

The identification of subordinate clauses: The case of three Colleges of Education

Rebecca Arthur

Department of English Education, University of Education, Winneba, Post Office Box 25. Winneba, Central Region. Ghana, West Africa.
Tel:+2330244739358. E-mail:wilsbeck41.rw@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper focuses on how students of selected Colleges of Education identify subordinate clauses which is one of the important elements in sentence construction in the English Language. Test item and interviews were used for the data collection, with the test item used to find out how the students could identify the functions of the subordinate clause. Also, some teachers were interviewed to find out their views towards the teaching/learning of subordinate clauses. The study adopted Corder's (1974) model of analysing students' errors. The findings indicated that students had problems in identifying subordinate clauses and this was rooted in their lack of understanding of 'the clause' as a unit of grammar. Also, there were no prescribed textbooks for both teachers and students to use for the teaching/learning process. It was suggested that there should be the provision of prescribed textbooks, adequate coverage of subordination in the syllabus and the use of effective language teaching strategies to assist students to overcome their difficulty in clauses.

Key Words: Subordinate Clauses, Error Analysis, Colleges of Education.

Introduction

The importance of the teacher as the most vital single resource in the school seems to be virtually undisputed, especially the English teacher. According to Byram & McPartland (1982) "Nobody would deny that teachers constitute the crucial educational resource. Good teaching can compensate for many other deficiencies in a school; poor teaching can render nugatory almost any other advantages." This statement presupposes that teachers are the backbone of our education. The English Language is the language that is used to teach all subjects across the curriculum in Ghanaian schools from Basic 4 upwards, with the exception of the Ghanaian Languages. Even with that, English is used alongside when teachers are teaching the Ghanaian Languages. Therefore, a fall in standard in the use of English will affect performance in other subjects across the curriculum. It is therefore the responsibility of teachers to teach the use of the language in such a way that students will gain a certain level of proficiency in its use. Unfortunately, these teachers are themselves constrained in a number of ways, especially teachers who teach English at the Colleges of Education. Interactions I have had with some teachers show that teachers' limitations in the teaching of the language are as a result of the following:

- i) Teachers' own inability to plan lessons adequately,
- ii) Lack of prescribed English textbooks for teachers at colleges of education,
- iii) Some teachers' lack of confidence to innovate.

The truth is, we are at a loss as to where the source of our problems in education is. However, if we can fortify English proficiency and eventually improve the quality of our education, it will be necessary to examine the competence of teachers and ensure that they are better qualified to effect the desired positive change in our

educational landscape. As Bishop puts it: “A curriculum is only as good as the quality of its teachers. Positively, a curriculum is enriched by the creativity and imagination of the best teachers; negatively, it is vitiated by the limitations of poor teachers and poor teacher training” (Bishop 1985,p. 190)

There has been a lot of suspicion about the quality of teachers, especially at the basic level. Of even more concern is the quality of teacher- trainees or newly qualified teachers of our colleges of education. There is the general impression that the English competence and proficiency of students who graduate from our colleges are low, and for that reason such teachers are ill-prepared to effectively equip our children with the desired knowledge and skills (Agor, 2003).

Agor (2003), for instance, observed the low level of competence in the use of concord among teacher- trainees with which he concluded that teacher-trainees hardly had any explicit knowledge of concord rules. The present study looked at the teacher- trainees, with its focus on students’ competence in identifying subordinate clauses.

Subordination is an essential part in forming sentences in the English Language as it is a way of combining clauses in order to make one part of it structurally more central than the other(s) (Cristofaro, 2003). Subordination in a correct sentence presupposes a principal clause and at least one subordinate clause. The relationship between the two is a constituent of another (Quirk & Greenbaum1973). For example:

- 1) *Kofi went to school.*
- 2) *Ama went to the market.*

The examples above are principal clauses because they make complete sense. Subordination can be effected by reducing the status of one of the clauses to a subordinate clause through the use of a subordinating conjunction like “although” to make the two independent clauses become; *Kofi went to school although Ama went to the market.* Sentences that use subordination usually have a main clause or an independent clause and one or more subordinate clauses or dependent clauses in them. For instance, in the sentence above, ‘*although Ama went to the market*’ becomes the subordinate clause and ‘*Kofi went to school*’ becomes the main clause. Such sentences are normally called complex sentences.

Other subordinators like ‘while’ and ‘so’ can also be used to transform the two clauses into a sentence:

- 3) *Kofi went to school while Ama went to the market.*
- 4) *Kofi went to school so Ama went to the market.*

The study of these complex linkages of sentence information at various scales is to avoid boredom and chopiness (Sekyi-Baidoo, 2003, cited in Opoku, 2015) by varying your sentence types. A subordinate clause is usually introduced by a subordinating element such as a subordinating conjunction or relative pronoun. A subordinate clause depends on the rest of the sentence for its meaning, as it does not express a complete thought and therefore cannot stand alone. The subordinate clause itself can be decomposed into further constituents such as phrases, having grammatical functions at the clause rank as subject, verb, object, complement, or adverbial. These smaller constituents/units assume a part-to-whole relationship with the subordinate clause. (Breindl, 2007).

The construction of subordinate clauses has been identified as one of the major challenges students encounter in their writing. Some teachers have attributed this problem to students’ inability to select the appropriate subordinators to form the different types of subordinate clauses we have. For this problem to be corrected, teachers need to know the types of errors students make in their attempt to construct or identify the subordinate clauses. Some studies have been done in the area of errors in concord, spelling, preposition, article, vocabulary and expressions, and others, on the Ghanaian students (Edu-Buandoh, 1997; Agor, 2003, Owu-Ewie & Lomotey, 2016). The focus of this paper was to give a descriptive account of errors that characterized the identification and functions of subordinate clauses by students in some selected colleges of education in Ghana. It is hoped that this study would provide important information on *subordinate clauses* for both teachers and students in the teaching and learning of the English Language at all levels of education. It would also help syllabus designers and textbook writers for the Colleges of Education to get an insight into students’ problems

in relation to the composition and grammar sections of the syllabus, as these are the areas where the problems with *subordinate clauses* occur.

Literature Review

Error Analysis

The use of error analysis for both research and pedagogical purposes dates back to the early years of the 20th century but became very popular in the 1960s (Agor, 2003). However, its popularity declined when it became associated with the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH), a procedure used in the second language learner errors by finding distinctions between the linguistic system of the mother tongue and the target language (Ellis, 1985; Agor, 2003; Lenon, 1991). Contrastive Analysis was widely criticised on its suggestion that interference from the mother tongue was the only source of error (Littlewood, 1985). Research proved that learner errors could be attributed to several sources, some of which were simply developmental and thus similar to errors of young native speakers (Dulay & Burt 1973, cited in Littlewood (1985). Again, contrastive analysis could not predict learner errors (Dulay & Burt, 1973, cited in Littlewood, 1985).

