cat allergy. I lived in Okinawa when I was elementary school first grade. I'm interested in other country culture. I had learned calligraphy. I want to go overseas. I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ year student. I have a younger brother and younger sister. My blood type is O .

## Sentence list

1. S-I15.S1: I'm X.
2. S-I15.S2: My birthday is December $4^{\text {th }}$.
3. S-I15.S3(i): I was born Niigata prefecture.
4. S-I15.S3(ii): But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993.
5. S-I15.S4(i): I like sports. Especially baseball and soccer.
6. S-I15.S5: I have played baseball for 6 years.
7. S-I15.S6: My favourite singer is Michael Jackson.
8. S-I15.S7: My part-time job is working bar at baseball stadium and cleaning for airline.
9. S-I15.S8: I hate cats because I have cat allergy.
10. S-I15: S9: I lived in Okinawa when I was elementary school first grade.
11. S-I15.S10: I'm interested in other country culture.
12. S-I15.S11: I had learned calligraphy.
13. S-I15.S12: I want to go overseas.
14. S-I15.S13: I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ year student.
15. S-I15.S14: I have a younger brother and younger sister.
16. S-I15.S15: My blood type is O.

Clause list

1. S-I15.C1: I'm X.
2. S-I15.C2: My birthday is December $4^{\text {th }}$.
3. S-I15.C3: I was born Niigata prefecture.
4. S-I15.C4: But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993.
5. S-I15.C5: I like sports. Especially baseball and soccer.
6. S-I15.C6: I have played baseball for 6 years.
7. S-I15.C7: My favourite singer is Michael Jackson.
8. S-I15.C8: My part-time job is [[working bar at baseball stadium]] and [[cleaning for airline]].
9. S-I15.C8[i]: [[working bar at baseball stadium]]
10. S-I15.C8[ii]: [[cleaning for airline]]
11. S-I15.C9: I hate cats
12. S-I15.C10: because I have cat allergy.
13. S-I15: C11: I lived in Okinawa
14. S-I15.C12: when I was elementary school first grade.
15. S-I15.C13: I'm interested in other country culture.
16. S-I15.C14: I had learned calligraphy.
17. S-I15.C15( $\alpha$ ): I want
18. S-I15.C15(' $\beta$ ): to go overseas.
19. S-I15.C16: I'm $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ year student.
20. S-I15.C17: I have a younger brother and younger sister.
21. S-I15.C18: My blood type is O.

## Sentence S-I15.S1 I'm $X$

## Clause S-I15.C1: I'm $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I15.C1

|  | I | 'm |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I15.S2: My birthday is December $4^{\text {th }}$.
Clause S-I15.C2: My birthday is December [ $4^{\text {th. }}$ ]

Analysis of clause S-I15.C2

|  | My birthday | is |  | December $\left[4^{\text {th] }}\right.$. $]$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement/ |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I15.S3(i-ii): I was born Niigata prefecture. But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993.
Clause S-I15.C3: I was born Niigata prefecture.

|  | I | was | born | $\theta$ | Niigata prefecture. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Goal | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |  |

Error list
E176: S-I15.S3(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus
E177: S-I15.C3: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I15.S3(ii): But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993.
Clause S-I15.C4: But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993.

|  | But | I | have grown up |  | in Chiba | since 1993. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ | x2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textua | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

No new errors

Sentence S-I15.S4: I like sports. Especially baseball and soccer.
Clause S-I15.C5: I like sports. Especially baseball and soccer.

Analysis of clauses S-I15.C5

|  | I | like |  | sports. |  | Especially baseball and soccer. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | gc: |  |  | $=2$ | (1 | +2) |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop | cap |  |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E178: S-I15.C5: EC 39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

Sentence S-I15.S5: I have played baseball for 6 years.
Clause S-I15.C6: I have played baseball for 6 years.

|  | I | have | played | baseball | for 6 years. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Ma |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Duration |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I15.S6: My favourite singer is Michael Jackson.
Clause S-I15.C7 My favourite singer is Michael Jackson.

Analysis of clause S-I15.C7

|  | My favourite singer |  | is | Michael Jackson. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I15.S7: My part-time job is working bar at baseball stadium and cleaning for airline.
Clause S-I15.C8: My part-time job is [[working bar at baseball stadium]] and [[cleaning for airline]].
Clause S-I15.C8[i]: [[working bar at baseball stadium]]*
Clause S-I15.C8[ii]: [[cleaning for airline]]*

Analysis of clause S-I15.C8(i)


## Error list

E179: S-I15.C8: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
*see below

Clause S-I15.C8[i]: [[working bar at baseball stadium]]

|  | [[working | $\Theta$ | $\Theta$ bar |  |  | baseball stadium]] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Material | Place |  | Place |  |  |  |
|  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  | ng: sing + Th |  | ng : sing | + Class | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E180: S-I15.C8[i].1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E181: S-I15.C8[i].2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E182: S-I15.C8[i].3: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Clause S-I15.C8[ii]: [[cleaning for airline]]

|  | [[cleaning | for | $\Theta$ | airline]] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | [[Pro: Material | Client]] |  |  |
|  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  | ng: sing | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | Rheme |  |  |  |

Error, list
E183: S-I15.C8[ii]: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I15.S8: I hate cats because I have cat allergy.
Clause S-I15.C9: I hate cats

|  | I | hate |  | cats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| id:log | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I15.C10: because I have cat allergy.

|  | because | I | have |  | $\Theta$ | cat | allergy. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Possessed |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E184: S-I15.C10: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I15.S9: I lived in Okinawa when I was elementary school first grade.
Clause S-I15.C11: I lived in Okinawa

Analysis of clause S-II 5.C11

|  | I | lived |  | in Okinawa |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\quad \alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I15.C12: when I was elementary school first grade.

Analysis of clause S-II5.C12

|  | when | I | was |  | $\Theta$ | elementary school fi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Circumstantial Attribute |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| id: $\log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ past | Predicator |  | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E185: S-I15.C12: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Location Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I15.S10: I'm interested in other country culture.
Clause S-I15.C13: I'm interested in other country culture.

|  | I | 'm |  | interested | in | [other country ] culture. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute | Circ: Matter |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  | poss |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E186: S-I15.C13: EC7b: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural relationship between possessive Deictic and Thing

Sentence S-I15.S11: I had learned calligraphy.
Clause S-I15.C14: I had learned calligraphy.

Analysis of clause S-I15.C14

|  | I | had learned |  | calligraphy. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| id : $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E187: S-I15.C14.2: EC26b /1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present' EC26b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'past'

Sentence S-I15.S12: I want to go overseas.
Clause S-I15.C15( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I15.C15( ${ }^{( } \beta$ ): [[to go overseas]]

Analysis of clauses S-I15.C15(i-ii)

|  | I | want |  | to go | overseas. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Meta-Phenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I15.S13: I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ year student.
Clause S-I15.C16: I'm [3 $3^{\text {rd }}$ year] student.

Analysis of clause S-I15.C16

|  | I | 'm |  | $\theta$ | [ 3 rd year] student. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E188: S-I15.C16: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I15.S14: I have a younger brother and younger sister.
Clause S-I15.C17: I have a younger brother and younger sister.

Analysis of clause S-I15.C17


## No errors

Sentence S-I15.S15: My blood type is $O$.
Clause S-I15.C18: My blood type is $O$.

Analysis of clause S-I15.C18


## No errors

## Text S-I16

I'm XY. Call me X. My tall is 150 cm . I have to try hard your class! I member of dance club. Dance club's name is Rabbit. I love dance and music. Especially rock music! Example, Avril, Green Day, Owl City. But, I've never been to their concert. I want to go to abroad concert someday! When I was high school student, I went to Australia. So excited!!! So I want to go to Australia again!! I like weather in Australia.

## Sentence list

1. S-I16.S1: I'm XY.
2. S-I16.S2: Call me X.
3. S-I16.S3: My tall is 150 cm .
4. S-I16.S4: I have to try hard your class!
5. S-I16.S5: I member of dance club.
6. S-I16.S6: Dance club's name is Rabbit.
7. S-I16.S7(i): I love dance and music.
8. S-I16.S7(ii): Especially rock music!
9. S-I16.S8: Example, Avril, Green Day, Owl City.
10. S-I16.S9: But, I've never been to their concert.
11. S-I16.S10: I want to go to abroad concert someday!
12. S-I16.S11: When I was high school student, I went to Australia.
13. S-I16.S12: So excited!!!
14. S-I16.S13: So I want to go to Australia again!!
15. S-I16.S14: I like weather in Australia.

Clause list

1. S-I16.C1: I'm XY.
2. S-I16.C2: Call me X.
3. S-I16.C3: My tall is 150 cm .
4. S-I16.C4: I have to try hard your class!
5. S-I16.C5: I member of dance club.
6. S-I16.C6: Dance club's name is Rabbit.
7. S-I16.C7: I love dance and music. Especially rock music!
8. S-I16.C8: Example, Avril, Green Day, Owl City.
9. S-I16.C9: But, I've never been to their concert.
10. S-I16.C10( $\alpha$ ): I want
11. S-I16.C10(' $\beta$ ): to go to abroad concert someday!
12. S-I16.C11: When I was high school student,
13. S-I16.C12: I went to Australia.
14. S-I16.C13: So excited!!!
15. S-I16.C14( $\alpha$ ): So I want
16. S-I16.C14(' $\beta$ ): to go to Australia again!!
17. S-I16.C15: I like weather in Australia.

## Sentence S-I16.S1: I'm $X Y$.

Clause S-I16.C1: I'm $X Y$.

Analysis of clause S-I16.C1

|  | I | 'm |  | XY. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I16.S2: Call me $X$.
Clause S-I16.C2: Call me $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II6.C2

|  | Call | me | X. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identified | Part: Identifier |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator | Complement | Complement |  |  |
|  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I16.S3: My tall is 150 cm .
Clause S-I16.C3: My tall is 150 cm .

Analysis of clause S-I16.C3


Error list
E189: S-I16.C3: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I16.S4: I have to try hard your class!
Clause S-I16.C4: I have to try hard your class!


Error list
E190: S-I16.C4: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I16.S5: I member of dance club.
Clause S-I16.C5: I member [of dance club].


Error list
E191: S-I16.C5.1: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E192: S-I16.C5.2: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'
E193: S-I16.C5.3: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E194: S-I16.C5.4: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I16.S6: Dance club's name is Rabbit.
Clause S-I16.C6: Dance club['s name] is Rabbit.


Error list
E195: S-I16.C6.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E196: S-I16.C6.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational- $\exp \rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific

Sentence S-I16.S7(i-ii): I love dance and music. Especially rock music!
Clause S-I16.C7: I love dance and music. Especially rock music!

Analysis of clauses S-I16.C7

|  | I | love |  | dance and music. |  |  | Esp | ly | rock music! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc | 1 | + 2 (1 |  | $=2$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |  |  | cap |  | exclamation mark |

Error list
E197: S-I16.C7: EC39a Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

Sentence S-I16.S8: Example, Avril, Green Day, Owl City.
Clause S-I16.C8: Example, Avril, Green Day, Owl City.


Error list
E198: S-I16.C8.1: EC22b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Participant
EC22b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'
E199: S-I16.C8.2: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E200: S-I16.C8.3: EC27a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Subject EC27a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Subject'

E201: S-I16.C8.4: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'
E202: S-I16.C8.5: EC33a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ideational Theme
EC33a /2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null ideational Theme'
E203: S-I16.C8.6: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Circumstance
EC18 /2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E204: S-I16.C8.7: EC39d: Convention $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise paratactic linker

Sentence S-I16.S9: But, I've never been to their concert.
Clause S-I16.C9: But, I've never been to their concert.

Analysis of clause S-I16.C9


No errors

Sentence S-I16.S10: I want to go to abroad concert someday!
Clause S-I16.C10( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause S-I16.C10(' $\beta$ ): to go to abroad concert someday!

Analysis of clauses S-I16.C10(i-ii)

|  | I | want |  | to go |  | to $\Theta$ | abroad | concert | someday! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | - | Pro: Material |  |  | rc: Place |  | Circ: Time |
|  |  |  |  | vg | pp: pg | + ng (sing | Class | + Thing) | advg |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator |  |  | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E205: S-I16.C10(' $\beta$ ).1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ‘singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E206: S-I16.C10( $\beta$ ) $)$.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I16.S11: When I was high school student, I went to Australia.
Clause S-I16.C11: When I was high school student,

Analysis of clause S-II6.C11

|  | When | I | was |  | $\Theta$ | high school | student, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: $\sin$ g | + Class | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E207: S-I16.C11: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Clause S-I16.C12: I went to Australia.

Analysis of clause S-I16.C12

|  | I | went |  | to Australia. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id: $\log$ | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite*: past | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I16.S12: So excited!!!
Clause S-I16.C13: So excited!!!

Analysis of clause S-I16.C13


Error list
E208: S-I16.C13.1: EC22b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Participant
EC22b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'
E209: S-I16.C13.2: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E210: S-I16.C13.3: EC27a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Subject
EC27a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Subject'
E211: S-I16.C13.4: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'
E212: S-I16.C13.5: EC33a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ideational Theme
EC33a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null ideational Theme'

Sentence S-I16.S13: So I want to go to Australia again!!
Clause S-I16.C14( $\alpha$ ): So I want
Clause S-I16.C14(‘ $\beta$ ): to go to Australia again!!

Analysis of clause S-I16.C14


## No errors

Sentence S-I16.S14: I like weather in Australia.
Clause S-I16.C15: I like weather [in Australia].

|  | I | like |  |  | weather | [in Australia]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : | + Thing | + Qualifier |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E213: S-I16.C15.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable' EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'

E214: S-I16.C15.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

## Text S-I17

My name is X. I'm from Tokyo. I had play piano at junior high school. I have one sister. She is junior high school student. She study piano. She play piano well more than me. My mother is piano teacher. She teach piano at my house. So, I can play piano every day in my house. I like travel. I had go Okinawa at March. Now I don't have any money. Because my university is very far to home. So I don't have time. I can't work. I like travel but I can't travel much time. I like soccer and music. My favourite soccer player is Ronaldhino. He has skill and idea. Idea is very important.

## Sentence list

1. S-I17.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I17.S2: I'm from Tokyo.
3. S-I17.S3: I had play piano at junior high school.
4. S-I17.S4: I have one sister.
5. S-I17.S5: She is junior high school student.
6. S-I17.S6: She study piano.
7. S-I17.S7: She play piano well more than me.
8. S-I17.S8: My mother is piano teacher.
9. S-I17.S9: She teach piano at my house.
10. S-I17.S10: So, I can play piano every day in my house.
11. S-I17.S11: I like travel.
12. S-I17.S12: I had go Okinawa at March.
13. S-I17.S13(i): Now I don't have any money.
14. S-I17.S13(ii): Because my university is very far to home.
15. S-I17.S14: So I don't have time.
16. S-I17.S15: I can't work.
17. S-I17.S16: I like travel but I can't travel much time.
18. S-I17.S17: I like soccer and music.
19. S-I17.S18: My favourite soccer player is Ronaldhino.
20. S-I17.S19: He has skill and idea.
21. S-I17.S20: Idea is very important.

## Sentence list

1. S-I17.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I17.C2: I'm from Tokyo.
3. S-I17.C3: I had play piano at junior high school.
4. S-I17.C4: I have one sister.
5. S-I17.C5: She is junior high school student.
6. S-I17.C6: She study piano.
7. S-I17.C7: She play piano well more than me.
8. S-I17.C8: My mother is piano teacher.
9. S-I17.C9: She teach piano at my house.
10. S-I17.C10: So, I can play piano every day in my house.
11. S-I17.C11: I like travel.
12. S-I17.C12: I had go Okinawa at March.
13. S-I17.C13: Now I don't have any money.
14. S-I17.C14: Because my university is very far to home.
15. S-I17.C15: So I don't have time.
16. S-I17.C16: I can't work.
17. S-I17.C17: I like travel
18. S-I17.C18: but I can't travel much time.
19. S-I17.C19: I like soccer and music.
20. S-I17.C20: My favourite soccer player is Ronaldhino.
21. S-I17.C21: He has skill and idea.
22. S-I17.C22: Idea is very important.

Sentence S-I17.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I17.C1: My name is $X$.


## No errors

Sentence S-I217.S2: I'm from Tokyo.
Clause S-I17.C2: I'm from Tokyo.

Analysis of clause S-II7.C2

|  | I | 'm |  | from Tokyo. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Circumstantial Attribute: Place |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite $:$ present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |
|  | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I17.S3: I had play piano at junior high school.
Clause S-I17.C3: I had play piano at junior high school.

Analysis of clause S-II7.C3

|  | I | had | play | piano | at junior high school. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  | vg: $\alpha-$ | $\beta$ en |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E215: S-I17.C3.1: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system: E216: S-I17.C3.2: EC14b: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'past'

## Sentence S-I17.S4: I have one sister.

Clause S-I17.C4: I have one sister.

|  | I | have |  | one sister. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite*: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I17.S5: She is junior high school student.
Clause S-I17.C5: She is junior high school student.

|  | She | is |  | $\Theta$ | junior high school | student. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E217: S-I17.C5: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I217.S6: She study piano.
Clause S-I17.C6: She study piano.


Error list
E218: S-I17.C6: EC12a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC12a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'

Sentence S-I17.S7: She play piano well more than me.
Clause S-I17.C7: She play piano well more than me.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C7

|  | She | play |  | piano | well more [than me]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Part: Scope | Comparison |
|  |  | $\mathrm{vg} \rightarrow$ plural |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {j }}$ present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E219: S-I17.C7.1: EC12a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular'
EC12a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'
E220: S-I17.C7.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LexiCal SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I17.S8: My mother is piano teacher.
Clause S-I17.C8: My mother is piano teacher.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C8

|  | My mother | is |  | $\Theta$ | piano | teacher. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+ \text {+ }}$ : present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Residue |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E221: S-I17.C8: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I17.S9: She teach piano at my house.
Clause S-I17.C9: She teach piano at my house.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C9

|  | She | teach |  | piano | at my house. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Place |
|  |  | vg : Event $\rightarrow$ plural |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite : present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E222: S-I17.C9: EC12a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC12a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'

Sentence S-I17.S10: So, I can play piano every day in my house.
Clause S-I17.C10: So, I can play piano every day in my house.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C10

|  | So | I | can play |  | piano | every day | in my house. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Range | Circ: Frequency | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Fin ${ }^{*}$ : modal | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I17.S11: I like travel.

Clause S-I17.C11: I like travel.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C11

|  | I | like |  | travel. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental |  | Phenomenon |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I17.S12: I had go Okinawa at March.
Clause S-I17.C12: I had go Okinawa at March.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C12


Error list
E223: S-I17.C12.1: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system
E224: S-I17.C12.2: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Time Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E225: S-I17.C12.3: EC14b: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'past'
E226: S-I17.C12.4: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SySTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I17.S13(i-ii): Now I don't have any money. Because my university is very far to home.
Clause S-I17.C13: Now I don't have any money.

|  | Now | I | don't have | any money. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int |  |  |  |  |
| text |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E227S-I17.S13(i-ii) EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus

Sentence S-I17.13(ii): Because my university is very far to home.
Clause S-I17.C14: Because my university is very far [to home].

Analysis of clause S-I17.C14


Error list
E228: S-I17.C14: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Sentence S-I17.S14: I don't have time.

Clause S-I17.C15: I don't have time.
Analysis of clause S-II7.Cl4

|  | I | don't $\quad$ have | time. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Possessed |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  |  |  |
|  | ideational |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I17.S15: I can't work.

Clause S-I17.C16: I can't work.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C16

|  | I | can't | work. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{-}$modal | Predicator |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I17.S16: I like travel but I can't travel much time.
Clause S-I17.C17: I like travel

Analysis of clause S-I17.C17

|  | I | like |  | travel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| id: $\log$ | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Theme |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I17.C18: but I can't travel much time.

Analysis of clause S-II7.C18

|  | but | I | can't | travel | much time. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ:? |
| id: $\log$ | x2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {a }}$ modal | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
| Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E229: S-I17.C18: EC17: Group rank (adverbial) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

## Sentence S-I17.S17: I like soccer and music.

Clause S-I17.C19: I like soccer and music.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C19

|  | I | like |  | soccer and music. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: $1+2$ |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I17.S18: My favourite soccer player is Ronaldhino.

Clause S-I17.C20: My favourite soccer player is Ronaldhino.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C20

|  | My favourite soccer player | is |  | Ronaldhino. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Identified | Pro: Relational |  | Part: Identifier |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I17.S19: He has skill and idea.
Clause S-I17.C21: He has skill and idea.


Error list
E230: S-I17.C21: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I17.S20: Idea is very important.
Clause S-I17.C22: Idea is very important.

Analysis of clause S-I17.C22

|  | Idea | is |  | very important. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier |  |  | Part: Attribute |
|  | Thing $\rightarrow$ singular | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite': present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E231: S-I17.C22: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

## Text S-I18

My name is X. I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade student. I live in Tokyo, near Tokyo Sky Tree. My hobby is watching movie, listening to music, shopping and eating! I love food and I love eating!! My birthday is $16^{\text {th }}$ December, and my blood type is O. I love sports, especially running, swimming, and soccer. When I was high school student, I joined to track and field club. This club is very hard, but I love running so I did my best. I'm from Yamagata. Yamagata is very beautiful place. Air is clear, people is very kind, and food is delicious. But rather cold place. I hate frog. So please not show frog to me. I am only child.

## Sentence list

1. S-I18.S1: My name is X.
2. S-I18.S2: I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade student.
3. S-I18.S3: I live in Tokyo, near Tokyo Sky Tree.
4. S-I18.S4: My hobby is watching movie, listening to music, shopping and eating!
5. S-I18.S5: I love food and I love eating!!
6. S-I18.S6: My birthday is $16^{\text {th }}$ December, and my blood type is O.
7. S-I18.S7: I love sports, especially running, swimming, and soccer.
8. S-I18.S8: When I was high school student, I joined to track and field club.
9. S-I18.S9: This club is very hard, but I love running so I did my best.
10. S-I18.S10: I'm from Yamagata.
11. S-I18.S11: Yamagata is very beautiful place.
12. S-I18.S12: Air is clear, people is very kind, and food is delicious.
13. S-I18.S13: But rather cold place.
14. S-I18.S14(i): I hate frog.
15. S-I18.S14(ii): So please not show frog to me.
16. S-I18.S15: I am only child.

Clause list

1. S-I18.C1: My name is X.
2. S-I18.C2: I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade student.
3. S-I18.C3: I live in Tokyo, near Tokyo Sky Tree.
4. S-I18.C4-C4[iv]: My hobby is [[watching movie]], [[listening to music]], [[shopping]] and [[eating!]]
5. S-I18.C5: I love food
6. S-I18.C6: and I love eating!!
7. S-I18.C7: My birthday is $16^{\text {th }}$ December,
8. S-I18.C8: and my blood type is O.
9. S-I18.C9: I love sports, especially running, swimming, and soccer.
10. S-I18.C10: When I was high school student,
11. S-I18.C11: I joined to track and field club.
12. S-I18.C12: This club is very hard,
13. S-I18.C13: but I love [[running]]
14. S-I18.C13[i]: [[running]]
15. S-I18.C14: so I did my best.
16. S-I18.C15: I'm from Yamagata.
17. S-I18.C16: Yamagata is very beautiful place.
18. S-I18.C17: Air is clear,
19. S-I18.C18: people is very kind,
20. S-I18.C19: and food is delicious.
21. S-I18.C20: But rather cold place.
22. S-I18.C21: I hate frog.
23. S-I18.C22: So please not show frog to me.
24. S-I18.C23: I am only child.

Sentence S-I18.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I18.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I18.S2: I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade student.
Clause S-I18.C2: I'm $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade student.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C2


Error list
E232: S-I18.C2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2z/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I18.S3: I live in Tokyo, near Tokyo Sky Tree.
Clause S-I18.C3: I live in Tokyo, near Tokyo Sky Tree.


## No errors

Sentence S-I18.S4: My hobby is watching movie, listening to music, shopping and eating!
Clause S-I18.C4-C4[iv]: My hobby is [[watching movie]], [[listening to music]], [[shopping]] and [[eating]]!

Analysis of clauses S-II8.C4(i-v)


Error list
E233: S-I18.C4: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E234: S-I18.C4[i]: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I18.S5: I love food and I love eating!!
Clause S-I18.C5: I love food

Analysis of clause S-I18.C5

|  | I | food |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Senser | Mental Process | Phenomenon |  |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |
| int | Subject |  | Residue |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Rheme |

## No errors

Clause S-I18.C6-C6[i]: and I love [[eating]]!!

Analysis of clause S-I18.C6-C6[i]

|  | and | I | love |  |  | [[eating]]!! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental |  |  | Phenomenon |
| id: $\log$ | +2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I18.S6: My birthday is $16^{\text {th }}$ December, and my blood type is $O$. Clause S-I18.C7: My birthday is $16^{\text {th }}$ December,

Analysis of clause S-I18.C7

|  | My birthday | is |  | $16^{\text {th }}$ December |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Identified | Relational Process | Identifier |  |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 | Predicator | Complement |  |
| int | Subject | Finite | Residue |  |
|  | Mood |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I18.C8: and my blood type is $O$.

Analysis of clause S-II8.C8

|  | and | my blood type | is |  | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | identified | Relational Process |  | Identifier |
| id: $\log$ | +2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  |  | Residue |
| text | textual | ideational |  |  |  |
|  |  | me |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I18.S7: I love sports, especially running, swimming, and soccer.
Clause S-I18.C9: I love sports, especially running, swimming, and soccer.


## No errors

Sentence S-I18.S8: When I was high school student, I joined to track and field club.
Clause S-I18.C10: When I was high school student,

Analysis of clause S-I18.C10

|  | When | I | was |  | high school student, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing) |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E235: S-I18.C10: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Clause S-I18.C11: I joined to track and field club.


## Error list

E236: S-I18.C11.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E237: S-I18.C11.2: EC22c/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Circumstance instead of a Goal
E238: S-I18.C11.3: EC29/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as Complement
E239: S-I18.C11.4: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Sentence S-I18.S9: This club is very hard, but I love running so I did my best.
Clause S-I18.C12: This club is very hard,

Analysis of clause S-I18.C12


## No errors

Clause S-I18.C13: but I love [[running]]
Clause S-I18.C13[i]: [[running]]

Analysis of clause S-II8.C13


## No errors

Clause S-I18.C14: so I did my best.

Analysis of clause S-II8.C14

|  | so | I | did |  | my best. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Range |
| id: $\log$ | x2 ) |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |
|  | ....Rheme ${ }^{1}$.. |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I18.S10: I'm from Yamagata.

Clause S-I18.C15: I'm from Yamagata.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C15


## No errors

Sentence S-I18.S11: Yamagata is very beautiful place.
Clause S-I18.C16: Yamagata is very beautiful place.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C16

|  | Yamagata | is |  | $\Theta$ | very beautiful | place. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E240: S-I18.C16: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I18.S12: Air is clear, people is very kind, and food is delicious.
Clause S-I18.C17: Air is clear,

Analysis of clause S-I18.C17


Error list
E241: S-I18.C17.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E242: S-I18.C17.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Clause S-I18.C18: people is very kind,


Error list
E243: S-I18.C18: EC12b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular'
EC12b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'

Clause S-I18.C19: and food is delicious.

Analysis of clause S-II8.C19

|  | and | $\Theta$ food | is |  | delicious. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
|  | - | ng: sp $\quad+$ Thing |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | +3 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | ...Rheme ${ }^{1}$ ref |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E244: S-I18.C19.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E245: S-I18.C19.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Sentence S-I18.S13: But rather cold place.
Clause S-I18.C20: But rather cold place.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C20

|  | But | $\Theta$ | $\Theta$ |  | rather cold | place. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part | Pre | Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Sub | Fin |  | Complement |  |
|  |  | [Mood] |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E246: S-I18.C20.1: EC22b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Participant
EC22b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Participant'
E247: S-I18.C20.2: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E248: S-I18.C20.3: EC27a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Subject
EC27a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Subject'
E249: S-I18.C20.4: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b /2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'

E250: S-I18.C20.5: EC33a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ideational Theme
EC33a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null ideational Theme'
E251: S-I18.C20.6: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I18.S14(i): I hate frog. So please not show frog to me.
Clause S-I18.C21: I hate frog.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C21

|  | I | hate |  | frog. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
|  |  |  |  | ng : Thing $\rightarrow$ singular |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E252: S-I18.S14(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus
E253: S-I18.C21: $\quad$ EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I18.S14(ii): So, please not show frog to me.
Clause S18.C22: So, please not show frog to me.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C22


Error list
E254: S-I18.C22.1: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'
E255: S-I18.C22.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I18.S15: I am only child.
Clause S-I18.C23: I am only child.

Analysis of clause S-I18.C23

|  | I | am |  | $\Theta$ | only | child. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E256: S-I18.C23: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text S-I19

I'm X. I've taken Justin's class last year. I really like to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture. I also like trip! It's very fun and interesting. I can view a lot of beautiful nature, historical building, and food. I think speaking skill is the most important for me but writing skill is also the same. Now, my brother does job hunting. It's very very hard for him! I don't know what does he want to do and what should he do. Why does university students have to find a job while stay university? I really don't understand it!! How about other country? I'm interested in translation. So I'm taking translation class. The teacher is John. His class is interesting. He knows English culture and American culture. It's really good for me because I want to know about it! I have some friends who can speak English. Sometime I chat with them in English.

Sentence list

1. S-I19.S1: I'm X.
2. S-I19.S2: I've taken Justin's class last year.
3. S-I19.S3: I really like to learn about English.
4. S-I19.S4: Especially communicative grammar, culture.
5. S-I19.S5: I also like trip!
6. S-I19.S6: It's very fun and interesting.
7. S-I19.S7: I can view a lot of beautiful nature, historical building, and food.
8. S-I19.S8: I think speaking skill is the most important for me but writing skill is also the same.
9. S-I19.S9: Now, my brother does job hunting.
10. S-I19.S10: It's very very hard for him!
11. S-I19.S11: I don't know what does he want to do and what should he do.
12. S-I19.S12: Why does university students have to find a job while stay university?
13. S-I19:.S13: I really don't understand it!!
14. S-I19.S14: How about other country?
15. S-I19.S15(i): I'm interested in translation.
16. S-I19.S15(ii): So I'm taking translation class.
17. S-I19.S16: The teacher is John.
18. S-I19.S17: His class is interesting.
19. S-I19.S18: He knows English culture and American culture.
20. S-I19.S19: It's really good for me because I want to know about it!
21. S-I19.S20: I have some friends who can speak English.
22. S-I19.S21: Sometime I chat with them in English.

Clause list

1. S-I19.C1: I'm X.
2. S-I19.C2: I've taken Justin's class last year.
3. S-I19.C3: I really like [[to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture]].
4. S-I19.C3[i]: [[to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture]]
5. S-I19.C5: I also like trip!
6. S-I19.C6: It's very fun and interesting.
7. S-I19.C7: I can view a lot of beautiful nature, historical building, and food.
8. S-I19.C8( $\alpha$ ): I think
9. S-I19.C8(' $\beta$ ): speaking skill is the most important for me
10. S-I19.C9: but writing skill is also the same.
11. S-I19.C10: Now, my brother does job hunting.
12. S-I19.C11: It's very very hard for him!
13. S-I19.C12: I don't know [[what does he want to do]]
14. S-I19.C12[io]: [[what does he want
15. S-I19.C12[i’ $\beta$ ]: to do]]
16. S-I19.C13: and [I DON'T KNOW] [[what should he do]].
17. S-I19.C13[i]: [[what should he do]]
18. S-I19.C14: Why does university students have to find a job
19. S-I19.C15: while stay university?
20. S-I19.C16: I really don't understand it!!
21. S-I19.C17: How about other country?
22. S-I19.C18: I'm interested in translation.
23. S-I19.C19: So I'm taking translation class.
24. S-I19.C20: The teacher is John.
25. S-I19.C21: His class is interesting.
26. S-I19.C22: He knows English culture and American culture.
27. S-I19.C23: It's really good for me
28. S-I19.C24( $\alpha$ ): because I want
29. S-I19.C24(' $\beta$ ): to know about it!
30. S-I19.C25: I have some friends [[who can speak English]].
31. S-I19.C25[i]: [[who can speak English]]
32. S-I19.C26: Sometime I chat with them in English.

## Sentence S-I19.S1: I'm $X$.

Clause S-I19.C1: I'm $X$.

Analysis of clause S-II9.CI

|  | I | 'm |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Identified/ Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I19.S2: I've taken Justin's class last year.
Clause S-I19.C2: I've taken Justin's class last year.

|  | I | 've take |  | Justin's class | last year. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ experience |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E257: S-I19.C2.1: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system
E258: S-I19.C2.2: EC26a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'past'
EC26a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'present'

Sentence S-I19.S3(i-ii): I really like to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture.
Clause S-I19.C3: I really like [[to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture]].
Clause S-I19.C3[i]: [[to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture]].

Analysis of clause S-II9.C3


Error list
E259: S-I19.C3: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause
E260: S-I19.C3[i]: EC39d: Convention $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise paratactic linker

Sentence S-I19.S5: I also like trip!
Clause S-I19.C5: I also like trip!

|  | I | also | like |  | trip! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | $7$ | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
|  |  | - |  |  | ng : Thing $\rightarrow$ singular |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adj | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E261: S-I19.C5: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I19.S6: It's very fun and interesting.
Clause S-I19.C6: It's very fun and interesting.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C6

|  | It |  | 's | Very fun and interesting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Carrier | Relational Process |  | Attribute |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I19.S7: I can view a lot of beautiful nature, historical building, and food.
Clause S-I19.C7: I can view a lot of beautiful nature, historical building, and food.


Error list
E262: S-I19.C7: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I19.S8: I think speaking skill is the most important for me but writing skill is also the same.
Clause S-I19.C8a: I think
Clause S-I19.C8b: speaking skill is the most important for me

Analysis of clauses S-I19.C8a-b

|  | I | think | speaking skill is the most important for me |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  |  |  |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 (Projection: $\alpha$ |  | ${ }^{\text {®) }}$ |
| int |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| text |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

No errors

Clause SI19.C9: but writing skill is also the same.

|  | but | Writing skill | is |  | also | the | same. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | - | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  |  | Part: Attribute |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  | plement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | ? |  |

Error list
E263: S-I19.C9: EC37b: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ reference item has unclear frame of reference

Sentence S-I19.S9: Now, my brother does job hunting.
Clause S-I19.C10: Now, my brother does job hunting.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C10

|  | Now | my brother | does |  | job hunting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Actor | Material Process |  | Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement |
| (decl) | Res... | Mood |  | ...idue |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { text } \\ \text { marked } \rightarrow \end{gathered}$ | ideational |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I19.S10: It's very very hard for him!
Clause S-I19.C11: It's very very hard for him!

