AN ANALYSIS OF NATIVE DARI SPEAKERS’ ERRORS IN UNIVERSITY-LEVEL DARI AND ENGLISH WRITING

by

SHAMIM NADERI

B. A., University of Balkh, 1997

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Modern Languages
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2010

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Young-ok Yum
Abstract

Writing well, especially in English, is an asset to anyone who aspires to succeed in the academic or other professional fields in this age of English as a lingua franca. Numerous scholars have investigated errors committed by English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) learners. However, to date there is no empirical study on the error patterns displayed in native Dari speakers’ EFL writing in English and in Dari. The present study investigates error occurrences in 20 native Dari speakers’ English and Dari writing. These participants were English majors attending Balkh University, in Mazar-i-Sharif, Afghanistan. Most of the participants self-identified their English proficiency levels as “advanced.” The data were collected through convenience sampling of the students enrolled in EFL writing courses who voluntarily participated in two writing tasks of different levels of difficulty; they completed these first in English and then a week later in Dari.

In order to observe any patterns, all spelling and word choice errors were identified by three independent judges (one Dari instructor at BU, one native-American-English-speaking graduate student in the English Department, and the author who is bilingual and works as an English instructor). All three worked separately initially and then discussed any discrepancies together in person (English) or via Skype (Dari), until they reached consensus. The analysis, concerning the three research hypotheses, supported these findings: (1) as predicted, the native Dari speakers committed a variety of errors similar to learners from previous studies; (2) as predicted, the participants made fewer errors in English than in Dari; and (3) counter to the hypothesis, the results indicated that the participants, when writing in Dari, demonstrated more errors in the simpler tasks; yet, the participants committed more errors in the more complex (versus simpler) English writing task, consistent with this hypothesis.
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CHAPTER 1 - Introduction

1.1. Spelling and Word Choice Errors in EFL Writing

English is *the* international language today, especially in this age of global interconnectedness. Writing well in English is a tool for economic advancement everywhere in the world, not only in English speaking countries. Many essential daily interactions may involve writing in English, for example, emailing friends, writing a paper on the computer, and texting on cellular phones. However, the ability to write well is not a skill that can be acquired without work. It takes training and practice to write well even in one’s first language (L1). Naturally, it is necessary for all learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL) to work on their writing skills in order to be good communicators whether for the purpose of business, education, or relationships. However, it is yet largely unknown how well EFL students in countries where the L1 literacy rate is low perform in EFL versus L1 writing.

Thus this research explored and analyzed writing samples in English and Dari by native Dari-speaking Afghan university students in order to examine the interrelationship between L1 and L2 writing errors. Analyzing errors to determine one’s L2 (and L1) competence is controversial. In L1 writing, the need for “fluency” is often the focus instead of having writers worry about committing errors and mistakes. Latif (2009) stated that fluency is important in L2 writing as investigating fluency can inform us of the difficulties students may encounter in producing their written texts in particular and in assessing writing in general. Although to a limited extent, the author believes analyzing L2 errors in writing will inform future researchers and teachers what to pay attention to in assessing Afghan EFL learners’ proficiency, partly accounted for by a low error probability. Mourtaga (2004) states that errors and mistakes are
different because an error cannot be self-corrected and is caused by a learner’s inadequate knowledge in the target language, whereas a mistake can be self-corrected.

1.2. The Purpose of the Present Study

The purpose of the present study is to identify spelling and word choice errors in the writing samples produced by Afghan native Dari speakers and to discover the interrelationship between errors in L1 and L2 in order to add to the pre-existing EFL research literature and offer some suggestions for better English teaching practices in Afghanistan.

The present study was designed to investigate native Afghan-Dari speakers’ English and Dari writing errors, and then offer some EFL pedagogical strategies regarding those errors. The unique thing about it is that no study has yet examined errors made by native Dari speakers in English and Dari. In addition, by employing error analysis in an Afghan EFL setting, the present study will analyze EFL learners’ spelling and word choice errors and offer implications for L2 teaching and research in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Finally, the present study was designed to generate meaningful findings that will attract other L2 researchers and teacher-scholars to study native-Dari-speaking foreign language learners, as well as other understudied L2 learner groups, and to facilitate the development of innovative and effective EFL teacher training programs in Afghanistan and around the globe.

It is proposed that writing in EFL may be challenging to Afghan learners due to three major factors: the interference of Dari in English writing, absence of a secure sociopolitical and educational infrastructure, and lack of exposure/development of L1 writing. Afghan students may struggle in English writing largely because of the differences in grammar and spelling that exist in their L1 and L2, the instruction that results from underdeveloped EFL teacher training programs, and poor L1 literacy education. Three decades of wars have destroyed the primary and
secondary education system and higher education institutions in Afghanistan for which reconstruction efforts are ongoing.

This study focuses on different categories of spelling and word choice errors which are important for writing, such as derivation, inflection, use of homophones, word choice and basic spelling mistakes. These particular error categories were chosen because they were the most frequent errors in the participants’ writing samples.

1.3. Dari: An Official Afghan Language

Dari (or Farsi or Persian), an indo-European language, is mainly spoken in Afghanistan, Iran, and Tajikistan. There are three main varieties: Farsi (Iran), Dari (Afghanistan), and Takiji (Tajikistan). As defined in the Constitution of Afghanistan, Dari is an official language of Afghanistan spoken by much of the Afghan population. The Afghan Constitution (2004) states, “From among the languages of Pashto, Dari, Uzbeki, Turkmani, Baluchi, Pashaei, Nuristani, and other languages spoken in the country, Pashto and Dari are the official languages of the state” (art.16, 4).

Although Dari and Pashto are both official languages of Afghanistan, Dari is considered to be the lingua franca in Afghanistan as all ethnicities speak Dari. Dari is the mother tongue of the Tajik and Hazara ethnicities, but other ethnicities speak Dari because it is used in schools in the northern part of the country. Dari primarily uses the Arabic alphabet, although it has characters that are unique to Dari. The Dari alphabet consists of thirty-two letters. There are no capital letters and its script is written from right to left. Letters of a word are adjoined with each other in both handwriting and print forms in Dari (Elwell-Sutton, 1963). The Dari alphabet is as follows:

ابپتثجحخدذرزسشصضطظغفقکگلمنوہ
In addition to the 28 Arabic characters, Dari contains 4 more letters nonexistent in the Arabic alphabet that are [p], [ch], [zh], and [g].

Although this study does not focus on grammar, some key differences between Dari and English should be mentioned. Dari grammar is similar to that of many other Indo-European languages, especially those in the Indo-Iranian family. There are several differences between English and Dari grammar, the first of which involves the order of different grammatical roles in a sentence. The sentence construction of Dari is different from that of English in that the canonical order of a sentence in Dari is Subject + Object + Verb (SOV), while in English it is Subject + Verb + Object (SVO). Examples 1 and 2 show sentence construction in Dari.

1. Man sib mikhoram.
   I apple eat.
   I eat an apple.

2. O kitab mikhanad.
   He/she book reads.
   He/she reads a book.

Another difference between English and Dari is that in Dari adjectives typically follow the nouns they modify, using the *ezafé* construct. Mace states, “The word اضافه (*Ezafé*) means 'addition' or ‘supplement’. It is an important grammatical device, which takes the form of a suffix added to a word to show its relationship to the following word or words” (2003, p. 213). This refers to an enclitic, in this case the unstressed vowel *e* that joins a noun to an adjective. This enclitic denotes possession (Elwell-Sutton, 1963). For example, *ketab-e man* means *my book*. When *ezafé* follows a noun ending in a vowel, it becomes a glide known as *hey ye* and represented by the character ʰ, pronounced –ye: e.g., *khaneh-ye man* for *my house* (Ghomeshi,
If a Dari speaker wishes to say that he/she just saw a beautiful girl. He will utter a phrase like Example 3.

3. Dokhtar -e- maqbol
   Girl               beautiful
   Beautiful girl

The third grammatical feature that Dari does not share with English is compound verbs.

In the majority of the cases *kardan ‘do, make’* is combined with a noun to make compound verbs as in examples 4, 5, 6 and 7.

4. Kar kardan (to work)
5. Khawab kardan (to sleep)
6. Safar kardan (to travel)
7. Bidar kardan (to awake)

In other words, Dari speakers use compound verbs to convey meaning that in English could be done by a single word. For example, the English verb “to work” in Dari is made up of the noun *Kar* (work) and *Kardan* (to do). The most common verbs that are used for making compound verbs are *Kardan* (to do), *Shudan* (to become), and *Bodan* (to be) (Glassman, 1971).

The above mentioned particular differences were chosen because they related to structures observed in the Dari writing samples collected for this study.

### 1.4. EFL Education in Afghanistan

While teaching English at Balkh University in Afghanistan, the author observed that most Afghan students have difficulty with writing in English and in their L1, Dari. In Afghanistan, English instruction used to begin in grade 7 in schools, but fortunately it now begins in grade 4. This means that Afghan students begin studying English nine years before they enter the
universities. Still, the percentage of those who write well in English and Dari is low. Afghan EFL learners tend to speak fluently in both languages, but cannot explain their thoughts in a concise and logical manner when writing. This may be due to the fact that they have not been explicitly taught in Dari to express their feelings and thoughts or to present a well-structured argument.

Cummins explains why people may speak well in a language, but not write as well. He argues that if the development of literacy in a target language (L2) is the goal of a course, then extensive reading in that language is crucial (2001). Since most Afghan youth have exposure to English through television and other forms of electronic media, not to mention they are immersed in a Dari-speaking environment all the time, they can speak fluently in both languages, but they may not write as well as they speak in that language given Cummins’s notion mentioned above. During the last few decades, Afghan youth have been neither encouraged nor experienced in extensive reading and writing in L1; thus, reading L2 for fun or to learn the L2 is an ability that would need long-term training for Afghan EFL learners in order to learn how to write and practice writing.

Unfortunately, most Afghan learners believe that they do not need to practice their L1 with conscious effort; they need only acquire the foreign language because they believe that they have already mastered their L1 (Wazinpoor, 2007).