Lately, there has been a resurgence of interest in error analysis as a result of measures to streamline its procedure (Ellis, 1985). Originally, error analysis mainly consisted of mere impressionistic collection of common errors and their linguistic classification. This information was basically used to sequence items for language instructions or for remedial lessons (Ellis, 1985). However, today error analysis has transformed into a systematic procedure used by both researchers and teachers to collect samples of learners' language, identify the errors in the sample, describe these errors, classify them according to their hypothesised causes and evaluate their seriousness.

Even though the procedure for error analysis is more systematic and comprehensive today, it continues to experience changes as more and more proposals are added in a bid to streamline it. Corder (1974), for instance, elaborated five distinguished stages in the procedure for error analysis (Lenon, 1991). These are:

- (i) Selection of a corpus of language
- (ii) Identification of errors in the corpus
- (iii) Classification of errors identified
- (iv) Explanation of the psychological causes of errors
- (v) Evaluation of the gravity of error.

(Ellis 1985; Lenon, 1991)

This procedure has been common in many studies involving error analysis. Lenon (1991) in response to Corder's (1974) procedure proposes that in identifying errors, the first consideration should be to unambiguously define error. He, further, illustrates his proposal through a study of the narrations produced by four advanced learners, aged 20-24 years, who were German university students of English. In setting out his procedure, Lenon (1991, p.181) cautiously defines 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 speakers' native speaker counterparts." He concedes that many a learner error could indeed occur in native speaker production as a slip of tongue. For this reason, it will be necessary to define errors with close reference to native speaker and context. In Lenon's (1991) procedure, therefore, he uses native speaker counterparts, that is, British students who separately judged each corpus produced by his subjects.

Agor (2003) also analyses the concord errors in the writings of three hundred (300) teacher- trainees from three (3) selected colleges in Ghana. He chose the essays of participants as the corpus. Findings and conclusions from Agor (2003) shows that teacher- trainees hardly have any explicit knowledge of concord rules. He recommends more attention for the teaching of English at the teacher training level. The present study attempts to analyse teacher- trainees' errors on subordinate clauses using Corder's (1974) model. These studies and more show that Error Analysis has made significant contributions to language studies. For instance, it has refocused attention on error from a language processing and language acquisition perspective (Lenon, 1991).

Error analysis was used in the study to analyse the errors students made. It involved the five stages commonly used to analyse errors. For the purpose of this study, these stages were adapted:

- (i) Identification of errors: here all the errors were identified from the test.
- (ii) Classification of errors: This was done according to the types of errors made. So for instance, errors on the use of subordination as adjuncts, complements, and so on were identified.
- (iii) Explanation: This paper attempted to explain the causes of the errors learners made on subordinate clauses through the interviews conducted.
- (iv) Finally, evaluation of errors: At this stage the errors were evaluated to find out the extent to which there were errors and whether there was the need for intervention or not.

Purpose of the Study

The paper sought to find out teacher-trainees' knowledge about subordinate clauses, which is one of the basic elements that goes into acceptable sentence structure, at the Colleges of Education. It was also to identify how these trainees could identify the subordinate clause and the errors that go in their attempt to identify the subordinate clauses and what could be done to help the trainees to overcome their challenges.

Research Questions

The study basically was to find answers to the following research questions:

- What is students' knowledge about subordinate clauses?
- Why do students have problems with the use of subordinate clauses?
- How can students use the various types of subordinators to construct subordinate clauses correctly?

Methodology

This paper used the descriptive approach to research. The participants of the study consisted of three(300) students (100 from each college) at level 200 from three colleges of education in Ashanti Region of Ghana as well as three(3) teachers who teach English in these colleges. For confidential reason, the names of the colleges are not mentioned. The purposive sampling technique was used in selecting the three colleges used for the study because the study wanted to focus on two single sex colleges and one mixed sex college. To ensure that ethical issues are observed, the researcher contacted the principals of the three colleges as well as the teachers of the students for permission to use the students for the study. The students agreed to participate in the study by responding to the questions. The principal, the teachers and the students were assured that the information that would be gathered would be used only for this study and that their names and that of their colleges would not be used. The sources of data were test item and interviews designed by the researcher. The test item was made up of ten questions designed to test the students' ability to identify the structure and functions of the subordinate clauses. The data was analysed using item analysis and the adaption of Corder's (1974) model of analysing students' errors. The errors manifested in the answers provided by the students were identified and itemized, followed by an in-depth explanation of the error type. The correct answers to the questions were also provided. There was also an evaluation of the errors. The interviews were used to buttress the argument which was made out of the findings from the text item. Findings and discussions were based on the research questions.

Findings and Discussions

The findings and discussions of the study were done based the three main research questions posed earlier. An analysis of the intervention strategies used in this study as well as the revelations by the responses of the participants on the questions was done by using the research questions of this study as major sub-headings.

Research Question 1:What is students' knowledge about subordinate clauses?

This question sought to find out whether students at the colleges of education could identify the elements that made up the structure of the subordinate clause. It was also to find out if students could identify the various functions of the subordinate clauses. For this question to be answered, the ten questions had to be analysed item

by item to identify the type and number of errors in the participants' responses to each question. For the purpose of the analysis, the colleges were labelled A, B and C. These errors are fully discussed below.

Error Types and Analysis

Error Types (Item 1)

The first question that this study set out to address was for the participants to identify the subject in the structure: *What I hate most is your dishonesty*. As to the errors in question 1, most of the students underlined a word in the structure that constituted the subordinate clause functioning as the subject in the construction. Instead of the answer:

- 1) 'what I hate most'

The answer:

- i) 'I'

was provided as a clause. There must be a verb in the answer provided and this is absent in the answer that has been provided by the students. A pronoun has been picked or lifted out of the structure that forms the nominal clause functioning as the subject to represent the answer. For college A, there were as many as 66 of such responses. College B had 59 and College C had 41. There are responses that are made up of the pronoun plus the verb, which also shows that the students picked some elements out of the whole structure to represent the answer and this is:

- ii) 'I hate'.