Analysis of clause S-I19.C11

|  | It | is |  | very very hard | for him |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Carrier | Relat | Process | Attribute | Circ |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I19.S11: I don't know what does he want to do and [I DON'T KNOW] what should he do.
Clause S-I19.C12( $\alpha$ ): I don't know
Clause S-I19.C12(' $\beta$ ): [ [what does he want to do]]*

Analysis of clauses S-I19.C12 $\alpha-\beta$


Error list
*See below

Clause S-I19.C12[io-‘ $\beta$ ]: [[what does he want [[to do]] ]]

|  | [[what |  | does | he | want | $[[$ to $\operatorname{do}]]]]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Goal |  |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative | Projected Metaphenomenon |
|  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  | Material |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | ' $\beta$ ( Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |
| int | Complement |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | Predicator |
|  | Resi... |  | Mood $\rightarrow$ interrogative |  | ...due | Residue |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{6}$ |

Error List
E264: S-I19.C12[i].1: EC31: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'declarative' E265: S-I19.C12[i]:2: EC35: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural Theme

Clause S-I19.C13: and [I DON'T KNOW] [[what should he do]].
Clause S-I19.C13[i]: [[what should he dol]*

Analysis of clause S-I19.C13(i)

|  | and | [I] | [DON'T KNOW] |  | [[what should he do]]* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | [SENSER] | [MENTAL] |  | Projected Metaphenomenon |
| id:log | +2 (Projection |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | [SUBJECT] | [FINITE ${ }^{+}$: PRESENT] | [PREDICATOR] | Complement |
|  |  | Mo[OD] |  | [RES]idue |  |
| text | textual | [IDEATIONAL] | Rheme ${ }^{8}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{9}$ |
|  |  | heme ${ }^{8}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{7}$ |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
*See below

Clause S-I19.C13[i]: [[what should he do]]

Analysis of clause S-I19.C13(ii)

|  | [[what |  | should | he | do]] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | [[Part: Goal |  | Pro: Material]] |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | [[Complement |  | Finite ${ }^{*}$ : modal | Subject | Predicator]] |
|  | [[Resi... |  | Mood $\rightarrow$ interrogative |  | ...due]] |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{10}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{10}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error List
E266: S-I19.C13[i].1: EC31: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'declarative' E267: S-I19.C13[i]:2: EC35: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of structural Theme

Sentence S-I19.S12: Why does university students have to find a job while [THEY ARE] stay university?
Clause S-I19.C14: Why does university students have to find a job

|  | Why |  | does | university students | have to find | a job |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Circ: Reason |  | Pro... | Part: Actor | ...cess: Material | Part: Goal |
|  |  |  | $\mathrm{vg} \rightarrow$ singular... |  | (...) |  |
| id:log | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | , |  | $\alpha$ (i) |  | $\alpha$ (ii) $\quad \beta$ |  |
| int | Adjunct |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Re... |  | Mood: interrogative |  | ...sidue |  |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E268: S-I19.C14: EC12b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC12b/2:Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select ‘singular’

Clause S-I19.C15: while [THEY ARE] stay university?

Analysis of clause S-II9.C15


Error list
E269: S-I19.C15: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Sentence S-I19.S13: I really don't understand it!!

Clause S-I19.C16: I really don't understand it!!

|  | I | really | don't understand |  | it! |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Senser |  | Mental Process |  | Phenomenon |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite | Predicator | Complement |
| (decl) | Mood |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I19.S14: How about other country?
Clause S-I19.C17: How about other country?

Analysis of clause S-I19.C17

|  | How about | other country? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  |  |  |
|  |  | ng: Deictic $\quad$ + Thing $\rightarrow$ singular |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |
| int |  |  |  |
| text |  |  |  |

Error list
E270: S-I19.C17: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I19.S15(i-ii): I'm interested in translation. So I'm taking translation class.
Clause S-I19.C18: I'm interested in translation.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C18


Error list
E271: S-I19.S15(i-ii): EC39a Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus

Sentence S-I19.S15(ii): So I'm taking translation class.
Clause S-I19.C19: So I'm taking translation class.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C19

|  | So | I | 'm taking |  | translation class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Actor | Material Process |  | Goal |
| id:log | x 2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement |
| (decl) |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational |  |  | Rheme |
| Theme |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |

No new errors

## Sentence S-I19.S16: The teacher is John.

## Clause S-I19.C20: The teacher is John.

|  | The teacher | is |  | John |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Identified | Relational Process |  | Identifier |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I19.17: His class is interesting.

Clause S-I19.C21: His class is interesting.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C21


## No errors

Sentence S-I19.S18: He knows English culture and American culture.
Clause S-I19.C22: He knows English culture and American culture.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C22


## No errors

Sentence S-I19.S 19: It's really good for me because I want to know about it!
Clause S-I19.C23: It's really good for me

Analysis of clause S-I19.C23

|  | It | 's |  | really | good | for me |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Carrier | Relational Process |  |  | Attribute | Circ |
| id: $\log$ | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Clause S-I19.C24(a): because I want
Clause S-I19.C24(b): to know about it.


## No errors

Sentence S-I19.S20: I have some friends [[who can speak English]].
Clause S-I19.C25(i): I have some friends [[who can speak English]].
Clause S-I19.C25(ii): [[who can speak English]]

Analysis of clause S-I19.C25(i)


No errors

Sentence S-I19.S21: Sometimes I chat with them in English.
Clause S-I19.C26: Sometimes I chat with them in English.

Analysis of clause S-I19.C26

|  | Sometimes. | I | chat |  | with them | in English |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Actor |  | Process | Circ | Circ |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Mood Adjunct | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Text S-I20

My name is X. I am called "Y" from my friends. I live in Tokyo. Tokyo has lots of place nearby. So Tokyo is useful and convenience city. I am commuting house to school by train. I use Sobu Line, Keisei Line and Musashino Line. I live my father, mother and one younger brother. We are maybe nice family. We don't have pets but we took care of hamsters few years ago. My hobby is talking with my friends and eating delicious sweets. I often eat chocolates during break time because chocolates make me happy and cheerful. When I have holidays I often work at Lalaport. If you have a time, please come to my shop!

## Sentence list

1. S-I20.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I20.S2: I am called " Y " from my friends.
3. S-I20.S3: I live in Tokyo.
4. S-I20.S4(i): Tokyo has lots of place nearby.
5. S-I20.S4(ii): So Tokyo is useful and convenience city.
6. S-I20.S5: I am commuting house to school by train.
7. S-I20.S6: I use Sobu Line, Keisei Line and Musashino Line.
8. S-I20.S7: I live my father, mother and one younger brother.
9. S-I20.S8: We are maybe nice family.
10. S-I20.S9: We don't have pets but we took care of hamsters few years ago.
11. S-I20.S10: My hobby is talking with my friends and eating delicious sweets.
12. S-I20.S11: I often eat chocolates during break time because chocolates make me happy and cheerful.
13. S-I20.S12: When I have holidays I often work at Lalaport.
14. S-I20.S13: If you have a time, please come to my shop!

Clause list

1. S-I20.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I20.C2: I am called "Y" from my friends.
3. S-I20.C3: I live in Tokyo.
4. S-I20.C4: Tokyo has lots of place nearby.
5. S-I20.C5: So Tokyo is useful and convenience city.
6. S-I20.C6: I am commuting house to school by train.
7. S-I20.C7: I use Sobu Line, Keisei Line and Musashino Line.
8. S-I20.C8: I live my father, mother and one younger brother.
9. S-I20.C9: We are maybe nice family.
10. S-I20.C10: We don't have pets
11. S-I20.C11: but we took care of hamsters few years ago.
12. S-I20.C12: My hobby is [[talking with my friends]] and [[eating delicious sweets]].
13. S-I20.C12[i]: [[talking with my friends]]
14. S-I20.C12([ii]: [[eating delicious sweets]]
15. S-I20.C13: I often eat chocolates during break time
16. S-I20.C14: because chocolates make me happy and cheerful.
17. S-I20.C15: When I have holidays
18. S-I20.C16: I often work at Lalaport.
19. S-I20.C17: If you have a time,
20. S-I20.C18: please come to my shop!

Sentence S-I20.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I20.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite $^{+}:$present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  |  |
|  | ideational |  | Residue |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I20.S2: I am called " $Y$ " from my friends.
Clause S-I20.C2: I am called " $Y$ " from my friends.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C2


Error list
E272: S-I20.C2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Sentence S-I20.S3: I live in Tokyo.

Clause S-I20.C3: I live in Tokyo.

|  | I | live |  |  | In Tokyo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Actor | Material process |  |  | Circumstance |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite | Predicator |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I20.S4(i-ii): Tokyo has lots of place nearby. So Tokyo is useful and convenience city.
Clause S-I20.C4: Tokyo has [lots of] place nearby.

|  | Tokyo |  | has | [lots of | place | nearby. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Possessed |  | Circ: Place |
|  |  |  |  | ng: Num | + Thing $\rightarrow$ singular |  |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E273: S-I20.C4: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I20.S4(ii): So Tokyo is useful and convenience city.
Clause S-I20.C5: So Tokyo is useful and convenience city.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C5


Error list
E274: S-I20.C5.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E275: S-I20.C5.2: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence S-I20.S5: I am commuting house to school by train.
Clause S-I20.C6: I am commuting house to school by train.

|  | I | am | mmuting |  |  | house |  | school | by tra |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |  | Circ: Means |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pre Minor Range |  |  |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ppc | $\alpha$ |  | $=\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E276: S-I20.C6: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Place Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I20.S6: I use Sobu Line, Keisei Line and Musashino Line.
Clause S-I20.C7: I use Sobu Line, Keisei Line and Musashino Line.


Error list
E277: S-I20.C7.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E278: S-I20.C7.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Sentence S-I20.S7: I live my father, mother and one younger brother.
Clause S-I20.C8: I live my father, mother and one younger brother.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C8


Error list
E279: S-I20.C8: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence S-I20.S8: We are maybe nice family.
Clause S-I20.C9: We are maybe nice family.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C9

|  | We | are |  | maybe | $\theta$ | nice | family. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:0xp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\square$ | ng : sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Mood Adjunct | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mo.. (decl) |  | Resi... | ...od | ...due |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E280: S-I20.C9: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence S-I20.S9: We don't have pets but we took care of hamsters few years ago.
Clause S-I20.C10: We don't have pets

|  | We | don't have |  | pets |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Possessor | Relational Process |  | Possessed |
| id: $\log$ | Paratactic expansion |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite - | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  |  | Residue |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I20.C11: but we took care of hamsters few years ago.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C11

|  | but | we | took care of |  | hamsters | few years ago. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E281: S-I20.C11: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I20.S10: My hobby is talking with my friends and eating delicious sweets.
Clause S-I20.C12: My hobby is [[talking with my friends]] and [[eating delicious sweets]].
Clause S-I20.C12([i]: [[talking with my friends]]
Clause S-I20.C12[ii]: [[eating delicious sweets]]

Analysis of clause S-I20.C12(i)

|  | My hobby | is |  | [[talking with my friends]] and [[eating delicious sweets]]. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Identifier/Token |  |  |  |
|  | ng: $\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{Th} \rightarrow$ singular |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc | 1 |  | +2 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E282: 2S-I20.C12: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence S-I20.S11: I often eat chocolates during break time because chocolates make me happy and cheerful. Clause S-I20.C13: I often eat chocolates during break time

|  | I | often | eat |  | chocolates | during break time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I20.C14: because chocolates make me happy and cheerful.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C14

|  | because | chocolates | make |  | me |  | happy | and | cheerful. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Attributor | Pro: Rel: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Carrier | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 |  | +2 |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Complement |  |  |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I20.S12: When I have holidays I often work at Lalaport.
Clause S-I20.C15: When I have holidays

Analysis of clause S-I20.C15

|  | When | I | have |  | holidays |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Possessed |
| id:log | Hypotactic expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  |  | od | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Clause S-I20.C16: I often work at Lalaport.

Analysis of clause S-I20.C16

|  | I | often | work |  | at Lalaport |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Actor |  | Material process |  | Circ |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite | Predictor | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I20.S13: If you have a time, please come to my shop!
Clause S-I20.C17: If you have a time,

Analysis of clause S-I20.C17

|  | If | you | have |  | a time, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Possessed |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : sing + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $x \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E283: S-I20.C17: EC2b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular'
EC2b/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'

Clause S-I20.C18: please come to my shop!

Analysis of clause S-I20.C18


No errors

## Text S-I21

My name is X. I'm nineteen years old. There are three people in my family. I like reading books and listening to music. I usually read fantasies and mysteries. I read comics, too. My favourite foods are sushi and noodles. I eat noodles for lunch on holidays. I like cats and dogs. I have a dog. I have had seven cats when I was a child. I went to Los Angeles last summer. I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks. It was a good experience.

## Sentence list

1. S-I21.S1: My name is X .
2. S-I21.S2: I'm nineteen years old.
3. S-I21.S3: There are three people in my family.
4. S-I21.S4: I like reading books and listening to music.
5. S-I21.S5: I usually read fantasies and mysteries.
6. S-I21.S6: I read comics, too.
7. S-I21.S7: My favourite foods are sushi and noodles.
8. S-I21.S8: I eat noodles for lunch on holidays.
9. S-I21.S9: I like cats and dogs.
10. S-I21.S10: I have a dog.
11. S-I21.S11: I have had seven cats when I was a child.
12. S-I21.S12: I went to Los Angeles last summer.
13. S-I21.S13: I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks.
14. S-I21.S14: It was a good experience.

Clause list

1. S-I21.C1: My name is X .
2. S-I21.C2: I'm nineteen years old.
3. S-I21.C3: There are three people in my family.
4. S-I21.C4: I like [[reading books]] and [[listening to music]]
5. S-I21.C4[i]: [[reading books]]
6. S-I21.C4[ii]: [[listening to music]]
7. S-I21.C5: I usually read fantasies and mysteries.
8. S-I21.C6: I read comics, too.
9. S-I21.C7: My favourite foods are sushi and noodles.
10. S-I21.C8: I eat noodles for lunch on holidays.
11. S-I21.C9: I like cats and dogs.
12. S-I21.C10: I have a dog.
13. S-I21.C11: I have had seven cats
14. S-I21.C12: when I was a child.
15. S-I21.C13: I went to Los Angeles last summer.
16. S-I21.C14: I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks.
17. S-I21.C15: It was a good experience.

Sentence S-I21.S1: My name is $X$.
Clause S-I21.C1: My name is $X$.

Analysis of clause S-I21.C1

|  | My name | is |  | X. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational | sive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier/Token |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence SI21.S2: I'm nineteen years old.
Clause S-I21.C2: I'm nineteen years old.


## No errors

Sentence S-I21.S3: There are three people in my family.
Clause S-I21.C3: There are three people in my family.

|  | There | are |  | three people | in my family |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Existe | Process | Existent | Circ |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I21.S4: I like reading books and listening to music.
Clause S-I21.C4-C4[ii]: I like [[reading books]] and [[listening to music]].

Analysis of clause S-I2 1.C4-C4[ii]


## No errors

Sentence S-I21.S5: I usually read fantasies and mysteries.
Clause S-I21.C5: I usually read fantasies and mysteries.

|  | I | usually | read |  | fantasies and mysteries. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Behaver |  | Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Range |  |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite+: present | Predicator |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

Sentence S-I21.S6: I read comics, too.
Clause S-I21.C6: I read comics, too.


## No errors

Sentence S-I21.S7: My favourite foods are sushi and noodles.
Clause S-I21.C7: My favourite foods are sushi and noodles.

|  | My favourite foods | are |  | sushi and noodles. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | + |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |
| str | ng | vg |  | ng conjg ng |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I21.S8: I eat noodles for lunch on holidays.

Clause S-I21.C8: I eat noodles for lunch on holidays.

|  | I | eat |  | noodles | for lunch | on holidays. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Role? (Purpose?) | Circ: Time |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I21.S9: I like cats and dogs.

Clause S-I21.C9: I like cats and dogs.

|  | I | like |  | cats and dogs. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

## No errors

## Sentence S-I21.S10: I have a dog.

Clause S-I21.C10: I have a dog.

|  | I | have |  | a dog |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Possessor | Relational Process |  | Possessed |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int (decl) | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Complemen |  |
|  | Mood |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

No errors

Sentence S-I21.S11: I have had seven cats when I was a child.
Clause S-I21.C11: I have had seven cats

Analysis of clause S-I21.C11

|  | I | have had |  | seven cats |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Possessor | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Possessed |
| id:log | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood; decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

## No errors

Clause S-I21.C12: when I was a child.

Analysis of clause S-I21.C12

|  | when | I | was |  | a child. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E284: S-I21.C12: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ Lexical System $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence S-I21.S12: I went to Los Angeles last summer.
Clause S-I21.C13: I went to Los Angeles last summer.

Analysis of clause S-I21.C13


## No errors

Sentence S-I21.S13: I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks.
Clause S-I21.C14: I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks.

|  | I | went |  | to UCLA | for study | abo | for | three weeks. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Purpose | Circ: Duration |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min |  | Minor Process | Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E285: S-I21.C14: EC6: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of experiential structure
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Note: For logistical reasons, only the analyses of clauses with errors have been included in Volume III of the appendix

## Appendix 2 -Sunday Routine texts

## Text SR1

I usually go shopping. I usually go with my friend. I usually go to Ikspiari. I usually buy the clothes. I usually study at home. I usually study for TOEIC. I usually study alone. I usually clean my room. I usually clean at five. I usually cook dinner.

## Sentence list

1. SR1.S1: I usually go shopping.
2. SR1.S2: I usually go with my friend.
3. SR1.S3: I usually go to Ikspiari.
4. SR1.S4: I usually buy the clothes.
5. SR1.S5: I usually study at home.
6. SR1.S6: I usually study for TOEIC.
7. SR1.S7: I usually study alone.
8. SR1.S8: I usually clean my room.
9. SR1.S9: I usually clean at five.
10. SR1.S10: I usually cook dinner.

## Clause list

1. SR1.C1: I usually go shopping.
2. SR1.C2: I usually go with my friend.
3. SR1.C3: I usually go to Ikspiari.
4. SR1.C4: I usually buy the clothes.
5. SR1.C5: I usually study at home.
6. SR1.C6: I usually study for TOEIC.
7. SR1.C7: I usually study alone.
8. SR1.C8: I usually clean my room.
9. SR1.C9: I usually clean at five.
10. SR1.C10: I usually cook dinner.

## Sentence SR1.S4: I usually buy the clothes.

Clause SR1.C4: I usually buy the clothes.

Analysis of clause SR1.C4


Error list
E286: SR1.C4.1: EC36b/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-identifiable'
EC36b/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'identifiable'
E287: SR1.C4.2: EC2d/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-specific' EC2d/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'specific'

## Text SR2

I usually work on Sundays. I go to work place by car. I work at Disney store. I usually play tennis. I play tennis with my friends. I play tennis in Tokyo. I usually watch TV. I like One Piece and Chibimaruko. I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother. I buy clothes and foods.

## Sentence list

1. SR2.S1: I usually work on Sundays.
2. SR2.S2: I go to work place by car.
3. SR2.S3: I work at Disney store.
4. SR2.S4: I usually play tennis.
5. SR2.S5: I play tennis with my friends.
6. SR2.S6: I play tennis in X.
7. SR2.S7: I usually watch TV.
8. SR2.S8: I like One Piece and Chibimaruko.
9. SR2.S9(i-ii): I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother.
10. SR2.S10: I buy clothes and foods.

Clause list

1. SR2.C1: I usually work on Sundays.
2. SR2.C2: I go to work place by car.
3. SR2.C3: I work at Disney store.
4. SR2.C4: I usually play tennis.
5. SR2.C5: I play tennis with my friends.
6. SR2.C6: I play tennis in X.
7. SR2.C7: I usually watch TV.
8. SR2.C8: I like One Piece and Chibimaruko.
9. SR2.C9: I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother.
10. SR2.C10: I buy clothes and foods.

Sentence SR2.S2: I go to work place by car.
Clause SR2.C2: I go to work place by car.

Analysis of clause SR2.C2

|  | I | go | to | $\Theta$ work place | by car. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine | Circ: Place |  | Circ: Means |
|  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sp + Classifier + Thing |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E288: SR2.C2.1: EC36a: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise anaphoric reference
E289: SR2.C2.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Sentence SR2.S3: I work at Disney store.
Clause SR2.C3: I work at Disney store.

Analysis of clause SR2.C3

|  | I | work |  | at | $\Theta$ | Disney | store. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E290: SR2.C3: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular

Sentence SR2.S9(i-ii): I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother.
Clause SR2.C9: I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother.


Error list
E291: SR2.C9: EC39b:
E292: SR2.C9.1: EC22c/1:

E293:SR2.C9.2: EC29/1:
Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise
Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as
Predicator/Complement

## Text SR3

I usually go to shopping on Sunday. I usually go to shopping in Shibuya. I usually go to shopping at afternoon. I usually go to shopping on alone. I usually study English on Sunday. I usually study English at home. I usually study English at morning. I usually study English use textbook. I usually study English at short time.

## Sentence list

1. SR3.S1: I usually go to shopping on Sunday.
2. SR3.S2: I usually go to shopping in Shibuya.
3. SR3.S3: I usually go to shopping at afternoon.
4. SR3.S4: I usually go to shopping on alone.
5. SR3.S5: I usually study English on Sunday.
6. SR3.S6: I usually study English at home.
7. SR3.S7: I usually study English at morning.
8. SR3.S8: I usually study English use textbook.
9. SR3.S9: I usually study English at short time.

Clause list

1. SR3.C1: I usually go to shopping on Sunday.
2. SR3.C2: I usually go to shopping in Shibuya.
3. SR3.C3: I usually go to shopping at afternoon.
4. SR3.C4: I usually go to shopping on alone.
5. SR3.C5: I usually study English on Sunday.
6. SR3.C6: I usually study English at home.
7. SR3.C7: I usually study English at morning.
8. SR3.C8: I usually study English
9. SR3.C9: use textbook.
10. SR3.C10: I usually study English at short time.

Sentence SR3.S1: I usually go to shopping on Sunday.
Clause SR3.C1: I usually go to shopping on Sunday.

Analysis of clause SR3.C1

|  | I | usually | go | to shopping | on Sunday. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Actor | - | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine | Circ | Circ: Location |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E294: SR3.C1.1: EC22c/1:

E295: SR3.C1.2: EC29/1:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-ex $\rightarrow$ TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as
Predicator/Complement

Sentence SR3.S2: I usually go to shopping in Shibuya.
Clause SR3.C2: I usually go to shopping in Shibuya.

Analysis of clause SR3.C2

|  | I | usually | go |  | to shopping | in Shibuya. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | + | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list

E296: SR3.C2.1: EC22c/1:

E297: SR3.C2.2: EC29/1:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-ex $\rightarrow$ TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as
Predicator/Complement

Sentence SR3.S3: I usually go to shopping at afternoon.
Clause SR3.C3: I usually go to shopping at afternoon.

Analysis of clause SR3.C3


Error list

E298: SR3.C3.1: EC36a/1:
EC36a/2:
E299: SR3.C3.2: EC22c/1:

E300: SR3.C3.3: EC29/1:

E301: SR3.C3.4: EC2c/1:
EC2c/2:
E302: SR3.C3.5: EC1a:

Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant / Process
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as Predicator / Complement
Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Sentence SR3.S4: I usually go to shopping on alone.

Clause SR3.C4: I usually go to shopping on alone.

Analysis of clause SR3.C4

|  | I | usually | go |  | to shopping |  | alone. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | , | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ | Circ: Accompaniment |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E303: SR3.C4.1: EC22c/1:

E304: SR3.C4.2: EC29/1:

E305: SR3.C4.3: EC17:

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-ex $\rightarrow$ TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as
Predicator/Complement
Phrase / Group rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

## Sentence SR3.S7: I usually study English at morning.

Clause SR3.C7: I usually study English at morning.

|  | I | usually | study |  | English | at | $\Theta$ | morning. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Time |  |  |
|  |  | - |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sp | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E306: SR3.C7.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E307: SR3.C7.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E308: SR3.C7.3: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Clause SR3.C9: use textbook.

Analysis of clause SR3.C9


Error list
E309: SR3.C9.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E310: SR3.C9.2: EC11a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfective'
EC11a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective'
E311: SR3.C9.3: EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'

Sentence SR3.S9: I usually study English at short time.
Clause SR3.C10: I usually study English at short time.

Analysis of clause SR3.C10

|  | I | usually | study |  | English | at $\quad \theta$ |  | shor | time. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Duration |  |  |  |
|  |  | $7$ |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Ep | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement |  | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E312: SR3.C10.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E313: SR3.C10.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Text SR4

I usually do my homework. I usually eat Susai. I usually go shopping. I usually go to Harajuku. I usually sleep during ten hours. I usually go to bed at twelve. I usually talk my friends.

## Sentence list

1. SR4.S1: I usually do my homework.
2. SR4.S2: I usually eat Susai.
3. SR4.S3: I usually go shopping.
4. SR4.S4: I usually go to Harajuku.
5. SR4.S5: I usually sleep during ten hours.
6. SR4.S6: I usually go to bed at twelve.
7. SR4.S7: I usually talk my friends.

## Clause list

1. SR4.C1: I usually do my homework.
2. SR4.C2: I usually eat Susai.
3. SR4.C3: I usually go shopping.
4. SR4.C4: I usually go to Harajuku.
5. SR4.C5: I usually sleep during ten hours.
6. SR4.C6: I usually go to bed at twelve.
7. SR4.C7: I usually talk my friends.

## Sentence SR4.S5: I usually sleep during ten hours.

Clause SR4.C5: I usually sleep during ten hours.

Analysis of clause SR4.C5

|  | I | usually | sleep |  | during ten hours. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Behaver |  | Pro: Beha | oural | Circ: Duration |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E314: SR4.C5: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICALSYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Sentence SR4.S7: I usually talk my friends.

Clause SR4.C7: I usually talk my friends.

Analysis of clause SR4.C7


## Error list

E315: SR4.C7: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Circumstance
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

## Text SR5

I usually go shopping. At Shibuya and Harajuku. I went to with my sister. I bought clothes. It was fun. I usually study English. At home. I usually eat breakfast at morning.

## Sentence list

1. SR5.S1(i-ii): I usually go shopping. At Shibuya and Harajuku.
2. SR5.S2: I went to with my sister.
3. SR5.S3: I bought clothes.
4. SR5.S4: It was fun.
5. SR5.S5(i-ii): I usually study English. At home.
6. SR5.S6: I usually eat breakfast at morning.

## Clause list

1. SR5.C1: I usually go shopping. At Shibuya and Harajuku.
2. SR5.C2: I went to with my sister.
3. SR5.C3: I bought clothes.
4. SR5.C4: It was fun.
5. SR5.C5: I usually study English. At home.
6. SR5.C6: I usually eat breakfast at morning.

## Sentence SR5.S1(i-ii): I usually go shopping. At Shibuya and Harajuku.

Clause SR5.C1: I usually go shopping. At Shibuya and Harajuku.

|  | I | usually | go | shopping. | At Shibuya and Harajuku. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | , | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Circ: Place |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap $\begin{aligned} & \text { full stop }\end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E316: SR5.C1: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\boldsymbol{\rightarrow}$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

## Sentence SR5.S2: I went to with my sister.

Clause SR5.C2: I went to with my sister.

Analysis of clause SR5.C2

|  | I | went |  | to $\theta$ |  | with my sister. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ completed |  | Circ: Place |  | Circ: Accompaniment |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Min Range |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Predicator | Min Comp |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E317: SR5.C1: EC19/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Range
EC19/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Range'
E318: SR5.C2: EC20/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Complement
EC20/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Complement'

## Sentence SR5.S5(i-ii): I usually study English. At home.

Clause SR5.C5: I usually study English. At home.

|  | I | usually | study |  | English. |  |  | ome. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |  | Circ: Place |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop |  | cap | full stop |

Error list
E319: SR5.C5: EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\boldsymbol{\rightarrow}$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' within a clause

Sentence SR5.S6: I usually eat breakfast at morning.
Clause SR5.C6: I usually eat breakfast at morning.

Analysis of clause SR5.C6


Error list
E320: SR5.C6.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E321: SR5.C6.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E322: SR5.C6.3: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Text SR6

I go to part time job. I study English. I visit a grandmother's house. I go shopping. I play soccer. I watch a movie. I listening a music. I often go to see an artist in Tokyo. I cooking dinner for my family. I sleep a long time. I go to eat dinner. I go to TPL. I read a book. I swimming in pool.

## Sentence list

1. SR6.S1: I go to part time job.
2. SR6.S2: I study English.
3. SR6.S3: I visit a grandmother's house.
4. SR6.S4: I go shopping.
5. SR6.S5: I play soccer.
6. SR6.S6: I watch a movie.
7. SR6.S7: I listening a music.
8. SR6.S8: I often go to see an artist in Tokyo.
9. SR6.S9: I cooking dinner for my family.
10. SR6.S10: I sleep a long time.
11. SR6.S11: I go to eat dinner.
12. SR6.S12: I go to TPL.
13. SR6.S13: I read a book.
14. SR6.S14: I swimming in pool.

## Clause list

1. SR6.C1: I go to part time job.
2. SR6.C2: I study English.
3. SR6.C3: I visit a grandmother's house.
4. SR6.C4: I go shopping.
5. SR6.C5: I play soccer.
6. SR6.C6: I watch a movie.
7. SR6.C7: I listening a music.
8. SR6.C8: I often go.
9. SR6.C9: to see an artist in Tokyo
10. SR6.C10: I cooking dinner for my family.
11. SR6.C11: I sleep a long time.
12. SR6.C12: I go.
13. SR6.C13: to eat dinner.
14. SR6.C14: I go to TPL.
15. SR6.C15: I read a book.
16. SR6.C16: I swimming in pool.

## Sentence SR6.S1: I go to part time job.

Clause SR6.C1: I go to part time job.

|  | I | go |  | to | $\theta$ | part time | job. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pro: Material |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Class | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E323: SR6.C1: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

Sentence SR6.S3: I visit a grandmother's house.
Clause SR6.C3: I visit [a grandmother's] house.

Analysis of clause SR6.C3


Error list
E324: SR6.C3.1: EC36/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E325: SR6.C3.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E326: SR6.C3.3: EC9/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ' + interactant'
EC9/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select '- interactant'

## Sentence SR6.S7: I listening a music.

Clause SR6.C7: I listening a music.

|  | I | listening |  | $\Theta$ | a | music. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Behaver | Pro: Behavioural |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
|  |  | vg: imp |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | non-finite | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mo[od] |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

E327: SR6.C7.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ PHRASE TRANSITIVITY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E328: SR6.C7.2: EC2b/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular'
EC2b/2 :Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select ‘singular
E329: SR6.C7.4: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'
EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

Sentence SR6.S9: I cooking dinner for my family.
Clause SR6.C10: I cooking dinner for my family.

|  | I | cooking |  | dinner | for my family. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Beneficiary |  |
|  |  | vg: imp |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | non-finite | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mo[od] |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E330: SR6.C10.2: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite' EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

Sentence SR6.S14: I swimming in pool.
Clause SR6.C16: I swimming in pool.

|  | I | swimming |  | in | $\theta$ | pool. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
|  |  | vg: imp |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | non-finite | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E331: SR6.C16.1: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis
E332: SR6.C16.3: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'
EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

## Text SR7

I usually study English. I go to shopping. I visit grandmother's house with my mother. I play tennis. I watching movie. It's musical movie, Disney movie. Because I love musical. I will go to Disneyland with my mother. I reading a book. I cooking breakfast. I eat sweets. I love chocolate. I go to cafe.

## Sentence list

1. SR7.S1: I usually study English.
2. SR7.S2: I go to shopping.
3. SR7.S3: I visit grandmother's house with my mother.
4. SR7.S4: I play tennis.
5. SR7.S5: I watching movie.
6. SR7.S6(i): It's musical movie, Disney movie.
7. SR7.S6(ii): Because I love musical.
8. SR7.S7: I will go to Disneyland with my mother.
9. SR7.S8: I reading a book.
10. SR7.S9: I cooking breakfast.
11. SR7.S10: I eat sweets.
12. SR7.S11: I love chocolate.
13. SR7.S12: I go to cafe.

## Clause list

1. SR7.C1: I usually study English.
2. SR7.C2: I go to shopping.
3. SR7.C3: I visit grandmother's house with my mother.
4. SR7.C4: I play tennis.
5. SR7.C5: I watching movie.
6. SR7.C6: It's musical movie, Disney movie.
7. SR7.C7: Because I love musical.
8. SR7.C8: I will go to Disneyland with my mother.
9. SR7.C9: I reading a book.
10. SR7.C10: I cooking breakfast.
11. SR7.C11: I eat sweets.
12. SR7.C12: I love chocolate.
13. SR7.C13: I go to cafe.

Sentence SR7.S2: I go to shopping.
Clause SR7.C2: I go to shopping.


Error list
E333: SR7.C2.1: EC22c/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ TRANSITIVITY structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Circumstance instead of Participant/Process
E334: SR7.C2.2: EC29/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Modal structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Adjunct as Predicator/Complement

Sentence SR7.S3: I visit grandmother's house with my mother.
Clause SR7.C3: I visit [grandmother's] house with my mother.

Analysis of clause SR7.C3

|  | I | visit |  |  | [grandmother | house | with | my mother. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |  |  | Circ: Accompaniment |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: [sp | + poss] | + Thing | Minor Process | Minor Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  | Adjunct |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: int |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  | id |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E335: SR7.C3.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E336: SR7.C3.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E337: SR7.C3.3: EC9/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of ' + interactant'
EC9/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select '- interactant'

## Sentence SR7.S5: I watching movie.

Clause SR7.C5: I watching movie.

Analysis of clause SR7.C5

|  | I | watching |  | Ө movie. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Behaver | Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Scope |
|  |  | vg: imp |  | ng : sing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | non-finite | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E338: SR7.C5.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E339: SR7.C5.3: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'
EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite':

Sentence SR7.S6(i-ii): It's musical movie, Disney movie. Because I love musical.
Clause SR7.C6: It's musical movie, Disney movie.

Analysis of clause SR7.C6


Error list
E340: SR7.S6(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus
E341: SR7.C6.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E342: SR7.C6.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence SR7.S6(ii): Because I love musical.
Clause SR7.C7: Because I love musical.

Analysis of clause SR7.C7

|  | Because | I | love |  | musical. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : Thing $\rightarrow_{\text {sing }}$ |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | [x $\beta$ ] |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E343: SR7.C7: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

## Sentence SR7.S8: I reading a book.

Clause SR7.C9: I reading a book.

Analysis of clause SR7.C9

|  | I | reading |  | a book. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Behaver | Behavioural |  | Scope |
|  |  | vg: imp |  |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | non-finite | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E344: SR7.C9.2: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite' EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

## Sentence SR7.S9: I cooking breakfast.

Clause SR7.C10: I cooking breakfast.