1.5. Conclusion

This thesis is organized in five chapters, each of which discusses a different phase of the project. Chapter one presented an introduction to the topic, the purpose of the study and it provided information on Dari, an official language in Afghanistan. Chapter 2 presents a review of relevant literature, most of which is from similar studies with EFL students from other
language communities than Dari; chapter 3 details the methodology employed for data collection, coding, and analysis; chapter 4 presents the results of data analysis; and chapter 5 concerns the discussion of key findings, implications for pedagogy, and future research followed by a conclusion.
CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review

2.1. Introduction
This chapter reviews the previous research on EFL education with native speakers of other languages. The studies mentioned below conducted error analysis in order to identify the writing errors and their possible sources. The present study focuses on EFL learners’ spelling and word choice errors in both English and Dari.

2.2. Previous Research
In a study with Palestinian students regarding their writing problems, Mourtaga (2004) made an observation: “Students state clearly that they have the ideas in mind; however, they find it difficult to put these ideas on paper” (Mourtaga, 2004, p. 3). The author would suggest that the Afghan students with whom she has worked have the same issue as the Palestinian students. Having a clear idea is one thing, but communicating the idea coherently in written form is another. Mourtaga’s (2004) study was informative and invaluable to designing this study, because the present study is a replication of that study. Mourtaga (2004) was designed to study the interrelationship between L1 and L2 with Palestinians and the present study does this with Afghan speakers because the research regarding Afghan Dari speakers is non-existent to date, particularly pertaining to the interaction between the composition skills of L1 and L2. Therefore, additional research is necessary to replicate and extend Mourtaga (2004) and discover what L1 and L2 spelling and word choice errors university-level interlingual Afghan EFL learners’ produce in writing samples in both English and Dari.
2.3. EFL Learners Write Better in L2 than L1

The purpose of the aforementioned Mourtaga’s (2004) study was to identify and analyze Palestinian university students’ EFL writing errors in order to determine if the students and their instructors were aware of those errors (2004). Mourtaga (2004) identified errors based on data collected for his study in which he and his two colleagues analyzed 70 writing samples of freshman students enrolled in courses offered by the Department of English at the Islamic University of Gaza (IUG).

Mourtaga (2004) found that it is possible for one’s L2 writing skills to be better than one’s L1 skills. In his study, the Palestinian participants’ English writing was more accurate than their Arabic writing. These findings could be replicated with Afghan participants and probably anywhere the L1 literacy rate is low. The results of his study showed that IUG students made errors in all categories measured. Errors in verbs, punctuation, and articles were most frequent while those with conjunctions, adjectives, and adverbs were least frequent. The findings revealed that interference of L1 was not the only source of errors made by students, because their lack of proficiency in English, L2, itself was also the source of many errors. Mourtaga (2004) concluded that “sufficient practice of English writing and a proper way of teaching grammar” (p.175) aid in reducing and eliminating writing errors. The overall point of Mourtaga’s research shows that not only is L1 interference a major source of errors, but L2 itself is also the source of errors (e.g., omission of ‘-s’ in third person singular, confusion between active and passive, and agreement between subject and verb). Still, additional research is necessary to check the applicability of his findings in other languages.

Another study, Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000), went a step further in attempting to discover the interrelationship between L1 and L2 acquisition, comparing the writing ability of
native Arab speakers in academic English and Arabic at a university in Jordan. The participants included 150 university-aged students who were selected randomly; they wrote about ‘co-education in Jordanian universities’ in both English and Arabic. Each of them wrote two essays in each language: one was an argumentative essay and the other was an expressive essay. A three-month gap between writing the Arabic and English essays occurred, preventing duplication of the original essays.

The data collected by Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000) were evaluated and analyzed by two English language testing (ELT) specialists and two Arabic linguists on the basis of grammar, vocabulary, cohesion, and clarity of their compositions. The variables studied in the present study are quite different from those of the study done by Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000). The current study focuses more purely on form (other studies mentioned later in this chapter examine similar the variables studied in the present study), but their findings are still of interest for this study. The two evaluators graded all the essays independently and their error codes were computed to check the coder reliability for both Arabic and English essays. The evaluators decided the identified writing weaknesses to be serious on the basis of their frequent occurrence. The participants had the same weak points in both languages and the only difference between their writing in English and Arabic was that the problems were more serious in Arabic than in English.

The authors claimed that the students’ deficiencies in English writing were related not only to the quality of EFL teachers, but also to the interference from the participants’ L1. Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000) found that none of the subjects wrote academic Arabic “properly” even though it was their L1. In this study, not being written “properly” meant that the students’ essays revealed common errors, including a lack of cohesion and coherence, and tense
errors. Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000) stated that Jordanian students face problems when using English for academic purposes due to the same reasons they make errors in L1 writing. Although the current study does not examine these same types of errors, similar patterns were noticed, for example, in grammatical number and subject-verb agreement errors.

Khuwaileh and Al-Shomali’s research is similar to that of Mourtaga (2004) in two respects: both studies investigated Arab EFL learners and both found that their subjects had more writing problems in their L1 than L2. However, the two studies are different in proposing solutions to address those problems. Mourtaga (2004) concluded that sufficient English (L2) writing practice can solve the problem, whereas Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000) concluded that the students’ English writing issues can be solved not only by a better EFL pedagogy but also by better L1 instruction, which will be possible only through better L1 teacher training and curriculum development. The author speculates that, similar to their Arab counterparts, Dari native speaking EFL learners may exhibit writing problems in English that already exist in their native language writing, in which case the problem may be developmental: as the students’ L2 improves and interlanguage errors decrease, L1 interference may become less and less frequent.

2.4. L1 Transfer and Types of Errors Common among EFL Learners

Studies on EFL students’ writing errors have been conducted with those who speak languages other than Arabic (e.g., Japanese and Kenyan) and have shown that EFL or ESL learners across the world have difficulty with grammar and spelling, and errors affecting coherence and cohesion, similar to the conclusions of Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali (2000) and Mourtaga (2004). Izzu (1999) found errors including sentence construction, subject-verb and number agreement, paragraph development, and use of articles and verbs. Izzu studied Japanese students’ English writing errors by surveying 34 professors teaching English as a second
One highly frequent category of error by the Japanese EFL learners in Izzo’s (1999) study was the use of articles in L2. Japanese EFL learners may exhibit particularly difficult problems with articles because Japanese does not have an article system. Therefore, learning articles in English is presumed to be more difficult for Japanese students; a concept that accounts for this issue is called *markedness* (whether any feature of a language is marked or unmarked for learners. According to the *markedness differential hypothesis* developed by Eckman (1977), unmarked features in L1 are more likely to transfer while marked features in L2 are predicted to be harder to learn (Eckman, 1977). If a feature is marked in the learner’s L1 and the same feature in L2 is unmarked, the feature is easier for the learner to learn in L2. There will be no L1 negative transfer to L2. On the other hand, if a learner’s L1 feature is unmarked and it is marked in L2, the L1 feature may negatively transfer to L2. Mitchell and Myles (2004), in a summary of research, reported that most EFL learners produce more target-like structures for unmarked features and they produce less target-like structures for marked ones.

In addition to the errors associated with articles, spelling errors were commonly found in the extant literature. Nyamasyo (1994) studied the written English competence of native Kenyan students who were learning English as a second language. She reported four broad categories of spelling errors caused by the substitution of one letter for another (e.g., as in *s* for *c* in *celebrate* or *i* for *e* as in *intertain*), omission of letters in a word (e.g., as in *exess*, or *neglible*), addition of letters in a word (e.g. as in *relligion; dairly*), and incorrect internal punctuation.
Lexical errors were also present in the English compositions of EFL learners. Hemchua and Schmitt (2006) did an analysis of Thai learners and identified two main categories—formal and semantic errors. The formal category had three subcategories of misselection involving those words that have the same root, but different suffixes (e.g., considerable instead of considerate, and competition instead of competitiveness), misformation (calque: translation of a word or phrase from L1 words; for example, *We have to find a car to bring us go to* instead of *bring us to the hospital*) and distortions (e.g., omissions like intresting instead of interesting, and overinclusion as dining room instead of dining room). The semantic errors were divided into four subcategories: confusion of sense relations (e.g., using a hypernym for a hyponym: for example, *We have modern equipment* instead of *appliances in the house*), collocation errors (e.g., semantically determined word selection: for example, *The city is grown* instead of *developed*), connotation errors (connotative meaning seems to add something new and cover conceptual meaning for example, *There are too many* instead of *other advantages of living in the city*), and stylistic errors (one type of stylistic meaning was infelicity called verbosity (e.g., *I informed my friend of the party through the medium of telephone*) and the other one was called underspecification when L2 learners cannot convey meaning in their writing (e.g., *Although cars in the country are lower* instead of *Although there are fewer cars in the country*). Similar errors in word choice and spelling were found in the present study data as well.

ESL learners also find diverse genres of writing (e.g., argumentative and creative) difficult. Agha (2007) investigated English writing errors made by 25 Iranian students enrolled in ESL programs at various universities throughout California. Errors were found in both argumentative and creative modes. Agha identified 820 errors and divided the errors into 10 major categories: 14.5% of mistakes concerned the usage of articles, 10.2% prepositions, 9.3%
tense, 9.2% grammatical number, 8.6% conjunctions and connectors, 5.3% adjectives, 5.5% subject and predicate, 4.8% verb phrases, and 4.8% pronouns. Additional errors found in Agha (2007) included the omission and misuse of prepositions, errors in terms of number, and in adjective use. These participants did not know how to form the correct forms of adjectives, and they used nouns as adjectives.