This structure has a verb but what is absent is a subordinator which always introduces the subordinate clause. Therefore, the underlined structure cannot be taken as the correct answer and this appeared in many of the scripts. For College A, there were 2 of such responses, 5 responses from students of College B manifested this kind of error, and for College C, 4 responses showed this error type. Another error identified is where only the subordinator:

- iii) 'What'

is underlined. Only a subordinator does not form the subordinate clause but it rather introduces the subordinate clause; therefore in the case of the answer to the question, there should be an element of a pronoun, a verb and an adverb with the subordinator 'what' beginning the structure. College A had 5 of this kind of error type with College B having 4 and College C also having 4 of such error type.

Another error type identified is:

- iv) 'What I hate'

Regarding this error, almost all the elements needed to form the subordinate clause are present with the exception of 'most' which if ignored, will still make the underlined answer correct but since it forms part of the construction, it cannot be done away with. For this error, College A had 2 of this error type, College B had 4, and College C had 8 of such error type.

The last error identified in question 1 is the type where students underlined some elements that were not part of the structure of the subordinate clause (nominal clause) but rather they formed part of the matrix or main clause. That is:

- v) 'your dishonesty'.

About this error, College A had 5 responses, College B had 7 responses, and College C also had 7 responses of this type of error.

By far the most prevalent error is where the students just underlined a word out of the whole structure constituting the subordinate clause (nominal clause). A greater number of students in all the three colleges underlined the word 'I' as their answer to question one. This could be represented on the table below:

Table 1: The Error Types Made in Item 1

College	I	I hate	What	What I hate	Your dishonesty	Total Errors
A	66 responses	2 responses	5 responses	2 responses	5 responses	80
B	59 responses	5 responses	4 responses	4 responses	7 responses	79
C	41 responses	4 responses	4 responses	8 responses	7 responses	64
Total	166	11	13	14	19	223

Error Types (Item 2)

The second question was for the participants to identify the object in the structure: *I heard that you were leaving*. Question 2 has errors that are similar to that of question 1. What the students were expected to do was to underline the object in the sentence and the answer is:

- 2) 'that you were leaving.'

Most of the students provided:

- i) 'you'

as their answer to the question. The problem with this answer is that, there is the absence of a subordinator which introduces the subordinate clause. Also, there is the absence of a verb which is an important element in a clause. College A had 81 of this type of error. College B had 62 and College C also had 62 of such error.

Another type of error recorded was where students provided the answer:

- ii) 'you were leaving.'

There is the elimination of a subordinator 'that' that makes the structure a subordinate clause; therefore the structure cannot be taken as a subordinate clause (nominal clause). Such an error appeared in 3 of College A responses, 9 of College B responses, and 13 of College C responses.

There is also another error type as:

- iii) 'leaving'

Here, there is the elimination of the subordinator 'that', the pronoun 'you', and the auxiliary verb 'were' in the structure. For this, College A had 12 of this error type, College B recorded 17, and College C had 10 of such error type.

Another type of error recorded is:

- iv) 'that you'

What is wrong with this answer is that there is the elimination of the verb that makes the structure a (subordinate) clause. College A recorded no such error, College B recorded 6 of such an error, and College C recorded 1 of such error. There is also the response that is not part of the subordinate clause; instead, it forms part of the main clause that has been lifted as an answer to the question and this is:

- v) 'I'

For this type of error, only College A recorded 1. College B and C had no such error type.

There is also the type of error recorded as:

- vi) 'I heard that'

For this response, there is the lifting of elements from the main clause plus the subordinator 'that'. This cannot be accepted as the answer to the question. For this type of error, only one college, that is, College C recorded 2 of such error type. In the responses given so far, the type of error common to all the three colleges is the elimination of a subordinator, and the verb element in the structure of the subordinate clause by providing 'you' as the answer. The table 2 below summarises the results

Table 2: The Error Types Made in Item 2							
College	you	you were leaving	Leaving	that you	I	I heard that	Total Errors
A	81	3	12	-	1	-	97
B	62	9	17	6	-	-	94
C	62	13	10	1	-	2	88
Total	205	25	39	7	1	2	279

Error Types (Item 3)

Regarding the sources of errors in Question 3, which participants were to identify the subject in the structure: ***That car which was stolen has been found***, the most common is the elimination of elements from the subordinate clause (nominal clause) as the responses to the question. The answer expected from the students is:

- 3) 'That car which was stolen'

The most common error type recorded is:

- i) 'That car'.

There is the elimination of the subordinator 'that', and the verb 'was stolen' from the structure that makes up the subordinate clause. College A had 48 of such an error, College B had 58 responses of such a kind, and College C had 80 of this type of error. There is also the response that states the type of error as:

- ii) 'That car which'

In this error type, there is the absence of the verb element that is crucial in the structure of the clause, and for this type, College A recorded 2, College B recorded 6, and College C recorded no such error.

Another type of error recorded is the type where just the verbal element in the subordinate clause structure has been provided as the answer to the question as:

- iii) 'was stolen'

Here, there is the absence of the noun element 'the car' and the subordinator 'that' in the structure. To this, College A, B, and C recorded 1 each of such an error type.

There is also the recorded type of error such as:

- iv) 'car'

where there were the eliminations of the article 'the', the subordinator 'that', and the verb 'was stolen'. All these elements were absent from the response. College A had 4 of such a response, College B had 5 of such response, and College C had 2 of such response.

The last error type recorded is the response which only 'that' introducing the subordinate clause in the structure is recorded as the answer to the question and this is:

- v) 'that'

And with this, only College A recorded 2 of such type of error. Below is the summation of the students' results.

Table 3: The Error Types Made in Item 3						
College	The car	The car that	was stolen	Car	the	Total Error
A	48	2	1	4	2	57
B	58	6	1	5	-	70
C	80	-	1	2	-	83
Total	186	8	3	11	2	210

Error Types (Item 4)

Question 4 which was for the participants to identify the adjunct in the structure: *We arrived when they had closed*, reveals some errors, as it is with all the questions so far discussed. The response which the students are expected to provide is:

- 4) 'when they had closed'

There is the error of elimination of some elements from the structure of the subordinate clause. A response like:

- i) 'they had closed.'

has eliminated the subordinator 'when' from the structure. College A had 6 of this error, College B had 4, and College C had 4 of this error.

Another type of error is the absence of the pronoun and the verb elements in the structure of the subordinate clause and this response is:

- ii) 'when'

This appeared in 27 responses of College A, 9 in College B, and as many as 45 in College C.

There is also the situation where only the verbal element in the structure of the subordinate clause is presented as the answer to question 4. This means there is the absence of the subordinator 'when' and the pronoun 'they' in the response provided as:

- iii) 'had closed'

College A had 24 of this error, College B had 34, and College C had 5.

There is also the situation where some elements have been lifted out of the main clause structure as the response to the question. There is a response like:

- iv) 'We arrived'

College A had 5 of this type of error. College B had 13, and College C had 1.