Analysis of clause SR7.C10

|  | I | cooking |  | breakfast. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | non-finite | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E345: SR7.C10: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite' EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

Sentence SR7.S12: I go to cafe.
Clause SR7.C13: I go to cafe.

Analysis of clause SR7.C13


Error list
E346: SR7.C13: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text SR8

I often play basketball with my friends. I often study English for TOIEC in library. I often get up at 9a.m. I often talk in front of my house with my boyfriend. I often go shopping in Tokyo. I often go to bed at 11p.m. I often watch Sazaesan. I often clean in my room. I often help my mother.

## Sentence list

1. SR8.S1: I often play basketball with my friends.
2. SR8.S2: I often study English for TOIEC in library.
3. SR8.S3: I often get up at 9a.m.
4. SR8.S4: I often talk in front of my house with my boyfriend.
5. SR8.S5: I often go shopping in Tokyo.
6. SR8.S6: I often go to bed at $11 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$.
7. SR8.S7: I often watch Sazaesan.
8. SR8.S8: I often clean in my room.
9. SR8.S9: I often help my mother.

Clause list

1. SR8.C1: I often play basketball with my friends.
2. SR8.C2: I often study English for TOIEC in library.
3. SR8.C3: I often get up at 9a.m.
4. SR8.C4: I often talk in front of my house with my boyfriend.
5. SR8.C5: I often go shopping in Tokyo.
6. SR8.C6: I often go to bed at 11 p.m.
7. SR8.C7: I often watch Sazaesan.
8. SR8.C8: I often clean in my room.
9. SR8.C9: I often help my mother.

Sentence SR8.S2: I often study English for TOIEC in library.
Clause SR8.C2: I often study English for TOIEC in library.

|  | I | often | study |  | English | for TOEIC |  | in | $\theta$ | library. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Part: Purpose |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing |  |  | + Thing |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement | Adj |  |  | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E347: SR8.C2: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

## Appendix 3 - Last Weekend texts

## Text LW1

I played badminton last Saturday. Then very hot. Badminton is very speedy and very hard. Because I very very tired. I thought dead. But enjoyed!! My purpose is No. 1 badminton player in Japan. On Sunday I went to Tokyo for TOEIC. TOEIC was very difficult. I do my best.

## Sentence list

1. LW1.S1: I played badminton last Saturday.
2. LW1.S2: Then very hot.
3. LW1.S3: Badminton is very speedy and very hard.
4. LW1.S4(i): Because I very very tired.
5. LW1.S4(ii): I thought dead.
6. LW1.S5: But enjoyed!!
7. LW1.S6: My purpose is No. 1 badminton player in Japan.
8. LW1.S7: On Sunday I went to Tokyo for TOEIC.
9. LW1.S8: TOEIC was very difficult.
10. LW1.S9: I do my best.

## Clause list

1. LW1.C1: I played badminton last Saturday.
2. LW1.C2: Then very hot.
3. LW1.C3: Badminton is very speedy and very hard.
4. LW1.C4: Because I very very tired.
5. LW1.C5a: I thought
6. LW1.C5b: dead.
7. LW1.C6: But enjoyed!!
8. LW1.C7(i): My purpose is [[No. 1 badminton player in Japan]].
9. LW1.C7(ii): [[No. 1 badminton player in Japan]]
10. LW1.C8: On Sunday I went to Tokyo for TOEIC.
11. LW1.C9: TOEIC was very difficult.
12. LW1.C10: I do my best.

Sentence LW1.S2: Then very hot.
Clause LW1.C2: Then very hot.

Analysis of clause LW1.C2

|  | Then | $\theta$ | $\Theta$ |  | very hot. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Time | Part | Pro |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Circ Adjunct | Sub | Fin | [Predicator] | Complement |
|  | , | [Mood] |  | [Res]idue |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { text } \\ \text { marked } \rightarrow \end{gathered}$ | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E348: LW1.C2.1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E349: LW1.C2.2: EC22a Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E350: LW1.C2.3: EC27a Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E351: LW1.C2.4: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite

Sentence LW1.S4(i-ii): Because I very very tired. I thought dead.
Clause LW1.C4: Because I very very tired.

Analysis of clause LW1.C4

|  | Because | I |  | $\Theta$ | very very tired. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Carrier |  | Pro | Part: Atrribute |
| id:log | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Fin | [Predicator] | Complement |
|  |  | Mo[od] |  | [Res]idue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop |

Error lit
E352: LW1.S4(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop after the bound second clause of a clause complex
E353: LW 1.C4.1:EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process
E354: LW1.C4.2:EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite

## Sentence LW 1.S4(ii): I thought dead.

Clause LW1.C5a: Ithought ; Clause LW1.C5b: dead.

Analysis of clauses LW1.C5a-b

|  | I | thought |  | $\Theta$ |  |  | dead. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part |  |  | Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int (decl) | Subject | Finite | Predicator | Sub | Fin | [Predicator] | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue | [Mood] |  | Residue |  |
| textmarked $\rightarrow$ | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E355: LW1.C5b. 1 EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E356: LW1.C5b.2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E357: LW1.C5b.3: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E358: LW1.C5b.4: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite E359: LW1.C5b.5: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme

Sentence LW1.S5: But enjoyed!!
Clause LW1.C6: But _ _ enjoyed!!

Analysis of clause LW1.C6

|  | But | $\Theta$ | enjoyed |  | $? \quad!!$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | - | Paft | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Conj Adj | Sub | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | [Mo]od |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E360: LW1.C6.1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E361: LW1.C6.2: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E362: LW1.C6.3: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E363: LW1.C6.4: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme

Clause LW1.C7[i]: [[No. 1 badminton player [in Japan] ]]

Analysis of clause LW1.C7(ii)

|  | [[ $\quad$ O |  | $\theta$ | No. 1 | badminton | player | [in Japan] | ]] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Pre | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ng : | sp | Epithet | + Classifier | +Thing | + Qualifier |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | [[Pred | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E364: LW1.C7[i].1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E365: LW1.C7[i].2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process
E366: LW1.C7[i].3: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator
E367: LW1.C7[i].4: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Sentence: LW1.S9: I do my best.

Clause LW1.C10: I do my best.

Analysis of clause LW1.C10

|  | I | do |  | my best. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{*}$ : present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E368: LW 1.C10.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Text LW2

I went to shopping and played tennis with my high school friend. I bought clothes, hat, and book there. By tennis, I lost many times, but very fun! And more, I played guitar in my house. My skill was not well. So I practise more. I took part in TOEIC. Because I graduate from university. I watched DVD. I studied English.

## Sentence list

1. LW2.S1: I went to shopping and played tennis with my high school friend.
2. LW2.S2: I bought clothes, hat, and book there.
3. LW2.S3: By tennis, I lost many times, but very fun!
4. LW2.S4: And more, I played guitar in my house.
5. LW2.S5(i): My skill was not well.
6. LW2.S5(ii): So I practise more.
7. LW2.S6(i): I took part in TOEIC.
8. LW2.S6(ii): Because I graduate from university.
9. LW2.S7: I watched DVD.
10. LW2.S8: I studied English.

## Clause list

1. LW2.C1: I went to shopping
2. LW2.C2: and played tennis with my high school friend.
3. LW2.C3: I bought clothes, hat, and book there.
4. LW2.C4: By tennis, I lost many times,
5. LW2.C5: but very fun!
6. LW2.C6: And more, I played guitar in my house.
7. LW2.C7: My skill was not well.
8. LW2.C8: So I practise more.
9. LW2.C9: I took part in TOEIC.
10. LW2.C10: Because I graduate from university.
11. LW2.C11: I watched DVD.
12. LW2.C12: I studied English.

Sentence LW2.S1: I went to shopping and played tennis with my high school friend.
Clause LW2.C1: I went to shopping

Analysis of clause LW2.C1

|  | I | went |  |  | shopping |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |  | Circ |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E369: LW2.C1.1: EC22c/1:

E370: LW2.C1.2: EC29/1:
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Participant/Process as a Circumstance

Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a
Predicator/Complement as an Adjunct

Sentence LW2.S2: I bought clothes, hat, and book there.
Clause LW2.C3: I bought clothes, hat, and book there.

Analysis of clause LW2.C3

|  | I | bought |  | cloth | $\Theta$ | hat, | and | $\Theta$ | book | there. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |  |  |  |  | Circ: Place |
|  |  |  |  | ng | $\mathrm{ng}: \operatorname{sing}$ | + Thing |  | ng : sing | + Thing |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | +2 |  |  | +3 |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E371: LW2.C3.2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis E372: LW2.C3.3: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence LW2.S3: By tennis, I lost many times, but very fun!
Clause LW2.C4: By tennis, I lost many times,

Analysis of clause LW2.C4

|  | By tennis | I | lost |  | many times, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Matter | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Frequency |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Res... | Mood: decl |  |  | ...idue |
| textmarked $\rightarrow$ | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E373: LW2.C4: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Clause LW2.C5: but very fun.

Analysis of clause LW2.C5

|  | but | $\theta$ | $\theta$ |  | very fun. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part | Pro |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log | x 2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Sub | Fin | [Predicator] | Complement |
|  |  | [Mood] |  | [Res]idue |  |
| text | textual | ideatinal | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E374: LW2.C5.1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E375: LW2.C5.2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E376: LW2.C5.3: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E377: LW2.C5.4: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite E378: LW2.C5.5: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme

Sentence LW2.S5(i-ii): My skill was not well. So I practise more.
Clause LW2.C7: My skill was not well.

|  | My skill | was not |  | well. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {neg. }}$ : past | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E379: LW2.S5(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before a paratactic Linker
E380: LW2.C7:
EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a nominal item as adverbial

## Sentence LW2.S5(ii): So I practise more.

Clause LW2.C8: So I practise more.

Analysis of clause LW2.C8

|  | So | I | practise |  | more. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Degree |
| id: $\log$ | x2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E381: LW2.C8: EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

## Sentence LW2.S6(i-ii)): I took part in TOEIC. Because I graduate from university.

Clause LW2.C9: I took part in TOEIC.

Analysis of clause LW2.C9

|  | I | took | part | in TOEIC. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ |
| id: $\log$ | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E382: LW2.S6(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex

Sentence LW2.S6(ii): Because I graduate from university.
Clause LW2.C10: Because I graduate from university.

Analysis of clause LW2.C10

|  | Because | I | graduate |  | from university. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Circumstantial Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E383: LW2.C10: EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

Sentence LW2.S7: I watched DVD.
Clause LW2.C11: I watched DVD.

|  | I | watched |  |  | $\Theta$ | DVD. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Behaver | Behavioural |  | Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: | sing | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E384: LW2.C11: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Text LW3

I stayed my home last Saturday. Because I studied English very hard. I did TOEIC pre-test. But I was sleepy. So I slept. After sleeping, I cooked somen. I used a lot of vegetables. It was delicious. I went to Takadanobaba last Sunday. I did TOEIC test. TOEIC was very difficult. So I was unhappy. But I ate cake.

## Sentence list

1. LW3.S1(i): I stayed my home last Saturday.
2. LW3.S1(ii): Because I studied English very hard.
3. LW3.S2: I did TOEIC pre-test.
4. LW3.S3(i): But I was sleepy.
5. LW3.S3(ii): So I slept.
6. LW3.S4: After sleeping, I cooked somen.
7. LW3.S5: I used a lot of vegetables.
8. LW3.S6: It was delicious.
9. LW3.S7: I went to Takadanobaba last Sunday.
10. LW3.S8: I did TOEIC test.
11. LW3.S9(i): TOEIC was very difficult.
12. LW3.S9(ii): So I was unhappy.
13. LW3.S10: But I ate cake.

## Clause list

1. LW3.C1: I stayed my home last Saturday.
2. LW3.C2: Because I studied English very hard.
3. LW3.C3: I did TOEIC pre-test.
4. LW3.C4: But I was sleepy.
5. LW3.C5: So I slept.
6. LW3.C6: After sleeping,
7. LW3.C7: I cooked somen.
8. LW3.C8: I used a lot of vegetables.
9. LW3.C9: It was delicious.
10. LW3.C10: I went to Takadanobaba last Sunday.
11. LW3.C11: I did TOEIC test.
12. LW3.C12: TOEIC was very difficult.
13. LW3.C13: So I was unhappy.
14. LW3.C14: But I ate cake.

Sentence LW3.S1(i-ii): I stayed my home last Saturday. Because I studied English very hard.
Clause LW3.C1: I stayed my home last Saturday.

|  | I | stayed |  | $\theta$ | my home | last Saturday. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  | Circ: Time |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |  |
| id: $\log$ | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E385: LW3.S1(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex
E386: LW3.C1:
EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

## Sentence LW3.S2: I did TOEIC pre-test.

Clause LW3.C3: I did TOEIC pre-test.

Analysis of clause LW3.C3

|  | I | did |  | $\Theta$ |  | TOEIC | pre-test. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  |  | Part: Range |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pro: Material |  | ng : | sing | + Class | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E387: LW3.C3: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

## Sentence LW3.S3(i-ii): But I was sleepy. So I slept.

Clause LW3.C4: But I was sleepy.

Analysis of clause LW3.C4


Error list
E388: LW3.S3(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before a paratactic Linker

## Sentence LW3.S8: I did TOEIC test.

Clause LW3.C11: I did TOEIC test.

Analysis of clause LW3.C11

|  | I | did |  |  | $\Theta$ | TOEIC | test. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Range |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: | sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  |  | Complement |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E389: LW3.C11 EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

Sentence LW3.S9(i-ii): TOEIC was very difficult. So I was unhappy.
Clause LW3.C12: TOEIC was very difficult.

Analysis of clause LW3.C12


Error list
E390: LW3.S9(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before a paratactic Linker

## Text LW4

I met my mother and we ate Chinese food. I ate ebichiri. She ate subata. It was delicious. We talk about my father. My father recently falls to ladder and he had broken his arm. I was worried; and he is good now.

## Sentence list

1. LW4.S1: I met my mother and we ate Chinese food.
2. LW4.S2: I ate ebichiri.
3. LW4.S3: She ate subata.
4. LW4.S4: It was delicious.
5. LW4.S5: We talk about my father.
6. LW4.S6: My father recently falls to ladder and he had broken his arm.
7. LW4.S7: I was worried; and he is good now

Clause list

1. LW4.C1: I met my mother
2. LW4.C2: and we ate Chinese food.
3. LW4.C3: I ate ebichiri.
4. LW4.C4: She ate subata.
5. LW4.C5: It was delicious.
6. LW4.C6: We talk about my father.
7. LW4.C7: My father recently falls to ladder
8. LW4.C8: and he had broken his arm.
9. LW4.C9: I was worried;
10. LW4.C10: and he is good now.

Sentence LW4.S5: We talk about my father.
Clause LW4.C6: We talk about my father.

Analysis of clause LW4.C6


Error list
E391: LW4.C6.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Sentence LW4.S6: My father recently falls to ladder and he had broken his arm.
Clause LW4.C7: My father recently falls to ladder

Analysis of clause LW4.C7

|  | My father | recently | falls |  | to | $\theta$ | ladder |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Circ: Time | Pro: Material |  |  | Circ: Place |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Minor Process | ng : sing | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Adjunct | Finite: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |
|  |  | Re... |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E392: LW4.C7.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'
E393: LW4.C7.3: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis
E394: LW4.C7.4: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Clause LW4.C8: and he had broken his arm.

Analysis of clause LW4.C8

|  | and | he | had | broken | his arm. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x2 (Result) |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |
| (decl) |  | Mo[od] |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E395: LW4.C8: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system:

## Clause LW4.C10: and he is good now.

Analysis of clause LW4.C10

|  | and | he | is |  | good | now. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational |  | Part: Attribute | Circ |
| id:log | x2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ext $\rightarrow$ add Rheme $^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E396: LW4.C10: EC38: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ CONJUNCTION TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'adversative' as 'additive'

## Text LW5

I went Sendai by train. I usually ride the bus. I meet to my boyfriend. I ate gyutan. It was very delicious. It was his birthday. I gave for him photo book. He was very pleased. I cooked cake too. He likes sweets. His family was very kind of me.

## Sentence list

1. LW5.S1: I went Sendai by train.
2. LW5.S2: I usually ride the bus.
3. LW5.S3: I meet to my boyfriend.
4. LW5.S4: I ate gyutan.
5. LW5.S5: It was very delicious.
6. LW5.S6: It was his birthday.
7. LW5.S7: I gave for him photo book.
8. LW5.S8: He was very pleased.
9. LW5.S9: I cooked cake too.
10. LW5.S10: He likes sweets.
11. LW5.S11: His family was very kind of me.

## Clause list

1. LW5.C1: I went Sendai by train.
2. LW5.C2: I usually ride the bus.
3. LW5.C3: I meet to my boyfriend.
4. LW5.C4: I ate gyutan.
5. LW5.C5: It was very delicious.
6. LW5.C6: It was his birthday.
7. LW5.C7: I gave for him photo book.
8. LW5.C8: He was very pleased.
9. LW5.C9: I cooked cake too.
10. LW5.C10: He likes sweets.
11. LW5.C11: His family was very kind of me.

## Sentence LW5.S1: I went Sendai by train.

Clause LW5.C1: I went Sendai by train.

Analysis of clause LW5.C1

|  | I | went |  | $\Theta$ | Sendai | by train. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  | Circ: Means |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E397: LW5.C1: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

## Sentence LW5.S3: I meet to my boyfriend.

Clause LW5.C3: I meet to my boyfriend.

|  | I | meet |  | to my boyfriend. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circumstance |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E398: LW5.C3.1: EC22c/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Participant as a Circumstance

E399: LW5.C3.3: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Complement as an Adjunct
E400: LW5.C3.4: EC29/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Sentence LW5.S7: I gave for him photo book.

Clause LW5.C7: I gave for him photo book.


Error list
E401: LW5.C7.1: EC22c/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Participant as a Circumstance
E402: LW5.C7.2: EC29/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Complement as an Adjunct E403: LW5.C7.3: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis E404: LW5.C7.4: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system
*Not necessarily a photo 'album'

Sentence LW5.S11: His family was very kind of me.
Clause LW5.C11: His family was very kind of me.

Analysis of clause LW5.C11

|  | His family | was |  | very kind | of me. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute | Circ: 'Location' |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E405: LW5.C11: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Text LW6

I got up at 9.00a.m. last Sunday. After, I went to X University. Because I had a TOEIC test. After TOEIC test, I did my part-time job from 6.00 pm to 1.00 am . It was very busy. Because Sunday was holiday. Many people came to Kappa Sushi. I went to bed at 2.00 am .

Sentence list

1. LW6.S1: I got up at 9.00a.m. last Sunday.
2. LW6.S2(i): After, I went to X University.
3. LW6.S2(ii): Because I had a TOEIC test.
4. LW6.S3: After TOEIC test, I did my part-time job from 6.00 pm to 1.00 am .
5. LW6.S4(i): It was very busy.
6. LW6.S4(ii): Because Sunday was holiday.
7. LW6.S5: Many people came to Kappa Sushi.
8. LW6.S6: I went to bed at 2.00 am .

## Clause list

1. LW6.C1: I got up at 9.00a.m. last Sunday.
2. LW6.C2: After, I went to X University.
3. LW6.C3: Because I had a TOEIC test.
4. LW6.C4: After TOEIC test, I did my part-time job from 6.00 pm to 1.00 am .
5. LW6.C5: It was very busy.
6. LW6.C6: Because Sunday was holiday.
7. LW6.C7: Many people came to Kappa Sushi.
8. LW6.C8: I went to bed at 2.00 am .

## Sentence LW6.S2(i-ii): After, I went to X University. Because I had a TOEIC test.

Clause LW6.C2: After, I went to X University.

Analysis of clause LW6.C2

|  | After, | I | went |  | to X University. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | , | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log | Hypotactic expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conjunctive Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |
| (decl) | , | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E406: LW6.S2(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex

Sentence LW6.S3: After TOEIC test, I did my part-time job from 6.00pm to 1.00am.
Clause LW6.C4: After TOEIC test, I did my part-time job from 6.00pm to 1.00am.


## Error list

E407: LW6.C4.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E408: LW6.C4.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Sentence LW6.S4(i-ii): It was very busy. Because Sunday was holiday.
Clause LW6.C5: It was very busy.

Analysis of clause LW6.C5


Error list
E409: LW6.S4(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex

## Sentence LW6.S4(ii): Because Sunday was holiday.

Clause LW6.C6: Because Sunday was holiday.

|  | Because | Sunday | was | $\theta$ | day. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite: past | Com |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E410: LW6.C6: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Text LW7

Last weekend, I did my homework and studied for test, but I didn't have enough time. I did part-time job Saturday every day, so I study little at night. My part-time is at restaurant which is beef tongue. It tasted good. Sunday, I received TOEIC, after that I met my friend and friend's family. We went restaurant and then we talked about new things. On Sunday, I bought cosmetic item because I love it! My mother gave me many cosmetic so I'm very happy. I studied my homework and studied for your test at night, but I could understand right away. I'm tired now.

## Sentence list

1. LW7.S1: Last weekend, I did my homework and studied for test, but I didn't have enough time.
2. LW7.S2: I did part-time job Saturday every day, so I study little at night.
3. LW7.S3: My part-time is at restaurant which is beef tongue.
4. LW7.S4: It tasted good.
5. LW7.S5: Sunday, I received TOEIC, after that I met my friend and friend's family.
6. LW7.S6: We went restaurant and then we talked about new things.
7. LW7.S7: On Sunday, I bought cosmetic item because i love it!
8. LW7.S8: My mother gave me many cosmetic so I'm very happy.
9. LW7.S9: I studied my homework and studied for your test at night, but I could understand right away.
10. LW7.S10: I'm tired now.

## Clause list

1. LW7.C1: Last weekend, I did my homework
2. LW7.C2: and studied for test,
3. LW7.C3: but I didn't have enough time.
4. LW7.C4: I did part-time job Saturday every day,
5. LW7.C5: so I study little at night.
6. LW7.C6(i): My part-time is at restaurant [[which is beef tongue]].
7. LW7.C6(ii): [[which is beef tongue]]
8. LW7.C7: It tasted good.
9. LW7.C8: Sunday, I received TOEIC,
10. LW7.C9: after that I met my friend and friend's family.
11. LW7.C10: We went restaurant
12. LW7.C11: and then we talked about new things.
13. LW7.C12: On Sunday, I bought cosmetic item
14. LW7.C13: because i love it!
15. LW7.C14: My mother gave me many cosmetic
16. LW7.C15: so I'm very happy.
17. LW7.C16: I studied my homework
18. LW7.C17: and studied for your test at night,
19. LW7.C18: but I could understand right away.
20. LW7.C19: I'm tired now.

Clause LW7.C2: and [I ]studied for test,

|  | and | [I] | studied |  | for | $\Theta$ test, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | [ACTOR] | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Purpose |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Thing |
| id:log | ...+2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int (decl) | [SUBJECT] <br>  |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  |
|  |  |  | od | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | [IDEATIONAL] | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ...Theme ${ }^{1} .$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E411: LW7.C2: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

Sentence LW7.S2: I did part-time job Saturday every day, so I study little at night.
Clause LW7.C4: I did part-time job Saturday every day,

Analysis of clause LW7.C4


Error list
E412: LW7.C4.1: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis
E413: LW7.C4.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Clause LW7.C5: so I study little at night.

Analysis of clause LW7.C5

|  | SO | I | study |  | little | at night. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Degree | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E414: LW7.C5.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Sentence LW7.S3: My part-time is at restaurant which is beef tongue.
Clause LW7.C6: My part-time is at restaurant [[which is beef tongue]].
Clause LW7.C6(ii): [[which is beef tongue]]

Analysis of clause LW7.C6(i)

|  | My part-time $\quad \Theta$ | is |  | at |  | restaurant [[which is beef tongue]]. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Rel: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Thing | + Qualifier |
| id:log | ng: premodifier + Head |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E415: LW7.C6.1: EC4: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable E416: LW7.C6.2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of singular deixis
E417: LW7.C6.3: EC8: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of nominal group Head

## Sentence LW7.S4: It tasted good.

Clause LW7.C7: It tasted good.

Analysis of clause LW7.C7

|  | It |  | tasted | good. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E418: LW7.C7.2: EC26b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'present' as 'past'

Sentence LW7.S5: Sunday, I received TOEIC, after that I met my friend and friend's family. Clause LW7.C8: Sunday, I received TOEIC,

Analysis of clause LW7.C8


Error list
E419: LW7.S5: EC39c: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to use a comma instead of a full stop or semi-colon E420: LW7.C8: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Clause LW7.C9: after that I met my friend and friend's family.

Analysis of clause LW7.C9


Error list
E421: LW7.C9.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E422: LW7.C9.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Sentence LW7.S6: We went restaurant and then we talked about new things.
Clause LW7.C10: We went restaurant

Analysis of clause LW7.C10

|  | We | went |  | $\theta$ | $\Theta$ | restaurant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro |  | Minor Range |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Thing |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: past | Predicator | [Complement] |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E423: LW7.C10.1: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process E424: LW7.C10.2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence LW7.S7: On Sunday, I bought cosmetic item because I love it!
Clause LW7.C12: On Sunday, I bought cosmetic item

Analysis of clause LW7.C12

|  | On Sunday, | I | bought |  |  | $\Theta$ | cosmeti | item |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Time | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |  |  | Part: Goal |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: | sing | + Class | + Thing |
| id:log | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Circumstantial Adjunct | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  |  | Complement |  |
|  | Res... | Mood |  |  |  |  | ...idu |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E425: LW7.C12: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence LW7.S8: My mother gave me many cosmetic so I'm very happy.
Clause LW7.C14: My mother gave me many cosmetic

Analysis of clause LW7.C14

|  | My mother | gave |  | me | many |  | cosmetic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Recipient |  |  | rt: Goal |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng | Num | + Thing $\rightarrow$ sing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  | mplement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E426: LW7.C14: EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

Sentence LW7.S9: I studied my homework and studied for your test at night, but I could understand right away. Clause LW7.C16: I studied my homework

Analysis of clause LW7.C16


Error list
E427: LW7.C16: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

## Text LW8

I had test of driving on last weekend. And, I had TOEIC at X University. I ate Chinese food last weekend. I ate harumaki and gyoza. It was very delicious! I ate with my family. I ate Chinese restaurant at Chiba near the station. We went to there by car. Because my sister likes Chinese food, we went to Chinese restaurant. I like ebi yakisoba. Their ebi yakisoba is very delicious! My family often go to there.

## Sentence list

11. LW8.S1: I had test of driving on last weekend.
12. LW8.S2: And, I had TOEIC at X University.
13. LW8.S3: I ate Chinese food last weekend.
14. LW8.S4: I ate harumaki and gyoza.
15. LW8.S5: It was very delicious!
16. LW8.S6: I ate with my family.
17. LW8.S7: I ate Chinese restaurant at Chiba near the station.
18. LW8.S8: We went to there by car.
19. LW8.S9: Because my sister likes Chinese food, we went to Chinese restaurant.
20. LW8.S10: I like ebi yakisoba.
21. LW8.S11: Their ebi yakisoba is very delicious!
22. LW8.S12: My family often go to there.

## Clause list

21. LW8.C1: I had test of driving on last weekend.
22. LW8.C2: And, I had TOEIC at X University.
23. LW8.C3: I ate Chinese food last weekend.
24. LW8.C4: I ate harumaki and gyoza.
25. LW8.C5: It was very delicious!
26. LW8.C6: I ate with my family.
27. LW8.C7: I ate Chinese restaurant at Chiba near the station.
28. LW8.C8: We went to there by car.
29. LW8.C9: Because my sister likes Chinese food,
30. LW8.C10: we went to Chinese restaurant.
31. LW8.C11: I like ebi yakisoba.
32. LW8.C12: Their ebi yakisoba is very delicious!
33. LW8.C13: My family often go to there.

Sentence LW8.S1: I had test of driving on last weekend.
Clause LW8.C1: I had test of driving on last weekend.

Analysis of clause LW8.C1

|  | I | had |  |  | test | of driving] | on last weekend. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |  |  | Circ: Time |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Thing | + Qualifier |  |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ \text { (decl) } \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Comp | ement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E428: LW8.C1.1: EC18: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable
E429: LW8.C1.2: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis
E430: LW8.C1.3: EC7d: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect metafunctional realisation of structural relationship

Sentence LW8.S7: I ate Chinese restaurant at Chiba near the station.
Clause LW8.C7: I ate Chinese restaurant at Chiba near the station.

|  | I | ate |  | $\theta$ | $\theta$ | Chinese restaurant |  | at Chiba | near the station. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Place |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Class | + Thing |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ \text { (decl) } \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E431: LW8.C7.1: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process E432: LW8.C7.2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Sentence LW8.S8: We went to there by car.

Clause LW8.C8: We went to there by car.

Analysis of clause LW8.C8

|  | We | went |  | to there | by car. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Means |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Actor | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E433: LW8.C8: EC17: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Clause LW8.C10: we went to Chinese restaurant.

Analysis of clause LW8.C10

|  | we | went |  | to | $\Theta$ | Chinese | restaurant. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor |  |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pro: Material |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sp | + Class | + Thing |
| id:log | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | djunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | id |  |  |

Error list
E434: LW8.C10.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E435: LW8.C10.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Sentence LW8.S12: My family often go to there.

Clause LW8.C13: My family often go to there.

Analysis of clause LW8.C13

|  | My family | often | go |  | to there. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Actor | , | Material |  | Place |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E436: LW8.C13: EC17: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

## Text LW9

I went to Ikebukuro with my sister. First, we went to shopping in Sunshine City. We bought some clothes and comic book. After we finish shopping, we went to Karaoke. We sung about 3 hours. We enjoyed singing.

## Sentence list

1. LW9.S1: I went to Ikebukuro with my sister.
2. LW9.S2: First, we went to shopping in Sunshine City.
3. LW9.S3: We bought some clothes and comic book.
4. LW9.S4: After we finish shopping, we went to Karaoke.
5. LW9.S5: We sung about 3 hours.
6. LW9.S6: We enjoyed singing.

## Clause list

1. LW9.C1: I went to Ikebukuro with my sister.
2. LW9.C2: First, we went to shopping in Sunshine City.
3. LW9.C3: We bought some clothes and comic book.
4. LW9.C4(i): After we finish [[shopping]],
5. LW9.C4(ii): [[shopping]]
6. LW9.C5: we went to Karaoke.
7. LW9.C6: We sung about 3 hours.
8. LW9.C7(i): We enjoyed [[singing]]. 9. LW9.C7(ii): [[singing]]

Sentence LW9.S2: First, we went to shopping in Sunshine City. Clause LW9.C2: First, we went to shopping in Sunshine City.

Analysis of clause LW9.C2

|  | First, | we | went |  | to shopping | in Sunshine City. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Process |  | Circ | Circ: Place |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct | Circumstantial Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E437: LW9.C2.1: EC22c/1:

E438: LW9.C2.2: EC29/1:
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Participant/Process as a Circumstance
Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Predicator/Complement as an Adjunct

## Sentence LW9.S3: We bought some clothes and comic book.

Clause LW9.C3: We bought some clothes and comic book.

Analysis of clause LW9.C3

|  | We | bought |  | some clothes |  |  |  | and | comic |  | book. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ngc: |  | ng |  | conjg | ng : | Class | + Thing $\rightarrow_{\text {sing }}$ |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  | ngc: |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E439: LW9.C3: EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

## Sentence LW9.S4: After we finish shopping, we went to Karaoke.

Clause LW9.C4(i): After we finish [[shopping]],
Clause LW9.C4(ii): [[shopping]]

Analysis of clause LW9.C4(i-ii)

|  | After | we | finish |  | [[shopping]], |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| id:log | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text ${ }_{\text {marked } \rightarrow}$ | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E440: LW9.C4(i).2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Text LW10

I went to see a movie. The movie is Disney movie, "Nemo". I enjoyed it. The movie's time is from 1.00 to 2.00 . After I saw it, I went to shopping mall. The place is big! I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books. New bag is very cute. T-shirt is very cool. After I bought things, I went to eat pizza. I eat vegetable pizza. It taste good.

## Sentence list

1. LW10.S1: I went to see a movie.
2. LW10.S2: The movie is Disney movie, "Nemo".
3. LW10.S3: I enjoyed it.
4. LW10.S4: The movie's time is from 1.00 to 2.00 .
5. LW10.S5: After I saw it, I went to shopping mall.
6. LW10.S6: The place is big!
7. LW10.S7: I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books.
8. LW10.S8: New bag is very cute.
9. LW10.S9: T-shirt is very cool.
10. LW10.S10: After I bought things, I went to eat pizza.
11. LW10.S11: I eat vegetable pizza.
12. LW10.S12: It taste good.

## Clause list

1. LW10.C1: I went
2. LW10.C2: to see a movie.
3. LW10.C3: The movie is Disney movie, "Nemo".
4. LW10.C4: I enjoyed it.
5. LW10.C5: The movie's time is from 1.00 to 2.00 .
6. LW10.C6: After I saw it,
7. LW10.C7: I went to shopping mall.
8. LW10.C8: The place is big!
9. LW10.C9: I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books.
10. LW10.C10: New bag is very cute.
11. LW10.C11: T-shirt is very cool.
12. LW10.C12: After I bought things,
13. LW10.C13: I went
14. LW10.C14: to eat pizza.
15. LW10.C15: I eat vegetable pizza.
16. LW10.C16: It taste good.

Sentence LW10.S2: The movie is Disney movie, "Nemo".
Clause LW10.C3: The movie is Disney movie, "Nemo".

Analysis of clause LW10.C3


Error list
E441: LW 10.C3: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

Sentence LW10.S4: The movie's time is from 1.00 to 2.00 .
Clause LW10.C5: The movie's time is from 1.00 to 2.00.

Analysis of clause LW10.C5

|  | The movie's time |  | is |  | from 1.00 to 2.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Rel: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ppc: | $\alpha \quad=\beta$ |
|  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E442: LW10.C5: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Clause LW10.C7: I went to shopping mall.

Analysis of clause LW10.C7

|  | I | went |  | to | $\Theta$ | shopping | mall. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor |  |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |
|  |  | Pro: Material |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Class | + Thing |
| id:log | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | djunct |  |  |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E443: LW10.C7: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

Sentence LW10.S7: I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books.
Clause LW10.C9: I bought new bag, T-shirt, and some books.

|  | I | bought |  | $\Theta$ | new | bag, | $\theta$ | T-shirt, | and | some books. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : $\quad$ sing | + Ep | + Thing | ng : $\quad \operatorname{sing}$ | + Thing | conjg | ng |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E444: LW10.C9.1:EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

E445: LW10.C9.2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Sentence LW10.S8: New bag is very cute.

Clause LW10.C10: New bag is very cute.

Analysis of clause LW10.C10

|  | $\Theta$ | New bag | is |  | very cute. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier |  | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
|  | ng : sp | + Ep + Thing |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  |  | Residue |  |
| text |  | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | id | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

Error list
E446: LW10.C10.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E447: LW10.C10.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Sentence LW10.S9: $T$-shirt is very cool.