Using contrastive analysis, Agha (2007) analyzed the differences and similarities between Persian (or Farsi, Dari-Persian) and English grammars and then analyzed learners’ writing errors. Agha’s findings indicated that there was no considerable difference between the argumentative and creative essays because the error types and their frequency of errors were the same. According to the author, the benefit of conducting contrastive analysis before conducting error analysis is that these analyses allow EFL teachers to explore possible L1 causes of errors, illuminate a new approach to error treatment, and seek instructional materials and strategies. Since Persian and Dari are variations of the same language, the errors observed in Agha’s data may occur in the present study: Persian- and Dari-speaking EFL learners should display similar error patterns in their writing. However, one key difference is that Agha’s subjects were living in an English-speaking environment whereas the participants of this study are not.

This review of sample literature on error analysis in writing reinforces that L2 writing requires a complex set of cognitive skills that demand more time and effort than speaking or reading. Secondly, native Dari-speaking EFL learners may make errors in EFL writing similar to EFL learners of other languages because they are also going through the same learning process as other learners. Lastly, another conclusion that may be drawn from the existing literature is that instructional strategies can influence EFL learners to avoid making errors and increase the cohesiveness and coherence of EFL compositions and their effectiveness. Common EFL errors
reported in the aforementioned literature are largely attributed to L1 interference with L2 writing, especially when the two languages are very different, and to EFL learners’ poor L1 writing ability as precondition for inducing L2 errors. Given these stipulations, an investigation of EFL writing produced by native Dari speakers will aid in identifying their common errors and perhaps the sources of these errors, and generate implications from these findings for EFL pedagogy, especially in the Afghan setting.

2.5. Research Hypotheses

The review of relevant literature revealed a wide range of errors identified in the English writing samples of learners from different countries. Since no study has yet observed Afghan Dari speakers’ English errors, the following hypotheses were posited:

**Hypothesis 1:** Native Dari-speaking learners of EFL will likely commit fewer spelling and word choice errors in English writing than in Dari writing tasks. Earlier research (e.g., Khuwaileh & Al-Shoumali, 2000) found that Arab university students committed more errors in L1 than in L2 (English).

**Hypothesis 2:** Afghan native-Dari-speaking EFL learners will display a range of spelling and word choice error types in English writing tasks. These error types will reveal characteristics of interlanguage.

**Hypothesis 3:** Native Dari-speaking EFL learners will make fewer errors in a simpler English writing task in which they describe a familiar experience than a more demanding task in which they argue in favor of a certain position. This hypothesis was formed considering Khuwaileh and Al-Shoumali’s (2000) finding that EFL learners committed fewer errors in expressive than argumentative writing and that formal language is serious, whereas informal writing is more like spoken language, relaxed and conversational (Orr, 2002).
To recap, the present study is an exploratory attempt at investigating native Dari speakers’ spelling and word choice errors in English and Dari from a native Dari-speaking EFL teacher’s perspective in order to advance TEFL research and pedagogy in Afghanistan and elsewhere. The findings from the study contribute to the extant scholarship in TEFL expanding the scope of error analysis research by examining EFL learners who are native speakers of Dari in Afghanistan and comparing spelling and word choice errors in their English and Dari writing samples. Also, the findings offer additional insight into the theories of L1 transfer to L2 as a major barrier to L2 acquisition.

Pedagogically speaking, the author hopes that the present study will help the author and other EFL instructors (especially those who teach Afghan native-Dari-speaking EFL learners) develop teaching strategies that address the patterns of errors made by Afghan EFL learners and build their ability to monitor themselves when using EFL as well as Dari, thus improving their ability to more effectively communicate in writing (and speaking) in both languages.
CHAPTER 3 - Methodology

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology including the participants, data collection, and data coding, including the use of error analysis and the categories of errors identified in the present study.

3.2. Participants

The participants of this study were 20 Afghan university students who are learning English as a foreign language and majoring in English at Balkh University located in the city of Mazar-i-Sharif in the northern Afghanistan. Afghan English majors, especially those participating in the present study, do not speak English on a daily basis, and their exposure to English is sometimes limited to university English classes \( (n = 2, 10\%) \) and in many cases to university courses supplemented by private English courses \( (n = 18, 90\%) \). In this study, 7 participants \( (35\%) \) reported using media (e.g., news and movies) as an English learning tool. All 20 participants were seniors majoring in English and had taken a total of 21 credit hours of English writing (3 hours in each of seven semesters in writing courses that met three times per week).

Self-reported English proficiency level varied between “advanced” \( (n = 12) \) and “intermediate” \( (n = 8) \). All participants graduated from different high schools with a degree of baccalaureate before coming to Balkh University; therefore, all began learning English in grade school. Some of the participants \( (n = 13, 65\%) \) had studied English for 6 years before coming to college (i.e., beginning in grade 7); others \( (n = 2, 10\%) \) for 9 years (i.e., beginning in grade 4). One participant stated 9 years (but included his college English classes in those nine years),
whereas 4 stated they had studied for 4 years (apparently only university EFL learning as majors), which makes it impossible to know the entire length of their EFL learning period, for, as said above, in grade schools some began at the 4th grade and others at 7th.

None of the participants had taken a university writing course in Dari. They all indicated that they had taken a Dari grammar course, but not a writing course, for two semesters as freshmen. From personal experience, the author is aware that no writing course is typically offered in Afghan grade schools. Only some writing tasks and activities are done in the reading and Dari literature courses for learning those subjects, not for learning writing.

Ten of the 20 participants were female and 10 were male. Among those reporting their ages, they ranged between 18 and 24 (\(M = 19.9, SD = 2.87; n = 13\) for 19 years, 6 for 24 years). All participants were native Dari speakers from different provinces of Afghanistan, although a majority of them (\(n = 11, 55\%\)) were from Balkh Province. Other provinces included Panshir, Laghman, Badakhshan, Baghlan, Kabul, Qandahar, Samangan, Sar-e-Pol, and Faryab). Figure 1 below shows the provinces in Afghanistan.
3.3. Data Collection

As an initial step, since the present study required working with human subjects, approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Kansas State University was obtained before collecting data. The IRB approval was received in August 2009, which included the agreement from the unaffiliated investigator at Balkh University who would administer the tasks according to the author’s instructions. Refer to Appendix G.

The participants of this study were selected from the university students to represent different levels of English proficiency. Particular students were selected by the unaffiliated investigator because they were those who exhibited high, intermediate and low abilities, but the selection was not compulsory and they participated voluntarily. All participants were assured of anonymity and had the option to withdraw from the study. They were required to give informed consent so that they could understand the general purpose of the project and their rights as participants and agree to participate in this study before doing the tasks. The participants were assured of confidentiality both in the informed consent form and orally by the unaffiliated investigator. To see the informed consent form, refer to Appendix A.

A pre-test questionnaire (Appendix B), two English tasks (Appendix C), and two Dari tasks (Appendix D) were administered in the English classroom during class hours at three different times, with an interval of one day between the pre-test and the English tasks and then one week between the English and Dari tasks. At the pre-test, participants were asked to sign the informed consent and fill out the 9-item demographic questionnaire (constructed in Dari). Since computers have auto-spell and grammar check tools, the unaffiliated investigator (the English instructor) was asked not to allow the participants to use computers. Therefore, participants
handwrote their essays without assistance from a computerized spelling and grammar check or a dictionary.

For each language, the participants completed two tasks. The first English task was designed to help the participants “warm up” before the second task. They were simply asked to write two pages introducing themselves, their university, and their daily routines. The time length for this initial task was 20 minutes. In the second English task, participants were asked to write two pages responding to a question prompt: *What is the most important skill a person should acquire in order to be successful in the world today?* In this task, students were instructed to choose only one skill and use specific reasons and examples to support their choices (Appendix C). The time length for this task was 45 minutes. The benefit of timing the writing was the reliability of the data to be collected. All students were given the same amount of time. If one has been given a certain time for doing a task, one must read the question carefully and spend a few minutes planning, and then begin writing. However, a drawback of the timed writing was that it took longer for some students to warm up and they likely did not perform up to their abilities, potentially raising validity concerns. The second task was challenging and demanding to most of the participants so that their control of university-level argumentation could be measured.

One week after completing the English tasks, the participants did similar tasks in Dari. The time and page length requirements for the Dari tasks were identical to those for English tasks. However, the topics were different in order to avoid repetition of ideas from the English tasks. In the first Dari task, the participants were asked to answer two related questions about Mazar-i-Sharif: the major tourist attractions and what they most like about the city. In the second Dari task, they were asked to respond to a passage about the importance of education in
Afghanistan and indicate whether or not they agreed with the position and explain why (Appendix D). Following these two tasks, participants were given a debriefing about the purpose of these tasks and thanked for participating in the study. To see debriefing, please refer to Appendix E.

The data for this project were collected in September 2009. The initial collection involved 24 students, but only 20 writing samples were included for analysis because four participants did not complete all the tasks.

### 3.4. Error Analysis

One frequently used method of studying L2 writing output is error analysis, as documented in Chapter 2. Although quality writing is not simply a direct result of ‘zero’ error occurrences or accuracy, errors might reflect an L2 learner’s fluency. Numerous studies have employed error analysis as a tool for assessing EFL writing competence among speakers of other languages across the world (e.g., Arabic: Palestinians by Mourtaga [2004] and Jordanians by Khuwaileh & Al-Shoumali [2000]; Japanese by Izzu [1999]; Swahili: Kenyans by Nyamasyo [1994]; Thai by Hemchua & Schmitt [2006]; Farsi: Iranians by Agha [2007]). The present study employed error analysis, since its purpose was exploratory in nature by examining Dari speaking EFL learners’ writing; at the same time, this study is confirmatory by testing the current sample in consideration of the research findings available in the previous scholarship of other L1-speaking samples. Using the same method will allow the author to validly compare the differences among different L1 users.

### 3.5. Data Coding

After data collection, the author started coding the data with the assistance of a Dari faculty member in the Dari Department at Balkh University for the Dari tasks and a native
American-English-speaking graduate student from the English Department at Kansas State University for the English tasks. Each task was coded twice in order to achieve inter-coder agreement and valid outcome. First the three coders (i.e., the author, the Dari instructor, and the English tutor) identified the errors independently. To reach inter-coder consensus, the author had discussions with the English coder in person and with the Dari coder via Skype.