In some responses, only the verbal element in the main clause is recorded as:

- v) 'arrived'

About this, College A had 7 of this type of error. College B recorded no such error but College C recorded 5 of such an error. These results are represented below.

Table 4: The Error Types Made in Item 4						
College	they had closed	when	had closed	We arrived	arrived	Total Error
A	27	-	24	5	-	56
B	9	-	34	13	5	61
C	45	-	5	1	5	56
Total	81	-	63	19	10	173

Error Types (Item 5)

Question 5 has the structure: *How you think is what you are* and in this participants were to identify the complement in the structure. The response expected is:

- 5) 'what you are'

The first type of error recorded is where the main verb in the main clause is added to the structure of the subordinate clause (complement clause) as in:

- i) 'is what you are.'

About this error, College A recorded 21 of the kind, College B recorded 20, and College C recorded 40 of such an error.

Arthur

There is also the response of the auxiliary plus the main verb in the main clause which is added to the subordinate clause as the structure for the subordinate clause, like:

- ii) 'think is what you are.'

College A recorded 2 of this type of error, College B recorded no such error and College C recorded 1 of such error.

Another type of error recorded is the response that forms part of the main clause and therefore has got no link with the subordinate clause and this is:

- iii) 'How you think'

This appeared in 4 responses of College A, 13 responses of College B, and 3 responses of College C. There is also the situation where only the auxiliary verb in the main clause is selected as the response for the question:

- iv) 'think'

For this error, College A had 13 responses, College B had 4, and College C had no such error.

In another situation, only the main verb in the main clause is selected as the response to the question and this does not fall within the structure of the subordinate clause. This is:

- v) 'is'

For this error, College A had no such response; College B had 9 of such, with College C having 3 of such an error. An error of the type that has only the subordinator:

- vi) 'what'

as the response to the question also appeared. In this response, there is the absence of the pronoun 'you' and the verb 'are'. For this, College A had 4 of such error, College B recorded no error of such a type and College C recorded 10.

There is also the elimination of the subordinator 'what' from the structure given as a response to the question, therefore producing the structure:

- vii) 'you are'

College A had 13 of this kind, College B had 4, and College C had 2.

There is also the last error type that appeared in the responses provided by the students. Some elements are lifted from the main clause which has got nothing to do with the elements in the subordinate clause structure. This is:

- viii) 'you think'

For this type of error, only College B had 4 responses. The rest of the colleges had no responses for this type. The table below represents the results.

Table 5: The Error Type Made in Item 5									
College	is what you are	think what you are	How you think	think	is	what	you are	you think	Total Error
A	21	2	4	13	-	4	13	4	61
B	20	-	13	4	9	-	4	-	50
C	40	1	3	-	3	10	2	-	59
Total	81	3	20	17	12	14	19	4	170

Error Types (Item 6)

Question 6 requires respondents to underline the Object Complement in the structure: *We made John who he is today* and the answer is:

- 6) 'who he is today'

However, some responses provided have errors in them. There is an error type in the response provided which eliminated the pronoun, the verb, and the adverb in the structure of the subordinate clause. The response only provided the subordinator:

- i) 'who'.

College A had 13 of such a response, College B had 10, and College C had no such a response.

In another response, the type of error recorded is the elimination of the subordinator 'who' from the structure, therefore making the response not a subordinate clause as it is the subordinator that is the element that begins the subordinate clause. This is:

- ii) 'he is today'

For this type of error, College A had 25 responses, College B had 28, and College C had 55.

Another error type recorded is where the response provided has no element of the subordinate clause in it. It rather has the object of the sentence as the response to the question:

- iii) 'John'

So there is a total absence of the subordinate clause. For this type of response, College A had 8, College B had 4, and College C had 1.

There is also the response where there is the elimination of the subordinator 'who', the verb 'is' and the adverb 'today'. Only the pronoun

- iv) 'he'

which is an element in the structure of the subordinate clause is given as a response. College A had 10 of such, College B had 8 and College C had no such response.

There is again the situation where an element which is not part of the subordinate clause is added to it, that is, the object of the sentence is added to the structure of the subordinate clause, and therefore the response to the question is:

- v) 'John who he is today.'

College A had 5 of this kind of response, College B had 14 and College C had 5 of such a response.

Another type of error is that the response provided has no element of the subordinate clause but rather elements of the main clause as the answer to the question as:

- vi) 'We made John'

College B had 3 of such a response, and College C had 2 while College A had no response.

There is the lifting of the object 'John' and the subordinator 'who' together as the response to the question, therefore the response:

- vii) 'John who'

This means there is the absence of the pronoun 'he', the verb 'is', and the adverb 'today' but there is the addition of an element from the main clause- 'John'. College A had 1 of this type of error, College B had 5, and College C had no response. As a type of error to the response to question 6, there is the elimination of the verb 'is' and the adverb 'today' from the structure of the subordinate clause. So the answer provided is:

- viii) 'who he'

College A had 3 of such a response, College B had 1, and College C had no response on that.

There is a response provided by only College A and it is an element from the main clause that is not part of the subordinate clause. That is:

Table 6: The Error Types Made in Item 6

College	who	he is today	John	he	John who he is today	We made John	John who	who he	We	Total Error
A	13	25	8	10	5	-	1	3	3	68
B	10	28	4	8	14	3	5	1	-	73
C	-	55	1	-	5	2	-	-	-	63
Total	23	108	13	18	24	5	6	4	3	204

Error Types (Item 7)

In question 7, the participants were to identify the complement of a preposition in the structure: ***Our success depends on how we play***. The expected answer is ‘*how we play*’. This also has some errors displayed by the subjects. There is the error where subjects added the preposition in the sentence to the elements that form the subordinate clause i.e. 7) ‘*how we play*’; therefore, providing the answer:

- i) ‘on how we play.’

College A provided 51 answers of this kind, College B provided 38, and College C provided 87.

Another type of error is where the response has a verbal element lifted outside the structure of the subordinate clause and added to the preposition which is also outside the structure of the subordinate clause to provide the answer:

- ii) ‘depends on’

For this type of error, College A had 9, College B had 5, and College C had 1.

Some subjects also provided only the preposition:

- iii) ‘on’

which has nothing to do with the subordinate clause in the sentence as the answer. There is a total elimination of the elements in the structure of the subordinate clause. For College A, 9 of such a response occurred, College B, 12, and College C no response indicating such an error.

- iv) ‘We play’

is also a response provided by some subjects and that is an error. These are parts of the subordinate clause without the subordinator. College A had 5 of such a response, College B had 8, and College C had 1.

