CONFLICTS OF TIME SCALE IN THE LEARNING OF ENGLISH TENSES

Muhammad Athar Khurshid
Govt. Degree College, Phool Nagar (Boys), Kasur, Pakistan

ABSTRACT: *This paper describes a conflict in the minds of learners that obstructs the learning of English tenses. The researcher tested the tense competence of his class students in grade-XIII(in Pakistani educational background). He came to know that the students remained more confused in the use of some tenses than others. Theyconfused the Past Simple and the Present Perfect tenses, the Past Simple and the Past Perfect tenses, the Present Perfect and the Past Perfect tenses, the Progressive and Perfect Progressive tenses, and the prepositions* for *and* since *in the Perfect Progressive tenses.The participants described three reasons for their usage.The researcher has coded them as:(1) superimposition of L1 time scale on L2,(2) intermixing of their personal time frame with that of the text;(3) intuitive manipulation of time scale. The first confusion was the result of L1 interference; the second arose from the communication gap between the student and teacher; the third resulted from the student's wild guess which was, in return, the result of insufficient exposure and lack of practice. To reduce the above mentioned confusions, the researcher suggests the following remedies:(1) inclusion of the activitiesthat promote communication skill;(2) inclusion of the specimens of today's English, e.g. English movies and TV programs;(3) inclusion of the testing of listening and speaking skills in the examination system;(4)upgradation of the testing and evaluation system.*

Key Terms: cognition, tenses, time scale, time frame, conflict, L1 interference

INTRODUCTION

In Pakistanipublic sector schools and colleges, English is taught though Grammar Translation Method GTM[1]. Working in such an institution, the researcher was facing difficulties in the teaching of tenses. Many who had learnt the tenses, relapsed to old errors. In order to develop a detailedunderstanding of the students' reasons in structuring sentences,the researcher conducted a PhD research[1]. He collected 728 reasons from 25 learners, which were categorized into 10 main and 45 sub-groups. This paper is based on one of the 10 main categories which cause confusion and result in errors.

Statement of the Problem

Very often learners of English confuse tenses. For example, the mistake of using the past simple tense instead of the present and past perfect tenses is very common. Some learners form and use mechanical inter-lingual and intra-lingual links. But here the researcher wants to explore what grammatical meaning of different tenses the learners have in their minds.

Purpose of Research

The researcher's purpose behind this research is to develop better understanding of learner's concept of tense system.

Research Objectives

To develop understanding in the learners' concept of tense and aspect.

Research Questions

Why do the learners confuse tenses?
Why do the learners confuse aspects?
What are the differences between Urdu and English time scales?
Is there any role of L1 interference in time scale conflict?
Is there any role of overgeneralization in time scale conflict?

Research Design

As the current study is of exploratory nature, it follows qualitative research design.

Population

The sample for this research was selected from a public sector institution, Govt. S. E. College, Bahawalpur.

Sample

A convenience sample of 25 male students of grade-XIII was selected.

Research Framework

For the analysis of data, Corder's framework of error analysis was adopted. Two more instruments were incorporated in it: (1) contrastive analysis (2) analysis of paradigmatic choices. To access the learners' understanding, interviewtechnique was used.

Delimitations

1. This research is limited to the study of declarative and interrogative structures.
2. As this study consists of the convenience sample of 25 male students of one institution only, its generalizability is very limited.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The present study is based on framework of error analysis by a Researcher in [3], [4]. This framework suggests four steps of error analysis:

Identification of errors means identifying the faulty part of the text.
Description of errors refers to giving detail of the nature of the error.
Explanation of errors requires suggesting probable reason for the error.
Classification of errors means coding of data.

A Researcher in[5]studied the errors of 28 Thai students of grade-III.He administered a test consisting of: (1) questions about simple and compound structures, and (2) question about paragraph writing. He combined four frameworks for analysis: *contrastive analysis*, *error analysis*, *interlanguage analysis*, and *contrastive rhetoric*. The list of errors was long. But two of them coincided with the present study:

Features of L1 syntactic interference in the students' written English.
Faulty subject-verb agreement.