Selected errors were grouped into five major categories: Derivational and inflectional errors which are morphology problems, word choice errors which are related to semantics, homophones and near homophones errors which are more phonological, and orthography (basic spelling) errors. The descriptions and examples of the error categories scrutinized in this study are as follows:

3.5.1. Derivational Errors

Derivation is the combination of a word stem with a morpheme which forms a new word which is often from a different class. Here by derivation, the author means that if EFL learners were forming a new word and the word formation process resulted in spelling errors of the derived word, it is called a derivational error. That is when speakers wanted to make, for example, the word develop become development, redevelop, or developmental. For the participants of the present study, the additional of derivational morphemes caused problems. For example, when they wanted to make these new words from a stem or root, they made some spelling errors (e.g. grammatical instead of grammatical, academical in place of academic, conversational instead of conversational, beautiful as beautifull, and powerful as powerfull).

3.5.2. Inflectional Errors

Inflectional errors also are considered morphological errors. Inflection changes the form of a word and gives an extra grammatical meaning to it. An inflection can be grammatical
number, person, case, gender, tense, mood, or aspect. This morpheme can be a suffix, a prefix, or a vowel change. The *s* in *books* is an inflectional morpheme. The *-ed* in *studied* indicates past tense. In this study, inflection errors were examined for *-s* (plural), *-s* (3rd-person singular), and *-ed* (past tense). The participants of the present study had various inflectional problems, including, for example, *after 3 year, I studied, a person who receive it, reading improve our knowledge*.

### 3.5.3. Word choice errors

In English, word choice decisions are difficult for EFL learners due to semantic intricacies within the same word. Word choice errors can still occur even after the EFL learner has been immersed in the language community for an extended period of time and has learned about the various contexts of use in which a word may appear. An EFL learner with a vast amount of English vocabulary may still have trouble using a word adequately within all the contexts in which the word is appropriate. Pragmatic rules can be learned through a trial-and-error learning process in a natural setting and through repeated interactions with native speakers. Additionally, native speakers of any language can commit errors. Typical word choice error examples from the Dari speakers in this study were: *give* in place of *take* (e.g. *I lost my mother and my father gave the responsibility of me to grow up*), *become* instead of *turn* and also *attend* in place of *enroll* (e.g. *When I became 6 years old my father attended me in a primary school*).

### 3.5.4. Homophone errors

The third category of errors is homophones which are considered phonological in nature. This study examined homophones and near homophones—perceived as homophones due to phonological similarities, but which are orthographically different. Homophones are words that are pronounced the same as another word when speaking but have different meaning, use,
different spelling and origin, such as *reed* and *read*. Near homophones include one different phoneme, whereas the other phonemes are similar. For example *ear* and *air* are near homophones. Homophone errors may arise due to lack of similar sounds in Dari as well as lack of exposure to extensive reading and writing practice. The participants of this study had more problems with near homophones than homophones. For example, they made these homophone errors: *rolls* as *rules*, *weight* as *wait*, and *piece* as *peace*. Also, they produced near homophone errors such as *pair* as *peer*, *floor* as *flour*, *fund* as *fond*.

### 3.5.5. Basic Spelling Errors

Basic spelling errors occur in situations in which the EFL learners do not try to form a new word, but rather make a spelling error in the root of the word.

When one word had two spelling problems (i.e., it comes under two categories of errors)—for example, an error in a root and inflection—the author counted it as a mistake in the root, not inflection, because the root may affect meaning more. EFL learners have difficulty in spelling words correctly. Even some good writers are bad spellers and so are some native speakers of every language. Spelling errors that EFL learners make are those errors that alter the meaning of the word and, potentially, the entire sentence. An example of a basic spelling error made by the participants of this study is *abolution* for *ablution*.

Coding units were individual errors following the conventions existing in the literature, especially Hemchua and Schmitt (2006). Hemcuha and Schmitt counted multiple errors in a phrase separately.
CHAPTER 4 - Results

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the data from both the Dari and English tasks. Analyses were performed to display and summarize key patterns in spelling and word choice errors.

4.2. Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that native Dari-speaking learners of EFL would likely commit fewer errors in English writing than in the Dari writing tasks. The results supported this hypothesis. The results from the 20 participants indicated that Afghan students in fact had made 71 more spelling and word choice errors in Dari as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dari</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Number of errors in both languages

This result may be due to not being exposed to writing practice in Dari in school nor at the university because three decades of war destroyed the education system in Afghanistan. In Dari courses the students are mostly taught reading, grammar, and literature. They are not given writing opportunities.

4.3. Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that native Afghan-Dari-speaking EFL learners would display a range of error types characteristic of interlanguage in their English writing tasks, in accordance with the findings from previous research with EFL learners in other countries. As predicted, the
participants committed a variety of errors in spelling and word choice. However, their errors in English were quite different in nature than those in Dari. To make the types of errors manageable for analysis, five categories of errors were grouped: derivational, inflectional, (near) homophones, basic spelling, and word choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derivational</td>
<td>57 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Near) Homophones</td>
<td>28 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>70 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Spelling</td>
<td>203 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Choice</td>
<td>52 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>410 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Error categories in English*

In all, the two tasks in English produced 410 errors (see Table 2), of which 203 (49%) were basic spelling, 70 (17%) were inflectional errors, 57 (14%) were derivational errors, 52 (13%) were word choice errors, and 28 (7%) were from confusing (near) homophones. The results revealed that the basic spelling errors were the most frequent, followed by inflection.

Inflectional errors mainly concerned the use of nouns (e.g., plural forms, number agreement and use of nouns as gerunds) while derivational errors were mostly in adjectives (e.g. adding a suffix to form an adjective, doubling of final consonant, making adjectives from verbs and nouns) and nouns (e.g. using suffixes like –tion). These problems may occur due to the fact that Dari does not have the same derivational and inflectional morphology and EFL learners are likely to make these sorts of errors in their interlanguage.

Word choice errors occurred most frequently when using adjectives, including, for example, comparatives adjectives (e.g. less instead of little), demonstrative adjectives (e.g. this tasks instead of these tasks), and the use of another in several cases (e.g., internet and another
technologies are successful). In the use of nouns, the participants demonstrated word choice problems such as the substitution of a country in place of a language (France instead of French). In the use of verbs, the participants made errors by using double verbs (e.g., make prepare, get preparation); these errors may be accounted for by the fact that the participants are literally translating these verb forms from Dari, a language that contains compound verbs.

In the homophone category, the participants demonstrated these following near homophone problems: adjectives (e.g., fund instead of fond, reach instead of rich), nouns (e.g., floor as flour, airplane as earplane), and verbs (e.g., will in place of well, weak up in lieu of wake up). Moreover, they had homophone problems with nouns (e.g., piece instead of peace) and with verbs (e.g., sea in place of see).

In the basic spelling category, participants generated the most errors (203 [49%] of the errors they made in English). Examples of these errors are as follows: adjectives (e.g., private as priavite), nouns (e.g., opanion instead of opinion; completion as complition), and verbs (e.g., believe as belive).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derivational</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>111 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Spelling</td>
<td>276 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>90 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>481 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Error categories in Dari

Table 3 shows that in the Dari tasks, the participants produced 481 errors, of which only 4 (1%) were derivational errors, while 276 (57%) were basic spelling, 111 (23%) were inflectional errors, and 90 (19%) were word choice errors. There were no homophones and near homophones errors found in the Dari sample. One explanation why the participants demonstrated
few derivation problems may be due to the fact that Dari is their L1 and they are quite used to deriving words.

Inflection was the second most frequent error category in Dari, but only due to errors committed when participants used the Ezafe vowel. For example, they wrote جامعه سالم /Jamiha Salem instead of Jamiha e Salem, عهده آن /Odah An instead of Odahe An). In some cases they overused the Ezafe vowel (e.g., شهري گرمسيري /Shahre Garm Seirei instead of Share Garm Ser, نسيمی ملايم /Nasimi Molaim instead of Nasime Molaim, گرمايي و سرمايي /Garmahii wa Sarmaii instead of Garma wa Sarma.

4.4. Error categories and the word classes

Word class was assigned to all the Dari and English errors, and this distribution is shown in Tables 4 and 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of errors/word class</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derivation</strong></td>
<td><strong>57 (14%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Near) Homophones</strong></td>
<td><strong>28 (7%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other classes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflection</strong></td>
<td><strong>70 (17%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Spelling</strong></td>
<td><strong>203 (49%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other classes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word choice</strong></td>
<td><strong>52 (13%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other classes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>410 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Categories of errors by word class in English
As Table 4 shows above, the participants had the most derivational errors in forming nouns (32%, N=18/57) and adjectives (2%, N=33/57). In inflection, they had 21% (N=15/70) of their problems with nouns, but 78% (N=55/70) with verbs, namely with third person singular –s. With the homophones category, adjectives (25%, N=7/28) and nouns (53%, N=15/28) were the most problematic. In addition, in the basic spelling category, the participants had 24% (N=49/203) of their problems in adjectives, 50% (N=102/203) in nouns, and 19% (N=38/203) with verbs. Lastly, in the word choice category, the learners frequently struggled with adjectives (13%, N=7/52), nouns (38%, N=20/52), and verbs (40%, N=38/52). Having errors in a variety of word classes underscores the finding that participants’ interlanguage is displayed in the English writing samples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of errors/word class</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derivation</strong></td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflection</strong></td>
<td>111 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Spelling</strong></td>
<td>276 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Word choice</strong></td>
<td>90 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectives</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nouns</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>481 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Categories of errors by word class in Dari

Table 5 shows the four main error categories and word classes in Dari. The derivation category was the least frequent error in the participants’ Dari writing. In basic spelling they produced the most errors in nouns (47%, N=130/276), adjectives (19%, N=52/276), and verbs (29%, N=79/276). Additionally, in the inflection category, they had the most errors in nouns (44%, N=49/111) and with verbs (45%, N=50/111). Beside these, in the word choice category,
they had the most errors in nouns (37%, N=33/90), with verbs (36%, N=32/90), and with adjectives (27%, N=24/90). It should be mentioned that in the inflection category, most of the verb errors were when participants used the compound verbs that exist in Dari (e.g., feel worry, get prepare). Also in the errors with nouns, pluralization was problematic for most participants because there are Arabic plural forms which are used in Dari too. For example, they wrote *Makatib* (letters) instead of *makateb* (school), *kotub ha* (books) instead of *kotub*, also *Daha Qahraman ha* (ten champions) instead of *Daha Qahraman*, and *Chandin Ha* instead of *Chandin*.