There is also the error type where there is the lifting of some elements from the main or matrix clause that are not part of the subordinate clause as the answer to the question:

- v) ‘Our success’

College A displayed 13 of such a response, College B displayed 13, and no such a response for College C.

Another response that is also an error is where some subjects provided only the subordinator:

- vi) ‘how’

as the answer to the question. There is the elimination of the pronoun ‘we’ and the verb ‘play’. College B had 1 of this kind of response, with College A and C having no response to that kind. The last error type as a response to question 7 is where in College C 2 respondents have lifted some elements outside the subordinate clause to add to the subordinate clause as the answer to the question and this is:

- vii) ‘depends on how we play.’

The table below sums up the results.

Table 7: The Error Type Made in Item 7

College	on how we play	depends on	on	We play	Our success	how	depends on how we play	Total Error
A	51	9	9	5	13	-	-	87
B	38	5	12	8	13	1	-	77
C	87	1	-	1	-	-	2	91
Total	176	15	21	14	26	1	2	255

Error Types (Item 8)

Question 8 required the participants to identify the adjunct in the structure: *He lent her the money because she needed it*. A lot of the errors that appeared in question 8 are of the type where students eliminated the pronouns 'she' and 'it', and the verb 'needed' that add to the subordinator 'because', to form the subordinate clause. The expected answer is 8) 'because she needed it'. They therefore provided only the subordinator as the answer to the question:

- i) 'because'

College A displayed 22 of this type of error, with College B displaying 10 and College C also displaying 20. Another type of error is where the main clause is provided as the answer to the question. There is total elimination of the subordinate clause. The answer provided for the question is:

- ii) 'He lent her the money,

College A gave 2 of such a response, College B 10, and College C 1.

There is also the response which indicated the absence of the subordinator that begins the subordinate clause. All the other elements in the subordinate clause are present with the exception of the subordinator in the response:

- iii) 'she needed it'

For this response, College A gave 36, College B 34 and College C 36.

Also, a response using the verb only:

- iv) 'lent'

from the main clause is provided as the answer to the question and this has no link to the subordinate clause. College A provided 9 responses to this kind of error. College B provided 4 and College C provided 5.

College B provided a type of error which the other two colleges did not provide. An element;

- v) 'the money'

is lifted from the main clause and added to the subordinate clause as the response to the question. There were 3 of this type of error. Summation of the results is done in the table below.

Table 8: The Error Type Made in Item 8

College	because	He lent her the money	she needed it	Lent	the money	Total Error
A	22	2	36	9	-	69
B	10	10	34	4	3	61
C	20	1	36	5	-	62
Total	52	13	106	18	3	192

Error Types (Item 9)

The participants were to identify the object in the structure: *I noticed that he spoke Akan with an Australian accent*. Question 9 has some errors displayed by the students of the three colleges. The expected answer to the question is 9) 'that he spoke Akan with an Australian accent'. One of the errors is the lifting of an element out of the elements that form the structure of the subordinate clause and this is:

- i) 'Akan'.

College A had 17 of this kind of error, College B had 10, and College C had 7.

Another type of error is the lifting of an element from outside the elements that form the structure of the subordinate clause as the response to the question.

- ii) 'I'

as the response provided to the question is part of the main clause. For this, College A provided 5, College B provided no such error, and College C provided 1.

There is also the type of error where there is the absence of the subordinator 'that', the pronoun 'he', and the verb 'spoke' from the structure that forms the subordinate clause, therefore the answer provided is:

- iii) 'Akan with an Australian accent.'

College A provided 7 of this answer, College B provided 7, and College C 21.

There is another element lifted out of the structure of the subordinate clause as the response to the question and this is:

- iv) 'Australian accent'.

College A had 22 of this kind of response, College B had 32, and College C had 50.

In another response the subordinator 'that' is present with the pronoun 'he' and the verb 'spoke'. There are some other elements added to those mentioned to form the structure of the subordinate clause but the response eliminated parts of these elements ('with an Australian accent.') and added 'Akan' to the first mentioned elements, therefore making the answer incomplete. The response is:

- v) 'that he spoke Akan'

College A gave 1 of such a response, College B and College C gave no response of this type. In another case, only the pronoun:

- vi) 'he'

in the subordinate clause is provided as the answer to the question. Which means all the other important elements forming the structure of the subordinate clause are absent. For this, College A provided 46 of the kind, College B 23 and College C none.

Another type of error is the lifting of the main clause and adding it to some part of the subordinate clause as the response to the question:

- vii) 'I noticed that he spoke Akan'.

College B is the only college that responded to such a response, with 11 responses.

The last error type to question 9 is provided by Colleges B and C with B providing 15 and C providing 14 responses. The error made is that the subordinator 'that' is absent from the structure of the subordinate clause that is provided as the answer to the question:

- viii) 'he spoke Akan with an Australian accent.'

The table below represents the results.

Table 9: The Error Type Made in Item 9

College	Akan	I	Akan with an Australian accent.	Australian accent	that he spoke Akan	he	I noticed that he spoke Akan	he spoke with an Australian accent.	Total Error
A	17	5	7	22	1	46	-	-	98
B	10	-	7	32	-	23	11	15	98
C	7	1	21	50	-	-	-	14	93
Total	34	6	35	104	1	69	11	29	289

Error Types (Item 10)

The last type of error types to be discussed in this section is found in question 10. The participants were to identify the adjunct in the structure: *If you see them, give them my best wishes*, and the expected answer is 10) 'if you see them'. The first error is where only the subordinator:

- i) 'If'

is provided as the answer to the question. This means there is the absence of the pronouns 'you' and 'them' and the verb 'see' which form part of the elements that constitute the structure of the subordinate clause. College A provided 39 of such a response, College B provided 18, and College C provided 43.

Some elements from the main clause were lifted in response to the question and these are:

- ii) 'best wishes.'

This response is not associated with the structure of the subordinate clause. College A had 29 of this type of error, College B had 32, and College C had 11.

Another type of error is that the subordinator 'if' and one of the pronouns 'you' are absent from the structure provided as the subordinate clause. The response provided is:

- iii) 'see them'

College A provided 2 of such a response, College B provided 2, and College C provided 1.

There is also the situation where the main clause is provided as the answer to the question. There is no element in the structure of the subordinate clause present. The response provided is:

- iv) 'give them my best wishes.'

Table 10: The Error Type Made in Item 10

College	If	Best wishes	See them	Give them my best wishes	Total Error
A	39	29	2	10	80
B	18	32	2	13	65
C	43	11	1	7	62
Total	100	72	5	30	207

College A provided 10 of the response, College B provided 13, and College C provided 7.