Clause LW10.C11: T-shirt is very cool.

Analysis of clause LW10.C11


Error list
E448: LW10.C11: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E449: LW10.C11.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Sentence LW10.S11: I eat vegetable pizza.
Clause LW10.C15: I eat vegetable pizza.

Analysis of clause LW10.C15

|  | I | eat |  | vegetable pizza. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E450: LW10.C15.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Sentence LW10.S12: It taste good.
Clause LW10.C16: It taste good.

Analysis of clause LW10.C16

|  | It |  | taste | good. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Int $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E451: LW10.C16: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Text LW11

I play tennis last weekend with my friends. Last week is sunny. It was very fun! After we play tennis went to cafe. It was very fun!!

## Sentence list

1. LW11.S1: I play tennis last weekend with my friends.
2. LW11.S2: Last week is sunny.
3. LW11.S3: It was very fun!
4. LW11.S4: After we play tennis went to cafe.
5. LW11.S5: It was very fun!!

## Clause list

1. LW11.C1: I play tennis last weekend with my friends.
2. LW11.C2: Last week is sunny.
3. LW11.C3: It was very fun!
4. LW11.C4: After we play tennis
5. LW11.C5: went to cafe.
6. LW11.C6: It was very fun!!

Sentence LW11.S1: I play tennis last weekend with my friends.
Clause LW11.C1: I play tennis last weekend with my friends.

Analysis of clause LW11.C1

|  | I | play |  | tennis | last weekend | with my friends. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Time | Circ: Accompaniment |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E452: LW11.C1.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Sentence LW11.S2: Last week is sunny.

Clause LW11.C2: Last week is sunny.

Analysis of clause LW11.C2

|  | Last week |  | is | sunny. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |
| str | ng |  | vg | adjg |

Error list
E453: LW11.C2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Sentence LW11.S4: After we play tennis went to cafe.
Clause LW11.C4: After we play tennis

Analysis of clause LW11.C4

|  | After | we | play |  | tennis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| id:log | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E454: LW11.C4.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Clause LW11.C5: went to cafe.

Analysis of clause LWI1.C5


Error list
E455: LW11.C5.1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E456: LW11.C5.2: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E457: LW11.C5.3: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme E458: LW11.C5.4: EC2a: Group rank (ng) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text LW12

I went to mall with my mother. I bought bag and shoes. I studied English. I listen to music. What do you like? I like J-Pop. But, I like K-Pop. I got up 9:00. I go to bed 11:00. I meet my friend.

## Sentence list

1. LW12.S1: I went to mall with my mother.
2. LW12.S2: I bought bag and shoes.
3. LW12.S3: I studied English.
4. LW 12.S4: I listen to music.
5. LW12.S5: What do you like?
6. LW12.S6: I like J-Pop.
7. LW12.S7: But, I like K-Pop.
8. LW12.S8: I got up 9:00.
9. LW12.S9: I go to bed 11:00.
10. LW12.S10: I meet my friend.

Clause list

1. LW12.C1: I went to mall with my mother.
2. LW12.C2: I bought bag and shoes.
3. LW12.C3: I studied English.
4. LW12.C4: I listen to music.
5. LW12.C5: What do you like?
6. LW12.C6: I like J-Pop.
7. LW12.C7: But, I like K-Pop.
8. LW12.C8: I got up 9:00.
9. LW12.C9: I go to bed 11:00.
10. LW12.C10: I meet my friend.

## Sentence LW12.S1: I went to mall with my mother.

Clause LW12.C1: I went to mall with my mother.

Analysis of clause LW12.C1


Error list
E459: LW12.C1: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

## Sentence LW12.S2: I bought bag and shoes.

Clause LW12.C2: I bought bag and shoes.

Analysis of clause LW12.C2

|  | I | bought |  | $\Theta$ | bag | and | shoes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Thing | conjg | ng |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E460: LW12.C2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Sentence LW12.S4: I listen to music.

Clause LW12.C4: I listen to music.

Analysis of clause LW12.C4


Error list
E461: LW12.C4.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Sentence LW12.S8: I got up 9:00.

Clause LW12.C8: I got up 9:00.

Analysis of clause LW12.C8

|  | I | got up |  | $\theta$ | 9:00. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Time |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E462: LW12.C8: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

## Sentence LW12.S9: I go to bed 11:00.

Clause LW12.C9: I go to bed 11:00.

Analysis of clause LW12.C9

|  | I | go |  | to bed | $\theta$ | 11:00. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Time |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E463: LW12.C9.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'
E464: LW12.C9.3: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Minor Process

Sentence LW12.S10: I meet my friend.
Clause LW12.C10: I meet my friend.

Analysis of clause LW12.C10

|  | I | meet |  | my friend. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E465: LW12.C10.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Text LW13

I went to X University last weekend. Because I had a TOEIC. I went to there with my friends. TOEIC was very difficult for me. But, I have to get 500 point. So I have to study more. I went to a restaurant with my friends after the TOEIC. We talked five hours in a restaurant. It was really enjoy. We ate pasta and a dessert. We talked about TOEIC, school life, friends and so on. And, we decided to meet in summer vacation.

## Sentence list

1. LW13.S1(i): I went to X University last weekend.
2. LW13.S1(ii): Because I had a TOEIC.
3. LW13.S2: I went to there with my friends.
4. LW13.S3: TOEIC was very difficult for me.
5. LW13.S4(i): But, I have to get 500 point.
6. LW13.S4(ii): So I have to study more.
7. LW13.S5: I went to a restaurant with my friends after the TOEIC.
8. LW13.S6: We talked five hours in a restaurant.
9. LW13.S7: It was really enjoy.
10. LW13.S8: We ate pasta and a dessert.
11. LW13.S9: We talked about TOEIC, school life, friends and so on.
12. LW13.S10: And, we decided to meet in summer vacation.

## Clause list

1. LW13.C1: I went to $X$ University last weekend.
2. LW13.C2: Because I had a TOEIC.
3. LW13.C3: I went to there with my friends.
4. LW13.C4: TOEIC was very difficult for me.
5. LW13.C5: But, I have to get 500 point.
6. LW13.C6: So I have to study more.
7. LW13.C7: I went to a restaurant with my friends after the TOEIC.
8. LW13.C8: We talked five hours in a restaurant.
9. LW13.C9: It was really enjoy.
10. LW13.C10: We ate pasta and a dessert.
11. LW13.C11: We talked about TOEIC, school life, friends and so on.
12. LW13.C12(a): And, we decided
13. LW13.C12(b): to meet in summer vacation.

Sentence LW13.S1(i-ii): I went to X University last weekend. Because I had a TOEIC.
Clause LW13.C1: I went to $X$ University last weekend.
Analysis of clause LW13.C1

|  | I | went | to X University |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| id:exp |  |  |  |
| id:log | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |
| int |  |  |  |
| text |  | full stopenend. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Error list
E466: LW13.S1(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex

## Sentence LW13.S1(ii): Because I had a TOEIC.

Clause LW13.C2: Because I had a TOEIC.

Analysis of clause LW13.C2


Error list
E467: LW13.C2: EC8: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of nominal group Head

Sentence LW13.S2: I went to there with my friends.
Clause LW13.C3: I went to there with my friends.

Analysis of clause LW13.C3

|  | I | went |  | to there | with my friends. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Accompaniment |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {+ }}$ : past | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E468: LW13.C3: EC17: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence LW13.S4(i-ii): But, I have to get 500 point. So I have to study more.
Clause LW13.C5: But, I have to get 500 point.

Analysis of clause LW13.C5


Error list
E469: LW13.S4(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before a paratactic Linker E470: LW13.C5: EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

Sentence LW13.S6: We talked five hours in a restaurant.
Clause LW13.C8: We talked five hours in a restaurant.

Analysis of clause LW13.C8

|  | We | talked |  | $\Theta$ | ive hours | in | $\underline{\mathrm{a}}$ | restaurant. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Behaver | Pro: Behavioural |  | Circ: Duration |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | pp: pg + | (sp | + Thing) |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E471: LW13.C8.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E472: LW13.C8.2: EC18:

E473: LW13.C8.3: EC2c:

Minor Process
Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Sentence LW13.S7: It was really enjoy.
Clause LW13.C9: It was really enjoy.

Analysis of clause LW13.C9

|  | It | was |  | really enjoy. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E474: LW13.C9: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

## Text LW14

I got up 10:00. I went to school. I played tennis with my friend. Because it was very hot, we could not play tennis many time. But we enjoyed playing tennis. After I played tennis, I went home.

Sentence list

1. LW14.S1: I got up 10:00.
2. LW14.S2: I went to school.
3. LW14.S3: I played tennis with my friend.
4. LW14.S4: Because it was very hot, we could not play tennis many time.
5. LW14.S5: But we enjoyed playing tennis.
6. LW14.S6: After I played tennis, I went home.

## Clause list

1. LW14.C1: I got up 10:00.
2. LW14.C2: I went to school.
3. LW14.C3: I played tennis with my friend.
4. LW14.C4: Because it was very hot,
5. LW14.C5: we could not play tennis many time.
6. LW14.C6(i): But we enjoyed [[playing tennis]].
7. LW14.C6(ii): [[playing tennis]]
8. LW14.C7: After I played tennis,
9. LW14.C8: I went home.

## Sentence LW14.S1: I got up 10:00.

Clause LW14.C1: I got up 10:00.


Error list
E475: LW14.C1: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

Clause LW14.C5: we could not play tennis many time.

Analysis of clause LW14.C5

|  | we | could not play |  | tennis | many | time. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Frequency |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: Num | Thing $\rightarrow$ sing |
| id:log | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite": past, modal | Predicator |  | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E476: LW14.C5.1: EC22d: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ CIRCUMSTANCE TYPE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'Duration' as 'Frequency' E477: LW14.C5.2: EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

## Text LW15

Last weekend is TOEIC test. So I studied hard on Saturday. I got up at early. I tried remember TOEIC words. I want 600 point. Sunday is TOEIC test day. I went to X University where TOEIC place. I met my friends in Tokyo. We talked each other. We were nervous. It was hot day, so I put off jacket. Before test, I listening to music. Test was very hard.

## Sentence list

1. LW15.S1(i): Last weekend is TOEIC test.
2. LW15.S1(ii): So I studied hard on Saturday.
3. LW15.S2: I got up at early.
4. LW15.S3: I tried remember TOEIC words.
5. LW15 .S4: I want 600 point.
6. LW15.S5: Sunday is TOEIC test day.
7. LW15.S6: I went to $X$ University where TOEIC place.
8. LW15.S7: I met my friends in Tokyo.
9. LW15.S8: We talked each other.
10. LW15.S9: We were nervous.
11. LW15.S10: It was hot day, so I put off jacket.
12. LW15.S11: Before test, I listening to music.
13. LW15.S12: Test was very hard.

## Clause list

1. LW15.C1: Last weekend is TOEIC test.
2. LW15.C2: So I studied hard on Saturday.
3. LW15.C3: I got up at early.
4. LW15.C4: I tried remember TOEIC words.
5. LW15.C5: I want 600 point.
6. LW15.C6: Sunday is TOEIC test day.
7. LW15.C7: I went to X University
8. LW15.C8: where TOEIC place
9. LW15.C9: I met my friends in Tokyo.
10. LW15.C10: We talked each other.
11. LW15.C11: We were nervous.
12. LW15.C12: It was hot day,
13. LW15.C13: so I put off jacket.
14. LW15.C14: Before test, I listening to music.
15. LW15.C15: Test was very hard.

Sentence LW15.S1(i-ii): Last weekend is TOEIC test. So I studied hard on Saturday.
Clause LW15.C1: Last weekend is TOEIC test.

Analysis of clause LW15.C1

|  | Last weekend | is |  | $\theta$ |  | TOEIC | test. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identifier/Token | Pro: Rel: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Identifying $\rightarrow$ |  | Part: Identified/Value |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : | sing | + Class | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  |  | full stop |  |

Error list
E478: LW15.S1(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before a paratactic Linker
E479: LW15.C1.1: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'
E480: LW15.C1.2: EC2e: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect, and unrecoverable, realisation of deixis

## Sentence LW15.S2: I got up at early.

Clause LW15.C3: I got up at early.

|  | I | got up |  |  | at early. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Time |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E481: LW15.C3: EC17: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence LW15.S3: I tried remember TOEIC words.
Clause LW15.C4: I tried remember TOEIC words.

|  | I | tried | remember |  | TOEIC words. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |
|  |  | vg : aspect: ? |  |  |  |
| id:log |  | vgc: | + $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite*: past | Predicator |  | Complement |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E482: LW15.C4: EC11b: Group rank (verbal group complex) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ choice of Aspect unrecoverable

## Sentence LW15.S4: I want 600 point.

Clause LW15.C5: I want 600 point.

Analysis of clause LW15.C5


Error list
E483: LW15.C5: EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

Sentence LW15.S5: Sunday is TOEIC test day.
Clause LW15.C6: Sunday is TOEIC test day.

|  | Sunday | is |  | TOEIC test day. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identifier/Token | Pro: Rel: Circumstantial $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identified/Value |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E484: LW15.C6.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Clause LW15.C8: where TOEIC place

Analysis of clause LW15.C7(ii)

|  | where |  | $\Theta$ |  | TOEIC place |  | $\theta$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Circ Attribute |  | Part: Carrier |  |  |  | Pro |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | + Class | + Thing |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $=\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Circumstantial Adj |  | Subject |  |  |  | Fin |  |
|  | Resi... |  | Mo[od] |  |  |  |  | [...due] |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  | id |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E485: LW15.C8.1: EC36/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E486: LW15.C8.2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E487: LW15.C8.3: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite
E488: LW15.C8.4: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Sentence LW15.S8: We talked each other.

Clause LW15.C10: We talked each other.

Analysis of clause LW15.C9

|  | We | talked |  | $\Theta$ | each other. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Sayer |  |  | Range |  |
|  |  | Behavioural |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E489: LW15.C10: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Minor Process

Sentence LW15.S10: It was hot day, so I put off jacket.
Clause LW15.C12: It was hot day,

|  | It | was |  |  | $\theta$ | hot | day, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : | sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E490: LW15.C12: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Clause LW15.C13: so I put off jacket.

Analysis of clause LW15.C12

|  | SO | I | pu | off |  | $\theta$ | jacket. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : | sp | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  |  | ment |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : | int |  |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | id |  |

Error list
E491: LW15.C13.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E492: LW15.C13.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis E493: LW15.C13.3: EC9: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise interactant E494: LW15.C13.4: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

Sentence LW15.S11: Before test, I listening to music.
Clause LW15.C14: Before test, I listening to music.

Analysis of clause LW15.C13

|  | Before $\Theta$ test, |  | I |  | ning | to music. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Time |  | Part: Behaver | Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Range |
|  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  | vg: imp |  |  |
|  | pp: $\quad \mathrm{pg} \quad+\mathrm{ng}$ | (sp + Thing) |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Circ Adjunct |  | Subject | non-finite | Predicator | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Resi... |  | Mood |  | ...due |  |
| text | ideational |  | Rheme |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E495: LW15.C14.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E496: LW15.C14.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis
E497 LW15.C14.4: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'
EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

Sentence LW15.S12: Test was very hard.
Clause LW15.C15: Test was very hard.

Analysis of clause LW15.C14


Error list
E498: LW15.C15.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E499: LW15.C15.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Text LW16

I went to X University. I had a test. I used train. I visit the university at 11:25, but test begin at 13:00. I talked my friends. I studied English words. I can learn English more and more. I was sleepy that day. I can't hear listening, but I hard on writing test. Test was finished 15:00. After, I went to watch a movie with my mother. Movie's title is Y. It's very famous. I was look forward to this movie. After I watched movie, back to my home. But, suddenly it was raining. I can't cycling. I walked my house, used umbrella. I eat dinner is instant food. It was so tasty. I liked it.

## Sentence list

1. LW16.S1: I went to X University.
2. LW16.S2: I had a test.
3. LW16.S3: I used train.
4. LW16.S4: I visit the university at 11:25, but test begin at 13:00.
5. LW16.S5: I talked my friends.
6. LW16.S6: I studied English words.
7. LW16.S7: I can learn English more and more.
8. LW16.S8: I was sleepy that day.
9. LW16.S9: I can't hear listening, but I hard on writing test.
10. LW16.S10: Test was finished 15:00.
11. LW16.S11: After, I went to watch a movie with my mother.
12. LW16.S12: Movie's title is Boom.
13. LW16.S13: It's very famous.
14. LW16.S14: I was look forward to this movie.
15. LW 16.S15: After I watched movie, back to my home.
16. LW16.S16: But, suddenly it was raining.
17. LW16.S17: I can't cycling.
18. LW16.S18: I walked my house, used umbrella.
19. LW16.S19: I eat dinner is instant food.
20. LW16.S20: It was so tasty.
21. LW16.S21: I liked it.

## Clause list

1. LW16.C1: I went to $X$ University.
2. LW16.C2: I had a test.
3. LW16.C3: I used train.
4. LW16.C4: I visit the university at $11: 25$,
5. LW16.C5: but test begin at 13:00.
6. LW16.C6: I talked my friends.
7. LW16.C7: I studied English words.
8. LW16.C8: I can learn English more and more.
9. LW16.C9: I was sleepy that day.
10. LW16.C10: I can't hear listening [TEST],
11. LW16.C11: but I hard on writing test.
12. LW16.C12: Test was finished 15:00.
13. LW16.C13: After, I went
14. LW16.C14: to watch a movie with my mother.
15. LW16.C15: Movie's title is Boom.
16. LW16.C16: It's very famous.
17. LW16.C17: I was look forward to this movie.
18. LW16.C18: After I watched movie,
19. LW16.C19: back to my home.
20. LW16.C20: But, suddenly it was raining.
21. LW16.C21: I can't cycling.
22. LW16.C22: I walked my house,
23. LW16.C23: used umbrella.
24. LW16.C24(i): [[I eat]] dinner is instant food.
25. LW16.C24(ii): [[I eat]]
26. LW16.C25: It was so tasty.
27. LW16.C26: I liked it.

## Sentence LW16.S3: I used train.

Clause LW16.C3: I used train.


Error list
E500: LW16.C3: EC2e: Group rank (ng) $\rightarrow$ ideational (experiential) $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to select from the system

Sentence LW16.S4: I visit the university at 11:25, but test begin at 13:00.
Clause LW16.C4: I visit the university at 11:25,

Analysis of clause LW16.C4

|  | I | $\underline{\text { visit }}$ |  | the university | at 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E501: LW16.C4.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Clause LW16.C5: but test begin at 13:00.

Analysis of clause LW16.C5


Error list
E502: LW16.C5.1: EC36/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E503: LW16.C5.3: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'
E504: LW 16.C5.4: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis
E505: LW16.C5.5: EC12: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a singular Event as plural

## Sentence LW16.S5: I talked my friends.

Clause LW16.C6: I talked my friends.


Error list
E506: LW16.C6: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

Sentence LW16.S9: I can't hear listening, but I hard on writing test.
Clause LW16.C10: I can't hear listening [TEST],

Analysis of clause LW16.C10

|  | I | can't | hear | $\Theta$ | listening [TEST], |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Perceptive $\rightarrow \underline{\text { routine }}$ |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sp | + Class |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present/modal | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | id |  |

Error list
E507: LW16.C10.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E508: LW16.C10.2: EC16b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'modal past'
EC16b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ MODAL TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'modal present'
E509: LW16.C10.4: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Clause LW16.C11: but I hard on writing test.


Error list
E510: LW16.C11.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E511: LW16.C11.2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E512: LW16.C11.3: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite E513: LW16.C11.4: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Sentence LW16.S10: Test was finished 15:00.
Clause LW16.C12: Test was finished 15:00.

Analysis of clause LW16.C12


Error list
E514: LW16.C12.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E515: LW16.C12.2: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Minor Process
E516: LW16.C12.3: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis
E517: LW16.C12.4: EC25/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'middle'
EC25/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ AGENCY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'effective'

Sentence LW16.S12: Movie's title is $Y$.
Clause LW16.C15: [Movie's] title is $Y$.


Error list
E518: LW16.C15.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable' EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'

E519: LW16.C15.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Sentence LW16.S14: I was look forward to this movie.

Clause LW16.C17: I was look forward to this movie.

Analysis of clause LW16.C17

|  | I | was | look forward to | this movie. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  | vg: $\alpha-$ | $\beta \Theta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E520: LW16.C17: EC14a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ id-logical $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Secondary Tense present

## Sentence LW16.S15: After I watched movie, back to my home.

Clause LW16.C18: After I watched movie,

Analysis of clause LW16.C18


Error list
E521: LW16.C18.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E522: LW16.C18.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

Clause LW16.C19: back to my home.

|  | $\Theta$ | $\Theta$ |  | back |  | to my |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part | Pre |  | Circ: Place |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\alpha$ |  |  | advgc: | 1 | $=2$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ \text { (decl) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sub | Fin | Predicator |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E523: LW16.C19.1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E524: LW16.C19.2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E525: LW16.C19.3: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E526: LW16.C19.4: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite E527: LW16.C19.5: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme

Sentence LW16.S17: I can't cycling.
Clause LW16.C21: I can't cycling.

Analysis of clause LW16.C21

|  | I | can't cycling. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |
| id:log |  | vg: $\quad \alpha$ | $\beta \theta^{\text {ing }}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ \text { (decl) } \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {nes }}$ : modal | Predicator |
|  |  |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |

Error list
E528: LW16.C21: EC16b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'modal past' EC16b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ MODAL TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'modal present'
E529: LW16.C21: EC14a: Group rank (v) $\rightarrow$ id-log $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to mix finite modal and finite non-modal tenses

## Sentence LW16.S18: I walked my house, used umbrella.

Clause LW16.C22: I walked my house,

Analysis of clause LW16.C22

|  | I | walked |  | $\Theta$ | my house, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |  | irc: Place |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| id:log | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E530: LW16.C22: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Minor Process

Clause LW16.C23: used umbrella.

Analysis of clause LW16.C23


Error list
E531: LW16.C23.1: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis
E532: LW16.C23.2: EC11a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfective' EC11a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective'
E533: LW16.C23.2: EC15a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ int $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a non-finite verbal group as finite

Sentence LW16.S19: I eat dinner is instant food.
Clause LW16.C24(i): [[I eat]] dinner is instant food.
Clause LW16.C24(ii): [[I eat]]*

Analysis of clause LW16.C24(i)

|  | [ [I | eat] | dinner | is |  | instant food. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Identified/Value |  |  | Pro: Rel: Int $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |
|  | sp |  |  |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject |  |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood |  |  |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  | Rheme |  |  |
|  | id Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inf | ng: $\quad$ New $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ Given |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E534: LW16.C24(i).1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E535: LW16.C24(i).2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present' E536: LW16.C24(i).3: EC2c: Group rank (ng) $\rightarrow$ ideational (exp) $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC SPECIFICITY $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific' E537: LW16.C24(i).4: EC10: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ INFORMATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Given as New *See below

Clause LW16.C24(ii): [[I eat]]
Analysis of clause LW16.C24(i)

|  | [[ I | eat]] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |
|  | ideational |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |

Error list
E538: LW16.C24(ii).2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Text LW17

I wake up at 7:00 am. I hoped for grandmother in the hospital. After I came back to home at 12:00pm I eat a hamburger. I go to fireworks festival. I enjoyed fireworks festival. After I watching TV I slept at 2am.

## Sentence list

1. LW17.S1: I wake up at 7:00 am.
2. LW17.S2: I hoped for grandmother in the hospital.
3. LW17.S3: After I came back to home at $12: 00 \mathrm{pm}$ I eat a hamburger.
4. LW17.S4: I go to fireworks festival.
5. LW17.S5: I enjoyed fireworks festival.
6. LW17.S6: After I watching TV I slept at 2 am .

## Clause list

1. LW17.C1: I wake up at 7:00 am.
2. LW17.C2: I hoped for grandmother in the hospital.
3. LW17.C3: After I came back to home at 12:00pm
4. LW17.C4: I eat a hamburger.
5. LW17.C5: I go to fireworks festival.
6. LW17.C6: I enjoyed fireworks festival.
7. LW17.C7: After I watching TV
8. LW17.C8: I slept at 2 am .

Sentence LW17.S1: I wake up at 7:00 am.
Clause LW17.C1: I wake up at 7:00 am.


Error list
E539: LW17.C1.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Sentence LW17.S2: I hoped for grandmother in the hospital.

Clause LW17.C2: I hoped for grandmother in the hospital.

Analysis of clause LW17.C2

|  | I | hoped |  | for | $\theta$ | grandmother | in the hospital. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser |  |  | Circ: Beneficiary |  |  | Circ: Place |
|  |  | Pro: Behavioural |  | Minor Process |  | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sp | + Thing |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  | Adjunct |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Predicator |  | or Complement |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : int |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  | id |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E540: LW17.C2.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E541: LW17.C2.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E542: LW17.C2.3: EC9: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PERSON $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise interactant

E543: LW17.C2.4: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence LW17.S3: After I came back to home at 12:00pm I eat a hamburger.
Clause LW17.C3: After I came back to home at 12:00pm

Analysis of clause LW17.C3

|  | After | I | came back |  | to home | at 12:00pm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | $\square$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct | Adjunct |
|  |  |  |  | Resi |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | neme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E544: LW17.C3: EC17: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Clause LW17.C4: I eat a hamburger.

Analysis of clause LW17.C4

|  | I | eat |  | a hamburger. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme |  |  |  |

Error list
E545: LW17.C4.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Sentence LW17.S4: I go to fireworks festival.

Clause LW17.C5: I go to fireworks festival.

Analysis of clause LW17.C5

|  | I | go |  | to | $\theta$ | fireworks | festival. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Actor | Material |  | Place |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Adjunct |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| Text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E546: LW17.C5.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'
E547: LW17.C5.3: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Sentence LW17.S5: I enjoyed fireworks festival.

Clause LW17.C6: I enjoyed fireworks festival.

Analysis of clause LW17.C6


Error list
E548: LW17.C6.1: EC36/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E549: LW17.C6.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

## Sentence LW17.S6: After I watching TV I slept at 2 am.

Clause LW17.C7: After I watching TV

Analysis of clause LW17.C7

|  | After | I | watching |  | TV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Behaver | Pro | vioural | Part: Range |
| id:log | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | $\underline{\text { non-finite }}$ | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { text } \\ \text { marked } \rightarrow \end{gathered}$ | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E550: LW17.C7.2: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite' EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'

## Appendix 4 - Future Dream texts

## Text FD1

I want to become ground staff. Because of I use English in my job. Therefore I need to study English very hard. I want to do happy life. I will have husband and two children. I will enjoy my life.

## Sentence list

1. FD1.S1(i): I want to become ground staff.
2. FD1.S1(ii): Because of I use English in my job.
3. FD1.S2: Therefore I need to study English very hard.
4. FD1.S3: I want to do happy life.
5. FD1.S4: I will have husband and two children.
6. FD1.S5: I will enjoy my life.

## Clause list

1. FD1.C1(a): I want
2. FD1.C1(b): to become ground staff
3. FD1.C2: Because of I use English in my job.
4. FD1.C3(a): Therefore I need
5. FD1.C3(b): to study English very hard
6. FD1.C4(a): I want
7. FD1.C4(b): to do happy life
8. FD1.C5: I will have husband and two children.
9. FD1.C6: I will enjoy my life.

Sentence FD1.S1(i-ii): I want to become ground staff. Because of I use English in my job.
Clause FD1.C1(a): I want
Clause FD1.C1(b): to become ground staff

Analysis of clauses FD1.C1a-b

|  | I | want |  | to become | ground staff. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Metaphenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop |

Error list
E551: FD1.S1(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'full stop' at a clause nexus

Sentence FD1.S1(ii): Because of I use English in my job.
Clause FD1.C2: Because of I use English in my job.

Analysis of clause FD1.C2

|  | Because of | I | use |  | English | in my job. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | - | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal | Circ: Place |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E552: FD1.C2.1: EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log and interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time E553: FD1.C2.2: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence FD1.S3: I want to do happy life.
Clause FD1.C4(a): I want
Clause FD1.C4(b): to do happy life

Analysis of clauses FD1.C4a-b

|  | I | want |  | to do | $\Theta$ | happy | life. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Part: Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E554: FD1.C4b.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E555: FD1.C4b.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

Sentence FD1.S4: I will have husband and two children.
Clause FD1.C5: I will have husband and two children.

Analysis of clause FDI.C5

|  | I | will have |  |  | sband | and | two children. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Possessive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | ng : $\operatorname{sing}$ | + Thing | Part: Attribute <br> conjg <br> ng |  |
| id:log |  |  |  | ngc: |  | 1 | +2 |
| int | Subject | Finite+ ${ }^{+}$: future | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E556: FD1.C5: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text FD2

I will go to Hawaii in summer holidays with my family. I want to diving in Oafu Island and I want to feel nature. I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours. I think my English skill is improve. I listening English an hour every day now. For example, many CD , movie and music. I will go to festival with my friend. I want to many festival every year. I want to go to festival the most fireworks. My future dream is Wedding Planner. I want to make many people happy. I believe in myself. I will be wedding planner. I think I don't marry, maybe. However, I want to marry! And, I want three children.

## Sentence list

1. FD2.S1: I will go to Hawaii in summer holidays with my family.
2. FD2.S2: I want to diving in Oafu Island and I want to feel nature.
3. FD2.S3: I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours.
4. FD2.S4: I think my English skill is improve.
5. FD2.S5(i): I listening English an hour every day now.
6. FD2.S5(ii): For example, many CD, movie and music.
7. FD2.S6: I will go to festival with my friend.
8. FD2.S7: I want to many festival every year.
9. FD2.S8: I want to go to festival the most fireworks.
10. FD2.S9: My future dream is Wedding Planner.
11. FD2.S10: I want to make many people happy.
12. FD2.S11: I believe in myself.
13. FD2.S12: I will be wedding planner.
14. FD2.S13: I think I don't marry, maybe.
15. FD2.S14: However, I want to marry!
16. FD2.S15: And, I want three children.

## Clause list

1. FD2.C1: I will go to Hawaii in summer holidays with my family.
2. FD2.C2(a): I want
3. FD2.C2(b): to diving in Oafu Island
4. FD2.C3(a): and I want
5. FD2.C3(b): to feel nature.
6. FD2.C4: I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours.
7. FD2.C5(a): I think
8. FD2.C5(b): my English skill is improve.
9. FD2.C6: I listening English an hour every day these days.
10. FD2.C7: For example [ ] text CD, movie and music.
11. FD2.C8: I will go to festival with my friend.
12. FD2.C9(a): I want
13. FD2.C9(b): to many festival every year.
14. FD2.C10(a): I want
15. FD2.C10(b): to go to festival [the most fireworks].
16. FD2.C11(i): My future dream is [[Wedding Planner]].
17. FD2.C11(ii): [[Wedding Planner]]
18. FD2.C12(a): I want
19. FD2.C12(b): to make many people happy.
20. FD2.C13: I believe in myself.
21. FD2.C14: I will be wedding planner.
22. FD2.C15(a): I think
23. FD2.C15(b): I don't marry, maybe.
24. FD2.C16(a): However, I want
25. FD2.C16(b): to marry!
26. FD2.C17: And, I want three children.

Sentence FD2.S1: I will go to Hawaii in summer holidays with my family.
Clause FD2.C1: I will go to Hawaii in summer holidays with my family.


## Error list

E557: FD2.C1.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable' EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E558: FD2.C1.2: EC2c: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific' EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Sentence FD2.S2: I want to diving in Oafu Island and I want to feel nature.
Clause FD2.C2(a): I want
Clause FD2.C2(b): to diving in Oafu Island


Error list
E559: FD2.C2(' $\beta$ ): EC11d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of perfective aspect

Sentence FD2.S3: I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours.
Clause FD2.C4: I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours.

Analysis of clause FD2.C4

|  | I | will study |  | English | in |  | $\theta$ | summer | olidays | every day | in | 2 hours. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Scope | Circ: Time |  |  |  |  | Circ: Interval | Circ: Duration |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process | Minor Range |  |  | Min Process | Min Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: pg | + | ng ( sp | + Classifier |  |  |  | + Thing) |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: Future | Pred |  | Complement | Adjunct |  |  |  |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme id |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E560: FD2.C4.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E561: FD2.C4.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'
E562: FD2.C4.3: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence FD2.S4: I think my English skill is improve.

## Clause FD2.C5(a): I think

Clause FD2.C5(b): my English skill is improve.

|  | I | think |  | my English skill | is | improve. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | projected Metaphenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part: Actor |  | aterial |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | vg: $\quad \alpha$ - | $\beta \Theta$ |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Mood |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E563: FD2.C5(' $\beta$ ): EC14a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-logical $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Secondary Tense present

Sentence FD2.S5(i-ii): I listening English an hour every day now. For example, many CD, movie and music.
Clause FD2.C6: I listening English an hour every day now.


Error list
E564: FD2.S5(i-ii): EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to use a full stop instead of a comma or dash
E565: FD2.C6.2: EC15b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'finite'
EC15b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-finite'
E566: FD2.C6.3: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E567: FD2.C6.4: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence FD2.S5(ii): For example, many CD, movie and music.
Clause FD2.C7: For example, many CD, movie and music.

Analysis of clause FD2.C7

|  | For example, | [I | LISTEN] | $\theta$ | many CD , |  |  | movie | and | music. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  |  |  | Part: Range |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: Num + Thing $\rightarrow \underline{\text { sing }}$ ng: Thing $\rightarrow \underline{\text { sing }}$ conjg |  |  |  |  | ng |
| id: $\log$ | $=2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ngc: | 1 | 2 |  | +3 |
| int | Conjunctive Adjunct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (decl) |  |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Text | textual |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E568: FD2.C7.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E569: FD2.C7.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'
E570: FD2.C7.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence FD2.S6: I will go to festival with my friend.
Clause FD2.C8: I will go to festival with my friend.

|  | I | will go |  | to |  | $\theta$ | festival | with my friend. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  | Circ: Accompaniment |
|  |  |  |  | Minor P | cess |  | r Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: pg | $+$ | ng ( sp | + Thing) |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: future | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  | Adjunct |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E571: FD2.C8: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence FD2.S7: I want to many festival every year.
Clause FD2.C9(a): I want.
Clause FD2.C9(b): to many festival every year.

Analysis of clauses FD2.C9(i-ii)


Error list
E572: FD2.C9(b).1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process
E573: FD2.C9(b).2: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator
E574: FD2.C9(b).3: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence FD2.S8: I want to go to festival the most fireworks.
Clause FD2.C10(a): I want
Clause FD2.C10(b):[to go to festival [the most fireworks].