A Scholar in [6] collected both quantitative and qualitative data from 710 Chinese adult learners of English. In

---

[1] The memorization of vocabulary, deductive teaching of grammar, reading and writing skills are mainly focused in GTM [2].

interviews, the participantstold that they first called upon their NL before they wrote the TL structures. Chan's research points outthe role of L1interference in SLA. The current study provides evidence of L1 interference in the learning of L2 time scale.

A researcher in [7] studied the errors of the advanced learners of English in Pakistan. His long list carried the following errors too: *overgeneralization of the progressive aspect*; and *the use of the present progressive tense instead of the present perfect progressive tense*. He [7] describes these errors as a process of creolization of British English in Pakistan. However, hehas not assigned them cognitive reasons.

Scholars in [8] applied Corder's [3] technique of Error Analysis. Their participants showed 80% errors in the usage of the present perfect tense in spite of the fact that 5 units were specified in the book for the practice of the same tense. Moreover, they noted errors of following types:

a. Use of the simple present tense for simple past tenseto describe past action.
b. Use of the simple past tense for simple present tense.
c. Use of simple future tense for simple present tense.
d. Use of the present perfect tense for past perfect tense to show the sequence of two actions which happened in the past.
e. Use of the present perfect tense for simple past tense to describe past action.
f. Use of the past perfect tense for present perfect tense to show something that is still carried out.
g. Use of present progressive for simple present tense.
h. Use of present progressive for simple past tense to describe a continuous action.
i. Use of two verbs in the past progressive when one verb should be in the simple past tense to show two things happening simultaneously.
j. Use of the past continuous tense for simple present tense to show routine or habit.

A Researcher in [9] replicated [1] and studied the confusion in the usage of the present simple and the present perfect tenses. He classified his reasons in eleven main categories. One of his main categories describes the errors of time scale. This suggests that the classification of errors which the researcher arrived at in 2010 is valid still in 2016.

A Scholar in [10] studied the confusions of O level students' in the use of past tense. He has described the errors of time scale under the head *Manipulation of ERS by wild guesses*.

The evidence of confusion in the usage of time scale is available in the studies cited above; but its reasons are not suggested. The researcher has tried to access the reasons of such errors.

METHOD

The researcher used qualitative research design for the present study. The sampleswere taken from Govt. S. E. College, Bahawalpur. 25 male students of grade-XIII were selected for this task. Keeping within the GTM system, the researcher prepared an Urdu to English translation test. The sentences were selected from a book of grammar of grade-IX and X[11]. The reason for preparing the test from a book of lower grades was to provide the participants with the easiest grammatical structures so that they might apply their grammatical skill conveniently and should be able to explain their reasons without difficulty.An idea was borrowed from Systemic grammar [12, 13, 14] for the preparation of the test. The sentences were picked to test the learner's ability to select from theparadigmatic choices[1]. That is, the *unmarked* affirmative, negative, polarity interrogative, wh- interrogative structures in the declarative mood were included in the test. In all, they made 48 sentences, 4 sentences per tense. The purpose was tofurnish the test with the maximum variety of grammatical choices within the declarative moodand then see whichwere to be picked bythe participants.By interviews, the researcher tried to access the participants' reasons formaking their choices. The researcher asked them the reasons fortheir constructions, mostly the faulty ones. The learners did not know whether their teacher was asking them the reasons for incorrect or correct constructions. They just shared their reasons. The researcher also asked their opinion about other possible answers, by trying different paradigmatic choices. The purpose was to access their conceptual network.

Reliability of the Tool

The reliability of the test was made sure by two steps. First, the questions were selected from a book of lower grade. The students had already studies that book many years age. That book of grammar is published by the government of Pakistanfor the teaching of tenses to the students of grade-IX and grade-X. Second, the results of the test matched with those other researchers who had worked on similar topics.

Validity of Inferences

The researcher established the validity of inferences by three ways. First, he verified his understanding by repeating it before the participant. Second, he cross matched a participant's answers. Third, he conducted the contrastive analysis of the sentences and mapped the similarities and differences in the morphological and syntactic features of the Urdu and their corresponding Englishsentences. The external validity of the present study was determined by two pieces of MPhil research [9,10]. Two researchers replicated Khurshid [1] in different institutions and reached very similar results. It means the findings of a study of 2010 are still valid in 2016.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

---

[1]Here, 'grammatical paradigms' refers to the probable choices in a slot for a grammatical item, not the lexical ones. This term is the combination of two ideas. The former is borrowed from Palmer [16], who differentiates the grammatical categories from the lexical categories; while the latter is borrowed from systemic grammar; and it refers to choices [12,13,14]. The term grammar incorporates Carnie's [17] concept of grammar which includes features of person, number, and tense (PNT) marked on the main verb in the present and past simple tenses.