In addition, in basic spelling, they had 19% in adjectives (e.g., *فرحیخته* instead of *فرحیخته*), 47% in nouns (e.g., *ارتقاع* instead of *ارتقاع*), and 28% in verbs (e.g., *محروم مانده بودند* instead of *محروم مانده*). Also in the word choice category, they had problems with these word classes: 27% in adjectives (e.g., *مترقی یافته* instead of *مترقی یافته*), 37% in nouns (e.g., *عین و تعلیم* instead of *بین های تاریخی*), and 36% in verbs (e.g., *عقب اتکا نمودن* instead of *سوق دهی*).

### 4.5. Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that native Dari speakers would demonstrate fewer errors in the simpler writing task (Task 1) in English than in the more complex writing task (Task 2) in English. The results did not support the hypothesis in Dari (see Table 7), but they did in English (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Task</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>195 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>215 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. English Tasks
Table 6 indicates that the third hypothesis is supported in English because the participants indeed had fewer errors in the simpler task and more in the complex one. This may be because they have taken 21 credits of writing courses in English since they entered the university. This means that they were exposed to writing activities in English more than Dari. For example, when writing letters, articles, and paragraph writing, students are asked to write about themselves, their city, their family, and daily activities. They have practiced many writing tasks which were similar to Task 1, but they had not practiced writing similar to Task 2. Therefore, it was complex for them and they committed more errors in that task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dari Task</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>268 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>213 (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>481 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Dari Tasks

Table 7 shows that the third hypothesis was not supported for Dari because the participants demonstrated more errors in Task 1 which was simpler and fewer errors in Task 2 which was considered to be complex. This may be because the participants were not taught well how to write in Dari and are not used to writing in Dari, but further research is needed.
CHAPTER 5 - Discussion

5.1. Introduction

This chapter firstly discusses EFL teaching at Balkh University and provides the background from which the current study emerged. Secondly, it explores the pedagogical implications of the data obtained.

5.2. Background

5.2.1. Physical Environment

A major problem that English instructors face at Balkh University in Afghanistan is insufficient space. Because English is taught not only within the English department but also to students within each college, i.e., in an unconsolidated manner, there are multiple demands made on the same classroom space. A compounding factor is the fact that space is so limited that two colleges have to conduct English and other instruction in a separate building far from Balkh University campus.

One of the effects of space limitations is large numbers of students in each class, and this in turn creates pedagogical challenges for the instructors. While recent developments within the BU English Department have led to reducing class size to between 20-30 students, the problem of large numbers in the other colleges remains.

A second problem is that English teachers have few materials and equipment to work with. A prime example of this is the lack of textbooks. Due to both a lack of availability and cost, students are not expected to pay for more than a set of photocopied lecture notes which are handed to them at the beginning of the semester. Additional limitations include a lack of even
basic audio-visual equipment and other materials used in language classes in more affluent settings.

Lastly, there is a lack of teachers themselves. Indeed, after August 2010, only eight faculty members will remain teaching English courses for the undergraduate English majors as well as those students fulfilling general education requirements in all the other colleges.

5.2.2. Curriculum and Pedagogy

In Afghanistan, the Ministries of Education and Higher Education oversee and control the process of curriculum development and syllabi. Individual teachers and instructors develop lesson plans according to the course objectives, curriculum standards, and requirements from the authorities. The required courses in the English Department, College of Literature and Humanities, are:

Freshman and sophomore: writing, reading comprehension, pronunciation, grammar and general foundations.

Sophomore and Junior: conversation or spoken English, writing, reading and grammar.

Junior and senior: literature, linguistics, teaching methods, methods of research and translation, writing, reading and grammar. Eight semesters are required of all English majors.

The current curriculum is old and outdated. There are no speaking courses for freshmen and no listening classes for English majors at any stage in their degrees. In addition, students with different levels of proficiency study in the same courses and receive instruction from the same syllabi.

The pedagogy which is used at Balkh University is lecture-based and teacher-centered. The teacher delivers the material to students who are not given opportunities to contribute. The
instructor talks and the students listen. There is no pair or group work, and the only voice that is
heard is the teacher’s.

Large numbers of students and lack of space and materials perhaps reinforce the teacher-
centered pedagogy. However, the lack of qualified teachers is another factor. Instructors have
minimal training, little to no exposure to diverse teaching methods and learn to rely on mass
lectures.

5.2.3. The Educational Culture

The prevailing educational culture is one of memorization and minimal reading. Students
memorize specific materials and reproduce them as exactly as possible in examinations. Critical
thinking is not encouraged and extensive reading not a priority. During a typical class, students
do not interact among themselves and do not ask questions.

5.3. Discussion: Strategies for Improved Performance

The analyzed data of the present study revealed interlanguage (IL) errors. Interlanguage,
also called learner language, refers to the type of language produced by nonnative speakers or
EFL learners in the process of learning a second or a foreign language. The term interlanguage is
defined with two concepts: “The language produced by the learner is a system in its own right,
obeying its own rules; and it is a dynamic system, evolving over time” (Mitchell and Myles,
2004, p. 39). In other words interlanguage is a stage that every learner goes through. It is a phase
where we can compare the process of L1 and L2 developmental sequence (Saville-Troike, 2006).

With respect to interlanguage errors, the present study focuses on two main categories,
spelling and word choice errors, which are further divided into five sub-categories: derivation,
inflection, word choice, homophones, and basic spelling. These were the most frequent errors in
the participants’ writing samples in English. To deal with these, the importance of increasing
reading requirements cannot be overstated. Moreover, the use of enhanced text to highlight the areas where errors of the above types could occur should better enable students to perceive and integrate them into their learning.

5.3.1. **Derivation Findings:**

The participants of this study had derivational problems in forming a new word using its stem or root as shown in the examples below.

1- Next morning of the *comming* day

2- By doing this job and *studing* hardly I will get first position in my class

3- *Geting* Education and Higher Education

5.3.1.1. **Methods: Deductive Approach**

In a deductive approach, the teacher starts a lesson by presenting a grammar rule and then follows it by examples in which the rule is applied (Thornbury, 1999). This is an appropriate method for addressing the above finding.

5.3.1.2. **Example of Activity:**

In teaching the formation of gerunds to freshmen, I would teach them the rule first, explain it and give some examples. Also, I would include the spelling rule for adding *–ing* at the end of verbs in this lesson so that they can derive gerunds properly. I would define a gerund as the noun form of a verb. Then I would ask my students what a particular gerund might mean. They might answer, "The act of teaching.", "the idea of speaking." I would write what they say on one side of the board. At the end I would write this formula on the board for them to copy. The formula would be used as a reinforcement to develop correct pattern responses.
5.3.1.3. **Reason for using this method:**

The reason I chose the deductive approach is that it is especially appropriate when teaching adult learners. It satisfies their need for explanation. In addition, students at Balkh University are used to the deductive approach. However, this initial approach would be followed by multiple exposures to gerunds in reading and practice in context. One useful way to provide controlled practice in context would be to use a controlled composition in which they identify verbs to be changed and then change them to gerunds, restructuring the sentences so that the words appear as nouns.

5.3.2. **Inflection Finding:**

The students had problems with tense, number agreement, subject-verb agreement, pluralization and modal auxiliaries.

4. This building is small and don't have the capacity to cover all the students.

5. If somebody read something.

6. They could chose the best way in life.

7. After that I read or studied some books or lesson.

5.3.2.1. **Methods:** *Focus on forms using the deductive and communicative approaches*

Focus on forms is when we teach grammar, and our students study grammatical forms one by one (Harmer, 2007). Most of the instructors at Balkh University use focus on forms.

5.3.2.2. **Example of Activity:**

In order to address subject-verb agreement, I would use simple present tense. First of all, I would define the simple present tense as describing an action that occurs on a regular or daily basis. Then I would teach them how to conjugate the verbs in simple present tense and also the
grammatical rule of adding morpheme –s at the end of the verbs for third person singular as the following examples show:

10. She/He/It talks. She/He/It walks. She/He/It dances. She/He/It thinks.
11. They talk. They walk. They dance. They think.
12. We talk. We walk. We dance. We think.

I would then divide my students into groups or pairs and ask them to tell each other about their daily routine activities. At the end I would ask one student from each group to say what her group member does every day. This way they could practice the third person singular inflection too.

5.3.2.3. **Reason for using this method:**

Again, adult learners’ value having rules articulated for them, but teachers can start integrating other approaches such as learner intercommunication to gradually enhance the learning process.

5.3.3. **Word Choice Findings:**

The participants of the present study had these word choice problems.

Examples:

I study another issues like poem books, story and another issues

I graduated in 4 o'clock from my lessons.

All of his written pieces are sacred pieces which estimatly all of the world use from these written.

We can mistake on the board.
5.3.3.1. Methods: Inductive Approach

In order to overcome word choice problems, I would like to use a reading approach. In this approach, only the grammar useful for reading comprehension is taught. Vocabulary is controlled at first and then expanded based on its frequency and usefulness (Celce-Murcia, 2001).

5.3.3.2. Example of Activity:

In order to reduce word choice errors, I would assign extensive reading activities for EFL learners. Harmer stated, “The best way of helping students to learn how to spell is to have them read as much as possible” (2004, p. 47). Unfortunately, Afghan EFL learners are not used to extensive reading. The only reading Afghan learners typically do is a limited number of short texts assigned in a given course. This could be done by providing a portable library. Students would report on the books they have read using a specific template and which they would turn in for evaluation. Students could vote for the best book from the library at the end of the term. In addition, teachers could encourage their students to use dictionaries in order to check their word choice errors.