Analysis of clauses FD2.C10(a-b)


## Error list

E575: FD2.C10(b).1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'

E576: FD2.C10.2: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E577: FD2.C10(i).3: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Clause FD2.C11(ii): [/Wedding Planner]]

Analysis of clause FD2.Cl1(ii)

|  | $\Theta$ | $\Theta$ | Wedding Planner]] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Pre |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Pred Attribute |  |  |  |
|  | Residue | Complement |  |  |
| text | Rheme |  |  |  |

Error list
E578: FD2.C11(ii).1: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E579: FD2.C11(ii).2: EC28/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite EC28/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'
E580: FD2.C11(ii).3: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence FD2.S12: I will be wedding planner.
Clause FD2.C14: I will be wedding planner.

Analysis of clauses FD2.C14

|  | I | will be |  | $\theta$ |  | wedding | lanner. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : | sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: future | Predicator |  |  | Complement |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E581: FD2.C14: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence FD2.S13: I think I don't marry.
Clause FD2.C15(a): I think
Clause FD2.C15(b): I don't marry.

Analysis of clauses FD2.C15(a-b)

|  | I | think |  | I | don't marry. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | projected Meta-phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ |  |
| id: $\log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {neg: }}$ present | Predicator |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Mood |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  |  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |

Error list
E582: FD2.C15(b): EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

## Text FD3

I think I should study English more for my future. I have not decided my future dream yet. But I want to work that use English. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer. For my future dream, I should study English and I'll get dream. Then, I want to go to a lot of foreign countries with my family, friends, and my boyfriend. I'll be good English speaker, and then they can rely on me.

## Sentence list

1. FD3.S1: I think I should study English more for my future.
2. FD3.S2: I have not decided my future dream yet.
3. FD3.S3(i-ii): But I want to work that use English. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer.
4. FD3.S4: For my future dream, I should study English and I'll get dream.
5. FD3.S5: Then, I want to go to a lot of foreign countries with my family, friends, and my boyfriend.
6. FD3.S6: I'll be good English speaker, and then they can rely on me.

## Clause list

1. FD3.C1(a): I think
2. FD3.C1(b): I should study English more for my future.
3. FD3: C2: I have not decided my future dream yet.
4. FD3.C3(a): But I want
5. FD3.C3(bi-ii): to work that use English. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer.
6. FD3.C4: For my future dream, I should study English
7. FD3.C5: and I'll get dream.
8. FD3.C6(a): Then, I want
9. FD3.C6(b): to go to a lot of foreign countries with my family, friends, and my boyfriend.
10. FD3.C7: I'll be good English speaker,
11. FD3.C8: and then they can rely on me.

Sentence FD3.S3(i-ii): But I want to work that use English. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer.
Clause FD3.C3(a): But I want Clause FD3.C3(bi): to work [[that use English]]. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer.
Clause FD3.C3(bii): [ [that use English]]


Error list
E583: FD3.S3(i-ii): EC39b: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sub-sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to use a full stop instead of a comma or dash E584: FD3.C3(bi).1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E585: FD3.C3(bi).2: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator E586-588: FD3.C3(bi).4-6: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Clause FD3.C3(bii): [ [that use English]]

Analysis of clause FD3. C3(iii):


Error list
E589: FD3.C3(bii): EC12b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular' EC12b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'plural'

Clause FD3.C5: and I'll get dream.

Analysis of clause FD3.C5

|  | and | I | 'll |  |  | $\Theta$ | dream. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: | sp | + Thing |
| id:log | x2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {: f future }}$ | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| Text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | id |  |

Error list
E590: FD3.C5.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E591: FD3.C5.2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific'
EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-specific'

Sentence FD3.S6: I'll be good English speaker, and then they can rely on me.
Clause FD3.C7: I'll be good English speaker,

|  | I | 'll be |  |  | $\theta$ |  | ood | English | speaker, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Attribute |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: | sing | + | Epithet | + Classifier | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$f future | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E592: FD3.C7: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular' EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text FD4

My future dream is to be cabin attendant. I want to be cabin attendant, because when I went to Taiwan two years ago I was attracted cabin attendant in Narita airport. They looked beautiful and cool for me. And I like airport very much. Another reason is I love English very much. I have started studying English when I was eight years old. Studying English is very interesting for me.

## Sentence list

1. FD4.S1: My future dream is to be cabin attendant.
2. FD4.S2: I want to be cabin attendant, because when I went to Taiwan two years ago I was attracted cabin attendant in Narita airport.
3. FD4.S3: They looked beautiful and cool for me.
4. FD4.S4: And I like airport very much.
5. FD4.S5: Another reason is I love English very much.
6. FD4.S6: I have started studying English when I was eight years old.
7. FD4.S7: Studying English is very interesting for me.

## Clause list

1. FD4.C1(i): My future dream is [[to be cabin attendant]].
2. FD4.C1(ii): [[to be cabin attendant]]
3. FD4.C2(a): I want
4. FD4.C2(b): to be cabin attendant,
5. FD4.C3: because when I went to Taiwan two years ago
6. FD4.C4: I was attracted cabin attendant in Narita airport.
7. FD4.C5: They looked beautiful and cool for me.
8. FD4.C6: And I like airport very much.
9. FD4.C7(i): Another reason is [[I love English very much]].
10. FD4.C7(ii): [[I love English very much]]
11. FD4.C8: I have started studying English
12. FD4.C9: when I was eight years old.
13. FD4.C10(i): [[Studying English]] is very interesting for me.
14. FD4.C10(ii): [[Studying English]]

Sentence FD4.S1: My future dream is to be cabin attendant.
Clause FD4.C1(i): My future dream is [[ to be cabin attendant]].
Clause FD4.C1(ii): [[to be cabin attendant]]

|  | My future dream | is |  | [[to be | $\Theta$ | cabin attendant ]]. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified/Value | Pro: Relational: <br> Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Relational $\rightarrow$ Att | Part: Attribute |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {t }}$ : present | Predicator |  | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E593: FD4.C1[i]: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence FD4.S2: I want to be cabin attendant because when I went to Taiwan two years ago I was attracted cabin attendant in Narita airport. Clause FD4.C2(a): I want
Clause FD4.C2(b): to be cabin attendant

Analysis of clauses FD4. C2(i-ii)


## Error list

E594: FD4.C2[i]: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Clause FD4.C4: I was attracted cabin attendant [in Narita airport].

Analysis of clause FD4.C4

|  | I | was attracted |  |  | cabin attenda | [in Narita airport]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: Class + Thing $\rightarrow$ sing | + Qual |
| id:log | $\alpha$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past/pass | Predicator |  |  | Complemen |  |
| (decl) | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| textmarked $\rightarrow$ | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{7}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ....Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E595: FD4.C4.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E596: FD4.C4.2: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence FD4.S3: They looked beautiful and cool for me.
Clause FD4.C5: They looked beautiful and cool for me.

Analysis of clause FD4.C5

|  | They | looked |  |  | autif | d cool | for me. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  | Circ: Angle |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  | 1 | +2 |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E597: FD4.C5: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Sentence FD4.S4: And I like airport very much.

Clause FD4.C6: And I like airport very much.

|  | And | I | like |  | airport | very much. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon | Circ: Degree |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng: Thing $\rightarrow$ sing |  |
| id: log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E598: FD4.C6: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural' EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

Sentence FD4.S6: I have started studying English when I was eight years old.
Clause FD4.C8: I have started studying English

Analysis of clause FD4.C8


Error list
E599: FD4.C8.1: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system E600: FD4.C8.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

## Text FD5

I want to become supervisor who make TV program. I want to make about all over the world TV. I go to a lot of countries and collect a lot of information. I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years.

## Sentence list

1. FD5.S1: I want to become supervisor who make TV program.
2. FD5.S2: I want to make about all over the world TV.
3. FD5.S3: I go to a lot of countries and collect a lot of information.
4. FD5.S4: I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years.

## Clause list

1. FD5.C1(a): I want
2. FD5.C1(bi): to become supervisor [[who make TV program]].
3. FD5. C1(bii): [[who make TV program]]
4. FD5.C2(a): I want
5. FD5.C2(b): to make [about all over the world] TV.
6. FD5.C3: I go to a lot of countries
7. FD5.C4: and collect a lot of information.
8. FD5.C5: I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years.

Sentence FD5.S1: I want to become supervisor who make TV program.
Clause FD5.C1(a): I want
Clause FD5.C1(bi): to become supervisor [[who make TV program]].
Clause FD5.C1(bii): [[who make TV program]]*

Analysis of clauses FD5.C1(i-ii)


## Error list

E601: FD5.C1(bi): EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis
*see below

Clause FD5.C1(bii): [ [who make TV program]].

Analysis of clause FD5.C1(iii)

|  | [[who | make |  | TV | program |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |  |
|  |  | vg : Event $\rightarrow$ plural |  | ng: Classifier | + Thing $\rightarrow$ sing |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | mplement |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E602: FD5.C1(bii).1: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular E603: FD5.C1(bii).2: EC12a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a singular Event as plural

Sentence FD5.S2: I want to make about all over the world TV.
Clause FD5.C2(a): I want
Clause FD5.C2(b): to make [about [all over the world] ] TV

Analysis of clauses FD5.C2a-b

|  | I | want |  |  | to make | abo | ver the world |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| id: $\log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Inf |  | ng : | New $\leftarrow \rightarrow$ Given |

Error list
E604: FD5.C2(b): EC10: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ INFORMATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Given as New

Sentence FD5.S3: I go to a lot of countries and collect a lot of information.
Clause FD5.C3: I go to a lot of countries

Analysis of clause FD5.C3


Error list
E605: FD5.C3: EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

Sentence FD5.S4: I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years.
Clause FD5.C5: I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years.

Analysis of clause FD5.C5


Error list
E606: FD5.C5.1: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis
E607: FD5.C5.2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

## Text FD6

I'd like to be a cabin attendant. To my dream real, I'd like to study abroad. I'd like to go America because America is suitable. It is called a melting pot. I can study about language and American culture. I'd like to talk with various kinds of people, and try to understand them. I have an another dream. I'd like to marry with American or European. Because I'd like to study about foreign country every day. I like to study foreign language, culture, music, food.

## Sentence list

1. FD6.S1: I'd like to be a cabin attendant.
2. FD6.S2: To my dream real, I'd like to study abroad.
3. FD6.S3: I'd like to go America because America is suitable.
4. FD6.S4: It is called a melting pot.
5. FD6.S5: I can study about language and American culture.
6. FD6.S6: I'd like to talk with various kinds of people, and try to understand them.
7. FD6.S7: I have an another dream.
8. FD6.S8(i): I'd like to marry with American or European.
9. FD6.S8(ii): Because I'd like to study about foreign country every day.
10. FD6.S9: I like to study foreign language, culture, music, food.

## Clause list

1. FD6.C1(a): I'd like
2. FD6.C1(b): to be a cabin attendant.
3. FD6.C2: To my dream real,
4. FD6.C3(a): I'd like
5. FD6.C3(b): to study abroad.
6. FD6.C4(a): I'd like
7. FD6.C4(b): to go America
8. FD6.C5: because America is suitable.
9. FD6.C6: It is called a melting pot
10. FD6.C7: I can study about language and American culture.
11. FD6.C8(a): I'd like
12. FD6.C8(b): to talk with various kinds of people,
13. FD6.C9: and try to understand them.
14. FD6.C10: I have an another dream.
15. FD6.C11(a): I'd like
16. FD6.C11(b): to marry with American or European.
17. FD6.C12(a): Because I'd like
18. FD6.C12(b): to study about foreign country every day.
19. FD6.C13(a): I like
20. FD6.C13(b): to study foreign language, culture, music, food

Sentence: FD6.S2: To my dream real, I'd like to study abroad.
Clause FD6.C2: To my dream real,

Analysis of clauses FD6.C2

|  | To $\Theta$ | my dream | real, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Pre | Part: Actor (erg: Medium) | Part: Attribute |
| id:log | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |
| int | Pred | Complement | Complement |
|  | Residue |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme $^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E608: FD6.C2.1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E609: FD6.C2.2: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator

Sentence FD6.S3: I'd like to go America because America is suitable.
Clause FD6.C4(a): I'd like
Clause FD6.C4(b): to go America

Analysis of clauses FD6.C4(i-ii)

|  | I | 'd | like | to go | $\theta$ | America |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Place |  |
|  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| id:log | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { int } \\ (\mathrm{decl}) \end{gathered}$ | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: modal | Predicator |  | Predicator |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E610: FD6.C4(ii): EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Minor Process

## Sentence FD6.S7: I have an another dream.

Clause FD6.C10: I have an another dream.


Error list
E611: FD6.C10: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

Sentence FD6.S8(i-ii): I'd like to marry with American or European. Because I'd like to study about foreign country every day. Clause FD6.C11(a): I'd like [[to marry with American or European]].
Clause FD6.C11(b): [[to marry with American or European]]


## Error list

E612: FD6.S8(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex E613: FD6.C11(b): EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence FD6.S8(ii): Because I'd like to study about foreign country every day.
Clause FD6.C12(a): Because I'd like
Clause FD6.C12(b): to study about foreign country every day.

Analysis of clauses FD6.C12(i-ii)


Error list
E614: FD6.C12(b): EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of plural Thing

Sentence FD6.S9: I like to study foreign language, culture, music, food.
Clause FD6.C13(a): I like [[to study foreign language, culture, music, food.]]
Clause FD6.C13(b): [[to study foreign language, culture, music, food.]]

Analysis of clauses FD6.C13(i-ii)

|  | I | like |  | to study |  | foreign language, | culture, | music, | $\theta$ | food. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pro: Material Scope |  |  |  | Scope |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ ' $\beta$, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ngc : | 1 | +2 | +3 | Link | +4 |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator |  |  | Complem |  |  |  |
| (decl) |  | Mood | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | heme ${ }^{1}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E615: FD6.C13(b): EC39d: Group rank (nominal group complex) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise paratactic linker

## Text FD7

I will want to do need English job. Because I like English from become a university student. I want to get TOEIC score. I want to get 900 points! I study hard every day about two hours. But my life is wonderful.

## Sentence list

1. FD7.S1(i): I will want to do need English job.
2. FD7.S1(ii): Because I like English from become a university student.
3. FD7.S2: I want to get TOEIC score.
4. FD7.S3: I want to get 900 points!
5. FD7.S4: I study hard every day about two hours.
6. FD7.S5: But my life is wonderful.

## Clause list

1. FD7.C1(a): I will want
2. FD7.C1(b): to do [[need English]] job
3. FD7.C2: Because I like English
4. FD7.C3: from become a university student.
5. FD7.C4(a): I want.
6. FD7.C4(b): to get TOEIC score
7. FD7.C5(a): I want [[to get 900 points]]!
8. FD7.C5(b): [[to get 900 points]]
9. FD7.C6: I study hard every day about two hours.
10. FD7.C7: But my life is wonderful.

Sentence FD7.S1(i): I will want to do [[need English]] job. Because I like English from become a university student.
Clause FD7.C1(a): I will want
Clause FD7.C1(bi): to do [[need English]] job. Clause FD7.C1(bii): [[need English]]


Error list
E616: FD7.S1(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place a full stop before the bound second clause of a clause complex
E617: FD7.C1(bi).1: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

E618: FD7.C1(bi).2: EC10: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ INFORMATION $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise Given as New E619: FD7.C1(bii): EC12a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a singular Event as plural

Sentence FD7.S1(ii): Because I like English from become a university student.
Clause FD7.C2: Because I like English

Analysis of clause FD7.C2

|  | Because | I | like |  | English |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Ment $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Phenomenon |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\mathrm{x} \beta \quad$ (Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E620: FD7.C2: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to select from the system

Clause FD7.C3: from become a university student.

Analysis of clause FD7.C3

|  | from | become | a university student. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute |
| id:log | x $\beta$ ) |  |  |
| int |  | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | vg: finite |  |
|  |  | Residue |  |
| text | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | ...Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

## Error list

E621: FD7.C3.1: EC11a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'imperfective' EC11a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective'
E622: FD7.C3.2: EC15a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ int $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a non-finite verbal group as finite
E623: FD7.C3.3: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

## Sentence FD7.S2: I want to get TOEIC score.

Clause FD7.C4(a): I want
Clause FD7.C4(b): to get TOEIC score.

Analysis of clauses FD7.C4(i-ii)


Error list
E624: FD7.C4(b): EC2a: Group rank (ng) $\rightarrow$ ideational (exp) $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ inc. choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text FD8

I want to speak English very well. Because I want to talk with many foreign people in English. Speaking to many people is very interesting. So, I should study very hard. In summer vacation, I will study English over 4 hours. This study is very important. I will go to foreign country. Because I can know different thinking.

## Sentence list

1. FD8.S1(i): I want to speak English very well.
2. FD8.S1(ii): Because I want to talk with many foreign people in English.
3. FD8.S2: Speaking to many people is very interesting.
4. FD8.S3: So, I should study very hard.
5. FD8.S4: In summer vacation, I will study English over 4 hours.
6. FD8.S5: This study is very important.
7. FD8.S6(i): I will go to foreign country.
8. FD8.S6(ii): Because I can know different thinking.

Clause list

1. FD8.C1a: I want
2. FD8.C1b: to speak English very well.
3. FD8.C2(a): Because I want
4. FD8.C2(b): to talk with many foreign people in English.
5. FD8.C3(i): [[Speaking to many people]] is very interesting.
6. FD8.C3(ii): [[Speaking to many people]]
7. FD8.C4: So, I should study very hard.
8. FD8.C5: In summer vacation, I will study English over 4 hours.
9. FD8.C6: This study is very important.
10. FD8.C7: I will go to foreign country.
11. FD8.C8: Because I can know different thinking.

Sentence FD8.S1(i-ii): I want to speak English very well. Because I want to talk with many foreign people in English. Clause FD8.C1(a): I want
Clause FD8.C1(b): to speak English very well.

Analysis of clauses FD8.C1(a-b)

|  | I | want |  | to speak | English | very well. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Verbal | Part: Verbiage | Circ: Manner |
| id:log | Expansion: $\alpha$ (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  | full stop |  |  |

Error List
E625: FD8.S1(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place full stop before bound second clause of clause complex

Sentence FD8.S6(i): I will go to foreign country. Because I can know different thinking.
Clause FD8.C7: I will go to foreign country.

| Analysis of clause FD8.C7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | I | will | go | to |  |  | $\Theta$ | foreign | country. |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Minor Process |  |  | Minor Range |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | pg | + | (sing | + Classifier | + Thing) |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$f future | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  |  |  | full stop |  |  |

Error list
E626: FD8.S6(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place full stop before bound second clause of clause complex E627: FD8.C7: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Text FD9

My future dream is cabin attendant or hotelman. I would like to become someone make happy. Because I think that people's smile is excellent. Smile is happy life. So I want to help people's happy life. When I was high school student, I have been to Australia. There, I enjoyed shopping, sightseeing, but seldom talked people. I didn't know what Australian spoke to me.

## Sentence list

1. FD9.S1: My future dream is cabin attendant or hotelman.
2. FD9.S2(i): I would like to become someone make happy.
3. FD9.S2(ii): Because I think that people's smile is excellent.
4. FD9.S3: Smile is happy life.
5. FD9.S4: So I want to help people's happy life
6. FD9.S5: When I was high school student, I have been to Australia.
7. FD9.S6: There, I enjoyed shopping, sightseeing, but seldom talked people.
8. FD9.S7: I didn't know what Australian spoke to me.

## Clause list

1. FD9.C1(i): My future dream is [[cabin attendant or hotelman]].
2. FD9.C1(ii): [[cabin attendant or hotelman]]
3. FD9.C2(a): I would like
4. FD9.C2(bi): to become [[someone make happy]].
5. FD9.C2(bii): [[someone make happy]]
6. FD9.C3(a): Because I think
7. FD9.C3(b): that people's smile is excellent.
8. FD9.C4: Smile is happy life.
9. FD9.C5(a): So I want
10. FD9.C5(b): to help people's happy life.
11. FD9.C6: When I was high school student,
12. FD9.C7: I have been to Australia.
13. FD9.C8(i): There, I enjoyed [[shopping]], [[sightseeing]],
14. FD9.C8(ii): [[shopping]]
15. FD9.C8(iii): [[sightseeing]],
16. FD9.C9: but seldom talked people.
17. FD9.C10(i): I didn't know [[what Australian spoke to me]].
18. FD9.C10(ii): [[what Australian spoke to me.]

## Sentence FD9.S1: My future dream is cabin attendant or hotelman.

Clause FD9.C1(i): My future dream is [[cabin attendant or hotelman]].
Clause FD9.C1(ii): [[cabin attendant or hotelman]]*

|  | My future dream | is | [[ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\Theta$ cabin attendant or hotelman] ${ }^{*}$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Identified/Value | Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Identifier/Token |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present |  | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  |  | Residue |
|  | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
| text | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
*See below

Clause FD9.C1(ii): [[cabin attendant or hotelman]]


Error list
E628: FD9.C1(ii).1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process
E629: FD9.C1(ii).2: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator
E630 FD9.C1(ii).3: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence FD9.S2(i-ii): I would like to become someone make happy. Because I think that people's smile is excellent. Clause FD9.C2(a): I would like
Clause FD9.C2(bi): to become someone [[make happy]] Clause FD9.C2(bii): [[make happy]]*

|  | I | would like |  | to become | someone [[make happy]]*. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Rel: Int $\rightarrow$ Att | Part: Attribute]] |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\alpha \quad$ (Projection $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: modal | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  | Mood |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  |  | full |

Error list
E631: FD9.S2(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place full stop before bound second clause of clause complex
*See below

Clause FD9.C2(bii): [[make happy]]

Analysis of clause FD9.C2b(ii)

|  |  |  |  |  | $\theta$ | happy]] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part |  | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part | Part: Attribute |
|  |  |  | vg: Event $\rightarrow$ plural |  |  |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Sub |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Comp | Complement |
|  | Mood |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E632: FD9.C2(bii).1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E633: FD9.C2(bii).2: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant E634: FD9.C2(bii).3: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject E635: FD9.C2(bii).4: EC30: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Complement E636: FD9.C2(bii).5: EC33b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the textual Theme E637: FD9.C2(bii).6: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme E638: FD9.C2(bii).7: EC12a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a singular Event as plural

Sentence FD9.S2(ii): Because I think that people's smile is excellent.
Clause FD9.C3(a): Because I think
Clause FD9.C3(b): that people's smile is excellent.

Analysis of clauses FD9.C3a-b


Error list
E639: FD9.C3(b): EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

Sentence FD9.S3: Smile is happy life.
Clause FD9.C4: Smile is happy life.

Analysis of clause FD9.C4

|  | $\theta \quad$ Smile | is |  | $\Theta$ | happy life. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identifier/Token | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying |  | Part: Identified/Value |  |
|  | ng : sing + Thing |  |  | ng: sing | + Epithet + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E640: FD9.C4.1: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis E641: FD9.C4.2: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence FD9.S5: When I was high school student, I have been to Australia.
Clause FD9.C6: When I was high school student,

|  | When | I | was |  |  |  | high school student, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive |  | Part: Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ng : | sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator |  |  | Complement |  |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E642: FD9.C6: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Clause FD9.C7: I have been to Australia.

Analysis of clause FD9.C7

|  | I | have been |  | to Australia. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Circ: Place |
| id:log | $\alpha$ |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
| marked $\rightarrow$ | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error List
E643: FD9.C7.1: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system E644: FD9.C7.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'Deictic Tense: present'

Sentence FD9.S6: There, I enjoyed shopping, sightseeing, but seldom talked people.
Clause FD9.C8(i-iii): There, I enjoyed [[shopping]], [[sightseeing]],


Error list
E645: FD9.C8(i): EC39d: Group rank (nominal group complex) $\rightarrow$ ideational- $\log \rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the paratactic linker

Clause FD9.C9: but seldom talked people.

Analysis of clause FD9.C9

|  | but | [I] | seldom | talked |  | $\Theta$ | people. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | [ACTOR] |  | Behavioural |  | Range |  |
|  |  |  | $\square$ |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| id : log | x 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | [SUBJECT] | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Complement |  |
|  |  | [M]ood (decl) |  |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | textual | [IDEATIONAL] | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E646: FD9.C9: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

## Sentence FD9.S7: I didn't know what Australian spoke to me.

Clause FD9.C10(a): I didn't know
Clause FD9.C10(b): what Australian spoke to me.

Analysis of clause FD9.C10(a-b)

|  | I | didn't | know | what | Australian | spoke |  | me. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Part: Verbiage | Part: Sayer | Pro: Behavioural | Part: Recipient |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: Thing $\rightarrow$ sing |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int <br> (decl) | Subject | Finite ${ }^{\text {neg }}$ : past | Predicator | Complement | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood |  | Residue | Resi... | Mood |  |  | ...due |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E647: FD9.C10(b).1: EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular E648: FD9.C10(b).2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect lexical realisation

## Text FD10

My future dream is not decided now. But I want to work in abroad. I like English. And I love foreign country's goods. I often watch TV and Twitter about world news. But there are only English always, so I study English very hard and I want to understand there. I'm interested in sightseeing business.

## Sentence list

1. FD10.S1: My future dream is not decided now.
2. FD10.S2: But I want to work in abroad.
3. FD10.S3: I like English.
4. FD10.S4: And I love foreign country's goods.
5. FD10.S5: I often watch TV and Twitter about world news.
6. FD10.S6: But there are only English always, so I study English very hard and I want to understand there.
7. FD10.S7(i-ii): I'm interested in sightseeing business.

## Clause list

1. FD10.C1: My future dream is not decided now.
2. FD10.C2(a): But I want
3. FD10.C2(b): to work in abroad.
4. FD10.C3: I like English.
5. FD10.C4: And I love foreign country's goods.
6. FD10.C5: I often watch TV and Twitter about world news.
7. FD10.C6: But there are only English always,
8. FD10.C7: so I study English very hard
9. FD10.C8(a): and I want
10. FD10.C8(b): to understand there.
11. FD10.C9: I'm interested in sightseeing business.

Sentence FD10.S2: But I want to work in abroad.
Clause FD10.C2(a): But I want
Clause FD10.C2(b): to work in abroad.

Analysis of clause FD10.C2(i-ii)


Error list
E649: FD10.C2(b): EC17: Phrase / Group rank (adverbial) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence FD10.S4: And I love foreign country's goods.
Clause FD10.C4: And I love [foreign country's] goods.

Analysis of clause FD10.C4


Error list
E650: FD10.C4:EC3a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a plural Thing as singular

Sentence FD10.S5: I often watch TV and Twitter about world news.
Clause FD10.C5: I often watch TV and Twitter about world news.

Analysis of clause FD10.C5

|  | I | often | watch |  |  | TV and Twitter | about world news. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | , | Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Range |  | Circ: Matter |
| id:log |  |  |  |  | ngc: | $1 \quad+2$ |  |
| int | Subject | Mood Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |  | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood (decl) |  |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E651: FD10.C5: EC24: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence FD10.S6: But there are only English always, so I study English very hard and I want to understand there. Clause FD10.C6: But there are only English always,

Analysis of clause FD10.C6

|  | But | there | are |  | only English | always, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  |  | $\mathrm{vg}:$ Event $\rightarrow$ plural |  | Part: Existent |  |
| id:log | Expansion: 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement | Mood Adjunct |
|  |  | Мо... |  | Residue |  | ..od (decl) |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{ne}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E652: FD10.C6: EC12a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a singular Event as plural

## Clause FD10.C8(a): and I want

Clause FD10.C8(b): to understand there.

Analysis of clauses FD10.C8(i-ii)


Error list
E653: FD10.C8(b): EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence FD10.S7(i-ii): I'm interested in sightseeing business.
Clause FD10.C9: I'm interested in sightseeing business.

Analysis of clause FD10.C9


Error list
E654: FD10.C9.1: EC36a/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36a/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E655: FD10.C9.2: EC2c: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise specific deixis

## Text FD11

I want be a groundstaff. I hope to work in airport. I want to abroad to study English. It is my future dream since I'm a child. I want to go Miami. Because, the most beautiful city. I'm go, and I make friends.

Sentence list

1. FD11.S1: I want be a groundstaff.
2. FD11.S2: I hope to work in airport.
3. FD11.S3: I want to abroad to study English.
4. FD11.S4: It is my future dream since I'm a child.
5. FD11.S5(i): I want to go Miami.
6. FD11.S5(ii): Because, the most beautiful city.
7. FD11.S6: I'm go, and I make friends.

## Clause list

1. FD11.C1(a): I want
2. FD11.C1(b): be a groundstaff.
3. FD11.C2(a): I hope
4. FD11.C2(b): to work in airport.
5. FD11.C3(a): I want
6. FD11.C3(b): to abroad
7. FD11.C4: to study English.
8. FD11.C5: It is my future dream
9. FD11.C6: since I'm a child.
10. FD11.C7(a): I want
11. FD11. C7(b): to go Miami.
12. FD11.C8: Because, the most beautiful city.
13. FD11.C9: I'm go,
14. FD11.C10: and I make friends.

## Sentence FD11.S1: I want be a groundstaff.

Clause FD11.C1 ( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause FD11.C1(' $\beta$ ): be a groundstaff.

Analysis of clauses FD11.C1(i-ii)

|  | I | want |  | be | a groundstaff. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |
|  |  |  |  | Rel: Int $\rightarrow$ Att | Part: Attribute |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  |  |  | vg: finite |  |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |

Error list
E656: FD11.C1(' $\beta$ ).1:EC11c/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'perfective' EC11c/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E657: FD11.C1(‘ $\beta$.1: EC15a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ int $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a non-finite verbal group as finite*

Sentence FD11.S2: I hope to work in airport.
Clause FD11.C2(a): I hope
Clause FD11.C2(b): to work in airport

Analysis of clauses FD11.C2(i-ii)

|  | I | hope |  | to work |  |  |  | $\theta$ | airport. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Place |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Minor Process |  |  | Minor Range |  |
|  |  |  |  | pp: | pg | + | ng ( sing | + Thing) |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Adjunct |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E658: FD11.C2(b): EC2a: Group rank (ng) $\rightarrow$ ideational -exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence FD11.S3: I want to abroad to study English.
Clause FD11.C3(a): I want
Clause FD11.C3(b): to abroad
Clause FD11.C4: to study English.

Analysis of clauses FD11.C3(i-ii), C4

|  | I | want |  | to $\Theta$ | abroad | to study | English. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part; Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  | Pro: Material | Part: Range |
|  |  |  |  | Pro | Circ: Location |  |  |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\alpha$ (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |  | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Pred | Adjunct | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |

Error list
E659: FD11.C3(b).1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E660: FD11.C3(b).2: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator

Sentence FD11.S4: It is my future dream since I'm a child.
Clause FD11.C5: It is my future dream


Error list
E661: FD11.C5: EC14c: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to select from the system

Clause FD11.C6: since I'm a child.

Analysis of clause FD11.C6

|  | since | I | 'm |  | a child. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier |  | Pro: Relational: Int $\rightarrow$ Att |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | x $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E662: FD11.C6: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Sentence FD11.S5(i): I want to go Miami. Because, the most beautiful city.
Clause FD11.C7(a): I want
Clause FD11.C7(b): to go Miami.

Analysis of clauses FD11.C7(i-ii)

|  | I | want |  | to go $\Theta$ |  | Miami. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Part: Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  |  | - | Pro: Material | Circ: Place |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |
| id:log | Expansion: $\alpha \quad$ (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Adjunct |  |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| punc | cap |  |  |  | full stop |  |

## Error list

E663: FD11.S5(i-ii): EC39a: Punctuation $\rightarrow$ Sentence $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place full stop before bound second clause of clause complex E664: FD11.C7(b): EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Minor Process

Sentence FD11.S5(ii): Because, the most beautiful city.
Clause FD11.C8: Because, the most beautiful city.

Analysis of clause FD11.C8

|  | Because, | $\theta$ | $\theta$ |  | the most beau |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part | Pro |  | Part: Attribute |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $\mathrm{x} \beta$ ] |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Sub | Fin | [Predicator] | Complement |
|  |  | [Mood] |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E665: FD11.C8.1: EC22b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise a Particpant
E666: FD11.C8.2: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process
E667: FD11.C8.3: EC27a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Subject
E668: FD11.C8.4: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite
E669: FD11.C8.5: EC33a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the ideational Theme

## Sentence FD11.S6: I'm go, and I make friends.

Clause FD11.C9: I'm go,

Analysis of clause FD11.C9

|  | I | 'm | go, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ ? |  |
| id:log | Paratactic expansion: 1 |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E670: FD11.C9.2: EC14a: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'present'

## Clause FD11.C10: and I make friends.

Analysis of clause FD11.C10

|  | and | I | make |  | friends. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material $\rightarrow$ routine |  | Part: Goal |
| id:log | +2 |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | heme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E671: FD11.C10: EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

## Appendix 5 - Job Interview texts

Text JI1'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'Where are you from?' 'I'm from Tokyo.' 'What sports do you like?' 'I like basketball.' 'Why do you choose this company?' 'I'm interesting in this company.' 'When do you want to join?' 'I want to join two years ago.' 'Do you like chemistry?' 'Yes, I do.' 'Do you have a passion about job?' 'I have one'.

## Sentence list

1. JI1.S1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI1.S2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI1.S3: 'Where are you from?'
4. JI1.S4: 'I'm from Tokyo.'
5. JI1.S5: 'What sports do you like?'
6. JI1.S6: 'I like basketball.'
7. JII.S7: 'Why do you choose this company?'
8. JI1.S8: 'I'm interesting in this company.'
9. JI1.S9: 'When do you want to join?'
10. JI1.S10: ‘I want to join two years ago.'
11. JI1.S11: ‘Do you like chemistry?'
12. JI1.S12: 'Yes, I do.'
13. JI1.S13: ‘Do you have a passion about job?'
14. JI1.S14: 'I have one'.

## Clause list

1. JI1.C1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI1.C2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI1.C3: 'Where are you from?'
4. JI1.C4: 'I'm from Tokyo.'
5. JI1.C5: 'What sports do you like?'
6. JI1.C6: ‘I like basketball.'
7. JII.C7: 'Why do you choose this company?'
8. JI1.C8: 'I'm interesting in this company.'
9. JI1.C9(a): 'When do you want'
10. JI1.C9(b): to join
11. JI1.C10(a): 'I want
12. JI1.C10(b): to join two years ago
13. J11.C11: 'Do you like chemistry?'
14. J11.C12: 'Yes, I do.'
15. JI1.C13: 'Do you have a passion about job?'
16. J11.C14: 'I have one'

Sentence JI1.S7: ‘Why do you choose this company?'
Clause JI1.C7: ‘Why do you choose this company?’

Analysis of clause JII.C7

|  | 'Why |  | do | you | choose | this company?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Cause |  | Pro: Mat... | Part: Actor | ...terial | Part: Goal |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Res... |  | Mood (inter) |  |  | ...idue |
| text | int | id | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E672: JI1.C7.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present'

Sentence JI1.S8: 'I'm interesting in this company.'
Clause JI1.C8: 'I'm interesting in this company.'