For data analysis, the researcher used Corder's framework [3], [4]. The description of this approach is given above in the section *Review of Literature*.The researcher relied on three types of evidences: (1) the participants' direct answer; (2) evidences collected from the comparison of the participants' answers, (3) evidences collected from the contrastive analysis of the L1 and L2 structures. For the contrastive analysis, the researcher used a Researcher in [15] technique of elaborating lexico-functional features of both Urdu and English with the help of a gloss.

The data was collected in two steps: (1) by Urdu to English translation test, and (2) by interviews. Code names were assigned to the participants. 25 code names were arranged in alphabetical order under each question. Their answers and comments were placed in front of their respective code names. Another list was made that contained individual participants' answers and comments. The second list was used to compare the answers and comments of an individual participant; the first one was used to compare theanswers and comments of all of them.By analyzing the data in the above mentioned manner, the researcher observed a pattern that suggested a phenomenon which he titled as *superimposition of personal time scale*[1].The examples of that phenomenon are given below.

Superimposition of the Personal Time Scale
While using English, learners have to maintain three distinct time frames side by side. Two of them are the time/tense systems of Urdu and English which are only partially similar; the third one is the learner's contextual time frame. Reichenbach's terminology [18], describes time scale in three degrees: Speech time (S), Event time (E), Reference time (R).Learners often confuse three SERs.They mergethe time frames. In this way, three SERs[1]begin to clash with one another [1].

In Urdu, the problem is further aggravated by the presence of too many perfectivity markers. Though basically they appear in four morphemes,[a], [e], [i],and [ĩ][2], yetthey marktoo many light verbs[3] which are: [lɪja], [li]; [d̪ɪja] [d̪i]; [kɪja] [ki]; [gəja], [gəe], [gəi], [gəĩ]. [t͡ʃʊka], [t͡ʃʊke], [t͡ʃʊki], [t͡ʃʊkĩ] are the most frequently used perfectivity markers in Urdu[1].The researcher recorded 9.6% (70/728) errors in this category, committed by 84% (21/25) learners.

The Present Perfect Tense Treated as the Present Simple Tense
The light verbs that mark perfectivity in Urdu (mentioned above) may appear alone or in combination with thepresent tense *be* [hɛ]. In the latter combination, they impart the meanings of the present perfect tense; in the former case, they produce the sense of the past simple tense.

This error was caused by the learners' inability to differentiate the grammatical meanings of English present

perfect tense from the English present simple tense. Though they would not have confused these two tenses in Urdu, yet their lack of understanding in the time/tense system of English led them to identify the Urdu present perfect tense with the English present simple tense.Talif and Edwin [8], and Raza [9] have also pointed out this type of error. The researcher recorded 9 errors of this type, committed by 8 learners. Some of the examples of this confusion are given below. For detailed information, vide [1].

7.25a P3[4]:

[t͡ʃʊhõ	ne	d̪ɪʋaːr	mẽ	bɪl		bəna	lɪj -e	h	-ɛ̃]
Rat.m.3.p.	Erg.	wall.f.3.s.	in.Loc.	hole.m.3.Nom.		make	take.p.	be.pres.m.p.	

Rats have made holes in the wall.

> **Muh[5]:**Rat*[s (have made)6]*make the hole in the wall.
>
>   [1]

He, not being able to make anycorrelations or a associations, translated it as the present simple tense.

7.26n P3:

[məriːz	ne	d̪əʋa		nəhĩ	p -i		h	-ɛ̃]
Patient.m.3.s.	Erg.	Medicine.f.s.Nom.		not	drink.Perf.f.s.		be.pres.m.s.	

The Patient has not drunk medicine.