5.3.3.3. Reason for using this method:

When students are exposed to extensive reading, they can see the words used in different contexts, and this can inductively help them with word choice. In order for students to add learned vocabulary to their own working vocabulary, they need to see and use the words multiple times. Therefore, in addition to extensive reading, there would need to be a systematized approach to specific vocabulary learning and selection of texts accordingly.

5.3.4. Homophone Findings:

The data of the present study revealed that the participants had problems with homophones and near homophones.
Examples

Everyone should obtain knowledge as Mohammad piece be upon him said.

There are for skills in a language.

A student who knows grammatical rolls.

Then I drink a cap of coffee.

5.3.4.1. Methods: Task-based Learning

Task-based learning focuses on meaningful tasks using the target language.

5.3.4.2. Example of Activity:

In a dictation activity, I would write a text or a poem that has lots of homophones and near homophones on a hidden portion of the board and divide the class into 5 groups. Then, I would call on one member from each group to go to the front of the class and read one sentence and come back and dictate that sentence to the rest of her/his group. Once the group completes writing the sentence, another student would repeat the same steps. All the groups would do the same activity until one of the groups has the complete text or poem. That group would win. In this dictation activity, the text should contain all the homophones the students have just studied together with affixes and other variations. I could add interest by including some tongue twisters and riddles. Tongue twisters are amusing and students remember them; thus, they provide a model for future language production.

5.3.4.3. Reason for using this method:

Task-based learning is useful because students can practice pronunciation and fluency in targeted activities, thereby reducing their errors.

5.3.5. Basic spelling Findings

The participants had the following types of problems in basic spelling.
Example

It is said that respect is *mutual*.

University which is an *academic* place.

I am happy with my life and my position in *society*.

I don't have any especial *secadual*.

5.3.5.1. *Methods: Communicative Language Learning*

Spelling is taught in our writing courses. Communicative language learning would be an appropriate method to use in writing courses where spelling is taught. “The basic principle involved is in orientation towards collective participation in a process of use and discovery achieved by cooperation between individual learners as well as between learners and teachers.” (Celce-Murcia, 2001, p.24) Students would therefore collectively and individually engage in meaningful tasks.

5.3.5.2. *Example of Activity:*

In order to improve Afghan EFL learners’ spelling, it is a good idea to provide a variety of writing activities, such as dictation and handwriting practice. For example, I would ask my students to write a paragraph on a topic about which they have already read and including a short list of familiar vocabulary words. I would ask them to bring their papers to class the next day, and then put them in groups to do peer editing with dictionaries.

5.3.5.3. *Reason for using this method:*

The reason for using this method is that while working in pairs and checking each others’ papers, students can learn not only from their own errors but from having to find those of others. They will have to focus on the corrections and at the same time, they will be further developing dictionary skills.
5.4. Conclusion

When writing my thesis I learned how to plan and undertake a research project under the supervision of a committee and to report on it in accordance with the scientific standards of my research field. In addition, I learned how to analyze and interpret the data found in my study by using other studies and theoretical perspectives which are current in the research area in relation to the specific research in my case, second language acquisition. Also, in the process of working on my thesis, I learned how to collect the data, analyze and present the data and findings.

I realized that the objective of my research was to provide new information which would be useful in my field of study, in this case pedagogy and second language acquisition. I learned how to approach methodological problems my students have and above all, how to become a reflective practitioner in my field of practice.

During my MA studies at Kansas State University, I learned new methods and approaches to teaching and learning. When doing observations and teaching in course practica, I learned how to create and implement communicative methods, meaningful activities and strategies which are used when teaching a second language.

The references I have used and the texts I acquired have exposed me to current pedagogical methods and taught me how to adapt materials to suit the needs of my students. I have become more aware of their specific needs and the standards they should strive to achieve to compete with their peers on an international level.

In addition I took five writing courses to improve my writing as an EFL writing instructor. I plan to continue teaching writing at Balkh University.
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Appendix A - Informed Consent Form

Foreign Language Use and Production

APPROVAL DATE OF PROJECT: EXPIRATION DATE OF PROJECT:

You are invited to participate in a project that looks at how people learn English as a foreign language. My name is Freshta Momand, an instructor in the English Department, College of Literature and Humanities at Balkh University. You were selected as a possible participant in this study because you are currently learning English as a second language or have learned it in the past and are a native speaker of Dari language.

If you decide to participate in this study, I will give you 20 copies of two questionnaires which contain 9 questions. You will be asked to provide written answers for those questions. Answering the questions will take about 10 minutes if you decide to participate in this study. Then you will do two writing tasks that will take no more than one hour.

Any risks (i.e. physical, psychological, social, or legal) involved in this study are minimal and are comparable to risks in everyday life.

There is no cost to you for participating nor will you receive any payment for your participation in this study. However, this project hopes to provide you with an indirect benefit by contributing to your knowledge of how second languages are used and which instructional techniques are perceived as useful.

Please note that any information obtained by this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. More specifically, all written as well as computer files will be coded so that no personally identifying information is on the label or the file name. Any analysis of the written documents will use code names and numbers. No personally identifying information will be included in the analysis of your answers, thus your anonymity will be ensured. All materials will be kept in a secure place such as a locked file cabinet; all data files will be stored on a computer that requires password access. All written answers of yours and photocopies of data collected and analyzed in this research project will be used for research and data analysis purposes only. The data files will not be released to anyone, including other researchers, without your written permission (you can give your consent to this below).

Following analysis, the answers will be kept in a secure place for possible further research purposes or destroyed if no longer needed for research. In the future, very brief excerpts of the answers and analysis might be used for research publications if you give your consent to this below. All data used for these purposes will be coded to ensure the protection of your identity.

Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your future relations with me or Balkh University. You are under no obligation to participate in this study. You are free to (a) discontinue participation in the study at any time, (b) request that already written answers be destroyed and thus excluded from the study.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the information provided above and willingly agree to participate in this study under the terms described. You understand that this project is for research. You also understand that you are free to withdraw
your consent at any time and stop participating at any time after signing this form without explanation and without consequences (without penalty, or loss of benefits, or academic standing to which you may otherwise be entitled). Your signature below also acknowledges that you have received a signed and dated copy of this consent form.

If you have any questions about this study now, please ask me. If you need additional information later, please do not hesitate to contact Shamim Naderi or Young-ok Yum, her thesis advisor. You can reach Shamim Naderi at 785-304-0236, e-mail: shamimm@ksu.edu, and Dr. Yum at: 785-532-6937, E-mail: youngok@ksu.edu. Should you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, you can contact: Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 532-3224 or Jerry Jaax, Associate Vice Provost for Research Compliance and University Veterinarian, 203 Fairchild Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, (785) 332-3224.

You may keep a copy of this same form.

_______________________________________  ____________________
Name of Participant                      Signature of Participant                      Date

_______________________________________  ____________________
Signature of Investigator/Outside Collaborator                      Date

Please answer the following questions by checking a response and by signing your initials:

I grant the investigator permission to share with students (researchers in training) in the field excerpts of the data in the classroom.

[ ] yes      [ ] no

Initials

I grant the investigator permission to share with other researchers in the field excerpts of the transcribed data.

[ ] yes      [ ] no

Initials

I grant the investigators permission to use the written excerpts at professional meetings and in professional publications. Any name or place references will be changed.

[ ] yes      [ ] no

Initials
Dari Translation of Informed Consent Form

 موافقت نامه

 استفاده و محصول لسان خارجی

 تاریخ منظوری پروژه:

 از شما دعوت به میان‌داشتن در پروژه تحقیقی که در مورد آموزش لسان انگلیسی بوده و باین می‌دارد که مردم چگونه لسان انگلیسی را منحیط لسان خارجی می‌پرمیوند اشتراک نمایند. اینجانب فرضیه می‌باشد که آموزش یکی از استراتیژیهای لسان انگلیسی باشد و علمی شری با دانشگاه بلحاظ میانگین به اطلاع شما مرسوم است که شما به دلیل اینکه قبلاً لسان انگلیسی را منحیط لسان دوم آموخته و یا فعلاً در حال آموزش لسان انگلیسی امیدارید، به عنوان اشتراک کننده این برنامه تحقیقی انتخاب شدید.

 در صورتیکه شما تصمیم به اشتراک در این برنامه را داشته باشید، شما یک پیش‌شناخت داده می‌شود که حاوی 9 سوال می‌باشد. از شما خواسته می‌شود تا به سوالات مذکور پاسخ تحریری ارائه نمایید که کمتر از نیم ساعت وقت شما را خواهد گرفت.

 بخاطر این داشتن هر معلومات را که شما طی این پروژه فراهم می‌نمایید، محرم حفظ گردیده و

 صرف به اجزای خود شما به سایرین در میان گذاشته خواهد شد مشخصاً پایدار بوده که تام اسناد و

 مدارک تحقیری و کمپوزیتی به شکل که مشخص خواهد گردید تا معلومات فراهم شده به نام شخصی

 اطلاع نگردد. در تحلیل که در مورد معلومات اجرایی می‌گردد با استفاده از دک شماره صوتی می‌گیرد.

 هر موارد خصوصی در تحلیل جوابات انتخاب شده، شمار نمی‌گردد و از همین رو محدودیت اطمینان

 کامل تضمین گردید. تمام موارد برنامه در محل منبع یعنی در یک مارک فل شده حفاظت می‌گردد.

 تمام موارد کمپوزیتی در فاصله های که بایستد که به رمز نیاز دارید، حفظ خواهد گردید. تمام جوابات کننده

 شما خواهان برنامه تحقیقی و فوتوکپی مواد بسته آمده از شما صرف ممکن تحقیق و تحلیل موارد

 مورد استفاده می‌گردد. موارد مذکور به قید فردی به شمول تحقیقی کننده گان، بدون اجازه کننده

 شما داده نمی‌شود. (شما می‌توانید رضایت خویش را کسب کنید از اوراق ذهاب اظهار دارد).