Analysis of clause JII.C8

|  | 'I | 'm | interesting | in this company.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Carrier | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Attributive | Part: Attribute | Circ: Matter |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Complement | Adjunct |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E673: JI1.C8: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence JI1.S10: 'I want to join two years ago.'
Clause JI1.C10(a): 'I want [[to join two years agol].'
Clause JI1.C10(b): [[to join two years ago]]

Analysis of clause JII.C1Oa-b

|  | 'I | want |  | to join | two years ago.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser |  |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |
|  |  | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Cognitive |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Time |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Adjunct |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |

Error list
E674: JI1.C10(i).2: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence JI1.S13: ‘Do you have a passion about job?'
Clause JI1.C13: 'Do you have a passion about job?'


Error list
E675: JI1.C13: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICALSYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

## Text JI2

'Where you from?' 'I'm from Tokyo.' 'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'How are you doing?' 'I'm fine.' 'What do your hobbies?' 'I like a watching baseball.' 'What do you like baseball team?' 'I like Yokohama Baystars.' 'Who do you like baseball player?' 'I like Ishikawa.' 'Why do you want to our company?' 'I want to work this company for childhood.' 'Do you have sister or brother?' 'I have one sister and two brothers.'

## Sentence list

1. JI2.S1: 'Where you from?'
2. JI2.S2: 'I'm from Tokyo.'
3. JI2.S3: 'What's your name?'
4. JI2.S4: 'My name is X.'
5. JI2.S5: 'How are you doing?'
6. JI2.S6: 'I'm fine.'
7. JI2.S7: 'What do your hobbies?'
8. JI2.S8: 'I like a watching baseball.'
9. JI2.S9: 'What do you like baseball team?'
10. JI2.S 10: 'I like Yokohama Baystars.'
11. JI2.S11: 'Who do you like baseball player?'
12. JI2.S12: 'I like Ishikawa.'
13. JI2.S13: 'Why do you want to our company?'
14. JI2.S 14: 'I want to work this company for childhood.'
15. JI2.S15: 'Do you have sister or brother?'
16. JI2.S16: 'I have one sister and two brothers.'

## Clause list

1. JI2.C1: 'Where you from?'
2. JI2.C2: 'I'm from Tokyo.'
3. JI2.C3: 'What's your name?'
4. JI2.C4: 'My name is X.'
5. JI2.C5: ‘How are you doing?'
6. JI2.C6: 'I'm fine.'
7. JI2.C7: ‘What do your hobbies?'
8. JI2.C8(i): ‘I like [[a watching baseball.']]
9. JI2.C8(ii): [[a watching baseball.']]
10. JI2.C9: 'What do you like baseball team?'
11. JI2.C10: 'I like Yokohama Baystars.'
12. JI2.C11: 'Who do you like baseball player?'
13. JI2.C12: ‘I like Ishikawa.’
14. JI2.C13(a): ‘Why do you want
15. J12.C13(b): to our company?'
16. JI2.C14(a): ‘I want
17. J12. C14(b): to work this company for childhood.'
18. JI2.C15: 'Do you have sister or brother?'
19. JI2.C16: 'I have one sister and two brothers.'

Sentence JI2.S1: ‘Where you from?'
Clause JI2.C1: 'Where you from?'

Analysis of clause JI2.C1

|  | 'Where |  | $\Theta$ |  | you |  | from?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Circ: Pla... |  | Pro |  | Part: Carrier |  | ...ce |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adj... |  | Fin |  | Subject |  | ...unct |
|  | Resi... |  |  | Mood (inter) |  |  | ...due |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E676: J12.C1.1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E677: J12.C1.2: EC27b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Mood: Finite

## Sentence JI2.S7: 'What do your hobbies?'

Clause JI2.C7: 'What do your hobbies?'

Analysis of clause JI2.C7

|  | 'What |  | do | your | hobbies? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identifier/Token |  |  |  | Identified/Value |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Complement |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present |  | Subject |
|  | Re... |  | Mood (inter) |  |  |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E678: JI2.C7: EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICALSYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence JI2.S8: 'I like a watching baseball.'
Clause JI2.C8(i): ‘I like [[a watching baseball. ']]
Clause JI2.C8(ii): [ [a watching baseball. ']]

|  | 'I | like |  | [[a watching |  | baseball.']] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Emotive |  | Part: Micro-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  | , |  | [[Pro: Behavioural |  | Part: Range]] |
|  | , |  |  | vg: ng Deictic / Event |  | ng |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |  |  |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E679: J12.C8[i]: EC: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a verbal group with a nominal group Deictic

Sentence JI2.S9: 'What do you like baseball team?'
Clause JI2.C9: 'What do you like baseball team?'

Analysis of clause JI2.C9

|  | 'What | do | you | like | baseball team?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Pheno... | Pro: Mental... | Part: Senser | $\ldots \rightarrow$ Emotive | ...menon |
|  | ng: Deictic... | v... | ng | ...g | $\ldots+$ Classifier + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Comple... | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | ...ment |
|  | Resi... | Mood (inter) |  | ...due |  |
| text | interpersonal Theme | Rheme |  | Ideational Theme |  |

Error list
E680: J12.C9.1: EC34: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place the ideational Theme in the Rheme E681: JI2.C9.2: EC6: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a nominal group as discontinuous

Sentence JI2.S11: 'Who do you like baseball player?’
Clause JI2.C11: 'Who do you like baseball player?'

Analysis of clause JI2.C11

|  | ${ }^{\prime}$ Who | do | you | like | baseball player?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: exp | Part: Pheno... | Pro: Mental... | Part: Senser | $\ldots \rightarrow$ Emotive | ...menon |
|  | ng: Deictic... | v... | ng | ...g | ...+ Classifier + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Comple... | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | ...ment |
|  | Resi... | Mood (inter) |  | ...due |  |
| text | Interpersonal Theme | Rheme |  | ideational Theme |  |

Error list
E682: JI2.C11.1: EC34: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place the ideational Theme in the Rheme
E683: J12.C11.2: EC6: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a nominal group as discontinuous

Sentence JI2.S13: 'Why do you want to our company?’
Clause JI2.C13(a): 'Why do you want
Clause JI2.C13(b): to our company?

Analysis of clauses JI2.C13(i-ii)


Error list
E684: JI2.C13(b).1: EC22a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Process E685: J12.C13(b).2: EC28: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise the Predicator

Sentence JI2.S14: 'I want to work this company for childhood.'
Clause JI2.C14(a): 'I want
Clause JI2.C14(b): to work this company for childhood.'

Analysis of clauses JI2.C14a-b

|  | 'I | want |  | to work | $\theta$ | ompany | for childhood.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |
|  |  | , |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Place |  | Circ: Time |
|  |  |  |  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |  |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Adjunct |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue |  | Residue |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |

Error list
E686: J12.C14(b).1: EC18: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise Minor Process E687: JI2.C14(b).2: EC17: Phrase / Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence JI2.S15: 'Do you have sister or brother?'
Clause JI2.C15: 'Do you have sister or brother?'

Analysis of clause JI2.C15


Error list
E688: JI2.C15: EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

## Text JI3

'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'Where are you from?' 'I'm from Tokyo.' 'Why do you want to join our company?' 'I want to be professional engineer in your company.' 'Why do you choice our company?' 'I know that your company is best.'

## Sentence list

1. JI3.S1: ‘What's your name?'
2. JI3.S2: 'My name is $X$.'
3. JI3.S3: 'Where are you from?'
4. JI3.S4: 'I'm from Tokyo.'
5. JI3.S5: 'Why do you want to join our company?'
6. JI3.S6: 'I want to be professional engineer in your company.'
7. JI3.S7: 'Why do you choice our company?'
8. JI3.S8: 'I know that your company is best.'

## Clause list

1. JI3.C1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI3.C2: 'My name is X .'
3. JI3.C3: 'Where are you from?'
4. JI3.C4: 'I'm from Tokyo.'
5. JI3.C5(a): 'Why do you want
6. JI3.C5(b): to join our company?'
7. JI3.C6(a): ‘I want
8. JI3.C6(b): to be professional engineer in your company.'
9. JI3.C7: 'Why do you choice our company?'
10. JI3.C8(a): ‘I know
11. JI3.C8(b): that your company is best.'

Sentence JI3.S6: 'I want to be professional engineer in your company.'
Clause JI3.C6(a): 'I want [[to be professional engineer in your company]].'
Clause JI3.C6(b): to be professional engineer in your company.'

Analysis of clauses JI3.C6(i-ii)

|  | ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I}$ | want |  | to be | $\Theta$ | fessional | ngineer | in your company.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Part: Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Rel: Int $\rightarrow$ Att | Attribute |  |  | Circ: Place |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Classifier | + Thing |  |
| id:log | Projection: $\quad \alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: pres | Predicator | Predicator |  | Complem |  | Adjunct |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E689: J13.C6( $\beta$ ): EC2a: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice not to realise singular deixis

Sentence JI3.S7: 'Why do you choice our company?’
Clause JI3.C7: 'Why do you choice our company?'

Analysis of clause JI3.C7

|  | 'Why | do | you | choice | our company?’ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Reason | Pro: Mat... | Part: Actor | $\ldots$...erial $\rightarrow$ | Part: Scope |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Re... | Mood (inter) |  |  | ...sidue |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E690: JI3.C7.2: EC26a: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ PRIMARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'past' as 'present' E691: JI3.C7.3: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

## Text JI4

'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'OK, how old are you?' 'Eighteen years old.' 'What do you like sport?' 'I like tennis and soccer.' 'What your hobby?' 'My hobby are read the book, play the game, and listen to music.'

## Sentence list

1. JI4.S1: ‘What's your name?'
2. JI4.S2: 'My name is $X$.'
3. JI4.S3: ‘OK, how old are you?'
4. JI4.S4: 'Eighteen years old.'
5. JI4.S5: 'What do you like sport?'
6. JI4.S6: 'I like tennis and soccer.'
7. JI4.S7: 'What your hobby?'
8. JI4.S8: 'My hobby are read the book, play the game, and listen to music.'

## Clause list

1. JI4.C1: ‘What's your name?'
2. JI4.C2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI4.C3: 'OK, how old are you?'
4. JI4.C4: 'Eighteen years old.'
5. JI4.C5: 'What do you like sport?'
6. JI4.C6: ‘I like tennis and soccer.'
7. JI4.C7: 'What your hobby?'
8. JI4.C8(i): 'My hobby are [[read the book]], [[play the game]], and [[listen to music]].'
9. JI4.C8(ii): [[read the book]]
10. JI4.C8(iii): [[play the game]]
11. JI4.C8(iv): [[listen to music]]

Sentence JI4.S5: 'What do you like sport?'
Clause JI4.C5: 'What do you like sport?'

Analysis of clause JI4.C5

|  | ${ }^{\prime}$ What | do | you | like | sport? ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Pheno... | Pro: Mental... | Part: Senser | $\ldots$... $\rightarrow$ Emotive | ...menon |
|  | ng: Deictic... | v... | ng | ...g | ...+ Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Comple... | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | ...ment |
|  | Res... | Mood: interr |  | ...idue |  |
| text | interpersonal Theme | Rheme |  | ideational Theme |  |

Error list
E692: JI4.C5.1: EC34: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ Thematic structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to place the ideational Theme in the Rheme E693: JI4.C5.2: EC6: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a nominal group as discontinuous

Sentence JI4.S7: ‘What your hobby?’
Clause JI4.C7: 'What your hobby?'

Analysis of clause JI4.C7

|  | 'What | $\theta$ |  | your hobby?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identifier/Value | Pro |  | Part: Identified/Token |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Complement | Fin | Subject |  |
|  | Residue | Mood |  |  |
| text | interpersonal / ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |

Error list
E694: JI4.C7.1: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E695: J14.C7.2: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'

Sentence JI4.S8: 'My hobby are read the book, play the game, and listen to music.'
Clause JI4.C8(i): 'My hobby are [[read the book]], [[play the game]], and [[listen to music]].'
Clause JI4.C8(ii): [[read the book]]
Clause JI4.C8(iii): [[play the game]]
Clause JI4.C8(iv): [[listen to music]]

Analysis of clause JI4.C8(i)


Error list
E696: JI4.C8(i): EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular
*See below

## Clause JI4.C8[i-iii]:

Analysis of clause JI4.C8(i)

|  | [[ read | the | book]], | [[play | the | game]], | and | [ [listen | to music]]. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id-exp |  | ng : sp | + Thing |  | ng: sp | + Thing |  |  |  |
| int | vg: fin |  |  | vg: fin |  |  |  | vg : fin |  |
| text | . | rec |  |  | rec |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E697: JI4.C8[i].1: $\quad$ EC36b/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-identifiable' EC36b/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'identifiable'
E698: JI4.C8[ii].1: $\quad$ EC36b/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-identifiable' EC36b/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'identifiable'

E699: JI4.C8[i].2: $\quad$ EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect EC11b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'
E700: JI4.C8[i].3: $\quad$ EC15a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-finite' EC15a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ FINITENESS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'finite'
E701: JI4.C8[i].4:
EC2d/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-specific'
EC2d/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'specific'
E702 JI4.C8[ii].2: $\quad$ EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect
EC11b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'

E703: JI4.C8[ii].4:

E704: JI4.C8[iii].1:

EC2d/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-specific' EC2d/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'specific'
EC11b/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Aspect
EC11b/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ASPECT $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'perfective $\rightarrow$ zero'

## Text JI5

'I am going to talk to you. Are you ready?' 'Yes I am.' 'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'Why are you attracted our company?'
'I want to help for weak human.'

## Sentence list

1. JI5.S1: 'I am going to talk to you.
2. JI5.S2: Are you ready?'
3. JI5.S3: 'Yes I am.'
4. JI5.S4: 'What's your name?'
5. JI5.S5: 'My name is X.'
6. JI5.S6: 'Why are you attracted our company?'
7. JI5.S7: 'I want to help for weak human.'

Clause list

1. JI5.C1: 'I am going to talk to you.
2. JI5.C2: Are you ready?'
3. JI5.C3: 'Yes I am.'
4. JI5.C4: 'What's your name?
5. JI5.C5: 'My name is X.'
6. JI5.C6: 'Why are you attracted our company?'
7. JI5.C7(a): ‘I want
8. JI5.C7(b): to help for weak human.'

Sentence JI5.S6: 'Why are you attracted our company?'
Clause JI5.C6: 'Why are you attracted our company?'

Analysis of clause J15.C6


Error list
E705: J15.C6: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence JI5.S7: 'I want to help for weak human.'
Clause JI5.C7( $\alpha$ ): 'I want
Clause JI5.C7(' $\beta$ ): to help for weak human.'

Analysis of clauses J15.C7(a-b)


## Error list

E706: JI5.C7(' $\beta$ ).1: EC22c/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Participant as a Circumstance
E707: JI5.C7( $\beta$ ).2: EC29/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise a Complement as an Adjunct
E708: J55.C7( ${ }^{\beta} \beta$ ).3: EC3a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'plural'
EC3a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'singular'

## Text JI6

'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'Why did you choice this company?' 'Because I want to work with some musicians.' 'What work do you want to with some musicians?' 'I want to recording. I want to be recording director.' 'Nice. Next, teach me feature this company.'

## Sentence list

1. JI6.S1: ‘What's your name?'
2. JI6.S2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI6.S3: 'Why did you choice this company?'
4. JI6.S4: 'Because I want to work with some musicians.'
5. JI6.S5: 'What work do you want to with some musicians?'
6. JI6.S6: 'I want to recording.
7. JI6.S7: I want to be recording director.'
8. JI6.S8: 'Nice.
9. JI6.S9: Next, teach me feature this company.'.

Clause list

1. JI6.C1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI6.C2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI6.C3: 'Why did you choice this company?'
4. JI6.C4(a): ‘Because I want
5. JI6.C4(b): to work with some musicians.'
6. JI6.C5(a): 'What work do you want
7. JI6.C5(b): to with some musicians?'
8. JI6.C6(a): I want
9. JI6.C6(b): to recording.
10. JI6.C7(a): I want
11. JI6.C7(b): to be recording director.'
12. JI6.C8: 'Nice.
13. JI6.C9: Next, teach me feature this company.'

Sentence JI6.S3: 'Why did you choice this company?'
Clause JI6.C3: 'Why did you choice this company?'

Analysis of clause J16.C3


Error list
E709: JI6.C3: EC1b: Word rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of word class

Sentence JI6.S5: 'What work do you want to with some musicians?'
Clause JI6.C5( $\alpha$ ): 'What work do you want
Clause JI6.C5(' $\beta$ ): to with some musicians?'

Analysis of clauses J16.C5(i-ii)


## Error list

E710: JI6.C5(' $\beta$ ).1: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E711: JI6.C5(‘ $\beta$ ).2: EC28/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Predicator EC28/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Residue structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Predicator'

## Sentence JI6.S6: 'I want to recording.

Clause JI6.C6( $\alpha$ ): 'I want
Clause JI6.C6(' $\beta$ ): to recording.

Analysis of clauses J16.C6(i-ii)

|  | 'I | want |  | to recording. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material |
|  |  |  |  | vg: perf $\rightarrow$ ing |
| id: $\log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  | ' $\beta$ |
| int | Subject | Finite $^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator |
|  | Mood (decl) |  | Residue | Residue |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |

Error list
E712: JI6.C6(' $\beta$ ): EC11d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ structural $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of perfective aspect

Sentence JI6.S7: I want to be recording director.'
Clause JI6.C7( $\alpha$ ): I want
Clause JI6.C7( ${ }^{\prime} \beta$ ): to be recording director.'

Analysis of clauses J16.C7(a-b)

|  | I | want |  | to be |  | $\theta$ | recording | director.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Rel: Int $\rightarrow$ Att | Attribute |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng : | sing | + Classifier | + Thing |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E713: JI6.C7(' $\beta$ ): EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence JI6.S9: Next, teach me feature this company.'
Clause JI6.C9: Next, teach me feature [this company].'

Analysis of clause J16.C9

|  | Next, | teach | me | $\theta$ | feature | $\theta$ | is company].' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Pro: Material | Part: Goal | Part: Goal |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ng: sing | + Thing | + Qualifier |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Min Pro | Minor Range |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Conj Adj | Predicator | Complement | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Residue: imp | Residue: imp |  |  |  |  |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E714: JI6.C9.1: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'
E715: JI6.C9.2: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

## Text JI7

'What's your name?' 'My name is X.' 'Where are you from?' 'I from in Chiba.' 'How old are you?' 'I'm eighteen years old.' 'When is your birthday?' 'It's March.'

## Sentence list

1. JI7.S1: ‘What's your name?’
2. JI7.S2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI7.S3: 'Where are you from?'
4. JI7.S4: 'I from Chiba.'
5. JI7.S5: 'How old are you?'
6. JI7.S6: 'I'm eighteen years old.'
7. JI7.S7: 'When is your birthday?'
8. JI7.S8: 'It's March.'

## Clause list

1. JI7.C1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI7.C2: 'My name is $X$.'
3. JI7.C3: 'Where are you from?'
4. JI7.C4: ‘I from Chiba.'
5. JI7.C5: 'How old are you?'
6. JI7.C6: 'I'm eighteen years old.'
7. JI7.C7: 'When is your birthday?'
8. JI7.C8: 'It's March.'

## Sentence JI7.S4: 'I from Chiba.'

Clause JI7.C4: 'I from Chiba.'


Error list
E716: JI7.C4.1: EC22a/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Process
EC22a/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Process'
E717: J17.C4.2: EC27b/1: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Finite
EC27b/2: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ interpersonal $\rightarrow$ Mood structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Finite'

## Text JI8

'What's your name?' 'My name's X.' 'Why do you want to work my company?' 'Because I use my professional skill.' 'What's your skill?' 'It's difficult skill.' 'Where did you study it?' 'I studied in Z University.' 'How long had you studied it?' 'I had studied it for four years.'

## Sentence list

1. JI8.S1: ‘What's your name?'
2. JI8.S2: 'My name is X.'
3. JI8.S3: 'Why do you want to work my company?'
4. JI8.S4: ‘Because I use my professional skill.'
5. JI8.S5: 'What's your skill?'
6. JI8.S6: 'It's difficult skill.'
7. JI8.S7: 'Where did you study it?'
8. JI8.S8: ‘I studied in Z University.'
9. JI8.S9: ‘How long had you studied it?’
10. JI8.S10: ‘I had studied it for four years.'

Clause list

1. JI8.C1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI8.C2: 'My name is X .'
3. JI8.C3(a): 'Why do you want
4. JI8.C3(b): to work my company?'
5. JI8.C4: ‘Because I use my professional skill.'
6. JI8.C5: 'What's your skill?'
7. JI8.C6: ‘It’s difficult skill.’
8. JI8.C7: 'Where did you study it?'
9. JI8.C8: 'I studied in Z University.'
10. JI8.C9: ‘How long had you studied it?’
11. JI8.C10: 'I had studied it for four years.'

Sentence JI8.S3: 'Why do you want to work my company?'
Clause JI8.C3( $\alpha$ ): ‘Why do you want
Clause JI8.C3(' $\beta$ ): to work my company?’

Analysis of clause JI8.C3(i-ii)

|  | 'Why | do | you | want | to work | $\Theta$ | my | company?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Reason |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative | projected Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Pro: Material | Circ: Behalf |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Min Pro |  | or Range |
| id:log | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | Predicator |  |  |  |
|  | Res... | Mood (inter) |  | ...idue | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |

Error list
E718: JI8.C3(' $\beta$ ): EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

Sentence JI8.S4: 'Because I use my professional skill.'
Clause JI8.C4: 'Because I use my professional skill.'

Analysis of clause JI8.C4

|  | 'Because | I | use |  | my profession |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material |  | Part: Goal |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Complement |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E719: JI8.C4: EC21b: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-log or interpersonal $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of future time

Sentence JI8.S6: 'It's difficult skill.'
Clause JI8.C6: 'It's difficult skill.'

Analysis of clause JI8.C6

|  | 'It | 's |  | $\Theta$ | difficult | skill.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Identified | Pro: Relational: Intensive $\rightarrow$ Identifying | Part: Identifier |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ng: | sing | + Epithet | + Thing |
| id: $\log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Subject | Finite+: present | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E720: JI8.C6: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'

Sentence JI8.S9: 'How long had you studied it?'
Clause JI8.C9: 'How long had you studied it?'

Analysis of clause JI8.C9

|  | 'How long |  | had | you | studied | it? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Circ: Duration |  |  | Part: Actor | Pro: Material | Part: Goal |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| int | Adjunct |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: past | Subject | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Res... |  | Mood: interr |  |  | ...idue |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme |  |  |  |
|  | Theme |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E721: J-I8.C9: EC14d: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-log $\rightarrow$ SECONDARY TENSE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select from the system

## Text JI9

'What's your name?' 'I am X.' 'Why do you want to join us?' 'Because your company have good future.' 'Why do you think so?' 'You discovered new technology. I think this is great technology.' 'Where team do you want to join?' 'I want to join electric team, because I want to distribute.' 'Come the team room next Wednesday. This is over.'

## Sentence list

1. JI9.S1: ‘What's your name?'
2. JI9.S2: ‘I am X.'
3. JI9.S3: 'Why do you want to join us?'
4. JI9.S4: 'Because your company have good future.'
5. JI9.S5: 'Why do you think so?'
6. JI9.S6: 'You discovered new technology.
7. JI9.S7: I think this is great technology.'
8. JI9.S8: 'Where team do you want to join?'
9. JI9.S9: 'I want to join electric team, because I want to distribute.'
10. JI9.S10: ‘Come the team room next Wednesday.
11. J19.S11: This is over.'

## Clause list

1. JI9.C1: 'What's your name?'
2. JI9.C2: ‘I am X.'
3. JI9.C3(a): ‘Why do you want
4. JI9.C3(b): to join us?'
5. JI9.C4: 'Because your company have good future.'
6. JI9.C5: ‘Why do you think so?’
7. JI9.C6: 'You discovered new technology.
8. JI9.C7(a): I think
9. JI9.C7(b): this is great technology.'
10. JI9.C8(a): 'Where team do you want
11. JI9.C8(b): to join?'
12. JI9.C9(a): ‘I want
13. JI9.C9(b): to join electric team,
14. JI9.C10(a): because I want
15. JI9.C10(b): to distribute.'
16. J19.C11: 'Come the team room next Wednesday.
17. JI9.C12: This is over'

Sentence JI9.S4: 'Because your company have good future,'
Clause JI9.C4: 'Because your company have good future.'

Analysis of clause JI9.C4


Error list
E722: JI9.C4.1: EC2a/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'singular'
EC2a/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEICTIC NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-singular'
E723: JI9.C4.2: EC12a/1: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ ideational $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'non-singular'
EC12a/2: Group rank (verbal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ EVENT NUMBER $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'singular'

## Sentence JI9.S8: 'Where team do you want to join?'

Clause JI9.C8( $\alpha$ ): ‘Where team do you want
Clause JI9.C8(' $\beta$ ): to join?’

Analysis of clause JI9.C8

|  | ${ }^{\prime}$ Where team |  | do | you | want | to join?' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Goal |  |  | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative | projected Meta-Phenomenon |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Pro: Material |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |
| int | Complement |  | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Subject | Predicator | Complement |
|  | Resi... |  | Mood: interr |  |  | ...due |
| text | interpersonal | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |

Error list
E724: JI9.C8( $\alpha$ ): EC1a: Word rank $\rightarrow$ LEXICAL SYSTEM $\rightarrow$ incorrect selection from a lexical system

Sentence JI9.S9: 'I want to join electric team, because I want to distribute.'
Clause JI9.C9( $\alpha$ ): 'I want
Clause JI9.C9( $-\beta$ ): to join electric team,

Analysis of clauses JI9.C9a-b

|  | 'I | want |  | to join |  | $\Theta$ | electric | team, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp | Part: Senser | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  | Part: Meta-Phenomenon |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Pro: Material |  |  | Pert: G |  |
|  | , |  |  |  | ng : | sp | + Classifier | + Thing |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | Expansion: $\alpha$ (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ ) |
| int | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: present | Predicator | Predicator | Complement |  |  |  |
|  | Mood: decl |  | Residue | Residue |  |  |  |  |
| text | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{3}$ |  | Rheme ${ }^{4}$ |  | id |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Error list

E725: JI9.C9( ${ }^{-} \beta$ ).1: EC36/1: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'identifiable'
EC36/2: Around the clause $\rightarrow$ textual $\rightarrow$ REFERENCE $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'non-identifiable'
E726: JI9.C9(' $\beta$ ).2: EC2c/1: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of 'specific' EC2c/2: Group rank (nominal) $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ DEIXIS $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to realise 'non-specific'

Clause JI9.C10( $\alpha$ ): because I want
Clause JI9.C10(' $\beta$ ): to distribute.'

Analysis of clauses JI9.C10a-b

|  | because | I | want |  |  | to distribute.' |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id:exp |  | Part: Senser |  |  | Part: Phenomenon |  |
|  |  |  | Pro: Mental $\rightarrow$ Desiderative |  |  | Pro: Material |
| $\mathrm{id}: \log$ | $x \beta \quad$ (Projection: $\alpha$ |  |  |  |  | ' $\beta$ |
| int |  | Subject | Finite ${ }^{+}$: pres | Predicator |  | Predicator |
|  |  | Mood |  | Residue |  | Residue |
| text | textual | ideational | Rheme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Theme ${ }^{5}$ |  |  |  | Rheme ${ }^{6}$ |  |
|  | Rheme ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Error list
E727: JI9.C10(' $\beta$ ): EC24: Clause rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-experiential $\rightarrow$ intended realisation unrecoverable

Sentence JI9.S10: 'Come the team room next Wednesday.
Clause JI9.C11: 'Come the team room next Wednesday.

Analysis of clause JI9.C11

|  | 'Come | $\Theta$ | the team room | next Wednesday. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| id: $\exp$ | Pro: Material | Circ: Place |  | Circ: Time |
|  |  | Min Pre | Minor Range |  |
| id:log |  |  |  |  |
| int | Predicator |  | Adjunct | Adjunct |
| (imp) | Residue |  |  |  |
| text | ideational |  |  |  |
|  | Theme | Rheme |  |  |

Error list
E728: JI9.C11: EC18/1: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ instantial $\rightarrow$ incorrect realisation of Minor Process
EC18/2: Phrase rank $\rightarrow$ ideational-exp $\rightarrow$ Phrase Transitivity structure $\rightarrow$ incorrect choice to select 'null Minor Process'

## Appendix 6 Tables of errors

The following tables list all the errors in the data. They are laid out in tables, one table per category or sub-category. Within each category, the errors are listed in the order they appear in the Texts (see Appendix 1-5).
Table EC1a: List of EC1a 40 errors ..... 757
Table EC1b List of EC1b 10 errors ..... 759
Table EC2a: List of EC2a 86 errors ..... 760
Table EC2b: List of EC2b 4 errors ..... 764
Table EC2c: List of EC2c 48 errors ..... 765
Table EC2d: List of EC2d 4 errors ..... 767
Table EC2e: List of EC2e 14 errors ..... 768
Table EC3a: List of EC3a 55 errors ..... 769
Table EC3b: List of EC3b 3 errors ..... 772
Table EC4: List of EC4 4 errors ..... 772
Table EC5: List of EC5 1 errors ..... 772
Table EC6: List of EC6 4 errors ..... 773
Table EC7a: EC7a 1 error ..... 773
Table EC7b: EC7b 1 error ..... 773
Table EC7c: EC7c 1 error ..... 774
Table EC7d: EC7d 1 error ..... 774
Table EC8: List of EC8 2 errors ..... 774
Table EC9: List of EC9 7 errors ..... 775
Table EC10: List of EC10 4 errors ..... 775
Table EC11a: List of EC11a 5 errors ..... 776
Table EC11b: List of EC11b 10 errors ..... 776
Table EC11c: List of EC11c 3 errors ..... 777
Table EC12a: List of EC12a 9 errors ..... 778
Table EC12b: List of EC12b 5 errors ..... 778
Table EC13: EC13 1 error ..... 779
Table EC14a: List of EC14a 5 errors ..... 779
Table EC14b: List of EC14b 2 errors ..... 779
Table EC14c: EC14c 1 error ..... 780
Table EC14d: EC14d 7 error s ..... 780
Table EC15a: List of EC15a 17 errors ..... 781
Table EC15b: List of EC15b 10 errors ..... 782
Table EC16a: List of EC16a 1 error ..... 783
Table EC16b: EC16b 2 errors ..... 783
Table EC17: List of EC17 9 errors ..... 784
Table EC18: List of EC18 53 errors ..... 785
Table EC19: EC19 1 error ..... 788
Table EC20. EC20 1 error ..... 788
Table EC21a: List of EC21a 3 errors ..... 788
Table EC21b: List of EC21b 6 errors ..... 789
Table EC22a: List of EC22a 26 errors ..... 790
Table EC22b: List of EC22b 15 errors ..... 791
Table EC22c/1 and Table EC29/1: List of 10 EC22c/1 and EC29/1 errors ..... 793
Table EC22c/2 and Table EC29/2: List of 5 EC22c/1 and EC29/1 errors ..... 794
Table EC22d: EC22d 1 error ..... 794
Table EC23a: List of EC23a 2 errors ..... 794
Table EC23b: EC23b 1 error ..... 795
Table EC24: List of EC24 3 errors ..... 796
Table EC25: List of EC25 1 error ..... 796
Table EC26a: List of EC26a 32 errors ..... 797
Table EC26b: List of EC26b 3 errors ..... 799
Table EC27a: List of EC27a 13 errors ..... 800
Table EC27b: List of EC27b 18 errors ..... 801
Table EC28: List of EC28 9 errors ..... 802
Table EC30: List of EC30 1 error ..... 802
Table EC31: List of EC31 2 errors ..... 803
Table EC32: List of EC32 1 error ..... 803
Table EC33a: List of EC33a 11 errors ..... 804
Table EC33b: List of EC33b 2 errors ..... 804
Table EC34: List of EC34 3 errors ..... 805
Table EC35: List of EC35 3 errors ..... 805
Table EC36a: List of EC36a 47 errors ..... 806
Table EC36b: List of EC36b 4 errors ..... 808
Table EC37a: List of EC37a 1 error ..... 809
Table EC37b: List of EC37b 1 error ..... 809
Table EC37c: List of EC37c 1 error ..... 809
Table EC38: List of EC38 2 errors ..... 809
Table EC39a: List of EC39a 28 errors. ..... 810
Table EC39b: List of EC39b 10 errors ..... 812
Table EC39c: List of EC39c 10 errors ..... 812
Table EC39d: List of EC39d 1 error ..... 813

Table EC1a: List of 41 EC1a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E33: S-I4.C10 | I necessary to bring my iPod. |
| E51: S-I6.C5.2 | Chiba is good place [for live]. |
| E66: S-I7.C12 | By the way, are you like sneakers. |
| E68: S-I7.C14 | I'm collected Air Jordans, Puma, Adidas and Pro-Keds. |
| E99: S-I10.C7 | (I live there) when I was born. |
| E130: S-I11.C9.2 | I especially like Donald Duck in Disney character. |
| E173: S-I14.C13(‘ $\beta$ ) | (I think) he is the best player [all over the world]. |
| E189: S-I16.C3 | My tall is l50cm. |
| E206: S-I16.C10(‘ß).2 | (I want) to go to abroad concert someday! |
| E220: S-I17.C7.2 | She play piano well more [than me]. |
| E226: S-I17.C12.4 | I had go Okinawa at March. |
| E228: S-I17.C14 | (Now I don't have money.) Because my university is very far [to home]. (So I don't have time I can't work.) |
| E269: S-I19.C15 | (Why does university students have to find a job) while stay university? |
| E272: S-I20.C2 | I am called ' $Y$ ' from my friends. |
| E281: S-I20.C11 | (We don't have pets) but we took care of hamsters few years ago. |
| E284: S-I21.C12 | (I have had seven cats) when I was a child. |
| E302: SR3.C3.5 | I usually go to shopping at afternoon. |
| E308: SR3.C7.3 | I usually study English at morning. |
| E313: SR3.C10.2 | I usually study English at short time. |

Table EC1a: List of 41 EC1a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E314: SR4.C5 | I usually sleep during ten hours. |
| E322: SR5.C6.3 | I usually eat breakfast at morning. |
| E373: LW2.C4 | By tennis, I lost many times, (but very fun') |
| E380: LW2.C7 | My skill was not well. |
| E394: LW4.C7.4 | My father recently falls to ladder (and he had broken his arm.) |
| E404: LW5.C7.4 | I gave for him photo book. |
| E405: LW5.C11 | His family was very kind of me. |
| E413: LW7.C4.2 | I did part-time job Saturday every day, (so I study little at night.) |
| E420: LW7.C8 | Sunday, I received ToEIC, (after that I met my friend and friend's family.) |
| E427: LW7.C16 | I studied my homework. |
| E494: LW15.C13.4 | (It was hot day', so I put off jacket. |
| E543: LW17.C2.4 | I hoped for grandmother in the hospital. |
| E555: FD1.C4(' $\beta$ ).2 | (I want) to do happy life |
| E562: FD2.C4.3 | I will study English in summer holiday every day in 2 hours. |
| E597: FD4.C5 | They looked beautiful and cool for me. |
| E607: FD5.C5.2 | I'm going to become famous supervisor after 15 years. |
| E611: FD6.C10 | I have an another dream. |
| E623: FD7.C3.3 | (Because I like English) from become a university student |
| E648: FD9.C10(' $\beta$ ).2 | I didn't know what Australian spoke to me. |