> **Ajm:**Patient*[(has not drunk)]*drink his medicine.
> **Zaf:**Thepatient do*[(has)]*not take*[n]* medicine.[1]

Cognitive Problem. The learners usually correlate English present perfect tense with Urdu perfective markers [t͡ʃʊka hɛ], [t͡ʃʊke hɛ̃], [t͡ʃʊki hɛ], [t͡ʃʊki hɛ̃]. In the above cases, these markers were missing. So, the learners had to determine the tense intuitively. They did not make idle correlations of [hɛ], [hɛ̃], and [hũ] with *is, are, am* etc. Had it been so, they would have inserted *be* in their answers.

*Remedies.*The following steps may be taken to overcome this problem.

- Get the learners memorize a few short paragraphs of easy sentences in different tenses.
- Teach the tenses on time line with the help of SER[7] cues.
- Communicative situations should also be created for oral drill.

The Present Perfect Tense Treated as the Past Simple Tense:
The difference between English past simple tense and English present perfect tense can be mapped with help of the following model:

Past: E, R_S (For example, *She was at home yesterday*; R=yesterday.)

---

[1]Speech Time, Event time, Reference time [18].
[2][a] marks masculine singular; [e] marks masculine plural; [i] marks feminine singular;and [ĩ] marks feminine plural;
[3] Light verbs are the free morphemes which either transform a noun/adjective into a verb, or expand the sense of a main verb [15], [19].

[4] In the above code, the numbers (like 7.26) mark the question number. Letters in lower case, next to the question number (a, p, n, w) are abbreviations of: Affirmative, Negative, Polarity question, Wh-question. Next, P1, P2, P3, P4; Pt1, Pt2, Pt3, Pt4; F1, F2, F3, F4 represent the twelve tenses.
[5] Code name of the participant.
[6] The researchers' suggestion.
[7] Speech Time, Event time, Reference time [17].

Present perfect: E_S, R (For example, *The crowd has now moved to plaza*; R=now)

(E: Event time, S: Speech time, R: Reference time)   [17]

In the former, Event and Reference times are the same and exist in the past, while Speech time follows them; in the latter, Speech and Reference times are one and exist in the present, while Event time precedes them.

The present perfect tense has different chemistry in Urdu. Here, it may appear either like English E_S, R, or in another way E, R_S. The example of the latter is: **He has arrived yesterday.* The translation of this text would be an acceptable sentence in Urdu. In the E, R_S combination, the present perfect tense and the past simple tense appear with the same formation on timeline. This overlapping often confuses the learners.Talif and Edwin [8] have also recorded this type of error. The researcher recorded 17 examples of such errors in 9 learners. Some examples of such confusion are given below. For detailed information, vide [1].

7.25a P3:

[t͡ʃʊhõ   ne   d̪ɪʋaːr   mẽ   bɪl   bəna   lɪj -e   h   -ɛ̃]

Rat.m.3.p.   Erg.   wall.f.3.s. in.Loc.   hole.m.3.Nom.   make   take.p.   be.pres.m.p.

Rats have made holes in the wall.

    Akm:*Mouse*(Mice have)***maked***(made)*a wholes in wall.*
    Nav:*The mouse*(has made)*mak*ed *the hole- in wall.*
    Qam:*The mouse*(has made)***maid** *the hole in the wall.*[1]

7.26n P3:

[məɾiːz   ne   d̪əʋa   nəhĩ   p   -i   h   -ɛ]

Patient.m.3.s.   Erg.   Medicine.f.s.Nom.   not   drink.Perf.f.s.   be.pres.m.s.

The Patient has not drunk medicine.

    Ami: *The patient did not take medicine.*
    Dil:*Patient was*(has)*not take*^{n}(Ved)*medicine.*
    Irf:*The patient did*(has)*not took*(taken)*the medicine.*[1]

7.27p P3:

[kɾja ʊs   ne   gaõ   həmeʃa   k -e   lɪje   t͡ʃʰoɽ   d̪ɪj -a   h   -ɛ]?

Int.   P.that(pserson).s. Erg. village.m.3.s.Nom. always Gen.Obl.for.Post. leave give.Perf.m.s. be.pres.m.s.?

Has he left the village for good?

    Ajm: *Did*(**Has**)*he leave*(left)*his village for always.*
    Ami: *Did*(Has)*he leave*(left)*the village already.*
    Dil:*Was*(Has)*he left*(**Ved**)*the village for*for ever*?*[1]

7.28w P3:

[aːp   ne   ʊs   aːd̪mi   ko   kəhã   d̪ekʰ -a   h   -ɛ]?