It is seen from the discussions made so far that question 6 has the highest number of error types, that is, 9 different types of errors. This is followed by questions 5, and 9 with 8 error types. Question 7 has 7 error types, question 2 with 6, questions 1, 3, 4, and 8 with 5 different types of errors each. Question 10 has the least number of error types and that is 4. Clearly, these indicate a significant level of errors, thus suggesting that respondents'

knowledge or understanding of subordination was generally poor. The table below gives a frequency distribution on all the results.

Table 11: Frequency Distribution			
Questions	High: 8 to 9	Mid: 4 to 5	Low: 6 to 7
1	-	5	-
2	-	-	6
3	-	5	-
4	-	5	-
5	8	-	-
6	9	-	-
7	-	-	7
8	-	5	-
9	8	-	-
10	-	4	-
Total	25	24	13

The response to research Q1: '*what is students' knowledge about subordinate clauses?* '

The errors manifested in the discussions are clear evidence that the students did not understand the nature of the clause, i.e. what constitutes a clause. A clear example is the response given to question 4 where respondents provided only the subordinator *when* as the answer to the question. The important constituents of the clause *they* and *had closed* were eliminated. College A had 27 of this, College B, 9 and College C as many as 45. They did not also understand clause functions- subject, object, complement and adjunct as in question 6 where respondents were to underline the object complement in "We made John who he is today." Students' responses included *who, he is today, John, he, etc.* when the correct answer is *who he is today*.

Another problem identified was that they did not understand the subordination device. In constructing a subordinate clause, one key element is the use of a subordinator that clearly identifies one part of the sentence as the subordinate clause and the other as the main clause. And students from all the three colleges of education were seen to lack the basic knowledge of subordination. For example in question 2, a response like *you were leaving* instead of *that you were leaving*, was registered.

The recorded errors indicated that a significant number of students at the colleges of education did not have knowledge about *subordinate clauses*.

Q2: Why do students have problems with the use of subordinate clauses?

This second research question sought to find out the reason/s behind the students of colleges of education's inability to identify the functions or the use of subordinate clauses. This question was answered through the use of interviews of the teachers. The study used interviews to identify some of the causes of errors that the students commit in their identification of subordinate clauses as well as their inability to use subordinate clauses. The questions were to find out some of the challenges, if any, that confront them in the teaching/learning of English at the colleges of education, what the tutors thought was their students' reaction to subordinate clauses; if they saw it as an important tool in the construction of sentences in the English Language and, if subordinate clause was well covered in textbooks that they use. These interviews were transcribed by the researcher.

Responses from the Interview

College A

In College A, on the question of students' reaction to subordinate clauses, the interviewed tutor responded by saying that students found it difficult to understand the structure of the subordinate clause. Sometimes, students in their attempt to write a sentence would write a dependent clause (subordinate clause). He thought that the students lacked knowledge of the essential elements in the clause structure especially, the verb. Apart from the verb, there were also the subordinating conjunctions in the structure of the subordinate clause to begin with, and

students had the problem of having to choose the correct subordinators to construct the subordinate clauses. In his reaction to whether he saw subordination as an important aspect of grammar especially for students, he said it was one of the devices used in constructing sentence. Therefore without it, students' writing would be boring as they needed to vary their sentence construction by using the different types of sentences in a written discourse. He insisted that proficiency was possible only if each student had a book from which he/she could work out some practice exercises.

College B

The tutor interviewed in this college thought that lack of prescribed textbooks, specially designed for the colleges of education was a major contributory factor to students' inability to identify subordinate clauses. He added that the textbooks available in the market had language that was sometimes difficult to understand by the tutors themselves. To him, English Language was compulsory and that was why the students were compelled to do it. He also thought that the time allocated for the teaching of the English Language on the timetable was not adequate to cover all the various aspects of the subject. As a result, each aspect was not well treated to the understanding of the students. The course outline did not cover much as far as the treatment of subordination was concerned. He, therefore, suggested that the examining body did something about it.

College C

The tutor interviewed here also accepted the fact that his students had problems with subordinate clauses but was quick to add that some tutors were contributors to the students' problems, as these tutors advised them to be simple in their sentences by writing simple expressions. He had a problem with the expression 'simple sentence' as it was not defined. He added, "Are we talking about the structure being simple or the fact that students should not use subordination?" To the specific areas of problem with regards to subordination, he mentioned that the students found the use of appropriate subordinators to form the different types and functions of the subordinate clause difficult. They also had difficulty with the sequence of tenses in the clauses. In summary, all the teachers interviewed in the three colleges agreed to the importance of *subordinate clauses* in the construction of sentences. They, therefore, suggested that much attention should be given to it and its treatment in the course outline for the colleges of education.

The final question the study sought to answer is:

Q3: How can students use the various types of subordinators to construct subordinate clauses correctly?

Here, particular attention was given to how the students used the different kinds of subordinators in constructing the different types of subordinate clauses in their essays. The use of subordinators like *which, who, that, whom, whose*, etc. by the students to form relative clauses was what was first looked at in the scripts. Of the 150 scripts analysed, the relative pronoun *which*, appeared in 92 scripts with each of the scripts using this subordinator correctly to construct the relative clause, except 15. For example, one of the scripts had a sentence like:

1) *Mr. Chairman, related to the above is huge pocket money which is given to boys by their parents (adults).*

In the above construction, it is seen that the student does not only use the subordinator to construct the relative clause correctly, but he is also able to show that the clause (subordinate) is embedded in the matrix/main clause. Some of the wrong forms identified were:

1) *Some students destroy school furniture which is not good.*

2) *They chose to do which ever they want.*

3) *All the people which are witnesses must volunteer information.*

The next subordinator which was used correctly by most of the students was *who* and this appeared in 60 scripts out of the 150 scripts. For example, a student wrote:

1) *I then decided to go to join the area guys who had assembled near the stream making merry.*

In this construction, the student is able to use the relative clause to give us additional information about the noun 'the area guys' in the sentence; therefore making it easier for us to know the specific 'area guys' he is talking about. Another subordinator which was used in almost all the 150 scripts is the subordinator *that* which is used

in constructing the relative clause. In fact, this subordinator appeared in 147 scripts and it appeared severally in each script. Examples of the use of this subordinator in some of the scripts are:

1. *'I will begin my submission by making it emphatically clear that corruption is becoming more alarming in recent time and the root cause of this is politicians.'*
2. *'To begin with, survival syndrome is one of the greatest problem that causes the high number of street children in our society.'*