Table EC1a: List of 41 EC1a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E674: JI2.C10(i).2 | 'I want [[to join two years ago]].' |
| E675: JI1.C13 | Do you have a passion about job? |
| E678: JI2.C7 | What do your hobbies? |
| E724: J19.C8 $(\alpha)$ | Where team do you want (to join)? |

Table EC1b: List of 10 EC1b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E94: S-I10.C4.2 | (My hometown is Tsukubamirai City). There is very beautiful city. |
| E97: S-I10.C5.3 | There has rice field surrounded my house |
| E152: S-I12.C16(' $\beta$ ).3 | (I prefer foreign movie [to J movie] because I think) foreign movie is more excite [than Japanese movie] (...) |
| E275: S-I20.C5.2 | So Tokyo is useful and convenience city. |
| E474: LW13.C9 | It was really enjoy. |
| E553: FD1.C2.2 | Because of I use English in my job. |
| E653: FD10.C8(' $\beta$ ) | (..., so I study English very hard) and I want to understand there. |
| E673: JI1.C8 | 'T'm interesting in this company'. |
| E691: J13.C7.3 | Why do you choice our company? |
| E709: JI6.C3 | Why did you choice this company? |

Table EC2a: List of 86 EC2a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E17: S-I.C11.2 | (And I couldn't come this class for two weeks.) Because I have to go \{pg \{sing very important tournament\}\}. |
| E23: S-I2.C7(' $\beta$ ). 3 | (I want) to get \{over 500 [of TOEIC score], all credit and \{sing driver's licence\}\}. |
| E37: S-I4.C13.2 | My part-time job is \{pg \{sing supermarket\}\}. |
| E46: S-I5.C13 | I'm working \{at \{sing hotel and fitness club\}\}. |
| E47: S-I6.C3.1 | I'm \{sing [4 year] student\}. |
| E50: S-I6.C5.1 | Chiba is \{sing good place [[for live ]] \}. |
| E80: S-I8.C11.2 | My part-time job is \{pg \{sing flower shop [in Daiei ] \}\}. |
| E92: S-I9.C14( ${ }^{\text {P }}$ ) | (I think) I'm \{sing dull person\}. |
| E93: S-I10.C4.1 | There is [sing very beautiful city]. |
| E103: S-I10.C12 | (I learn to dance) when I was \{sing high school student\}. |
| E104: S-I10.C13 | I went \{to \{sing dance studio\}\} twice [a week]. |
| E133: S-I12.C4 | I'm \{sing only child, \} (so I want to get brothers or sisters!) |
| E138: S-I12.C8 | (I began play volleyball) when I was \{sing junior high school student\} (and I continue it). |
| E141: S-I12.C11.2 | I often go \{pg \{sing book shop or library\}\} (and I buy or rent it, so I read a book two weeks.) |
| E161: S-I13.C8 | I work \{in \{sing pub\}\}. |
| E181: S-I15.C8[i]. 2 | (My part-time job is) \{ [[working \{pg \{sing bar at baseball stadium]]\}\} and [[cleaning for airline]] \}. |
| E182: S-I15.C8[i]. 3 | (My part-time job is) \{ [[working bar \{at \{sing baseball stadium]] \}\} and [[cleaning for airline]] \}. |
| E183: S-I15.C8[ii] | (My part-time job is) \{ [[working bar at baseball stadium]] \} and [[cleaning \{for \{sing airline]] \}]\}. |
| E184: S-I15.C10 | (I hate cats) because I have \{sing cat allergy\}. |
| E188: S-I15.C16 | I'm \{sing [ [3rd year] student\}. |

## Table EC2a: List of 86 EC2a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E193: S-I16.C5.3 | I \{sing member [of dance club] \}. |
| E194: S-I16.C5.4 | I \{member [\{ of \{sing dance club\}\} ] \}. |
| E205: S-I16.C10(' $\beta$ ).1 | (I want) to go \{to \{sing abroad concert\}\} someday! |
| E207: S-I16.C11 | When I was \{sing high school student\}, (I went to Australia.) |
| E217: S-I17.C5 | She is \{sing junior high school student\}. |
| E221: S-I17.C8 | My mother is \{sing piano teacher\}. |
| E232: S-I18.C2 | I'm \{sing [3'd grade] student\}. |
| E235: S-I18.C10 | When I was \{sing high school student\}, (I joined to track and field club) |
| E240: S-I18.C16 | Yamagata is \{sing very beautiful place\}. |
| E251: S-I18.C20.6 | But \{sing rather cold place\}. |
| E255: S18.C22.2 | (I hate frog.) So, please not show \{sing frog\} to me. |
| E256: S-I18.C23 | I'm \{sing only child\}. |
| E274: S-I20.C5.1 | So Tokyo is \{sing useful and convenience city\}. |
| E280: S-I20.C9 | We are maybe \{sing nice family\}. |
| E290: SR2.C3 | I work \{at \{sing Disney store\}\}. |
| E309: SR3.C9.1 | (I usually study English) use \{sing textbook\}. |
| E312: SR3.C10.1 | I usually study English \{at \{sing short time\}\}. |
| E338: SR7.C5.1 | I watching \{sing movie\}. |
| E341: SR7.C6.1 | It's \{\{sing musical movie\}, Disney movie\}. |
| E342: SR7.C6.2 | It's \{musical movie, \{sing Disney movie\}]. |

## Table EC2a: List of 86 EC2a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E346: SR7.C13 | I go \{to \{sing cafe\}\}. |
| E371: LW2.C3.2 | I bought \{clothes, \{sing hat\}, and book\} there. |
| E372: LW2.C3.3 | I bought \{clothes, hat, and \{sing book\} there. |
| E384: LW2.C11 | I watched \{sing DVD\}. |
| E393: LW4.C7.3 | My father recently falls \{to \{sing ladder \}\} (and he had broken his arm.) |
| E403: LW5.C7.3 | I gave for him \{sing photo book\}. |
| E410: LW6.C6 | (It was very busy.) Because Sunday was \{sing holiday\}. |
| E416: LW7.C6.2 | My part-time is \{at \{sing restaurant [[which is beef tongue]] \}\}. |
| E424: LW7.C10.2 | We went \{pg \{sing restaurant\}\} (and then we talked about new things.) |
| E425: LW7.C12 | On Sunday, I bought \{sing cosmetic item\} (because I love it!) |
| E432: LW8.C7.2 | I ate \{pg \{sing Chinese restaurant\}\} at Chiba near the station. |
| E444: LW10.C9.1 | I bought \{\{sing new bag\}, T-shirt, and some books\}. |
| E445: LW10.C9.2 | I bought \{new bag, \{sing T-shirt\}, and some books\}. |
| E458: LW11.C5.4 | (After we play tennis) went \{to \{sing cafe\}\}. |
| E460: LW12.C2 | I bought \{\{sing bag\} and shoes\}. |
| E490: LW15.C12 | It was \{sing hot day\}, (so I put off jacket.) |
| E531: LW16.C23.1 | I used \{sing umbrella\} |
| E547: LW17.C5.3 | I go \{to \{sing, fireworks festival\}\}. |
| E554: FD1.C4(' $\beta$ ).1 | (I want) to do \{sing happy life\}. |
| E556: FD1.C5 | I will have \{\{sing husband\} and two children\}. |

## Table EC2a: List of 86 EC2a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E571: FD2.C8 | I will go \{to \{sing festival\}\} with my friend. |
| E580: FD2.C11[i]). 3 | (My future dream is) [[ [sing Wedding Planner\} ]]. |
| E581: FD2.C14 | $I$ will be \{sing wedding planner\}. |
| E586: FD3.C3(' $\beta \mathrm{i}$ ). 4 | (But I want) to \{work [[that use English]]. \{Such as \{sing CA\}, hotel woman and announcer\}\}. |
| E587: FD3.C3(' $\beta \mathrm{i}) .5$ | (But I want) to work [[that use English]]. \{Such as \{CA, \{sing hotel woman\} and announcer\}. |
| E588: FD3.C3(' $\beta \mathrm{i}) .6$ | (But I want) to work [[that use English]]. \{Such as CA, hotel woman and \{sing announcer\}\}. |
| E592: FD3.C7 | I'll be \{sing good English speaker\}, (and then they can rely on me) |
| E593: FD4.C1[i] | My future dream is [[to be sing cabin attendant]] |
| E594: FD4.C2(' $\beta$ ) | (I want) to be \{sing cabin attendant\} (because when I went to Taiwan two years ago I was attracted by CA.) |
| E601: FD5.C1('ßi) | (I want) to become \{sing supervisor [[who make TV program]] \}. |
| E602: FD5.C1(' $\beta \mathrm{iii}$ ) | (I want) to become \{sing supervisor [[who make TV program]] \}. |
| E606: FD5.C5.1 | I'm going to become \{sing famous supervisor\} after 15 years. |
| E613: FD6.C11( $\left.{ }^{( } \beta\right)$ | (I'd like) to marry (with \{sing American\} or European\}. |
| E617: FD7.C1( $\left.{ }^{\text {® }} \mathrm{i}\right) .1$ | (I will want) to do \{sing [[need English]] job\}. |
| E624: FD7.C4( ${ } \beta$ ) | (I want) to get \{sing TOEIC score\}. |
| E627: FD8.C7 | I will go \{to \{sing foreign country\}]. [Because I can know different thinking] |
| E630: FD9.C1[i]. 3 | My future dream is [[ \{\{sing cabin attendant\} or hotelman\} ]] |
| E640: FD9.C4.1 | \{sing Smile\} is happy life. |
| E641: FD9.C4.2 | Smile is \{sing happy life\}. |
| E642: FD9.C6 | When I was \{sing high school student\}, (I have been to Australia) |

Table EC2a: List of 86 EC2a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E658: FD11.C2 (' $\beta$ ) | (I hope) to work \{in \{sing airport\}\}. |
| E688: JI2.C15 | 'Do you have \{\{sing sister\} or brother\}?'' |
| E689: JI3.C6(b) | (I want) to be \{sing professional engineer\} in your company.' |
| E713: J16.C7 (' $\beta$ ) | (I want) to be \{sing recording director\}.' |
| E715: JI6.C9.2 | Next, teach me \{sing feature [this company] \}. |
| E720: J18.C6 | It's \{sing\} difficult skill. |
| E722: JI9.C4.1 | 'Because your company have \{sing good future\}.' |

Table EC2b: List of 4 EC2b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E109: S-I10.C18[i].1 | I like [[watch a movie]]. |
| E112: S-I10.C19 | If I had a free time I watched a movie on my TV. |
| E283: S-I20.C17 | If you have a time, please come to my shop! |
| E328: SR6.C7.2 | I listening a music. |

## Table EC2c: List of 47 EC2c errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E2: S-I1.C6.2 | Kumamon is \{sp favourite character\}. |
| E5: S-I1.C7.2 | \{sp Favourite foods\} is Karashirenkon, and Basashi. |
| E12: S-I1.C9.3 | I join \{sp yachting club\}. |
| E45: S-I5.C10.2 | I'm \{sp youngest\}. |
| E75: S-I8.C5.2 | I have \{ [ljob hunting]] and sp final karate club competition\}. |
| E86: S-I9.C9.2 | \{sp [[I usually listen]] music\} is 60's ~ 70's music. |
| E101: S-I10.C8.2 | My grandmother is \{sp most kind person [in my family] \}. |
| E108: S-I10.C17.2 | I practise hard \{for \{sp next event\}\}. |
| E156: S-I13.C3.2 | I live in Ichikawa City \{with \{sp twin sister\}\}. |
| E196: S-I16.C6.2 | [sp Dance club's] name is Rabbit. |
| E214: S-I16.C15.2 | I like \{sp weather [in Australia] \}. |
| E239: S-I18.C11.4 | (When I was high school student,) I joined to \{sp track and field club\}. |
| E242: S-I18.C17.2 | \{sp Air\} is clear, (people is very kind, and food is delicious.) |
| E245: S-I18.C19.2 | (Air is clear, people is very kind), and \{sp food\} is delicious. |
| E278: S-I20.C7.2 | I use \{\{sp Sobu Line\}, Keisei Line and Musashino Line\}. |
| E289: SR2.C2.2 | I go to \{sp \{work place\}\} by car. |
| E301: SR3.C3.4 | I usually go to shopping \{at \{sp afternoon\}\}. |
| E307: SR3.C7.2 | I usually study English \{at \{sp morning\}\}. |
| E321: SR5.C6.2 | I usually eat breakfast \{at \{sp morning\}]. |
| E325: SR6.C3.2 | I visit \{ [\{sp grandmother's] house\}. |

## Table EC2c: List of 47 EC2c errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E336: SR7.C3.2 | I visit [\{sp grandmother's] house\} with my mother. |
| E367: LW1.C7[i]. 4 | (My purpose is) [[ [sp No.l badminton player [in Japan] \} ]]. |
| E408: LW6.C4.2 | \{After \{sp TOEIC test\}], I did my part-time job from 6.00pm to 1.00am. |
| E422: LW7.C9.2 | (Sunday, I received TOEIC, ) after that I met \{my friend and [\{sp friend's] family\} \}. |
| E435: LW8.C10.2 | (I ate Chinese restaurant at Chiba near the station.)...we went \{to \{sp Chinese restaurant\} ${ }_{L}$. |
| E447: LW10.C10.2 | \{sp New bag\} is very cute. |
| E449: LW10.C11.2 | [sp T-shirt\} is very cool. |
| E473: LW13.C8.3 | (I went to a restaurant with my friends after the TOEIC.) We talked five hours in \{a/sp restaurant \}. |
| E488: LW15.C8.4 | (I went to X University) where \{sp TOEIC place \}. |
| E492: LW15.C13.2 | (It was hot day,) so I put off \{sp jacket\}. |
| E496: LW15.C14.2 | Before \{sp test\}, I listening to music. |
| E499: LW15.C15.2 | [sp Test) was very hard. |
| E504: LW16.C5.4 | (I visit the university at 11:25,) but \{sp test\} begin at 13:00. |
| E509: LW16.C10.4 | I can't hear \{sp listening [TEST] \}, (but I hard on writing test.) |
| E513: LW16.C11.4 | (I can't hear listening [TEST],) but I hard \{on \{sp writing test\}\}. |
| E516: LW16.C12.3 | \{sp Test \} was finished 15:00. |
| E519: LW16.C15.2 | \{ [sp Movie's] title\} is Boom. |
| E522: LW16.C18.2 | (After, I went to watch a movie with my mother.) ... After I watched \{sp movie\}, (back to my home.) |
| E536: LW16.C24.3 | \{sp [[I eat]] dinner\} is instant food. |
| E541: LW17.C2.2 | I hoped \{for \{sp grandmother\}\} in the hospital. |

Table EC2c: List of 47 EC2c errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E549: LW17.C6.2 | I enjoyed \{sp fireworks festival. |
| E558: FD2.C1.2 | I will go to Hawaii (in \{sp summer holidays\}) with my family. |
| E561: FD2.C4.2 | I will study English \{in \{sp summer holiday\}\} every day in 2 hours. |
| E577: FD2.C10 (' $\beta$ ).3 | to go \{to \{sp festival [the most fireworks] \}\}. |
| E591: FD3.C5.2 | (For my future dream, I should study English) and I'll get \{sp dream\} |
| E655: FD10.C9.2 | I'm interested \{in \{sp sightseeing business\}\}. |
| E726: J19.C9 (' $\beta$ ).2 | ('Where team do you want to join? 'I want) to join \{sp electric team\}, (because I want to distribute) |

Table EC2d: List of 4 EC2d errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E145: S-I12.C14[i].2 | (I like) [[ watch \{the movie\} ]], too. |
| E287SR1.C4.2 | I usually buy the clothes. |
| E701: JI4.C8(ii).4 | ('My hobby are) \{\{ [[read the book]] \}, [[play the game]], and [[listen to music]] \}.' |
| E703: JI4.C8(iii).4 | ('My hobby are) \{[[read the book]], \{ [[play the game]] \}, and [[listen to music]] \}.' |

## Table EC2e: List of 15 EC2e errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E105: S-I10.C15 | I belong to \{ ? dance circle, 'Rabbit'\}. |
| E323: SR6.C1 | I go \{to \{ ? part time job\}\}. |
| E331: SR6.C16.1 | I swimming \{in \{ ? pool\}\}. |
| E347: SR8.C2 | I often study English for TOIEC \{in \{ ? library\}\}. |
| E387: LW3.C3 | I did \{ ? TOEIC pre-test\}. |
| E389: LW3.C11 | I did \{ ? TOEIC test\}. |
| E411: LW7.C2 | (Last weekend, I did my homework) and I studied \{for \{ ? test\}, (but i didn't have enough time) |
| E412: LW7.C4.1 | I did \{ ? part-time job\} Saturday [in a day], (so I study little at night.) |
| E429: LW8.C1.2 | I had \{ ? test [of driving] \} on last weekend. |
| E441: LW10.C3 | The movie is \{\{ ? Disney movie\}, "Nemo"\}. |
| E443: LW10.C7 | (After I saw it,) I went (to \{ ? shopping mall\} \}. |
| E459: LW12.C1 | I went \{to \{ ? mall\}\} with my mother. |
| E480: LW15.C1.2 | Last weekend is \{ ? TOEIC test \}. |
| E500: LW16.C3 | I used \{ ? Train\}. |
| E560: LW16.C23.1 | (I walked my house, ) used \{ ? umbrella\} |

## Table EC3a: List of 54 EC3a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E22: S-I2.C7( $\left.{ }^{( } \beta\right) .2$ | (I want) to get over 500 [of TOEIC score], \{all credit\} and driver's licence. |
| E24: S-I2.C9 | I like \{movie\}. |
| E35: S-I4.C11.2 | Then, \{my favourite food\} is yakiniku and curry. |
| E53: S-I6.C6 | \{My hobby\} is [[playing baseball]], [[snowboarding]], [[reading book]], [[listening music]] and [[watching movie]]. |
| E54: S-I6.C6[ii] | My hobby is [[playing baseball]], [[snowboarding]], [[reading \{ book \}]], [[listening music]] and [[watching movie]]. |
| E55: S-I6.C6[iv] | My hobby is [[playing baseball]], [[snowboarding]], [[reading book]], [[listening music]] and [[watching \{movie]]]. |
| E56: S-I6.C7 | \{My favourite movie\} are "Snatch", ... and "Joe Black". |
| E61: S-I7.C5[ii] | For example, enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country]. |
| E62: S-I7.C5.4 | For example, enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country]. |
| E63: S-I7.C5.5 | For example, enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country]. |
| E96: S-I10.C5.2 | There has \{rice field\} surrounded my house. |
| E123: S-I11.C6(' $\beta$ [i]). 5 | I feel especially [[Tokyo Dome held \{\{baseball match\}, concert\}]] is very interesting.[...] |
| E124: S-I11. C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]) .6$ | I feel especially [[Tokyo Dome held \{baseball match, \{concert\}]]] is very interesting. [...] |
| E127: S-I11.C8.3 | For example \{ \{Disney movie\}, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character \}. |
| E128: S-I11.C8.4 | For example \{ Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, \{Disney character \} \}. |
| E129: S-I11.C9.1 | I especially like Donald Duck \{in \{Disney character\}\}. |
| E132: S-I11.C11 | But I have \{[a lot of] class\}. |
| E134: S-I12.C6 | [My hobby\} is ([ [playing volleyball]] and [[reading book]] ). |
| E135: S-I12.C6[ii] | (My hobby is) \{ [[playing volleyball]] and [[reading \{book\} ]] \}. |
| E148: S-I12.C15.1 | I prefer [foreign movie [to Japanese movie] \} (because I think...) |

## Table EC3a: List of 54 EC3a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E149: S-I12.C15.2 | I prefer \{foreign movie [to Japanese movie] \} (because I think...) |
| E150: S-12.C16( $\beta$ ) . 1 | (I prefer foreign movie [to Japanese movie] because I think) \{foreign movie〕 is more excite [than Japanese movie] (...) |
| E151: S-12.C16( $\beta$ ) 22 | (I prefer foreign movie [to Japanese movie] because I think) \{foreign movie is more excite [than \{Japanese movie\} ] (...) |
| E153: S-I12.C17.1 | (... because I think foreign movie is more excite [than Japanese movie]) and [foreign movie\} have big scene and wonderful action. |
| E154: S-I12.C17.2 | (... because I think foreign movie is more excite [than Japanese movie]) and foreign movie have \{\{big scene\} and wonderful action\}. |
| E179: S-I15.C8 | \{My part-time job\} (is [[working bar at baseball stadium]] and [[cleaning for airline]] ). |
| E230: S-I17.C21 | He has \{skill and \{idea\}\}. |
| E231: S-I17.C22 | \{Idea\} is very important. |
| E233: S-I18.C4 | \{My hobby\} is [[watching movie]], [[listening to music]], [[shopping]] and [[eating]]! |
| E234: S-I18.C4[i] | My hobby is \{\{ [[watching movie]] \}, [[listening to music]], [[shopping]] and [[eating]] \}! |
| E253: S-I18.C21 | I hate \{frog\}. |
| E261: S-I19.C5 | I also like \{trip\}! |
| E262: S-I19.C7 | I can view \{a lot of beautiful nature, \{historical building\}, and food\}. |
| E270: S-I19.C17 | How about \{other country\}? |
| E273: S-I20.C4 | Tokyo has \{[lots of] place\} nearby. |
| E282: S-I20.C12 | \{My hobby\} is [[talking with my friends]] and [[eating delicious sweets]]. |
| E343: SR7.C7 | Because I love \{musical\}. |
| E426: LW7.C14 | My mother gave me \{many cosmetic\} (...) |
| E439: LW9.C3 | We bought \{some clothes and \{comic book\}\}. |
| E470: LW13.C5 | But, I have to get \{500 point\} |

## Table EC3a: List of 54 EC3a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E477: LW14.C5.2 | (...) we could not play tennis \{many time\}. |
| E483: LW15.C5 | I want \{600 point\}. |
| E560: FD2.C7.2 | For example, \{\{ many CD\}, movie and music\}. |
| E570: FD2.C7.3 | For example, \{ many CD, \{movie\} and music\}. |
| E574 FD2.C9(b).3 | (...) \{to \{many festival\}\} every year. |
| E596: FD4.C4.2 | (...) I was attracted \{ \{cabin attendant\} [in N airport] \}. (They looked beautiful and cool for me.) |
| E598: FD4.C6 | And I like \{airport\} very much. |
| E602: FD5.C1(bii).1 | (I want) to become supervisor[[who make TV program]]. |
| E614: FD6.C12(b) | [...] (Because I'd like) to study \{about \{foreign country\}\} every day. |
| E639: FD9.C3(b) | [...] (Because I think) that \{people's smile\} is excellent. |
| E647: FD9.C10(b).1 | (I don't know) [[what \{Australian\} spoke to me]]. |
| E650: FD10.C4 | And I love \{ [foreign country's] ] goods. |
| E696: JI4.C8 | \{'My hobby\} are [[read the book]], [[play the game]], [[and listen to music]].' |
| E708: JI5.C7(b).3 | (I want) to help \{for \{weak human\}\}.' |

## Table EC3b: List of 3 EC3b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E43: S-I5.C9.2 | $\{$ My families \} are 6 people. |
| E82: S-I9.C3 | (I'm 18 years old) and I'm $\left\{\right.$ in $\left\{1^{\text {st }}\right.$ grades $\left.\}\right\}$. |
| E131: S-I11.C10 | $\{\{1$ years $\}$ ago $\}\}$ I went to Disneyland three times [a week]. |

## Table EC4: List of 4 EC4 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E20: S-I2.C5 | I work \{at \{Tokyo Disneyland's restaurant\}\}. |
| E21: S-I2.C7(' $\beta$ ).1 | (I want) to get \{\{over 500 [of TOEIC score]\}, all credit and driver's licence\}. |
| E83: S-I9.C5 | (I can't speak English too much) because I have \{no output [[that skill or translate Japanese to English]] \}. |
| E415: LW7.C6(i).1 | My part-time is \{at \{restaurant [[which is beef tongue]] \}\}. |

Table EC5: 1 EC5 error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E48: S-16.C3.2 | I'm $\{4$ year student $\}$. |

Table EC6: List of 4 EC6 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E285: S-I21.C14 | I went to UCLA for study about for three weeks. |
| E681: J12.C9.2 | 'What do you like baseball team?' |
| E683: JI2.C11.2 | 'Who do you like baseball player?' |
| E693: JI4.C5.2 | 'What do you like sport?' |

Table EC7a: 1 EC7a error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E139: S-I12.C10 | I like \{various kinds [str book] \}. |

## Table EC7b: 1 EC7b error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E186: S-I15.C13 | I'm interested in [other country poss] culture |

## Table EC7c: 1 EC7c error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E76: S-I18.C6 | This year \{my karate's dream\} is [[I win the All Japan championship]].. |

Table EC7d: 1 EC7d error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E430: LW8.C1.3 | I had test [of driving] on last weekend. |

Table EC8: List of 2 EC8 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E417: LW7.C6(i).3 | \{My part-time Head \} is at restaurant [[which is beef tongue]]. |
| E467: LW13.C2 | Because I had \{a TOEIC Head \}. |

## Table EC9: List of 7 EC9 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E3: S-I1.C6.3 | Kumamon is \{int favourite character\}. |
| E6: S-I1.C7.3 | \{int Favourite foods\} is Karashirenkon, and Basashi. |
| E157: SI13.C3.3 | I live in Ichikawa City \{with \{int twin sister\}\}. |
| E325: SR6.C3.3 | I visit \{ [a grandmother's] house\}. |
| E337: SR7.C3.3 | I visit \{ \{ [int grandmother's] house\} with my mother. |
| E493: LW15.C13.3 | (It was hot day,) so I put off \{int jacket\}. |
| E542: LW17.C2.3 | I hoped \{for \{int grandmother\}\} in the hospital. |

Table EC10: List of 4 EC10 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E87: S-I9.C9.3 | \{ [[I usually listen]] music\} is 60 's ~ 70's music. |
| E537: LW16.C24.4 | \{ [II eat]] dinner\} is instant food. |
| E604: FD5.C2(b) | (I want) to make \{ [about [all over the world]] TV\}. |
| E618: FD7.C1(bi).2 | (I will want) to do \{ [[need English]] job\}. |

## Table EC11a: List of 5 EC11a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E18: S-I2.C3[ii].1 | My hobby is [[watching baseball]] and [[ \{listen\} to music]]. |
| E70: S-I7.C16( $\beta$ ).2 | (I want) keep collect |
| E310: SR3.C9.2 | (I usually study English at morning) use textbook |
| E532: LW16.C23.2 | (I walked my house, ) used umbrella |
| E621: FD7.C3.1 | (Because I like English) from become a university student |

Table EC11b: List of 10 EC11b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E25: S-I3.C8[i].1 | I like [[\{go\} to karaoke]]. EC11b |
| E90: S-I9.C12[i] | (I hate) [[sing]] (because I can't do well.) EC11b |
| E110: S-I10.C18[i].2 | I like [[watch a movie]] EC11b |
| E136: S-I12.C7.1 | I \{began play] volleyball (when I was junior high school student and I continue it.) |
| E146: S-I12.C14[i].3 | (I like) [[watch the movie]], too. EC11b |
| E174: S-I14.C14[i].2 | My hobby is listen to music EC11b |
| E482: LW15.C4 | I tried remember TOEIC words. EC11b |
| E699:JI4.C8[i].2 | My hobby are read the book, play the game, and listen to music. |
| E702: JI4.C8[ii.2 | My hobby are read the book, play the game, and listen to music. |
| E704: JI4.C8[iii]. | My hobby are read the book, play the game, and listen to music |

Table EC11c: List of 5 EC11c errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E69: S-I7.C16[‘ $\beta$ ].1 | (I want) keep collect. |
| E115: S-I10.C21[' $\beta$ ].1 | (I want) go to Tsutaya after school. |
| E656:FD11.C1\|(' $\beta$ ).1 | I want be a groundstaff |
| E559: FD2.C2(' $\beta$ ) | I want to diving in Oafa Island and I want to feel nature. |
| E712: JI6.C6 | 'I want to recording.' |

## Table EC12a: List of 10 EC12a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E218: S-I17.C6 | She study piano. |
| E219: S-I17.C7.1 | She play piano well more than me. |
| E222: S-I17.C9 | She teach piano at my house. |
| E505: LW16.C5.5 | (...) but test begin at 13:00. |
| E589: FD3.C3(bii) | (But I want) to work [[that use English]]. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer. |
| E603: FD5.C1(bii).2 | (I want) to become supervisor[[who make TV program]]. |
| E619: FD7.C1(bii) | (I will want to do) [[need English]] ( job). |
| E638: FD9.C2(bii).7 | (I would like to become) someone [[make happy]]. |
| E652: FD10.C6 | But there are only English always, (...) |
| E723: JI9.C4.2 | 'Because your company have good future.' |

## Table EC12b: List of 4 EC12b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E7: S-I1.C7.4 | Favourite foods is Karashirenkon, and Basashi. |
| E78: S-I8.C9.2 | My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, soccer. |
| E243: S-I18.C18 | (Air is clear,) people is very kind, (and food is delicious.) |
| E268: S-I19.C14 | Why does university students have to find a job ...? |

## Table EC13: 1 EC13 error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E716: JI2.C8[i] | (I like) [[ a watching baseball.']] |

Table EC14a: List of 6 EC14a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E30: S-I4.C3.2 | I'm live in Saitama. |
| E49: S-I6.C4.2 | I'm live in Chiba. |
| E106: S-I10.C16 | We are practise our dance every Monday and Thursday. |
| E520: LW16.C17 | I was look forward to this movie. |
| E563: FD2.C5(b) | (I think) my English skill is improve. |
| E670: FD11.C9.2 | I'm go, (and I make friends.) |

## Table EC14b: List of 2 EC14b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E216: S-I17.C3.2 | I had play piano at junior high school. |
| E225: S-I17.C12.3 | I had go Okinawa at March. |

## Table EC14c: 1 EC14c error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E98: S-I10.C6 | I live there (when I was born). |
| E113: S-I10.C20.1 | (If I had a free time) I watched a movie on my TV. |
| E661: FD11.C5 | It is my future dream (since I'm a child.) |
| E632: FD7.C2 | (...) Because I like English (from become a university student) |

Table EC14d: 7 EC14d error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E215: S-I7.C3.1 | I had play piano at junior high school. |
| E223: S-I7.C12.1 | I had go Okinawa at March. |
| E257: S-I19.C2.1 | I've taken Justin's class last year. |
| E395: LW4.C8 | and he had broken his arm. |
| E599: LD4.C8.1 | I have started studying English (when I was eight years old.) |
| E643: FD9.C7.1 | I have been to Australia |
| E721: JI8.C9 | How long had you studied it? |

## Table EC15a: List of 17 EC15a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E19: S-I2.C3[ii].2 | My hobby is [[watching baseball]] and [[\{listen\} to music]]. |
| E26: S-I3.C8[i].2 | I like [[ \{go\} to karaoke]]. |
| E71: S-I7.C16(' $\beta$ ).3 | (I want) \{keep\} collect. |
| E72: S-I7.C16(' $\beta$ ).4 | \{I want\} keep \{collect\}. |
| E91: S-I9.C12[i].2 | (I hate) [[sing]] (because I can't do well.) |
| E111: S-I10.C18[i].3 | I like [[watch a movie]] |
| E116: S-I10.C21(' $\beta$ ).2 | (I want) go to Tsutaya after school. |
| E137: S-I12.C7.2 | I \{began play\} volleyball (when I was junior high school student and I continue it.) |
| E147: S-I12.C14[i].4 | (I like) [[watch the movie]], too. |
| E175: S-I14.C14[i].2 | (My hobby is) [[listen to music]] |
| E311: SR3.C9.3 | (I usually study English) use textbook. |
| E533: LW16.C23.2 | (I walked my house) used umbrella. |
| E622: FD7.C3.2 | (Because I like English) from become a university student. |
| E657: FD11.C1(' $\beta$ ) | (I want) be a groundstaff |
| E700: JI4.C8(i).3 | ('My hobby are) [[read the book]], [[play the game]], and [[listen to music]].' |
| E741: JI4.C8(iii).3 | ('My hobby are) [[read the book]], [[play the game]], and [[listen to music]].' |
| E744: JI4.C8(iv).2 | ('My hobby are) [[read the book]], [[play the game]], and [[listen to music]].' |

Table EC15b: List of 10 EC15b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E81: S-I8.C16 | (I usually listen to music) or sleeping in my free time. |
| E329: SR6.C7.4 | I listening a music. |
| E330: SR6.C10.2 | I cooking dinner for my family. |
| E332: SR6.C16.3 | I swimming in pool. |
| E339: SR7.C5.3 | I watching movie. |
| E344: SR7.C9.2 | I reading a book. |
| E345: SR7.C10 | I cooking breakfast. |
| E497: LW15.C14.4 | Before test, I listening to music. |
| E550: LW17.C7.2 | After I watching TV I slept to 2am. |
| E565: FD2.C6.2 | I listening English an hour every day now. For example, many CD, movie and music. |

Table EC16a: 1 EC16a error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E15: S-II.C10.2 | I couldn't come this class for two weeks. |

Table EC16b: List of 2 EC16b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E508: LW16.C10.2 | I can't hear listening [TEST].. |
| E528: LW16.C21 | I can't cycling. |

## Table EC17: List of 10 EC17 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E229: S-I17.C18 | (I like travel) but I can't travel much time. |
| E305: SR3.C4.3 | I usually go to shopping on alone. |
| E430: LW8.C1.3 | I had a test of driving on last weekend. |
| E433: LW8.C8 | We went to there by car. |
| E436: LW8.C13 | My family often go to there. |
| E468: LW13.C3 | I went to there with my friends. |
| E481: LW15.C3 | I got up at early. |
| E544: LW17.C3 | After I came back to home at 12:00pm |
| E649: FD10.C2(' $\beta$ B) | But I want to work in abroad. |
| E687: JI2.C14(' $\beta$ ).2 | I want to work this company for childhood |