P.2.Res.   Erg.   that.mod.   man.m.3.s.   Acc.   where   see.   Perf.m.s.   be.pres.m.s.?

Where have you seen that man?

    Dil:*Where*(have)*you was seen*(**Ved**)*this man?*
    Moh: *Where*(have)*did you see*^{n} *that man?*
                     [1]

Cognitive Problem.The learners identify the completion of an action with pastness. They fail to see the reference time of a past event in present.

Remedy.The following tips may be helpful in solving this problem.

- Oral drills in different sentence structures.
- Teaching of the tenses on timeline with the help of ERS cues.

The Present Perfect Tense Treated as the Past Perfect Tense

Though the researchers could collect only one example of this type for the current study, yet in their professional career they have encountered plenty of such examples.Talif and Edwin [8] have also pointed out this type of error.

7.27p P3: Saf: *Had*(has)*he left the village always.*
                                  [1]

Cognitive Problem.The learner has tried to highlight both the completed action and the pastness. In this effort he changed the tense.

The Past Perfect Tense Treated as the Past Simple Tense

Though this study offers only one example of this error yet this type is neither new nor rare for the researchers.

7.32w Pt3: Was: *Why the people **went** back before the arrival of the bus?*[1]

Cognitive Problem. The learner placed event time and reference time at one spot on time line. They did not know that reference time and event time exist at two different points in past, in the past perfect tense.

The Past Tense Treated as the Present Tense

Three learners failed to differentiate the past tense from the present tense in three sentences. They did not display any over generalization of the inter-lingual error, or the mental association error. They knowingly translated the given sentences into the present tense.

7.6n Pt1: Kas: *You do*(did)*not listen*(to)*me.*

In the learner's opinion the implied speaker's speech time (S) and the implied listener's listening time (E) are occurring at the same moment. In this confusion, he inserted the default[1] reference time (R) too.

.   **Shb:***You do*(did)*not listen to me.*

7.7p Pt1: Bil: (Did)***What** you enjoy flight?*

Biltranslated *enjoyment* in the present tense because he thought *it*reflected the implied listener's state of mindwhich is described in the default (present) tense [17,11]

Cognitive Problem.This error occurred because the learners confused the ERS system in the following way:

Normal paradigm	Distorted paradigm
The Present Simple tense: SER.	
The Past Simple tense: ER_S.	SER [1]

The Future Perfect Tense Treated as the Future Simple Tense

Nine learners translated the future perfect tense as the future simple tense in seventeen cases. In two sentences the perfectivity maker [t͡ʃʊka] is also present. But still the learners failed to maintain its correlation with *has*. A few examples of this error are given below. For detailed information, vide [1].

7.33a F3:

---

[1] Michaelis [17] describes the present tense as the default tense.

[lə̪ɽk-e　　　ɪm̪ʈha:n　k -i　ʈ̪əja:ri　　　kʌr　ʧ̂ʊk-e　　ɦ-õ　ɡ -e]

Boys.m.3.p.Nom.　exam.m.3.s　Gen.f.s　preparation.f.3.s.Nom　do　Perf.　p.　be.p.　will.m.p.

Boys will have prepared for the exam.

Abd: *The students will^(have)prepaire^d for the examination.* [1]

7.34n F3:

[m -ẽ　　ne　ʈ̪ʊmha:r-a　xʌʈ̪　-　　nəhĩ　kʰol -a　　h-o　ɡ -a]

P.1.s.Obl　Erg.　P.pos.2.s.　letter.m.3.s.Nom.　not　open.m.s.Perf.　be.s.　will.m.s.

I will not have opened your letter.

Abd:*I shall not^(have)open^ed your letter.*
Qam:*I shall ^(have)not open^ed your letter.*
Wse: *I shall not^(have)open^ed your letter.*
Zaf:*I will not^(have)open^ed your letter.*[1]

7.35p F3:

[kɪja mehma:n -　　ʌpn -i　dʒ̂əɡa　pʌr　beʈʰ ʧ̂ʊk-e h-õ　ɡ -e]?

Int.　guests.p.3.Nom.　P.pos.f.s.　seat.f.3.s　on.Loc.　sit　Perf.p.　be.p.　will.m.p.?

Will the guests have sit on their seats?