The ability of some students to use some of the subordinators mentioned above to construct relative clauses correctly, indicates that they know what goes into the construction of the relative clauses, to some extent. However, there were a few instances where some of the subordinators used in constructing some relative clauses were used wrongly by some of the students. In fact, the majority of the students did not use these subordinators and the few who attempted using them had them wrong. For instance, the subordinator **whom** appeared in only 2 out of the 150 scripts, meaning that only two students attempted using it. However, the two who attempted to use it had it wrongly used. One of the scripts had this as it tried to use the subordinator **whom**:

- 1) *'It is no wonder that the president claim that any DCE or MCE whom wanted to contest for election as MP should resign.'* That of the second script is:
- 2) *'On the 11th day of January, 2000, thieves broke into the room of one of the tenant whom had travelled at about 2:00 p.m. and took away a lot of his precious personal effects.'*

We can see that the students cannot differentiate between the uses of the subordinators **who** and **whom** to form the relative clause. **Who** as a subordinator is used when the pronoun in the relative clause is the subject of the verb. On the other hand, if the pronoun is not the subject but the object of the verb in the relative clause, then **whom** as a subordinate is used. For instance, in a sentence like:

- i. *'The boy who sold the pen is my brother'*, the subordinator **who** is selected because it is the subject of the verb sold. But in a sentence like:
 - ii. *'The boys whom we beat are crying'*, the pronoun **whom** as a subordinator is selected because it is not the subject in the relative clause, instead we is the subject. This information is what the students lack, therefore their use of the wrong subordinator to construct the relative clause which has made the whole structure wrong. Students could also use other subordinators appropriately to form the various kinds of the relative clause, which is an indication that they know the rules governing the construction of the relative clauses, to some extent. The other types of subordinate clauses also looked at in the 150 scripts to find out how far the students are able to use them were: the adverbial clauses of time, place, reason, etc. With the subordinators use in forming the adverbial clause of time, the students used a lot of them in the essays. The subordinator **after** appeared in 56 out of the 150 scripts and it was used correctly. For instance, one of the scripts has it that:
1. *'It was around 10:00 pm when I left the premises of the Roxy Cinema after the night film show was over.'*

Another subordinator used is **while** which appeared in 16 out of the 150 scripts with one of them using it wrongly. For instance, a script has it in a sentence as:

1. *'They intend telling lies that they want to visit one of their parent while they go about roaming with friends.'* Here, the construction is correct and it is easy to identify which is the subordinate clause with the subordinator **while** and which is the main clause. There is also an instance where this same subordinator has been used wrongly. For example:
2. *'While most cases poor parents engage their wards in hard time businesses which involve roaming on the streets of our country instead of attending school.'*

A critical look at this construction reveals that the sentence is incomplete because the student failed to add a main clause to the subordinate clause. This is a clear indication that he/she does not know how to construct sentences using the subordinate clause. Other subordinators like **before** appeared in 18 scripts, since in 10 scripts, immediately in 5, when in 28, and as in 4 scripts. All these were used correctly with the exception of **since** which one of the scripts had used wrongly. For example these subordinators appeared in the following correct sentences:

1. *'The most solution to this problem is that couples preparing for this marriage should take counselling session very seriously, before they go into marriage and take proper care of their children.'*

2. *'Immediately I stepped out of the room, I removed my mobile phone and tried to call the police.'*
3. *'As I walked along the streets I saw a dark blue four wheel drive packed in front of a nice building.'*
4. *'When there is a divorce in most cases, children are not properly taken care of by the father.'*

Although, all these subordinators are used correctly, there are instances where some of the subordinators used to construct the adverbial clause of time are wrongly used and/or did not appear in any of the scripts. For instance, the subordinator *till* did not appear in any of the 150 scripts. *Till* appeared in only one script and that was wrongly done as in:

5. *'To solve these problems till the Government should establish a lot of job opportunities for the youth.'*

One cannot tell which part of the above sentence is the subordinate clause with the subordinator *till*. It would have been better if the student had not put in the subordinator and this would have made the sentence meaningful. As mentioned earlier, *since* is used wrongly by one student as he writes:

6. *'Most young girls in the society are not educated and since of them a put in a family by irresponsible men who may end up not accepting the pregnancy.'*

It is very difficult for one to make meaning out of the whole structure. One cannot differentiate between the main clause and the subordinate clause in the construction. There is a subordinator *since* alright but it does not make the part of the structure it is beginning to become a subordinate clause. Also, subordinators used in forming the adverbial clause of place are looked at in the 150 scripts. For instance, the subordinator *where* correctly appeared in 30 out of the 150 scripts. For example, in one of the scripts, it is written:

7. *'It is quite surprising that most of them were brought up in a religious home where moral teachings were given to them to lead a better life.'*

Wherever, as a subordinator appeared in only one script and it was used wrongly in:

8. *'Wherever they had shot my brother, they all went on to pick more eggs from the poultry farm.'*

The problem with this construction is that there is no link or agreement of meaning between the subordinate clause and the main clause.

The next items analysed were the subordinators for constructing the clause of reason. Here, *since* appeared in 6 out of 150 scripts and it was used correctly. For example:

9. *'Since I knew the poultry farm was been (sic.) guided by two strong watchmen I thought nothing could happen.'*

Because *as* a subordinator appeared in 21 out of the 150 scripts and it was used correctly. For example, one of the scripts has it that:

10. *'Because of the high taxes imposed on the goods, they might face certain financial problems.'*

With the clauses of reason, the students did not have problems using the appropriate subordinators to construct them. Regarding the clause of concession, the subordinators used in constructing it rarely appeared in the 150 scripts. *Although* and *though* appeared in 2 and 3 respectively out of the 150 scripts. One out of the 2 scripts has the use of *although* wrong. All the three scripts have *though* used correctly. For example, in one of the scripts, it is written:

11. *'Though this may seem unrealistic, it has worked in countries like United Kingdom and USA where there are laws which compels both close and extended relations of children in the absence of their parents to take care of the children.'*

In the above, the subordinate clause is referring to an earlier mentioned statement which is in contrast to the main clause in the sentence. Not only does the student know how to construct the subordinate clause using the subordinator *though*, he also knows that it is used to show contrast between the subordinate clause and the main clause. The wrong use of *although* appeared in the following:

12. *'In the first place, there should be although laws to track down parents or relatives or adopters who refuses to perform their duties either with ignorance or intentional.'*

In this construction, one cannot tell which part of it is the subordinate clause with the subordinator "although", and which part is the main clause. If one tries to make a subordinate clause out of the construction, then it means there is going to be no main clause. In fact, the best thing one has to do to get the whole structure correct is for one to do away with the subordinator "although" so that the sentence will read:

- a) In the first place, there should be laws to track down parents or relatives or adopters who refuse to perform

their duties either with ignorance or intentional.