## Table EC18: List of 51 EC18 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E14: S-I1.C10.1 | I couldn't come \{Min Pro this class\} for four weeks. |
| E16: S-I.C11.1 | Because I have to go \{Min Pro very important tournament\}. |
| E27: S-I3.C11 | My part time job is \{Min Pro an apparel clerk\}. |
| E31: S-I4.C4 | So university is really far \{Min Pro me\}. |
| E36: S-I4.C13.1 | My part-time job is [MMin Pro supermarket]. |
| E38: S-I5.C5( $\beta$ ) | (It takes about 2 hours from here, so I want) to live \{Min Pro myself\}. |
| E52: S-I6.C6(iv) | My hobby is [[playing baseball]], [[snowboarding]], [[reading book]], [[listening [Min Pro music\}]] and [[watching movie]]. |
| E79: S-I8.C11.1 | My part-time job is \{Min Pro flower shop [in Daiei] \}. |
| E88: S-I9.C9[i] | \{ [[I usually listen Min Pro ]] music\} (is 60's ~ 70's music). |
| E118: S-I11.C4.2 | My part-time job is \{Min Pre S/bucks. The S/bucks [nearby T Dome] . |
| E140: S-I12.C11.1 | I often go \{Min Pro book shop or library\} (and I buy or rent it, so I read a book two weeks). |
| E143: S-I12.C13 | (I often go book shop or library and I buy or rent it), so I read a book \{Min Pro two weeks\}. |
| E166: S-I13.C11[ii] | (In my free time, [[sleeping]] ), [[talking \{Min Pro someone\} by cell phone]] (and [[walking]] ). |
| E167: S-I13.C12[i] | [[listening \{MMin Pro music\} ]]. |
| E168: S-I14.C8[i] | (.And, I like) [[watching soccer \{Min Pro TV\} ]]. |
| E177: S-I15.C3 | I was born \{Min Pro Niigata prefecture\}. |
| E180: S-I15.C8[i]. 1 | (My part-time job is) [[working [Min Pre bar\} at baseball stadium]] (and [[cleaning for airline]] ). |
| E185: S-I15.C12 | (I lived in Okinawa) when I was \{Min Pro elementary school first grade\}. |
| E190: S-I16.C4 | I have to try hard \{AMin Pro your class!\} |
| E203: S-I16.C8.6 | \{Min Pro Example\}, Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |

## Table EC18: List of 51 EC18 errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E224: S-I17.C12.2 | I had go \{Min Pro Okinawa\} at March. |
| E276: S-I20.C6 | I am commuting \{\{Min Pro house\} to school\}\} by train. |
| E279: S-I20.C8 | I live \{Min Pro my father, mother and one younger brother\}. |
| E315: SR4.C7 | I usually talk \{Min Pro my friends\}. |
| E327: SR6.C7.1 | I listening \{Min Pro a music\}. |
| E386: LW3.C1 | I stayed \{Min Pro my home\} last Saturday. |
| E397: LW5.C1 | I went \{Min Pro Sendai\} by train. |
| E423: LW7.C10.1 | We went \{Min Pro restaurant\} (and then we talked about new things.) |
| E428: LW8.C1.1 | I had test of driving on last weekend. |
| E431: LW8.C7.1 | I ate \{Min Pro Chinese restaurant\} at Chiba near the station. |
| E462: LW12.C8 | I got up \{Min Pro 9:00\}. |
| E464: LW12.C9.3 | I go to bed \{Min Pro 11:00\}. |
| E472: LW13.C8.2 | We talked \{Min Pro five hours\} in a restaurant. |
| E475: LW14.C1 | I got up \{Min Pro 10:00\}. |
| E489: LW15.C10 | We talked \{Min Pro each other\}. |
| E506: LW16.C6 | I talked \{Min Pro my friends\}. |
| E515: LW16.C12.2 | Test was finished \{Min Pro 15:00\}. |
| E530: LW16.C22 | I walked \{Min Pro my house\}, (...) |
| E566: FD2.C6.3 | I listening \{Min Pro English\} an hour every day now. |
| E567: FD2.C6.4. | I listening English \{Min Pro an hour\} every day now. |

## Table EC18: List of 51 EC18 errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E568: FD2.C7.1 | For example, \{AMin Pre many CD, movie and music). |
| E576: FD2.C10[i]. 2 | (...) to go to festival [ [Min Pro the most fireworks] ]. |
| E595: FD4.C4.1 | (...) I was atracted \{Min Prө cabin att. [in N airport] ]. |
| E610: FD6.C4(ii) | (I'd like) to go \{Min Pre America\} (...) |
| E646: FD9.C9 | (...) but seldom talked [MAin Pre people]. |
| E664: FD11.C7(b) | (I want) to go \{MAin Pro Miami\}. [...] |
| E686: J12.C14(b). 1 | (I want) to work \{AHin Pro this company\} for childhood.' |
| E705: JI5.C6 | Why are you attracted [Min Pro our company]? |
| E714: JI6.C9.1 | Next, teach me feature [Min Pro this company] \}.' |
| E718: JI8.C3(b) | (Why do you want) to work [Miin Pre my company?'\} |
| E728: J19.C11 | 'Come \{Min Pro the team room\} next Wednesday.' |

Table EC19: 1 EC19 error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E317: SR5.C1 | I went \{to Min Renge\} with my sister. |

Table EC20: 1 EC20 error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E318: SR5.C2 | I went \{to Min Compl with my sister. |

Table EC21a: 3 EC21a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E57:S-I6.C9 | If you never watch those movies, please watch! |
| E73:S-I8.C3 | so I choose this class. |
| E84:S-I9.C7 $[i-\alpha]$ | [ why I decide |

## Table EC21b: 6 EC21b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E381: LW2.C8 | So I practise more. |
| E383: LW2.C10 | Because I graduate from university.. |
| E552: FD1.C2.1 | (I want to become ground staff.) Because of I use English in my job. |
| E582: FD2.C15(' $\beta$ (I think) I don't marry |  |
| E605: FD5.C3 | I go to a lot of countries |
| E671: FD5.C3 | and I make friends. |
| E719: JI8.C4 | 'Because I use my professional skill'. |

## Table EC22a: List of 26 EC22a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E40: S-I5.C8.1 | It Pro really fun. |
| E163: S-I13.C11.2 | In my free time, Pro [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]]* and [[walking]]. |
| E191: S-I16.C5.1 | I Pro member [of dance club]. |
| E199: S-I16.C8.2 | Example, Pro Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |
| E209: S-I16.C13.2 | Pro So excited!!! |
| E247: S-I18.C20.2 | But Prө rather cold place. |
| E349: LW1.C2.2 | Then Pro very hot. |
| E353: LW1.C4.1 | Because I Pro very very tired. |
| E356: LW1.C5b.2 | (I thought) Pro dead. |
| E365: LW1.C7(ii).2 | (My purpose is) [[Pro No.1 badminton player [in Japan] J]. |
| E375: LW2.C5.2 | (By tennis, I lost many times) but Pro very fun. |
| E486: LW15.C8.2 | (I went to X University) where TOEIC place Pro . |
| E511: LW16.C11.2 | (...) but I Pro hard on writing test. |
| E524: LW16.C19.2 | (After I watched movie,) Pro back to my home. |
| E572: FD2.C9(b).1 | (I want) to Prө many festival every year. |
| E578: FD2.C11(ii).1 | (My future dream is) [[Pro Wedding Planner]]. |
| E584: FD3.C3(bi).1 | (But I want) to Pro work [[that use English]]. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer. |
| E608: FD6.C2.1 | To Prө my dream real, (...) |
| E628: FD9.C1(ii).1 | (My future dream is) [[Pro cabin attendant or hotelman]]. |
| E659: FD11.C3(b).1 | (I want) to Pro abroad (to study English) |

Table EC22a: List of 26 EC22a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E666: FD11.C8.2 | (I want to go Miami.) Because, Pre the most beautiful city. |
| E676: JI2.C1.1 | 'Where Pre you from?' |
| E684: JI2.C13(b).1 | (Why do you want) to Pre our company?' |
| E694: JI4.C7.1 | 'What Pro your hobby?' |
| E710: JI6.C5(b).1 | (What work do you want) to Pre with some musicians?' |
| E716: JI7.C4.1 | 'I Pre from Chiba.' |

## Table EC22b: List of 16 EC22b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E58: S-I7.C5.1 | For example, Part enjoy dancing, skateboarding, watching movie and trip to other country. |
| E159: S-I13.C7.1 | I love Part so much., |
| E162: S-I13.C7.1 | In my free time, [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]]* and [[walking]]. |
| E198: S-I16.C8.1 | Example, Part Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |
| E208: S-I16.C13.1 | Part So excited!!! |
| E246: S-I18.C20.1 | But Part rather cold place. |
| E348: LW1.C2.1 | Then Part very hot. |


| E355: LW1.C5b.1 | (I thought) Part dead. |
| :--- | :--- |
| E360: LW1.C6.1 | But Part enjoyed! |
| E361: LW1.C6.2 | But enjoyed Part! |
| E374: LW2.C5.1 | (By tennis, I lost many times) but Part very fun. |
| E455: LW11.C5.1 | Part Went to café. |
| E523: LW16.C19.1 | Part Back to my home. |
| E632: FD9.C2(bii).1 | (I would like to become) someone [[Part make happy]]. |
| E633: FD9.C2(bii).2 | (I would like to become) someone [[make Part happy]]. |
| E665: FD11.C8.1 | (I want to go Miami.) Because, Part the most beautiful city. |

Table EC22c/1 and Table EC29/1: List of 10 EC22c/1 and EC29/1 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E169: S-I14.C10.1/2 | I go to snowboarding every winter. |
| E171: S-I14.C11.1/2 | Of course I went to snowboarding this winter. |
| E292: SR2.C9.1/2 | I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother. |
| E294: SR3.C1.1/2 | I usually go to shopping on Sunday. |
| E296: SR3.C2.1/2 | I usually go to shopping in Shibuya. |
| E299: SR3.C3.2/3 | I usually go to shopping at afternoon. |
| E303: SR3.C4.1/2 | I usually go to shopping on alone. |
| E333: SR7.C2.1/2 | I go to shopping. |
| E369: LW2.C1.1/2 | I went to shopping (...) |
| E437: LW9.C2.1/2 | First, we went to shopping in Sunshine City. |

Table EC22c/2 and Table EC29/2: List of 5 EC22c/2 and EC29/2 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E8: S-I1.C8(' $\beta$ ).1 | (I think) you should visit in Kumamoto. |
| E237: S-I18.C11.2 | (When I was high school student,) I joined to track and field club. |
| E398: LW5.C3.1/3 | I meet to my boyfriend. |
| E401: LW5.C7.1/2 | I gave for him photo book. |
| E706: J15.C7(b).1/2 | (I want) to help for weak human. |

Table EC22d: 1 EC22d error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E476: LW14.C5.1 | (Because it was very hot,) we could not play tennis many time. |

Table EC23a: List of 2 EC23a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E42: S-I5.C9.1 | My families are 6 people. |
| E158: S-I13.C4 | My family is five people (and I have three dogs.) |

Table EC23b: 1 EC23b error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E95: S-I10.C5.1 | There has rice field surrounded my house. |

Table EC24: List of 3 EC24 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E64: S-I7.C8 | I want to go to New York once again this year, because I'm really favourite there. |
| E651: FD10.C5 | I often watch TV and Twitter about world news. |
| E727: J19.C10(b) | Because I want to distribute |

Table EC25: 1 EC25 error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E517: LW16.C12.4 | Test was finished 15:00.. |

## Table EC26a: List of 32 EC26a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E102: S-I10.C11.2 | I learn to dance (when I was high school student) |
| E258: S-I19.C2.2 | I've taken Justin's class last year. |
| E368: LW1.C10.2 | I do my best. |
| E391: LW4.C6.2 | We talk about my father. |
| E392: LW4.C7.2 | My father recently falls to ladder (...) |
| E399: LW5.C3.3 | I meet to my boyfriend. |
| E414: LW7.C5.2 | ( I did part-time job Saturday every day,) so I study little at night. |
| E440: LW9.C4.2 | After we finish shopping, ((we went to Karaoke).) |
| E442: LW10.C5 | The movie's time is from 1.00 to 2.00. |
| E450: LW10.C15.2 | I eat vegetable pizza. |
| E451: LW10.C16 | It taste good. |
| E452: LW11.C1.2 | I play tennis last weekend with my friends. |
| E453: LW11.C2 | Last week is sunny. |
| E454: LW11.C4.2 | After we play tennis (went to cafe.) |
| E461: LW12.C4.2 | I listen to music. |
| E463: LW12.C9.2 | I go to bed 11:00. |
| E465: LW12.C10.2 | I meet my friend. |
| E479: LW15.C1.1 | Last weekend is TOEIC test. |
| E484: LW15.C6.2 | Sunday is TOEIC test day. |
| E501: LW16.C4.2 | (I used train) I visit the university at 11:25, (...) |
|  |  |

## Table EC26a: List of 32 EC26a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E503: LW16.C5.3 | (...) but test begin at 13:00. |
| E535: LW16.C24.2 | [ [I eat]] dinner is instant food. |
| E538: LW16.C24[i].2 | [[I eat]] dinner is instant food |
| E539: LW17.C1.2 | I wake up at 7:00 am. |
| E545: LW17.C4.2 | (After I came back to home at 12:00pm) I eat a hamburger. |
| E546: LW17.C5.2 | I go to fireworks festival. |
| E600: FD4.C8.2 | I have started studying English (when I was eight years old) |
| E644: FD9.C7.2 | (When I was high school student) I have been to Australia. |
| E662: FD11.C6 | (It is my future dream) since I'm a child. |
| E672: J11.C7.2 | 'Why do you choose this company?' |
| E690: JI3.C7.2 | 'Why do you choice our company?' |

Table EC26b: List of 3 EC26b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E120: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]) .2$ | (I feel especially) Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert (is very interesting. Because so many people come into the S/bucks). |
| E187: S-I15.C14.2 | I had learned calligraphy. |
| E418: LW7.C7.2 | It tasted good. |

## Table EC27a: List of 13 EC27a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E59: S-I7.C5.2 | For example, Sub enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country]. |
| E164: S-I13.C11.3 | In my free time, Sub [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]] * and [[walking]]. |
| E200: S-I16.C8.3 | Example, sub Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |
| E210: S-I16.C13.3 | Sub So excited!!! |
| E248: S-I18.C20.3 | But Sub rather cold place. |
| E350: LW1.C2.3 | Then Sub very hot. |
| E357: LW1.C5b.3 | (I thought) sub dead. |
| E362: LW1.C6.3 | But Sub enjoyed!! |
| E376: LW2.C5.3 | (By tennis, I lost many times) but Sub very fun. |
| E456: LW11.C5.2 | (After we play tennis) Sub went to cafe. |
| E525: LW16.C19.3 | (After I watched movie,) Sut back to my home. |
| E634: FD9.C2(bii).3 | (I would like to become) someone [[Sub make happy]]. |
| E667: FD11.C8.3 | (I want to go Miami.) Because, Sub the most beautiful city. |

## Table EC27b: List of 18 E27b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E41: S-I5.C8.2 | It Fin really fun. |
| E165: S-I13.C11.4 | In my free time, Fin [[sleeping]], [[talking someone by cell phone]]* and [[walking]]. |
| E192: S-I16.C5.2 | I Fin member [of dance club]. |
| E201: S-I16.C8.4 | Example, Fin Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |
| E211: S-I16.C13.4 | Fin So excited!!!' |
| E249: S-I18.C20.4 | But Fin rather cold place. |
| E254: S-I18.C22.1 | So, please Fin not show frog to me. |
| E351: LW1.C2.4 | Then Fin very hot. |
| E354: LW1.C4.2 | Because I Fin very very tired. |
| E358: LW1.C5b.4 | (I thought) Fin dead. |
| E377: LW2.C5.4 | (By tennis, I lost many times) but Fin very fun. |
| E487: LW15.C8.3 | (I went to X University) where TOEIC place Fin. |
| E512: LW16.C11.3 | (...) but I Fin hard on writing test. |
| E526: LW16.C19.4 | (After I watched movie,) Fin back to my home. |
| E668: FD11.C8.4 | (I want to go Miami.) Because, Fin the most beautiful city. |
| E677: J12.C1.2 | 'Where Fin you from?' |
| E695: JI4.C7.2 | What Fin your hobby?' |
| E717: J17.C4.2 | 'I Fin from Chiba.' |

## Table EC28: List of 9 E28 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E366: LW1.C7(ii).3 | (My purpose is) [[Pred No.1 badminton player [in Japan] ]] |
| E573: FD2.C9(b).2 | (I want) to Pred many festival every year. |
| E579: FD2.C11(ii).2 | (My future dream is) [[Pred Wedding Planner]]. |
| E584: FD3.C3(bii).2 | (But I want) to Pred work [[that use English]]. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer. |
| E609: FD6.C2.2 | To Pred my dream real, (...) |
| E630: FD9.C1(ii).2 | (My future dream is) [[Pred cabin attendant or hotelman]]. |
| E660: FD11.C3(b).2 | (I want) to Pred abroad (to study English) |
| E684: JI2.C13(b).2 | (Why do you want) to Pred our company?' |
| E711: JI6.C5(b).2 | (What work do you want) to Pred with some musicians?', |

## Table EC30: List of 2 E30 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E160: S-I13.C7.2 | I love Comp so much. |
| E635: FD9.C2(bii).4 | (I would like to become) someone [[make Comp happy]]. |

Table EC31: List of 2 EC31 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E264: S-I19.C12[i].1 | I don't know what does he want to do... |
| E266: S-I19.C13(ii).1 | ... and [I DON'T KNOW] what should he do |

## Table EC32: 1 EC32 error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E114: S-I10.C20.2 | (If I had free time) I watched a movie on my TV. |

## Table EC33a: List of 11 E33a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E60: S-I7.C5(i).3 | For example, ideational Theme enjoy [[dancing]], [[skateboarding]], [[watching movie]] and trip [to other country]. |
| E202: S-I16.C8.5 | Example, ideational Theme Avril, Green Day, Owl City. |
| E212: S-I16.C13.5 | ideational Theme So excited!!! |
| E250: S-I18.C20.5 | But ideational Theme rather cold place. |
| E359: LW1.C5b.5 | (I thought) ideational Theme dead. |
| E363: LW1.C6.4 | But ideational Theme enjoyed!! |
| E378: LW2.C5.5 | (By tennis, I lost many times) but ideational Theme very fun. |
| E457: LW11.C5.3 | (After we went cafe) ideational Theme went to cafe. |
| E527: LW16.C19.5 | (After I watched movie,) ideational Theme back to my home. |
| E637: FD9.C2(bii).6 | (I would like to become) someone [[ideational Theme make happy]]. |
| E669: FD11.C8.5 | (I want to go Miami.) Because, ideational Theme the most beautiful city. |

## Table E33b: List of 2 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E121: S-I11.C6(' $\beta[\mathrm{i}]) .3$ | (I feel especially) [textual Theme T D held b/ball match, concert]] (is very interesting. Because so many people come into the S/bucks. |
| E636: FD9.C2(bii).5 | (I would like to become) someone [[textual Theme make happy]]. |

## Table EC34: List of 3 E34 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E680: J12.C9.1 | 'What do you like baseball team?' |
| E682: J12.C11.1 | 'Who do you like baseball player?' |
| E692: JI4.C5.1 | 'What do you like sport?' |

Table EC35: List of 2 E35 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E265: S-I19.C12[i].2 | I don't know what does he want to do... |
| E267: S-I19.C13(ii).2 | (and [I DON'T KNOW]) [[what should he do]]. |

## Table EC36a: List of 47 EC36a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E1: S-I1.C6.1 | Kumamon is td favourite character. |
| E4: S-I1.C7.1 | id Favourite foods is Karashirenkon, and Basashi. |
| E10: S-I1.C9.1 | I join id yachting club. |
| E44: S-I5.C10.1 | I'm id youngest. |
| E74: S-I8.C5.1 | I have [Ijob hunting]] and ted final karate club competition. |
| E85: S-I9.C9.1 | itd [[I usually listen]] music is 60 's ~ 70's music. |
| E100: S-I10.C8.1 | My grandmother is id most kind person [in my family]. |
| E107: S-I10.C17.1 | I practise hard for id next event. |
| E155: S-I13.C3.1 | I live in Ichikawa City with id twin sister. |
| E195: S-I16.C6.1 | Itd Dance club's] name is Rabbit. |
| E213: S-I16.C15.1 | I like id weather [in Australia]. |
| E236: S-I18.C11.1 | When I was high school student, I joined to id track and field club. |
| E241: S-I18.C17.1 | (Yamagata is very beautiful place.) id Air is clear, people is very kind, and food is delicious. |
| E244: S-I18.C19.1 | (Yamagata is very beautiful place. Air is clear, people is very kind) and id food is delicious. |
| E277: S-I20.C7.1 | I use id Sobu Line, Keisei Line and Musashino Line. |
| E288: SR2.C2.1 | I go to id work place by car. |
| E298: SR3.C3.1 | I usually go shopping at id afternoon. |
| E306: SR3.C7.1: | I usually study English at id morning. |
| E320: SR5.C6.1 | I usually eat breakfast at id morning. |
| E324: SR6.C3.1 | I visit [a grandmother's] house. |

## Table EC36a: List of 47 EC36a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :---: | :---: |
| E335: SR7.C3.1 | I visit [d grandmother's] house with my mother. |
| E364: LW1.C7(ii). 1 | [[id No. 1 badminton player [in Japan]]] |
| E407: LW6.C4.1 | After id TOEIC text, I did my part-time job from 6.00pm to 1.00am |
| E421: LW7.C9.1 | After that I met my friend and id friend's family |
| E434: LW8.C10.1 | We went to id Chinese restaurant. |
| E446: LW10.C10.1 | it New bag is very cute. |
| E448: LW10.C11 | it $T$-shirt is very cool. |
| E471: LW13.C8.1 | We talked five hours in a restaurant. |
| E485: LW15.C8.1 | Where id TOEIC place. |
| E491: LW15.C13.1 | So I put off id jacket. |
| E495: LW15.C14.1 | Before id test, I listening to music. |
| E498: LW15.C15.1 | id Test was very hard. |
| E502: LW16.C5.1 | But test begin at 13.00 |
| E507: LW16.C10.1 | I can't hear id listening [TEST]. |
| E510: LW16.C11.1 | But I hard on id writing test. |
| E514: LW16.C12.1 | id Test was finished 15.00. |
| E518: LW16.C15.1 | [id Movie's] title is Y. |
| E521: LW16.C18.1 | After I watched id movie, back to my home. |
| E534: LW16.C24(i) | [[I eat]]id dinner is instant food. |
| E540: LW17.C2.1 | I hoped for id grandmother in the hospital. |

## Table EC36a: List of 47 EC36a errors (continued)

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E548: LW17.C6.1 | I enjoyed id fireworks festival. |
| E557: FD2.C1.1 | I will go to Hawaii in id summer holidays with my family. |
| E560: FD2.C4.1 | I will study English in id summer holiday every day in 2 hours. |
| E576: FD2.C10(b).1 | I want to go to ted festival the most fireworks. |
| E590: FD3.C5.1 | And I'll get tream. |
| E654: FD10.C9.1 | I'm interested in td sightseeing business. |
| E725: J19.C9(b) | I want to join id electric team, because I want to distribute. |

## Table EC36b: List of 4 EC36b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E144: S-I12.C14[i].1 | I like [[watch the movie, too]]. |
| E286: SR1.C4.1 | I usually buy the clothes. |
| E697: JI4.C8(i).2 | (My hobby are) [[read the book]], [[play the game]] and [listen to music]] |
| E698: JI4.C8(ii).2 | (My hobby are) [[read the book]], [[play the game]] and [listen to music]] |

Table EC37a: 1 EC37a error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E67: S-I7.C13 | (By the way, are you like sneakers?) I love it. |

## Table EC37b: 1 EC37b error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E263: S-I19.C9 | (I think speaking skill is the most important for) me but writing skill is also the same. |

Table EC37c: 1 EC37c error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E142: S-I12.C12 | (I like various kinds book. I often go b/shop or library) and I buy or rent it, ... |

## Table EC38: List of 2 EC38 errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E34: S-I4.C11.1 | Then, my favourite food is yakiniku and curry. |
| E396: LW4.C10 | (I was worried;) and he is good now. |

## Table EC39a: List of 28 EC39a errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E13: S-I1.S9(i-ii) | I couldn't come this class for two weeks. Because I have to go very important tournament. |
| E28: S-I4.S3(i-ii) | I'm live in Saitama. So university is really far me. |
| E65: S-I7.S8(i-ii) | But, I'm job hunting now. So I'm busy and can't accumulate the money. |
| E119: S-111.S6(i-ii) | I feel especially Tokyo Dome held baseball match, concert is very interesting. Because so many people come into the Starbucks. |
| E176: S-I15.S3(i-ii) | I was born Niigata prefecture. But I have grown up in Chiba since 1993. |
| E197: S-I16.C7 | I love dance and music. Especially rock music. |
| E227: S-I17.S13(i-ii) | Now I don't have any money. Because my university is very far to home. |
| E252: S-I18.S14(i-ii) | I hate frog. So please not show frog to me. |
| E271: S-I19.S15(i-ii) | I'm interested in translation. So I'm taking translation class. |
| E340: SR7.S6(i-ii) | It's musical movie, Disney movie. Because I love musical. |
| E352: LW1.S4(i-ii) | Because I very tired. I thought dead. |
| E379: LW2.S5(i-ii) | My skill was not well. So I practise more. |
| E382: LW2.S6(i-ii) | I took part in TOEIC. Because I graduate from university. |
| E385: LW3.S1(i-ii) | I stayed my home last Saturday. Because I studied English very hard. |
| E388: LW3.S3(i-ii) | But I was sleepy. So I slept. |
| E390: LW3.S9(i-ii) | TOEIC was very difficult. So I was unhappy. |
| E406: LW6.S2(i-ii) | After, I went to X University. Because I had a ToEIC test. |
| E409: LW6.S4(i-ii) | It was very busy. Because Sunday was holiday. |
| E466: LW13.S1(i-ii) | I went to X University last weekend. Because I had a TOEIC. |
| E469: LW13.S4(i-ii) | But, I have to get 500 point. So I have to study more. |

## Table 39a: List of 28 EC39a errors continued

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E478: LW15.S1(i-ii) | Last weekend is TOEIC test. So I studied hard on Saturday. |
| E551: FD1.S1(i-ii) | I want to become ground staff. Because of I use English in my job. |
| E612: FD6.S8(i-ii) | I'd like to marry with American or European. Because I'd like to study about foreign country every day. |
| E616: FD7.S1(i-ii) | I will want to do [[need English]] job. Because I like English from become a university student. |
| E625: FD8.S1(i-ii) | I want to speak English very well. Because I want to talk with many foreign people in English. |
| E626: FD8.S6(i-ii) | I will go to foreign country. Because I can know different thinking. |
| E631: FD9.S2(i-ii) | I would like to become someone make happy. Because I think that people's smile is excellent. |
| E663: FD11.S5(i-ii) | I want to go Miami. Because, the most beautiful city. |

## Table 39b: List of 10 EC39b errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E32: S-I4.C7 | Especially, I like rock music. For example, B'z and Bon Jovi. |
| E89: S-I9.C11 | But, I like [[listening to world music. For example Italian, Israel and German]]. |
| E117: S-I11.C4.1 | My part-time job is Starbucks. The Starbucks nearby Tokyo Dome. |
| E125: S-I11.C8.1 | I like all of Disney very much. For example Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Disney character. |
| E178: S-I15.C5 | I like sports. Especially baseball and soccer. |
| E259: S-I19.C3 | I really like [[to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, culture]]. |
| E291: SR2.C9 | I usually go to shopping by car. With my mother. |
| E316: SR5.C1 | I usually go shopping. At Shibuya and Harajuku.. |
| E319: SR5.C5 | I usually study English. At home. |
| E564: FD2.S5(i-ii) | I listening English an hour every day now. For example, many CD, movie and music. |
| E583: FD3.S3(i-ii) | But I want to work [[that use English]]. Such as CA, hotel woman and announcer. |

Table EC39c: 1 EC39c error

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E419: LW7.S5 | Sunday, I received TOEIC, after that I met my friend and friend's family. |

## Table EC39d: List of 7 EC39d errors

| Error code | Clause |
| :--- | :--- |
| E77: S-I8.C9.1 | My favourite sports is badminton, tennis, Link soccer. |
| E122: S-I11.C6(‘ $\beta[\mathrm{i}]) .4$ | [[Tokyo Dome held basketball match, Link concert]]. |
| E129: S-I11.C8.2 | I like [all of] Disney. For example Disney movie, Disney's music, Disneyland, Link Disney character. |
| E204: S-I16.C8.7 | Example, Avril, Green Day, Link Owl City. |
| E260: S-I19.C3[i] | [[to learn about English. Especially communicative grammar, Link culture]] |
| E615: FD6.C13(b) | [[to study foreign language, culture, music, Link food.]] |
| E645: FD9.C8(i) | There, I enjoyed [[shopping]],Link [[sightseeing.]]. |
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## RIKKYO UNIVERSITY

3-34-1 Nishi Ikebukuro, Toshima-ku Tokyo 171-8501, Japan


Center for General Curriculum Development

November 6, 2009

To Whom It May Concern,

Justin Falkus is employed here as English lecturer, and is currently studying for a PhD at Macquarie University, Australia. As part of his PhD studies, he is conducting research here. We are aware of his project, and that he is following the research ethics protocol of Macquarie University. We give permission for him to conduct his PhD research here.

Sincerely yours,

[^3]
## Appendix 7B：Information and Consent Form：Japanese version

```
MACQUARIE
UNIVERSITY
Department of Linguisticsf

``` ッ土川・タラスー・スさりえで
```





```畨へとつなかるであるうと蔀虎しています。 「
```





``` るちのてす。 「
```




``` にみなさんにさらなる暊閴からえらわることはありませんっ「
```



```人門完さわるということはありません，テースは大场に管理さわ，アクセルできるのはスーバ
```




```
    後でももの聿穴をいつでも馀回することがてきます。「
```



 $\qquad$

``` \(\rightarrow\) でロック体ヶ
回章責せが，
```



``` －
目尤：
``` \(\qquad\)
``` §
开䆖乽点
``` \(\qquad\)
``` －
（ 7 品こう术に
田究者サ人ン
``` \(\qquad\)
``` \(\rightarrow\)
```

$\qquad$

``` \(\uparrow\)
目会：
``` \(\qquad\)
``` f：unamonamen：Section Break（Next Page）
``` \(\qquad\)

Dopartment-of Linguistiest
MACCUARIE UNWERSITY-NSW-2100-AUSTRALIA
Phone \(+61-(0) 2-5850-8740 \mathrm{H}\)
Fax \(+81(02085001006\)
Email IIngadminglingmq eduau






\section*{Appendix 7C: Information and Consent Form: English version}


Name of Project: The English writing of Japanese university students: a-Systemic-Functional-Grammar analyzisๆ
T
You are invited to participate in a study of Japanese university 'students' English grammar. The purpose of the study is to get a clear picture of Japanese university students' grammar by analysing their writing. I believe this will help me to improve grammar teaching at universities in Japan. \(\uparrow\)

The study is being conducted by Justin Falkus-(office: :3111; telephone:-(03)-3985-2830-(w), 090 \(2471 \cdot 7011\) (m); e-mail: jcfalkus @live.co.uk)-to meet the requirements of my PhD-in-Linguistics under the supervision of Mr John Knox (telephone: +61. 2. 9850. 8729;- e-mail: john knox@mq.eduau)-of the Department of Linguistics, Macquarie University.*| T

If you decide to participate, it means you give permission for me to keep copies of your written homework, and use the homework as data for my grammar analysis. You will not be asked to do any additional writing tasks.โ
\(\uparrow\)
Any information or personal details gathered in the course of the study are confidential. \(\cdot\) No individual will be identified in any publication of the results. Only myself and my supervisor will have access to the data, which will be locked safely in my office, and kept on a passwordprotected computer also in my office. A summary of the results of the data will be placed on the noticeboard outside my office; it can also be made available to you on request if you contact me in person Results of the study will be reported in my PhD thesis They may also be reported in conference presentations, and scholarly articles and or books. \(\uparrow\)
ๆ

\(\uparrow\)
Participation in this study is entirely voluntary: you are not obliged to participate, and if you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without having to give a reason and without consequence.f I. \(\qquad\) have read and understand the information above, and any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. - I agree to participate in this research, knowing that I' can withdraw from further participation in the research at any time without consequence.-I have been given a copy of this form to keep. I

II

(BLOCK-letters) \({ }^{\|}\)
Participant's Signature \(\qquad\) §
\({ }^{1}\) \(\qquad\) \(\pi\)
\(\uparrow\)

\section*{MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY}
. Department-of-Linguistios MACCUARIEUNMERSITY-NSN-2100-AUSTRALHF
- Phone - 661 (012-9050-87409

Fax \(\rightarrow+01\) (0)2.905091905
Emai - Ingadmineling mq_odu aul

\footnotetext{
Investigator's Nam\&
(BLOCK letters) 1
Investigator's-Signature: \(\qquad\) \(\star\)
Date \(\qquad\)
The ethical aspects of this study have been approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee-(Human Research). If you have any complaints or reservations about any ethical aspect of your participation in this research, you may contact the Ethics. Review Committeethrough the Director, Research Ethics (telephone \(9850-7854\); email ethics(9) mq. edu am). If you prefer to contact someone in Japan, you may contact Satomi- Takahashi- (telephone: 03-3985-4145;-e-mail : satomit(0)rilkyo.ac.jp). Any complaint you make will be treated in confidence and investigated, and you will be informed of the outcome. \(\uparrow\)
โ
}

\section*{Appendix 7D: Final and Official Ethics Approval}


Research Office
Research Hub, Building C5C East MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY NSW 2109

Phone +61 (0)2 98508612
Fax \(\quad+61\) (0)2 98504465
Email ro@vc.mq.edu.au
Ethics
Phone
\(+61(0) 298506848\)
Email ethics.secretariat@vc.mq.edu.au

11 January 2010
Mr Justin Falkus
103 Purezensu AM-I
3-26-11 Maebara Nishi
Funabashi-shi Chiba-ken
Japan 274-0825
Reference: 5200903492D

Dear Mr Falkus

\section*{FINAL APPROVAL}

Title of project: The English writing of Japanese university students: a Systemic Functional Grammar analysis

Thank you for your recent correspondence. Your responses have addressed the issues raised by the Faculty of Human Sciences Sub-Committee of the Ethics Review Committee (Human Research). Final approval has been granted, effective \(24^{\text {th }}\) December 2009, and you may proceed with your research.

Please note the following standard requirements of approval
1. The approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007)
2. Approval will be for a period of five ( 5 years) subject to the provision of annual reports. Your first progress report is due on 24th December 2010.

If you complete the work earlier than you had planned you must submit a Final Report as soon as the work is completed. If the project has been discontinued or not commenced for any reason, you are also required to submit a Final Report on the project.
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[^0]:    E374: (By tennis, I lost many times) but ? (?) very fun.

[^1]:    No errors

[^2]:    * cultural context: A house would most likely be surrounded by several small rice fields, so this error is more likely than the choice not to realise singular deixis

[^3]:    Sotmi Jahanahiv
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    Director
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