Abd:*Will the guests^(have)set ^on their places*?
Akm:*Will guests^(have)set on their place.*
Dil:*Will the guests ^(have)sit on their sites^(seats)*? [1]

7.36w F3:

[ʌfsər　　ne　ʈ̪ʊmha:ri　d̪ʌrxwa:sʈ̪　pʌr　kʌb　jɔ:r　　kɪj-a　h-o　ɡ -a]

Officer.m.3.s.　Erg　P.pos.f.2.s　request.f.3.s　on.Loc.　when　attention.m.3Nom　did.m.s.　be.s.　will.m

When will the officer have considered your application?

Abd: *When will the officer^(have)consider^ed your application*?
Akm: *^(When)Will officer^(have)thought about your leave^(request)*?
Moh:*When will your officer^(have)consider^ed on your application*?
Wse:*When^(will)the officer^(have considered)will concern your application.*[1]

Cognitive Problem.The presence of *be* equivalents [ho] and [hõ]makes the learners overlook [ʧ̂ʊka] or its variant, the learners could not identifyit as the perfect tense.So, they translated it as the future simple tense.

Remedy.Teachers should adopt two strategies:

Extensive drills in the Urdu variants of the perfect tense markers.

Teaching of tenses on time line.

The Present Simple Treated as the Past Simple Tense

Only one learner committed this error in one case.Talif and Edwin [8] have also pointed out this type of error.

7.2n P1: Moh:*I did^(do)not know this stranger.*

Moh said he wrote *did* because the act of knowing had occurredin the past. [1]

Cognitive Problem.For some unknown reason, the learner associated the act of knowing with the past tense. This has occurred because of his intuitive manipulation of the tense system.

Remedy.Teacher should adopt following strategies to get rid of this problem:

- Drills in the understanding of the ERS system.

- Teaching of tenses on time line.

Use of *since* and *for*

In Urdu, the *oblique temporal case* [19] substitutes both *since* and *for* in time adjuncts. Teachers mostly associate their usage with the notions of*starting point* and *duration*respectively. Teaching of these prepositions by this method confuses the learners. A few examples are their confusions are given below. For detail, vide [1].

7.37a　P4**:** **Jam:** *Aslam^(has been)is fling the kite for^(since)afternoon.*

7.38n P4**: Zaf:***We are not^(have not been)buying books **since**^(for) five year.*

7.39p P4**: Jam:***^(Has)Is the patient^(been)resting **for**^(since)afternoon.*

7.41a　Pt4**:Irf:***The students weremaking a noise **since**^(for)half^(an)hour.*

Moh:*The students had been making a noise **since**^(for)last half an hour.*

Qmr:*The students ^(have been) are making a noise **since**^(for)half anhour.*

Saf:*The students have been making a noise **since**^(for)half an hour.*

7.42n Pt4**: Saf:***My brother had not been taking examination **for**^(since)11th.*

7.43p　Pt4**:** **Mat:***Had your brother been giving you advise^s**since**^(for)two days.*[1]

Cognitive Problem.The problem occurs because of the learners' inability to differentiatethe text's speech time from their own speech time. If the adverbial *now* is given in the question to translate, they think it refers to the time of doing the paper. If the adverbial *2006 se* is given, they would count all the mediating years between 2013 (test time) and 2006 and think themselves justified in using *for* instead of *since*. Similarly, if the duration [ʈi:n sa:l se] is given, they would subtract three years from 2013 (test time) and think the starting point is known. In this way, they create a reason for the use of *since* instead of *for*[1].

Remedy. The following remedies are suggested to overcome this problem:

- Reasoning with the learners about the usage.
- Let the learners memorize a few examples of the usage of *since* and *for*from his daily routine.

CONCLUSION

The data obtained helps to arrive at the following reasons for time scale confusion:

1. The learners confuse time scale due to three reasons: (1) The time scale of L1 tended to dominate over the time scale of L2,
2. (2) the learners unknowingly confused their own situational context with the temporal context of thetext,
3. (3) The learners intuitively assigned time scale.

In the light of the above reasons, the research questions can be answered as follows:

1. The learners confuse time scales (tense and aspect) because of *L1 interference*, because of *merging time frame of the situational context with the context of*

the text, because of *the intuitive manipulation of time scale.*

2. The difference between Urdu and English time scale is the presence of Reference time (R) [18]. In English, reference time is more clearly present, especially in perfect tenses. Moreover, perfect progressive tenses are absent in Urdu.