This will now make the subordinate clause become a relative clause with a subordinator “who” and this will make the sentence correct. With the clause of concession, the use of the subordinator however was attempted by few students, that is, eighteen students but most of these students did not use it to show the contrast between the subordinate and the main clauses. These students just began paragraphs with the subordinator “however” without first making any statement to show the contrast. For instance, in a sentence like:

1. ‘However as I got nearer to the shop I was sensing danger but I did not know, when I got to the shop, I saw the car parked in front of the shop,’ by one of the students which is a sentence beginning a paragraph, there is no statement made in the previous paragraph that this particular statement is contrasting with.

The adverbial clause of result constructed with subordinators like so that, as a result, and so also occurred. “As a result” as a subordinator appeared in 15 out of the 150 scripts. Fourteen out of the 15 scripts had this subordinator used correctly. An example is:

1. ‘It is as a result of this that I wish to bring out my views on the problem and suggest possible remedies.’

The subordinate clause with the subordinator as a result is in agreement with the main clause of the sentence. On the other hand, the other script has the subordinator “as a result” used wrongly:

2. ‘Sir, According to my own research being made about some industrial and some central business centres like Ashanti Region, for Kumasi to be precise, come to notice that as a result of the research most of the youth both male and females from the northern part of the country and rural or remote areas troop into the cities to seek a greener pastures to cater for their parents and also some get unwanted pregnancies which leads to abundance of their children because of single parenting, in which them alone parents the child hence streetism.’

Looking at this lengthy sentence with unclear meaning, there is no agreement between the subordinate clause with the subordinator “as a result” and the supposed main clause. It is even difficult to differentiate between the main clause and the subordinate clause. ‘So that’ as a subordinator appeared in 5 scripts, and it was used correctly. An example of this is:

3. ‘I hired a hotel in Accra to lodge so that I can accompany my brother back to Kumasi the next day.’

‘If’ is a subordinator used for constructing the conditional clause of reason and it appeared in 13 out of the 150 scripts and all were correctly used. An example is:

4. ‘The issue of street children can be dealt with more successfully if we flag up the expansion of orphanages and the building of new ones to cater for them.’

All the students who used the subordinator “if” understood how and when to use this subordinator.

Summary of Findings

From the analyses so far made it is clear that some of the students can use some of the subordinators to construct some subordinate clauses correctly while some cannot. Through the analyses it was clear that the students found it easy to construct the relative clauses but when it came to constructing some of the adverbial clauses some of the students could not use the appropriate subordinators to construct them. This means that they did not understand the nature of some of the adverbial clauses. For example, the subordinators while and till could not be used to form the correct adverbial clauses as shown in the examples.

Pedagogical Implications on Findings

This study has pedagogic implications for the teaching and learning of English in colleges of education in Ghana. Policy makers in our educational sector should ensure that teachers are encouraged to investigate into areas that they find their students lacking so that they can help bring solutions to these areas to help improve upon the educational system in the country. The information gathered out of the research can guide all those involved in producing teaching/learning materials for use at the colleges of education. It is important for curriculum designers, especially trainers of teachers, to include in their curriculum the philosophy behind the inclusion of the aspects of language, and all other subjects they are trained to teach, for that matter. This will enable the trainee teachers to appreciate the relevance of these inclusions after their training.

All the stakeholders involved in the planning of activities for the colleges of education must not forget the importance of textbooks to the teaching/learning process. They should, therefore, ensure that textbooks are provided for both tutors' and students' use. In the preparation of the textbooks, the tutors who teach the various subjects/aspects should be involved since they know the peculiar problems students face in the classroom. The textbooks when designed should seek to address these problems.

I strongly believe that the skill of subordination is an important tool for the construction of meaningful sentences. It must, therefore, be included in the syllabi of all the various levels of education, especially from the junior high school to the university level, so that students would be competent in its use.

Conclusion

The objective of this paper was to find out if students at the colleges of education could identify and use subordinate clauses because of the inability of students to construct the complex sentence in their essays and also, use the skills in their answers to comprehension passage questions. Most of the students avoided using the complex sentence and those who used it did not write complete sentences. This problem was identified in the end-of-semester examination conducted by Institute of Education, where students were made to write essays and also answer questions on comprehension passage.

The difficulties students faced in their use of subordinate clause were manifested in the corpus of errors collected in the test item. Also, tutors interviewed attested to the fact that students did not find grammar a pleasant subject to learn and this included all grammatical issues. Apart from this problem, both teachers and students did not have prescribed textbooks to use for the teaching/learning process. All these give answers to the research questions that guided the study.

References

- Agor, J.T. (2003). *Investigating English Concord Problems in the Writings of Teacher Trainees*. Unpublished M.Phil. Thesis, University of Ghana.
- Breindl, E. (2007b). Additive Konjunktionen und Adverbien im Deutschen. In *Feldergrammatik in der Diskussion. Funktionaler Grammatikansatz in Sprachbeschreibung und Sprachvermittlung*, J. Buscha and R. Freudenberg-Findeisen (eds.), 141-164. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang.
- Bishop, G. (1985). *Curriculum Development: A Textbook for Students*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Byram, R. & McPartland, M. (1982). "Introduction". In Goodings et al., (eds). *Changing Priorities in Teacher Education*. London: Croom. Helm.
- Corder, S. P. (1974). *The Significance of Learners' Errors*. IRAL. 5/4. Oxford: OUP.
- Cristofaro, S. (2003). *Subordination*. Oxford: University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp 118-122).
- Edu-Buandoh, D. (1997). A Preliminary Report on the Study of Error Patterns in Written Essays of Selected Students. In M. E. Kropp Dakubu (Ed.) *English in Ghana*. Accra: Black Mask Publishers.
- Lenon, P. (1991). *Error: Some Problems of Definition, Identification, and Distinction*. *Applied Linguistics* 12 (2), 180-196
- Littlewood, W. (1985). *Foreign and Second Language Learning*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Opoku, K. (2015). *The Study of Clause Complexing in the Editorials of the "Daily Graphic"*. Unpublished Thesis, University of Education, Winneba
- Owu-Ewie, C., & Lomotey, C.F. (2016). L1 (Akan) interference errors in L2 (English) writing: the case of three junior high school students in Ghana. *American Journal of Language and Literacy*, 1, A1-A18. Retrieved on February 26 2017 from <http://www.ASRAresearch.org/ajll-vol-1-no-1-2016/>
- Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. London: Longman