 بعد از قرار دادن مقررات در تحقیق‌های بعدی در محل من حفاظت

 می‌گردد. در آینده خلاصه از جوابات شما و تحلیل آن در دیدگاه شما رضایت خویش را در ذل اظهار دارد. باز هم باید گفت که تمام موارد جمع

 آوری شده به این هدف که داده خواهد شد شاخص یا شما محدود باشد.

 تصمیم مثبت یا منفی که جهت اشتراک در این برنامه تحقیقی مربوط به ارتباط شما با من و یا

 دانشگاه گزارش کدام اثر منفی که شما ایشتراک شما در برنامه تحقیقی این الزامی نیست. شما

 اختیار دارید که: (الف) هر زمانی با معرفی ادامه برنامه را توقف دهید (ب) تفاکس نمایید یا جوابات قبلاً

 ارائه شده توسط شما از این برنامه شود و شامل برنامه تحقیقی نگرد.

 امضاء شما در دیل این یافته آنست که شما تمام موارد حاوی این بند را مطالعه و درک نموده

 اید و داوطلبانه و بدون کدام فشار می‌خواهید در این برنامه تحقیقی به شرایط فوق اشتراک نمایید. شما
همچنان فهمیده ایم هر چقدر زمانی که بخواهید رضایت‌نامه خویش را باطل اعلان نمایید و اشتراک خد را در این برنامه توقف دهید بدون اینکه از شما کدام سوال و یا توضیحات خواسته شود و یا کدام عاقبت دیگر از قبیل مکان، از دادن امتناعات و یا امتناعات علمی که ممکن شما مستند گردید منویه شما گردد امشایش شما در دول التصدیق بر آن خواهد بود که شما یک کابین امضا شده این رضایت‌نامه را دریافت نموده اید.

در صورتی که شما در مورد این برنامه تقدیم کدام سوال داشته باشید، با من به تماس شوید.

เขา در صورتی بعضاً به کدام محدودیت‌های زمانی نیاز دیده است، لطفاً با شمیم نادری و یانگ او کی په در عکس تاریخی

های ذیل به تماس شوید:

امام

شماله تیلوفون

شمالشناداری

دارک یانگ او کی په

shamimn@ksu.edu

203 ترمیب فهری لولتی، دانشگاه اتالی کنرس، شهیر سپاهنی ایالت کنرس 66506، شمال

شمالون: 532 785 3224

شیه میتراد کی این فورته را نزد خود حفظ نمایید.

امام اشتراک کننده

امضاء: اشتراک کننده

تاکنون

امضاء تحقیق کننده و یا همکار ایشان

لطفاً سوالات آن را با گذرانی اعلامه صحیح در مقابل جوابات داده شده و امضایا در مقابل آن، پاسخ دهید.

من باید تحقیق کننده اجازه میدهد تا نتایج از جوابات را با محصلین یا محققین یا شیوه این تحقیق این در میان گزارش.

امضا ( ) نخیر ( )

من به تحقیق کننده اجازه میده تا نتایج از جوابات را با سایر تحقیق کننده گان که شامل این برنامه تحقیقی نیستند، در میان گزارش.

امضا ( ) نخیر ( )

من به تحقیق کننده اجازه میده تا نتایج از جوابات را در مجالس علمی و در نشریه های علمی به چاپ برساند. (هر نام و مکان استفاده شده توسط شما در جوابات، تغییر داده خواهد شد.)

امضا ( ) نخیر ( )

امضا ( )
Appendix B - Personal Information Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant #:</th>
<th>____________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Gender: Male Female
   [Gense: Zokor Onas]

2. Age: 18-23 24-29 30-35 36-41 41 and above
   آن ۰۳ ۲۴-۲۹ ۳۰-۳۵ ۳۶-۴۱
   سن: ۰۳ ۱۸-۲۳ ۴۱ و بالاتر از
   [Sen: 18-23 24-29 30-35 36-41 41 wa bala tar az aan]

3. Native Language: ________________
   زبان مادری ________________
   [Zabaani Maadari]

4. Which province of Afghanistan are you from? ________________
   از کدام ولایت افغانستان استید؟
   [Az Kodam Wolayate Afghanistan Astid?]

5. How long have you studied English both in grade school and in the English Department? Check all that apply.
   a. 6 years in grade school
   b. 9 years in grade school
   c. 1-4 years at university
   d. More than four years (if you take private courses)
   e. Other ________________

   [Cheqadar waqt mishawad ki shoma ingelisi mikhwanid ham da maktab wa ham dar departmenti ingelisi? Tamame bakhsh hai ki shamel mishawad check konid.]
   Alef- Shash sal dar maktab
6. What is your semester standing?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Graduate student
   f. Other

7. Do you speak a language other than Dari and English?
   Yes  No
   • If yes, please list the other language (s) you speak in the order of most fluent to least fluent in speaking:

   • List the other language (s) you speak in the order of most fluent to least fluent in writing:

   آیا بجز دری و انگلیسی به کدام لسان دیگر هم صحبت کرده می‌تانید؟
   بله  نه
   اگر بله لطفاً لسان (لسان‌های) دیگر را که به آنها صحبت می‌کنید به ترتیب فضاحت صحبت نمودن از
   بیشترین به کمترین لست نمایید:

   لطفاً لسان (لسان‌های) دیگر را که به آنها صحبت می‌کنید به ترتیب روان‌پردازی را به کمترین به
   کمترین لست نمایید:

   [Aya ba joz Dari wa Ingelisi ba kodam lesani degar ham sohbat karda mitawanid?]
Bali Nakhair

Agar Bali lotfan lesane (lesan hay) degar ra ki ba an sohbat mikonid ba tartibe fasahat sohbat kardan az beshtarin ba kamtarin list nomaid.
Lotfan lesane (lesan hay) degar ra ki ba aanha sohbat mikonid ba tartibe rawan bodane naweshtaretan az beshtarin ba kamtarin list nomaid.]

8. I learned English through:
   a. English Department classroom activities
   b. Private English Courses
   c. Listening to news and watching American movies
   d. All of the above
   e. Primarily a and b
   f. Primarily b and c
   g. Primarily a and c
   h. Other ______________________________

9. Answer the following questions:
   a. What is your overall proficiency level in Dari (both speaking and writing?)
   b. What is your proficiency level in writing in Dari?
   c. Is Dari your mother tongue?
   d. If Dari is not your mother tongue, how long have you spoken Dari on a regular basis?
   e. Have you ever taken a university course in writing in Dari? If yes, how many times?
   f. What is your overall proficiency level in (American) English?
   g. What is your proficiency level in writing in (American) English?
   h. Have you taken a university course in writing English?
If yes, how many times?

به سوالات ذیل جواب دهید:

1- بطور عموم میزان کارایی یا سطح مهارت تان در لسان داری چطور است؟ (هم در صحبت کردن و هم در نوشتن)

2- سطح آگاهی تان در نگارش دری چطور است؟ یا دری تان به کدام سویه قرار دارد؟

3- ایا دری لسان مادری تان است؟

4- اگر دری زبان مادری تان نیست چقدر وقت می‌شود که منظماً به دری صحبت می‌کنید؟

5- ایا کدام کورسی مضمون نگارش در لسان داری را در دانشگاه گرفته‌اید؟ اگر بله، چند بار؟

6- بطور عموم سطح مهارت تان در انگلیسی امریکایی چیست؟ (سطح ابتدایی، متوسط یا پیشرفته)

7- سطح آگاهی تان در نگارش انگلیسی امریکایی به کدام سویه قرار دارد؟

8- ایا کدام کورسی مضمون نگارش در لسان انگلیسی را در دانشگاه گرفته‌اید؟ اگر بله، چند بار؟

[Ba sawalat zayl jawab dehid:]
Appendix C - English Tasks

Task One: Please introduce yourself and your university. Write about your daily routine (that is, schedule of activities and responsibilities on a given day). Write two pages (approximately 250 words). Time limit: 20 minutes.

Task Two: In about 250 words, respond to the following question. Time limit: 45 minutes. What is the most important skill a person should acquire in order to be successful in the world today? Choose one skill and use specific reasons and examples to support your choice.

Translation of English Tasks in Dari

وظیفه اول: وظیفه اول: وظیفه اول: لطفاً در دو صفحه با تقریباً ٢٥٠ کلمه و در مدت زمان ٢٠ دقیقه خود را معرفی و در مورد دانشگاه تان معلومات ارائه نمایید. راجع به کار های روزمره تان بنویسید. (یعنی تقسیم وقت های فعالیت ها و مسئولیت های روزانه تان را شرح دهید.)

وظیفه دوم: در دو صفحه (تقریباً ٢٥٠ کلمه) و در مدت زمان ٥ دقیقه و با استفاده از چند سوال قسمت چه کار اکثریت نماهنگ و در جهان امروزی باید به دست آورده، کدام است؟ یک مهارت مهمترين مهارت که یک شخص با خاطر دار در جهان امروزی باید به دست آورد؟ کدام است؟ یک مهارت انتخاب نموده و با استفاده از دلایل و مثال های مشخص انتخاب تان را تاپید نمایید.
Appendix D - Dari Tasks

وظایف دری

[Wazaaife Dari]

Task One: Respond to the following questions in two pages (approximately 250 words).
Time limit: 20 minutes.
1- What are the major tourist attractions in Mazar-i-Sharif?
2- What do you like about Mazar-i-Sharif?

[Wazifae awal: Lotfan dar do safha ya 250 kalema wa dar modat zamani 20 daqiqi sawalate zayl ra jawab dehid.
1- Mawzoahate omdahe ki tawajohe sayahan ra dar shahari mazar-i-sharif ba khod jalb minomaid kodam ha and?
2- Kodam chiz dar mazar-i-sharif zeyad khoshetan miyayiad?]