3. L1 interference was observed. The absence of reference time in Urdu made the learners translate the perfect tenses as the simple tenses. Moreover, the learners' inability to identify the grammatical sense of the perfectivity markers led them to translate the present perfect tense as present simple tense.

4. No evidence of the role overgeneralization in time scale errors was observed.

The researcher suggests the following measures to overcome this problem:

- Teaching of L2 with the help of communicative situations.
- Letting them memorize good number of examples of the targeted structures by repetition.
- Maximum use of oral activities.
- Testing of listening and speaking skills.
- Use of time line and ESR system for teaching of tenses and aspects, when needed.
- Teaching of the grammatical features of L1, when necessary.

REFERENCES

1. Khurshid, M. A. *Cognitive Problems of Urdu-Medium College Students in Learning English Syntax* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad. (2010).

2. Larsen-Freeman, D. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching* (2nd. ed.). London: Oxford University Press, (2000)

3. Corder, S. P. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, (1981)

4. Ellis, R. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, (1994)

5. Bennui, P.,"A Study of L1 Interference in the Writing of Thai EFL Students", *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research,* **4**,72-102, (2008).Retrieved from: http://www.melta.org.my/modules/tinycontent/Dos/PairoteBennui2008.pdf

6. Chan, A. Y. W. "Syntactic Transfer: Evidence from the Interlanguage of Hong Kong Chinese ESL learners", *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(1), 56-74, (2004, Spring), DOI: 10.1111/j.0026-7902.2004.00218.x

7. Rehman, T. *Pakistani English*: *The Linguistic Description of a Non-Native Variety of English.* Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Quaid-e-Azam University, (1990)

8. Talif, R. and Edwin, R.T.M. "Error Analysis of Form Four English Compositions", *The English Teacher,XVIII*. Malaysian English Language Teaching Association (MELTA), (1989, September). Retrieved from: http://www.melta.org.my/index.php/membership/types-of-membership/11-melta-articles/140-error-analysis-of-form-four-english-compositions

9. Raza, M. A. *Cognitive Problems of 11th Grade Students in Learning English Subject-Verb Agreement in the Present Simple and the Present Perfect Tenses* (unpublished MPhil thesis). The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, (2016)

10. Ali F. *Cognitive Problems of O Level Male Students in Learning English Past Tenses*: *A study Conducted in Bahawalpur* (Unpublished M. Phil Thesis). The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (2015)

11. Chishti, B. A. and Hashmi, A. Q. *English Grammar & Composition, 9-10* (Ist. ed.). Lahore: Punjab Textbook Board, (2010)

12. Muir, J. *A Modern Approach to English Grammar*: *An Introduction to Systemic Grammar*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd. (1972)

13. Berry, M. *An Introduction to Systemic Linguistics*:*1 Structures and Systems*. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd. (1975)

14. Berry, M. *Introduction to Systemic Linguistics*: *2 Levels and Links*. London:B. T. Batsford Ltd. (1977)

15. Butt, M. *The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu*. Stanford, California, CA: CSLI Publications, Center for the Study of Language and Information (1995).

16. Palmer, F. *Grammar*. London**:** Penguin Books, (1984)

17. Carnie, A. *Syntax*: *A Generative Introduction* (2nd. ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell, (2006)

18. Michaelis, L. A. "Tense in English" in B. Aarts and A. McMahon (Eds.), *The Handbook of English Linguistics* (pp. 220-243). Oxford: Blackwell, (2006)

19. Davison, A. "Non-nominative subjects in Hindi/ Urdu VP Structure and Case Parameter", In P. Bhaskararao and K.V. Subbarao (Eds.), *Non-nominative Subjects*, *1*, 141-168. Amsterdam**:** Benjamins, (2004). Retrieved from: http://clas.uiowa.edu/linguistics/files/linguistics/nonnom.PDF

20. Rizvi, S. M. J. Indications of Urdu Tetravalent Verbs Having 'Oblique Agents' in the Argument Structure. In M. Butt and H. King (Eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference* (pp. 434-453).Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, (2008).Retrieved from: http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/LFG/13/lfg08.pdf