Task Two: In about 250 words, respond to the following passage.
Indicate whether or not you agree with the position and explain why. Time limit: 45 minutes.

[Wazifae dowom: Lotfan dar do safha (taqriban 250 kalema) wa dar modat zamani 45 daqiqi nazaretan ra dar baraie paragrafe zayl benawesid ki aya ba aan mawafeq hastid ya khair, agar bali ya na sharha dehid chera?]

The Importance of Education in Afghanistan

“Afghanistan has experienced wars for about three decades, which nearly destroyed the foundation of Afghan public education system. Good education is one of the pillars of a healthy and sustainable society. Therefore, the development of a public education system is most crucial to rebuilding Afghanistan as a nation today.” Indicate whether you agree or disagree with this position. Explain why.
[Ahamayate Tahlim wa Tarbia dar Afghanistan]

[Afghanistan nazdik ba seh dahah jang ra tajroba kardaeh ast ki taqriban bonyade sestomi tahlim wa tarbia ra az bain borda ast. Benahan barahi destrase ba yak jamiehai salim, ba sebat, paaia dar wa tawseha yrafta bayad nizami amozeshi kara wa mohasr saman dada shawad. Zira tahlim wa tarbia sangi benhai taghair e mosbat dar yak jamieha boda wa roshde tahlim wa tarbia jehte baz sazi jamiaha e imrozi Afghanistan ik amri besyar mohem wa hayati mibashad. Aya shoma baa in tarsi fekr mawafeq hastid ya mokhalif? Dar har do sorat dalayilitan ra sharah dehid.]
Appendix E - Debriefing

Dear Participant:

Thank you very much for your participation in this study. Please note that you have the right to withdraw from this research project even after the study is completed. You can request that your questionnaire data not be used.

When signing the consent form, you were informed that this study focuses on foreign language use. The research focus was given in very broad terms so that knowledge about the specific details of what we are investigating would not influence your behavior in the answers. The precise nature of the study is to analyze English students’ writing productions.

If you have further questions at this time, you may ask me now. Thank you once again for your help in completing this project.

Dari Translation of Debriefing

تشکر نامه

اشتراک کننده عزیز:

از اشتراک فعالانه شما در ب رنامه تحقیقی ها اظهار قدردانی می‌نماییم. بخاطر داشتن‌اش شما

میتوانید هر زمانی حتی بعد از اکمال این پروژه از این برنامه خارج شوید. میتوانید تقاضا نمانتید که

پرسشنامه‌های خانه‌بری شده توسط شما نباید استفاده شود.

بعد از امضای فورمه‌ی رضایت‌نامه، به شما گفته شد که باید این تحقیق را استفاده کنید. لداندا

خارجی متمرکز می‌باشد. موضوع مورد بحث این تحقیق به شکل بسیار مفصل توضیح گردیده تا اقناع شما

حاصل گردید و موضوعات را که مایل روزی این تحقیق مینماید با ایشان شیوه جوابگویی شما در پرسشنامه‌ه

ها تأثیری نگذارد. هدف خاص از این تحقیق اینست تا نمونه‌های نگارش فصل‌کرده نگارش انگلیسی را

تحت‌ обязательно.

در صورتی که در این مرحله کدام سوال داشته باشید، همین حالا هم می‌توانید بپرسید. از اینگونه مرا

در تکمیل این پروژه همکاری مینمایند، با هم اظهار امتنان می‌نماییم.

تشکر!
Appendix F - Writing Samples in English and Dari

No. 4

Task One:

I am Aziz Ahmad Muradi, son of Imam Nazar Muradi, a student of fourth class, English Department, Literature and Humanities Faculty, Balkh University.

Balkh University, which is the second biggest university in Afghanistan, has eight faculties with many more departments, is a best academic place.

I get up at 4:00 A.M. Then I tidy up my bed and go to bathroom to get abolition. After that I go to mosque to offer prayers in congregation. Then I return to my dorm in order to prepare the breakfast. After having breakfast I leave my dorm. From 6:30 A.M. I go to the park for jogging, then I go to Medica Mondial office. I am an English teacher. I teach the lawyers English. My class begins at 8 A.M. I teach that class Saturday through Wednesday.
At 9 A.M. I go to Balkh University. I have classes at in agriculture faculty. I teach them English six days a week Saturday through Thursday from 9-10 A.M. From 10 to 12 I go to Unicef office to translate the social issues from English to Dari.

From 12-2 p.m I rest for a while and get prepared for my university lessons.

At 2 p.m I go to university and I study there till 4:50 p.m.

From 5 p.m. till 8 p.m a teach English in Sina Private College of Professional Learning. I teach six periods a week Saturdays, Sundays and Tuesdays. At 8 p.m I come back to my dorm to cook dinner. After dinner I watch T.V for a while, then I have a special English class from 10-11 p.m. After 11 p.m I get prepared for my next days lessons.

Finally I go to bed at 12 A.M.
Skill which leads to Success

There are many more skills which causes the people to be successful in our daily life. But, it depends to the needs of our society and the situation. In today's community, having skill in I.T can lead us to success.

There are numerous reasons that why I.T skill causes success. First, today's world is called the world of technology and development. The second reason is that our society has less people who are I.T technician.

Due to the second aforementioned reason, a person who has skill in I.T will be employed with high salary because the number of people who has this skill is less. But, in spite of all these mentioned things, it heavily depends on a person's interest that he should himself find the base of the motive that he can be successful by.
No. 4

To conclude, I can say that in a world full of progress and equipped with the latest forms of technologies it wouldn't be impossible that if we have computer and IT skills, which should not be possible to lead us to success and great achievements.
جواب اینجاست: در کنار جامعه جهانی، نظام رشتی که از سازمان انسان دوستی
عفویه شهادت مادران و نوازندگان، نمایشگاه بزرگ و شاهد حضور
جان بادشاهم لیبرتی، هنرمند ایرانی در سال ۱۳۸۱ به سمت رازی
که لغو سلماش و داله نمایش می‌کند، سرمایه‌ای بسیاری است.
راستی و جوانی را بپیوند، سلماش بی‌بی از سی هماند.
انسان‌شناسان و روزانه‌های جهانی به روزیه‌های ایرانی از طرف شهدا رسان می‌یابند.
چه چیزی در دنیای انگلیس و آمریکا را پشت سر گذاشته شده.
امکان دارد این امر از طرف مردم و خانواده زمان هم ارتباطی بزند که لازم
بایسته مفرشیی در مرکز‌های دانش و دادن به راه حل و گزینه‌های بهتری
روزانه‌های ایرانی سی و دربار، بایستی به شاهدا رسیدگی کرده، به همراه
روزانه هایی است خاص که درون‌روی شاهدا را در دنیای دیگری
درتا و به دنیای دیگری انتقال داده و درون‌روی مسجدی به ایران می‌گردد.
همن‌طور که در مسیر محور مسجد بزرگ، در مسیر شاهدین و هر دو راه
مطالب دیگر از این مطالعه به‌شماره ۱۱ نیز در فصل دوم از نظر امامزاده اشکان‌زاده علیه السلام، مورد بررسی قرار گرفته است.

انقلاب و شهاکنش از سراسر جهان و از سرجهای مختلف امامان مورد بررسی قرار گرفته و در منابع مختلف، در بحث‌هایی سیاسی راهنمایی شده است.

نرخ را نیز هنگامی جمع‌سازی و هنگامی که منابع مهرام چاپ خواند، ها و عمور دارد، دربار صفر از جمله مهم‌ترین افراد در این منابع ایستاده است.

برای بررسی این موضوع، هنگامی که منابع مهدی و مسلم صفر از جمله مهم‌ترین افراد در این منابع دیده شد، هنگامی که منابع مهدی و مسلم صفر از جمله مهم‌ترین افراد در این منابع دیده شد.
حرب ٨

دران افغانستان به کشور خالی بدست آمد و مرزهای به دفع مختل ماند. در این دوره، افرادی از افغانستان به سفارت‌های و دیپلمات‌های نظام شرکت کرده و در مرز افغانستان، با مرزبانان و مسئولان دیپلماتیک کار می‌کردند.

در این دوره، افرادی از افغانستان به سفارت‌های و دیپلمات‌های نظام شرکت کرده و در مرز افغانستان، با مرزبانان و مسئولان دیپلماتیک کار می‌کردند.

مهم‌ترین هدف از این فعالیت‌های دیپلماتیک، حفظ منافع و توانمندی‌های افغانستان در مواجهه با تهدیدات و ضعف‌های داخلی و خارجی بود.

مهم‌ترین هدف از این فعالیت‌های دیپلماتیک، حفظ منافع و توانمندی‌های افغانستان در مواجهه با تهدیدات و ضعف‌های داخلی و خارجی بود.

در این دوره، افرادی از افغانستان به سفارت‌های و دیپلمات‌های نظام شرکت کرده و در مرز افغانستان، با مرزبانان و مسئولان دیپلماتیک کار می‌کردند.

مهم‌ترین هدف از این فعالیت‌های دیپلماتیک، حفظ منافع و توانمندی‌های افغانستان در مواجهه با تهدیدات و ضعف‌های داخلی و خارجی بود.
با رزگ خانم مهربانی می‌خوانم و همیشه به یک
است که در اسلام هر همیشه تمام افراد مسلمان در سیره زندگی و هر امر
و امرitle را در حیات و سیره زنده مسلمانان همراه داریم.

یکی از امروزه صنفی نماینده مسلمان

سکن بستر هر یک از اهل اسلام علیه
امام به مرور زمان را در راه مسلمانان ظریف جهان
سیر می‌کند. این از که افزودن کار در امامان زنده
سیم و افزودن به امروزات، امروزاتی که همیشه در
سیر حیات مسلمانان نسیم با خاطم
باید نظیره عرب تنظیم و سازمان‌دهی در امامان روز
دو نه کنم.
Appendix G - IRB Approval

TO: Young-Ok Yum  
Communication Studies, Theatre, and Dance  
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